0. Introduction

One of the most pressing questions faced by linguistic theory in general, and in particular by any account of dialect variation within the Principles and Parameters (or any other) framework, is the division of labour between syntax and morphology. Previous analyses of clitic phenomena, for example, have tended to opt for one extreme position or another: either clitics are essentially syntactic, which inevitably contributes to the proliferation of functional categories, or they are purely morphological, in which case we lose some of the explicative value of X∗ structures. This study follows an approach which attempts to reconcile these two extremes by recognizing that both modules may play a role in different cases of cliticization. Since we believe in working from empirical data rather than from theoretical assumptions about the nature of cliticisation, we will begin with a presentation of a range of Romance facts which involve the behaviour of pronominal clitics in nonstandard varieties of Spanish, as well as Milanese, Portuguese and Franco-ontarian. For each case, it will be shown that a syntactic analysis of the clitic facts in question is either impossible or highly undesirable. In this light, we will conclude by suggesting how morphological templates could better account for the clitic facts in these cases.

I. Enclitic /-n/ in Nonstandard Spanish

According to sources such as Kany (1951) and Rosenblat (1946), a phenomenon known as "enclitic n" is found in several nonstandard varieties of Spanish. The morpheme in question is not really what would normally be called an enclitic, but rather the desinence /-n/ which marks a third-person plural subject. In Standard Spanish, this plural morpheme appears directly after the verb stem, i.e. before any enclitic pronouns, as in (1). In some nonstandard varieties (Nonstandard Spanish I, herein NS I), enclitic /-n/ does not appear where it "should be", but rather after the enclitic pronouns, as in (2)a. In other nonstandard varieties (Nonstandard Spanish II, herein NS II), the /-n/ morpheme can appear a second time following one or more enclitic pronouns, as in (2)b:

(1) Síéntense. Standard Spanish
sit+I+reflexive (plural imperative)
'Sit down.'
(2) a. Siéntesen
    sit+reflexive+N (plural imperative)
    'Sit down.'

b. Siéntensen
    sit+N+reflexive+N (plural imperative)
    'Sit down.'

This phenomenon will obviously only surface with third person plural verb forms which are followed by at least one object (including reflexive) pronoun. Thus, simple verb forms as in (3) will exhibit exactly one /-n/ in all three varieties.

(3) Coman y disfruten.
    eat+N and enjoy+N (plural imperative)
    'Eat and enjoy.'

While object pronouns can follow all nonfinite verbal forms, the enclitic /-n/ is most commonly attested after plural imperative forms as in (1) and (2). As in all varieties of Spanish, the /-n/ in question is morphologically third-person plural (cf. ellas, ellos), but semantically second person plural (ustedes) in these imperatives. The third person plural appears to be the only case which allows for this phenomenon in Spanish; however, very similar behaviour is found in Milanese, an unrelated Romance variety, where it is the first person plural desinence which appears after the clitic, as in (4):

(4) Ripusèseme
    rest+reflexive+IMP ending
    'Let's rest' (Rohlfs 1966: 175)

Neither of the two forms in (2)§ seems to be characteristic of a particular geographical dialect, but rather of several different nonstandard varieties of Spanish. This said, they are both decidedly more common outside of peninsular Spain (Kany 1951:113). Where they do occur, they correspond to an uneducated register, rather than to careful educated speech. The effect of education being increasingly felt on all nonstandard vernaculars, it is not surprising that we find Standard Spanish forms like those in (1) alternating with either of the Nonstandard Spanish forms in (2). Both nonstandard forms are documented with a variety of different object pronouns, as in (5).

(5) Demen un vaso de fresco.
    give+me+N a glass of drink (plural imperative)
    'Give me a glass of drink.'

---

1. We have no data at this point to indicate whether NS I and NS II can coexist in one variety or not, and whether this would have any significance if they did.
Delen las pildoras esta noche.
give+3dative+N the pills this night (plural imperative)
'Give her/him the pills tonight.' (Calcaño 1897:483)

Váyansen, suéltemen.
go+reflexive+N release+me+N (plural imperative)
'Go away, let me go.'

Siéntensen.
sit+N+reflexive+N (plural imperative)
'Sit down' (Navarro Tomás 1948:126)

¡Lárguennon!
release+N+3accusative+N (plural imperative)
'Let him/her go!' (Saubidet 1943:206)

Márchensen de aquí.
leave+N+reflexive+N from here (plural imperative)
'Go away from here.'

Cállesen.
silence+reflexive+N (plural imperative)
'Shut up.'

Apúreensen.
hurry+N+reflexive+N (plural imperative)
'Hurry up.'

Srívansen.
serve+N+reflexive+N (plural imperative)
'Serve yourselves.'

Obviously, syllable structure plays a role here: one does not find (nor would one expect to find) an enclitic /-n/ following a pronoun which ends in a phonological consonant (whether or not this consonant is actually realized phonetically) such as los las, nos, etc. However, this is not simply phonetic or phonological process, as Rosenblat notes:

The forms irsen, etc., and the coexistence of forms such as cdyensen, etc., absolutely eliminate the idea that this is a phonetic process of metathesis. The process is purely analogical. (1946:321, our translation)

Clearly, the infinitive forms in (6) could not be the result of a phonological spreading process, since there is no source for an /n/ in the underlying phonological representation of the infinitive.
(6) Al marcharse ellos...
Upon to-leave+reflexive+N they ...
'When they leave... ' (Menéndez Pidal 1941:253)

Esos chicos van a pegarse.
those children go-3pl. to-hit+reflexive+N
'Those children are going to hit each other.'

Van a comérsel un cordero.
go-3pl. to-eat+reflexive+N a sheep
'They are going to eat a lamb.'

¡A estudiarsel las lecciones!
to-study+reflexive+N the lessons
'Go study the lessons !'

No por quererse mucho han de estar juntos todo el día.
not for to-love+reflexive+N much ought to-be together all day
'It's not because they love each other a lot that they have to stay together all day.'
(Borao 1884:89)

¿Quieren casarse?
want-you-pl. to-wed+reflexive+N
'Do you (pl) want to get married?' (Agüero 1940:49)

Deben tener las niñas encerradas.
ought-3pl. to-keep+reflexive+N the girls locked up
'Girls should be kept behind closed doors.' (Agüero 1940:62)

Kany gives one of the few "explanations" of the enclitic /-n/ which exists in the
dialectological literature. This account, which is really more of an impressionistic description,
is nonetheless interesting because of the "feeling" it ascribes to the verb+clitic sequence:

The sound -n satisfies the feeling of plurality for third person verbs, just as -s satisfies
the same feeling in nouns and pronouns. In siéntense that feeling of plurality is
unfulfilled for many speakers who see in the combined form a single verb concept and
not a combination of verb and pronoun; these speakers expect that feeling of plurality
to be satisfied at the very end of the word, as happens in the majority of imperative
forms: hablen, vengan, coman. Apparently, then, the formation was purely analogical.
The commonest mode, which is also the oldest, is -sen for -se. This was influenced
not only by plural -n, but probably also by the imperfect subjunctive ending -sen
(hablasen, tuviesen). Later the analogy was extended to -me, -le, -lo, etc. Finally, the
inner n, being superfluous, was dropped. (Kany 1951:112, emphasis added)

Obviously, while this description may be superficially plausible, it remains completely
intuitive. Real though it may seem, analogy can at best motivate this phenomenon in the
speaker's mind. A formal linguistic account is necessary to determine whether this phenomenon is syntactic or morphological.

II. Portuguese futures and conditionals

Object clitics in European Portuguese appear as enclitics on their verbs in simple, positive, affirmative sentences. They seem to follow a vestigial version of the Tobler-Mussafia law in that they never appear sentence initially, although they may be proclitics following initial negation, WH-words, and quantified NPs, or in subordinate clauses (Spencer 1991: 363-4). What concerns us here is that, when combined with synthetic future and conditional forms like those in (7), the clitics appear between the verb stem and the tense/aspect desinences, as in (8).

(7) levarei
to-raise+will-I
'I will raise.'

levarias
to-raise+would-you
'You would raise.'

(8) levá-lo-ei
to-raise+it/him+will-I
'I will raise it/him.'

levá-lo-ias
to-raise+it/him+would-you
'You would raise it/him.' (Spencer 1991: 365-6)

This anomalous position is maintained with forms of the auxiliary ter, as in (9), as well as with sequences of more than one clitic, as in (10):

(9) te-lo-ei levado
to-have+it/him+will-I-raise+past participle
'I will have raised it/him.'

te-lo-ias levado
to-have+it/him+would-you-raise+past participle
'You would have raised it/him.'

(10) mostra-no-los-á
to-show+us+them+will-she
'She will show us them.' (Spencer 1991: 365-6)
The position in which these clitics appear was unproblematic in older forms of the language in which the old auxiliary *haver* had not yet been morphologized into tense/aspect desinences (and indeed, we find cases of such "endoclisis" in other medieval Romance vernaculars such as Old Spanish). But since the modern future and conditional forms are clearly synthetic, with the former auxiliary forms reduced and fused onto the verbs as inflectional desinences, it is unclear how this ordering could be achieved syntactically, given the general tendency for tense/aspect markers to appear closer to a verb stem than person/number markers (Bybee: 1985).²

III. Franco-ontarian object clitics

The Franco-ontarian facts that we will be considering come from Nadasdi (in progress) and reveal two aspects of FO pronominal clitics: the first involves cooccurrence restrictions on the number and type of preverbal clitics; the second concerns the syncretism of third person oblique clitics with direct object clitics. The following data come from interviews with ten speakers from Hawkesbury, Cornwall, North Bay and Pembroke and represent a sub-sampling of the Mugeon/Beniak corpus. The speakers studied can be divided into two distinct groups: group A, composed of francophones whose use of French is highly restricted, and group B, who show no restriction in their use of French.

The first characteristic that we note in the speech of group A speakers is the existence of constraints on preverbal clitic strings. Such constraints are not found among group B speakers, who can regularly produce strings similar to those found in Standard French, as in (11) and (12):

(11) ...quand qu’ils recommencent à nous l’expliquer
    when that they restart to us it to-explain
    ’when they start to explain it to us again’

(12) i vont me l’conseiller
    they are going to to-me it advise
    ’They are going to advise it to me.’

As these examples indicate, group B speakers regularly construct strings involving two object clitics. However, nowhere in the corpus have we encountered such strings with group A speakers. Rather, when expressing more than one object with pronominal elements, we find sentences as in (13) and (14), where one of the arguments is realized by a postponed strong form:³

2. In general, Romance clitics are clearly "less bound" to verb stems than either tense/aspect markers or subject desinences. The clitics in (1) to (6) are somewhat atypical inasmuch as they are all enclitics and thus adjacent to other verbal inflexion; in typical tensed contexts, the clitics would exhibit a much greater degree of freedom.

3. Haiman (1990: 355-376) makes a similar distinction between Swiss and Italian varieties of Rhaeto-Romance.
(13) Mon père toujours me dit ça
my father always to-me says that
'My father always says that to me.'

(14) J'en donnerai à lui
I some will-give to him
'I will give some to him.'

Two-clitic strings can only occur among group A speakers when the first is a subject clitic.

The second characteristic that we note in the speech of group A speakers is the elimination of the distinction between dative and accusative clitic forms, as illustrated in the following examples:

(15) Ma soeur ... l'a donné les directions
my sister her-accusative gave the directions
'My sister gave her/him the directions.'

(16) La fille, ils ont essayé de la dire de s'enlever
the girl they tried to her-accusative tell to leave
'The girl, they tried to tell her to leave.'

(17) Nos amis sont tout en anglais, alors on les parle en anglais
our friends are all in English, so we them-accusative speak in English
'Our friends are all English, so we speak to them in English.'

This tendency is widespread among group A speakers, who use syncretized forms in 75% of constructions involving a third person dative clitic. It should be noted that in the case of sentence (16) and (17), the presence of an accusative form cannot be attributed to a change in the sub-categorization frames of dire and parler, since these verbs are still followed by à when an object NP is post-posed.

It is also possible to find examples where an accusative clitic form attaches to the left of a verb which subcategorizes for de, for example:

(18) Être bilingue ... ils l'ont besoin
to be bilingual...they it-accusative need
'To be bilingual... they need it.'

(19) De l'école ... je pourrais le parler le plus mieux en anglais
of the school...I could it-accusative speak the most best in English
About school...I could speak about it best in English.'

These constructions, although much less common than those exhibiting syncretism between dative and accusative clitics, support the claim that group A speakers have a tendency to use accusative clitic forms which correspond to an argument normally governed by a preposition.
For a more adequate explication of why and how all the constructions examined thus far are possible, we will consider two competing formal analyses, one syntactic and the other morphological.

IV. A Syntactic Movement Approach

In this section we will examine how these data would be analysed under a syntactic movement approach (specifically, Kayne 1991), in which clitics are base-generated in argument position and end up adjoined to the verb via movement rules mediated by functional categories. Let us first consider the Spanish data (cf. Bessler et al 1992). As shown in (20), Kayne's (1991) analysis accounts quite straightforwardly for the Standard Spanish example.

(20) \textit{Síéntense} \hspace{1cm} \text{(Standard Spanish)}

The nonstandard examples, however, complicate matters considerably. In order to generate the NS I example it would be necessary to assume three distinct movements, one of which would be a rightward movement, as in (21). The NS II example would require four distinct movements, one of which would have to be rightward, as in (22).
These examples therefore not only complicate the syntax unnecessarily, but also force derivations which violate constraints on head movement (Travis 1984). The Milanese and Portuguese data, in which clitics appear between the verb stem and the verbal desinences, pose similar problems for a syntactic analysis.

Turning now to the Franco-ontarian data, we find that the constraints on clitics among group A speakers present quite different problems for a syntactic analysis. Again following Kayne (1991), it would be necessary to assume that direct object clitics could be generated in indirect object position. As well, given that it would be impossible for both the direct and indirect objects of a given verb to be represented by clitics, (because only one could be adjoined to the verb, leaving the other unadjoined), it would be necessary to stipulate that only one of the verb’s internal arguments could be represented by a clitic. In other words, the generation of a clitic in a given argument position would depend on the presence or absence
of a clitic in another argument position. It is not obvious how either of these constraints could by formalized syntactically.

Haiman and Benincà (1992) discuss a similar case in Friulian. They note that subject clitics are obligatory in Friulian, the only systematic exception being that they can (and, in some cases, must) be omitted in the presence of an object clitic. This "blocking" of an otherwise obligatory clitic by the presence of another clitic poses the same difficulties for a syntactic analysis as the Franco-ontarian examples. It should also be noted that this constraint applies to all subject clitics except second person singular. This property would obviously further compound the difficulties which a syntactic analysis would face, in that it would necessitate a movement rule which was sensitive to the internal features of a morpheme.

All of the examples presented thus far share one common characteristic: they represent language- or dialect-specific properties of clitics. It must be noted, however, that these properties refer only to the realization of the clitics, and not to the argument positions which they represent. It is for this reason that a syntactic analysis, in which the syntactic and morphological properties of a clitic are inseparable, fails to account for the data straightforwardly.

V. Morphological templates

Turning from syntax to morphology of the associative (or nonconcatenative) variety, we find a mechanism already available which, although proposed for very different purposes, can explain the type of variation we have seen here. We are referring, of course, to the formal devices that have been called "templates". Since this term has been applied fairly loosely to a range of formalisms corresponding to quite different grammatical models, it may be useful to begin by specifying what we do not mean by "templates".

Firstly, and obviously, we are decidedly not referring to "templates" in the sense in which the term is used by the American Structuralists. In that framework (where descriptive method is linguistic theory), templates are a purely descriptive device which allowed for the economical statement of the relative order in which morphemes can be concatenated (cf. Grimes 1967, among others). Note that this approach also assumes a direct correlation between the meanings and the phonological forms of a morpheme, tempered by a certain amount of allomorphy. While logically independent, these two assumptions about the nature of morphology went together under such names as "decade notation" and "positional analysis" to provide a framework adequate for the description of many of the languages frequently examined by this school, of the type shown by the examples in (23):

(23) kir-il-ma-di-lar-mi
    break+passive+negative+past+3person plural active+interrogative
    'Were they not broken?' (Gleason 1955:113-4)

    Hegh-qang-moH-lu'-pu'
    3person+die+volitional+causative+indefinite+perfective
    'It made him/her willing to die.' (Okrand 1992:45)
It is, however, important to retain two things from the American Structuralist conception of templates: the notion of paradigmaticity, and the possibility of slots at a given point in a string remaining unfilled (of, alternatively, being "filled" with zero morphs). The real problem with the American Structuralist approach is the identification of template slots with the actual phonological shapes of the morphemes that end up occupying them. In this sense, we are assuming a framework which is more like that of the European Structuralist tradition, as exemplified by Bierwisch (1967), in which "morphemes" are seen as abstract (bundles of) features rather than a particular phonological shape. This assumption is of course shared by most generative work in morphosyntax, and is logically independent of templates or any other linearization formalism.

It should also be stressed that, like Simpson & Withgott we are not advocating the use of templates which would act as "filters" applying to S-structure strings:

An important type of word-formation creates a linear structure which may be thought of as a series of positions, or slots, filled by grammatically specified morpheme sets. Morphemes concatenated in this way refer to discrete arguments and sentence operators. We call such word-formation processes "template morphology" [...]. However, we do not advocate the often concomitant position that templates act as "surface filters" on the syntactic string. Indeed, our view of word-formation carries with it a sharp distinction between facts concerning morphology and those concerning syntactic categories. This is in keeping with the view that the nonlexical component of a language should be maximally general. (Simpson & Withgott 1986:149-50).

Templates are of course much better known as a mechanism in nonlinear phonology, and especially, morphophonology, a fact which allows us to come at these problems from a somewhat different perspective. Harris (1980, 1986) shows that nonconcatenative or associative morphophonology can resolve a long-standing problem concerning the plural forms of Spanish nouns by using morphological templates. Concretely, he proposes that the apparent allomorphy of plural markers in words like libro+s, lapic+es and dosis+θ can in fact be explained by the interaction of the morphemic template for nominal plurals [[ ]VC], and the single plural morpheme -/sl/. Then normal association conventions apply as in (24), producing the correct surface forms.

(24) \( \text{libr} \ o + s \ => \ \text{libr} \ o \ s \ \text{tapiz} + s \ => \ \text{tapic e s} \)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
[ [ ] \text{V C} ] & [ [ ] \text{V C} ] & [ [ ] \text{V C} ] & [ [ ] \text{V C} ] \\
\end{array}
\]

\( \text{dosis} + s \ => \ \text{dos i s} \)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
[ [ ] \text{V C} ] & [ [ ] \text{V C} ] \\
\end{array}
\]

What is particularly interesting for our purposes is that Harris also extends this same formalism to account for certain Nonstandard Spanish plural forms, such as cañes for standard cafés (the so-called "double plurals"), or mujeres for standard mujeres (so-called "-se plurals"). Rather than a difference in morphemes, Harris shows that the real interdialectal variation here can be reduced to the different shapes of templates which are available in the
nonstandard varieties, as in (25), with the same rules and processes applying to the same basic morphemes, as in (26):

\[(25) \quad \begin{array}{c}
  [[ \ ] \ C \ V \ C] \quad \text{(template for "double plurals")}
  \\
  [[ \ ] \ V \ C \ V] \quad \text{(template for -se plurals)}
\end{array}\]

\[
(26) \quad \begin{array}{c}
  \text{cated } +s \Rightarrow \text{cated } s \Rightarrow \text{cated } s \; s \\
  / \backslash
  \begin{array}{c}
    [[ \ ] \ C \ V \ C] \\
    [[ \ ] \ C \ V \ C] \\
    [[ \ ] \ C \ V \ C]
  \end{array}
  \quad \begin{array}{c}
    \text{mujer } +s \Rightarrow \text{mujer } +s \Rightarrow \text{mujer } e \; s \; e \\
  \end{array}
  \begin{array}{c}
    [[ \ ] \ V \ C \ V] \\
    [[ \ ] \ V \ C \ V] \\
    [[ \ ] \ V \ C \ V]
  \end{array}
\end{array}\]

We are proposing an extension of this formalism, in which the "slots" in the templates are not specified C or V, but rather for abstract morphemes such as [desinence] or [clitic], with further morphosyntactic (or agreement?) features as necessary. Thus the template for the NS I and NS II forms would look something like (27) and (28), respectively:

\[(27) \quad [[\text{imperative verb}] \quad (\text{CL})_{0}^{3} \; \text{desinence}(3\text{pl})]\]

\[(28) \quad [[\text{imperative verb}] \quad \text{desinence} \quad (\text{CL})_{0}^{3} \; \text{desinence}(3\text{pl})]\]

The Standard Spanish imperative forms can of course be expressed by a template as well, but as already discussed, it can be accounted for equally well in syntax. The notation given in (27) and (28) assumes that the (CL) slot is unitary; in fact, we have not (as yet) found cases of the N desinence breaking up a string of clitics.\(^4\) This notation also stipulates (through the use of subscript 0 and superscript 3) that strings of clitics will not exceed three, which is true in the data we have found thus far (where no clitic occurs, the two desinences of course merge, and surface as one). One of the advantages of this notation is that other length constraints on clitic strings can easily be stated, and this is in fact a dimension along which otherwise closely-related Romance dialects often vary considerably (cf. Perlmuter, among others). Finally, this notation allows a slot to be specified, where necessary, for particular morphosyntactic features, thus allowing for idiosyncratic constraints of a type which is virtually untestable in purely syntactic terms. Given this, one can easily construct templates to account for the data from Milanese, Portuguese and Franco-ontarian which have been shown to be problematic for a syntactic analysis.

---

4. Sadock (1991) cites a form *tirenmelen*, where the *-a* desinence appears three times, and seems to break up the underlying clitic string *-mel-o*. The existence of such data would require us to postulate a template with a form something like [imperative verb] desinence (CL) desinence (CL) desinence. Note that under our account, where templates are essentially lexical, such variation is predicted; a syntactic analysis of such a form would require yet another movement back to AGR cf. (22). Note also that Sadock's suggestion, whereby these three instances of *-a* are somehow the result of spreading, cannot account for the infinitive forms in (6).
Part of the attraction of the template notation is that it allows fairly naturally for morpheme metathesis, a diachronic process analogous to phonological metathesis but with no real syntactic counterpart. It is an intractable fact about Romance clitics that their orderings are subject to this kind of change (Santangelo & Vennemann 1976), something which syntax can deal with only awkwardly if at all, but template morphology allows for quite naturally:

While through historical change, certain elements in layered, concatenative morphology may reorder with respect to other elements, what is clearly going on here [Romance nonstandard clitic orderings] is that classes of morphemes are reordering. This type of reordering of position classes suggests a restructuring of a flat configured morphological template. In concatenative, layered morphology, there is no functional reason for the metathesis of morphemes, since there are no "slots" or fixed positions. (Simpson & Withgott 1986:164).

Other attractive characteristics of templates, for our purposes, include the ability to state horizontal co-occurrence restrictions, and their listed or paradigmatic nature. Because they are listed items, we should not be surprised to find that templates vary rather like lexical items, and may even tolerate more than one variant in a given variety. Templates are paradigmatic in that they draw from paradigms of, for example, pronouns, in order to interpret certain morphosyntactic features. This means that templates are in effect semantically null lexical items which allow other closed-class items to arrange themselves in well-formed strings, as proposed by Simpson and Withgott:

The template is a conventional signifier, which by itself, has no meaning. On this view of morpheme arrangement, it is a conventional structure imposed on minimal semantic units in order to convey further information. Jakobson (1981:63), drawing on Thomas Aquinas, felicitously contrasts morphemes and phonemes, the latter taken as conventional signs which serve to signify, "but which, at the same time, taken in themselves signify nothing." Templates with their position classes are such significantia artificialiter, members of a species whose meaning is conveyed with the grammatical device of relative, oppositive, and potentially empty slots. (Simpson & Withgott 1986:173)

All this suggests that the place of templates in the grammar is in a Morphological Interface (either pre- or post-syntactic) where morphosyntactic features are read onto their phonological form, and perhaps "adjusted" as necessary. In this sense, our proposal is rather similar to Bonet's 1991 "late linearization" model, although we have our differences with certain details of her proposal. Of course, we have yet to truly explain these idiosyncrasies,

---

5. It is worth noting that there is one interesting attempt (Rosenblat 1946:321) to divide the various Nonstandard Spanish varieties on the basis of which object pronouns can occur with an enclitic l-a: se alone, just me, te and se, or me, te, se and the third person forms lote/a as well.

6. With respect to nontransparent surface strings of clitics: the claim (Bonet 1991:11) that the "phonological output of the rule always coincides with an independently existing clitic" is not borne out by the Romance facts. In Old Spanish, for example, underlying le-lo strings surface as gelo, where the form ge- does not exist independently.
since we do not have a theory which constrains the possible shapes a template can take; we have, however, taken a step in the right direction by placing these idiosyncrasies where they belong, i.e. in morphology rather than in syntax.
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