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1. Data

Basic pattern of subject clitic doubling:

(1) \{
complementizer \}
subject₂ subject₃ ...
finite verb

clitic *strong pronoun
*coordination +DP

strong pronoun
(2) da se zaai he gisteren niet geweest is.
that she daa she saan here yesterday not been is
'that she wasn’t here yesterday'

Jeroen van Craenenbroeck & Marjo van Koppen

2. Comparison between clitic doubling and finite verb agreement

coordination (I): pronoun & pronoun
(3) * da ze [aai en zaai] da suimen wel kann oplossen.
that they daa he saan and she saan that together PRET can out.come
INTENDED: 'that he and she can solve that together.'

coordination (II): DP & pronoun
that they daa the mayor and he that together will do
INTENDED: 'that the mayor and he will do that together.'

coordination (III): pronoun & DP
that they daa the mayor and the priest that together will do
INTENDED: 'that he and the mayor will do that together.'

coordination (IV): DP & DP
that they daa the mayor and the priest that together will do
INTENDED: 'that the mayor and the priest will do that together.'

DP
(7) * da ze de kinner jn da suimen gonj duan.
that they daa the children that together will do
INTENDED: 'that the children will do that together.'

Anti-intervention with object clitics:

(8) \{
complementizer \}
subject₁ object subject₂ ...
finite verb

clitic clitic *strong pronoun
*coordination with a pronominal conjunct
*coordination w/o a pronominal conjunct +DP

strong pronoun
(9) da se t zaai nie geduun eit.
that she daa it saan she saan not done has
'that she hasn’t done it.'

coordination (I): pronoun & pronoun
(10) * da ze t [aai en zaai] suimen wel kann oplossen.
that they daa it saan he saan and she saan together PRET can out.come
'that he and she can solve it together.'

coordination (II): DP & pronoun
(11) * da ze t [den burremiester en aai] suimen gonj duan.
that they daa it daa the mayor and he together will do
'that the mayor and he will do it together.'
coordinatenon-pro-nominal  

15) Type of subject DP  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coordination with a pronominal conjunct</th>
<th>no object clitic</th>
<th>object clitic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coordination with a pronominal conjunct</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination with no pronominal conjunct</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-pronominal DP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Theoretical Background: Two Types of Doubling

2.1 A classification of dialect Dutch subject pronouns

Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002): a three-way split in the typology of pronouns:

16) a. pro-DPs  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pro-DPs</th>
<th>pro-ϕPs</th>
<th>pro-NPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ϕP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>ϕ</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ϕ NP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests to determine the categorial status of a pronoun:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>test</th>
<th>pro-DP</th>
<th>pro-ϕP</th>
<th>pro-NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Condition C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bound variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a simple subject</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b sloppy identity under ellipsis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 argument</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen (2008): based on these (and similar) tests it can be shown that while subject clitics in Dutch dialects are ϕPs, strong and clitic doubled pronouns are DPs:

17) subject  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clitic</th>
<th>ϕP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clitic doubled</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: sloppy identity under ellipsis

18) Jef paust dat n gui winnen, en Piet oek.  

| a thinks that he goes win, and Piet also |
| = λ x [x thinks that Jef win] & λ y [y thinks that Jef win] ✓ [strict] |
| = λ x [x thinks that x win] & λ y [y thinks that y win] ✓ [sloppy] |

19) Marie paust da zaai gui winnen, en Julia oek.  

| a thinks that she goes win, and Julia also |
| = λ x [x thinks that Mary win] & λ y [y thinks that Mary win] ✓ [strict] |
| = λ x [x thinks that x win] & λ y [y thinks that y win] ✓ [sloppy] |

20) Marie paust da zaai gui winnen, en Julia oek.  

| a thinks that she goes win, and Julia also |
| = λ x [x thinks that Mary win] & λ y [y thinks that Mary win] ✓ [strict] |
| = λ x [x thinks that x win] & λ y [y thinks that y win] ✓ [sloppy] |

2.2 Doubling as movement: the big-DP analysis

Note: if subject clitic ≡ ϕP and strong pronoun ≡ DP, then a subject clitic is a structural subset of a strong pronoun

2.3 Doubling as agreement: doubling with coordinated subjects

problem: the big DP-analysis of clitic doubling cannot account for doubling of coordinations:

(24) da ze t [den burremiester en aai] suimen gonj daun. that they_{clit} know the mayor and he together will do ‘that the mayor and he will do it together.’

→ given that the NP-part of den burremiester en aai ‘the mayor and he’ contains a coordination with lexical material, it cannot be spelled out as the clitic ze ‘she’

proposal: this type of doubling is the result of an Agree-relation between (unvalued features of) a C-head and the subject

(25) CP

C

C' [TP

[DP T

A

den burremiester en aai

23) structure of a clitic doubled subject (STEP TWO: DOUBLE SPELL-OUT)

2.3.1 Two properties of object clitics

(1) object clitics are disallowed in non-finite contexts

subject infinitives

(29) <<∗∗’em’/em’>> gesten emmen is ni genoeg. seen have-PL is not enough ‘Having seen him is not enough.’

root infinitives

(30) En gou <<∗∗’em’/em’>> helpen zekeř? and you <<∗∗’em’/em’>> help-INF surely ‘And you’re gonna help him, I suppose?’

ECM-clauses

(31) ‘K em goed da ge <<∗∗’em’/em’>> gou <<∗∗’em’/em’ >> I have heard that-you {him_{2inf} / him_{2inf}} you {him_{2inf} / him_{2inf}} Marie <<∗∗’em’/em’ >> uin de kinjern eį zien introduceem. Marie {him_{2inf} / him_{2inf}} to the children have see introduce ‘I have heard that you saw Marie introduce him to the children.’
infinitival clauses with a complementizer
(32) *Z’ ei geprobeerd om <“n’ em > t’ elpen.
  she has tried to <himels / himelk> to help
  ‘She has tried to help him.’

implementation: object clitics carry an unvalued [Fin]-feature that needs to be valued by
(marching features on) a finite Fin-head.

(ii) object clitics move in narrow syntax to a position in the left periphery

→ object clitics surface in a very specific left-peripheral position (Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2002; Van Craenenbroeck & Haegeman 2007).

(33) da ge (n) gou (*n) gezien et.
  that youdik, himdik youseeg himdik, seen have
  ‘that you have seen him.’

→ object clitics feed Condition C (Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2002; Van Craenenbroeck & Haegeman 2007):

(34) a. dan t.C, den aigenere van ‘t lemmeken, zelf ei muun doewtuun.
  that it.C, the owner of the lamb self has have.to kill
  ‘that the owner of the lamb has had to kill it (not the lamb) himself.’

b. da den aigenere van ‘t lemmeken, et.C zelf ei muun doewtuun.
  that the owner of the lamb it.C, self has have.to kill
  ‘that the owner of the lamb has had to kill it (not the lamb) himself.’

implementation: object clitics move in narrow syntax to a position in the left periphery, i.e. they target the [Fin]-feature on Finº.

3.1.2 No unvalued features on phase heads

Richards (2007): Feature Inheritance is the optimal way of reconciling two at first sight conflicting premises:

Premise 1 Value and Transfer of aF must happen together.
Premise 2 The edge and non-edge (complement) of a phase are transferred separately.

Conclusion aF must spread from edge to non-edge (i.e. from C to T, i.e. to V, etc.).

in other words:
• Feature Inheritance is motivated by the fact that the aF of a phase head must be valued and transferred at the same time.
• This requirement is met when the non-phase head of its complement inherits its aF.

consequence: a head that acquires aF in the course of the derivation cannot be (or is no longer) a phase head.

3.1.3 Movement of the object clitic voids the phasehood of Fin

conclusion from section 3.1.1: object clitics have a [Fin]-feature and move to Finº in narrow syntax.

conclusion from section 3.1.2: heads that carry unvalued features during the derivation are not phase heads.

consequence: object clitic movement to Finº voids the phasehood of FinP (on FinP as a phase, see Branigan 2005, López 2009). In other words, in clauses that contain an object clitic, Finº ceases to be a phase.

3.2 Doubling via agreement: anti-intervention

(35) da ze t [den burremieter en aai] suimen gonj duan.
  that theydik, itaai the mayor and he together will do
  ‘that the mayor and he will do it together.’

(36) NPhP
  spelled out as  
  den burremieter en aai

main ingredients of the analysis:
- the unvalued features of the higher phase head Forceº are inherited by a lower non-phase head NPhº
- movement of the object clitic to Finº voids the phasehood of FinP
- because Finº is no longer a phase, NPhº can probe the subject in specTP and value its phi-
  and [C-DJ] features
- this valued feature bundle is spelled out as the subject clitic ze ‘they’

  that theydik the mayor and he that together will do
  INTENDED: ‘that the mayor and he will do that together.’
main ingredients of the analysis:
- the unvalued features of (the higher phase head) Forceº are inherited by a lower non-phase head NPhº
- there is no object clitic movement to Finº, so FinP remains a phase boundary
- because FinP is a phase, NPhº cannot probe the subject in specTP (PIC-violation)
- lack of Agree does not lead to a crashing derivation (Preminger 2011), but to a default (in this case: null) spell-out of the Probe

3.3 Doubling via movement: no anti-intervention

3.3.1 The basic cases

(39) da se t zaai nie geduin eit.
that she didn't do has
'that she hasn't done it'

(40) main ingredients of the analysis:
- the unvalued features of (the higher phase head) Forceº are inherited by a lower non-phase head NPhº
- movement of the object clitic to Finº voids the phasehood of FinP
- because FinP is no longer a phase, the subject clitic can move to specNPhP without any intermediate stopovers

(41) da se zaai ie gisteren niet geweest is.
that she wasn't here yesterday not been is
'that she wasn't here yesterday'

3.3.2 First conjunct clitic doubling

Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen (2008): there is a second case of doubling via movement, i.e. first conjunct clitic doubling

(43) Ik verij da se t [zaailn en gaailn] suimen moeij oplossen.
I find that they and you together must solve
'I think they and you should solve it together.'
prediction: given that first conjunct clitic doubling involves movement, it should not be sensitive to the phasal status of FinP, i.e. there should be no anti-intervention from object clitics:

(44) Ik venj da se [zaailn en gaailn] da suimen moetj oplossen. I find that they and you that together must solve ‘I think they and you should solve that together.’

4 Comp-agreement vs. clitic doubling

4.1 No anti-intervention with comp-agreement

Comp-agreement is not sensitive to intervention of object clitics:

(45) a. Ik vin də-n ie en zie da saom moen uplosn. I think that he and she that together must solve ‘I think that he and she should solve that together.’

b. Ik vin da-n t ie en zie saom moen uplosn. I think that it he and she together must solve ‘I think that he and her should solve that together.’

The Compagr Probe has different features than Force°: it has phi-features but no [C-D]-feature

(46) k peinzen da-n Pol en Valère Marie kenn-en. I think that Pol and Valère Marie know-en. ‘I think that Pol and Valère know Marie.’

Proposal: the Compagr Probe is Fin°.

4.2 Analysis

(47) Ik vin da-n ie en zie da saom moen uplosn. I think that he and she that together must solve ‘I think that he and she should solve that together.’

Object movement does not have an effect on the Compagr-Probe (Fin°)

(49) Ik vin da-n t ie en zie saom moen uplosn I think that he and she together must solve ‘I think that he and her should solve that together.’

5 Conclusion

5.1 Summary

Data

(51) Type of subject DP                      no object clitic          object clitic
    pronoun                                      ✓                       ✓
    coordination with a pronominal conjunct     *                       *
    coordination with no pronominal conjunct    *                       *
    non-pronominal DP                           *                       *

Analysis

- Two types of subject doubling:
  - Doubling via movement: clitic is part of pronominal subject DP (Big DP) and moves into the CP-domain
  - Doubling via Agree: clitic spells out phi-features of Force, Force agrees with subject

- Object clitic intervention:
  - The CP-domain has two phi-feature probes: Force° and Fin°.
  - Fin° is phase and intervenes between Force° and the subject
  - Object clitic moves to Fin° and voids the phasehood of Fin°
  - Force° can probe the subject
(52) **Type of doubling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of subject DP</th>
<th>FinP is a phase (no object clitic)</th>
<th>FinP is not a phase (object clitic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>Doubling via movement</td>
<td>Doubling via movement or Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination pronominal conjunct</td>
<td>Doubling via movement</td>
<td>Doubling via movement or Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Doubling via Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination with no pronominal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-pronominal DP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 **Question for further research**

1. Not all dialects have an ameliorating effect of object clitic intervention:

   (53) * Ik peis dame ‘t zii en eik wel samen aan kunn.
   
   "I think that we it they and I part together solve" [Nieuwkerken/Wen Dijkstra]

   - Possible explanations for dialects of this type:
     - subject clitics do not move in syntax but at PF (Van Cr naenbroeck & Hageman 2007:173, note 8)
     - object clitics are not sensitive to finiteness and hence have no [Fin]-feature

2. How does our view on phases relate to existing accounts?

   Bošković (to appear): “X, which works as a phase, ceases to work as a phase when another phrase Y is added on top of X in the extended projection of the same lexical category (with X being the highest projection in this domain when Y is absent).”

   Den Dikken (2007:1, example (3)): “Phase Extension: syntactic movement of the head H of a phase α up to the head X of the node β dominating α extends the phase up from α to β; α loses its phasehood in the process, and any constituent on the edge of α ends up in the domain of the derived phase β as a result of Phase Extension.”
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