1 Introduction

- CENTRAL DATA: *there*-expletives in a Brabant dialect of Dutch
- **EMPIRICAL RESULTS:**
  - *there*-expletives form an integral part of the subject pronominal system in showing degrees of morphosyntactic deficiency and in being able to undergo doubling and tripling
  - even the proximate locative pronoun *here* can display expletive-like behavior
- **THEORETICAL APPROACH:** expletives involve the raising of genuine locative elements into the subject position (cf. Klockmann et al. 2015).

2 Background: the pronominal system of Wambeek Dutch

2.1 Three degrees of deficiency

Cardinaletti and Starke (1999): a tripartition of increasingly structurally complex pronominal forms:

![Diagram showing the tripartition of pronominal forms: strong, deficient, weak, and clitic]

→ the dialect of Wambeek provides evidence for this tripartition in its pronominal system (van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen 2000):

(2) *me / we / waaile*

**test #1:** strong pronouns can be clefted, while deficient ones (= clitics and weak pronouns) cannot

(3) *T zen { * me / * we / waaile } da da muten duun.*

It are we we we that that must do

‘It’s we who have to do that.’
**test #2:** strong and weak pronouns can occur in V2-position, but clitics cannot

(4)  
{ * Me / We / Waaile } komme mergen.  
we we we come tomorrow  
‘We’re coming tomorrow.’

**complication:** the situation in (2), i.e. a three-way morphological distinction is rare; much more commonly, there is a two-way split:

(5)  
ze / zaai  
she she  
‘she’  
→ three possible scenario’s:

(6)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clitic</th>
<th>weak</th>
<th>strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>option #1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option #2:</td>
<td>ze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option #3:</td>
<td>ze</td>
<td>ze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ the interaction between such forms and the system of pronominal doubling suggests that option #3 is the correct one

2.2 Two types of doubling

**note:** there are (at least) two types of pronominal doubling in Dutch dialects (Haegeman 1991, 1992, van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen 2002, 2008, de Vogelaer 2005, de Vogelaer and Devos 2008)

**type #1:** pronoun doubling

(7)  
We emme waaile ie niks te ziekem.  
we\_weak have we\_strong here nothing to seek  
‘We have no business being here.’

**properties:**

1. the second subject element is always a strong pronoun; the first can be a weak pronoun \(7\), a strong pronoun \(8\), a full DP \(9\), or a proper name \(10\), but not a clitic \(11\)

(8)  
Waaile emme waaile ie niks te zien.  
we\_strong have we\_strong here nothing to seek  
‘We have no business being here.’

(9)  
Dei vrau ei zaai ie niks te zien.  
that woman has she\_strong here nothing to seek  
‘That woman has no business being here.’

(10)  
Marie ei zaai ie niks te zien.  
Marie has she\_strong here nothing to seek  
‘Marie has no business being here.’

(11)  
* Me emme waaile ie niks te zien.  
we\_clitic have we\_strong here nothing to seek  
INTENDED: ‘We have no business being here.’

**note:** the example in (12) suggests that the deficient pronoun in (5) can at least be a weak pronoun (i.e. option #2 is out):

(12)  
Ze ei zaai ie niks te zien.  
she\_weak has she\_strong here nothing to seek  
‘She has no business being here.’

2. pronoun doubling is restricted to subject-initial main clauses; it doesn’t occur in embedded clauses (13) or in inverted main clauses (14)

(13)  
*omda waaile waaile ie niks te zien emmen.  
because we\_strong we\_strong here nothing to seek have  
INTENDED: ‘because we have no business being here.’

(14)  
*Gisteren ome waaile waaile ie niks te zien.  
yesterday had we\_strong we\_strong here nothing to seek  
INTENDED: ‘We had no business being here yesterday.’
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van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen (2002): pronoun doubling is a case of copy spell-out: the subject moves from the canonical subject position (say, specTP) into the left periphery and the lower copy of this movement chain is spelled out as a strong pronoun.

(15)

\[ CP \]
\[ waai\]
\[ C_1 \]
\[ C \]
\[ TP \]
\[ emme \]
\[ waai \]
\[ T_1 \]
\[ T \]
\[ ie niks te zieken \]

Type #2: clitic doubling

(16) omdat \( n \) aai ma guid elpen.

‘because he\textsubscript{clitic} he\textsubscript{strong} me help

\ ‘because he’s going to help me.’

Properties:

1. the second subject element is always a strong pronoun, the first is always a clitic

(17) *omdat aai aai ma guid elpen.

‘because he\textsubscript{strong} he\textsubscript{strong} me help

\ INTENDED: ‘because he’s going to help me.’

(18) omdat we waaile em guin elpen.

‘because we\textsubscript{weak} we\textsubscript{strong} him goes help

\ INTENDED: ‘because we’re going to help him.’

Note: the example in (19) suggests that the deficient pronoun in (15) can also be a clitic (i.e. option #1 is out, and only option #3 remains):

(19) omda \( ze \) zaai ma guid elpen.

\because he\textsubscript{clitic} she\textsubscript{strong} me help

\ ‘because she’s going to help me.’

2. clitic doubling only occurs in embedded clauses and inverted main clauses; it is disallowed in subject-initial main clauses.

(20) Guit \( n \) aai ma elpen?

\because he\textsubscript{clitic} he\textsubscript{strong} me help

\ ‘Is he going to help me?’

(21) *N \( guid \) aai ma elpen.

he\textsubscript{clitic} goes he\textsubscript{strong} me help

\ INTENDED: ‘He’s going to help me.’

Analysis: van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen (2008): clitic doubling involves a so-called big DP (see also Uriagereka (1999), Laenzlinger (1998), Grohmann (2000), Belletti (2003), Kayne (2005), Poletto (2008)), whereby a clitic doubled subject like \( ze zaai \) in (19) starts life as a single DP, and the occurrence of the clitic is due to subextraction of part of that DP. More specifically (and cf. Déchaine and Wiltschko (2002)):

(22) strong subject pronoun

(23) subject clitic

\[ DP \]
\[ \phi P \]
\[ D \]
\[ \phi \]
\[ NP \]
\[ \phi \]
\[ N \]
(24) **clitic doubled subject pronoun**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ZE} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D} \\
\phi \text{P} \\
\phi \text{NP} \\
\text{N}
\end{array}
\]

**note:** nothing precludes topic doubling and clitic doubling from co-occurring in one and the same example ⇒ **tripling**

(25) *We emme me waaile ie niks te zieken.*

we\text{weak} have we\text{clitic} we\text{strong} here nothing to seek

‘We have no business being here.’

2.3 **Only subjects double**

⇒ both clitic doubling and pronoun doubling (and the combination of the two, i.e. tripling) only ever apply to subjects:

• objects cannot be pronoun doubled:

(26) *Em em ik em gezien.*

him\text{strong} have I him\text{strong} seen

INTENDED: ‘I saw him yesterday.’

• objects cannot be clitic doubled:

(27) *da kn gisteren em wou elpen.*

that I him\text{clitic} yesterday him\text{strong} wanted help

INTENDED: ‘that I wanted to help him yesterday.’

• locative adverbs (whether as arguments (28) or as adjuncts (29)) cannot be pronoun doubled:

(28) *Dui em ek dui gewoentj*.  

there have I there lived  

INTENDED: ‘I used to live there.’

(29) *Dui ei Jef Marie dui gezien.*  

there has Jef Marie there seen  

INTENDED: ‘Jef saw Marie there.’

**aside:** do locative clitics exist? van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen (2007): the only elements that can intervene between the two parts of a clitic doubled subject are other (object) clitics:

(30) *Dui em / *em zaai gezien eit.*

that she\text{clitic} him\text{DO.clitic} him\text{DO.weak} she\text{strong} seen has  

‘that she saw him.’

(31) *Dui zaai / *em gezien eit.*

that she\text{clitic} she\text{strong} him\text{DO.clitic} him\text{DO.weak} seen has  

‘that she saw him.’

⇒ the reduced form of the locative pronoun, i.e. er can also occur in this position, suggesting that this form is in fact a clitic:

(32) *da ze er zaai gewoendj eit.*

that she\text{clitic} there she\text{strong} lived has  

‘that she has lived there.’

• locative adverbs (whether as arguments (33) or as adjuncts (34)) cannot be clitic doubled:

(33) *da ze er zaai dui gewoendj eit.*

that she\text{clitic} there she\text{strong} there lived has  

INTENDED: ‘that she has lived there.’
The ability to undergo pronominal doubling is a clear test for subjecthood in this dialect.

3 The new data: expletives as part of the pronominal system

3.1 Strong vs. deficient expletives

\[\text{Wambeek Dutch uses the weak locative form } \mathit{er} \text{ ‘there’ (sometimes realized as } \mathit{t’r} \text{ or } \mathit{d’r}, \text{ always glossed as } \mathit{Ċė} \text{) as its expletive pronoun.}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(35) } & \quad \mathit{d’r} \text{ } \mathit{stui} \text{ } \mathit{ne\ vantj\ inn} \text{ } \text{of.} \\
& \quad \mathit{er}\text{ stands a } \mathit{man} \text{ in the garden} \\
& \quad \text{‘There’s a man in the garden.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(36) } & \quad \mathit{Stuit} \quad \mathit{t’r}\ne\mathit{vantj\ inn} \quad \text{of?} \\
& \quad \text{stands } \mathit{ER} \text{ a } \mathit{man} \text{ in the garden} \\
& \quad \text{‘Is there a man in the garden?’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(37) } & \quad \mathit{da} \quad \mathit{t’r}\ne\mathit{vantj\ inn} \quad \text{of stuit.} \\
& \quad \text{that } \mathit{ER} \text{ a } \mathit{man} \text{ in the garden stands} \\
& \quad \text{‘that there is a man in the garden.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{however} \quad \text{the strong form of the locative pronoun, } \mathit{dui} \text{ ‘there’ can also be used as an expletive:} \\
\text{(38) } & \quad \mathit{Dui} \quad \mathit{stui} \quad \mathit{ne\ vantj\ inn} \quad \text{of.} \\
& \quad \text{there stands a } \mathit{man} \text{ in the garden} \\
& \quad \text{‘There’s a man in the garden.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{support for the expletive analysis:} \\
& \quad \text{• this } \mathit{dui} \text{ is compatible with conflicting locative expressions:}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(39) } & \quad \mathit{Dui} \quad \mathit{stuid} \quad \mathit{ie\genner} \quad \mathit{ne\ vantj\ inn} \quad \text{of.} \\
& \quad \text{there stands here/over a } \mathit{man} \text{ in the garden} \\
& \quad \text{‘There’s a man here/over there in the garden.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{• this } \mathit{dui} \text{ imposes a definiteness restriction on the subject:} \\
\text{(40) } & \quad \#\mathit{Dui} \quad \mathit{stui} \quad \mathit{Jef\ inn} \quad \text{of.} \\
& \quad \text{there stands Jef in the garden}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{• this } \mathit{dui} \text{ can occur in purely existential sentences:} \\
\text{(41) } & \quad \mathit{Dui} \quad \mathit{zen\ mo\ vier\ priemgetalle\ klanjer\ as\ tien.} \\
& \quad \text{there are only four prime numbers smaller than ten} \\
& \quad \text{‘There are only four prime numbers smaller than ten.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Wambeek Dutch has both a strong and a deficient expletive pronoun, completely parallel to its pronominal subject system} \\
\text{moreover the choice between the strong and the deficient expletive parallels that between a strong and a deficient subject pronoun: the former imposes emphasis or focus:}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(42) } & \quad \mathit{Kom}\ \mathit{ze}\ \mathit{mergen?} \\
& \quad \text{comes } \mathit{she}\text{deficient tomorrow} \\
& \quad \text{‘Is she coming tomorrow?’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(43) } & \quad \mathit{Kom}\ \mathit{zaai\ mergen?} \\
& \quad \text{comes } \mathit{she}\text{strong tomorrow} \\
& \quad \text{‘IS SHE coming tomorrow?’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(44) } & \quad \mathit{Zen}\ \mathit{er}\ \mathit{mo\ vier\ priemgetalle}\ \mathit{klanjer\ as\ tien?} \\
& \quad \text{are } \mathit{ER} \text{ only four prime numbers smaller than ten} \\
& \quad \text{‘Are there only four prime numbers smaller than ten?’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(45) } & \quad \mathit{Zen}\ \mathit{dui}\ \mathit{mo\ vier\ priemgetalle}\ \mathit{klanjer\ as\ tien?} \\
& \quad \text{are } \mathit{there only four prime numbers smaller than ten} \\
& \quad \text{‘Are you sure that there only four prime numbers smaller than ten?’}
\end{align*}\]
3.2 Subject doubling of expletives

$\rightarrow$ dui can appear twice in the same clause $\rightarrow$ in the non-locative reading an example like (46) looks like pronoun doubling of an expletive:

(46) $\text{Dui eit dui niemand me Jef geklapt.}$

There has there no-one with Jef talked

'No-one spoke with Jef (there).'

support for an analysis in terms of pronoun doubling:

• doubled dui can be combined with conflicting locative expressions:

(47) $\text{Dui leit dui ie e vliegsk en men and.}$

There lies there here a fly. $\text{dim}$ on my hand

'There's a fly here on my hand.'

• in embedded clauses and inverted main clauses (= contexts disallowing pronoun doubling, cf. [13] and [14]) dui-doubling obligatorily has a locative reading:

(48) $\text{omda dui dui niemand me Jef geklapt eit.}$

Because there there no-one with Jef talked has

'because no-one spoke with Jef *(there).'

(49) $\text{Eit dui dui niemand me Jef geklapt?}$

Has there there no-one with Jef talked

'Did no-one speak with Jef *(there)?'

• the first dui can be replaced by the deficient expletive pronoun (compare with (51)):

(50) $\text{D'r eit dui niemand me Jef geklapt.}$

ER has there no-one with Jef talked

'No-one spoke with Jef (there).'

(51) $\text{Ze eit zaai ie niks te zieken.}$

she$\text{deficient}$ has she$\text{strong}$ here nothing to seek

INTENDED: ‘She has no business being here.’

• when the second dui is replaced by the deficient expletive pronoun, the locative reading becomes obligatory (compare with (53)):

(52) $\text{Dui eit er niemand me Jef geklapt.}$

There has ER no-one with Jef talked

'No-one spoke with Jef *(there).'

(53) $\text{*Zaai eit zaai ie niks te zieken.}$

she$\text{strong}$ has she$\text{deficient}$ here nothing to seek

INTENDED: ‘She has no business being here.’

$\rightarrow$ in embedded clauses (and inverted main clauses, not illustrated here), expletive dui can co-occur with expletive er, in a configuration reminiscent of clitic doubling:

(54) $\text{dat er dui niem boek op tuifel ligt.}$

that ER there a book on tafel lies

‘that there is a book (there) on the table.’

support for an analysis in terms of clitic doubling:

• this configuration is compatible with an additional, conflicting locative modifier:

(55) $\text{dat er dui ie nbi boek op tuifel ligt.}$

that ER there a book on tafel lies

‘that there is a book here on the table.’

• this configuration imposes a definiteness restriction on the subject:

(56) $\text{*dat er dui mennen boek op tuifel ligt.}$

that ER there my book on tafel lies

INTENDED: ‘that my book is lying (there) on the table.’
• the order of deficient and strong pronoun cannot be inverted (compare with (58)):

(57) */?? dat dui d'r nen boek op tuifel ligt. that there ER a book on tafel lies ‘that there is a book *(??there) on the table.’

(58) *omda zaai ze ma guid elpen. because she*strong she*deficient me goes help INTENDED: ‘because she’s going to help me.’

Wambeek Dutch expletive pronouns can be both pronoun doubled and clitic doubled, again completely paralleling the pronominal subject system

moreover just as was the case with subject pronouns, clitic doubling and pronoun doubling of expletive pronouns can be combined in a single example, leading to expletive tripling (59) (compare to (25)):

(59) Dui eit er dui ie niemand me Jef geklapt. there has ER there here no-one with Jef talked ‘No-one spoke with Jef here.’

3.3 Expletive here?

first impression: the proximate locative adverb ie ‘here’ is always, only, and necessarily locative in nature:

(60) le stui ne vantj inn of. here stands a man in the garden ‘There’s a man in the garden *(here).’

support for this position:

• ie is incompatible with purely existential sentences:

(61) #le zen mo vier priemgetalle klanjer as tien. here are only four prime numbers smaller than ten

‘There are only four prime numbers smaller than ten here.’

• ie necessarily imposes a locative reading (compare with (63)):

(62) le is niks gebeed. here is nothing happened ‘Nothing happened *(here).’

(63) Dui is niks gebeed. there is nothing happened ‘Nothing happened (there).’

• ie is incompatible with additional conflicting locative modifiers:

(64) #le stuid dui/genner ne vantj inn of. here stands there/over there a man in the garden INTENDED: ‘There’s a man there/over there in the garden.’

however ie can be doubled:

(65) le eit ie niemand me Jef geklapt. here has here no-one with Jef talked ‘No-one spoke with Jef *(here).’

→ and when it is, it imposes a definiteness restriction on the subject (compare with (67)):

(66) *le eit ie Marie me Jef geklapt. here has here Marie with Jef talked INTENDED: ‘Marie spoke with Jef here.’

(67) le eit Marie me Jef geklapt. here has Marie with Jef talked ‘Marie spoke with Jef here.’

→ in fact, ie can even be tripled:
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Ie here eit has niemand me Jef geklapt.

No-one spoke with Jef *(here).’

but even when doubled, ie retains its locative meaning, e.g. it remains incompat-
ible with conflicting locative expressions:

#ie eit genner niemand me Jef geklapt.

No-one spoke with Jef over there.’

note: ie can also be doubled in inverted main clauses (and embedded clauses, not
shown here):

Eit er ie niemand me Jef geklapt?

Did no-one speak with Jef *(here)?’

→ and it can be tripled in subject-initial main clauses:

ie eit er ie niemand me Jef geklapt.

No-one spoke with Jef here.’

The Wambeek Dutch proximate locative adverb ie ‘here’ displays mixed,
expletive-like behavior: it can be doubled (= subjects/expletives), when
doubled it imposes a definiteness restriction on the subject (= expletives),
but it always retains its locative meaning (≠ expletives)

4 Towards a new analysis of there-expletives

take-home lessons from the Wambeek Dutch data: (i) expletive pronouns are
fully integrated into the subject system, and (ii) expletives can make use
of/recycle material from lower down in the structure

starting point for an analysis: the Standard Dutch expletive pronoun er can be
left out when followed by the locative adverbs daar ‘there’ or hier ‘here’ (see
in particular Klockmann et al. (2015), from which the following data are taken):

Werd *( er ) gedanst?

There was dancing.’ (Standard Dutch)

• note that er cannot be left out willy-nilly (i.e. the EPP is operative in Dutch):

Werd *( er ) daar gedanst?

Was there dancing at that time?’ (Standard Dutch)

• and that the locative adverb has to be adjacent to the expletive:

Werd *( er ) wel gedanst daar?

Was there really dancing there?’ (Standard Dutch)

• and that temporal adverbs do not have the same effect:

Werd *( er ) toen gedanst?

Was there dancing at that time?’ (Standard Dutch)
• and that for many speakers even locative PPs don't have the same effect:

(77) Werd %(er) in het park gedanst?
    'Was there dancing in the park?' (Standard Dutch)

Klockmann et al. (2015): in the absence of another filler of specTP, the locative adverbs hier 'here' and daar 'there' can move into this position → I generalize this proposal to all Wambeek Dutch expletives, and add pronominal doubling

(78) Dui woentj dui niemand.
    'No-one lives there.'

(80) dat er dui nen boek op tuifel ligt.
    'that there is a book (there) on the table.'

5 Summary and conclusion

• dialect Dutch expletives behave completely parallel to pronominal subjects: they come in strong and deficient forms, and they can be pronoun and clitic doubled

• even the proximate locative here can partake in this pattern (while at the same time retaining its locative meaning)

• this supports an analysis of expletives whereby they raise from a clause-internal, genuinely locative position into specTP
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