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MAIN THEORETICAL CLAIMS
• Phases are not absolute ("once a phase, always a phase")
• The phasehood of Fin\(^*\) can be voided if it acquires unvalued features during the derivation
• Object clitic movement into the left periphery bleeds the phasehood of FinP and feeds subject clitic doubling

CENTRAL DATA
• Subject clitic doubling with coordinations in Dutch dialects
• Anti-intervention effects with object clitics
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1. Data
Basic pattern of subject clitic doubling:

(1) \{ complementizer \} \{ finite verb \} \{ subject\(_1\) subject\(_2\) ... clitic \}

strong pronoun
(2) \( \text{da se zaai i gisteren niet geweest is.} \)
that she\(_{rr} \) was\(_{rr} \) not here yesterday
that she wasn't here yesterday

coordination (I): pronoun & pronoun
(3) * \( \text{da ze } [\text{aai en zaai}] \) da suimen wel kunnen oplossen.
that they\(_{rr} \) he\(_{rr} \) and she\(_{rr} \) together PRF can outcome
INTENDED: 'that he and she can solve that together.'

coordination (II): DP & pronoun
(4) * \( \text{da ze } [\text{den burremiester en aai}] \) da suimen gonj duan.
that they\(_{rr} \) the mayor and he that together will do
INTENDED: 'that the mayor and he will do that together.'

coordination (III): pronoun & DP
(5) * \( \text{da ze } [\text{aai en den burremiester}] \) da suimen gonj duan.
that they\(_{rr} \) he and the mayor that together will do
INTENDED: 'that he and the mayor will do that together.'

coordination (IV): DP & DP
(6) * \( \text{da ze } [\text{den burremiester en de pastoer}] \) da suimen gonj duan.
that they\(_{rr} \) the mayor and the priest that together will do
INTENDED: 'that the mayor and the priest will do that together.'

DP
(7) * \( \text{da ze de kinnerjn da suimen gonj duan.} \)
that they\(_{rr} \) the children that together will do
INTENDED: 'that the children will do that together.'

Anti-intervention with object clitics:

(8) \{ complementizer \} \{ finite verb \} \{ subject\(_1\) object subject\(_2\) ... clitic clitic \}

strong pronoun
(9) \( \text{da se t zaai nie geduin cit.} \)
that she\(_{rr} \) it\(_{rr} \) not done has
'that she hasn't done it.'

coordination (I): pronoun & pronoun
(10) \( \text{da ze t } [\text{aai en zaai}] \) suimen wel kunnen oplossen.
that they\(_{rr} \) he\(_{rr} \) and she\(_{rr} \) together PRF can outcome
'that he and she can solve it together.'

coordination (II): DP & pronoun
(11) \( \text{da ze t } [\text{den burremiester en aai}] \) suimen gonj duan.
that they\(_{rr} \) it\(_{rr} \) the mayor and he together will do
'that the mayor and he will do it together.'
coordination (III): pronoun & DP

(12) da ze t [aai en den burremiester] suimen gonj duan.
that they,sg he and the mayor together will do
‘that he and the mayor will do it together.’

coordination (IV): DP & DP

(13) *da ze t [den burremiester en de pastoer] suimen gonj duan.
that they,sg he and the priest together will do
INTENDED: ‘that the mayor and the priest will do it together.’

DP

(14) *da ze t de kinnerj suimen gonj duan.
that they,sg the children together will do
INTENDED: ‘that the children will do that together.’

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: TWO TYPES OF DOUBLING

2.1 A classification of dialect Dutch subject pronouns

Décheanie & Witzscho (2002): a three-way split in the typology of pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of subject DP</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>

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</td>
<td>Condition C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bound variable</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>simple φP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>sloppy identity under ellipsis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>argument</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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>example: sloppy identity under ellipsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(18) Jef paust dat n gui winnen, en Piet oek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jef thinks that he,sg goes win, and Piet also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= x [x thinks that Jef will win]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= x [x thinks that x will win]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Marie paust da zaai gui winnen, en Julia oek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary thinks that she,sg goes win, and Julia also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= x [x thinks that Mary will win]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≠ x [x thinks that x will win]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Marie paust da ze zaai gui winnen, en Julia oek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary thinks that she,sg she,sg goes win, and Julia also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= x [x thinks that Mary will win]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≠ x [x thinks that x will win]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


(21) structure of strong subject pronouns
(22) structure of a clitic doubled subject (STEP ONE: MOVEMENT)

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

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 gong duan.
that they mayor and he together will do
‘that the mayor and he will do it together.’

→ given that the NP-portion of den burremiester en aai ‘the mayor and he’ contains (a coordination with) lexical material, it cannot be spelled out as the clitic φ ‘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[a]

TP

A1

den burremiester en aai

2.3.1 Core of the analysis

3.1 Two properties of object clitics

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

subject infinitives

(29) <‘n/en> gezien emmen is ni genoeg.
seen have-ENF not is enough
‘Having seen him is not enough.’

root infinitives

(30) En gou <‘n/en> helpen zeker?
and you help-ENF surely
‘And you’re gonna help him, I suppose?’

ECM-clauses

(31) ‘k em goed da-ge <‘n/en> gou I have heard that you have seen you
Marie <‘n/en> uin de kinjern eiq zien introduceen.
Mary see him to the children have see introduce
‘I have heard that you saw Mary introduce him to the children.’

note: this C-head must be distinct from the one triggering comp-agreement:

(26) Iedere vint peist da-n de burgemeester en ie da t’hope moern uplosn.
every man thinks that-PL the mayor and he that together must solve
‘Every man thinks that he and he should solve that together.’

→ we return to the distinction between comp-agreement and agreement-driven clitic doubling in section four

technical implementation of the analysis: the Agree-relation in 25) is triggered by the feature [C(ontext)-D(ependent)], which signals that pronouns “must be assigned a value by the context-determined assignment function” (Bianchi 2005:8) → only pronouns (or coordinations containing at least one pronoun) can be doubled

supporting evidence: Bianchi (2005): bound variable pronouns do not carry a [C]-feature → clitic doubling with coordinations is not allowed with bound variables:

(27) Elke man, paast da ze t aai, aai en zaai suimen maarm oplossen.
every man thinks that he and she and she together must solve
‘Every man thinks he and she should solve that together.’

(28) Elke man, paast da aai en zaai suimen maarm oplossen.
every man thinks that he and she together must solve
‘Every man thinks he and she should solve that together.’
infinitival clauses with a complementizer

32. Z* ei geprooide om <*n/ en > t’ elpen. she has tried to <him_in / him_in> to help
"She has tried to help him." [Example: Dutch]

Implementation: object clitics carry an unvalued [Fin]-feature that needs to be valued by
(matching 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 (t*o) gezien eti. that you_esp him_esp you_esp him_esp seen have
"that you have seen him." [Example: Dutch]

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

(a) dan-t* den aigeneir van ‘t lemenken, zelf ei muut doewruun. that 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 aigeneir van ‘t lemenken, et* zel ei muut doewruun. that the owner of the lamb it itself has have-to kill
"that the owner of the lamb has had to kill it (not the lamb) himself."

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 Fin° in narrow syntax

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

3.2 Doubling via agreement: anti-intervention

35. da ze t [den burremiester en aai] suimen gonj duan. that they_esp it_esp the mayor and he together will do
"that the mayor and he will do it together."

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

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, t* 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

Main ingredients of the analysis:
- the unvalued features of (the higher phase head) Force* are inherited by a lower non-phase head NPb°
- movement of the object clitic to Fin° bleeds the phasehood of FinP
- because FinP is no longer a phase, NPb° can probe the subject in specTP and value its phi and [C-DJ]-features; in other words, object clitic movement feeds subject clitic doubling
- this valued feature bundle is spelled out as the subject clitic c’ they’t

37. *da ze [den burremiester en aai] da suimen gonj duan. that they_esp it_esp the mayor and he that together will do
"that the mayor and he will do that together."

[Example: Dutch]
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 no longer a phase, the subject clitic can move to specNPhP without any intermediate stopovers

3.3 Doubling via movement: no anti-intervention

3.3.1 The basic cases

(38)

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

(40)

(41) da se zaai ie gisteren niet geweest 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

(42) Ik verii da se t [ zaain en gaaiin] suimen moeitj oplossen.
I find that they object 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 verij da se [zaalén en gsaalén] da suimen moetj oplossen.
    I find that they and you should together must_u 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 da-n ie en zie da saom moen uplosn.
    I think that_u he and she that together must solve
    'I think that he and her should solve that together.'

b. Ik vin da-n t ie en zie saom moen uplosn
    I think that_u 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 kennen.
    I think that_u Pol and Valère Marie know.
    'I think that Pol and Valère know Marie.'

Proposak: the Compagr Probe is Fin°.

4.2 Analysis

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

(48) \[\text{Fin}^P \rightarrow \text{phase boundary} \]

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_u he and she that 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
    pronom
    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 a phase and intervenes between Force° and the subject
  - Object clitic moves to Fin° and bleeds the phasalhood of Fin°
  - This in turn feeds subject clitic doubling, as Force° can now 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 (First Conjunct)</td>
<td>Doubling via movement</td>
<td>Doubling via Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination with a pronominal conjunct (Full)</td>
<td>Doubling via movement or Agree</td>
<td>Doubling via Agree</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>

5.2 **Question for further research**

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

   (53) * ik peis dame ’t zij en eik wel samen aan kun. (Nieuwkerken Waas)
   
   - Possible explanations for dialects of this type:
     - subject clitics do not move in syntax but at PF (Van Craenenbroeck & Haegeman 2007:173, note 8)
     - object clitics are not sensitive to finiteness and hence have no [\text{FinP}-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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