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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

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\} subject₁ subject₂ ...
   \{finite verb\} clitic 'strong pronoun
   *co-ordination
   *+DP

strong pronoun
2) da se t zaai nie geding eit.
   that she\textsubscript{da} she\textsubscript{zaai} not done has
   'that she hasn't done it.'

coordination (I): pronoun & pronoun
(3) * da ze [aai en zaai] da suimen well kunn oplossen.
   that they\textsubscript{da} he\textsubscript{aai} and she\textsubscript{zaai} that together
   PRT can out.come
   INTENDED: 'that he and she can solve that together.'

coordination (II): DP & pronoun
   that they\textsubscript{da} the mayor and he that
   together will do
   INTENDED: 'that the mayor and he will do that together.'

coordination (III): pronoun & DP
   that they\textsubscript{da} he and the mayor that
   together will do
   INTENDED: 'that he and the mayor will do that together.'

coordination (IV): DP & DP
   that they\textsubscript{da} 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 kinnerj\textsubscript{den} da suimen goni duan.
   that they\textsubscript{da} the children that together will do
   INTENDED: 'that the children will do that together.'

Anti-intervention with object clitics:

6) \{complementizer\} subject₁ object subject₂ ...
   \{finite verb\} clinic clinic 'strong pronoun
   *co-ordination with a pronominal conjunct
   *co-ordination w/o a pronominal conjunct
   *+DP

strong pronoun
9) da se t zaai nie geding eit.
   that she\textsubscript{da} it\textsubscript{zaai} she\textsubscript{zaai} not done has
   'that she hasn't done it.'

coordination (I): pronoun & pronoun
(10) da ze t [aai en zaai] suimen well kunn oplossen.
   that they\textsubscript{da} he\textsubscript{aai} and she\textsubscript{zaai} together
   PRT can out.come
   'that he and she can solve it together.'

coordination (II): DP & pronoun
(11) da ze t [den burremiester en aai] suimen goni duan.
   that they\textsubscript{da} it\textsubscript{den} he\textsubscript{burremiester} and she\textsubscript{aai} together
   'that 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 clitic, 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 passtoer] suimen gonj duan.
    that they clitic, the mayor and the priest
together will do
INTENDED: ‘that the mayor and the priest will do it together.’

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  b. pro-ϕPs  c. pro-NPs
    DP    ϕP    ϕP    NP
    \phantom{D}    \phantom{ϕP}    \phantom{ϕP}    |    NP
    D    \phantom{ϕP}    \phantom{ϕP}    \phantom{ϕP}    |    N
    \phantom{ϕ}    NP    \phantom{ϕ}    \phantom{ϕ}    N
    \phantom{ϕ}    N

Tests to determine the categorical 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 DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b sloppy identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 argument</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DP coordination (III) vs. coordination with no pronominal conjunct

Theoretical background: two types of doubling

2.1 A classification of dialect Dutch subject pronouns

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

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

\[ \phi' \]
\[ \phi \]
\[ N \]
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 duan.*

that they$_{clitic}$ hat$_{agg}$ the 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 *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) **Core of the analysis**

3. Analysis

3.1 Core of the analysis

3.1.1 Two properties of object clitics

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

**subject infinitives**

(29) *<‘n/’em>*

gesten emmen is ni genoeg.
seen have-INF is not enough

'Having seen him is not enough.'

**root infinitives**

(30) En gou *<‘n/’em>* helpen zeker?

and you *<him$_{agg}$/ him$_{tok}$>* help-INF surely

'And you’re gonna help him, I suppose?'

**ECM-clauses**

(31) *‘n/’em* goed da-gé *<‘n/’em>* gou *<‘n/’em>*

I have heard that you$_{agg}$/ you$_{tok}$ you$_{agg}$/ you$_{tok}$

Mary *<‘n/’em>* uin de kinjern en zien introduiseem.

Mary *<him$_{agg}$/ him$_{tok}$>* 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 h’ope moest uplosn.

every man thinks that-PL the mayor and he that must solve

'Every man thinks the mayor 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-D]-feature → clitic doubling with coordinations is not allowed with bound variables:

(27) Elke man, paast da ze t aai en zaai suimen muun oplossen.

every man thinks that they$_{agg}$/ he$_{agg}$ he and she$_{agg}$/ she$_{agg}$ together will solve

'Every man thinks he and she should solve that together.'

(28) Elke man, paast da aai en zaai da suimen muun oplossen.

every man thinks that he and she$_{agg}$/ she$_{agg}$ together will solve

'Every man thinks he and she should solve that together.'
infinitival clauses with a complementizer

32) \( Z' \) ei geprobeerd om \( <^n/ \text{em} > \) telpen. she has tried to \( <\text{him}_{\text{loc}} / \text{him}_{\text{acc}} > \) to help

'Her has tried to help him.'

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

\[ \rightarrow \] 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 etj.

that you\_\_\_\_ him\_\_\_\_ you\_\_\_\_ him\_\_\_\_ seen have

'that you have seen him.'

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

34) a. dan\_\_\_\_ den eigenaar van \( 't \) lemmeken, zelf ei muun doewtuun.

that\_\_\_\_ the owner of the lamb self ei muun doewtuun.

'that the owner of the lamb has to kill it (not the lamb) himself.'

b. da den eigenaar van \( 't \) lemmeken, et\_\_\_\_ zelf ei muun doewtuun.

that the owner of the lamb et\_\_\_\_ self ei muun doewtuun.

'that the owner of the lamb has 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

consequence: object clitic movement to Fin* 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, FinP ceases to be a phase.

3.2 Doubling via agreement: anti-intervention

35) da ze t [den burremiester en aai] suimen gonj duan.

that they\_\_\_\_ it\_\_\_\_ the mayor and he together will do 'that the mayor and he will do it together.'

36) ForceP

spelled out as \( \phi \) NPhP

Find° no longer a phase boundary

main ingredients of the analysis:
- the unvalued features of [the higher phase head] Force* are inherited by a lower non-phase head NPh*
- movement of the object clitic to Fin* voids the phasehood of FinP
- because FinP is no longer a phase, NPhP can probe the subject in specTP and value its phi- and [C-DI]-features
- this valued feature bundle is spelled out as the subject clitic \( \phi \) 'they'


that they\_\_\_\_ it\_\_\_\_ the mayor and he that together will do INTENDED: 'that the mayor and he will do that together.'
3.3 Doubling via movement: no anti-intervention

3.3.1 The basic cases

(39) **da se t zaai nie gedaan ei.**

that she done has

‘that she hasn’t done it’

[Westhoek Dutch]

(40) 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) spill-out of the Probe

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

(43) **Ik ver mij da se t [ zaain en gaain] suimen moeij oplossen.**

I find that they and you and together must solve

‘I think they and you should solve it together.’

[Westhoek Dutch]

→ the clitic a ‘they’ subextracts from the first conjunct and moves to a head position inside the CP-domain (see Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2008 for considerations concerning the subject island and CSC)
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:

I find that they, 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 da-n ie en zie da saom moe|t up|losn.
I think that, 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 moe|t up|losn.
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\(^{\circ}\); it has phi-features but no \(C-D\)-feature

I think that, Pol and Valère Marie know-en.
‘I think that Pol and Valère know Marie.’

Proposal: the Compagr Probe is Fin\(^{\circ}\).

4.2 Analysis

(47) Ik vin da-n ie en zie da saom moe|t up|losn.
I think that, he and she that together must solve
‘I think that he and her should solve that together.’

Object movement does not have an effect on the Compagr-Probe (Fin\(^{\circ}\))

(49) Ik vin da-n t ie en zie saom moe|t up|losn.
I think that, it he and she together must solve
‘I think that he and her should solve that together.’

(50)\[\text{Figure}\]

5 Conclusion

5.1 Summary

Data

(51) Type of subject DP \hspace{1cm} no object clitic \hspace{1cm} object clitic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\hspace{1cm}</th>
<th>\hspace{1cm}</th>
<th>\hspace{1cm}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<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>

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\(^{\circ}\) and Fin\(^{\circ}\).
  - Fin\(^{\circ}\) is phase and intervenes between Force\(^{\circ}\) and the subject
  - Object clitic moves to Fin\(^{\circ}\) and voids the phasehood of Fin\(^{\circ}\)
  - Force\(^{\circ}\) 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doubling via Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>Doubling via movement</td>
<td>Doubling via movement or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal conjunct</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doubling via Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First Conjunct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Doubling via Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a pronominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Full)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with no pronominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-pronominal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:

   "Ik peis dame 't zij en elik wel samen aan kunn."

   I think that we it they and I part together solve

   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 [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 ⬇ dominating α extends the phase up from α to ⬇. α loses its phasehood in the process, and any constituent on the edge of α ends up in the domain of the derived phase ⬇ as a result of Phase Extension.”
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