Pronominal doubling in Germanic dialects

Introduction
Based on new data from three southern Dutch dialects we show that there is not one, but two types of pronominal doubling in Germanic. The first one is the well-known clitic doubling construction (Haegeman 1992, De Geest 1995, Cardinaletti & Starke 1999), the second one we dub topic doubling.

Data
(1) \( \ldots \) dat \( n \) / *ij / *dou man / *Jeff \( \) ‘ij geduid eit (Wambeek Dutch)
\[ \ldots \] that \{he_{clitic} / he_{strong} / that man / Geoff\} it he_{strong} done has ‘…that he has done it.’
In a clitic doubling construction the first subject element can only be a clitic \( (n) \). The doubled element is always a strong pronoun \( (ij) \). Furthermore, clitic doubling is restricted to subclauses and inverted main clauses. It does not occur in subject initial main clauses.

Topic doubling on the other hand is restricted to subject initial main clauses (cf. (2)).
(2) \( \{*N / IJ / Dou man / Jeff\} \) komt \( ij \). (Wambeek Dutch)
\{he_{clitic} / he_{strong} / that man / Geoff\} comes he_{strong} ‘He / That man / Geoff comes.’
The first subject element can be a weak pronoun, a strong pronoun, a definite DP or a proper name, but not a clitic. The doubling element is once again a strong pronoun.

Analysis
Clitic doubling: We analyse clitics as D✲ and weak and strong pronouns as full DPs (Uriagereka 1995, Grohmann 2000). A clitic doubled pronoun is then a D✲-clitic selecting an NP containing a strong pronoun. In other words, a clitic doubled pronoun starts out as one single DP.

(3) \[ n \ ij = [DP \{D✲ n \ [np \ ij]\}] \] he_{clitic} he_{strong} (‘he’)
It is an inherent property of clitics that they need a phonologically realised host. As Dutch clitics are always enclitic, this host has to be to their left. The distribution of clitic doubled subjects follows from these assumptions. A DP such as ‘\( n \ ij \)’ moves to Spec,IP in narrow syntax. When the phrase marker is handed over to PF, the derivation only converges when the clitic finds a host to its left. This situation only occurs when the C-domain is activated.

(4) a. syntax: \[ [CP [C dat [IP [DP n [np \ ij]] \{ r Γ [VP t \ \ldots ]\}]\] b. PF: \[ [CP [C dat+n [IP [dp t\ɛ [np \ ij]] \{ r Γ [VP t \ \ldots ]\}]\]
This analysis explains why subject clitics do not occur in subject initial main clauses. These are AGRPs, not CPs (Zwart 1997). Since the clitic has no host to cliticise to, the derivation crashes.

Topic doubling: in topic doubling the subject moves from Spec,IP to Spec,CP. At PF the trace in Spec,IP gets spelled out as a strong (resumptive) pronoun. This analysis is illustrated in (5).

(5) a. syntax: \[ [CP DP_{subject} [C V_{fin} [IP t_{subject} \ldots ]]] \] b. PF: \[ [CP DP_{subject} [C V_{fin} [IP DP_{subject<!proc> \ldots }]] \]
This structure explains why topic doubling is restricted to subject initial main clauses. In inverted main clauses Spec,CP is filled (so the subject cannot move there) and in Dutch subclauses, Spec,CP is not accessible to topics (Zwart 1993, Barbiers 2000). Independent evidence for this analysis comes from the behaviour of quantifiers and Wh-elements in topic doubling constructions. Only strong quantifiers can be topic doubled (cf (6)), whereas Wh-elements can only be doubled if they acquire a rhetorical reading. We will show that this follows in a straightforward manner from analysing topic doubling as movement of the subject to Spec,CP.

(6) Alle / *Gin manne meege zaailn ie binn. (Wambeek Dutch)
al / no men may the_{strong} here in ‘All men may come in.’

Extensions of the analysis
In the final part of our talk we apply our analysis of clitic placement to object clitics. Firstly, we will show that Zwart (1993) is not correct in assuming that object clitics can occur in a post-subject position in Dutch subclauses. Secondly, we argue that object clitic placement in Dutch dialects can be explained under the assumptions outlined above. Finally, we apply our analysis to the pronominal systems of German (Grohmann 2000).
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