

CLITIC DOUBLING AND COORDINATION: TOWARDS A MICRO-TYPOLOGY OF PRONOMINAL DOUBLING IN DUTCH DIALECTS

JEROEN VAN CRAENENBROECK & MARJO VAN KOPPEN

As is well-known, many dialects of Dutch allow a strong subject pronoun and a subject clitic to co-occur in one clause (i.e. so-called clitic doubling, cf. Haegeman 1992, 2005; De Geest 1995; Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2002, 2006). A typical example is given in (1).

- (1) Ik venj da-ge gou da moetj oplossen.
I find that-you_{clitic} you_{strong} that must solve
'I think you should solve that.'

In this talk we shed new light on this phenomenon on the basis of data such as those in (2) and (3).

- (2) Ik venj da-ge gou en ik da suimen muutn oplossen.
I find that-you_{clitic} you_{strong} and I_{strong} that together must solve
'I think you and I should solve this together.'
(Wambeek Dutch)

- (3) Ik venj da-me gou en ik da suimen muutn oplossen.
I find that-we_{clitic} you_{strong} and I_{strong} that together must solve
'I think you and I should solve this together.'
(Wambeek Dutch)

What is interesting about these examples, is that the subject of the embedded clause consists of a coordination of two pronominal DPs (note that an analysis in terms of IP-coordination is not an option due to the choice of the embedded predicate, cf. Aoun, Benmamoun & Sportiche 1994). Surprisingly, however, both these sentences also contain an instance of clitic doubling. In (2) only the first conjunct is clitic-doubled, whereas in (3) the entire coordination is.

These data are relevant at least in two respects. Firstly, they show that we need to rethink the syntactic analysis of clitic doubling. Specifically, the strong pronoun (e.g. *gou* 'you' in (1)) cannot be a mere dummy doubling element (*pace* De Geest 1995; Haegeman 1992, 2005) given that it can also be a coordination. On the other hand, the clitic cannot always be the spell-out of an agreement head either (*pace* Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2002, 2006) given that in (2) it does not have the same phi-specification as the verb. Secondly, these data represent a new source of microparametric variation. Whereas first conjunct clitic doubling data such as those in (2) are also allowed in the dialects of Klemskerke (West Flanders) and Nieuwkerken-Waas (East Flanders), full coordination clitic doubling (cf. (3)) is disallowed in these varieties.

We will argue that the above facts suggest that there are no less than three distinct doubling mechanisms in the Dutch dialects under consideration here, i.e. topic doubling, clitic doubling with an agreement head, and DP-internal clitic doubling. We will examine the implicational relationship between topic doubling and clitic doubling, as well as the interaction of these three phenomena with the placement of object clitics, complementizer agreement, pronominal tripling and the possibility of DP-internal modifiers.