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1. Data patterns

1.1 Subject initial main clauses

pattern₁a: topic doubling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject₁</th>
<th>finite verb</th>
<th>subject₂</th>
<th>…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weakening pronoun</td>
<td>strong agreeing pronoun</td>
<td>strong pronoun</td>
<td>full DP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) * Mec gojn ze waile nuir ojsh bringen. (Wambeek)
we₁WEAK go them we₁STRONG to home bring
'We're going to take them home.'

(2) Me gojn ze waile nuir ojsh bringen. (Wambeek)
we₁WEAK go them we₁STRONG to home bring
'We're going to take them home.'
Zij hebben ze daar niets mee te maken.
‘They have nothing to do with that.’ (Zuiddorpe)

Marie heeft ze daar niets mee te maken.
‘They have nothing to do with that.’ (Koewacht)

We hebben me weir daar niks mee te maken.
‘We have nothing to do with that.’ (Affligem)

Marie eid ie niks te zuken.
‘Mary has no business here.’ (Wambeek)

Dui stond i een vrou inn of.
‘There was a woman standing in the garden.’ (Wambeek)
1.2 Inverted main clauses and embedded clauses

pattern1: clitic doubling

(23) \( \{ \text{complementizer} \} \ \text{subject}_1 \ \text{subject}_2 \ \ldots \ \{ \text{finite verb} \} \ \text{clitic} \ \text{strong pronoun} \ \text{coordination} \)

inverted main clauses

(24) Gisteren \( \text{is} \ \)zeaien \( \text{ie} \ \)nie \( \text{geweest}. \)

yesterday is she \text{CLITIC} she \text{STRONG} here not been

‘She wasn’t here yesterday.’ (Wambeek)

subclauses

(25) … da \( \text{se} \ \)zeaai \( \text{ie} \ \)gisteren niet geweest is.

that she \text{CLITIC} she \text{STRONG} here yesterdat not been is

‘… that she wasn’t here yesterday.’ (Wambeek)

(26) Ik paus \( \)da \( \text{me} \ \)t [gou \ en \ ik \ ] suimen wel

I think that \text{we} \text{CLITIC} it \text{you} \text{STRONG} and \text{I} \text{STRONG} together \text{PRT}

kunn oplossen.

can solve ‘I think that you and I can solve that together.’ (Wambeek)

(27) Ik paus \( \)da \( \text{se} \ \)zaailln \( \text{en} \ \)waailn \text{d}i suimen wel

I think that they \text{CLITIC} they \text{STRONG} and \text{we} \text{STRONG} there together \text{PRT}

toigenuiken

out.come ‘I think that they and we will solve that together.’ (Wambeek)

pattern2a: topic marking

(28) \{ \text{complementizer} \} \ \text{subject}_1 \ \text{subject}_2 \ \ldots \ \{ \text{finite verb} \} \ \text{strong non-agreeing pronoun} \ \text{coordination} \ \text{full DP} \)

(29) Zijn \( \text{tet} \ \)de studenten weg?

are \text{TET} the students away ‘Have the students left?’ (Lapscheure)

(30) … dad \( \text{ij} \ \) Jef oek \( \text{mag} \ \)kommen.

that \text{he} \text{STRONG} Jef also may come ‘… that Jef is also allowed to come.’

pattern2b: topic marking

(31) \{ \text{complementizer} \} \ \text{subject}_1 \ \text{subject}_2 \ \ldots \ \{ \text{finite verb} \} \ \text{clitic} \ \text{strong non-agreeing pronoun} \ \text{tet} \)

(32) Hoevele \( \text{flassen} \text{ee}-j \text{tet} \)gekocht?

how.many bottles have \text{you} \text{CLITIC} \text{TET} bought ‘How many bottles have you bought?'

pattern3: tripling

(33) \{ \text{complementizer} \} \ \text{subject}_1 \ \text{subject}_2 \ \text{subject}_3 \ \{ \text{finite verb} \} \ \text{clitic} \ \text{strong non-agr. pronoun} \ \text{strong pron. coordination} \ \text{tet} \)

(34) … da-ze \( \text{tet} \ \)zie \( \text{da kent}.

that \text{she} \text{CLITIC} \text{TET} she \text{STRONG} that knows ‘… that she knows that.’
2. Additional generalizations and considerations

2.1 Only subjects can double

(35) * Ik em ze ee gezien.
I have herCLITIC herSTRONG seen
INTENDED: ‘I saw her.’

2.2 Pronominal doubling is always optional

(36) Marie muu (zaai) ie nie kommen.
Mary must sheSTRONG here not come
‘Mary shouldn’t come here.’ (Wambeek)

(37) … da se (zaai) ie gisteren niet geweest is.
that sheCLITIC sheSTRONG here yesterday not been is
‘… that she wasn’t here yesterday.’ (Wambeek)

(38) … da (se) zaai ie gisteren niet geweest is.
that sheCLITIC sheSTRONG here yesterday not been is
‘… that she wasn’t here yesterday.’ (Wambeek)

(39) … dad (ij) Jef oek mag kommen.
that heSTRONG Jef also must come
‘… that Jef is also allowed to come.’ (Wambeek)

2.3 Pronominal doubling is used to express ‘emphasis’

(40) Ze komd oek mergen.
she comes also tomorrow
‘She’s also coming tomorrow.’

(41) Ze komd zaai oek mergen.
she comes zaai also tomorrow
‘In spite of what you might think, she’s also coming tomorrow.’

2.4 Is topic marking really subject doubling?

arguments con: - the ‘doubling’ pronoun doesn’t agree in phi-features with the subject
- it has a different distribution from ‘genuine’ doubling
  pronouns (Haegeman 2008)

argument pro: - it interacts with doubling in making possible otherwise illicit
  configurations:

(42) ? Z’ ei se ‘t geduin.
sheSTRONG has sheCLITIC it done
INTENDED: ‘She’s done it.’ (Wambeek)

(43) Z’ ei se ‘d ij geduin.
sheSTRONG has sheCLITIC it heSTRONG done
‘She’s done it.’ (Wambeek)

2.5 Movement of the doubling or doubled element

disallowed in clitic doubling

(44) * Zaaile paus ek da-za ie nie geweest zen.
theySTRONG think I that theyCLITIC here not been are
INTENDED: ‘They I don’t think were here.’

allowed in topic marking

(45) Jef paus ek dad ij oek muu kommen.
Jef think I that heSTRONG also must come
‘Jef I think must also come.’
2.6 Tripling as the combination of two types of doubling

→ generally, tripling can be analyzed as the combination of two types of doubling

**pattern 2a:** tripling = topic doubling + clitic doubling

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{subject}_1 & \quad \text{finite verb} & \text{subject}_2 & \quad \text{subject}_3 & \quad \ldots \\
& \quad *\text{clitic pronoun} & & \quad \text{clitic} & \quad \text{strong agreeing pronoun} \\
& \quad \text{weak pronoun} & & \quad \text{strong pronoun} & \quad \text{full DP} \\
& \quad \text{proper name} & & \quad \text{coordination} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(46) We hebben me weer daar niks mee te maken.
We have nothing to do with that.
(Affligem)

**pattern 2b:** tripling = topic doubling + topic marking

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{subject}_1 & \quad \text{finite verb} & \text{subject}_2 & \quad \text{subject}_3 & \quad \ldots \\
& \quad *\text{clitic pronoun} & & \quad \text{clitic} & \quad \text{strong pronoun} \\
& \quad \text{weak pronoun} & & \quad \text{strong pronoun} & \quad \text{full DP} \\
& \quad \text{proper name} & & \quad \text{coordination} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(47) Ze kent tet zit dat.  
She knows it that.
(Lapscheure)

**pattern 3:** tripling = clitic doubling + topic marking

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{complementizer} & \quad \text{subject}_1 & \quad \text{finite verb} & \quad \text{subject}_2 & \quad \text{subject}_3 & \quad \ldots \\
& & & \quad \text{clitic} & \quad \text{strong non-agr. pronoun} & \quad \text{coordination} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(51) … da-ze tet zie da kent.  
that she clitic Tet she strong that knows  
‘…that she knows that.’

→ exception: **pattern 2b:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{subject}_1 & \quad \text{finite verb} & \text{subject}_2 & \quad \text{subject}_3 & \quad \ldots \\
& \quad *\text{clitic pronoun} & & \quad \text{clitic pronoun} & \quad \text{strong non-agr. pronoun} \\
& \quad \text{weak pronoun} & & \quad \text{strong pronoun} & \quad \text{full DP} \\
& \quad \text{proper name} & & \quad \text{coordination} \\
& \quad \text{sentence} & & \quad \text{expletive} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(52) Z’ ei se ‘d ij oek nie gemakkelijk.  
She’s not having an easy time either.
(Wambeek)

→ the dialect of Wambeek has no independent means of doubling a weak pronoun with a clitic (looks like Zeeland-style topic doubling)

2.7 Correlations between tripling and other phenomena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B-DIALECTS</th>
<th>A-DIALECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clitic doubling in infinitivals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP-agreement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tripling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B-DIALECTS
(54) Me (se) zui te komme,…
with they\textsubscript{clitic} they\textsubscript{strong} to come
‘Because of them coming,…’ (Brussels)

A-DIALECTS
(55) Mee (*se) zunder te komen
with they\textsubscript{clitic} they\textsubscript{strong} to come
‘Because of them coming,…’ (Waregem)

\rightarrow clitic doubling is disallowed in infinitival clauses in A-dialects.

B-DIALECTS
(56) Ik paus da(*n) se zaailn kommen.
I think that-PLURAL they\textsubscript{clitic} they\textsubscript{strong} come
‘I think they are coming.’ (Wambeek)

A-DIALECTS
(57) K peizn da-n ze zider komn.
I think that-PLURAL they\textsubscript{clitic} they\textsubscript{strong} come
‘I think they are coming.’ (Wijtschate)

\rightarrow complementizer agreement is only allowed in the A-dialects

2.8 First conjunct vs. Full coordination clitic doubling

(58) Ik paus da me t [gou en ik] suimen wel
I think that we\textsubscript{clitic} it you\textsubscript{strong} and i\textsubscript{strong} together PRT
can solve
‘I think that you and I can solve that together.’ (Wambeek)

(59) Ik paus da se [zaailn en waailn] dui suimen weI
I think that they\textsubscript{clitic} they\textsubscript{strong} and we\textsubscript{strong} there together PRT
goiteruiken out come
‘I think that they and we will solve that together.’ (Wambeek)

\rightarrow when clitic doubling a coordination, either the first conjunct or the entire
coordination can be doubled by the clitic

2.9 Object clitic anti-intervention effects & full coordination clitic doubling

\rightarrow full coordination clitic doubling is only allowed when an object clitic intervenes
between the clitic and the coordinated subject

(60)*? Ik venj da se aai en zaai da suimen muutn oplossen.
I find that they\textsubscript{clitic} [he and she] that together must solve
INTENDED: ‘I think he and she should solve that together.’ (Wambeek)

(61) Ik venj da se ‘t aai en zaai suimen muut oplossen.
I find that they\textsubscript{clitic} it [he and she] together must solve
‘I think that he and she should solve that together.’ (Wambeek)

3. Analyses

3.1 Copy spell-out

A. Proposed for: Topic Doubling

B. How it works

\textbullet The copy of the topicalized subject is spelled out by a strong subject pronoun

(62) [CP waalle, komme [AgrP waalle, [VP …]]]
\rightarrow Copy Spell-Out: [CP waalle komme [AgrP waalle, [VP …]]]

Arguments pro:

\textbullet Restriction to Subject-Initial main clauses \rightarrow only sentence type in which
Spec,CP is available for the subject.

\textbullet Restriction to strong or generically interpreted weak quantifiers \rightarrow only those
quantifiers can be topicalized
(63) a. Alle * gin manne meege zaaiie binn all no men may theSTRONG here inside

‘All men can come in.’ (Wambeek)
b. Een vrou komt zaai e kaffee binn.

‘Women usually enter a bar.’

# ‘A woman enters a bar.’

• Meaning of a wh-question changes to a rhetorical question

(64) Wie eid-ij da geduin? (Wambeek)

who has-heSTRONG that done

* ‘Who has done that?’ (real question)

‘It is obvious that X/no-one has done that.’ (rhetorical question)

Arguments pro:
• The copy is not necessarily identical to the topicalized subject:

(65) Die vrouw komt zaa morgen. (Gent)

that woman comes sheSTRONG tomorrow

‘That woman is coming tomorrow.’

• It is unclear why objects cannot be doubled

3.2 Big DP

A. Proposed for: Clitic Doubling, Topic Doubling with weak subjects

B. How it works
• General idea: A subpart of the subject is moved out of the subject to a sentence initial position.

• Specific implementation: Based on the pronominal inventory of Dechaine & Wiltschko (2002): Strong subject pronouns are DPs, Subject clitics are φPs.

• Schematic structure of a Clitic Doubled strong subject pronoun:

(66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DP</th>
<th>D'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DφP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong pronoun

Arguments pro:
• It explains why objects cannot be doubled → object clitics are DPs according to the tests of Dechaine & Wiltschko (2002)

• It explains why full DP-subjects/proper names cannot be doubled → the NP contains lexical material and cannot be spelled out as a clitic.

Arguments con:
• Subject Island violation

• CSC violation (with FCCD see above)

• If this structure is also used for Topic Doubling → how to explain Topic Doubling with non-weak pronouns?

3.3 Functional head

A. Proposed for: Clitic Doubling & Topic Marking

B. How it works

B1. Clitic Doubling

→ the clitic spells out a functional head position (for instance Fin°)
Arguments pro:  
- It explains why there is no object Clitic Doubling $\rightarrow$ I° agrees with the subject, not with the object.

Arguments con:  
- No doubling of full DP-subjects

(68) * Ik paus da se [ Marie] komt  
I think that she Mary comes  
'I think that they and we will solve that together.'

- FCCD $\rightarrow$ the features of the subject and hence of I° are not the features spelled out by the subject clitic.

(69) Ik paus da se [ zaailn en waailn] dui suimen  
I think that they she and we there together  
wel 'I think that they and we will solve that together.'

B2. Topic marking

(70) [CP [c- dat] [TP [c- t] [TP Valèrer [ da nie wilt doen]]]  
that sheCLITIC sheSTRONG that not wants do

3.4 Left dislocation

A. Proposed for: Topic Doubling  
B. How it works  
- The first element of the doubled subject is base-generated in Spec,CP  
  (satellite).  
- The subject pronoun moves from Spec,VP to Spec,IP

(71) [CP Marie, komt [IP zaai [VP zaai ...]]  
M. comes she she

Arguments pro: see 3.1 above

Arguments con:  
- It is unclear how the relation between topic in Spec,CP and strong pronoun in Spec,IP is exactly established.  
- It is unclear why the second element of the doubled subject has to be a strong subject pronoun.  
- It is unclear why objects can be doubled

3.5 Spelling out of phi-features for emphatic reasons

A. Proposed for: Topic Doubling with weak pronoun, Clitic Doubling

B. How it works

(72) a. Subject initial main clause  
[CP Zê, [c- heef t] [TP zij gisteren [VP t [v= t gewerkt]] hi t]].  
b. Inverted main clause/embedded clause  
[CP Gisteren [c- heef ze] [TP zij [VP v=gewerkt]] hi t]].

Arguments pro:  
- unification of Topic Doubling and Clitic Doubling

Arguments con:  
- How to account for Topic Doubling with non-weak subjects?  
- No doubling of strong pronouns/proper names/full DP-subjects

(73) * Ik paus da zij/ Marie/ die vrouw komt  
I think that sheSTRONG she/Mary/that woman comes  
'I think that they and we will solve that together.'

- Coordination data (FCCD) shows that the strong pronoun in inverted main clauses/embedded clauses are is the thematic subject (rather than the clitic pronoun):
(74) Ik paus da se [zaailn en waailn] dui suimen
I think that the YSTRONG theySTRONG and weSTRONG there together
wel oitgeruiken
PRT out.come
‘I think that they and we will solve that together.’

Coordination data (FCCD vs FuCCD) shows that the strong pronoun in
inverted main clauses/embedded clauses is not the same as the strong
pronoun in subject initial main clauses:

(75) Jan en Pierre muute zaailn dui oek zen.
John and Pete must they there also be
‘John and Pete must also be there!’

(76) * Ze muute Jan en Pierre dui oek zen.
They must John and Pete there also be
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