

## The correlation between subject doubling and demonstrative doubling

Sjef Barbiers, Meertens Instituut and Utrecht University  
(joint work with Marjo van Koppen, Hans Bennis en Norbert Corver)

This paper presents a newly discovered correlation holding for all Dutch dialects that were investigated in SAND and DIDDD (cf. [www.meertens.knaw.nl/mimore](http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/mimore)): *If a dialect has demonstrative doubling, then it has second person pronoun doubling and vice versa*. Examples of both phenomena are in (1). This is an intriguing correlation as it involves both a phenomenon at the level of DP and at the level of CP.

- (1) Northern Brabantish
- |    |                         |      |            |              |         |                        |
|----|-------------------------|------|------------|--------------|---------|------------------------|
| a. | Ik                      | heb  | <b>de</b>  | <b>dieje</b> | gezien  | demonstrative doubling |
|    | I                       | have | the        | that         | seen    |                        |
|    | ‘I have seen that one.’ |      |            |              |         |                        |
| b. | He- <b>de</b>           |      | <b>gij</b> | da           | gezien? | 2p subject doubling    |
|    | have.you.w              |      | you.s      | that         | seen    |                        |
|    | ‘Did you see that?’     |      |            |              |         |                        |

We argue that 2s subject doubling and demonstrative doubling share the same underlying syntactic structure and syntactic derivation and that the surface differences between the various diasystems are a consequence of different spell-out options, thus reducing syntactic variation to properties of the functional lexicon.

More specifically, we show that the geographic area in which this correlation is visible should be divided into three diasystems: (i) Flemish - a diasystem that has phrasal spell-out for the relevant nominal substructure  $\varphi$ P and a generalized  $\varphi$ -probe in C; (ii) Northern Brabantish - a diasystem that has no phrasal spell-out of  $\varphi$ P and no generalized  $\varphi$ -probe; (iii) Southern Brabantish - a transitional diasystem which only has phrasal spell out of 2p subject pronouns and no generalized  $\varphi$ -probe. In addition to 2p subject doubling and demonstrative doubling the analysis captures variation in complementizer agreement and distal D-pronoun fronting in the dialect areas under discussion.