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ABSTRACT

This introduction discusses some reasons for doing large-scale microvariation research on syntactic doubling. It provides an overview of the types of syntactic doubling phenomena attested so far, the issues that they raise and the types of analyses that have been proposed.

1 SYNTACTIC DOUBLING

The syntax of natural language can be defined as the set of rules or principles according to which morphosyntactic features are combined into morphemes, morphemes into words, words into phrases and phrases into sentences. According to the Principle of Compositionality, one of the leading hypotheses of modern linguistic research, the meaning of a complex expression is determined by the meanings of its constituent expressions and the rules used to combine them. If this is correct, every constituent should contribute to the meaning of the complex. From this point of view, syntactic doubling is an unexpected phenomenon. In syntactic doubling, a constituent (i.e., a morphosyntactic feature, morpheme, word or phrase) is expressed two or

---

1 The papers in this volume are a selection of the papers presented at the Edisyn workshop on Syntactic Doubling that was organized at the Meertens Institute in Amsterdam, March 16-18, 2006. All papers were assessed by two anonymous reviewers and by the editors. Since the papers start with an abstract, they are not summarized in this Introduction.

2 The Principle of Compositionality is commonly attributed to Frege (1892).
more times within a clause. For example, in the colloquial English sentence in (1a), negation is expressed three times, whereas Standard English would use only one negative element (1b). The construction in (1a) is known as negative concord.

(1)  
   a. At the end of the month, nobody ain’t got no money.  
   b. At the end of the month, nobody has money.  

Since the additional negative elements in (1a) do not yield a meaning different from (1b), the question arises as to why these elements are there, or even, how they can be there. Normally, when we interpret a sentence, it is impossible to simply ignore the presence of some of the constituting elements, and that is exactly what we seem to have to do in (1a) to arrive at the intended interpretation. These questions are important, because syntactic doubling is a pervasive and very frequent phenomenon, and by no means restricted to negative elements.

The Principle of Compositionality is primarily relevant for semantic research. Its syntactic counterpart, the Economy Principle, states that language design is maximally economical and efficient. According to this principle, there should be no superfluous steps and elements in the derivation of a syntactic structure. The Economy Principle is one of the reasons why current generative syntactic research concentrates on dependencies, such as the dependency between the argument position of a Wh-word and the fronted position in which it surfaces, and syntactic agreement phenomena, such as the agreement between a subject and a finite verb. Both are considered to be imperfections that a language conceivably could do without, since they involve seemingly superfluous steps or elements. Syntactic doubling, of which agreement is in fact a subcase, should be part of the list of imperfections, as it seems to violate economy as well.

Syntactic doubling may provide us with a window on pure syntax, i.e., on those aspects of syntax that are independent of building a complex meaning. This does not imply, however, that doubling never contributes to the information that is conveyed by a sentence. Even when it does not contribute to the meaning in the narrow sense, doubling can have a discourse function, for example in dislocation constructions, where a constituent can be presented as a contrastive topic. Therefore, for each doubling construction, we have to ask if it involves purely syntactic doubling, doubling with a semantic effect or doubling with a discourse function.

It is possible that there is more syntactic doubling in natural language than meets the eye. Suppose we take subject-verb agreement to be the default, given that so many languages have it. On this perspective, doubling of morphosyntactic features of the subject is obligatory. For cases where such doubling is not visible, it must then be assumed that there is abstract doubling. For finite verbs, there are two relevant cases of invisibility: (i) absence of finite

---

3 The Economy Principle was proposed in Chomsky (1995).
inflection; (ii) absence of the subject. An example of the first case is given in (2b), where abstract first person singular inflection is taken to be present on the verb on the basis of the contrast with (2a). Similarly, it may be necessary to assume for languages that do not have finite verb inflection at all (e.g. Chinese) that there is abstract inflection in the whole paradigm. An example of the second case, absence of the subject, is the well-known pro drop phenomenon, e.g. in the Italian sentence in (2c).

(2)  

a. He walk-s (-s: 3p, singular) (English)  
b. I walk-Ø (-Ø: 1p, singular) (English)  
c. Ø ti am-o (Ø: I = 1p, singular) (Italian)

If doubling is the default case in certain syntactic domains, the question arises under which circumstances one of the doubles can or must be unpronounced. It is clear that there are language-specific and even morpheme-specific rules. For example, in (2a) both the subject pronoun and the agreement morpheme have to be pronounced, in (2b) the agreement morpheme has to be unpronounced, and in (2c), the subject pronoun can optionally be pronounced but the agreement morpheme must be pronounced. An advanced morphosyntactic theory should be able to explain these properties and cross-linguistic differences. More generally, the syntactic researcher should be aware of the possibility that there is abstract doubling.\(^5\)

2 SYNTACTIC MICROVARIATION

Modern syntactic research has primarily focused on idealized idiolects, often standard languages, and there are good methodological reasons for this choice. Our current state of syntactic knowledge, however, calls for an extension to large-scale microcomparative syntactic research.\(^6\) Morphosyntactic feature specifications, e.g. for gender, number, person, definiteness, tense, aspect and negation, play a central role in modern syntactic research, and cross-linguistic variation in feature specifications is hypothesized to correlate with other syntactic differences such as word order variation and various types of ellipsis.\(^7\) More fine-grained data are necessary to investigate minor morphosyntactic differences between closely related language varieties, and the number of data and language varieties involved should be large enough to test hypothesized correlations in a reliable way. In the words of Kayne, large-scale microcomparative syntactic research comes closest to a language laboratory where one

---

\(^5\) Two interesting examples of proposals for abstract doubling in the realm of focus particles are Bayer (1996) and Kayne (2000).


\(^7\) This is a central hypothesis in the Minimalist Program that starts with Chomsky (1995).
could do experiments with languages by altering minor properties of a language and observe which other properties change as a result of this.\(^8\)

The insight that large-scale microcomparative syntactic research is required to make the next steps towards understanding the syntax of natural language has led to a considerable number of dialect syntax projects recently: the ASIS project on Northern-Italian dialects, the FRED project on English dialects, Scandiasyn on Germanic Scandinavian dialects, Findiasyn on dialects of Finnish, Cordial-Syn and Duplex on European Portuguese dialects, the SAND project on dialects of Dutch, and projects on varieties of Afrikaans, Swiss-German, Basque, Breton, and Appalachian English.\(^9\) There are several initiatives for similar projects elsewhere in Europe.

All of these projects cooperate in the framework of the European Dialect Syntax project (Edisyn).\(^{10}\) Edisyn has two goals. One goal is to make all the dialect syntactic data that are collected in these projects available in an on-line network of databases with a common search engine, to support microcomparative syntactic research. The second goal is to study syntactic doubling phenomena, for the reasons discussed above, but also because the results of some of the dialect syntax projects suggest that syntactic doubling is much more frequent in substandard varieties than in standard varieties. For example, the negative concord phenomenon in (1a) occurs in many dialects of German, English and Dutch, but it is absent in the corresponding standard languages. The SAND-data show the same for subject doubling, complementizer doubling, Wh- and relative pronoun doubling, auxiliary doubling, agreement doubling (complementizer agreement). All of them are impossible in Standard Dutch but possible in substandard varieties.

If it is true that syntactic doubling phenomena are much more common and frequent in substandard varieties, this raises interesting questions about the differences between standard and substandard languages. Received wisdom has it that the main difference is socio-political, but here we may have identified a linguistic difference. The question is why such a difference should exist. One possible answer would be normative pressure, in which case we need to document the activities that normative grammarians undertook to get rid of doubling. For negative concord, this may be possible,\(^{11}\) but there is no evidence so far that the same would hold for other types of syntactic doubling. One could also ask why the tendency does not go in the opposite direction, such that syntactic doubling phenomena would be more typical for standard languages. A relevant observation for this question could be that syntactic doubling is also quite common in child language.\(^{12}\)

\(^8\) Kayne (2000: 5).
\(^9\) Cf. [http://www.dialectyntax.org//](http://www.dialectyntax.org//) for more information and links to these projects.
\(^{10}\) [http://www.meertens.nl/projecten/edisyn](http://www.meertens.nl/projecten/edisyn)
\(^{12}\) Cf., e.g., Van Kampen (1997) for Wh-doubling in Standard Dutch child language.
3 TYPES OF SYNTACTIC DOUBLING

The papers in this volume show that doubling of functional elements such as determiners, prepositions, complementizers, negation, auxiliaries, pronouns, agreement, comparative and superlative morphemes, tense and aspect morphemes is quite common. When lexical elements are doubled, they are usually doubled by a functional element, e.g., in many dialects a verb can be doubled by the meaningless auxiliary DO. Doubling involving two lexical elements seems to be much rarer and is totally absent in this volume. This may be accidental, however, as it is known that such doubling does exist. For example, duplication of a lexical verb has been attested (see section 3.5.1). This section provides an overview of the various types of syntactic doubling that have been found, with an example of each type.

3.1 Doubling in the nominal domain

The types of doubling attested for nominal phrases include determiner doubling, ONE-insertion, various types of agreement, possessive, proximal and distal pronoun doubling.

3.1.1 Determiner doubling. In some Germanic varieties determiners can be doubled. An example is Swiss German, which allows doubling of indefinite and definite articles.\(^ {13}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ä ganz ä liebi frau.} & \text{(Swiss German)} \\
& \text{a really a lovely wife} \\
\text{b. } & \text{de vil de schöner garte.} & \text{(Swiss German)} \\
& \text{the much the nicer garden}
\end{align*}
\]

Alemannic has doubling of indefinite determiners but not of definite ones.\(^ {14}\) Double indefiniteness also occurs in Bavarian, northern Swedish and northern Norwegian.\(^ {15}\) Frisian has an indefinite singular adjectival suffix that doubles the indefinite article and expresses high degree. This suffix can optionally be combined with \textit{ONE}, giving rise to tripling.\(^ {16}\) Double definiteness occurs in Faroese, Norwegian and Swedish, with a definite determiner and a definite suffix on the noun.\(^ {17}\) This may also be analyzable as definiteness agreement. Multiple occurrence of a non-suffixal definite determiner exists in Modern Greek.\(^ {18}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Examples from Glaser and Frey (2006).
\(^{14}\) Brandner (this volume).
\(^{15}\) Kalluli and Rothmaier (2006), Delsing (1993).
\(^{16}\) Tiersma (1999), Barbiers (2005b).
\(^{17}\) Cf. Julien (2005) for recent discussion.
In south-eastern varieties of Dutch, the numeral één ‘one’ can optionally cooccur with an indefinite article (4a). When één ‘one’ occurs, the construction expresses high degree. Since één ‘one’ is the stressed counterpart of een ‘a’, the features indefinite and singular are doubled.\(^{19}\) Cases like (4a) can be taken to be a permutation of the construction in (4b). Since the construction in (4b) is also possible in Standard Dutch, it is not doubling that distinguishes dialectal Dutch from Standard Dutch under this analysis, but the possibility of permutation.\(^{20}\)

\[(4)\]
\[
a. \text{Je bent een raar kind (één).} \quad \text{(South-eastern Dutch)}
\]
\[
you are a strange kid (one)
\]
\[
\text{You are a very strange kid!}
\]
\[
b. \text{één zo ’n raar kind.} \quad \text{(Standard Dutch)}
\]
\[
one such a strange kid
\]

Definite determiner doubling is also attested in southern varieties of Dutch, but only in elliptical constructions, where the definiteness feature is represented twice, once in the article and once in the demonstrative:

\[(5)\]
\[
a. \text{Hij wil den dieën hebben.} \quad \text{(Southern Dutch)}
\]
\[
he want the that have
\]
\[
He wants to have that one.
\]
\[
b. \text{Hij wil (*den) dieën auto hebben.} \quad \text{(Southern Dutch)}
\]
\[
he want the that car have.
\]

3.1.2 Agreement in nominal groups. Agreement should be considered a doubling phenomenon, as agreeing affixes by definition express one or more morphosyntactic features of an element elsewhere in the clause (cf. also section 1). Agreement is often obligatory and in that case it cannot be exploited to convey a special meaning or discourse status, unlike some of the doubling phenomena discussed in this book.

A first case of agreement is adjectival concord, which doubles morphosyntactic information such as gender, number and definiteness that is present elsewhere in the nominal group, e.g., on the noun and/or the determiner. This is illustrated for gender agreement in French in (6).

\[(6)\]
\[
\text{a. un-g bon*(-ne) histoire} \quad \text{(French)}
\]
\[
a.FEM \quad \text{good.FEM story.FEM}
\]

\(^{19}\) Cf. Perlmutter (1970) for this relation between English one and a.

\(^{20}\) Cf. Barbiers (2005b) for description and analysis.
A second case involves case agreement, in which more than one element in a nominal group expresses the same case information. An example from German is given in (7).

(7) ein-es schön-en Haus-es
    a.GEN.NEUT nice.SUFF house.GEN.NEUT

A third case of agreement is found in Alemannic in examples like (8). This type of doubling is restricted to family names and unique nouns referring to families. Although the nominal phrase diachronically is a singular genitive, in present-day Alemannic it behaves as a plural nominative, witness the plural agreement on the finite verb.

(8) s Nochbar-s kumm-et ooh.
    -s neighbour-s come-PL also

3.1.3 Possessive doubling. Doubling of possessive pronouns is quite frequent. In colloquial varieties of German and Dutch, a possessive pronoun can double a full nominal phrase, as in (9a,b). There are also varieties that allow doubling of the possessive pronoun itself (9c,d). Doubling of the possessive pronoun in non-standard German and Dutch is only possible when the second pronoun is third person, even when the first pronoun is not third person (9e,f).  

(9) a. der Lola ihr Film
    the Lola her film
    Lola’s film

b. Jan z’n boek
    John his book
    John’s book

c. em Haus
    him his Haus
    his house

d. hem z’n boek
    him his book
    his book

e. meiner seiner
    mine his
    mine

21 Cf. Brandner, this volume.
22 Cf. Weiß, this volume.
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f. jouw (*je) boek (Colloquial Dutch)
your your book

3.1.4 Proximal and distal doubling. A final type of doubling inside nominal groups involves words like here and there. An example from Norwegian is given in (10a). A slightly different construction is found in Afrikaans (10b), where proximity is expressed by a demonstrative and a proximal locative pronoun.

(10) a. den her-re (her) boka (her) (Norwegian)
    the here.AFF here book.DEF here
    this book here
    b. in hier-die mooi land (Afrikaans)
    in here-this beautiful country
    in this beautiful country

3.2 Doubling in the adjectival domain

Doubling in adjectival phrases is found in comparative and superlative constructions. It has been reported for varieties of English and Dutch. In the superlative, it may involve cooccurrence of superlative most with a superlative suffix (11a), or it may involve addition of a superlative suffix to a suppletive superlative, as in (11b). The same possibilities exist for the comparative (11c,d).

(11) a. It is one of the most liveli-est towns that I know of. (App.English)
    b. That was the best-est chocolate gravy I ever ate. (Colloq. American)
    c. Then we can promote a more healthi-er environment. (Fiji English)
    d. Ik voel me wat beter-der. (Coll. Dutch)
    I feel me what better-er
    I feel somewhat better.

3.3 Doubling in the prepositional domain

3.3.1 Preposition doubling. Preposition doubling is found in many language varieties. An Icelandic example is given in (12). The construction has also been reported for Norwegian, Swedish, and English, although in the latter language it is restricted to relative clauses. We seem to have a case of pure syntactic doubling in (12), as the verb takes a prepositional complement in which the preposition is meaningless.

(12) Um hvað eruð þið að tala um? (Coll. Icelandic)
    about what are you to talk about
    What are you (pl.) talking about?

Cases like (12) should not be confused with cases like (13) in Colloquial Dutch. In (13), the preposition tegen ‘against’ is stranded by the R-pronoun daar ‘there’. The combination of daar and tegen is doubled by the full PP tegen die man in left dislocated position.

(13) Tegen die man daar praat zij niet tegen. (Coll. Dutch)
    against that man there talks she not against
    She does not talk to that man.

A third type of P-doubling, illustrated in (14), occurs in directional and locational PPs.

(14) a. Ich fahr uff Koostanz uffi. (Alemannic)
    I drive on Konstanz on
    I’ll drive to Konstanz.
    b. Es hanget a de Wand (d)anne. (Alemannic)
    it hangs on the wall on
    It is attached to the wall.

3.3.2 R-pronoun doubling. In some language varieties that have R-pronouns, these can be doubled. R-pronouns typically occur in languages in which P-stranding is only possible if the nominal complement of the preposition is replaced by an R-pronoun, such as German and Dutch. In Upper German dialects, the R-pronoun can be doubled, as in (15).

---

25 Jónsson (this volume).
26 Brandner (this volume).
27 The pronoun is called R-pronoun because in Dutch all forms of its pronominal paradigm contain an /r/. R-pronouns in other language varieties do not necessarily contain an /r/. Cf. Van Riemsdijk (1978).
28 Cf. Brandner (this volume) and Fleischer (2002).
3.4 Pronoun doubling

Pronouns seem to be the prototypical candidates for syntactic doubling. In addition to the possessive pronouns discussed in 3.1.3 and the R-pronouns discussed in 3.3.2., doubling is found with subject pronouns, expletive pronouns, direct and indirect object pronouns, Wh-pronouns, relative pronouns and resumptive pronouns.

3.4.1 Subject pronoun doubling. Various types of subject pronoun doubling have been reported in the literature. It occurs, e.g., in Flemish, Brabantish, northern Italian dialects, West Swedish, Finland Swedish, Colloquial Norwegian, Colloquial Finnish. Some examples are given in (16).\textsuperscript{29}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(16)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item[a.] dat \textit{ze} \textit{zij} in Brussel werkt. (Flemish)\textsuperscript{29}
\item[b.] Zij werkt \textit{zij} in Brussel. (Brabantish)
\item[c.] Marie \textit{ee} \textit{zij} daar niet mee te maken. (East-Flemish)
\item[d.] Te ghe de vegni anche ti. (Milanese)
\item[e.] Ig ar \textit{ig} sakt \textit{ig} mier y gryt-un. (West-Swedish)
\item[f.] An a \textit{han} joort hi. (Finland Swedish)
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. De Vogelaer and Devos (this volume), Van Craenenbroeck and Van Koppen (this volume) for Brabantish and Flemish; Poletto (this volume) for northern Italian dialects; Holmberg and Nikanne (this volume) for Colloquial Finnish, Vangsnes (this volume) for Colloquial Norwegian and Swedish. The West-Swedish example is from Levander (1909). The Finland Swedish example is from Östman (2006).
Several distinctions need to be made in this domain. Firstly, one type of subject pronoun doubling involves dislocation structures, i.e. sentences in which one occurrence of the subject is in the initial or final position of the clause and separated from it by an intonational break. An example is (16h). The dislocation usually has a discourse effect, e.g., the dislocated subject is interpreted as a contrastive topic. It is clear that this type of doubling is not the same construction as subject pronoun doubling without dislocation (e.g., 16a,b). There is no clear discourse effect in the latter, and languages can have one of the constructions while disallowing the other. For example, Colloquial Dutch allows the dislocation construction illustrated for Norwegian in (16h), but not doubling constructions of the type in (16a,b). For non-dislocation cases like (16a), it has been claimed that the linearly first pronoun can never be more specified than the second one. The second distinction must be made between doubling of pronouns, as in (16a,b,d,e-g) and doubling of full nominal constituents, such as (16c,h). Finally, we distinguish doubling and tripling. An example of tripling is (16e). It can also be found in various Flemish dialects and in colloquial Finnish.

3.4.2 Doubling by expletives. Expletive constructions can be taken to involve doubling as well. This is most obvious for subjects, as in some languages the expletive pronoun occurs in a syntactic position that is otherwise restricted to subjects. This is illustrated for English in (17). If doubling always involves the sharing of one or more morphosyntactic features, then this must be the case in expletive constructions too. Possible candidates are partitive or indefinite features.

30 Cf. Cinque (1990) for a distinction between different types of dislocation structures.
31 Nuyts (1995) claims that the subject doubling construction in the dialect of Antwerp expresses more empathy from the part of the speaker than a construction with one subject. If true, that could be a discourse effect. However, it is not very clear how the notion of empathy is defined. Eefje Boef (p.c.) tried to test this claim for various Flemish and Brabantish dialects by setting up situations which involve a lot of empathy and found that both doubling and non-doubling were allowed.
32 Colloquial Dutch right-dislocation of the type found in (16h) differs from its colloquial Norwegian counterpart in that the first element of the doubling pair can only be a pronoun if the right-dislocated element is a pronoun.
33 Cf. Nuyts (1995) for this observation and Barbiers, Koeneman and Lekakou (in press) for an extension to Wh-doubling and an explanation.
34 Cf. Haegeman (this volume) and Carrilho (this volume) for expletive constructions in West-Flemish and European Portuguese that cannot be analyzed as instances of doubling.
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(17) There is a bird on your shoulder. (English)

There is a striking asymmetry between subjects and objects, since expletive constructions like (18) with an object instead of a subject do not seem to be possible cross-linguistically:

(18) * John bought there a house. (English)

Intended interpretation: There was some house that John bought.

When the object is clausal, doubling by an expletive pronoun is possible:

(19) I really regret it that the parcel has not arrived. (English)

In languages with R-pronouns, this is also possible with clausal complements introduced by a preposition.

(20) Hij hoopt er op dat zij wint. (Dutch)

He is hoping that she will win.

3.4.3 Direct and indirect object pronoun doubling. Many language varieties allow doubling of direct and indirect objects. As in the case of subject pronoun doubling, this may involve doubling of a phrasal object or indirect object by a pronoun, or doubling of a pronoun by a clitic. These constructions often involve dislocation constructions with a discourse effect. It is not clear if the type of non-dislocative doubling discussed in section 3.4.1 (example (16a)) is ever possible for direct and indirect objects. In any case, there are language varieties that allow subject pronoun doubling but not doubling of direct and indirect object pronouns, e.g. the southern Dutch subject pronoun doubling varieties. Direct and indirect object doubling, or clitic doubling, is particularly well-known from Romance and Slavic languages. Some examples are given in (21).

(21) a. Lo vedo, Gianni

him see.I Gianni
Gianni, I see him.

b. Le di un regalo a mi madre.

to her gave-I a gift to my mother
I gave my mother a gift.

c. Petre mu go DADE proektot nemu. (Macedonian)

Petre him.DAT.CL it.ACC gave project-the him.DAT
Petre did give the project to him.
3.4.4 Wh-pronoun doubling. In Wh-pronoun doubling a Wh-constituent is doubled by another Wh-constituent. The first distinction to be made is clause-bound Wh-doubling (short Wh-doubling) and Wh-doubling across clause boundaries (long Wh-doubling). These two types of Wh-doubling constructions are independent, as a language variety may allow one but not the other. Short Wh-doubling is attested in Swiss German and in various northern Italian dialects. Some examples are given in (22). As the examples show, the two Wh-elements can be identical (22a), or different (22b).

(22) a. Wer isch da gsi wer? (Swiss German)
   who is there been who
   Who was there?

b. Sa alo magnà che? (Northern Italian)
   what has-he eaten what
   What did he eat?

In long Wh-doubling constructions, a Wh-pronoun in the initial position of an embedded clause is doubled by a Wh-pronoun in the initial position of a higher clause. As in the case of short Wh-pronoun doubling, the two (or more) Wh-pronouns can be identical (23a) or different (23b). In a small number of Dutch varieties, the second pronoun in a doubling construction is a relative pronoun (23c). It is also possible for a Wh-pronoun to double a Wh-phrase (23d). The opposite order of pronouns in (23b,c) is never possible, which suggests the same generalization as in the case of non-dislocative subject pronoun doubling, i.e. the first pronoun cannot be more specified than the second pronoun.35

(23) a. Wie denk je wie ik gezien heb? (Coll. Dutch)
   who think you who I seen have
   Who do you think I have seen?

b. Wat denk je wie ik gezien heb? (Coll. Dutch)
   what think you who I seen have
   Who do you think I have seen?

c. Wat/wie denk je die ik gezien heb? (dialectal Dutch)
   what/who think you REL I seen have
   Who do you think I have seen?

d. Wat denk je welk boek ik gekocht heb? (Coll. Dutch)
   what think you which book I bought have
   Which book do you think I have bought?

3.4.5 Doubling in relative clauses; 3.4.5.1 Short relatives. In some language varieties a relative pronoun can cooccur with a complementizer. An example of this so called doubly filled COMP effect is given in (24a). Doubly filled COMP is a theoretical notion from a stage of generative theory in which it was assumed that there was one clause initial position, COMP, which could be filled by exactly one constituent in some languages but by two constituents in other languages.\(^{36}\) In English, for example, the COMP position can be filled by a complementizer or by a relative pronoun, but not by both. Although complementizers and relative pronouns have different syntactic functions, it is not unlikely that certain morphosyntactic features are doubled here. For example, the relative pronoun and the complementizer in (24a) possibly share a definiteness feature.

\[(24)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{de man die} \quad \text{da het verhaal verteld heef}t \quad \text{(Brabantish)} \\
& \quad \text{the man REL.AGR that the story told} \quad \text{has} \\
& \quad \text{the man who told me the story} \\
b. & \quad \text{de man die} \quad \text{(*da) het verhaal verteld heef}t \quad \text{(St. Dutch)} \\
& \quad \text{the man REL.AGR that the story told} \quad \text{has} \\
c. & \quad \text{the man that} \quad \text{told me the story} \quad \text{(English)}
\end{align*}
\]

3.4.5.2 Long relatives. In long relatives, the relative pronoun can sometimes be doubled. In such cases there is a relative pronoun that occurs in the initial position of the most deeply embedded relative clause and a relative pronoun in the initial position of the higher relative clause. An example is given in (25). Relative pronoun doubling is found both in subject and in object relatives.\(^{37}\)

\[(25)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{de man die} \quad \text{ik denk die} \quad \text{het verhaal heef}t \quad \text{verteld} \quad \text{(East-Flemish)} \\
& \quad \text{the man REL} \quad \text{I think REL the story has told} \\
& \quad \text{the man who I think told us the story}
\end{align*}
\]

In some dialects, this type of doubling can be combined with the doubly filled COMP phenomenon discussed in 3.4.5.1. This is illustrated for Tyrolean in (26).\(^{38}\)

\[(26)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{es Haus des wos du glapsch des wos die M. gekaaf}t \quad \text{hot} \quad \text{(Tyrolean)} \\
& \quad \text{the house REL C-REL you think REL C-REL the M. bought has} \\
& \quad \text{the house which you think Maria bought}
\end{align*}
\]


\(^{37}\) Cf. SAND Volume 1 (Barbiers et al 2005) for different variants and their geographic distribution.

\(^{38}\) Cf. Alber (this volume) for data, analysis and a different view on doubly filled COMP..
Another type of doubling in long relative constructions involves resumption. An example is given in (27).

(27) de man waar van ik denk dat ze hem geroepen hebben (East. Dutch)
    the man where of I think that they him called have
    the man who I think they have called

3.5 Doubling in the extended verbal domain

In the doubling constructions described so far, at least one of the elements is functional, belonging to a closed class of elements with a primarily grammatical function. In the types of languages discussed in this volume doubling with two identical lexical elements is very rare. We have not found any such cases for adjectives or nouns. Prepositions do double, but they are often considered to be (semi-)functional elements as well. In the verbal domain, doubling also usually involves functional material, but there are exceptions.

3.5.1 Doubling of lexical verbs. In some languages, including Spanish, Portuguese, Hungarian, Turkish and Hebrew, a lexical verb is doubled when fronted. An example from Spanish is given in (28).39

(28) Leer, ningún estudiante ha leído este libro. (Spanish)
    read.INF no student has read this book
    As for reading, no student has read this book.

Some other languages use DO when a lexical verb is fronted and there is no auxiliary to carry finite inflection.

(29) Werken doet Jan niet. (Dutch)
    work.INF does Jan not

Semantically empty DO that doubles a lexical verb also occurs in the so called periphrastic DO construction as it is found in spoken German, Dutch and English. An example from German is given in (30).40

---

39 Example from Vicente (2007)
40 Example from Erb (2001).
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(30) Sie tut ein Buch lesen.  
    she does a book read  
    She is reading a book./ She reads a book.

In present day Standard English, do-support is restricted to the so called NICE environments: negative and interrogative sentences, emphasis, ellipsis and tags. In this use, do seems to have lost all of its aspectual properties, such that it is even compatible with stative raising verbs like seem. In this respect, periphrastic do in many dialects of Dutch is different, in that it is only compatible with dynamic verbs.\(^{41}\)

3.5.2 Auxiliary doubling: 3.5.2.1 Double modals. Double modals are found in varieties of English. An example from Scottish English is given in (31).\(^{42}\)

(31) He should can go tomorrow.  
    He ought to be able to go tomorrow.

From the perspective of Standard English that allows only one modal per clause, this is a case of doubling. However, syntactic doubling was defined in the Introduction as multiple expression of the same constituent (i.e., morphosyntactic feature, morpheme, word or phrase). In modal doubling of the type illustrated in (31) there are two distinct modals and each modal makes an independent semantic contribution. In languages that freely allow more than one modal per clause and in which these modals can be identical, such as Dutch, apparent doubling of a modal always has semantic consequences. For example, in (32a) the modal can either have an epistemic or a dispositional interpretation but not both at the same time. In (32b), on the other hand, the first instance of kunnen ‘can’ has an epistemic interpretation whereas the second instance has a dispositional interpretation.

    Jan can skate  
    Jan is able to skate.  
    It is possible that John is skating.  
    # It is possible that John is able to skate.

b. Jan kan best schaatsen kunnen.  
    Jan can best skate kunnen
    It is perfectly possible that John is able to skate.

Thus, according to the definition in the Introduction, modal doubling is not a genuine case of doubling. In fact, modals seem to be the only type of auxiliary that do not allow real doubling, an observation that calls for an explanation.

3.5.2.2 Doubling of perfective auxiliaries

Perfective auxiliary doubling, i.e. doubling of have or be, is attested in varieties of German, French, Italian and Dutch. Some examples are given in (33).

(33) a. On a eu mis de l’eau sur les chaises. (Franco-Provençal)\(^{43}\)
    one has had put of the water on the chairs.
    They have put water on the chairs.

b. I ha gässa cha und denn bin i hei gange. (Bavarian German)\(^{44}\)
    I had eaten had and then am I home gone
    I had eaten and then I went home.

c. Co go bio magnà,… (Northern Italian)\(^{45}\)
    when have.1sg had eaten,…
    when I had eaten...

d. Ik heb vandaag nog niet gerookt gehad. (Brabantish)\(^{46}\)
    I have today yet not smoked had.PCP
    I haven’t yet smoked today.

Here as well, the question arises as to whether the two instances of have make independent semantic contributions. The following interpretations/functions could be suggested for perfective auxiliary doubling: (i) perfect tense in language varieties in which preterite tense was lost and substituted by the perfect tense; (ii) a perfect tense referring to an unspecified moment in the remote past; (iii) the perfect tense of an inalienable possession (undative). For Brabantish and Limburgian Dutch it has been shown that none of these options apply. In these varieties, perfective auxiliary doubling seems to be a genuine case of semantically empty doubling.\(^{47}\) For Franco-Provençal, it has been suggested the participle eu ‘had’ in doubling constructions has been reanalyzed as a particle, given that it also occurs with verbs that normally select être ‘be’ as their perfective auxiliary.\(^{48}\)

In German and dialectal Dutch the passive auxiliary allows doubling in the perfect tense, as illustrated in (34b). At first sight, this does not look like doubling since (34b) contains

\(^{43}\) Example from Carruthers (1994).
\(^{44}\) Example from Poletto (2007).
\(^{45}\) Example from Poletto (2007).
\(^{46}\) Example from Barbiers, Koeneman and Lekakou (2008).
the perfective auxiliary BE and the passive auxiliary BECOME and each of these auxiliaries makes its own contribution. However, the fact that in Standard Dutch the participle of the passive auxiliary (geworden) must be left out suggests that its presence is redundant and thus that we are dealing with a genuine case of doubling.

(34) a. De hond wordt geslagen. (Dutch)
   the dog becomes beaten
   The dog is being beaten.

   b. De hond is geslagen geworden. (South-eastern Dutch)
   the dog is beaten become
   The dog has been beaten.

3.5.2.3 Doubling of aspectual and causative auxiliaries. Doubling and even tripling of aspectual GO, COME and BEGIN is found in Swiss German (35a-c). It is also possible to double COME with GO (35d). Causative LET can be doubled in Swiss German as well (35e).

(35) a. Si gaat de zmittag go (ge) choche. (Swiss German)
   she goes the lunch go go cook
   She is going to cook lunch.

   b. Si chunt de zmittag cho (ge) choche. (Swiss German)
   she comes the lunch come go cook
   She is coming to cook lunch.

   c. Si faat de zmittag afe choche. (Swiss German)
   she begins the lunch begin cook
   She is beginning to cook lunch.

   d. Si chunt de zmittag go (ge) choche. (Swiss German)
   she comes the lunch go go cook
   She is coming to cook lunch.

   e. Si laat de zmittag la aabräne. (Swiss German)
   she lets the lunch let burn
   She is letting the lunch burn.

Doubling and tripling of GO also occurs in West-Flemish.\footnote{First reported in Haegeman (1990). Example from Van Riemsdijk (2002).}

\footnote{Examples from Van Riemsdijk (2002).}
\footnote{According to Van Riemsdijk (2002), the sentences in (35b) and (35d) do not mean exactly the same.}
(36) dank morgen goan go (gen) fish. (West-Flemish)
that-I tomorrow go go go fish
that I am going to go fishing tomorrow

3.5.3 Doubling of verbal morphology
Doubling of verbal morphology has been attested for finite verbs (both past and present tense), imperatives and participles. This is illustrated in (37) for colloquial Swedish.52

(37) a. Lars försöker o skriver ett brev. (Colloquial Swedish)
Lars try.PRES and write.PRES a letter
Lars tries to write a letter.
b. Lars försökte o skrev ett brev. (Colloquial Swedish)
Lars try.PAST and write.PAST a letter
Lars tried to write a letter.
c. Försök o skriv ett brev! (Colloquial Swedish)
try.IMP and write.IMP a letter
Try to write a letter!
d. Lars hade försökt o skrivit ett brev. (Colloquial Swedish)
Lars had try.PCP and write.PCP a letter
Lars had tried to write a letter.

Finite verbal agreement (i.e., person and/or number) can also be doubled on the complementizer. Complementizer agreement occurs in dialects of Dutch and German.53 An example from Bavarian is given in (38).54 Notice that Bavarian allows the subject pronoun to be silent here. This is also the case in Frisian.

(38) Wenn-st moan-st … (Bavarian)
if-2SG think-2SG
If you think ...

Doubling of participial morphology occurs in Alemannic, Frisian and some north-eastern dialects of Dutch (39a). It is also known as the Participium pro Infinitivo construction, because a participle occurs where an infinitive is expected on the basis of the selecting auxiliary.55 The

52 Cf. Wiklund (2007) and this volume for data and analysis.
53 Cf. SAND Volume 1 (Barbiers et al. 2005) for complementizer agreement in the dialects of Dutch.
54 Example from Brandner (this volume).
55 Cf. SAND Volume 2, Barbiers et al. 2008 for geographic distribution and references.
opposite, the well-known Infinitivus pro Participio effect in which an infinitive occurs instead of the expected participle, may be taken to be a case of infinitive morphology doubling (39b).\(^{56}\)

(39) a. Zou hij dat gedaan hebben gekund? (North-eastern Dutch)
   would he that done.PCP have.INF could.PCP
   Could he have done this?

   b. Hij had het moeten doen. (Dutch)
      he had it must.INF do.INF
      He should have done it.

Doubling of the infinitival marker is attested in certain dialects of Alemannic. A Swabian example is given in (40).\(^{57}\)

(40) Mir bruuchet der Bese zum dGarage zum / z /Ø fürbe. (Swabian)
   we need this broom for-to the garage to wipe
   We need this broom to wipe the garage.

3.5.4 Negation doubling. An example of negation doubling in which multiple instances of negation express a single sentential negation (i.e. negative concord) was given in (1), repeated here as (41).

(41) At the end of the month, nobody ain’t got no money.

In (41), the negative morpheme \(n\)- is doubled. It is present as constituent negation in the negative quantifiers *nobody* and *no money*, and as part of the sentential negation *n’t*. There are also language varieties that have doubling of the sentential negation itself. Well-known cases are Standard French, Flemish and Afrikaans (42a-c).\(^{58}\) Cases of tripling and quadrupling of clausal negation can be found in dialects of Italian. This is illustrated for Venetian in (42d) and for Ligurian in (42e).\(^{59}\)

(42) a. Je n ai pas lu ce livre. (French)
    I not have not read that book

   b. da Valère nie en-wilt werken. (West-Flemish)
      that Valère not not-wants work
      that Valère does not want to work.

---

\(^{56}\) Cf. SAND Volume 2, Barbiers et al. 2008 for geographic distribution and references.

\(^{57}\) Example from Brandner (this volume).

\(^{58}\) Flemish example from Haegeman (1995).

\(^{59}\) Venetian example from Poletto (2008). Ligurian example from Manzini (this volume).
3.5.4 Focus particle doubling. In some languages, focus particles such as just, only, already, even can double. In Dutch, there are two types of focus particle doubling: doubling by an identical particle and doubling by a distinct particle.\(^6^0\) Identical doubling is illustrated in (43a), distinct doubling is illustrated in (43b). Since focus particles can be associated to nominal and verbal constituents it must be proven that cases like (43a) are not just apparent cases of doubling, involving an adnominal and adverbial occurrence of the particle with independent contributions from each particle. The sentence in (43c) shows that the particle maar ‘only’ is incompatible with the stative verb kennen ‘know’. The second, “adverbial”, instance of maar ‘only’ in (43a) must therefore be licensed by the presence of adnominal maar, so we are dealing with a genuine case of doubling.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(43) a. } & \text{Maar één student ken ik maar.} \quad \text{(Dutch)} \\
& \text{only one student know I only} \\
& \text{I know only one student.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Jan is alleen maar boos op Marie.} \quad \text{(Dutch)} \\
& \text{Jan is only only angry at Marie} \\
& \text{Jan is only angry at Marie.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{Die student ken ik (*maar).} \quad \text{(Dutch)} \\
& \text{that student know I only}
\end{align*}\]

3.5.5 Complementizer doubling. There are two types to distinguish here, doubly filled COMP and true complementizer doubling. Doubly filled COMP was discussed in section 3.4.5. True complementizer doubling involves multiple occurrence of complementizers. An example of this from Colloquial Dutch is given in (44a), where the interrogative complementizer cooccurs with the default subordinating complementizer. As (44b) shows, complementizer doubling and doubly filled COMP can cooccur.\(^6^1\) Example (44c) illustrates that the default subordinating

---

\(^{6^0}\) Cf. Barbiers (2003) for description and analysis.

\(^{6^1}\) Examples from SAND Volume 2 (Barbiers et al. 2008).
complementizer *dat* ‘that’ can not be left out in Dutch in the absence of the interrogative complementizer *of* ‘if’. Since *dat* ‘that’ can be left out in (44a), this suggests that it represents redundant features there. This redundancy presumably involves the features finite and subordinate. The order of interrogative and default subordinating complementizer is not fixed cross-linguistically. Hungarian, for example, has the opposite order of Dutch (46d).62

\[(44)\] a. Weet jij of (dat) Jan komt? (Colloquial Dutch)  
know you if that John comes  
Do you know whether John will come?  
b. Weet jij wie of dat er komt? (Colloquial Dutch)  
know you who if that there comes  
Do you know who is coming?  
c. Ik weet *(dat)* Jan komt. (Dutch)  
I know that John comes  
d. Nem tudom hogy megjött-e János. (Hungarian)  
not know-I SUB came-INTER János  
I don’t know if John has arrived.

4 TYPES OF SYNTACTIC ANALYSES

4.1 Introduction

The papers in this volume provide extensive and detailed syntactic analyses of many of the doubling phenomena discussed so far, and there are quite some analyses in the literature as well. The goal of the present section is not to review these analyses but to classify them into different types. It should be stressed that a unified analysis of syntactic doubling is unlikely in view of the heterogeneity of the doubling phenomena. It also does not seem to be possible to classify the syntactic doubling phenomena discussed in this chapter in terms of their function or meaning, since for many of the doubling phenomena it is not clear that they contribute anything to the semantics or pragmatics of the sentence.

One function of doubling that has been suggested now and then in the literature is reinforcement of a phonetically weak or weakened element. The best known example is the so-called Jespersen Cycle, illustrated here for negation in French.63

62 Example from Szabolcsi (1994).
(45) a. Je ne dis. 
I NEG say 
(Old French)
b. Je ne dis pas. 
I NEG say NEG 
(Modern French)
c. Je dis pas. 
I say NEG 
(Colloquial French)

A weak negative element *ne* comes to be reinforced by a phonetically stronger non-negative element *pas*. In the next stage, *ne* disappears and *pas* becomes the only negative element. The subsequent diachronic development could be that *pas* weakens such that reinforcement by a new negative element becomes necessary. Doubling in other syntactic domains could be interpreted in the same way. For example, a hypothetical Jespersen-cycle for subject doubling and the pro drop phenomenon could be:

(46) a. mang io 
et I 
b. mang-io 
et-I 
c. (io) mang-io 
I eat.1SG 
d. io mang 
I eat 

Though not at all implausible, proposals of this type must be made more precise by defining the syntactic positions available in a clause on the basis of comparative syntactic research. This is what theoretical syntactic research has tried to do in the past 50 years or so, and also what we will do in the next sections.

### 4.2 Doubling as multiple spell-out of chain positions

According to the first type of analysis, a constituent can be associated with more than one position in a syntactic structure, and doubling arises when more than one of these positions is spelled out.64 The simplest example involves the position of verbs. In Dutch, verbs occur at the end of the clause (47a), but the finite verb occurs in the position of the complementizer when the clause has no complementizer (47b). The main verb remains in its clause-final position if

---

64 The most articulated recent theory of multiple chain link spell out is Nunes (2004). In this volume, the analyses of Alber, Holmberg, Van Craenenbroeck and Van Koppen, and Jónsson assume multiple chain link spell out.
there is an auxiliary in first position (47c). If there is no meaningful auxiliary and the main verb remains in clause-final position, a dummy auxiliary has to be inserted in first position that carries the finite morphology (47d).

(47)  

   a.  Als Jan de speler weg stuur-t, dan ...  
   if Jan the player away send-s then...  
   If Jan sends the player away, ...  

   b.  Stuur-t Jan de speler weg ____, dan ...  
   send-s Jan the player away ____ then...  
   If Jan sends the player away, ...  

   c.  Wil Jan de speler weg sturen, dan...  
   wants Jan the player away send then...  
   If John wants to send the player away,...  

   d.  Doe-t Jan de speler weg sturen, dan...  
   doe-s Jan the player away send then ...  
   If Jan sends the player away, ...  

The underlined positions in the examples in (47) form a chain of dependent positions, as the position of the main verb is dependent on the presence of a complementizer or auxiliary. The main verb in (47b) can be said to occupy both positions. It is in clause final position because it forms a predicative unit with the particle *weg* ‘away’ and it is in clause initial position where it marks the clause as a conditional clause. If building a syntactic structure starts with the main verb and proceeds from right to left (or, in hierarchical terms, from bottom to top), we can say that in (47b) the verb *stuur-t* ‘send-s’ starts in the clause-final position and moves up to the clause-initial position. These two positions for the verb are visible in (47d), where the main verb remains in situ and is doubled by the dummy verb *DO*.

Besides the periphrastic *DO* construction exemplified in (47d), some of the other doubling phenomena discussed in section 3 are good candidates for an analysis in terms of multiple chain link spell out. Subject pronoun doubling (section 3.4.1; cf. ex. 48a,b) qualifies as such.65

(48)  

   a.  dat ze zij in Brussel werkt. (Flemish)  
   that she.w she.s in Brussels works  
   that she is working in Brussels  

---

65 The analyses in Van Craenenbroeck and Van Koppen (2000, 2002, this volume) and Haegeman (1990a, 1991) show that this is a considerable simplification of the the actual structure.
b. Zij werkt zij in Brussel. (Brabantish)
   she.s works she.s in Brussels
   She is working in Brussels.

As in the case of periphrastic DO, it can be shown that a clause has more than one position for subjects. The sentences in (49a,b) show that there is a position for subjects preceding adverbials such as gisteren ‘yesterday’ and a position for subjects following such adverbials. The sentences in (49c,d) show that the subject can precede or follow the finite verb in verb second position.

(49)  
   a. dat <zij> gisteren <zure> gebeld heeft.66 (Dutch) 
       that she.s yesterday she.s called has 
   b. dat <ze> gisteren <*ze> gebeld heeft.67 (Dutch) 
       that she.w yesterday she.w called has 
   c. Toen heeft zij gebeld. (Dutch) 
       then has she called 
   d. Zij heeft toen gebeld. (Dutch) 
       she has then called 

Thus, we can say that there is a chain of subject positions and that in subject doubling constructions the subject pronouns fill those positions, whereas in non-doubling constructions/language varieties only one subject position per clause is visible.

  Even in the latter type of language varieties the availability of more than one subject position can be visible, as in the case of expletive constructions (cf. section 3.4.2). In the English example in (50a), the expletive fills a position that is a designated position for subjects, as (50b,c) show.

(50)  
   a. There is someone calling you. (English) 
   b. Someone is calling you. (English) 
   c. * You is someone calling. (English) 

Wh-doubling as it occurs, for example, in German and Colloquial Dutch (cf. section 3.4.3 and example 51) has been analyzed as multiple chain link spell out as well.

66 In the post-adverbial position focal stress is obligatory.
67 As a weak pronoun, ze ‘she’ cannot bear stress, and elements following adverbs like gisteren ‘yesterday’ require stress.
(51) Wie denk je wie ik gezien heb? (Coll. Dutch)
who think you who I have seen have
Who do you think I have seen?

Parallel to periphrastic DO and subject doubling constructions, it can be shown that a sentence may have more than one position for Wh-elements. More specifically, every clause has a clause-initial position for Wh-elements, which means that if a sentence consists of more than one clause, it has more than one position for Wh-elements:

(52) a. Wie heb je gezien?
who have you seen
b. Ik weet niet [wie hij gezien heeft].
I know not who he has seen has
c. Wie denk je wie hij gezien heeft?
who think you who he seen has

Again, language varieties would not differ with respect to the number of positions that they have available for Wh-elements, but only in the number of positions that can be pronounced in one sentence.

Periphrastic DO, subject doubling and Wh-doubling have in common that the duplicate does not have to be identical to the original morphologically. Thus, a main verb can be duplicated by DO, zij ‘she.s’ can be duplicated by ze ‘she.w’, and wie ‘who’ can be duplicated by wat ‘what’. The generalization appears to be that the original cannot be underspecified with respect to the duplicate.68 Other candidates for an analysis in terms of multiple chain link spell out include R-pronoun doubling, relative pronoun doubling, auxiliary doubling and preposition doubling.

The multiple chain link analysis explains why there can be two or more occurrences of one constituent. To capture cross-linguistic variation w.r.t. the availability of doubling and tripling, additional assumptions are necessary. Optimality theory is a possible approach, in which doubling is favored or disfavored due to different constraint rankings.69 Another possibility would be that even in languages that do not have multiple spell out, multiple spell out does not violate any grammatical principle. It could simply be an option that is allowed but not utilized by the language due to language-external factors.70

68 Cf. Barbiers, Koeneman and Lekakou (to appear) and Holmberg and Nikanne (this volume) for an explanation in terms of partial copying. Cf. Nunes (2004) and Fanselow and Cavar (1999) for an explanation of non-identical doubling in terms of scattered deletion (i.e. deletion of different parts of two or more copies).
69 Cf. Alber (this volume).
70 Cf. Barbiers (2005a, in press) for such an approach.
Another issue that needs to be addressed in the multiple spell out approach include cross-linguistic differences w.r.t. the size of constituents that can be doubled. There is a tendency for constituents with more than one word to not double, but there are exceptions, e.g. in Afrikaans it is possible to double a constituent consisting of a preposition and a Wh-element. Languages also differ as to which positions in the chain can be spelled out. In Wh-chains like (52c), the Wh-element can occur in the clause initial positions, but it cannot occur in the argument position where it occurs in multiple Wh-questions (cf. (54)).

4.3 Doubling as big constituent splitting

The second type of analysis proposed in the literature to account for doubling starts from the assumption that what surfaces as multiple occurrences of one constituent originates as one big constituent consisting of all the visible occurrences. For example, according to such an analysis the German construction in (53) would start with a constituent [was wen]. In the course of building up the syntactic structure this constituent would split up into wen and was, was taking the higher Wh-position, wen taking the lower Wh-position. Like the multiple spell out analysis, this analysis crucially assumes that there is more than one Wh-position in the clause.

(53) a. Was denkst du [was wen] ich gesehen habe? (German)
   who think you who I seen have
   b. Was denkst du [was wen] ich gesehen habe? (German)
      what think you what who I seen have

This type of analysis raises a number of issues. The first issue is why the hypothesized big constituents never surface as such. For example, in many languages a Wh-constituent remains in its base position when there is another Wh-constituent in clause initial position. In such a configuration, the big XP is expected to become visible, but that seems to be generally excluded. This is illustrated for German in (54).

(54) Wer hat [(*was) wen] gesehen?
   who has what who seen

Obviously, it is possible to explain this away. For example, for a case like (54) the features of was could be argued to be a subset of the features of wen. When was is adjacent to wen it is

---

71 Cf. Nunes (2004) for a formal account of the two properties in this paragraph.
locally redundant, so it is deleted (or not spelled out). Alternatively, the spell out of [was wen] could be taken to be wen.\textsuperscript{73}

A second issue involves the question why such big constituents would exist in the first place. It is true that assuming a big constituent solves the problem of redundancy at the clausal level. For example, the problem that the verb \textit{sehen} ‘see’ can only have one object but seems to have two in sentences like (53) seems to be solved if it is assumed that these two elements in fact constitute one constituent. However, this merely shifts the problem of redundancy to the constituent level, where we also would like to know why some or all features are doubled.

Finally, this type of analysis requires extraction from positions (e.g. the specifier of a specifier) that have been argued to disallow extraction.

4.4 Doubling as agreement

Subject–verb agreement has been central in the development of syntactic theory in the past fifty years. In subject–verb agreement constructions, morphosyntactic features of the subject are repeated on the verb. Thus, subject-verb agreement is a core case of syntactic doubling. It has been shown that finite verb agreement is associated to a designated syntactic position.\textsuperscript{74} Many languages have a clausal position that is only accessible to finite verbs. This is illustrated for French in (55). The finite verb in (55a) occurs between the two negative elements, but the non-finite verb has to follow them (55b). In English, main verbs for some reason cannot occur in this position, but auxiliaries can (55c,d). As we have seen above, if there is no auxiliary in the clause, the dummy verb \textit{do} has to be inserted to carry the finite inflection (55e).

\begin{enumerate*}[a.]
\item[55. a.] (Je sais) que Jean ne \textit{mange} pas des pommes. (French)
(I know) that Jean \textit{not} eats \textit{not} of apples
(I know) that John \textit{does not} eat apples.

\item[b.] (Il est stupide) de ne \textless{manger}\textgreater pas \textless{manger}\textgreater de pommes.
\textit{it is} \textit{stupid} to \textit{not} eat \textit{not} eat of apples
To \textit{not eat} any apples is \textit{stupid}.

\item[c.] * (I know) that John \textit{eats} \textit{not} \textit{any apples}.

\item[d.] (I know) that John \textit{will} \textit{not} \textit{eat} \textit{any apples}.

\item[e.] (I know) that John \textit{do-es} \textit{not} \textit{eat} \textit{any apples}.
\end{enumerate*}

The latter observation has led to the assumption that finite agreement originates in a position preceding negation and that the subject has to move to the position immediately preceding it to

\textsuperscript{73} As proposed in Barbiers, Koeneman and Lekakou (to appear).
\textsuperscript{74} Cf. Emonds (1976), Pollock (1989).
check this agreement. Similar agreement relations have been argued to hold for Wh-elements, negation, focus etc., and they are often visible because they may cause a constituent to move to the position where the features are generated.\textsuperscript{75} Schematically, such configurations look as in (56). An (abstract) functional head $F$ is in an agreement relation with a constituent or head that shares morphosyntactic features with $F$.\textsuperscript{76} In GB-theory and early minimalism, this agreement was considered to be the trigger of movement. Later minimalism assumes that agreement is a condition on movement but does not force it. Configurations such as (56) can give rise to two different types of surface doubling. When there is no movement, doubling involves a functional element high in the structure and an agreeing constituent lower down in the structure. When there is movement, doubling involves a so called SpecHead configuration in which the moved constituent is left-adjacent to the agreeing functional head.

\begin{enumerate}
\item F\[x,y,..\] ..... XP \[x,y,..\] \\
\hspace{1cm} agreement
\item F\[3\text{sing}\] ..... DP \[3\text{sing}\]
\item F\[\text{Wh}\] ..... DP \[\text{Wh}\]
\end{enumerate}

Agreement may also be at stake in doubling cases that look like a combination of an analytical and a synthetic construction. Comparative and superlative doubling discussed in section 3.2 can serve as an illustration. Both can be expressed analytically (57a,b), synthetically (57c,d) and doubly (57e,f). If the agreement configuration is as in (57g,h), we only have to assume variation in the spell out of the comparative/superlative features.

\begin{enumerate}
\item more lively  \hspace{1cm} c. livelier  \hspace{1cm} e. more livelier
\item most lively  \hspace{1cm} d. liveliest  \hspace{1cm} f. most liveliest
\item Degree [-er] ..... A [-er]
\item Degree [-est] ..... A [-est]
\end{enumerate}

The multiple chain link spell out approach discussed in section 4.2 is often combined with the agreement approach.

As was noted in the Introduction, in the minimalist program agreement and displacement are considered to be imperfections of language design and agreement is supposed to have no semantic import. A deeper question that remains to be answered under such an approach is why these imperfections are there, and thus, why doubling exists.

\textsuperscript{75} E.g. Rizzi (1996), Haegeman (1995).
\textsuperscript{76} Cf. Wiklund (this volume) for agreement between verbs.
An alternative approach is to assume that agreement does have semantic import. One option would be that agreement is a pronoun itself and thus an argument of the verb. The question then shifts to why an argument of the verb should be repeated. A second option is that agreement is playing a role in establishing predication relations.\textsuperscript{77}

An extension of the idea that a clause contains a range of functional heads that agree with other constituents is the assumption that a certain meaning element (e.g. negation) may be expressed by more than one functional head and that these heads are interpreted as a chain, i.e. as one constituent at the level of Logical Form.\textsuperscript{78} In the opposite situation, one element in syntax is broken up to create two meaning elements at Logical Form.\textsuperscript{79}

5 Doubling Questions – A Summary

The most relevant questions about doubling were discussed throughout this Introduction and many of them are explicitly addressed in the papers in this volume. We will therefore end this Introduction by providing a list of questions that should be kept in mind while reading these papers and for future research.

1. Why does natural language have doubling?
2. Are there cases of doubling with a purely syntactic function?
3. To what extent is it possible to provide a unified analysis of syntactic doubling?
4. What are the semantic and pragmatic contributions of doubling?
5. Why do languages differ with respect to the availability of doubling?
6. Why do languages differ with respect to the positions in which duplicates can occur?
7. Does the cross-linguistic variation as mentioned in 4. and 5. correlate with other syntactic properties of these languages or is it irreducible?
8. At which level of the grammar does doubling arise: in syntax, at PF, or both?
9. How is doubling handled at the level of LF, in particular if only one instantiation of the constituents is sufficient for semantic interpretation.
10. If all languages have the same abstract syntax (the Universal Base Hypothesis), should we assume that there is much more doubling than meets the eye?
11. Is it true that doubling phenomena are much more frequent in colloquial speech and in dialects than in formal speech and standard languages, and if so, how can this be explained?

\textsuperscript{77} Cf. Jelinek (1984) for the idea that agreement morphemes are pronouns. Cf. Rothstein (1983) for the idea that agreement has a function in establishing a predication relation. Barbiers (1995) also proposes that agreement is one of the ways to establish a predication relation: it reduces a dyadic relation to a monadic relation.

\textsuperscript{78} Cf. Manzini (this volume) for multiple negation.

\textsuperscript{79} For example, a Wh-constituent that is split into an operator and a restrictor part.
12. What is the relation between the temporary occurrence of doubling phenomena in child language and the occurrence of the same doubling phenomena in dialects of the language that the child is acquiring?

13. Why does doubling often involve at least one functional element?

14. Why is doubling of phrases that consist of more than one word rare if not non-existent?

15. Is it true that in doubling chains lower elements can not be underspecified w.r.t. higher elements?

16. Is it true that modals, unlike other auxiliaries, do not double cross-linguistically, and if so, why?
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