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Introduction

Various approaches to complementizer agreement (CA), mostly on the basis of Germanic, argue that CA is the result of clitic doubling (CD), (e.g., Van Craenendonck & Van Koppen 2008, 2008). However, one view to CD involves a purely Agree-based approach, in which clitic results from Agree with a functional head (e.g., Sproat 1996, Angélopolous 2019).

• One of the motivations for the view is that the morpheme on the complementizer is morphophonologically a weak clitic in CA, similar to the clitic in CD (van Aken 2020).
• Another argument used for an Agree-only approach to CD is First Conjunct Doubling (FCD) (Vanco Van Koppen, 2008, Papermera & Salmons 2020).

Arabic: on the surface follows from this view (1) the indexer on the C head, (1), and the one in CD, (2), are identical, and both differ from the canonical subject-verb agreement, realized as an affix. (3) FCD is attested.

(1) fakkar 7ms.m / *7ms.m / *7ms.m *hiyee rash-it. thought 3sg.m that-SG she went-3SG-SG
*He thought that she left.

(2) karim shef la-naaem / la-7in. K saw jms.m-SG to-Z / to-her
‘Karim saw Zeeva/her.’

(Lesbian Arabic, CA)

Today’s Goal. To provide an initial evaluation of the view (without committing to an analysis) that equates CA and CD on the basis of Arabic varieties, which have both phenomena.

Claim(s)

• CA exhibits various distinct behaviors from CD (and a Clitic Left Dislocation, CLLD) although the morpheme on the complementizer is morphophonologically a weak clitic in CA. Various challenges need to be addressed to reduce CA to CD (or vice versa), at least in Arabic.

Distribution of Clitic Doubling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Pronom</th>
<th>Dative object (DO)</th>
<th>Direct object (DO)</th>
<th>Objects of Preposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>(la-)zeena</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• A DO, (2), a possessor, (3), IO, (4), or a P-argument, (4), can be optionally doubled with lexical item/full pronoun preceded by the particle la- to in Lesbian Arabic. (LA)

(3) karim shef kteeb-a la-zeena / la-7in. K saw jms.m-SG to-Z / to-her
‘Karim saw Zeena/her book.’ (Possessor)

(4) karim 7al-la la-zeena 2ms.a. (5) ekitt ma-x la-7ariim. spoke 2sg.m said her to-Z story spoke 2sg.m with him to-K
‘Karim told Zeena a story.’ (10)

You spoke with him. (P-argument)

• The doubled possessor can also be used as the IO.

(6) karim yata bint-7o la-7arases kteeb. K gave girl his-to-H book
‘Karim gave Hassa’s daughter a book.’ (LA, IO possessor)

(7) karim qal bint-7o le riciel kihaye-7in. K said girl-her of men story-a
‘Karim told the men’s daughter a story.’ (Sason, IO possessor)

• Subjects cannot cliticize doubled in any dialect.

(8) neem (*la)-karim. slept 3ms.to-Karim
(9) nam-0 (*la)-karim. slept-3ps to-children
‘Karim slept.’ (Lebanese)

Commonalities between CA and CD

Commonality 1. Morphophonology, the morpheme on C, as well as the indexer in the doubling has the clitic form, unlike the subject-verb agreement, realized as an affix (cf. (1) and (22)).

Comonality 2. Both First Conjunct Agreement (FCA), (10) and First Conjunct Doubling (FCD) are possible, (11), including for collective predicates.

(10) fakkar 7ms-m / 7ms-a / 7ms-sm hiyye rash-it. thought 3sg.m-[that-PL / that-3SG / that] she he and help-pl. went-3SG-SG
*He thought that she left and he left.

(11) a. l-mdurria djamalt-it-[ma-ni-o / -im-a] [a]kippe w tpeex]-miberi. the principal-p gathered-X3sg-SG her and him yesterday
The principal gathered her and him yesterday and yesterday.

b. samir sar-[na-ni-o / -im-a]-la-7in w [la-7iene]-miberi. S said-3ms-1pl-X3sg-SG to-me and to-Z yesterday
‘Samir visited me and Zeeva yesterday.’

In this regard, they both behave like subject-verb agreement, (12), which also has FCA.

(12) a. hra-7a-[ma-ni-o / ma-ni-i] ana w makruw; met-1sg-1pl-X3SG I and M 1pl.
I and Marwan met.

‘You and Karim were leaving.’

The Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) holds in Arabic (both for head- and phrasal-movement), (13), as well as doubling configurations, (15).

(13) shrub- [sha-w-walhib] (14) *shrub- [sha-w-walhib] drank-1sg the-tea and-the-milk what drank-1sg and-the-milk I drank the tea and the milk.
‘What did I drink and the milk?’

(15) *min, djamalt-it-[ma-ni-o / -im-a] l-mdurria [w - tpeex]-miberi. who gathered X3sg-SG her and him yesterday
‘Who did the principal gather and him yesterday?’
(13) (11a)

On the basis of these two properties, CD has received a purely Agree-based account, and CA sometimes is reduced to CD.

*Jønsson et al. 1994 reports that CA is available only with pure AGREE-based accounts, and CA sometimes is reduced to CD.

Differences between CA and CD

CD differs from CA and subject-verb agreement (SVA) in several respects.

Differences 1. Definiteness contrast

While (negative) quantified NPs can be subject-agreement which show SVA and CA, and (16), they cannot be CD-ed, (17).

(16) quel le / le-naa bable morsa ma-cat-te. saw-[that-BF / that-3SG] any woman NEG-cause-3SG-FF
*He said that no woman arrived.’ (SA)

(17) *ma-sal-qu-la ha-haa mue-x sarar. NEG-said-1st-SG to-any woman woman
I didn’t tell any woman the news.’ (SA)

Though in Maghreb, such a restriction doesn’t hold in contemporary Arabic (Souag 2017), it doesn’t have CA, so a comparison can’t be drawn.

Differences 2. Possessors

Although CD with possessors is possible (cf. (3), (7)), the possessor cannot trigger subject-verb agreement (SVA) or CA.

(18) *ham-m-o rah-[hi-o] mother-his went-3SG-SG
*His mother left.’ (LA)

Differences 3. Clitic and the doubled DP form a unit

• The clitic and doubled DP (or D) are part of the same unit, i.e., form a constituent, unlike the indexer and its associated phrase involved in CA and SVA.

(20) a. riit kteeb-a la-zeena read-1st-SG book-to-H
1sg and Zeena’s book
b. kteeb-a, la-zeena, rit-o book-to-H read-1st-SG-SG
‘Zeena’s book was read: [passive]
d. 7al 7al it what read-1sg
‘Zeena’s book, I read it’ (CLLD)

‘What did I read?’ (interrogative)

It is not possible to separate the clitic and the doubled element, or target a subpart of the complex.


(22) ‘la-zeena, rit-o kteeb-a ... to-Z read-1st-SG-SG book-to-H
‘Zeena’s book, I read it.’

No such constituency exists between the indexer and the DP in CA, (24), or SVA, (25). A similar property holds in long-distance operations, e.g., focusing.

(24) fakkar 7ms-a rash-it.m. thought 3sg.m-[that-3SG-SG went-3SG-SG woman
*He thought that Maya left.’ (LA)

(25) qal-e balki Leyla hikaye-ma. said-3SG-F probably Leyla story-ma
‘Leyla told probably a story.’ (Sason)

Property 4. CA exhibits Anaphor Agreement Effect, as in (26), in which an anaphoric object is focused-fronted, and agreement is disallowed ( unlike non-anaphoric objects, cf. (27) (Akkus 2021).)

(26) qal-tu le / le-naa rixaiirri-tu buntu said-[that-BF / that-3SG] himself herself showed-1sg-SG girl
‘I said that I showed the girl herself (not something else).’ (Sason)

(27) qal-tu le / le-naa *ruxaiirri-tu buntu said-[that-BF / that-3SG] herself herself showed-1sg-SG girl
‘I said that I showed the girl (not someone else) herself’ (Sason)

Future directions:

• investigation of quantified phrases allowed in CD, particularly their scope properties in comparison with their non-doubled counterparts.

• examination of Arabic CD in the context of theories of CD.

Tentative Conclusions

• Complementizer Agreement and Clitic Doubling share some properties in Arabic.

The indexer is realized morphophonologically as a clitic.

• Both CA and CD exhibit first conjunct ‘agreement’ and ‘doubling’, respectively.

• Yet, there are some differences that need addressing in order to fully assimilate one phenomenon into the other.
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