

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN DUTCH LONG-DISTANCE RELATIVE CLAUSES

In Standard Dutch long-distance relative clauses (1), the relative clause is introduced by the relative pronoun *die* and the lower clause is introduced by the subordinate complementizer *dat*. With respect to these long-distance relatives, Dutch dialects show variation along the following four dimensions: (i) the form of the element that introduces the relative clause (*die/dat*), (ii) the form of the element that introduces the most deeply embedded clause (*die/dat*), (iii) the presence/absence of a complementizer in addition to the relative pronoun (*doubly filled COMP*), and (iv) the presence/absence of an overt subject (*resumptive pronoun*) at the extraction site (cf. SAND; Barbiers et al. 2005,2006). Thus, no variety of Dutch allows zero-relativization: there always needs to be (at least) one element (*die* or *dat*) present in the COMP-domain (cf. also Dekkers 1999). In this talk, I will only be concerned with the first two dimensions, i.e. variation in the distribution (and status) of the elements *die* and *dat*.

- (1) a. Dat is de man [die ik denk [dat __ het verhaal verteld heeft]]. *subject extraction*
 that is the man RP I think that the story told has
 'That is the man who I think told the story.'
- b. Dat is de man [die ik denk [dat ze __ geroepen hebben]]. *object extraction*
 that is the man RP I think that they called have
 'That is the man who I think they have called.'

When only taking into account dimensions (i) and (ii), we predict 4^2 (=16) logically possible combinations of long subject and object relatives, yet, only the six systems in table 1 are attested; the table shows for each system of long relativization the corresponding system of short relativization it employs. The variation in table 1 can be summarized by the three descriptive generalizations in (2).

Table 1; six systems of relativization

	<i>short subject</i>	<i>short object</i>	<i>long subject</i>	<i>long object</i>
system I	die	die	die-dat	die-dat
system II	die	dat	dat-die	dat-dat
system III	die	die	die-die	die-dat
system IV	dat	dat	dat-dat	dat-dat
system V	die	die	die-die	die-die
system VI	die	die	dat-die	dat-die

- (2) A long-distance relativization without a subject/object asymmetry - i.e. the pattern used for subject extraction is identical to the pattern used for object extraction - shows all logically possible variants - *die-dat*, *dat-dat*, *die-dat*, *die-die*
- B a subject/object asymmetry can appear only in the CP containing the extraction site
- C in case of a subject/object asymmetry, *die* occurs with subject extraction, whereas *dat* occurs with object extraction

Assuming a raising/promotion analysis of relative clauses along the lines of Kayne (1994) and De Vries (2002) amongst others, and extending this analysis to long relatives by assuming that movement of the relative DP proceeds in a successive-cyclic fashion, I show that the attested variation can be accounted for by (a hierarchy of) the following four micro-parameters:

- (3) a. +/- spell out of φ -agreement between the (moved) subject and the complementizer
- b. +/- use of relative pronouns
- c. +/- spell out of multiple chain links
- d. +/- partial copying

The geographical distribution of systems that show a subject/object asymmetry, i.e. systems II and III, shows a significant positive correlation with the geographical distribution of *complementizer agreement*, a well-known phenomenon in West-Germanic languages by which the complementizer overtly agrees with the subject of the clause it introduces. I follow Mayr (to appear) in taking φ -agreement with the most local complementizer (generalization B) to license extraction of subjects (cf. Rizzi 1990), and I argue that the element *die* that is found in the most deeply embedded clause of (long) subject relatives in systems II and III is an agreeing variant of the complementizer instead of a

relative pronoun (generalization C). Independent evidence for this claim is provided by the observation that normally, in West-Flemish (i.e. system II) argument clauses the complementizer is always overt – independent of the presence of an additional constituent in Spec,CP (cf. Haegeman 1992) – but in (long-distance) relative clauses it is never overt (i.e. doubly filled COMP *die dat* is not attested). Given the observation that not all dialects show a subject/object asymmetry, and following the null-hypothesis that an agreement relation with the local complementizer always needs to be established in order for the subject to extract, I propose that dialects may differ with respect to whether they spell out the agreement relation with the local complementizer or not (micro-parameter 1), cf. Postma (2006) for a similar claim. To account for the difference between systems II and III, I argue that not all dialects make use of relative pronouns (micro-parameter 2). The observation that zero-relativization is non-existent in Dutch explains the presence of a complementizer in the absence of a relative pronoun. From these two micro-parameters, the existence of systems I, II, III and IV follows naturally:

Table 2; two micro-parameters

	+ spell out C-agreement	- spell out C-agreement
- relative pronouns	dat _{comp} -die _{comp} , dat _{comp} -dat _{comp} (II)	dat _{comp} -dat _{comp} , dat _{comp} -dat _{comp} (IV)
+ relative pronouns	die _{rel} -die _{comp} , die _{rel} -dat _{comp} (III)	die _{rel} -dat _{comp} , die _{rel} -dat _{comp} (I)

Whereas the systems in table 2 spell out only the highest chain link of the movement chain of the relative DP, it has been observed that some languages allow the spell out of more than one chain link (e.g. Nunes 2004). I argue that the patterns of system V and VI are also the result of multiple copy spell out (micro-parameter 3), but whereas system V shows identical doubling of the relative pronoun, system VI shows non-identical doubling. That is to say, the pattern of system VI is the result of the interaction between the syntactic operation *partial copying* (micro-parameter 4) and the spell out of multiple chain links (cf. Barbiers, Koenenman & Lekakou 2008). *Die* and *dat* are thus treated as lexicalizing different parts of the DP structure, a claim which forces one to assume that pronouns are the spell outs of phrases, an assumption that (recently) has been argued for extensively in the literature (cf. amongst others Cardinaletti & Starke 1999, Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002, Van Koppen 2005). Given this analysis of systems V and VI, and given a raising/promotion theory of relative clauses, we are faced with the problem that the intermediate copy in relative clauses is never fully spelled out (i.e. the relative head noun only gets spelled out in the highest chain link). Several solutions to this problem are available - e.g. the notion of reduced copies (Van Koppen 2005) or an analysis that involves PF-deletion (e.g. Nunes 2004) - but, more importantly, doubling of relative pronouns seems to reopen the debate about the structure of relative clauses (i.e. head-external or head-internal).

References

- BARBIERS, S. et al. (2005). *Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects (SAND)*, Volume I. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- BARBIERS, S. et al. (2006). *Dynamische Syntactische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten (DynaSAND)*. Amsterdam, Meertens Instituut. URL: <http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/sand/>.
- BARBIERS, S. & O. KOENEMAN & M. LEKAKOU (2008). 'Syntactic Doubling and the Structure of Chains.' In: C.B. Chang & H.J. Haynie (eds.), *Proceedings of the 26th WCCFL*, 77-86. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- CARDINALETTI, A. & M. STARKE (1999). 'The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns'. In: H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, 145-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- DÉCHAINÉ, R.M. & M. WILTSCHKO (2002). 'Decomposing Pronouns'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 409-442.
- DEKKERS, J. (1999). *Derivations & Evaluations. On the Syntax of Subjects and Complementizers*. PhD dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam. Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.
- HAEGEMAN, L. (1992). *Theory and description in generative syntax: A case study in West-Flemish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KOPPEN, M. VAN (2005). *One Probe - Two Goals: Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects*. PhD dissertation, Leiden University. LOT Diss. 105.
- KAYNE, R. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- MAYR, C. (to appear). 'On the Necessity of ϕ -features: The Case of Bavarian Subject Extraction'. In: P. Panagiotidis (ed.), *The Complementizer Domain: Subjects and wh-dependencies*. Oxford University Press.
- NUNES, J. (2004). *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- POSTMA, G.J. (2006). 'Toward a syntactic theory of number neutralisation; the Dutch pronouns *je* 'you' and *ze* 'them''. In: J.M. Hartmann & L. Molnárfi (eds.), *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- RIZZI, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- VRIES, M. DE (2002). *The Syntax of Relativization*. PhD dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam. LOT Diss. 53.