Long-distance relativization in varieties of Dutch

Dutch dialects show a wealth of variation regarding long-distance relative clauses (cf. the Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects (SAND; Barbiers et al. 2005,2006)). With respect to the Standard Dutch long subject relative clause in (1) - in which the relative clause is introduced by the relative pronoun *die* and the lower clause is introduced by the subordinate complementizer *dat* - the Dutch dialects show variation along the following four parameters: (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 (i.e. doubly filled COMP), and (iv) the presence/absence of an overt subject (*resumptive pronoun*) at the extraction site. The same variation is found with long object relatives.

(1) Dat is de man [die ik denk [dat __ het verhaal verteld heeft]]
that is the man RP I think that the story told has
'That is the man who I think told the story.'

Whereas there exists an extensive literature on the syntax of relative clauses (e.g. Alexiadou et al. (2000)), little is known about long-distance relativization, let alone variation attested within this particular construction. As it seems natural to treat the data in a uniform way, I hypothesize that all the variants of long-distance relativization have the same underlying structure; the differences are just surface effects. Assuming a raising analysis of relative clauses along the lines of Kayne (1994) and De Vries (2002) amongst others - according to which relative clauses are derived by *wh*-movement of the relativized constituent consisting of the head noun and the relative pronoun - and extending this analysis to long relatives - movement of the relative DP proceeds in a successive-cyclic fashion, thus leaving an intermediate copy - I show that the attested variation can be accounted for by (a hierarchy of) four micro-parameters, (predominantly) interacting of the interface between Syntax and Phonology/Morphology.

I am concerned with the following six systems of relativization (i.e. no resumption and no doubly filled COMP) - the table shows for each system of long-distance relativization, the corresponding system of short relativization it makes use of.

Table 1; six systems of relativization

	short subject	*short object*	*long subject*	*long object*
system I	die	die	die-dat-Ø	die-dat-Ø
system II	die	dat	dat-die-Ø	dat-dat-Ø
system III	die	die	die-die-Ø	die-dat-Ø
system IV	dat	dat	dat-dat-Ø	dat-dat-Ø
system V	die	die	die-die-Ø	die-die-Ø
system VI	die	die	dat-die-Ø	dat-die-Ø

The existence of these six patterns and the non-existence of all other logically possible patterns of relativization can be captured by the three generalizations in (2). The aim of this talk is to discuss the patterns of relativization in table 1 and provide an explanation for the generalizations in (2).

(2) I long-distance relativization without a subject/object asymmetry shows all the possible variants - *die-dat - die-dat*, *dat-die - dat-die*, *die-die - die-die*, *dat-dat - dat-dat*
II a subject/object asymmetry can appear only in the CP containing the extraction site
III in case of a subject/object asymmetry, *die* occurs in the most deeply embedded clause when the subject is extracted, whereas *dat* occurs in the most deeply embedded clause in case of object extraction

On the basis of the observation that the geographic distribution of the systems that exhibit subject/object asymmetries (II and III) roughly corresponds to the geographic distribution of

complementizer agreement - a well-known phenomenon in West-Germanic languages by which the complementizer agrees with the subject of the clause it introduces - I claim that there is a correlation between complementizer agreement and subject/object asymmetries. More specifically, I follow Mayr (to appear) and assume that (overt) complementizer agreement licenses extraction of subjects (cf. Rizzi 1990). Given this assumption, the element *die* that is found in the most deeply embedded clause of long subject relatives (and with short subject relatives) in systems II and III is then taken to be an agreeing variant of the complementizer instead of a relative pronoun. Independent evidence for this claim is provided by the observation that normally, in West-Flemish 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 is not attested). Whereas this observation would be puzzling under an account that assumes *die* is a relative pronoun, it follows from the analysis of *die* as a complementizer. Dialects may differ with respect to whether they spell out the agreement relation with the local complementizer (microparameter 1). To account for the difference between systems II and III, I argue that not all dialects make use of relative pronouns (microparameter 2). From these two parameters the existence of system I (Standard Dutch) and system IV follows naturally.

The account of Barbiers, Koeneman & Lekakou (2008) regarding doubling of *wh*-pronouns, provides an adequate analysis of systems V and VI. On their account, system V, which shows *identical doubling* of the relative pronoun, is taken to be the result of the spell out of more than one chain link (microparameter 3). System VI - provided that it shows *non-identical doubling* - is assumed to be the result of the interaction between the syntactic operation *partial copying* - an operation that targets only a subconstituent of the relative DP and (re)merges it in a higher position (microparameter 4) - and the spell out of multiple chain links. That is, *die* and *dat* are 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). The final two parameters are capable of accounting for several other (somewhat marginal) systems of relativization as found in the SAND corpus - providing evidence that this analysis is on the right track.

References

Alexiadou, A. et al. (eds.), (2000). *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

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 West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 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.

Déchaine, R.M. & M. Wiltschko (2002). 'Decomposing Pronouns'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 409-442.

Haegeman, L. (1992). *Theory and description in generative syntax: A case study in West-Flemish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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.

Rizzi, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vries, M. de (2002). *The Syntax of Relativization*. Doctoral dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam. LOT Dissertations 53.