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1 • Overview

Most of the papers in this volume were presented at the Workshop Syntactic Microvariation that was held in August 2000 at the Meertens Instituut in Amsterdam. With this workshop, we aimed at initiating cooperation between a number of large scale European dialect syntax projects, including the ASIS-project in Italy, the SAND-project in the Netherlands and Belgium, the project English Dialect Syntax from a typological perspective in Freiburg, Germany, and the project Dialect Syntax of Swiss German (SADS) in Zürich, Switzerland. This volume contains both papers discussing the design and methodology of dialect syntax research projects (Bucheli & Glaser, Cornips, Kortmann), and papers describing and analyzing syntactic microvariation from a typological and generative point of view (the others). Table 1 provides an overview of the contributors to this volume, the language varieties and the syntactic variables they discuss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>VARIETIES</th>
<th>SYNTACTIC VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbiers</td>
<td>Dutch dialects</td>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucheli &amp; Glaser</td>
<td>Swiss German</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornips</td>
<td>Heerlen Dutch</td>
<td>Infinitival Complementizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vogelaer, Neuckermans &amp; Vandenberg</td>
<td>West Flemish, East Flemish, Waaslands, Brabantish</td>
<td>Complementizer agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleischer</td>
<td>German dialects</td>
<td>Preposition stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haegeman</td>
<td>French Flemish, West Flemish</td>
<td>DP internal negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kortmann</td>
<td>South Western English dialects</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poletto</td>
<td>Rhaetoromance dialects</td>
<td>V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seiler</td>
<td>Upper German dialects</td>
<td>Prepositional dative marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Craenenbroeck &amp; Van Koppen</td>
<td>Brabantish &amp; Flemish dialects</td>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiß</td>
<td>Bavarian</td>
<td>Sentential negation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study of syntactic microvariation has various goals. The goal of traditional dialect syntax is to explore the geographic distribution of syntactic variables. The geographically determined syntactic variation thus established can be used for other types of research, such as the investigation of language change and external language history. Recently, the aim of syntactic microvariation research has been extended to studying the universal properties of the human language, since it contributes to our understanding of the patterns, loci and limits of syntactic variation within that system. This goal is shared by both the typological and the generative approach. The main difference between the two approaches lies in the types of explanations provided: functional in the case of the typological approach, and formal in the case of the generative approach (cf. Kortmann, this volume).

The papers in this volume all focus on interdialectal variation and reflect one or more of the above-mentioned goals. Some focus primarily on the description and analysis of the geographic distribution of one or more syntactic patterns, others consider first and foremost the description and analysis of the syntactic properties of one pattern in a restricted number of dialects. The papers show that the study of syntactic microvariation is a valuable contribution to macrovariation research, which is the more common in comparative syntax. Whereas the latter is primarily concerned with standard varieties, microvariation research includes non-standard varieties. This does not only enhance the empirical basis of syntactic theory, but it also reduces the influence of prescriptive rules and makes it possible to test potential correlations between syntactic variables while keeping other, possibly interfering factors constant.

The papers in this volume are all concerned with an idealized language system and not with dialect internal variation. This means that topics such as language contact and change, code switching, bilingualism and multilingualism, speaker’s attitudes, language choice, and language accommodation are left aside. Although this is a justifiable abstraction from the complex linguistic reality (cf. Chomsky 1986), we would like to note that various language system external factors may influence the system itself. Every dialect is a heterogeneous system. A dialect does not exist in isolation, it is in a constant interaction with one or more standard languages and with other dialects. Consequently, dialect speakers are usually bilingual or multilingual. It is well-known that social factors such as age, class, education, gender and ethnicity
determine synchronic linguistic variation too (cf. Cornips, this volume). Moreover, dialect systems are not static but in an ongoing process of change as a result of social, political, cultural and economical influences. It is to be expected that future research in syntactic microvariation, even when system and not use oriented, will pay more attention to the influence of these factors on the language systems explored.

2.1 • Microvariation in the left-periphery
Three papers in this volume concentrate on the fine structure of the left periphery: De Vogelaer, Neuckermans and Vanden Wyngaerd on complementizer agreement in Flemish and Brabantish dialects, Poletto on V2 and V3 in Rhaetoromance and van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen on pronominal subject doubling in Flemish and Brabantish dialects.

De Vogelaer, Neuckermans and Vanden Wyngaerd
De Vogelaer, Neuckermans and Vanden Wyngaerd test two generalizations concerning complementizer agreement: the Inversion Generalization and the Identity Generalization. According to the Inversion Generalization, agreement morphology on the complementizer is always identical to agreement morphology on the verb in inversion. West and East Flemish dialects turn out to confirm the validity of this generalization. According to the Identity Generalization, complementizer agreement only occurs when the agreement ending of the inverted auxiliary in the present tense is identical with the agreement ending of the inverted auxiliary in the preterite. A comparison between the dialect of the transitional area Waasland and the neighbouring Brabantish dialect provides evidence for the correctness of the Identity Generalization.

Poletto
Poletto’s paper investigates V2, V3 and the structure of the left-periphery in the Rhaetoromance dialect of San Leonardo. Elaborating on Rizzi’s work, Poletto argues that there is evidence for a split CP in V2 languages that consists of the following positions: [Hanging Topic [Scene setting adverb [Force [Left dislocated element [Left Dislocated element [Focus [WH [FinP]]]]]]]]. Despite the many available positions preceding the finite verb, the San Leonardo dialect is a V2 language. This can be
explained if the first constituent moving across the finite verb blocks fronting of other constituents by relativized minimality. This predicts that V3 orders should be possible if one of the two constituents preceding the verb is base generated in sentence initial position. Poletto shows that this prediction is borne out. Microvariation in the distribution of XPs in the V3 order is argued to follow from the different positions of the finite verb. The verb has to move to a low position of the CP layer in all V2 varieties, but in some varieties it moves up to a higher position Force.

Van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen
Van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen show that pronominal subject doubling in Southern Dutch dialects involves two different phenomena: topic doubling and clitic doubling. Topic doubling is restricted to subject initial main clauses and involves the doubling of weak and strong pronouns, full DPs and proper names (subject to parametrization) by a strong pronoun. Clitic doubling, on the other hand, occurs in subordinate clauses and inverted main clauses, and can only involve the doubling of a clitic by a strong pronoun. On the basis of this distinction van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen argue that a split CP analysis is necessary for these Southern Dutch dialects. In particular, their analysis of clitic doubling requires a left-peripheral functional head attracting object clitics and a higher head attracting subject clitics. In subject initial main clauses, which only allow topic doubling, these CP layers are absent.

2.2 • Microvariation in negation
Three papers in this volume deal with microvariation in the syntax of negation, Haegeman on DP internal negative doubling in Flemish dialects, Weiß on sentential negation and negative concord in Bavarian and Barbiers on variation in negation in varieties of Dutch.

Haegeman
Haegeman’s paper concentrates on DP-internal negative doubling in French Flemish and West Flemish yielding negative concord. Haegeman argues that the Neg criterion is operative within DP as well. A negative quantifier inside DP is licensed in the Spec of a DP-internal negative head. Microvariation is reduced to parametrization of spell out: in the varieties of Flemish discussed in this paper the preferred option is to spell
out the DP-internal negative head, whereas this head cannot be spelled out in Standard Dutch. Haegeman also provides evidence for a split DP analysis.

Weiβ

Weiβ’s paper provides a detailed description and analysis of sentential negation in Bavarian. Weiβ argues that Bavarian, a negative concord language, has three types of sentential negation: ordinary sentential negation, presuppositional negation and expletive negation. The projection of ordinary negation is immediately dominating VP, presuppositional negation is right above IP, while expletive negation is in a particle position within the CP-layers. Weiβ also defends the interesting claim that all languages are negative concord languages. Obligatoriness of single negation is mainly found in standard varieties such as Standard English and German. In these languages, it can be regarded as the result of artificial, language-external developments. From a syntactic point of view, these languages can be shown to exhibit hidden negative concord.

Barbiers

Barbiers’ paper provides an overview of variation in negation attested in varieties of Dutch. One of the central observations in this paper is that variation in the X-bar status of sentential negation is not only found cross-linguistically but also intralinguistically. In Standard Dutch, sentential negation nie(t) sometimes behaves as a head and sometimes as an XP. Barbiers argues that this varying property of sentential negation does not need to be stipulated but follows from the interaction between the lexical specification of sentential negation and general syntactic licensing mechanisms. Another claim is that much of the distribution of negative elements in varieties of Dutch, among which expletive clause final negation in Aarschots and Afrikaans, can be understood as the result of generalized movement of negative constituents to SpecNegP (Haegeman’s Neg-criterion) and a parametrized doubly filled NegP filter.
2.3 • Microvariation in the prepositional domain
The volume contains two papers on microvariation in the prepositional domain, a paper by Fleischer on preposition stranding and a paper by Seiler on prepositional dative marking.

Fleischer
On the basis of written sources Fleischer describes the geographic distribution of preposition stranding, long and short R-pronoun doubling and orphan prepositions (i.e. prepositions without an overt complement) in the German dialects. The relevance of Fleischer’s paper is that the data falsify several claims in the literature about the geographic distribution of these constructions and about the interaction between syntactic constraints and phonological constraints. First, the geographic distribution presents no evidence for the complementary distribution of the stranding construction (prepositions with an initial consonant) and the long doubling construction (prepositions with an initial vowel). Instead, the data points towards an asymmetrical relation. Prepositions with an initial vowel only allow (long) doubling of the R-pronoun, while prepositions with an initial consonant allow both the stranding and the (long) doubling construction. Stranding of the preposition mit ‘with’ is an exception since it is attested all over the German speaking area. Secondly, it is not the case that in the long doubling construction the two R-pronouns have to be ‘phonologically identical’. Finally, the claim in the literature that the preposition has to be left adjacent to the lexical non-finite verb in OV languages does not hold for the doubling construction.

Seiler
Seiler describes the distribution and the properties of prepositional dative marking (henceforth: PDM), i.e. a dative NP introduced by a preposition-like morpheme an or in in Bavarian and Alemannic (Upper German) dialects. The area is not homogeneous; some Bavarian and Alemannic dialects have PDM, others do not. In three respects the marker in the PDM construction behaves like a preposition. It is in complementary distribution with prepositions, given the fact that it cannot occur on an NP embedded in PP. Just like prepositions the marker cannot occur inside a clitic cluster. Just like prepositions, the marker can be fused with a determiner. The dative marker differs
from prepositions in that it cannot be omitted in coordination, it cannot be separated from determiners/quantifiers by particles such as ONLY, it cannot be a host for clitics, and it does not cooccur with R-pronouns. Moreover, personal pronouns do not provide a suitable environment for PDM. It is interesting that Seiler does not find any correlation between the lack of overt dative morphology and the occurrence of PDM in Alemannic and the Bavarian dialects. Hence, where variation between PDM and bare dative exists, this variation is guided to a large extent by discourse-pragmatic and phonological differences that can be traced back to the fact that PDM has an additional syllable.

3 • METHODOLOGY OF SYNTACTIC MICROVARIATION RESEARCH

Dialect syntax projects deal with the geographic distribution of syntactic variables. The geographic aspect makes it crucially different from other types of syntactic research and it has a number of consequences for methodology. First, all other factors potentially determining syntactic variation have to be kept constant. Syntactic variation may be a consequence of having a heterogeneous sample of language users. It is necessary to homogenize the sample with respect to social variables of the speakers such as autochthony, geographic mobility, language background (monolingual or bilingual speaker), socio-economic background, and gender.

Secondly, an atlas project requires oral and/or written elicitation methods in order to collect reliable and sufficient data. Elicitation of data, for instance by collecting grammaticality judgements, is necessary in addition to corpora in order to be able (i) to examine sentence types that rarely occur in spontaneous speech or (written and recorded) corpora and (ii) to examine negative data that an observational study cannot provide. Note that dialect monographs usually do not provide information about the syntax.

However, oral and written elicitation fieldwork both have their disadvantages. Every elicitation situation is artificial, because the subject is being asked for a sort of behavior that is entirely different from everyday conversation (cf Schütze 1996: 3). Sociolinguistic research has clearly shown that the response of subjects on direct judgement tasks (‘Is this a good sentence in your dialect?’) often tends to reflect the form which they believe to have prestige or obeys the learned norm, rather than the
form they actually use (Labov 1972: 213). A reasonable alternative is to use more indirect elicitation tasks (e.g. ‘Do you encounter this sentence in your dialect?’). Different levels of speech style (informal and formal) yield another complicating factor for syntactic data elicitation.

Oral elicitation differs from written elicitation in that the former enables the researcher (i) to elicit a more natural reflection of ordinary language use and (ii) to observe and immediately respond to the reactions and answers of the subjects. However, there is a high risk that the subjects will accommodate i.e. adjust from the dialect towards the standard-like varieties or more formal speech styles of the interviewer. A solution to this problem is to summon the assistance of another dialect speaker(s) from the same community with the same social variables, as in the SAND-project (cf. Cornips & Jongenburger 2001).

Written elicitation methods induce numerous well-known task effects such as: (i) repetition effect, i.e. the subjects repeat exactly the sentence offered to them; (ii) sentences are rejected on the basis of lexical items, knowledge of the world and context of the sentence; (iii) subjects give judgements on the basis of interpretability rather than grammaticality; (iv) habituation effect: when a given sentence type is offered repeatedly, acceptability tends to increase; (v) order effect: the relative order in which test sentences are presented to the subject has influence on the judgements; (vi) written forms are unduly influenced by prescriptive educational practices. These task effects have to be taken into account, both in the design of elicitation methods and in the resulting analysis.

There are various elicitation tasks in addition to the ones mentioned above such as: (i) Indirect grammaticality judgement task combined with a scale; e.g., the subjects have to indicate how uncommon (highest value = 1) or how common (highest value = 7) the variant is in their local dialect; heterogeneity is assumed by providing several alternatives for one test sentence; (ii) Discourse driven elicitation task (Bucheli & Glaser, this volume); a little story or a relevant context precedes each sentence to create a discourse situation; (iii) Translation task; (iv) Empty spots task; the subject has to fill in the relevant (function)word(s) from his dialect; (v) Completion task; the subject has to finish the sentence; (vi) Compliance tests (Greenbaum 1973); the task is to transform a stimulus sentence in some way, for example, to convert a statement into a question; (vii) Relative judgements; common practice in generative research of
the late 60s and early 70s. The subject is not asked to give a judgement about one sentence but rather to compare the acceptability of two or more sentences and (viii) Meaning questions; In this task the subject is asked to provide the meaning of a sentence.

Bucheli & Glaser, Cornips and Kortmann pay attention to the methodological challenges facing large-scale projects within the field of dialect syntax.

Bucheli & Glaser
Bucheli and Glaser describe the aims, the methods and the material of the *Syntaktischer Atlas der Deutschen Schweiz* ‘Syntactic Atlas of Swiss German’ (SADS). In the first phase of the SADS thirteen different syntactic phenomena are involved. They are basically chosen on (i) the fact that little is known about the areal distribution of these constructions, (ii) the assumption that they will be geographically distributed throughout the Swiss German area. Written elicitation is chosen based on the density of the grid, the large geographical area and the limited resources. The first phase resulted in a total of 2,534 completed written questionnaires from 344 reference points. The different elicitation tasks in the written questionnaire in the SADS are: translation task, sentence completion task and multiple choice task. In particular the latter one yields very good results. Furthermore, each question was preceded by an everyday context, i.e. a little story, in order to create a discourse situation. Finally, with respect to the social variables of the informants, an interesting finding of Bucheli and Glasers’ research is that the answers of a proportion of the highly educated people (mostly male), teachers and people interested in dialectology are unreliable in that they show normative judgements, hypercorrection and influences of the standard language.

Cornips
Cornips examines the variation between *om* and *voor* as two variants of the infinitival complementizer in Heerlen Dutch, a regional Dutch variety. Heerlen Dutch may be considered the result of imperfect group learning during the very rapid process of language shift due to an insufficient availability (of speakers) of Standard Dutch in the beginning of the 20th century. Such a shift began with the transfer of contrasts and
patterns from the shifters’ local dialect into their version of Standard Dutch: that is, with their failure to learn that these patterns did not exist in the target language. Subsequently, these patterns have spread to the target language as a whole. Cornips tries to detect the sources of syntactic variation in spontaneous speech at the level of the individual and the group of speakers. Although the syntactic variation does not present a clear-cut situation, Cornips demonstrates that the variation can be minimized and understood by taking social and linguistic factors into consideration as well. Furthermore, the distribution of infinitival complementizers in spontaneous speech data differs from that in elicitation data. In particular, speakers with a higher education are able to control variation in elicitation procedures, but not in spontaneous speech.

Kortmann
Kortmann discusses the increase of dialect syntax study for generative theory, optimality theory and language typology. The existing databases of for instance the English dialects are too small and display an insufficient range of syntactic features needed for typological and generative research. Therefore, the Freiburg research group is compiling a very large corpus (FRED; already 1,5 million words) of English dialects. The corpus includes a subcorpus of the Southwestern dialects in England (160,000 words including many unpublished interviews of dialect speakers born around 1900). Kortmann discusses briefly the geographic distribution of several syntactic features. Some exclusively occur in the English dialects of the southwest, such as unstressed auxiliary do. Others occur in other English dialect areas too, such as zero-relativization of the subject. The phenomenon of double negation is not regionally bound but generally occurs in spoken non-standard English.
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Section 3.1 describes variation in negative concord and the syntactic distribution of negative constituents. Section 3.2 discusses how the attested variation can be captured by the classical analysis according to which negative constituents move to SpecNegP.

Section 4.1 describes a special case of sentential negation, clause final negation as it is found in Afrikaans and certain Brabantish dialects. Section 4.2 argues that clause final negation can either arise by V-movement or by VP-movement, where language varieties may differ with respect to the option that is chosen. VP-movement is suggested to be an effect of the general requirement that negative constituents move to SpecNegP.

Section 5 summarizes the loci of microvariation in sentential negation in varieties of Dutch. The Appendix contains a description of further instances of microvariation in negation.

2 • S E N T E N T I A L  N E G A T I O N

2.1 • Description

We start by distinguishing three ways of expressing sentential negation, illustrated in (1) for three stages of Dutch (from Hoeksema 1997: 140):

(1) a. **Preverbal clitic**
   
   Ic en was siec (Old Dutch)
   I NEG-CL was sick
   ‘I was not sick.’

b. **Preverbal clitic and NOT**
   
   Ic en was niet siec (Middle Dutch)
   I NEG-CL was NOT sick.
   ‘I was not sick.’

c. **NOT**
   
   Ic was niet siec (Modern Dutch)
   I was NOT sick
   ‘I was not sick.’

These types of negation occur in modern varieties of Dutch as well:\(^2\)

---

\(^2\) The preverbal negative clitic only occurs in varieties of Dutch spoken in Flanders. It is usually optional and it seems to be gradually disappearing. Pauwels (1958:454) reports for the southern Brabantish dialect of Aarschot that there are hardly any instances of a negative particles in main clauses anymore. There is some reason to doubt
(2)  

a. K’en doen  
   I NEG-CL do  
   ‘I don’t.’ 

b. Valère (en-)eet nie ’s avonds  
   Valère NEG-CL eats NOT evening’s  
   ‘Valère does not eat in the evening.’  

c. Valère eet niet ’s avonds  
   Valère eats NOT evening’s  
   ‘Valère does not eat in the evening.’ 

2.2 • NOT: head or spec 

Pollock (1989) and Belletti (1990) propose that sentential negation projects a NegP dominating TP. They assume that in a language like French that has clitic negation (\textit{ne}) and \textit{NOT} (\textit{pas}), the clitic \textit{ne} is generated as the head of NegP, while \textit{pas} is generated as the specifier of NegP. Haegeman (1995) proposes a similar structure for West Flemish: the clitic \textit{en} is taken to be the head of Neg, while \textit{nie} \textit{NOT} is the specifier. According to this proposal, the structure of a negative clause is as in (3) (from Haegeman 1995:28): 

\begin{itemize}
  \item[i] a. ‘kgoa ‘tu zeggen gelakofda ‘t en-es  
     I go it you say like if that it EN is  
     ‘I’ll tell it to you the way it is.’ 
  
  b. Zie dadier wig zat vuur dat a op u kappe en-komt  
     see that you here away are before that he on you hood EN comes  
     ‘Clear out before he gets you.’ 
\end{itemize} 

Haegeman (1995) observes that the negative clitic does not occur in infinitival clauses in West Flemish and Old English, whereas it does in French en Italian:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[ii] a. da Valère prebeerdige [van ip niemand nie dul (*en) te (*en) zijn  
     that Valère tried of on no one not angry NEG to NEG be  
     ‘that Valère tried not to be angry with anyone’ 
  
  b. Pierre dit *(ne) pas manger  
     Pierre said NEG not eat  
     ‘Pierre said not to eat’. 
  
  c. *(Non) parlare a nessuno sarebbe un errore  
     NEG talk to no one would be a mistake 
\end{itemize} 

that the negative particle always is a negative element (cf. Haegeman 1995:160ff). Tavernier (1959) provides some examples of non-negative \textit{en} in the dialect of Ghent:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [i] a. ‘kgoa ‘tu zeggen gelakofda ‘t en-es  
     I go it you say like if that it EN is  
     ‘I’ll tell it to you the way it is.’ 
  
  b. Zie dadier wig zat vuur dat a op u kappe en-komt  
     see that you here away are before that he on you hood EN comes  
     ‘Clear out before he gets you.’ 
\end{itemize} 

Haegeman (1995) observes that the negative clitic does not occur in infinitival clauses in West Flemish and Old English, whereas it does in French en Italian:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [ii] a. da Valère prebeerdige [van ip niemand nie dul (*en) te (*en) zijn  
     that Valère tried of on no one not angry NEG to NEG be  
     ‘that Valère tried not to be angry with anyone’ 
  
  b. Pierre dit *(ne) pas manger  
     Pierre said NEG not eat  
     ‘Pierre said not to eat’. 
  
  c. *(Non) parlare a nessuno sarebbe un errore  
     NEG talk to no one would be a mistake 
\end{itemize} 
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1 • INTRODUCTION

The first goal of this paper is to provide a descriptive overview of the microvariation in negation attested in varieties of Dutch.¹ The second goal is to consider some of the theoretical questions arising from this variation. Description is provided in the first subsection of every main section, while the other subsections contain a theoretical discussion of one or more aspects of the variation described in the first part. Readers mainly interested in description can skip these subsections.

Section 2.1 describes the different patterns of sentential negation found in varieties of Dutch. Section 2.2-2.6 address the question as to whether sentential negation NOT is generated in SpecNegP or in the head Neg. Whereas Haegeman (1995) argues that West Flemish NOT is in SpecNegP and Hoeksema (1997) claims that Middle Dutch NOT is a head, it is argued here that in modern Standard Dutch NOT is sometimes generated in the head of NegP and sometimes in SpecNegP, the choice being fully determined by the interaction of the lexical specification of NOT with general syntactic licensing requirements. Evidence for the proposed specification of NOT comes from the syntactic distribution of the complementizer/preposition van ‘of’. If this approach is correct, it suggests that the cross-linguistically varying X-bar status of NOT may be reducible to a cross-linguistically varying lexical specification of NOT.

¹ I thank Hans den Besten, Liliane Haegeman and Helmut Weiß for valuable comments on previous versions of this paper. The usual disclaimers apply.

¹ This paper was written in May 2000 in preparation of the Dutch – Flemish research project Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects (SAND). The goal of this project is to take stock of and analyze current syntactic microvariation in the varieties of Dutch spoken in Flanders and the Netherlands, in four empirical domains: (i) The left periphery of the clause; (ii) The right periphery of the clause; (iii) Negation and Quantification, and (iv) Pronominal reference. The project will both yield a traditional atlas that represents the geographic distribution of microsyntactic variables and it will yield an electronic database that makes it possible to investigate the correlations between microsyntactic variables. The latter investigation will contribute to the theory of language system internal sources and limits of syntactic variation.
Given the NegP hypothesis, we would like to know for every morpheme expressing sentential negation in the patterns described above whether it is a maximal projection XP in SpecNegP or a head in Neg.

It should be noted that the head or XP status of a negative morpheme cannot be inferred from its form. What seems to be a single morpheme and hence a head at first sight may turn out to be an XP upon closer scrutiny. As a consequence, the identity of the form of NOT in two varieties, e.g. West Flemish and Standard Dutch, does not necessarily entail that NOT is an XP generated in SpecNegP in both language varieties.

2.3 • Middle Dutch NOT

For Middle Dutch, Hoeksema (1997:149ff) argues that NOT behaves as a head rather than a maximal projection, even though Middle Dutch is very similar to West Flemish and French in having en (clitic negation) cooccurring with niet ‘NOT’. Hoeksema’s arguments are summarized in (4). An example of each phenomenon is given in (5).

(4) (i) niet en en may merge (5a).
(ii) In addition to the ordering niet...Verb-en-Vf, we also find the order Verb-niet -en-Vf (5b). The latter can only be derived if niet is in a head position, not if it is in a Spec position. Verb and Vf arguably form a head cluster in (Middle) Dutch, hence if niet is within this cluster, it must be a head.
(iii) niet can sometimes move along with the finite verb in V2 constructions (5c); this is not possible for XPs.
(iv) niet cannot be preposed, whereas XPs normally can (5d).

(5) a. So lijde hi dat hi nin ware Christus
     so confessed he that he not-NEG were Christ
     Middle Dutch

     b. dat si keren niet en mochten
     that they turn not NEG could
     Middle Dutch
c. Des *niet* en fael ic Middle Dutch  
that NOT NEG fail I  
‘I won’t fail in that’

d. *Niet heb ik gewerkt* Standard Dutch  
not have I worked

However, the arguments in (4) are not conclusive arguments against an XP status of Middle Dutch NOT. The merger of *niet* and *en* exemplified in (5a) may be a PF-phenomenon triggered by linear adjacency. There are clear cases of phonological merger of a constituent in Spec position with a head, e.g. Middle Dutch *ic en* ‘I NEG-CL’ realized as *in*, and Standard Dutch *dat is* ‘that is’ realized as *das*. The order in (5b) may be the result of leftward movement of the VP *keren* ‘turn’ across *niet*, an option that is available in Standard Dutch as well: *omdat zij [VP rondjes draaien] nog niet zo goed konden* lit. ‘because they rounds turn yet not so well could’. The order in (5c) is exceptional (cf. Hoeksema 1997).

Finally, although the equivalent of (5d) is not found in Middle Dutch, this is not conclusive evidence for a head status either. To be sure, preposing is a standard test for V2-languages to establish constituenthood, i.e. XP status. However, in Standard Dutch preposing of NOT gives mixed results. The well-formedness of NOT-preposing in Standard Dutch appears to depend on the presence of a complement clause. This, to the best of my knowledge, novel observation is illustrated by the minimal pair in (6a,b).

(6)  
a. Ik had wel gezien dat Jan aankwam, maar NIET had ik gezien dat Ed vertrok.  
I had AFFIRM seen that John arrived, but NOT had I seen that Ed left  
‘I had seen that John arrived but I had not seen that Ed left.’

b. *Ik had Jan wel gezien, maar NIET had ik Marie gezien.*  
I had John AFFIRM seen but NOT had I Mary seen

---

3 Although the observed contrast is rather strong for many native speakers, there are also speakers who do not have a contrast here, in two directions: some accept both (6a) and (6b), others reject both of them. I have no explanation for this variation.
c. *Jan heeft wel gelopen maar NIET heeft hij gezwommen
   John has AFFIRM run but NOT has he swum

d. *Jan kent Marie wel maar NIET kent hij Anna.
   John knows Mary AFFIRM but NOT knows he Anna

The conclusion of this section is that there is no evidence to exclude an XP status of Middle Dutch NOT. In view of the similarity of French, West Flemish and Middle Dutch, the null hypothesis seems to be that Middle Dutch NOT is an XP.

2.4 • Standard Dutch NOT: sometimes a head, sometimes an XP

The hypothesis that Middle Dutch NOT is an XP does not entail that Standard Dutch NOT is an XP as well. It could be that Standard Dutch NOT was reanalyzed as a head after the loss of the negative clitic. The fact that Standard Dutch NOT can sometimes be preposed but not always suggests that it is sometimes an XP and sometimes a head. This is exactly what we argue in this section. The head or XP status and hence the distribution of Standard Dutch NOT will be shown to be fully determined by the interaction between the lexical specification of NOT and general syntactic licensing conditions. The advantage of this analysis is that it makes it unnecessary to stipulate the X-bar level status of NOT, thus supporting bare phrase structure theory (Chomsky 1995).

   As was observed in (6), Standard Dutch NOT can only be preposed if the verb in the same clause selects a complement clause. We take this to show that Standard Dutch NOT is an XP only in the presence of a complement clause. In all other cases Standard Dutch NOT is a head that cannot be preposed. The next question to ask is how a complement clause can make an XP position available that is not available otherwise.

   The analysis of complement clauses proposed in Barbiers (2000a) provides an answer to this question. According to that analysis the structural base position of complement clauses differs from the structural base position of DP complements. Thus, verbs that can either take a CP or a DP complement have two potential internal argument positions, a preverbal position and a postverbal
position.\(^4\) This is illustrated in (7). The structural positions are given in (8): CP is the sister of V, while DP is in SpecVP.

(7)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Ik weet dat Jan dat denkt (*dat Piet komt)} \\
& \quad \text{I know that John that thinks that Piet comes} \\
b. & \quad \text{Ik weet dat Jan (*dat) denkt dat Piet komt} \\
& \quad \text{I know that John that thinks that Piet comes}
\end{align*}

(8)  
\[
[CP \ [TP \ [VP \ DP \ [v \ \text{thinks [CP]})]]] 
\]

As (7b) shows, the two argument positions cannot be filled both at the same time.\(^5\) Let us assume that this follows from the \(\theta\)-criterion: THINK has only one \(\theta\)-role to assign, so one of the arguments would remain without a \(\theta\)-role.\(^6\) This entails that in constructions such as (7b) the preverbal position should in principle be available, but only for constituents that do not require a \(\theta\)-role from the verb. I would like to suggest that Standard Dutch NOT is such a constituent and in this sense is similar to expletive pronouns.

2.5 • A bare phrase structure analysis of Modern Dutch NOT

It is necessary to be a bit more precise about the distribution of Standard Dutch NOT as an XP in argument positions. In the classical GB analysis of the distribution of DP and CP complements (e.g. Stowell 1981), both require a \(\theta\)-role but only DPs require case. Let us assume, following Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), that case is an uninterpretable Tense feature \(uT\). DPs have \(uT\) which must be checked by the verb or Tense, while CPs have an interpretable tense feature \(iT\) which need not be checked. Suppose that to have argument status means to have an (un)interpretable T feature, a \(\theta\)-role, or both. This predicts the existence of four types of arguments:

\(^4\) Cf. Corver (1997) for similar ideas w.r.t. analysis of adjectival complementation.
\(^5\) This only holds for sentences which constitute one intonational phrase. With comma intonation preceding that embedded clause, cooccurrence of pronoun and CP is possible. The latter presumably involves right dislocation, which arguably has different syntactic properties.
\(^6\) Obviously the verb has an additional, external \(\theta\)-role, but this is irrelevant for the present discussion. I assume following Hale & Keyser (1993), Chomsky (1995) that this role is assigned by the abstract little \(v\).
Types of arguments\(^7,^8\)

(i) Arguments with an uT-feature and a \(\theta\)-role
   DP arguments

(ii) Arguments with an uT-feature and no \(\theta\)-role
    expletives/negation

(iii) Arguments with an iT-feature and a \(\theta\)-role
    CP arguments

(iv) Arguments with an iT-feature and no \(\theta\)-role
    Root CPs

As in most analyses, expletives such as *it* in *I regret *it* that John is sick* are arguments with uT (i.e. without case) and without a \(\theta\)-role. The fact that both *NOT* in argument position and internal argument expletives require the presence of a CP complement suggests that the analysis presented here is on the right track.

The distribution of Standard Dutch *NOT* now follows from the assumption that *NOT* should not receive a \(\theta\)-role and has a uT feature that must be checked by the verb or T, either in a Spec Head configuration or in a head-head configuration. This means that *NOT* is excluded from all positions to which a \(\theta\)-role is assigned. It also follows that it is excluded from adjunct positions, where it cannot get its uT feature checked. Only with verbs that have two argument positions but use only one can *NOT* occur in an argument position. If there is no such position, *NOT* must be generated as a functional head in the extended domain of the verb, being licensed in a head-head relation with V or Tense.

In this view, then, the head or XP status of *NOT* is not a stipulated primitive but follows from the interaction between the lexical specification of *NOT* as an element with uT that cannot receive a \(\theta\)-role, and general syntactic licensing requirements.

The proposed analysis captures the facts in (10):

---

\(^7\) For ease of exposition I use the notion of \(\theta\)-role. This notion should ultimately be reducible to a syntactically defined semantic relation, as in Barbiers (1995) and Heim & Kratzer (1998). The property of requiring/not allowing a \(\theta\)-role should not be considered a primitive property of lexical elements or constituents, but should follow from the semantic and morphosyntactic properties of such constituents and elements.

\(^8\) I do not consider PP-complements here. In Barbiers (1995, 2000a,b), I argue that non-resultative PP-complements are not arguments of the verb but predicates of some (extended) projection of the verb.
It is impossible for \textit{NOT} to occur in the preverbal or postverbal argument position (10a,b), as expected as it would receive the $\theta$-role there that a complement DP and CP receive respectively.\footnote{The sentence in (10a) is only ungrammatical under the intended interpretation. It is grammatical with the interpretation ‘You know that I don’t think.’ In the latter case \textit{THINK} has an implicit internal argument and negation is a functional head.} In (10c), \textit{het} ‘it’ is the internal argument of V. This means that the argument position taken by \textit{het} ‘it’ is not available for \textit{NOT}, which therefore must be a functional head here. As expected, fronting of \textit{NOT} is impossible in this construction (10d).

In (10e) the PP [\textit{van niet}] ‘of \textit{NOT}’ is an internal argument of the verb given that it is in complementary distribution with a CP-complement and interpretively functions as an argument. This raises the question why it is possible for \textit{NOT} to be in an argument position when \textit{van} ‘of’ is present. Recall that Standard Dutch \textit{NOT} has a feature $uT$ that must be deleted and that it should not receive a $\theta$-role. This entails that \textit{van} ‘of’ must have an iT feature and does not assign a $\theta$-role. The entire constituent [\textit{van niet}] ‘of not’ receives a $\theta$-role from the verb, but \textit{niet} ‘\textit{NOT}’ itself does not. The constituent [\textit{van niet}] satisfies the the selectional restrictions of \textit{THINK} if selectional restrictions are defined in

(10) a. \textit{*Je weet dat ik \textit{niet} denk.}
\hspace{1cm} you no that I not think
\hspace{1cm} Intended interpretation: ‘You know that I don’t think so.’

b. \textit{*Je weet dat ik denk \textit{niet}.}
\hspace{1cm} You know that I think not
\hspace{1cm} Intended interpretation: ‘You know that I don’t think so.’

c. \textit{Ik denk het \textit{niet}}
\hspace{1cm} I think it not
\hspace{1cm} ‘I don’t think so.’

d. \textit{*\textit{Niet} denk ik het.}
\hspace{1cm} not think I it

e. \textit{Ik denk van \textit{niet} (*dat Jan komt).}
\hspace{1cm} I think of not (that John comes)
\hspace{1cm} ‘I don’t think so.’
terms of features: Standard Dutch THINK selects a complement with an iT feature, which can either be a CP or [van niet].

2.6 • The specification of van

On the basis of its ability to license NOT as an argument I have proposed that the lexical specification of *van* ‘of’ is as in (11):

(11) **van**: ‘of’ Feature = iT  
    Argument structure: assigns no internal θ-role

There is ample evidence that this lexical specification of *van* ‘of’ is correct. A first case is *van* ‘of’ introducing a finite clause. In Standard Dutch *van* ‘of’ turns root clauses into embedded clauses, i.e. whereas V1 and V2 clauses normally do not occur as embedded clauses, *van* ‘of’ makes this possible (12a-c). Conversely, *van* ‘of’ is impossible with canonical embedded clauses with V in clause final position (12e).

(12) a. Dan denk ik [CP van waarom doe je dat].  
    then think I of why do you that  
    ‘Then I think: Why are you doing that?’

b. Dan denk ik [CP van ga weg].  
    then think I of go away  
    ‘Then I think: Go away!’

c. Dan denk ik [CP van ik stop vandaag]  
    then think I of I stop today  
    ‘Then I think: I’ll stop today,’

d. *Ik denk van dat je morgen moet stoppen.*  
    I think of that you tomorrow must stop

The fact that main clauses normally do not occur as embedded clauses follows from assumption (9-iv) that root clauses should not receive a θ-role. It also follows that *van* ‘of’ can turn root clauses into embedded clauses: Whereas the
van-CP as a whole receives a θ-role from the matrix verb, the CP complement of van ‘of’ itself does not receive a θ-role, as van ‘of’ has no θ-roles to assign. Since both van ‘of’ and root clauses have an iT feature, there neither are checking requirements nor potential feature clashes. The incompatibility of van ‘of’ with true embedded clauses also follows, since true embedded clauses need a θ-role, which they do not get when they are the complement of van ‘of’.

A second piece of evidence for the proposed specification of van ‘of’ comes from temporal adjuncts. When van ‘of’ introduces a temporal adjunct it does so obligatorily and it gives the temporal adjunct a specific temporal reference which is absent with a preposition like in ‘in’, as the examples in (13) show. When van ‘of’ is present, as in (13a), avond ‘evening’ must refer to the evening of the day of the utterance. Therefore, an adverb that requires there to be more evenings, such as altijd ‘always’ in (13b) is incompatible with van ‘of’. In (13c), we have in ‘in’ instead of van ‘of’, and now avond ‘evening’ can refer to any evening, and in ‘in’ is compatible with altijd ‘always’. The examples in (14) illustrate the same point.

(13)  a. We gaan *(van) avond.
     we go of evening
     ‘We’ll go this evening.’

     b. *We gaan altijd van avond.
     we go always of evening

c. We gaan in de avond.
     ‘We’ll go in the evening.’

d. We gaan altijd in de morgen.
     we go always in the evening
     ‘We always go in the evening.’

---

10 Consequently, DP-arguments of N should get their θ-role directly from N and not through van. See below for an analysis along the lines of Hoekstra (1999).

11 The examples in (13) and (14) also show that the Dutch orthographic convention to write vanmorgen ‘this morning’, vannmiddag ‘this afternoon’ and vanavond ‘this evening’ as one word is wrong. These “words” consist of a preposition van ‘of’ and an adverbial and behave the same as constituents consisting of van and a time denoting DP.
Thirdly, as observed in Barbiers (1995) *van ‘of’ in (15a) introduces a temporally opaque, independent domain, again strongly suggesting that it has an iT feature. The adverb *gisteren ‘yesterday’ in the constituent [die jongen gisteren] forces a past tense on the finite verb (15b,c), but when *van ‘of’ is there, as in (15a), the present tense is allowed as well.

The properties of *van ‘of’ described so far suggest that it is a complementizer rather than a preposition. On the basis of Kayne (1994), Hoekstra (1999) proposes to analyse case assigning *van ‘of’ in DPs as a complementizer to capture backward binding (16a) and parasitic gap licensing (16b) in DPs, facts that do not follow from analyses that take *van-PPs to be complements or adjuncts to (a projection of) N. Hoekstra’s analysis of (16a) is given in (17). The reciprocal is bound by *die flessen ‘the bottles’ in the base structure. When the moved XP
contains a parasitic gap, as in (16b), this gap is licensed by movement of the object to SpecIP prior to remnant movement of XP.

(16)  a. het naast elkaar zetten van de flessen
the next each other putting of the bottles
‘putting the bottles next to each other’

b. het [zonder e te bestuderen] terugbrengen van je boeken
the without to examine returning of your books
‘returning your books without examining them’

(17)  [DP het [CP [XP de flessen] naast elkaar zetten] [C van [IP [DP de flessen] H
the the bottles next each other put of the bottles
[CP de flessen naast elkaar zetten][]])

This analysis of “case assigning” van ‘of’ is compatible with the specification of van ‘of’ proposed in this paper: van ‘of’ does not assing a θ-role to the DP de flessen ‘the bottles’ in (16a), as required since this DP gets its θ-role directly from the (nominalized) verb. In this respect θ-role assignment within DPs and within CPs is entirely parallel.

To summarize, it was argued in this section that sentential negation NOT in Standard Dutch is usually generated in a head position and sometimes in a Spec position. This distribution is fully determined by the lexical specification of NOT as an element that has an uninterpretable tense feature uT and cannot receive a θ-role. It is not necessary to stipulate the X-bar level of NOT in the lexicon. More precisely, NOT behaves exactly as bare phrase structure theory (Chomsky 1995) would lead us to expect. According to this theory, an element generated in a head position remains a head during the rest of the derivation and hence cannot show up in non-head positions. The same element generated in a Spec position is a head and an XP at the same time. It therefore can also move to Spec or adjunct positions.
Obviously, the analysis proposed here does not automatically carry over to other languages without further investigation. In English, for example, *[I think of not]* is strongly ungrammatical, while *I think not* is well-formed. There are also differences between the distribution of *of* in English and *van* in Standard Dutch. For example, English *of* does not introduce temporal adjuncts; instead, English is using *to*, as in *today, tonight*. I leave the precise analysis of English and other languages for future research.

3 • Negative Concord and the Distribution of Negative Constituents

3.1 • Description

As is well known, language varieties differ with respect to the interpretation of multiple negation, i.e. the interpretation of clauses with sentential negation and one or more negative constituents. In negative concord languages such as West Flemish, the negative elements in a clause together may constitute one sentential negation (18a). 12 In double negation languages such as Standard Dutch the negative elements normally cancel each other out, e.g., when there is sentential negation and one negative constituent the result is a positive interpretation, while sentential negation and two negative constituents yields a negative sentence (18b).

(18)  

a. da Valère van niemand (nie) ketent en was  
   West Flemish  
   that V. of no one (not) contented en was  
   'that Valère was not pleased with anyone'

b. dat Jan op niemand niet boos is geworden  
   Standard Dutch  
   that John at no one not angry has become  
   'there’s no one such that John did not become angry at him'  
   # 'that John did not become angry at anyone

12 In West-Flemish *nie NOT* is optionally absent in the presence of a negative constituent.  
13 A double negation reading for this sentence is marginally possible with focal stress on *niemand* and a pause to precede *nie* (Haegeman 1995).
It should be noted, however, that the difference between the two types of languages is not as absolute as the examples in (18) may seem to suggest. With deaccented *niet* ‘NOT’ in (18b) a negative concord reading is marginally possible for many speakers of Standard Dutch. Moreover, there are contexts in which all speakers of Standard Dutch seem to be able to get a negative concord reading, e.g. (19a); the presence of “superfluous” *niet* ‘NOT’ in this construction is almost obligatory.

(19) a. Ik ga niet opzij, voor jou niet en voor niemand ??(niet).
I go not out of the way, for you not and for no one not
‘I don’t get out of the way, not for you and not for anyone’

b. * Ik ga niet opzij, niet voor jou en niet voor niemand.
I go not out of the way, not for you and not for no one

c. Ik ga niet opzij, niet voor jou en ook niet voor de koningin.
I go not out of the way, not for you and also not for the queen
‘I don’t get out of the way, neither for you nor for the queen’

Observations such as (18) and (19) suggest that Weiß (2001; this volume, ftn. 4) is correct in claiming that the absence of negative concord in the standard varieties of English, Dutch and German is an artificial phenomenon, resulting from language external factors such as modelling languages after Latin grammar or logical considerations in the course of standardization. Many non-standard varieties of these languages do have negative concord, and the standard varieties themselves reveal their hidden negative concord character on certain syntactic tests.

The distribution of negative constituents in the negative concord language West Flemish is similar to that in the “non negative concord” language Standard Dutch (Haegeman 1995). As the contrast between (19a) and (19b) shows, the negative construction in Standard Dutch is only possible if the negative PP precedes *niet* ‘NOT’, while (19c) shows that there is no general requirement for PPs to precede *niet* ‘NOT’. This scrambling of negative constituents is obligatory in both West Flemish and Standard Dutch (20a, 21a). When scrambling does not take place, as in (20b,21b), a positive interpretation is the result.
(20) a. da Valère \(_{pp}\) me niets \(_A\) ketent (en-)was
that Valère with nothing contented (en) was
‘that Valère was not pleased with anything’
b. da Valère \(_A\) ketent \(_{pp}\) me niets (*en) was
that Valère contented with nothing (en) was
‘that Valère was pleased with nothing’

(21) a. dat Valère \(_{pp}\) met niets \(_A\) tevreden was
that Valère with nothing contented was
‘that Valère was not pleased with anything’
b. dat Valère \(_A\) tevreden \(_{pp}\) met niets was\(^{14}\)
that Valère contented with nothing was
I. #‘that Valère was not pleased with anything’
II. ‘that Valère was pleased with nothing’

3.2 • *Analysis: Negative scrambling and the doubly filled NegP filter*

Let us assume that Haegeman (1995) is right that all negative constituents must
move (scramble) to SpecNegP to satisfy the NEG-criterion; if a negative
constituent does not move to SpecNegP it does not get a negative interpretation.
The difference between Standard Dutch and West Flemish can then be captured
if we assume that both West Flemish \(nie\) ‘NOT’ and Standard Dutch \(niet\) ‘NOT’ are
normally generated as the head of NegP and attract negative constituents to
SpecNegP.\(^{15}\) The difference between Standard Dutch and West Flemish would
then be that it is impossible in Standard Dutch to spell out both the head and the
spec of NegP, a kind of doubly filled NegP filter (cf. Robbers 1992). This type of
microvariation would be of the same type as we find in CPs, where varieties
differ with respect to the possibility to fill both SpecCP and C: the doubly filled
COMP filter (cf. Chomsky & Lasnik 1977) active in English but not e.g. in
Standard Dutch.\(^{16}\)

\(^{14}\) For me the negative reading is available in (21b) with a slightly different intonation. This may be the result
of focus movement of \(tevreden\) ‘contented’ across the scrambled PP \(met niets\) ‘with nothing’.

\(^{15}\) This assumption is in accordance with the fact that West Flemish \(nie\) NOT cannot be fronted.

\(^{16}\) This analysis of West Flemish \(nie\) differs from Haegeman (1995:125), according to which \(nie\) is generated in
SpecNegP rather than Neg.
The doubly filled NegP filter can be further generalized to doubly filled SpecNegPs to capture another difference between West Flemish and Standard Dutch. In West Flemish several constituents may occur in SpecNegP (22a), while in Standard Dutch only one constituent is allowed (22b). Again, we know that there is similar cross linguistic variation in the CP domain, with single Wh-fronting in English, Standard Dutch and French and multiple Wh-fronting in Polish, Czech and Rumanian (Haegeman 1995).

(22)  

a. da Valère an niemand niets nie gezeid (en)-oat
    that Valère to nobody nothing not said (NEG)-has
    ‘that Valère had not said anything to anyone’

b. dat Jan (*nooit) op niemand boos is
    that John (never) at no one angry is
    ‘that John is not angry at anyone’

If this approach is correct, the fact that Standard Dutch does not have overt negative concord and the fact that it does not allow multiple scrambling of negative constituents are both consequences of one parameter: In Standard Dutch the generalized doubly filled NegP filter is active, in West Flemish it is not.¹⁷

---

¹⁷ On theoretical grounds, another potential source of variation may be that movement to SpecNegP to fulfill the NEG citerion may apply at different levels of derivation, i.e. overtly or covertly. For the domain of Wh-movement it has been proposed that some languages have covert Wh-movement (Chinese) while others have overt movement (English). Similarly, there may be languages that have covert negative constituent movement. Italian is a candidate:

(i) Gianni non telefona a nessuno
    Gianni not telephones to no one
    ‘Gianni does not call anyone.’

However, the issue is more complicated. Haegeman (1995) proposes that the Neg-criterion must be fulfilled overtly even in Italian: an empty operator occupies Spec,NegP in Italian. Moreover, if Kayne (2000) is right that there is no covert movement, the clause final position of nessuno in (i) is the result of leftward movement of nessuno followed by remnant movement of (extended) VP across nessuno. Microvariation in movement of negative constituents to SpecNegP then really involves microvariation in remnant movement.
4 • CLAUSE FINAL NOT

4.1 • Description

A final instance of microvariation in sentential negation involves clause final negation as it is found in Aarschots and Afrikaans:18

(23)  a. Ik geluuf dat er niemand nie en komt (nie)

      Aarschots (Pauwels 1958:443)

      I believe that there no one NOT NEG-CLITIC comes (NOT)

    b. dat niemand glo dat hy dit gedoen het nie

      Afrikaans (Robbers 1992:224)

      that no one believes that he this done has NOT

      ‘that noone believes that he has done this’

Pauwels (1958: 464) claims that clause final negation in Aarschots and Afrikaans have different properties. In Aarschots, clause final *nie ‘NOT’* is optionally present, whereas in Afrikaans it is obligatory. More importantly, in Aarschots clause final *nie ‘NOT’* cannot be separated from its clause by an embedded clause or by extraposed material, whereas this is standardly the case in Afrikaans, e.g. in (23b). In Transvaals (spoken in the north of South Africa) clause final *nie ‘NOT’* occurs both at the end of the matrix clause and at the end of the embedded clause.

4.2 • Analysis

So far, the proposed analysis of negation makes use of one functional projection NegP present in the sentences in the case of sentential negation.19 The cooccurrence of preverbal *nie ‘NOT’*, the negative particle *en* and clause final *nie ‘NOT’* in Aarschots clearly shows that the latter *nie ‘NOT’* is not in the head or spec of the NegP discussed in the previous sections. This implies that there must be a second NegP in the clause. This has been suggested for English in Lasnik (1974), for Afrikaans in Robbers (1992), for Italian in Zanuttini (1991) and for West Flemish in Haegeman (2001a, 2001b). For Afrikaans, Robbers argues convincingly that the clause final negation position behaves the same as the high Neg-position

---

18 Helmut Weiß (p.c) notes that clause final negation also occurs in a variant of Bavarian spoken in the Valle del Férnia (Trentino, Italy) (cf. Rowley, undated).

19 Putting the exceptional status of negation as an argument aside.
in Italian. She therefore assumes that clause final negation is high in the clause but head final; consequently the complement of Neg linearly precedes it.

If the Universal Base Hypothesis, according to which all languages have the same number and hierarchy of projections, is correct, the fact that we find two positions for NegP in certain languages entails that all languages should have those two positions. Explaining variation in this respect would then amount to explaining why in certain languages only high NegP is visible, in other languages only low NegP, while in others both are visible.

I will briefly speculate on negation in Aarschots and Afrikaans to indicate in which direction such an explanation may go. Let us assume that Robbers (1992) is right that clause final negation is high NegP. Let us further assume that syntactic structures are antisymmetric, hence that a complement is generated as a right hand sister of a head. Robbers’ analysis must then be modified: clause final negation is the result of base generating the sister XP of high Neg to the right of Neg and then moving it to SpecNegP (we refer to this constituent as XP rather than TP to remain agnostic about the precise categorial status of the constituent).

Since movement to high SpecNegP is independently motivated for negative constituents, as we have seen in section 3, it is straightforward to account for movement of XP to high SpecNegP in the same terms. Low NegP makes XP a negative constituent and the NEG criterion forces this negative XP to move to high SpecNegP. Thus, we use a generalized version of the NEG criterion to account for the possibility of clause final negation in Aarschots and Afrikaans.

Since movement of negative constituents to high SpecNegP is obligatory in Standard Dutch as well (cf. section 3), it is plausible that XP movement to the Spec of high NegP takes place in Standard Dutch too. The question why clause final negation is not visible in Standard Dutch now reduces to the more general question why Spec and head of NegP cannot be filled both at the same time in Standard Dutch. As we have seen, preverbal sentential negation *NIET* and scrambled negative constituents are in complementary distribution, suggesting that Robbers is right that there is a doubly filled NegP filter that may or may not be active in a language.

In the analysis suggested here, then, there is no parameter “high NegP present yes/no”. All language varieties have the same projections in the same
hierarchy and obey the NEG-criterion. Varieties differ in whether the doubly filled NegP filter is active, just like varieties differ in whether the doubly filled CP filter is active. More generally, we conclude that doubly filled XP filters are an important locus of cross-linguistic variation. Obviously, it is necessary to investigate whether doubly filled XP filters can be further reduced to deeper properties of the elements involved.

So far we have treated clause final negation in Aarschots and Afrikaans as a uniform phenomenon. However, in section 4.1 it was noted that matrix clause associated nie ‘NOT’ can follow an embedded clause in Afrikaans but not in Aarschots. The fact that this is impossible in Aarschots is problematic for the analysis proposed above. If clause final nie ‘NOT’ involved movement of XP to SpecNegP, it should be possible for XP to carry along a CP or extraposed material that is part of XP:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CP} & \quad \text{NegP} \\
\text{CP} & \quad \text{NegP} \quad [\text{Neg nie } \{\text{XP [VP [CP]]}\}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

This problem is not sufficient to reject the proposed analysis, since Pauwels (1958:465, fn. 51) reports that for him clause final nie ‘NOT’ is natural in the Aarschots sentence in (25):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hij is nie weggelopen <nie> voor het spook dat afkwam <nie>} \\
\text{he is not away-run not for the ghost that approached not} \\
\text{‘He did not run away for the ghost that was approaching.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Perhaps, then, Aarschots is like Transvaals in allowing both matrix clause final and embedded clause final nie ‘NOT’, with a tendency to avoid a long distance between the matrix verb and nie ‘NOT’.

This solves the problem of the near non-occurrence of embedded clause final nie ‘NOT’ in Aarschots, but it does not solve another problem for the analysis proposed above, namely the fact that matrix clause final nie ‘NOT’ preceding an embedded clause is possible at all. It is impossible to derive that from the base structure in (24), as movement of XP will always carry along CP.
A possible solution is that matrix clause final *nie ‘NOT’* preceding an embedded clause is the result of head movement of the verb across *nie ‘NOT’* to an abstract functional head, as in (26). Embedded V-movement has been proposed on independent grounds for West Flemish in Haegeman (1998, 2000).

(26) \[ \text{[CP C [NegP Spec nie [VP V]]]]} \]

The preliminary conclusion is that there are two ways for a language to have clause final *nie ‘NOT’*: (i) Movement of the sister XP of high Neg to the Spec of high NegP, as in Afrikaans and Aarschots, and (ii) movement of the verb (or verb cluster) across low Neg, as in Aarschots. In Transvaals, both options are available.

5 • SUMMARY: LOCI OF MICROVARIATION FOR SENTENTIAL NEGATION

The basic clause structure of the varieties discussed in this paper is as in (27) (irrelevant projections left out):

(27) \[ \text{[CP C [NegP Spec nie [XP X]] [NegP Spec nie [VP V]]]}} \]

Aarschots  nie (nie)
Afrikaans   nie Ø
Standard Dutch Ø Ø niet
Middle Dutch Ø Ø (en)
Transvaals  nie Ø (en)
West Flemish Ø Ø (en)

In all of these varieties, movement of negative constituents to SpecNegP is obligatory. This also holds for XP when it contains NegP. The reflex of this is clause final *nie ‘NOT’* in Afrikaans, Aarschots and Transvaals, being a spell out of high Neg. This is a locus of microvariation, as the same head is not spelled out in Standard Dutch, Middle Dutch and West Flemish. A second locus of microvariation is found in the lower NegP, where the head, the Spec or both
A third locus of microvariation yields movement of V to F. This movement accounts for matrix clause final negation preceding embedded and extraposed material, possible in Aarschots and Transvaals. Since the other varieties discussed do not have such clause final negation, this movement operation may either be absent or show no overt reflex.

**APPENDIX: MORE MICROVARIATION IN NEGATION**

This appendix provides a brief description of some further instances of microvariation in negation.

**THE STATUS OF N-WORDS**

N-words such as *niemand* ‘no one’, *nooit* ‘never’, *niets* ‘nothing’ may have the status of negative polarity items (NPIs) with existential force in one variety and of negative quantifiers in another (cf. Hoeksema 1997). For Standard Dutch, it is clear that the N-words do not behave like NPIs. NPIs in Standard Dutch cannot occur without an overt licenser (28a), N-words however can and in such cases they still express sentential negation (28b). A second test is whether the N-word can be used as an answer. If it can, it is not an NPI (28c,d). A third test is modification by *almost*: possible for Negative Quantifiers, impossible for NPIs (28e,f).

(28)  

a. *Ik heb ook maar iemand gezien.*  
    I have even only anyone seen  

b. *Ik heb niemand gezien.*  
    I have no one seen  
    ‘I haven’t seen anybody’

c. *Who did you meet?*  
    No one / *Anyone

d. *Heb je iemand ontmoet?*  
    Nee, niemand / *Nee, ook maar iemand  
    no, no one no, even only anyone

e. *Ik begrijp er bijna niets van.*  

---

We did not find any evidence distinguishing between PF-absence and complete absence.
I understand there almost nothing of 'I hardly understand anything of it.'

Moreover, NPIs can be licensed by downward entailing environments, not just by negation (29a,b). The N-words in Standard Dutch do not behave like NPIs in such environments; they are simply negative constituents (29c,d).

(29) a. zonder ook maar een keer te lachen
   without even only once to laugh
   'without ever laughing'

b. alvorens ook maar iets te zeggen
   before even only something to say
   'before saying anything'

c. *zonder nooit te lachen
   without never to laugh

d. *alvorens niets te zeggen
   before nothing to say

On the other hand, Hoeksema (1997: 152-153) observes that Middle Dutch N-words do appear in downward entailing contexts that are not defined by sentential negation.

(30) Without-clause
a. sonder nemmermeer daer jeghen te comene
   without never there against to come
   'without ever coming against that'

Before-clause
b. Ic sal mi doden met enen knive eer ic nemmer doe sconinx wille
   I will me kill with one knive ere I never do the-king’s wish
   'I will kill myself before I do the king’s wish.'
It is clear that the N-words in these constructions are NPIs, not negative quantifiers, since the negative particle *en* cannot show up here.

The latter correlation does not seem to be absolute cross-linguistically, as Hoeksema (1997:154) notes. Whereas Italian behaves like Middle Dutch in not having a negative head when the NPI is licensed by a downward entailing context different from an N-word (31b), in Spanish the negative head shows up even in such environments (32b).

(31) Italian
   a. Non ha telefonato nessuno.
      Neg has called n-body
      ‘Nobody called’
   b. Ha telefonato nessuno?
      has called n-body
      ‘Did anybody call?’

(32) Spanish
   a. No llamó ninguno.
      neg called n-body
      ‘Nobody called’
   b. ¿No llamó ninguno
      neg called n-body
      ‘Did anybody call?’

Another potential source of variation is the type of downward entailing environments that allow N-words to be used as NPIs. Middle Dutch allows N-words as NPIs in the environments in (33), but not in questions (Hoeksema 1997:153).
Relative clause restricting a universal quantifier

a. God die makere es alre dinc dat nie was of lijf ontfinc
   God who maker is of everything that (n)ever was or received life
   ‘God who is the creator of all things that ever were or sprung to life.’

Relative clause restricting a superlative

b. dat hi die beste ridder was die noit quam in sconinx hof
   that he the best knight was that (n)ever came in the king’s court
   ‘that he was the best knight that ever came to the king’s court.’

Comparative clauses

c. Ick belove u [...] meer dan ghi noyt hadt van vrienden oft magen.
   I promise thee more than thou never hadst from friends or relatives
   ‘I promise you more than you ever had from friends or relatives.’

A peculiar property of some dialects is that the initial /n/ of negative words preceding NOT can optionally be dropped (Pauwels 1958:457). An example from the Brabantish dialect of Aarschot is given below:

(34) Ik heb (n)iemand niet gezien (nie) Aarschots
   I have (no) one not seen
   ‘I haven’t seen anybody’

According to Pauwels, in Aarschots this is possible with nievers ‘nowhere’, nieverans ‘nowhere’ and niemand ‘no one’, but not with nooit ‘never’. The precise conditions under which this is possible require further investigation. It seems clear, however, that negative concord is not a sufficient condition. In the limited cases in which Standard Dutch has negative concord, /n/-drop is impossible.

(35) Ik ga niet opzij, voor jou niet en voor *(n)-iemand niet Standard Dutch
   I go not out of the way, for you not and for *(no) one not
**NEGATIVE CONCORD IN DP'S**

Vanacker (1975) and Haegeman (this volume) observe that some Flemish dialects spoken in northern France and West Flanders have DP-internal negative concord, as illustrated in (36):

(36)  

a. \[K'(en)-een \textbf{nie vele geen} \text{ geld} \]
     I (en) have not much no money
     ‘I don’t have much money.’

b. \[K'(en)-een \textbf{nie genoeg geen} \text{ geld} \]
     I (en) have not enough no money

**MICROVARIATION IN SCOPE**

Varieties seem to differ with respect to the availability of an inverse scope reading in sentences such as (37):

(37)  

a. Iedereen is geen vakman.
     everyone is no craftsman
     I. ‘Everyone is no craftsman.’
     II. ‘Not everyone is a craftsman.’

b. Hij heeft overal geen vrienden.
     I. ‘Everywhere he does not have friends.’
     II. ‘He does not have friends everywhere.’
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**ABSTRACT**

In this paper, we will give a description of the aims, the methods and the material of the Syntactic Atlas of Swiss German dialects (Syntaktischer Atlas der Deutschen Schweiz, SADS). Dialectal syntactic structures are the subject of various disciplines: dialectology, theory of grammar and typology. Only some years ago the Swiss German Dialect Atlas (Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz (SDS)), which is considered a major work in German dialectology, was completed. Although the authors initially had the intention of including syntactic phenomena, the atlas only shows half a dozen maps demonstrating geographical syntactic variation. The reason why there are so few syntactic maps is not to be found in the research object itself, but in the specific difficulties of syntactic investigation in general. In this paper, we’ll deal with the different research methods of various syntactic phenomena we use in our research project. We’ll also give an overview of the investigated phenomena and we’ll show the first results of our investigation with written questionnaires.

I GOALS AND METHODS

1 PROBLEMS OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY CONCERNING DIALECT SYNTAX

In our paper, we’ll try to give a brief outline of the goals, the methods and the content of the Syntactic Atlas of Swiss German dialects we are preparing. Our presentation is divided into two parts. The first part discusses more general points and the second part presents our questionnaire and elicitation techniques.¹

¹ The whole paper was produced in collaboration. Part I is written by Elvira Glaser, part II by Claudia Bucheli. We are grateful to the two reviewers for their useful comments and to Anna Dale and Katherine White for improving our English.
It was only some years ago that the Swiss German Dialect Atlas (SDS), which is still considered a major work in German dialectology, was finished. Although in the beginning the authors intended to include syntactic phenomena, the published volumes contain only a very few maps concerning syntactic variation.\(^2\) That means that our knowledge about the geographical variation of syntactic structures within the Swiss German area is far from complete. If one is convinced as we are that geographical variation exists also in syntax, then the research program is clear. We demonstrated this to the Swiss National Science Foundation (Schweizerischer Nationalfonds, SNF) who - as a result - gave us financial support for two part-time postgraduates and a part-time undergraduate for three years. We are required to present first results at the end of the 3 years’ period. Compared to the SAND-project,\(^3\) our funds are much smaller. But the same holds true, of course, for the area in question, which is to be seen on the map at the end of our paper.

We started our research program at the beginning of this year (3 January 2000). Until now we have had intensive discussions about the range of phenomena to be included and on the exploration methods to be used. In the meantime, we have sent out our first questionnaire, which will be discussed in greater detail in the second part.

As our first impetus was to complete the Swiss German Dialect Atlas we wanted to know, before even starting our work, why the research team had provided so few syntactic maps. We discussed this question with Rudolf Trüb, the major editor of the last volumes and one of the few persons involved in the project since its start in the forties who are still alive. Ultimately we came to the conclusion that the main reasons are the specific difficulties of syntactic investigation in general and the impossibility of combining traditional empirical research on phonetics, or phonology, and on lexical items with a syntactically oriented investigation. That is why we dedicated considerable time to the elaboration of the adequate elicitation technique. We also contacted other atlas

\(^{2}\) Cf. Glaser (1997) on this topic. M. Gerritsen (1990: 49) gives an overview over the percentage of syntactic maps in linguistic atlases. The SDS is mentioned with 7 maps (= 0,8%).

\(^{3}\) Cf. the paper of Hans Bennis at the conference and the website of Meertens Instituut.
projects in the German-speaking area, dealing at least partially with syntactic phenomena, such as the ‘Sprachatlas von Bayerisch Schwaben’ (SBS) at Augsburg, the ‘Sprachatlas von Österreich und Südtirol’ (cf. Patocka 1988) and the ‘Sprachatlas von Niederbayern’ (SNIB) at Passau, because we consider it crucial not to neglect the results of other surveys.

The classical method of dialectological fieldwork is the interview, with the help of a questionnaire containing essentially naming questions and to a lesser extent completing questions, generally organized according to semantic fields. Everybody familiar with this kind of survey can attest that after a short period of adjustment to the questioning system, good informants are normally able to answer quite quickly. Even so, this kind of interview required four or even more days (cf. Hotzenköcherle 1962: 128) for each questionnaire; the fieldworkers of the SDS, who had to visit e.g. 600 villages in Switzerland, had to hurry to complete their work. The similarity of the basically onomasiological questions such us ‘How do you call what you have to do, if the scythe is blunt?’ if you want to hear ‘to sharpen’ or ‘What can you make from milk?’ if you want to hear ‘butter, cheese’ etc. helped a great deal in limiting the duration of the interviews. But it is quite difficult to take this sort of short-cut if you are interested in a specific syntactic construction. In the case of the Swiss German Atlas, as in the atlases of Bayerisch Schwaben and Niederbayern, the method used for eliciting syntactic properties was the translation from standard German in oral interviews.

Obviously, there are several problems with this kind of elicitation. It is generally known that the presentation of a linguistic form may influence the responses. And this kind of interference seems to be much greater in syntax than in phonetics or phonology, or even in vocabulary. But there are still other problems. Translations of sentences very rapidly exhaust the informants, because of the concentration on more abstract phenomena. And even informants good at

\footnote{Cf. Chambers/Trudgill (1998: 22f.).}

\footnote{For further detail concerning the method of questioning cf. Hotzenköcherle (1962: 127) on the ‘Zeige- und Vormachmethode’ [demonstration technique E.G.] and ‘umschreibende Fragen’ [description technique E.G.].}
providing phonetic and lexical material can be bad at translation or get rattled very quickly by the questions. Though such observations are shared by many fieldworkers, there hasn’t existed until now a description of the specific difficulties. The experiences of the Swiss German Dialect Atlas team with syntactically oriented translation questions were quite bad, as Rudolf Trüb told us, because either the informants too often provided a literal translation from standard German and getting the natural responses would have taken too much time, or the informants often didn’t understand at all the task they were faced with. That is why the atlas ended with so few syntactical maps. And, moreover, most of the maps are based primarily on so-called spontaneous material: forms and structures the interviewer came across in spontaneous speech during the interview. That holds true for example for the maps showing the occurrence of the pronominal partitive genitive (as in (1), cf. SDS III, 235) and the marking of the copredicative function of an adjective (as in (2), cf. SDS III, 256, 257, B. II).

(1) i wott er o:
   I want Prn:3Pl.Gen.Prtv too
   ‘I want some [cherries], too’
   ‘Ich will auch welche [Kirschen]’

This construction shows up in the so-called Highest Alemannic dialects in the southern and western part of German-speaking Switzerland (cf. Glaser 1995: 70f.):

...............................................
6 Cf. Hotzenköcherle (1962: 127 note 2): "Dem Ergebnis solcher ‘Übersetzungsfragen’ stehen wir heute im ganzen eher skeptisch gegenüber; es hängt in besonders empfindlichem Maße von der Qualität der Gewährsleute ab. [‘after all we are now quite skeptical about the results of translation questions. They are particularly dependent on the quality of the informants.’ [transl. E.G.]
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(2) sie sollten die Milch warm trinken

\textit{they should drink the milk warm}

\textit{‘sie sollten die Milch warm trinken’}

The special marking of the copredicative function with a (petrified) adjective ending (\textit{warm}) not identical with a potential feminine adjectival inflection in the VP (as e.g. ... \textit{isch warm} ‘... is warm’) is concentrated in the area of Appenzell (eastern Switzerland).

As a matter of fact, the major editor of the SDS, Rudolf Hotzenköcherle, writes in his introduction (1962: 134) that it was primarily with the help of spontaneous material that he was able to include maps for those phenomena otherwise almost impossible to elicit, ‘wie die meisten Probleme der Satzphonetik und zahlreiche eigentlich syntaktische Probleme’ (‘as most of the phenomena depending on sentential stress and quite a lot essentially syntactic problems’). Transl. E.G.). But as he points out there were also translation questions with quite good results (Hotzenköcherle 1962: 128), e.g. concerning morphology, verbal conjugation, etc.

So we can conclude that it may be difficult to elicit certain syntactic phenomena in a survey alongside with phonology and vocabulary because of different requirements concerning the informants and the elicitation techniques. With the appropriate technique, it is, however, possible to uncover syntactical isoglosses, too, as it is shown by the map on pronominal clitics in the Atlas of Swiss German Dialects (SDS III, 259: nom. acc. vs. acc. nom: \textit{du es/ es du}).

Nevertheless, some phenomena will in fact remain inexplorable by a questionnaire. As far as we can see, that holds true especially for phenomena dependent on particular discourse conditions, as e.g. the so-called ‘downtoners’

\textit{........................................................................}

\textit{7 This example is given here in the standard German form.}

\textit{8 Cf. the construction types C and I in Plank’s typology (1985: 163, 170). Plank, however, doesn’t mention types with overt marking of the copredicative function.}

\textit{9 The serialization was explored by a translation question: \textit{hast du’s gern?} ‘do you like it?’}
That means, given these limitations, that we have to carefully choose which phenomena to explore. It remains, however, our intention to cover as much geographic variation as possible, because our primary goal is to show the dialectal differentiation of syntactic structures in the Swiss German area. The elicitation methodology has to be adapted to different types of phenomena, and in the final analysis of the data obtained we have to evaluate the exploration differences and to allow for different kinds of variants, as there are preferred constructions, unique constructions, tolerated ones and so on. And we have to cover the variation within the community, because we have up to ten informants in the same place. The adequate presentation of these data is another problem to be resolved at the end of our investigation.

2 • WHY INVESTIGATE DIALECT SYNTAX?

So far, we have treated questions of research methodology, but one might ask whether a syntactic survey is worthwhile, if it causes so much trouble. We think that there are at least three reasons in favor of it.

In the first place, it is a question of general linguistic interest whether syntactic isoglosses within given dialect areas do exist. With the development of spoken language research in the sixties, most linguists were convinced that dialectal syntactic features were mere features of spoken language and that essential syntactic isoglosses do not exist at all. This conviction was backed up by the fact that syntactic areas normally are much larger than phonological ones, and that, perhaps as a result, regional syntactic variants often are not recognized as such even by conscious speakers. Until now, we have no way of knowing whether in fact syntactic constructions vary more freely than e.g. pronunciation, as is commonly held. It is likely that syntactic phenomena do not behave in a uniform manner. That means that there are phenomena with quite clear borderlines and

\[10\] Cf. Glaser (1999) on the downtowner *fai* in Bavarian, as for example in the sentence: "mit Eahnan dreckigen Bett brauchan S’ mir *fei* ’s Maul net abwisch’n!” (I inform you] you shouldn’t wipe my mouth with your dirty blanket).
others where variation dominates over a large area. But the existence of syntactic isoglosses as such cannot be doubted. Isoglosses may also mark off a variation zone. Otherwise, a syntactic atlas, a basically geographic presentation, wouldn’t make any sense. We’ll give here some examples of various types from the German-speaking area.11

In a large south-eastern area, mass nouns can take - and normally do take - an indefinite article, like in Bavarian (cf. Kolmer 1999, Glaser 1996:163-166):

(3) gib ma-r-a geld!
    give me-0-a money
    ‘Give me some [sm] money’
    ‘Gib mir Geld!’

In other areas, as in German-speaking Switzerland, this construction is completely ungrammatical, except in some transitional zones, i.e. in Baden-Württemberg (cf. Glaser 1995: 74), which show variation.

Variation zones often show the standard German constructions alongside the local variants, as also in the case of phrasal verb constructions (4), like in Southern Rhine Frenkish dialect where we find the equivalents of ‘it begins to rain’ with and without the infinitive particle se as in (4a) and (4b), respectively:

(4a) s fangd aa rächne
    it begins rain

(4b) s fangd aa se rächne
    it begins to rain

The construction with the infinitive particle corresponds to the standard German sentence es fängt an zu regnen.

........................................................................
11 A comparative syntax of the German dialects remains still to be written, cf. Schirmunski (1962: 150, 411), Henn (1983: 1272f.).
The same holds true in the case of conditional (and other subordinate) clauses, like in Bavarian where we find left-hand-extraction (cf. Weiß 1998: 36-41) as in (5a) alongside the standard German word ordering as in (5b):

(5a)  dees wenn i gwisst hääd, (wààr i need kema)
      *this* if *I known had* (*were I not come*)

(5b)  wenn i dees gwisst hääd, (wààr i need kema)
      *if* *I this known had, (were I not come)*
      ‘if I had known this (I wouldn’t have come)’
      ‘wenn ich das gewusst hätte, wäre ich nicht gekommen’

In most German-speaking areas, it is completely impossible to topicalize the object in this way, but until now we do not know exactly where. There is, however, some evidence that this construction doesn’t exist in Alemannic and Rhine/Middle Frenkish dialects.\(^\text{12}\)

There are in fact very few non-standard syntactic constructions which seem to fail a geographic distribution within the German-speaking area (cf. Mironov 1957: 394-397), as e.g. the possessive construction with dative NP (cf. Henn 1983):

(6a)  wem sein Hausist abgebrannt?
      WH.Dat *his house is burnt_down*
      ‘whose house has burnt down?’

(6b)  dem Bäcker sein Hausist abgebrannt
      the baker:Dat *his house is burnt_down*
      ‘the baker’s house has burnt down’

\(^\text{12}\) At least it is not mentioned in Labouvie (1938: 118-120). In my own dialect (southern Rhine Frenkish) it is completely impossible. Staedele (1927: 77) only mentions the extraction type with resumption of the focused element.
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or the periphrastic progressive construction with *am* + infinitive, its overall occurrence, however, not yet being proved:\(^\text{13}\)

\[
(7) \quad \text{ich} \quad \text{bin} \quad \text{am} \quad \text{Lesen}
\]

\[
I \quad am \quad at\_the \quad read:Inf
\]

‘I am reading’

But even if these constructions (6) and (7) are widespread there can still be differences with respect to the syntactic distribution, to the semantic classes of the elements involved, to the obligatoriness of the construction and so on (cf. Ebert 2000).

What we have tried to underlinewith these examples is the necessity of exploring the geographic distribution of syntactic constructions, if only because there exist a lot of so-far unproved assumptions about geographical variation. Of course it would be possible to draw syntactical maps on the basis of hundreds of dialect monographs, but they do not yet exist. And the few existing ones normally do not contain syntax.

Moreover, the scarcity of syntactic descriptions of dialects may be one of the reasons why dialectal structures normally are not taken into consideration for typological accounts. And that is the second reason why dialect syntax is a desideratum. There is no doubt that alongside data from standard languages, typological research should also take dialectal structures into account. In this way, the range of phenomena can be widened, the areal distribution of typological features can be determined more precisely, and sometimes even implicational statements can be corrected.\(^\text{14}\) The difference in the use of the indefinite article between mass nouns and common nouns, which seems to characterize the European article-languages for ex. is not shared by Bavarian, as we already pointed out (cf. also Kolmer 1999). Frans Plank (1994) discussed Bavarian data to correct


\(^{14}\) Kortmann (in this volume) mentions several instructive examples.
assumptions on number marking with one-based indefinites. This is a rather rare example of relying on dialect data for the purposes of the Eurotyp project (Noun phrase group) (cf. König 1996). It is, however, true that in the meantime typologists are becoming more and more interested in dialect data, which could be provided by dialectologists (cf. Kortmann (in this volume)). Of course, typologists planning a wide-range survey on a certain phenomenon are dependent on published data. Dialectological research should therefore cover as many typologically relevant constructions as possible. Even though it is not easy to define what is relevant to a general audience because of changing preferences, the topics of the Eurotyp working groups could perhaps be mentioned as a starting point.

A third reason for investigating dialect syntax can be recognized in the interest of grammar theory in syntactical microvariation. Dialects provide the opportunity of studying minimally different linguistic systems. In several recent publications, this topic is treated at some length (cf. Kayne 1996: ix-xviii; Penner/Bader 1995: 7-9; Kortmann in this volume). Helmut Weiß, who dedicated a whole book to the generative analysis of Bavarian syntax, is convinced that the investigation of dialectal syntactic structures is crucial to the outline of grammar theory (1998: 20f.) because dialects represent prototypical natural, consistent and regular systems and show a lot of variants suppressed by prescriptive standard norms. Hans Bennis also pointed out this argument concerning Generative Grammar in his conference paper and argued in favor of the investigation of dialect syntax. Therefore, we will skip the details of this subject and pass on to a closely related final argument.

Areal distribution is still considered to be a reflex of the spread of innovations. As far as phonology is concerned, it is common practice to control theoretical assumptions on the conditions of language change by comparing

\footnote{Cf. also Glaser (1996) on the topic.}

\footnote{In the meantime you can check the publications of this large typological research programme of the European Science Foundation, i.e. de Groot (2000), which covers above all the European standard languages.}
different dialect systems, in order to find out the triggering elements and relevant combinations. A theory of language change including grammatical change should therefore take into account that systems of neighboring dialects may provide data concerning the direction and the stages of a certain development. In our opinion, dialectal data is crucial for the construction of any theory of syntactic change, be it grammaticalization theory or other theoretical conceptions, because of the possibility of comparing very similar syntactic systems and controlling our assumptions about linguistic diversification on a more or less common basis. And last but not least: If we concentrate on standard languages, we neglect the vast quantity of dialectal data on natural language change.¹⁷

It is well known that dialect geography arose as an empirical test of the Neogrammarian sound laws. Additionally, we expect it to propose answers to some of the questions concerning syntactical change, as for example its regularity, directionality, intermediate stages of variation, the structural requirements, and the possibilities and limits of dialectal borrowing. Harris/Campbell (1995: 326) suggest that a regular difference between two living dialects provides evidence for the regularity of syntactic change just as two stages of a language would. Obtaining direct evidence for diachronic change and syntactic reconstruction is a well-known problem due to the limitations of historical corpora. A comparative study of related dialects provides us with a perspective similar to that offered by diachronic studies. The important advantages, however, are that the variants to be compared can be investigated directly, and can be studied with respect to their interdependency with other phenomena in the same geographical area. By employing the appropriate question techniques, we are sure to get corresponding structures to identical stimuli, a problem often discussed in historical syntax (cf. Harris/Campbell 1995: 346-353).

¹⁷ Even if we would not go so far as Helmut Weiß (1998) who considers dialectal data the only natural language data at all.
It is then, of course, the historical syntactician’s task to differentiate between the older and the innovative patterns. As a result, we hope, for example, to gain new insights into the development of different kinds of constructions of non-finite purposive clauses (see below II (8) - (10)) and into the loss of adjectival congruity in certain syntactic positions (see above (2)).

This basically sums up our goals and methods and at this point we’ll continue on with the discussion of the questionnaire.

II  THE FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE SYNTACTIC ATLAS OF SWISS GERMAN DIALECTS

1  INTRODUCTION

In this second part, we will present how our investigation is organized, what our questionnaire looks like and what our experience is with the first part of the investigation. Some preliminary remarks are necessary.

First, it is important to emphasize that we use the indirect method of sending a written questionnaire to the informants. However, we don’t send the whole questionnaire to an informant at one time. It is split up into 4-5 parts, each containing about 20 questions, distributed on 10 to 15 pages. An informant should not have more than 45 minutes to fill in one exemplar. The reason for this is clear: on one hand, the informant should not get too tired, on the other hand this allows us to work on our method after the first part of the investigation for the profit of the further parts.

Secondly, the informants are asked to write down the answers at his or her own discretion. There is no transcription system to be learned. The persons are advised to write down their answers according to their own pronunciation. Thirdly, as a new method, we try to get 10 informants at each location in order to have enough material for comparison, in contrary to a direct, oral investigation that usually interviews only one single person per place.
THE QUANTITATIVE FACTS

In August, September and October 2000, exactly 3,770 dialect speakers received the first questionnaire. By the end of January 2001, 2,672 questionnaires had been filled in and sent back (70.9%). Only 138 of the completed questionnaires were absolutely unfit for use (see section 3 for details). These persons have been canceled from the informants’ list. The remaining 2,534 questionnaires will be evaluated and will constitute the data reference pool of the Syntactic Atlas of the Swiss German Dialects.

The 2,534 informants live at 344 different reference points distributed over the whole area of German-speaking Switzerland. These are small and larger villages, small and larger towns in the Midlands (‘Mittelland’), the Jura Mountains and the Lower Alps. In the highest mountains (Wallis, Graubünden, Innerschweiz) some communities, which are in size larger but in number of inhabitants smaller, are subsumed to one reference point. Our 344 reference points were selected out of the 600 points the Sprachatlas der Deutschen Schweiz (SDS) had used. Even though our reference point system contains only half of their quantity, a comparison of the isoglosses should be possible.

As a pleasant surprise, we received in 10 locations more than 10 answers, in 3 communities even more than 20. This amount of material will allow us a special control, comparison and evaluation of the written elicitation technique. In the meantime, our database (Filemaker) is fed with all the answers of the first questionnaire and allows rapid search and retrieval. For the drawing of maps, an interdisciplinary collaboration with the Geographical Institute of the University of Zurich is in progress. Our database will provide the data tables which will be imported to a Geographical Information System (GIS) for the purpose of making maps corresponding to our requirements.

UNHELPFUL AND PROBLEMATIC ANSWERS

124 of the 138 completed questionnaires which proved to be of no use for our investigation were filled in by ‘migrated’ informants, i.e. who no longer live where they grew up or whose parents were not from this place.
After all, only 14 informants were simply not able to reply to the questions because they didn’t understand the aim of the questionnaire at all. Three persons (aged 46, 86 and 87, all male), who gave consistently standard German answers to translation questions, were obviously unable to translate into dialect. Five persons (all ages, male and female) could not decide between all the suggested sentences in the multiple choice questions: they marked everything as being correct in their dialect. Other persons gave completely aberrant responses by continuing the context-stories. Some of these responses are listed below:

- Question 2: Instead of the translation of the sentence "Wem will er diese Blumen bringen?" ‘To whom will he bring these flowers?’ someone made out of this speech act another one:
  
  *Was muess dä ächt guetmache? ‘What does he have to compensate for?’*

- Question 4: Instead of completing the sentence with ”she is shopping” a person wrote: *Si isch im Chäller ‘She is in the cellar’.*

- Question 6: Instead of completing the sentence with ”I even have to take pills in order to get to sleep” someone replied: *...wells im Gsundheitswese so vil Problem git. ‘...because there exist so many problems in the public health service’.*

- Question 12: Instead of choosing one of the variants of the sentence ”You have to fry the fish fingers frozen”, an informant gave the advice: *”I always defrost them.”*

  These persons obviously didn’t understand that the investigation asks for linguistic patterns and not for opinions or comments about real-life situations. We note a strong tendency for those persons to be very old (80 years and more). Obviously, they will not receive any further questionnaires.

Moreover, among the 2,672 informants who answered correctly, a special social group can be identified who had a negative impact on the results. Some very well-educated persons (mostly male) or some persons who concentrate on dialectological research on words (mostly male too) sometimes don’t understand the aim of our syntactic questionnaire: on one hand, they are very influenced by standard German, on the other hand, they are convinced to know how one should speak and focus too much on the words’ pronunciation (and writing). As a
consequence, their answers contain variants which aren’t alive anymore or which simply don’t exist (hypercorrection). It is evident that their answers don’t account for the synchronic reality of the Swiss German syntax. We hope to minimize these effects by keeping the group of highly educated persons, which at the moment totals 21.5%, as small as possible. Nevertheless, we will pay special attention to these persons’ responses.

4 • THE PHENOMENA INVESTIGATED IN THE FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

The following list supplies all the phenomena that were investigated in the first questionnaire,\textsuperscript{18} with the respective question type (translation, completion, multiple choice, see below II.5) and the question number. Only one phenomenon is inquired into by all three types, i.e. the purposive clause. The prepositional dative marking is asked for with a translation and two multiple choice questions. As the project’s time is limited, most of the phenomena will be covered only once by one type of question, usually multiple choice. In the first questionnaire, 14 of 20 questions make use of it.

1 • Purposive clause: translation (Q 1), finishing a sentence (Q 6), multiple choice (Q 11)
2 • Prepositional dative marking: translation (Q 2), multiple choice (Q 7 and Q 20) (see Guido Seiler in this volume)
3 • Infinitive replacing past participle in perfect construction with the verb hören ‘hear’ and helfen ‘help’: translation (Q 3), multiple choice (Q 8)
4 • Infinitive particle go: finishing a sentence (Q 4)
5 • Resultative vs. perfect i.e. inflection of the past participle: finishing a sentence (with a picture) (Q 5)
6 • Position of two verbal elements in subordinate clauses (verb cluster) ...ob er hätt zalt/zalt hätt “if he has paid” and ...ob er will hürate/ob er hürate will “if he

\textsuperscript{18} The entire first questionnaire is available in German at the authors’ address. See also our sites: http://www.research-projects.unizh.ch/phil/unit64100/area477/p1794.htm http://www.unizh.ch/ds/content/seminar/forschung/projekt5.html.
It is one of the basic tasks of dialectological research to provide information on the areal distribution of linguistic phenomena, i.e. in our case the distribution of syntactical phenomena. Therefore, we are deeply convinced that, as a general principle, all phenomena indicating geographical distribution deserve a thorough documentation. The temporal and economic limitations of such a research project, however, make it necessary to concentrate on a restricted number of items. Our choice is based upon the following criteria.

First of all, we decided to investigate those phenomena that we had known very little about until now, whether geographically or functionally, such as the marking of the copredicative function (cf. above nr. 8), and the impersonal passive construction (nr. 9). On the basis of our first findings concerning the areal distribution and the grammatical range of these phenomena, further investigations can be made concerning the functional details.\(^{19}\)

Secondly, we also include better known phenomena, of which the areal distribution is unknown or not precisely known, such as the purposive infinitival clause (1) or article doubling (7). Moreover, there are phenomena included in our investigation that are obtaining much attention in the current theoretical discussion, e.g. pronoun dropping (11) and verb raising (6). Referring to this, we

\(^{19}\) As for the copredicative marking cf. Glaser (in print), Bucheli (to appear).
try to provide further data on the distribution of the phenomena within the Swiss German area.

Finally, we include constructions especially interesting in relation to a typological or comparative view, for example the prepositional dative marking (2). Basically, we concentrate on phenomena that we assume to be geographically distributed throughout the Swiss German area or at least along a syntactic borderline in close vicinity to Switzerland. As can be seen in the above list, the first questionnaire already covers thirteen quite different types of syntactic phenomena.

Different theoretical and practical reasons caused us to choose these phenomena from the multitude of known variants in our area of investigation.²⁰ First of all, we required solid information about the phenomenon and its variation, i.e. a good sentence, mostly overheard or picked out of grammars. Then, we had to create an everyday context, i.e. a little story, preceeding this sentence in the questionnaire (see below sections 5.1. - 5.3. for the different question types). In the case of multiple choice questions and completion questions, the vocabulary of the given sentences had to be non-specialised, i.e. known in the whole Swiss German area. Moreover, the variants we assigned to the multiple choice questions should cover all the empirical possibilities (see below section 5.3.).

In consideration of the final analysis of the data, we also preferred phenomena with little variation or at least we tried to split up the problems in parts with less variation (except 1., the purposive clause). This strategy provides us with the possibility to test our written method and our question types mostly with controllable phenomena displaying few variants. In respect to the purposive clause, however, we also attempted to manage a phenomenon that has a lot of variation. In some cases (2, 12), we wanted to provide material for ongoing doctoral theses about the respective phenomena as soon as possible. As a result, there is a lot of practical motivation for the selection of the phenomena in the first

²⁰ For a first overview on the typical syntactic phenomena of German-speaking Switzerland cf. Glaser (in print).
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questionnaire. Moreover, we tried to cover as many different types as possible (verbal and nominal phrases, pronominal problems, serialization and doubling, morphosyntactic phenomena) in order to quickly evaluate our questioning methods and to get first results that would allow us to investigate related phenomena in future questionnaires employing the appropriate question type.

Additional information on the same and other phenomena will be asked for in the following questionnaires; e.g. verb-3-cluster, 2nd person pronominal drop and definite article doubling will be investigated in the second questionnaire.

5 • QUESTION TYPES USED IN THE FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

As the Swiss German Dialect is restricted to oral use, it seems that a written informant consultation demands the impossible: in a writing situation, a dialect speaker has to give information about his spoken language. Our project attempts to manage this challenge by means of two strategies: creating a discourse situation by presenting a small text before each question and using three types of questions.

As for the first, the informant should feel that he is in a natural dialogue situation with the help of a little story. For example, in (8) below, the story takes place at the railway station, in (9) a politician says something to the press and in (10) someone makes a telephone call. It must be mentioned that in German-speaking Switzerland these represent typical dialect situations since everyone speaks dialect. Even professors and bank managers speak together in dialect, in contrast to in Germany or France.

Our practical observations confirm that these little stories work very well and seem to be fun, as some informants’ comments prove. Only one person made a criticism: that the situation in (8) could also mean that he has to speak to someone from outside his village or even to a stranger and must switch into another dialect or into standard German. This is true and will be accounted for in the second questionnaire.
As for the second, the use of three different types of questions allows us to have different degrees of control over the elicited data and at last even of the informant’s reliability and certainty. The problem is how to make the informant give exactly the syntactic construction we are looking for.

We use the following question types: translations, completion and multiple choice. The experience with the first investigation show us that every type of question has its advantages and its disadvantages. They will be explained in the following subsections.

5.1 • The translation
In a translation question, the informant is simply asked to translate a sentence from standard German into dialect. In example (8) a purposive clause is asked for:

(8) Question 1: You have to buy a ticket at the railway station, but there is no ticket counter. You realize that you don’t have enough change to buy a ticket at the machine. You ask a person for change:

   Translate the following sentence in your dialect and write it down as you would say it:

   Entschuldigung, ich habe zu wenig Kleingeld, um ein Billett zu lösen
   sorry, I have too little change to buy a ticket
   ‘Sorry, I have too little change to buy a ticket’

(8a) Entschuldigetzi, i ha zu weni Münz zom e Billet löse
(St. Gallen SG)
Other solutions:

(8b) Entschuldigung, i ha zweni Münz für nes Billiet z’löse
  sorry I have too_little change Conj a ticket to_buy
  (Steffisburg BE)

(8c) Entschuldigung, ich ha zwenig Münz um es Billet z’chaufe
  sorry I have too_little change Conj a ticket to_buy
  (Zürich ZH)

Not intended solutions:

(8d) Entschuldigetsi i ha kei Münz und sött ä Billet poschtä
  sorry I have no change and should a ticket buy
  (Steffisburg BE)

(8e) Äxgüsi, ich ha zwenig Münz für es Billet
  sorry I have too_little change Prep a ticket
  (Birmenstorf AG)

The sentence ‘Entschuldigung, ich habe zu wenig Kleingeld, um ein Billet zu lösen’ is rendered by an informant from the eastern area as expected in (8a) with the conjunction zom and in (8b) by an informant from the western area with für and an infinitive particle z. The variant in (8c) follows the standard German model what shows that either this informant is not able to answer in dialect i.e. he copied the standard German conjunction, or that the standard German conjunction um is also a strategy in dialect. This has to be investigated further.

The answer given in (8d), a coordination of two sentences with und ‘and’ is not intended but it shows that coordination can manage the meaning of a purposive clause. In total, 108 informants provided such a coordination, 72 of them are better educated persons. In particular, teachers or in dialectology interested persons, having read in some prescriptive grammars that this is the preferred dialect strategy, tended to reply with such a coordination.
In (8e), the informant has translated a prepositional phrase instead of a purposive clause. This also accounts for the fact that this short form is a possible solution in speech but was not intended.

If informants give constantly standard German answers like (8c) or defective solutions like (8e), they obviously don’t respond in the intended manner to our written questionnaire.

It’s the translation questions that provide the least influenced and most spontaneous form of any indirect question type. However, translation carries the danger that too many unintended variants appear. Even if these unintended variants inspire the linguist to conduct further research, all these useless answers, which come up to 10-15% of the whole, clearly show the disadvantage of translation: the control over the elicitation is minimal because the informant has too much freedom in answering. Therefore, we use also other elicitation strategies to investigate. The results of the translation can serve to supervise the results of completion or multiple choice questions asking for the same phenomena. Therefore, in the first questionnaire, we asked for the purposive clause with all three question types and for the pronominal dative marking with translation and multiple choice. In any case, the idea of having about 10 informants at one location turns out to be a good one: if one informant fails to give the expected answer, another will provide it.

To sum up, by combining the quantity of answers with the different question types, we will compensate for the disadvantages of some question types and finally get a reliable picture.

5.2 • Sentence completion
The second question type, finishing a sentence (9), is expected to determine the range of answers to a higher degree than a translation: as in (9a), we supply a blank for the informant to fill in with a purposive clause using a given verb. As a result, a construction with *zom* (‘to_the’) appears:
Question 6: A politician suffers from insomnia. She says to the press: *Complete the sentence; it should explain why the politician needs pills (einschlafen ‘to get to sleep’):*

(9a) Wüsset si, jetzt bruch ich sogar Tabletten zum iischloofe

know you now need I even pills Conj get_to_sleep:Inf

‘I need pills/medicine even to get to sleep’

(St Gallen SG)

Other solutions:

(9b) um chönne iischlofe

Conj can:Inf get_to_sleep<to>

(St. Gallen SG)

(9c) dass i cha schlafe

Conj I can sleep

(Steffisburg BE)

(9d) Schlaftablette

tranquilizer

(St. Gallen SG)

In (9b), the standard German variant *um ... zu* appears although it was avoided in the formulation of the situational setting, and in (9c) the informant formulated a subordinated sentence with the conjunction *dass* ‘that’ and the conjugated verb *cha* ‘can’. (9d) shows that this informant didn’t understand the question because he just replaces *Tablette* by *Schlaftablette* ‘sleeping pills = tranquilizer’. This person will perhaps be canceled from the informants list, if the same problem occurs with other questions.

There are only a very few people who don’t understand this question type at all. However, some 8% of the informants transformed the completion questions into pure translation questions by recopying the beginning of the sentence we gave.

To summarize, we observe that this question type has to struggle with fewer but exactly the same kinds of problems as the translation.
5.3 • The multiple choice question

The multiple choice question (10) provides a range of dialect patterns for one phenomenon out of which the informant can select a single or several options. In addition, the informant has to decide which variant is the most natural form for him.

(10) Question 11: After a busy day you make yourself comfortable on the couch because you want to read a good book. But the phone rings. It’s your mother, who wants you to come over. You answer:

Which of the following sentences can you say in your dialect (“yes”), which ones are impossible (“no”)?

yes  no
1) □  □ Aber jetzt bin i grad aneghocket für es Buechz läse. 'But I have just sat down in order to read a book.'
2) □  □ Aber jetzt bin i grad aneghocket für es Buech läse.
3) □  □ Aber jetzt bin i grad aneghocket es Buech z läse.
4) ☒  □ Aber jetzt bin i grad aneghocket zum es Buech läse.
5) ☒  □ Aber jetzt bin i grad aneghocket zum es Buech z läse.
6) □  □ Aber jetzt bin i grad aneghocket um es Buech z läse.
7) □  □ Aber jetzt bin i grad aneghocket für zum es Buech z läse.
8) □  □ Aber jetzt bin i grad aneghocket für zum es Buech läse.

Which of the above sentences seems the most natural to you?

Nr. 4

Would you say the sentence in another form that is not given above?

☒ yes  □ no

If “yes”: Please write down the sentence in the way you would say it:

abgsesse ‘sit_down.PstPart’ (Zürich ZH)

The multiple choice question eliminates the problem of unintended variants because the informant has only a limited choice between several given sentences. This question type also has the advantage that more than one construction can be
selected, which accounts better for local microvariation, if there is any. The given sentences, however, can never render every informant’s exact pronunciation. As a matter of fact, the informant has to think in more abstract categories.

As a special proceeding, for the very differently speaking Wallis (Valais), the suggested dialect sentences were written down in Highest Alemannian, i.e. in an approximative form to the local dialect, which has been provided to us by a contact person from Agarn.

For all informants other than those in the Wallis, the suggested dialect sentences were noted in the same kind of a ‘neutral’ dialect of High Alemannian. In other words, we tried to construct the sentences in such a way as to contain only pan-high-alemannic expressions. Words which are restricted to one region were avoided. This comparatively ‘neutral’ form, however, is based on the eastern variant of Swiss German dialects (to which also Zurich belongs), as it is impossible to construct completely ‘neutral’ sentences. Although the suggested dialect variants are not identical to the actual dialect of Zurich, some informants, especially in the western area of the research zone, considered it to be so, as their comments showed us. This ‘ideological’ or ‘mentality’ problem also had to be accounted for in the preparation of the second questionnaire, which will soon be distributed. Much to our surprise, the rest of Switzerland managed to deal very well with the ‘neutral’ dialect sentences. Therefore, we never had any problem making those informants judge the multiple choice sentences appropriately. An adaptation of the suggested sentences for the western area, as for the Wallis, seems to be the only solution to this problem as words and their pronunciation seem to be essential for those dialect speakers.

In total, some 10% of the informants accepted the opportunity to write down the exact spelling of words at the bottom of such a multiple choice question, on a line. Another 25% of the informants refused to accept even one of the given sentences because of their different pronunciation of the words, thus noting only their (single) solution on the line offered at the bottom of the question. In such cases, the written sentences follow in structure exactly the ‘models’ we suggested.
In fact, the informant changes the multiple choice question into a translation question. Although such an answer doesn’t account for coexistent variation, if there is any, we handle it as if it were marked in the multiple choice and at the same time as the most natural variant. As long as not more than 25% of the informants note their answers in such a way, we hope that this will not influence the results too greatly and especially the registration of the most natural form. We have to be aware of these factors.

To summarize, as a consequence of the first questionnaire, in order to satisfy the need for exact spellings, we will also provide a local dialect variant (Berndeutsch) to the speakers in western Alemannian speaking Switzerland as we have done for the Wallis. In addition, we will always ask the informants to write down their own solution at the bottom of each multiple choice question.

5.4 • Twice filled-in questionnaires
Due to an error in the distribution of the questionnaire, three informants, aged 92, 79 and 61 and living at different places, filled in the same first questionnaire two times, which provides again material for the evaluation of the written questionnaire method. The answers to the multiple choice questions differ rarely: deviations are found only sporadically and concern only the acceptance but never the preference for a suggested variant. Translation questions, however, show more deviations. Surprisingly, on the completion questions no deviations are observed. Thus, we conclude that multiple choice questions remain the favored method in our investigations.
There are some phenomena that can be elicited successfully only with a specific question type. I will treat some examples in the following.

It is certain that regarding the indefinite article doubling, a multiple choice question (12) provides the best results since in a translation or completion question, a large number of informants would follow the standard German construction (12.3) which, in fact, appears in dialect, but very rarely.

(12) Question 10: Bruno knows a nice young girl who he could imagine as wife of his son, who is still a bachelor. Bruno says:

Which of the following sentences can you say in your dialect ("yes"), which ones are impossible ("no")?

yes  no

12.1) ☒  ☐ D Susi wär e ganz e liebi Frau für de Markus!

‘Susi would be a really lovely wife for Markus.’

12.2) ☒  ☐ D Susi wär ganz e liebi Frau für de Markus!

12.3) ☐  ☐ D Susi wär e ganz liebi Frau für de Markus!

Which of the above sentences seems the most natural to you?
Nr. 2

Would you say the sentence in another form that is not given above?
☒ yes ☐ no

If "yes": Please write down the sentence in the way you would say it:

à Markus ‘the Markus’ (Steffisburg BE)
Regarding the inflected past participle, elicitation proved to be difficult. As Fuchs 1990 observed in her work on the predicative adjective inflection\(^\text{22}\) in the Highest Alemannic dialects (Höchstalemannisch), for a resultative meaning, the past participle appears with an adjectival inflection ending, in perfect and past meaning without. This distinction is found especially in the area of Wallis. I succeeded in eliciting this distinction in direct inquiries in Gressoney and Issime\(^\text{23}\) with the help of pictures showing a stative situation and not a process.

Therefore, we constructed a completion question in the first questionnaire (13) and included a picture of an empty basket that has fallen down in order to help to elicit the inflected resultative form of the past participle of any verb meaning ‘fallen’.

(13) Question 5: What happened to the basket in the picture?  
(Was ist los mit dem Korb im Bild?)

Complete the sentence:

(13a) Dä Chorb isch unghitta (Matten St. Stephan BE: old person)

other solution: leerä (Visp VS: young person)

‘passive construction’: ischt ubertutz ggaange (Zermatt VS)

\(^{22}\) See also map 256 and the remarks p. 257 in SDS III which show that the distribution of the predicative adjective inflection is restricted to the Highest Alemannic zone.

\(^{23}\) An excursion in summer 2000 leaded the project’s researchers and some students to these (still) Highest Alemannic speaking places. They are located in Valle d’Aosta, Italy, close to the Swiss border.
Most of the informants followed our intention and noted a past participle. There were very few persons who gave adjectives, as in (13b). Nobody gave nonsense responses like “big” or “black”. But, concerning this phenomenon, the intended resultative inflected form of the past participle (13a) did occasionally appear, as did some inflected adjectives (13b). Thus, we conclude that we will have to improve the context and choose another verb. In the second questionnaire, we will ask again for this phenomenon, perhaps using multiple choice.

Besides, (13c) shows that unintended answers can provide new constructions. One person from Zermatt in the Wallis noted an equivalent construction that looks like an ‘unknown’ pseudo-passive form, with the conjugated verb isch ‘is’ and the past participle ggange ‘gone’. This proves again that the decision to question 10 persons in one community was a good one. A question on the passive in the second questionnaire will show us if such constructions are productive or if we just found a fixed or isolated expression.24

Another area of investigation is the so-called ‘verb doubling’ (see Lötscher 1993) ich gang go ‘I go go’, also so-called ‘infinitive particle’ go. In the first questionnaire, it is asked for by a completion question (14). This method was chosen firstly to elicit the most spontaneous form. Secondly, it influences the informant less than translation from standard German, which doesn’t have such an infinitive particle. Thirdly, as the particle has several forms (go, ga, gi, gu) in the different dialects, the completion question helps us in the sense that we don’t have to select one form in writing it, as we would have to in a multiple choice question.

24 In Gressoney and Issime in the Valle d’Aosta (Italy), such passive constructions were found to be productive: isch verchaufs gangu ‘has been sold’, isch gschossus gangu ‘has been shot’. If this pattern is due to Italian influence or an old Highest Alemannic strategy can’t be decided yet. Szadrowsky (1930: 114) mentions that a passive with gaan ‘go’ must have existed because he has found such a construction in a historical document (Davoser Landbuch) of the 16th century.
(14) Question 4: You call your best friend to tell her the latest news. Her son answers. You tell him that you would like to speak to his mother. He replies:

Complete the sentence; it should give information about where your best friend is (einkaufen ‘shopping’):

(14a) Oh, si ischnid da, si isch go poschte (ggange)

‘Oh, she is not here, she is off shopping.’

(Zürich ZH)

In this special absentive construction, the infinitive particle go is supposed to be obligatory in the whole Swiss German area and the verb of motion’s past participle ggange ‘gone’ is not needed. We can now test this supposition. Further investigations of the infinitive particle go in facultative contexts are planned.

III CONCLUSION

Regarding the quantitative participation of the informants and the high quality of the answers, there is no doubt that our first investigation with a written questionnaire has been a success. We found on the one hand that written elicitation has the advantage of a small expense of money and time, as well as of a large pool of data. On the other hand, the written elicitation carries along with it some problems which we hope to manage through the use of different questionnaire techniques. Both written and oral question types asking for linguistic structures carry problems (for direct oral elicitation technique see Leonie Cornips in this volume) of which the investigator has to be aware.

Contrary to Groot (2000: 718) we consider the construction in (14a) to be the Swiss German absentive because of the typical information on absence. The construction differs from the Standard German one in the obligatory use of the particle go which is probably etymologically related to the verb gaa ‘to go’, cf. Lötscher (1993).
First try-outs with automatically generated maps using the material of our first investigation show in some cases a geographical distribution, and certain border lines can be identified. In other cases, we have found variation in several constructions throughout the area.

In the case of the infinitival purposive clause, we have found a geographical distribution of the complementizers: zum in the eastern part and für...z in the western part. In a transition zone in between, we find variations and contaminations (für zum) of the two types. In contrast, the article doubling is found all over the Swiss German speaking area in variation with the other possibilities given. These results encourage us to continue our investigation with the written questionnaire technique.

PICTURE 2 • Swiss map
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Variation between the infinitival complementizers \textit{om/voor} in spontaneous speech data compared to elicitation data

Leonie Cornips

\textit{Meertens Instituut}

1 • INTRODUCTION

In several previous dialect atlas projects in The Netherlands and in the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium, the focus has always been on lexical, phonological and morphological variables.\(^1\) This corresponds to atlas projects all over the world in which no more than five percent of published dialect maps involve syntactic data (Gerritsen 1993:343). There are two well-known reasons why syntactic research is always neglected in dialect atlas projects or in dialect research more generally (cf. Bucheli and Glaser in this volume). The first one has to do with the views of more traditional dialectologists that syntactic variation in the Dutch dialects is barely visible and, subsequently, is negligible by comparison to lexical, phonological and morphological variation. Apart from atlas projects, which are a more traditional dialect enterprise, it is only a very recent development in the Netherlands and in Belgium that generative linguists take the dialect as an object of research. The generative framework differs from that of dialectology in that the former considers syntactic features always in interaction with other variants as predicted by theory whereas the latter examines syntactic variants in isolation. The second reason is linked to the fact that special methodology is required to obtain syntactic dialect data from a large geographical area regardless or whether this data is needed to device a linguistic atlas or as a contribution to theory refinement. The variationist approach diverges from both traditional dialectology and generative approaches since it focuses on achieving representativeness regarding the speakers observed; obtaining controlled recordings of vernacular speech and collecting a substantial quantity of data in order to achieve descriptive and observational adequacy (cf. Cornips and Corrigan t.a.).

\(^1\) I like to thank Karen Corrigan for her valuable suggestions and correction of the English of the first three sections of this paper.
However, it is nearly impossible to collect data from a large geographical area using these methods. Apart from the amount of time required to collect spontaneous speech data that is truly vernacular across a large geographical area, there are other, often insurmountable problems, namely (i) syntactic tokens are infrequent and they do not involve the whole range of possible variants, that is to say, the syntactic tokens do not exhibit the complete paradigm, (ii) the syntactic variables do not always show up in interaction with other relevant syntactic variables that are predicted by theory and (iii) negative data are lacking. As a result, in addition to systematic recording of spontaneous speech and introspective judgements, an approach is needed in which dialect data are collected by other elicitation techniques such as written questionnaires and oral tasks in order to achieve greater observational and explanatory force.

In this paper, I will discuss the discrepancies between spontaneous speech data and elicitation data with respect to the linguistic and social distribution of syntactic variants. The structure of this paper is as follows: Section 2 discusses the unreliability of introspective judgements; Section 3 deals with the task-effects of written questionnaires that are used to collect syntactic dialect data in a large geographical area such as the written questionnaires used in the SAND-project (syntactic atlas of Dutch dialects, cf. Cornips & Jongenburger 2001). In the last section, I will discuss the discrepancies between spontaneous speech and oral elicitation data with respect to the linguistic and social distribution of linguistic variables, focussing on the variation between the infinitival complementizers om and voor in Heerlen Dutch. These empirical data concerning the complementizers om and voor shed more light on the answers to the questions whether the variation between om andvoor is a syntactic and/or a semantic phenomenon or just a phenomenon of lexical substitution.

2 • UNRELIABILITY OF INTROSPECTIVE JUDGEMENTS

Generativists focus on native-speaker introspection in an idealised environment in their pursuit of explanatory adequacy. Direct questions about the (un)grammaticality of syntactic features may provide insight into a speaker’s competence far more readily than spontaneous speech data do. However, since Labov (1972), the unreliability of native speaker judgements is well known. He has shown that: “whenever a subordinate dialect (stigmatized) is in contact with a superordinate dialect (prestige), answers given in any
formal test situation will shift from the subordinate towards the superordinate in an irregular and unsystematic manner (1972: 21)." Moreover, "speakers’ attitudes towards well-established linguistic variables will also be shown in self-evaluation tests. When asked which of several forms is characteristic of their own speech, their answers reflect the form which they believe has prestige or is “correct” rather than the form they actually use. ...this kind of test data cannot be interpreted without data on the subjects’ actual speech patterns" (Labov 1972: 213). Thus, one of the conditions that promote the failure of linguistic intuitions is social intervention, that is to say, when a socially superordinate norm takes precedence over the native system (Labov 1996: 100). These findings are particularly relevant in a setting in which two or more language varieties or dialects differ in social prestige as in the English vernacular observed in the United States. With respect to the European dialect context, the Dutch case represents the same language situation, that is: a diglossia type in which the standard language is both spoken and written showing vertical and horizontal levelling in the most widespread context (cf. Auer 2000). It is obvious that in the Dutch context, especially in the western part of the Netherlands in which there is one, single style continuum between the dialect and the standard language, the social intervention condition on the reliability of elicited speaker judgements may play an important role. Hence, there is no sharp discontinuity between the local vernacular and the standard language (cf. Hinskens 1996: 132). However, this condition may not be relevant in a medial diglossia situation in which the dialect is spoken and the standard language is exclusively a written variety, such as Nynorsk in Norway and Swiss standard German. These dialects have high prestige and regarding code-switching, they are equal partners and show a balanced repertoire (cf. Auer 2000). Clearly, spontaneous speech data and elicitation data such as introspective judgments may differ due to the social prestige of the dialect varieties in relation to the standard language.

3 • THE TASK-EFFECTS OF WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRES

An important experimental method in order to construct a dialect atlas or to collect dialect data in a large geographical area is the use of written questionnaires. In each location relevant to the research, a single native speaker, that is to say, a so-called NORM (Non-mobile, Older, Rural, Male speaker) for whom the local dialect is native
is asked to complete a questionnaire. This method has the advantage of systematically gathering dialect data in a large geographical area within a short time span. Moreover, it is an elicitation technique that enables the researcher to standardize both the collection of, and the analysis of, the material. However, this method induces numerous well known task effects, which are briefly discussed below (cf. Greenbaum 1973, Oxford 1982).

The first task effect is immediately obvious: that is, in general, standard languages are written varieties whereas dialects are spoken ones. Subsequently, the written response of the informant will often be unduly influenced by prescriptive educational practices.

Secondly, most written questionnaires contain a translation task whereby the speaker has to 'translate' constructions from the standard language into the local dialect. One task-effect, which this action is inclined to induce is the repetition-effect; that is, the standard construction will be translated literally into the local dialect. Hence, the speaker has to write in dialect, although he is not used to doing so. As a result, s/he will concentrate more on the task of spelling and translating dialectal lexical elements not conventionally represented in the standard language with the result that more of their attention is focused on completing this insignificant aspect of the task from the researcher's perspective who ia actually more interested in the respondent's ability to handle syntactic variation.

The third task-effect is that grammatical constructions on the syntactic level may be judged to be ungrammatical simply on the basis of lexical items. Figure 1 illustrates this task-effect. In 1995, a questionnaire was sent out by the Meertens Instituut in the Rhineland area and it was offered in standard German. For each location, one native speaker of the local dialect filled in the questionnaire. In this Rhineland questionnaire both the impersonal and adjunct middle with and without the reflexive \textit{sich} were administered (cf. Cornips 1996b, Cornips & Corrigan 2001). For each variant (a), (b), (c), and (d) in figure 1, the native speakers were asked to answer the following two questions. The first question was: do you ever ‘encounter’ the variant in your local dialect ‘kommt vor/ ist manchmal zu hören’? Furthermore, the speakers were asked if they considered the variant to be the most ‘common’ one in their local dialect ‘am gebräuchlichsten’. In addition, the native speaker was asked to give a translation ‘Übersetzung’ of the most common construction in his dialect.
The comments of the speaker in the Übersetzung phase in figure 1 reveals that he doesn’t consider any of the middle constructions to be acceptable due to the fact that the lexical item herrlich ‘pleasantly’ is unknown in the local dialect ‘total ungebräuchlich’. However, the reflexive impersonal construction in (c) is fully grammatical in the Rhineland dialect and in standard German.

The fact that the native speaker judges a certain form to be completely unacceptable but can nevertheless, be recorded using freely in every-day conversation, is a striking task-effect of both elicited introspective judgements and written questionnaires which inquire about the (relative) acceptability of a given construction (Labov 1996: 78). Thus, the translation task of the most common sentence, in addition to questions about acceptability, shed light on the issue of why the native speaker judges a specific construction to be unacceptable. Moreover, it provides more insight into the reason why the native speaker is understanding or interpreting a specific construction, in a specific way which was not intended by the researcher, as illustrated in figure 2. The same Meertens questionnaire in the Rhineland area reveals that only one speaker (out of nineteen) judged the argument middle in the perfect without a reflexive in (c) as acceptable (‘encounter’ and ‘most common’ see bold print) in the dialect (cf. Cornips and Corrigan t.a.):
However, the speakers’ translations (Übersetzung) demonstrate that he has interpreted this middle as a regular reflexive lassen (‘let’)-construction and/or as a totally different construction.

Finally, a specific task-effect is an order-effect. The more the speaker has to make judgements about a specific construction that is offered several times in a different way in one questionnaire, the more he will judge it to be acceptable. An alternative to this task-effect is to vary the order of the questions per list (cf. Bree 1981, Cornips 1994: 46). Note, that this is only an alternative if there are more informants present at each location. Otherwise, the variation due to the different orders of the questionnaires may be attributed to the geographical spread of the questionnaires themselves.

In conclusion, written questionnaires have different task-effects that must be considered in any resultant analysis.
4 • THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SPONTANEOUS SPEECH DATA AND ORAL ELICITATION DATA

In this section, I will discuss the discrepancies between spontaneous speech data and oral elicitation data (Bock 1986). To this end, I will present a subpart of a study on the social dimensions of the regional Dutch spoken in Heerlen (henceforth: Heerlen Dutch), focusing on the variation between the infinitival complementizers om and voor (cf. Cornips 1994, 1996a). Heerlen is situated in the province of Limburg in the southeast of The Netherlands, near the Belgian and German border and it is the result of a process of abrupt language shift in the beginning of this century with the local dialect as the source and standard Dutch as the target language.

4.1 • Spontaneous speech data

The data consist of 33,5 recorded hours of spontaneous speech between two speakers who did not know each other but they belonged to the same cell (in-group conversation) and the recordings took place at the speakers’ homes. A total of 67 male speakers participated in this survey. Later, I will come back in more detail to the sociolinguistic part of this study.

In Heerlen Dutch, two variants of the infinitival complementizer arise, om is the standard Dutch variant realization, while voor is the local dialect variant realization (Jongeneel 1884: 65, Cornips 1994). The data reveal variation to a large extent. As can be seen in figure 3, some speakers produce only om (for example, speaker 1 and 2 in the first column), some speakers use both om and voor (for example, speaker 4 in the first column) and one speaker uses only voor (speaker 67 in the first column).

2 Only one informant had a conversation with the interviewer.
3 Only the data showing an overt complementizer om or voor are taken into consideration.
Let us examine in more detail the syntactic factors that might affect the occurrence of *om* or *voor* in Heerlen Dutch as presented in figure 3.

\[\text{\textbf{FIGURE 3} • Individual production of om and voor}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Speaker</th>
<th>no. OM</th>
<th>no. VOOR</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>proportion</th>
<th>31-32</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>38-40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49-52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>57-58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65-66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us examine in more detail the syntactic factors that might affect the occurrence of *om* or *voor* in Heerlen Dutch as presented in figure 3.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{4} All speakers are male (see also 4.2).}\]
First, both *om* and *voor* arise if the infinitival clause is an object clause, as in (1). The infinitival clause is the complement of the verb *proberen* ‘try’:

(1) a. ik heb wel tachtig keer geprobeerd *om* met dat roken te stoppen (15: Jan) 

‘I have tried to quit smoking eighty times’

b. hebben een paar keer geprobeerd *voor* mee te doen aan zo’n quiz (2: Wybe) 

‘several times (we) tried to participate in such a quiz’

Both *om* and *voor* show up if the infinitival clause is used as an adjunct. In (2), the infinitival clauses are purpose clauses:

(2) a. je ziet vaak een taxi van Aken hier in Heerlen rondrijden ...ja *om* het spul op te halen

‘in Heerlen you often see a cab from Aken driving around to collect the

b. die moest naar de hei gaan elke dag *voor* te wandelen *voor* lucht te krijgen (14: Ralph)

‘every day he had to go to the heath to walk, to get air’

..............................

5 The figure appearing before the speaker’s pseudonym refers to the number of the tape-recording.
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Further, both *om* and *voor* appear if the infinitival clause is the complement of an adjective, such as *moeilijk* ‘difficult’ in (3a):

(3)  
a. is ( )moeilijk *om* Sinterklazen te vinden (10: Nico)  
is difficult COMP Santa Clauses to find  
‘is difficult to find Santa Clauses’

b. *ik* vind het zo *erg* *voor* een beest  
*I find it so terrible* COMP *an animal*  
kapot te maken (31: dhr Bast)  
RESULT to make  
‘I find it so terrible to destroy an animal’

In addition, both *om* and *voor* are used with verbs of object control and arbitrary control, as illustrated in (4) and (5), respectively:

(4)  
a. dan riep *ik* m’n vrouw naar .. het raam *om* te kijken als d’r een fietser langskwam (7: Ruiter)  
then called *I* my wife to the window COMP to look if there a cyclist came along

b. en dan *wil* ik je nou *de* kans geven voor nog wat bij te verdienen (4: dhr Mije)  
and then want *I* you adv the opportunity give COMP ADV something to earn  
‘I want you to give the opportunity to earn an additional income’

(5)  
a. dat blijft heel moeilijk *om* d’r in te geloven (21: Mart)  
‘It remains very difficult to believe in

b. het is *nou* tijd he *voor* te stekken (2: Wybe)  
it is ADV time uh COMP to strike cuttings of plants

In addition, both *om* and *voor* show up in infinitival relative clauses:

(6)  
a. .. leuke jongen *om* mee op te schieten maar hij kan geen nee hebben (5: André)  
‘nice boy to go along with but he can’t stand a ‘no’-answer’
b. die groep van eh vijftien tot achttienjarigen (...) .. dat is best wel aardig 
voor mee te werken ja dus eh (19: Cor) 
‘this group of youngsters aged between fifteen and eighteen is nice to 
work with’

Strikingly, the syntactic variation between *om* and *voor* manifests itself at the 
individual level even while one speaker is maintaining the same level of speech style 
(Bickerton 1971 (cf. Figure 3). Consider the constructions in (7) that were uttered by 
one speaker (‘Bert’) on the same occasion. It appears that the same speaker uses both 
*om* and *voor* in the same linguistic category: that is, the verbs (*terug*)komen in both (7a) 
and (7b) are verbs of subject control and both sentences are infinitival purpose clauses:

(7)

a. moet ik terug komen *om* dat half jaar ( ) af te maken (12: Bert)  
must I back come COMP that half year PART to finish  
‘I must come back in order to finish that half year’

b. je komt hier *voor* te studeren (12: Bert)  
you come here COMP to study  
‘You will come here in order to study’

From the above, it will be clear that in Heerlen Dutch both at the individual and at the 
group level, *voor* has the same syntactic distribution as *om*. The similar syntactic 
distribution of *om* and *voor* suggest that they are only lexical variants.

However, it is worthwhile to find out certain tendencies selecting the 
complementizer *voor* or *om*. First, let us consider standard Dutch. In the spoken 
variety of standard Dutch, in addition to the infinitival complementizer *om*, *voor* is 
also marginally used. It has been pointed out in the literature that *voor* in Dutch 
dialects is sometimes used if the infinitival clause is a purpose clause as in (3) 
(Gerritsen 1991: 61, 69). Since in Dutch dialects (as is the case in standard Dutch) the 
preposition *voor* is also capable of expressing purpose (Geerts 1984: 881), it can be 
argued that the form *voor* in a purpose infinitival clause corresponds semantically to 
the form *voor* used as a preposition. Therefore, it may be argued that in Dutch there 
exists a syntactic/semantic factor that promotes or inhibits the occurrence of the 
complementizer *voor*. Let us now consider whether this factor is also relevant in
Heerlen Dutch with regard to the occurrence of the complementizer *voor*. Table 1 reveals the data of speakers who use both *om* and *voor* occurring in the two types of infinitival clauses, namely [+/- purp] infinitival clause. It displays that in spontaneous speech the factor [+purp] yields significant results with the use of the dialect variant *voor*: that is, *voor* is used more frequently in a [+purp] clause.

**Table 1** • *The distribution of* om *en* voor *according to* [+purp] *and* [-purp]-infinitival clause (spontaneous speech)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>VOOR</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- purp</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ purp</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>253</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2(\text{+ purp}) = 56.21 \text{ df}=1 \ p<.001\]

The range of individual grammars in Heerlen Dutch based on 643 *om*/*voor* occurrences in spontaneous speech, 67 speakers and 2 infinitival-types, e.g. [+purp] and [-purp] clauses reveals that the speakers produce eight different grammars that take the form *om* or *voor* or *om*/*voor* in each linguistic category (see also Bickerton 1971). Furthermore, 28 speakers produce only *om*, whereas 22 speakers produce *om* in a [-purp] clause but *om*/*voor* in a [+purp] clause, respectively grammar 1 and 2. Note that the speakers do not produce grammar 9. This behaviour confirms, to a certain extent, the results shown above; if both *om* and *voor* are simultaneously available, an infinitival non-purpose clause promotes the variant *om* and an infinitival purpose clause promotes the variant *voor*.6

6 Only grammar 8 in figure 4 is a counterexample.
Five out of eight grammars display inherent variability, namely the grammars 2, 4, 5, 6, 8. I argue that the inherent variability in Heerlen Dutch is due to a semantically controlled dialectization of the spoken variety of standard Dutch. In other words, influenced by the use of voor both in the local dialect and in the spoken variety of standard Dutch, the speakers do not derive the variant om but the variant om/voor from standard Dutch. Since in standard Dutch the variant om/voor is most frequently used in an infinitival purpose clause, only this option explains clearly the large number of realisations of grammar 2.

4.2 • The social stratification of voor-usage in spontaneous speech.

In standard Dutch the use of voor in an infinitival purpose clause is due to a recent language change. From the above, it is not obvious in Heerlen Dutch whether, from the synchronic point of view, the use of voor in an infinitival purpose clause originates from the local dialect or from a recent development in standard Dutch.

In contrast, it is certain that the use of voor in a non-purpose clause originates exclusively from the local dialect since this use is not acceptable in standard Dutch, that is to say, it is rejected by prescriptive norms. With the above assumptions in mind, we expect that (i) the group of dialect speakers will produce more voor in a non-
purpose clause than the other groups of speakers and (ii) *voor* in a purpose clause will be more frequently used by the younger speakers.

By means of the sociolinguistic part of this study, these hypotheses can be confirmed or rejected. In this survey, the speakers were divided into three language groups according to their language background, namely immigrant (N=19), dialect (N=29) and Heerlen Dutch (N=19). Immigrant speakers spoke (Heerlen) Dutch as a first language, and their parents were born outside the province of Limburg. Dialect speakers spoke the local dialect as a first language and (Heerlen) Dutch as a second language. Heerlen Dutch speakers spoke (Heerlen) Dutch as a first language and, their parents spoke the local dialect as a first language. The speakers were then further subdivided into smaller groups according to their education/occupation and age. The education/occupation variable is based on two values on a high to low scale, i.e. middle/high level employees (N= 39) and unskilled/skilled labour (N=28). With respect to the age, ‘young’ speakers (aged between 20 and 45, N= 37)) were distinguished from ‘old’ speakers (aged over 60, N= 30). The speaker variables are shown in table 2. The specification of these variables made it possible to investigate whether the groups of speakers show any social stratification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low level of education</th>
<th>high level of education</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>young</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heerlen Dutch</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantitative analysis confirms the hypotheses. 73% of the speakers producing *voor* in a non-purpose clause belong to the group of dialect speakers and 82% belong to the group of older speakers. Sure enough, this distribution supports the hypothesis that the use of *voor* in a non-purpose clause originates from the local dialect.

Moreover, as expected, 62% of the speakers producing *voor* in a purpose infinitival clause belong to the youngest age group (cf. Cornips 1996a).

4.3 • Oral elicitation data
The data in this sociolinguistic survey were also collected by means of a simple oral repetition test. In the repetition test, I offered 66 speakers 11 infinitival clauses. Five of the infinitival sentences were purpose clauses and six non-purpose clauses (cf. Cornips 1994, 1996, see appendix). All of the speakers were asked to repeat sentences that contained more than twenty items or words containing either the *om* or *voor* complementizer. It can be argued that the large number of items has an effect on the capacity of the speakers’ short-term memory. It is reasonable to assume that this kind of stimulus makes it difficult to repeat exactly the structure and, as a result, the speaker has to rely on his own grammar. If this is so, an accurate repetition of *om* or *voor* provides weak evidence that the test variant is within the speaker’s dialect; consistent inaccuracies (usually translation, e.g. substitution of *om* for *voor* or the reverse) provide strong evidence that the test variant, e.g. *om* or *voor*, is not within his dialect (Carden 1976: 101).

It is evident from table 3 that in the test data the factor [± purp] clause yields significant results with the dialect variant *voor*. As in the spontaneous speech data, *voor* is used more often in a [+purp] clause than in a [-purp] clause, namely 20% and 6% respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[- purp] clause</th>
<th>[+ purp] clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td>19/168 (11%)</td>
<td>39/169 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>om</em> by</td>
<td>2/160 (1%)</td>
<td>33/198 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>21/328 (6%)</td>
<td>72/367 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 (\pm purp) = 26.10, df = 1, p<.001\]

---

7 One older informant had many difficulties to hear the test sentences. This informant is not involved in the procedure of the elicitation tests.

8 One reviewer pointed out to me that “neurologists use retarded repetition which has to be produced at least five seconds after the stimulus. There is evidence that after this period the speaker cannot use his memory and has to ‘go through’ his own linguistic knowledge, even in the case of very simple sentences.” Of course, this type of test might be used here also.
However, no significant correlations are found with respect to the social distribution of the complementizer *voor*, and as a result, the social distribution of *om*/voor in the testdata differs from the spontaneous data. I argue that these different patterns are primarily due to distinct test effects. In order to provide some insight into these test effects, I present a detailed list of all the speakers with their variables who have a deviant output in the test data compared with their spontaneous speech in figure 5.

It is clear from figure 5 that a total of 25 speakers (one third of the speakers) display a different test output in comparison to their spontaneous speech data. There are two ways in which the speakers may vary in their test production. First, they use only *om* in their spontaneous speech whereas their test data display also *voor* (see group I, II and III in figure 5) or they realise only *voor* in spontaneous speech while they use only *om* in the test (see group IV). With respect to the seven speakers in group I and II, I argue that their translations of *om* by *voor* provide strong evidence that the infinitival complementizer *voor* is within their language variety, although it is not present in their spontaneous speech. Of course, the fact that the variant *voor* does not arise in their spontaneous speech does not imply that it does not belong to the grammar of these speakers "since nonoccurrence in a corpus may always be due to nongrammatical, contextual factors or even to chance” (Kroch 1989:200). Further, the output of the eighteen speakers in groups III and IV displays interesting test effects. Consider first group III. Since these six speakers only repeat the test input but do not translate it, their test production can be ascribed to a repetition effect (Bock 1986).

If we examine the speaker variables in this group, we see that proportionally, the majority of these six speakers belongs to the oldest age group (OLD: 4/29 = .14 versus YOUNG: 2/38 = .05), to the immigrant speakers (IMM: 4/29 = .21, HD = 1/19 = .05, DIA = 1/28 = .04) and to the group of speakers with a high level of education/occupation (HIGH: 4/38 = .11 versus LOW 2/28 = .07).
**FIGURE 5** • *Number of speakers according to variables who display a deviant test output in comparison with their spontaneous speech (N=25)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Spontaneous Speech</th>
<th>Repetition voor</th>
<th>Translation of N om by voor</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>IMM-young-low</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIA-young-high</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>IMM-young-high</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMM-old-high</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMM-old-low</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD-old-high</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD-young-high</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>IMM-young-high</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMM-old-low</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMM-old-high</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIA-old-high</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD-young-low</td>
<td><em>om</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IMM-old-high</td>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMM-young-high</td>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIA-old-high</td>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIA-old-low</td>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIA-young-high</td>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD-young-high</td>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD-young-low</td>
<td><em>voor</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group IV displays another performance-mechanism since these twelve speakers neither repeat nor translate the test input. As a result they use only *voor* in their spontaneous speech but the variant *voor* does not show up in their test output. We can conclude from this that these speakers are subject to stylistic variation. Their test output shows that they are capable of controlling variation between *om* and *voor*. These speakers are subject to the social intervention condition since *om* is the prestige variant belonging to the domain of standard Dutch (see §2). The majority of the speakers who are able to control the stylistic variation belong to the group of speakers with a high level of education/occupation (*HIGH*: 10/38 = .26 versus *LOW*: 2/28 = .07),
to the older speakers (OLD: 7/29 = .24 versus YOUNG 5/37 = .14) and the dialect speakers (DIA: 8/28 = .29, IMM/HD: 2/19 = .11).

Another striking result is that proportionally there are hardly any Heerlen Dutch, e.g. five out nineteen speakers (.26) who display a different test output in comparison to their spontaneous speech. From this, we may conclude that these five speakers use both om and voor to a great extent since the speakers in figure 5 use only om or voor but not both in their spontaneous speech.

5 • CONCLUSION

The infinitival complementizers om and voor have the same syntactic distribution as om in Heerlen Dutch at the individual and the group level. Both variants appear with verbs of subject, object and arbitrary control. Further, om and voor arise in adjunct and complement infinitival clauses. The similar syntactic distribution of om and voor suggest at first sight that they are only lexical variants. However, the sociolinguistic part of this study shows that if both om and voor are simultaneously available, an infinitival non-purpose clause promotes the variant om and an infinitival purpose clause promotes the variant voor. Moreover, it is shown that there are no discrepancies between spontaneous speech and oral elicitation data with respect to the linguistic distribution of the infinitival complementizers om and voor. However, the social distribution of the test output differs from the social distribution of the variants in spontaneous speech. I have argued that these differences are primarily due to different test effects. What is more, it appears that speakers with a high level of education and occupation in particular are capable in controlling their test output in contrast to their spontaneous speech. Apparently, the method of elicitation - in this case study a repetition test - determines the social stratification of the speakers, and hence, it is worthwhile to take this effect into account in examining syntactic variation.
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• APPENDIX

Test sentences (cf. Cornips 1994: 82, 245-246):

A  Infinitival purpose clauses, standard Dutch version

(i) en die visjes zijn niet voor om op te eten
and those little fish are not to COMP PART to eat

(ii) Is tien uur voor Klaas nog niet te laat om naar
is ten o’clock for Klaas ADV yet too late COMP PREP de film te gaan?
the movie to go

(iii) Vroeger zaten er ()rode ringen om de vliegtuigen te
formerly were there red rings COMP the planes to
waarschuwen.
warn

(iv) Als de kleinkinderen komen dan kan ik ()iets
if the grandchildren come then can I something
voor hun kopen om mee te spelen.
for them buy with to play

(v) Komt dat voetbalelftal (...) om te voetballen?
come that football-team (...) COMP to play-football

(vi) en dan kun je ’m niet meer voeren om aan te
and then can you him no longer feed COMP to
sterken
strengthen
‘and then you are no longer able to feed him in order to build up his strength’

.................................

* Note that om (4) is an infinitival relative clause.
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Infinitival non-purpose clauses, standard Dutch version

(i) Het is me erg lastig om al die zinnen na te zeggen.
   it is me very difficult COMP all those sentences too repeat

(ii) ( )dat dat te mooi is om waar te zijn.
    that that too beautiful is COMP true to be

(iii) Het is onmogelijk voor de politie in Heerlen om overal op te letten.
     it is impossible for the police in Heerlen COMP everything too watch

(iv) Het is goed om te weten (...)
     it is good COMP too know

(v) Het is me te moeilijk om (...die zesentwintig zinnen in te spreken.
    it is me too difficult COMP those twenty-six sentences to speak
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1 • INTRODUCTION

The topic of complementizer agreement has received a fair amount of attention in the dialectological literature (e.g. Van Ginneken 1938, Van Haeringen 1939, Vanacker 1949, Goeman 1979, Hoekstra & Smits 1997; see also the references in Goeman 1997). In this article we start out by considering the question to what extent verbal and complementizer agreement paradigms are similar. In doing so, we shall be testing the validity of the Inversion Generalisation proposed by Hoekstra & Smits (1997). A proper evaluation of this generalisation will require us to make a distinction between the phenomena of cliticisation of a weak pronoun onto a complementizer or finite verb on the one hand, and that of complementizer agreement on the other. As the difference between both phenomena is not always obvious, we shall look at the evidence in a rather detailed way, focusing in particular on complementizer agreement (and cliticisation) as it is found in the Belgian provinces of West- and East-Flanders. We shall also look at two other generalisations: the Identity Generalisation formulated by Hoekstra & Smits (1998), and the Monosyllable in Clitic Group Generalisation proposed by Goeman (2000). We argue that the concepts in terms of which these generalisations are formulated are too wide, and that the relevant concept is the narrower one of a verb with a CV-stem.

2 • SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VERBAL AND COMPLEMENTIZER AGREEMENT PARADIGMS

Since both the verb and the complementizer can show agreement, the question arises to what extent both agreement paradigms are similar. For a first idea, consider the following paradigm from the dialect of Lapscheure (West-Flanders) (Haegeman 1992):
At first sight, the only thing the two paradigms have in common are the boldfaced items in the complementizer paradigm, i.e. the 1st sg. and 3rd pl. agreement-\(n\). The agreement \(t\) on the verb in the 3rd sg. and in the 2nd person (sg. and pl.) is absent in the complementizer paradigm. A further difference is the extra morpheme on the complementizer (\(k, j(e), se, me\) and \(ze\)), which is completely lacking in the verbal paradigm. In this article, we shall argue that, in spite of these apparently substantial differences, there is in fact a large degree of similarity between the verbal and complementizer agreement paradigms.

3 • THE INVERSION GENERALISATION

The question to what extent verbal and complementizer agreement paradigms are similar has been addressed in Hoekstra & Smits (1997). On the basis of the literature available they formulate the Inversion Generalisation.

\[
\text{(2) The Inversion Generalisation} \\
\text{If the complementizer shows agreement morphology, it is identical to the agreement morphology found on the verb when it occurs in inversion.}
\]

It is well-known that verbal agreement morphology in inversion can be different from that in non-inversion contexts (e.g. Standard Dutch \(jij\) denk-\(t\) ‘you think’ \(vs\) denk \(jij\) ‘think you’). The phenomenon is not restricted to 2 sg. (e.g. \(wy\) speul-\(t\) ‘we play’ \(vs\) speul-\(e\) \(wy\) ‘play we’ in eastern dialects; Van Haeringen 1958). For a proper evaluation of the Inversion Generalisation, we therefore need to look at inversion paradigms. Haegeman (1992) quotes the paradigms in (3) for Lapscheure, and Magda Devos (p.c.) provides the data in (4) for the nearby dialect of Klemskerke:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{(1)} & I-think & that & pronoun & tomorrow goes \\
\text{sg. 1} & Kpeinzen & dan-k & (ik) & morgen goa_n. \\
\text{2} & Kpeinzen & da-j & (gie) & morgen goat. \\
\text{3} & Kpeinzen & da-se & (zie) & morgen goat. \\
\text{pl. 1} & Kpeinzen & da-me & (wunder) & morgen goa_n. \\
\text{2} & Kpeinzen & da-je & (gunder) & morgen goat. \\
\text{3} & Kpeinzen & dan-ze & (zunder) & morgen goa_n. \\
\text{sg. 3} & Kpeinzen & da & Valère & morgen goat. \\
\text{pl. 3} & Kpeinzen & dan & Valère en Pol morgen goa_n.
\end{array}
\]
These paradigms confirm the inversion generalisation in a striking way. The verbal inversion paradigm in (3) exactly matches the complementizer paradigm in (1). Both the complementizer and the verbal inversion paradigm lack the t-morpheme of the 3rd sg. and of the 2nd person (sg. and pl.). The Klemskerke paradigms in (4) likewise confirm the correctness of the Inversion Generalisation. They differ from the Lapscheure data in that the 1 sg. agreement nasal consonant is lacking both on the verb and on the complementizer, as well as in the occurrence of a nasal vowel in 3 pl.

As far as the morphemes k, j(e), se, me and ze are concerned, we observe that these appear identically on the verb in inversion and on the complementizer. This could be taken to indicate that these morphemes should be analysed as agreement morphemes. The complementizer would then agree with the subject not only in person and number, but also in gender; agreement would furthermore be sensitive
to the difference between a pronominal and a non-pronominal subject. At the same time, the possibility cannot be ruled out that $k, j(e), se, me$ and $ze$ are clitic pronouns, and consequently are not part of the agreement morphology. A first reason for adopting such an analysis has already been hinted at: an agreement analysis would presuppose that agreement is sensitive for the difference between pronominal and nonpronominal subjects, as (most of) these dialects only allow pronominal subjects to follow the morphemes under investigation (eg goase ziel/*Marie). It is highly uncommon for agreement to be sensitive in this way.

Another argument supporting the clitic pronoun hypothesis is that it allows one to establish a fairly far-reaching similarity between inversion and non-inversion paradigms. By contrast, if $k, j(e), se, me$ and $ze$ are taken to be agreement morphemes, this would imply a rather large discrepancy between the inversion and the non-inversion paradigms. The latter shows only two agreement morphemes ($n$ and $t$), whereas the inversion paradigm would have up to nine different agreement morphemes. And although not all discrepancies between inversion and non-inversion paradigms can be eliminated, it is obvious that we would like those paradigms to differ as little as possible.

A third argument to assume that the inversion paradigms contain clitic pronouns is to be found in the fact that in non-inversion contexts a weak form of the pronoun can precede the verb, which is, in almost all cases, identical to the morpheme found in inversion contexts. This is shown by the following data from the Poperinge dialect (Vallaey 1997):

(5) Poperinge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no inversion</th>
<th>inversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>k xon ek</td>
<td>go-n-k ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>je got xiej</td>
<td>go-je giej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>æ got iej</td>
<td>got-n iej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>ze got siej</td>
<td>go-se ziej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>me gon wieder</td>
<td>go-me wieder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>je got xieder</td>
<td>go-je gieder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ze gon zieder</td>
<td>gô-ze zieder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the weak pronouns which precede the verb cannot co-occur with weak pronouns following it. These facts strongly suggest that both are one and the same
The weak pronouns preceding the verb are not fully identical to those following it. A case in point is 3 sg. m., where the pronoun consists of only a vowel in front of the verb (æ ‘he’), and only a nasal consonant (-n) in inversion. We assume with Vanacker (1949:77) that the n is the original accusative form of the personal pronoun hij ‘he’. The appearance of accusative forms of pronouns in inversion contexts is a widely attested phenomenon, which is even mentioned in the grammar of Standard Dutch (Haeseryn et. al. 1997:251). As far as the non-inversion context is concerned, the possibility cannot be excluded that we are dealing with the nominative pronoun in 3 sg. m. Observe, however, that the nasal consonant that is found in inversion contexts can also appear in non-inversion contexts when the verb begins with a vowel. e.g. Poperinge æn est ‘he is’, an æt ‘he has’ (Vallaeys 1997), so that we could be dealing with an accusative pronoun here as well. We shall leave this issue unresolved here, however. The situation found in the Poperinge dialect is not unique: in most dialects, a number of formal differences arises between the possible weak pronouns before and after the verb, but most of these formal differences can be explained as a result of assimilation processes.¹

A second difference between the inverted and the non-inverted paradigm concerns the t of the 2nd person and the 3rd person sg. Haegeman (1992:49) suggests a phonetic explanation for the disappearance of this t in the inversion paradigm: “in [the inversion column in (3)…] the –t ending of the second persons singular and plural and of the third person singular is assimilated to the following consonant”. Haegeman does not formulate the phonetic processes responsible for the disappearance of t, or discuss the system governing it (see, however, Haegeman 1998 for a discussion of t-deletion in extraposition contexts), but we may turn to another source. De Visser & Goeman (1979) discuss the deletion of final t in the

¹ A reviewer points out that there exist some irreducible differences between pre- and postverbal weak pronouns, eg Wambeek has guit-n ‘goes he’ but the preverbal form is never followed by a nasal consonant, eg ij guit ‘he goes’, ij(∗n) es ‘he is’. Similarly in 1 pl., where Wambeek has loepe me/we ‘run we’ vs we/∗me loepe ‘we run’. The latter case, however, could be explained in terms of assimilation, the labio-velar [w] of the weak pronoun triggering a bilabial nasal [m] on the agreement affix before deleting. Obviously, such assimilation cannot occur if the pronoun precedes the verb. In any event, although we acknowledge the existence of discrepancies between weak pronouns preceding and following the verb, it is clear that such discrepancies constitute the exception rather than the norm.
dialects of Zeeuws-Vlaanderen, stating that final t is only pronounced before a pause or sentence-finally. It does not seem unreasonable to assume that this rule might also hold for the dialects discussed here, which belong to the same dialect area. This would imply that final t also disappears in the non-inversion paradigm provided further material follows. Haegeman (p.c.) reports that this is indeed the case, e.g. Valère goa [f]roeg naar huis vandaag ‘V goes early to home today’. There is more to be said about this process of deletion of t, given that it does not delete in 3 sg. m., e.g. got-n ‘goes he’ (see (4) and (5) above). Also, the Poperinge data from Vallaeys suggest a situation that deviates from the situation sketched for Zeeuws-Vlaanderen by De Visser & Goeman, as t deletes preceding an incorporated clitic (e.g. go-se ziej ‘goes she’) but not when it precedes a full pronoun (ze got siej ‘she goes she’; Haegeman, p.c., reports that the latter form is unacceptable in her dialect). It therefore appears that t-deletion in Poperinge is more restricted than in the more easterly dialects of Lapscheure, Klemskerke, and the Zeeland area. This is confirmed by the fact that t-deletion remains absent in the West of West-Flanders in contexts where it invariably occurs in the East (Magda Devos, p.c.; examples include dat [s]a(l)/komt/betekent/[f]raag/[x]a ‘that will/comes/means/ask/goes’).

That phonetic deletion of t in the third person does take place is supported by certain voicing assimilation phenomena. This appears from the Poperinge paradigm in (5), where in the case of 3 sg. f. the pronoun has a voiced fricative in the onset in non-inversion (ze ‘she’), but a voiceless one in inversion contexts (go-se ‘goes she’). This alternation is also found with non-pronominal subjects: thus the underlying voiced v of Valère in fact appears as devoiced f as a result of voicing assimilation with an underlying t agreement morpheme (i.e. goa [f]alère ‘goes V’). This phenomenon is also found in certain Brabant dialects, where function words like dat ‘that’, met ‘with’, and niet ‘not’ can be pronounced without final t, while at the same time this underlying t gives rise to devoicing of a following fricative (Goyvaerts 1980). Whether such a rule of phonetic reduction can be invoked for the 2nd person as well is a moot question, that we shall leave unresolved here (De Schutter 1997:32 appears to answer the question in the positive). Observe that this case might actually be a different one than that of 3 sg. t. For one thing, the phonological environments are quite different, so that it does not seem easy to generalise over both cases. For another, the case of t-deletion in 2 sg., unlike that of 3 sg., is also found in standard Dutch.
By assuming on the one hand that \( k, j(e), \) se, me and ze are clitic pronouns, and on the other hand that there is an underlying t in the third person sg., we have achieved a near-complete identity between the paradigms with and without inversion, which appeared to be quite different at first sight. On top of that, we have ample evidence to conclude that the Inversion Generalisation is correct.

4 • THE NATURE OF COMPLEMENTIZER AGREEMENT: PERSON OF NUMBER, OR BOTH?

4.1 • Introduction

Vanacker (1949), in his article entitled ‘Over enkele meervoudsvormen van voegwoorden’ [on some plural forms of complementizers] takes the nasal consonant on the complementizer to be a morpheme indicating plural number. Hoekstra & Smits (1997:9) likewise consider the complementizer agreement as it occurs in Flanders and Zeeland to be a case of number agreement. The use of the term ‘number agreement’ is probably inspired by the verbal agreement paradigm such as it is found in Standard Dutch, where the –en morpheme does indeed mark plural agreement. In the dialects, there also exist a number of minimal pairs, such as West and East Flemish da-ze ‘that she’ vs. dan-ze ‘that they’, or Zeeland toen-ik ‘when I’ vs toene-me ‘when we’. In Vanacker’s perspective, the inflection on the complementizer is likewise an indication of plural number. In the two sections to follow, we shall argue that on closer inspection, this analysis is mistaken: on the one hand, the Flemish plural-\( n \) is not used exclusively for plural forms, whereas on the other hand, plural-\( n \) is unattested for second person plural (section 4.2). This analysis is further confirmed by a look at the t-morpheme that is found elsewhere in the paradigm (section 4.3).

4.2 • The n-forms in the complementizer paradigm

Vanacker (1949) considers the \( n \) in Flemish forms as dan-ze ‘that they’ (3 pl.) to be a plural-\( n \). Nevertheless, a nasal consonant is rife in the first person singular in these dialects as well. This \( n \) appears in complementizer-clitic sequences like da\( Nk \) ‘that I’ (see (1)) and dan\( e \)k ‘that I’, as well as in forms like anek ‘if I’. Since Vanacker does not consider these occurrences of \( n \) to be agreement morphemes, he explains them on phonetic grounds: ‘voor da\( Nk \) kunnen we aannemen dat de spieren niet dadelijk voldoende gespannen zijn om de \( k \) te articuleren, waardoor de ongespannen
velaire explosief N tussen de vocaal en de gespannen velaire explosief k ontstond’ [for daNk ‘that I’ we may assume that the muscles are not sufficiently tense for the articulation of k right away, which gave rise to the lax velar plosive N between the vowel and the tense velar plosive k] (1949:41). The n in danek ‘that I’ cannot be so explained, however. Vanacker therefore assumes this form to either reduce to an earlier da_k ‘that I’, or, alternatively, to the existence of an ‘anorganic’ liaison consonant between the vowels a and e (1949:42).

This analysis of Vanacker’s has already been called into question by De Visser & Goeman (1979) (see also De Schutter 1997:32). We believe that Vanacker’s analysis is indeed doubtful. A number of arguments support the idea that the first person singular n is an agreement morpheme. For one thing, as already noted, Vanacker’s account does not really work well for the forms danek ‘that I’ and anek ‘if I’.

Vanacker’s phonetic explanations in terms of the concept of ‘ease of articulation’ also strikes us as being ad hoc. He does not adduce any independent evidence suggesting that the insertion of such liaison consonants is in fact a more widespread phenomenon, and we are not aware of any such evidence either. Furthermore, if phonetic motivations for such consonants are admissible in the case of the first person, it is unclear why they could not also be adduced to explain the plural forms (eg danze ‘that they’).

For another, the Inversion Generalisation confirms the analysis of n as an agreement morpheme, as the verbal paradigm also has n in the first person. If indeed it is true that complementizers agree like verbs, we expect there to be a large measure of similarity between both paradigms. In this connection, it is worth pointing out that a binary opposition in agreement paradigms between, on the one hand, 1 sg., 1 pl. and 3 pl., and, on the other hand, 2 sg., 2 pl. and 3 sg., as it is found in the dialects discussed above, perfectly agrees with Postma’s (1993) circular topology of morphological agreement paradigms (in particular, his (19A)). In particular, the existence of analogical pressure between 1 sg. and 1 pl. is perfectly in line with Postma’s theory. Furthermore, it is also fairly common cross-

---

2 J. Taeldeman suggests the case of pampier, which is apparently an alternative articulation of the Standard Dutch word papier ‘paper’. As far as we are aware, this is an isolated case, however. Alternative pronunciations such as bankboter for bakboter ‘margarine’ are notoriously absent.

3 Another clear case of illustrating the parallelism between 1 sg., 1 pl. and 3 pl. involves the paradigm of the irregular verb zijn ‘to be’ in the Brabant dialects: ik zijn, gij zij(t), hij is, wij zijn, gijle
linguistically (Cysouw 2001:186). If indeed first person sg. n is an agreement morpheme, as we claim, it cannot be the case that this morpheme expresses (plural) number. Rather, it must be seen as a portmanteau morpheme expressing both person and number.

A further argument for treating n as a portmanteau morpheme expressing both person and number resides in the fact that it never appears in the 2nd person plural. If the nasal consonant were an indication of number, as Vanacker would have it, we would expect to find it in all persons of the plural, which, however, is not the case. For the sake of completeness, we may add that we agree with Vanacker (1949) that the form of the clitic pronoun me in 1 pl. prevents us from seeing whether agreement takes place or not. We nevertheless assume it to be present but invisible, due to the phonetic processes of nasal assimilation and degemination. This is confirmed by the fact that forms with labio-velar [w] like danwe ‘that we’ are also sporadically attested in the provinces of West and East Flanders.

As a final point in this section, we would like to point out that not all Flemish dialects display this first person singular n. It is not found, for example, in the West of East Flanders. However, as the Inversion Generalisation predicts, the absence of a first person singular n in the verbal paradigm seems to correlate with the absence of n on the 1 sg. complementizer. Also, it should be noted that different verb classes may show different agreement paradigms in a large number of dialects. De Visser & Goeman (1979) already point out that in comparing complementizer agreement patterns to the verbal paradigm, one should pay special attention to the category of monosyllabic irregular verbs. We shall return to this issue more extensively below.

4.3 ■ The t-forms of the 2nd person and the 3rd person sg.
Let us now shift our attention from the nasal agreement consonant to the plosive t that is found in 3 sg. and in the 2nd person, both sg. and pl. Is it possible to find a trace of this agreement morpheme in the complementizer paradigm? As it turns

*zij(t), zjle zijen. Latin and, presumably, Proto-Indo-European, also show a distribution of the m morpheme that involves 1 sg. and 1 pl. (eg Latin subjunctive vincam, vincas, vincat, vincamus, vincatis, vincant). The paradigm of Latin esse furthermore has forms with initial s in 1 sg., 1 pl. and 3 pl. (sum, es, est, sumus, estis, sunt).

4 Whether there is actually an underlying t agreement morpheme in the 2 sg. inversion paradigm is an open question.
out, an unambiguous instance of an agreement-\(t\) is hard to come by. This relates to
a number of factors. If the complementizer is \(dat\) ‘that’, which itself ends in \(t\), the
presence of an agreement-\(t\) attached to it will not easily strike the eye. With \(als\) ‘if’,
on the other hand, chances of finding an agreement \(t\) might at first sight appear to
be better. Yet here as well a number of processes are at work that may blur the
picture. Some of these factors have already been discussed above, when we
discussed the paradigms in (3) and (4), finding that an underlying \(t\) often
disappears as a result of phonetic reduction, so that its presence can only be
observed indirectly. This was notably the case for a form like goase ‘goes she’
(Lapscheure), which we have argued reduces to goat ze ‘goes she’. Consider now
the paradigm for \(als/of\) ‘if/whether’ for Klemskerke, to which we add, for
completeness’ sake, the paradigms of \(dat\) ‘that’ and gaan ‘go’:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{(6)} & \text{Klemskerke} & \text{dat} & \text{gaan} & \text{als/of} \\
\text{sg.} & 1 & \text{da-k} & \text{goo-k} & \text{o-k} \\
& 2 & \text{da-j(e)} & \text{go-j(e)} & \text{o-j(e)} \\
& 3 & \text{m.} & \text{da-t} & \text{goot-n} & \text{ot-n} \\
& \text{f.} & \text{da-se} & \text{goo-se} & \text{o-se} \\
& \text{n.} & \text{da-se} & \text{go-t} & \text{ot} \\
\text{pl.} & 1 & \text{da-me} & \text{go-me} & \text{o-me} \\
& 2 & \text{da} & \text{go (junder)} & \text{o (junder)} \\
& 3 & \text{da-se} & \text{gō-ze} & \text{o-se} \\
& & \text{dā-ze} & \text{ō-ze} \\
\end{array}
\]

Again, the three paradigms are strikingly similar (excepting the optionality of the
nasal vowel in the complementizer paradigms in 3 pl.). There is also a certain
amount of \(t\)-deletion in the \(if\)-paradigm, notably in those contexts where \(t\) is
missing in the other paradigms as well (i.e. 3 sg. f. and the 2\(^{nd}\) person), but at least
in 3 sg. f. the presence of underlying \(t\) can be observed indirectly through voicing
assimilation. Arguably, in 3 sg. n. \(t\) has disappeared as a result of degemination. In
contrast, the 3 sg. m. provides direct evidence for the presence of an agreement-\(t\):
all three paradigms have this \(t\) (\(dat-n\), \(goot-n\), and \(ot-n\)). In the latter two cases in
particular, this \(t\) cannot be a consonant belonging to the stem, so that it must be an
inflectional morpheme. This is, then, the only case where an agreement-\(t\) can be
directly observed. We find this agreement-\(t\) not only in West-Flanders, but also in
other parts of the Flemish complementizer agreement area (e.g. a(s)tij ‘if he’ in various places in East-Flanders, at least as far east as Sint-Niklaas).

Summarising, we have tried to tease apart the phenomena of cliticisation of pronouns onto complementizers and finite verbs on the one hand, and that of complementizer agreement on the other. While it is obvious that not everything that looks like complementizer agreement at first glance actually is (a point made by Van Marle 2000), it appears to us that it is equally uncontroversial that certain morphological phenomena are best described in those terms.

5 • A Transitional Area: The Waasland

In this section, we would like to subject both our findings and the Inversion Generalisation to thorough testing. For that purpose, we take a closer look at the transitional area between the Flemish and Brabant dialects. The dialect of Nieuwkerken-Waas presents the following picture (a subject clitic is added to each paradigm):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nieuwkerken-Waas</th>
<th>complementizer</th>
<th>verb in inversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg. 1</td>
<td>da-k</td>
<td>go-k</td>
<td>zit-ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dan-ek</td>
<td>gon-ek</td>
<td>*zit(e)n-ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>da-de (da-xe)</td>
<td>go-de</td>
<td>zit-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>dat-e</td>
<td>got-e</td>
<td>zit-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>da-se</td>
<td>go-se</td>
<td>zit-se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>dan-t</td>
<td>gon-t</td>
<td>zit-e(n)t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. 1</td>
<td>da-me</td>
<td>go-me</td>
<td>zite-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>da-de (da-xe)</td>
<td>go-de</td>
<td>zit-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>da-se, dan-ze</td>
<td>gon-ze</td>
<td>zite-ze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Van Marle (2000) discusses Substandard Dutch forms such as astie ‘if he’, arguing that these may have nothing to do with complementizer agreement, the -tie being an allomorph of the clitic pronoun ie ‘he’. Van Marle does not present any criteria, however, which may allow one to decide for any particular case if we are dealing with complementizer agreement or pronoun allomorphy.

6 The form daxe in the second person is probably a Brabantism. Thus it is rare in combination with subject doubling: ??daxe gij vs dade gij.
A first issue that we want to discuss in connection with these paradigms is that of the occurrence of a nasal consonant in 3 sg. n. \textit{dant} ‘that it’ and \textit{gont} ‘goes it’. This consonant turns out to be a bit of a mystery, and we shall be unable to fully account for it. Some observations on its nature can be made, however.

It is unlikely that this nasal consonant is an agreement morpheme, for a number of reasons. First, treating the nasal as an agreement morpheme would make the dialects that have it stand out typologically, in so far as neither of the neighbouring dialect families (i.e. the Flemish and Brabant dialect groups) have it. It would furthermore imply that the agreement system would be sensitive to gender distinctions, which is again a typologically unexpected property within the Germanic family. More importantly, the nasal consonant also appears in contexts where the subject has different agreement features. The generalisation seems to be that it occurs preceding a 3 sg. n. clitic, whether the latter functions as subject or as object. Some more evidence from Vanacker from the same area illustrating this is reproduced in (8):

\begin{itemize}
\item[(8)] \textit{Sint-Niklaas}
\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] zoude ni zeggen dantaa amoel wit.
\quad would-you not say that-it-he all knows
\quad ‘Wouldn’t you say that he knows it all?’
\item[b.] dasekers dataa da gezeideet.
\quad that-is-certain that-he that said has
\quad ‘It’s certain that he said that.’
\item[c.] ze zeggen dat er aa van onder getrokken is.
\quad they say that there he of under drawn is
\quad ‘They say that he has absconded.’
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

We are very likely not dealing with an agreement-\textit{n} here, as all sentences of (8) have a 3 sg. m. subject, yet the nasal only appears in (8a). For these reasons, and for want of a better term, we shall call this \textit{n} an epenthetic nasal consonant. The neuter clitic ‘\textit{t} ‘it’ apparently readily lends itself to the insertion of a preceding nasal consonant. This further transpires from the following data (taken from Vanacker 1949), which all feature a 3 sg. n. object clitic:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(9)] \textit{Lokeren} \quad 3 pl. \quad dänzent, dänzet ‘that they it’
\end{itemize}
The 3 pl. form *dãnzent* in Lokeren and Wetteren is particularly instructive: the first nasal consonant is an agreement morpheme, so that the second must be seen as an epenthetic nasal. The examples in (11) furthermore show that this nasal is also attested in the verbal paradigm.

Vanacker (1949:81) suggests a phonetic source for this epenthetic nasal: ‘we menen dat de *n* voor de *t* in *dant* = *dat het* ook hier fonetisch te verklaren is door een onvoldoende afsluiting der neusholte bij de uitspraak der *t*’ [we assume that the *n* preceding *t* in *dant* = *dat het* ‘that it’ is to be explained in phonetic terms through insufficient closure of the nasal cavity in the articulation of *t*]. Although we believe a purely articulatory account of this epenthetic nasal is ultimately unsatisfactory, its nonagreement character should lead us to have an open mind about possible explanations for its occurrence. As noted by De Schutter (1997:35), the reason for its insertion cannot be explained in purely phonetic terms, as it does not appear in contexts that are phonetically identical, but that involve the definite article *het* ‘it’ instead of the homophonous clitic pronoun.

(12) a. *dant* goed is
    that-it good is
    ‘that it is good’

b. *da(*n)*’t meiske komt
    that-the girl comes
    ‘that the girl comes’
On the other hand, not all dialects appear to behave identically in this respect. Thus some dialects that have the epenthetic nasal in (12a) also allow it in (12b) (e.g. Nieuwkerken-Waas). On the other hand, these dialects do not have it in phonetically similar contexts not involving het ‘it/the’ (e.g. dat(*n)Tongeren in Limburg ligt ‘that Tongeren lies in Limburg’ vs. dan-t-orgel in de kerk staat ‘that the organ stands in the church’). Even in these dialects, then, there are structural factors involved in the distribution of the epenthetic nasal consonant. At this point, we must leave further analysis of the epenthetic nasal as a topic for future research.

Returning to (7), we now address its status with respect to the Inversion Generalisation. We find that the 1 sg. nasal is optional in both the complementizer and the verbal paradigm. This could be taken to show that we are dealing with a transitional area. On the other hand, the 1st sg. n does not enjoy universal distribution in the West of the Flanders dialect area either, as transpires from the Klemskerke paradigm in (4) above.

Another matter is the absence of n from some verbs, witness the impossibility of *zit(e)n-ek ‘sit I’ vs gonek ‘go I’; the 3 pl. likewise has no n with zitten ‘to sit’, but it does with gaan ‘to go’. It is hard to tell whether this difference reflects a difference in agreement paradigms between different verb classes, or whether it results from a phonetic rule deleting or inserting n. Insertion of n between adjacent vowel sounds is a phenomenon observed elsewhere in Dutch, eg Hilde-n-is naar de markt ‘Hilde has gone to the market’. However, in Standard Dutch this insertion only occurs after unstressed vowels. That different verb classes may have different agreement morphemes is suggested by the fact that in the neighbouring Brabant dialects the verb form for 1 sg. is different for the strong verb like gaan ‘to go’ and the weak werken ‘to work’: ik gaan terug/gaan ik terug? ‘I go back/Go I back?’ vs Ik werk(*en)/werk(*en) ik? ‘I work/Work I?’. An analysis of the n in Brabant as a phonetically inserted liaison vowel is unlikely, as it never occurs if the verb is past tense (eg deet(*ne)k ‘did I’, zei(*ne)k ‘said I’); see Postma (1994) for a similar pattern in Amsterdam Dutch. Apart from the fact that verbs like gaan ‘to go’ and werken ‘to work’ differ on the strong/weak dimension, however, they also differ in the phonological structure of the stem (CV vs CV(C)C). That the latter fact is also relevant is shown by the case of zitten in (7), which is strong (like gaan), but has a CV(C)C stem (like werken), and behaves like the latter with respect to the agreement-n in 1 sg. In order to fully tease the relevant factors apart, we would...
need to consider a weak verb with a CV stem, but the class of verbs with a CV stem is extremely restricted, and all its members are strong. This suggests that the properties of having a CV stem and that of being a strong verb are related, although only in one direction: if a verb has a CV stem it is strong, but if it is strong its stem is not necessarily CV (as the case of *zitten* ‘to sit’ shows: strong but no CV stem). We shall therefore call the class of verbs that display an agreement-n in the first person CV-verbs. Turning to the Inversion Generalisation, it is clear that it only holds when the complementizer paradigm is compared with the CV-verb paradigm. Observations to this effect have been made before, but in different terms. Thus Hoekstra & Smits (1998) suggest that for the purposes of the Inversion Generalisation, only the verbal paradigms of auxiliaries are relevant (see (13) below). Although they do not provide a definition of the class of auxiliaries, for the Waasland dialects at least this characterisation is inaccurate, as many uncontroversial auxiliary verbs having CVC stems feature no agreement-n in 1 sg. (eg *willek* ‘want I’, *zallek* ‘shall I’, *moetek* ‘must I’, *magek* ‘may I’ etc.). Similarly, Goeman (2000:283) suggests that the relevant class is that of monosyllabic verbs (his Monosyllable in Clitic Group Generalisation or MCGG). Again, we believe that actually only a subset of those is relevant, viz. those with a CV stem, for reasons already discussed. The reason for the privileged status of CV-stems may reside in phonological properties of the syllable. Thus nasal consonants cannot follow obstruents at the end of the syllable because they are more sonorous than obstruents; as a result, nasal agreement morphemes will be ruled out with CVC-stems (unless n is syllabic). By contrast, coronal obstruents are known to behave exceptionally with respect to syllable structure, in particular with respect to the sonority curve: thus they may follow stops at the right syllable boundary (eg Vpt, Vps, Vkt, etc.). As a result, agreement-t attaches to CV(C)C-stems without any problem.

7 Other verbs with a CV stem include *staan* ‘to stand’, *zien* ‘to see’, *doen* ‘to do’, and, in Standard Dutch, *slaan* ‘to hit’ (*slagen* in most southern dialects). All these verbs are strong. In many dialects, *hebben* ‘to have’ might also be a candidate, the final bilabial consonant being absent and the vowel long.

8 Hoekstra & Smits (1998) discuss evidence from the Limburg dialects, where the complementizer shows an agreement t in 2 pl. This agreement t is found with all verb classes in the present, but only with a limited set in the past tense (e.g. *waor-t ger* ‘were you’ vs *woende-t ger* ‘lived you’). Although clearly the agreement-t attaches to a CVC-stem, this morpheme will undoubtedly also show
The Inversion Generalisation given in (1) above does not embody a claim about the geographical distribution of the phenomenon of complementizer agreement. A number of other generalisations discussed by Hoekstra and Smits, however, do make predictions concerning geographical distribution. We shall briefly discuss the Identity Generalisation here, which appears in Hoekstra & Smits (1998):

(13) The Identity Generalisation

Complementizer agreement only occurs when the agreement ending of the inverted auxiliary in the present tense is identical to the agreement ending of the inverted auxiliary in the preterite

Although a full discussion of this generalisation would lead us too far afield here, it is interesting to note that the transition between the Waasland and Brabant dialects provides evidence in support of the correctness of (13) (aside from the concept of ‘auxiliary’, which we have argued should be replaced by ‘CV-verb’).

The verbal paradigm for the present tense is in many respects identical for the Waasland and most Brabant dialects, both having an agreement-n in 1 sg. of verbs with a CV-stem. The Brabant dialects, however, do not have complementizer agreement. If the Identity Generalisation is correct, there should be a difference in agreement paradigms in the past tense between these dialects. This does indeed turn out to be the case. An agreement-n is present in the past tense in Nieuwkerken-Waas in the 1 sg.: regular verbs feature the suffix -tel(ge)n in 1 sg., and verbs having a CV-stem in the past tense can likewise reveal this nasal consonant, e.g. ‘k zun ‘I would’, ‘k deen ‘I did’, ‘k won ‘I wanted’ (next to ‘k wilde(ge)n ‘I wanted’), ‘k zeen ‘I said’. The Brabant CV-verbs, on the other hand, do not display an agreement-n in the past tense 1 sg. Summarising, the Waasland and Brabant data appear to indicate that the identity of present and past tense agreement paradigms is a necessary condition for complementizer agreement to take place. Whether it is also a sufficient condition, is a question that we shall leave unaddressed here.

up with CV-stems, so that a consideration of this class will give the correct results for this dialect group as well.

Just as in the present tense complementizer paradigm, agreement in the 1st person sg. is optional in the past tense verbal paradigm. These facts actually support the intimate connection between verb and complementizer agreement in general, and the Identity Generalisation in particular: suppose that
We have tested the Inversion Generalisation (Hoekstra & Smits 1997) against the data from West- and East-Flemish dialects and found it to be valid. We have furthermore argued that there is a large degree of similarity between inversion paradigms and non-inversion paradigms, despite great apparent differences. Following De Visser & Goeman (1979) we have assumed that the nasal in 1 sg. is an agreement morpheme. We have discussed the problem of the mysterious epenthetic nasal consonant that is found preceding a 3rd sg. n. clitic. We have looked for an agreement-t in the complementizer paradigm, and have managed to find one. As far as the nature of complementizer agreement is concerned, we have shown that the Flemish data do not provide any evidence for a phenomenon such as number agreement, but that complementizers agree with combinations of person and number, just like verbs. The case of the transitional area of the Waasland has revealed once again (see Hoekstra & Smits 1998; Goeman 2000) that, for a proper evaluation of the correctness of the inversion generalisation one must not confine one’s attention to the present tense of regular verbs. Rather, the CV-verbs turn out to be the relevant class that should be taken into account for an evaluation of the Inversion Generalisation. Finally, a comparison between data from the Waasland and neighbouring Brabant dialect area has revealed some evidence supporting the Identity Generalisation proposed by Hoekstra and Smits (1998).

1 sg. agreement-n in the past tense were on the way out in this dialect, due to influence from Brabant. We would then expect complementizer agreement in 1 sg. to disappear with it.
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• ABSTRACT

In this paper, I will investigate the syntax of pronominal adverbs in German. One construction to be discussed is commonly called preposition stranding, this construction has been paid wide attention in the discussion on the structure of the PP. In section 1, I will argue that most studies dealing with preposition stranding in German are based on insufficient empirical evidence. In section 2, I will present the different constructions pronominal adverbs may be involved in, the data base being restricted to German dialects. It turns out that the pronominal adverbs exhibit a great variety of different constructions which should be accounted for. In section 3, I will draw some conclusions from the areal distribution of the various constructions and I will discuss some of the common assumptions concerning the constructions dealt with in the present paper. Finally, I will propose a theory which tries to relate the type of preposition stranding known from Germanic SOV-languages to the type known from Germanic SVO-languages. For that purpose, Dutch and Frisian data will also be taken into consideration. In section 4, I will briefly discuss the findings achieved so far with regard to the relation between dialectology and formal linguistic theories.
1 • INTRODUCTION

The phenomena subsumed under the term *preposition stranding* have been paid wide attention within the discussion on the structure of the PP, the most influential studies probably being Riemsdijk 1978 (focusing on Dutch), Hornstein and Weinberg 1981 (mainly on English) and Oppenrieder 1990 (on German). First of all, it should be kept in mind that the term *preposition stranding* covers two quite different constructions. In Germanic SVO-languages such as English, preposition stranding refers to a construction in which a full DP (very often, though not obligatorily, specified for [+wh]) is moved from its governing preposition, such as in example (1):

(1)  *Who* did you write *about*?  
     (Hornstein and Weinberg 1981:56)

Germanic SOV-languages, such as for example Dutch, do not seem to have a direct equivalent (but see section 3. 5). It is only the small group of the so-called *pronominal adverbs* which exhibit a somewhat similar behaviour. *Pronominal adverbs* are formed from R-pronouns\(^1\) (such as *daar* or *waar*) and primary prepositions\(^2\) (leading to

---

\(^1\) The term *R-pronoun* has the following origin: “These pronouns are usually called R-pronouns (following Van Riemsdijk 1978), because they all have the r-sound in their phonological form (eR, daaR, hieR, waaR …).” (Zwarts 1997a:1092).

\(^2\) Not all prepositions can form a pronominal adverb. For Dutch, Zwarts (1997a: 1093) distinguishes between what he calls *type A prepositions* (which can form a pronominal adverb, and hence also exhibit stranding phenomena) and *type B prepositions* (which cannot). Zwarts (1997b: 2-6) shows that these two groups of prepositions are set apart by a number of other criteria, among them the following: type A prepositions form a closed class, which only consists of native words, usually small, monomorphemic, and frequent, while type B prepositions are an open class, containing also borrowings, the words are usually longer, often derived from other parts of speech, and non-frequent (see Zwarts 1997b: 6). –

Within the framework of *Grammaticalization Theory*, a noun-to-affix cline has been postulated which involves also adpositions as steps on the scale and which reads as follows (taken from Hopper and Traugott 1993:107):

(i)  relational noun > secondary adposition > primary adposition > agglutinative case affix > fusional case affix

Primary and secondary adpositions are described as follows: “Secondary adpositions are usually forms (words or short phrases) that define concrete rather than grammatical relationships. They are typically derived from relational nouns, e.g., *beside the sofa, ahead of the column*. Primary adpositions are thought of as the restricted set of adpositions, often monosyllabic, that indicate purely grammatical relationships, such as *of, by, and to*. (Hopper and Traugott 1993:107).

It seems thus that Zwarts’ (1997a, 1997b) *type A* and *type B prepositions* can be classified as *primary* and *secondary prepositions*. I will use the term *primary preposition*, rather than *type A preposition*, since this term at least tries to denote a property of the group of prepositions to be described and is thus somewhat more meaningful.
combinations such as *daarmee*, literally ‘there-with’, or *waarmee*, literally ‘where-with’). These pronominal adverbs can be split up in Dutch, as shown in example (2):

(2)  *Waar heb je het mee gedaan?*

*where have you it with done*

‘what have you done it with?’

(Riemsdijk 1978:192)

Similarly, German too has a paradigm of pronominal adverbs: they can be formed by combining the R-pronouns *da(r)-, wo(r)-* and *hier-* with about twenty primary prepositions. According to the Duden Grammatik (1998:373), the following combinations are possible in Standard German:
### Table 1 - Pronominal adverbs in standard German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>da(r)-</th>
<th>wo(r)-</th>
<th>hier-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>daran</td>
<td>hieran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auf</td>
<td>darauf</td>
<td>hierauf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aus</td>
<td>daraus</td>
<td>hieraus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bei</td>
<td>dabei</td>
<td>hierbei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durch</td>
<td>dadurch</td>
<td>hierdurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>für</td>
<td>dafür</td>
<td>hierfür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gegen</td>
<td>dagegen</td>
<td>hiergegen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinter</td>
<td>dahinter</td>
<td>hierhinter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>darin/darein</td>
<td>hierin/hierin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mit</td>
<td>damit</td>
<td>hiermit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nach</td>
<td>danach</td>
<td>hiernach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neben</td>
<td>daneben</td>
<td>hierneben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ob</td>
<td>darob</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>über</td>
<td>darüber</td>
<td>hierüber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>um</td>
<td>darum</td>
<td>hierum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unter</td>
<td>darunter</td>
<td>hierunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von</td>
<td>davon</td>
<td>hiervon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vor</td>
<td>davor</td>
<td>hiervor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wider</td>
<td>dawider</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zu</td>
<td>dazu</td>
<td>hierzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwischen</td>
<td>dazwischen</td>
<td>hierzwischen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (3) suggests that German pronominal adverbs can also be split up:

(3) wo träumst du denn immer von?
    where dream you then always of
    ‘what are you always dreaming of?’
    (Oppenrieder 1990:160)

Before I turn to a description of the occurrence of this construction in German, it has to be mentioned that from a theoretical point of view, one could voice some objections
to classifying example (3) as preposition stranding: since R-pronouns always occur to the left of their governor, should one not rather talk of postposition stranding? It is for this reason that Abraham (1995:337) claims: “German does not have preposition stranding. What comes close to this phenomenon characteristic for English only occurs in the substandard and rather concerns postposition-like elements”. Nevertheless, the construction became quite important in theoretical discussions: “An enormous attention has been paid to this phenomenon since van Riemsdijk’s (1978) detailed study on analogous cases in Dutch; cf. e.g. Fanselow (1983; 1991), Koster (1987), Grewendorf (1989), Bayer (1990; 1994), Müller (1991), Oppenrieder (1991), and Trissler (1993, 1999).” (Müller 2000:141).

There is, however, one main difference between the Dutch and the German cases: whereas the construction occurs in the standard language in Dutch, it does not in German. At least in written standard German, this construction is unidiomatic. It is therefore may be not surprising that in different studies dealing with the construction,

---

1. I do not think that the term postposition (and hence postposition stranding) is a particularly fortunate terminological solution for the adpositional element in a pronominal adverb. It is true, of course, that the adposition follows rather than precedes the R-pronoun in 

(i) *mit da damit ‘with it’

(ii) mit dem Mann *dem Mann mit ‘with the man’

It would thus sometimes be necessary to talk of ‘mit’ as a preposition and sometimes as a postposition. This is particularly awkward because in German, there are some adpositions which can take the same complement to their left and to their right (cf. (iii)), and there are even some adpositions which can only take a complement to their left, thus ‘real postpositions’ (cf. (iv)):

(iii) wegen des Wetters des Wetters wegen ‘because of the weather’

(iv) *zuliebe dem Mann dem Mann zuliebe ‘for the man’s sake’

If we talk of mit in (i) as of a postposition and of mit in (ii) as of a preposition, then the terms preposition and postposition refer to grammatical processes rather than to lexical properties, which is somewhat contra-intuitive. The term postposition should be restricted to items like zuliebe in (iv) where it is clear that the property of taking a complement only to the left is part of the lexical entry of this item. As one reviewer points out: calling the adposition after an R-pronoun a postposition “would be tantamount to saying that French is an SOV language when the objects in a clause are clitics”.


we find strikingly different statements on its occurrence. According to Grewendorf, it occurs in “certain regional varieties of German” (1988:184); Breindl claims that it occurs “in Northern German varieties”, but that it also belongs to the “passive language competence of speakers of Southern German” (1989:149). According to Oppenrieder, the construction can be found in “certain varieties of Standard German” (1990:159), but on the other hand he also speaks of “stranding dialects” (1990:162). Trissler claims that it occurs “in German” (1993:249), but whenever talking about one particular subtype of the construction, she refers to “some speakers” (1993:250, 269, 270, 271). For Abraham, as already quoted above, it occurs “in the substandard” (1995:337), for Gallmann, it belongs to “Low German and High German with Low German substratum” (1997:39), and for Müller, finally, it occurs “in Northern German varieties” (2000:141).

Apart from the consensus that the construction is associated with the north of the German speaking area, only one conclusion can be drawn from this quite heterogeneous picture: it is not clear (or at least not unitary), which variety these analyses are based on. And by variety I understand grammar, i.e. a linguistic system in its own right. Indeed, the data situation badly needs further investigation. In a paper on German dialect syntax dating from as early as 1909, we find the following remark: “It would for example be desirable to investigate, … how far southward the Northern German property of splitting up adverbs goes, for example da hab' ich nichts von gewußt” (Weise 1909:734-5). To my knowledge, no investigation of this sort has ever been carried out.

To make things even more complicated, the construction seen so far sometimes seems to be in interaction with another construction: apart from the splitting up of pronominal adverbs, another construction exists which is claimed to occur in complementary distribution with the former. Prepositions with initial consonant are claimed to exhibit the stranding construction. If a preposition begins with a vowel, however, the stranding construction is claimed to be impossible; instead, the R-pronoun is doubled:

\[\ldots\text{\ldots}\ldots\]

---

\(^6\) “[Z]. B. wäre es wünschenswert zu untersuchen, … wie weit südwärts die norddeutsche Trennung der Adverbien [reicht], z. B. da hab' ich nichts von gewußt …”. (Weise 1909:734-5)
In many dialects, sentences such as *Da freuen wir uns drauf/dran/drüber* are very widespread, but apart from that also sentences such as *Da haben wir nichts von/durch gelernt*. In the former case (prepositions with initial vowel) it looks as if a *da* has been added to the ‚shortened‘ pronominal adverb *drauf* etc. in the prefield (‚doubling construction‘). In the latter case (prepositions with initial consonant) the pronominal adverb seems to have been split up in such a manner that the adverb is in the prefield while the preposition is left behind (‚preposition stranding‘). (Eisenberg 1999:195)

It has been argued that such a complementary distribution might be in conflict with the hypothesis of the autonomy of syntax: “Given a conception of an autonomous syntax, as proposed in GB-theory, it is not possible to make the syntactic restructuring rule depend on a phonological property of the items concerned.” (Oppenrieder 1990:163).

As I have shown, not entirely clear in which variety the stranding construction really occurs. This is even less clear in the case of the doubling construction and still less clear in the case of the claimed complementary distribution of the two. Before going into detail of the analyses of these constructions, it is therefore necessary to check first of all where the various constructions actually occur. In addition to that, I will present some related constructions so far not touched upon, in order to get a fuller picture of the syntactic behaviour of pronominal adverbs.

2 • THE SYNTAX OF PRONOMINAL ADVERBS IN GERMAN DIALECTS

Section 2 of this paper is based on Fleischer 1999, where I documented the geographical distribution of the different constructions involving pronominal adverbs. As the varieties for investigation, I chose the dialects of German. The term *dialect* is quite traditionally being restricted to the variety spoken by nonmobile
populations (see Chambers and Trudgill 1998:29). By relying on and restricting oneself to this type of data, differences with respect to geographical distribution should become apparent as clear-cut as possible. Since the area of my investigation covers the whole German speaking area, it was of course not possible to collect the data by direct elicitation or questionnaires. Instead, I had to rely exclusively on printed sources, namely on descriptive grammars of various dialects, on dictionaries, on transcriptions of sound recordings, and sometimes even on fiction written in dialect (the pros and cons of these different types of sources are discussed in Fleischer 1999:5-8). By relying on these four types of sources, it was sometimes possible to get a quite detailed picture of the geographical distribution of the different constructions. Nevertheless, in certain areas the data situation is better than in others, and in some it is still insufficient. The results presented here should therefore be regarded as preliminary, since the data base is still being extended.

For the description of the geographical distribution in which the different constructions occur, I will use the classification of German dialects (and use the dialect names) given by Wiesinger (1983). In the remaining parts of this paper, only data which show the different constructions if the R-pronoun 'da' is involved are considered; the R-pronouns 'wo' and 'hier' would display the same phenomena in a somewhat more restricted way. To include the syntactic behaviour of these R-pronouns would go beyond the scope of the present paper.

2.1 • The Stranding Construction
In this paper, for constructions as seen in example (3), I will adopt the term stranding construction. In order to avoid confusion, I will adopt the term liberal preposition stranding for constructions similar to example (1), the ‘classical case’ of preposition stranding known from English (cf. section 2.5).

The examples in (4) show the stranding construction with three different groups of prepositions: in example (4a) from North Saxon, the preposition begins with a vowel, in example (4b), from North Thuringian, the preposition begins with a consonant, and example (4c), from Rhine Franconian, shows a single preposition, namely 'mit' 'with', which forms a group of its own. If the preposition begins with a vowel, the stranding construction mainly occurs in the north of the German speaking area: it is attested in all Low German dialects, in Low Franconian, and also in
Ripuarian. As far as prepositions beginning with a consonant are concerned, the use of the stranding construction is a little further expanded to the south: examples like (4b) are found again in all Low German dialects and in Low Franconian, but also in Middle Franconian, in Rhine Franconian, in North Hessian, and in North Thuringian. So far, it has been shown that the construction appears to be restricted to the north and to some extent to the centre of the German speaking area. However, there is an important exception: one preposition, namely 'mit', displays a clear deviation from this pattern. Stranding constructions with this particular preposition occur in great parts of the German speaking area. Example (4c), as has already been mentioned before, comes from the Low Alemannic area, quite far to the south, where other stranding constructions are unknown. The geographical distribution of the stranding construction in connection with the preposition 'mit' can best be described ex negativo: I found examples like (4c) in all German dialects, exceptions being Bavarian and Highest Alemannic.

(4a)  *Dar hebb ik nät an docht*
      da habe ich nicht an gedacht
      *there have I not of thought*
      ‘I have not thought of it’
      (Wiesenhann 1936:44)

(4b)  *do weiß ich nischt vunne*
      da weiß ich nichts von
      *there know I nothing of*
      ‘I know nothing of it’
      (Thüringisches Wörterbuch VI:617)

(4c)  *Dœf kane nigs mit äfaN‘*
      da kann=ich nichts mit anfangen
      *there can=I nothing with begin*
      ‘I cannot do anything with it / it does not mean a thing to me’
      (Badisches Wörterbuch III:642)
2. 2 • The Long R-Pronoun Doubling Construction
Apart from the preposition 'mit', the stranding construction is restricted to the north of the German speaking area. The construction which exhibits doubling of the R-pronoun (which I will call long R-pronoun doubling construction, or in short, long doubling construction) is associated with the south of the German speaking area: both examples in (5) are from Bavarian. If the preposition begins with a vowel, as in example (5a), the construction is possible in all High German dialects and also in Westphalian, while it is very rare in other Low German dialects. As far as prepositions beginning with a consonant are concerned, as in example (5b), the construction appears to be virtually restricted to High German dialects; in Low German dialects it is almost non-existent (in my material, I found only two counterexamples, both from the North Saxon dialect area; see Fleischer 1999:75, 80).

(5a) \[ \text{da} \text{ howi gor ned } \text{dro}^\text{\textquotedbl} \text{ denkt} \]
\[ \text{da habe=} \text{ich gar nicht daran gedacht} \]
\[ \text{there have=} \text{I at-all not there-of thought} \]
\[ \text{‘I have not thought of it at all’} \]

(Bayerisches Wörterbuch I:387)

(5b) \[ \text{Do}^\text{\textquotedbl} \text{woas i nix } \text{davo}^\text{\textquotedbl} \]
\[ \text{da weiß ich nichts davon} \]
\[ \text{there know I nothing there-of} \]
\[ \text{‘I do know nothing of it’} \]

(Zehetner 1985:148)

Example (5a) shows practically the same context as example (4a), except that in example (5a), the R-pronoun 'da' occurs twice; example (5b) shows exactly the same context as example (4b), again with the exception that the R-pronoun 'da' occurs twice in example (5b). From a comparative point of view, one could therefore claim that the two constructions are equivalent.
2. 3 • The Short R-Pronoun Doubling Construction

The two constructions seen so far share the property that one R-pronoun is never adjacent to the preposition. In the examples (4) and (5), the first R-pronoun is always in the prefield, while the preposition follows far behind the inflected verb. The construction which is at issue in this section differs in this respect: the R-pronoun is again doubled, but the two R-pronouns occur in direct adjacency. For this construction I will use the term short R-pronoun doubling construction, or in short, short doubling construction. The short doubling construction appears in about the same geographical distribution as its long counterpart. If the preposition begins with a vowel, as in example (6a), it mainly occurs in High German dialects, and only in southern Low German dialects; if the preposition begins with a consonant, as in example (6b), it exclusively occurs in High German dialects, but in the High German area, it can be found quite far to the north (and east): example (6b), as well as example (6a), are from Silesian. I should add, however, that the short doubling construction with prepositions beginning with a consonant is also quite rare on the southern fringes of the German speaking area: in the archaic Highest Alemannic dialects spoken in the German speaking part of the Swiss Kanton Wallis, I found one single instance in a rather big corpus of transcribed sound recordings (cf. Fleischer 1999:16-7), and it seems to be rarely occurring in Southern Bavarian, too.

(6a)  
dodrone denkt er nicht
dadaran denkt er nicht
there-there-of thinks he not
‘he does not think of that’

(Schlesisches Wörterbuch I:179)

(6b)  
Dodervone weiβ ich nischte
dadavon weiβ ich nichts
there-there-of know I nothing
‘I do know nothing of it’

(Menzel 1972:41)
The context in example (6a) is very similar to the context in examples (4a) and (5a), whereas example (6b) resembles examples (4b) and (5b). This strongly suggests that these different constructions are related to each other.

2. 4 • Orphan Prepositions

In this section, I will present a construction that consists only of a preposition without any overt complement, which, however, is retrievable from the context. For this construction I will use the term orphan preposition.¹⁰ In example (7a), from North Saxon, the preposition begins with a vowel; within this group of prepositions, I found the construction in all Low German dialects, but not in High German dialects. If the preposition begins with a consonant, as in example (7b), from Mecklenburgish, it occurs apart from all Low German dialects also in Low Franconian, in Middle Franconian, in North Hessian, and in North Thuringian. The preposition mit, however, constitutes a group of its own; example (7c) is from Low Alemannic, and I found analogous examples in all German dialects except Bavarian and Highest Alemannic.

(7a) Dat hangt anne Wand un lett witt, un man dröögt sik de Han’n in af
das hängt an=der Wand und lässt weiß, und man trocknet sich die Hände in ab
that hangs on=the wall and lets white, and one dries oneself the hands in PRF
‘it hangs on the wall and looks white, and one dries one’s hands with it’
(Feyer 1939:27)

These findings seem to be only partially confirmed by the material collected so far for the project of a syntactic atlas of Swiss German dialects (see Bucheli and Glaser, this volume). This could, however, be due to the method applied in this project.

The term orphan preposition is borrowed from Zribi-Hertz 1984. It denotes a preposition without an overt complement, while no movement seems to be involved (which is assumed to be the case in stranding constructions). In a different meaning (namely denoting the phenomenon which today would be called preposition stranding), it seems to have first been used by Postal (see Zribi-Hertz 1984:33, note 2).
(7b) ik nehm mi ’n bäten brod mit, dat ik van unnerwegens ok wat harr
ich nehme mir einen Bissen Brot mit, dass ich von unterwegs auch was habe
*I take me a bite bread with, that I of on-the-way also something have
‘I take with me a bite of bread, in order to have something of it on the way’
(Wossidlo 1895:54)

(7c) Bhalt dei’ Messer, ich kann nigs mitschneide!
behalte dein Messer, ich kann nichts mit schneiden
*keep your knife, I can nothing with cut
‘keep your knife, I cannot cut anything with it’
(Badisches Wörterbuch I:412)

It is at first sight not easy to decide whether the missing complement of these orphan prepositions is preceding or following the preposition (should example (7a) be formalised as \[PP \text{ in } [DP \emptyset]\] or rather as \[PP [DP \emptyset] \text{ in}\])? However, we can find instances of simple pronominal adverbs in very similar syntactic environments where orphan prepositions also occur. Example (7a’) is taken from the same source (and even from the same page) as example (7a) and shows a practically identical syntactic environment:

(7a’) Ja, aver Hinnerk, man dröögt sik doch de Han’n nich drin af!
ja, aber Hinnerk, man trocknet sich doch die Hände nicht darin ab
*yes, but Hinnerk, one dries oneself yet the hands not there-in PRF
‘well, Hinnerk, but one does not dry one’s hands with it’
(Feyer 1939:27)

Data like example (7a’) strongly suggest that the empty complement is equivalent to an R-pronoun preceding the preposition, rather than to any other DP following it. In my sources there is even some evidence suggesting that orphan prepositions and simple pronominal adverbs are interchangeable. Thus, for the Alsatian Low Alemannic dialects we read: “Adverb *damit, rarely used, mostly substituted by mit*” (Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten I:737).\(^{11}\) Such an analysis is also justified

\(^{11}\) “Adv. damit, selten gebr., meist steht dafür mit.” (Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten I:737)
from a comparative point of view: it has been observed that an orphan preposition in one variety is equivalent to a simple pronominal adverb in another. Thus, again for an Alsatian Low Alemannic dialect, the dialect of Colmar, we find the following remark: “In several expressions where German uses \textit{damit}, Alsatian contents itself with a simple \textit{mit}” (Muller 1983:260).

Further evidence for this analysis comes from the fact that the R-pronoun \textit{da} can be omitted if it is part of a stranding construction (this phenomenon should be regarded as a case of topic drop). Thus, we read in a grammar of North Saxon: “If a pronominal adverb is separated into its two components, the adverb can be omitted” (Lindow et al. 1998:274). As an example, they provide the following sentence (brackets in the original):

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
(8) \text{\textit{Dar}} Kaamt se veel billiger \textit{bi weg} \\
\phantom{(8)} \text{da kommen sie viel billiger bei weg} \\
\phantom{(8)} \text{there come they much cheaper by away} \\
\phantom{(8)} \text{‘this way, they get away much cheaper’} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{(Lindow et al. 1998:274)}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The R-pronoun \textit{da} can also be omitted if part of a long doubling construction. Example (9b), from Bavarian, shows a very similar context as example (5a), repeated here as (9a). But it is only the case in the first example that the R-pronoun in the prefield is phonetically realised:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
(9a) \text{\textit{då}} howi gor ned \textit{dro“} denkt \\
\phantom{(9a)} \text{da habe=ich gar nicht daran gedacht} \\
\phantom{(9a)} \text{there have=I at-all not there-of thought} \\
\phantom{(9a)} \text{‘I have not thought of it at all’} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{(Bayerisches Wörterbuch I:387)}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
(9b) \text{und na1 ha1ma hoid a so ksÜNo}[^]\text{(dad midana)1na, Ø de}Nge1 so o]\text{ft dro} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{................................................}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{\textsuperscript{12}} \text{[D]ans plus. locutions où l’all. dit \textit{damit}, l’als. se contente d’un simple \textit{mit} …}” (Muller 1983:260)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
I therefore conclude that in the examples of orphan prepositions seen so far, the missing element is an R-pronoun, rather than another pronoun (or any DP) following the preposition. There are, however, other types of orphan prepositions where the missing element cannot be an R-pronoun, see section 3.4 and especially note 22.

2.5 • Liberal Preposition Stranding
Contrary to what has been maintained in previous studies, there are also constructions in German (or, to be more exact: in some varieties of German) which are, if we consider the surface structure only, identical to the kind of preposition stranding known from Germanic SVO-languages. In a description of the syntax of the dialect of Glücksstadt, a town at the right bank of the river Elbe between Hamburg and the North Sea, belonging to the North Saxon dialect area, we find the following description: "If a word governed by a preposition is heavily stressed, it is placed without the preposition at the beginning and the preposition follows at the end of the sentence" (Bernhardt 1903:25). In German dialects, this construction is quite rare, and yet it exists: it occurs in Westphalian and North Saxon. Bernhardt (1903) provides the following example:

(i)  Kostüme sind unsere Frauen für verantwortlich
    costumes are our wives responsible for
    ‘for costumes, our wives are responsible’

(ii) Und jetzt willst du auf 58 Kilo dich runterhungern? – Och ja, 59 bin i auch schon mit zufrieden.
    (Breindl 1989: and now want-you on 58 kilos yourself down-hunger – oh well, 59 am I also already with happy, 139)
    ‘And now you want to starve yourself to 58 kilos? – Well, I am already happy with 59!’

(iii) Stetigkeit muß ich mich von lösen
    (Breindl 1989:139)
(10) *een heff ik genuch an*
    eins habe ich genug an
    *one have I enough on*
    ‘one is enough for me’

(Bernhardt 1903:25)

It should be noted that in German, this construction is restricted to the north-west. This fits rather well to the fact that in the vicinity of these German dialects other languages display this construction as well, as will be discussed in section 3.5.

3 • CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GEOGRAPHICAL FINDINGS;
CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ANALYSES

After having clarified the data situation to some extent, I will now move on to the interpretation of the data. In the present paper, no comprehensive analyses of the different constructions will be offered. Rather, I will concentrate on an evaluation of

```
steadiness must I myself from detach
‘from steadiness, I have to detach myself’
```

Interestingly though, it can be shown that these examples, although they consist of non-dialectal material, belong exactly to the same region as my dialectal material does. Oppenrieder’s four sentences, one of which is example (i), are taken from short stories by a writer called Jürgen von Manger. He comes from Koblenz and Herne and “caricatures language and mentality of a man from the Ruhr area” (Sowinski 1997:382); the Ruhr area belongs to the Westphalian dialect area.

Example (ii), Breindl’s first sentence to illustrate this construction, is taken from Brons-Albert (1984:29); it is indicated that the speaker’s native dialect is Westphalian (Brons-Albert 1984:29). Finally, example (iii), Breindl’s second example, is taken from Wichter (1980:38). In Wichter (1980:38) we learn that the sentence was heard by the author of the paper, unfortunately without any further local indication. However, we find that the author, at least at the time in question, is a resident of Bochum (Wichter 1980:50), which belongs also to the Westphalian area.

To sum up, the data discussed by Breindl 1989 and Oppenrieder 1990 originate from the same area where I found the liberal stranding construction. This gives even more support to the claim that these data should not be regarded as “planning errors and breaking-offs of constructions” (“Plan[u]ngsfehler und Konstruktionsabbrüche”, Breindl 1989:139). I place some special emphasis on that because previous studies have tended not to do so, as this quotation clearly shows. The same holds, by the way, also for the Dutch equivalent of liberal preposition stranding (to be discussed in section 3.5): “Nobody has ever proposed a transformational solution for the Dutch stranding cases. The reason for this is that such cases are and always have been considered ungrammatical” ("Niemand heeft ooit een transformationele oplossing voor de Nederlandse strandinggevallen voorgesteld. De reden daarvoor is, dat deze gevallen altijd als ongrammatikaal werden en worden beschouwd ….", Jansen 1981:98).
some points which have been raised in previous studies, and complement with further interesting aspects of the constructions presented.

3.1 The Problem of the Complementary Distribution

Oh the basis of my data, the complementary distribution of the stranding construction (prepositions with initial consonant) and the long doubling construction (prepositions with initial vowel) as suggested by Eisenberg (1999:195) among others cannot be confirmed. One would expect complementary distribution to occur in those geographical areas where the stranding construction only occurs with prepositions beginning with a consonant. This area (which is not the area where the complementary distribution really occurs, but where it is possible that it may occur) constitutes only a relatively small belt, comprising (from west to east) parts of the Rhine Franconian, Moselle Franconian, Hessian and Thuringian dialect areas. It could be the case that the systems of these dialects, displaying the stranding construction only with prepositions beginning with a consonant, are the result of contact phenomena. Thus, for those parts of Thuringian where the stranding construction is possible for prepositions beginning with a consonant, the following characterisation can be found: “According to tape recordings, this double use of *da* occurs everywhere in Thuringia, but is rarer in the dialects of the Eichsfeld and of North Thuringia, presumably because here the Low German rule of splitting up compounded adverbs is still at work” (Spangenberg 1993:256).16

This quotation only deals with the frequency of the doubling construction in an area where the stranding construction also occurs. But what about the aspect of complementary distribution? Interestingly, in my dialectal data, it simply does not occur. At first sight, especially if there is only limited material for a certain region, one may receive the impression that one deals with a system displaying complementary distribution. But then it quite often turns out that the stranding construction, as expected, is impossible with prepositions beginning with a vowel, whereas, on the other hand, the doubling construction is not impossible for prepositions beginning with a consonant. There is thus an asymmetry in such systems: prepositions beginning with a vowel only allow the long doubling construction, while prepositions...
beginning with a consonant allow both the stranding construction and the long
doubling construction. The differences between these two constructions within the
group of prepositions beginning with a consonant are of a pragmatic nature (the
stranding construction being unmarked). Thus, in the following Rhine Franconian
examples, a special stress (marked by the author of this grammar by <··>) laid on a
constituent other than the R-pronoun seems to give rise to a stranding construction,
this case is illustrated in example (11a). If, however, an R-pronoun da is especially
stressed, it seems to lead to a doubling construction, as in example (11b):

(11a)  
'dre: "mi:r ,nid di: 'sax 'a:n l do : 'kan "if ,nigs fç:r

drehe mir nicht die Sache an, da kann ich nichts für
'\textit{turn me not this thing PRF, there can I nothing for}
‘do not blame me for this, it is not my fault’

\hspace{1cm} (Steitz 1981:150)

(11b)  
"dç : kanlıf ,nigs d'fç:r

da kann=ich nichts dafür
'\textit{there can=I nothing there-for}
‘this is not my fault’

\hspace{1cm} (Steitz 1981:151)\footnote{Steitz 1981 gives the following German translations of these examples (italics in the original): 'Schiebe mir nicht die Sache zu! Dafür kann ich nichts!' (= (11a); Steitz 1981:150); 'Da, in diesem Fall, an diesem Ort, kann ich nichts dafür' (= (11b); Steitz 1981:151).}

The postulated complementary distribution is sometimes motivated by a kind of
"identity condition":

"The moved \textit{da} and the deleted expression have to correspond in what concerns their
form … Exactly in the cases when the preposition begins with a vowel, these
conditions are not fullfilled, because an -r- is placed between the pronominal da and the preposition … or there is no 'identical deletion'." (Oppenrieder 1990:166)\textsuperscript{18}

This claim, however, is not supported by the empirical facts. The following two sentences come both from Mühlhausen, which is located in the northern part of the Thurninigan dialect area, where the standing construction and the long doubling construction may occur both (which is, as has been shown, relatively rare). However, the second sentence, displaying the long doubling construction, shows that the two R-Pronouns don't have to be "phonologically identical" at all:

(11c) do kannst bie verdiene
da kannst=du bei verdienen
there can=you by gain
‘you can gain money with this’

(11d) dó fraisd du dn Deiwel drnóch
da fragst du den Teufel danach
there ask you the devil there=after
‘you don’t care at all’

In the light of such data, the "deletion under identity" cannot be maintained.

3. 2 • Verb Left Adjacency

In examples (4a)-(4c) and (5a)-(5b), the preposition, stranded or to the right of an R-pronoun, always appears to the left of the verb. As a matter of fact, this seems to be the usual position of the preposition and gives rise to the following claim: "Verb left adjacency is indispensable, as shown in [(12a)-(12c)], and is probably due to the

\textsuperscript{18} "Das verschobene da und der getilgte Ausdruck müssen in ihrer Form übereinstimmen; … Genau in den Fällen mit vokalisch anlautender Präposition sind diese Bedingungen nicht erfüllt, da zwischen dem pronominalen da und der Präposition ein -r- eingeschoben ist..." (Openrieder 1990:166)
canonical government direction of the verb in German (and Dutch/Frisian).”
(Abraham 1995:337). Abraham 1995 gives the following set of data:

(12a) *Da will ich drüber sprechen
there want I not there-over speak
‘I do not want to talk about it’

(12b) *Da will ich drüber nicht sprechen

(12c) *Da will ich nicht sprechen drüber

However, the claimed ungrammaticality of structures like in example (12b) and (12c) cannot be supported by empirical evidence. Abraham’s grammaticality judgements can be falsified, as shown in example (12b’), from Bavarian, and example (12c’), from East Franconian:

(12b’) do¶ ha)1mar a za¶idlã1N a ros ko¶d, an sÜime1; do¶ hã¶ma damüd seiwa a¶v SÛtra¶uwen
kfo¶n
da sind=wir eine Zeit-lang ein Pferd gehabt, einen Schimmel; da haben=wir damit selber auf Straubing gefahren
there have=we a time-long a horse had, a white-horse; there have=we there-with self to Straubing driven
‘for some time we had a white horse; we rode it to Straubing ourselves’

(Kollmer 1989:468)
While examples like (12b') are not frequent, examples like (12c') are encountered less rarely as one might expect. Data like the b- and c-examples represent strong empirical evidence against an analysis which is based on incorporation of the preposition into the verb. Such an analysis could explain why the R-pronoun is allowed to be separated from the preposition: because the latter, after being incorporated into the verb, would no longer govern the R-pronoun (instead, it would be governed by the complex verb, and verbs allow their complements to be non-adjacent). However, such an analysis, although very attractive, cannot be maintained in the light of empirical findings.

3.3 • The Emergence of Orphan Prepositions

As was shown in section 2.4 by a comparison of example (7a) and (7a'), it is possible to have a simple pronominal adverb instead of an orphan preposition: both constructions appear to be syntactically equivalent. However, one receives the impression that the simple pronominal adverb is the unmarked and the orphan preposition is the marked construction. The question now arises as to whether the emergence of orphan prepositions is caused by phonological or grammatical factors. There are some indications for the former; thus we read for example in a sketch of the syntax of Low German in general (remember that orphan prepositions equivalent to simple pronominal adverbs occur chiefly in Low German dialects): "There are forms which lack the pro-element. Certain signs indicate that it disappeared because of the tonal weakness. — Thus, there are examples, where it exists only rudimentarily" (Saltveit 1983:323). It is likely that reduced forms of the R-pronoun led to orphan prepositions; at least, in recent Low German dialects we find side by side non-reduced

(12c') ɗá hât er niks gsâcht drière
   da hat er nichts gesagt darüber
   there has he nothing said there-about
   ‘he did not say anything about it’

(Beyschlag and Werner 1961:217)
R-pronouns, reduced R-pronouns (the reduction going to different extents), and orphan prepositions. This is indicated by the following quotation which deals with the phonetic properties of pronominal adverbs in the North Saxon dialect of Hamburg: "In most instances, the second part is stressed; in this case dor may be shortened to da, do, ’er,  ’r, or dor lacks entirely" (Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:609). This scale from non-reduced R-pronouns to orphan prepositions could represent a diachronic development.

Reduced forms of the R-pronoun are illustrated in examples (13a) and (13b); example (13a) shows that a reduced and a non-reduced R-pronoun adjacent to the preposition may occur in the same syntactic environment; example (13b) shows that a reduced R-pronoun may also occur in a stranding construction:

(13a) He plöögt un will ’r bi / will darbi bliben
     er pflügt und will=da bei / will dabei bleiben
     he ploughs and wants=there by / wants there-by stay
     ‘he is ploughing and he wants to go on’
     (Niedersächsisches Wörterbuch III:91)

(13b) snackt hebbt se  ’r mol van
     gesprochen hat sie da mal von
     spoken has she there once of
     ‘she once has spoken of it’
     (Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:630)

To sum up, for the Low German dialects there is some evidence that the emergence of orphan prepositions may be conditioned by phonological developments. We should remember, however, that orphan prepositions, as far as the preposition ’mit’ is concerned, occur in an area far bigger than the Low German area (see section 2.4).

And for the High German dialects, I found no evidence for the existence of reduced R-pronoun forms comparable to the ones seen in examples (13a) and (13b). At least in

---

[21] "Meist wird der zweite Teil betont; do@r kann dann zu da, do, ’er,  ’r gekürzt sein, … oder do@r fehlt ganz …” (Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:609)
the case of 'mit', a purely phonological explanation will not do. The non-appearance of the R-pronoun may in this case be better explained as deletion. As was seen at the end of section 2.4, an R-pronoun in the prefield may be deleted. Therefore, we have to take into account deletion of an R-pronoun as a mechanism independent of the phonological developments just seen.

3.4 • The Special Case of the Preposition 'mit'

Compared to the other prepositions, the deviant behaviour of the preposition 'mit' with regard to the stranding construction and the orphan preposition construction emerged in a surprisingly evident manner from my material: the preposition 'mit' allows these constructions in High Alemannic, Low Alemannic, Swabian, East Franconian, Upper Saxon, and Silesian. In all these dialects the stranding construction and the orphan preposition construction are totally unknown with prepositions other than 'mit' (this also holds, apart from the dialects already listed up, for wide parts of the Rhine Franconian, the Central Hessian, and the Thuringian dialect areas). For the time being, I cannot offer a convincing explanation why the preposition 'mit' exhibits such deviant behaviour from other preposition. However, I found a remark dealing with the prepositions mit and ooni ('without') 22 in the High Alemannic dialect of

22 Until now, I have not mentioned the preposition 'ohne' ('without'), for a very simple reason: as we can learn from the table in section 1, there simply is no pronominal adverb 'darohne'. This is the reason why this preposition is not involved in the constructions presented in this paper. This view, however, now deserves some modification. In some dialects, most of them located in the south-west of the German speaking area, I found the form 'darohne' (see Fleischer 1999:11, 19, 23, 59, 79). For Moselle Franconian and Riparian, even the form do4@d´ro4@:nt (Rheinisches Wörterbuch I:1208), illustrating the short doubling construction in connection with the preposition 'ohne', is attested. Nevertheless, the form 'darohne' is very rare in the dialects of German, and it is nonexistent in most of them. However, this preposition can also occur without any overt complement in varieties which do not have a pronominal adverb 'darohne'. This is illustrated by the following sentences from the High Alemannic dialect of Zürich in example (i), and from (the Swiss version of) the German Standard language (example (ii) is taken from a newspaper article which appeared in the Neue Zürcher Zeitung 246 (2000): 115); in both varieties there is no form 'darohne':

(i)  ya3 nyyt maγa ooni (z)
‘you-can nothing do without it’ (Riemsdijk 1975:196)

(ii) Auf den Kolchosen lagerten die Inlandpässe im Schrank des Direktors; ohne Ø konnte man nicht abhauen auf die kolkhizes liez the domestic-passports in-the cupboard of-the director; without could one not break-out ‘on the kolkhzes, the domestic passports were kept in the director's cupboard; without them you were not able to break out’

This is clear evidence that apart from the type of orphan preposition seen in section 2.4, where the missing element was equivalent to an R-pronoun, there is another type of orphan preposition, where
Zürich: "To find that it is these two prepositions that behave exceptionally is not too surprising, since they do so in other languages as well." (Riemsdijk 1975:196). In his paper, Riemsdijk shows that the complement of the prepositions 'mit' and 'ohne', contrary to other prepositions, can be missing in relative clauses, in sentence final position, in elliptic idiomatic expression, and in gapping constructions (see Riemsdijk 1975:196-7). As an example of elliptic idiomatic expressions, the following sentences involving the preposition 'mit' are given:

(14a) wo biZ an’ mit (´m)?
    where are-you to with it
    'Where did you take it?'
    (Riemsdijk 1975:196)

(14b) iZ daz mit (zErvis etc.)?
    'is that with service'
    (Riemsdijk 1975:196)

It may be debated whether the lacking element in Riemsdijk’s first example quoted above constitutes a real equivalent to a personal pronoun of the third person singular neuter in the dative case: if one has to refer to an inanimate entity, and this is strongly suggested by Riemsdijk’s translation ”with it”, one would rather take an R-pronoun, at least in my personal competence of Zürich German. I do not think, however, that example (14a) is acceptable if referring to a person. Rather, it seems to me that example (14a) is a further example of the orphan preposition construction seen in section 2.4 (which is, by the way, not treated in Riemsdijk 1975). This view is confirmed by the fact that examples similar to (14a) are subsumed under damit in the Schweizerisches Idiotikon (IV:560). Nevertheless, it is evident that Riemsdijk’s

The same objection also holds for another example given in Riemsdijk 1975, illustrating the behaviour of ‘mit’ in a relative clause:

(xxii) də vrynd wo mɔr aŋəl zind go ʃuute mit hæt khyraəə
     ‘the friend WH we used-to are to play-socker with has married’ (Riemsdijk 1975:196)
analysis of example (14b) is correct: in this case, the preposition ‘mit’ allows dropping of a full DP complement. The conclusion that the preposition ‘mit’, for whatever reasons, exhibits a different behaviour than other prepositions, with respect to a number of phenomena, is therefore justified at least for Zürich German, and this will most probably hold also for other varieties of German.

To conclude this section, I think that we have to take into account the special semantic and syntactic behaviour of the preposition ‘mit’. In order to explain the possibility of the orphan preposition construction and the stranding construction in connection with this particular preposition, at least for the areas where these constructions are unknown otherwise, this seems to be a better solution than to seek for a phonological explanation. Referring to phonological developments might account for the emergence of the orphan preposition construction in the Low German dialects. There it seems possible with all prepositions which allow an R-pronoun as their complement. For the deviant behaviour of the preposition ‘mit’, however, we have to find another explanation (see also section 3.3).

3.5 • Emergence of Liberal Preposition Stranding

........................................

I doubt whether this example is really acceptable if it refers to a human being (which has to be the case here). I found examples structurally similar to example (i), but only with inanimate entities involved, where one would rather use an R-pronoun instead of a personal pronoun (see example (ii); usually, instead of mit one would say demit, while mit ere, using a personal pronoun referring to the DP e Taktik, is uncommon). This suggests that here again, we are dealing with an empty element equivalent to an R-pronoun.

(ii) das isch e Taktik, wo si offebaar susch Erfolg hät mit (Zürich, spontaneous speech)

that is a tactic, where she obviously otherwise success has with

‘that is a strategy which she obviously is usually successful with’

Two grammars of dialects not far away from Zürich, namely of Zug and of Luzern, are also quite explicit when it comes to determining the missing element. The following examples contain the original notation or remark, respectively, suggesting that the missing element is an R-pronoun:

(iii) De Hammer, won er de Naagel inegschlaage hed (de-)mit (Bossard 1962:142)

der Hammer, where he the nail knocked-in has (there-)with

‘the hammer, which he has knocked in the nail with’

(iv) Daas esch di Flente, won er ne Vögel met (statt «demit») gschösse hëëd (Fischer 1960:430)

das ist die Flinte, where he a bird with (instead of «there-with») shot has

‘that is the rifle which he has shot a bird with’
At the end of section 2.5, I pointed out that liberal preposition stranding in German is rare and restricted to north-western dialects. If we look beyond the borders of German, however, we see that it also occurs in neighbouring languages. It is, of course, found in Danish, as well as in other Germanic SVO-languages, but it also occurs in Germanic SOV-languages. This is illustrated for the North Frisian dialect of the Mittelgoesharde in example (15a), and for West Frisian in example (15b). Finally, liberal preposition stranding also occurs in Dutch varieties, namely in spoken Dutch: "Stranding sentences may only be used in the spoken language" (Jansen 1981:92); for spoken Dutch, this construction is illustrated in example (15c).

(15a) *de grote* weil üüs Mem niks fun wääs

the big wants our mother nothing of know

'our mother does not want to know anything of the big ones'

(Grünberg, Schlåchti 38)

(15b) *dy sifers* haw ik my slim oer fernuvere

those figures have I myself much about puzzled

'I have wondered much about those figures'

(Hoekstra and Tiersma 1994:527)

(15c) *dat mes* kan ik niet mee snijden

this knife can I not/nothing with cut

'I cannot cut anything with this knife'

(Jansen 1981:93)

In the remaining part of this section, I would like to show how liberal preposition stranding may be related to the stranding construction. My argument is based on

24 "[I]n tegenstelling tot de andere vooropplaatsingsverschijnselen die allemaal zowel in schrijftaal als spreektaal voorkwamen, mogen strandingzinnen alleen in de spreektaal gebruikt worden." (Jansen 1981:92)

25 I am grateful to Jarich Hoekstra for providing me with this example. It is taken from a manuscript entitled Schlåchti by Peter Grünberg, who was a native speaker of Mittelgoesharder Friesisch. The manuscript is kept by Nils Århammar, and the Nordfriesische Wörterbuchstelle, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel has a copy of this text, which will be published alongside with other manuscripts from the same author by Jarich Hoekstra.
recent German dialect data, but it can also be understood as representing a diachronic line, leading thus to a theory of development of liberal preposition stranding. In North Saxon and Westphalian, I found sentences like (16a). In this North Saxon example, there is a full DP in a kind of left-dislocation, and this DP is followed by an R-pronoun which is part of a stranding construction. Example (16b), from Westphalian, shows the same construction, with only one very small difference: there is no comma anymore between the initial DP and the R-pronoun. It is very difficult to judge whether this feature is really indicative of a systematic difference. A possible explanation would be that the comma in example (16a) indicates a comma intonation, showing that the DP de erste Fro is in a position which may be called pre-prefield, whereas in example (16b), one gets the impression that the seemingly left-dislocated DP belongs to the same intonational unit as the rest of the sentence. This would mean that here, the DP is in the prefield, together with the following R-pronoun. (There is some empirical evidence to support the postulated intonational pattern. I will return to this point further below.) Anyway, if in a sentence like (16b) the R-pronoun is dropped, we are left with a sentence identical to example (10), repeated here as (16c):

(16a) de eerste Fro, do#r hett he fief Görn mit
die erste Frau, da hat er fünf Kinder mit
the first wife, there has he five children with
‘from his first wife, he has got five children’
(Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:620)

(16b) e¶in chla#s do# heww-ik chena“ch ake
ein Glas da habe=ich genug an
one glass =I have=I enough on
‘one glass is enough for me’
(Grimme 1922:130)

(16c) een heff ick genuch an
eins habe ich genug an
We already saw in example (16c) that liberal preposition stranding also occurs in spoken Dutch (see above); and the same holds for structures like example (16b), they occur in spoken Dutch as well (see Jansen 1981:157). There is yet another development which I believe to be quite parallel to the one just seen. There are examples very similar to the ones in (16), but there is one major difference: the first constituent is not a DP, but a whole PP. In example (17a), from Eastphalian, we find a left-dislocated PP which is followed by an R-pronoun involved in a stranding construction. In example (17b), from North Saxon, we have the same construction, with only one difference: there is again no comma between the initial PP and the R-pronoun, as was the case in example (16b). If the R-pronoun disappears, one is left with a structure as represented in example (17c), from North Saxon: a PP in sentence-initial position, the preposition of which is repeated without any overt complement, is in a position after the inflected verb. This construction will subsequently be referred to as preposition doubling.

(17a) an disse ollen Murker, dà is doch gär nich so veel anne!
    on these old bricklayers, there is really at-all-not so much on
    ‘there is nothing so special about these old bricklayers’
    (Bethge and Flechsig 1958 3:16-7)

(17b) in dat Glas dar weer nix mehr in
    in das Glas da war nichts mehr in
    ‘there was nothing left in the glass’
    (Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:619)

(17c) van Vörgeschichten kann ik wal wat van vertellen
    von Vorgeschichten kann ich wohl was von erzählen
of past histories can I well something of tell

'I can very well tell something about past histories'

(Niedersächsisches Wörterbuch IV:40)

Preposition doubling also occurs in spoken Dutch, but seemingly only in a quite restricted way (see Jansen 1981:157-8).

If we look at the developments just sketched, leading to liberal preposition stranding and to preposition doubling, it is obvious that we deal with processes quite different from preposition stranding in SVO-languages (where it is commonly assumed that movement of the DP out of the PP is involved). This fits well with the analysis Hoekstra (1995) has suggested for liberal preposition stranding in West Frisian: "[T]he full DP in sentence-initial position cannot have been moved from PP. The obvious solution is to assume that it is base-generated in Spec-CP, from where it binds an empty resumptive R-pronoun in the postpositional complement position." (Hoekstra 1995:99). Put into a formalisation, his analysis looks as follows:

(18) \[ \text{CP DP}_i \ldots \left[ \text{PP pro}_i \text{P} \ldots \right] \]

(Hoekstra 1995:99)

I think that the Low German data presented in this section should also be analysed in a similar way. However, after what has been presented, I would rather like to propose that the empty resumptive R-pronoun is in the prefield, and does not need to be adjacent to the preposition. In any case, it is clear that although the surface structure of liberal preposition stranding is identical to preposition stranding in English, the process of syntactic derivation leading to it is quite different. 26

The emergence of liberal preposition stranding and of preposition doubling can be traced back to a more general peculiarity of the varieties displaying this particular

26 It could be possible, however, that structures like (18) may get reanalysed: pro is exchanged by a trace which has to be in the canonical complement position of the preposition, that is, to its right. This might have happened in the history of English. In Old English, the type of preposition stranding called stranding construction in the present paper is attested (see Behaghel 1932:237), but this type does not exist anymore in Modern English. The reason is simple: apart from some fossilised forms as for example therefore or whereby, no pronominal adverbs exist anymore. If, for whatever reasons, R-pronouns (or at least their syntactic behaviour) disappear, this will hold all the more for their phonetically empty counterparts, forcing the reanalysis described above. Such a reanalysis did not take place in the continental West Germanic languages, but it could if R-pronouns disappeared.
construction. Precisely these varieties seem to allow the resumption of seemingly left-dislocated constituents in a quite liberal way. Thus, we find the following description in a grammar of North Saxon: "A part of the sentence can occur more than once. In such cases, the subject, an object, or an adverbial are expressed a second time by a following pronoun, pronominal adverb, or adverb. This doubling often serves as a means of emphasising." (Lindow et al. 1998:287). Among the examples provided in this grammar, there are sentences like example (19), which involves a demonstrative pronoun, but apart from that, there are also sentences like example (20), showing a construction structurally equivalent to example (16b):

(19) De Tiet de löppt
die Zeit die läuft
*the time this runs
'time flies

(Lindow et al. 1998:287)

(20) De Sieverssch dar ward in Baasdörp veel över snackt
die Sieverssschen da wird in Baasdörp viel über gesprochen
*the Sievers there is in Baasdörp much over talked
‘about the Sievers family, they talk a lot in Baasdörp

(Lindow et al. 1998:287)

The demonstrative pronoun in example (19) is exactly in the same position as the R-pronoun in example (20). As I have already mentioned, the fact that there is no comma between the initial DP and the following pronoun gives rise to the assumption that the DP belongs to the same intonational unit as the rest of the sentence, examples (19) and (20) thus having no comma intonation. This would mean that the seemingly left-dislocated DPs are not in the pre-prefield but in the prefield,
together with the following pronoun. For my Low German data, this conclusion is admittedly somewhat tentative. Apart from the missing comma, I have no further empirical evidence concerning the intonational pattern in examples like (19) and (20). In Dutch, however, there are sentences which are structurally identical to example (19):

(21) een boer *die* heeft altijd werk

'a farmer that-one has always work'

(Jansen 1980:142)

This example is taken from Jansen 1980, where some findings of a corpus-based study are presented, the corpus containing about 19,000 sentences of spoken Dutch (Jansen 1980:141). Jansen calls a construction as seen in example (21) Dem-LD (LD stands for left-dislocation, and since this type of left-dislocation involves a demonstrative pronoun, Dem is added). It is now interesting what Jansen has to say about the intonation of such sentences:

The most important feature of Modern Dem-LD is its intonation. The actual intonation found contrasts with descriptions of LD based on intuitions (Van Riemsdijk and Zwarts 1974; Koster 1978). Such descriptions invariably give a comma intonation between the LD-element and the sentence; however, I found this intonation in only 15% of the LD-sentences. Thus, there is no reason to assume that the LD-element is set off from the remainder of the sentence by comma intonation. (Jansen 1980:142)

Jansen’s description shows clearly that the intonational pattern postulated in the present paper for North Saxon and Westphalian in examples like (16b), (17b), (19), and (20), exists in another language. One should not forget that this other language is closely related and neighbouring the north-western dialects of German. I take this as an important argument in favour of my analysis of liberal preposition stranding and of preposition doubling.

However, there is one serious problem which should not go unmentioned: despite the empirical evidence that a seemingly left-dislocated constituent and the following

I might be the case "that the prosodic argument which invites such a solution is not strong enough", as one reviewer points out. However, I can’t think of another diagnostic which would allow to decide whether or not a DP is integrated in the following CP.

........................................

28 I might be the case "that the prosodic argument which invites such a solution is not strong enough", as one reviewer points out. However, I can’t think of another diagnostic which would allow to decide whether or not a DP is integrated in the following CP.
pronoun may occur together in the prefield, forming thus one constituent, up to the present I cannot see how this could be formalised. As a solution to this problem, postulating an adjunction structure might probably lead to an adequate analysis.

4 • CONCLUDING REMARKS

In my study on preposition stranding and related constructions, I have collected a whole range of empirical evidence for a better understanding of a construction which has been paid wide attention in theoretically oriented studies. However, I have to confess that I sometimes get the impression that the bigger the amount of data gets, the less clear seem to me the theoretical consequences to be drawn from the former. To illustrate this, we should bear in mind the findings concerning the geographical occurrence of the stranding construction. Disregarding the special behaviour of the preposition ‘mit’, we find one big area (mainly Low German) where this construction occurs with all primary prepositions, and another big area (mainly High German), where this construction does not occur. These systems are homogeneous. However, there is a belt between these two areas, where the stranding construction is restricted to one group of prepositions, namely the ones beginning with a consonant. Seen from the perspective of traditional dialect geography, which intends to document variation and areal transitions, such findings make sense. But how should a transitional belt such as the one just described be treated in a formal theory?

This study is not the place of a general discussion of the problem sketched. It has to be mentioned, however, that this problem has already been recognised in pre-generative frameworks, for example by William G. Moulton, who was probably the first to integrate and interpret large amounts of dialectal data within a formal framework, namely data collected for the *Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz* in structuralist phonology: "There is always a bit of messiness at the transitions between two systems, and it is precisely the dialectologist who has to face up to this obvious fact." (Moulton 1968:458).
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1 • INTRODUCTION: AIM AND SCOPE OF THE PAPER

In the literature on negation, attention has been paid to the encoding of negation at the sentence level. Relations such as those between a negative head and a negative constituent or that between multiple negative constituents have, for instance, been examined mainly in terms of sentence structure (see, for instance, Horn 1989, van der Wouden 1994, Bayer 1990, Corblin and Tovena 2000, Déprez 1999, etc). The realisation and interaction of negation markers at sub-sentential levels such as DP, PP etc has, to the best of my knowledge, received little and only sporadic attention. I suspect that this is because in the core case there is one negative marker per DP, PP etc and negative concord (NC) has not been signalled at those sub-sentential levels. However, the Flemish data in (1), described by Vanacker in the late 1970s in a paper written in Dutch, reveal that co-occurrence of negative constituents is also attested at the sub-sentential level. The examples in (1) were collected in the Flemish speaking area in northern France (Vanacker 1975: 127):

(1) a. Bij de jonge gasten en-is er nie vele geen Vlaams mee(r) gesproken.
   'Among the younger people, not much Flemish is spoken.'

b. T'es daarvoren da kik nie vele geen beesten en-oude.
   'That’s why I don’t keep many animals.'

In these examples, the negative DPs, nie vele geen Vlaams ('not much no Flemish') and nie vele geen beesten ('not many no animals'), contain two expressions of negation: the negative marker nie which negates the quantifier vele ('many'), and the negative quantifier geen, the Flemish/Dutch equivalent of English no, or German kein.

The DP-internal co-occurrence of what seems to be two negative quantifiers is interesting and raises a number of questions. First the data suggest that at least in the Flemish dialects, the surface position of the quantifier veel ('many') can (or perhaps must) be different from that of the negative quantifier geen ('no'), allowing
them to co-occur. Moreover, the order in (1) suggests that the quantifier *veel* is spelt out in a position higher than *geen*.

That quantifiers and articles may not occupy the same position is not a novel idea. As early as 1977 Jackendoff (1977: 105) indicated that quantificational elements need not all be spelt out at the same position, and specifically he assigned a different position to the English quantifiers *no* and *many* (see also Giusti (1997) for a recent discussion of the position of prenominal quantifiers). However, in Jackendoff’s proposal English *many* would actually be spelt out lower than the negative quantifier *no*:

Since some quantifiers [*some, each, all, no, any, lh*] are now Art[icle]s and some [*many, few, several, lh*] are Q[uantifier]s, the phrase structure component will generate structures in which two quantifiers appear, one in each position, e.g. *no many men, *all several men, *any much wine. (Jackendoff 1977: 105)

Jackendoff (1977:105) rules out such co-occurring quantifiers on semantic grounds:

These are ruled out semantically, however, by the Specifier Constraint (5.1.), which *forbids two (semantic) quantifiers in the same NP specifier.* (Jackendoff 1977: 105, my italics)

One might in fact expect that if there are two quantifiers in the Flemish constructions, *geen* (‘no’) and *nie vele* (‘not many’), the construction will crash because one of the quantifiers will quantify vacuously. Obviously, this is not the case since such data are attested

Vanacker’s data in (1) are mainly drawn from Flemish dialects in Northern France, but he signals that the phenomenon is also to be found in the West Flemish coastal areas (1975: 132). My own WF dialect (Haegeman 1992), which is spoken in the rural area inland of Knokke-Heist, also exhibits such DP-internal negative doubling. The relevant data have already been briefly discussed in Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996). The main purpose of the present paper is to render the DP-internal negative doubling data accessible to a wider audience by offering a detailed description in English. As far as I can tell, the empirical facts of the WF dialect which I will be describing parallel those described by Vanacker. I hope that this description may encourage other researchers to look at the pattern. In a more
speculative second part of the paper, I will also offer some proposals for an analysis.

The paper is organised as follows: section 2 sets the background and describes the properties of DPs containing negative markers in WF. Section 3 provides a detailed description of the syntactic properties of WF DPs with negative doubling and shows that these seem, to all intents and purposes, to share the external syntactic properties of non-doubled DPs. Section 4 is added to complete the survey and deals with internal negative doubling and NP ellipsis. Section 5 offers an analysis of the internal structure of DPs with negative doubling. Based on additional data from English, an articulated DP is elaborated to accommodate the patterns observed. Section 6 introduces additional data involving degree markers. Section 7 summarises the paper.

2 • WF NEGATIVE QUANTIFIERS, NEGATED QUANTIFIERS AND CLAUSAL SCOPE

In my WF idiolect, a DP can be negated by the negative quantifier geen. Such 'negative DPs' may express sentential negation and may be doubled by the negative head en in finite sentences. For syntactic restrictions on the distribution of the negative head I refer to my earlier papers (cf. Haegeman 1998a, 1998b, 2000).¹

(2) K'(en)-een geen geld.
    I (en)-have no money
    'I don't have money

As I have discussed at length elsewhere, negative DPs undergo the characteristic leftward movement imposed on all negative constituents with sentential scope (Haegeman 1995 and references cited there, see also Kayne 1998 for a generalised account). In (3), for instance, the adjective ketent ('contented') takes a complement introduced by a preposition van. Only the order in which the complement precedes the adjective is grammatical.

(3) a. dan-k van geen boeken ketent (en)-zyn
    that I of no books contented (en)-am

¹ In current work I am exploring the possibility that en in fact heads Pol rather than Neg. (Haegeman, to appear)
‘that I am not satisfied of any books’

b  *dan-k ketent van geen boeken en-zyn

c  *dan-k ketent en-zyn van geen boeken

When, on the other hand, the complement of ketent does not contain a negative quantifier, other patterns are also possible. As shown by (3d) the complement may follow the adjective ketent, and (3f) shows that it may also extrapose.

(3)  d.  dan-k van vele boeken ketent zyn

that I of many books contented am

‘that I am pleased with many of the books’

e  dan-k ketent van vele boeken zyn

f  dan-k ketent zyn van vele boeken

A second way of negating a DP is by means of a negated quantificational element. This is illustrated in (4):

(4)  K'(en)-een nie vele tyd.

I (en)-have not much time

‘I don't have much time’

In (4), the DP-internal negation marker nie, which bears on the quantifier vele (‘much’), takes sentential scope. This is shown by the availability of the negative morpheme en on the finite verb (see Haegeman 1995). Somehow the negative feature of nie, with scope over the quantifier vele, must also be able to percolate to the containing DP and to take scope over the containing clause. (5) shows that such a negative DP whose negation marker has clausal scope also has to undergo the typical leftward movement displayed by negative constituents.

(5)  a.  dan-k van nie vele boeken ketent (en)-zyn

that I of not many books contented (en)-am

‘that I am not pleased with many of the books’

b  *dan-k ketent van nie vele boeken (en)-zyn

c  *dan-k ketent (en)-zyn van nie vele boeken

---
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At the clause level, both negative DPs in which negation is encoded by *geen* and those in which negation is expressed by means of the negation marker *nie* associated with a quantifier can enter into a N(egative) C(oncord)-relation with clause-mate negative constituents. In (6a) and (6c) they enter into a NC relation with *nooit* (‘never’) in (6b) and (6d) they enter into a NC relation with *niemand* (‘no one’).

(6)  

(a) *K'(en)-een nooit geen tyd.*  
*I (en)-have never no time*  
‘I never have any time.’

(b) t'(en)-eet ier niemand geen tyd.  
*it (en)-has here no one no time*  
‘No one has any time around here.’

(c) *K'(en)-een nooit nie vele tyd.*  
*I (en)-have never not much time*  
‘I never have a lot of time’

(d) t'(en)-ee niemand nie vele tyd.  
*it (en)-has no one not much time*  
‘No one has much time.’

One proviso is in order here. There are restrictions as to constituents entering into NC relations at the clausal level. Specifically, as shown in Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996), negative constituents in which negation is expressed by means of *geen* or by means of a negated quantifier, cannot enter into a NC relation with the canonical marker of sentential negation *nie*.

(6)  

(e) *K'(en)-een geen nie tyd nie.*  
*I (en)-have no time not*  

(f) *K'(en)-een nie vele tyd nie*  
*I (en)-have not much time not*

Observe that linear sequence, the fact that *nie* follows the relevant constituent, is not as such an issue since when we replace *nie* by *nie meer* the sentences become grammatical:
On the other hand, negative constituents such as *niemand, niets, nooit*, do enter into NC with *nie*:

(6)  

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>K'(en)-een geen tyd nie meer.</td>
<td><em>I (en)-have no time not more</em></td>
<td>'I don't have any time left.'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>K'(en)-een nie vele tyd nie meer</td>
<td><em>I (en)-have not much time not more</em></td>
<td>'I don't have much time left'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ungrammaticality of NC with *nie* for the negative DPs in (6e) and (6f) should be related to some matching requirement applying to constituents entering into NC, as discussed in Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996). Leaving aside the issue of matching requirements on NC, I conclude that negative DPs of the type illustrated above which contain the negative quantifier *geen* or which contain a quantifier negated by *nie* can function as clausal negators. As mentioned before, the negative feature of the DP-contained negative marker (*nie, geen*) must be able to percolate to the level of the containing constituent – DP - and ultimately to the clause level, to which it gives negative force.

The DP-internal negative quantifier *geen* and the DP-internal negated quantifier such as *nie vele* (*not much/many*) do not necessarily take clausal scope. Their scope may also be restricted to the containing DP (see Haegeman 2000a for more discussion). In the examples in (7), the negative quantifier *geen* has its scope restricted to the dominating PP *vu geen geld* (*for no money*). This is shown by the fact that (i) the negative morpheme *en* is ungrammatical on the finite verb, and that (ii) in (7b) the PP containing the negative constituent is extraposed, an option unavailable for a PP with a negative quantifier taking sentential scope.
(7)  

a. **Vu geen geld** (*en*-oan-ze da gedoan gekregen. 

*for no money* (*en*-had they that done got 

'They got that done for a very small sum of money.'

b. dan-se da (*en*-goan keunen doen **vu geen geld**

*that they that* (*en*-go can do for no money

'that they will be able to do that for a very small sum of money.'

In the examples in (8) the negated quantifier *nie vele* (‘not much’) has its scope restricted to the dominating PP. Again, (i) the negative head *en* is ungrammatical on the finite verb, and (ii) the negated PP may appear in extraposed position (8b).

(8)  

a. **Vu nie vele geld** (*en*-oan-ze da gedoan gekregen. 

*for not much money* (*en*-had they that done got 

'For a small fee, they got that done.'

b. dan-se da (*en*-goan keunen doen **vu nie vele geld**

*that they that* (*en*-go can do for not much money

'that they will be able to do that for a small fee.'

3 • DP-INTERNAL NEGATIVE DOUBLING

3.1 • The data

As already signalled by Vanacker (1975), some western Flemish dialects allow a DP-internal negated quantifier to be doubled DP-externally by the negative quantifier *geen* (‘no’). This is illustrated in (9). In (9a), for instance, the DP *nie vele geen geld* (‘not much no money’), contains both the negated quantifier *nie vele* and the negative quantifier *geen*. Though each of these as such may carry negative force and negate a sentence, in the example under discussion they do not cancel each other out, rather they express a single negated quantification: *nie vele geen* (‘not many no’) is equivalent to *nie vele* (‘not many’). As already discussed by Vanacker, then, the negative quantifier *geen* here serves to reduplicate the negation *nie* associated with the quantifier *vele*. Vanacker gives examples with *nie vele*, and with *nie vele meer* (‘not many/much more’). In my idiolect the doubling pattern also occurs with *genoeg* (9d).
(9) a. K'(en)-een nie vele geen geld.  
    I (en)-have not much no money  
    'I don't have much money.'

b. K'(en)-een nie te vele geen geld.  
    I (en)-have not too much no money  
    'I don't have too much money.'

c. K'(en)-een nie meer geen geld.  
    I (en)-have no more no money  
    'I don't have more money.'

d. K'(en)-een nie genoeg geen geld.  
    I (en)-have not enough no money  
    'I don't have enough money.'

With respect to the co-occurrence of negative markers that do not cancel each other, a distinction is often made between negative doubling and negative spread, following Den Besten (1986) and van Der Wouden (1994). Van Der Wouden (1994: 95) gives the following definitions:

(i) **NEGATIVE SPREAD**: the negative features is 'spread' or distributed over any number of indefinite expressions within its scope.

(ii) **NEGATIVE DOUBLING**: a distinguished negative element shows up in all sentences that contain a negative expression.

At the clausal level, negative spread is illustrated by (10a), in which *niemand* ('no one') and *niets* ('nothing') jointly express a single negation. Negative doubling is illustrated by (10b), in which the negative morpheme *en* appears on the finite verb.

(10) a. T’ee niemand niets gezeid.  
    it has no one nothing said  
    'Nobody said anything.'

b. T–en- ee niemand entwa gezeid.  
    it en-has no one something said  
    'Nobody said anything.'

In (10c) we find both negative spread (*niemand, niets*) and negative doubling (*en*):
I will assume that the DP-internal multiple negative markers in (9) illustrate negative doubling, since the negated quantifier is systematically doubled by geen. In the first part of this paper I concentrate on examples with nie vele geen; in section 6 I will briefly discuss the other examples.

3.2 Constituency

The string nie- quantifier- geen NP in the above examples definitely is a single constituent. This is shown (i) by the fact that DPs with this type of negative doubling can occupy the first position in a root V2 clause (11a), and (ii) by the fact that they may be the complements of prepositions. For the latter argument, I use an extraposed PP in (11b), since the constituent structure of such examples is more transparent. As expected, the scope of the negation in the latter example is restricted to the containing PP:

\[(11)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{?[Nie vele geen mensen ] (en)-weten der da.} \\
& \text{not many no people (en)-know there that} \\
& \text{'}Not many people are aware of that.'^2 \\

b & \text{Z'} (*en)-een da gedoan [vu nie vele geen geld]. \\
& \text{they (*en)-have that done for not much no money} \\
& \text{'}They did that for little money.' \\
\end{align*}

^2 The sentence is marginal but the marginality is not due to the negative doubling:

\[(i)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{??[Nie vele mensen ] (en)-weten der da.} \\
& \text{not many people (en)-know there that} \\
& \text{'}Not many people are aware of that.' \\

b & \text{??[ Geen mensen ] (en)-weten der da.} \\
& \text{no people (en)-know there that} \\
& \text{'}No people are aware of that.' \\
\end{align*}

It seems that with negated quantificational subject of this kind WF prefers the subject to remain in the middle field:

\[(ii)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{T weten da nie vele mensen.} \\
& \text{it know that not many people} \\

b & \text{T weten da geen mensen.} \\
& \text{it know that no students} \\

c & \text{T weten da nie vele geen mensen.} \\
& \text{it know that not many no people} \\
\end{align*}
To the best of my knowledge, the presence or absence of doubling *geen* makes no difference in the distribution and/or interpretation of the DPs or the sentences that contain them. In my idiolect, the preferred form of the DP is that displaying doubling *geen*.3 Vanacker (1975:128) also points out the tendency in Northern French Flemish to use the doubled construction in preference to the non-doubled variant. DP-internal doubling of negation is not grammatical in Dutch nor is it generally admitted in Flemish dialects, and according to Vanacker (1975) it is a recent innovation.

### 3.3 **Scope of negative DPs with doubling**

I will first show that the negative doubled DPs in (9) share the syntactic/scopal properties of the non-doubled variants. DPs with negative doubling can take sentential scope, in which case they license *en* on the finite verb (12a,13a). When taking sentential scope, DPs with negative doubling undergo obligatory leftward movement (12) and they enter into negative concord with clause-mate negative constituents (13).

(12)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a. } & \text{dan-k van nie vele geen studenten ketent (en)-zyn} \\
& \text{that I of not many no students contented (en)-am} \\
& \text{'that I am not satisfied with many students} \\
\text{b. } & \*\text{dan-k ketent van nie vele geen studenten (en)-zyn} \\
\text{c. } & \*\text{dan-k ketent (en)-zyn van nie vele geen studenten} 
\end{align*} \]

(13)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a. } & \text{K'(en)-een nooit nie vele geen studenten.} \\
& \text{I (en)-have never not many no students} \\
& \text{'I never have a lot of students.'} \\
\text{b. } & \text{t'(en)-een niemand nie vele geen studenten.} \\
& \text{it (en)-has no one not many no students} \\
& \text{'No one has many students.'} 
\end{align*} \]

3It is therefore not really possible to say that doubling with *geen* is emphatic, since *geen* is preferably present.
On the other hand, just like their non-doubled counterparts, the negative markers in DPs with negative doubling need not have sentential scope: the scope of the negative component may also be restricted to the dominating constituent:

(14) a. **Vu nie vele geen geld** (*en)-oan-ze da gedoan gekregen. 
   *for not much no money* (*en*)-had they that done got
   'For a small fee, they got it done.'

b. **dan-se da** (*en*)-goan keunen doen **vu nie vele geen geld**
   *that they that* (*en*)-go can do for *not much no money*
   'that they will be able to do that for a small fee.'

In the examples in (14), the DP-contained doubled negation fails to license the negative head *en* on the finite verb, it does not trigger leftward Neg-movement, nor will the negation enter into NC with other clause-mate constituents with sentential negation. In (15), the negation expressed internally to the PP **vu nie vele geen geld** (‘for not much no money) does not enter into a negative concord relation with other constituents in the clause. In (15a) the negative marker *nie* takes sentential scope and can thus license the negative morpheme *en* on the finite verb, but the sentential negation encoded by *nie* does not enter into a negative concord relation with the negation expressed by *nie vele geen* in the extraposed PP. Similarly, the expression of sentential negation *niemand* in (15b) does not enter into a negative concord relation with the negation expressed by *nie vele geen* in the extraposed PP.

(15) a. **da-j da nie** (en)-keut doen **vu nie vele geen geld**
   *that you that not (en*)-can do for *not much no money*
   'that you cannot get that done that for a small fee.'

b. **dat er da niemand** (en)-keut doen **vu nie vele geen geld**
   *that there that no one (en*)-can do for *not much no money*
   'that no one can get that done for a small fee.'

3.4 • **Type of negative DPs with doubling**

In my idiolect the DP-internal doubling phenomenon is restricted to the type of negated quantifiers illustrated in (9), i.e. those in which negation is spelt out separately from the quantifier. A quantifier like *wenig* (‘few, little’) which is
arguably near-synonymous to *nie vele* (‘not much/many’) does not allow for this kind of doubling, nor does the quantifier *minder* (‘fewer, less’):  

(16) a  K’ een weinig (*geen*) tyd.  
*I have little (*no*) time*  
b  K’ een minder (*geen*) tyd.  
*I have less (*no*) time*  

3.5 *The distribution of negative DPs with doubling*  
DPs with internal negative doubling may serve an array of grammatical functions in the clause, an observation also made by Vanacker. Some illustrations of WF examples are given in (17). The relevant DP is a subject in (17a), a direct object in (17b), an indirect object in (17c,d), a predicate in (17e), and an adjunct in (17e).  

(17) a. T (en)-weten da *nie vele geen mensen*.  
*it (en)-know that not many no people*  
‘Not many people know that.’  
b K’(en)-een doa *nie vele geen mensen gezien*.  
*I (en)-have there not many no people seen*  
‘I didn’t see many people there.’  
c K’(en)-een dat an *nie vele mensen gezeid*.  
*I (en) have that to not many no people said*  
‘I didn’t tell that to many people.’  
d K’(en)-een *nie vele geen studenten dienen cursus gegeven*.  
*I (en)-have not many no students that course given*  
‘I did not give that course to many students.’  
e Dat (en)-is *nie vele geen werk vu myn*.  
*that (en)-is not much no work for me*  
‘That is not much work.’  
f J’(en)-ee *nie genoeg geen doagen gewerkt*.  

---  

4 I add for completeness’ sake that in my idiolect both *weinig* and *minder* marginally licenses sentential *en*. The syntax of these elements awaits further study.  

(i) a  K’ (?en) een weinig tyd.  
*I have little time*  
b  K’ (?en) een minder tyd dan anders.  
*I have less time than otherwise*
he (en)-has not enough no days worked
'He has not totalled up enough working days.'

4 • DOUBLING AND NON OVERT NP

For completeness’ sake, I briefly consider ellipsis contexts in this section, but I will not develop this issue in the remainder of the paper. I wish to present the data, though, so as to make them available.

With NP ellipsis, bare geen is possible, in which case it has an –e ending, presumably to license the null NP (cf. Lobeck 1995, Kester 1996):

(18) a. K’en een gene ∅
   I have gene
   'I have none'

However, with NP ellipsis in a negative DP with negated quantifier, geen doubling is ungrammatical:

(18) b. K'(en) een nie vele (*gene) ∅
   I en have not much (*gene)
   'I don't have much'

In a split-topic construction (cf Van Riemsdijk 1989), the quantifier vele can be stranded (19a) but stranded geen is ungrammatical in my idiolect (19b):

(19) a. Boeken een-k vele
    books have I many

b. *Boeken (en)-een-k geen/gene
    books (en) have-I geen/gene

Similarly, with a split construction containing a negated quantifier, doubling geen would also be ungrammatical both in the stranded part (19a) and in the topicalised part (19b). Only the version without geen is acceptable:

---

This section tries to provide an answer to a question raised by Henk van Riemsdijk.
(20)  a. *Boeken (en)-een-k nie vele geen/gene
    books (en) have-I not many geen/gene
  b. *Geen boeken (en)-een-k nie vele
    geen books (en) have-I not many
  c. Boeken (en) een-k nie vele
    books (en) have I not many

On the other hand, when the NP complement of the negative quantifier is extracted as partitive er (cf Bennis 1986: 171-258) on various uses of er), then bare (inflected) geen is possible:

(21)  K’en een der gene.
      I en have there

With partitive er-extraction, negative doubling is marginally possible in (22a), though in my idiolect non-doubled (22b) remains the preferred option.

(22)  a. ??K'(en) een der nie vele gene.
      I (en) have there not many no
      I don't have many of them
  b  K(en) een der nie vele.
      I (en) have there not many

But these data should be investigated further since doubling becomes more natural (23a) when there is an additional negative constituent such as nie meer. Even so, I still prefer the non-doubled (23b).

(23)  a. (??) K'(en) een der nie vele gene nie meer
      I (en) have there not many no no more
      I don't have many of them
  b  K(en) een der nie vele nie meer
      I (en) have there not many no more
This section will outline a first analysis of the DPs with internal negative doubling. Section 6 refines the analysis somewhat.

5.1 *Geen as D [NEG]*

It might at first sight seem natural to propose that *geen* spells out a negated indefinite article, or, putting it differently, that *geen* is the result of a merger of the negative quantifier with the indefinite article. This was the analysis proposed in Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996), and it would be in line with analyses of English *no* as a (negative) determiner (cf. Jackendoff (1977), cited in section 1)

(24)

Evidence in support of this proposal comes from the observation that in the masculine singular *geen* bears the -en- ending which is also found on the article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masc</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Neut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>‘a book’</td>
<td>‘a door’</td>
<td>‘a house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg+singular</td>
<td>‘no book’</td>
<td>‘no door’</td>
<td>‘no house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>‘books’</td>
<td>‘doors’</td>
<td>‘houses’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg+ plural</td>
<td>‘no books’</td>
<td>‘no doors’</td>
<td>‘no houses’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negated quantifiers such as *nie vele* could be argued to occupy a specifier position, and given that in the doubling construction such negated quantifiers precede *geen* one might propose that they occupy [Spec,DP], giving rise to a specifier head.
relation with the head occupied by *geen*. Since both the negated quantifier and *geen* can express sentential negation independently, I assume that both carry the [NEG]-feature.

(26)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{D'} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

a. Nie vele *geen* studenten
   \[\text{[NEG]} \quad \text{[NEG]}\]

b. Nie vele *∅* studenten
   \[\text{[NEG]} \quad \text{[NEG]}\]

Taken this way, the negative doubling pattern in (26a) can be seen as the overt spell out of a checking relation between a negative head *geen* and a negated quantifier (*nie vele*). In the standard language and in the dialects which lack doubling, D [NEG] is zero (26b).\(^6\)

The relation is reminiscent of, for instance, the relation between [Spec,NegP] and the negative head, which is usually taken to be instantiated by French *pas* and *ne*.

(27) a. Je ne mange pas de viande.
   \[I \text{ ne eat not de meat}\]

The difference between standard Dutch and WF could be stated in terms of whether [NEG] on D is spelt out or not. The same kind of variation is instantiated at

\(^6\) Another instance of a specifier head relation with both elements spelt out is illustrated by the doubled possessor construction in (i): (i) dienen vent zyn boeken
   that man his books
(ii) da wuf eur boeken
   that woman her books

In these cases, though, there is an asymmetry in that while the prenominal possessive pronoun may appear without the doubling possessor, the latter, in a prenominal position, requires some spell out of possession relation, either by the doubling pronoun or by the invariant possessor morpheme *se*:

(iii) a. zyn boeken b. eur boeken
    his books her books
(iv) a. dienen vent se boeken da wuf se boeken
    that man *se* books that woman *se* books

For discussion see Haegeman (2000c, 2001).
the clausal level in French: colloquial French allows the negative head to be non-overt:

(27) b. Je mange pas de viande.

WF and standard Dutch differ similarly in terms of the spell out of the negative head *en* on the finite verb (but see note 1 and Haegeman (to appear)) for a different view.

(28) a. Wfl dan-k ik niemand dienen boek gegeven (en)-een
    \[that-I \ I \ no \ one \ that \ book \ given \ (en)-have\]
    'that I have not given anyone that book.'

b. Du dat ik niemand dat boek gegeven heb
    \[that \ I \ no \ one \ that \ book \ given \ have\]

Observe that in my own work (Haegeman 1995) I do not treat the relation between *niemand* and *en* in (28) or that between *pas* and *ne* as 'negative concord'. In my approach, the relation between *niemand* and *en* is a reflex of the Neg-Criterion, a specifier head requirement on negative constituents.\(^7\)

5.2 • A split DP

Though the structure in (26) allows a first description of the WF negative doubling data, additional data make it clear that a more articulated structure of the D-layer will be required. Jackendoff (1977: 105) assumed that 'some quantifiers [some, each, all, no, any, lh] are now articles.' As a first interpretation we might take this to mean that if there is a single designated position for the article, such quantifiers will merge in the sole position D and hence be in complementary distribution with each other and with articles. Negative quantifiers such as *no, geen, kein,* could be seen as the spell out of a negative indefinite article, or, putting it differently, an indefinite article bearing a [NEG] feature. It turns out that, even for English, the assumption, that negative quantifiers such as *geen, kein, no* are the negative form of the

\(^7\) Obviously, the Neg Criterion can be reinterpreted in terms of feature checking (Watanabe 1998, Kato 1999, 2000 etc).

Recall that I reserve the term ‘negative concord’ for the absorption process applying to multiple negative XPs (den Besten’s (1986) ‘negative spread’). I refer to the DP-internal co-occurrence of two negative components, the negated quantifier and *geen*, as negative doubling.
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indefinite article and that they merge in the same position as the indefinite article, i.e. a designated position for articles, $D$, is not straightforward. The following English examples would be problematic for such a view since, in both examples, the quantifier *no* is clearly distinct from the indefinite article *a*:

\[(29)\]

- a. There is no more brutal a species than man. (*Sunday Times. Books. 19.4.98, p. 2*)
- b. The US does well but, contrary to myth, is no more open a society than the UK in terms of social origins and destinations. (*Guardian, 30.4.1, page 11, col 40*)

These examples can be paraphrased as follows:

\[(29)\]

- a’. There is no species more brutal than man.
- b’ There is no society more open than the UK.

The predicative APs *more brutal* and *more open* have inverted with the NP that they are predicated of. Following Bennis et al (1998), to which I return below, I assume that the preposed predicates *more brutal* and *more open* have undergone DP-internal predicate inversion and that they have moved to a pre-nominal specifier position. Assuming that the indefinite article *a* spells out a functional head which we provisionally label $D$, and also assuming that the inverted predicate occupies $\text{[Spec,DP]}$, then we must conclude that at least in (22a) and (22b) the negative quantifier *no* is not inserted at the same point as the indefinite article, i.e. $D$. We conclude that in such cases *no* is merged as a higher functional head. A further illustration of the problem arising in (29) is illustrated by (30):

\[(30)\] On his previous visit he had not been in any too sunny a frame of mind.


Just like *no* in (29), *any* in (30) is not in complementary distribution with the indefinite article.

Data such as (29) and (30) lead us to the conclusion that in the same way that $C$ has to be decomposed into a more articulated structure (Rizzi 1997), $D$ can be decomposed into a sequence of functional heads (cf. Giusti 1996, Haegeman 2001)
and many others). For the present discussion, I will label both relevant functional heads D, since as yet too little is known about the projections in the DP periphery to characterise with more precision the nature of the higher functional head.\(^8\)

\[(31)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{DP2} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{D2} \\
\text{D2} \\
\text{DP1} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{D1} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{no} \\
\text{more brutal} \\
\text{a} \\
\text{species} \\
\text{no} \\
\text{more open} \\
\text{a} \\
\text{society} \\
\text{any} \\
\text{too sunny} \\
\text{a} \\
\text{frame of mind}
\end{array}
\]

English (29a,b) shows that we need to be able to keep separate the negative quantifier no and the indefinite article. It is not clear what happens in examples such as (29a',b'), where there is no separate instantiation of the indefinite article. In these examples no seems to merge the function of article and that of negation. One way of looking at this is to say that in the absence of an overt specifier, D1 incorporates to the higher D2, or alternatively that D may either spell out as one unitary head (along the lines of Jackendoff (1977) there would be a negative indefinite article), or that it may be split over several heads (D1,D2), depending on whether the head features are required to license specifiers.

5.3 • The interaction of geen and zuk

5.3.1 • The data

The splitting of no and the indefinite article in English (29) in the context of predicate inversion is relevant for our analysis of the Flemish DPs with internal negative doubling because in a similar context in the dialect we also find geen emerging separately from the position occupied by the indefinite article. The pattern arises typically with the demonstrative element zuk and is illustrated in (32a), in which geen precedes demonstrative zuk and modifies a singular masculine N student. Observe that the negative quantifier geen lacks the en-ending. (32b)

\(^8\) As pointed out by Chris Collins, an alternative way of analysing these data is to postulate multiple specifiers, with the inverted predicate as an inner specifier and the scope taking negative quantifier as an outer specifier.
illustrates an alternative word order, in which *geen* follows *zuk* and is associated with the *en* –ending (cf (25)).

(32)  

a.  G’ (en)-meugt dat an *geen zuk nen student* tuogen.  
you (en)-may that to no (uninflected) such a student show  
‘You must not show that to such a student.’

b.  G’ (en)-meugt dat an *zuk geen* nen student tuogen.  
you (en)-may that to such no-inflected students show  
‘You must not show that to such a student.’

5.3.2 • Prenominal *zuk*

Before dealing with the interaction of *zuk* and negative quantification, I will briefly discuss some of the properties of *zuk* in WF. I do not provide a full-fledged account here, but I will merely outline those properties that bear on the negative doubling data.

In (33) *zuk* is adjacent to what seems to be an indefinite article. At first sight one might propose that *zuk* is adjoined to D, where it incorporates to the article.

(33)  

a.  K’een ook *zuk nen boek*.  
*I have also such a book*

b.  K’een ook *zuk en deure*.  
*I have also such a door*

c.  K’een ook *zuk en us*.  
*I have also such a house*

Before going into the discussion of (33) I should point out that WF seems also to display an alternative pattern with prenominal *zuk* which I feel is less common and perhaps marginal. It is illustrated in (34). Here, *zuk* follows the article and has adjectival inflection. The pattern is to my mind more acceptable in the plural as illustrated in (35). Given that there is no plural indefinite article, I use definite DPs to illustrate the position of *zukke* with respect to the determiner, here a demonstrative.

(34)  

a.  ?K’een ook nen *zukken boek*.  
*I have also a such book*
b  ?K’een ook en zukke deure.
   *I have also a such a door*

c  ??K’een ook en zuk us.
   *I have also a such a house*

(35)  a.  Die zukke dikke boeken moe-j nie kuopen.
      *those such thick books must-you not buy*
      ’You should not buy such big books.’

b  Die zukke dikke deuren moe-j nie verwen.
   *those such thick doors must-you not paint*
   ’You needn’t paint such thick doors.’

c  Die zukke gruote uzen goan-ze verkuopen.
   *those such tall houses will they sell*
   ’They will sell those high houses.

Though they are obviously also interesting on their own score, I will not go into the data in (34)-(35), in which zuk appears to the right of the article. I assume that zuk is adjectival in nature. Like other prenominal adjectives in WF it agrees with the head noun. Various analyses have been proposed for prenominal adjectives, either they are heads selecting NP complements or they occupy the specifier positions of specialised projections, or they are adjoined to maximal projections (for the various views see Abney 1987, Androtspoulou 1996, Cinque 1994, Delsing 1993, Sproat and Shih 1988).

In (33) zuk precedes what seems to be the singular indefinite article. Let us turn to the plural variant of these examples. In (36) zuk is invariant and it modifies a plural head N. In these examples, though, zuk again precedes what looks like an indefinite article:

(36)  a.  K’een ook zuk en boeken.
       *I have also such en books*

b  K’een ook zuk en deuren.
   *I have also such en doors*

c  K’een ook zuk en uzen.
   I have also such en houses
These examples display what has been called a 'spurious' article (Bennis et al. 1998). Bennis et al. (1998) identify the spurious article in the Standard Dutch constructions in (37). In such cases, a singular - spurious – article, *een* ('a'), spells out the head whose specifier is the landing site of a predicate which has undergone DP-internal leftward movement ('predicate inversion'). The spurious article is insensitive to the number of the head N: *boeken* ('books') in (37b,c,d) is plural. The relevant movement is taken to be A-movement in (37a) and A’-movement in (37b-d). I refer to Bennis et al. (1998) for more discussion and motivation.

(37) a. *een beer van een vent*
   *a bear of een man*
b. *Wat een boeken!*
   *What een books*
c. *wat voor een boeken*
   *what for een books*
d. *zo’n boeken*
   *so-een books*

Following Bennis et al. (1998: 106), I assume that *en* in the WF *zuk*-construction in (36) is a spurious article and that it spells out a DP-internal functional head which I label D. Given the semantic analogy with (37d), I assume that, like *zo* in (37d), *zuk* is the inverted predicate of a small clause which has undergone leftward A’-movement.9

5.3.3 • Prenominal *zuk* and negation

When we turn to the negation of the DP containing *zuk*, there are three options. In (38a) *geen* is added to the pattern in (34), i.e. where *zuk* follows the determiner and is adjectival. I do not deal with this example here. In (38b) *geen* is merged higher than uninflected *zuk*, and the (spurious) article is present. In (38c) *geen* follows uninflected *zuk*.10

---

9 That we have to do with a spurious article is also suggested by data such as those in (i), in which *zuk nen* precedes a mass term *melk* ('milk'):
(i)  *Zuk nen melk drinken-k nie.*
   *such `a` milk drink I not*

10 The alternation between inflected and uninflected *zuk* is also found in German, where *solch* is invariant when preceding the article and agrees with the head noun when following the article.
(38)  a.  K’een geen zukke boeken.
   *I have no such books
   *I have no such books.’

   b  K’een geen zuk en boeken.
   *I have no such en books

   c. K’een zuk geen boeken.
   *I have such no books
   *I have no such books’

Let us suppose that the two D-postions postulated above, D1 and D2, are always projected as separate heads, and that the negative features of a DP is merged in D2. This would be in line with the structure for English (29).

Let us first consider (38b) in which geen precedes zuk. Above I assumed that zuk is an inverted predicate occupying a specifier position whose head is filled by the indefinite article. This would lead to the structure in (39a).

(39)  a. 

For (38c), I will assume that geen continues to occupy D2. I also assume that given that D1 is not spelt out by an article, it has incorporated to D2. In order to derive the order in which zuk precedes geen we could propose that it has either moved to the specifier of D2 (39b) or that it has incorporated to D2 (39c). Below I will show that the latter may be preferable and I will consider the ramifications of this conclusion for the analysis of (38b/39a).
The spurious article emerges in D1 only when the specifier of D1 is filled overtly. This could be related to a requirement on the inverted predicate, possibly the inverted predicate requires for the head to which it moves to be overt.

With the negated quantifier *nie vele*, we get the patterns in (40):

(40) a. \( \text{K'(en)-een nie vele geen zukke boeken.} \)

'I don't have many such books.'

b. \( \text{K'(en)-een nie vele geen zuk en boeken.} \)

'I don't have many such books.'

c. \( \text{K'(en)-een nie vele zuk geen boeken.} \)

'I have no such books.'

In (40a) inflected *zukke* is adjectival and D is *geen*. This example again will not concern us here. For the analysis of (40b) we can use the structure in (39a) as a starting point.
In (41) "nie vele" has a specifier head relation with "geen." This relation can be seen as another instantiation of a licensing requirement on negative quantifiers along the lines of the Neg Criterion (Haegeman and Zanuttini 1991, 1996, Haegeman 1995) or in terms of feature checking (Watanabe 1998, Kato 1999, 2000 etc). As was the case for sentential negation, languages vary with respect to the spell-out of the doubling negative head. Standard Dutch does not allow the spell out of "geen" on D2 when its specifier is filled. WF allows is, indeed it is the preferred option in many cases.

The structure of (40c) should correspond to the structure for (38c) with the addition of the negated quantifier. For (38c) we had envisaged two options, with "zuk" either a specifier of D2 (39b) or adjoined to it (39c). If we assume that the negative quantifier also has to attain a specifier head relation with D2 (in the spirit of the Neg-criterion or of feature matching) then (39b) would lead to a multiple specifier analysis. The inner specifier is the inverted predicate and the outer specifier is "nie vele."

I have so far not opted for the multiple specifier analysis in my other (related) work on sentential negation at the clausal level in WF, I feel that I would only be able to
endorse the multiple specifier analysis if I had also examined its consequences for WF sentential negation.

(39c) allows nie vele to simply be inserted as the specifier of D2:

The proposal that uninflected zuk is adjoined to D2, however, raises a question as to the analysis of examples in which it follows geen. The option I present above has zuk as a specifier of D1, it might also be seen, alternatively, as adjoined to D1. The spell out of the article might be required to provide a morphological host for the incorporation of zuk.

The advantage of the latter option is that it offers a unified analysis for uninflected zuk: it head-joins to either D2 or to D1. We could propose that inflected zuk heads a maximal projection while uninflected zuk is a clitic-like element and is incorporated to a functional head.

6 • THE NEGATIVE QUANTIFIER

At this point I have only dealt with the pattern (9a), repeated here as (45a), which is also the kind of example discussed by Vanacker.
a. K'en-een nie vele geen geld.
I en-have not much no money

In the above I have not detailed the structure of the prenominal negated quantifier. As a first approximation, one might assume that vele heads QP and that nie is its specifier.

(46)
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{Nie} \\
Q' \\
\text{Q} \\
\text{vele}
\end{array}
\]

For completeness' sake, I point out that in many instances, illustrated in (45), there is in addition to the quantificational element also a degree element present in what we could loosely call the prenominal modifiers. (45b-k) illustrate the enriched patterns:

b. K'en-een nie te vele geen geld.
I (en-) have not too much no money

c. K'en-een nie vrie vele geen geld.
I (en-) have not very much no money

d. K'en-een nie zu vrie vele geen geld.
I (en-) have not so very much no money

e. K'en een nie styf vele geen geld.
I (en-) have not very much no money

f. K'en-een nie al te vele geen geld.
I (en-) have not all too much no money

g. K'en-een nie bezunder/speciaal vele geen geld.
I (en-) have not specially much no money

h. K'en een nie vele meer geen geld dan tun.
I (en-) have not much more no money than then

i. K'en-een nie genoeg geen geld.
I (en-) have not enough no money
As shown by the availability of the negative morpheme *en* on the finite verb in (45) the DP-internal negation systematically may take sentential scope. As shown by the examples in (47) all the relevant strings are constituents:

(47) a.  Ge keut da doen [vu nie vele geen geld].
    *you can that do [for not much no money]*

    b.  Ge keut da doen vu [nie te vele geen geld].
    *you can that do for not too much no money*

    c.  Ge keut da doen vu [nie vrie vele geen geld].
    *you can that do for not very much no money*

    d.  Ge keut da doen vu [nie zu vrie vele geen geld].
    *you can that do for not so very much no money*

    e.  Ge keut da doen [nie styf vele geen geld].
    *you can that do for not very much no money*

    f.  Ge keut da doen vo [nie al te vele geen geld].
    *you can that do for not all too much no money*

    g.  Ge keut da doen vu [nie bezunder/* speciaal* vele geen geld].
    *you can that do for not specially much no money*

    h.  Ge keut da kuopen vu [nie vele meer geen geld].
    *you can that buy for not much more no money*

    i.  [An nie genoeg geen mensen] en een'k da keunen zeggen.
    *to not enough no people en have I that can say*

These examples can be handled in the same way as the earlier examples, with additional structure for the negative quantifier in [Spec, DP2]. Assuming that the degree word head a projection selecting QP (Corver 1997a,b), we would however now have to assume that *nie* is the specifier of Deg.
A further complication arises for (45f) repeated here as (49). If we do not allow for multiple specifiers, and if al is a specifier to te in Deg, then it is not possible that nie is the specifier of Deg.

(49) a. nie al te vele
    b. [\[ Nie ]_{DegP} [ al ]_{Deg} [ te ]_{QP} vele ]

In order to accommodate such examples we might in fact propose that nie is a specifier of NegP, both when it functions as clausal negation, and when it functions as a constituent negation (which may also attain clausal scope). This would allow for nie to be generated consistently in the same position.

(49) c. [ NegP nie ]_{Neg} [ NegP al ]_{DegP} [ te ]_{Deg} [ QP vele ]

If all QPs are dominated by DegP, then in the absence of the overt degree word we would have the structure in (49d):

(49) d. [ NegP nie ]_{NegP} [ NegP ]_{DegP} [ QP vele ]

Alternatively, if DegP were only projected when there is an overt degree word, structures without such a degree expression might have the structure in (49e), in which NegP would select QP.
The generalisation of NegP to DegP (and possibly QP) obviously raises further questions. One that concerns us here is whether there should be an NegP projected in the DP. I leave this for future study.

7 • CONCLUSION

The first part of this paper offers a description of DP-internal negative doubling in WF. I discuss the scope and distribution of such DP in comparison with non-doubled DPs with a negative quantifier.

In the second part of the paper I analyse the WF data in the light of the articulation of the DP. An interesting pattern of variation is shown to emerge when we take into consideration the interaction of DP-internal negative doubling with prenominal *zuk*. This leads to the hypothesis of DP-recursion. In the last section of the paper I briefly discuss the syntax of degree expressions and the syntax of negation markers at the sub-clausal level.
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0 • INTRODUCTION

At the turn of the 21st century there are new prospects for the study of dialect syntax. These are primarily due to developments outside dialectology, more exactly in linguistic theorizing. What is responsible for the currently observable rise of dialect syntactic research in several European countries is, in the first place, a broadening of the perspective in recent generative theory and language typology. No longer is it cross-linguistic variation only that matters. Variation within individual languages, too, is increasingly attributed important theoretical significance. One of the consequences of this is that a strong need is felt to improve the empirical basis for reliable descriptive generalizations and for drawing conclusions for linguistic theory. In other words, due to the rising interest in variation across dialects within generative linguistics and language typology, we are witnessing a period in which a much improved data situation will allow us to make substantial advances in exploring dialect grammar and integrating the findings into a larger theoretical frame.

The two major aims of this paper are the following. First of all, the theory-internal developments will be sketched which are responsible for this relatively recent interest in dialect grammar within the generative framework, on the one hand, and the framework of language (more exactly: functional or Greenbergian) typology, on the other hand (Part 2.2). In a second step, the significance of various phenomena of English dialect syntax will be demonstrated when looked at from a generative and functional-typological perspective (Part 4). Before looking at the new prospects, though, the role of dialect syntax in past and, especially, present Anglo-American dialectology will briefly be evaluated.
The study of dialect grammar, especially of the syntax of regional varieties, neither plays nor ever has played a major role in English dialectology. Numerous statements to this effect can be found in the recent literature on English dialects. Just compare Toon on dialect research for the Old English period, Fischer and Lass for the Middle English period, Görlach for the Modern English period and, for example, Wakelin or Trudgill and Chambers on dialect research in the 20th century:

- **OE:** "Syntactic variation between dialects has scarcely been studied and in any event the material is relatively meagre." (Toon 1992: 451)

- **ME:** "The Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English (1986) provides an extensive survey of dialectal differences in the fields of phonology, morphology and lexis, but it has nothing on syntactic variants. In the introduction it is stated that 'it may well be that syntax will perforce remain the Cinderella of Middle English dialectology' (McIntosh et al. 1986: 32)." (Fischer 1992: 208)

- **EModE:** "... evidence of Early Modern English dialect syntax is almost nil." (Görlach 1999: 492)

- **PrDE:** "... modern dialectology has until recently largely neglected the field of syntax..." (Görlach 1999: 493)

  "Syntax is an unwieldy subject which dialectologists have fought shy of." (Wakelin 1977: 125)

A major part of the problem in the second half of this century has been the absence of reliable data and, to start with, a sufficient amount of data. Take, for instance, the Survey of English Dialects (SED), which was compiled in the course of the 1950s and has served as the most important data source for English dialectologists and dialect geographers in the last four decades. This major survey was simply not geared to the systematic collection of syntactic data, despite the good and serious intentions Harold Orton and Eugen Dieth, whose brainchild the SED was, may originally have had (cf. Kirk 1985: 130). Only a fraction of the 1322 questions in the SED questionnaire was explicitly
designed to collect morphological and syntactic information (cf. Klemola 1996: 39). Thus, for example, Upton et al. (1994) compiled their SED-grammar on the basis of breadcrumbs, as it were, making use in particular of the (relatively scarce) grammatical information to be obtained from the answers collected for the bulk of questions geared towards phonology and lexis. In addition, they drew upon parts of the so-called incidental material of the SED, i.e. utterances that the fieldworkers picked up during their interviews or from more informal conversations with the informants and took down in their notebooks. The latter type of material “proved to be specially rich” (Upton et al. 1994: 479) for finding out more about syntactic variation across English dialects as displayed by traditional dialect speakers (the well-known NORMS).¹

Even today, when we look at current Anglo-American dialect research, there is no denying that the study of dialect syntax still constitutes no more than a sideline, despite the statement by Trudgill/Chambers (1991: 1) that there has been a noticeable "upsurge" in attention to dialect syntax since the 1980s, especially in the British Isles.² For instance, none of the papers in the proceedings volume edited by Upton and Wales (1999) addresses a problem of dialect syntax, although this volume is meant to provide a survey of "current research projects in urban as well as rural dialect studies" (1999: vii). In the last 20 years morphology and syntax have regularly played a role only in connection with the substrate question of the so-called Celtic Englishes (like "Which features of Irish English go back to Irish Gaelic?") and in studies concerned with the genesis of African American Vernacular English (just witness Poplack’s volume on The English History of African American English (2000)). What still dominates dialectological research are phonological studies, these days especially in connection with urban varieties (for a recent publication cf. Foulkes/Docherty (1999) Urban Voices or Labov’s studies (e.g. in Labov 1994).²

¹ But, to be fair, we should not forget one of the major aims of the SED. Along with documenting regional differences in the middle of the 20th century, "Orton and Dieth were explicitly interested in modern dialects as evidence for [the] study of historical varieties of English,..." (Kretzschmar 1999: 274), thus continuing the 19th century tradition of English (and German) dialectology (just cf. A.J. Ellis' survey of the phonology of English dialects (1889)). And since syntax played no or no more than a minor role in historical dialectology, the problem that the SED-material poses for dialect syntacticians was to be expected.

² The full statement runs as follows: "In recent years there has been a move, as far as interest in dialects of English is concerned, from a concern with purely phonological, lexical and historical issues towards a deeper interest in the grammar of different English varieties. This is especially true of syntax, which has traditionally received much less attention from dialectologists than morphology. This upsurge has been particularly noticeable, in the 1980s, in the British Isles." (as opposed to North America; Trudgill/Chambers 1991: 1)
and to appear) on the Northern City Shift in the United States). New research trends are linked to this: studies on language (or in this case: dialect) and identity, and studies within the framework of perceptual dialectology, i.e. on how people perceive speech features and dialects (Preston 1999; cf. also Kretzschmar 1999: 279).

This is not to deny, of course, that there exist quite a number of publications on English dialect syntax. For the most part, though, they concentrate on just one particular phenomenon in one particular dialect or dialect area, are based on a very small database and are purely descriptive. Furthermore, the small size of the database often makes it very difficult to arrive at valid descriptive generalizations. Virtually non-existent in English dialectology are systematic comparative studies, whether theory-driven or not, of individual grammatical subsystems across a selection of dialects (like comparative studies of the tense and aspect systems, pronominal systems, relativization or complementation patterns).

This is the rather sobering situation of dialect syntax in past and current dialectology. There are, however, new prospects for the study of the morphology and especially syntax of regional varieties of English (and, I should add, of other languages). These prospects are primarily due to the two developments mentioned in the introduction: a growing interest in syntactic variation both from a generativist and typological point of view and, largely as a consequence of this, a much improved data situation.

2 • WHY NEW PROSPECTS NOW?

2.1 • The data situation
The data situation has improved and continues to improve in three ways. First, of the SED data, there is more material than the so-called “Basic Material” (elicited by the questionnaire) and the so-called “Incidental Material” (in the field workers’ notebooks) which will soon be ready for linguistic analysis. These are the 8-10 minute sound recordings from all SED localities, which will shortly be published on CD-ROM (Klemola 2001). Here we have stretches of fairly natural informal discourse (however brief) which, together with the incidental
material, may at least augment grammatical analyses of the individual dialects. In both types of material we run a much greater chance of encountering certain constructions that are far less frequently found in the rather formal questionnaire-oriented interview situation (e.g. unstressed periphrastic do in affirmative sentences, which occurs very frequently in the fieldworkers' notebooks for the English Southwest).

Second, more and more efforts are made at collecting interviews with dialect speakers which provide us with long stretches of conversational, more or less informal discourse. As is well-known, a much larger amount of data is necessary for the study of syntax than for the study of phonology and lexis. One important source that is currently being exploited are interviews conducted in oral history projects across the British Isles in the course of the 1970s and 1980s. These discourse data are being made available in the form of computerized corpora, which shortly will, and to some extent already do, lend themselves to all the corpus-analytic methods and studies familiar from research based on, for example, the British National Corpus (which itself provides some dialect material). A computerized corpus of English dialects has been built up over the last three years in the English department at the University of Freiburg (FRED). The result already constitutes the largest corpus of English dialects that has ever been computerized (currently some 1.5 million words). So the Freiburg research team will soon be able to formulate much more reliable descriptive generalizations than in the past and to perform, at least for high-frequency phenomena, quantitative analyses, which according to Kretzschmar (1999: 282) "will be the hallmark of future analysis in dialectology".

Third, the need is felt for collecting new data, data which represent the status of regional and urban varieties of English around the year 2000 and, on top of that, do not neglect issues of dialect grammar as they were neglected in the SED. There are currently two major models for this kind of data collection: One large project is being planned in England (the Survey of Regional English (SuRE); cf. Kerswil/Llamas/Upton 1999) whose aim it simply is to record as much natural discourse material as possible, without following a strict questionnaire method. The second type of project intends to collect data specifically for the purpose of syntactic analyses, using elicitation questionnaires. This method is currently being explored in Switzerland for
Swiss dialect syntax (cf. the contributions by Glaser, Fleischer, and Seiler, this volume) and in The Netherlands and Belgium for the SAND project on Dutch and Flemish dialect syntax. This method is also anticipated in the second phase of the Freiburg research project on the syntax of English dialects.3

2.2 • DIALECT SYNTAX IN CURRENT LINGUISTIC THEORISING
Even more important with regard to the present state and especially the future of dialect syntactic research is the growing interest in dialect syntax outside dialectology, more exactly in generative syntactic theory and, as yet much less pronounced, in functional approaches to grammar. This is an extremely astonishing development in view of the often stated lack of interest or even averseness of traditional dialectological research to linguistic theorising (cf. Kretzschmar 1999: 274, Chambers/Trudgill 1991) and, vice versa, the lack of interest of syntactic theory in issues of variation, at least up to the 1980s. But the changed role of variation in more recent generative theory is indeed the key to understanding the new development: "... variation [has indeed become, B.K.] highly relevant for the theoretical grammarian" (Haspelmath 1999: 191).

2.2.1 • Syntactic theory: Principles & Parameters and Optimality Theory
In generative linguistics, variation seriously started to matter with the advent of the Principles & Parameters approach in the 1980s, i.e. the idea that Universal Grammar (UG) is an invariant system of highly abstract principles some of which, within a given language, permit at most a specified degree of variation. The (core) grammar of any particular language is considered to consist of these universal principles and the language-specific settings for a small number of parameters or, as Chomsky puts it (1995: 129), "... the rules of L are the principles of UG as parameterized for L." The concept of parametric variation thus accounts for variation observable across languages.

Important for this paper is the crucial step that was taken in generative studies from the study of parametric (more exactly, macroparametric) variation

---

3 Note, incidentally, that the data situation for Early (and Late) Modern English may also soon be brightening up given, for example, the Corpus of Early English Correspondence that is currently being compiled at the English Department of the University of Helsinki (Terttu Nevalainen, Irma Taavitsainen, Matti Rissanen).
to the study of microparametric, i.e. language-internal, variation. Relevant research is strongest for Italian, Dutch and Flemish dialects; less frequent are studies on microparametric syntax in German dialects (with the exception of Bavarian and individual dialects of Swiss German), and least frequent for English dialects. With regard to the further development of generative theory, the study of microparametric syntax is expected to yield more insights into, for example, the form and range of syntactic parameters as well as into the effects which variation along a single parameter may have. Compare the following quotations:

on the form of syntactic parameters: "It seems reasonable to expect work in microparametric syntax to play a privileged role in the future in answering the more general question concerning the form that syntactic parameters may take. Chomsky's recent work, for example, suggests that all syntactic variation might be expressible in terms of strong/weak features on various functional heads; microparametric work will enable to test this kind of hypothesis in a particularly interesting way." (Kayne 1996: xiv)

on the range of syntactic parameters: "Note that there has in effect been a shift in linguistic theory recently, though one that has been largely unacknowledged,... [...] ..., we have moved from a conception of parameters as very wide-ranging to one where,..., they cover a much smaller range of phenomena. What we have found out about dialect variation suggests that this is the right approach. [...] However we formalise these, we have to admit that something like construction-specific differences between dialects, and optionality of movement, must be able to be part of the variation between grammars permitted by UG, something which we might have missed if study was confined to the larger-scale differences typically found between those varieties generally characterised as different languages." (Henry 1996: 91f.)

on variation along a single parameter: "In a linguistic group of interrelated dialects with little differentiation, we can expect to find realized only those

---

possibilities which are admitted by the theory. It is evident, then, that the more the dialects are similar to one another, the more possible it becomes to find, for a specific grammatical area, the ideal case of some dialects differing only in respect to phenomena that can be traced back unambiguously to a single parameter." (Benincà 1989: 3)

Note that in generative linguistics of the 1990s, the study of cross- and intralinguistic variation continues to matter not only within the Principles & Parameters approach, but also in one of the latest developments of generative linguistics, namely Optimality Theory (for an overview cf. Archangeli/Langendoen 1997). Optimality Theory views UG as a set of constraints that can be violated. It further holds that each language makes use of the same set of constraints, but has its own rankings for these constraints, so that the differences between constraint rankings give rise to systematic variation between and within (!) languages (in synchrony and diachrony; cf. also Dahl 1999: 209).\(^5\) Optimality within this theory means that a particular constraint ranking chosen in any given language will satisfy the relevant constraints best. This can be achieved, for example, by tolerating violations of lower ranked constraints in order to help avoid violating some higher ranked constraint (cf. Archangeli 1997: 15f.).

2.2.2 • Functional typology
Like the generative approach, functional typology pursues the aims of identifying language universals and, more modestly, determining the patterns and limits of cross-linguistic variation.\(^6\) Like the generative approach, its major focus is on morphology and syntax. Like the generative approach, it also has an

---

\(^5\) Of course, historical variation is also accounted for in this way. As Traugott (1999: 238) puts it: "It is a given of OT that differences among dialects and stages of a language can be accounted for in terms of different rankings [of constraints, B.K.]." Compare also Kayne's statement on the significance of the study of microparametric syntax for the study of diachronic syntax: "It is also clear that the study of minimal syntactic variation is bound to provide crucial evidence bearing on questions of diachronic syntax (which involves the study of the minimally different stages in the evolution of the syntax of a language)." (1996: xiv)

\(^6\) Just compare the striking similarities between this characterization and the following definition of linguistics from a recent introduction to Optimality Theory. Anyone who does not know the source would rather expect this to be a definition entertained in language typology. "There are two central research objectives in linguistics. The first is to determine and characterize universal properties of language..., ..., the second research objective in linguistics [is] to determine and characterize the range of possible language variation." (Archangeli 1997: 2)
important diachronic dimension (cf. Kortmann 1997, Croft 1990: 203-245 or, most recently, Croft 2000). Among the major differences between these two approaches are the following: functional typology has a much stronger empirical orientation and, above all, advocates the hypothesis that form, i.e. linguistic structure, should primarily be explained in terms of (linguistic, communicative) function (cf. Croft 1990: 2).

A rather minor difference, which is important though in the context of this paper, is the following: much earlier than functional typology, namely in the 1980s, did generative theory acknowledge the importance of studying intralinguistic variation (i.e. microparametric syntax) besides cross-linguistic variation. In functional typology we can only observe first steps in that direction. In fact, as yet these steps have primarily been taken by the present author’s own research group, which aims to study English dialect syntax from a typological perspective (cf. Kortmann 1999). Among other things, this means that the cross-dialectal variation observable in individual domains of grammar (e.g. negation, relative clauses, pronominal systems) is judged against the cross-linguistic variation described in typological studies: How much of the range of variation across languages is found in varieties of a single language? Adopting a typological approach also means that the Freiburg research group will soon be using questionnaires for the collection of dialect syntactic data which will follow the format of such questionnaires in recent typological research, also taking into consideration, however, the experiences Glaser’s research team on Swiss dialect syntax has made with their questionnaire method (cf. Glaser 2000, Glaser/Bucheli this volume).

Both dialect syntacticians and typologists are bound to profit from this kind of approach. On the one hand, dialectologists can draw upon a large body of typological insights in and hypotheses on language variation, which simply helps them to look at dialect data from a different perspective; no longer is it just the historical perspective or the comparison with the standard variety that matters in evaluating the observable cross-dialectal variation. On the other hand, typologists will get a broader and, perhaps, more adequate picture of what a given language is like when no longer ignoring dialectal variation. To start
with, they will encounter variation at their doorstep, as it were, variation that otherwise can only be observed, if at all, in languages in other parts of the world. Moreover, it is a much ignored problem that, for languages that do have standards, typology is typically concerned with the standard varieties only and, which makes it even worse, with the written standards. Especially the grammars of languages with a long literary tradition (like many European languages) may have been subject to non-natural language change in the course of their history, be it due to prescriptivist grammarians or kind of “levelling processes” that affected particularly the written language. This is an important factor to be reckoned with in the shaping of the Standard Average European language complex.

This concludes the scene-setting first part of this paper. In the second part (sections 3 and 4) the focus will be on the presentation and discussion of a selection of phenomena in English dialect syntax, especially when looked at from a generative and functional-typological point of view.

---

7 Consult the following homepage for information on the current research activities within the project and the current state of the computerized Freiburg Corpus of English Dialects (FRED): http://www.uni-freiburg.de/philfak3/eng/.  
8 The reason for this is of course not one of principle, but one of practicality, or simply convenience. The major source of information for the relevant languages typically is a (set of) reference grammar(s), and these are based on the standard varieties.
Rather than culling data from a wide range of English dialects, it will be syntactic phenomena from one particular dialect area that will be discussed, this area being the Southwest of England. According to Wakelin (1986: 3) this area is mainly constituted by the counties of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, South Avon, Wiltshire and Dorset, with East Cornwall, Devon and (West) Somerset forming its core. Anyone who knows a little bit about English dialects will not be surprised by this choice. Since medieval times the rural dialects of the geographically rather secluded Southwest of England have constituted one of the most distinctive and best known dialect areas (best known not only by specialists but, to the present day, by their fellow countrymen and women; cf. e.g. Ihalainen 1998 and Inoue 1999). In this respect the Southwest is only rivalled by the dialects of East Anglia and the North (especially Northeast) of England. Noteworthy from a phonological point of view, for example, is the rhoticity of the southwestern dialects and the voicing of the voiceless fricatives \( [f,s,ʃ] \), which are pronounced \( [v,z,ʒ] \), as in \( [vɔks] \) fox, \( [zi:] \) see, or \( [ʒʊr] \) sure.

There are three major reasons for choosing the English Southwest for the purposes of illustration in this paper:

(a) As in their phonology, the relevant dialects exhibit a relatively large number of grammatical properties which make them distinct as a dialect group among the regional varieties of the British Isles. Several of these properties are almost impossible to observe outside this area and are extremely interesting to look at from a theoretical perspective. In addition, of that, we can of course observe features of grammar here that are found in other dialect areas, too, so that for these features the SW is as good a point of departure as any other dialect area.

(b) It is the Southwest for which we can find a considerable number of recent publications offering fairly detailed syntactic analyses based upon carefully collected and relatively recent material (notably those by Ossi Ihalainen and Juhani Klemola in Helsinki).

(c) It is the Southwest (mostly Somerset) for which the Freiburg research group has compiled one of the largest subcorpora of the Freiburg English Dialect Corpus (currently about 160,000 words including many unpublished interviews...
of dialect speakers born around 1900). So the data situation is very good, relatively speaking, and allows us to put to test many previously made claims which were based on far fewer data. In fact, at various points of this paper it will be seen that claims made in the relevant literature (even in relatively recent publications) cannot be upheld in light of the FRED data. To give just one example: In a study of relative clauses in the Southwest, Ihalainen (1980: 189) claims that the relativizer that is only used for relativizing subjects and prepositional objects, but not for relativizing NPs serving as the direct object in the relative clause (for instance I know the man that you just greeted is claimed to be out). This would be extremely astonishing since it contradicts the predictions of the well-known Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy by Keenan and Comrie (cf. also section 4.2.2). But this problem is really simply a problem of too few data that Ihalainen had to work with. In the FRED data from the Southwest there is ample evidence for that relativizing NPs in the direct object function, too.

The grammatical features to be observed in the dialects of the Southwest fall into three main groups: exclusively southwestern features (Group 1), features also found in other dialect areas (Group 2), and features that are no longer regionally bound and rather constitute part of a general spoken non-standard (Group 3). The lists for the second and third group are non-exhaustive; also the boundaries between these two groups are anything but hard and fast. The five features in bold print (1a, 2a, 3e, 3f, and 4a) will be returned to in section 4, where they will be discussed with regard to their significance in syntactic theory and functional typology.

• **Group 1** exclusively southwestern features: these are essentially to be found in two domains of grammar, namely verbs, as in (1), and pronouns, as in (2) (cf. also Wakelin 1986: 33 and Ihalainen 1991: 105):

---

9 The author would like to thank Juhani Klemola (Helsinki) for the permission to make use of his data from the English Southwest, which formed the central basis for Klemola (1996). These data approximately account for 20% of the relevant subcorpus of FRED.

10 Compare, for example, Cheshire/Edwards/Whittle (1993) for a set of grammar features characteristic of a large number of British urban dialects. Thus the Group-2 features in (3a,b) and (3e,f) are candidates for Group-
(1a) unstressed \textit{do} as simple tense-carrier in affirmative sentences

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{We do breed our own cows. This man what do own this,...}
\item \textit{We’ve been up milking at 6 o’clock in the morning, and then we did go on haymaking,...}
\end{itemize}

(1b) \textit{be}-paradigm: e.g. invariant \textit{be} in the present tense, clitics:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{I’m}/\textit{you’re}/\textit{we’re}/\textit{they’re}, negation: \textit{bain’t}
\end{itemize}

(1c) special morphological marking (-\textit{y}) of intransitive verbs or intransitively used transitive verbs (extremely rare):

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Then you had to stand in and milky,...} (Somerset)
\item \textit{Can you zew up these zeam? vs. Can you zewy?} (Dorset)
\end{itemize}

(2a) \textit{gender diffusion}: gender system primarily sensitive to mass/count distinction (\textit{it} for mass nouns, \textit{he/she} for count nouns):

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Pass the bread - it’s over there. vs. Pass the loaf - he’s over there.}
\item \textit{Sewing machine? You’d better take he back where you had him from.}
\end{itemize}

(2b) pronoun exchange: the use of subject pronouns in object position and, occasionally, the converse:\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{O-Pro in S-position: Her don’t like it! Us be a-goin.}
\item \textit{S-Pro in O-position: I used to go up to my uncle’s and help he.}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Work didn’t frighten we, we knew we had to do it,...}
\item \textit{He were along with we.}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{3} membership: regularized reflexives (3a), unmarked plurals after numerals (3b), \textit{were/was}-generalization (3e), and \textit{what} as a general relativizer (3f).

\textsuperscript{11} Note that pronoun exchange is an extremely rare phenomenon. It accounts for less than 1\% of all cases in the FRED subcorpus for the Southwest analyzed so far (some 160,000 words, with a strong Somerset bias). Moreover, there are hardly any instances of object pronouns in subject position. For most speakers in our corpus no instances were found, at all; and those speakers who do use object pronouns in subject position do this primarily in questions and, especially, question tags (cf. similarly Ihalainen 1991: 106), i.e. employ the object form as a kind of weak, unstressed form of the subject pronoun. It seems more adequate to speak no longer of pronoun exchange, but rather of a pronounced tendency for ‘subject’ pronouns to do service for all grammatical functions: subject, direct object, and prepositional object. Thus in the Somerset dialect(s) we observe a further reduction of case-marking in English.
(c) they instead of them and those: to/with/under they, I used to go
down there couple hours and mind they cows, in they days

(d) special pronominal forms: e.g. thou, thee, unstressed un/en for
him, unstressed ee for he (in South Devon also for ye/thee)

(e) special demonstrative pronouns (extremely rare):
e.g. thick/thicky (here), thuck/thucker (there)

- Group 2 features also found in other dialect areas:

(3) (a) regularized reflexives-paradigm (possessive pronoun +
self/selves)
(b) unmarked plurals after numerals (e.g. three year)
(c) irregular use (omission or insertion) of article:
omission: I had nice garden..., they had awful job...; Father
rented the farm under Squire, take them to market
insertion: about a three fields or about a seven inches square on
a board; I had the toothache

(d) regularized Past and Past Participle forms of irregular verbs

(e) regularized be-paradigms: e.g. generalization of were or was
(Southwest: were-generalization in positive
contexts; in negative contexts generalization of
weren’t or (!) wasn’t)

(f) special relativization strategies: e.g.
- gapping in subject position: There was one or two people___
made their living by this.
- shadow (or: resumptive) pronouns: I jumped in and bought this,
which I were lucky in a way to get
it.
- Southwest: what ... they’d put a couple in the old anchor boat
what we weren’t using it
• **Group 3** features no longer regionally bound, constituting part of a general spoken non-standard English:

(4) (a) **double/multiple negation** (*I’ve never been to market to buy no heifers*)

(b) **them instead of those** (e.g. *one of them things what run around*)

(c) **me instead of my/I**

### 4 • CASE STUDIES

In the present section five of the grammatical features in Groups 1 to 3 will briefly be discussed in order to demonstrate what can be interesting about dialect data when looked at from a generative or typological point of view.

#### 4.1 • Unstressed periphrastic do from a generative perspective

The use of unstressed periphrastic *do* as a simple tense-carrier in affirmative sentences, as in the examples in (1a), seems to be a truly southwestern innovation documented already in the 13th century (Fischer 1992: 272, Tristram 1997: 413, Garrett 1998: 284). Among the dialects of English today, those of the Southwest have gone furthest in grammaticalising *do* as a tense marker. From a generative perspective the existence of this construction causes a significant problem for an argument advanced by Chomsky in a 1995 article (first published in 1989) on the “Economy of Derivation and Representation”. Chomsky constructs an argument why English needs the rule of *do*-support in interrogatives and why at the same time the use of unstressed *do* as a tense carrier in declaratives is ungrammatical or “illegitimate”, as he calls it. English needs the clearly language-specific rule of *do*-insertion in interrogatives lacking auxiliaries because otherwise the "legitimate D-Structure representation" in (5) would not permit a legitimate, i.e. grammatical, output.

---

12 Cf. Klemola (1996) for a detailed account of *do*-periphrasis as in (1a) for the English Southwest.

13 Note that even in the fast-changing world of of syntactic theory Chomsky’s account is still relevant today (cf., for example, Radford 1997 or Collins 2001). An alternative argument for why English needs *do*-support has been suggested and has "gained some support" within an economy-based framework in the meantime (cf. Collins 2001: 46 on Bobaljík 1995 and Lasnik 1995), but from a dialectological point of view it suffers from the same fundamental problems as Chomsky’s account does. This alternative argument is based on adjacency and assumes that the inflectional head I(NFL) contains an affix. Under this approach the use of unstressed *do* in *John did write books* is blocked because *do*-support is legitimate only "when the derivation would otherwise lead to a stranded affix" (Collins 2001: 46) and thus to an ungrammatical output.
In Chomsky’s words, "To permit an output from the legitimate D-Structure representation ... [in (5), B.K.], English makes use of the dummy element do to bear the affix,..." Only this rule of do-support yields the grammatical English question Did John write books? The interesting point Chomsky (1995: 139 f.) now makes is this: "The same device, however, permits the illegitimate form John did write books (do unstressed) alongside John wrote books, both deriving from the declarative form corresponding to (5) (lacking Q)" [i.e. from the D-Structure representation in (6), B.K.].

(5) Q John I Agr write books

Chomsky continues (1995: 140): "In fact, this option is not only available but in fact arguably obligatory [my emphasis, B.K.] if shorter derivations are always preferred. The reason is that the illegitimate form requires only the rule of do-insertion and raising, whereas the correct form requires overt lowering and subsequent LF raising." So Chomsky has three problems:

Problem 1: The do-insertion rule that is necessary for English interrogatives is not allowed in the case of declaratives although, within the economy-based approach that Chomsky himself is advocating, it represents the more elegant, because more economical rule ("... shorter derivations are always chosen over longer ones", 1995: 139).

Problem 2 is concerned with the competition between principles of Universal Grammar (UG) and language-particular rules. In the case of interrogatives, English needs a language-specific rule "... to 'save' a D-Structure representation yielding no [grammatical] output,..." (1995: 140). In other words, here a language-specific rule, namely do-support, is necessary, a “last resort” as it were (Radford 1997: 219), to save a representation that strictly abides by UG principles. But why does not the same happen for do-support in declaratives? Because, according to Chomsky (ibid.) “... UG principles are applied wherever possible, with language-particular rules used only to 'save' a D-Structure representation yielding no output:.... UG principles are thus 'less costly' than
language-specific principles.” In simple words: You could not ask a grammatical question in English if it was not for the do-support rule. But since there exists a grammatical declarative sentence *John wrote books*, which is formed according to UG principles, do-support does not apply in the case of declaratives. It would be unnecessarily costly.

Problem 3: Chomsky evidently does not know about the dialects of the English Southwest and their use of unstressed *do* as a simple tense carrier in declarative sentences. What then does the existence of the "illegitimate" construction *John did write books* along (!) with the legitimate construction *John wrote books* in these dialects mean for Chomsky’s line of reasoning? On the one hand he can be happy, since this solves Problem 1. Within his economy-driven approach, it makes perfect sense for a variety of English to have the insertion of unstressed *do* in declaratives. On the other hand, there is really bad news for the solution that Chomsky suggests for Problem 2. In the Southwestern dialects a language-/dialect-particular rule seems to permit overruling principles of UG even if they yield legitimate output; these dialects allow both the ‘less costly’ and the ‘more costly’ solution, as it were. Languages or dialects, it seems, may happily let universal principles and language-particular rules compete, allowing also for rivalling outputs. Haegeman/Guéron’s (1999: 633) distinction between ‘core grammars’ of a language (governing the unmarked variety) and ‘peripheral grammars’ of a language (governing special registers and styles) also offers no solution to this problem. Surely, Chomsky’s model of the division of tasks between UG principles and language-particular rules should apply to peripheral grammars, too. In the face of this situation, Chambers/Trudgill (1991: 295) have a point when concluding that, with regard to this division of tasks, “..., the generality of Chomsky’s claim simply dissolves, rendering it vacuous.” But maybe this is the kind of problem that Optimality Theory can help to solve: the dialects of the English Southwest, it could be argued, exhibit a different constraint ranking from Standard British English.14

---

14 It could also be argued that, given the existence of unstressed periphrastic *do* in the Southwest, in the relevant dialects INFL is a stronger head than in other varieties of English, notably Standard English, since this position is often (though not obligatorily) filled even in unemphatic declarative sentences (cf. Radford 1997: 218f. and 226ff. on Chomsky’s strength metaphor).
4.2 • Three domains of grammar from a typological perspective

In this section three domains of dialect syntax will be commented on from the point of view of functional typology. The three domains are gender diffusion in the Southwest, relativization and negation (cf. Kortmann 1999 for a fuller account).

4.2.1 • Gender diffusion

Gender diffusion as exemplified in (2a) essentially involves a semantic system of gender marking. Unlike the system in Standard English, though, this gender system is not primarily sensitive to the animate/inanimate-distinction, but rather to the distinction between mass and count nouns: it is used only for mass nouns, count nouns take he unless they refer to female humans, in which case she is used (cf. (7 and 8).

(7) it: only for mass nouns
    he: only for count nouns (male humans or nonhumans)
    she: only for count nouns (female humans)

(8) a. Pass the bread - it’s over there.
    b. Pass the loaf - he’s over there.

Among varieties of English, such or similar gender systems have only been observed in the English Southwest, from where it was exported, as it were, to Newfoundland and, possibly, to Tasmania (cf. Pawley 1994). Interesting from a typological perspective is, first of all, that a semantic gender system which is primarily conditioned by the mass/count distinction is extremely unusual and has not been described for a European language so far. So here we have a case of variation at our doorstep which typologists otherwise have to go a long way for. Secondly, Siemund (2001) has looked at a range of languages with semantic gender systems and comes to the conclusion "... that the inanimate nouns treated as animate in this way come from relatively homogeneous semantic domains and are surprisingly similar in languages that are completely

---

15 These domains are only three of many that could be discussed from a typological perspective. Periphrastic do, for example, has recently also been investigated from exactly this angle (cf. van der Auwera 1999).
unrelated in genetic terms. Among the domains recurring in language after language are higher and lower animals, heavenly bodies, plants, body parts, instruments... and household utilities”. Moreover, he formulates the hypothesis that a high degree of individuation may be the crucial clue for understanding assignment of animate gender to inanimate nouns, "i.e. the use of he and she with inanimates occurs predominantly with those inanimate nouns that denote highly individualised entities. The animation of mass nouns, by contrast, is an extremely rare phenomenon”. It remains to be seen to what extent this hypothesis will stand the test of time and further data (e.g. the 'gender' behaviour of abstract nouns), but Siemund’s study itself is a very nice (and, to the present author’s knowledge, the first) example of a typological study that was triggered by studies on dialect syntax, in this case on gender diffusion in the English Southwest.

4.2.2 • Relevatization

There is one particular relativization strategy that is very common in English dialects (including the Southwest) but not found, at all, in Standard English: zero-relativization (or: gapping) of the subject position, as in (3f). Noteworthy from a typological perspective is that in having this relativization strategy, English dialects conform to basic constraints on and predictions of Keenan and Comrie’s Accessibility Hierarchy (1977, 1985) where Standard English does not.

(9) Accessibility Hierarchy (AH) in the original version:

subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique > genitive > object of comparison

According to the AH, if a language can relativize any NP position further down on the hierarchy, it can also relativize all positions higher up, i.e. to the left of it. This is what Hawkins (1999: 256), from a processing point of view, recently formulated as the Relative Clause Gap Hierarchy. For gapping there is thus a clear prediction that the relativized NP is most likely to be gapped if it is the subject of the relative clause, next most likely if it is the direct object of the relative clause, etc. (cf. Keenan 1985: 154). English dialects conform to this
prediction whereas Standard English does not: here only the (direct, prepositional) object position can be relativized by gapping.

Another basic constraint on the AH is that any relative-clause forming strategy must apply to a continuous segment of the hierarchy. It is this constraint that made Ihalainen's earlier mentioned observation on relative clauses introduced by *that* look rather suspicious right from the start (cf. section 3). Ihalainen (1980) claimed that in the Southwest such relative clauses are used only for the relativization of the subject and indirect object/oblique position. This would have meant a non-continuous segment on the AH and would thus have run counter to it.

Another relativization strategy often found in dialects is pronoun retention, i.e. the use of resumptive (or: shadow, copy pronouns). Here Keenan/Comrie made the prediction that this strategy is more likely to be used for positions further down on the AH. Compare similarly the prediction made by Hawkins’ (1999: 258) "Relative Clause Copy Pronoun Hierarchy: If a relative clause is grammatical in position P on a complexity hierarchy H, then copy pronouns will be grammatical in all lower positions that can be relativized at all." This remains to be tested for varieties of English, but is most likely to be confirmed.16

4.2.3 • Negation

Negation is yet another area of grammar where English dialects conform to prevailing cross-linguistic tendencies whereas Standard English does not. Double (or: multiple) negation is a well-known case in point. What is less known is that the pronounced tendency to use invariant negation markers (*don’t, ain’t*) in many non-standard varieties of English seems to follow a pattern that has been observed by Bernini/Ramat (1996) for Finnic languages, for example. Within Europe, these are the only languages besides Standard English (!) with inflected verbs or auxiliaries that must be used in negation. For the Finnic languages, Bernini/Ramat identify "a growing tendency to transform these verbs or negative auxiliaries into invariable NEG markers" (1996: 111).

---

16 The use of resumptive pronouns violates the Silent Trace Constraint in Optimality Theory ("Don't pronounce the trace of a moved constituent."). Far more on this constraint and under which conditions it can be violated (e.g. in conversational English), cf. Pesetsky (1997: 153ff.).
This is exactly what we can observe in many non-standard varieties of English. In fact, this is part of the supra-regional spoken non-standard English.\textsuperscript{17}

In her monograph \textit{Negation in Non-Standard British English}, Anderwald (to appear) makes another interesting observation that has hardly been noticed yet. This observation links up with what was said above about the regularization of the \textit{be}-paradigm in many traditional and modern dialects: for the past tense, for example, as illustrated in (3e) many dialects use either \textit{was} or \textit{were} for all persons in the singular and plural. The dialects of the Southwest generalize \textit{were}. Anderwald investigated among other things these two generalization strategies for negative sentences and found the following three patterns:

\begin{enumerate}[a.]
  \item \textit{was}-generalization in positive and negative contexts (\textit{was} - \textit{wasn’t})
  \item \textit{were}-generalization in positive and negative contexts (\textit{were} – \textit{weren’t})
  \item mixed system: \textit{was}-generalization in positive contexts and \textit{weren’t}-generalization in negative contexts
\end{enumerate}

The patterns in (b) and (c) are characteristic of non-standard varieties of current British English, with the mixed system in (c) being the more frequent pattern of the two.\textsuperscript{18} According to Anderwald, varieties making use of this mixed system have "remorphologized"\textsuperscript{19} the \textit{was}-\textit{were} distinction: the number distinction for the \textit{was}/\textit{were} choice familiar from Standard English has been replaced by a polarity distinction. This Anderwald interprets from a functional point of view. In the relevant varieties we can observe a maximization of the phonological and morphological difference between the positive and the negative form of past tense BE (\textit{was} vs. \textit{weren’t}). This maximized formal distinction, in turn,

\textsuperscript{17} Note that in African-American Vernacular English \textit{ain’t} is often used for negative forms of \textit{do}, \textit{too}. Compare Kautzsch (to appear) on this characteristic in Earlier African-American Vernacular English.

\textsuperscript{18} The pattern in (a) is found only in very few British dialect areas, and there only very marginally. Only in positive contexts is \textit{was}-generalization clearly preferred over \textit{were}-generalization. In negative contexts, on the other hand, the use of generalized \textit{weren’t} over \textit{wasn’t} is much more common and pronounced than is the use of generalized \textit{was} over generalized \textit{were} in positive contexts. In general, Anderwald found that in non-standard varieties of English generalization in negative clauses is three times as likely as in positive clauses.

\textsuperscript{19} This term was used first by Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (1996) for the same phenomenon in the dialect of Ocracoke in the Southern US.
offers crucial processing advantages in that it iconically codes a maximal
cognitive difference, namely the positive-negative distinction.

In closing, two points are worth noting concerning Anderwald’s
observations. She explicitly states that in her data of the British Isles only the
mixed system in (10c) can be found, not the logical second possibility of varieties
with generalizes were in positive contexts and generalizes wasn’t in negative
contexts. It needs to be added here that Anderwald did not investigate
traditional dialects. In the FRED corpus, there are indications that at least
individual traditional dialect speakers may use exactly this were-wasn’t pattern.
For example, although the Southwest is an area with were-generalization in
positive and negative contexts, there is one speaker in the southwestern data
who employs the were-wasn’t pattern consistently at least in the singular, as
illustrated in the examples in (11):\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{enumerate}
\item I were married in 1920....
\item During the war, when the trade were bad.
\item In they days there wadn any Frisian about...
\item And when this milk trade were so bad, ..., you had to do as best you
could with it, see. Oh, it wadn very much money then, you see.
\end{enumerate}

This shows again how important it is to work with a relatively large database
for the study of dialect syntax. In a given dialect or dialect area, you may come
across interesting phenomena, but, more importantly, you can put these in
perspective and do not run the risk of formulating for this dialect or dialect area
generalizations on the basis of what appears to be rather an idiolect.

On a larger scale, the negative markers and negation strategies found in
non-standard varieties, i.e. the invariant forms ain’t and don’t as well as the
was/were-patterns in (10), conform to the following much more general
tendencies: (a) the doing away with person and number distinctions for present
and past tense forms of be, i.e. a development towards a much simplified be-
paradigm in line with the simplification of the paradigms of full verbs (e.g. in
the present tense: either generalized -s or for no person -s); (b) at the same time
this instantiates the elimination of the last remnants of subject-verb agreement in English; (c) from a typological point of view, more exactly from what is known about markedness phenomena across languages, we can observe the reduction of morphological distinctions under negation. From here it is tempting to move on to the fascinating question to what extent the grammars of English dialects can be said to exhibit, in general, a higher degree of regularity and consistency than Standard English (from an English-internal and cross-linguistic perspective). But this will need to be explored in another paper.

20 In the interview of this informant there are unfortunately no negative contexts in the plural. If this speaker followed the pattern consistently, we would expect wasn’t (or rather wadn) in the plural, too.
5 • CONCLUSION

The last two decades have seen an increasing number of attempts at a rapprochement between generative linguistics and functional typology (cf. For example Newmeyer 1998 and Haspelmath 1999). Dialect syntax is the most recent area where we can observe or at least expect a fruitful competition between these two theoretical frameworks. This competition offers advantages for the further development of the relevant theories, but in the first place for the status of syntactic research in dialectology. The much improved data situation in itself offers new prospects for the study of English dialect syntax.

Of course, these new research opportunities and research efforts will not remedy all the shortcomings of the past with regard to the collection of data relevant for the study of dialect syntax. Local dialects continue to disappear and "weaken" (dialect levelling) due to an increased mobility, urbanization, and the impact of the standard variety in education and the media. But that there are bright prospects for the study of dialect syntax can hardly be denied. This is amply documented in this volume, which itself is a result of the fact that in several European countries (Italy, The Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany) there currently exist major projects on dialect syntax. In the course of the next years, this opens up excellent perspectives not only for the study of the dialects spoken in the individual countries, but especially for cross-linguistic dialect studies, for instance for comparative studies of the West Germanic dialects.

21 Haspelmath (1999) offers a thought-provoking attempt at reinterpreting the grammatical constraints in Optimality Theory as ultimately functionally motivated and thus as user-based constraints. On a more sobering note, it looks as if such laudable attempts at a rapprochement remain rather isolated cases, though.
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1 • INTRODUCTION

In this work I analyze V2 and V3 sequences in a Rhaetoromance variety which combines V2 with a complex left periphery typical of Romance languages showing that a split CP perspective can shed light on the apparently bizarre properties of this language.

The V2 phenomenon as originally defined by den Besten (1983) for German and Dutch can be split into three distinct syntactic properties: a) subject inversion, b) second position of the inflected verb (the so called 'linear restriction') c) root character of the phenomenon. In the traditional analysis these three properties are accounted for by assuming that in V2 languages the C° position must always be filled, therefore, in main clauses the inflected verb has to move to the C° position. V to C movement results in subject inversion; moreover, the ban against V2 in embedded contexts is derived by the fact that C° is already filled by the complementizer. The ungrammaticality of V3 sequences also follows because there is only one position available higher than C°, namely SpecC.

Subsequent work on Germanic languages has shown that the three properties do not always go together: as for the third property, it has been shown by Santorini (1989), Vikner (1995) (among others) that not all Germanic languages display V2 only in main clauses, Yiddish and Icelandic are so called 'generalized V2' languages, where V2 is possible in all embedded contexts.

The second observation which contributes to a further definition of the V2 phenomenon comes from Old Romance languages. Following Benincà’s (1984) proposal for Old French and medieval Northern Italian dialects, it is generally assumed the Old Romance languages were V2, although the root versus embedded asymmetry is not found in Spanish (cf. Fontana (1993)) and Southern Italian varieties. Moreover, Old Italian did not display the typical 'linear restriction' observed in the Germanic domain: in old Italian texts V3 and V4 sequences can be found, although the subject is located in between the auxiliary and the past participle, in the typical inversion pattern of Germanic languages (from now now
g-inversion\(^1\). The parallel between Old Romance and Germanic is thus based on g-inversion, which becomes the core property defining V2 languages as languages with obligatory V to C movement. Nevertheless, including Old Romance in the set of languages that have the V2 property leaves unexplained why the linear restriction is clearly observed by all Germanic languages, but not by Old Romance. In other words, admitting that Old Romance were also V2 in the technical sense that the inflected verb moved to C\(^0\) captures the parallel behavior of Romance and Germanic varieties concerning g-inversion, but does not say anything concerning the difference, namely the fact that Germanic obeys the linear restriction, Old Romance (except a given stage in Old French) does not.

On the other hand, the split CP perspective proposed by Rizzi (1997), and now generally adopted for Romance is not immediately compatible with the way the linear restriction is derived in the 'classical' theory. If the CP layer has to be conceived as a number of distinct functional projections, each hosting a different type of element and checking distinct semantic features, the traditional account of the linear restriction in terms of V to C movement is no longer valid and we need to reformulate it in the new perspective.

This is what I will try to do in this paper focussing on a Rhaetoromance dialect, which seems to be an intermediate stage between Old Romance and Germanic, as it displays a restricted set of V3 cases. Starting from a structure like the one proposed in Rizzi (1997) exemplified in (1), I will examine various possibilities to account for the linear restriction of the V2 constraint:

(1) \text{Force\ldots(TOP*) (FOC) (TOP*) Finiteness}

The first possibility which comes to mind to get hold of the linear restriction is to say that V2 languages do not have this layered CP at all. This has been proposed by Poletto and Tomaselli (1999) for Germanic V2: they assume that the difference between languages which possess a CP layer as the one in (1) and languages which have a single CP projection can be analyzed in terms of Giorgi and Pianesi’s (1997) theory of 'feature scattering': languages have the option of realizing more than one feature on a single head or ‘scatter’ each feature on a distinct functional head. Rhaetoromance data on V3 sequences described in section 5 show that this is not the case.

\(^1\) g-inversion has to be distinguished from free inversion, where the subject occurs at the right of the past participle.
The second logical possibility proposed by Poletto (2000) translates the old theory into the new framework based on den Besten’s intuition that V2 is movement to the highest layer of the sentence: we can assume that although there are several CP projections available, V2 languages have to move an XP and the inflected verb to the CP highest position, namely Force in Rizzi’s framework. Following this line of reasoning, the difference between two languages like, say, Italian and German would consist in an additional requirement of checking some Force feature both in the head and in the specifier of this projection, a contrast which is active in German but not in Italian.

The third logical option has been proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999), who both assume that V2 is not a property of the highest CP position, but a property of the lowest CP, namely Fin°, which encodes the [+/-finiteness] distinction in Rizzi’s theory. Their system runs as follows: V2 languages have to fill the lowest C position by movement or by merge. Verb movement to Fin° is a last resort strategy for checking a strong [+Fin] feature, which is in fact not chosen in embedded contexts, where a complementizer checks the Fin feature. The necessity of the verb ‘being second’ is derived by two fundamental assumptions: the first one is that all second position phenomena follow from the EPP, which has to be conceived as a general requirement on having a predicative structure as the highest relation in the clause. Hence, EPP requires an XP movement to SpecFin when the verb is in Fin°. This explains why there must be at least one XP in front of the verb. The second basic claim accounts for the fact that there can be at most one XP in front of the verb implementing relativized minimality in its recent version (cf. Rizzi (2001)) into the analysis of V2: EPP is a feature which, being ‘of no particular type in terms of the typology of potential interveners, … is able to block any type of movement’ (Roberts (1999):39). Once an XP has moved to SpecFin to satisfy the EPP feature in Fin°, no other element can move to the CP domain without violating minimality. In other words, Fin° constitutes a ‘bottle neck’ through which only one XP can move. In principle this analysis admits cases of V3 when the first element is base-generated in the CP layer, as left dislocated elements are.

In this paper I will show that a) V3 cases are indeed restricted the way Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999) predict; b) both the XP and the verb move to positions which are higher than Fin° crossing over sentential particles which are directly merged in the CP domain c) the necessity to check a strong Force feature in Rhaetoromance but not in Old Italian accounts for the different distribution of XPs
in the Comp domain in these languages. In order to derive the particular
distribution of V3 instances in the Rhaetoromance dialect of S. Leonardo (from
now on Rr), I will adopt a combination of Poletto’s (2000) hypothesis that in
Germanic languages the inflected verb raises to a very high position in the CP layer
with the Haegeman and Roberts’ idea that the number of XPs moved to the CP
layer cannot be more than one, and that this is due to a property of a low CP
position.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 I illustrate a modification of Rizzi’s
theory proposed by Benincà (2001), which is essential to the framework I adopt
here. Benincà shows that there is no Topic position lower than the Focus layer,
therefore all Left dislocated elements are located higher than focalized elements;
moreover, inside the ‘Topic field’ there is a special position for scene setting
adverbs, and Focus is a field containing several projections too. In section 3 and
section 4 I discuss further modifications to the split CP structure preposed by Rizzi
(1997). In section 5 the number and type of V3 sequences found in Rhaetoromance,
are described and discussed. In section 6 I formulate a proposal which captures the
distinction between Old Italian and Rr V3 sequences.

2 • TOPIC AND FOCUS

In order to analyze V2 on the basis of a split CP analysis we first have to have a
precise hypothesis on the type, number and properties of FPs contained in the CP
area. Therefore, in this section I briefly sketch the arguments given in Benincà
(2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2001) which on the basis of Italian data modify the
Topic/Focus portion of the CP structure proposed in Rizzi (1997) leading to a
structure containing three sublayers: a) a low one containing a number of Focus
projections and b) an intermediate one containing topics or themes which have a
resumptive clitic and c) a high one containing base generated Hanging Topics
(HTs). The Topic/Focus portion of the CP structure results to be different from the
one proposed in (1):
The three sublayers illustrated in (2) contain a number of functional projections, here I concentrate on some data that provide evidence for the internal composition of these ‘fields’. This structure differs from (1) in essentially two aspects: the first has to do with the lack of a Topic layer lower than Focus, the second with the split between Hanging Topic (HT) and Left Dislocation (LD).

In Benincà and Poletto (2001) the internal structure of each layer is examined. HT has to be distinguished from LD on the basis of the following differences:

a) HT does not copy the case (or the preposition) of the resumptive element in the clause, while LD does,

b) there can only be one HT, while there can be more than one left dislocated element,

c) the resumptive pronoun does not need to be a clitic, but can be a tonic pronoun or a full DP

d) HT requires a resumptive element while LD only does when the element is the direct object

e) HT is marginal (in some languages impossible) in embedded clauses, LD is not

f) when possible in embedded contexts it occurs before the complementizer while LD occurs after it. (see Benincà and Poletto (2001) for examples and for a detailed discussion of these differences).

This last piece of evidence distinguishing HT from LD also shows that HT is located higher, while LD is located lower than Force. This will constitute an important fact when considering V3 in Rr interrogatives.

The other important claim I will make use of in this paper is that LD can only occur higher than Focus. The first argument showing that there is no Topic lower than Focus proposed by Benincà (2001) is the ungrammaticality of sentences like (3):

(3) a  *A GIANNI, un libro di poesie, lo regalere
to GIANNI, a book of poems, you will give it
‘You will give a book of poems to Gianni’

b  Un libro di poesie, A GIANNI, lo regalere
a book of poems, TO GIANNI, you will give it
In (3a) a left dislocated object (un libro di poesie) is located lower than contrastive focus and the sentence is ungrammatical, the opposite order illustrated in (3b) is perfectly well formed. However, Rizzi (1997) provides cases in which a left dislocated elements seems to occur lower than a contrastive element:

\[(4)\]
\[
a. \hspace{1cm} \text{QUESTO a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire!} \\
   \text{this to Gianni, tomorrow, to-him should tell} \\
   \text{‘Tomorrow we should tell this to Gianni’}
\]
\[
b. \hspace{1cm} \text{A Gianni, QUESTO, domani gli dovremmo dire!} \\
   \text{to Gianni, THIS, tomorrow, to-him should tell} \\
   \text{‘Tomorrow we should tell this to Gianni’}
\]
\[
c. \hspace{1cm} \text{A Gianni, domani, QUESTO gli dovremmo dire!} \\
   \text{to Gianni, tomorrow, THIS to-him should tell} \\
   \text{‘Tomorrow we should tell this to Gianni’}
\]

Among the three sentences, (4c) has the correct order LD, Focus and is derived also by the structure given in (2). In (4b), the element located lower than Contrastive Focus is an adverbial, which has been shown by Benincà (2001) to occupy a position specialized for adverbs located lower than the usual preverbal subject position at the IP border. Therefore, it does not constitute a valid counterexample to the hypothesis in (2). However, (4a) seems a clear case of a left dislocated indirect object occurring lower than contrastive focus. Again, it is possible to show that this is not a genuine case of base generated LD but an instance of movement to a low secondary Focus position. First of all, the resumptive clitic in (4a) can be analyzed as a case of clitic doubling, and not as a true resumptive pronoun as the following sentence shows:

\[(5)\]
\[
\text{Gliel’ho detto a Gianni} \\
\text{to him-it have told to John} \\
\text{‘I told this to Gianni’}
\]

Benincà (1988) notes that in colloquial Italian sentences like (5), where the clitic doubles a DP in its argumental position, are common. Therefore, the fact that a dative is doubled does not constitute compelling evidence in favor of its dislocated status.

Second, Benincà (2001) shows that the indirect object in that position is sensitive to the weak cross over effect, a typical property of operator-variable chains, which is displayed by focussed elements but not by topics, as the contrast in (6) shows:

\[(6)\]
\[
\text{un libro di poesie a Gianni} \\
\text{a book of poems to Gianni} \\
\text{‘a book of poems to Gianni’}
\]
\[
\text{a Gianni, un libro di poesie} \\
\text{to Gianni, a book of poems} \\
\text{‘to Gianni, a book of poems’}
\]
(6)  
a  *A MARIA, Giorgio\textsubscript{\textnu} sua, madre presenterà
to Maria, George, his mother will present
‘His mother will present Giorgio to Maria’
b  Gianni\textsubscript{\textnu}, suo\textsubscript{\textnu} padre l\textsubscript{\texti}’ha licenziato LD
‘Gianni has been fired by his own father’

Therefore, sentences like (4a) can be interpreted as two Foci and not as of LD embedded under a Focus and we can rely on data like the one in (3) and assume a simpler structure as the one illustrated in (2). Therefore, Focus, on a par with LD, is also a complex field containing more than one projection. We will not further discuss the internal structure of the LD and Focus fields (for details see Benincà and Poletto (2001), as it is not relevant to the main question discussed here, namely the distribution of V2 and V3 sequences in Rr. In the next section I present some data which suggest that an additional projection lower than HT but higher than LD has to be added to the structure in (2).

3 • THE SCENE SETTING POSITION

In this section I will examine data of a V2 Rhaetoromance variety spoken in the Badia valley, in the village of S. Leonardo. This dialect displays the core property of V2 phenomenology, as it has g-inversion. It also displays a V2 matrix versus embedded asymmetry, but only in wh contexts, a fact which will not be further discussed here. As for the linear restriction, this is not always respected (see section 5), but for the moment I will leave these cases aside concentrating on the analysis of circumstantial adverbs. The examples in (7) illustrate g-inversion, those in (8) and (9) the linear restriction:
The examples in (8) and (9) show that these dialects obey the V2 linear restriction: when two (or more) elements are located at the left of the verb, the sentence is ungrammatical. This is true when the two elements are two internal arguments (as in (9)), a lower adverb and an internal argument (8), two lower adverbs, or a lower adverb and the subject (but see below for a detailed discussion of V3 orders).

Evidence in favour of the idea that circumstantial and quantificational adverbs can occupy a special high position inside the CP layer, is already provided by the lack of contrastive focalization that circumstantial adverbs display with respect to other adverbial elements.

In V2 varieties the first position of the clause is often considered to be a Focus position, this is true at least for objects but surely not for subjects (cf. Zwart (1997) for a recent analysis of these facts)) and for expletives like German *es. Adverbs split into two classes with respect to focalization: lower adverbs\(^2\) can only appear in first position when they are contrastively focalized, circumstantial adverbs do not

\(^2\) I use here Cinque (1999) terminology, lower adverbs are those adverbs that are located in the specifiers of the possible movement positions of the past participle.
need any particular intonational contour and are not necessarily associated with the contrastive-focus interpretation:

(10)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item[(a)] Duman n vagn-l pa nia \\
    tomorrow not goes-he not not \\
    ‘Tomorrow he is not coming’
\item[(b)] DUMAN n vagn-l pa nia \\
    tomorrow not goes-he not not \\
    (interpret. ‘not-tomorrow’) 
\end{enumerate}

(11)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item[(a)] *Trees l feje-l \\
    always it does-he \\
    ‘He always does it’
\item[(b)] TREES l feje-l 
\end{enumerate}

Modulo the V2 property this is true also in languages like standard Italian: lower adverbs must be contrastively focalized, circumstantial adverbs need not:

(12)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item[(a)] SEMPRE lo fa \\
    always it-does (he)
\item[(b)] *Sempre lo fa 
\end{enumerate}

(13)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item[(a)] DOMANI viene \\
    tomorrow comes (he) \\
    ‘Tomorrow he will come’
\item[(b)] Domani viene 
\end{enumerate}

All adverbs can occupy a Contrastive Focus position in the CP layer, as the grammaticality of (10b) and (11b) show. Only circumstantial adverbs can occupy a very high position where they are not focalized, and do not interfere with the V2 linear restriction, as the contrast between (10a) and (11a) indicates. Indeed, the semantics of sentences like (13b) is completely different from contrastive focus, as here the adverb provides the hearer with some background information or ‘setting the scene’. Therefore, I will refer from now on to the high position occupied by non focalized circumstantial and quantificational adverbs as a ‘scene setting position’. Additional evidence that the class of circumstantial adverbs has to be kept apart from all other adverbial classes when it occurs in first position is provided by...
subject agreement patterns: in dialect of S. Leonardo, there are three possible agreement patterns, as exemplified in (14):

(14) a  Duman mangia la muta pom  No clitic
   tomorrow eats P. apples
   'Tomorrow the girl will eat apples'

b  Duman mang-la la muta pom  Full agreeing clitic
   tomorrow eats-she the girl apples

c  ??Duman mang-l Maria pom  Only older generation

 d  Dar incà vegn-el la si  Third person clitic
   just here comes-it the fence

e  Dar incà vegn-la la si  Full agreeing clitic
   just here come-she the fence

f  La muta mangia pom  
   the girl eats apples
   'The girl is eating apples'

g  *La muta la mangia pom  
   the girl she eats apples

In (14a) the inverted subject is not doubled by any subject clitic and is located at the left of the object. In (14b) a full agreeing clitic doubles the postverbal subject (which is still in a pre-object position). A third agreement pattern, where an expletive third person singular masculine clitic doubles the postverbal subject, is exemplified in (14c, d). As this is is only marginally possible with transitive verbs while it is perfect only with inaccusatives, I will leave this third pattern aside. Notice that the only possible pattern with a preverbal subject is the one without any clitic, as the contrast between (14g) and (14h) shows, so the same as the one exemplified in (14a) with a postverbal subject. I will consider here the first two patterns. When a lower adverb is selected only one of the two patterns is possible, namely the one with the doubling clitic:

(15) a  *Gonoot mangia la Maria pom  
   often eats the Mary apples
   'Often Mary eats apples'

b  Gonoot mang-la la Maria pom  
   often eats-he the Mary apples
This is not true for circumstantial adverbs, which admit both agreement patterns, as shown in (14).

Hence, circumstantial adverbs display a different intonational pattern and can trigger a special subject agreement when they are located in first position.

Although these data show that circumstantial adverbs have to be singled out as a special class, they do not show how this is encoded in the structure of the CP layer. The decisive argument showing that circumstantial adverbs occupy a special position in the CP domain is provided by embedded contexts, where a circumstantial adverb can only be focalized:

(18)  
\( a \)  Al m a dit c DUMAN va-\( \text{al} \) a Venezia +focus  
he me has told that tomorrow goes-he to Venice  
‘He told me that he is going to Venice tomorrow.’  

\( b \)  *Al m a dit c duman va-\( \text{al} \) a Venezia  
he me has told that tomorrow goes-he to Venice  
‘He told me that he is going to Venice tomorrow.’  

In Poletto (2000) I argued that the contrast between (18a) and (18b) can be accounted for in terms of split CP in the following way: the special position for circumstantial adverbs is only available in matrix clauses. Given that the semantics of these adverbials when they are located in this sentence initial position is precisely that of ‘setting the scene’, it is plausible that such a position is only needed (hence possible) in a matrix domain where this type of information is
expressed. The fact that the ‘scene setting’ position occupied by this special class of adverbs is only found in matrix clauses immediately recalls the distribution of HT. As we noted in section 3, HTs contrast with LD because they are at least marginal in embedded contexts: they cannot occur in embedded domains in French and in relative clauses in standard Italian (cf. Benincà and Poletto (2001) for a discussion on this point). Therefore, being (at least partially) restricted to matrix contexts seems to be a property of the ‘outer portion’ of the CP layer, the one located higher than Force, which is obviously present in both matrix and embedded contexts.

If we are on the right track, there should be some empirical evidence which helps us singling out the scene setting position from the higher HT position. This is provided by the possibility of having a scene setting adverb in V2 contexts, while a HT is ungrammatical in declarative clauses:

(19) a Duman ti dai l lber a Giani
    tomorrow to-him give-I the book to Giani
    ‘Tomorrow I will give the book to John’

   b *Giani, ti ai bel dè l liber
    John, to him have-i given the book
    ‘John, I already gave him the book’

Hence, scene setting adverbs can satisfy the V2 requirement, and be located immediately before the verb, while HTs cannot. That the scene setting position is lower than the HT position, which is most probably only a position for DPs, can be shown on the basis of standard Italian, where circumstantial adverbs can occur lower than HTs but the reverse is not true (we report here data from Benincà and Poletto ((2001: 46), which the reader is referred to for a detailed discussion):

(20) Mario, nel 1999, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel
    Mario, in the 1999 to-him have given the Prize Nobel
    ‘M., in 1999, they gave him the Nobel Prize’

(21) a ??Nel 1999, Mario, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel
    in the 1999, Mario, to-him have given the Prize Nobel

   b *Sul giornale, Mario, ne hanno parlato malissimo
    on the newspaper, Mario, of him have spoken very badly
    ‘They spoke very basdly about Mario o the newspaper’
As (20) and (21) show the ordering scene setting-HT is ungrammatical, while the opposite is possible. Hence, these data show a) that HTs and scene setting have to be distinguished because they cooccur b) scene setting is located lower than HT. The structure of the CP layer assumed here can thus be modified as it follows:

(22) [Hanging TopicP [Scene setting [Force [Left Dislocation [FocusP [IP ]]]]]]

We will adopt this structure in the following sections.

4 NEW CONTEXT PARTICLES

Badiotto has a number of sentence particles, some of which occurring at the very beginning of the clause, some others occurring in sentence internal position. I concentrate here on the particle *pa*, which marks the lack of any presupposed context, and is compatible with all sentence types, with the same semantics. In a recent paper Poletto and Zanuttini (2001) propose that pa is located in a low Comp position. Firstly, elements marking this type of pragmatic features are typically located in the CP domain, as the locus where informational structure is encoded and in particular, if we are right in following Benincà’s (2001) intuition that the Focus field is lower than the Topic field, it belongs to the lowest portion of the left periphery. Syntactic evidence in favor of this claim is provided by the following examples:

(23) a Al a pa d sigy mangé
    SCL have pa of sure eaten
    ‘He has surely eaten’

b *Al a d sigy pa mangé
   SCL has of sure pa eaten

c Al a pa magari bel mangé
   SCL has pa perhaps already eaten
   ‘Perhaps he has already eaten’

d *Al a magari pa bel mangé
(24)  a  Inier a pa Giani mangé la ciara  
\textit{yesterday has pa John eaten the meat}  
‘Yesterday John ate meat’  
b  *A i m a domané s al n fus pa bel.  
\textit{SCL SCL me asked if SCL neg was pa nice}  
‘He asked me whether it was nice’

(25)  a  ch’ al vagnes ma ince os cumpagn!  
\textit{that he comes prt also your friend}  
‘Your friend may come in’  
b  *ch’ al vagnes pa ince os cumpagn!  
\textit{that he comes prt also your friend}

The particle \textit{pa} occurs higher than ‘higher adverbs’ in Cinque’s (1999) hierarchy, it also occurs higher than the subject located in SpecAgrS or, following more recent minimal accounts, SpecTP; hence higher than the highest IP elements. Furthermore, it is incompatible with a low complementizer, as the interrogative complementizer \textit{se} and the complementizer of suppletive imperative forms like the one in (25b); it contrasts with other particles (cf. (25a) which are perfectly grammatical in these contexts and which occur lower than \textit{pa} when the two are combined (cf. Poletto and Zanuttini (1999) on the syntax and semantics of these particles in imperative clauses):

(26)  a  Faal pa ma!  
\textit{do-it prt. prt.}  
‘Please, do it’  
b  *Faal ma pa!

Hence, the semantics and the syntax of \textit{pa} both indicate that its position is on the border between CP and IP. \textit{Pa} is also used in other dialects, which have lost the V2 property and can have main interrogative clauses introduced by a complementizer. \textit{Pa} and the interrogative complementizer are incompatible also in main interrogatives, just like in V2 Rhaetoromance embedded ones:

(27)  a  Olà che tu vas?  
\textit{where that you go?}  
\textit{Pera di Fassa}
‘Where are you going?’

b  Olà pa tu vas?
   \textit{where INTERR MARKER you go?}

c  *Olà che pa tu vas?
   \textit{where that INTERR MARKER you go?}
   ‘Where are you going?’

d  *Ola pa che tu vas?
   \textit{where interr marker that you go?}

Therefore, we can assume that it occupies a low position in the CP layer. This position has to be lower than the position of the inflected verb in V2 contexts, which obligatorily precedes it. As \textit{pa} can only be present in the clause when the sentence conveys new information outside a context, we propose that the position it occupies is the syntactic reflex of its semantics: \textit{pa} occupies a 'new information' (NI) position in the lower portion of the CP layer.\textsuperscript{3} Concerning the status of the particle as a head or a specifier, the head movement constraint forces us to assume that it occupies the specifier position of the NI projection, as the verb is moving to its head and then to higher head positions. The analysis of \textit{pa} as a low SpecCP has interesting consequences for the analysis of V2 in the split CP framework. As discussed in section 1 one possible way to reconcile the V2 linear restriction and the split-CP hypothesis has been proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999), who assume that the inflected verb occupies the lowest CP position and, being subject to the EPP requires an element in its specifier position, which then blocks all other elements which might move to the CP domain. In Badiotto a particle is merged in a low SpecCP, while the verb moves higher, and the XP at its left must obviously be even higher. This shows that the position targeted by the inflected verb and by the XP at its left is not the lowest position in the CP domain, but a higher one.

We will come back to this in section 6.

\textsuperscript{3} In Benincà and Poletto (2001) this position is the same where XPs corresponding to the new information of the clause are located in languages like Old Italian and Old and modern Sicilian. This is still to be ascertained, but we will leave this question aside for the moment.
Once we have established the precise layering of the CP structure and the fact that the verb is raising higher than the lowest position we now turn to the distribution of V2 and V3 sequences.

Let us first consider V2 instances. In Rr the set of elements that can satisfy V2 is restricted to focalized constituents, scene setting adverbs and wh-items; HTs and LD items cannot enter a V2 structure:

\[(28)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \ast \text{LGiat, l'ai odu}^4 \\
& \quad \text{*the cat, it have-I seen} \\
& \quad \text{'I have seen the cat'} \\
\text{b} & \quad \ast \text{Giani, ti ai bel baiè} \\
& \quad \text{Giani, to him have-I already spoken} \\
& \quad \text{'I already talked to John'} \\
\text{c} & \quad \ast \text{De Giani ai bel baié} \\
& \quad \text{of Giani, have-I already spoken} \\
& \quad \text{'I already talked about John'}
\end{align*}
\]

This is totally unexpected in the traditional view that places whatever element in SpecC. It is also unexpected under Poletto and Tomaselli’s (1999) approach that analyzes V2 languages as having an ‘unscattered CP’: if any type of element can satisfy the V2 requirement, why should HT and LD elements be excluded?

On the other hand, the V2 constraint in Rr is not absolute, V3 depends on the type of elements that occur in first and second position. This is a general property of V2 languages, where V3 orders are admitted, but always in a very limited way which depends on the type of the first of the two XPs preposed to the inflected verb. Standard German for instance displays V3 cases which look (at least partially) similar to Romance HT or to LD:

\[(29)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Peter, ich werde ihn sehen} \\
& \quad \text{Peter, I will him see} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Den Peter, den habe ich gesehen} \\
& \quad \text{the+acc. Peter him have I seen} \\
& \quad \text{'I already saw Peter'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[^4\] A sentence like this is ambiguous between a HT and a LD. The fact that it is ungrammatical shows that not only the HT is out but also the LD possibility.
A closer examination of all the possible V2 and V3 patterns found in Badiotto making use of the layered structure of the CP field we have adopted from Benincà and Poletto (2001), reveals a complex pattern which is only partially similar to the one of standard German in (29).

As in the Germanic languages, it is not possible to have V3 with two XPs in the Focus field:

(30)  
(a)  
*Da trai l liber ti a-i de a Giani  
sometimes the book to-him have-I given to John  
‘Sometimes I gave the book to John’  
(b)  
*L liber da trai ti a-i de a Giani  
the book sometimes have-I given to John

The same is true for the combination of a focalized constituent and a wh-item:

(31)  
*L LIBER che ti a de a Giani?  
the book who to him has given to John  
‘Who gave the book to John?’

However the combination of a focalized constituent (or a wh item) with a scene setting adverb is marginally possible:

(i)  
(a)  
Duman vagnel  
*Tomorrow comes-he  
(b)  
L GIAT ai odu  
THE CAT have-I seen

The sentence in (ia) contains a scene setting adverb, which behaves like the focalized object in (ib). 
So, the evidence provided by (ia) and (ib) is contradictory: (ia) indicates that, at least marginally scene setting adverbs can be directly merged in CP, while the fact that they satisfy the V2 requirement on a par with HT and LD cases. Contrary to our expectations, they do:

5 An apparent exception to the pattern outlined here is the case of scene setting adverbs: as illustrated in section 3 scene setting adverbs are marginally possible in the first position of a V3 clause. 
This could in principle be considered as evidence in favor of the direct merge of scene setting adverbs into the Scene Setting Projection where they surface. If this is so, they should not satisfy the V2 requirement, on a par with HT and LD cases. Contrary to our expectations, they do:

(i)  
(a)  
Duman vagnel  
*Tomorrow comes-he  
(b)  
L GIAT ai odu  
THE CAT have-I seen

The sentence in (ia) contains a scene setting adverb, which behaves like the focalized object in (ib). 
So, the evidence provided by (ia) and (ib) is contradictory: (ia) indicates that, at least marginally scene setting adverbs can be directly merged in CP, while the fact that they satisfy the V2 requirement on a par with focalized and wh- items shows that they must have operator-like properties. The solution to the puzzle rests on the marginality of sentences like those in (32), which are in fact accepted only by the younger generation: scene setting adverbs like duman do display operator-like movement from the IP to the left periphery, but can also marginally be analyzed as DPs and only under this analysis be directly merged into the HT position, which is a exclusively a position for DPs. This also explains the feeling of the speakers who note that in a sentence like (ia), the adverb is "out of the sentence” while this is not true of cases like (ib).
I will discuss the intermediate status of examples like (32) in section 7. The only possible V3 orders that are clearly admitted in declarative clauses when the first of the two elements is a HT:

(33) L liber, A GIANI ti l'ai bel dé
    the book, TO GIANI it have-I already given
    ‘I already gave the book to John’

Left dislocation is not possible as the first element of a V3 structure, as the following example shows:

(34) *De Giani CUN PIERO ai bel baié
    Of Giani, WITH PIERO have-I already spoken

The situation changes radically in interrogative sentences, as it is possible to left-dislocate all XPs in front of a wh-item; this may be a subject as illustrated in (35b), an object as in (36) or an adverb as in (37):

(35) a De Giani, con che bai-la pa?
    of Giani, with whom speak-she INTERR. PRT?
    ‘With whom did talk about John?’

  b Giani, ci o-l pa?
    John what wants-he INTERROGATIVE MARKER?
    ‘What does John want?’

  c *Ci Giani o-l pa?
    what John wants-he INTERROGATIVE MARKER?

(36) a L liber chi l tol pa?
    the book who it takes INTERROGATIVE MARKER?
    ‘Who is going to take the book?’
While the sequence left dislocation-wh-item is grammatical, the opposite wh-item/left-dislocation order is totally excluded.

Rr left-dislocation displays the usual properties of Romance left-dislocation, namely: a) recursivity, (cf (38)); and b) free word order of left-dislocated elements (as shown by the grammaticality of the pairs (38a)-(38b) and (38c)-(38d) and occurrence in embedded contexts, as illustrated in (38e)).

### (38)

a. Giani, inier, ci a-al pa fat?
   *John yesterday what has-he INTERROGATIVE MARKER done?*
   ‘What has John done yesterday?’

b. Inier, Giani, ci a-al pa fat?
   *yesterday John what has-he INTERROGATIVE MARKER done?*
   ‘Yesterday John has done what?’

c. Giani, inier, l as-tody?
   *John yesterday him has-you seen?*
   ‘Did you see John yesterday?’

d. Inier, Giani, l as-tody?
   *yesterday John him has-you seen?*
   ‘Did you see John yesterday?’

e. Al m a demanee Giani, can c al vagn a ciasa
   he me has asked John when that he comes at home
   ‘He asked me when John is coming home’

The contrast between declaratives and interrogatives is illustrated in (39) by a minimal pair:

### (39)

a. *Giani, duman l vaiges-t*
   *John tomorrow him see-you*
   ‘You will see John tomorrow’
Rhaetoromance left-dislocation is similar to standard Italian left-dislocation (as it is recursive, all orders of left-dislocated elements are possible and embedding is allowed), although this is a V2 variety. The only difference with respect to standard Italian is the limited context in which left-dislocation may occur in Rhaetoromance.6

Summing up what we have seen so far:

a) V2 is only possible when the first constituent is a focalized XP, a scene setting adverb or a wh-item.
b) V3 instances are possible in declaratives only if the first constituent is a HT (or marginally a scene setting adverb) and the second is a focalized XP or a wh-item.
c) V3 in interrogative clauses is possible if the first element is a HT or a LD item.
d) Interrogative clauses also admit V4 structures, given that it is possible to combine HT with LD and LD is recursive.

6 • V3 AND SPLIT CP

In this section I will propose an analysis which accounts for the data illustrated in section 5.

First, we noted that the V2 requirement can only be satisfied by a moved element, elements like LD and HT cannot occur at the immediate left of the inflected verb in the S. Leonardo dialect.

The grammaticality of V3 sequences also depends on the type of elements that are located to the left of the verb: V3 sequences are excluded if both elements are moved to the CP domain. This includes all cases of two focalized elements or a focalized element and a wh, whatever the ordering of the two elements is:

*Giani, duman l vaiges-t?
John tomorrow him see-you
‘Will you see John tomorrow?’
V3 is only possible when one of the two elements is merged inside CP and not moved, which leaves only sequences formed by a HT or LD element (which have been analyzed by Cinque (1990) as base generated in the position where they occur) and by a focalized or wh-item. I will refer to this phenomenon as the 'restriction on type', meaning by that that V2 and V3 are sensitive to the type of elements located at the left of the verb.

Second, the ordering of the two elements is rigid: the first of the two elements preceding the inflected verb has to be merged in CP (either HT or, in interrogatives, a LD). If the first of the two elements is a focalized element and the second is a HT, the sequence is out even if the first restriction is respected:

(41)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>*Foc HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>HT Foc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>*Wh HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>HT Wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Wh LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>*LD Wh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will refer to this as the 'restriction on ordering'.

Third, an asymmetry between main interrogatives and declaratives has been observed in Rr: in interrogative clauses a LD can occur in front of a wh-item, but this is not the case for a focalized element in declarative clauses:

(42)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>LD Wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>*LD Foc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will refer to this as the 'wh-asymmetry'.

The three restrictions illustrated in (40), (41) and (42) are straightforwardly captured within the split CP framework adopted here on the basis of the following assumptions: a) the first assumption we need to make is Haegeman’s (1997) and Roberts’ (1999) proposal (already illustrated in section 1) that in all V2 languages the verb has to move at least to the head of a low CP position because that head
has a strong feature. Moreover, in order to satisfy EPP, an XP has to move to the Spec position of this low CP position, which, being 'neutral' in terms of features, blocks all movements of other XPs to the CP domain by minimality.

If we assume Haegeman’s (1997) and Roberts’ (1999) analysis of V2 which excludes V3 sequences on the basis of a restriction on movement through the lowest CP position, we predict that:

a) if V2 is a condition which leads to the deletion of EPP features, we expect that no element which is directly merged in a higher CP can satisfy this condition. Hence, only elements that are merged in or moved to (or through) SpecFin can satisfy V2, while elements that are merged higher than this position cannot. This prediction is borne out, as no LD or HT can satisfy the V2 requirement.

b) On the other side, V3 cases are possible only when the first of the two elements preceding the inflected verb is merged directly inside CP and not moved from within the clause because all movements across SpecFin is banned by minimality. This prediction is also borne out, as the only elements that can occur in the first position of a V3 sequence are merged in CP.

Hence, the restriction on type can be straightforwardly derived by Haegeman’s (1997) and Robert’s (1999) system: given that focalized elements and wh-items are both moved to the CP layer, they would both have to move to the low SpecCP position, which is not possible in an antisymmetric framework where there is only one specifier position as the one adopted here following Kayne (1994).

Alternatively, one of the two would have to move crossing the low SpecCP position, violating minimality. Therefore, a combination of two moved elements is never possible in V2 languages, nor is the combination of two elements merged in a higher CP.

b) The second assumption is that the CP layer is split also in V2 languages; furthermore it is similar to the CP of non V2 languages as modern standard Italian and is made of (at least) the following projections:

(43) \[ \text{HT} \ [\text{Scene setting} \ [\text{Force} \ [\text{LD} \ldots \ [\text{LD} \ [\text{Focus} \ [\text{WH}]])])]] \]

The Focus position needs to be distinguished from the position of wh-items as Cinque (p.c.) noted, because it is possible to combine a focalized element with a wh-item in embedded interrogative clauses, as shown in (44)\(^7\):

---

\(^7\) In addition to this, it is well known that there can be more than one LD element in Romance; Benincà and Poletto (2001) show that there are several LD positions, some of which can be
Mi hanno chiesto A GIANNI chi ha portato il libro, non ad Antonio
they asked me to Gianni who has taken the book, not to Antonio
‘They asked me who sent the book to John, not to Antony’

The restriction on ordering formulated above can be captured if we combine
Haegeman and Roberts’ proposal with the split CP in (43): we saw above that it is
not possible to combine two moved elements at the left of the inflected verb,
having, Haegeman’s and Robert’s proposal does not block sequences where one
of the two elements is moved and the other is base generated in CP, as Hanging
Topics and most probably Left dislocated elements are. Hence, the combination of
one moved element with one element merged in CP is predicted to be grammatical
by Haegeman and Robert’s framework. This is however not sufficient to account
for the distribution of V3 sequences in Rr: as noted above the only possible
ordering is the one in which the first element is a LD or a HT (namely the one that
is merged in CP) and the second is a moved element (a focus or a wh-item). This
follows crucially from the format of the split CP adopted here: if the ‘Topic field’
containing Hanging Topic and Left Dislocation is located higher than the one of
moved elements like Focus and wh-items, the only possible ordering is precisely
the one in (43): given that HT and LD elements are merged higher than Focus and
wh-items, there is no possible derivation for the ordering in (41 a, c, f). On the
contrary, if a split CP is simply conceived as recursion, the restriction on ordering
remains unexplained.

As for the third restriction, namely the asymmetry between interrogative and
declarative clauses, this is a priori unexpected if the null hypothesis is maintained,
namely that each element moved to the CP domain ultimately targets the
projection where its features are checked, so wh-items move to a wh-projection,
focalized elements to a Focus projection and scene setting adverbs to the scene
setting position. We need an additional device to account for this. Moreover, we
also have to keep in mind that this restriction is language specific; as mentioned in
the introduction, Benincà (1984) shows that Old Italian did have declarative
sentences where a LD element was followed by a Focus. Hence, Old Italian did not

---

(distinguished on the basis of their syntactic and semantic properties. However, we leave this
further refinement out, because it is tangential to the question discussed here and simply note the
fact that there can be many LD positions with “…” between the two LD projections.)
show any interrogative/declarative asymmetry; LD was always possible provided
it was located higher than a focalized constituent or a wh-item.
In Poletto (2000) I proposed that the position ultimately targeted by focalized
elements in Rr is higher than the LD position: this means that once the focalized XP
has reached its SpecFocus position, it has to raise further to a higher position,
which must be located lower than Hanging Topic (given that Hanging Topic-Focus
sequences are possible), but higher than LD, as shown in (45):

(45)  [HT [Scene setting [Force [LD [LD [Focus [WH]]]]]]]

This position already exists, in Rizzi’s account it is Force, namely the projection
where the sentence is typed. Suppose that the Force position has strong features
that must be checked before spell out in Rr. This means that it must be filled by
some element. In embedded contexts a complementizer is merged in Force°, in
matrix clauses it is targeted by all elements moved to the CP layer. If focalized
elements move higher than LD, one might expect that the sequence Foc-LD is
possible, which is not true (cf. (41) above). An independent constraint proposed by
Rizzi (1997) rules out this sequence: suppose that the inflected verb has to raise to
Force°, given the head movement constraint it should have to stop in the head of
the LD position before moving higher. This is not possible: as Rizzi (1997) notes,
the head position of a Topic projection is not accessible to verb movement, because
it already contains strong features; hence the inflected verb cannot move through
the LD° head and reach the head of the V2 position giving rise to
ungrammaticality.
Therefore, both orderings Focus-LD and LD Focus are excluded in Rr, with the
consequence that LD is banned from declarative clauses.
Consider now interrogative clauses. There is empirical evidence that the Force
projection typing interrogative clauses is located much lower in the structure than
declarative Force (Rizzi (1997) and Rizzi (2001a) assumes this; see Poletto and
Therefore, in interrogative clauses the inflected verb does not need to raise higher
than the LD position, because the interrogative sentence is already typed lower;
LD is thus perfectly compatible with interrogative clauses.
On this basis, we can also derive the difference between Rr and Old Italian: in Old
Italian the Force position does not need to be checked before spell out; focalized
elements remain in SpecFocus, therefore the ordering LD-Focus is possible, on a
par with the sequence LD-wh-item. Thus, Old Italian represents the 'null option'
mentioned above, a language in which Force does not have strong features, hence
no further movement is required higher than the position where the semantic
features of an XP are checked. Hence, V2 languages all have a low CP projection
where strong features have to be checked, some of them have an additional
requirement of checking the higher Force projection. Verb movement to Force
results in a ban against LD in declaratives but not in interrogatives, hence V3
sequences are very limited and we observe an asymmetry between interrogatives
and declaratives.
This amounts to saying that V2 is a conspiracy of different factors, some of which
are language specific, while others are common properties of the CP layer. The
language specific factors are:
a) the requirements of checking a low CP, common to all V2 languages and
b) the necessity to check Force features, which is only necessary in some V2
languages.

Independent properties of the CP layer are:
a) the layering we have described above,
b) the distinct positions for declarative and interrogative Force and
c) the ban against verb movement through the LD positions.

Considering the V2 phenomenon as a complex set of requirements instead of
trying to find out a single property which characterizes all V2 languages also has
the advantage of discharging that burden of the major difference between Old
Italian and Rr on independent factors, namely the distinct realization of Force in
interrogatives with respect to declaratives, a fact which is true of Romance in
general and not simply of V2 varieties. On the other side, a modular account of V2

---

8 Our analysis could be in principle extended to Germanic languages. Nevertheless, it is not clear
whether the construction known as “Linksversetzung” in languages like German is really the
counterpart of Romance LD, given that it differs from Romance LD with respect to the following
properties: a) it is never recursive and b) it does not occur in embedded domains. In Romance,
these two properties are typical of the HT and not of LD, thus suggesting that the so called
Linksversetzung is probably to be located in the HT position, which is the highest position in the
sentence. This in turn opens up the problem of the position of the “Nominativus pendens”, which
has all the properties of Romance HT (it only occur in main clauses, it is not recursive, and it does
not “copy” the case of the argument in the clause). These considerations show that we have to be
cautious in extending the CP structure elaborated on the basis of Romance data trying to find the
Germanic analogues of LD and HT. Therefore, I will leave this to future research.
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is more flexible and permits to account for the differences among V2 languages as well as for the difference between V2 and non V2 languages.

8 • CONCLUSION

In the preceding sections I argued in favor of a split CP analysis for a V2 variety, the Rhaetoromance dialect of S. Leonardo in the Badia valley. The data we considered here shed light on the following questions:

a) it is not possible to analyze V2 languages as having an ‘unsplit CP’ and derive the linear restriction in this way;
b) the CP layering of V2 languages is identical to the one of non V2 languages;
c) the V2 phenomenon derives from the properties of at least two projections (Force and Fin).

The Rr data analyzed in this paper clearly exclude some of the possible theoretical accounts of V2 illustrated in section 1. For instance, it is clear that postulating that V2 languages have an unsplit CP consisting of a single projection does not capture the Rhaetoromance pattern. A weak version of the same basic idea as the one proposed in Poletto and Tomaselli (1999) which postulates that whenever V3 cases are found a ‘feature scattering’ process along the lines proposed by Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) has applied, still does not account for the complex pattern of Rhaetoromance. In Poletto and Tomaselli’s proposal, feature scattering is constrained by a general restriction which imposes that the mechanism that scatters one feature per projection can only apply starting from the lowest feature and proceeding to the higher ones. If we assume the CP structure discussed above, this analysis fails to predict the difference found between HT and LD on one side and Scene Setting on the other: scene setting adverbs are found in V2 constructions but only marginally in V3, while LD and HT cannot occur in V2 but only as the first element of the V3 sequence. This is not expected in such a system: given that LD is lower than Scene Setting it should be possible to have an LD constituent immediately followed by the inflected verb, which is not the case. Among the possible analyses mentioned in section 1, we also have to discard an analysis which imposes a requisite of spec-head agreement between the verb and whatsoever element in Comp (a sort of wh-criterion extended to all XPs found in CP) because this cannot derive the peculiar restrictions V3 sequences in Rr show. Although the analysis proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999) does not immediately capture the whole complex pattern illustrated above, it does when it
is combined with the format of the split CP proposed by Benincà and Poletto (2001), which is adopted here. Moreover, the difference internal to the V2 languages concerning V3 sequences can be modularized by assuming that some V2 languages but not all have a strong Force feature, while all V2 languages have a strong Fin feature. The idea that V2 languages allow different V3 patterns depending on the type of strong features assigned to the various CP projections is also potentially promising to account for language variation within the domain of Germanic languages.
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The left-periphery of V2-Rhaetoromance dialects: a new view on V2 and V3

Cecilia Poletto
Università di Padova

1 • INTRODUCTION

In this work I analyze V2 and V3 sequences in a Rhaetoromance variety which combines V2 with a complex left periphery typical of Romance languages showing that a split CP perspective can shed light on the apparently bizarre properties of this language.

The V2 phenomenon as originally defined by den Besten (1983) for German and Dutch can be split into three distinct syntactic properties: a) subject inversion, b) second position of the inflected verb (the so called 'linear restriction') c) root character of the phenomenon. In the traditional analysis these three properties are accounted for by assuming that in V2 languages the C° position must always be filled, therefore, in main clauses the inflected verb has to move to the C° position. V to C movement results in subject inversion; moreover, the ban against V2 in embedded contexts is derived by the fact that C° is already filled by the complementizer. The ungrammaticality of V3 sequences also follows because there is only one position available higher than C°, namely SpecC.

Subsequent work on Germanic languages has shown that the three properties do not always go together: as for the third property, it has been shown by Santorini (1989), Vikner (1995) (among others) that not all Germanic languages display V2 only in main clauses, Yiddish and Icelandic are so called 'generalized V2' languages, where V2 is possible in all embedded contexts.

The second observation which contributes to a further definition of the V2 phenomenon comes from Old Romance languages. Following Benincà’s (1984) proposal for Old French and medieval Northern Italian dialects, it is generally assumed the Old Romance languages were V2, although the root versus embedded asymmetry is not found in Spanish (cf. Fontana (1993)) and Southern Italian varieties. Moreover, Old Italian did not display the typical 'linear restriction' observed in the Germanic domain: in old Italian texts V3 and V4 sequences can be found, although the subject is located in between the auxiliary and the past participle, in the typical inversion pattern of Germanic languages (from now Now
The parallel between Old Romance and Germanic is thus based on g-inversion, which becomes the core property defining V2 languages as languages with obligatory V to C movement. Nevertheless, including Old Romance in the set of languages that have the V2 property leaves unexplained why the linear restriction is clearly observed by all Germanic languages, but not by Old Romance. In other words, admitting that Old Romance were also V2 in the technical sense that the inflected verb moved to C° captures the parallel behavior of Romance and Germanic varieties concerning g-inversion, but does not say anything concerning the difference, namely the fact that Germanic obeys the linear restriction, Old Romance (except a given stage in Old French) does not.

On the other hand, the split CP perspective proposed by Rizzi (1997), and now generally adopted for Romance is not immediately compatible with the way the linear restriction is derived in the ‘classical’ theory. If the CP layer has to be conceived as a number of distinct functional projections, each hosting a different type of element and checking distinct semantic features, the traditional account of the linear restriction in terms of V to C movement is no longer valid and we need to reformulate it in the new perspective.

This is what I will try to do in this paper focusing on a Rhaetoromance dialect, which seems to be an intermediate stage between Old Romance and Germanic, as it displays a restricted set of V3 cases. Starting from a structure like the one proposed in Rizzi (1997) exemplified in (1), I will examine various possibilities to account for the linear restriction of the V2 constraint:

(1) Force…(TOP*) (FOC) (TOP*) Finiteness

The first possibility which comes to mind to get hold of the linear restriction is to say that V2 languages do not have this layered CP at all. This has been proposed by Poletto and Tomaselli (1999) for Germanic V2: they assume that the difference between languages which possess a CP layer as the one in (1) and languages which have a single CP projection can be analyzed in terms of Giorgi and Pianesi’s (1997) theory of ‘feature scattering’: languages have the option of realizing more than one feature on a single head or ‘scatter’ each feature on a distinct functional head. Rhaetoromance data on V3 sequences described in section 5 show that this is not the case.

1 g-inversion has to be distinguished from free inversion, where the subject occurs at the right of the past participle.
The second logical possibility proposed by Poletto (2000) translates the old theory into the new framework based on den Besten's intuition that V2 is movement to the highest layer of the sentence: we can assume that although there are several CP projections available, V2 languages have to move an XP and the inflected verb to the CP highest position, namely Force in Rizzi's framework. Following this line of reasoning, the difference between two languages like, say, Italian and German would consist in an additional requirement of checking some Force feature both in the head and in the specifier of this projection, a contrast which is active in German but not in Italian.

The third logical option has been proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999), who both assume that V2 is not a property of the highest CP position, but a property of the lowest CP, namely Fin°, which encodes the [+/−finiteness] distinction in Rizzi's theory. Their system runs as follows: V2 languages have to fill the lowest C position by movement or by merge. Verb movement to Fin° is a last resort strategy for checking a strong [+Fin] feature, which is in fact not chosen in embedded contexts, where a complementizer checks the Fin feature. The necessity of the verb 'being second' is derived by two fundamental assumptions: the first one is that all second position phenomena follow from the EPP, which has to be conceived as a general requirement on having a predicative structure as the highest relation in the clause. Hence, EPP requires an XP movement to SpecFin when the verb is in Fin°. This explains why there must be at least one XP in front of the verb. The second basic claim accounts for the fact that there can be at most one XP in front of the verb implementing relativized minimality in its recent version (cf. Rizzi (2001)) into the analysis of V2: EPP is a feature which, being 'of no particular type in terms of the typology of potential interveners, … is able to block any type of movement' (Roberts (1999):39). Once an XP has moved to SpecFin to satisfy the EPP feature in Fin°, no other element can move to the CP domain without violating minimality. In other words, Fin° constitutes a 'bottle neck' through which only one XP can move. In principle this analysis admits cases of V3 when the first element is base-generated in the CP layer, as left dislocated elements are.

In this paper I will show that a) V3 cases are indeed restricted the way Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999) predict; b) both the XP and the verb move to positions which are higher than Fin° crossing over sentential particles which are directly merged in the CP domain c) the necessity to check a strong Force feature in Rhaetoromance but not in Old Italian accounts for the different distribution of XPs.
in the Comp domain in these languages. In order to derive the particular
distribution of V3 instances in the Rhaetoromance dialect of S. Leonardo (from
now on Rr), I will adopt a combination of Poletto’s (2000) hypothesis that in
Germanic languages the inflected verb raises to a very high position in the CP layer
with the Haegeman and Roberts’ idea that the number of XPs moved to the CP
layer cannot be more than one, and that this is due to a property of a low CP
position.
The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 I illustrate a modification of Rizzi’s
theory proposed by Benincà (2001), which is essential to the framework I adopt
here. Benincà shows that there is no Topic position lower than the Focus layer,
therefore all Left dislocated elements are located higher than focalized elements;
moreover, inside the ‘Topic field’ there is a special position for scene setting
adverbs, and Focus is a field containing several projections too. In section 3 and
section 4 I discuss further modifications to the split CP structure proposed by Rizzi
(1997). In section 5 the number and type of V3 sequences found in Rhaetoromance,
are described and discussed. In section 6 I formulate a proposal which captures the
distinction between Old Italian and Rr V3 sequences.

2 • TOPIC AND FOCUS

In order to analyze V2 on the basis of a split CP analysis we first have to have a
precise hypothesis on the type, number and properties of FPs contained in the CP
area. Therefore, in this section I briefly sketch the arguments given in Benincà
(2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2001) which on the basis of Italian data modify the
Topic/Focus portion of the CP structure proposed in Rizzi (1997) leading to a
structure containing three sublayers: a) a low one containing a number of Focus
projections and b) an intermediate one containing topics or themes which have a
resumptive clitic and c) a high one containing base generated Hanging Topics
(HTs). The Topic/Focus portion of the CP structure results to be different from the
one proposed in (1):
The three sublayers illustrated in (2) contain a number of functional projections, here I concentrate on some data that provide evidence for the internal composition of these ‘fields’. This structure differs from (1) in essentially two aspects: the first has to do with the lack of a Topic layer lower than Focus, the second with the split between Hanging Topic (HT) and Left Dislocation (LD).

In Benincà and Poletto (2001) the internal structure of each layer is examined. HT has to be distinguished from LD on the basis of the following differences:

a) HT does not copy the case (or the preposition) of the resumptive element in the clause, while LD does,

b) there can only be one HT, while there can be more than one left dislocated element,

c) the resumptive pronoun does not need to be a clitic, but can be a tonic pronoun or a full DP

d) HT requires a resumptive element while LD only does when the element is the direct object

e) HT is marginal (in some languages impossible) in embedded clauses, LD is not

f) when possible in embedded contexts it occurs before the complementizer while LD occurs after it. (see Benincà and Poletto (2001) for examples and for a detailed discussion of these differences).

This last piece of evidence distinguishing HT from LD also shows that HT is located higher, while LD is located lower than Force. This will constitute an important fact when considering V3 in Rr interrogatives.

The other important claim I will make use of in this paper is that LD can only occur higher than Focus. The first argument showing that there is no Topic lower than Focus proposed by Benincà (2001) is the ungrammaticality of sentences like (3):

(3) a  *A GIANNI, un libro di poesie, lo regalerete

   TO GIANNI, a book of poems, you will give it

   ‘You will give a book of poems to Gianni’

b  Un libro di poesie, A GIANNI, lo regalerete

   a book of poems, TO GIANNI, you will give it
In (3a) a left dislocated object (*un libro di poesie*) is located lower than contrastive focus and the sentence is ungrammatical, the opposite order illustrated in (3b) is perfectly well formed. However, Rizzi (1997) provides cases in which a left dislocated element seems to occur lower than a contrastive element:

\[(4)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{QUESTO a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire!} \\
& \quad \text{this to Gianni, tomorrow, to-him should tell} \\
& \quad \text{‘Tomorrow we should tell this to Gianni’} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{A Gianni, QUESTO, domani gli dovremmo dire!} \\
& \quad \text{to Gianni, THIS, tomorrow, to-him should tell} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{A Gianni, domani, QUESTO gli dovremmo dire!} \\
& \quad \text{to Gianni, tomorrow, THIS to-him should tell}
\end{align*}\]

Among the three sentences, (4c) has the correct order LD, Focus and is derived also by the structure given in (2). In (4b), the element located lower than Contrastive Focus is an adverbial, which has been shown by Benincà (2001) to occupy a position specialized for adverbs located lower than the usual preverbal subject position at the IP border. Therefore, it does not constitute a valid counterexample to the hypothesis in (2). However, (4a) seems a clear case of a left dislocated indirect object occurring lower than contrastive focus. Again, it is possible to show that this is not a genuine case of base generated LD but an instance of movement to a low secondary Focus position. First of all, the resumptive clitic in (4a) can be analyzed as a case of clitic doubling, and not as a true resumptive pronoun as the following sentence shows:

\[(5)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Gliel’ho detto a Gianni} \\
& \quad \text{to him-it have told to John} \\
& \quad \text{‘I told this to Gianni’}
\end{align*}\]

Benincà (1988) notes that in colloquial Italian sentences like (5), where the clitic doubles a DP in its argumental position, are common. Therefore, the fact that a dative is doubled does not constitute compelling evidence in favor of its dislocated status.

Second, Benincà (2001) shows that the indirect object in that position is sensitive to the weak cross over effect, a typical property of operator-variable chains, which is displayed by focussed elements but not by topics, as the contrast in (6) shows:
Therefore, sentences like (4a) can be interpreted as two Foci and not as of LD embedded under a Focus and we can rely on data like the one in (3) and assume a simpler structure as the one illustrated in (2). Therefore, Focus, on a par with LD, is also a complex field containing more than one projection. We will not further discuss the internal structure of the LD and Focus fields (for details see Benincà and Poletto (2001), as it is not relevant to the main question discussed here, namely the distribution of V2 and V3 sequences in Rr. In the next section I present some data which suggest that an additional projection lower than HT but higher than LD has to be added to the structure in (2).

3 • THE SCENE SETTING POSITION

In this section I will examine data of a V2 Rhaetoromance variety spoken in the Badia valley, in the village of S. Leonardo. This dialect displays the core property of V2 phenomenology, as it has g-inversion. It also displays a V2 matrix versus embedded asymmetry, but only in wh contexts, a fact which will not be further discussed here. As for the linear restriction, this is not always respected (see section 5), but for the moment I will leave these cases aside concentrating on the analysis of circumstantial adverbs. The examples in (7) illustrate g-inversion, those in (8) and (9) the linear restriction:
The examples in (8) and (9) show that these dialects obey the V2 linear restriction: when two (or more) elements are located at the left of the verb, the sentence is ungrammatical. This is true when the two elements are two internal arguments (as in (9)), a lower adverb and an internal argument (8), two lower adverbs, or a lower adverb and the subject (but see below for a detailed discussion of V3 orders).

Evidence in favour of the idea that circumstantial and quantificational adverbs can occupy a special high position inside the CP layer, is already provided by the lack of contrastive focalization that circumstantial adverbs display with respect to other adverbial elements.

In V2 varieties the first position of the clause is often considered to be a Focus position, this is true at least for objects but surely not for subjects (cf. Zwart (1997) for a recent analysis of these facts)) and for expletives like German es. Adverbs split into two classes with respect to focalization: lower adverbs\(^2\) can only appear in first position when they are contrastively focalized, circumstantial adverbs do not

---

\(^2\) I use here Cinque (1999) terminology, lower adverbs are those adverbs that are located in the specifiers of the possible movement positions of the past participle.
need any particular intonational contour and are not necessarily associated with the contrastive-focus interpretation:

(10)  

a  Duman n vagn-l pa nia
   tomorrow not goes-he not not
   ’Tomorrow he is not coming’

b  DUMAN n vagn-l pa nia
   tomorrow not goes-he not not  (interpret. ’not-tomorrow’)

(11)  

a  *Trees l feje-l
   always it does-he
   ’He always does it’

b  TREES l feje-l

Modulo the V2 property this is true also in languages like standard Italian: lower adverbs must be contrastively focalized, circumstantial adverbs need not:

(12)  

a  SEMPRE lo fa
   always it-does (he)

b  *Sempre lo fa

(13)  

a  DOMANI viene
   tomorrow comes (he)
   ’Tomorrow he will come’

b  Domani viene

All adverbs can occupy a Contrastive Focus position in the CP layer, as the grammaticality of (10b) and (11b) show. Only circumstantial adverbs can occupy a very high position where they are not focalized, and do not interfere with the V2 linear restriction, as the contrast between (10a) and (11a) indicates. Indeed, the semantics of sentences like (13b) is completely different from contrastive focus, as here the adverb provides the hearer with some background information or ’setting the scene’. Therefore, I will refer from now on to the high position occupied by non focalized circumstantial and quantificational adverbs as a ’scene setting position’. Additional evidence that the class of circumstantial adverbs has to be kept apart from all other adverbial classes when it occurs in first position is provided by
subject agreement patterns: in dialect of S. Leonardo there are three possible agreement patterns, as exemplified in (14):

(14) a Duman mangia la muta pom  
*tomorrow eats P. apples*  
'Tomorrow the girl will eat apples'
b Duman mang-la la muta pom  
*tomorrow eats-she the girl apples*
c ??Duman mang-l Maria pom  
Only older generation
d Dar incà vegn-el la si  
*just here comes-it the fence*
e Dar incà vegn-la la si  
*just here comes-she the fence*
f La muta mangia pom  
*the girl eats apples*  
'The girl is eating apples'
g *La muta la mangia pom  
*the girl she eats apples*

In (14a) the inverted subject is not doubled by any subject clitic and is located at the left of the object. In (14b) a full agreeing clitic doubles the postverbal subject (which is still in a pre-object position). A third agreement pattern, where an expletive third person singular masculine clitic doubles the postverbal subject, is exemplified in (14c, d). As this is is only marginally possible with transitive verbs while it is perfect only with inaccusatives, I will leave this third pattern aside. Notice that the only possible pattern with a preverbal subject is the one without any clitic, as the contrast between (14g) and (14h) shows, so the same as the one exemplified in (14a) with a postverbal subject. I will consider here the first two patterns. When a lower adverb is selected only one of the two patterns is possible, namely the one with the doubling clitic:

(15) a  
*Gonoot mangia la Maria pom  
*often eats the Mary apples*  
'Often Mary eats apples'
b  
Gonoot mang-la la Maria pom  
*often eats-he the Mary apples*
This is not true for circumstantial adverbs, which admit both agreement patterns, as shown in (14).

Hence, circumstantial adverbs display a different intonational pattern and can trigger a special subject agreement when they are located in first position. Although these data show that circumstantial adverbs have to be singled out as a special class, they do not show how this is encoded in the structure of the CP layer. The decisive argument showing that circumstial adverbs occupy a special position in the CP domain is provided by embedded contexts, where a circumsticial adverb can only be focalized:

(18)  a  Al m a dit c DUMAN va-al a Venezia  +focus
  he me has told that tomorrow goes-he to Venice
  ‘He told me that he is going to Venice tomorrow.’

b  *Al m a dit c duman va-al a Venezia
  he me has told that tomorrow goes-he to Venice
  ‘He told me that he is going to Venice tomorrow.’

In Poletto (2000) I argued that the contrast between (18a) and (18b) can be accounted for in terms of split CP in the following way: the special position for circumstantial adverbs is only available in matrix clauses. Given that the semantics of these adverbials when they are located in this sentence initial position is precisely that of ‘setting the scene’, it is plausible that such a position is only needed (hence possible) in a matrix domain where this type of information is
expressed. The fact that the 'scene setting' position occupied by this special class of adverbs is only found in matrix clauses immediately recalls the distribution of HT. As we noted in section 3, HTs contrast with LD because they are at least marginal in embedded contexts: they cannot occur in embedded domains in French and in relative clauses in standard Italian (cf. Benincà and Poletto (2001) for a discussion on this point). Therefore, being (at least partially) restricted to matrix contexts seems to be a property of the 'outer portion' of the CP layer, the one located higher than Force, which is obviously present in both matrix and embedded contexts. If we are on the right track, there should be some empirical evidence which helps us singling out the scene setting position from the higher HT position. This is provided by the possibility of having a scene setting adverb in V2 contexts, while a HT is ungrammatical in declarative clauses:

(19)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Duman ti dai l lber a Giani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>tomorrow to-him give-I the book to Giani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Tomorrow I will give the book to John'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>*Giani, ti ai bel dè l liber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John, to him have-i given the book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'John, I already gave him the book'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, scene setting adverbs can satisfy the V2 requirement, and be located immediately before the verb, while HTs cannot. That the scene setting position is lower than the HT position, which is most probably only a position for DPs, can be shown on the basis of standard Italian, where circumstantial adverbs can occur lower than HTs but the reverse is not true (we report here data from Benincà and Poletto (2001: 46), which the reader is referred to for a detailed discussion):

(20)  

| Mario, nel 1999, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel |
| Mario, in the 1999 to-him have given the Prize Nobel |
| 'M., in 1999, they gave him the Nobel Prize' |

(21)  

| ??Nel 1999, Mario, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel |
| in the 1999, Mario, to-him have given the Prize Nobel |
| 'They spoke very basdly about Mario o the newspaper' |

| *Sul giornale, Mario, ne hanno parlato malissimo |
| on the newspaper, Mario, of him have spoken very badly |
| 'They spoke very basdly about Mario o the newspaper' |
As (20) and (21) show the ordering scene setting-HT is ungrammatical, while the opposite is possible. Hence, these data show a) that HTs and scene setting have to be distinguished because they cooccur  b) scene setting is located lower than HT. The structure of the CP layer assumed here can thus be modified as it follows:

(22)  [Hanging TopicP [Scene setting [Force [Left Dislocation [FocusP  [IP ]]]]]]

We will adopt this structure in the following sections.

4 • NEW CONTEXT PARTICLES

Badiotto has a number of sentence particles, some of which occurring at the very beginning of the clause, some others occurring in sentence internal position. I concentrate here on the particle pa, which marks the lack of any presupposed context, and is compatible with all sentence types, with the same semantics. In a recent paper Poletto and Zanuttini (2001) propose that pa is located in a low Comp position. Firstly, elements marking this type of pragmatic features are typically located in the CP domain, as the locus where informational structure is encoded and in particular, if we are right in following Benincà’s (2001) intuition that the Focus field is lower than the Topic field, it belongs to the lowest portion of the left periphery. Syntactic evidence in favor of this claim is provided by the following examples:

(23)  a  Al a pa d sigy mangé  (S. Leonardo)
     SCL have pa of sure eaten
     ‘He has surely eaten’

     b  *Al a d sigy pa mangé
     SCL has of sure pa eaten

     c  Al a pa magari bel mangé
     SCL has pa perhaps already eaten
     ‘Perhaps he has already eaten’

     d  *Al a magari pa bel mangé
The particle *pa* occurs higher than 'higher adverbs' in Cinque's (1999) hierarchy, it also occurs higher than the subject located in SpecAgrS or, following more recent minimal accounts, SpecTP; hence higher than the highest IP elements. Furthermore, it is incompatible with a low complementizer, as the interrogative complementizer *se* and the complementizer of suppletive imperative forms like the one in (25b); it contrasts with other particles (cf. (25a) which are perfectly grammatical in these contexts and which occur lower than *pa* when the two are combined (cf. Poletto and Zanuttini (1999) on the syntax and semantics of these particles in imperative clauses):

(26)  a  Faal pa ma!
     do-it  prt.  prt.
     'Please, do it'
 b  *Faal ma pa!

Hence, the semantics and the syntax of *pa* both indicate that its position is on the border between CP and IP. *Pa* is also used in other dialects, which have lost the V2 property and can have main interrogative clauses introduced by a complementizer. *Pa* and the interrogative complementizer are incompatible also in main interrogatives, just like in V2 Rhaetoromance embedded ones:

(27)  a  Olà che tu vas?  Pera di Fassa
     where that you go?
‘Where are you going?’

b Olà pa tu vas?

where INTERR MARKER you go?

c *Olà che pa tu vas?

where that INTERR MARKER you go?

‘Where are you going?’

d *Ola pa che tu vas?

where interr marker that you go?

Therefore, we can assume that it occupies a low position in the CP layer. This position has to be lower than the position of the inflected verb in V2 contexts, which obligatorily precedes it. As pa can only be present in the clause when the sentence conveys new information outside a context, we propose that the position it occupies is the syntactic reflex of its semantics: pa occupies a ‘new information’ (NI) position in the lower portion of the CP layer. Concerning the status of the particle as a head or a specifier, the head movement constraint forces us to assume that it occupies the specifier position of the NI projection, as the verb is moving to its head and then to higher head positions. The analysis of pa as a low SpecCP has interesting consequences for the analysis of V2 in the split CP framework. As discussed in section 1 one possible way to reconcile the V2 linear restriction and the split-CP hypothesis has been proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999), who assume that the inflected verb occupies the lowest CP position and, being subject to the EPP requires an element in its specifier position, which then blocks all other elements which might move to the CP domain. In Badiotto a particle is merged in a low SpecCP, while the verb moves higher, and the XP at its left must obviously be even higher. This shows that the position targeted by the inflected verb and by the XP at its left is not the lowest position in the CP domain, but a higher one. We will come back to this in section 6.

3 In Benincà and Poletto (2001) this position is the same where XPs corresponding to the new information of the clause are located in languages like Old Italian and Old and modern Sicilian. This is still to be ascertained, but we will leave this question aside for the moment.
Once we have established the precise layering of the CP structure and the fact that the verb is raising higher than the lowest position we now turn to the distribution of V2 and V3 sequences.

Let us first consider V2 instances. In Rr the set of elements that can satisfy V2 is restricted to focalized constituents, scene setting adverbs and wh-items; HTs and LD items cannot enter a V2 structure:

\[(28)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{*L Giat, l’ai odu}^4 \\
& \quad \text{the cat, it have-I seen} \\
& \quad \text{‘I have seen the cat’} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{*Giani, ti ai bel baï} \\
& \quad \text{Giani, to him have-I already spoken} \\
& \quad \text{‘I already talked to John’} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{*De Giani ai bel baï} \\
& \quad \text{of Giani, have-I already spoken} \\
& \quad \text{‘I already talked about John’}
\end{align*}
\]

This is totally unexpected in the traditional view that places whatever element in SpecC. It is also unexpected under Poletto and Tomaselli’s (1999) approach that analyzes V2 languages as having an ‘unscattered CP’: if any type of element can satisfy the V2 requirement, why should HT and LD elements be excluded?

On the other hand, the V2 constraint in Rr is not absolute, V3 depends on the type of elements that occur in first and second position. This is a general property of V2 languages, where V3 orders are admitted, but always in a very limited way which depends on the type of the first of the two XPs preposed to the inflected verb. Standard German for instance displays V3 cases which look (at least partially) similar to Romance HT or to LD:

\[(29)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Peter, ich werde ihn sehen} \\
& \quad \text{Peter, I will him see} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Den Peter, den habe ich gesehen} \\
& \quad \text{the+acc. Peter him have I seen} \\
& \quad \text{‘I already saw Peter’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^4\) A sentence like this is ambiguous between a HT and a LD. The fact that it is ungrammatical shows that not only the HT is out but also the LD possibility.
A closer examination of all the possible V2 and V3 patterns found in Badiotto making use of the layered structure of the CP field we have adopted from Benincà and Poletto (2001), reveals a complex pattern which is only partially similar to the one of standard German in (29).

As in the Germanic languages, it is not possible to have V3 with two XPs in the Focus field:

\[(30)\]
\[
a \quad *\text{Da trai } l\text{ liber } ti\ a\-i\ de\ a\ Giani \\
\quad \text{sometimes the book to-him have-I given to John} \\
\quad \text{‘Sometimes I gave the book to John’}
\]

\[
b \quad *\text{L liber da trai } ti\ a\-i\ de\ a\ Giani \\
\quad \text{the book sometimes have-I given to John}
\]

The same is true for the combination of a focalized constituent and a wh-item:

\[(31)\]
\[
*\text{L LIBER che ti a de a Giani?} \\
\quad \text{the book who to him has given to John} \\
\quad \text{‘Who gave the book to John?’}
\]

However the combination of a focalized constituent (or a wh item) with a scene setting adverb is marginally possible⁵:

\[(32)\]
\[
a \quad \text{Duman vagne}l \\
\quad \text{Tomorrow comes-he}
\]

\[
b \quad \text{L GIAT ai odu} \\
\quad \text{THE CAT have-I seen}
\]

The sentence in (ia) contains a scene setting adverb, which behaves like the focalized object in (ib). So, the evidence provided by (ia) and (ib) is contradictory: (ia) indicates that, at least marginally scene setting adverbs can be directly merged in CP, while the fact that they satisfy the V2 requirement on a par with HT and LD cases. Contrary to our expectations, they do:

\[(i)\]
\[
a \quad \text{Duman vagne}l \\
\quad \text{Tomorrow comes-he}
\]

\[
b \quad \text{L GIAT ai odu} \\
\quad \text{THE CAT have-I seen}
\]

The solution to the puzzle rests on the marginality of sentences like those in (32), which are in fact accepted only by the younger generation: scene setting adverbs like duman do display operator-like movement from the IP to the left periphery, but can also marginally be analyzed as DPs and only under this analysis be directly merged into the HT position, which is a exclusively a position for DPs. This also explains the feeling of the speakers who note that in a sentence like (ia), the adverb is "out of the sentence” while this is not true of cases like (ib).
I will discuss the intermediate status of examples like (32) in section 7. The only possible V3 orders that are clearly admitted in declarative clauses when the first of the two elements is a HT:

\[(33) \quad \text{L liber, A GIANI ti l'ai bel dé} \]
\[
\text{the book, TO GIANI it have-I already given}
\]
\[
\text{‘I already gave the book to John’}
\]

Left dislocation is not possible as the first element of a V3 structure, as the following example shows:

\[(34) \quad *\text{De Giani CUN PIERO ai bel baié} \]
\[
\text{Of Giani, WITH PIERO have-I already spoken}
\]

The situation changes radically in interrogative sentences, as it is possible to left-dislocate all XPs in front of a wh-item; this may be a subject as illustrated in (35b), an object as in (36) or an adverb as in (37):

\[(35) \quad a \quad \text{De Giani, con che bai-la pa?} \]
\[
\text{of Giani, with whom speak-she INTERR, PRT?}
\]
\[
\text{‘With whom did talk about John?’}
\]
\[
b \quad \text{Giani, ci o-I pa?} \]
\[
\text{John what wants-he INTERROGATIVE MARKER?}
\]
\[
\text{‘What does John want?’}
\]
\[
c \quad *\text{Ci Giani o-I pa?} \]
\[
\text{what John wants-he INTERROGATIVE MARKER?}
\]

\[(36) \quad a \quad \text{L liber chi l tol pa?} \]
\[
\text{the book who it takes INTERROGATIVE MARKER?}
\]
\[
\text{‘Who is going to take the book?’}
\]
While the sequence left dislocation-wh-item is grammatical, the opposite wh-item/left-dislocation order is totally excluded. 

Rr left-dislocation displays the usual properties of Romance left-dislocation, namely: a) recursivity, (cf (38)); and b) free word order of left-dislocated elements (as shown by the grammaticality of the pairs (38a)-(38b) and (38c)-(38d) and occurrence in embedded contexts, as illustrated in (38e)).

(38)  

a  Giani, inier, ci a-al pa fat?

John yesterday what has-he INTERROGATIVE MARKER done?

‘What has John done yesterday?’

b  Inier, Giani, ci a-al pa fat?

yesterday John what has-he INTERROGATIVE MARKER done?

c  Giani, inier, l as-t ody?

John yesterday him has-you seen?

‘Did you see John yesterday?’

d  Inier, Giani, l as-t ody?

yesterday John him has-you seen?

e  Al m a demanee Giani, can c al vagn a ciasa

he me has asked John when that he comes at home

‘He asked me when John is coming home’

The contrast between declaratives and interrogatives is illustrated in (39) by a minimal pair:

(39)  

a  *Giani, duman l vaiges-t

John tomorrow him see-you

‘You will see John tomorrow’
Rhaetoromance left-dislocation is similar to standard Italian left-dislocation (as it is recursive, all orders of left-dislocated elements are possible and embedding is allowed), although this is a V2 variety. The only difference with respect to standard Italian is the limited context in which left-dislocation may occur in Rhaetoromance.

Summing up what we have seen so far:

a) V2 is only possible when the first constituent is a focalized XP, a scene setting adverb or a wh-item

b) V3 instances are possible in declaratives only if the first constituent is a HT (or marginally a scene setting adverb) and the second is a focalized XP or a wh-item.

c) V3 in interrogative clauses is possible if the first element is a HT or a LD item.

d) Interrogative clauses also admit V4 structures, given that it is possible to combine HT with LD and LD is recursive.

6 • V3 AND SPLIT CP

In this section I will propose an analysis which accounts for the data illustrated in section 5.

First, we noted that the V2 requirement can only be satisfied by a moved element, elements like LD and HT cannot occur at the immediate left of the inflected verb in the S. Leonardo dialect.

The grammaticality of V3 sequences also depends on the type of elements that are located to the left of the verb: V3 sequences are excluded if both elements are moved to the CP domain. This includes all cases of two focalized elements or a focalized element and a wh, whatever the ordering of the two elements is:

---

*The contrasts just presented combined with the fact that HTs and LDs cannot be found as the first element of a V2 declarative clause, but can always be realized in interrogative clauses, (because interrogative clauses always contain a wh-operator which satisfies the V2 requirement), has the effect of rendering LD much more common in interrogative contexts than in declarative ones. This has also been noted in diachronic work of Old French by Roberts (1993).*
V3 is only possible when one of the two elements is merged inside CP and not moved, which leaves only sequences formed by a HT or LD element (which have been analyzed by Cinque (1990) as base generated in the position where they occur) and by a focalized or wh-item. I will refer to this phenomenon as the 'restriction on type', meaning by that that V2 and V3 are sensitive to the type of elements located at the left of the verb.

Second, the ordering of the two elements is rigid: the first of the two elements preceding the inflected verb has to be merged in CP (either HT or, in interrogatives, a LD). If the first of the two elements is a focalized element and the second is a HT, the sequence is out even if the first restriction is respected:

\[(41) \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a} & *\text{Foc HT} \\
\text{b} & \text{HT Foc} \\
\text{c} & *\text{Wh HT} \\
\text{d} & \text{HT Wh} \\
\text{e} & \text{Wh LD} \\
\text{f} & *\text{LD Wh}
\end{array}\]

I will refer to this as the 'restriction on ordering'.

Third, an asymmetry between main interrogatives and declaratives has been observed in Rr: in interrogative clauses a LD can occur in front of a wh-item, but this is not the case for a focalized element in declarative clauses:

\[(42) \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a} & \text{LD Wh} \\
\text{b} & *\text{LD Foc}
\end{array}\]

I will refer to this as the 'wh-asymmetry'.

The three restrictions illustrated in (40), (41) and (42) are straightforwardly captured within the split CP framework adopted here on the basis of the following assumptions: a) the first assumption we need to make is Haegeman’s (1997) and Roberts’ (1999) proposal (already illustrated in section 1) that in all V2 languages the verb has to move at least to the head of a low CP position because that head
has a strong feature. Moreover, in order to satisfy EPP, an XP has to move to the
Spec position of this low CP position, which, being ‘neutral’ in terms of features,
blocks all movements of other XPs to the CP domain by minimality.
If we assume Haegeman’s (1997) and Roberts’ (1999) analysis of V2 which
excludes V3 sequences on the basis of a restriction on movement through the
lowest CP position, we predict that:
a) if V2 is a condition which leads to the deletion of EPP features, we expect that
no element which is directly merged in a higher CP can satisfy this condition.
Hence, only elements that are merged in or moved to (or through) SpecFin can
satisfy V2, while elements that are merged higher than this position cannot.
This prediction is borne out, as no LD or HT can satisfy the V2 requirement.
b) On the other side, V3 cases are possible only when the first of the two elements
preceding the inflected verb is merged directly inside CP and not moved from
within the clause because all movements across SpecFin is banned by
minimality. This prediction is also borne out, as the only elements that can
occur in the first position of a V3 sequence are merged in CP.
Hence, the restriction on type can be straightforwardly derived by Haegeman’s
(1997) and Robert’s (1999) system: given that focalized elements and wh-items are
both moved to the CP layer, they would both have to move to the low SpecCP
position, which is not possible in an antisymmetric framework where there is only
one specifier position as the one adopted here following Kayne (1994).
Alternatively, one of the two would have to move crossing the low SpecCP
position, violating minimality. Therefore, a combination of two moved elements is
never possible in V2 languages, nor is the combination of two elements merged in
a higher CP.
b) The second assumption is that the CP layer is split also in V2 languages;
furthermore it is similar to the CP of non V2 languages as modern standard
Italian and is made of (at least) the following projections:

(43)  [HT [Scene setting [ Force [LD … [LD [Focus [WH]]]]]]]

The Focus position needs to be distinguished from the position of wh-items as
Cinque (p.c.) noted, because it is possible to combine a focalized element with a
wh-item in embedded interrogative clauses, as shown in (44)7:

7 In addition to this, it is well known that there can be more than one LD element in Romance;
Benincà and Poletto (2001) show that there are several LD positions, some of which can be
(44) Mi hanno chiesto A GIANNI chi ha portato il libro, non ad Antonio
they asked me to Gianni who has taken the book, not to Antonio
‘They asked me who sent the book to John, not to Antony’

The restriction on ordering formulated above can be captured if we combine Haegeman and Roberts’ proposal with the split CP in (43): we saw above that it is not possible to combine two moved elements at the left of the inflected verb, however, Haegeman’s and Robert’s proposal does not block sequences where one of the two elements is moved and the other is base generated in CP, as Hanging Topics and most probably Left dislocated elements are. Hence, the combination of one moved element with one element merged in CP is predicted to be grammatical by Haegeman and Robert’s framework. This is however not sufficient to account for the distribution of V3 sequences in Rr: as noted above the only possible ordering is the one in which the first element is a LD or a HT (namely the one that is merged in CP) and the second is a moved element (a focus or a wh-item). This follows crucially from the format of the split CP adopted here: if the ‘Topic field’ containing Hanging Topic and Left Dislocation is located higher than the one of moved elements like Focus and wh-items, the only possible ordering is precisely the one in (43): given that HT and LD elements are merged higher than Focus and wh-items, there is no possible derivation for the ordering in (41 a, c,f). On the contrary, if a split CP is simply conceived as recursion, the restriction on ordering remains unexplained.

As for the third restriction, namely the asymmetry between interrogative and declarative clauses, this is a priori unexpected if the null hypothesis is maintained, namely that each element moved to the CP domain ultimately targets the projection where its features are checked, so wh-items move to a wh-projection, focalized elements to a Focus projection and scene setting adverbs to the scene setting position. We need an additional device to account for this. Moreover, we also have to keep in mind that this restriction is language specific; as mentioned in the introduction, Benincà (1984) shows that Old Italian did have declarative sentences where a LD element was followed by a Focus. Hence, Old Italian did not

distinguished on the basis of their syntactic and semantic properties. However, we leave this further refinement out, because it is tangential to the question discussed here and simply note the fact that there can be many LD positions with “…” between the two LD projections.
show any interrogative/declarative asymmetry; LD was always possible provided it was located higher than a focalized constituent or a wh-item. In Poletto (2000) I proposed that the position ultimately targeted by focalized elements in Rr is higher than the LD position: this means that once the focalized XP has reached its SpecFocus position, it has to raise further to a higher position, which must be located lower than Hanging Topic (given that Hanging Topic-Focus sequences are possible), but higher than LD, as shown in (45):

(45) [HT [Scene setting [Force [LD [LD [Focus [WH]]]]]]]

This position already exists, in Rizzi’s account it is Force, namely the projection where the sentence is typed. Suppose that the Force position has strong features that must be checked before spell out in Rr. This means that it must be filled by some element. In embedded contexts a complementizer is merged in Force°, in matrix clauses it is targeted by all elements moved to the CP layer. If focalized elements move higher than LD, one might expect that the sequence Foc-LD is possible, which is not true (cf. (41) above). An independent constraint proposed by Rizzi (1997) rules out this sequence: suppose that the inflected verb has to raise to Force°, given the head movement constraint it should have to stop in the head of the LD position before moving higher. This is not possible: as Rizzi (1997) notes, the head position of a Topic projection is not accessible to verb movement, because it already contains strong features; hence the inflected verb cannot move through the LD° head and reach the head of the V2 position giving rise to ungrammaticality.

Therefore, both orderings Focus-LD and LD Focus are excluded in Rr, with the consequence that LD is banned from declarative clauses.

Consider now interrogative clauses. There is empirical evidence that the Force projection typing interrogative clauses is located much lower in the structure than declarative Force (Rizzi (1997) and Rizzi (2001a) assumes this; see Poletto and Pollock (2000) for a detailed discussion on the position of Interrogative Force).

Therefore, in interrogative clauses the inflected verb does not need to raise higher than the LD position, because the interrogative sentence is already typed lower; LD is thus perfectly compatible with interrogative clauses.

On this basis, we can also derive the difference between Rr and Old Italian: in Old Italian the Force position does not need to be checked before spell out; focalized
elements remain in SpecFocus, therefore the ordering LD-Focus is possible, on a par with the sequence LD-wh-item. Thus, Old Italian represents the 'null option' mentioned above, a language in which Force does not have strong features, hence no further movement is required higher than the position where the semantic features of an XP are checked. Hence, V2 languages all have a low CP projection where strong features have to be checked, some of them have an additional requirement of checking the higher Force projection. Verb movement to Force results in a ban against LD in declaratives but not in interrogatives, hence V3 sequences are very limited and we observe an asymmetry between interrogatives and declaratives.

This amounts to saying that V2 is a conspiracy of different factors, some of which are language specific, while others are common properties of the CP layer. The language specific factors are:

a) the requirements of checking a low CP, common to all V2 languages and
b) the necessity to check Force features, which is only necessary in some V2 languages.

Independent properties of the CP layer are:

a) the layering we have described above,
b) the distinct positions for declarative and interrogative Force and
   c) the ban against verb movement through the LD positions.

Considering the V2 phenomenon as a complex set of requirements instead of trying to find out a single property which characterizes all V2 languages also has the advantage of discharging that burden of the major difference between Old Italian and Rr on independent factors, namely the distinct realization of Force in interrogatives with respect to declaratives, a fact which is true of Romance in general and not simply of V2 varieties. On the other side, a modular account of V2

---

8 Our analysis could be in principle extended to Germanic languages. Nevertheless, it is not clear whether the construction known as “Linksversetzung” in languages like German is really the counterpart of Romance LD, given that it differs from Romance LD with respect to the following properties: a) it is never recursive and b) it does not occur in embedded domains. In Romance, these two properties are typical of the HT and not of LD, thus suggesting that the so called Linksversetzung is probably to be located in the HT position, which is the highest position in the sentence. This in turn opens up the problem of the position of the “Nominativus pendens”, which has all the properties of Romance HT (it only occur in main clauses, it is not recursive, and it does not “copy” the case of the argument in the clause). These considerations show that we have to be cautious in extending the CP structure elaborated on the basis of Romance data trying to find the Germanic analogues of LD and HT. Therefore, I will leave this to future research.
is more flexible and permits to account for the differences among V2 languages as well as for the difference between V2 and non V2 languages.

8 • CONCLUSION

In the preceding sections I argued in favor of a split CP analysis for a V2 variety, the Rhaetoromance dialect of S. Leonardo in the Badia valley. The data we considered here shed light on the following questions:

a) it is not possible to analyze V2 languages as having an ‘unsplit CP’ and derive the linear restriction in this way;
b) the CP layering of V2 languages is identical to the one of non V2 languages;
c) the V2 phenomenon derives from the properties of at least two projections (Force and Fin).

The Rr data analyzed in this paper clearly exclude some of the possible theoretical accounts of V2 illustrated in section 1. For instance, it is clear that postulating that V2 languages have an unsplit CP consisting of a single projection does not capture the Rhaetoromance pattern. A weak version of the same basic idea as the one proposed in Poletto and Tomaselli (1999) which postulates that whenever V3 cases are found a ‘feature scattering’ process along the lines proposed by Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) has applied, still does not account for the complex pattern of Rhaetoromance. In Poletto and Tomaselli’s proposal, feature scattering is constrained by a general restriction which imposes that the mechanism that scatters one feature per projection can only apply starting from the lowest feature and proceeding to the higher ones. If we assume the CP structure discussed above, this analysis fails to predict the difference found between HT and LD on one side and Scene Setting on the other: scene setting adverbs are found in V2 constructions but only marginally in V3, while LD and HT cannot occur in V2 but only as the first element of the V3 sequence. This is not expected in such a system: given that LD is lower than Scene Setting it should be possible to have an LD constituent immediately followed by the inflected verb, which is not the case. Among the possible analyses mentioned in section 1, we also have to discard an analysis which imposes a requisite of spec-head agreement between the verb and whatsoever element in Comp (a sort of wh-criterion extended to all XPs found in CP) because this cannot derive the peculiar restrictions V3 sequences in Rr show. Although the analysis proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999) does not immediately capture the whole complex pattern illustrated above, it does when it
is combined with the format of the split CP proposed by Benincà and Poletto (2001), which is adopted here. Moreover, the difference internal to the V2 languages concerning V3 sequences can be modularized by assuming that some V2 languages but not all have a strong Force feature, while all V2 languages have a strong Fin feature. The idea that V2 languages allow different V3 patterns depending on the type of strong features assigned to the various CP projections is also potentially promising to account for language variation within the domain of Germanic languages.
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Prepositional Dative Marking in Upper German: A Case of Syntactic Microvariation*
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ABSTRACT

In several Upper German dialects, a dative NP can optionally be introduced by a preposition-like morpheme ('an' or 'in'):

'er hat's  _an_ (or: _in_) der  Mutter gesagt'

he has it _AN_ IN the:Dsf mother told

In the present paper I will pursue the following questions:
- In which dialect areas is prepositional dative marking (PDM) attested?
- What type of morpheme are the dative markers 'an' and 'in'?
- Under which conditions does PDM occur?
- What are possible explanations for the emergence of PDM?

I will show that the occurrence of PDM is influenced by morphological, syntactic, discourse-functional and phonological factors, the relevance of which varies between the different dialect areas.

1 INTRODUCTION

In several Alemannic and Bavarian dialects, it is possible to introduce a dative NP by a preposition-like morpheme that is homophonous with the prepositions _an_ ('at, beside of') and _in_ ('in, into'). Schematically:

(1)  [ _NP_{DAT}_ ]  ==>  [ _an_ / _in_ + _NP_{DAT}_ ]

*I am grateful to Anna Dale, Paris, for improving my English.

† Although the arguments for a DP analysis of nominal constituents in German are striking, I use the term 'NP' since it is more widely established cross-theoretically.
I will call this construction prepositional dative marking (PDM), the morphemes *an* or *in* dative markers. On the surface, PDM exactly looks like a PP; however, the syntactic behavior of the dative markers *in* or *an* is clearly distinct from that of the homophonous true prepositions (see below, section 4). Used as dative markers, *in* and *an* are functionally equivalent; their distribution is geographically determined (See below, Section 2).

In (2)-(5) PDM is exemplified by *in* and *an* as dative markers in Bavarian or Alemannic, respectively:

(2) Bavarian, AN: \(\text{du muasst es} \quad \text{a deinà frau} \quad \text{vaschraibn lássn}\)

\(\text{you must:2s it} \quad \text{AN your:Dsf wife transfer let:Inf}\)

‘you have to transfer it [=the money] to your wife’

(Malching; Ströbl 1970:66)

(3) Bavarian, IN: \(\text{sàg’s in der frau}\)

\(\text{say it IN the:Dsf woman}\)

‘say it to the woman’

(Upper Inn Valley; Schöpf 1866:286)

(4) Alemannic, AN: \(\text{er git dr Öpfel a mir, statt a dir}\)

\(\text{he gives the apple AN me:D instead AN you:D}\)

‘he gives the apple to me, not to you’

(Glarus; Bäbler 1949:31)
(5) Alemannic, IN: Di isch uf d´ alt´ Eed´mburg ufpau´,
    *this is on the:Dsfl old:Dsf [a castle] built*
    di wòòrschinlich i d´ Edl vo Jeeschtet´
    *which:Nsf probably IN the:Dp noble:p from [a village]*
    khöört hät.
    *belonged has*

'This [chapel] is built on the old Edenburg which probably belonged to the nobles of Jestetten'
(Jestetten; Keller 1970:57)

Note that PDM makes use of dative case morphology. It doesn't replace the dative case, but dative case morphology is 'recycled', i.e. used again in this prepositional construction. In other words, PDM is more a reinforcement than a substitution of the dative case.

It is generally assumed that the emergence of similar analytic constructions in modern Romance or Germanic languages (*à ma mère, to my mother*) is connected with the loss of distinctive case morphology: whether the erosion of dative case endings causes the grammaticalization of directional prepositions into indirect object markers, or whether it is the grammaticalization of prepositions that forces the loss of case inflection: in both views, the causality between the absence of case morphology and the presence of prepositional encoding strategies seems to be beyond any doubt.

In Upper German, however, we can observe prepositional encodings of the IO although dative case morphology is fairly intact. Thus, an explanation of PDM as a compensatory strategy for eroded case morphology clearly fails. Nevertheless, the geographical spread, the synchronic distribution and the diachronic development of this prepositional construction are very instructive of the conditions under which it is possible for prepositional encodings of the IO to emerge and to be preferred over non-prepositional ones.

In the present paper I will first give a short overview of the geographical spread of PDM (section 2). Section 3 deals with the paradigmatic status of dative case
morphology in Bavarian and Alemannic. I will then consider the syntactic behavior of the dative marker (section 4), in order to determine what type morpheme the dative marker is. Section 5 is about the distributional properties of PDM; it presents the environment factors governing the insertion of the dative marker as well as geographical differences in the occurrence of PDM. Section 6 proposes an explanation of the diachronic emergence of PDM. I will conclude with a few remarks about possible generalizations we can extract from PDM with regard to a theory of grammatical change (section 7).

This paper deals with the topic of my doctoral thesis that I will submit at Zurich University. It presents some of my findings – those I think are among the most interesting –, but it is clear that it is not possible to present all the relevant data and generalizations detected so far. On the other hand, insofar as the work is still in progress, many of the observations I am presenting here have a preliminary character and will be completed and refined in my doctoral thesis (Seiler (forthcoming)).

2 • GEOGRAPHICAL SPREAD OF PDM

PDM is widespread in Bavarian and Alemannic, although it doesn't occur over the entire Upper German dialect area. In order to get a picture of the geographical distribution of PDM I have evaluated different source types:
- Dialect dictionaries
- Grammatical descriptions
- Transcripts of records
- Dialect literature
- Spontaneous utterances
- Informant consultations
- Unpublished language atlas materials: German-speaking Switzerland (SDS), South-West Germany (SSA), Vorarlberg (VALTS), Bavarian Swebia (SBS), Upper Bavaria (SOB), Low Bavaria (SNIB), Upper Austria (SAO).

2 These sources are not exhaustively quoted in section 9, References.
3 I thank Rudolf Trüb, Zürich, Renate Schrambke, Freiburg/Breisgau, Eugen Gabriel, Wangen/Allgäu, Werner König, Augsburg, Cordula Maivald, Passau, Rosemarie Spannbauer-Pollmann, Passau, Hans-Werner Eroms, Passau, Hermann Scheuringer, Linz, Stephan Gaisbauer, Linz.
In Alemannic, PDM is found in (from North-West to South-East): Middle Alsace; South Baden; North Switzerland (Cantons of Aargau, Solothurn and Schaffhausen); Central Switzerland (Cantons of Lucerne, Zug, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Uri, Glarus); geographically separated in Fribourg at the German-French language boundary; only sporadically in the environments of Berne and Zurich. The dative markers \textit{an} and \textit{in} occupy distinct areas: \textit{an} in the eastern parts of Central Switzerland (Uri, Glarus, partly Schwyz), \textit{in} throughout the rest. In the transition zone around the eastern part of the Lake of Lucerne, \textit{in} and \textit{an} coexist; they do so in Fribourg, too.$^4$

In Bavarian, PDM occurs in South Bavarian up to Southeastern Middle Bavarian. The \textit{in}-type perhaps covers the entire South Bavarian dialect area, although PDM is attested only punctually here (the low density of PDM-instances reflects the lack of useful language atlas materials in this area and thus must not be misinterpreted). \textit{An} dominates the Middle Bavarian PDM-zone, but is attested sporadically also in South Bavarian.

PDM occurs in Bavarian language islands in Northern Italy, too (Luserna and Fersina Valley).$^5$ The dative marker is \textit{in}, in Fersina Valley in free variation with \textit{an} (\(=\text{[a]},\) probably imported from Trentinian).

Surprisingly, PDM is not attested in Vorarlberg and Bavarian Suebia. Thus, the Alemannic and Bavarian PDM areas are not adjacent, i.e., they don't form one coherent zone, and there is no evidence that they ever did.

In German-speaking Switzerland, the geographical picture gained from the protocols of the SDS (Language Atlas of German-speaking Switzerland) and the preliminary

---

$^4$ The isolated occurrence of PDM and the coexistence of \textit{an} and \textit{in} in Fribourg are striking. Perhaps PDM has been imported here from the dialects of Central Switzerland, the area with the highest PDM-prominence in Switzerland. This assumption is not completely unlikely, due to the fact that Fribourg and Central Switzerland are traditionally closely related in religion and culture (both are Catholic). For instance, students from Central Switzerland tended to study at Fribourg University more than in Zurich, Basel or Berne (which are Protestant), even in the 20th century. On the other hand, some influence from the neighbouring romance languages (Standard French and, earlier, Franco-Provençal) is not excluded, either. However, Romance language contact does not provide an explanation for the existence of the dative marker \textit{in} in Fribourg.

results of the Syntactic Atlas of Swiss German Dialects (cf. Bucheli & Glaser in this volume) completely coincide. This is remarkable in two respects. First, the geographical extent of PDM has been stable over the last 50 years (the material for the SDS was explored in the 1940-1950s), that is, no levelling of the areal contrasts can be observed with respect to PDM in Switzerland. Second, the SDS and the Syntactic Atlas of Swiss German Dialects are based on different exploration techniques: the material for the former was explored in direct interviews, whereas the latter makes use of written questionnaires.

3 • CASE MORPHOLOGY IN BAVARIAN ALEMANNIC

It is widely recognized that case morphology in Upper German is reduced in comparison with earlier stages (Old and Middle High German) and Modern Standard German. Special attention has been paid to the nearly complete loss of the genitive case. Since morphological distinctiveness is not guaranteed in Upper German with its dramatically simplified case inflection, the insertion of dative markers seems to be plausibly motivated: PDM enables speakers to encode the IO distinctly.

My claim, however, is that the insertion of the dative marker cannot be triggered by the lack of case inflection in Upper German. An analysis of Upper German case morphology has to take into account that case morphology is not realized in inflectional endings of nouns, but in determiners and quantifiers.⁶ Therefore, these items need to be considered in case paradigms as well. Bavarian obviously reflects this fact:

⁶This analysis is argued for in Dal 1960.
The question is now whether the occurrence of PDM depends on the ±distinctiveness of the dative case. If there were a correlation between dative morphology and PDM, the prediction would be: that the dative marker is not inserted when dative case is marked overtly (by means of determiner inflection), but it appears when overt dative morphology is missing.

Example (6) is in fact covered by this prediction, since the IO is marked solely by the dative marker but not by any case morphology:

(6) in di Schwain ge:m
    (di Schwain : N or A or D plural)
    IN thep pigs give
    'to give to the pigs'
    (St. Georg, Carinthia; Hilzensauer 1995:141)

However, PDM is far from obligatory in such cases, as is illustrated in (7):
(7) gib di lait ts-ēsÅ (di lait : N or A or D plural)
give:ipv2s the people to-eat
'give the people to eat'
(Upper Inn Valley; WBÖ III:1637)

On the other hand, PDM also occurs with morphologically clearly distinguished datives such as a dainà frau (D), (vs. dai frau (N=A), see above example 2). Thus, Bavarian lacks any correlation between PDM and the ±distinctiveness of dative case in both directions.

Let us turn now to Alemannic:

**TABLE 2 • Alemannic (Alsatian, Rünneburger 1989):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>'the letter'</th>
<th>'my letter'</th>
<th>'the duck'</th>
<th>'my duck'</th>
<th>'the ducks'</th>
<th>'my ducks'</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>der brief</td>
<td>minner brief</td>
<td>d ant</td>
<td>minni ant</td>
<td>d ante</td>
<td>minni ante</td>
<td>isch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>der brief</td>
<td>minner brief</td>
<td>d ant</td>
<td>minni ant</td>
<td>d ante</td>
<td>minni ante</td>
<td>misc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>emm brief</td>
<td>mim brief</td>
<td>de ant</td>
<td>minnere ant</td>
<td>de ante</td>
<td>minne ante</td>
<td>mér</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in Bavarian, the three cases, nominative, accusative and dative, are morphologically distinguished only in personal pronouns (column 7). Unlike in Bavarian, all other Alemannic case paradigms (1-6) are uniform: nominative and accusative merge, whereas the dative is kept distinct by determiner inflection.

However, although the dative forms are explicit in all instances, Alemannic too shows PDM as Bavarian does. Even more evidently than in Bavarian, PDM in Alemannic can by no means be explained as a compensatory strategy for the lack of dative case morphology: not only is the dative the best conserved case, it is the only case that is distinguished from the others morphologically.

To sum up, no correlation between the lack of overt dative morphology and the occurrence of PDM has been found; this holds strikingly for Alemannic, but – though less evidently – for Bavarian as well. Thus, a functional explanation of PDM in terms
of possible case-distinctions does not hold; PDM is redundant with regard to the structure of case paradigms.

4 • SYNTACTIC BEHAVIOR OF THE DATIVE MARKER

Is the dative marker a preposition, or something else? Not only its material realization, but also its syntactic behavior is for the most part in accordance with that of prototypical prepositions; nevertheless, in some respects its behavior deviates from that of prepositions, as will be shown in this section.

a) The dative marker behaves like a preposition

The dative marker seems to occupy the same structural position as true prepositions do. No dative marker can be inserted if the dative NP is embedded in a PP:

(8) *[mit [i de frau]]

\textit{with IN the:Dsf woman}

\textquote{with the woman} (informant consultations)

In Upper German, there are clitic forms of personal pronouns. Prepositions cannot be integrated into a clitic cluster. Thus, if a dative clitic is involved, it cannot be prepositionally introduced; PDM is possible only if the full form of the pronoun appears outside the clitic cluster:

(9) hēd-mer-em -s gsēid? vs. *hēd-mer-i-em-s gsēid? vs. hēd-mer-s i ìmm gsēid?

\textit{has one him(clit):D it told IN him:D}

\textquote{did they tell it to him?}

(Lucerne; Fischer 1960:250f)

Finally, the dative marker surfaces in fused morphemes <dative marker + determiner>, in parallel with fused morphemes <preposition + determiner>: \textit{am}

\textquote{AN_theDsm' like am 'at_the:Dsm' or zum 'to_the:Dsm'}. 
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b) The dative marker behaves unlike a preposition

Unlike prepositions (10c), the dative marker cannot be omitted in coordination (10b):

(10) a. bring:2s the cake IN the:Dsf (name) or IN the:Dsf mother 
'do you bring the cake to Susi or to the mother? 
(informant consultations)

b. *bring:2s the cake IN the:Dsf mother 

Unlike prepositions (11c), the dative marker must not be separated from determiners or quantifiers by *nume 'only' (11a):

(11) a. *that we'll send to only two persons 
('that we'll send to only two persons' 
(informant consultations)

b. that we'll send to only two persons (=ok.)

c. in only two minutes 
'in only two minutes (...it was ready)'

Unlike prepositions (12b), the dative marker cannot be a host for clitics (12a):

(12) a. *IN-me:D(clit)

(only: i mír) 
(informant consultations)
The dative marker does not form so-called pronominal adverbs, but prepositions do:

(13) demit 'there-with', drin 'there-in'; but: *drin 'there-IN' (IN = dative marker)

In sum, the observations made (10-11) indicate that, informally speaking, the dative marker is 'closer', more coalescent to the head noun than prepositions are. (12-13) suggest that the dative marker is a structural dummy element that is inserted by syntax. This diagnosis can fairly well be formalized in terms of the KP hypothesis presented by Löbel (1992) or Bader \textit{et al.} (2000:51), in which it is assumed that NP is dominated not only by DP, but also by a functional projection KP bearing case features. The syntactic behavior of the dative marker suggests that its structural position is lower than Pº but higher than Dº. However, the KP hypothesis does not, as far as I can see, provide an explanation for the distributional properties of PDM discussed in section 5.3 below; I will show that the occurrence of PDM is for the most part governed by discourse-functional and phonological factors, i.e., that its occurrence is not fully predictable from syntactic or semantic structure. Thus, although the KP hypothesis provides an assumption about the structural position of the dative marker that is perhaps correct, it does not solve the distributional problems in a satisfying way.\footnote{Cardinaletti & Starke 1995:28-29, 36 propose two functional projections above DP, namely $C_N$P and $\Sigma$P. $C_N$º is the structural position of dummy IO markers such as a in Italian; thus, $C_N$P corresponds to, as far as I see, what is called KP in other notations. $\Sigma$º bears prosody-related features and is called elsewhere FocusP. Interestingly, the occurrence of PDM is in fact closely related to focus and sentence stress, as will be shown in section 5.3.2. Although the place for a dummy case marker would be (following Cardinaletti & Starke), $C_N$º rather than $\Sigma$º, $\Sigma$P could possibly have some importance for PDM.}
The insertion of the dative marker is subject to cross-dialectal and internal variation.

Cross-dialectal variation concerns not only the fact that PDM is attested only in some parts of the Upper German dialect area. Even within the PDM-zones the use of the dative marker is not uniform, but underlies stronger or weaker restrictions in one or another area (see below, subsection 5.3).

Internal variation has been recognized but not explained by some dialect grammarians:

(14) «Der wem-Fall-Artikel *dr* wird gerne durch *in* verstärkt […] Ebenso können auch Fürwörter durch *in* verstärkt werden» (The dative article *dr* is often reinforced by *in*; in the same way pronouns can be reinforced by *in*). (Kaiserstuhl, Baden; Noth 1993:368; emphasis GS).

(15) «Neben dem einfachen dat. besitzt die ma. eine mit der präp. 'in' umschriebene form» (The dative article *dr* is often reinforced by *in*; in the same way pronouns can be reinforced by *in*). (Pernegg, Carinthia; Lessiak 1903:164; emphasis GS).

Thus, the dative marker seems to be used not consequently, i.e., not every dative NP undergoes PDM. This diagnosis is confirmed by corpus analysis, informant consultations and observations of spontaneous speech.

It has indeed never been considered in the dialectological literature whether prepositionally introduced dative NPs and bare datives are contrasting on some grammatical or semantic level, or whether they are morphological alternants, and if so, in what distribution. Hence, it must be asked what is the grammatical status of the coexistence of the two forms. This question will be considered in the following subsections. I will first discuss whether there is any semantic contrast between bare
and prepositionally marked datives (5.1). In 5.2 I will ask whether there are any syntactic slots where PDM is required. In 5.3, I will isolate environment factors influencing the more or less preferred insertion of the dative marker. In 5.4, I will sum up the observations and try to translate some of them into an OT notation.

5.1 • No semantic effects
PDM is not sensitive to different semantic roles, and PDM does not encode different information than does a bare dative NP.

PDM is found in all the semantic roles that a dative NP can bear in Upper German as well as in Standard German. Some relevant examples are given below.

RECIPIENT:
(16) er git dr Öpfel a mir, statt a dir
    he gives the apple AN me:D instead AN you:D
    'he gives the apple to me, not to you'
    (Glarus; Bäbler 1949:31)

BENEFACTIVE:
(17) häbed a dem Fuerme ds Ross
    hold:ipv2p AN this:Dsm driver the:n horse
    'hold the horse for this driver'
    (Glarus; Bäbler 1949:31)

POSSESSORY, [+alienable]:
(18) däs is än wen sei Haus?
    that:Nsn is IN who:A/D his:Nsm house
    'Whose house is that?'
    (Carinthia; Pichler-Steinern 1999:55)
POSSESSOR, [-alienable]:

(19) hed Eine öppis z'säge, se söll-er's hërzaft säge. 

has someone something to say so should-he-it courageous say

Ich wo't g'wüss a Niemerem es Schlössli a's Redhûs hänke. 

I want certainly AN nobody:Ds a lock at-the mouth hang

'If someone has something to say, he should say it courageously. I certainly don't want to hang someone a lock at the mouth.'

(Einsiedeln SZ)

EXPERIENCER:

(20) s isch i allne glychlig gange 

it is IN all:Dp alike gone

'it was the same for everybody' (literally: 'it went alike to everybody') (Lucerne)

SOURCE:

(21) es klima, wo a de wüesseschaftler de mumm nimmt 

a climate REL AN the:Dp scientists the:m power takes_away

'a climate taking away the power from the scientists'

(sp.; Zurich)

Although dative NPs are prototypically high in animacy, inanimate ones undergo PDM as well:

(22) en schii, wo a däm standard entspricht 

a ski REL AN this:Dsm standard agrees

'a ski which agrees with this standard'

(Andermatt, Uri; Bernhard Russi, TV-interview)

PDM can be attested with indefinites as well:

(23) Geb daas e öpperem ander aa 

give:ipv2s this IN someone:Ds else (preverb)
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'tell this to someone else'
(Lucerne; Fischer 1960:238)

So far, PDM seems to be completely independent from the semantic role the dative NP bears as well as its inherent semantic properties such as animacy, definiteness, or inalienable possession. In short: PDM has nothing to do with semantics.

However, one consultant postulates a slight semantic difference between prepositionally introduced datives and bare ones. PDM should be preferred when directionality is involved (RECIPIENT), but not with non-directional datives like POSSESSOR:

(24) «Some older speakers translated the example 'he says it to the mother' spontaneously with a bare dative. However, they told me that the prepositional construction means rather that something 'moves towards' the dative object. They also accepted ich sägs a der Muäter [PDM]. But: Äs gheerd der Muäter [no PDM], it belongs to the mother» (p.c. Karl Imfeld, priest in Kerns, Obwalden).

These observations have not been confirmed by my own investigations and will not be considered any more in the present paper; nevertheless, a possible preference for directional datives will be subject to further research.

5.2 • Syntactic slots
It is possible to isolate some syntactic slots where PDM is strictly excluded, namely true PPs and clitic clusters, as has already been shown in section 4.

About other positions, however, where PDM is allowed, no strong prediction can be made, i.e., the insertion or the lack of the dative marker does not result in any grammaticality contrast.

PDM is highly preferred but not obligatorily required in right-dislocated datives:

(25) die händ immer no nüüt zalt [a de Jude]
these have:3p always still nothing paid AN the:Dp jews
'these have still nothing paid to the jews'
(sp., Zurich; informant consultations)

In this point, PDM-datives exactly behave like prototypical PPs which can be right-dislocated, too. However, many speakers accept a right-dislocated dative NP without PDM.⁹

The relative order of direct and indirect object in the middle field doesn't cause any asymmetry in the acceptance of PDM.¹⁰ Likewise, it is irrelevant whether the dative is a complement of a verb (see above 4), whether it is adnominal (18), or whether it is a so-called free dative (17). Three- vs. two-place predicates (22) pattern alike with respect to PDM.

To sum up, the occurrence of PDM is not predictable from the syntactic position the dative NP takes. With the exception of clitic clusters and PPs, every dative NP is a possible candidate for PDM.

5.3 • Asymmetries in occurrence
The occurrence of PDM is, though variable with respect to semantic contrasts and syntactic positions, not completely unstructured; variability does not mean that there is no regularity at all. It is indeed possible to identify preferred environments for PDM. The preference for PDM depends on whether the NP is lexically filled or pronominalized, on information structure, and on phonological factors such as sentence stress and rhythm.

⁹ Many speakers of Alemannic, at least. I have not yet tested this point with speakers of Bavarian. Moreover, it is nearly impossible to elicit right-dislocation. Informants usually reject it, although they use it constantly.
¹⁰ And if it does, this is rather due to information structure, see below, section 5.3.2. What is certain is that no grammaticality contrast is involved here.
5.3.1 • NP >> personal pronoun
There is a clear asymmetry between lexically filled NPs and personal pronouns.\textsuperscript{11} The former are the preferred environment of PDM.

This implicative hierarchy is reflected in the geographical distribution of PDM with personal pronouns: the places allowing PDM with personal pronouns are a subset of the entire PDM zone. In Alemannic, they form clusters in Middle Alsace (in contrast to the adjacent northern and southern areas), South-East Black Forest, and parts of Central Switzerland.

There is no evidence for PDM with personal pronouns from Middle Bavarian; in South Bavarian, it is occurring at least in Carinthia and the Tyrol.\textsuperscript{12}

Even in the dialects allowing PDM with personal pronouns, PDM doesn't occur consequently. At some places, however, PDM seems in fact to be consequently used and therefore obligatory. This can be the case in:
- some areas of Central Switzerland, above all Lucerne and its environs, but also the valleys of Muotathal and Melchtlal; moreover some places in the Canton of Aargau;\textsuperscript{13}
- Middle Alsace;\textsuperscript{14}
- Carinthia (basilectal speakers);\textsuperscript{15}
- Fersina Valley (Bavarian language island in Trentino, Italy): PDM is obligatory with lexically filled NPs and highly preferred but not strictly required with pronouns.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{11} I.e., full forms of personal pronouns. Note that in Upper German there are full forms as well as clitics. In clitic clusters, PDM is excluded, see above section 5.2.
\textsuperscript{12} See Pichler-Stainern 1999:57 for Carinthia, Schatz 1897:159 for Tyrol.
\textsuperscript{13} Evidence from the Syntactic Atlas of Swiss German Dialects (see Bucheli & Glaser in this volume) and my own informant consultations. Speakers from these areas reject bare datives even if suggested. As for the Muotathal Valley, my recent fieldwork (January 2001) unquestionably confirms that PDM is in fact obligatory here.
\textsuperscript{14} Beyer 1963:162, Mankel 1896:46.
\textsuperscript{15} Pichler-Stainern 1999:57. However, Pohl (1989:63) notes that PDM is used only “occasionally”.
\textsuperscript{16} Rowley 1986:202, 221.
5.3.2 • Information structure and sentence stress

To a large extent, the insertion of the dative marker depends on information structure and sentence stress. Focussed and thus intonationally highlighted dative NPs show PDM with greater preference than unfocussed ones do. For illustration, compare examples (27-28), collected from the same text:

(26) diä Eifachheit isch nur nu i dr Alp hinnä z findä gsy,  
    *this simplicity is only still in the upland behind to find:*INF been  
    wo ich ästags uf dr Gritt a dry Chindä us dr Geschneralp  
    *where I once on the (place name)AN three children:*Dp from the (place name)  
    begägnnet bi  
    *met am  
    'this simplicity was found only on the uplands, where I met once on the Grüt three children from the Göscheneralp'  
    (Göschenen, Uri)  

(27) Äs het si gheert, dass mä dennä Mannä im Fäld zum  
    *it has REFL be_suitable that one this:*Dp men in_the:Dsn field to_the:Dsm  
    Troscht äinisch Chabis unt Schaffleisch ufstellt  
    *consolation once cabbage and mutton offers  
    'it was suitable that one offers these men in the field cabbage and mutton as consolation'  
    (ibd.)

In (26), the dative NP a dry Chindä 'to three children' is the most salient piece of information in the sentence. In the context of the story told here, the encounter with the children is an unexpected event the elaboration of which will be continued in what follows; for our purposes, of course, the continuation itself is not of further interest. In (27), however, dennä Mannä 'to these men' is already well established as a discourse topic and thus minimally rhematic. The most salient information here is what food

---

17 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 refer to observations made in Alemannic only. It is not clear whether they can be extended to Bavarian as well.

they were served, or, in other words: what is highlighted is rather another constituent than the dative NP.

In order to capture these differences less intuitively, let us work with the following basic assumptions\textsuperscript{19} about focus and sentence stress:

(i) **Focus**

It is necessary to distinguish focus constituents from those to which no focus is assigned. Focus constituents are those bearing the information unit the speaker assumes to be the most relevant according to the knowledge and the interest of the hearer. Focus constituents are intonationally highlighted. They tend to be placed towards the right edge of the sentence rather than towards the left edge. A dative NP can be a focus or a non-focus constituent.\textsuperscript{20}

(ii) **Compleitive vs. contrastive focus**

When we come to the discourse function of focus, we have to distinguish completive (information) from contrastive focus. Compleitive focus just adds new information to the hearer's knowledge which the speaker assumes to be unknown so far. In contrastive focus, however, the information under focus is in contrast to the assumptions of the hearer. Given a restricted range of alternatives, it rejects all options except one. Contrastive focus is intonationally more highlighted than completive focus.

(iii) **Stress suppression of non-focus constituents**

Non-focus constituents are suppressed intonationally. This stress suppression is stronger with contrastive focus than with completive focus.\textsuperscript{21}

---

\textsuperscript{19} These assumptions are partly adopted from Siewierska 1991:149 and Dik 1997:330-335, though simplified for our purposes.

\textsuperscript{20} In the most trivial cases, the IO tends to be a non-focus constituent; prototypically, it shares semantic and pragmatic properties with the subject (high in animacy, definiteness, and topicality). In this sense, a focussed IO is the marked case.
The distinctions made here form a hierarchy of increasing intonational prominence, indicated by the values 0-3:

A non-focus dative NP cooccurs with contrastive focus: 0
A non-focus dative NP cooccurs with completive focus: 1
The dative NP bears completive focus: 2
The dative NP bears contrastive focus: 3

If PDM really correlates with intonational prominence, then an increasing preference for PDM is expected, following the hierarchy proposed here.

I tested sentences from all the four degrees with PDM speakers. The results were striking, as they exactly followed the prediction: the more a dative NP is intonationally highlighted (due to its discourse function), the higher is the preference for the insertion of the dative marker. It is necessary to say that I observed a great deal of variation from speaker to speaker and from one dialect to another. For instance, some speakers spontaneously inserted the dative marker only on degree 3 of intonational prominence, but accepted it for all degrees if it was suggested, others only accepted PDM on degrees 2-3 but nowhere else etc. Nevertheless, all individual informant consultations were covered by the hierarchy proposed here. What is constant is not a concrete position cutting the hierarchy into two pieces, 'always PDM' and 'never PDM', but the preference direction as such.

How can this preference direction be explained? Why do discourse-functionally more salient IOs tend to appear as PDM rather than as a bare dative NP? I would propose that the asymmetry can be motivated by iconicity principles. PDM involves more structural complexity and more phonological material (namely: one syllable more) than a bare dative NP. If there are two possible encoding options, a more expensive one (PDM) and a less expensive one (bare NP), it is highly iconic when the more expensive one is used when more salient information is transported by it. On the other hand, less rhematic constituents tend, if iconicity holds, to involve less material.²²

²¹ Welke 1992:47.
Since information structure is connected with sentence stress, it is possible to formulate a purely phonological correlation between sentence stress and PDM: the encoding option of the IO involving a longer string of syllables (=PDM) is preferred when the IO bears main sentence stress.

Interestingly, a similar generalization has been made in prosodic phonology. The 'Weight-to-Stress-Principle' (WSP) has been suggested in the context of quantity-sensitive stress patterns. It accounts for «the close relation between syllable weight and [prosodic, GS] prominence» and can be translated as «Heavy syllables are stressed» (Kager 1999:155). If we adopt WSP for our purposes and extend its scope from word stress and syllable weight to sentence stress and 'constituent weight', the prediction would be: constituents bearing main sentence stress attempt to contain as much material as possible. Given two equivalent encoding options for the IO, the 'heavier' one (=PDM) is chosen when it bears main sentence stress.

5.3.3 • More on phonology
There are some asymmetries suggesting that the insertion of the dative marker possibly depends on factors that are rather phonological in nature, such as the principle of stress clash avoidance:

\[(\text{28}) \quad \text{\textit{*CLASH: Two adjacent stressed syllables are avoided.}}^{23}\]

This principle is well known from stress patterns in German (or English) compounds, compare:

\[(\text{29}) \quad \begin{array}{llll}
\text{a.} & \text{b.} & x \\
\quad x & x & x \\
\quad x & x & x & x
\end{array} \\
\text{Marschall vs. Feldmarschall} \quad \text{(Ramers 1998:115)}\]

\[^{22}\text{Compare Lambrecht 1994:242, and Haiman 1985:150.}\]
\[^{23}\text{Kager 1999:165.}\]
In (29a), the first syllable bears word stress. In (29b), main word stress is assigned to the first element of the compound. Secondary stress does not remain on the first syllable of Marschall, but is shifted to the second, due to *CLASH.

With respect to PDM, the prediction *CLASH provides is that PDM is more preferred if the insertion of the (always unstressed) dative marker separates two stressed syllables, and it is less likely to be chosen if the insertion of the dative marker does not contribute anything to an avoidance of a stress clash.

Example (30) is in fact in accordance with *CLASH:

(30) er hed das gält i allne ggëë
    \(he\ has\ this\ money\ IN\ all:Dp\ given\)
    'he gave this money to all of them'
    (sp., Lucerne; informant consultations)

The dative marker is set here between two stressed syllables:

(30a) x x x x
      x x x x
      gält i all ne

In (31), however, the dative marker does not intervene between two stressed syllables:

(31) er hed die sachen i allne ggëë
    \(he\ has\ this\ things\ IN\ all:Dp\ given\)
    'he gave these things to all of them'
(31a) x x x x x x
      sa chen i all ne
Speakers I consulted agree in saying that, if there is an asymmetry between (30) and (31) with respect to PDM, it is (31) where the dative marker is "better", "more necessary".

5.3.4 • Restrictions on PDM: a case for Optimality Theory?
In this subsection I attempt to sketch how a regulation mechanism for PDM could be formulated, derived from the distributional properties of PDM presented above.

First, we have to decide (i) whether we are dealing with a PP subcategorized by, prototypically, a verb, with the dative marker as head, which then requires a dative NP as its complement, or (ii) whether it is the presence of a dative NP in the clause that triggers the insertion of the dative marker as a structural, dummy element. There is no doubt the the latter assumption is more likely than the former. Remember the non-preposition-like behavior of the dative marker discussed in section 4 above. A PP headed by a true preposition containing some lexical content can under no circumstances be replaced by a clitic, whereas this is possible with a dative NP, though introduced by the dative marker. Furthermore, it is possible for true prepositions but never for the dative marker to form pronominal adverbs. This suggests that the dative marker is not 'there from the beginning', but is inserted in some stage of the derivation.

In the few dialects24 where the dative marker is obligatorily inserted whenever a (non-clitic) dative NP is involved, the matter is rather simple: the presence of a dative NP in the clause automatically triggers PDM unless a true preposition is already there; the dative marker is just plugged in, without any consideration for the requirements of information structure or the phonological environment.25

Much more interesting with regard to syntactic microvariation, however, are the dialects where PDM is optional. Here, syntax provides two options for the materialization of a case feature D A T I V E: dative case morphology, or dative marker + dative case morphology. In other words: in Upper German syntax there is a

---

24 See section 5.3.1.
25 For instance, in Mir verchauffid i de Chunde nur Mère-Josephine-Poulets ‘we sell IN the:Dp clients only Mère-Josephine chicken’ (sp., Lucerne), PDM cannot be motivated by WSP or “CLASH.
mechanism guaranteeing that whenever a dative NP is involved, a dative marker can be inserted. Nothing else is regulated by syntax. Syntax provides the technique of dative marker insertion, without determining when it is applied; whether the insertion happens or not is not specified in syntax but by non-syntactic factors (such as information structure and prosodic phonology).

I think it is useful to separate the insertion mechanism as such from its (non-syntactic) restrictions. Thus, in the description of PDM, we have to account for an insertion process and, apart from it, for mechanisms governing and constraining this process.

Let us start with the restrictions. We have seen that the distribution of PDM is guided by preferences formulated in terms of different linguistic levels. Furthermore, the relevance of these preferences differs diatopically. Nevertheless, we would like to model this in one homogeneous notation. Such a notation has to satisfy the following requirements:

(i) **Explicitness**: All relevant factors are explicitly formulated.
(ii) **Coherence**: All relevant factors can be integrated into one coherent regulation mechanism.
(iii) **Flexibility**: Diatopic contrasts can be formulated by means of a recombination of the relevant factors.

Optimality Theory does in fact provide – by means of constraint ranking – an explicit, coherent and flexible notation. In OT, it is possible to describe the regulation of PDM as an interaction of ranked constraints, i.e. possibly conflicting but hierarchized principles. Diatopic differences can be accounted for by a re-ranking of these constraints. For illustrational purposes, two tableaux are presented here, involving two constraints with relevance for PDM.

---

26 Only when I was revising the present paper, I came upon Vincent 1999. Vincent analyses the developments of PPs from Indo-European to modern Romance in the light of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG, see Bresnan 2001). As far as I see, the LFG framework exactly fits the requirements formulated here. In LFG, argument structure, functional structure and constituent structure are parallel levels of grammatical representation. These levels and the way they are related can be separately described. It is very likely that within the relational architecture of LFG PDM can be described as a matter of correspondence between abstract f-structure features and their overt expressions on c-structure. Moreover, it is possible to integrate into LFG OT-like constraints since the mapping between f-structure and c-structure «is determined by the interaction of rerankable constraints rather than in absolute terms» (Vincent 1999:1144).

27 Although I think that it is productive to adopt these phonological constraints for our purposes, this is, of course, not unproblematic methodologically.
WSP: Constituents bearing main sentence stress attempt to contain as much phonological material as possible (cf. section 5.3.2 above).

DEPIO: 'No epenthesis' (= 'No insertion'). This constraint has been developed in the context of segment epenthesis processes in phonology. Under the assumption that the insertion of the dative marker is also a sort of epenthesis but on the syntactic level, we extend the scope of DEPIO to syntax.

If DEPIO dominates WSP, no PDM is possible, for DEPIO is violated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEPIO</th>
<th>WSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dr Frau</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i dr Frau</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the case in dialects where PDM does not occur at all. A re-ranking of DEPIO and WSP, however, lets the PDM candidate win, if the dative NP is focussed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WSP</th>
<th>DEPIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dr Frau</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i dr Frau</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This tableau covers dialects where PDM is possible but only if the dative NP bears main sentence stress. Note that we are dealing here with a classical conflict between a faithfulness constraint (DEPIO) and a markedness constraint (WSP), whereby the latter is contextually bound.

Other factors governing dative marker insertion can be translated into OT constraints as well. The purpose of this section, however, is not to present a complete OT analysis; what I intend here is only to demonstrate that constraint (re-) ranking is a

\[28\] Kager 1999:68.
promising means for the description of dialect variation. For a more extensive
discussion of an OT approach, its advantages and problems, I refer to Seiler
(forthcoming).

Let us turn now to the insertion itself. In dialects where PDM is consequently used,
the mechanism triggering the insertion must not be dominated by constraints that
play a part in other dialects where the occurrence of PDM underlies variation.
Certainly, the effect of the insertion process is rather simple to describe:

(32) Postprepositional dative NPs are preferred over bare dative NPs.

If the dative NP is already embedded into a PP, nothing happens. If no preposition is
given, a dummy preposition (= the dative marker) is inserted, due to (32). Of course,
(32) is much too powerful for dialects where PDM does not occur consequently, but it
can easily be constrained by the principles involved in what I called above the
'regulation' of PDM. A more serious problem is how the existence of such an insertion
mechanism can be motivated at all: what is 'wrong' with Upper German dative NPs?

In order to find an answer it is necessary to consider the diachronic development. I
will argue in the following section that the insertion mechanism may be motivated by
the developments of Upper German case systems. It will be shown that PDM solves a
problem in the Upper German encoding systems of grammatical relations. The way
the dative marker itself emerged materially (section 6.1) completely fits the systematic
diachronic motivation I will propose (section 6.2).
6 • ON THE EMERGENCE OF PDM

6.1 • Where does the dative marker come from? A scenario

I suggest that the dative marker in or an is not due grammaticalization of the true prepositions in and an, but rather emerged by reanalysis of the definite article Dsm, a process that was possible only under specific phonological conditions. The reanalysis proceeded in three stages A - C:

A: MHG dëm ('the:Dsm') > 'm, -m in postprepositional enclisis
The Middle High German definite article Dsm dëm lost its initial dental when cliticized to a preposition. This is attested already in the late Middle Ages, as is shown in (33):

(33) obem 1280, ufflem 1270, am 1277, im 1258, underm 1276, us(s)em 1409, vom 1277, vorem 1280, hinderm 1403, bim 1280, zem 1245 (IDIOTIKON XIII, 1191f).

B: Extension of this form into other environments:
By analogical extension, this dentalless form has come into use also in other environments, i.e., in other positions than only after preposition.30

(34) hern Erchenpreht em purkrave von Gors
lord:Dsm (name) the:Dsm earl of (name)
1301, Altenburg (Weinhold 1867:376)

Phonetically, this form was very similar or even equal to the preexisting fusional morphs im and am = <preposition (in or an) + definite article Dsm>, especially insofar

---

29 Although there are prepositional constructions in Standard German as well as in Upper German that are functionally equivalent with a bare dative NP if this encodes a RECIPIENT: Ich habe das Buch an den Vater geschickt, literally 'I have the book to the:Asm father sent', and ich habe das Buch dem Vater geschickt 'I have the book the:Dsm father sent'. Note, however, that directional an assigns accusative but not dative. It cannot be directional an plus accusative that was grammaticalized into PDM, for in general it is not isolated morphemes (an) that are grammaticalized, but constructions (an plus accusative). If this construction was grammaticalized into an analytic encoding of the IO, something else would have resulted than PDM, namely an plus accusative (or, in Alemannic: an plus direct case) and under no circumstances an plus dative.

30 This process is plausibly argued for in Nübling 1992:201.
as *im* and *am* are often phonetically weakened in Upper German. Thus, the three morphs MHG *dëm* 'the:Dsm', *im* 'in_the:Dsm', and *am* 'at_theDsm' merged phonetically in [‘m].

C: Reanalysis of ‘*m* as something plus -m’
The crucial step is that the exponent ‘*m* has been reanalyzed as a fusional morph where the definite article Dsm is attached to something. This was possible due to the existence of a paradigm of fusional morphs <preposition + definite article Dsm>, e.g. *bim* (=bi+‘*m* 'beside_the:Dsm), or *zum* (=zu+‘*m*) among others. The vowel resulting from this reanalysis was in some areas *i*, in others *a*.\(^{31}\)

The use of the dative marker has been extended to environments other than the definite article Dsm:

\[(35) \quad \text{am} \implies \text{a der, a dëre, etc.} \]

The strongest argument for this scenario comes from dialect geography: the PDM-zone is included in a zone showing loss of the initial dental of MHG *dëm*. In other words, PDM had a chance to arise only where the initial dental was lost. In Highest Alemannic (Wallis, Bernese Highlands) PDM is not attested – and the article is *d’m, dum*.

6.2 • The rise of PDM in the context of Upper German case systems
In this subsection I will suggest that the Upper German dative has a structural property which provides a diachronic motivation and thus an explanation for why in PDM dialects there exists an insertion mechanism at all.

PDM makes it possible to ‘simulate’ a prepositional environment of the dative: whenever a lexical preposition is not given, a dummy preposition (= the dative

\(^{31}\)It is possible to correlate the development towards *i* or *a* with other phonological properties of the respective dialects. For instance, it is a common phenomenon in some dialects that the nucleus of reduced syllables is realized as *i* rather than as ‘.\)
marker) can be inserted. In this sense, the insertion of the dative marker is similar to other insertions of expletive elements, since they are inserted in order to occupy a structural position that must not be empty at the surface.

Why is this so? It is a fact that in Upper German – despite PDM – the most frequent occurrence of dative case is not as an IO (bare dative NP) but as a complement in (true) PPs.\(^{32}\) Thus, it is a structural property of dative NPs even in pre-PDM-Upper German that they usually occur postprepositionally. In PDM dialects, then, this prototypical occurrence of the dative is generalized.

Therefore, I conclude that in Upper German the dative is about to be reinterpreted as a prepositional case.

The way the dative marker itself emerged exactly fits this assumption: remember that 'm 'the:Dsm' has been reanalysed as 'something plus -m'. Thus, it must have been more attractive in PDM-dialects to interpret 'm as a prepositional fusional morph than as a bare dative article form – which was the starting point for the extention of the dative marker to other, non-fusional environments.

In Alemannic and Bavarian, the encoding strategy of the IO merges by means of PDM with that of other oblique relations (relations other than subject and direct object); in other words, PDM makes it possible to give up a separate encoding strategy for the IO. Furthermore, in Alemannic nominative and accusative always merged morphologically (except in personal pronouns) in a, let us call it, direct case, such that the dative is the only morphologically marked case. Thus, in pre-PDM Alemannic, the IO is the only grammatical relation expressed exclusively by case marking. Consequently, this encoding strategy of the IO is completely isolated. With PDM, an encoding of grammatical relations by means of morphological case marking alone can

\(^{32}\) See Nübling 1992:221. NÜbling presents statistics concerning the ±postprepositional occurrence of the dative.
be given up altogether (subject and direct object are both realized in the direct case nominative=accusative):\textsuperscript{33}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grammatical relations</th>
<th>encoding strategies</th>
<th>(no PDM)</th>
<th>(PDM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>direct case</td>
<td></td>
<td>direct case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct object</td>
<td>direct case</td>
<td></td>
<td>direct case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect object</td>
<td>dative case</td>
<td></td>
<td>prep. + dative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblique</td>
<td>prep. + dative (/direct) case</td>
<td></td>
<td>prep. + dative (/direct) case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typologically, the status of the IO is very controversial; Dik (1997a:370) remarks that there is no typological legitimation for an independent IO position on the Accessibility Hierarchy (‘Keenan/Comrie-Hierarchy’), because what is mentioned as ‘IO’ usually patterns either like the DO, or like obliques. In pre-PDM-Alemannic, the IO is not supported by the encoding system insofar as neither SU and DO nor obliques are encoded by the same strategy.\textsuperscript{34} Thus, it is not unlikely that the IO encoding tends to merge with that of obliques due to the lack of system-internal support. In pre-PDM-Bavarian, the IO encoding strategy – case marking – is better supported only insofar as case marking is involved also in the DO encoding (masculine singulars); however, this support collapses since dative case morphology is not distinct here, due its merger with the accusative.

If I am right in assuming that the dative in Upper German PDM-dialects is reinterpreted as a prepositional case, one problem, however, remains: why does PDM

\textsuperscript{33} Interestingly, the Alemannic direct vs. oblique distinction is reflected also in relativization patterns: Whereas the IO and all other obliques can (and must for many speakers) be pronominally resumed, this is completely excluded for SU and DO.

\textsuperscript{34} One could think that in languages like, for instance, Russian, the IO is also ‘isolated’ insofar as it is the only grammatical relation encoded by dative case. What I mean, however, is that the strategy type ‘encoding by case marking’ as such is well established and thus supported in Russian, but not in Alemannic.
not always occur? If the prepositional case (=dative) triggers the insertion of a dummy preposition, why do bare dative NPs nevertheless surface in most PDM dialects?\(^{35}\)

7 \bold{CONCLUSIONS: EMERGENCE VS. IMPLEMENTATION}

The problem mentioned at the end of the preceding section can be solved within a specific approach to the development of grammar that I will propose in what follows. The case of PDM is very instructive with regard to the more general issue of how grammatical change has to be modelled (theoretically) and investigated (empirically).

Let us start with the geographical picture. In the course of the evaluation of all source types that were available it became apparent that the instances of PDM are widespread over a large area, but only in some parts of it they form homogeneous PDM zones. Thus, in many regions there is no clear-cut distinction between areas with 100 percent PDM and others without any reflexes of PDM. Furthermore, the geographically homogeneous PDM areas differ in the systematic prominence of PDM (i.e., the use of PDM is more or less obligatory or constrained, respectively). Where the two options PDM vs. bare dative NP coexist, their distribution is guided to a large extent by discourse-pragmatic and phonological principles that can be traced back to the fact that PDM counts one syllable more. Only in a few areas, however, the regulation of PDM seems to be fully syntactizised, i.e. it has become a purely syntactic automatism.

What do these facts teach us about the evolution of grammar in time and space? I think that it is essential for a historical syntactician to distinguish between (i) the emergence of an encoding strategy and (ii) its stages of implementation.\(^{36}\)

Grammatical innovations by all means involve stages of variation between

\(^{35}\) This issue is not relevant for dialects where PDM is consequently used, see section 5.3.1.

\(^{36}\) The distinction proposed here is inspired by Haspelmath’s theory of diachronic adaptation (Haspelmath 1999). For a detailed discussion of this approach and its consequences with respect to PDM, I refer to Seiler (forthcoming). Haspelmath proposes a theory of ‘diachronic adaptation’: What happens in grammatical change is that given a range of equivalent variants one of them is chosen due to its adaptivity with respect to its functionality or naturalness, whereas others die out. For my purposes, the most relevant aspect is that within this framework grammatical change necessarily involves variation; this is what led me to the distinction between emergence (= a new variant appears) and stages of implementation (=which candidate is chosen under which circumstances).
alternatives, and it has to be investigated what principles guide this variation as well as under which conditions the prominence of one alternant increases, possibly until obligatorization – which is, however, only the final step.

Emergence involves the genesis of a grammatical pattern as such. In the case of PDM, the emergence consists of the reanalysis of definite article forms as fusional morphs <dative marker + article>. Of course, there are many other diachronic processes than reanalysis resulting in new patterns, such as, for instance, the grammaticalization of lexical into grammatical units.

Implementation involves the development this pattern takes, its (changing) paradigmatic relations to similar patterns, its (changing) combinatorics, its (changing) functional extent, possibly its obligatorization, but also its geographical spread as well as its sociolinguistic transmission, etc. What concerns PDM, it is a matter of implementation that some dialects allow it only with lexically filled dative NPs whereas others allow it also with personal pronouns, or that under focus PDM is much more preferred, or to what extent it is obligatorized, etc.\[^{37}\]

Why is the conceptual distinction between emergence and implementation so important and so useful for our purposes (and, in my opinion, for the study of grammar and especially dialectology in general)? Because it provides an explanation for a paradox in Upper German syntax: on the one hand, there seems to be a problem with bare dative NPs such that a dative marker insertion mechanism is introduced, but, on the other hand, this insertion is to a large extent optional.

In section 6.2 I tried to motivate the emergence of the insertion mechanism in the context of Upper German case systems. Thus, although the pure existence of such a

\[^{37}\] It is not unlikely that information structure and sentence stress (among other factors) played some part in the development of the Romance IO, as long as case marked NPs and PPs were in free variation. I think that principles like WSP ('weight-to-stress', see above, section 5.3.2) can be involved in what is called 'emphasis', 'expressivity', or 'extravagance' (Haspelmath 1999a) in grammaticalization theory (it is due to 'emphasis' that the use of more expensive, more explicit constructions increases – which is, in principle, highly uneconomic; consequently, such constructions get over time more and more desemantizised and automatized). Principles like WSP provide a more concrete motivation for the choice of a more expensive construction, rather than a quite unspecific notion like 'emphasis' does.
mechanism can (I hope so) plausibly be motivated, nothing is said about its stages of implementation. It would be highly unlikely if a newly emerged grammatical strategy were immediately obligatorized, i.e. implemented to the full extent. Instead, the emergence of PDM first results in the coexistence of two encoding options. In this sense, the variation between PDM and bare dative can be seen as an intermediate stage of the implementation process of PDM. It is very likely that such implementation processes extend over long periods, and it is certainly not said that PDM ever will be fully obligatory everywhere.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clit</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipv</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>case phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>Middle High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Optimality Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>prepositional dative marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>preposition phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp.</td>
<td>spontaneous utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 • INTRODUCTION

In this paper we focus on pronominal subject doubling in three southern Dutch dialects.¹ We first argue that, contrary to what is generally assumed, there is not one, but two types of pronominal doubling in these dialects. More specifically, we show that the type of doubling found in subject-initial main clauses differs from that in subclauses and inverted main clauses. The latter is commonly referred to as clitic doubling, the former we dub topic doubling. The remainder of the paper is concerned with giving an analysis of these two phenomena, while at the same time explaining their distribution across sentence types. In doing so, we will take a closer look at the left periphery of the dialects under consideration, arguing on the basis of the distribution of object clitics that subject clitic placement is a narrow syntax phenomenon that should be analysed in a split-CP structure in the sense of Rizzi (1997). Topic doubling on the other hand involves the base-generation of a full DP subject in a left peripheral topic position, the argument position being filled by the doubling strong pronoun.

¹ We would like to thank Sjef Barbiers, Lisa Cheng, Aniek Ijtmpa, Aniko Lipták, Lutz Marten, Ineke van der Meulen, Johan Rooryck, the audiences of the Workshop on Syntactic Microvariation (Meertensinstitute, Amsterdam, August 30-31, 2000), ConSole 9 (Lund University, December 8-10, 2000) and the 16th Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop (McGill University, Montréal, May 5-6, 2001), and two anonymous reviewers for stimulating discussions and valuable comments. Furthermore, we want to thank Hilda van der Borght, Wim de Geest, Karolien van Geldre, Liliane Haegeman, Yves d’Hulst and Johan Rooryck for their help with the dialect data. All errors and shortcomings are our own.

¹ The dialects under consideration here are those of Gent (East Flanders), Lapscheure (West Flanders) and Wambeek (Brabant). The first has been discussed in a number of publications by Wim de Geest (de Geest 1990, 1995), the second by Liliane Haegeman (Haegeman 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993). The dialect of Wambeek has up till now not been discussed in the generative literature.
Throughout this paper we will be working in the framework outlined in Kayne (1994). This means that in our analyses rightward movement, right-adjunction and multiple specifiers (i.e. multiple adjunction) are disallowed.

2 • TWO TYPES OF DOUBLING

In the linguistic literature it is generally assumed that the dialects of Dutch have only one type of subject doubling, namely clitic doubling (cf. Haegeman 1990, 1992; De Geest 1995; Zwart 1993a, 1993b; Cardinaletti & Starke 1994, 1995). This type of doubling always involves a clitic pronoun and a strong pronoun. It is illustrated in (1) with two examples from the dialect of Gent.

(1) a. …da ze zaa gisteren gewerkt ee. (Gent)
   \[that\ she_{\text{clitic}}\ she_{\text{strong}}\ \text{yesterday worked has}\]
   ‘…that she has worked yesterday.’

b. Gisteren ee ze zaa gewerkt.
   \[yesterday\ has\ she_{\text{clitic}}\ she_{\text{strong}}\ \text{worked}\]
   ‘Yesterday she has worked.’

Although this generalisation seems to hold for subclauses (1a) and inverted main clauses (1b), the above mentioned authors have failed to notice that pronominal doubling in subject-initial main clauses does not involve a clitic in first position, but rather a weak pronoun. This observation is obscured by the fact that clitics and weak pronouns are nearly always homophonous, but it can be illustrated very clearly in the dialect of Wambeek, which morphologically distinguishes between clitics and weak pronouns in the first person plural.

(2) *Me / We gojn ze waailie nuir ojsh bringen. (Wambeek)
   \[we_{\text{clitic}} / \text{we}_{\text{weak}}\ \text{go\ them\ we}_{\text{strong}}\ \text{to\ home\ bring}\]
   ‘We’re going to take them home.’

---

2 Throughout this paper we will be assuming that the tripartition of the pronominal system into strong, weak and clitic pronouns proposed in Cardinaletti & Starke (1994, 1995, 1999) also holds for the dialects of Dutch. For argumentation in support of this claim, cf. Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen (2000a).
These data show that in a subject-initial main clause the first element of a pronominally doubled subject cannot be a clitic. What is traditionally thought of as a clitic is in fact a weak pronoun. What is more, not only weak pronouns, but also strong pronouns, full DPs and proper names can serve as the first element of a pronominally doubled subject in this sentence type. This is shown in (3)-(5).

(3) Waaile gojn ze waaile nuir ojsh bringen. (Wambeek)

We STRONG go them We STRONG to home bring
‘We’re going to take them home.’

(4) Die vrouw komt zaa morgen. (Gent)

That woman comes She STRONG tomorrow
‘That woman is coming tomorrow.’

(5) Marie muu zaai ie nie kommen. (Wambeek)

Mary must She STRONG here not come
‘Mary shouldn’t come here.’

In section 4.3 we will come back to the dialectal variation regarding this phenomenon in more detail. What is important here, however, is the fact that this construction is restricted to subject-initial main clauses. That is, in subclauses and inverted main clauses weak pronouns, strong pronouns, full DPs and proper names cannot be doubled. This is shown in (6)-(8).

(6) …da <me / *we / *waaile> ze waaile nuir ojsh gojn bringen. (Wambeek)

…that <we CLITIC / we WEAK / we STRONG> them We STRONG to home go bring
‘that we’re going to take them home.’

(7) * Morgen komt die vrouw zaa. (Gent)

tomorrow comes that woman She STRONG

(8) a * Gistere moest Marie zaai ie nie kommen. (Wambeek)

yesterday had.to Mary She STRONG here not come

b * …da Marie zaai ie nie muu komen.

…that Mary She STRONG here not must come
Summing up, in this section we have shown that pronominal subject doubling in Dutch dialects should no longer be thought of as a unitary phenomenon. Rather, there are two types of doubling. One is the well-known clitic doubling construction, which always involves a clitic and a strong pronoun, and which only occurs in subclauses and inverted main clauses. The second type of doubling, which we propose to call topic doubling for reasons that will become clear later, is restricted to subject-initial main clauses. Here, the doubling element is a strong pronoun, whereas the first subject element can be a weak pronoun, a strong pronoun, a full DP or a proper name. We have summarized these findings in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>clitic doubling</th>
<th>topic doubling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first subject element</td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>weak / strong / full DP / proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution</td>
<td>subclauses / inverted main clauses</td>
<td>subject-initial main clauses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These generalisations are the focus of the remainder of this paper. We will provide an analysis for the two types of doubling, at the same time accounting for their distribution. In the next section we focus our attention on clitic doubling.

3 • CLITIC DOUBLING

In this section we will give an analysis of subject clitic doubling. Before being able to do so, however, we need to make a small digression into the realm of object clitics. We will use object clitics to test whether clitic placement in the dialects under consideration is syntactic or phonological in nature, and based on our findings we will make a specific proposal about the functional structure making up the left periphery in these dialects.

3.1 • Object clitics

3.1.1 • Syntactic or phonological clitic placement?
Consider the data in (9)-(10).
There is a striking distributional asymmetry between weak and strong object pronouns and full object DPs on the one hand and object clitics on the other. Whereas the former necessarily follow the subject, object clitics can only occur immediately after the complementizer, i.e. before the subject. An obvious question raised by these examples is whether the placement of the object clitic in (9) is a mere PF-phenomenon or whether it occupies this position in narrow syntax as well. This can be tested in a fairly straightforward manner. If it can be shown that the clitic in its pre-subject position has an effect on the interpretation of the sentence, then it must occupy this position at LF, and not just after the derivation has branched off to the PF-component. The interpretive effect we have in mind here comes from Binding Theory. Consider the examples in (11)-(12).

(11) …dan-t i/*j den aaigeneir van ’t lemmeken j zelf ei muutn doewtuun. (Wambeek)

…that-it_{clitic} the owner of the lamb-DIM self has have.to kill

‘…that the owner of the lamb has had to kill it (not the lamb) himself.’

(12) …da-se i/*j Marie j eur dochter gezien eet. (Lapscheure)

…that-her_{clitic} Mary her daughter seen has

‘…that Mary’s daughter has seen her (not Mary).’

In both these examples the object clitic cannot be coreferential with a DP contained in the subject. The placement of the object clitic – whether it be the result of base generation or of movement – thus seems to feed Condition C. This implies that the placement of the object clitic is not a PF-phenomenon, but that it takes place in narrow syntax.

The conclusion reached in the previous paragraph raises a new issue. If the object clitic is situated in a pre-subject position in narrow syntax, what position exactly does it occupy then? Assuming there to be no right-adjunction (following
Kayne 1994, cf. supra), it cannot be adjoined to C°-head hosting the complementizer.³ Multiple specifiers, on the other hand, are also not allowed in the framework we are adopting. As a result the object clitic cannot be said to be adjoined to or in an outer specifier of whichever projection is hosting the subject. The only option left is that the object clitic is hosted in a projection of its own. Following Uriagereka (1995) we will call this projection FP, and we will assume it to be a projection which is targeted specifically by object clitics (cf. also Sportiche 1995).

3.1.2 • Situating FP in the clausal architecture

Now that we have argued for the introduction of FP, a number of new questions obtain. Where exactly should this projection be situated in the clausal hierarchy? Is it part of the IP-domain or of the CP-domain? Or put differently: is it an A- or an A’-projection? What are the licensing conditions for this FP? In this section we will focus on these questions. Consider first the example in (13).

(13)  ...dan-t Jef ‘m gistere ni ei vertelt. (Wambeek)
      ...that-it_clitic Geoff to.himweak yesterday not has told
      ‘...that Geoff hasn’t told him yesterday.’

This sentence contains not only an object clitic, but also a weak indirect object pronoun. It is well-known that weak pronouns scramble out of the VP in Dutch (Zwart 1992). Moreover, given that the indirect object also precedes the TP-level adverb gistere ‘yesterday’ in (13), it must have scrambled even higher than TP. This in turn implies that the subject Jef ‘Geoff’ occupies the highest subject position available in this sentence, i.e. Spec,AgrSP. That brings us to a first approximation of the location of FP: it must be situated higher than AgrSP.

The next question we want to focus on is whether FP belongs to the IP- or to the CP-domain. Recall in this respect the examples in (11)-(12), repeated here.

³ This is not to say that the object clitic doesn’t adjoin phonologically to the complementizer (cf. the liaison-n on the complementizer in (11) and the devoicing of the initial consonant of the object clitic in (12)). We want to distinguish this kind of adjunction, however, from purely syntactic adjunction, which doesn’t necessarily correspond to the surface phonology of the utterance.
In the previous section we argued that the object clitic induces a Condition C violation in these sentences. From this we concluded that object clitic placement is not a PF-phenomenon in the dialects we are considering. The same facts now allow us to infer that the position the object clitic occupies is part of the IP-domain (i.e. it is L-related in the sense of Chomsky 1993). Given that pronominal binding is always A-binding, object clitic placement cannot target an A'- or non-L-related position, as it feeds Condition C. In other words, FP cannot be part of the CP-domain.

Finally, we want to focus on the question of what licenses FP. Is this projection always present or does it appear under certain circumstances? We will show that FP is only licensed in finite contexts, a fact which we will interpret theoretically by claiming that FP can only be present when it is selected by a FinP with a positive value (i.e. [+finite]). We define FinP as in Rizzi (1997) as the lowest projection of the CP-domain, which hosts the finiteness features of the clause. The following examples show that object clitics (and thus FP) are indeed only licensed in finite contexts.

(14) <‘Him / ‘M> gezien emmen is ni genoeg.  
    <him_{CLITIC} / him_{WEAK}> seen have-INF is not enough  
    ‘Having seen him is not enough.’

(15) En gou <‘Him / ‘M> helpen zeker?  
    and you <him_{CLITIC} / him_{WEAK}> help-INF surely  
    ‘And you want to help him, I suppose?’

---

Note that we assume that the CP-layer in Dutch is split up in two projections only. The lower one is FinP and the higher one, hosting the complementizer, CP.
All these examples are from the dialect of Wambeek and more specifically they all involve third person singular masculine object pronouns, since here, the dialect distinguishes morphologically between weak pronouns and clitics (cf. supra example (2) for a similar distinction in the first person plural). The sentence in (14) contains a subject infinitive. As the grammaticality judgments indicate, only weak object pronouns are allowed in this construction. The clitic pronoun ‘n ‘him’ is ruled out. The same holds for the root infinitive in (15). Again, only the weak pronoun is allowed. The example in (16) is particularly instructive. It illustrates the behaviour of deficient object pronouns in ECM-contexts. It is well-known that weak object pronouns can raise out of ECM-sentences into the higher clause (Zwart 1996). What the example in (16) shows, however, is that clitics necessarily raise out of the lower clause, and moreover, that they target not just any position in the higher clause, but a position immediately below the complementizer.¹ The sentence in (17), finally, is meant to illustrate that the ungrammaticality of the previous examples is not due to the absence of an overt complementizer. In this example the infinitival complementizer om ‘to’ is present, and yet the object clitic is still not licensed. All these examples corroborate our claim that object clitics are licensed by finiteness. As mentioned above, we take this to indicate that the FP hosting the object clitic can only be present when it is selected by a FinP which is marked [+finite].

¹ In the next section we will come back extensively to the fact that the subject clitic intervenes between the complementizer and the object clitic.
3.1.3 • Conclusion

In section 3.1 we have focused on object clitics. We have reached two conclusions. Firstly, we argued that object clitic placement in the dialects under consideration is not a PF-phenomenon, but rather takes place in narrow syntax. In the remainder of this paper we will generalize this claim to all clitic placement. This means that when we focus on subject clitics in the next section, we will assume that their surface position too is the result of syntactic movement or base generation, and not of PF-movement. Secondly, we have argued in favour of the existence of a left-peripheral L-related functional projection hosting object clitics. In the spirit of Uriagereka (1995), we have named this projection FP. Moreover, we argued that this FP is licensed by a specialized projection hosting the finiteness features of the sentence. We captured this by splitting up the CP-domain into two projections, the lower one being FinP (cf. Rizzi 1997) and the higher one (which we will continue to call CP) hosting the complementizer.

3.2 • Subject clitics and clitic doubling

3.2.1 • The analysis

Although distributionally and formally there are a lot of similarities between subject and object clitics, there is one crucial difference between them. Whereas subject clitics can be clitic doubled (18), object clitics cannot (19).

(18) …da ze zaa werkt. (Gent)
   …that she_{clitic} she_{strong} works
   ‘…that she is working.’

(19) * …da ze Marie ee gezien eit. (Wambeek)
   …that her_{clitic} Mary her_{strong} seen has

We take this difference to reflect an asymmetry with respect to where these clitics are base generated. Given that subject clitics can be doubled with a strong pronoun, they are not themselves an argument of the verb. Instead, they are the overt realization of an agreement head, more specifically the head of AgrSP (cf. Zwart 1997; Sportiche...
The strong pronoun doubling the clitic is merged in Spec,VP and raises to Spec,AgrSP. Object clitics on the other hand cannot be doubled. We take this to mean that they are merged in the canonical object position, and subsequently raise to FP.

We will now give an analysis of subject clitic doubling in the dialects of Gent, Lapscheure and Wambeek. Recall that we are assuming the subject clitic is base generated as the head of AgrSP, while the doubling strong pronoun raises to Spec,AgrSP in the course of the derivation. This means that we expect the strong pronoun to linearly precede the subject clitic in the ultimate representation of the sentence. Consider in this respect the example in (20).

(20) …da ze t zaa ör in ör ande gestoke ee (Gent)
	…that she_{clitic} it_{clitic} she_{subj} her in her hands put has
	‘…that she has put it in her hands.’

Contrary to our expectations, the subject clitic precedes the strong pronoun. This can mean two things. Either the strong pronoun hasn’t moved to Spec,AgrSP, but instead has remained in a lower subject position, or the subject clitic has moved on, ‘stranding’ the strong pronoun in Spec,AgrSP. The choice between these two options is fairly straightforward, given the fact that the example also contains an object clitic. In the previous section we have argued at length that object clitics occupy a projection which is situated below the lowest CP-projection, but higher than AgrSP. This implies that the subject clitic in (20) is also situated higher than AgrSP, and therefore that it has moved. Note that this reasoning in itself does not exclude the possibility that the strong pronoun is nonetheless in a low subject position. The following example, however, shows that it occupies Spec,AgrSP.

\[\text{\ldots}\]

\(6\) Note that we do not consider the option of base generating the clitic and the strong pronoun as one DP (cf. Uriagereka 1995, Laenzlinger 1998, Grohmann 2000, Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2000a). We believe such an analysis raises more problems than it solves. Most notably it is unclear where exactly the strong pronoun would be situated within the DP. If it occupies Spec,DP, does that mean there is a pro in the complement position of the clitic? How is this pro licensed? What is its relation to the strong pronoun? Isn’t the theta-criterion violated in this configuration? If the strong pronoun is merged as the complement of the clitic, does that mean it is an NP (contra Postal 1966)? Or is this a case of DP-recursion (normally excluded in Dutch)? Moreover, assuming the clitic at one point in the derivation moves independently of the strong pronoun (as we will do, cf. infra), the one-DP-analysis would predict a violation of a Subject island, yet no ungrammaticality ensues.

\(7\) Note that this implies that object clitics have DP/D°-status as in Chomsky 1995 (assuming the clitic moves to the head of FP).
In this example the strong subject pronoun precedes the scrambled weak indirect object pronoun, which in turn precedes TP-level adverbs such as *merge* ‘tomorrow’, and negation. We take this to indicate that the strong subject pronoun is in Spec,AgrSP.

The next question to answer is then: where has the subject clitic moved to? Assuming there to be no right-adjunction (cf. supra), it cannot have moved to the C°-position hosting the complementizer. On the other hand, given that FP is a projection targeted by object clitics and by object clitics only, it cannot have moved to F° either, since it has not reason to move there. We therefore conclude that the subject clitic has moved to a projection in between the CP-layer hosting the complementizer and the FP hosting the object clitic. Note, however, that we have already encountered such a projection in the previous section, when we argued in favour of splitting CP into two separate projections, the higher one hosting the complementizer, and the lower one (FinP) hosting the finiteness features of the clause. We therefore propose that the subject clitic in the example in (20) moves to the head of FinP. This is illustrated in (22) and (23).
The analysis in (22)-(23) shows how the subject clitic is merged as the head of AgrSP, and how it subsequently moves to Fin°, via the F°-head hosting the object clitic. This explains why the subject clitic in the example in (20) precedes both the object clitic and the doubling strong pronoun. Note that a central part of our analysis is the movement of the subject clitic to the head of FinP. Although it is at this point not yet clear to us what the exact trigger for this movement is, we would like to point out that it seems to provide a theoretical interpretation to the intuition sometimes expressed in the literature that subject clitics in (dialects of) Dutch are somehow ‘C°-related’ (cf. Rooryck 2000 chapter 8). If these clitics necessarily move to the head of a low C°-projection, then this intuition would fall into place. Note moreover that movement of the head of AgrSP into the C°-domain is not without precedents. Zwart has argued in a number of publications in favour of the existence of AgrS°-to-C°-movement in Dutch (Zwart 1993a, 1997). For the time being, however, we will leave the exact characterization of the movement of the subject clitic into the C°-domain as a topic for further research.

---

8 Note that the object clitic, being a deficient pronoun, first scrambles out of VP to a high position just below AgrSP. We have neutrally labelled the projection targeted by this scrambling operation XP, as we do not want to go into the theoretical debate on scrambling. The object clitic then moves from the Spec of XP to the head of FP (recall that it has XP/X°-status in the sense of Chomsky 1995). The ambivalent nature of this movement operation possibly also explains why the object clitic is allowed to skip AgrS° on its way to F°, thus seemingly violating the HMC.
3.2.2 • Distribution

One crucial aspect of clitic doubling raised in the introduction to this paper has been left unaddressed in the previous subsection, namely its distribution. Recall that clitic doubling is restricted to subclauses and inverted main clauses. The analysis of subclauses has already been given in the previous section, and the account of inverted main clauses is not very different. The crucial difference is that the C°-position is not filled by the complementizer this time, but by the finite verb, which has raised out of the VP in order to satisfy the V2-constraint which holds in Dutch main clauses. On its way to the C°-position, the verb picks up both the subject clitic and the object clitic, yielding the order Vfin – subject clitic – object clitic, exactly as it is found in the data. As an illustration of all this, consider the analysis in (25) of the example in (24).

(24) Merge gui ze t zaai zien.

\[\text{tomorrow goes she}_{\text{CLITIC}} \; \text{it}_{\text{CLITIC}} \; \text{she}_{\text{STRONG}} \; \text{see}\]

‘Tomorrow she’s going to see it.’

(25)

[Diagram showing the syntactic structure of the example (24)]

[Diagram showing the syntactic structure of the example (24)]
A more intriguing question, however, is raised by subject-initial main clauses, as in this sentence type clitic doubling is excluded (cf. supra, section 2). In order to account for this we will crucially rely on our analysis of subject clitic placement being the result of Agr$^\circ$-to-Fin$^\circ$-movement. Assuming this movement to be vital for the licensing of the clitic, we predict subject clitics not to be allowed when for some reason, the head of FinP is not available as a landing site. If we combine this idea with analyses of subject-initial main clauses as being IPs (Travis 1984, Zwart 1997), we have an account of why subject clitic doubling is not allowed in this sentence type. If the FinP necessary for licensing the clitic is not present, then it is impossible for the head of AgrSP to be realized as a clitic. Consequently, clitic doubling is impossible.

3.2.3 • Conclusion
In this section we have given an analysis of subject clitic doubling. Based on a comparison with object clitics, we proposed to analyse subject clitics as being base generated in the head of AgrSP. The strong pronoun doubling the clitic is merged in argument position and raises to Spec,AgrSP to check case and agreement. Subsequently, the clitic moves out of AgrSP to a higher head, which we have argued to be Fin$^\circ$. It was also this movement which helped explain the distribution of clitic doubling across sentence types. In subject-initial main clauses, the CP-domain (including FinP) is absent. As a result subject clitics are not licensed and subject clitic doubling is not allowed.

4 • TOPIC DOUBLING
In section two we have shown that southern Dutch does not exhibit one type of pronominal doubling, but rather two: clitic doubling, already known from the literature (cf. among many others Haegeman 1992) and topic doubling, a construction that has gone unnoticed until now. In topic doubling constructions, a subject is doubled by a nominative strong pronoun.

9 Note that we are abstracting away from the question of where the fronted adverb merge ‘tomorrow’ is base generated, as this is not relevant to the issue at hand. The only thing we do assume, however, is that is ends up in Spec,CP.
(26) Marie komt zaai. (Wambeek)

Mary comes she<sub>STRONG</sub>
‘Mary is coming.’

In the first subsection we propose an analysis for this construction. We argue that the first subject element is a topic (hence the name topic doubling), occupying Spec,CP, whereas the doubling strong pronoun ends up in Spec,AgrSP. In subsection two we show how this analysis accounts for the distribution of topic doubling across sentence types. In the final subsection we focus on the dialectical variation concerning this construction.

4.1 • The analysis

First we want to argue that the first subject element in a topic doubling construction is a topic. The argumentation in favour of this claim comes from the behaviour of indefinites and Wh-subjects. Consider the sentences in (27).

(27) a. Jan kust een meisje. (Standard Dutch)

\[ \text{John}_{\text{SUBJECT}} \text{ kisses } a \text{ girl}_{\text{OBJECT}} \]

‘John is kissing a girl.’


\[ a \text{ girl}_{\text{OBJECT}} \text{ kisses John}_{\text{SUBJECT}} \]

‘John is kissing a GIRL (not a boy).’

#‘John is kissing a girl’

In (27a) the direct object can be interpreted as a non-specific indefinite. In (27b), where the direct object is topicalised, this interpretation is no longer available. Instead, the direct object has a contrastive reading. These examples show that topicalising an indefinite direct object makes the non-specific interpretation unavailable. With this in mind, consider the examples in (28).
In (28a) the indefinite subject is not doubled. As the translation indicates, the interpretation of this indefinite can be non-specific. In the b-sentence on the other hand, where the subject is doubled by a strong pronoun, only a generic interpretation is available. This shows that indefinite subjects doubled by a strong pronoun behave exactly the same as topicallyised indefinite direct objects: they are both incompatible with a non-specific indefinite reading. We take this to indicate that the doubled subject is in (28b) is in fact in a topic position.

The behaviour of Wh-subjects confirms this conclusion. Consider the example in (29).

(29) Wie eid i j da geduin? (Wambeek)

who has hestrong that done

meaning:

#‘Who has done that?’
‘It is obvious that X has done that.’
‘It is obvious that nobody has done that.’

In (29) a subject Wh-phrase is doubled by a strong pronoun. As the English translations of this example show, a Wh-phrase can only be doubled if the sentence in which it occurs is interpreted as a rhetorical question, not when it is a request for information. In (29) the Wh-phrase refers to an entity that is already known or understood by the hearer (either a specific person or no one at all). This shows that the only readings available for the Wh-subject are those compatible with a topic. We therefore conclude that the first subject element in a topic doubling construction should be analysed as a topic. If this is the case, then we assume it to occupy Spec,CP.
There is some supporting evidence for this assumption. Consider again the sentence in (26), repeated here as (30).

(30) Marie komt zaai.  
*Mary comes she\textsuperscript{STRONG}\textsuperscript{STRONG} ‘Mary is coming.’

The pronoun \textit{zaai} ‘she’ and the proper name \textit{Marie} ‘Mary’ are coreferential. Furthermore, \textit{Marie} c-commands \textit{zaai}. This means that \textit{zaai}, a pronoun, is locally bound. We would expect this to cause a Condition B violation, \textit{quod non}. Assuming the first subject element to be in Spec,CP, however, this can be explained in a straightforward manner. The pronoun is now no longer locally A-bound and as a result Binding Theory is not relevant. We consider this to be indirect support for the claim that \textit{Marie} in (30) occupies Spec,CP.

In the structure in (22) four positions are available for subject DPs: Spec,VP, Spec,AgrSP, Spec,FinP and Spec,CP. Given that the first subject element is in Spec,CP, only the former three positions are available for the strong subject pronoun. If this pronoun were to occupy Spec,VP, scrambled direct objects should be able to precede it. As is shown in (31), this is not the case.

(31) * Marie eit ‘m zaai gezien.  
*Mary has him\textsuperscript{WEAK} she\textsuperscript{STRONG} seen

This means there are only two possible positions left for the strong subject pronoun: Spec,FinP and Spec,AgrSP. Again, word order allows us to eliminate one of the two options. In section 3.1 we have argued that object clitics move to F°. In this position they precede regular (i.e. non-doubled) subjects (cf. example (9)). When the doubling strong pronoun is in the same position as regular subjects, we would expect object clitics to precede it. If the subject pronoun is in FinP, however, we would predict it to be higher than object clitics. As the example in (32) shows, the subject pronoun follows the object clitic. This means that the second subject element in a topic doubling construction is in the regular subject position, i.e. Spec,AgrSP.
(32) Marie eit ‘n zaai gezien.  

*Marie has him*clitic *she*strong *seen*  

‘Mary has seen him.’

We have now shown that the first subject element is in Spec,CP and the second one is in Spec,AgrSP. We assume that the latter receives a theta-role from the verb in Spec,VP and then moves to Spec,AgrSP to check its Φ-features against AgrS° and to receive nominative case, just like regular subjects. Furthermore, we assume the first subject element to be a base-generated topic in Spec,CP. This element forms a chain with the lower subject to receive a value for case and a theta-role. The derivation of a sentence with a topic doubled subject as in (33), is given in (34).

(33) Marie komt zaai.  

*Mary comes she*strong  

‘Mary is coming.’

(34)
Nothing we have said so far, would prevent clitic doubling and topic doubling from co-occurring in one and the same sentence. Thus we predict the possibility of ‘tripling’, whereby a strong pronoun is both part of clitic doubling and of topic doubling. This prediction is confirmed by the data in (35). In this sentence the subject Marie ‘Mary’ is doubled by the strong pronoun zaai ‘she’, which in turn is doubled by the clitic ze ‘she’.

(35) Marie ei ze zaai niks te verliezn.  
Mary has she \textsc{clitic} she \textsc{strong} nothing to lose  
‘Mary has nothing to lose.’

In this section we have given an analysis of topic doubling. We argued that the first element in this construction is a topic, base generated in Spec,CP. The strong subject pronoun ends up in Spec,AgrSP. We assume that these two subject elements share the theta-role and case associated with the external argument by forming a chain. Furthermore, we have shown that the dialects under consideration allow instances of tripling, whereby clitic doubling and topic doubling co-occur in one and the same sentence. This fact follows naturally from our analyses and thus constitutes further support for them.

4.2 • Distribution

In the introduction we have shown that topic doubling is not available in inverted main clauses and embedded clauses. In this subsection we propose an explanation for this distribution. The first subject element in a topic doubling construction occupies a topic position. From this fact, the unavailability of topic doubling in embedded clauses and inverted main clauses, follows naturally. Consider first the embedded sentence in (36).

(36) * ‘k paus Marie da zaai merge komt.  
\textsc{I think Mary that} she \textsc{strong} tomorrow comes

(Wambeek)
This example shows that topic doubling is not possible in embedded clauses. The explanation for this is fairly straightforward. Various authors have argued that Dutch does not allow embedded topicalisation (cf. among others Barbiers 2000; Hoekstra & Zwart 1994, 1997; Zwart 1997). The example in (37) shows that this generalisation extends to dialects of Dutch as well.

(37)  *  'k paus daun boek da Jef geleezn eit.  
\textit{I think that book that Geoff read has}

If embedded topicalisation is generally disallowed in this dialect, then we don’t expect topic doubling to be possible in embedded contexts either, as this construction makes crucial use of a topic position (cf. supra). Thus the distribution of topic doubling follows naturally from the analysis given in the previous subsection.

A similar explanation holds for inverted main clauses. Consider the sentence in (38).

(38)  *  's Monduis Marie komt zaai.  
\textit{on Monday Mary comes she}

Topic doubling is impossible when a non-subject DP occupies sentence-initial position. This too follows from the assumption that the first subject element (i.e. \textit{Marie}) is in the specifier of CP. As is shown by Hoekstra & Zwart (1997), Dutch does not allow multiple topicalisation. Consider the standard Dutch example in (39) and its Wambeek Dutch translation in (40).

(39)  *  's Maandags de hond geeft Marie eten.  
(40)  *  's Monduis n’ont geeft Marie eetn.  
\textit{on Monday the dog gives Mary food}

Note that the ungrammaticality of this sentence is not due to the V2-constraint, as it is equally ungrammatical with the finite verb in second position.

(i)  *  's Monduis komt Marie zaai.  
\textit{on Monday comes Mary she}

The same observation holds for the examples in (39)-(40).
Hoekstra & Zwart (1997) argue that this sentence is ungrammatical because there is only one position for topicalised constituents in Dutch (Spec,TopP in their terminology, Spec,CP in ours). In (39) both the adverbial phrase ‘s Maandags ‘on Monday’ and the indirect object de hond ‘the dog’ are topicalised. As there is only one topic position available, the derivation crashes. Given the similarity between (39) and (40), we assume that the same explanation holds for Wambeek Dutch. These data now also account for the absence of topic doubling in inverted main clauses. In (38) there are also two constituents competing for the topic position, namely the subject Marie and the temporal adverb ‘s Mondays ‘on Monday’. Thus the absence of topic doubling in inverted main clauses follow from a ban on multiple topicalisation in combination with the analysis given in the previous subsection.

4.3 • Dialectical variation

The dialects under consideration show quite a bit of variation with respect to topic doubling. More specifically, they differ in the range of subjects that can be topic doubled. Consider the examples in (41)-(43).

(41)  <Ze/*Zie/*Da wuf/*Marie> geeft ze zie een flasse wyn. (Lapscheure)
<she_WEAK / she_STRONG / that woman / Mary> gives to.them she_STRONG a bottle wine
‘She gives them a bottle of wine.’

(42)  <Ze/ Zaa/ die vrouw/*Marie> komt zaa morgen. (Gent)
<she_WEAK / she_STRONG / that woman / Mary> comes she_STRONG tomorrow
‘She/that woman will come tomorrow.’

(43)  <Ze/ zaai/dei vrou/Marie> gui zaai nuir ojsh. (Wambeek)
<she_WEAK / she_STRONG / that woman / Mary> goes she_STRONG to home
‘She/that woman/Mary is going home.’

The examples in (41) show that the dialect of Lapscheure only allows weak pronouns to be topic doubled. The dialects of Gent and Wambeek on the other hand can also

11 Note that Haegeman (1992) among others analyses these pronouns as clitics rather than weak pronouns. As far as we can see the strongest argument in support of this claim is the fact that these pronouns cannot be left out in a coordination structure. For argumentation in favour of the opposite view cf. Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen (2000b, 2001).
topic double strong pronouns and full DPs. Moreover, the latter dialect also allows topic doubling with proper names. We have summarised the variation in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>First Subject Element in a Topic Doubling Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lapscheure</td>
<td>weak pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gent</td>
<td>weak pronoun, strong pronoun, definite DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wambeek</td>
<td>weak pronoun, strong pronoun, full DP, proper name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that this type of dialectal variation is not at all unexpected in a construction where a DP is doubled by a pronominal element. In the literature on clitic doubling in Romance and Slavic similar observation have been made (cf. among other Anagnostoupou 1999). This illustrates that what we have observed fits in nicely with cross-linguistic generalisation about pronominal doubling.

5 • CONCLUSION

In this paper we have shown that pronominal doubling in southern Dutch is not a unitary phenomenon. Rather, it comprises not only clitic doubling (well-known from the literature), but also a construction we have called topic doubling. In the latter a base-generated topic in Spec,CP is doubled by a strong pronoun in the regular subject position. In our analysis of clitic doubling we have argued for the existence of two left-peripheral functional projections, the lower one attracting object clitics and the higher one (FinP) serving as the landing site for subject clitic movement.
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Three Types of Negation: A Case Study in Bavarian
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1 • INTRODUCTION

One of the few linguistic phenomena which seems to be universal in a very straightforward sense is negation: all human languages have means to overtly “deny the truth of a proposition” (Dahl 1993: 914). So not surprisingly, negation is one of the topics which have attracted much interest in recent linguistics from various perspectives. The semantics and syntax of sentence negation and especially the phenomenon called negative concord has been widely studied in the nineties (cf. Acquaviva 1994; Brown 1999; Haegeman 1995; Haegeman & Zanuttini 1991; Ladusaw 1992, 1994; Progovac, 1994; Ouhalla 1997; van der Wouden 1997; Weiß 1998a, b, 1999; Zanuttini 1997; Zwarts 1996, among many others). Some interest has also been contributed to special cases like presuppositional negation (Vanden Wyngaerd 1999, Zanuttini 1997) or expletive negation (Brown 1999, Espinal 1992). However, what is rather rarely found in literature is a thorough investigation of all three types of non-constituent negation in one and the same language which could probably shed more light on the complex syntax-semantics interface behaviour of negation in natural languages. The following paper is a first attempt to do so for Bavarian.¹

My goal here is to present and investigate some data showing that there are three types of non-constituent negation in Bavarian which do not only differ semantically but syntactically as well (which does not seem to be the case in all languages, see section VI). The two types of (non-expletive) clausal negation differ

* I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments. Special thanks to Janna Zimmermann and John Loutzenhiser for checking and improving my English.
in their syntactic position: negation 1 - as predicate negation it constitutes the
unmarked case of sentence negation - immediately dominates VP, whereas
negation 2 is located higher in the sentence structure. There are some further
differences, for instance that only Neg 1 induces negative concord, but not Neg 2,
as the contrast between (1a) and (1b) shows: in the scope of Neg 1, weak indefinites
have to appear as negative indefinites, but not so when in the scope of Neg 2,
where they are licensed without being inherently negated. Thus in (1b) the
Bavarian indefinite pronoun *ebba* corresponding to German *jemand* or English
*someone* can occur within the scope of Neg 2 without forcing ungrammaticality or
being interpreted as specific. This lack of specificity is an interesting point which
will be discussed below.

(1)  a  daß’ma koana ned furtgehd

that-me nobody not away-goes

b  damid ned ebba aaf dumme Gedankn kimmd

that not somebody on stupid ideas comes

Both types of clausal negations contribute negative force to sentence
meaning, putting them in clear contrast to expletive negation which contributes no
negative meaning despite the presence of the negative particle. Expletive negation
occurs, e.g., in questions (2a) or in before-sentences (2b).

(2)  a  hamd’s ned olle vo uns gsogd?

have-it not all of us said

b  bevorsd ned aaframsd, dearsd ned Fernsehschaun

before-2SG not tidy-up, may not TV-watch

These different kinds of negation will be explored in more detail in the
sections III, IV and V.

---

2 As for the syntax of Bavarian in general, the reader is referred to Weiß (1998a).
First of all, I will briefly outline some theoretical and empirical assumptions which the following remarks on the three types of negation are based upon. Generally, in my account of negation, there are two fundamental assumptions regarding its syntactic and semantic nature. First, in accordance with the Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995) or the NegP hypothesis (Ouhalla 1997), I assume that sentence negation corresponds to a functional projection of its own, the so-called negation phrase. In the case of Bavarian I further assume that it is Neg° rather than the Specifier of NegP which hosts the negative particle ned ‘not’, and the complement position is filled by VP in the unmarked case. Hence, a Bavarian sentence like the one in (3) has a simplified structure as indicated (cf. Weiß 1998a, b, 1999, 2002b):

(3) \[ S'Marah, \text{woid an Hans}[^{\text{NegP}}[^{\text{Neg°}}[^{\text{ned}}[^{\text{VP}}[^{t_i}[^{t_j}[^{\text{hairadn}}]]]]]]] \]

the Mary wanted the John not marry

Grewendorf (1990) or Ouhalla (1997) have proposed that the German negative particle nicht occupies the specifier of NegP, because it does not prevent the verb from moving to C° in main clauses, as is the case, for instance, in English, where verb-movement is blocked. This can be accounted for, if one assumes that not fills the Neg°-position and therefore it can block verb-movement due to the Head Movement Constraint. Though Bavarian ned also does not show any blocking effect, I nevertheless hold the Neg° analysis to be the correct one. The main reason for this is that the Neg° status of ned fits better into accounts of negative concord which rely on specifier head agreement, and I simply think that this mechanism could not be dispensed with in whatever special account one favours in the end. I will return to this issue below.

Second, I assume that negation is an ordinary quantifier and not just a propositional operator as logic treats it. Like Krifka (1989), Aquaviva (1994) and many others, I take the event-variable as being bound by the negative quantifier (cf. Weiß 2002a, b). Thus, natural language negation consists - like any other quantifier

---

3 Throughout this paper, I use the term event in its broadest sense, that is synonymous with Bach's (1986) eventuality which comprises states, processes, and events.
- of three parts: quantifier, restriction and scopal domain. Take, for example, a sentence like the one in (4a) and its paraphrase in (4b) - the example is taken from Beghelli (1997) -, which could be transformed into a semantic form like (4c): here the Neg quantifier binds the event-variable in its restriction and scopes over the predicate.

(4)  

a  John didn’t come  
b  ‘there is no event of coming of which John was the agent’  
c  Neg(x) [event (x)] [come (J,x)]

On this account, negation is much like quantificational adverbs, which, e.g. in Chierchia’s (1995) analysis, also quantify over events. So a sentence containing the frequency adverb often - such as (5a) - is analysable in exactly the same way as was the sentence (4a): the only difference is that this time it is the adverb which binds the event-variable in its restriction. But both semantic forms (4c) and (5c) share the same tripartite structure.

(5)  

a  John often drinks beer  
b  ‘there is often an event of drinking beer of which John is the agent’  
b  often(x) [event (x)] ∃y [beer(y) ∧ drink(J,y,x)]

3 • Neg P1

3.1 • Structural considerations

Now let’s return to negation in Bavarian and begin with the lower negation phrase NegP1. As said above, this is the unmarked case of clausal negation. In example (6a), we can see some of its fundamental characteristics. Given that Bavarian is a SOV language (as realized in non-root sentences), then NegP1 follows subject and object but precedes the verb. Despite the adjacency of negative particle and verb, I think that Bavarian is basically a NegSOV language because the VP containing the
verb and its arguments is as a whole the complement of NegP1. The correct structural analysis is thus something like (6b), where it is assumed that subject and object have left their VP-internal base position and moved to the left of negation.

(6)  

a  
adăs’ s’Maral an Hans ned hairadd

that the Mary the John not marry

b  
adăs’ s’Maral i an Hans [Neg P [Neg’ ned [VP t₁ t₂ hairadd]]]

There are good arguments in favour of this analysis. First the theoretical argument that, if one adopts the NegP hypothesis in the version sketched above, then one is left only with the structural analysis as given in (6b), because NegP cannot take a non-maximal projection as a complement as would be the case with the verb alone. Other possibilities permitted on theoretical grounds are in conflict with empirical data. Assume for the moment that the negative particle ned is a clitic which adjoins to the verb either by lowering itself to it or by attracting the verb which raises to Neg°. The two possibilities are given in (7a) and (7b), where the latter is the somewhat simplified and modified structure which Haegeman (1998a) has developed for West Flemish negated sentences. Under both assumptions the negative particle would have to adjoin to the finite verb which is indeed the case in WF, but not in Bavarian where it is separated from the finite verb by the participle.

(7)  

a  
adăs [Neg P [Neg’ t₁ [VP s’Maral an Hans ned, hairadn woid]]]

b  
adăs’ s’Maral i an Hans [Neg P [Neg’ ned [hairadn woid]k [VP t₁ t₂ k]]]

Furthermore, there are some cases in which the adjacency of negation and verb is dispensed with. This is the case with argumental PPs (8a), r-pronouns (8b), and non-referring definite NPs (8c) which can intervene between negation and verb. With a clitic approach this should not be possible. However, the grammaticality of the sentences in (8) follows from the NegP hypothesis adopted here where intervening material poses no problems.

(8)  

a  
ea mog ned in d’Schui geh

he wants not in the-school go
What many people find problematic in this account is that it relies on the notion of ‘obligatory scrambling’ (e.g., Grewendorf 1990), because, for instance, referring definite NPs must leave VP, as can be seen in (6a) above where both subject and object have to scramble out of VP. But I think there is a way to explain this strange behaviour. I will return to this issue below.

3.2 • Negative Concord (NC)

There is another strange thing associated with NegP1. Consider the contrast between (9) and (10). To negate a sentence in Bavarian or German it normally suffices to add the negative particle. (9b) differs from (9a) in just this respect and is thus the negated version of (9a). The surprising point is that the insertion of the negative particle alone is insufficient in the case that the positive sentence contains a weak indefinite pronoun. As (10b) shows, in addition to this, the indefinite must be inherently negated. So besides the insertion of the negative particle in (10b), neamd ‘nobody’ has replaced ebba ‘somebody’.

(9)  a  Otto hat gestern angerufen  
     Otto has yesterday called  
  b  Otto hat gestern nicht angerufen  
     Otto has yesterday not called

(10) a  Gesdan hod ebba angrufa  
        yesterday has somebody called  
  b  Gesdan hod neamd ned angrufa  
     yesterday has nobody not called

This phenomenon is called negative concord (NC): multiple occurrences of items overtly marked for negativity do not cancel each other, but form a single
negation. Logically speaking this does not make much sense. According to the law of double negation, patterns attested for standard English or German where only one item expresses negation - see (11a, b) - could be expected.

(11)  a  nobody came  
      b  niemand kam

However, typological research has shown that this pattern does not occur very frequently in natural languages: it is mainly restricted to some standard languages (Haspelmath 1997, Weiβ 2002a). Furthermore, there is good evidence that its development had to do with language external factors such as modelling languages after Latin grammar or logical considerations in the course of standardization (Weiβ 2001a). So we can suppose that the pattern found in the standard varieties of English and German is an artificial phenomenon. On the other hand, negative concord constructions seem to be what some natural languages do in order to negate a sentence containing a weak indefinite.

The crucial question to ask w.r.t. negative concord constructions is why weak indefinites have to be inherently negated. I admit that this does not imply the

4 Besides typological and diachronic facts (as mentioned in the main text), there is a vast amount of empirical evidence that the incompatibility of n-indefinites and clausal negation in the standard variants of German, English, or Dutch is, to say the least, exceptional. Particularly striking is the fact, that all dialects of these standard languages have NC (Weiβ 2002b). Furthermore, even n-indefinites in these standard variants do not always have a negative meaning, as can be seen in cases of VP-ellipsis such as (i). Given that the elided VP must be identical with an antecedent VP (in order to be recoverable), an appropriate antecedent VP for the elided one – [VP e] – would be [einen Fisch mag], that is, we must analyse keinen Fisch in the first conjunct as being under negation and VP-internal – what follows without any stipulation from the account of NC given here, and reveals Standard German to be a hidden NC language.

   (i) weil Peter keinen Fisch mag, und Hannah auch nicht [VP e]  
       because Peter no fish likes, and Hannah also not

More arguments for analysing Standard German (English, etc) as hidden NC languages are given in Weiβ (2002b).
usual approach to NC constructions. Negative indefinites are often treated as
negated quantifiers which take sentential scope. My account of NC is based on the
fact that their semantic import corresponds to that of non-negated existentials in
positive sentences. To see this, let’s consider examples (12a, b). The most
appropriate paraphrases would be something like (13a, b).

(12)  a  Gesdan han’ e ebban gseng
      yesterday have-I somebody seen

     b  Gesdan han’ e neamd ned gseng
      yesterday have-I nobody not seen

(13)  a  it was the case that yesterday I saw somebody

     b  it was not the case that yesterday I saw anybody

The semantics of negative indefinites does not involve any negative meaning
despite their negative morphology. It seems that they are weak indefinites in the
sense of Discourse Representation Theory (in short: DRT), which introduces
restricted variables which get bound by existential closure. Before explaining this
in greater detail, let me show some further support for this hypothesis coming
from cross-linguistic research (Weiß 2002a).

Though it might sound rather odd, it is nevertheless the case that most
languages in the world do not possess words like nobody or nothing and yet they
can express that ‘yesterday I have seen nobody’. One of these ‘strange’ languages is
Malayalam, a Dravidian language spoken in South India (cf. Hany Babu 2000). In
Malayalam, indefinites are made up of an interrogative stem and three suffixal
‘indefinite markers’. Consider first example (14), a positive sentence, where an
indefinite occurs consisting of the wh-word aar- meaning ‘who’, a case marker,
and the suffix -oo. Now consider the negated version in (15): though Malayalam

5 Very special thanks to Hany Babu for supplying me with data from Malayalam and discussing
them with me.
lacks n-indefinites, it has special forms for indefinites within the scope of clausal negation: they are suffixed with -um.

(14) innale naan aar-e-oo kantu
    yesterday I who-ACC-oo saw
    ‘Yesterday I saw someone’

(15) innale naan aar-e-um kantilla
    yesterday I who-ACC-um saw-not
    ‘Yesterday, I did not see anybody’

The crucial point is now that (15) can be adequately paraphrased with (13b) above, just as (12b). Though (12b) and (15) differ from each other in that the former contains a negative indefinite and the latter does not, their semantics are identical and do not reflect the difference in morphology at all. A rather straightforward explanation for this comes from the quantifier approach to negation introduced in section 2: there I proposed that negation consists of three parts as can be seen in the formula given in (16a). Applying it to both (12b) and (15), the result is something like (16b): In each case the neg quantifier binds the event-variable in its restriction and the variable introduced by the indefinite is bound by existential closure in the scope of negation.

(16) a  Neg(x) [event (x)] [_____]  

    b  Neg(x) [event (x)] ∃y [person (y) ∧ see (I, y,x)]

This analysis immediately follows from the syntactic assumptions made above and some additional semantic assumptions. As is standard within DRT style semantics, weak indefinites of the somebody-anybody-kind are taken to just introduce restricted variables which get bound by an existential quantifier, a default mechanism called existential closure. The syntactic domain of existential closure is the VP, which also establishes the scope of negation in negated sentences. The two strange properties of NegP1, namely obligatory scrambling and negative concord, follow from this scenario.
Consider first obligatory scrambling: according to DRT assumptions à la Diesing (1992) and others, definite NPs must leave VP in order to escape existential closure since they do not introduce new discourse referents. Thus the observed movement to the left of negation has nothing to do with negation proper, but is independent from it. If the notion of obligatory scrambling is problematic - and I think it is - it is not w.r.t. negation alone. It is hard to imagine that avoidance of existential closure could trigger syntactic movement, at least if one tries to stick within the lines of the MP where movement is taken to be semantically myopic (Hornstein 1995: 69). Due to lack of space I cannot go into details, but I would like to offer a proposal which keeps within the lines of the MP. Note that NPs/DPs which can stay within VP - be they indefinites which get existentially closed or predicative nominals - have in common that they are non-referential and not presupposed, whereas all others which have to leave VP are either referential as definite DPs or at least presupposed as strong quantifiers.\(^6\) One could assume that referentiality and/or presupposition is associated with, say, the D-feature and that this is a feature which has to be checked away before Spell-Out. Under this conception, the trigger for movement is the need for feature checking and leaving the domain of existential closure is a pure, but welcome side-effect. What is called obligatory scrambling out of VP could thus be reduced to A-movement to the appropriate AGR-projections and it is no kind of movement of its own (in analogy to Hornstein’s (1995) dispensing with quantifier raising). For further arguments see Weiß (2001b).

The term scrambling should be restricted to optional movements which result in somehow marked constructions. This can be seen in the contrast between (17) and (18) or (19), respectively. Scrambling, e.g. inverting indirect and direct

\(^6\) One of the reviewers objects that in Dutch definites can stay in VP if they are not presupposed, i.e. discourse new or contrastive. This is roughly the same in German (and Bavarian). However, such cases are marked constructions, requiring, e.g., constrastive accent. In Weiß (2001b), I have tried to give arguments for not considering marked and unmarked constructions on par with each other. The proposed distribution of definite and indefinite DPs holds only for unmarked constructions (with, e.g., grammatical accent).
object as in (17b vs. a) shows both optionality and markedness. As (18) and (19) demonstrate, VP-escape of definite NPs is neither optional nor marked, irrespective of whether it is the indirect or the direct object which has to leave VP.

(17) a weil er dem Lehrer die neue Sekretärin vorstellte
   because he the teacher-DAT the new secretary-ACC introduced

   b weil er die neue Sekretärin dem Lehrer vorstellte
   because he the new secretary-ACC the teacher DAT introduced

(18) a ??/*weil er einem Lehrer die neue Sekretärin vorstellte
     because he a teacher-DAT the new secretary-ACC introduced

   b weil er die neue Sekretärin einem Lehrer vorstellte
     because he the new secretary-ACC a teacher-DAT introduced

(19) a weil er dem Lehrer eine neue Sekretärin vorstellte
     because he the teacher DAT a new secretary-ACC introduced

   b ??/*weil er eine neue Sekretärin dem Lehrer vorstellte
     because he a new secretary-ACC the teacher DAT introduced

Now let us consider negative concord. As said above, I assume that negative indefinites are weak indefinites in the sense of DRT, that is, they only introduce variables which get existentially closed. I hold indefinites generally to be semantically decomposable into three parts: a quantifier - in most cases delivered by the default mechanism of existential closure -, the restricted variable and an additional feature depending on the context in which they appear. This additional feature could be, e.g., [+/-Spec], [+wh] or [+Neg], as is shown in table 1 (taken from Weiß 2002a, b):
The Neg-feature of negative indefinites is licensed by negation, but the variable is bound by existential closure, so licensing and binding have to be distinguished. Semantically, the negative morpheme is – intuitively speaking – an inclusion marker, just as the Malayalam suffix -um which means ‘also, even’: both indicate that the indefinite has to be interpreted in the scope of negation (Weiß 2002a). This approach differs from existing analyses in some respects (Weiß 2002a, b): for instance, SpecNegP is only a checking, but not a scope position (in contrast to Haegeman 1995 and others), it does not establish the restriction of the negative operator (as in Ladusaw’s 1992, 1994 account), and the variable introduced by n-indefinites is not bound by the negative operator (as proposed by Acquaviva 1994).

Syntactically, the Neg-feature can be thought of as an uninterpretable formal feature in the sense of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995). Therefore, n-indefinites have to move to SpecNegP, either overtly as in Bavarian or covertly as in Romance languages, in order to get their Neg-feature checked away, cf. (20a vs. b).

(20)  a  i han neamd ned gseng
     I have nobody not seen
    b  non ho visto nessuno

There are at least two ways to explain this overt-covert difference. The standard minimalist approach would be to resort to feature strength: the Neg-feature in Bavarian n-indefinites is strong, thus requiring it to be checked before Spell-Out, whereas it is weak in Romance, therefore permitting it to be checked after Spell-Out.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Feature & Quantifier & Restriction \\
\hline
\textit{Jemand} ‘someone’ & [aSpec] etc. & \exists & \textit{person (x)} \\
\textit{Wer} ‘who’ & [+wh] & \exists & \textit{person (x)} \\
\textit{Niemand} ‘nobody’ & [+Neg] & \exists & \textit{person (x)} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Table 1}
\end{table}
Another way would be to apply Chomsky’s (1999) concept of *derivation by phase* in which feature strength is not needed any longer. Suppose for the moment that checking of the Neg feature need not take place before Spell Out in general, as indicated by Italian. The question to be answered is what forces n-indefinites in Bavarian to move before Spell Out if not feature strength. One major difference of Bavarian and Italian is that Bavarian is an OV language which in the case of presence of sentence negation would yield the order Neg > O > V (for ease of argumentation, I omit subjects in what follows). Recall now that semantically I have conceived negation as an operator binding the event-variable, which is located in or associated with V°, and that binding means syntactically c-commanded by an appropriate antecedent, whereby the usual conditions like the minimal link condition (MLC, cf. Chomsky 1995) must be obeyed. This amounts to Neg° binding V°. Now consider what happens when the negated indefinite object stays in place as in (21): here the Neg-operator c-commands and thus binds the object yielding a ‘logical’ double negation reading (i.e. both negations cancel each other).

(21) wai’a ned mit nix zfriem is

*because-he not with nothing content is*

‘because he is not content with nothing’

This reading follows immediately from the analysis of negation as a variable binding operator in the assumed syntactic framework. But pre-Spell-Out movement of negative indefinites cannot be forced by this semantic reason, since movement is “semantically myopic” (Hornstein 1995: 69), as said above. However,  

As one of the reviewers rightly objects, the proposed explanation cannot be maintained in a Kaynian style syntax which held all languages to be underlyingly SVO (for arguments in favour of SOV-languages being SVO-languages cf. Haegeman 1998b). According to this theory, the OV-order in languages like Bavarian can be derived through object raising to the specifier of the Agreement Object Phrase. In Weiß (2001b), I have tried to show that existentially interpreted indefinite DPs stay in their VP-internal base position in Bavarian – what the same reviewer claims to be roughly the case in Dutch, too. However, then the Kaynian SVO-analysis cannot be correct, since it predicts a VO-order in those cases, contrary to the facts!
there is a way to derive the (c)overt difference: The crucial difference w.r.t. the structural position of NegP is that it is above TP in Italian-type languages (Zanuttini 1997), but below it in Bavarian-type languages (Weiß 1999). So it seems that NegP belongs to different phases (in the sense of Chomsky 1999) in both language types: in Bavarian NegP is the edge of VP so that Neg° has access to items inside VP and can attract them, whereas this is not possible in Italian (cf. the relevant definitions in Chomsky 1999: 9-11). Note if one of the two analyses is the correct one, it would reveal a further optimal solution in the minimalist sense: the computational system, though semantically (and/or functionally) “dumb” (Martin 1999) and “myopic” (Hornstein 1995), derives structures which optimally correspond to some semantic requirements of certain lexical items it could not know of.

4 • NEG P2

Now let us turn to NegP2, which differs from NegP1 in that it is located higher in the clause structure. Whereas NegP1 rests between VP and the layer of functional projections which for convenience I will call IP, as was formerly common (22a), NegP2 dominates IP, as can be seen in (22b):

(22)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad [\text{IP} [\text{NegP} [\text{Neg'}} \ned [\text{VP }]]]] \\
\text{b} & \quad [\text{NegP} [\text{Neg'}} \ned [\text{IP } [\text{VP }]]]] \\
\end{align*}
\]

Resulting from the distinct positioning there are some differences in the syntax of both NegPs. First, the most obvious one is that NegP2 does not induce

---

As one of the reviewers objects, such a structural difference would be excluded under the Universal Base Hypothesis. However, as far as I know, it is standard assumption in the literature on the syntax of negation that languages may differ with respect to the position of NegP. E.g., Rivero (1991) distinguishes – within the Slavic languages – between languages where NegP takes TP as complement and languages where NegP is the complement of TP.
NC, as already mentioned at the beginning of the paper. Consider the examples in (23) where the weak indefinites do not appear in inherently negated forms as was the case with NegP1.

(23)  
\[\text{a} \quad \text{damid ned irgendwo ebba aaf dumme Gedankn kimmd} \]
\[\text{that not somewhere somebody on stupid ideas comes}\]
\[\text{b} \quad \text{damid ned a Linka d’Wäu gwind (adapted from Grewendorf 1990)} \]
\[\text{that not a left the election wins}\]

Note that this does not follow from distinct scopal behaviour since the indefinites in (23) are also within the scope of negation, syntactically as well as semantically. Otherwise they would get a specific interpretation as in (24a) where a certain somebody is meant who did not come. Regarding specificity or scope taking, the indefinites in (23) do not behave differently from n-indefinites. However, this does not mean that there is no semantic difference at all: for instance, the numeral *oana* ‘one’ can replace the indefinite *ebba* ‘someone’ without yielding a different meaning, cf. (24b) vs. (23a), thus indicating deviation from the ‘normal’ weak interpretation of the latter in (23a).

(24)  
\[\text{a} \quad \text{Ebba is ned kema} \]
\[\text{somebody is not come}\]
\[\text{b} \quad \text{damid ned oana aaf dumme Gedankn kimmd} \]
\[\text{that not one on stupid ideas comes}\]

A second difference is that NegP2 precedes definite DPs, as can be seen in (25a). Note that it is not necessary to interprete the definite object as discourse new or contrastive in (25a) so it cannot be VP-intern (see footnote 6) and thus this NegP cannot be identical with NegP1 because it must be higher in the sentence structure. An important exception to the above generalization seem to be topics as in (25b) which precede NegP2. This can be accounted for if we assume a topic phrase which is above NegP2 and above the position of sentential adverbs (cf. Frey 2000), as illustrated by sentence (25c).
A third difference comes from strong quantifiers and determiners which follow NegP2, as in (26a, b) where it even appears to be possible that negation scopes over all quantifiers present, and does not have narrow scope over only the first quantifier, thus showing not to be a constituent negation. For a Beghelli-Stowell style clause structure (Beghelli 1997, Beghelli & Stowell 1997) this would imply that NegP2 is above the functional phrases proposed as landing-sites for these quantifiers.

(26)  

\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{ma ka laida ned owai oin ois rechd mocha} \\
& \quad \text{one can unfortunately not always all all right make} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{wai leida ned a jeda ois vostandn hod} \\
& \quad \text{because unfortunately not an everyone all understood has}
\end{align*}

A fourth difference concerns lower adverbs. Take as example the temporal adverb schon ‘already’ which divides the IP and VP domains, as the definite-indefinite test in (27) reveals since it precedes indefinites but follows definites. (28a) shows that NegP2 precedes schon.\(^9\) The contrast to (28b) reveals furthermore that

\begin{align*}
\text{(i)} & \quad \text{daß ja ned da Beda schö gejd, */??sondan da Hans} \\
& \quad \text{that Prt not the Peter already goes but the John} \\
\text{(i)} & \quad \text{daß ja ned da Beda schö gejd, oba da Hans kann schö ge} \\
& \quad \text{that Prt not the Peter already goes but the John can already go}
\end{align*}

\(^9\) As (i) shows, (28a) cannot be interpreted as constituent negation, as one of the reviewers suggests. The only possible form of giving an alternative is (ii), showing that the subject plus the predicate constitute the scope of negation.
some semantic difference between negating a sentence via NegP1 and via NegP2 must exist, since the former does not tolerate *schen*, whereas the latter does. In presence of NegP1 only the adverb noch ‘still’ is permitted, as can be seen in (28c).

(27) a  Hosc an Hans schō troffa
    *Have-you the John already met*

    b  Hosc schō an Bekandn (*schō) troffa
    *Have-you already an acquaintance met*

(28) a  daß ja ned da Beda schō gejd
    *that Prt not the Peter already goes*

    b  daß da Beda schō (*ned) kema is
    *that the Peter already not come is*

    c  daß da Beda nō ned kema is
    *that the Peter still not come is*

To summarize the discussion so far, one can propose that the two negation phrases are inserted in the clausal structure as indicated in (29) where irrelevant aspects as, for instance, the position of particles, are omitted.

10 One of the reviewers rightly observes that schon is possible with NegP1 in (i) to which can be added (ii). In such cases, schon is licensed by an additional item, mehr in (i) and the repetetive adverb in (ii). Therefore, it may be that the claim made in the main text should be modified, as the reviewer suggests. However, the fact that NegP1 alone cannot license schon, whereas NegP2 can, still holds.

(i)  weil der Peter schon nicht mehr da war
    because the Peter already not more there was

(i)  weil der Peter schon wieder nicht da war
    because the Peter already again not there was
This structural difference parallels with the fact that both NegPs obviously do not import the same kind of negativity into the sentence meaning, as shortly mentioned above w.r.t. (24b) and (28). Consider the following contrast: though the grammaticality of both (30a) and (30b) may suggest a kind of semantic equivalence of NegP1 and NegP2, the fact that (30c) - a root sentence with NegP1 - does not allow a parallel construction with NegP2 reveals a fundamental difference in meaning.

(30)  
a  damid da Sepp ja ned an Fusel kaafd  
that the Joe Prt not a rotgut buys  
b  damid da Sepp ja koan Fusel ned kaafd  
that the Joe Prt no rotgut not buys  
c  da Sepp hod koan Fusel ned kaafd  
the Joe has no rotgut not bought  
d  *da Sepp hod ned an Fusel kaafd  
the Joe Prt not a rotgut bought  

In accordance with existing literature on other languages (cf. vanden Wyngard 1999, Zanuttini 1997), I will assume without further discussion that NegP2 is some kind of presuppositional negation in Bavarian as well. Since investigating the semantics of NegP2 in an appropriate manner is outside the scope of the present paper and deserves much further research, I will confine myself to mentioning just three points. First, NegP2 mainly occurs in embedded sentences. Second, it is not excluded from root sentences in general, as can be seen from (25c) above. Third, there seems to exist a relation between speaker-oriented adverbs at least of the evaluative type (cf. Cinque 1999) and NegP2, because the presence of the former increases the compatibility of NegP2 and root sentences, as the contrast between (31a) and (31b) clearly shows.\textsuperscript{11} Especially this last point is strong

\textsuperscript{11} Note that (31b) is fine when interpreted as contrast negation.
evidence for NegP2 negating certain presuppositions on the speaker- or hearer-side.

(31)  a  da Sepp hod laida/godsaidank ned sei Schwesda mitbrood
       the Joe has unfortunately/thank-god not his sister with-brought

       b  *da Sepp hod ned sei Schwesda mitbrood
           the Joe has unfortunately not his sister with-brought

Despite the structural and semantic differences discussed above, there is one fundamental property which they have in common: both NegPs can license negative polarity items (NPI) like brauchen ‘need’ as seen in (32). This is what could be expected since both have negative force.

(32)  a  wai da Sepp ned sei Muadda um Erlaubnis frong brauchd  [NegP2]
       because the Joe not his mother for permission ask need

       b  wai koana ned kema brauchd  [NegP1]
           because noone not come need

5 • NEG P3

Besides the two kinds of negation discussed so far there is a third whose main property is that it does not contribute any negative force to sentence meaning. This class of expletive or pleonastic negation presumably comprises several distinct kinds which, for example, occur in questions like (33a) or under certain conjunctions like German bevor, solange, bis (33b). I will restrict myself to expletive negation occurring in questions, leaving aside the type of negation found in (33b) (as Brown 1999 does for Russian, too).

(33)  a  hamd’s ned olle vo uns gsogd?
       have-it not all of us said

       b  bevor sd / solang sd / bisd ned aaframsd, dearfsd ned Fernsehschaun
       before/as long/until-2SG not tidy-up, may not TV-look
It is known that in many languages as diverse as Chinese and Italian, negation can function as a question marker. Consider the example of Chinese (cf. Zanuttini 1997): there, yes-no questions are formed either by addition of the question particle ma (34a) or the negative particle meiyou (34b), both in sentence final position. As (34c) shows, both cannot co-occur.

(34)  a  Ta lai-le ma?
     he come-perf. y/n
   b  Hufei qu-le meiyou?
     H. go-perf. neg
   c  *Zhangsan lai-le meiyou ma?

There is a similar question marker in Bavarian: the clitic particle (a)n corresponding to German denn. This particle occurs in yes-no questions (35a) as well as in wh-questions (35b), where it appears to be obligatory (at least in cases where the wh-item is not stressed as in 35c).

(35)  a  Gesd'(an) schō ins Bedd?
     Go-you-Prt already in-the bed
   b  Wos hosd'*(n) gsogd
     what have-you-Prt said
   c  WOS hosd gsogd

However, the distribution of question marker and expletive negation in Bavarian is rather different from Chinese. In yes-no questions it seems to be the case that true questions containing a negative particle can only be interpreted as negated questions, that is with non-expletive negation. This means that the negated question in (36a) does not have the same meaning as the non-negated one in (36b), which can be seen, for instance, from the fact that the positive answers to each question differ in their response particle (36c, d).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} English possesses no real equivalent to the response particle doch which introduces positive
Sometimes it is maintained that “in questions, negation is neutralized […]:
Can you hear nothing? and Can you hear anything? have identical truth conditions”
(Haspelmath 1997: 121). As we have seen, this is definitely not the case in Bavarian, and it could easily be shown that it does not hold for other languages either. Take for example SHG and Italian which both exhibit the following illustrating contrast: whereas non-negated questions containing jemand ‘someone’ are construable with both schon ‘already’ and noch ‘still’ (37a, b) in SHG, corresponding negated questions are only compatible with the latter (37c vs. d). (38a, b) and (38c, d) display the same contrast for Italian. This result is totally unexpected if negation would be neutralized in questions per se. Therefore, the neutralizing hypotheses could not be the correct one.

(36) a Hosg’n’an ned gseng?
have(-you)-him-Prt seen
b Hosg’n gseng?
c Doch, i hob’n gseng
yes, I have-him seen
d Ja, i hob’n gseng
yes, I have-him seen

(37) a ist schon jemand gekommen
is already someone come
b ist noch jemand gekommen
is still someone come
c ist noch niemand gekommen
is already noone come

answers to negated questions. So French si or Norwegian ju would be more appropriate translations (cf. Askedal 2000)

13 See also Bernini & Ramat (1996: 127): „In these [i.e. interrogative] contexts the optional nature of the sentence negation morpheme non in Italian, is such that the pronouns qualcuno/qualcosa and nessuno/niente are functionally equivalent.”

14 Thanks to Ilaria Cicchetti and Sara Dassatti for supplying me with the Italian data.
d  *ist schon niemand gekommen
    is still noone come

(38)  a  è gia arrivato qualcuno
     b  è ancora arrivato qualcuno
     c  non è ancora arrivato nessuno
     d  *non è gia arrivato nessuno

Now let us return to expletive negation which is only permitted in rhetorical questions like the one in (39a) or questions expressing a request like (39b).

(39)  a  Hamd’s ned olle von uns gwiast
       have-it not all of us known
     b  Kand ned ebba s’Fensda zumocha?
       Could not somebody the window shut

Wh-questions show an identical picture. Whereas true questions do not permit expletive negation, it can occur in wh-exclamative clauses, see (40a, b):

(40)  a  Wos hosd’n (*ned) am Sepp vosprocha?
       what have-you-Prt not the Joe promised
     b  Wos hod’a eam ned vosprocha!
       what has-he him not promised

The incompatibility of expletive negation and true questions may be due to semantic reasons. I take this kind of expletive negation to be a modal particle, as particles like ja, doch, denn and so forth, and for these items it is not unusual to be restricted to certain sentence types. For example, the above mentioned question marker is - trivially - only licensed in questions in Bavarian. Therefore, I will assume that expletive negation occupies the same position as modal particles do.

There is additional empirical evidence for this structural analysis. Putting aside the special case of NC, two occurrences of negation within the same sentence always cancel each other in Bavarian as well. Consider (41a) which simultaneously
contains NegP1 and NegP2: though being far from stylistically well-formed or easy parseable, if it can receive an interpretation at all, it must be one where both negations have a cumulative reading according to the law of double negation. This interpretation sharply contrast with (41b) where the two negations do not cancel each other. (41b) conveys more or less the same question as (41c) where the expletive negation is replaced by the adverb *wirkle* ‘really’. So we have strong evidence for the expletiveness of ‘modal’ negation as well as for that it does not occupy the same position as NegP2.

(41)  

    a  Da Sepp hod laida ned sein Buam ned enterbt
        *the Joe has unfortunately not his son not disinherited*
    
    b  Hamd’s ned olle von uns ned gwiast
        *have-it not all of us not known*
    
    c  Hamd’s wirkle olle von uns ned gwiast
        *have-it really all of us not known*

However, things are not that straightforward. There is contrary evidence as well. Given the diagnostics of response particles, expletive negation must convey some kind of negativity, since a rhetorical question like (39a), here repeated as (42a), requires a positive answer introduced by the particle *doch* (cf. 42b) which usually introduces positive answers to negated questions (see above). Thus, a somewhat paradoxical situation in Bavarian seems to exist: there is simultaneously strong empirical evidence for both the presence and absence of negativity in questions with expletive negation.

(42)  

    a  Hamd’s ned olle von uns gwiast
        *have-it not all of us known*
    
    b  Doch, olle hamd’s gwiast
        *Yes, all have-it known*

However, this situation seems not to be unique to Bavarian since a similar situation holds in Russian as well: whereas sentential negation can license both...
genetive of negation and inherently negated indefinites, expletive negation can only license the latter, but not the former (Brown 1999).

Putting the problem of negativity aside for further research, one can assume a final sentence structure like (43), where expletive negation generates in the particle position.

(43) [CP [Prt [TopP [S-Adv [NegP2 [IP [VP-Adv [NegP1 [VP ...]]]]]]]]]

6 • CONCLUSION

To end my paper I will point out the fact that more than one type of clausal negation, for which I have tried to give evidence in Bavarian, can be attested in other languages as well. Take for example English: Vanden Wyngaerd (1999) refers to the fact that in English it is sometimes possible to have an indefinite NP in the object position of negated sentences without a specific meaning, see (44a) in contrast to (44b) where the indefinite object has the regular NPI any as determiner. In his explanation Vanden Wyngaerd resorts to presuppositions which are involved in (44a), but not in (44b): so it is assumed in societies like ours that, if one has a wife, it is no more than one, and that men of a certain age do have a wife. However, “there is no presupposition that the children one has should amount to one, in contrast to the numbers of wives” (Vanden Wyngard 1999: 217). He concludes that cases like (44a) can be analyzed as negating this existing presupposition.

(44) a Sam doesn’t have a wife
    b Sam doesn’t have any children

Though English possesses semantically different negations, there is no difference on the structural or lexical level. However, this is the case in Italian, as Zanuttini (1997) has shown. In dialects which have two distinct negative markers, one is used as presuppositional negative marker and the other as regular clausal negation. This is, for instance, found in Piedmontese: the particle pa is the
presuppositional negative marker which is structurally higher than the regular negative marker nen. As we have seen, Bavarian exhibits a third type: Though it does not have lexically distinct negative markers, it has two NegPs from which sentences can be negated. And it strongly appears to be the case that NegP2 is a kind of presuppositional negation, but this issue deserves further research.
• BIBLIOGRAPHY


