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Assumption
A language or dialect is not an accidental set of syntactic constructions but a system of interdependent interacting elements/principles/rules/constraints (cf. Weinreich 1954).

Goals
- Find clusters of correlating properties.
- Model properties and variation theoretically.
- Reduce clusters to abstract building principles
- Put grammars on the map, instead of individual properties
- Project: Maps and Grammar (ifarm.nl/maps/)
Geographic distribution and grammar

Some questions

What changes when we move from one grammar to the next on the map?

Should these changes be characterized in terms of parameters, morphosyntactic features, constraints?

What happens in transition zones, i.e. contact situations? E.g. (i) separate grammar; (ii) grammar with mixed properties (ungrammatical but realized?); (iii) multilectal speakers
Case study

Correlation between subject doubling and demonstrative doubling

North-Brabantish

(1) a. **Subject doubling (CP level)**
He-*de* gij da gezien?
have-you.w you.s that seen
‘Did you see that’?

b. **Demonstrative doubling (DP level)**
Ik *zag* *de* dieje.
I saw the that
‘I saw that one.’
West and East Flanders; Belgian and Dutch Brabant
Demonstrative doubling

didd (169)

West and East Flanders; Belgian and Dutch Brabant
Correlation

- Subject doubling (95)
- Demonstrative doubling (44)
## Apparent exception: Zeeuws

### (2) Productive: Brabantish (gender, distal, prox)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>die-n / dizze-n opa</td>
<td>a.’ de-n die-n / dizze-n</td>
<td>that.m / this.m grandpa</td>
<td>the.m that.m / this.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>die / dees tante</td>
<td>b.’ de die / dees</td>
<td>that.f / this.f aunt</td>
<td>the that.f / this.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>da / di kind</td>
<td>c.’ da / di</td>
<td>that.n / this.n child</td>
<td>that.n / this.n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (3) Improductive: Zeeuws (only distal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>die / deze opa</td>
<td>a.’ den diejen / ??dizzen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>die / deze tante</td>
<td>b.’ den diejen / ??dizzen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>dat / dit kind</td>
<td>c.’ den diejen / ??dizzen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Making the correlation precise (i): 2p

- subject doubling 3p.pl (51)
- demonstrative doubling (40)
- subject doubling 2p.sg (95)
Making the correlation precise (ii): inversion contexts

- Subject doubling 2p.sg after C (59)
- Subject doubling 2p.sg after V (95)
- Demonstrative doubling (40)
Correlations

(i) Flemish and Brabantish (i.e., West and East Flanders, Belgian and Dutch Brabant)

Second person subject pronoun doubling in clauses with subject-verb inversion correlates with demonstrative doubling.

(ii) Flemish (i.e. West and East Flanders)

Subject pronoun doubling in all clause types correlates with demonstrative doubling.
Three grammars

- W&E Flanders (70)
- Belgian Brabant (55)
- Dutch Brabant (56)
Three grammars

**North-Brabantish**
- only subject doubling in the second person
- only subject doubling in VS-clauses
- demonstrative doubling
- distal D-pronoun fronting in imperatives
- no complementizer agreement

**Belgian Brabantish**
- only subject doubling in the second person
- only subject doubling in VS-clauses
- demonstrative doubling
- no (distal D-pronoun) fronting in imperatives
- no complementizer agreement

**Flemish**
- subject doubling in all person/number combinations
- subject doubling in VS-clauses and in embedded clauses
- demonstrative doubling
- no (distal D-pronoun) fronting in imperatives
- complementizer agreement
Three parameters

1. **Generalized φ-probe in clausal C-domain**
   (cf. van Craenenbroeck & van Koppen 2014)
   + generalized subject doubling
     all subjects, all clause types
     complementizer agreement

2. **Spell out of nominal φP**
   (i) phrasal spell out: *de/ge*
   + 2p pronoun doubling, demonstrative
doubling, no fronting in imperatives
   (ii) head
   + 2p pronoun doubling, demonstrative
doubling, fronting in imperatives
   (iii) no spell out
   + no doubling, no fronting in imperatives

3. **V.2p has uPerson**
V.2p has uPerson

lopen - to walk

1. ik loop       loop ik
2. jij loop-t    loop jij
3. hij/zij/het loop-t loop-t hij/zij/het

- Max. one suffix on a finite verb in Dutch (dialects) (e.g. no person in past tense)
- 3p = no person \(\rightarrow\) -t is finiteness
- 1p is interpretable person (covert suffix blocks \(-t\)) [iPerson]
- 2p is uninterpretable person [uPerson]
Analysis: Background assumptions (i)

Base structure of pronouns
\[ [\text{CnP} [\text{Cn} [\text{DP} [\text{D} [\varphi \text{P} ]]]]] \]


Base structure of doubled pronouns
\[ [\text{CnP} [\text{Cn} [\text{DP} \text{gi} [\text{D} [\varphi \text{P} \text{de/ge } ]]]]] \]

Base structure of regular DPs
\[ [\text{CnP} [\text{Cn} [\text{DP} \text{die} [\text{D} [\varphi \text{P} \text{leuke} \text{opa } ]]]]] \]
that nice grandfather

Base structure of demonstrative doubling
\[ [\text{CnP} [\text{Cn} [\text{DP} \text{die} [\text{D} [\varphi \text{P} \text{de } ]]]]] \]
de replaces $[\varphi_P (\text{Num}) (\text{Adj}) \text{N}]$

(4) a. Die man gaat naar huis.
   ‘That man is going home.’

   [All Dutch dialects]

b.* De die man gaat naar huis.
   ‘That man is going home.’

   [All Dutch dialects]

c. De dieje gaat naar huis.
   ‘That one is going home.’

   [Doubling dialects]

d. (*De) die gaat naar huis
   ‘That one is going home.’

   [Non-doubling dialects]

e. De dieje (*twee) (*rode) liggen op de tafel.
   the those two red are on the table

f. Die (twee) (rode) liggen op de tafel.
   those two red are one the table
Derivation for Flemish dialects

(5)  
(i)  **base structure: phrasal spell out of φP**

\[ [\text{CnP} \; [\text{Cn} \; [\text{DP \, die/gij} \; [\text{D \, [φP \, de]]]}]]] \]

(ii) **φP to SpecCnP**

\[ [\text{CnP} \; [\varphi \, de] \; [\text{Cn} \; [\text{DP \, die/gij} \; [\text{D \, [φP \, de]]]}]]] \]

(iii) **φP extraction from nominal CnP (subject doubling only)**

\[ [\text{CP} \; [\varphi \, de] \; [\text{TP} \; [\text{VP \, ...} \; [\text{CnP} \; [\varphi \, de] \; [\text{Cn} \; [\text{DP \, gij} \; [\text{D \, [φP \, de]]]}]]]] \]
Derivation for Belgian Brabantish

(6) (i) **base structure: phrasal spell out of ϕP**

\[ [\text{CnP} \ [\text{Cn} \ [\text{DP} \text{ die/gij} \ [\text{D} \ [\varphi \text{P} \text{ de}]])]])] \]

(ii) **ϕP to SpecCnP**

\[ [\text{CnP} \ [\varphi \text{P} \text{ de}] \ [\text{Cn} \ [\text{DP} \text{ die/gij} \ [\text{D} \ [\varphi \text{P} \text{ de}]])]])] \]

(iii) **ϕP extraction from nominal CnP iff V has [uPerson] (i.e. only in 2p; recall: no generalized ϕ-probe)**

\[ [\text{CP} \text{ ga} \ [\varphi \text{P} \text{ de}] \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{VP} \ldots \ [\text{CnP} \ [\varphi \text{P} \text{ de}] \ [\text{Cn} \ [\text{DP} \text{ gij} \ [\text{D} \varphi \text{P} \text{ de}]])]])] )] \]
Derivation for Dutch Brabantish

(7)  (i) base structure: φ spells out as a head
      \[[CnP \ [Cn [DP \text{die/gij} \ [D \ [\phi \text{de}]]] ]]]

(ii) φ to Cn
     \[[CnP \ [Cn [\phi \text{de}] \ [DP \text{die/gij} \ [D \ [\phi \text{de}]]] ]]]

(iii) φ extraction from nominal CnP iff V has [uPerson] (i.e. only in 2p; recall: no
      generalized φ-probe )
     \[[CP \ [C \text{ga-de}_\phi] \ [TP \ [VP ... [CnP \ [Cn [\phi \text{de}] \ [DP \text{gij} \ [D \ [\phi \text{de}]]] ]]]]]
Derivation for Dutch

(7) (i) **base structure: no spell out of $\varphi(P)$**

$$[\text{CnP} \quad [\text{Cn} \quad [\text{DP} \quad \text{die/gij}] \quad [\text{D} \quad [\varphi_{\text{P}} \varnothing]]]]]$$

(ii) **DP to SpecCnP**

$$[\text{CnP} \quad [\text{DP} \quad \text{die/gij}] \quad [\text{Cn} \quad [\text{DP} \quad [\text{die/gij}] \quad [\text{D} \quad [\varphi_{\text{P}} \varnothing]]]]]$$

⇒ No doubling
Fronting in imperatives
(Barbiers 2013)

(i) Imperative C/CP must be marked 2p
(ii) 2p = [person, distal]
(iii) German: imperative verb has [person] [distal] ➞ generalized fronting in imperative
(iv) Dutch, Flemish, Belgian Brabantish: phrasal pro.2 moves to clausal SpecCP ➞ no fronting in imperatives
(v) North Brabantish: [iPerson] head incorporates into clausal C ➞ distal D-pronoun fronting
## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal property</th>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flemish</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- generalized φ-Probe</td>
<td>comp-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- phrasal spell out of φP</td>
<td>subject/demonstr. doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and mvt φP to SpecCnP</td>
<td>no fronting in imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- φP subextracts from CnP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-Brabantish</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no generalized φ-Probe</td>
<td>no comp-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- V-2p has [uPerson]</td>
<td>2p subject doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only in inversion contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- phrasal spell out of φP</td>
<td>subject/demonstr. doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and mvt φP to SpecCnP</td>
<td>no fronting in imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- φP subextracts from CnP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-Brabantish</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no generalized φ-Probe</td>
<td>no comp-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- V-2p has [uPerson]</td>
<td>2p subj pronoun doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only in inversion contexts</td>
<td>subject/demonstr. doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- spell out head φ</td>
<td>distal D-pron. fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and mvt φ to Cn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- φ iPerson subextracts from CnP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>