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MAIN GOAL OF THIS PAPER
To provide an illustration of how microvariational research can shed new light on
questions raised at a macro-(or meso-)variational level, i.e. to pursue Kayne’s dream:

(1) Kayne’s dream
"Comparative work on the syntax of a large number of closely related languages can
be thought of as a new research tool, one that is capable of providing results of an
unusually fine-grained and particularly solid character." (Kayne 1996:xii)

MORE SPECIFICALLY
To revisit a number of central generalizations in the area of Germanic expletives from the
perspective of dialectal Dutch.

THEORETICAL CLAIMS
1. So-called specCP-expletives spell out a C°-head, i.e. they are complementizers.
2. SpecTP-expletives of the there-type are the spell-out of locative agreement with T°.
3. Within Belgian Dutch, variation with respect to expletives, proninal doubling, and
complementizer agreement is reducible to a single parameter: the absence vs. presence of
obligatory T°-to-C° movement.

OUTLINE OF THE TALK
1. Germanic expletives: the lay of the land
2. Zooming in: expletives (and more) in dialect Dutch
3. Zooming out: back to the Pangermanic perspective
4. Two remaining issues
5. Summary and conclusions

1 Germanic expletives: the lay of the land
1.1 Introduction

→ expletive constructions have been argued to come in many shapes and sizes, including at
least the following:

weather and time expressions
(2) a. It is snowing.
    b. It is five o’clock.

clausal extraposition
(3) a. It is hard to believe that you dislike Lady Gaga.
    b. I take it that you dislike Lady Gaga.
    c. You must see to it that he buys the new Lady Gaga album.

‘unlinked expletives’ in object position (Postal & Pullum 1988)
(4) a. The wimp couldn’t take it.
    b. He has it in for me.
    c. Beat it!
    d. Keep it up with the sarcasm and I’ll belt you.
    e. The president seems completely out of it.

impersonal passives
(5) Det ble danset. (Danish, Mohr 2005:121)
    it was danced
    ‘There was dancing.’

existentials
(6) There are dinosaurs in your room.

presentational constructions
(7) Er staat een man in de tuin. (Dutch)
    there stands a man in the garden
    ‘There is a man standing in the garden.’

in this talk the focus is on expletive constructions where the expletive takes a DP-associate,
i.e. (6) and (7)
1.2 Classifying the data: three variables

→ the expletive data from Germanic can be classified along the following three axes:

(a) morphology of the expletive: in some languages expletives are personal (or demonstrative) pronouns (i.e. of the *it/that*-type), while in others they are locative in nature (i.e. of the *there*-type)

**ii-type expletives** (Vikner 1995:225-226)
(8) a. Det har kommit en pojke. (Swedish)
   it has come a boy
   ‘A boy has come.’

b. Es ist ein Junge gekommen. (German)
   it is a boy come
   ‘A boy has come.’

c. Þau hefur komið strákur. (Icelandic)
   it has come a boy
   ‘A boy has come.’

**there-type expletives** (Vikner 1995:225-226)
(9) a. Det er kommet et dreng. (Danish)
   there is come a boy
   ‘A boy has come.’

b. Er is een jongen gekomen. (Dutch)
   there is a boy come
   ‘A boy has come.’

c. There arrived three men. (English)

(b) positional restrictions on the expletive: some expletives can only occur in a limited number of structural positions/sentence types, while others are not positionally restricted. The relevant positions are subject-initial (or rather: expletive-initial) main clauses, inverted main clauses and embedded clauses.

**type #1: no positional restrictions**
(10) a. Er staat een man in de tuin. (Dutch)
   there stands a man in the garden
   ‘There is a man standing in the garden.’

b. Staat er een man in de tuin?
   stands there a man in the garden
   ‘Is there a man standing in the garden?’

c. dat er een man in de tuin staat.
   that there a man in the garden stands
   ‘that here is a man standing in the garden.’

type #2: only allowed in expletive-initial main clauses
(11) a. Es ist ein Junge gekommen. (German)
   it is a boy come
   ‘A boy has come.’

b. * Ist es ein Junge gekommen?
   is it a boy come
   ‘A boy has come.’

c. * das es ein Junge gekommen ist.
   that it a boy come is
   ‘A boy has come.’

type #3: only allowed in expletive-initial main clauses and embedded clauses
(12) a. það eru myð í baðkerinu. (Icelandic, Thráinsson 2007:310,312,329)
   it are mice in bathub.the
   ‘There are mice in the bathrub.’

b. * En það myð í baðkerinu?
   are it mice in bathub.the
   ‘There are mice in the bathrub.’

c. að það verði ball í skólanum á mórgun.
   that it will.be dance in school.the tomorrow
   ‘That there will be a dance in the school tomorrow.’

terminological note: expletives that are positionally restricted are traditionally called **specCP-expletives** (the idea being that this is the only position they can occur in), while those that are not positionally restricted are called **specTP-expletives**

(c) agreement: in some languages verbal agreement tracks (the phi-features of) the associate DP, while in others it tracks (the phi-features of) the expletive

(13) Es sind/ist zwei Männer im Garten. (German)
   it are/is two men in the garden
   ‘There are two men in the garden.’

(14) Det er natt skote/skorne nokre elgar.
   it.nsg is just shot.nsg/skorne mpl some elk.mp
   ‘Some elks were just shot.’

   cf. (15) Elgane var skorne.
   the elk.mp were shot.mp
   ‘The elks were shot.’
1.3 The interaction between the three variables

→ even though they are logically independent, the three variables introduced above show a systematic pairwise interaction:

(a) morphology vs. positional restrictions: expletives that show positional restrictions (specCP-expletives) never have locative morphology (Biberauer & Richards 2005:149-150n23, Mohr 2005:142)

(16) a. Es ist ein Junge gekommen. (German, Vikner 1995:226)
   it is a boy come
   ‘A boy has come.’
   b. Það eru mýs í baðkurina. (Icelandic, Vikner 1995:226)
   it has come a boy
   ‘A boy has come.’
   c. Es iz gekumen a yingl. (Yiddish, Vikner 1995:226)
   it is come a boy
   ‘A boy has come.’

(b) positional restrictions vs. agreement: when there is a specCP-expletive, verbal agreement always tracks (the phi-features of) the associate DP

(17) a. Es sind zwei Männer im Garten. (German)
   it_{sg} are_{pl} two men_{pl} in the garden
   ‘There are two men in the garden.’
   b. Það eru mýs í baðkurina. (Icelandic, Ólafsson 2007:310)
   it has come a boy
   ‘A boy has come.’
   c. Es vil vedgjöf hreyfingar kóskum for dag.islandit. (Íslendingaság
   it_{sg} will_{pl} stand.up great sages_{pl} from German
   ‘Great sages from Germany will stand up’
   (Prince 1988:176)

(18) a. Es gibt ein Brunnen im Garten. (German)
   it gives a well in the garden
   ‘There’s a well in the garden.’
   b. Gibt es ein Brunnen im Garten?
   gives it a well in the garden
   ‘Is there a well in the garden?’
   c. Es *geben/gibt zwei Brunnen im Garten.
   it_{sg} give_{sg}/gives_{pl} two wells_{sg} in the garden
   ‘There are two wells in the garden.’

19. a. Es ist ein Junge gekommen. (German)
   it is a boy come
   ‘A boy has come.’
   b. * Ist es ein Junge gekommen?
   it is a boy come
   ‘Is it a boy come?’
   c. Es sind/*ist zwei Männer im Garten.
   it_{sg} are_{pl}/it_{sg} two men_{pl} in the garden
   ‘There are two men in the garden.’

(c) agreement vs. morphology: when the expletive is locative in nature, verbal agreement always tracks (the phi-features of) the associate DP

(20) a. * Dett er nett skote/*skotne nokre elgar. (Stryn-dialect of Norwegian)
   it_{sg} is just shot_{sg}/shot_{pl} some elks_{pl}
   (Áfarli 2009)
   ‘Some elks were just shot.’
   b. Der er nett *skote/*skotne nokre elgar.
   there is just shot_{sg}/shot_{pl} some elks_{pl}
   ‘Some elks were just shot.’

1.4 Data summary

(21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>morphology of the expletive</th>
<th>position of the expletive</th>
<th>agreement target</th>
<th>sample languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>specCP</td>
<td>associate</td>
<td>German, Icelandic, Yiddish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>expletive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specTP</td>
<td>associate</td>
<td>Swedish, Stryn-dialect of Norwegian (det)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERE</td>
<td>expletive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specTP</td>
<td>associate</td>
<td>Dutch, English, Danish, Afrikaans, Stryn-dialect of Norwegian (det)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Faroese is the only language I know of that has an ét-type specTP-expletive, but where the verbal agreement tracks the associate. The facts are debated, however: while the agreement data are clear, some authors claim the Faroese expletive ét is of the specCP-type (see Enkvist 2009, Cardinaletti 1997:523n2, Holmqvist & Platzack 1995:103n13, Ólafsson e.a. 2004:275 for conflicting views). It that turns out to be the case, this cell might also be empty.
1.5 Research questions

→ the data and generalizations just reviewed raise a number of research questions:

(22) Question #1:
How can semantically vacuous elements be positionally determined, i.e. what is the difference between specCP- and specTP-expletives?

(23) Question #2:
Why are specCP-expletives never morphologically locative?
related side-question:
Why are object expletives never morphologically locative?

(24)
 a. The wimp couldn't take it/*there.
 b. He has it/*there in for me.
 c. Beat it/*there!
 d. Keep it/*there up with the sarcasm and I'll belt you.
 e. The president seems completely out of it/*there.

(25) Question #3:
Why is agreement with the expletive only possible (a) when it is not of the specCP-type, and (b) when it is not locative?

2 Zooming in: expletives (and more) in dialect Dutch

2.1 Recreating the basic contrasts on a micro scale

→ expletive constructions in the dialects of Dutch spoken in Belgium (and the northeast of France) show the same contrast between (non-locative, non-agreeing) specCP-expletives and (locative, non-agreeing) specTP-expletives as the one found across Germanic:

specCP-expletives (Lapscheure Dutch, Grange & Haegeman 1989, Haegeman 1986, L. Haegeman p.c.)

(27) a. T zyn gisteren drie studenten gekommen.
 it arepl yesterday three students come
 ‘Three students came yesterday.’
b. * Zyn t gisteren drie studenten gekommen?
 are it yesterday three students come
 ‘Why are there three students gone?’
c. * dan t gisteren drie studenten gekommen zyn.
 thattp pl yesterday three students come are

→ in inverted main clauses and embedded clauses, these dialects use a locative form as expletive (er/t’r/d’r). In some dialects, this locative shows up as an option (though often marked) in subject-initial main clauses as well:

(28) a. ?? Der zyn vee mensen gekommen. (Lapscheure Dutch)
there arepl many peoplepl come (Haegeman 1986:10)
 ‘Many people came.’
b. Gisteren zyn der drie studenten gekommen.
yesterday are there three students come
 ‘Three students came yesterday.’ (Grange & Haegeman 1989:160)
c. dan der nie vele mensen woaren.
thatpl there not many people were
 ‘that there weren’t many people.’ (Haegeman 1992:50)

g�eographical distribution of specCP-expletives:

Map #1: Distribution of specCP-expletives in Belgian Dutch (data from Barbiers e.a. 2006)

terminological note: henceforth, dialects with specCP-expletives = C-dialects, and dialects with specTP-expletives = T-dialects

→ the Belgian dialects of Dutch recreate on a micro scale a substantial portion of the Pangermanic generalizations about expletives introduced in the previous section
2.2 Additional correlations and generalizations

→ given that the dialects discussed here are closely related (e.g. same setting for 'macroparameters' such as V2, V-to-I, OV, etc.), the chances of empirical correlations being due to the same (micro)parameter setting are greatly increased (cf. Kayne's dream)

→ the SAND-data (Barbiers e.a. 2005, 2006, 2008) contain (at least) five phenomena that correlate with the split between C- and T-dialects:

(30) **Generalization A:**
In C-dialects the (locative) expletive is always obligatory in inverted main clauses and embedded clauses, while in T-dialects it is not (see also Haegeman 1986).

| (31) | dat *(er) in de fabrieke nenjongen werkte. (Lapscheure Dutch) |
| (32) | dat *(er) in dei fabrick nenjoeng werktn. (Wambeck Dutch) |

geographical distribution:

(33) Map #2: Obligatory expletive in inverted main clause (data from Barbiers e.a. 2006)

(34) **Generalization B:**
T-dialects can use the emphatic/demonstrative form of the locative pronoun (i.e. *daar* 'there') as expletive, but C-dialects cannot.

| (35) | * Doa lig ier nen brief ip tafel. (Lapscheure Dutch) |

geographical distribution:

(36) Map #3: Use of *daar* as expletive (Barbiers e.a. 2005:49)

(37) Map #4: Complementizer agreement in -er in 3pl (Barbiers e.a. 2005:35)

(38) **Generalization C:**
C-dialects display complementizer agreement.

| (39) | Kvinden da*(n) die boeken te diere zyn. (Lapscheure Dutch) I find that PL those books too expensive are (Haegeman 1992:51) |
| (40) | Ik venj da*(n) dei boeken te dier zen. (Wambeck Dutch) I think that PL those books too expensive are 'I think noone will buy that book.' |

geographical distribution:

(41) Map #4: Complementizer agreement in -er in 3pl (Barbiers e.a. 2005:35)

(36) Dui leit ie nen brief op tuifel. (Wambeck Dutch) there lies here a letter on table 'There's a letter lying on the table here.'
(42) **Generalization D:**
C-dialects have a complete clitic doubling paradigm, while T-dialects only have a partial paradigm (typically 1st sg and 2nd sg/pl).

(43) Kpeinzen dase (zie) morgen goat. (Lapscheure Dutch)
I think that she she tomorrow goes (Haegeman 1992:49)
‘I think she’s gonna go tomorrow.’

(44) Asse (*zij) zo gevaarlijk leeft, dan...
if she she so dangerous lives then...
‘If she lives so dangerously, then...’ (Antwerp Dutch, Barbiers e.a. 2006)

**geographical distribution:**

(45) Map #5: Full vs. partial clitic doubling paradigm (Barbiers e.a. 2005:60)

(46) **Generalization E:**
Pronominal doubling in subject-initial main clauses with two strong pronouns is disallowed in C-dialects.

(47) * Zie goa zie.
   shestrong goes shestrong (Haegeman 1992:66)
   ‘She’s going.’

(48) Zaai gui zaaai.
   shestrong goes shestrong (Wambeek Dutch)
   ‘She’s going.’

**geographical distribution:**

(49) Map #6: Subject-initial pronominal doubling with 2 strong pronouns (Barbiers e.a. 2005:53-59)

**note:**
this generalization matches (the mirror image of) the C-dialect area less nicely than generalizations A-D → possible confounding factor: the use of the third person masculine pronoun as a general purpose focus marker (and hence not an instance of pronominal doubling)

(50) Marie eid ij duimee niks te zien. (Wambeek Dutch)
Mary has他he there.with nothing to see
‘That’s none of Mary’s business.’

**geographical distribution (second attempt):**

(51) Map #7: Subject-initial pronominal doubling with 2 strong pronouns but without 3.m.sg, compared to specCP-expletives (Barbiers e.a. 2005:53-59, Barbiers e.a. 2006)
2.3 Data summary

→ the split between dialects with a specCP-expletive (C-dialects) and dialects with a specTP-expletive (T-dialects) in Belgian Dutch correlates with a number of additional properties

C-dialects: - have an obligatory locative expletive in inverted and embedded contexts
- display complementizer agreement
- have a complete clitic doubling paradigm

(T2)

T-dialects: - can use daar as expletive
- can have subject-initial pronominal doubling with 2 strong pronouns
- only have a partial clitic doubling paradigm

(T3)

2.4 The central hypothesis

hypothesis: the correlations and generalizations reviewed above are all the result of a single parametric difference between C-dialects and T-dialects, i.e. a different setting for the T-to-C-movement parameter:

(54) T-to-C-movement parameter:
Tº {does/does not} obligatorily move to Cº.

(55) C-dialects
no obligatory T-to-C

\[
\text{Cº} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{Cº} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{Tº} \quad \ldots
\]

T-dialects
obligatory T-to-C

\[
\text{CP} \\
\text{Cº} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Tº} \quad \ldots
\]

corrolaries:
- while in C-dialects Cº can have a (e.g. phi-)feature specification independently of Tº, in T-dialects there is one unique feature specification for the entire Tº/Cº-complex
- the structures in (55) imply that while T-dialects are Den Besten-type languages (in Postma’s 2010, 2011 terminology), C-dialects are Zwart-type languages

(56) Den Besten-type languages: all V2-sentences are CPs

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{subject-initial: } & \quad \text{CP SUBJECT} \quad \text{Cº VERB} \\
\text{inverted: } & \quad \text{CP XP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{subject-initial: } & \quad \text{TP SUBJECT} \quad \text{TP tVERB} \\
\text{inverted: } & \quad \text{TP XP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(57) Zwart-type languages: subject-initial V2-sentences are TPs

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{subject-initial: } & \quad \text{TP SUBJECT} \quad \text{TP VERB} \\
\text{inverted: } & \quad \text{TP XP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{subject-initial: } & \quad \text{TP SUBJECT} \quad \text{TP tVERB} \\
\text{inverted: } & \quad \text{TP XP} \\
\end{align*}
\]
2.5 The analysis: deriving the correlations

2.5.1 SpecCP-expletives

2.5.1.1 The traditional account

(58) T zyn gisteren drie studenten gekomen. (Lapscheure Dutch)

it are yesterday three studenten come

‘Three students came yesterday.’ (Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

traditional (mostly implicit) account: it is a reduced form of the third person neuter pronoun het ‘it’ which is base-generated in (or obligatorily moved to, see below) specCP (Grange & Haegeman 1989, Haegeman 1986, Vikner 1995)

(59)

\[ CP \]

\[ (h)et \]

\[ C' \]

\[ C \]

\[ TP \]

\[ gisteren drie studenten gekomen \]

2.5.1.2 Problems for the traditional account

(a) (h)et is independently disallowed in specCP: as discussed extensively by Zwart (1993, 1997), sentences in which the third person neuter pronoun is unambiguously in specCP are disallowed:

(60) * t eenk niet gezien. (Lapscheure Dutch, Haegeman 2004)

it have.I not seen

INTENDED: ‘I haven’t seen it.’

(b) the specCP-expletive cannot be replaced by dat ‘that’: all instances of (h)et ‘it’—including expletive uses—can be replaced by the demonstrative pronoun dat (h)et ‘that’, except for the specCP-expletive illustrated in (58) (Grange & Haegeman 1989):

(61) dat et/da regent (Lapscheure Dutch)

that it/that rains

‘that it is raining.’

(c) the specCP-expletive cannot be spelled out in full, i.e. as het: while the reduction of het to it is normally completely optional (with the full form perhaps being slightly more emphatic), the specCP-expletive is always it, never het (cf. also the fact that Haegeman 1990:356 refers to the specCP-expletive as “the third person neuter clitic it”)

(62) Ze aanverden et/da nie da se werk. (Lapscheure Dutch)

they accept it/that not that she works

‘They don’t accept that she has a job.’

(63) T/da ‘s Valère nie die da gezaid out. (Lapscheure Dutch)

it/that is V. not it/that said has

‘It is not Valère who said that.’

(64) Et/da bevalt men ier. (Lapscheure Dutch)

it/that pleases me here

‘I like it here.’

(65) Hêt/da was spyrg van dat ongeluk. (Lapscheure Dutch)

it/that was a pity of that accident

‘Too bad about that accident.’

(66) T/da zyn gisteren drie studenten gekommen. (Lapscheure Dutch)

it/that are yesterday three students come

‘Three students came yesterday.

Vanacker (1978:618): “We nemen zelfs dat t in de zin Er waren vijf prijzen (...) niet mag worden geïnterpreteerd als een vorm van het. In de eerste plaats valt het op dat voor die RND-zin nergens een vocalisch element vóór t wordt opgegeven.”

“We even assume that t in the sentence There were vijf prizes (...) cannot be interpreted as a form of het. Firstly it should be noted that no informant inserted a vocalic element before the t.”

(67) a. (E)t regent. (Blankenberge Dutch, K. Vanaudendaerde p.c.)

it rains

‘It is raining.’

b. (*E)t staan drie mannenn in den hof. (Lapscheure Dutch)

it stand three men in the garden

‘There are three men standing in the garden.’
(d) the specCP-expletive is incompatible with the locative expletive: if the obligatoriness of the locative expletive in embedded and inverted contexts indicates that specTP cannot remain empty, the analysis in (59) presents a counterexample to this generalization

recall:

| (69) Generalization A: |
| In C-dialects the (locative) expletive is always obligatory in inverted main clauses and embedded clauses, while in T-dialects it is not. (see also Haegeman 1986) |

(70) dat *(er) in de fabriek een jongen werkte. (Lapscheure Dutch) that there in the factory a boy worked (Haegeman 1986:3) ‘that a boy worked in the factory.’

possible account: specTP cannot remain empty (EPP), but indefinite subjects obligatorily surface lower than specTP in Lapscheure Dutch ⇒ er is obligatory (Haegeman 1986)

however: in subject-initial main clauses er is obligatorily absent:

(71) T stond *(er) hier gisteren een rare vent in de tuin. it stood there here yesterday a weird man in the garden INTENDED: ‘There was a strange man in the garden yesterday.’ (L. Haegeman p.c.)

→ if t is base-generated in specCP, then specTP remains empty in the absence of er

| (72) CP |
| t C' |
| C' stond |
| TP |
| T' |
| T* |
| t stond hier gisteren een rare man in de tuin |

→ another option would be to base-generate t in specTP and obligatorily move it to specCP (cf. Vikner 1995:186), but that fails to explain why the finite verb cannot agree with t (cf. the positional restrictions/agreement-interaction in (17)-(19))

conclusion: the traditional account of t as a specCP-expletive faces considerable empirical and theoretical problems

2.5.1.3 Towards an alternative: comparing dialect Dutch to Welsh and Breton

→ while specCP-expletives are typologically rare, there are other elements that show clear distributional similarities with specCP-expletives → in this section I compare West Flemish t to the Breton particle bez (Jouitteau 2005, 2008, 2011) and the Welsh particle fe (Willis 1998, 2007, Borsley e.a. 2007, Jouitteau 2008)

(73) Bez’ e ra glav. (Breton, Jouitteau 2008:170) PRT ® does rain ‘It rains.’

(74) Fe glywes i’r clo. (Welsh, Jouitteau 2008:168) PRT heard.s1sg the clock ‘I heard the clock.’

(a) disallowed in postverbal position

specCP-expletive

(75) *Zyn t gisteren drie studenten gekomen? (Lapscheure Dutch) are it yesterday three students come

Breton bez

(76) *Glav bez a ra. (Breton, Jouitteau 2008:170) rain PRT ® does ‘It rains.’

Welsh fe

(77) *Brynodd fe Elin dorth o fara. (Welsh, based on Borsley e.a. 2007:11) buy.PAST.3S PRT Elin loaf of bread ‘Elin bought a loaf of bread.’

(b) ungrammatical when another element precedes the verb

specCP-expletive

(78) *Gisteren t was veel volk ip die feeste. (Lapscheure Dutch) yesterday it was many people on that party INTENDED: ‘There were many people at the party yesterday.’ (L. Haegeman p.c.)
Breton bez

(79) “bez is in mutual exclusive distribution with any other pre-Tense element” (Jouitteau 2011:5)

Welsh fe

(80) * Hwyrach fe fydd thaid i chi aros. (Welsh)
probably PRT be.FUT.3S necessary to you wait.INF
‘You’ll probably have to wait.’ (Borsley e.a. 2007:124)

(c) disallowed in embedded clauses

specCP-expletive

(81) * dan t gisteren drie studenten gekommen zyn. (Lapscheure Dutch)
thatpl it yesterday three students come are

Breton bez

(82) “In embedded domains, bez is only licit in structures that independently allow for embedded V2 orders” (Jouitteau 2011:6)

Welsh fe

(83) “Occurrence of the Mi/Fe particles in Welsh is restricted to matrix sentences.” (Jouitteau 2008:168)

(d) regular subject-verb agreement

specCP-expletive

(84) T zyn gisteren drie studenten gekommen. (Lapscheure Dutch)
it arepl yesterday three studentenpl come
‘Three students came yesterday.’ (Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

Breton bez

(85) Bez’ e prenis eul leor d’am breur deh. (Breton)
PRT® bought.1sg a book to.my brother yesterday
‘I have bought my brother a book yesterday.’ (Jouitteau 2011:6)

Welsh fe

(86) Fe glywes i’r cloc. (Welsh, Jouitteau 2008:168)
PRT heard.1sg the clock
‘I heard the clock.’

conclusion: specCP-expletives show clear distributional parallelisms with preverbal particles in Welsh and Breton

standard account of such particles: they are the spell-out of a C°-head, i.e. they are essentially main clause complementizers (Jouitteau 2005, 2008, 2011, Willis 1998, 2007, Borsley e.a. 2007, Roberts 2005)

Willis (1998, 2007): the Welsh particle fe diachronically derives from the third person singular pronoun of ‘he/it’, which in Middle Welsh was used as a specCP-expletive. It was later reanalyzed as occupying C° rather than specCP.

(87) Ef a owwynha Duw y bobyl o lal tramwy.
it® visit God his people from hand passing
‘God will visit his people with a passing hand.’ (Middle Welsh, Willis 1998:161)

2.5.1.4 The analysis: t as a main clause complementizer

(88) T zyn gisteren drie studenten gekommen. (Lapscheure Dutch)
it are yesterday three studentenpl come
‘Three students came yesterday.’ (Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

(89)

→ when the subject doesn’t raise to specTP (and in Lapscheure Dutch indefinite subjects never do, cf. Haegeman 1986), the scene-setting adverb gisteren ‘yesterday’ is not fronted and no phrase (A’)-moves into the C°-domain. C-dialects have the (Last Resort) option of spelling out the C°-head as /t in order to satisfy V2
hey, but wait a minute:

1. Aren’t C-dialects supposed to be Verb Second (just like Standard Dutch), i.e. shouldn’t there be an XP in front of the finite verb in a main clause? How can a head satisfy the V2-requirement?

→ I follow Jouitteau (2005) in reclassifying V2-, SVO- and VSO-languages into one single category of X(P)-VSO

(90) “Je reconsidère (…) le classement typologique des langues. Je propose que toutes les langues mentionnées ci-dessus sont des sous-groupes du type X(P)-VSO. Les langues X(P)-VSO sont toutes dérivées par le déplacement de la tête prédicative dans la tête flexionelle. Ce mouvement crée l’ordre à verbe antéposé. (…) l’ordre à verbe antéposé doit être précédé par un constituant XP ou une tête X. Les ordres licites sont donc XP-VSO ou X*-VSO, créant la généralisation X(P)-VSO. Les variations à l’intérieur de la classe X(P)-VSO sont renvoyées à l’inventaire lexical d’une langue particulière. (…) Par exemple, l’allemand n’a pas de complémenteur de matrice. Dans une matrice de l’allemand, l’élément préverbal sera donc une projection maximale et on obtiendra l’ordre classique à verbe second.” (Jouitteau 2005:xvii-xviii)

“I reconsider the typological classification of languages and propose that all the languages mentioned above [i.e. V2, SVO and VSO, jvc] are subgroups of the type X(P)-VSO. In all of these languages the predicative head has moved into the inflectional head, which creates a word order in which the finite verb is fronted. This finite verb has to be preceded by a phrase XP or a head X⁰, leading to XP-VSO and X⁰-VSO as licit word orders (hence the overarching classification as X(P)-VSO). Variation within the group of X(P)-VSO-language is due to their lexical inventory. For example, German doesn’t have a matrix complementizer. As a result, only an XP will be able to precede the verb in matrix clauses, and the classical V2-word order ensues.”

→ the V2-constraint (however implemented and probably more aptly called the X(P)-VSO-constraint) prohibits the finite verb from being leftmost in the clausal phase (cf. Jouitteau 2011:10) → one of the ways in which this constraint can be respected in C-dialects is by merging t in C⁰

2. Isn’t the standard declarative complementizer dat in these dialects? Why then is it just ‘t here?

assume: just like the demonstrative pronoun dat (see Leu 2008, Rooryck 2003), the complementizer dat is morphologically complex (cf. also Postma 1997):

(91) dat → [dat: anaphoricity, t: definiteness/finiteness]

proposal: the anaphoric portion of the complementizer is only present when the tense domain it heads is c-commanded by (i.e. anaphoric on, cf. sequence-of-tense) another tense domain, i.e. in embedded contexts (cf. Pesenky & Torrego 2001:411n41, Postma 1997:3). The main clause complementizer found in (88) only expresses finiteness and hence is spelled out as t.

3. What about the EPP? Isn’t the EPP violated in this structure? How come specTP can remain empty?

→ I return to the EPP in section 2.5.4

two advantages of the proposal

(a) C-dialects vs. T-dialects: given that T-dialects have obligatory Tª-to-Cª-movement, they never have the option of spelling out Cª in order to satisfy the V2-constraint. Instead, specCP is always filled by a maximal projection, which leads to a ‘pure’ XP-VSO-pattern with no specCP-expletives.

(b) the distribution of specCP-expletives:

inverted main clauses

(92) * Zyn t gisteren drie studenten gekomen?
→ are yesterday three students come

verbs never adjoin to complementizers in (dialect) Dutch ⇒ this example is ruled out

embedded clauses

(93) * Kpeinzen dat t niemand da boek goa kopen. (Lapscheure Dutch)
→ l’think that it noone thatbook goes buy (Haegeman 1986:3)
‘I think noone will buy that book.’

→ this example is ruled out because Cª is expressed twice: the end-t of dat is the same element as the so-called expletive t

2.5.1.5 Conclusion
The specCP-expletive found in C-dialects is a matrix complementizer inserted to satisfy the V2-requirement. T-dialects have obligatory Tª-to-Cª and therefore lack this option.
2.5.2 Complementizer agreement

recall:

(94) Generalization C:
C-dialects display complementizer agreement.

(95) Kvinde: 'da(n) die boeken te diere zyn.' (Lapscheure Dutch)
'like noone will buy that book.'

(96) Ik venj 'da(n) de boeken te diere zen.' (Wambeek Dutch)
'I think that. pl. those books are too expensive.'

(97) Ich dink des doow en ik ôs treff-e.
'I think that your and I ourselves will meet.' (Tegelen Dutch, Van Koppen 2005:40)

(98) omdan die venten tun juste under computer kapot was.
'because then the computer broke down.' (Lapscheure Dutch, Haegeman & Van Koppen 2010:4)

→ in both these examples, the phi-feature specification on the complementizer differs from
the phi-feature specification on Tº/the finite verb

2.5.3 Clitic doubling

recall:

(99) Generalization D:
C-dialects have a complete clitic doubling paradigm, while T-dialects only have a
partial paradigm (typically 1st sg and 2nd sg/pl).

(100) Kpeinzen dase (zie) morgen goat. (Lapscheure Dutch)
'I think that she tomorrow goes.' (Haegeman 1992:49)

(101) Asse (*zij) zo gevaarlijk leeft, dan…
'If she so dangerous lives then…' (Antwerp Dutch, Barbiers e.a. 2006)

Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen (2007, 2008): clitic doubling is the result of an Agree-
relation (with concomitant movement) between phi-features in Cº and a φP
inside the subject pronoun in specTP

note: the phi-feature specification of the clitic is independent of that of Tº/the finite verb:

(102) Ik peis dan ze zulder en guilder dat kunt oplossen.
'I think that you too can solve that.' (Nieuwerkerken-Waas Dutch, VC&VK 2007:15)

(103) As gj wil blijve smore dan blijde gj smore.
'If you want to continue smoke then you'll smoke.' (Antwerp Dutch, Barbiers e.a. 2006)

possible answer: apparent clitic doubled forms such as egik (*I*, lit. LI) or egij (*you*, lit.
you.you) are in fact non-doubled, positionally restricted strong pronouns

(104) Jan en elik hebben dat gedaan. (Willebroek Dutch, Barbiers e.a. 2006)
'Jan and I have that done.'
2.5.4 Obligatory locative expletives

recall:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Generalization A:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In C-dialects the (locative) expletive is always obligatory in inverted main clauses and embedded clauses, while in T-dialects it is not. (see also Haegeman 1986)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(105)</th>
<th>Generalization A:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In C-dialects the (locative) expletive is always obligatory in inverted main clauses and embedded clauses, while in T-dialects it is not. (see also Haegeman 1986)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(106) dat *(er) in de fabrieke nen jongen werkte. (Lapscheure Dutch)
'that a boy worked in the factory.' (Haegeman 1986:3)

(107) dat (er) in de fabrique nen jongen werktn. (Wamheek Dutch)
'that there in that factory a boy worked' (Haegeman 1986:3)

question: What are locative adverbs doing in expletive constructions?

Freeze (1992): Locatives and existentials derive from the same underlying structure. The only difference concerns which constituent raises to subject position: the locatum in locatives, the location in existentials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locative</th>
<th>Existential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(109)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(108)</th>
<th>(109)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-well 7-be 17-3-village</td>
<td>17-3-village 7-be 7-well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The well is in the village.'</td>
<td>'There's a well in the village.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However: in some languages the location remains in situ in existentials, but a locative proform appears close to INFL: “the proform is lexically inseparable from AGR and/or TNS (…)”. The simplest account of these facts is that the proform is a spellout of a feature in INFL” (Freeze 1992:569)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locative</th>
<th>Existential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(110)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(110)</th>
<th>(111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ko e kurii 'oku 'i he funga teepile. (Tongan, Freeze 1992:569)</td>
<td>'oku 'i aî 'ae kurii 'i he poopao. (Tongan, Freeze 1992:569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP the dog PRES in 3sg a dog in the canoe</td>
<td>PRES in 3sg a dog in the canoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The dog is on the table.'</td>
<td>'There's a dog in the canoe.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal: Locative existentials in Germanic are the spell-out of locative agreement with T°

Locative agreement with T°: Ritter & Wiltshire (2009) argue that INFL is an abstract category the substantive content of which can be provided by tense (e.g. in English), location (e.g. in Halkomelem Salish), or person (e.g. in Blackfoot).

English as an INFL_new-language
(112) He walks/walked.

Halkomelem Salish as an INFL_older-language (Ritter & Wiltshire 2009:155)
(113) li/i qw'eyîl'ex tu-tl'î'o
AUXtens/AUXnon-tens dance he
'He is or was dancing there/here.'

Blackfoot as an INFL_older-language (Ritter & Wiltshire 2009:182)
(114) nit-ii-k-wakomin-m ok-innan-yi k-tan-iksi
1-very-love-INV-1.p1-3.pl 2-daughter-pl
'Your daughters love us.'

⇒ the first person prefix nit does not express a theta-role, but indicates whether an utterance participant is involved in the event

Importantly a language can be of one type and still show agreement for another type, e.g. English is an INFL_new-language, but shows person agreement, Blackfoot is an INFL_older-language that also has person agreement ⇒ locative expletives are the spell-out of location agreement in an INFL_older-language

(115) dat er T° in de fabrique nen jongen werkte. that there [+loc]+[+phi] in the factory a boy worked

 Spell-out Spell-out
 T° in the factory a boy worked

Back to generalization A: the EPP requires Tense to be overtly realized (Roberts & Roussou 2002), either via specTP or via T° (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2001) ⇒ in T-dialects this requirement is met by virtue of T°-to-C°, but in C-dialects, Tense remains unexpressed ⇒ er-insertion is obligatory
2.5.5 Subject-initial doubling with strong pronouns

recall:

(116) Generalization E:
Pronominal doubling in subject-initial main clauses with two strong pronouns is disallowed in C-dialects.

(17) * Zie goa zie. (Lapscheure Dutch)
she strong goes she strong
'She's going.'

(18) Zaaì gui zaaì. (Wambeek Dutch)
she strong goes she strong
'She's going.'

note: in embedded clauses and inverted main clauses doubling with two strong pronouns is disallowed in all dialects (Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2002a,2002b)

VC&VK (2002ab): this type of doubling involves copy spell-out. The subject moves from specTP to specCP and both copies of the movement chain are spelled out. It is disallowed in inverted main clauses because there specCP is already occupied, and in embedded clauses because embedded topicalization is independently disallowed (Hoekstra & Zwart 1994, 1997, Zwart 1997, Barbiers 2000)

(120)

CP

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{zaaì} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{Cº} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{gui} \\
\text{t\textsubscript{zaai}} \\
\text{T'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{zaaì} \\
\end{array} \]

note: this analysis accounts for Generalization E: the configuration in (120) only occurs in Den Besten-type dialects ⇒ no doubling with two strong pronouns in C-dialects

2.5.6 daar as an expletive

recall:

(121) Generalization B:
T-dialects can use the emphatic/demonstrative form of the locative pronoun (i.e. daar 'there') as expletive, but C-dialects cannot.

(12) * Doa ligt ier nen brief ip tafel. (Lapscheure Dutch)
there lies here a letter on table
'There's a letter lying on the table here.'

(123) Dui leit ie nen brief op tuifel. (Wambeek Dutch)
there lies here a letter on table
'There's a letter lying on the table here.'

hypothesis: the use of the strong/emphatic/demonstrative form of the locative pronoun as an expletive originates in dialects where the subject occupies specCP ⇒ only T-dialects can use daar as expletive

supporting evidence:

(a) diachronic development: in Middle Dutch (when the use of locative expletives was on the rise), daar was used in sentence-initial position, and er in all other positions (Van Der Horst 2008:969)

(124) Doe seid er een monic: … (Middle Dutch)
them said there weak a monk
'Then a monk said:…'

(125) Daer is een verrader onder ons. (Middle Dutch)
there strong is a traitor among us
'There's a traitor among us.'

(b) synchronic distribution: even in present-day dialects, the use of the strong form is dispreferred in inverted and embedded contexts

(126) Dui/?Der leit ie nen brief op tuifel. (Wambeek Dutch)
there\textsubscript{strong}/there\textsubscript{weak} lies here a letter on table
'There's a letter lying on the table here.'

(127) dat ?dui/er ie nen brief op tuifel leit. (Wambeek Dutch)
that there\textsubscript{strong}/there\textsubscript{weak} here a letter on table lies
'that there's a letter lying on the table here.'

(128) Leit ?dui/er ie nen brief op tuifel? (Wambeek Dutch)
ilies there\textsubscript{strong}/there\textsubscript{weak} here a letter on table
'There's a letter lying on the table here.'
2.6 Summary and conclusion

Both the split between C-dialects and T-dialects and the concomitant correlations (Generalizations A-E) can be derived from the T-to-C-movement parameter:

(129) T-to-C-movement parameter: Tº \{does/does not\} obligatorily move to Cº.

In particular:
- SpecCP-expletives are the spell-out of a Cº-head
  - only possible in a dialect without generalized T-to-C
- Locative SpecTP-expletives are the spell-out of locative agreement in TP
  - only required for EPP-reasons in a dialect without generalized T-to-C
- Complementizer agreement and clitic doubling require Cº to have a phi-feature specification that is independent of that of Tº
  - only possible in a dialect without generalized T-to-C
- Doubling with two strong pronouns and the use of daar as an expletive require the subject to be in SpecCP
  - only possible in a dialect with generalized T-to-C

3 Zooming out: Back to the Pangermanic perspective

The analysis of dialectal Dutch developed in the previous section sheds new light on the Pangermanic research questions raised in section one:

(130) Question #1:
How can semantically vacuous elements be positionally determined, i.e. what is the difference between SpecCP- and SpecTP-expletives?

Answer: SpecCP-expletives are the spell-out of a Cº-head and therefore have the same distribution as main clause complementizers or comparable clause peripheral particles. SpecTP-expletives of the locative type are the spell-out of locative Agree-relation between Tº and a locative element and therefore spell out in TP.

(131) Question #2:
Why are SpecCP-expletives never morphologically locative?

Answer: Because SpecCP-expletives are complementizers and complementizers in Germanic are never locative, always pronominal.

Related side-question: Why are object expletives never morphologically locative?

(132) a. The wimp couldn’t take it/*there.
    b. He has it/*there in for me.
    c. Beat it/*there!
    d. Keep it/*there up with the sarcasm and I’ll belt you.
    e. The president seems completely out of it/*there.

Answer: Because locative expletives are the spell-out of a locative Agree-relation between Tº and a locative element. Hence, they only surface in TP.

(133) Question #3:
Why is agreement with the expletive only possible (a) when it is not of the SpecCP-type, and (b) when it is not locative?

Answer: SpecCP-expletives are complementizers and verbs never agree with complementizers in Germanic. Locative expletives are themselves the spell-out of an Agree-relation.
4 Two remaining issues

4.1 Other specCP-expletives

question: to what extent does the account presented above carry over to other specCP-expletives, i.e. are they also complementizers?

(134) a. Es ist ein Junge gekommen. (German, Vikner 1995:226)
   it is a boy come  
   ‘A boy has come.’

b. það hefur komið strákur. (Icelandic, Vikner 1995:226)
   it has come a.boy  
   ‘A boy has come.’

c. Es iz gekumen a yingl. (Yiddish, Vikner 1995:226)
   it is come a boy  
   ‘A boy has come.’

4.1.1 German es

→ several of the problems for the specCP-analysis of dialect Dutch t carry over to the German specCP-expletive es

(a) phonological reduction: in spoken German the specCP-expletive es is always reduced to t. Using the full form es sounds stilted (S. Mohr p.c.).

(135) (??E)s sind zwei Männer im Garten. (spoken German) it are two men in. the garden  
   ‘There are two men in the garden.’

caveat: other clause-initial occurrences of es are also preferably reduced:

(136) (??E)s regnet. it rains  
   ‘It is raining.’

(b) es cannot be frontal to specCP: fronting of es to specCP is disallowed

(137) * Es hat Bernd auf den Tisch gelegt. (German, Meinunger 2007:554)
   it has Bernd on the table put
   ‘Bernd (has) put it on the table.’

caveat: the ban on clause-initial object es is not absolute:

(138) Es hat zum Glück niemand gefunden. (German, Meinunger 2007:559)
   it has to.the luck nobody found
   ‘Luckily, nobody found it.’

(c) specCP-expletive es cannot be replaced by das: while other (expletive and non-expletive) uses of es can be replaced by the demonstrative das, this is not possible for the specCP-expletive es

(139) Das regnet. (German, Mohr 2005:175n208)
   that rains
   ‘The rain is coming down in buckets!’

(140) * Das sind zwei Männer im Garten. (German, S. Mohr p.c.)
   that are two men in. the garden

conclusion: the analysis developed above for dialect Dutch specCP-expletives is potentially transferable to German

4.1.2 Icelandic það

→ the Icelandic specCP-expletive það differs from German/dialect Dutch in two respects:

(a) það is allowed in embedded clauses

(141) a. * dan t gisteren drie studenten gekomen zyn. (Lapscheare Dutch) that, pl it yesterday three students come are
   that,pl it yesterday three students come are
   ‘That there were three students.’

b. * das es ein Junge gekommen ist. (German)
   that it a boy come is
   ‘That (a boy) has come.’

c. að það verði hall í skólanum á morgun. (Icelandic)
   that it will.be dance in school. the tomorrow
   ‘That there will be a dance in the school tomorrow.’ (Thráinsson 2007:329)

3 I don’t know enough about Yiddish to say anything meaningful about it at this point. Interesting, though, is that Prince (1988:176) cites Zaretski (1929:168) as referring to the specCP-expletive es as a “prefix” on the verb.
(b) *ah is not a morphological subset of the finite complementizer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(142)</th>
<th>specCP-expletive</th>
<th>complementizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dialect Dutch</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>das</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>*ah</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ both these facts suggest that the specCP-expletive is not simply the spell-out of (a subpart of) the declarative complementizer ⇒ the specCP-expletive-as-complementizer analysis can only be maintained if *ah spells out a different C°-head than ah

note: Icelandic *ah differs from Dutch *at and German *as in that it occurs in both finite and infinitival clauses:

(143) a. Hann sagði *ah María hefði leitið bókina. (Icelandic)
He said C°inf M. had read book the
(Thraínsson 2007:444)

b. Þau lofuðu ekki *ah borða aldrei graut.
They promised not C°inf eat never pudding
‘They didn’t promise never to eat pudding.’ (Thraínsson 2007:451)

(144) a. Kpeinzen da Valère gisteren dienen boek gelezen cat.
I think C°inf V. yesterday that book read has
(Thraéne, Haegeman 1992:46)

V. tried C°inf that book to buy
‘Valère tried to buy that book.’ (Haegeman 1992:47)

(145) a. wenn du glaubst, dass er sich geirr habe (German)
if you believe C°inf he R²FL. erred has
‘if you believe he made a mistake’ (Haider 2010:4)

b. dass sie versuchte Ø das Buch zu lesen.
that she tried C°inf the book to read
‘that she tried to read the book.’ (Sabel 2006:247)

proposal: the fact that Icelandic *ah is insensitive to finiteness suggests that it is a spell-out of Force” rather than Fin” → this leaves the Fin”-head open to be spelled out as *ah (which explains why the two can co-occur and why the latter is not a morphological subset of the former) => Dutch *at and German *as are sensitive to finiteness, i.e. are a spell-out of Fin” and hence in complementary distribution with if’s

4.2 The Definiteness Effect

question: how does the present proposal account for the fact that the associate DP is necessarily indefinite?

observation: the Definiteness Effect is independent of the use of expletives:

(a) it also shows up in expletiveless existentials: even in languages that do not use expletives in their existential constructions, the subject is always indefinite (Freeze 1992:557):

(146) a. Lapset ovat kadulla. (Finnish locative, Freeze 1992:557n6)
childpl-loc COPpl streetpl-
‘(The) children are in the street.’

b. Kadulla on lapsia. (Finnish existential, Freeze 1992:557n6)
streetfins COP childfins
‘There are (*the) children in the street.’

(b) similar expletives may have different definiteness restrictions: dialect Dutch, Icelandic and German all have specCP-expletives, but they display different definiteness restrictions on the associate DP:

(147) a. * T stond alleen Valère in den lochttink. (Lapscheure Dutch)
it stood only V. in the garden (L. Haegeman, p.c.)

b. * T staan al de studenten vu o de deure.
it stand all the students in.front.of the door

(148) a. * Íaðhefur adeins þon ekki leitið þessa bók. (Icelandic)
it has only J. not read that book (Boeckx2001:47)

b. Íaðhafa allir kettir alltaf verið í eldhúsinu.
‘it have all cats always been in kitchen.the’

(Thraínsson 2007:319)

(149) a. Es hat nur der Hans dieses Buch nicht gelesen. (German)
it has only the Hans that book not read (Boeckx2001:47)

b. Es has heute jede Maus den Käse verschmäht.
it has today every mouse the cheese disdained (Haider 2010:2)

speculation: the Definiteness Effect reflects the types of subjects that can occur when the highest subject position is unavailable (cf. Moro 1997, Boeckx 2001, Vangsness 2002, Thraínsson 2007 among others), e.g. in West Flemish all definite subjects always sit in the highest position and hence become illicit in an expletive construction => in Icelandic proper names sit higher than universally quantified DPs and hence the latter can occur in *ah-sentences
5 Summary and conclusions

(a) general conclusion

“Comparative work on the syntax of a large number of closely related languages can be thought of as a new research tool, one that is capable of providing results of an unusually fine-grained and particularly solid character.” (Kaye 1996:xii)

(b) empirical observations

(151) a. SpecCP-expletives are never locative and never trigger verbal agreement.

b. Locative specTP-expletives never trigger verbal agreement.

c. Dutch dialects with specCP-expletives have complementizer agreement, a full clitic doubling paradigm, and obligatory expletives in inverted main clauses and embedded clauses.

d. Dutch dialects with specTP-expletives have at most a partial clitic doubling paradigm, can have subject-initial doubling with two strong pronouns, and can use the strong form daar as an expletive.

(c) theoretical claims

(152) a. SpecCP-expletives spell out a C*-head, i.e. they are complementizers.

b. Locative specTP-expletives are the spell-out of an agreement relation with locative features on T®.

c. The correlations in (151)cd can be reduced to a single parameter: dialects with specTP-expletives do, but those with specCP-expletives do not have obligatory T*-to-C*-movement.

(d) open questions

(153) a. To what extent is the account of locative specTP-expletives developed here similar to/compatible with one in terms of predicate inversion (Hoeckstra & Mulder 1990, Moro 1997)?

b. Why is there a difference in head movement between the two types of dialects? What triggers it? How did it arise diachronically? How should this parameter be technically implemented?

c. How does this parameter interact with others (cf. the fact that the correlations are not perfect)? To what extent can one of the properties in (151)cd occur without the others?

d. Do locative specTP-expletives also express locative agreement with T® in expletive constructions featuring unergative or transitive verbs? (See Belvin & Den Dikken 1997 for an extension in terms of predicate inversion, and see Zwart 1991, 1992 for the claim that there are two types of there-expletive constructions.)
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