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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 Tº.
3. Within Belgian Dutch, variation with respect to expletives, pronominal doubling, and complementizer agreement is reducible to a single parameter: the absence vs. presence of obligatory Tº-to-Cº 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) a. Det ble danset. (Danish, Mohr 2005:121)
   it was danced
   ‘There was dancing.’

existentials
(6) a. There are dinosaurs in your room.

presentational constructions
(7) a. 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)

*it*-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. það hefur komið strákur. (Icelandic)
   *it has come a boy
   ‘A boy has come.’

*there*-type expletives (Vikner 1995:225-226)

(9) a. Der er kommet en 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 kommen. (German)
   *it is a boy come
   ‘A boy has come.’

b. * Ist es ein Junge gekommen?
   *is it a boy come
   ‘That here is a man standing in the garden.’

c. * das es ein Junge gekommen ist.
   *that it a boy come
   ‘That there will be a dance in the school tomorrow.’

type #3: only allowed in expletive-initial main clauses and embedded clauses

(12) a. það eru myös í baðkerinu. (Icelandic, Thráinsson 2007:310,312,329)
   *it are mice in bathtub.the
   ‘There are mice in the bathtub.’

b. * Er það myð í baðkerinu?
   *are it mice in bathtub.the
   ‘That there will be a dance in the school tomorrow.’

c. að það verði ball í skólanum á morgun.
   *it tracks (the phi-features of) the expletive
   ‘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/*skotte nokre elgar. (Stryn-dialect of Norwegian)
   *it is just shotm/shotm.pl some elkmp
   ‘Some elks were just shot.’

cf. (15) Elgane vart skote. (Stryn-dialect of Norwegian)
   *the elmpl were shotm.pl
   ‘The elk 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 hefur komið strákur. (Icelandic, Vikner 1995:226)
       it has come a boy
       ‘A boy has come.’
   c. Es is ñ gekomen 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)
       *itng arctg2 two menpl in.the garden
       ‘There are two men in the garden.’
   b. Það eru mýs í baðkránu. (Icelandic, Thráinsson 2007:310)
       *itng arctg2 mice in bathub.the
       ‘There are mice in the bathub.’
   c. Es veln oyshteyn groise khakhomim fun Dayrshland. (Yiddish)
       *itng will stand.up great sagespl from Germany
       ‘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?
       it gives a well in.the garden
       ‘Is there a well in the garden?’
   c. Es *geben/gibt zwei Brunnen im Garten.
       *itng givez/givezg two wellspl 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?
       is it a boy come
       ‘Is it a boy come?’
   c. Es sind/*ist zwei Männer im Garten.
       *itng arctg2/itng two menpl 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. Det er nett skote/*skotne nokre elgar. (Stryn-dialect of Norwegian)
       *itng is just shotnpl some elkspl (Åfarli 2009)
       ‘Some elks were just shot.’
   b. Der er nett *skote/*skotne nokre elgar.
       *itng is just shotnpl some elkspl
       ‘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>expletive</td>
<td></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>expletive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERE</td>
<td>associate</td>
<td>Dutch, English, Danish, Afrikaans, Stryn-dialect of Norwegian (det)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expletive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Faroese is the only language I know of that has an it-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 tað ‘it’ is of the specCP-type (see Eriksen 2009, Cardinali 1997:523n2, Holmberg & Plantaz 1995:103n13, Thráinsson 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

(26) a. Dui stoïj twiëë vatijn inn of.
there standυ pl two menυ pl in.the garden
‘There are two men standing in the garden.’
b. Stoïj duïj twiëë vatijn inn of
standυ pl there two menυ pl in.the garden
‘Are there two men standing in the garden?’
c. dat duïj twiëë vatijn inn of stoïj,
that there two menυ pl in.the garden standυ pl
‘There are two men standing in the garden.’

specTP-expletives

(27) a. T zyn gisteren drei studenten gekommen.
it areυ pl yesterday three studentenυ pl come
‘Three students came yesterday.’
b. * Zyn t gisteren drei studenten gekommen?
are it yesterday three students come
‘Are three students come yesterday?’
c. * dan t gisteren drei studenten gekommen zyn.
that υ pl it yesterday three students come are
‘that there weren’t many people.’

→ 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.
there areυ pl many peopleυ pl come (Lapscheure Dutch)
‘Many people came.’
b. Gisteren zyn der drei studenten gekommen.
yesterday are there three students come (Grange & Haegeman 1989:160)
‘Three students came yesterday.’
c. dan der nie vele mensen woresen.
that υ pl there not many people were
‘that there weren’t many people.’

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

geographical 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
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 nen jongen werkte. (Lapscheure Dutch)
that there in the factory a boy worked (Haegeman 1986:3)
‘that a boy worked in the factory.’

(32) dat (er) in de fabriek een jongen werktm. (Wambeek Dutch)
that there in that factory a boy worked
‘that a boy worked in that factory.’

general geographic distribution:

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

(36) 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.’

general geographic distribution:

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

(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)
‘I think noone will buy that book.’

(40) Ik venj da*(n) dei boeken te dier zyn. (Wambeek Dutch)
I think that.pl those books too expensive are
‘I think noone will buy that book.’

general geographic distribution:

(41) Map #4: Complementizer agreement in -*a* in 3pl (Barbiers e.a. 2005:35)
(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. (Lapscheure Dutch)
she_{strong} goes she_{strong} (Haegeman 1992:66)
‘She’s going.’

(48) Zaai gui zaai. (Wambeek Dutch)
she_{strong} goes she_{strong}
‘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 i j duimee niks te zien. (Wambeek Dutch)
Mary has 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

(52)

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

(53)

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

T-dialects
- obligatory T-to-C

(56) Den Besten-type languages: all V2-sentences are CPs
subject-initial: [CP SUB]JECT [Cº VERB ] [TP SUBJECT [Tº t]VERB ] ...
inverted: [CP XP [Cº VERB ] [TP SUBJECT [Tº t]VERB ] ...

(57) Zwart-type languages: subject-initial V2-sentences are TPs
subject-initial: [TP SUBJECT [Tº t]VERB ] ...
inverted: [CP XP [Cº VERB ] [TP SUBJECT [Tº t]VERB ] ...

...
2.5 The analysis: deriving the correlations

2.5.1 SpecCP-expletives

2.5.1.1 The traditional account

The traditional account:

(58) $T$ zyn gisteren drie studenten gekomen.  
(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

"Three students came yesterday."

(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

traditional (mostly implicit) account: $t$ 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)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{(be)t} \quad C' \\
\text{C°} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{gisteren drie studenten gekomen}
\end{array}
\]

2.5.1.2 Problems for the traditional account

(a) (be)t 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.  
(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

"I haven’t seen it."

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

(61) $dat$ et/da regent  
(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

"That it is raining."

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

(62) Ze aanveerden et/da nie da se werkt.  
(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

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

(63) $T$/da ‘s Valère nie die da gezegd out.  
(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

"It is not Valère who said that."

(64) Et/da bevalt men ier.  
(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

"I like it here."

(65) Het/da was sypig van dat ongeluk.  
(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

"Too bad about that accident."

(66) $T$/da zyn gisteren drie studenten gekomen.  
(Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

"Three students came yesterday."
(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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(60)</th>
<th>Generalization A:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(70) dat *(er) in de fabriek nen 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 net raren 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'C' stond  TP
         /\  
        /   \  
       /     \  
      T'  T'  ...
          /\  
         /   \  
        /     \  
   t stond hier gisteren net 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.s1g 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) * Brynoddf fe Elin doth 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 rhaid 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 gekomen zyn. (Lapscheure Dutch) thatPL it yesterday three students come are

Welsh *fe*
(82) “In embedded domains, *fe* 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 students come
‘Three students came yesterday.’ (Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

Breton *bez*
(85) Bez’ e prenis eul leor d’am breur del. (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 clo. (Welsh, Jouitteau 2008:168) PRT heard.3sg 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 ovwynha Duw y bohyl o lau 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 students come
‘Three students came yesterday.’ (Grange & Haegeman 1989:163)

(89) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
C° \\
\hline
TP \\
\hline
T' \\
T° \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\xymatrix{
& C° \ar@{-}[d] \ar@{=}[r] & TP \\
& \ar@{-}[r] & T' \\
& \ar@{-}[r] & T° \\
& \ar@{-}[r] & \ldots \\
& \text{gisteren drie studenten gekomen} \\
}\\
\]

→ 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 flexionnelle. Ce mouvement créé l'ordre à verbe tensé antéposé. (...) l'ordre à verbe tensé antéposé doit être précédé par un constituant XP ou une tête X. Les ordres liètes sont donc XP-VSO ou Xº-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 predictive 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 Xº, leading to XP-VSO and Xº-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 Cº

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 → d: anaphoricity
     → e: 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. Pesetsky & 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 Tº-to-Cº-movement, they never have the option of spelling out Cº 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 it yesterday three students come

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

embedded clauses

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

→ this example is ruled out because Cº 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 Tº-to-Cº and therefore lack this option.
2.5.2 Complementizer agreement

recall:

Generalization C:
C-dialects display complementizer agreement.

(94) Kviden da*(n) die boeken te diere zyn. (Lapscheure Dutch)
I think that PL those books too expensive are
‘I think noone will buy that book.’

(95) Ik venj da*(n) de boeken te dier zyn. (Wambeek Dutch)
I think that PL those books too expensive are
‘I think noone will buy that book.’

analysis: only in C-dialects can C° have a phi-feature specification that is independent (spelled out) from the phi-feature specification of T° ⇒ only C-dialects can have complementizer agreement

corroborating evidence: the independence of C°-agreement and T°-agreement

complementizer agreement with coordinated subjects

Ich denk des doow en ich òs treffe-e.
I think thatsg youpl and I ourselvespl meetpl
‘I think that you and I will meet.’ (Tegelen Dutch, Van Koppen 2005:40)

external possessor agreement

(97) omdatu die venen tun juste underen computer kapot was,
becausepl those guys then just their computer broken waspl
‘because then the computer of those guys just 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 T°/the finite verb

2.5.3 Clitic doubling

recall:

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

(101) Asse (*zij) zo gevaartijk leeft, dan…
if she so dangerous lives then…
‘If she lives so dangerously, 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 C° and (a φP inside) the subject pronoun in specTP

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

(102) Ik peis dan ze zulder en guilder dat kunt oplossen.
I think thatpl theypl theypl and youpl that canpl solve
‘I think that you and they can solve that.’ (Nieuwerkerken-Waas Dutch, VC&VK 2007:15)

analysis: only in C-dialects can C° have a phi-feature specification that is independent from the phi-feature specification of T° and that can attract a clitic ⇒ only C-dialects can have a full elitic doubling paradigm

residual problem: how come T-dialects have a partial elitic doubling paradigm, typically consisting of 1.sg and 2.sg/pl?

(103) As gij wilt blijve smore dan blijife gij smore.
If you want continue smoke then continue you you smoke
‘If you want to continue to smoke, then you should continue to smoke.’
(Antwerp Dutch, Barbiers e.a. 2006)

possible answer: apparent elitic doubled forms such as ekik (‘I’, lit. I) or egij (‘you’, lit. you you) are in fact non-doubled, positionally restricted strong pronouns (Pauwels 1958, De Schutter 1994, Nuys 1995, De Vogelaer 2005)

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

recall:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalization A:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>

(103) **Generalization A:**

- dat *(er) in de fabrieke nen jongen werkte. (Lapscheure Dutch)
- ‘that a boy worked in the factory.’
- dat *(er) in dei fabriek nen jongen werken. (Wambeck Dutch)
- ‘that a boy worked in that factory.’

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 existentials, but a locative in locatives, the location in existentials 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)

locative

- 7-well 17-3-village
- ‘The well is in the village.’

existential

- 17-3-village 17-well
- ‘There’s a well in the village.’

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)

locative

(110) Ko e kurii 'oku 'i he funga teepile. (Tongan, Freeze 1992:569)
- TOP the dog PRES on the top table
- ‘The dog is on the table.’

existential

(111) 'oku 'i ai 'ae kurii 'i he poopao. (Tongan, Freeze 1992:569)
- PRES in 3.sg a dog in the canoe
- ‘There’s a dog in the canoe.’

**proposal:** locative existentials in Germanic are the spell-out of locative agreement with T

locative agreement with T**: Ritter & Wiltshcko (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

(112) He walks/walked.

Halkomelem Salish as an INFL

(113) li/i qw’eylex tu-t’ô AUXoral/AUXnom-dual dance he
- ‘He is or was dancing there/here.’

Blackfoot as an INFL

(114) nit-iik-wâkomimm-ok-innan-ì k-ìtan-ilksi
1-very-love-INV-1.pl-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-language, but shows person agreement, Blackfoot is an INFL-language that also has person agreement → locative expletives are the spell-out of location agreement in an INFL-language

(115) dat *(er) in de fabrieke nen jongen werkte. (Tongan, Freeze 1992:569)
- Tº 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 Tº (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2001) → in T-dialects this requirement is met by virtue of Tº-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.

(117) * Zie goa zie. (Lapscheure Dutch)

shestrong goes shestrong

'She’s going.'

(118) Zaaigui zaai. (Wambeek Dutch)

shestrong goes shestrong

'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)

(119) a. * da zaai zaai guit. (Wambeek Dutch)

that shestrong shestrong goes

b. * Mergen gui zaai zaai. (Wambeek Dutch)

tomorrow goes shestrong shestrong

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)

\[ \text{CP} \]

\[ \text{specTP} \]

\[ \text{C'} \]

\[ \text{specCP} \]

\[ \text{CP} \]

\[ \text{C'} \]

\[ \text{TP} \]

\[ \text{gut} \]

\[ t\text{zaai} \]

\[ \text{T'} \]

\[ \text{gu} \]

\[ \text{…} \]

\[ \text{zaai} \]

**note:** this analysis accounts for Generalization E: the configuration in (120) only occurs in Den Besten-type dialects \(\Rightarrow\) 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.

(122) * Doa light ier nen brief ip tafel. (Lapscheure Dutch)

there lies here a letter on table (L. Haegeman p.c.)

'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 \(\Rightarrow\) 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)

then said thereweak a monk

‘Then a monk said:…’

(125) Daer is een verrader onder ons. (Middle Dutch)

therestrong 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)

therestrong/thereweak 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 therestrong/thereweak 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)

lies therestrong/thereweak 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 eldite doubliong 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?

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) (?)Es 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) (?)Es regnet. it rains ‘It is raining.’

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

(137) * Es hat Bernd auf den Tisch gelegt. (German, Meinunger 2005:175n208) 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.) it are two men in the garden ‘There 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. * það er þegar þriða stúdentarnir gekommen. (Lapscheure Dutch) it is yesterday three students come are ‘Yesterday three students came.’

(b) það cannot be fronted to specCP: fronting of það to specCP is disallowed

(142) * það skall verða ball í skólanum á morgun. (Icelandic) it will be dance in school the tomorrow ‘That there will be a dance in the school tomorrow.’ (Thráinsson 2007:329)

1 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) *dað* is not a morphological subset of the finite complementizer

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{specCP-expletive} & \text{complementizer} \\
\text{dialect Dutch} & \text{I} & \text{dat} \\
\text{German} & \text{I} & \text{das} \\
\text{Icelandic} & \text{dað} & \text{að}
\end{array}
\]

→ 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 *dað* spells out a different Cº-head than að

**note:** Icelandic að differs from Dutch *dat* and German *das* in that it occurs in both finite and infinitival clauses:

(143) a. Hann sagði að María hefði lætið bókina. (Icelandic)
   he said Cºfin M. had read the book.
   ‘He said that Mary had read the book.’ (Thrainnsson 2007:444)

b. Pau lofuðu ekki að boraði alðrei graut.
   they promised not Cºinf eat never pudding.
   ‘They didn’t promise never to eat pudding.’ (Thrainnsson 2007:451)

(144) a. Kpeinzen da Valère gisteren dienen boek gelezen et.
   I think Cºfin V. yesterday that book read has
   ‘I think that Valère read that book yesterday.’ (Lapscheure, Haegeman 1992:46)

b. Valère prebeerdige vu dienen boek te koopen.
   V. tried Cºinf that book to buy
   ‘Valère tried to buy that book.’ (Haegeman 1992:47)

(145) a. wenn du glaubst, dass er sich geirrt habe (German)
   if you believe Cºinf he REF. erred has
   ‘if you believe he made a mistake’ (Haider 2010:4)

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

**proposal:** the fact that Icelandic að is insensitive to finiteness suggests that it is a spell-out of Forceº rather than Finº → this leaves the Finº-head open to be spelled out as *dað* (which explains why the two can co-occur and why the latter is not a morphological subset of the former) ⇒ < Dutch *dat* and German *das* are sensitive to finiteness, i.e. are a spell-out of Finº and hence in complementary distribution with /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)
   childplfin COP prebeerdige streetloc
   ‘The children are in the street.’

b. Kadulla on lapsia. (Finnish existential, Freeze 1992:557n6)
   streetplfin COP childplfin
   ‘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 lochntink. (Lapscheure Dutch)
   it stood only V. in the garden
   (L. Haegeman, p.c.)

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

(148) a. * Poðhafur aðeins Jón ekkí lætið þessa bók. (Icelandic)
   it has only J. not read that book
   (Boeckx2001:47)

b. Poðhafar allir kettir alltaf verði í æðhúsinu.
   it have all cats always been in kitchen.the
   (Thrainnsson 2007:319)

(149) a. Es hat nur der Hans dieses Buch nicht gelesen. (German)
   it has only the Hans that book not read
   (Boeckx 2001:47)

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, Thrainnsson 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 *dað*-sentences
5 Summary and conclusions

(a) general conclusion
(150) “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:cxii)

(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 daarr as an expletive.

c) theoretical claims
(152) a. SpecCP-expletives spell out a CP-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 (Hockstra & 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 explanation in terms of predicate inversion, and see Zwart 1991, 1992 for the claim that there are two types of then-expletive constructions.)
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