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Introduction

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

Main research goals
- Find clusters of correlating properties.
- Model properties and variation theoretically.
- Reduce clusters to abstract building principles.
- Put grammars on the map.
Introduction: methodology

MIMORE
MIcrocomparative MOphosyntactic REsearch tool
www.meertens.knaw.nl/mimore/ (CLARIN.EU)

Databases
SAND (morphosyntax)
GTR (MAND/FAND; morphophonology)
DIDDD (morphosyntax of nominal groups)

Tools
Search (text and tag strings, glosses, properties)
Analysis (set theoretic operations, export)
Cartography
(1) a. **Subject doubling (CP level)**
He-de____gij da gezien?
have-you.w you.s that seen
‘Did you see that’?

b. **Demonstrative doubling (DP level)**
Ik zag de____dieje.
I saw the that
‘I saw that one.’
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2. Discovering the correlation
### (4) Brabantish: Asten

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Leef ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Leef <em>de gij</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Leeft ze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Leve we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Leef <em>de gullie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Leve ze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (5) Flemish: Lokeren

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Peizek <em>ik</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><em>deed</em> <em>gij</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>deen</em> <em>sij</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td><em>deeme</em> <em>wij</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td><em>deed</em> <em>gulder</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td><em>deen</em> <em>ze zulder</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full person paradigm vs 2nd person
(6) Brabantish: Asten

As ge gezond leeft dan leefde ge langer.
If you healthy live then live-you you longer
‘If you live healthy, you will live longer.’

(7) Flemish: Lokeren

Adde godder zo gevaarlijk leeft dan gade nooit zo lang nie
If-you you so dangerously live then go-you never so long not leven azzekikke
live as-I-I
‘If you live so dangerously, you will never live as long as me.’
Word order: VS versus VS/CS

- Yellow circles: subject doubling 2p.sg after C (59)
- Red circles: subject doubling 2p.sg after V (95)
- Blue circles: demonstrative doubling (40)
2. Summary

(i) Brabantish (i.e. Belgian and Dutch Brabant)
Demonstrative doubling correlates with **Second person** subject pronoun doubling in clauses with subject-verb inversion

(ii) Flemish (i.e. West and East Flanders)
Demonstrative doubling correlates with subject pronoun doubling for **all persons** in clauses with subject inversion (VS) and after a complementizer (CS)
Three areas

- Yellow circle: Brabantish (49)
- Red circle: West and East Flemish (51)
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3a. Doubling parameter: prerequisite

Base structure of pronouns

\[ \text{CnP} \ \text{Cn} \ \text{DP} \ \text{D} \ \phi \ \text{P} \]}


Doubling parameter = lexical parameter

Dialects differ in

(i) whether they can spell out part of this pronominal structure via subextraction and

(ii) whether the spelled out part moves as XP or X
3a. Doubling parameter

**Base structure of doubled pronouns**

\[
(CnP \ Cn \ (\text{DP } gi \ (\text{D } (\varphi_P \ de/ge )))
\]

**Base structure of regular DPs**

\[
(CnP \ Cn \ (\text{DP } die \ (\text{D } (\varphi_P \ leuk \ opa )))
\]

that nice grandfather

**Base structure of demonstrative doubling**

\[
(CnP \ Cn \ (\text{DP } die \ (\text{D } (\varphi_P \ de )))
\]
3a. Doubling parameter

(8)a. Die man gaat naar huis.
     that man goes to house [All Dutch dialects]
     ‘That man is going home.’

b.* De die man gaat naar huis.
     the that man goes to house
     [All Dutch dialects]

c. De dieje gaat naar huis.
     the that goes to house
     ‘That one is going home.’
     [Doubling dialects]

d. De dieje (*twee) (*rode) liggen op de tafel.
     the those two red are on the table
3a. Doubling parameter

Assumption:

Dutch: no spell-out of $\varphi P$
Flemish: spell-out of $\varphi P$ + phrasal movement
Belgian Brabantish: spell-out of $\varphi P$ + phrasal movement
Dutch Brabantish: spell-out of $\varphi$ + head movement

Corroborating evidence: Fronting in imperatives (based on Barbiers 2013) ➔ Phrasal subextraction from subject pronouns to the clausal C-domain blocks fronting in imperatives.
3a. Fronting in imperatives

(i) German allows constituent fronting in imperatives

(ii) Modern Dutch, Flemish, Belgian Brabantish do not allow constituent fronting in imperatives

(iii) A set of Netherlandic dialects, among which Northern Brabantic, allows fronting in imperatives, but this is restricted to distal D-pronouns
3a. Fronting in imperatives

(9)  
a.  Da/*Da boek lees maar!  
That/That book read PART  
‘Just read that/that book!’  
[North-Brabantish]

b.  * Dat/Dat boek lees maar!  
That/That book read PART  
[standard Dutch]

c.  Das/Das Buch lies besser nicht!  
That/That book reads better not  
‘You better not read that/that book.’  
[German]
3a. Fronting in imperatives

Difference between Northern-Brabantish and standard Dutch: clitic *de* in second person
3a. Fronting in imperatives

Assumptions:

- Second person pronouns have [distal, person]
- Imperatives contain a second person *pro*

(10) a. Bekijk jezelf!
    examine yourself

    b. * Ik bekijk jezelf.
        I examine yourself

- C(P) needs to be marked for second person, hence for [distal, person]:

3a. Fronting in imperatives

The [distal,person]-features are checked by:

(i) Movement of pro with these features to Spec,CP (Dutch)

(11)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
    & \text{Spec,CP} & \text{C} & \text{Spec,IP} \\
    \text{Dutch} & \text{pro} & \text{V} & \text{pro} \\
    & \text{[distal,person]} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(ii) An imperative verb with [distal,person] → German

(12)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
    & \text{Spec,CP} & \text{C} & \text{Spec,IP} \\
    \text{German} & \_ & \text{V} & \text{pro} \\
    & \_ & \text{[distal,person]} & \\
    \text{German} & \text{Das Buch} & \text{lies} & \text{mal!} \\
    \text{German} & \text{that book} & \text{read} & \text{PART} \\
    \text{German} & \text{‘Read that book’} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Nimm! ‘Take!’
3a. Fronting in imperatives

(13) **German (paradigm of *nehmen* ‘take’)**
ich nehm-e / du nimm-st / sie nimm-t / wir nehm-en / ihr nehm-t / sie nehm-en / nimm!

(14) **Dutch (paradigm of *nemen* ‘take’)**
ik neem / jij neem-t / zij neem-t / wij neem-en / jullie neem-en / zij neem-en / neem!

(15) **Middle Dutch**: 1s neem-e + fronting in imperatives
3a. Fronting in imperatives

(iii) Movement of a distal pronoun to Spec,CP + incorporation of a person feature in C

(16)

\[
\text{North Brabantish} \quad \text{Spec,CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{Spec,IP}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[distal]</td>
<td>[person]</td>
<td>maar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>doe</td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Do that!’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion:

de has [iPerson], but not [iDistal]

de incorporates into C in Northern Brabantish, but not in Flemish, Dutch and Belgian Brabantish
3a. Phi-Probe parameter

The dialect does/does not have a phi-probe in the left periphery = lexical parameter
(Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2014, Van Koppen 2005)

Independent evidence, complementizer agreement in Flemish (Lokeren):

(17)  **A-n**  ze vur under werk leven leveze nie
      **if-PL**  they for their work live live-they not
      vur under kindern
      for their children

‘If they live for their job, they do not live for their children.’
3a. Complementizer agreement
3a. Phi-Probe parameter

Flemish has a Phi-Probe in the left periphery

Dutch and Brabantish do not have a Phi-Probe in the left periphery

Dutch and Brabantish do have a Phi-Probe in the left periphery in VS-orders, however:
3a. Phi-Probe parameter

lopen - to walk

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

• In the second person, the person feature of the finite verb is uninterpretable – [uPerson] – as its form coincides with the third person in regular order and with the first person in inverted order
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3a. Four areas

- Brabantish (33)
- North-Brabantish (16)
- Flemish (51)
3b. Derivation for Flemish

(i) **base structure**
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[} \text{CnP} \text{[Cn [DP die/gij [D [φP de]]]]]} \\
\end{array}
\]

(ii) **φP to SpecCnP**
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[} \text{CnP [φP de]} \text{[Cn [DP die/gij [D [φP de]]]]]} \\
\end{array}
\]

(iii) **φP extraction from nominal CnP (subject doubling only)**
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[CP [φP de]} \text{[TP [VP ... [CnP [φP de]} \text{[Cn [DP gij [D [φP de]]]]]} \\
\end{array}
\]
3b. Derivation for Belgian Brabantish

(i) **base structure**
\[
[CnP \quad [Cn \quad [DP \quad die/gij \quad [D \quad [\phi_P \quad de]]]]]
\]

(ii) **\(\phi_P\) to SpecCnP**
\[
[CnP \quad [\phi_P \quad de] \quad [Cn \quad [DP \quad die/gij \quad [D \quad [\phi_P \quad de]]]]]
\]

(iii) **\(\phi_P\) extraction from CnP iff V has [uPerson]**
(i.e. only in 2p; recall: no generalized \(\phi\)-probe)
\[
[CP \quad [\phi_P \quad de] \quad [TP \quad [VP ... \quad [CnP \quad [\phi_P \quad de] \quad [Cn \quad [DP \quad gij \quad [D \quad [\phi_P \quad de]]]]]] \quad ]]]
\]
3b. Derivation for Northern Brabantish

(i) **base structure**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[CnP} & \text{[Cn} & \text{[DP} \text{die/gij} & \text{[D} & \text{[φ} \text{de}]]]]
\end{array}
\]

(ii) **φ to Cn**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[CnP} & \text{[Cn} & \text{de} & \text{[DP} \text{die/gij} & \text{[D} & \text{[φ} \text{de}]]]]
\end{array}
\]

(iii) **φ extraction from CnP iff V has [uPerson]**

(i.e. only in 2p; recall: no generalized φ-probe)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[CP} & \text{[C} \text{V-de} & \text{[TP} \cdots & \text{[CnP} & \text{[Cn} \text{de} & \text{[DP} \text{gij} & \text{[D} & \text{[φ} \text{de}]]]]] & \text{[T} \cdots
\end{array}
\]
3b. Derivation for Dutch

(i) \textbf{base structure: no spell out of }\varphi(\mathbf{P})
\[[CnP \quad [Cn \quad [DP \quad \text{die/gij} \quad [D \quad [\varphi_{P} \varnothing]]]]]]

(ii) \textbf{DP to SpecCnP}
\[[CnP \quad [DP \quad \text{die/gij}] \quad [Cn \quad [DP \quad [DP \quad \text{die/gij}] \quad [D \quad [\varphi_{P} \varnothing]]]]]]

\Rightarrow \text{No doubling}
3b. Some additional corroborating evidence

Northern Brabantic DP structure:
$$[	ext{DP} [\text{D} [\text{NP} \text{de}]] [\varphi \text{P} \text{die/gij} [\varphi [\text{N} \text{de}]]]]$$

Flemish/Belgian Brabantic DP structure:
$$[	ext{DP} [\text{NP} \text{de}] [\text{D} [\varphi \text{P} \text{die/gij} [\varphi [\text{NP} \text{de}]]]]$$

→ In Northern Brabantic Spec, DP is available. This is corroborated by the following data from (some) Northern Brabantish dialects:

(17)  [**Door** den dieën] die zee dä ... there the that that said that ...
      'That one over there, he said that …’

(De Bont 1958:414)
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## 3a. Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Formal property</th>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flemish</strong></td>
<td>- generalized φ-Probe</td>
<td>comp-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- phrasal spell out of φP and mvt φP to SpecDP</td>
<td>subject/demonstr. doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- φP subextracts from DP</td>
<td>no fronting in imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-Brabantish</strong></td>
<td>- no generalized φ-Probe</td>
<td>no comp-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- V-2p has [uPerson]</td>
<td>2p subj doubling only in inversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- phrasal spell out of φP and mvt φP to SpecDP</td>
<td>subject/demonstr. doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- φP subextracts from DP</td>
<td>no fronting in imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-Brabantish</strong></td>
<td>- no generalized φ-Probe</td>
<td>no comp-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- V-2p has [uPerson]</td>
<td>2p subj doubling only in inversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- spell out head φ and mvt φ to D</td>
<td>subject/demonstr. doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- φ iPron subextracts</td>
<td>distal D-pron. fronting from DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dutch</strong></td>
<td>- no generalized φ-Probe</td>
<td>no comp-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- no spell out of φP</td>
<td>no doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- no incorporation of iPron into V</td>
<td>no distal D-pron fronting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Conclusion: interaction of Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phi Parameter</th>
<th>XP</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Flemish</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>For instance: South Hollandic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Belgian Brabantish</td>
<td>Dutch Brabantish</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The dialects in the dark yellow cell have fronting in imperatives

South Hollandic (Monster), complementizer agreement:

(18) ... datte me rijker benne dan hullie.

that-agr we richer are than they

‘...that we are richer than they are.’
2. Apparent exception Zeeuws
2a. Apparent exception: Zeeuws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Productive: Brabantish (gender, distal, prox)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>a. die-n / dizze-n opa</td>
<td>a.’ de-n die-n / dizze-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that.m / this.m grandpa</td>
<td>the.m that.m/this.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>b. die / dees tante</td>
<td>b.’ de die / dees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that.f / this.f aunt</td>
<td>the that.f / this.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>c. da / di kind</td>
<td>c.’ da / di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that.n / this.n child</td>
<td>that.n / this.n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improductive: Zeeuws (only distal)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>a. die / deze opa</td>
<td>a.’den diejen/??dizzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>b. die / deze tante</td>
<td>b.’den diejen /??dizzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>c. dat / dit kind</td>
<td>c.’den diejen/??dizzen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>