

# The typology of V2 and the distribution of pleonastic *DIE* in the Ghent dialect

Karen De Clercq<sup>1</sup> and Liliane Haegeman  
DIALING, Department of Linguistics, Ghent University

## 1. Aim and scope of the paper

### 1.1. Background: Adverbial V3 resumption in V2 languages

It has been noted in the literature that the adverbial resumption pattern illustrated in (1) for a range of Germanic languages is a striking property of V2 languages. In this pattern, an initial adverbial modifier is followed by a resumptive adverbial element and by the finite verb. While linearly a V3 pattern, the availability of this resumptive pattern seems to correlate with the V2 property. The resumptive pattern does not occur in languages that do not have a V2 structure. (Salvesen 2017:1). The resumptive adverbial element is optional; its absence yields the typical V2 pattern.

- (1)
- |    |                                                                  |                                       |                                                           |           |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| a. | Hvis du er sein i morgen,<br>if you are late tomorrow,           | ( <u>så / da</u> )<br><i>så / da</i>  | kommer du til å angre.<br>come you to regret it           | Norwegian |
| b. | Om du är sen imorgon,<br>if you are late tomorrow,               | ( <u>så / då</u> )<br><i>så / da</i>  | kommer du att ångra dig.<br>come you to regret it         | Swedish   |
| c. | Hvis du kommer for sent i morgen,<br>if you are late tomorrow,   | ( <u>så / ?da</u> )<br><i>så / da</i> | vil du komme til at fortryde det<br>come you to regret it | Danish    |
| d. | Wenn du morgen zu spät kommst,<br>if you tomorrow too late come, | ( <u>dann</u> )<br><i>dann</i>        | wird dir das Leid tun.<br>will to you that regret         | German    |
| e. | As jy more laat is,<br>if you tomorrow late is,                  | ( <u>dan</u> )<br><i>dan</i>          | sal jy jammer wees.<br>will you sorry be                  | Afrikaans |
| f. | Als je morgen laat bent,<br>if you tomorrow late are,            | ( <u>dan</u> )<br><i>dan</i>          | zal het je spijten.<br>will it you regret                 | Dutch     |

(1) illustrates two types of adverbial resumptive elements, which Salvesen (2017: 4-5) distinguishes as generalized resumptives vs. specialized resumptives. Patterns with a generalized resumptive are illustrated by the resumptive *så* ('so') in mainland Scandinavian (1a-c): generalized resumptives take the form of adverbial elements that have undergone semantic bleaching, and they may be preceded by a wide range of adjuncts. Languages with a generalized resumptive also have access to specialized resumptives. In patterns with specialized resumptives, the resumptive element is an adverbial element that retains its original meaning. In their resumptive use, the adverbs match the semantics of the initial adjunct. In the mainland Scandinavian data (1a)-(1c), the specialized resumptive is *da* ('then'), a temporal adverb. As illustrated in Norwegian (2), as a result of the matching condition, an initial temporal constituent has to be resumed by specialized *da* ('then') and cannot be resumed by *der* ('there'), the resumptive specialized for locative antecedents:

- (2)
- |                                                        |                                                          |                                                 |             |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Hvis du er sein i morgen,<br>if you are late tomorrow, | <u>da/ *der</u><br><i>da</i> temporal / <i>der</i> local | kommer du til å angre.<br>come you to regret it | (Norwegian) |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|

---

<sup>1</sup> De Clercq's research is funded by the Flemisch Fund for Scientific Research (FWO). We thank our informants for help with the data. Special thanks are due to Freddy Mortier, Claudine Muylle and Bert Verbeke for their help and especially to Prof. em. Luc De Grauwe who, in addition to the judgements also provided us with very helpful comments and insights all along this research.

Similar patterns are found in German, Afrikaans and Standard Dutch: in (1d-f) *dann/dan* ('then') is the resumptive specialized for temporal antecedents. Semantic matching between resumptive adverb and the initial constituent is illustrated (3): like Norwegian *der* ('there') in (2), Standard Dutch *daar* ('there'), the locative resumptive, is incompatible with a temporal antecedent. Moreover, Standard Dutch distinguishes between two specialised temporal adverbs *dan* ('then') and *toen* ('then'), which both translate into English as *then*: *dan* is specialised for future or conditional contexts, *toen* is specialised for past contexts. This difference is upheld in their specialised resumptive use, as shown in (3a), in which the future temporal clause is resumed by *dan* rather than by *toen*, while in (3b) *dan* is inappropriate and the past temporal clause must be resumed by *toen*. See Broekhuis and Corver (2016: 1704).

- (3) a. Wanneer je terugkomt naar Griekenland  
 when you back.come to Greece  
 \*daar/dan/\*toen moet je ons bezoeken  
 \*THERE/DAN/\*TOEN must you us visit  
 'When you come back to Greece, you must visit us.'  
 (Dutch, based on Salvesen 2016: 5)
- b. Toen ik thuiskwam, \*dan/ toen merkte ik  
 Toen I home-came, \*dan/toen noticed I  
 dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was.  
 that I my laptop forgotten was<sup>2</sup>

## 1.2. A generalized resumptive in the Ghent dialect

The focus of this paper is on the variety of Dutch spoken in Ghent and the surrounding region. The research is based on two transcribed recordings dating from the 1960s (Leemans 1966, Van Hoe 1981), on anecdotal data collected by the authors, as well as on consultation of native speakers and on elicitation by means of a questionnaire of native speakers.

The Ghent variety of Dutch is robustly V2. A striking property of the dialect and that of the surrounding region is the prolific use of the V3 resumptive pattern illustrated in (4), in which an initial adjunct is separated from the finite verb by an optional connecting particle<sup>3</sup> *die*:

- (4) a. vroeger, (die) bakten wij vier soorten brood  
 before (DIE) baked we four kinds bread  
 'We used to bake four kinds of bread.' (Gijzenzele 0.28) (Vanacker 1980: 76)
- b. den eersten zaterdag van december (die) is 't begonnen  
 the first Saturday of December (DIE) is it started  
 'It started on the first Saturday of December.' (Vanacker 1980: 76)
- c. os 't nodig is, (die) kunder u nog bij zetten  
 if it necessary is (DIE) can you still with sit  
 'If it's necessary, you can still come and sit with us.'  
 (Evergem: I. 200) (Vanacker 1980: 76)

<sup>2</sup> Flemish speakers use *dan* for both past and future/conditionals. They do not use the conjunction *toen* ('when<sub>PAST</sub>'), but rather use *als* ('if, when') for both past adverbial clause modifiers and for future/conditionals.

- (i) a. Als ge terugkomt naar Griekenland  
 if/when you back.come to Greece  
dan moet ge ons bezoeken.  
dan must you us visit  
 'When you come back to Greece, you must visit us.'
- b. Als ik thuiskwam, dan merkte ik  
 Toen I home-came, \*dan/toen noticed I  
 dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was.  
 that I my laptop forgotten was<sup>2</sup>

<sup>3</sup> We use the term 'particle' pretheoretically.

- d. Bij Arsène (die) hebben ze zo niet vele waar.  
 With Arsène (DIE) have they so not many PART  
 ‘At Arsène’s, they don’t have so many of these, is it?’  
 (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus I: 30, 23)

Vanacker (1980) characterizes this particle as a ‘pleonastic’ element<sup>4</sup>. At first sight, the particle DIE is a semantically bleached element used as a generalised resumptive. As seen in (4), the particle can follow, among others, a temporal adjunct (4a,b), a conditional adjunct (4c) and a locative adjunct (4d). The particle has no obvious English counterpart. In what follows, this resumptive use of *die* will be referred to as ‘pleonastic DIE’ and the particle will be glossed as DIE.

As already mentioned, pleonastic DIE is optional: it can always be omitted without loss of grammaticality. Truth-functionally, the omission of pleonastic DIE has no effect. Pleonastic DIE is immediately followed by the finite verb, which itself precedes the subject. This entails that the finite verb must have moved to a left peripheral position. Since movement of the finite verb to the left periphery is a root phenomenon in the Ghent dialect (on root phenomena cf. Emonds 1976, Hooper and Thompson 1973, Haegeman 2012 a.o.), it follows that pleonastic DIE is a root phenomenon

Though the exact geographical spread of the use of pleonastic DIE remains to be determined, the analogues of (4) are by and large ungrammatical in most areas outside of the Ghent dialect, as shown for Standard Dutch, from now on abbreviated as StD, in (5).

- (5) a. \*Vroeger, die bakten wij vier soorten brood  
 vroeger DIE baked we four kinds bread  
 b. \*Midden daarop, die stond een beeld van de rector.  
 middle there.on DIE stood a statue of the rector

StD and its varieties resort to the specialized resumptive adverb, cf. (3) and (6) (see Hoekstra 1999: 60, Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1704):

- (6) a. Vroeger toen bakten wij vier soorten brood.  
 Before *toen*<sub>temporal</sub> baked we four types bread  
 ‘We used to bake four types of bread.’  
 b. Als het nodig is dan kan je gaan zitten.  
 If it necessary is *dan*<sub>conditional</sub> can you go sit  
 ‘If it is necessary, then you can sit down.’  
 c. Bij Arsène (daar) hebben ze er zo niet veel  
 With Arsène (DIE) have they there so not many  
 ‘At Arsène’s, they don’t have so many of these.’

Like other languages with generalised resumptives (cf. Salvesen 2016), the Ghent dialect also deploys specialized resumptives in addition to the generalised resumptive: in (7a) the temporal adverb *tons* (‘then’) is used to resume a conditional adverbial; in (7b), the locative adverb *daar* (‘there’) resumes a locative adverbial PP. Both *tons* (‘then’) and *daar* (‘there’) can also be used as independent adverbs.

- (7) a. Os ge moet beginnen / u(w) stokken za(ge)n,  
 if you must start your sticks saw  
 en beginnen rond maken/ en u(w) (h)oor(n)s beginnen za(ge)n/  
 and begin round make and your horns begin saw  
 tons + en kunder nie(t) komen  
 then *en* can you there not come (Van Hoe 1981, Melle Corpus III: 98)

<sup>4</sup> Vanacker (1980: 77-8) suggests that pleonastic DIE might have originated as the instrumental use of the demonstrative. There are no records that trace its development.

- b. In ding in Oedelem, daar zate(n) m(e) in de slag.  
 In thing in Oedelem, there sat we in the battle  
 ‘In Oedelem we were caught up in the fighting’ (Van Hoe 1981, Melle Corpus III: 76)

### 1.3. Goal and organization of the paper

Except for a brief discussion in Zwart (1997: 249-250), pleonastic DIE has so far not been given much attention in the literature. This paper will document the pattern and provide an analysis of the data in terms of Wolfe’s (2016) cartographic typology of the syntax of V2.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the properties of the constituent immediately preceding pleonastic DIE, referred to here as the antecedent. Section 3 briefly inventories other pronominal uses of *die* in the dialect, focusing on its use in Contrastive Left Dislocation (CLD), which most closely resembles the pleonastic DIE pattern. Section 4 contrasts the use of pleonastic DIE with that of other specialized resumptives. Section 5 presents a first cartographic analysis of pleonastic DIE, proposing that it is a root complementizer merged in the left peripheral head Force. Sections 6 and 7 explore the predictions of the analysis. Section 7 refines the analysis and proposes that pleonastic DIE is a variant form of the declarative complementizer *dat*. Section 8 summarizes the paper.

## 2. The ‘antecedent’ of Ghent pleonastic DIE: an inventory

For convenience, from now on we refer to the constituent immediately preceding pleonastic DIE as its ‘antecedent’. The term is used pre-theoretically (cf. Section 5).

Vanacker (1980: 77) signals the ‘antecedent requirement’ on pleonastic DIE: the obligatory presence of the antecedent is confirmed both by our corpora and by our informants<sup>5</sup>. In the discourse fragment (8), A’s utterance provides a potential antecedent for the resumption in B, but as shown by the unacceptability of B’s utterance, this is insufficient: DIE must have an over antecedent:

- (8) A: Myriam komt morgen voor de katten zorgen.  
 Myriam comes tomorrow for the cats care  
 ‘Myriam will take care of the cats tomorrow’  
 B: \*Die kunnen we met een gerust hart naar de cinema gaan.  
 DIE can we with a peaceful heart to the movies go  
 (1<sup>9</sup> 2<sup>2</sup> 3<sup>0</sup> 4<sup>0</sup> 5<sup>1</sup>)<sup>6</sup>

In the present section, we inventory some properties of the antecedent: we will be looking at its syntactic category (2.1), its interpretation (2.2), its grammatical function (2.3) and its distribution (2.4).

### 2.1. The syntactic category of the antecedent

As seen in (4), the antecedent of pleonastic DIE can be realised by different syntactic categories, such as an adverbial phrase (4a), an adverbial clause (4b), a nominal with adverbial meaning (4c) and a PP (4d). In section 6.2. we will see that the antecedent of pleonastic DIE must be phrasal.

### 2.2. The interpretation of the antecedent

<sup>5</sup> De Clercq and Haegeman (2017a) point out one exception. For reasons of space we cannot go into this here.

<sup>6</sup> 12 informants from Ghent have participated in our survey. Each of them rated 52 sentences containing DIE on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 being unacceptable and 5 being fully acceptable. For every test sentence that we use in this handout we will present how many of our informants gave a particular score. 1<sup>9</sup> means that 9 informants considered the sentence unacceptable and gave it 1. If informants gave 3, 4 and 5, we considered the sentence acceptable.

The adjunct immediately preceding pleonastic DIE may have a range of (adverbial) interpretations: in (4a) and (4c) the antecedent is temporal, in (4b) it is conditional, in (4d) it is locative. To further illustrate the wide semantic range of the antecedents of pleonastic DIE, we add the examples in (9). In (9a) the antecedent is a goal adverbial, in (9b) it is a linking adverb, in (9c) it is an expression of evidentiality providing the source of the information, in (9d) it is an epistemic modal adverb.

- (9) a. Voor ulder hout te klieven die (h))adde(n) ze (h)ulder kliefm  
 For their wood to cleaveDIE had they their cleave.knife  
 ‘To cleave the wood, they used their cleaving knife.’  
 (Oostakker.I.202; Vanacker 1980:76)
- b. Bijgevolg die moet da zu rap meu(ge)lijk  
 consequently DIE must that so quick possible  
 dervan verwijderd wor(d)en  
 there.of removed become  
 ‘Consequently, that has to be removed as quickly as possible.’  
 (St. Martens-Latem I.239; Vanacker 1980: 76)
- c. Volgens de enquête, die is het stuk [rijweg]  
 According to the enquiry, DIE is the stretch [road]  
 aan de Dampoort er het slechtst aan toe  
 at the Dampoort worst affected  
 (2017, Female speaker, reported Luc de Grauwe, p.c. 04.09.2017)
- d. Waarschijnlijk die is hij weeral ziek.  
 probably DIE is he again sick  
 ‘He is probably ill again.’ (1<sup>2</sup> 2<sup>1</sup> 3<sup>2</sup> 4<sup>5</sup> 5<sup>2</sup>)

The acceptability of (9d) sheds doubt on Zwart ‘s proposal (1997: 249-50) that the pleonastic DIE pattern can be fully assimilated to the adverbial variant of Dutch contrastive left dislocation pattern, to which we return in Sections 3.2 and 4, according to which DIE would systematically be the specifier of a left peripheral topic head. In the Dutch contrastive left dislocation pattern, the antecedent of the resumptive element is systematically a discourse familiar topic (cf. Den Dikken 2017: 547, De Vries 2009) and an epistemic adverb such as *waarschijnlijk* (‘probably’) would be disqualified as an antecedent (cf. Broekhuis and Corver (2016: 1707) on *waarschijnlijk*).

### 2.3. The grammatical function of the antecedent

#### 2.3.1. Argumental PP

In the corpus, most antecedents to pleonastic DIE can be characterized as ‘optional’ adjuncts in the sense that they do not realize the thematic roles of the main predicate. However, selected arguments are also resumed by pleonastic DIE. We provide some relevant data here.

First, the corpus contains examples in which pleonastic DIE follows a locative argument. The following are relevant examples:

- (10) a. midden daarop die stond de vuurpot  
 middle there.on DIE stood the fire.pot  
 ‘In the middle on top of it stood the pot with fire’ (Vanacker 1980: 76)
- b. In ding in Assene(de) /die e ... (h)e(d) kik  
 In thingy in Assenede DIE e... had I  
 (e)ne kam ... (e)ne kameraad wonen  
 a friend ... a friend live  
 ‘I had a friend living in Assenede’ (Van Hoe 1981, Melle Corpus III: 7)

The majority of our informants accept some or all of the following examples with argumental PP antecedent.

- (11) a. Op t derde verdiep die zou ik nie willen wonen.

- on the third floor DIE would I not want live  
 ‘I would not want to live on the third floor.’ (1<sup>1</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>3</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)
- b. In mijn stoverij die doe ik nooit peperkoek.  
 in my stew DIE do I never nutmeg loaf  
 ‘I never add nutmeg loaf to my stew.’ (1<sup>1</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>2</sup>)
- c. In 1954 die is hij geboren.  
 in 1954 DIE is he born  
 ‘He was born in 1954.’ (1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>1</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)

But not only adverbial arguments are available: (12a), from the corpus, illustrates an experiencer PP being reprised by pleonastic DIE; in (12b) and (12c), both provided by an informant, a PP complement of the verbs, *spreke* (‘talk’) and *peize* (‘think’) respectively, is followed by pleonastic DIE.

- (12) a. Aan Cecile die vaart het hij ook natuurlijk ewaar.  
 to Cecile DIE fares it he also of course PART  
 ‘Cecile is also affected, of course.’ (Leemans 1966, Ghent corpus I: page 21)
- b. Van exâmes, die spreke wij nie in de lesse.  
 of exams, DIE talk we not in the class  
 ‘About exams, we don’t talk in class.’ (LdG, pc, email)
- c. Op (h)eur pensioen, die peist ze-zij nog nie .  
 on her retirement, DIE thinks she not yet  
 ‘About her retirement, she is not thinking yet.’ (LdG, pc, email)

### 2.2.3.2. *Wh* antecedents

For several of our informants, the antecedent of pleonastic DIE can be a *wh*-constituent: in (13a) the initial constituent *wanneer* (‘when’) is a *wh*-adjunct; in (13b) the initial constituent is a nominal *hoeveel* (‘how many’).

- (13) a. Wanneer die komt ze terug?  
 When DIE comes she back (1<sup>1</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)
- b. A: Hier zijn de bloemen voor de boeketjes.  
 These are the flowers for the bouquets  
 B: Hoeveel die moet ik er gebruiken per boeket?  
 How many DIE must I there use per bouquet?  
 (1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)

The fact that *wh*-antecedents are potential antecedents for DIE sheds further doubt on Zwart’s (1997: 249-50) analysis which assimilates the pleonastic DIE pattern to the adverbial variety of contrastive left dislocation and according to which DIE would systematically be the specifier of a left peripheral topic head: at first sight, it would be difficult to envisage the *wh*-constituent as the antecedent of a topical resumptive. We return to this point in Section 4.

## 2.4. The position of the antecedent of *DIE*

When the antecedent of pleonastic DIE is a *wh*-phrase (13), the *wh*-phrase contributes to the *it* encoding of illocutionary force, and hence it cannot be main clause external (in the sense of Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1133-1134) or ‘extra sentential’ (Astruc-Aguilera 2005): typically (see Haegeman and Greco (to appear)), main clause external constituents are added onto a sentence which already has illocutionary force and they do not themselves encode the illocutionary force of the associated clause. Only if the antecedent of pleonastic DIE occupies a clause internal left peripheral position will it be able to encode illocutionary force. Argumental antecedents (cf. Section 2.3.1) can also be taken to originate in a TP internal thematic position. (14) shows that the antecedent of pleonastic DIE can reconstruct for scope: the initial temporal PP *over drie jaar* (‘in three years’ time’) modifies the time

of the activity encoded in the lexical verb *verhuizen* ('move'), itself the complement of the modal *willen* ('want'). As shown extensively in Haegeman and Greco (to appear), main clause external constituents do not reconstruct to lower positions.

- (14) Over drie jaar die willen ze nog eens verhuizen.  
 in three years DIE want they once again move  
 'In three years' time, they want to move again.' (C.M. 27.09.2017, p.c. 11.25 a.m.)

### 3. Other uses of the formative *die* in the Ghent dialect

In the Ghent dialect, the formative *die* has a number of additional (though related) uses. Unlike the specific use of pleonastic DIE focussed on here, these uses are shared by other varieties of Dutch. In all these uses, *die* could be said to have nominal features: it is involved in the encoding of referential and coreferential relations, being used for instance as a distal demonstrative or as a relativizer. In such uses, *die* is gender sensitive: it has gender based inflection and it alternates with *dat*. For reasons of space we cannot discuss these uses of *die* in detail; we will provide a short overview and then focus on the resumptive use in contrastive left dislocation pattern, which we abbreviate as CLD.

#### 3.1. Overview

(15) illustrates some nominal uses of the formative *die*. First, *die* is part of the paradigm of the demonstrative determiner, as shown by *die cafes* ('those pubs') in (15a) and *dienen tijd* ('that time') in (15b). As shown by these examples, the demonstrative is inflected for gender, with *dienen* the masculine singular form. Pleonastic DIE does not manifest gender inflection.

In addition, (15b) illustrates the use of the distal demonstrative as an independently referring expression: in this use, *die* is preceded by an article (*den diene*). Again, the alternation between masculine singular *den diene* and feminine singular or plural *de die*, illustrated in (15c), is gender based. As seen in (15c), the 'strong form' *de die*, combining the determiner and the demonstrative, alternates with a short form *die*.

The second occurrence of *die* in (15a) with the form *dien*, illustrates its use as a relative pronoun. This form displays complementizer agreement: the plural ending *-n* matches the plural relativized subject *die cafes* ('those pubs'). Complementizer agreement is also instantiated on the subordinating conjunction *dat* ('that'), as illustrated in (15d).

- (15) a. en ge hebt daar die cafes dien ton zo inspringe  
 and you have there those pubs that.agr then so set.back  
 'and you have there those pubs that are slightly set back'  
 (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus I: 3)
- b. Dienen tijd dat er daar den diene bij zat die koste voetballe  
 that time that er there the that.one with was that could play.football  
 'those days that there was that one guy who could play football'  
 (Leemans 1966, Ghent corpus III: 25)
- c. en der rechtover staat ter een boerderij  
 and there opposite stands there a farm  
 en de die is ook geklasseerd.  
 and the that is also listed  
 [...] Ja, die is geklasseerd, die boerderij, ...  
 [...] yes, that is listed, that farm  
Die sta(at) geklasseerd.  
 That stands listed  
 'And opposite there is a farm which is also listed. [...] Yes, indeed, it is listed, that farm. It is listed.' (Van Hoe 1981, Ghent Corpus II: 32)
- d. A ze zegge dan de autobusse der kome•  
 they say that-PL the coaches there come  
 'they say that there will be coaches' (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus I: 3)

In all three uses illustrated in (15a-b-c), *die* alternates with *dat*, the latter being mainly associated with neuter gender (but see Rullman and Zwart (1996) for refinements). We will not dwell further on these manifestations of the formative *die*. The core points to retain are that pleonastic DIE does not alternate with *dat*, is not inflected for gender and does not display complementizer agreement.<sup>7</sup>

### 3.2. Contrastive left dislocation

The formative *die* is also used in Contrastive Left Dislocation (CLD): this is a pattern in which an initial constituent is reprinted by a resumptive pronominal belonging to the demonstrative paradigm (cf. Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 733-734/1328/1457/1691, Den Dikken 2017). The resumptive element matches the antecedent. In view of our later discussion, we distinguish three types.

#### 3.2.1. CLD with a DP antecedent.

(16)a illustrates StD CLD: the dislocated nominal constituent *Jan* is resumed by a pronominal *die*. Like examples with pleonastic DIE, CLD instantiates V3 order. As shown in (16b), *die* alternates with *dat*, the alternation being, among other things determined by gender, *dat* being neuter, and by semantic properties (see Rullman and Zwart 1996).

- (16) a. Jan die komt pas morgen.  
 Jan die comes only tomorrow.  
 b. Dat boek dat ken ik niet.  
 that book dat know I not

For CLD in the Ghent variety, two types of resumption are found in our corpus, reflecting the two forms of demonstrative *die* as a referential demonstrative as illustrated in (15b) and (15c) in Section 3.1.

In the first pattern, (17a), the CLD resumptive is the ‘strong’ variant of the demonstrative which combines determiner and demonstrative, with *dat* the neuter alternative (not illustrated, see note 7). The majority of CLD cases in the corpus illustrate the second pattern (17b), with the ‘short’ form of the demonstrative *die*.

- (17) a. Maar Potter, den dienen is al wa te(g)engekomen ze,  
 but Potter the *die*-infl is already something across come PART  
 ‘but things have already happened to Potter, you know’.  
 (Van Hoe 1981, Melle Corpus II: 59)  
 b. E, mijnheer van de bureau die had naar de bank geweest  
 e, sir of the office die had to the bank been  
 ‘And the boss had been to the bank.’  
 (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus I: 3)

For the second pattern, there is no systematic gender matching: even with a neuter antecedent, the form *die*, rather than the form *dat*, is used, as illustrated in (18a). In this respect, the Ghent dialect differs from most other Flemish dialects, in which gender matching is maintained.<sup>8</sup>

Resumptive *die* can also pick up a bare quantified nominal (18b,c), which has been reported as unacceptable for Dutch CLD.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Section 7.3. will show, however, that the particle is not completely invariant.

<sup>8</sup> Alternatives with *dat* are attested and judged acceptable. In a separate acceptability judgement test, one informant graded (i) with *die* a score 6/7 and indicated that *die* could be replaced by *dat*.

(i) Speltbrood die /dat koop ik enkel in het weekend.  
 Spelt bread die/dat buy I only at the weekend (CM, 14.9.2015)

The pattern in which the initial constituent is picked up by *dat* may in fact be an instantiation of the pattern in (17), i.e. with *dat* the neuter analogue of *den dienen* (cf. (17a))

<sup>9</sup> Hoekstra (1999: 66) gives (i) as ungrammatical:

- (18) a. dat geld die gingd' in een dink,  
 that money *die* went into a thing  
 'the money went into a thing' (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus II: 8)
- b. Niemand die was tevoren bereid  
 no one *die* was before prepared  
 om direkt da(t) groensel te kweken voor de vijand.  
 to directly that vegetable to grow for the enemy  
 'and before no one was immediately willing to grow vegetables for the enemy'  
 (Van Hoe 1981, Melle Corpus I: 5)
- e. Niemand die komt daar naartoe  
 no one *die* comes there to  
 'No one goes to the other animals [in the zoo].' (CM, 26.05.2009)

### 3.2.2. CLD, PP antecedents and P stranding

In StD (19), an initial PP (*over examens* 'about exams', *aan haar pensioen* 'about her pension') is resumed by the R-word *daar* ('there'), itself the complement of the stranded preposition. In line with the literature on Dutch (see a.o., Riemsdijk 1978, Koopman 2000, 2010, Noonan 2017), we assume that P-stranding is derived by movement of the resumptive R-pronoun *daar* ('there') from the complement position of the preposition.

- (19) a. Over examens, daar spreken wij niet over in de les.  
 about exams, there talk we not about in the class
- b. Aan haar pensioen, daar denkt ze nog niet aan.  
 on her retirement, there thinks she not yet on

(20) is the Ghent analogue of (19) (LdG, p.c. email): the fronted resumptive *daar* strands the associated preposition (*van* ('of') and *op* ('on')), and it is anteceded by a PP or by a DP.

- (20) a. (Van) Exâmes, daar spreke wij nie van in de lesse.  
 (of) exams, there talk we not of in the class
- b. (Op) (h)eur pensioen, daar peist ze-zij nog nie op.  
 (on) her pension, there thinks she not yet on

### 3.2.3. With an adverbial antecedent

It seems reasonable to follow Zwart (1997: 249-50) (also Hoekstra 1999: 60, Broekhuis and Corver 1916: 1704) and analyse StD V3 patterns in which an adverbial adjunct is picked up by a specialised resumptive d-word as the 'adverbial' variant of CLD: (3a,b) are repeated as (21a,b), (6c) is repeated as (21c).

- (21) a. Wanneer je terugkomt naar Griekenland,  
 when you back.come to Greece  
dan/\*toen moet je ons bezoeken  
*dan/\*toen* must you us visit  
 'When you come back to Greece, you must visit us.' (Dutch, From Salvesen 2016: 5)
- b. Toen ik thuiskwam, \*dan/ toen merkte ik  
*Toen* I home-came, *\*dan/toen* noticed I  
 dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was.

- 
- (i) \*Niemand die heeft ze gekust.  
 No one *die* has she kissed

See also Broekhuis and Corver (2016: 1458).

- c. that I my laptop forgotten was<sup>10</sup>  
 Bij Arsène daar hebben ze zo niet veel.  
 with Arsène THERE have they so not much  
 ‘At Arsène’s, they don’t have much.’ (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus I: 30, 23)

#### 4. Pleonastic DIE vs. the specialized resumptive in adverbial CLD

This section compares resumption with pleonastic DIE with the CLD pattern. We focus on the CLD pattern with the specialized adverbial resumptive illustrated in Section 3.2.3 and on the CLD pattern with P-stranding illustrated in Section 3.2.2.

With Zwart (1997) we assume that StD adverbial resumption is a variant of CLD with an initial adjunct and a fronted specialized resumptive in the sense of Salvesen (2017). We assume that this analysis carries over to resumption with the specialized adverbs (*dan* (‘then’), *daar* (‘there’) etc.) in the Ghent dialect.

As mentioned, Zwart (1997: 249-50) assimilates the Ghent pleonastic DIE pattern with other specialized resumptive patterns, such as pronominal *die* in CLD as well as adverbial *daar*, adverbial *dan/toen* and proposes that the pleonastic DIE element is the specifier of a left peripheral topic projection. We show that assimilating the two patterns fails to capture the contrasts between specialized resumptive adverbs and pleonastic DIE in the Ghent dialect; we will follow Zwart in analyzing the specialized resumptive adverbs as phrasal constituents in a left peripheral specifier position, but we will analyse pleonastic DIE as a left peripheral head.

##### 4.1. Distribution

In both StD and in the Ghent dialect, specialised resumptive adverbials like temporal *dan* (‘then’) can appear in a middle field position: this pattern arises whenever the dedicated left peripheral slot is unavailable because an additional left peripheral feature is independently activated; the relevant pattern is illustrated in (22). (22a) is the default pattern in which the initial conditional clause is resumed by the specialised adverbial resumptive *dan*, which occupies the initial position of the V2 clause. Being occupied by a *wh*-phrase, *wat* (‘what’) in (22b,c), the initial position can no longer host the resumptive adverb *dan*: therefore, the resumptive adverb cannot precede the finite verb. Instead, the resumptive adverb appears TP internally (22d). The pattern is replicated with nominal antecedents in CLD, see for instance Den Dikken (2017: 551, (14c)). In the Ghent dialect too, specialised adverbial resumptives occupy a mid position (22e, 22f) whenever the left peripheral slot is unavailable.

- (22) a. Als het regent, dan gaan we thuisblijven  
 if it rains, then go we home stay  
 b. \*Als het regent, wat dan gaan we doen?  
 if it rains, what then go we then do?  
 c. \*Als het regent, dan wat gaan we doen?

<sup>10</sup> Flemish speakers use *dan* for both past and future/conditionals. This is probably related to the fact that they also do not distinguish between the conjunctions *toen* (‘when<sub>PAST</sub>’) and *dan* (‘when<sub>FUTURE</sub>’), but systematically use *als* (‘if, when’) as conjunctions for both past adverbial clause modifiers and for future/conditionals.

- (i) a. Als ge terugkomt naar Griekenland  
 if/when you back.come to Greece  
dan moet ge ons bezoeken.  
*dan* must you us visit  
 ‘When you come back to Greece, you must visit us.’  
 b. Als ik thuiskwam, dan merkte ik  
*Toen* I home-came, \**dan/toen* noticed I  
 dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was.  
 that I my laptop forgotten was<sup>10</sup>

- d. if it rains, then what go we then do?  
 Als het regent, wat gaan we dan doen?  
 if it rains, what go we then do?
- e. as-t da nie en is, wat is't dan, hé?  
 If-it that not PART is, what is it then, PART  
 'If it is not that, what is it then?' (CM 27.01.2010)
- f. En daar tons nevest u. daarziede, wa gaan ze daar make'?'  
 and there then next you, there part, what go they there make  
 'And next door, what are they making there?'  
 (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus I: 1)

From (22) we infer that fronted specialized resumptive adverbs are in complementary distribution with *wh* operators. We assume that the resumptive adverbs are operators which by default target a left peripheral position. This entails that, like their non resumptive counterparts, specialised resumptive adverbs are phrasal and that their merge position is TP internal. We thus adopt a movement analysis for the derivation of adverbial CLD. Given that the fronted specialised resumptive adverbs target the same left peripheral position as fronted *wh*-phrases, it will follow that they do not themselves take *wh*-phrases as their antecedent.

For pleonastic DIE, on the other hand, a TP internal position is unavailable.<sup>11</sup> In (23), the left peripheral initial position hosts the *wh*-constituent *wat* ('what') but nevertheless DIE cannot occupy a lower position. This piece of evidence already suggests that the syntax of pleonastic DIE, a generalized resumptive, cannot be fully assimilated to that of its specialized counterparts.

- (23) \*Als het regent wat gaan we die doen. (1<sup>11</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>0</sup>, 4<sup>0</sup>, 5<sup>0</sup>)  
 if it rains, what go we DIE do

One option could be that unavailability of the TP internal position might be due to the fact that while pleonastic DIE is merged TP internally, because of some specific discourse-related feature its movement to the left periphery is mandatory. The relevant feature could be similar to, say, a *wh*-feature or the operator feature on relative pronouns. Alternatively, the fact that a TP internal position is unavailable could be due to the fact that pleonastic DIE is not merged TP internally at all but is merged directly in the left periphery. Below we pursue the latter option (see Section 4.6).

#### 4.2. Antecedent requirement

Adverbs deployed as specialized resumptives such as *dan* ('then'), *toen* ('then') or *daar* ('there') can be used independently as temporal/conditional/locative modifiers, both in initial position or in TP-internal position<sup>12</sup>. (24) is StD.

- (24) a. Dan gaan we wandelen.  
 Then go we walk  
 'Then we'll go for a walk'
- b. We gaan dan wandelen.  
 We go then walk  
 'We'll go for a walk then.'

<sup>11</sup> In contrast, when *die* resumes an argument nominal in CLD, mid position is available. This pattern is like the StD CLD pattern (cf. Den Dikken 2017: 551, his (14c))

- (i) a. Uwen laptop, die moogt ge niet gebruiken in het examen.  
 Your laptop, *die* may you not use in the exam
- b. Oei: mijn laptop, waar heb ik die nu gelaten?  
 PART: my laptop, where have I *die* now left
- c. Uwen laptop, laat die maar thuis!  
 Your laptop, let *die* part home (Ghent, CM, p.c. 30.09.2017)

<sup>12</sup> In this respect they again pattern with the demonstrative pronominals that function as resumptives in.

- c. Wie gaat er dan thuisblijven?  
 Who goes there then home stay  
 ‘Who is going to stay home then?’

In contrast, as mentioned, pleonastic DIE cannot be used independently with an adverbial function: it requires an antecedent. This was illustrated in (8), where we showed that even if the context makes an implicit antecedent available, this is insufficient to license the use of pleonastic DIE.

### 4.3. Type of antecedent

Recall that StD fronted specialized resumptives are not compatible with a *wh*-operator as an antecedent.<sup>13</sup> This follows if fronted specialized resumptive adverbs are left peripheral operators and target the same operator position as *wh*-operators.

- (25) a. \*In welke periode toen woonde zij in Geneve?  
 in which period then lived she in Geneva  
 b. \*Wanneer toen is ze terug gekomen?  
 when then is she back come  
 c. \*In welke van die twee winkels daar verkopen ze biofruit?  
 In which of those two shops daar sell they biological fruit

As already shown in (13), repeated as (26), pleonastic DIE is compatible with an initial *wh* adjunct as its antecedent.

- (26) Wanneer die komt ze terug?  
 When DIE comes she back (1<sup>1</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)

So, while fronted specialized resumptive adverbs compete with *wh*-operator, pleonastic DIE does not compete with *wh*-operator. We take this as a second strong indication of the difference between the specialized resumptive adverbs and pleonastic DIE.

Recall that in addition to *wh*-antecedents, other antecedents such as the epistemic modal adverb *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’ (9d), a licit initial constituent in the V2 pattern, are compatible with pleonastic DIE but are incompatible with the adverbial CLD pattern. See Broekhuis and Corver (2016: 1707 on *waarschijnlijk*).

### 4.4. Modifiers

The phrasal status of specialized resumptive adverbs is confirmed by the fact that they can be modified by focus particles such as *zelfs* (‘even’) or *juist* (‘exactly, precisely’), as seen in (27/8a). In contrast, pleonastic DIE cannot be so modified, as seen in (27/28b).

- (27) a. Als het regent, zelfs dan ga ik te voet naar het werk.  
 if it rains, even then go I on foot to the work  
 ‘When it rains, even then I walk to work.’  
 b. \* Als het regent,  
 if it rains,  
 zelfs die ga ik te voet naar het werk. (1<sup>8</sup>, 2<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>0</sup>, 5<sup>0</sup>)  
 even DIE go I on foot to the work
- (28) a. Toen de bel ging, juist dan ging ik vertrekken.  
 when the bell went, just then went I leave

<sup>13</sup> Judgements may vary : notably one of the authors of this paper, Karen De Clercq, has divergent judgements. We hope to return to this point later.

- ‘When the bell rang, just then I was going to leave.’
- b. \*Toen de bel ging, juist die ging ik vertrekken. (1<sup>8</sup>, 2<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>0</sup>, 5<sup>0</sup>)  
 when the bell went, just DIE went I leave

#### 4.5. Co-occurrence with specialized (resumptive) adverb

A final confirmation that pleonastic DIE differs syntactically from the fronted specialized adverbial resumptives and that indeed it occupies a different position comes from the fact that both when used independently (29) or when used as resumptives (30), the specialized adverbs (*dan/toens* ‘then’, *daar* ‘there’) can co-occur with pleonastic DIE: in this case, the specialized resumptive precedes pleonastic DIE, the alternative order is not available.

- (29) a. En dan die moeten we gaan kijken  
 And then DIE must we go watch (FM, 09.12.2009)  
 ‘and then we have to look’ (FM, 09.12.2009)
- b. \*En die dan moeten we gaan kijken
- (30) a. als ge spreekt dan die kunde da  
 when you speak then DIE can you that  
 ‘If you speak, then you can do that.’ (attested example, BV, August 2017)
- b. moar ois ’t regent toens die gomme nie  
 but when it rains then DIE go-we not  
 ‘but if it rains, then we won’t go’ (Luc De Grauwe, pc. 16.08.2017)
- c. Als ’t regent, zelfs toens die ga ’k te voete...  
 if it rains even then DIE go I on foot  
 ‘If it rains, even then I’ll go on foot.’ (Luc De Grauwe, p.c. 16.08.2017)
- d. Maar e wel ja in Sint Kruis /, daar die ...  
 but PART PART PART in Sint Kruis/ there DIE  
die (h)e(bben) me d(e) ee(r)ste Duitse tons+ gezien  
 DIE have we the first Germans then seen  
 ‘but, well, in St-Kruis we saw the first Germans’  
 (Van Hoe 1981, Melle Corpus III: 7)

Observe that if the resumptive adverbs in (30) have moved from a TP internal slot to the left periphery, this suggests that pleonastic DIE itself has not moved: movement of the two constituents would plausibly lead to intervention effects.

#### 4.6. P stranding

Recall the StD CLD example (19) and its Ghent analogue in (20), repeated here as (31), in which an initial PP (*over exmens* ‘about exams’, *aan haar pensioen* ‘about her pension’) is resumed by the R-word *daar* (‘there’), itself the complement of the stranded preposition. We adopt the hypothesis that CLD patterns are derived by movement of the resumptive element (here *daar*) from the complement position of the preposition (see Den Dikken 2017 for discussion and evaluation of alternatives).

In the Ghent examples with resumptive *daar* (‘there’) (31), the initial constituent can be either a PP (*van exames* ‘about exams’, *op heur pensioen* ‘about her pension’), or just a DP (*exames* (‘exams’), *heur pensioen* (‘her pension’)), the former a case of CLD, the latter plausibly an instantiation of hanging topic left dislocation (see Broekhuis and Corver 2016:1500-1502 for the difference). For both patterns, our informant signaled a prosodic break between the initial constituent and the sentence introduced by *daar*.

- (31) a. (Van) Exâmes, daar spreke wij nie van in de lesse.  
 (of) exams, there talk we not of in the class
- b. (Op) (h)eur pensioen, daar peist ze-zij nog nie op

(on) her pension,            there    thinks   she    not yet on

We have shown that pleonastic DIE also functions in a resumptive pattern in which the initial constituent is a prepositional argument of the verb: (12b-c) are repeated in (32). This pattern differs from that in (31) in at least three ways: (i) no prosodic break is signaled by our informant, (ii) the initial constituent cannot be the nominal (with P stranding), it must be a PP, and (iii) P stranding is not available. While the P-stranding facts in CLD (31) make it plausible that *daar* ('there') is an operator moved from the complement position of the preposition, this analysis is thus not optimal for pleonastic DIE in (32).

- (32) a.    \*(Van) exâmes,            die spreke        wij nie            (\*van) in de lesse.  
           Of exams,                DIE speak        we not            (\*of) in the class
- b.    \*(Op) (h)eur pensioen, die    peist    ze-zij    nog nie    (\*op).  
           Of her pension,            DIE    thinks   she    not yet    (\*on).

We formulate the hypothesis that pleonastic DIE is a head, merged directly in the left periphery. Recall that we also assume that antecedent of pleonastic DIE is moved to the left periphery from a TP internal position.

#### 4.7. Summary

Table 1 summarizes the contrasts discussed in the preceding section and lists our core hypotheses:

- (i) Specialized resumptives
- specialized resumptives are phrasal constituents, more specifically they are operators;
  - specialized resumptives are moved from a TP internal position to a left peripheral operator position (and hence compete with fronted *wh*-constituents)
- (ii) Pleonastic DIE
- pleonastic DIE is not a phrasal constituent, rather it is a head;
  - pleonastic DIE is merged in a left peripheral position

**Table 1:** specialized resumptive (*dan/tons/demonstrative pronoun*) vs. generalized DIE

	Specialized resumptive	Generalized DIE
<b>Patterns</b>		
Middle field position ( <i>wh/imperative</i> )	yes	no
Antecedent requirement	no	yes
<i>wh</i> antecedent	no	yes
Focal modifiers	yes	no
P stranding	yes	no
<b>Our hypotheses</b>		
Categorial status	phrasal (topic) operator	head
Derivation of Left peripheral position	internally merged	externally merged

We elaborate our head analysis of pleonastic DIE in Sections 5-7.

### 5. A first cartographic analysis of pleonastic DIE

This section outlines our analysis of the pleonastic DIE pattern in the Ghent dialect. Contrary to Zwart's (1997) proposal, which was admittedly not a fully developed account, we do not fully assimilate the syntax of pleonastic DIE to that of the fronted specialized resumptive adverbs *daar* ('there'), *toen* ('then') and *dan* ('then') in the adverbial CLD pattern.

- (i) A fronted specialized resumptive adverb can co-occur with pleonastic DIE. This entails *de facto* that what would be a generalized resumptive, i.c. pleonastic DIE, cannot be taken to occupy the same position as the fronted specialized resumptive adverb.
- (ii) The constituent to the immediate left of pleonastic DIE, its ‘antecedent’, can be a *wh*-phrase: this entails that the antecedent cannot be main clause external.
- (iii) Pleonastic DIE is incompatible with a TP-internal position and with P-stranding: this leads us to the hypothesis that it is not merged TP-internally and moved to the left periphery, but rather that it is merged directly as a left peripheral head.

### 5.1. Theoretical background: the typology of V2 languages

If the antecedent of the pleonastic DIE is merged in a clause internal position and moves to the left periphery, we need to postulate at least three positions in the clausal left periphery to derive the V3 pattern:

- (i) a phrasal position for the antecedent phrase;
- (ii) a head position for pleonastic DIE;
- (iii) the landing site for the finite verb (which precedes the canonical subject position): a head position.

To accommodate these positions, we explore cartographic proposals for an enriched CP structure (Rizzi 1997). We will not go into the details of or motivation for the cartographic framework; the present section simply outlines the assumptions that feed our analysis of the pleonastic DIE pattern.

In line with the cartographic elaboration of the left periphery (Rizzi 1997), the minimal CP structure is decomposed: the lowest projection in the CP layer is FinP, a projection whose head encodes the finiteness properties of the clause, and the projection which closes off the sentence is ForceP, the projection encoding illocutionary force.

We also adopt recent proposals by Poletto (2013) and specifically the implementation in Wolfe (2015, 2016) for the typology of V2 languages. According to these authors, V2 languages are diversified according to the left-peripheral locus targeted by the finite verb, which is either Fin° or Force° (Poletto (2013) and Wolfe (2015, 2016) for motivation). Thus, a distinction is made between so called Fin-V2 languages, with the left peripheral structure schematized in (33a) and Force-V2 languages, whose left periphery is schematically represented in (33b).

- (33) a.  $[\text{ForceP } \_\_\_\_\_\_ [\text{TopP } \_\_\_\_\_\_ [\text{FocP } \_\_\_\_\_\_ [\text{FinP } \mathbf{XP} [\text{Fin}^\circ \mathbf{V}] [\text{TP}\dots]]]]]]]$   
 b.  $[\text{ForceP } \mathbf{XP} [\text{Force}^\circ \mathbf{V}]\dots[\text{FinP } \dots [\text{TP}\dots]]]$

One of the predictions of the Poletto/Wolfe typology is that in Fin-V2 languages, multiple access to the left periphery remains potentially available, leading to the attestations of V3 and V4 orders. This prediction is explored for medieval Romance in Benincà and Poletto (2004), Benincà (2004, 2006, 2013). On the other hand, in Force-V2 languages, a V3 pattern should only be able to arise if what would in effect be main clause-external constituents (in the sense of Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1133-1134) occur in functional projections above ForceP. Following Haegeman and Greco (to appear), we assume that the West Flemish and StD V3 patterns involve constituents merged in a main clause external FrameP, as schematized in (34).

- (34)  $[\text{FrameP } \_\_\_\_\_\_ [\text{ForceP } \mathbf{XP} \text{Force}^\circ \mathbf{V}\dots [\text{FinP } \dots [\text{TP}\dots]]]]]$

We assume that the second position effect in V2 patterns is due to a bottleneck effect: filling SpecFinP blocks additional left-peripheral movement from within TP<sup>14</sup> (Haegeman 1996, Roberts 2004, Biberauer and Roberts 2014, Holmberg 2015).

<sup>14</sup> External merge of another constituent in the CP area is also unavailable, because such a constituent would itself block movement of the constituent in SpecFinP to SpecForceP. The externally merged constituent is by hypothesis inserted to satisfy a criterial feature and cannot itself move to SpecForce.

We assume that like StD and like the Flemish varieties of Dutch, the Ghent dialect is a Force V2 language, regular V2 sentences in the Ghent dialect are derived by V movement to Force, and by movement of a constituent to SpecForce via SpecFin as illustrated in (35):

(35)  $[\text{ForceP } \text{Morgen } [\text{Force } \text{komt}] [\text{FinP } \text{morgen } [\text{Fin } \text{komt}] [\text{TP } \text{hij } \text{terug } \text{komt}]]$   
tomorrow comes he back

Anticipating the discussion below, the Ghent dialect will be argued to diverge from other Force V2 languages: in pleonastic DIE patterns, which display a V3 order, the antecedent is not analysed as occupying an extra sentential position, i.e. it is not taken to be merged in FrameP, but rather, we will assume that it is located in SpecForceP.

## 5.2. The head analysis: pleonastic DIE as a root complementizer

Based on the differences in distribution between the fronted specialized resumptives in the CLD patterns in the Ghent dialect and pleonastic DIE, we have concluded that while the former are TP-internal phrasal operators which are moved to the left periphery, pleonastic DIE is a head merged directly in the left periphery. Schematically, we propose that the derivation of the adverbial variety of CLD with a specialized resumptive is as in (36a) and that of resumption with pleonastic DIE is as in (36b).

(36) a.  $[\text{FrameP } \text{morgen } [\text{ForceP } \text{dan } [\text{Force } \text{komt}] [\text{FinP } \text{dan } [\text{Fin } \text{komt} [\text{TP} \dots \text{dan } .]]]]]$   
tomorrow then comes  
b.  $[\text{ForceP } \text{Morgen } [\text{Force } \text{die}] [\text{FinP } \text{morgen } [\text{Fin } \text{komt}] [\text{TP } \text{hij } \text{terug } \text{komt}]]]$   
tomorrow DIE comes he back

Derivation (36b) can be summarized as follows:

- (i) The left periphery of a pleonastic DIE sentence instantiates two head positions, Fin, which is occupied by the finite verb (to the immediate left of the canonical subject position), and Force, which is occupied by pleonastic DIE.
- (ii) Fin, the head hosting the finite verb, encodes finiteness properties of the clause.
- (iii) The finite verb spells out complementizer agreement (encoded on Fin), which therefore is not instantiated on pleonastic DIE. This accounts for the difference between pleonastic DIE and relative *die* (cf. Section 3.1).
- (iv) The ‘antecedent’ of DIE moves through SpecFinP (cf. Haegeman 1996) to the specifier of Force (=pleonastic DIE), thus leading to the bottleneck effect.
- (v) Like the regular V2 pattern in the Ghent dialect, pleonastic DIE is a root phenomenon.

For the readers’ convenience, we briefly recall that a head analysis of pleonastic DIE (36b) is based on the following considerations:

- (i) pleonastic DIE cannot be modified by focusing particles (Section 4.4);
- (ii) pleonastic DIE is restricted to the left peripheral slot: mid position is ungrammatical (Section 4.1);
- (iii) preposition stranding is unavailable with pleonastic DIE (Section 4.6);
- (iv) fronted specialized adverbial resumptives can co-occur to the immediate left of pleonastic DIE (Section 4.5).

Since we analyze pleonastic DIE as a filler for a C head, this implies that we treat it as a kind of root complementizer. In Section 6 we will explore some consequences of the root complementizer analysis of pleonastic DIE. In Section 7 we consider some problems and we refine the analysis to capture these.

## 6. Exploring the head analysis of pleonastic DIE

The gist of our analysis is that pleonastic DIE is inserted in Force and that the obligatory presence of its antecedent is independent of the presence of DIE itself, but rather results from the Force V2 requirement. The proposal successfully captures several aspects of the distribution of pleonastic DIE in relation to other left peripheral constituents, and anticipating Section 7, it will also capture some initially surprising restrictions.

According to our analysis, the obligatory presence of a constituent to the immediate left of pleonastic DIE simply follows from the ‘V2 requirement’ on Force. Basically, the Force V2 requirement translates here as ‘Force DIE 2 requirement’. As seen in Section 2, pleonastic DIE does not appear to be selective in terms of the formal or semantic properties of the constituent to its left. Moreover, it is compatible with topical constituents as well as with foci (cf. *wh*-constituents) and with epistemic adverbials.

The analysis has two terminological implications. One consequence of our Force DIE 2 analysis is that the label ‘antecedent’ is not appropriate for the constituent immediately preceding pleonastic DIE, because in our conception of the structure, pleonastic DIE does not ‘reduplicate’ the initial constituent. Rather, the constituent preceding DIE satisfies Wolfe’s (2016) Force V2 requirement, the head Force happens to be spelt out by DIE.

The prediction of the Force DIE 2 analysis is that all constituents which can satisfy the Force V2 constraint can immediately precede pleonastic DIE and that constituents that cannot satisfy the V2 constraint cannot immediately precede pleonastic DIE. Or put differently, *ceteris paribus*, the insertion of pleonastic DIE should be possible in all V2 sentences in the Ghent dialect. Another implication is that the term ‘resumptive’ or ‘generalized resumptive’ is also perhaps not best suited for the use of pleonastic DIE, in that it does not really ‘resume’ the preceding constituent.

In the present section, we examine two related consequences of our analysis: Section 6.1. focusses on the co-occurrence of fronted specialized resumptives with pleonastic DIE ofwel

d in Section 4.5; Section 6.2. focusses on the prediction that any constituent satisfying the Force V2 requirement in a V2 sentence should also satisfy the DIE 2 condition, and conversely that a constituent unable to satisfy the Force V2 condition also does not satisfy the Force DIE 2 condition.

### 6.1. Co-occurrence with fronted specialized resumptive adverbs

Following the Poletto/Wolfe typology of V2 and the assumption that the Ghent dialect is a Force V2 language, the CLD pattern with a fronted specialized resumptive adverb illustrated in (37a) is derived as in (37b): the antecedent of the specialized resumptive, the PP *in Sint Kruis* (‘in Sint Kruis’), occupies the specifier of the clause external projection FrameP (cf. (36a)). The fronted specialized resumptive, here locative *daar* (‘there’), occupies the specifier position of ForceP and satisfies the Force V2 requirement. The finite verb moves to Force, via Fin.

- (37) a. In Sint Kruis daar hebben we de eerste Duitse gezien.  
 In Sint Kruis there have we the first Germans seen  
 b. [<sub>FrameP</sub> in Sint Kruis [<sub>ForceP</sub> daar [<sub>Force</sub> hebben] [<sub>FinP</sub> daar [<sub>Fin</sub> hebben [<sub>TP...</sub> daar .]]]]  
 in Sint Kruis there have

As schematized in (38a), we predict that pleonastic DIE can co-occur with a fronted specialized resumptive adverb, in effect giving rise to a V4 pattern. The prediction is correct, the relevant pattern was illustrated in (30d), repeated here as (38b), with the partial representation in (38c). The finite verb halts at Fin and DIE is inserted in Force to satisfy the Force V2 requirement. The PP *in Sint Kruis* (‘in Sint Kruis’), the ‘antecedent’ of the fronted specialized resumptives *daar*, occupies the specifier of the clause external FrameP; locative *daar* (‘there’), the fronted specialized resumptive, occupies the specifier position of ForceP and satisfies the Force DIE 2 requirement.

- (38) a. [<sub>FrameP</sub> XP [<sub>ForceP</sub> resumptive adverb [<sub>Force°</sub> DIE]... [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>Fin</sub> V<sub>fin</sub>] [<sub>TP...</sub>]]]]  
 b. Maar e wel ja in Sint Kruis /, daar die ...  
 but PART PART PART in Sint Kruis/ there DIE  
die (h)e(bben) me d(e) ee(r)ste Duitse tons+ gezien  
 DIE have we the first Germans then seen

‘but, well, in Sint Kruis we saw the first Germans’

(Van Hoe 1981, Melle Corpus III: 7)

c. [<sub>FrameP</sub> in Sint Kruis [<sub>ForceP</sub> daar [<sub>Force</sub> die] [<sub>FinP</sub> ~~daar~~ [<sub>Fin</sub> hebben [<sub>TP...</sub> ~~daar~~ .]]]]

## 6.2. Restrictions on the antecedent

If the constituent to the immediate left of pleonastic DIE satisfies the Force V2 requirement, constituents which fail to qualify as the first constituent in a V2 pattern should not qualify as ‘antecedents’ for pleonastic DIE. Conversely, any constituent that satisfies the Force V2 constraint should be able to function as the first constituent with pleonastic DIE. To illustrate this point, we will examine the compatibility of the pleonastic DIE pattern with the conjunctive adverb *ofwel* on the one hand and the closely similar conjunction *of* (‘or’), on the other. We return to a problematic aspect of the second component of the prediction in Section 7.

(39) illustrates the use of *of* (‘or’) and *ofwel* (‘either’) as first constituents in the context of V2 patterns. Though intuitively speaking, *ofwel* (‘either’) and *of* (‘or’) are interpretively similar, they differ in terms of their interaction with V2: for Flemish speakers, the adverb *ofwel* (‘either’) satisfies V2 (39a,b)<sup>15</sup>; the conjunction *of* (‘or’) does not (39c,d).<sup>16</sup> Let us tentatively assume this is because *ofwel* is phrasal and *of* is a coordinating head.

- (39) Ik geef u een korting  
I give you a reduction
- a. ofwel geef ik u een bon.  
either give I you a voucher
- b. \*ofwel ik geef u een bon.  
either I give you a voucher
- c. \*of geef ik u een bon.  
or give I you a voucher
- d. of ik geef u een bon.  
or I give you a voucher

If the constituent immediately preceding pleonastic DIE simply satisfies a Force V2 requirement, we predict that *ofwel* will be able to antecede pleonastic DIE. The data in (40) confirm this prediction: (40a) and (40b) are attested, (40c) and (40d) are based on our informant CM’s acceptability judgements.

- (40) a. Ofwel die zeggen we:…  
either DIE say we (FM, 30 June 2010)
- b. Ofwel die moet ik u…  
either DIE must I you (shop assistant, 27 September 2015)
- c. Ofwel die geef ik u 80 percent van de koopsom  
either DIE give I you 80 percent of the purchase sum

<sup>15</sup> The Netherlandic and Belgian varieties of Dutch differ : Netherlandic varieties allow for both (ia) and (ib), though (ib) is the majority choice; in Belgian varieties of Dutch (ia) is the form used (Electronic ANS: <http://ans.ruhosting.nl/e-ans/25/05/02/body.html>). We have nothing to say about this variation here.

- (i) a. Je moet meegaan ofwel *moet je* hier je werk afmaken.  
You must with go *ofwel* must you hier your job finish
- b. Je moet meegaan ofwel *je moet* hier je werk afmaken.  
You must with go *ofwel* you must here your job finish

<sup>16</sup> Either *ofwel* is merged in SpecFinP and moves to SpecForceP or, alternatively, it actually is merged in a TP internal position (cf. Larson 1986, Schwarz 1999 and Den Dikken 2006 on *either*).

- ofwel geef ik u een bon voor de totale som.  
 Either give I you a voucher for the total sum  
 ‘Either I give you an 80 per cent reduction for the total, or I give you a voucher for the total sum’  
 (CM, 01.09.2015)
- d.
   
Ofwel geef ik u 80 percent van de koopsom
   
either give I you 80 percent of the purchase sum
   
ofwel die geef ik u een bon voor de totale som.
   
Either DIE give I you a voucher for the total sum
   
‘Either I give you an 80 per cent reduction for the total, or I give you a voucher for the total sum’  
 (CM, 01.09.2015)

Our account correctly predicts that the conjunction *of* (‘or’), by hypothesis a head, cannot constitute the antecedent for pleonastic DIE: our corpus provides no attestations of the conjunction *of* (‘or’) as antecedent of pleonastic DIE and our informant CM, who accepts pleonastic DIE (40)c-d after *ofwel*, does not accept pleonastic DIE after *of* (‘or’) (41).

- (41)
   
Ofwel geef ik u 80 percent van de koopsom
   
either give I you 80 percent of the purchase sum
   
\*of die geef ik u een bon voor de totale som.
   
or DIE give I you a voucher for the total sum
   
‘Either I give you an 80 per cent reduction for the total, or I give you a voucher for the total sum’  
 (CM, 01.09.2015)

In the next section, we look a pattern where our prediction about the suitable antecedents for pleonastic DIE at first sight seems not to hold and we will refine our analysis of pleonastic DIE to capture the pattern.

## 7. Pleonastic die as a root declarative complementizer

### 7.1. A problem: V1, null operators and pleonastic DIE

As discussed, if the constituent immediately preceding pleonastic DIE merely serves to satisfy the Force V2 requirement, any constituent qualifying as the first constituent in a regular V2 pattern should qualify as ‘antecedent’ for pleonastic DIE. This prediction faces an empirical problem with respect to *yes/no* questions and imperatives.

It is well known that both *yes/no* questions and imperatives in Dutch display Verb first (V1) order. (42) contains two relevant examples:

- (42)
   
a. Komt Jan vanmiddag naar de vergadering?  
     comes Jan this afternoon to the meeting
   
b. Kom vanmiddag maar naar de vergadering!  
     come this afternoon PART to the meeting

The V1 order in *yes/no* questions and in imperatives is standardly considered compatible with the V2 nature of Dutch, on the hypothesis that a null operator in sentence-initial position satisfies the V2 condition. In line with our cartographic implementation sketched above and bearing in mind that the null operators would encode interrogative and imperative force respectively, we would propose that in the relevant examples the verb targets Force and that the null operator occupies the specifier of ForceP. We assume that the null operator transits via SpecFinP, giving rise to the bottleneck effect.

- (43)
   
a. [<sub>ForceP</sub> OP [<sub>Force</sub> Komt] [<sub>FinP</sub> ~~OP~~ [<sub>Fin</sub> ~~komt~~]  
     [<sub>TP</sub> Jan vanmiddag naar de vergadering ~~komt~~]]]?
   
b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> OP [<sub>Force</sub> Kom] [<sub>FinP</sub> ~~OP~~ [<sub>Fin</sub> ~~kom~~] [<sub>TP</sub>  $\emptyset$  vanmiddag naar de vergadering ~~kom~~]]]!

On this scenario, both in imperatives and in *yes/no* questions a null operator satisfies the ForceV2 constraint. All things being equal, then, pleonastic DIE should also be able to be inserted in *yes/no* questions and in imperatives, effectively leading to a pattern without an overt antecedent<sup>17</sup>. However, there are no attestations of such patterns: we have seen that pleonastic DIE requires an overt antecedent (Section 2). *Yes/no* questions and imperatives are incompatible with pleonastic DIE:

- (44) a. \*Die zou hij volgende week komen?  
 DIE would he next week come  
 b. \*Die bel Stef misschien eerst in verband met de onderzoeksdag.  
 DIE call Stef perhaps first in connection with the research day

The obvious problem with (44) is that pleonastic DIE is initial and lacks an overt antecedent, but recall that we assume that DIE instantiates Force and that the ‘antecedent requirement’ boils down to the Force V2 requirement. So, our account does not predict that (44) should be ungrammatical. The unacceptability of the data in (44) raises a question for the viability of our analysis, because it reveals that the null operator, while able to satisfy the V2 requirement on the finite verb in Force, is not able to satisfy the Force DIE 2 requirement. For completeness’ sake, note that even if a first constituent were to be added, as in (45), pleonastic DIE continues to be incompatible with *yes/no* questions or imperatives. We tested the following with our informant LdG, who was adamant that these were all unacceptable: (45a-d) illustrate *yes/no* questions, (45e) an imperative:

- (45) a. \*In de supermarkt die hebben ze (daar) shampoo?  
 in the supermarket DIE have they (there) shampoo  
 b. \*In Geneve die heb je (daar) ook aan de Universiteit gewerkt?  
 in Geneva DIE have you (there) also at the University worked  
 c. \*Vroeger die verkochten ze (tons) shampoo in de supermarkt?  
 before DIE sold they (then) shampoo in the supermarket  
 d. \*In de oorlog die hadden de mensen (dan/tons) nog groenten?  
 in the war DIE had the people (then/then) still vegetables  
 e. \*Als de les gedaan is die kom (dan) maar langs!  
 when the lesson finished is DIE come (then) PART along

However, bearing in mind our analysis, these data turn out not to be as surprising as all that. We analyze pleonastic DIE as a root complementizer: what the data in (44)-(45) show is that not all root clauses in the Ghent dialect admit the insertion of the root complementizer DIE. This is actually not unexpected; after all, the insertion of the complementizer encoding illocutionary force is sensitive to the features of Force. To give a straightforward example: in English *that* is selected for declaratives and *if* introduces interrogatives.

As a first stab, let us refine the analysis and propose that pleonastic DIE is a declarative root complementizer. It immediately follows that it will serve to introduce assertions and that it will be incompatible with non-declarative clauses such as *yes/no* questions and imperatives.<sup>18</sup>

A problem is of course the fact that pleonastic DIE is compatible with *wh*-questions as shown by the elicited data in (13) repeated in (46):

- (46) a. Wanneer die komt ze terug?  
 When DIE comes she back (1<sup>1</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)  
 b. A: Hier zijn de bloemen voor de boeketjes.  
 These are the flowers for the bouquets  
 B: Hoeveel die moet ik er gebruiken per boeket?  
 How many DIE must I there use per bouquet?  
 (1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)

<sup>17</sup> Thanks to Giuseppe Samo for bringing up this point.

<sup>18</sup> Thanks to Luc de Grauwe for very helpful discussion of these examples.

However, it is not insignificant that many speakers fail to accept these examples: only 5 out of 12 gave a score of 4 or 5. In addition, while pleonastic DIE introduces what amounts to a question, the questions concerned are constituent questions, i.e. questions presupposing the truth of the associated proposition: (46a) presupposes that ‘she is coming back’, (46b) is explicitly set in a context in which the speaker will be using the flowers. We speculate that the acceptability of pleonastic DIE in such examples is due precisely to the fact that the complement of the fronted *wh*-phrase is presupposed. Possibly, though this speculation requires further work, the insertion of pleonastic DIE in fact reinforces the presuppositional effect on the complement of the *wh*-phrase.<sup>19/20</sup>

## 7.2. Pleonastic DIE as a declarative complementizer: the *dat*/*die* alternation

If pleonastic DIE is inserted as a declarative complementizer in Force, the question arises why the complementizer takes the form *die* and why it is not possible to insert the declarative complementizer *dat*, the regular complementizer in the Ghent dialect, already illustrated in (15d) above.

Schematically the data are summarized in (47a); examples such as (47b) and (47c), with *dat* instead of DIE, are unattested and are judged unacceptable by our informants.

- (47) a. [ForceP [Force \**dat*/√DIE-] [FinP [Fin V<sub>fin PHI</sub>] [TP ...]]  
 b. \*Vroeger, dat bakten wij vier soorten brood.  
 before dat baked we four kinds bread  
 c. \*os ‘t nodig is, dat kunder u nog bij zetten  
 if it necessary is dat can-you you still with sit

An alternation between the formatives *dat* and *die* is not completely novel. We might in fact interpret the form *die* of the pleonastic element as an alternative realization of the declarative complementizer *dat* which is a byproduct of the proposed derivation of pleonastic DIE sentences. Schematically, this would mean that the underlying form of pleonastic DIE is the regular complementizer *dat* as represented in (48a), and that for some reason, which will be clarified below, this formative has to be converted to DIE.<sup>21</sup> We continue to assume that in (48a) the initial constituent in the pleonastic DIE sentence, here *morgen* (‘tomorrow’), first satisfies the V2 constraint on Fin and that it moves from

<sup>19</sup> This point needs to be further pursued. In particular we speculate that the clause typing effected by pleonastic DIE is like that which leads to Referential clauses in the sense of Haegeman and Ürogdi (2010a,b). However, for reasons of space we cannot elaborate this here.

<sup>20</sup> Consider the attested (i). Our own informant CM explicitly pointed out that she rejects this type of *die dat* sequences, so there is clearly variation across speakers.

- (i) Ik vind die da zaterdag te laat is  
 I find DIE that Saturday too late is  
 ‘I think Saturday is too late.’ (Vet, AS, 22.11.00 telephone conversation)

For speakers accepting (i) the position of *die* would be compatible with our proposal that pleonastic DIE spells out a declarative Force head. In the embedded clause, *die* precedes the regular (inflected) complementizer *da*: if we assume that the latter occupies Fin, then *die* could be in Force, where it would alternate with *of* (‘if’) for interrogatives:

- (ii) ik weet niet of da zaterdag te laat is.  
 I know not if that Saturday too late is

<sup>21</sup> There are of course other cases in which clauses introduced by *dat* can function as independent clauses: exclamatives such as (i) are a case in point. But in these patterns the finite verb remains in its TP internal position:

- (i) a. Dat hij dat heeft durven doen!  
 that he that has dared do  
 b. Gewerkt dat ze hebben.  
 worked that they have

In these examples the conditions for converting *dat* to *die* are not present.

SpecFinP to SpecForceP, leaving a copy in SpecFinP. Given this assumption and considering that copies correspond to traces in the earlier incarnation of our theoretical model, (48a) has the notational variant (48b), which instantiates a sequence of the complementizer *dat* followed by a trace. (48b) is then an instance of a violation of the *that*-trace filter (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977), arising through the movement of the constituent from SpecFinP to SpecForceP across the declarative complementizer *dat*.

- (48) a. \*<sub>[ForceP Morgen [<sub>Force</sub> dat] [<sub>FinP</sub> ~~morgen~~ [<sub>Fin</sub> komt] [<sub>TP</sub> hij terug ~~komt~~]</sub>  
 b. =\*<sub>[ForceP Morgen [<sub>Force</sub> dat] [<sub>FinP</sub> t [<sub>Fin</sub> komt] [<sub>TP</sub> hij terug t]</sub>

It is well known that some *that* trace violations are ‘repaired’ by a morphological change in the complementizer. One well known example of this type of morphological repair is illustrated by French (49): whereas direct object *que* (‘what’) can be successfully extracted across the complementizer *que* (‘that’) (49a), extraction of subject *qui* (‘who’) from its canonical position across the adjacent complementizer *que* leads to ungrammaticality: (49b) violates the *that*-trace filter. (49b) can be repaired by substituting the form *qui*, which has ‘nominal’ properties (Rizzi and Shlonsky 2006, 2007), for the regular complementizer *que* (49c).

- (49) a. Que<sub>i</sub> crois-tu que [<sub>TP</sub> Jean a fait t<sub>i</sub> ]?  
 what think-you that Jean has done  
 ‘What do you think (that) John did?’  
 b. \*Qui<sub>i</sub> crois-tu que [<sub>TP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> va partir]?  
 who think-you that will leave  
 c. Qui crois-tu qui [<sub>TP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> va partir]?  
 who think-you qui will leave  
 ‘Who do you think will leave?’

Just like replacing *que* by ‘nominal’ *qui* alleviates the *that* trace effect in French (49), replacing the formative *dat* by *die*, could then be taken to repair the *dat*- trace violation.

- (50) [<sub>ForceP</sub> Morgen [<sub>Force</sub> *dat* => DIE] [<sub>FinP</sub> ~~morgen~~ [<sub>Fin</sub> komt] [<sub>TP</sub> hij terug ~~komt~~]

(50) is a first tentative representation. Obviously, viewing the obligatory spell out of Force by DIE as a reflex of the *que/qui* alternation will require further work, in particular in relation to current views on the nature of the *que/qui* alternation (cf. Rizzi and Shlonsky 2006, 2007).<sup>22</sup>

### 7.3. Ellipsis and pleonastic DIE

One issue that we have not addressed concerns the motivation for the insertion of the root declarative complementizer DIE. Tentatively we have associated pleonastic DIE with a declarative value, but so far, the insertion of pleonastic DIE seems completely optional and does not add to the interpretation of the sentence, which is why we used the term ‘pleonastic’. This complete optionality is rather unexpected: true optionality runs counter to economy principles. However, an extension of the data suggests that pleonastic DIE may have some discourse related interpretive function.

(51) illustrates attestations of ellipsis of the complement of pleonastic DIE: the fact that a longer form of DIE is chosen can be related to the need to license the ellipsis. The elliptical patterns are quite common and they seem to be used by speakers to hold the floor while elaborating further their contribution to the conversation.

- (51) a. Ja, en mee tons soms al ne keer/ den een of den andere man  
 yes, and with then sometimes already once/ one man or the other

<sup>22</sup> Observe that while we do not attribute any specific interpretive property to the *dat*/DIE alternation here, it remains true that the rescue strategy summarized in (50) might be taken to add a nominal flavour to the neutral filler *dat* for Force. In future work we will explore to what extent the nominal nature of pleonastic DIE can be related to the referential status of the clause in the sense of Haegeman and Ürögdi (2010a,b).

- |    |                          |                                      |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|    | wat te geve dieje...     | (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus I: 33)   |
|    | something to give DIE-JE |                                      |
| b. | En tons die, die •••     | (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus III: 7)  |
|    | and then DIE DIE-JE      |                                      |
| c. | daarmee, die e...        | (Leemans 1966, Ghent Corpus II : 38) |
|    | therewith DIE-E          |                                      |

In addition, pleonastic DIE is also used in isolation, i.e. with ellipsis of both its complement and the ‘antecedent’. With respect to this isolated use, it has been noted (Luc De Grauwe p.c., also anecdotal observations by Liliane Haegeman) that speakers use the pattern as a conversational move with a purely phatic function. Luc De Grauwe (p.c., email) reports:

“bij ontmoetingen (met mezelf of in ruimer familieverband) viel soms een keertje een korte stilte in het gesprek/ de small talk. Dan had mijn tante de gewoonte, telkens als eerste die stilte te doorbreken door het uitspreken van het enkele woordje *dieë* (met langgerekte eerste lettergreep) - dit gewoon om het gesprek weer op gang te (laten) brengen, eventueel met een ander onderwerp.”

*Translation (kdc-lh)*

*in the course of meetings (with myself or in the larger family circle) it would happen that a sudden silence occurred in the conversation/small talk. Then my aunt had the habit to be the first to interrupt that silence by pronouncing the word *dieë* (with long first syllable) – with the sole purpose of getting the conversation going again (possibly on a different topic) (Luc De Grauwe, pc, 16.08.2017, email)*

If pleonastic DIE spells out a declarative root Force head, the use of the declarative complementizer DIE in isolation could be seen as a conversational move by which the speaker ‘declares’ his intention to speak by means of a minimal illocutionary act and thus takes and/or holds the floor. The use of pleonastic DIE would then be the overt encoding of the speaker’s commitment to a declarative speech act, be it as a way of taking the floor or continuing to hold the floor. Continuing to assume that the form *die* is a repair strategy to undo a *dat*-trace violation might be taken to imply that the isolated occurrence of DIE arises in a derivation in which a null constituent has moved to its left:

(52) [<sub>ForceP</sub> ~~XP~~ [<sub>Force</sub> *dat* => DIE] [<sub>FinP</sub> ~~XP~~ ]]

## 8. Summary: ForceV2 and pleonastic DIE

This paper discusses the use of the pleonastic particle DIE in the Ghent dialect. The particle is used in a V3 pattern in which the first constituent is an adverbial adjunct, followed by the particle DIE, followed by the finite verb.

Though, at first sight, pleonastic DIE could be taken to be a generalized counterpart to the fronted specialized resumptive adverbs *dan* (‘then’), *daar* (‘there’), etc. in the adverbial CLD pattern, and which are also available in the dialect under consideration, there are a number of arguments for not assimilating the two patterns. We propose that while the fronted specialized adverbs are phrasal operators moved to the left periphery, pleonastic DIE is a head directly merged in a left peripheral position.

In terms of the Poletto/Wolfe typology, the pleonastic DIE pattern in the Ghent dialect is argued to instantiate a variant of the Force V2 pattern: pleonastic DIE is inserted in Force, which requires an obligatory specifier to satisfy the ‘V2 condition’. Exotic though they might seem at first, the Ghent pleonastic DIE sentences are thus argued to be a twist on the Force V2 implementation.

It is proposed that pleonastic DIE is a root complementizer which is inserted in declarative clauses.

## References

- Astruc-Aguilera, Lluisa. 2005. The form and function of extra-sentential elements. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics 2*: 1–25.
- Benincà, Paola. 2004. The left periphery of Medieval Romance. *Studi linguistici e filologici online 2*: 243–297.
- Benincà, Paola. 2006. A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance. In *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics: Negation, tense and clausal architecture*, ed. Raffaella Zanuttini, 53–86. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Benincà, Paola. 2013. Caratteristiche del V2 romanzo. Lingue romanze antiche, Ladino Dolomitico e Portoghese. In *Introduzione alla linguistica del Mòcheno*, eds. Ermenegildo Bidese and Federica Cognola, 65–84. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier.
- Benincà, Paola and Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, focus, and V2. In *The structure of CP and IP*, ed. Luigi Rizzi, 52–75. Oxford and Boston: Oxford University Press.
- Biberauer Theresa and Ian Roberts. 2014. Rethinking formal hierarchies: A proposed unification. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics 7*: 1–35.
- Broekhuis, Hans and Norbert Corver. 2016. *Syntax of Dutch. Verbs and verb phrases*. Volume 3: Chapter 14: Main clause-external elements. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. <http://www.oopen.org/>.
- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. 1977. Filters and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry 8*: 425–504.
- Den Dikken, Marcel Den. 2006. Either float and the syntax of Co-ordination. *Natural language and Linguistic Theory 24*: 689–749.
- Dikken, Marcel Den. 2017. Contrasting Contrastive Left Dislocation explanations. *Linguistic Inquiry 48*: 543–584.
- Greco, Ciro & Liliane Haegeman. 2016. Frame setters and the macro variation of subject-Greco, Ciro and Liliane Haegeman. to appear. West Flemish V3 and the interaction of syntax and discourse. *Journal of comparative Germanic Linguistics*.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1996. Verb second, the split CP and null subjects in early Dutch finite clauses. *GenGenP* (<http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/001059>).
- Haegeman, Liliane and Barbara Ürögdi. 2010a. Referential CPs and DPs: an operator movement account. *Theoretical linguistics 36*: 111–152.
- Haegeman, Liliane and Barbara Ürögdi. 2010b. Operator movement, referentiality and intervention. *Theoretical linguistics 36*: 233–246.
- Hoe, van, Lieven. 1981. Enkele syntactische kenmerken van het dialect van Melle. Licentiate dissertation. Ghent University.
- Hoekstra, Eric. 1999. On D-pronouns and the movement of Topic features. *Folia Linguistica XXXIII*: 59–74.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2015. Verb second. In *Syntax. An international handbook of contemporary syntactic research*. 2nd edition, eds. Tibor Kiss and Artemis Alexiadou, 343–384. HSK Series. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Verlag.
- Koopman, Hilda. 2000. Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions, and particles. *The syntax of specifiers and heads*, 204–260. London: Routledge.
- Koopman, Hilda. 2010. The Dutch PP. In *Mapping spatial PPs: The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 6, eds. Guglielmo Cinque and Luigi Rizzi, 26–74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larson, Richard. 1985. On the Syntax of Disjunction Scope. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 3*, 217–264
- Leemans, Emilienne. 1966. Syntactische kenmerken van het Gents dialect. Licentiate dissertation. Ghent University.
- Noonan, Maire. 2017. Dutch and German R-pronouns and P-stranding. In *The structure of words at the interfaces*, eds. Heather Newell, Maire Noonan, Glyne Piggott, and Lisa deMena Travis. New York: OUP.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2013. On V2 types. In *The Bloomsbury companion to syntax*, eds. Sylvia Luraghi and Claudia Parodi, 154–164. London: Bloomsbury.

- Riemsdijk, Henk van. 1987. *A Case study in syntactic Markedness: the Binding Nature of Prepositional Phrases*. Foris Publications, Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, Ian. 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In *The cartography of syntactic structures*, volume 3, ed. Luigi Rizzi, 297-327. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rullman, Hotze and Jan-Wouter Zwart. 1996. On Saying *dat*. In *Progress in Linguistics*, eds. R. Jonkes, E. Kaan and A. Wiegel, 249-259. The Hague: Mouton.
- Salvesen, Christine Meklenborg. 2016. Resumptive particles and Verb Second. Manuscript. UiO.
- Vanacker, Valère F. 1980. Een Vlaams adverbiaal steuntje. In *Liber Amicorum Weijnen, Een bundel opstellen aan Prof. dr. A. Weijnen bij zijn zeventigste verjaardag*, eds. J. Kruijssen, 73-78. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Vries, Mark de. 2009. The left and right periphery in Dutch. *The Linguistic Review* 26, 291-327.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2016. On the left periphery of V2 languages. *Selected papers from the 41st Incontro di Grammatica Generativa. Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 38: 287-310.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1997. *Morphosyntax of verb movement. A Minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.