

The syntax of long A-bar chains: microcomparative evidence from Dutch

Eefje Boef, ZAS Berlin

boef@zas.gwz-berlin.de

Building and improving on a proposal by Barbiers et al. (2009) on doubling in long root *wh*-questions (*wh*-Qs) in Dutch, this talk proposes a unified analysis of pronoun doubling in Dutch long A-bar dependencies on the basis of new empirical data on doubling in long relative clauses (RCs), cf. Boef (forthcoming). The grammatical and ungrammatical doubling patterns to be accounted for are given in (1a) for *wh*-Qs that question a person *wie* ‘who’, and in (1b) for RCs with the non-neuter human RC head *man* ‘man’.

- (1) a. <***die/wie/wat**> denk je <**die/wie/?*wat**> het gedaan heeft?
REL.PR./who/what think you REL.PR./who/what it done has
‘Who do you think has done it?’
- b. de man <**die/wie/?*wat**> ik denk <**die/wie/?*wat**> het gedaan heeft
the man REL.PR./who/what I think REL.PR./who/what it done has
‘the man who I think has done it’ [colloquial Dutch]

I take all long A-bar dependencies to be derived by successive-cyclic movement via SpecCP of (part of) the interrogative/relative pronoun (A-bar pronoun). I propose that the internal structure of A-bar pronouns includes an operator that is located in the specifier of the pronoun. When an A-bar pronoun in a long A-bar dependency has reached the embedded CP domain, two possibilities emerge: either the whole pronoun (containing the operator that triggers movement) moves up (*pied piping*), or only the operator itself moves up (*subextraction*) – the pronoun and the operator in its specifier being *equally local* to the probe for operator movement in the higher CP. The former scenario results either in spell out of only the highest copy of the pronoun (2a), or in spell out of the highest copy *and* the intermediate copy of the pronoun in the embedded SpecCP (2b), cf. Nunes (2004). The latter scenario results in spell out of the operator (i.e. the operator becomes PF visible when extracted), as well as spell out of the pronoun from which it extracted (2c), for recoverability reasons. By spelling out the pronoun from which the operator extracted, a violation of the *Condition on Extraction Domain* (Huang 1982) is circumvented. This particular means to salvage an otherwise illicit step in the derivation, I call *rescue by PF spell out* – the logical counterpart of *rescue by PF deletion* (Bošković 2011).

- (2) a. [_{CP} **pronoun**₁ ... [_{CP} ~~pronoun~~_T ... ~~pronoun~~_T ...]] no doubling
b. [_{CP} **pronoun**₁ ... [_{CP} **pronoun**₁ ... ~~pronoun~~_T ...]] identical doubling
c. [_{CP} **operator**₁ ... [_{CP} **pronoun**₁ ... ~~pronoun~~_T ...]] non-identical doubling

The subextracted operator is spelled out as *wat* – *wat* being the most underspecified A-bar pronoun in Dutch (cf. Postma 1994 a.o.). The pronoun in the left periphery of the lower clause is spelled out as *wie* or *die*. Assuming a late insertion model of morphology, these pronouns are shown to be equally suited to spell out a structure that contains an operator and (at least) a [human] feature. This explains their interchangeability in (1). The ungrammatical doubling patterns in (1) are explained in terms of a violation of the *Inclusiveness Condition* (Chomsky 1995:228): to derive these patterns structure and features would have to be added during the course of the derivation (cf. Barbiers et al. 2009).

I show that the analysis can successfully be extended to account for different patterns of doubling involving complex *wh*-phrases (3a) and PPs (3b), in part by adopting the notion of *concord* (cf. Den Dikken 2009): the subextracted operator may share some features with the phrase it extracts from (a [human] feature in (3)), as a result of which it may surface as a form different from *wat* (*wie* in (3)).

- (3) a. <**wat/wie**> denk je **welke jongen** het gedaan heeft?
what/who think you which boy it done has
‘Which boy do you think has done it?’
- b. <**wat/wie**> denk je **op wie** hij verliefd is?
what/who think you on who he in love is
‘Who do you think he is in love with?’ [colloquial Dutch]

Barbiers, Sjef, Olaf Koenenman, and Marika Lekakou. 2009. Syntactic doubling and the structure of *wh*-chains. *Journal of Linguistics* 45:1–46.

Boef, Eefje. forthcoming. Doubling in relative clauses. Aspects of morphosyntactic microvariation in Dutch. Doctoral Dissertation, Meertens Instituut (KNAW)/Utrecht University.

Bošković, Željko. 2011. Rescue by PF Deletion, Traces as (Non)interveners, and the *That*-Trace Effect. *LI* 42:1–44.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

den Dikken, Marcel. 2009. On the nature and distribution of successive cyclicity. Adjunction, resumption, and scope marking as the roads to success in long-distance relation building. Ms., CUNY Graduate Center.

Huang, C.-T. James. 1982. Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*. LI Monographs 43. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Postma, Gertjan. 1994. The indefinite reading of WH. In *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1994*, ed. Reineke Bok-Bennema and Crit Cremers, 187–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.