



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

One Probe - Two Goals: Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects

Koppen, M. van

Citation

Koppen, M. van. (2005, April 13). *One Probe - Two Goals: Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects*. LOT dissertation series. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/2712>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/2712>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

**One Probe - Two Goals:
Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects**

Published by
LOT
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6006
fax: +31 30 253 6000
e-mail: lot@let.uu.nl
<http://www.lot.let.uu.nl/>

Cover illustration: railway bridge 'de hef' in Rotterdam – picture by
Marjo van Koppen

ISBN 90-76864-75-6

NUR 632

Copyright © 2005: Marjo van Koppen. All rights reserved.

**One Probe - Two Goals:
Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects**

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Dr. D.D. Breimer,
hoogleraar in de faculteit der Wiskunde en
Natuurwetenschappen en die der Geneeskunde,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op woensdag 13 april 2005
klokke 16:15 uur

door

Johanna Maria van Koppen

geboren te Rotterdam

in 1976

Promotiecommissie

promotor: prof. dr. J.E.C.V. Rooryck
co-promotor: dr. L.C.J. Barbiers (Meertensinstituut Amsterdam)
referent: prof. dr. J.D. Bobaljik (University of Connecticut)
overige leden: prof. dr. H.J. Bennis (Meertensinstituut Amsterdam)
prof. dr. L.L. Cheng
dr. C.L.J.M. Cremers
dr. Y.A.O. d'Hulst

Voor Peter, Nel en Huib van Koppen

Acknowledgements

The doctoral regulations of the University of Leiden prohibit me to thank those people that deserve my gratitude most.

During my time as a PhD-student, I have been lucky enough to have been surrounded by wonderful colleagues. The University of Leiden Centre for Linguistics (ULCL) has been a very stimulating working environment. I would like to thank all members of ULCL for creating such a splendid setting. Furthermore, I would like to thank my colleagues at the Meertens Institute in Amsterdam for the interesting time and the cosy coffee breaks and lunches. It has been a great experience to be part of this institute. Finally, my PhD-project was closely related to the SAND-project (Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects). I am grateful that I have been able to participate in this impressive undertaking. I would like to thank all members of the SAND-project: it has been a real pleasure to work with you.

The research for this thesis has benefited incredibly from discussion with fellow linguists over the years. In particular, I would like to thank: Peter Ackema, Boban Arsenijevic, Johan van der Auwera, Sjef Barbiers, Josef Bayer, Hans Bennis, Bert Botma, Reina Boerrigter, Boudewijn van den Berg, Hans den Besten, Jonathan Bobaljik, Hans Broekhuis, Denis Bouchard, Liesbeth de Clerck, Lisa Cheng, Crit Cremers, Leonie Cornips, Norbert Corver, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, Federico Damonte, Magda DeVos, Marcel den Dikken, Jenny Doetjes, Nourredine Elouazizi, Thea Gagnidze, Véronique van Gelderen, Ton Goeman, Dafna Graf, Stella Grillia, Liliane Haegeman, Margreet van der Ham, Irene Haslinger, Vincent van Heuven, Frans Hinskens, Eric Hoekstra, Jarich Hoekstra, Anders Holmberg, Yves d'Hulst, Rini Huybrechts, Aniek Ijbema, Mathilde Jansen, Willy Jongenburger, Richard Kayne, Susanne van der Kleij, Nancy Kula, Stephen Laker, Claartje Levelt, Boya Li, Anikó Lipták, Alies Maclean, Lutz Marten, Ineke van der Meulen, Maarten Mous, Ad Neeleman, Annemie Neuckermans, Jan Nijen Twilhaar, Jairo Nuñez, Marc van Oostendorp, Gertjan Postma, Hilke Reckmann, Chris Reintges, Milan Rezac, San-Jik Rhee, Kristina Riedel, Henk van Riemsdijk, Esterella de Roo, Johan Rooryck, Grazyna Rowicka, Martin Salzmann, Eric Schoorlemmer, Joanna Sio, Rint Sybesma, Erik-Jan van der Torre, Marina Tzakosta, Luis Vicente, Leendert de Vink, Mario van de Visser, Gunther de Vogelaer, Mark de Vos, Mark de Vries, Jeroen van de Weijer, Helmut Weiss, Frank Wijnen, Henk Wolf, Ton van der Wouden, Wim van der Wurff, Susi Wurmbrand, Hedde Zeijlstra, Malte Zimmermann and Jan-Wouter Zwart. Furthermore, I would like to thank the organizers and audiences of the following workshops and conferences for their input: the Lisbon Workshop on Agreement July 10-11, 2003 at the Universidade Nova de Lisboa; CGSW 18 September 18-20, 2003 at the University of Durham; Trans Syntax Seminar March 10, 2004 at the University of Utrecht – UiL-OTS; the Copy Workshop on the PF-

side December, 14-15 2004 at the University of Utrecht. Finally, I would like to thank José Birker, Gea Hakker, Jan-Pieter Kunst, Boudewijn van den Berg, Keetje van den Heuvel and last but certainly not least Margreet van der Ham for their help with many practical issues.

I would like to mention Jan Kooij here separately. Sadly, Jan died in the fall of 2004. He has been a very inspiring teacher and colleague. Like all members of ULCL, I miss his presence deeply.

Important input for this dissertation came from native speakers of the languages and dialects I discuss in this thesis. I would like to thank the following people for providing and/or collecting data: Nouredine Elouazizi and Hilke Reckman (Arabic), Sjef Barbiere, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, Marcello Jansen and Johan Rooryck (Dutch), Josef Bayer and Helmut Weiss (Bavarian), Liliane Haegeman (Lapscheure Dutch), Peter Vermeulen (De Panne Dutch), Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, Elcke van Craenenbroeck and Jef van Craenenbroeck (Wambeek Dutch), Crit Cremers, dhr. Hovens and dhr. Wijnen (Tegelen Dutch), Frans Hinskens (Waubach Dutch), Brian O’Curnáin (Irish), Edit Doron and Dafna Graf (Modern Hebrew), Eric Hoekstra, Henk Wolf, Ger de Haan, Jarich Hoekstra, Willem de Visser, Sybren Dyk, Wieteke Dykman and Arjan Hut (Frisian), dhr. Verdijseldonck (Astén Dutch), Jan Nijen Twilhaar (Hellendoorn Dutch), Anders Holmberg, Hannu Reime and Elsi Kaiser (Finnish), Gunther de Vogelaer (Nieuwkerken-Waas Dutch), Vicky van den Heede (Waregem Dutch), Lutz Marten (Swahili).

Finally, there are several people that I would like to mention separately because of the special place they have in my life:

During my time as a PhD-student, some of my colleagues have become friends: Aniek Ijbema, Véronique van Gelderen and Irene Haslinger. I would like to thank you for your support and I hope we will enjoy each other’s company in the years to come.

Jeroen van Craenenbroeck has played an important role in my life as a PhD-student. I have benefited immensely from our cooperation. Jeroen, you are not only a wonderful friend and travelling companion, you are and will always be one of my favourite linguists.

Susanne van der Kleij. We took our first steps in theoretical syntax together. We have been very close friends ever since and I hope we will be for a very long time. Thank you for your friendship.

Dagmara Wilschut. I have the feeling I have known you all my life. I know it is not easy when (one of) your best friend(s) is writing a PhD-thesis. However, I could not have done it without your encouragement...thank you.

Marcello, I cannot imagine life without you. Thank you for everything.

Finally, I thank my family. Unfortunately, my grandparents are not here to share this with me, but I am sure they keep an eye on me from heaven. Henny Marcus-Oprel, you are a true substitute grandmother, I am blessed to have met you. Tante Wil, thank you for your love and support.

I dedicate this book to the most important people in the world: my parents, Peter and Nel van Koppen, and my brother, Huib van Koppen.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	v
Abbreviations	xi
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Theoretical Background	
1. Introduction.....	11
2. The framework.....	11
2.1 Agreement in Syntax.....	13
2.2 Agreement in Morphology.....	15
3. The topic of this thesis: One Probe – two Goals	19
3.1 The syntactic part of the derivation.....	19
3.2. The morphological part of the derivation.....	22
4. Summary.....	26
Chapter 2 Agreement with Coordinated Subjects	
1. Introduction.....	27
2. Prerequisite: the analysis of Complementizer Agreement	32
2.1 Complementizer Agreement: an overview.....	32
2.2 Complementizer Agreement: analysis	33
2.3 The defectivity of Complementizer Agreement paradigms	35
3. CA with coordinated subjects: two Goals for one Probe	38
3.1 FCA on the complementizer: Tegelen Dutch.....	40
3.2 Either FCA or FA on the complementizer: Bavarian.....	43

3.3	Full Agreement on the complementizer: Lapscheure Dutch	48
3.3.1	Introduction	48
3.3.2	The Complementizer Agreement paradigm of Lapscheure Dutch	51
3.3.2.1	The first possibility: the <i>t</i> -element is not an affix	51
3.3.2.2	The second possibility: the <i>t</i> -element is an elsewhere-affix.....	57
3.3.3	Analysis of FA in Lapscheure Dutch.....	60
3.4	FCA on the complementizer: Waubach Dutch.....	63
3.5	Predictions of the analysis.....	67
3.5.1	Second Conjunct Agreement	68
3.5.2	Agreement with the specifier of the first conjunct.....	69
3.5.3	Modification of the coordinated subject	70
3.6	Summary	74
4.	Verbal agreement with coordinated subjects: one Probe, one Goal?	77
4.1	The absence of FCA on the finite verb: a paradox.....	79
4.2	The solution	81
4.2.1	Move = Agree + Merge	83
4.2.2	Specifier-Head agreement	86
4.2.3	Inaccessible copies	88
4.2.4	Summary	93
4.3	The absence of FCA on the verb: inaccessible copies	94
4.4	Predictions of the analysis.....	95
4.4.1	First conjunct agreement in Irish and standard Arabic	96
4.4.2	Subject extraction in Tegelen Dutch and Lapscheure Dutch.....	101
4.4.3	Subject extraction in Bavarian.....	104
4.5	Summary	105

Chapter 3 Agreement with Pronouns

1.	Introduction.....	107
2.	The internal structure of pronouns	112
2.1.	Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002)	112
2.2	Harley & Ritter (2002).....	116

2.3	The internal structure of Dutch pronouns	117
3.	CA with internally complex pronouns: two Goals for one Probe	120
3.1	Introduction.....	120
3.2	Hellendoorn Dutch.....	126
3.2.1	Double Agreement in Hellendoorn Dutch.....	126
3.2.2	The agreement paradigm of Hellendoorn Dutch	128
3.2.3	Double Agreement in Hellendoorn Dutch: analysis	132
3.2.3.1	Complementizer Agreement in Hellendoorn Dutch.....	133
3.2.3.2	Verbal agreement in SVO- and CSOV-clauses in Hellendoorn Dutch.....	134
3.2.4	Summary	136
3.3	Bavarian and Tegelen Dutch.....	137
3.3.1	Introduction	137
3.3.2	Complementizer Agreement.....	137
3.3.3	Agreement on the finite verb in SVO- and CSOV-clauses.....	140
3.4	Two types of Complementizer Agreement: predictions of the analysis.....	141
3.4.1	Modification of the subject.....	141
3.4.2	Subject extraction	144
3.5	Summary	146
4.	One Probe – Three Goals: FCA in Hellendoorn Dutch.....	148
4.1	One Probe, three Goals	148
4.2	FCA in Hellendoorn Dutch	150
5.	Two Probes – Three Goals: verbal agreement in the VSO-word order.....	152
5.1	Introduction: Agreement on the finite verb in VSO-sentences	154
5.2	Agreement with Goal 1	157
5.2.1	Agreement with coordinated subjects in Bavarian	158
5.2.2	Agreement with coordinated subjects in Lapscheure Dutch.....	160
5.2.3	Agreement with pronouns in Tegelen Dutch.....	161
5.3	Agreement with Goal 2.....	163
5.3.1	Agreement with internally complex pronouns in Hellendoorn Dutch.....	163
5.3.2	Agreement with coordinated subjects in Hellendoorn Dutch	165
6	Summary.....	168

Chapter 4 Previous Analyses of CA, DA and FCA

1.	Introduction.....	171
2.	Complementizer Agreement	171
2.1	Introduction.....	171
2.2	The T ^o -to-C ^o -movement analysis of CA.....	173
2.3	Ackema & Neeleman (to appear).....	175
2.3.1	CA: the analysis of Ackema & Neeleman (to appear).....	175
2.3.2	Arguments in favour of A&N's approach to CA.....	175
2.3.3	A&N's arguments against an Agree-based account of CA	178
2.3.4	A counterargument to a linear order approach of CA: modification ...	180
3.	Double Agreement	181
3.1	Introduction.....	181
3.2	Zwart (1993, 1997, 2001)	182
3.3	Ackema & Neeleman (to appear).....	185
4.	First Conjunct Agreement.....	187
4.1	Introduction.....	187
4.2	Van Koppen (to appear).....	187
4.3	Ackema & Neeleman (to appear).....	188
4.4	Johannessen (1998).....	190
4.4.1	The analysis of Johannessen (1998)	190
4.4.2	Swahili: a language with both FCA and SCA	192
4.4.3	FCA in Dutch dialects	194

Chapter 5 Conclusion and Avenues for Future Research

1.	Conclusion	195
2.	Avenues for future research	198
2.1	Agreement with coordinated subjects	198
2.1.1	First Conjunct Clitic Doubling	198
2.1.2	Second, Closest and Furthest conjunct agreement.....	199
2.2	One Probe – two Goals, a case study: agreement in Tsez.....	201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ix

2.3	Context-Sensitive Agreement languages: Bejar 2003	205
2.4	Agreement with Possessors	207
	References	211
	Language Index	223
	Samenvatting in het Nederlands	225
	Curriculum Vitae	231

Abbreviations

Probe	element with unvalued features
Goal	element with valued features
CA	Complementizer Agreement
FCA	First Conjunct Agreement: agreement with the first conjunct of a coordinated phrase
FA	Full Agreement: agreement with the coordinated phrase as a whole
DA	Double Agreement: agreement morphology on the finite verb differs according to the position of the finite verb
SpeechPart	feature bundle denoting the role of the speech participant
phi-features	person and number features
1P	first person
2P	second person
3P	third person
SG	singular
PL	plural
F	feminine
M	masculine
N	neuter
<i>u</i> phi	unvalued phi-features
<i>i</i> phi	valued phi-features
<i>u</i> F	unvalued features
<i>i</i> F	valued features
CL	clitic pronoun
STRONG	strong pronoun
PART	Particle
DAT	dative
EXPL	expletive
FocPart	Focus particle

