



**HAL**  
open science

# A generalized resumptive in the Ghent variety of East Flemish?

Karen De Clercq, Liliane Haegeman

► **To cite this version:**

Karen De Clercq, Liliane Haegeman. A generalized resumptive in the Ghent variety of East Flemish?. Adverbial resumption in verb second languages, In press, 9780197651155. hal-03482082v2

**HAL Id: hal-03482082**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03482082v2>**

Submitted on 21 Dec 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

#### 4. A generalized resumptive in the Ghent variety of East Flemish?<sup>1</sup>

Karen De Clercq (CNRS/LLF/ Université de Paris) and Liliane Haegeman (Ghent University)

##### 1. Focus of the chapter

The empirical focus of our chapter is (1a) from the East Flemish variety of the Ghent area<sup>1</sup>, in which the finite verb of a root clause is preceded by two constituents: (i) an initial temporal adjunct *volgende vrijdag* ('next Friday') followed by what looks like the distal demonstrative *die* ('that'). The analogue of (1a), (1b) is ungrammatical in Standard Dutch (StD) as well as in its other Dutch and Flemish varieties.

- (1) a. Volgende vrijdag **die** komt ze terug.  
*next Friday die comes she back*  
'Next Friday she'll be back.'
- b. \*Volgende vrijdag **die** komt ze terug.  
*next Friday die comes she back*

At first sight, one might assimilate (1a) to the specialized adverbial resumption pattern (1c) (as proposed in Zwart 1997: 249-50), with the only difference being that *die* would then be an invariant generalized resumptive (in the sense of Meklenborg 2020a, cf. the introduction to this volume). However, it will be argued that the superficial similarity between (1a) and (1c) is misleading and that (1a) is better treated as a variant of the V2 configuration (1d).

- (1) c. Volgende vrijdag **dan** komt ze terug.

---

<sup>1</sup> Will appear in *Adverbial Resumption in Verb Second Languages* (OUP, 2023)

- |    |                    |                  |                  |             |
|----|--------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|
|    | 1                  | 2                | 3                |             |
|    | <i>next Friday</i> | dan              | <i>comes she</i> | <i>back</i> |
| d. | Volgende vrijdag   | komt             | ze               | terug.      |
|    | 1                  | 2                |                  |             |
|    | <i>next Friday</i> | <i>comes she</i> | <i>back</i>      |             |

The discussion is based on two transcribed recordings dating from the 1960s (Leemans 1966; Van Hoe 1981), supplemented with anecdotally collected data, on elicitation by means of a questionnaire and on consultation of native speakers.

The study of (1a) is relevant for a better understanding of V3 resumption patterns and of the V2 phenomenon in more general terms. With respect to resumption, the data discussed and the account proposed here also leads to the conclusion that the label ‘resumption’ may be a misnomer to designate the Ghent pattern in that, as formulated below, unlike temporal adverbs our analysis does not attribute any resumptive role to *die*: the element does not function as a placeholder or a proform for the constituent to its left, nor does it ‘duplicate’ the features of that constituent. However, this point is obviously related to the overarching issue of the definition of the theoretical concept of ‘resumption’. With respect to the study of V2, our discussion offers further evidence that not all linearly V3 patterns have the same underlying structure.

## 2. Background: Standard Dutch V3 resumption

### 2.1 Specialized resumption

In the literature (a.o. Zwart 1997, 2005a; Hoekstra 1999; Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1134), StD specialized adverbial resumption (1c) has been analysed as the adverbial counterpart of contrastive left dislocation illustrated in StD (2) and for the Ghent variety in (3). In this

linearly V3 configuration, an initial constituent corresponding to an argument of the host clause is resumed by a matching pronominal element, which replicates some of the features of the initial constituent and which functions as a placeholder or proform for the constituent to its left: in the a-examples, the resumptive is a demonstrative pronoun, in the b-examples, it is the R-pronoun *daar*.

(2) a. Maar Jan, **die** heeft al wat meegemaakt.  
*but Jan die has already something experienced*  
 ‘but many things have already happened to Jan.’

b. Over examens, **daar** spreken wij niet **over** in de les.  
*about exams, there talk we not about in the class*  
 ‘Exams, we do not talk about them in class.’

(3) 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, Melle, II, 59)

b. Van exåmes, **daar** spreke wij nie **van** in de lesse.  
*of exams, there talk we not of in the class*  
 ‘Exams, we do not talk about them in class.’

These argumental dislocation patterns can be viewed as a case of so-called specialized resumption because the resumptive element matches the initial constituent. For instance, in (3a), the demonstrative *den dienen* (lit. ‘the that’) is masculine singular and matches the initial DP *Potter*.

Following a seminal hypothesis in Koster (1978) as later elaborated in a.o. Broekhuis and Corver (2016: 1679-1733) and Zwart (2005a), we assume that in CLD patterns the initial constituent is ‘main clause-external’ and that the resumptive is merged TP-internally and moves to the left periphery where it satisfies the V2 constraint. In this view, specialized V3 resumption can be viewed as compatible with the V2 constraint because the initial XP, being extra-cyclic, does not ‘count’:

(4) XP [CP *dan/die/daar* V<sub>fin</sub> [TP subject ...

1      2

In the literature, there is a consensus that the initial constituent XP in specialized V3 resumption (2)-(3) has a topical/discourse-given interpretation (Koster 1978; Zwart 1997: 249-50; Hoekstra 1999).

As discussed in the introduction to this volume (see section 3.3), both the hypothesis that XP in (4) is clause-external and the hypothesis that it is topical lead to the correct prediction that quantificational elements such as negative constituents (5) or *wh*-constituents (6) are not acceptable as initial constituents (‘XP’) in the resumptive patterns, whether the XP is associated with an argument function (5/6a) or is an adjunct (5/6b).

(5) a. \*Niemand **die** heeft ze gegroet.  
*no one die has she greeted*

(Hoekstra (1999: 66); Broekhuis and Corver (2016: 733, (260b), 1458, 1697, (49b)).

b. \*Nergens **daar** verkopen ze nog kleine notebroodjes.<sup>2</sup>  
*nowhere there sell they PART small nut rolls*

(6) a. \*Wie **die** ga je dan uitnodigen?

*who die go you then invite*

(Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1699, (54b))

b. \*In welke periode **toen** woonde zij in Geneve?

*in which period then lived she in Geneva*

Neither of these restrictions applies to the initial constituent in a regular V2 configuration in which the initial constituent may be focal and in which quantificational constituents are licit (see introduction section 3.3, examples (32), (33)).

## 2.2 Generalised resumptives

The Ghent variety of Dutch deploys invariant *die* to resume a range of adjuncts including temporal adjuncts (7a), conditional adjuncts (7b), locatives (7c), goal adjuncts (7d), causal adjuncts (7e), result adjuncts (7f).

(7) 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. Os ‘t nodig is, **die** kunder u nog bij zetten.

*if it necessary is die can you PART with sit*

‘If it’s necessary, you can still come and sit with us.’

(Evergem, I. 200) (Vanacker 1980: 76)

c. Bij Arsène **die** hebben ze zo niet vele waar.

*with Arsène die have they so not much PART*

‘At Arsène’s, they don’t have so many of these, do they’?

(Leemans Ghent Corpus I: 30, 23)

- d. Voor ulder hout te klieven  
*for their wood to cleave*  
**die** (h)adde(n) ze (h)ulder kliefmēs.  
*die had they their cleave.knife*

‘To cleave the wood they used their cleaving knife.’

(Oostakker.I.202; Vanacker 1980:76)

- e. Doordat er iets verkeerd gelopen is  
*because there something wrong went*  
**die** is die beschrijving verloren gegaan.  
*die is that description lost gone*

‘Because something went wrong, the description has been lost.’

(FM, 09.12.2009)

- f. 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)

As discussed in the introduction to this volume (section 3.1.2), an initial hypothesis might be that Ghent *die* be viewed as an instantiation of a generalized resumptive. Indeed, like the Scandinavian generalized resumptive *så*, the element *die* can co-occur with a specialized resumptive (*dan/daar*).<sup>3</sup>

- (8) 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, BV, August 2017)
- 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 III: 7)

The co-occurrence of the specialized resumptive with *die*<sup>4</sup> provides conclusive evidence that *die* is not itself a variant realization of the specialized resumptive and it shows that the two must be assigned distinct syntactic positions. As also pointed out in section 1, patterns such as those in (8) raise the question to what extent invariant *die* has a resumptive function at all, since it is at least intuitively clear that the initial constituent is ‘resumed’ by the specialized resumptive in these cases. In what follows, we will show in more detail how *die* differs from the specialized resumptive.

### 3. The syntax of *die* patterns in the Ghent variety

Before discussing invariant adverbial *die*, section 3.1 introduces the argumental resumption pattern illustrated in (3) for the Ghent variety. We then discuss specialized adverbial resumption in section 3.2. In section 3.3 we embark upon a comparison of specialized resumption and invariant adverbial *die*.



### 3.1 Argumental resumption in the Ghent variety: specialized vs. generalized

It turns out that in the case of argumental resumption, the Ghent variety deploys both a specialized and a generalized strategy: the pattern of argumental resumption in which the resumptive matches the initial constituent in terms of gender and number can be considered a case of specialized resumption; on the other hand, when the initial argument is followed by invariant *die* the pattern can be considered a case of generalized resumption. We discuss both patterns briefly here.

(9a) illustrates a pattern of specialized resumption: the initial constituent is resumed by the demonstrative *den dienen* ('the that'), which is composed of the definite article and the demonstrative, both of which inflected for masculine gender (differing in form both in terms of the definite article (*de* vs. *den*) and the demonstrative (*die* vs. *dienen*)). The form used for the resumptive function can be used in the absence of an initial constituent (9b), in which case it patterns with demonstratives.

(9) 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, Melle, II: 59)

b. Maar **den dienen** is al wa te(g)engekomen ze.  
*but the die-INFL is already something across come PART*  
'Things have already happened to him, you know'.

We assume that (9a) is equivalent to StD CLD and that the initial nominal is main clause-external. Like in StD, see (5)-(6), specialized argumental resumption (using a determiner and

a demonstrative) is incompatible with a bare quantified nominal (10a, b) or with a *wh*-phrase (10c):

(10) a. \*Niemand **den dienen** komt daar naartoe.

*no.one the dienen comes there to*

‘No one goes to the other animals [in the zoo]’

(CM, 26.05.2009)

b. \*Geen eenen student **den dienen** heb ik daar gezien.

*not one student the dienen have I there seen*

(LdG, 28.11.2018)

c. \*Wie **de die** wilt ge dan allemaal inviteren?

*who the die want you then all invite*

As before, the unavailability of a quantificational first constituent follows if the constituent to the left of the specialized resumptive *den dienen* is topical, because quantifiers are known to be incompatible with topic status (cf. Rizzi 1997). The restriction also follows if the initial constituent is main clause-external (Koster 1978; Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1133-1134; Zwart 2005a): a clause-external position will prevent the initial constituent from taking clause-internal scope (Haegeman and Greco 2018; Greco and Haegeman 2020, this volume).

As an alternative to the specialized resumptive, the Ghent variety deploys an invariant short form *die* with no matching for number and/or gender (11).<sup>5</sup> To the extent that the matching condition does not apply to those examples one might consider (11) to illustrate generalized argumental resumption.

(11) a. 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, Ghent, I: 3)

b.    *dat geld die gingd’ in een dink*

*that money die went into a thing*

‘the money went into a thing’                    (Leemans, Ghent, II: 8)

c.    *Speltbrood die koop ik enkel in het weekend.*

*spelt bread die buy I only at the weekend*

‘I only buy spelt bread at the weekend.’

(CM, 14.9.2015)

Argumental resumption with invariant *die* in (11) differs from the specialized variant in (9) in that it is compatible with a bare quantified nominal (12a,b) as well as with a *wh*-phrase (12c,d) as initial constituent. This entails that the constituent preceding invariant *die* is **not** necessarily topical, quantifiers being incompatible with topic status, and that the constituent preceding generalized resumptive *die* is **not** main clause-external, because the clause-external position would prevent the constituent from taking clausal scope.

(12) a.    *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, Corpus Melle, I: 5)

b.    *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)
- c. Geen eenen student **die** heb ik daar gezien. (LdG, 28.11.2018)  
*not one student die have I there seen*
- d. A: Hier zijn de bloemen voor de boeketjes.  
*these are the flowers for the bouquets*  
 ‘Here are the flowers for the bouquets.’  
 B: Hoeveel **die** moet ik er gebruiken per boeket?  
*how many die must I there use per bouquet?*  
 ‘How many should I use per bouquet?’
- e. A: ‘t is mijn verjaardag. Ik wil een feestje geven.  
*it's my birthday. I want a party give*  
 ‘It’s my birthday. I want to throw a party.’  
 B: Wie **die** wilt ge dan allemaal inviteren?<sup>6</sup>  
*who die want you then all invite (1<sup>0</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)*  
 ‘Who do you want to invite?’

We will not pursue the argumental resumption pattern here. In the remainder of the chapter we focus on adverbial resumption, though occasional comparisons with argumental resumption will be made.

### 3.2 Specialized adverbial resumption in the Ghent variety

In addition to adverbial resumption with invariant *die*, the Ghent variety instantiates specialized adverbial resumption, in which the resumptive constituent is an adverbial proform for the constituent to its left : it reduplicates some of the features of the initial constituent and, as suggested by our parentheses in (13), it can be used independently without a resumptive

function. The matching between the resumptive element and the initial constituent is illustrated in (13): *daar* is used for locatives, while *tons* ('then') and *dan* ('then') are used for temporals.

(13) a. (In ding in Oedelem), **daar** zate(n) m(e) in de slag.  
*(in thingy in Oedelem), there sat we in the battle*  
 'In Oedelem we were caught in the fighting'  
 (Van Hoe Melle Corpus III: 76)

b. (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*  
 'If you have to start sawing your sticks, and to round them and to start sawing your horns, then you cannot come.'  
 (Van Hoe, Melle Corpus , III: 98)

c. (Als de zon zo begint binnen te zitten)  
*(when the sun so begins inside to sit)*  
**dan** wordt het echt warm.  
*then becomes it really hot*  
 'If the sun starts shining into the house, then it gets really hot.'

(Peggy, Ghent female, °1968, 07.05.2018)



(15) 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 witha peaceful heart to the movies go*

'Then we can go to the movies with a peaceful mind.'

(1<sup>9</sup> 2<sup>2</sup> 3<sup>0</sup> 4<sup>0</sup> 5<sup>1</sup>)<sup>7</sup>

Differently from specialized resumption (as in (10) and (14)), invariant *die* is compatible with a negative adjunct to its immediate left:

(16) a. Nergens **die** verkopen ze nog kleine notenbroodjes.

*nowhere die sell they PART small nut rolls*

'Nowhere do they sell small nutrolls.'

b. Nooit **die** vindt ge kleine notenbroodjes.

*never die find you small nut rolls*

'Never can you find small nut rolls.'

c. In geen enkele winkel **die** verkopen ze dat nog.

*In no single shop die sell they that PART*

'In no shop can you buy that.'

(LdG, 28.11.2018)

For some speakers, invariant *die* is compatible with a *wh*-adjunct in initial position:

- (17) %Wanneer **die** komt ze terug?  
*when die comes she back*  
 ‘When is she coming back?’ (1<sup>1</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)

These data already reveal that invariant *die* is **not** (semantically and syntactically) equivalent to the specialized adverbial resumptives *dan/tons/daar* (pace Zwart 1997: 249-50). Since quantifiers are not suitable candidates for topic status, the data show that the constituent to the left of invariant *die* is **not** necessarily interpreted as a topic (see also below). The availability of negative and *wh*-adjuncts to the immediate left of invariant *die* also leads to the conclusion that the initial constituents are **not** in a clause-external position: in clause-external position they would be unable to scope over the clause or ensure clause typing.

Though linearly the pattern instantiates a V3 order, the invariant adverbial *die* pattern is at first sight more like ‘**regular**’ V2. This hypothesis in turn implies that the constituent to the left of invariant *die* occupies a **clause-internal left-peripheral specifier**. Though our hypothesis is formulated based on the data with a quantificational initial constituent, we will assume that it extends to cases in which the initial constituent is non-quantificational.

Two more considerations reveal that the constituent which precedes invariant *die* is not necessarily topical and thus differs from the initial constituent in specialized resumption.

First, the initial constituent preceding invariant *die* can supply an answer to a *wh*-question (18). This would be unexpected if this constituent were necessarily topical, i.e. if it represents old or discourse-given information: the answer to a *wh*-question typically constitutes new information.

- (18) Q: Wanneer komt ze terug?  
*when comes she back*



‘When is she returning?’

A: Volgende vrijdag **die** komt ze terug.  
*next Friday die comes she back*

‘She’s coming back next Friday.’ (1<sup>1</sup> 2<sup>0</sup> 3<sup>5</sup> 4<sup>1</sup> 5<sup>5</sup>)

Some adverbials (e.g. epistemic *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’, (19a)) which do not obviously constitute topics and which, as expected, are incompatible with specialized *dan* resumption (19b) (cf. Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1707), can precede invariant *die*. Once again then, invariant *die* differs interpretively and syntactically from the specialized adverbial resumptive strategy (19b) and the configuration is more like that in regular V2 (19c).

(19) a. 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>)

b. \*Waarschijnlijk **dan** is hij weeral ziek.  
*probably then is he again sick*

‘He is probably ill again.’

c. Waarschijnlijk is hij weeral ziek.  
*probably is he again sick*

‘He is probably ill again.’

A further distinction between the specialized resumptive in StD and Ghent *die* is illustrated in (20) and (21). In StD, proximal adjuncts such as *nu* (‘now’) or *vandaag* (‘today’) are inappropriate as initial constituents for resumptive *dan* or *daar* (see (9)). The same proximal adjuncts are licit initial constituents for *die*:<sup>8</sup>

- (20) a. \*Nu **dan** ga ik naar Gent.  
*now then go I to Ghent*  
 ‘Now I am going to Ghent.’
- b. \*Vandaag **dan** heeft hij nog een vergadering.  
*today then has he another meeting*  
 ‘Today he’s got another meeting.’
- c. ??/\*Hier **daar** zeggen we dat niet.  
*here there say we that not*  
 ‘We’re not usually saying these things here.’
- (21) a. Nu **die** ga ik bij haar.  
*now die go I to her*  
 ‘Now I am going to her.’ (Arlette Berreman, 23.03.2017, 17.45 phone)
- b. Vandaag **die** heeft hij nog een vergadering.  
*today die has he another meeting*  
 ‘Today he’s got another meeting.’ (1<sup>0</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>)
- c. Hier **die** zeggen we dat niet.  
*here die say we that not*  
 ‘We don’t usually say these things here.’ (CM February 2019)

### 3.3.2 The resumptive constituent

Apart from the fact that they double up as regular deictic adverbials, an option not open to invariant adverbial *die*, the specialized adverbial resumptives *dan*, *daar* etc. pattern with regular deictic adverbs, and differ from invariant *die* in three additional respects:

- (i) compatibility with focusing,
- (ii) availability for mid-position,
- (iii) compatibility with P-stranding,

The three differences, discussed in more detail below, would follow on the hypothesis that while adverbials such as *dan*, *daar* etc. are phrasal constituents which can be merged in the middle field and can function as complements, invariant *die* is merged as a left-peripheral head.

### 3.3.2.1 Focusing

Recall from the introductory chapter to this volume (section 3.4) that specialized resumptives such as *dan* and *daar* are compatible with focusing elements like ‘even’ in StD. The same holds for the Ghent variety (22):

(22) Als 't regent, zelfs **toens** ga 'k te voete...

*if it rains even then go I on foot*

‘If it rains, even then I’ll go on foot.’

(LdG 17.08.2018)

In contrast, invariant *die* is incompatible with focusing:

(23) a. \*Als het regent,

*if it rains,*

zelfs **die** ga ik te voet naar het werk.

*even die go I on foot to the work*

‘Even if it rains, I’d go to work on foot.’ (1<sup>8</sup>, 2<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>0</sup>, 5<sup>0</sup>)

- b. \*Toen de bel ging, juist **die** ging ik vertrekken.

*when the bell went, just die went I leave*

‘Exactly when the door bell rang, I was planning to leave.’ (1<sup>8</sup>, 2<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>0</sup>, 5<sup>0</sup>)

One way to account for the difference between the specialized resumptive and invariant *die* is to propose that the former is phrasal and that the latter is merged as a head. The coordination data in (24) show that invariant *die* does not form a constituent with the adjunct to its immediate left. If *die* were a constituent with the adjunct preceding it, one would expect that coordination of two such constituents would be possible, contrary to fact. Rather, the coordination of two adjuncts precedes a unique occurrence of *die*.

- (24) a. \*Gisteren **die** en eergisteren **die** heea ze thuisgewerkt

*yesterday die and the day before die has she home.worked*

‘Yesterday and the day before yesterday she worked from home.’

(LdG: 28.11.18: 0/5)

- b. Gisteren en eergisteren **die** heea ze thuisgewerkt

*yesterday and the day before yesterday die has she home-worked*

(LdG: 28.11.18: 5/5)

De Clercq and Haegeman (2018) propose that adverbial resumptive *die* is a head merged in the left periphery (LP).<sup>9</sup>

### 3.3.2.2 Mid-position of the resumptive

As discussed (introductory chapter, section 3.5), whenever the root left-peripheral slot is unavailable because a left-peripheral feature has been activated independently (e.g. by a *wh*-feature, imperative etc.), a specialized resumptive remains in a middle field position. This follows from the hypothesis that the specialized adverbial resumptive is merged in the middle field and, due to a discourse-related feature, moves to the left periphery whenever it can (see Hoekstra 1999: 63-5 for StD). In contrast, mid-position is never available for invariant *die*, even in those contexts in which the left periphery is independently activated: (25a) illustrates an imperative, (25b) a *wh*-question. This pattern also follows from our hypothesis that invariant *die* is merged in the left periphery, i.e. that in contrast with the specialized resumptive, invariant *die* cannot be merged TP-internally.<sup>10</sup>

- (25) a. \*Als het regent blijf **die** maar thuis.  
*if it rains, stay die PART home*  
(1<sup>8</sup>, 2<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>0</sup>, 5<sup>0</sup>)
- b. \*Als het regent wat gaan we **die** doen.  
*if it rains, what go we die do*  
(1<sup>11</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>0</sup>, 4<sup>0</sup>, 5<sup>0</sup>)

### 3.3.2.3 PPs and V3 resumption

In addition to its deictic locative function, the adverb *daar* ('there') doubles up as the R-pronoun complement of a preposition. The pronoun can be moved to the left periphery, pied-piping (26b) or stranding (26c) the preposition (Van Riemsdijk 1978).<sup>11</sup>

- (26) a. Wij spreken niet daarover in de les.  
*we talk not there-if in the lesson*  
 ‘We don’t talk about this in class.’
- b. Daarover spreken wij niet \_\_\_ in de les.  
*there talk we not not in the lesson*
- c. Daar spreken wij niet **over** \_\_\_ in de les.  
*there talk we not about in the lesson*

Used as a specialized resumptive, the R-pronoun *daar* can also pied-pipe or strand the preposition:

- (27) a. Over examens, **daarover** spreken wij niet \_\_\_ in de les.  
*about exams, there-of talk we not in the lesson*
- b. Over examens, **daar** spreken wij niet **over** \_\_\_ in de les.  
*about exams, there talk we not about in the lesson*  
 ‘Exams, we don’t talk about in class.’

In the Ghent variety too, the resumptive *daar* can strand the preposition, as shown in (28), confirming the hypothesis that it originates as the complement of the preposition:

- (28) a. Van exåmes, **daar** spreke wij nie **van** \_\_\_ in de lesse.  
*of exams, there talk we not of in the lesson*
- b. Op (h)eur pensioen, **daar** peist ze-zij nog nie **op**\_\_\_.  
*on her pension, there thinks she not yet on*  
 ‘Her retirement, she isn’t thinking about yet.’

Anticipating the discussion below, note that the alternatives (29) in StD and (30) for the Ghent variety are also available: here an initial nominal constituent *examens/exames* ('exams') is resumed by the R-pronoun *daar* which is the complement of the preposition. Again, these data are in line with the hypothesis that the pronoun originates as a TP-internal phrasal complement.<sup>12</sup>

- (29) a. Examens, **daar** spreken wij niet **over** \_\_\_\_ in de les.<sup>13</sup>  
*exams* there *speak* we not *about* *in the lesson*
- b. Haar pensioen, **daar** denkt ze-zij nog niet **aan** \_\_\_\_.  
*her pension,* there *thinks* *she-she* PART not *of*
- (30) a. Exâmes, **daar** spreke wij nie **van** \_\_\_\_ in de lesse.  
*exams,* there *talk* we not *of* *in the lesson*
- b. (H)eur pensioen, **daar** peist ze-zij nog nie **op** \_\_\_\_.  
*her pension,* there *thinks* *she* not yet on

In contrast with the specialized resumptive R-pronoun *daar*, invariant *die* is incompatible with P stranding, regardless of whether the initial constituent is a PP (31) or the nominal complement of the preposition (32). The unacceptability of this patterns follows if we assume that invariant *die* does not originate as the complement of the preposition. As a result, null complements being unavailable in the Ghent variety, the prepositions *van* and *of* in (31) and (32) would lack a complement.

- (31) a. \*Van exâmes, **die** spreke wij nie **van** \_\_\_\_ in de lesse.

- of exams, die talk we not of in the lesson*
- b. \*Op (h)eur pensioen, **die** peist ze-zij nog nie **op** \_\_\_\_.  
*on her pension, die thinks she not yet on*
- (32) a. \*Exames, **die** spreke wij nie **van**\_\_\_\_ in de lesse.  
*exams, die talk we not of in the lesson*
- b. \*(H)eur pensioen, **die** peist ze-zij nog nie **op** \_\_\_\_.  
*her pension, die thinks she yet not on*

That invariant *die* cannot itself function as the complement of the preposition or of the lexical verb, is in line with our hypothesis that *die* does not originate in the middle field but is merged directly in the left periphery.

(33) and (34) show that *die* can be preceded by a PP argument of the lexical verb: in (33) the initial PP is a locative complement, in (34) it is non-locative P-complement.

- (33) a. In de Sint Pieterskathedraal **die** ben ik al geweest.  
*in the Saint Peter.s.cathedral die am I already been*  
 ‘I’ve already been in St Peter’s cathedral.’  
 (CM, p.c. 12.09.2015)
- b. 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)
- c. 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 Melle Corpus III: 7)

- (34) a. Van exâmes, **die** spreke wij nie in de lesse.  
*of exams, die speak we not in the lesson*
- b. Op (h)eur pensioen, **die** peist ze-zij nog nie.  
*Of her pension, die thinks she PART not*
- c. 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 Ghent Corpus I: 21/ LdG, Ghent male, 29.03.2019)

If invariant *die* does not originate in the middle field and hence cannot be the complement of the verb, the question arises, which constituent then functions as the argument of the verbs in (34). The obvious answer is that it is the initial PP itself, at which point we need to ask how this PP is able to ‘connect up with the verb’. If *die* does not itself merge in the middle field, the initial PP cannot be occupying a main clause-external position because, if it were, it would not itself be able to function as a complement of V because main clause-external constituents are not ‘reconstructed’ (Haegeman and Greco 2018). We therefore formulate the hypothesis that it is the initial PP to the left of *die* itself which originates as the complement of the main clause predicate: the PP is merged in the vP-internal thematic position and moves to a main clause-internal LP position; in this landing site, the initial constituent satisfies the V2 constraint. We correctly predict that the analogues of (34) with a left-peripheral nominal (35) are ungrammatical: in these examples the lexical verbs *spreken* (‘talk’) and *peizen* (‘think’) require a PP complement. There is no such complement available: (i) by hypothesis *die* is

merged as a left-peripheral head and thus cannot function as the complement of the verbs, (ii) by hypothesis, the initial nominals *exâmes* ('exams') and *(h)eur pensioeη* ('her pension') are not main clause-external, they occupy the initial position typical for the V2 clause and could in theory be reconstructed to a TP-internal position, but not being PPs they will not satisfy the selectional requirements of the lexical verbs. On our analysis, (35a) and (35b) are ungrammatical for the same reason that the example in (36) is.

- (35) a. \*Exâmes\_ **die** spreke wij nie in de lesse.  
*exams die speak we not in the lesson*
- b. \* (h)eur pensioeη **die** peist ze-zij nog nie.  
*her pension die thinks she PART not*

(LdG, Ghent male, 29.03.2019)

- (36) a. \*Exâmes\_spreke wij nie in de lesse.  
*exams, speak we not in the lesson*
- b. \*(H)eur pensioeη peist ze-zij nog nie.  
*her pension, thinks she PART not*

(LdG, Ghent male, 29.03.2019)

### 3.4 Summary and consequences

Table 1 summarises the comparison between specialized adverbial resumption and the invariant adverbial *die* pattern, which is exclusive to the Ghent variety.

Table 1: specialized resumptive (*dan/tons/demonstrative pronoun*) vs. invariant *die*

			Specialized resumptive	Invariant <i>die</i>
	<b>Patterns</b>	<b>Section</b>		
(i)	initial constituent mandatory	3.3.1.	no	yes
(ii)	with proximal initial adjunct	3.3.1.	no (StD)	yes
(iii)	with negative quantifier	3.3.1.	no	yes
(iv)	with <i>wh</i> -constituent	3.3.1.	no	yes
(v)	with modal adverb	3.3.1.	no	yes
(vi)	middle field position ( <i>wh</i> /imperative)	3.3.2.2.	yes	no
(vii)	focal modification	3.3.2.1.	yes	no
(viii)	P stranding	3.3.2.3.	yes	no

The survey above leads to the conclusion that contrary to the claim in Zwart (1997: 249-50), invariant adverbial *die* in the Ghent variety cannot be assimilated to specialized adverbial resumption by *dan*, *daar* etc in StD or in the Ghent variety. Our conclusions and our analytical hypotheses are summarized below.

- The specialized resumptive is **phrasal**.

It doubles up as a **distal** demonstrative pronoun or adverb.

It is merged in a **TP-internal position** and, being topical, it is **moved** to the LP.

The moved resumptive **satisfies the V2 constraint**.

The constituent to the immediate left of the specialized resumptive is **clause-external**.

- Invariant *die* is a **head**.

It is **merged in the LP**.



- 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 Sint Kruis we saw the first Germans'  
 (Van Hoe III: 7)

#### 4. The V2 syntax of invariant adverbial *die*

This section outlines our analysis of the invariant adverbial *die* pattern in the Ghent variety of Flemish. Because of the differences, see Table 1, diagnosed between invariant *die* and the specialized adverbial resumptives, we do not assimilate the syntax of invariant *die* to that of a pattern with a specialized adverbial resumptive.

- (39) (i) A fronted specialized resumptive adverb can co-occur with invariant *die*. This entails *de facto* that invariant *die* cannot be taken to occupy the same position as the fronted specialized resumptive adverb.

(ii) The constituent to the immediate left of invariant *die* can be a *wh*-phrase: this entails that this constituent cannot be main clause-external.

(iii) Invariant *die* is incompatible with a TP-internal position and with P-stranding: this means that it is not first merged TP-internally and moved to the left periphery, but rather that it is first merged as a left-peripheral head.

In section 4.1 the theoretical background for the derivation of V2 patterns will be presented. section 4.2 provides an analysis for the V2 pattern in the Ghent variety and Section 4.3 discusses some predictions of the proposal.

#### 4.1. Theoretical background: the syntax and typology of V2 languages

The hypothesis that the constituent to the left of invariant *die* is merged in a TP-internal position and moves to the left periphery entails that we need to postulate at least three positions in the clausal left periphery:

- (40) (i) a phrasal position for the initial constituent;  
(ii) a head position for invariant *die*;  
(iii) the head position which is the landing site for the finite verb (which precedes the canonical subject position).

To generate the left-peripheral ‘space’ required to host these three components, a one-layer CP left periphery is insufficient, because by hypothesis such a structure would contain just one head, C. Hence, we adopt an articulated CP structure (Rizzi 1997). We briefly list our main assumptions here.

For the over-all analysis of V2 and the cross-linguistic variation of the pattern, we adhere to the cartographic analysis of V2 languages first developed in Haegeman (1996) and the ensuing typology of V2 languages in Poletto (2005, 2013) and elaborated by Wolfe (2016a). Wolfe (2016a) adopts Rizzi's articulated CP and crucially assumes that the heads Force and Fin can constitute the landing sites for the finite verb in V2 languages. Wolfe also proposes that V2 languages are differentiated according to whether the landing site of the finite verb is Fin (Fin-V2 languages) or Force (Force-V2 languages). Fin-V2 languages have the left-peripheral structure in (41a), Force-V2 languages have the left-peripheral structure in (41b).

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

By (41a), we can foresee that Fin-V2 languages will be 'more relaxed' in the realization of the V2 constraint because multiple access to the left periphery remains potentially available, and, as shown by, among others, Benincà and Poletto (2004) and Benincà (2006, 2013), the attestations of V3 and V4 orders in medieval Romance are evidence for this prediction. In Force-V2 languages, on the other hand, the access to the left periphery will be more restricted and these languages display a more rigid V2 pattern.

We postulate that the Ghent variety of Dutch is a Force V2-language in which both Fin and Force are active and need to be filled, i.e. the finite verb moves through Fin to Force. Following Haegeman (1996) and much later work, the rigidity of the V2 configuration in Force-V2 languages is the result of a 'bottleneck' effect (for recent discussion see Holmberg 2015): the constituent in SpecForceP in (41b) must transit through SpecFinP, as represented in (41c). This step blocks additional left-peripheral movement from within TP:

(41) c. [ForceP **XP** [Force° **V**]...[FinP ~~**XP**~~ [Fin° ~~**V**~~] [ [TP ...]]]

Because, by the bottleneck hypothesis, a filled SpecFinP gives rise to intervention effects (Haegeman 1996), the potential movement of additional constituents to the left periphery will be contingent on the featural content in SpecFinP, adopting a featural interpretation of Relativized Minimality (Starke 2001, for recent discussion see Villata, Rizzi, and Franck 2016). In ForceV2 languages, it is, however, not possible to merge a constituent directly in a left-peripheral slot in a position between FinP and ForceP because such a constituent will block the movement of the constituent from SpecFinP to SpecForceP. By hypothesis, the insertion of such an externally merged constituent between FinP and ForceP would itself be motivated by the need to satisfy a criterial feature of a functional head in the CP area (say focus or topic) and thus by criterial freezing (Rizzi 2010), it itself cannot move to SpecForce.<sup>14</sup> The net outcome of the derivation in (41c) is that in Force-V2 languages, a superficial V3 pattern only arises when main clause-external constituents (in the sense of Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1133-1134) are combined with a V2 clause, i.e. with ForceP. Concretely, following Haegeman and Greco (2018), we assume that main clause-external constituents in V3 patterns are inserted in a functional discourse domain outside ForceP, labelled FrameP.

(42) [FrameP \_\_\_ [ForceP **XP** [Force° **V**]...[FinP ~~**XP**~~ [Fin° ~~**V**~~] [ [TP ...]]]]

## 4.2 The syntax of V2 in the Ghent variety

### 4.2.1 The derivation of canonical V2: Force V2



We assume that the Ghent variety of Dutch is a Force-V2 language: the canonical V2 pattern with the verb in second position is derived as in (41c). Example (43a) with an adjunct in initial position is derived as in the partial representation (43b):

- (43) a. Volgende vrijdag komt hij terug  
*next Friday comes he back*  
 ‘Next Friday he’ll come back.’
- b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> Volgende vrijdag [<sub>Force</sub> komt] [<sub>FinP</sub> ~~volgende vrijdag~~ [<sub>Fin</sub> komt]  
 [<sub>TP</sub> hij terug ~~komt~~]]]

In the next section we consider how to derive patterns with invariant *die*.

#### 4.2.2 Invariant *die* as a root complementizer

According to our analysis so far, invariant *die* is first merged in a left-peripheral head position and like the initial constituent in a regular V2 configuration in a ForceV2 language with both the Fin and the Force requirement in place, (43b), the constituent to the immediate left of invariant *die* is first merged TP-internally and moves to a left-peripheral position, via SpecFinP.

- (44) a. Volgende vrijdag die komt hij terug.  
*next Friday die comes he back*
- b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> Volgende vrijdag [<sub>Force</sub> die]  
 [<sub>FinP</sub> ~~volgende vrijdag~~ [<sub>Fin</sub> komt] [<sub>TP</sub> hij ~~volgende vrijdag~~ terug ~~komt~~]]]

The step by step derivation of (44b) is as follows:

- Because of the requirement that Fin be filled, it is targeted by the finite verb, which is left-adjacent to the canonical subject position.

Our assumption is that the featural content of invariant *die* makes it itself unsuitable as a licit filler for Fin. One argument in support of this hypothesis is the observation that, though the Ghent variety of Flemish displays complementizer agreement, invariant *die* is incompatible with the complementizer agreement effect, which we think is the hallmark of an association between the complementizer and Fin (see the discussion of (47) below).

- The constituent immediately preceding invariant *die* is first merged TP-internally and transits via SpecFinP to SpecForce.
- Invariant *die* is inserted in Force to satisfy the requirement on Force. We take it that merger of *die* in Force takes priority over movement of the finite verb from Fin to Force because *die* has a dedicated feature associated with Force.
- The obligatory presence of a constituent to the immediate left of invariant *die* in Force, i.e. what could be called the “*die* second” constraint, is a variant of Wolfe’s (2016a) spell out requirement on SpecForce of the Force-V2 languages.
- Like the finite verb in Force in regular V2 root configurations, invariant *die* is not selective in terms of the constituent to its left; specifically: it is compatible both with topical constituents as well as with foci.

A derivation according to which invariant *die* fills a root C position (i.c. Force) comes down to saying that being a filler of Force, invariant *die* is a complementizer inserted in a root clause. In this context, an immediate question is why Force spelt out as *die*? Why is it not spelt out as *dat*, the usual form of the complementizer in this variety (and in StD).<sup>15</sup>

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

De Clercq and Haegeman (2018) speculate that the spell out of Force as *die* is a manifestation of a rescue strategy found elsewhere to overcome a potential *dat*-trace effect: invariant *die* spells out a featurally enriched variant of the complementizer *dat* to enable the (local) movement of the initial constituent from SpecFinP to SpecForceP. Consider (46a): in this derivation, the short movement of *volgende vrijdag* (‘next Friday’) from SpecFin to SpecForce and the insertion of *dat* (‘that’) in Force in effect *de facto* gives rise to what is labelled the *that*-trace sequence (46b). Replacing *dat* by the enriched *die* in (46c) rescues the configuration:<sup>16</sup>

- (46) a. \*<sub>[ForceP</sub> Volgende vrijdag <sub>[Force</sub> dat]  
<sub>[FinP</sub> ~~volgende vrijdag~~ <sub>[Fin</sub> komt] [<sub>TP</sub> hij ~~volgende vrijdag~~ terug ~~komt~~]]]
- b. \*<sub>[ForceP</sub> Volgende vrijdag <sub>[Force</sub> dat] [<sub>FinP</sub> t <sub>[Fin</sub> komt] [<sub>TP</sub> hij t terug t]]]
- c. <sub>[ForceP</sub> Volgende vrijdag <sub>[Force</sub> dat =>die] [<sub>FinP</sub> t <sub>[Fin</sub> komt] [<sub>TP</sub> hij t terug t]]]

As mentioned above, like many Flemish varieties of Dutch, the Ghent variety allows for complementizer agreement in finite clauses: in (47a), for instance, the complementizer *dat* takes the plural form *dan* because it agrees with the subject *de autobuase* (‘the coaches’). In terms of Rizzi’s (1997) articulated left periphery, the phi-features which give rise to C-

agreement are most plausibly located in the left-peripheral head Fin (47b), the head encoding finiteness. The Fin head agrees with the canonical subject in SpecTP.

- (47) a. A ze zegge **dan**<sub>PL</sub> de autobuase<sub>PL</sub> der kome<sub>PL</sub> •...  
*they say that-PL the coaches there come*  
 ‘they say that there will be coaches’ (Leemans, Ghent Corpus I: 3)
- b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>Force°</sub>] ... [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>Fin°</sub>] [<sub>TP...</sub>]]]

That invariant *die* is incompatible with complementizer agreement follows from our analysis. In the invariant *die* configuration, the finite verb occupies Fin to satisfy the requirement on Fin and it will spell out the relevant features (48b). We assume that *die* does not host the features enabling it to satisfy the head requirement on Fin.

- (48) a. Een jaar nadien **die/\*dien** waren ze al gescheiden.  
*one year after die/\*die.AGR were they already divorced*  
 ‘One year later they were already divorced.’ (CM, 24.2.2015)
- b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>Force</sub> *die*] [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>Fin</sub> V<sub>fin</sub> phi ] [<sub>TP</sub> ...]]]

#### 4.3 Some predictions of the analysis

Like regular V2 (=V' to C') patterns in the Ghent variety, the invariant *die* configuration, whose derivation implies finite V movement to Fin (=C), is correctly predicted to be a **root** phenomenon.

As already discussed, invariant *die* can co-occur with a (fronted) **specialized** resumptive (cf. section 3.4, (38)). In our analysis, the constituent to the immediate left of invariant *die* satisfies the **V2 condition**. Two predictions follow:

- (i) constituents unable to qualify as the first constituent in a V2 configuration will not be able to qualify as initial constituents for invariant *die*.
- (ii) constituents able to qualify as the first constituent in a V2 configuration will be licit first constituents for invariant *die*.

We look at both predictions in the next sections.

#### 4.3.1 *Ofwel* vs. *of*

For disjunction, Flemish uses both *ofwel* ('either') and *of* ('or'): as illustrated in (49) the conjunctions can be 'mixed', with one conjunct introduced by *ofwel* and the other by *of* (49c,d).

- (49) a.   Ofwel geef ik u 80 percent van de koopsom,  
          *either give I you 80 percent of the purchase.sum,*  
          ofwel geef ik u een bon.  
          *either give I you a voucher*
- b.   Of ik geef u 80 percent van de koopsom,  
          or I give you 80 percent of the purchase.sum,  
          of ik geef u een bon.  
          or I give you a voucher
- c.   Ofwel geef ik u 80 percent van de koopsom,  
          *either give I you 80 percent of the purchase.sum,*

- of ik geef u een bon.  
 or I give you a voucher
- d. Of ik geef u 80 percent van de koopsom,  
 or I give you 80 percent of the purchase.sum,  
 ofwel geef ik u een bon.  
 either give I you a voucher

‘Either I give you an 80 percent of the total sum or I give you a voucher.’

Crucially, the choice of the disjunctive element determines word order: *ofwel* constitutes the first constituent in a V2 configuration (50a) and cannot combine with a full-fledged V2 root clause (50b); conversely, *of* does not constitute the first constituent of a V2 configuration (51a) and must combine with a full-fledged V2 clause (51b).

- (50) Ofwel geef ik u 80 percent van de koopsom,  
 either give I you 80 percent of the purchase sum
- a. **ofwel** geef ik u een bon.  
 either give I you a voucher
- b. **\*ofwel** ik geef u een bon.<sup>17</sup>  
 either I give you a voucher

- (51) Ofwel geef ik u 80 percent van de koopsom,  
*either give I you 80 percent of the purchase sum*
- a. **\*of** geef ik u een bon.  
*or give I you a voucher*
- b. **of** ik geef u een bon.

*or I give you a voucher*

Since *ofwel* can constitute the first constituent in a V2 configuration, we correctly predict it to be compatible with invariant *die* (52a); conversely, since *of* cannot constitute the first constituent, we correctly predict it to be unable to be the first constituent for invariant *die* (52b).<sup>18</sup>

(52) Ofwel geef ik u 80 percent van de koopsom,

*either give I you 80 percent of the purchase sum*

a. 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)

b. \*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)

#### 4.3.2 Non-integrated adverbial clauses

There is a vast literature on the external syntax of adverbial clauses which we do not go into. We focus on just one point: the case of adverbial clauses which, following Frey’s (2016) recent diagnostics and classification, are taken to be syntactically unintegrated, abbreviated in his work as NiC. Roughly, NiCs modify some aspect of the speech act (e.g. its relevance, its timing etc.), rather than the content of the proposition contained in it. Typically, NiCs cannot

constitute the first constituent in a V2 configuration, rather they combine with a regular V2 clause. Among NiCs we cite, for instance, relevance conditionals (53), speech act modifiers (54 - 55) and irrelevance conditionals (56) (d’Avis 2004). These all systematically give rise to linear V3 patterns (as shown in the a-examples) and NiCs do not satisfy the V2 requirement (as shown in the b-examples). By our account, NiCs are correctly predicted not to be able to immediately precede invariant *die* (as shown in the c-examples): this is so because the constituent to the immediate left of invariant *die* is the one to satisfy the V2 requirement, a function that is incompatible with a NiC (cf. Frey 2016).

(53) a. Als g’honger hebt - **der** [‘daar, er’] ligt nog brood in de kast.

*if you hunger have there lies PART bread in the cupboard*

‘If you’re hungry, there’s bread in the cupboard.’

(LdG, 28/11/2018, score 5/5)

b. (\*)Als je honger hebt, ligt er nog brood in de kast.<sup>19</sup>

*if you hunger have lies there PART bread in the cupboard*

c. \*Als je honger hebt, **die** ligt er nog brood in de kast.

*if you hunger have die lies there PART bread in the cupboard*

(LdG, 28/11/2018, score 1/5)

(54) a. Voor we met de les beginnen,

*before we with the lesson start*

ik geef volgende week geen les.

*I give next week no lesson*

‘Before we start, I am not teaching next week.’

(LdG, 28/11/2018, score 5/5)



b. \*Voor we met de les beginnen,  
*before we with the lesson start*  
geef ik volgende week geen les.  
*give I next week no class*

c. \*Voor we met de les beginnen,  
*before we with the lesson start*  
**die** geef ik volgende week geen les.  
*die give I next week no class*

(LdG, 28/11/2018, score 0/5)

(55) a. Als je het per se moet weten,  
*if you it definitely must know,*  
ik ben al 2 maand zwanger.  
*I am already two months pregnant*  
'If you really need to know, I'm two months pregnant.'

b. \*Als je het per se moet weten,  
*if you it definitely must know,*  
ben ik al 2 maand zwanger.  
*am I already two months pregnant*

c. \*Als je het per se moet weten,  
*if you it definitely must know,*  
**die** ben ik al 2 maand zwanger.  
*die am I already two months pregnant* (1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>3</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>, 5<sup>1</sup>)

(56) a. Of het nu regent of niet,  
*if it now rains or not,*  
 we gaan wandelen.  
*we go walk*  
 ‘Whether it rains or not, we go for a walk.’

b. \*Of het nu regent of niet,  
*if it now rains or not,*  
 gaan we wandelen.  
*go we walk*

c. \*Of het nu regent of niet,  
*if it now rains or not,*  
**die** gaan we wandelen. (1<sup>6</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>1</sup>, 5<sup>0</sup>)  
*die go we walk*

## 5. Summary and further implications for V3 resumption

This chapter examines the invariant *die* pattern in the Ghent variety of Flemish. In this pattern an initial adverbial modifier precedes the invariant formative *die*, which in turn is left-adjacent to the finite verb. This pattern has been described in the literature (notably Vanacker 1986) but has received little attention in the generative literature, with the exception of Zwart (1997). Contra Zwart (1997), we have shown that given the distributional differences between the specialized resumptives both in StD and in the Ghent variety and invariant *die*, the two patterns must not be assimilated.

- (i) resumptives such as temporal *dan*, *toen* and locative *daar* are phrasal adverbials; the resumptives move to SpecForceP via SpecFinP and satisfy the Force-V2 constraint. The constituent preceding the specialized resumptive is clause-external.

(ii) Invariant *die* must merge in Force. Hence, the finite verb remains trapped in Fin.

The constituent to the left of invariant *die* moves to SpecForce to satisfy the Force-V2 constraint.

Our analysis has broader implications for the analysis of resumption. Indeed, as formulated, our analysis of invariant *die* entails that the label ‘resumptive’ is a misnomer for the Ghent invariant *die* pattern, because invariant *die* in fact does not have a resumptive function. Our chapter therefore illustrates that what looks like a V3 resumptive pattern at first sight, does not need to be one. A fine-grained data analysis sets apart resumptive patterns involving semantic matching between an antecedent and a placeholder from apparent V3-patterns like the invariant *die* pattern discussed in this chapter.

---

<sup>1</sup> The phenomenon was described in Vanacker (1980), a paper written in Dutch. Since then it has not received much interest in the literature.

The precise contemporary spread of the phenomenon has not been charted. From our data gathering we impressionistically observe that the phenomenon is restricted mainly to Ghent, i.e. both the city and its suburbs, and is more typically attested with older speakers but we have no firm evidence for this. We also observe that the phenomenon is also attested in the more standard spoken variety of Dutch used by the same speakers. The spread of the phenomenon definitely needs more research.

<sup>2</sup> This example is grammatical in a parse in which *nergens daar* (‘nowhere there’) is one constituent meaning ‘nowhere in that place’. This is not relevant for the issue at hand.

<sup>3</sup> The analogues of (8) with *die* used to resume an adjunct would be sharply ungrammatical in all Dutch varieties, including StD.

---

4 The double occurrence of *die* in (8b) should be read as a repetition due to hesitation on behalf of the speaker.

5 Our informant grades (11c) 6/7 and indicates that *die* can be replaced by *dat*.

(i) Speltbrood **dat** koop ik enkel in het weekend.

*spelt bread dat buy I only at the weekend*

(CM, 14.09.2015)

(i) may be a case of special resumption with *dat* as the neuter variant of *den dienen* (cf. (9)).

In any event, we cannot do justice to the pattern in which initial arguments are picked up by invariant *die* and the pattern requires further study.

6 Invariant *die* is not equally accepted with all *wh*-constituents: A comparison of (i) with (12e) is of interest. It looks as if the presence of *dan* ('then') in (12e) facilitates the presence of *die*. Given that *dan* ('then') anchors the sentence to the discourse, this might suggest a D-linking effect. This needs further study.

(i) A: t Is mijn verjaardag. Ik wil een feest geven.

'it's my birthday. I want to give a party.'

B: (\*)Wie **die** wilt ge allemaal inviteren?

*who die want you all invite?* (1<sup>6</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 4<sup>0</sup>, 5<sup>2</sup>)

7 12 informants from Ghent, who confirmed that they were users of the *die* pattern, have participated in our survey. Each informant 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 we report how many of our informants gave a particular score: 1<sup>9</sup> means that 9 informants considered the sentence unacceptable and gave it score 1. If informants gave 3, 4 or 5, we considered the sentence acceptable.

8 Thanks to Petra Sleeman (p.c.) for bringing this to our attention.

---

<sup>9</sup> For arguments against analyzing *die* as a weak/expletive pronominal element whose semantics are incompatible with focusing, see De Clercq and Haegeman (2021).

<sup>10</sup> There is a puzzling contrast with Ghent generalized argumental resumption, in which invariant *die* follows a referential nominal and does not display matching. When the LP slot is unavailable, in this use invariant *die* can occupy mid-position:

- (i) a. Uwen laptop, **die** moogt ge niet gebruiken in het examen.  
*your laptop, die may you not use in the exam*  
‘You cannot use your laptop during the exam.’
- b. Oei: mijnen laptop, waar heb ik **die** nu gelaten?  
*PART: my laptop, where have I die now left*  
‘Where have I put my laptop?’
- c. Uwen laptop, laat **die** maar thuis!  
*your laptop, leave die PART home*  
‘Leave your laptop at home!’ (Ghent, CM, p.c. 30.09.2017)

At this point we cannot say more about this: further scrutiny of argument resumption is necessary.

<sup>11</sup> In this chapter, we don’t go into a full discussion of demonstrative and deictic functions and their relation to P-stranding. In response to one question by an anonymous reviewer to this volume, note, for instance, that for one informant, the full demonstrative can also function as a complement of a preposition, i.e. replacement by *daar* is not mandatory. For instance, in (i) the full demonstrative composed of the article *den* and the demonstrative *dienen* is the complement of a preposition. In such examples the demonstrative will point to a contextually available antecedent, say a ladder in (ia) or a coach in (ib).

- (i) a. Ik ben van den dienen een keer gevallen

---

I am of the that once fallen

'I once fell off that one.'

b. Ik heb op den dienen nog niet geslapen.

I have on the that yet not slept

'I haven't slept on that one yet.'

Stranding of the preposition is possible for our informant, with only a very slight degradation: she graded (iia) and (iib) with a score 4.

(ii) a. Den dienen ben ik een keer van gevallen.

*the that am I once of fallen*

'That one, I once fell off.'

b. Dendien heb ik nog niet op geslapen .

*the that have I yet not on slept*

'That one, I haven't slept on.'

The short form of the demonstrative *die* shows a different and for the time being unclear pattern: below are the relevant examples with the scores assigned by one informant. These mixed judgements will require further study. We will not go into the distribution of demonstratives in the Ghent variety here, as this would lead us too far.

(iii) a. Ik ben van die een keer gevallen.

*I am of that once fallen*

'I once fell off that one.'

Score : 3

b. Ik heb op die nog niet geslapen.

---

*I have on that yet not slept*

‘I haven’t slept on that one yet.’

Score: 0

(iv) a. Die ben ik een keer van gevallen.

*that am I once of fallen*

‘That one, I once fell off.’

Score: 1

b. Die heb ik nog niet op geslapen.

*that have I yet not on slept*

‘That one, I haven’t slept on.’

Score: 2

<sup>12</sup> In support of our hypothesis that the initial constituent in special V3 resumption is clause-external, our informant (LdG) signals a clear prosodic break after the initial nominal constituent in (30).

<sup>13</sup> (35) and (36) can be viewed as cases of HTLD (Cinque 1990), with a dislocated ‘hanging topic’ in a clause-external position (e.g. SpecFrameP as in Haegeman and Greco 2018; cf. Eide 2011, 198).

<sup>14</sup> One derivation that does not seem to be ruled out by the Poletto/Wolfe hypothesis is that in which the specifier of FinP is filled by one constituent, the finite verb moves to Fin and then to Force, and another constituent is merged in SpecForceP, which would be like the mirror image of our analysis of invariant *die* in which the finite verb remains in Fin and invariant *die* is merged in Force. We have nothing to say about this issue here and hope it can be clarified in future work.

<sup>15</sup> We thank Marcel den Dikken for first pointing out this question to us.

<sup>16</sup> Rizzi (2006), Rizzi and Shlonsky (2006, 2007) reinterpret the *that* trace effect in terms of criterial freezing and relate the pattern to the Subject Criterion. Though space prevents a full discussion of this point here, it is feasible to rethink the analysis

---

developed in the current chapter along the lines developed there, as in De Clercq and Haegeman (2021).

<sup>17</sup> According to the ANS grammar StD *ofwel* does combine with a V2 clause (<http://ans.ruhosting.nl/e-ans/25/05/02/body.html>)

<sup>18</sup> Interestingly as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer for this volume, Norwegian *enten* ‘either’ and *eller* ‘or’ are similar, though not identical to the Flemish *ofwel/of* conjunctions. Both *enten* ‘either’ and *eller* ‘or’ seem to determine word order: like *ofwel*, *enten* is directly followed by the finite verb in a root clause while, like *of*, *eller* is followed by a (subject-initial) V2 clause. Unlike *of*, however, *eller* can combine with *så* (*of* cannot co-occur with invariant *die*), in which case, *så* immediately follows *eller*, and the finite verb immediately follows *så*. This pattern suggests that *eller* is followed by a V2 structure in this case too meaning in turn that *så*, unlike invariant *die*, is phrasal and can occur in SpecForceP. We thank the reviewer for bringing these data to our attention. Obviously the data are interesting in their own right and deserve further study.

<sup>19</sup> In (53b) the conditional does not have the intended relevance reading.