More on strategies of relativization: CP-extraction feeding complementizer agreement

Dalina Kallulli
University of Vienna

Klima (1964) took relative and sentential *that* to be the same element, namely a complementizer rather than a relative pronoun, a view that has recently been extended to (simplex) *wh*-elements (Pesetsky & Torrego 2006 for English/Dutch, Bayer & Brandner 2008 for German, cf. also Kayne 1976). Under an alternative construal, sentential complements are relative clauses (Manzini & Savoia 2003, Kayne 2008). Taking my cue from Bavarian German (henceforth: BG), this paper provides novel arguments for the former view.

1. Phenomenon: Felix (1985) draws attention to a peculiar construction in BG illustrated in (1), which is ungrammatical in Standard German (SG).

(1) Das ist der Kerl$_i$ den$_i$ wenn ich e_i erwisch, erschlag ich e_i (BG)
     this is the guy$_i$ who$_i$ if   I e_i catch   beat   I e_i
     'This is the guy who I will beat (up) if I catch him'

The construction in (1) has three mutually dependent properties: (i) the embedded *if*-clause immediately follows the *wh*-pronoun, a property that above all marks the construction as dialectal; (ii) the verb of the final clause precedes its subject, which as shown in (2) vs. (3) is not the regular word order in neither BG nor SG relative clauses; (iii) there are two empty categories in (1), both co-indexed with the relative pronoun.

(2) das ist der Kerl$_i$ den$_i$ ich e_i erschlag   **vs**.   (3) *das ist der Kerl$_i$ den$_i$ erschlag ich e_i
     this is the guy   who I e_i beat   this is the guy$_i$ who$_i$ beat   I e_i

Felix (1985) analyses (1) as a parasitic gap (PG) construction. Specifically, he argues that *den* in (1) is extracted from the adjunct clause, with the empty category in the final clause being a PG. As evidence for his view that the *wh*-phrase has been extracted from the *if*-clause rather than from the final CP, Felix brings in: (i) the existence of sentences in which there is only one gap from which the *wh*-phrase could have been extracted, (4), and (ii) the fact that there are sentences in which the verbs in the two clauses assign different morphological cases, (5):

(4) Das ist der Wein$_i$ den$_i$ wenn ich e_i trink, krieg ich Kopfweh
     this is the wine$_i$ which$_i$ if   I e_i drink get   I   headache

(5) Das ist der Kerl$_i$ den$_i$ / *dem$_i$ wenn ich e_i treff, werd ich e_i helfen
     this is the guy$_i$ whom$_i$ (acc) / whom$_i$ (dat) if   I e_i meet will   I e_i help

2. Problems with Felix (1985): In addition to theoretical problems bearing on extraction out of a strong island and others, there are also a number of empirical problems with Felix' analysis. First, extraction from strong islands is disallowed in another, similar parasitic gap construction in BG, namely the one that arguably feeds on the phenomenon of "Emphatic Topicalization" (cf. in particular Bayer 2001, Lutz 1997, 2004 *i.a.*):

(6)   a. Den, wann i *e* derwisch, derschlog i *e*.
        him   if   I *e* catch   slay   I *e*
        'If I catch him, I slay him'
    b. *Den Peter$_i$ / *Wen$_i$ ärgert   sich Hans, wenn er t$_i$ sieht?
        the$_{ACC}$ Peter / who annoys REFL Hans if   he   sees
    c. *Koa Mensch, wenn t$_i$ b'suffa is, foit eam$_i$ was   g'scheids ei.
        no man   if   drunk   is falls him something useful   in

Under Felix' analysis, if *den* in (1) leaves the island, this means among other things that it can reach a position from where it may c-command into the host CP, thereby licensing a parasitic gap in it. In addition to theory-internal problems, Felix' analysis predicts that the relative pronoun should be able to cyclically move higher up, producing examples like (7):

(7) *Das ist der Kerl den ich erwarte (dass) wenn ich erwisch, erschlag ich.
     this is the guy who I   expect (that) if   I   catch   slay   I

However, the very fact that the relative pronoun in (1) must appear in the left edge of the (leftward-moved) island (see next section) suggests that the pronoun never leaves this island. This is indeed what I propose. The crucial ingredients of my analysis are given in section 3.

3. Proposal: The central claims that I put forward are: (i) BG but not SG has a recursive CP, (8), where the (VP-adjoined) *if*-clause has moved to the specifier of the final CP, thereby triggering inversion (i.e. verb movement to C^0), much like in English (cf. Emonds 1969) – e.g. *Up to the parliament marched thousands of demonstrators*; (ii) the so-called 'relative pronoun' in sentences like (1) is in fact an agreeing complementizer, or at most a (PF-)merger of the complementizer *dass* 'that' and a clitic, analogous to the (dialectal) Italian *che l'* in (9) and the French *qui* in (10) – cf. Rooryck (2000), who analyzes *qui* as a complex of *que* and a clitic (cf. also Kayne 1976); (iii) the 'parasitic gap' in (1) is a null resumptive, i.e. *pro* (Cinque 1990), analogous to (11a) in Italian (compare (11a) to the rest of the paradigm).

(8) Das ist der Kerl [CP den$_j$ [CP [Spec,CP wenn ich e_j erwisch]$_i$ erschlag ich t$_i$ e_j]]

(9) e una cosa ***che l'*** ha   detto il ministro   (Fiorentino 2007)
    is a   thing **that it$_{CL}$**-has said the minister
    (standard = **che** ha detto **0** il ministro)
                   that has said **0** the minister

(10) je voudrais un renseignement: c'est à propos de ma femme ***qu'elle*** a été opérée y a deux mois
    I'd like to have some information: it regards my wife **that she** has been operated 2 months ago
    (standard = ***qui*** 'who')

(11) a. Questo è l'uomo$_i$ che se vedo e_i faccio morire e_i.
        this   is the man that if see-I   make-I die
    b. Questo è l'uomo$_i$ che se lo$_i$ vedo, faccio morire e_i.
        this   is the man that if him$_{cl}$ see-I make-I die
    c. ?/%Questo è l'uomo, che se lo   vedo, lo faccio morire.
           this   is the man that if him$_{cl}$ see-I him$_{cl}$ make-I die
    d. *Questo è l'uomo, che se vedo, lo faccio morire.
          this   is the man that if see-I him$_{cl}$ make-I die

The fact that neither Weak (and, in particular) nor Strong Crossover effects arise in BG in the relevant construction, (12) and (13), testifies to the correctness of this analysis; recall that resumption systematically gives rise to WCO obviation (cf. Demirdache 1991 and McCloskey 1990, who assign a bi-clausal structure to constructions containing resumptive pronouns, which for all intents and purposes, has the effects of the CP-recursion structure in (8) above):

(12) Wea is da Bua$_i$ den$_i$ waun sei$_i$ Muatta e_i dawascht, daschlogt-s(-n$_i$)/e_i?
    who is the guy whom if   his mother e_i catches   slays-she(-him)/e_i

(13) [Wöches Büdl vom Hauns$_i$]$_j$, des waun a$_i$ in da Zeitung e_j siagt, wü a$_i$ e_j himochn?
      Which picture of   Hans   which if he$_i$ in the paper e_j sees will he e_j destroy

In turn, the fact that BG but not SG violates the Doubly Filled Complementizer Filter (Bayer 1984, 2001) directly motivates my idea that CP-recursion is possible in BG but not in SG:

(14) I woaß ned **wer daß** des doa hat.
      I know not **who that** this done has

As mentioned, the idea that 'relative pronouns' are (inflected) complementizers has been independently argued for a.o. by Pesetsky & Torrego (2006) for Dutch (on top of English): "The Dutch counterpart to English finite *who* and *which* relatives […] displays a form that starts with *d-*, just like demonstratives and just like the normal declarative complementizer *dat*. […] We suspect that the presence of *d-* rather than *w-* is significant. The [...] elements *die* and *dat* are agreeing complementizers, not *wh*-phrases […]."

References

Bayer, J. 1984. COMP in Bavarian syntax. *The Linguistic Review* 3: 209-274.

Bayer, J. 2001. Asymmetry in emphatic topicalization. In C. Féry & W. Sternefeld (eds.) *Audiatur Vox Sapientiae*. Akademie-Verlag. 15-47.

Bayer, J. & E. Brandner. 2008. On Wh-Head-Movement and the Doubly-Filled-Comp Filter. *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 87-95.

Cinque, G. 1990. *Types of A-bar Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Demirdache, H. 1991. Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Appositives and Dislocation Structures. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Emonds, J. 1969. Root and structure-preserving transformations. Bloomington, IN: Indiana. University Linguistics Club.

Felix, S. 1985. Parasitic gaps in German. In W. Abraham (ed.) *Erklärende Syntax des Deutschen* 173-201. Tübingen: Narr.

Fiorentino, G. 2007. European relative clauses and the uniqueness of the relative pronoun type. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 19(2): 263-291.

Kayne, R. 2006. French relative ‚que'. F. Hensey & M. Lújan (eds.) *Current Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Georgetown University Press 255-299.

Kayne, R. 2008. Why isn't 'this' a complementizer? Ms, NYU.

Klima, E. 1964. *Studies in Diachronic Transformational Syntax*. PhD dissertation, Harvard.

Lutz, U. 1997. Parasitic gaps und Vorfeldstruktur. In F.-J. d'Avis & U. Lutz (eds.) *Zur Satzstruktur des Deutschen*. Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340, 90, 55-80.

Lutz, U. 2004. ET, parasitic gaps and German clause structure. In H. Lohnstein & S. Trissler (eds) *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery 265-311*. Berlin: Mouton.

Manzini, R. & L. Savoia. 2003. The nature of complementizers. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 28: 87-110.

McCloskey, J. 1990. Resumptive pronouns, A'-binding, and levels of representation in Irish. In R. Hendrick (ed.) *The Syntax of Modern Celtic Languages* 199–248. Academic Press.

Rooryck, J. 2000. *Configurations of Sentential Complementation*. Routledge: London.

Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego. 2006. Probes, goals and syntactic categories. In Y. Otsu (ed.) *Proceedings of the 7th annual Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*. Hituzi Syobo.