ON ITEMS INTRODUCING FINITE RELATIVE AND INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES IN ENGLISH AND DUTCH*

FRITS STUURMAN

University of Utrecht

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, some phenomena about the items introducing finite relative and interrogative clauses (complementizers, pronouns and determiners) in English and Dutch are reviewed. It will be suggested that a generalization obtains across the two languages that the rule that moves constituents containing pronouns and determiners in such clauses can only be characterized as a 'complementizer substitution' (rather than 'complementizer attraction') transformation if there is a complementizer in the language which belongs to the same morphological class as the characteristic item contained in the constituent moved.

In section II below it is demonstrated that in English there is one morphological class of pronouns and determiners characteristic of finite relative and interrogative clauses, viz. *wh-* items, whereas in Dutch there are two such morphological classes, *d*-items and *w*- items. Among the complementizers in relative and interrogative clauses, English again has a member of the morphological *wh-* class (*whether*); by contrast, Dutch does have a *d*- item among its complementizers (*dat*), but no *w*- item. In section III it is shown that whereas moved English *wh-* constituents (i.e. constituents containing a *wh-* item) and Dutch *d*- constituents are mutually exclusive with complementizers (and will consequently by said to have been moved by a 'complementizer substitution' transformation), Dutch *w*- constituents can freely (though with stylistic consequences) be followed by complementizers (and have therefore been moved by

a 'complementizer attraction' transformation). Finally, in section IV it is suggested that apparently arbitrary differences between English and Dutch complementizer-pairs can be systematically accounted for in the approach developed below.

II. ITEMS INTRODUCING FINITE RELATIVE AND INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES

English finite relative and (pronominal) interrogative clauses may contain any one of the following pronouns and/or determiners: *who, whom, whose, which, what, where, when, why, how* and compounds derived from these, mainly in *-ever* (e.g. *whatever*; also: *whence* and 'prepositional adverbs' such as *whereat, whereby,* etc.). On the basis of the morphological element shared by most of these, they are commonly referred to as *wh-* pronouns and determiners. Thus for instance:

(1) the girl *who* you kissed is my sister
(2) *which* girl did you kiss
(3) he asked *which* girl you kissed

In the parallel cases Dutch selects from two sets of pronouns and/or determiners: the so-called *d-* set (*die, dat*) and a set most of whose members share the morpheme *w-*, the *w-* set (*wie, wat, wiens, wier, welk(e), wanneer, hoe, waar,* and the 'prepositional adverbs' based on *waar* such as *waarop, waarbij,* etc.). Thus compare English (1) — (3) to their Dutch equivalents (4) — (6) respectively:

(4) a het meisje *dat* je kuste is mijn zuster
   b het meisje *wat* je kuste is mijn zuster[1]
(5)   *welk* meisje kuste je
(6)   hij vroeg *welk* meisje je kuste

It will be noted that in (4) there are two possibilities: *dat* and *wat*. This may suggest that only (4b) is really a parallel to (1), (4a) rather being like (7):

(7) the girl *that* you kissed is my sister

Such an identification of Dutch *dat* as in (4a) with English *that* as in (7) might seem to get additional support from the fact that the morphemes *that* and *dat* are also parallel in both appearing as demonstrative pronouns/determiners:

(8) I wanted *that* (thing)
(9) ik wilde *dat* (ding)

---

[1] Many of the Dutch examples are subject to dialectal differences in acceptability; thus in colloquial Dutch (4b) is far more normal than (4a), the latter, however, being preferred in formal and/or written Dutch.

However, there are a number of differences in the behaviour of the demonstrative *that* as in (8) and the *that* appearing in (7): see (10) — (14); rather, the latter is similar to the complementizer *that*: see (15). On the other hand, the behaviour of the demonstrative *dat* in (9) is very similar to the *dat* appearing in (4a) (and different from the complementizer *dat,* see below): see (16) — (21).

(10) a I wanted *that* thing (={8})
    b the thing *that* I wanted (cf. (7))
(11) a I looked *at that*
    b *the thing *at that* I looked
(12) a *I wanted *that* things
    b the things *that* I wanted
(13) a I wanted *those* things
    b *the things *those* I wanted
(14) a *I wanted — thing
    b the thing — I wanted

Thus, with respect to the (im) possibility of being preceded by a preposition (such as *at*: (11)), the (in) compatibility with a plural noun (see (12) — (13)), and optional/obligatory nature (see 14)), the two *that*'s differ consistently. The *that* introducing a relative clause (as in (7) and (10b)) rather patterns in the same way as the complementizer *that* (cf. (15)), with which it may therefore be identified:

(15) a he said *that* I wanted it
    *b he was amazed *at that* I wanted it
    *c he said *those* I wanted it
    d he said — I wanted it

Now consider the Dutch examples (16)—(21), similar in principle to English (10)—(14):

(16)a ik wilde *dat* ding (={9})
    b het ding *dat* ik wilde (cf. (4a))
(17)a *ik zorgde *voor(-)dat*
    b *het ding *voor(-)dat* ik zorgde
(18)a *ik wilde *dat* dingen
    b *de dingen *dat* ik wilde
(19)a ik wilde *die* dingen
    b de dingen *die* ik wilde
(20)a *ik wilde *dat* boot
      (I wanted that boat)
    b *de boot *dat* ik wilde

(21)a ik wilde *die* boot
  b *de* boot *die* ik wilde

The Dutch *dat*'s of (4a), (16b) and of (9), (16a) consistently behave in the same way with respect to the impossibility of being preceded by a preposition (such as *voor*: (17)), incompatibility with a plural noun (see (18)) and incompatibility with a singular noun of *de* gender (see (20); cf. '*het ding*', *'de* ding', *'het* boot', '*de* boot'). On this basis both these *dat*'s are identified as pronouns/determiners (either demonstrative or relative respectively). Consequently, (4b) is not to be considered as a parallel to (7) (nor (16b) to (10b)):

(7) the girl *that* you kissed …: *that*=complementizer
(4)b het meisje *dat* je kuste … : *dat*=pronoun

However, the issue is complicated by the fact that in Dutch relative clauses also an introducing item *dat* may appear which does not behave as the *dat* exemplified so far: –

(22) het moment *dat* je kwam
  (the moment   you came)

Applying the 'preposition', 'plural noun', and '*de* gender' tests to the *dat* in (22) we get:

(23)a hij betreurde *dat* moment (cf. (16a))
    (he regretted that moment)
  b het moment *dat* je kwam (=(22))
(24)a *hij schaamde zich voor(-)dat*
    (he was-ashamed-about   that)
  b het moment *voor-dat* je kwam
(25)a *hij betreurde *dat* moment*en*
  b de moment*en* *dat* je kwam
(26)a hij betreurde *die* momenten
  b *de momenten *die* je kwam
(27)a *hij betreurde *dat* dag
    (he regretted   day)
  b *de* dag *dat* je kwam
(28)a hij betreurde *die* dag
  b *de dag *die* je kwam

As was shown to be the case with the *that* introducing relative clauses in English, this Dutch *dat* patterns like the complementizer *dat*:

(29)a hij zei *dat* ik het wilde
    (he said that I it wanted)

  b hij zei het *voor- dat* ik het wilde
    (he said it before that I it wanted)
  c* hij zei *die* ik het wilde

In addition to the complementizers *that* in English and *dat* in Dutch, each language has at least one more finite clause complementizer:

(30)a	he said	*that*	I wanted it (=(15a))
b	*he said	*whether*	I wanted it
c	*he said	*that whether*	I wanted it
d	*he said	*whether that*	I wanted it
(31)a	*he asked	*that*	I wanted it
b	he asked	*whether*	I wanted it
c	*he asked	*that whether*	I wanted it
d	*he asked	*whether that*	I wanted it
(32)a	hij zei	*dat*	ik het wilde (=(29a))
b	*hij zei	*of*	ik het wilde
c	*hij zei	*dat of*	ik het wilde
d	*hij zei	*of dat*	ik het wilde
(33)a	*hij vroeg	*dat*	ik het wilde
b	hij vroeg	*of*	ik het wilde
c	*hij vroeg	*dat of*)	ik het wilde
d	hij vroeg	*of dat*	ik het wilde [2]

From the complementary distribution of *whether* with *that* it can be concluded that, given that *that* is a complementizer in (30a), *whether* is a complementizer as well in (31b). The situation in Dutch is slightly more complicated, since *of* and *dat* are not mutually exclusive, as (33d) shows. The approach implicitly adopted in Paardekooper (1971), as evidenced by his spelling: *ofdat*, is to consider *of dat* as one word. This solution, (getting some support from the impossibility of the opposite sequence (see (33c)), is the simplest one for our purposes: thus *of/ofdat* is in complementary distribution with *dat*, so that, given that *dat* is a complementizer in (32a), *of/ofdat* in (35b) and (33d) is a complementizer as well.

Summarizing, it appears that both English and Dutch have one finite clause complementizer that belongs to the same morphological class as (some of) the pronouns and determiners characteristic of relative and interrogative clauses, and one finite clause complementizer that does not thus belong to a morphological class of relative and interrogative pronouns and determiners. These facts may be schematically represented as in Table I:

---

[1] (33d) is rather colloquial, (33b) being preferred by many speakers.

	En. *th-*	En. *wh-*	Du. *d-*	Du. *w-*	Du. *o-*
pronouns/determiners	−	+	+	+	−
complementizers	+	+	+	−	+

Table I: Items introducing English and Dutch finite relative and interrogative clauses, classified morphologically.

III. MOVEMENT IN FINITE RELATIVE AND INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES

In what follows it is taken for granted that the *wh-*, *d-* and *w-* constituents that introduce finite relative and interrogative clauses are not base-generated *in situ*, but are generated in those positions that allow them to be assigned the appropriate grammatical functions. Thus, *who* in (1), *which girl* in (2) and (3), *dat* and *wat* in (4), and *welk meisje* in (5) and (6) are direct objects: underlying these examples would therefore be structures approximated in (34) and (35):

(34)a	... you kissed *who* ...		(underlying (1))
b	... you kissed *which girl* ...		(underlying (2) and (3))
(35)a	... je *dat*	kuste ...	(underlying (4a))
b	... je *wat*	kuste ...	(underlying (4b))
c	... je *welk meisje*	kuste ...	(underlying (5) and (6))

To get the direct objects of (34) and (35) into their clause-introducing surface position, we assume a structure preserving transformation which moves them into COMP (cf. Emonds (1976)), COMP being the clause-initial category into which complementizers may be placed

(36) SD: ... [$_{COMP}$ ...] ... X ...
         1   2

SC: 1   2 ⇒ 2 ∅

(X = English *wh-*, Dutch *d-*, *w-*)

In (present-day) English, if a *wh-* constituent is moved into COMP it is mutually exclusive complementizers with:

(37)a	the girl *who*	you kissed ... (=(1))
b	*the girl *who that*	you kissed
c	*the girl *that who*	you kissed
d	*the girl *who whether*	you kissed
e	*the girl *whether who*	you kissed

We will therefore call *wh-* movement a complementizer 'substitution' transformation.

In Dutch, a moved *d-* constituent is also mutually exclusive with complementizers:

(38)a	de jongen *die*	je kuste (cf. (4a))	
	(the boy	who	you kissed)
b	*de jongen *die dat*	je kuste	
c	*de jongen *dat die*	je kuste	
d	*de jongen *die of(dat)*	je kuste	
e	*de jongen *of(dat) die*	je kuste	

Thus, Dutch *d-* movement, like English *wh-* movement, is a complementizer substitution transformation. A different picture emerges however in the case of *w-* movement: *w-* constituents in COMP are (more or less) freely followed (but never preceded) by complementizers:

(39)a	het meisje *wat*	je kuste
b	het meisje *wat dat*	je kuste [3, 4]
c	*het meisje *dat wat*	je kuste
d	het meisje *wat of(dat)*	je kuste
e	*het meisje *of(dat) wat*	je kuste

The transformation which moves a constituent into COMP with the result that the moved constituent may co-occur with complementizers we will call a complementizer 'attraction' transformation.

To represent the facts dealt with in this section, the relevant parts of Table I (i.e. columns 2, 3, and 4) may be extended as in Table II:

	En. *wh-*	Du. *d-*	Du. *w-*
pronouns/determiners	+	+	+
complementizer	+	+	−
movement =	sub	sub	attr

Table II: Introducing items and movement transformations in English and Dutch finite relative and interrogative clauses, classified morphologically

(sub = complementizer substitution
attr = complementizer attraction)

---

[3] Traditionally, the complementizers *dat* and *of(dat)* are said not to co-occur with relative pronouns/determiners (e.g., Rijpma and Schuringa (1969:161); van Calcar's (1973) doubts whether this tradition does justice to the actual data were confirmed in a small-scale experiment carried out by some students which showed that

(i) hij vroeg *wat of(dat)* je wilde
(he asked what you wanted)

(ii) het ding *wat of(dat)* je wilde
(the thing which you wanted)

are about equally accepted and both much better than

(iii)* het ding *dat of(dat)* je wilde

[4] (39b) sounds worse to me than (39d); however, both seem to me to be possible, which was also the judgement that emerged from the experiment alluded to in note 3.

The facts a presented in Table II suggest that there is, for English and Dutch, a correlation between whether the language has a complementizer of the same morphological class as the characteristic items in the constituents moved and whether the transformation that moves these constituents is a complementizer substitution or a complementizer attraction transformation.[5] Thus we get the generalization (40) across English and Dutch:

(40)   In finite relative and interrogative clauses, movement transformations are only complementizer substitution transformations if a complementizer is available in the language which belongs to the same morphological class as the characteristic pronouns/determiners contained in the constituents moved

IV. ENGLISH AND DUTCH COMPLEMENTIZERS COMPARED

As a comparison of (10b) to (14b) and of (15a) to (15d) (here repeated as (41)) shows, the insertion of the complementizer *that* under COMP is optional in certain cases in English:

(41)a the thing *that* I wanted (=(10b))
    b the thing   I wanted (=(14b))
    c he said   *that* I wanted it (=(15a))
    d he said   I wanted it (=(15d))

This phenomenon has no direct parallel in Dutch (although, as (39b) and (39d) versus (39a) show, insertion of a complementizer under COMP is optional in Dutch if a *w-* constituent has been attracted to COMP):

(42)a het moment *dat* je kwam (=(22))
    b *het moment   je kwam
    c hij zei   *dat* ik het wilde (=(29a))
      *hij zei   ik het wilde

It would seem that the optionality of inserting English *that* versus obligatory insertion of Dutch *dat* under COMP correlate to whether or not these complementizers figure in Table II. In other words, *that* may well be less 'important' than *dat* because it does not have any implications with respect to whether a transformation is complementizer substitution or attraction.

Similarly, the difference between the English complementizer *whether* and the Dutch complementizer *of* now appears to be systematic. *Whether* is a

---

[5] It should be emphasized that this paper restricts itself to those two languages; none of its claims are intended as candidates for universality, its only aim being to develop a systematic account of the phenomena discussed.

wh- item and thus correlates with *wh-* movement being a complementizer substitution transformation; by contrast, *of* (like *dat*) is not a *w-* item and thus *w*-movement is not a complementizer substitution transformation. It has often been argued (cf. Grimshaw (1977 : 211—214) and the references cited there) that English *whether* should be analyzed as *wh-+-either*. Such an analysis nicely fits in with the argument of this paper: it makes it possible to say that both English *either* and Dutch *of* can serve as either a conjunction in a correlative coordination or as a complementizer:

(43)a they ask *wh-either* John comes
    b they ask *either*   John or Peter
(44)a ze vragen *of*   Jan komt
    b ze vragen *of*   Jan of Piet

Thus, *either/whether* and *of* are much more similar than they would appear to be at first sight: they have essentially the same distribution, appearing either as a correlative conjunction or as a complementizer; only, English *wh-* movement is a complementizer substitution transformation: thus, a *wh*-complementizer is required and therefore to *either* as complementizer *wh-* is added, so that it will actually emerge as *whether*.

V. CONCLUSION

The similarities and differences in the behaviour of English *that* and Dutch *dat* introducing finite relative clauses require a description by which *that* is always a complementizer, whereas *dat* may either be a complementizer or a pronoun. This means that Dutch has a morphological class of *d-* items which contains both *d-* pronouns and a *d-* complementizer, just as English has a morphological class of *wh-* items which contains both *wh-* pronouns and/or determiners and a *wh-* complementizer. However, Dutch also has a morphological class of *w-* items containing pronouns and/or determiners likewise introducing finite relative and interrogative clauses, but no complementizer. This correlates with a difference between movement transformations in finite relative clauses and interrogative clauses: *wh-* and *d-* movement are complementizer substitution transformations, *w-* movement is a complementizer attraction transformation. In this light it is possible to give a principled account of some otherwise arbitrary facts: the optionality of the English complementizer *that* versus the obligatoriness of the Dutch complementizer *dat* in many equivalent cases, and the relation between the English correlative conjunction *either* and complementizer *whether* and the Dutch correlative *of* and complementizer *of*.

REFERENCES

Calcar, W. van. 1973. "Het voegwoord 'of'". In Hulshof, H. (ed.). 1975. 262—280.

Emonds, J. E. 1976. *A transformational approach to the English syntax*. New York: Academic Press.

Grimshaw, J. B. 1977. *English wh- constructions and the theory of grammar*. Facsimile, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

Hulshof, H. (ed.). 1975. *Transformationeel-generatieve grammatica in artikelen*. Groningen: Tjeenk Willink.

Paardekooper, P. C. 1971. *Beknopte ABN-syntaxis*. Den Bosch: Malmberg.

Rijpma, E. and Schuringa, F. G. 1969. *Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen: Wolters.