Vortmer bidde wi unde manen alle guode lude...
DOUBLE AGREEMENT IN THE MIDDLE LOW GERMAN DIALECTS

The Middle Low German (MLG) dialects, spoken and written north of the Benrath line from ca. 1250 until 1600, are, concerning verbal inflection, particularly famous for their *Einheitsplural* (i.e. a common ending for all persons of the plural). In the plural, some dialects (particularly the western ones) have a common ending on -et, whereas other ones have a plural ending -en (or in the later period -ent) (cf. Lasch [2]1974). However, these endings, mentioned in the standard syntax works of MLG (e.g. Luebben 1882, Lasch [2]1974, Dietl 2002) are not the only ones found in the MLG dialects: other plural endings, e.g. on -e, are attested as well. In the second person an alternative ending can be found as well, mostly combined with a clitic singular pronoun.

In this paper we show, based on a corpus study, that there, where Lasch ([2]1974) mentions, that cases like *gifstu* ('you give' in inversion) have been developed as an assimilation of adjacent dentals (instead of *gifst du*), we are in fact dealing with position dependent/double agreement, a syntactic phenomenon which also occurs in other West Germanic dialects, e.g. in some Dutch dialects (cf. Barbiers et al. 2006, De Vogelaer 2008) and in Bavarian (cf. Weiss 2005). This means that verbs in inversion context (1) and in verb-second (V2) sentences with a filled topic position (2), in which the subject follows the left sentence bracket, show a different inflection as the ones in V2 sentences with the subject left of the left clause boundary (3).

We will present the results of a diachronic corpus study based on a corpus of dated and localized Middle Low German texts, which is balanced with regard to genre, writing period, and dialect and which shows that double agreement is robustly attested in all MLG dialects in the second person singular and in the first person plural, although the verbal endings in the dialects can differ. Regarding the analyses of a number of Dutch dialects of i.a. Zwart (1993), and Postma (2013) we develop an analysis for the phenomenon in MLG, based on the difference between verbs with the subject between the left and right sentence boundaries (in the *Mittelfeld*) and verbs with a preverbal subject, schematically represented as (4) for (5).

The cause of the difference between the structures lies, as it has been mentioned for Dutch, (cf. Postma) in the loss of a strong, movement-evoking EPP-feature on the pronoun agreeing with the inflected verb form. This is strengthened by the fact that MLG clitics/pronouns in the Wackernagel position clearly are weak (deficient) pronouns, i.e. they do spell out less features as full pronouns, f.e. the above mentioned inversed second person inflection *gifstu* (cf. Cardinaletti & Starke 1999), which is similar to what has been described for the High German dialects (cf. Weiß 2005).

Some puzzling cases we will focus on are structures which seem to involve second conjuncts (6). In these cases, the inflection of the verb shows the same inflection as the one in the V2 clauses with the topic preceding the left sentence bracket, which means that these structures with *vnde* are no real cases of conjunction reduction since they are asymmetric. This causes implications for the second conjuncts, since they should in this respect rather be analyzed as main causes. We will support this theory with recent findings on the use of *vnde* ('and') as a chunk initiating discourse marker instead of a real conjunction in MLG (Farasyn & Breitbarth 2015).

(1)   V1   [$_C$**hebbe** [$_{TP}$wy Greue Gerd vnde Greue Johan [...]]]

(2)   Topic+V2   [$_{CP}$Vortmer [$_C$**bidde** [$_{TP}$wi [...]]]

(3)   V2   (vnde) [$_{TP}$wi [$_T$**scolen** dar vmme manen [...]]]

<div align="right">(*Myrren bundeken*, Westphalian, 1480)</div>

(4)   [$_{CP}$ topic/Wh/contrastive XP [$_{C'}$ V-**e** [$_{TP}$ wi [$_T$ V-**en** ...]]]]

(5)   Queme dar ienich schade to den **endorue** wi nicht wedder lecghen , noch dar vmme in Riden , Mer wi **scholen** , dat vor volghen mit rechte vnde wesen dar na truweliken , mit alle vser macht"
„Should any damage come to them, we would not dare to oppose [...] but we shall follow it with right and be there faithfully, with all our might'

<div align="right">(*Urkundenbuch Lübeck*, North Low Saxon, 1328)</div>

(6)   "Vortmer , **bidde** wi *vnde* **manen** alle guode lude , Houeman , vnde husman Dat se alle mit eneme schrichte volghen..."
„Furthermore we pray and demand from every good man, nobleman and peasant, that they all sue with a complaint..."

<div align="right">(*Urkundenbuch Lübeck,* North Low Saxon, 1334)</div>

L<small>ITERATURE</small>
Barbiers, S. et al. (2006). *Dynamische Syntactische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten* (DynaSAND). Amsterdam, Meertens Instituut.
Cardinaletti, A. & Starke, M. (1999). The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. *Clitics in the languages of Europe*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 145-233.
De Vogelaer, G. (2008). *De Nederlandse en Friese subjectsmarkeerders: geografie, typologie en diachronie*. Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal-en Letterkunde.
Dietl, C. (2002). *Minimalgrammatik: Mittelniederdeutsch*. Kümmerle.
Farasyn, M. & Breitbarth, A. (2015). *Null Subjects in Middle Low German*. Paper presented at DiGS 17, Reykjavík.
Lasch, A. (^{2}1974). *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik*. Vol. 9. Walter de Gruyter.
Lübben, A. (1882). *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik: nebst Christomathie und Glossar.* Weigel.
Postma, G. (2013). Clause-Typing by [2] - the loss of the 2nd person pronoun du 'you' in Dutch, Frisian and Limburgian dialects. *Information Structure and Agreement*, 217-254.
Weiß, H. (2005). Inflected Complementizers in Continental West Germanic Dialects. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik*, 148-166.
Zwart, C.J.W. (1993). *Dutch syntax: A minimalist approach*. Diss. Universiteitsdrukkerij.