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0. ABSTRACT This paper explores the status of what in Relative Clauses of English. My investigation focuses on two different contexts in which what-relatives occur; non-standard English dialects and child language acquisition. The debate in the literature has proposed two possibilities; first that what is a relative pronoun in Relative Clauses, with distribution comparable to other wh-pronouns in these constructions (Seppänen 1999). The alternative view classes what as a complementiser in Relative Clauses, whereby what is base generated in C and simply introduces an embedded clause in a way equivalent to that (Radford 1988; Hermann 2005). I argue in favour of a pronominal status of what in Relative Clauses in both non-standard dialects of English and child language acquisition. I begin my investigation by considering the comparability of what to wh-pronouns in other wh-constructions and how its undisputed status as a wh-pronoun should cast doubt on any analysis of what as a complementiser. I then discuss the literature which opposes a pronominal analysis of what; namely its inability to pied-pipe, and its lack of co-reference with the head of the Relative Clause. I dispute the reality of these statements with data from non-standard dialects and child language acquisition. I claim that what in non-standard dialects of English and child language acquisition should retain a wh-pronoun status, as it does in all other wh-constructions. The evidence presented shows that a complementiser analysis does not take into account evidence to the contrary, and the use of what in Relative Clauses is not simply a complementiser with phonological similarity.

1. INTRODUCTION

The status of what in Relative Clauses has been widely discussed in the literature. Some claim that what is more comparable to the complementiser that (Radford 1988; Hermann 2005), whereby it would be base generated in C and show no co-reference to head of the Relative Clause, and a null wh-pronoun would raise up to the specifier of CP to check the strong [wh] feature on C (1). Alternative research has defended its pronominal status in the marker position (Seppänen 1999). This interpretation would treat what in a comparable way to other wh-pronouns which introduce Relative Clauses, where the wh-pronoun raises up to spec CP to check the strong [wh] feature on C, and the pronoun is
marked overtly for case or animacy to show co-reference with the head of the Relative Clause (2).

(1) The woman \([CP \emptyset [C \text{what} [[vP \text{lived [next door]]}]])

(2) The woman \([CP \text{what} [[vP \text{lived [next door]]}]])

Figure 1.1: \textit{What as a complementiser}

Figure 1.2: \textit{What as a wh-pronoun}

This paper defends the status of \textit{what} as a relative pronoun in non-standard English dialects and child language acquisition of English. Research in the past has focused on these two contexts individually, but has not (to my knowledge) considered \textit{what} across them.
Research claiming for a complementiser analysis of *what* poses two restrictions on a pronominal analysis. The ability to pied-pipe and co-refer with the head of the Relative Clause should be reflected if *what* is a wh-pronoun in marker position (Radford 1988). By looking at *what* in other wh-constructions, its distribution in non-standard dialects of English, and its employment by children in child language acquisition I argue for a pronominal analysis of *what*, where the *what* employed in child language acquisition is in some way comparable to the *what* in the Relative Clauses of non-standard English dialects.

2. THE DISTRIBUTION OF *what* OUTSIDE RELATIVE CLAUSES

Radford (1988) discusses the contexts in which wh-movement is involved. These constructions all permit the use of *what* as a wh-pronoun comparable to all other wh-pronouns (*why*, *which*, *who*, *when*, etc).

(3) *What* bit Jason?

(4) *What* a nice smile you have!

(5) Lucy commented on *what* a nice smile she had

(6) Mary is older than *what* Lucy is

Examples (3-6) are based on those discussed by Radford (1988) and all involve wh-movement. Example (3) is a simple wh-question, where the wh-pronoun raises to spec CP to satisfy a strong [uwh*] feature on C (Adger, 2003).

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.1**: *What* as a wh-pronoun

Examples (4) and (5) are wh-exclamatives, *what* can occur in both direct and indirect constructions of this type undertaking movement to spec CP. Example
(6) is a wh-comparative and is restricted to some non-standard dialects (Chomsky 1977:87), however, its lack of occurrence in the Standard does not change the status of the wh-pronoun what.

Contra to this, complementisers such as that, whether and if are base generated in C and introduce an embedded clause, but indicate nothing specific about the content or type of the embedded clause. In Standard English, Relative Clauses with an overt complementiser have a null wh-pronoun as the doubly filled comp filter prevents both being overtly realised. The null pronoun then raises to [spec, CP] to check the [wh] feature on C. Furthermore, only the declarative complementiser that can occur in Standard English Relative Clauses.

(7) The man that wanted to leave
(8) * The man whether wanted to leave
(9) * The man if wanted to leave

The comparability of what to other wh-constructions in English could simply be a phonological coincidence. However, given the declarative nature of the Relative Clause complementiser that, it would seem reasonable to assume the interrogative what should behave as a wh-pronoun, as it does without dispute in the constructions described above.

3. THE DIALECTS THAT USE WHAT

The geographical distribution of what as a marker in Relative Clauses is widely recorded, and the feature is not restricted to a specific regional area. Indeed, Hermann (2005) states that the feature originated around the East of England, specifically Essex. Cheshire, Edwards and Whittle (1993) found the feature used regularly in the North of England and Glasgow. The Survey of English Dialects (1962) reports usage of the feature in various areas around England. It seems, then, that this is not a feature restricted to the North or the South, or even to larger cities, rather it is becoming a “supra-regional non-standard relative marker” (Hermann, 2005: 57).

As discussed above, there are two objections to an analysis of what as a wh-pronoun in Relative Clauses. These are what’s inability to pied-pipe, and its lack of co-reference with the head of the Relative Clause. This section will discuss the literature of both a wh-pronoun analysis and a complementiser analysis with specific reference to these two objections to determine the status of what in the dialects which employ it.

3.1 WHAT’S INABILITY TO PIED-PIPE

In Standard English, prepositional pied-piping in Relative Clauses optionally occurs with wh-pronouns. It involves raising the whole of the PP to spec CP, the [wh] feature then ‘percolates’ onto the PP from which it can be checked.
locally by the wh-pronoun (Dougherty, 1970; Chomsky, 1973: 273). Pied-piping can only occur with overt movement of a wh-pronoun and cannot occur with the complementiser that as examples (10-13) demonstrate:

(10) The man [to whom Lucy talked]
(11) The man [(who(m)) Lucy talked to]
(12) * The man [to that Lucy talked]
(13) * The man [to Lucy talked]

Hermann (2005) classes what as a relative ‘particle’ (complementiser) based on its inability to pied-pipe. However, she derives this inability from the lack of occurrence of the construction in her data. Given that who also shows no evidence of pied-piping in her data, and must in fact be obligatorily replaced by the object form whom in order to pied-pipe (Quirk et al., 1985: 1249) it is curious that she comes to these conclusions about the status of what based upon deficient data.

An example provided by Radford (1988) further suggests the complementiser status of what as a consequence of its inability to pied-pipe:

(14) * The caf about what they was rabbiting. (Radford, 1988: 523)

This ungrammaticality is said to occur in dialects which employ what as a marker. Consequently if (14) reflects an actual dialectal judgement from a
speaker of a what-relative dialect it would advocate a complementiser status of what.

The only way in which to fully determine the acceptability of pied-piped what-relatives in the dialects which employ them would be to carry out acceptability judgement tasks. In a preliminary investigation I asked ten native speakers of English from various regions of England to undertake judgement tasks to assess the acceptability of pied-piped what-relatives. The short questionnaire (see Appendix A) comprised of twelve short sentences, all involving Relative Clauses, an example of a pied-piped what-relative was also included, repeated here as (15).

(15) The clock on what Mary relied

The subjects were asked to grade the sentences presented on a scale of one to three, where one was completely unacceptable and three was completely acceptable. After compilation of the results three of the ten speakers were omitted as they did not permit any of the what-relative constructions.

Only two of the speakers marginally permitted the pied-piped what-relative construction of (15), this was also the only construction involving a what-relative which they allowed. Given the semantic questionability of (15) caused by the verb rely, I re-contacted the seven speakers with a second questionnaire (see Appendix B) containing a greater variety of pied-piped and stranded constructions, four are repeated below.

(16) The book on the cover of what was a nice picture

(17) The meeting at what we discussed the issue

(18) The letter what she had declared her love in

(19) The table what she served dinner on

The judgements given clarified that the two speakers who had permitted the pied-piped construction were not speakers of a what-relative dialect. An explanation for their initial acceptance of the constructions is posed below. The judgements given for (16-19) are represented in figures 3.2 and 3.3.
Figure 3.2: Pied-piped what

Figure 3.3: What with Preposition Stranding

Figure 3.2 represents the judgements given in answer to the pied-piped constructions (16) and (17) respectively; figure 3.3 illustrates the judgements given for the stranded constructions in (18) and (19). Under Radford’s (1988) assumptions this would indicate a complementiser status of what. However, I would question the reliability of pied-piping as an indicator of pronominal status in non-standard Relative Clauses of English. The occurrence of pied-piping in English is restricted to formal, standard occasions; Kayne (1994: 25) discusses how his ‘colloquial’ English does not permit pied-piping of interrogatives and relatives.
He claims that the ability to preposition strand in non-standard English removes the ability to move the object of the preposition to [Spec, PP], and as a consequence pied-piped structures are classed as unacceptable.

Moreover, Heck (2008) discusses the claim that pied-piping is a feature of the standard, taught in schools, but not a reflection of the language employed in non-standard contexts. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that the Standard English grammar employs pied-piping, but non-standard dialects make use of preposition stranding. Indeed, in personal conversation with one of the speakers of the what-relative dialect, they commented on a preference of stranded constructions such as (22), even when presented with other wh-pronouns.

Subsequently, when the option of pied-piping non-standard what is presented it is interpreted as a bizarre blend of the most Standard (written) English dialect with a marked non-standard dialect feature, and is classed as unacceptable. The marginal acceptability of the constructions provided by the speakers in the first judgement task can thus be explained. When asked to provide judgements of their speech speakers may have selected an option they interpreted to be correct, based on the formality of pied-piping, rather than a representation of their actual usage.

3.2 What’s lack of co-reference with the head of the Relative Clause
Standard English relative pronouns are in a co-reference relationship with the head of the Relative Clause and are consequently marked overtly for animacy, case, subject, object etc, as examples (24-27) illustrate.

If what is indeed a relative pronoun it should reflect this relationship and its distribution should be restricted. Complementisers only act to introduce an
embedded clause, so are not constrained by the contexts in which they can occur.

(28) The man that went on holiday

(29) The stone that Lucy lost

Hermann (2005) claims that what occurs in dialects as a complementiser, yet, she acknowledges its “stronger propensity toward non-restrictive environments” (40), and goes onto say how it seems mostly in competition for the same syntactic position as which. Given that the use of complementisers to introduce non-restrictive Relative Clauses is rarely, if ever, acceptable (Quirk et al., 1985:1258), this preference of what towards non-restrictive environments indicates a pronominal status, contrary to Hermann’s (2005) interpretation.

The judgements provided by the speakers of my preliminary investigation (see Appendix A) are constrained by animacy, echoing the distribution of what in Hermann’s (2005) investigation. Judgements were provided in answer to constructions (30) and (31), and the results are reflected in figures 3.4 and 3.5 overleaf.

(30) The beach what Jason loved

(31) a. The man what travelled abroad

   b. The woman what Lucy visited

![Figure 3.5: If what with Relativised Inanimate Subject](image-url)
Figure 3.4 represents the results in answer to question (30) above with an inanimate subject relative. All of the speakers accept the construction. This contrasts with figure 3.5 where the animate nature of the subject or object in (31a) or (31b) has ameliorated the acceptability to varying degrees. These restrictions on the distribution of what are evidence in favour of a pronominal analysis.

Research has also suggested that what can be marked for genitive case. Radford (1988:523) emphasised the status of what as a complementiser with example (32) paired with (14) above:

(32) *the caf what’s roof got blown off

Contra to this, Seppänen (1999) considers the innovative genitive case marking on complementisers and how this has developed from a resumptive pronoun strategy. Although he discusses the development of case marking on complementisers, he includes what in his study but as a non-standard wh-pronoun which has acquired overt marking for genitive case in a comparable way to these complementisers, and perhaps even wh-pronouns as example (33) suggests.

(33) a. what his uncle was drowned / what’s uncle got drowned
    b. who his uncle were drowned / whose uncle were drowned

(Example taken from Seppänen, 1999: 23)
Seppänen (1999) interprets the cliticisation observable as initially only being applicable to contexts where his could be fully realised, but over time this has come to be a marker of genitive case with *what*, as appears to be the case with genitive case marked whose (33b). His proposal is echoed by Cheshire, Edwards and Whittle (1993) who find genitive case marking in their study of non-standard English dialects.

(34) That’s the girl what’s Mum loves horror films

Here, the marking of genitive case has been generalised to account for positions where *his* could not occur, even if a resumptive strategy were employed. Consequently, the marking of genitive case for *what* and whose can be comparably represented in Figures 3.6 and 3.7, with both wh-words raising to the Spec of CP as relative pronouns and checking the genitive case feature on D.

![Figure 3.7: Genitive Case-marked whose](image)

3.3 Summary
It would seem reasonable to conclude that in non-standard dialects of English *what* maintains its wh-pronoun status when it occurs in Relative Clauses. With regards to pied-piping there is a difference between the Standard dialect and other non-standard varieties. The analysis presented illustrates that although pied-piping may be a method to determine pronominal status in Standard English; this is not necessarily applicable to non-standard dialects where it does not prove a complementiser status of *what* in Relative Clauses.

The claim that *what* is not marked and consequently does not co-refer with the head of the Relative Clause is quite untrue. The analysis presented above shows that *what* is constrained comparably to which for animacy and favours
wh-pronoun environments. In addition, there is evidence that it can overtly mark genitive case in a way comparable to whose.

4. LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND what

The use of what by children acquiring English is a common occurrence, even in children for whom it is not reflected in their adult dialect (Menyuk, 1969). I argue for a pronominal status of what in child language acquisition in opposition to the two main objections discussed above; what's inability to pied-pipe and its lack of co-reference with the head of the Relative Clause.

4.1 What’s Inability to Pied-Pipe

Given the rarity of pied-piping in spoken adult English, it is not surprising that this construction is not found in children's early Relative Clauses (Diessel 2004). In French, pied-piping is obligatory as a consequence of the prepositions inability to properly govern a trace (Kayne 1983:167). However, Labelle (1990) discusses how children acquiring French prefer to employ alternative strategies and no occurrences of pied-piping are found, despite its necessity in the adult grammar. Consequently, the added complexity involved in the derivation and the optionality of the construction in English, could result in children selecting the simplest path in the construction of an already complex sentence.

The difference between pied-piping in the Standard and non-standard dialects highlighted above could also indicate why children fail to employ this construction in their early Relative Clauses. The Standard English dialect is not reflected in the actual speech of the majority of adult English speakers; consequently, pied-piping may not be part of the grammar the child is developing. If this was the case, preposition stranding would be the only option presented by the grammar from which the child was developing his language.

4.2 What’s Lack of Co-Reference with the Head of the Relative Clause

The constraints observable on wh-pronouns in the Relative Clauses of children differ to those in the adult language (Menyuk 1971). Children acknowledge the existence of a group of wh-words per se, however, they do not distribute the relative pronouns comparably to the adult grammar in terms of animacy. Additionally, Children and adults differ on what they interpret as ‘animate’; Menyuk (1971:174) discusses how children determine ‘animacy’ based on visible properties, rather than actual functional attributes of the objects in question.

An investigation by McKee et al. (1998) revealed systematicity in children who used what as a relative pronoun. Their study comprised of a controlled
elicitation task with twenty-eight American infants acquiring English with a mean age of 3;3. Of the twenty-eight children, three employed what as a relative pronoun, these children were not only the most systematic, but also acquired Relative Clauses earlier. Indeed, on analysis of Figure 1 (p.588, repeated here as Figure 4.1) only seven children used twelve unambiguous Relative Clauses, the youngest of these was CT (2;10) who employed what as a relative pronoun.

In addition, the children who used what contrasted it with one other marker; either who, that, or zero. They also distinguished animacy, whereby what was used only with inanimate heads.

(35) a. DK 3;9 – potato – the potato what she’s rolling

b. DK 3;9 – chairs – the chairs who are flying

(Examples taken from McKee et al., 1988: 586)

Although in the adult language the chairs of (35b) would be represented inanimately, given their ‘animacy’ in the task (the chairs themselves are flying) the child infers this to be animate, and consequently the animate wh-pronoun who here is not a mistake.

The constraints on the distribution of what in Relative Clauses at such an early age indicates a relative pronoun status, if the children were employing what as a complementiser it would be expected to occur with both animate and inanimate heads. Indeed, Menyuk (1969) briefly comments on the use of what in children’s early Relative Clauses. The status of what as a wh-pronoun is not questioned, yet she claims it is used for replacement of any relative pronoun (who, which etc.) in early Relative Clauses. It would appear that although there may be no restrictions on the pronouns which what can replace, it is constrained as a wh-pronoun and not a complementiser.

McKee et al (1998) interpret their results as suggesting that what is a ‘default guess’ employed by the children before they decipher the distribution of Relative Clauses in their dialect. The late acquisition of which implied by their data, combined with what’s restricted distribution indicates that it could be a precursor to which in child language acquisition.

This is further reflected in the analysis I undertook using the Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES) online database. Compiling both the Wells and Manchester corpuses, four children were found to employ what in their construction of Relative Clauses (see Appendix C), even though there was no evidence of these in the speech of their parents. Initial consultation of the Manchester corpus was largely unsuccessful (see Appendix C); the corpus includes data from a longitudinal study of twelve children between two and three. Children do not develop Relative Clauses long before the age of three, so it would have been surprising to find any children who were using the construction. However, one of the children in the sample, Aran, did employ
Relative Clauses from 2;7.07. Moreover, Aran utilised what as a relative pronoun once in the data. This use of what precedes any occurrences of which, which are not evidenced in the data until 2;9.02, where which is employed in a simple sentence construction, not a Relative Clause. Aran has acquired who and uses this with animate subjects in his Relative Clauses, this is contrasted with his use of what with inanimate heads.

(36) 2;7.07 ‘little holes what they live in’ (aran23a.cha—line: 2729)

(37) 2;9.02 ‘that one who looks out the window’ (aran29b.cha—line: 1993)

(38) 2;10.28 ‘I’m gonna be the robber who steal the steam train’ (aran34b.cha—line:1648)

Just as McKee et al. (1998) found, it appears Aran is using what as an inanimate relative pronoun as a precursor to which.

The Wells database (see Appendix D) contains the speech of thirty-two pre-school children recorded intermittently between the ages of 1;6 and 5;0. From this database, eight used Relative Clauses in the later interviews, and three employed what as a relative pronoun

(39) Frances 3;6 ‘that book what you got’ (frances10.cha—line: 594)

(40) Harrie 4;10 ‘these are sandwiches what I made’ (harric21.cha—line: 1222)

(41) Stella 3;3 ‘it’s got three legs what we xxx xxx’ (stella09.cha—line: 316)

Both Frances and Harrie contrast what with another relative marker, Frances employs who to mark for animacy, and Harrie employs that.

(42) Frances 3;6 ‘the little boy who was on Peter Pan’ (frances10.cha—line: 836)

(43) Harrie 4;10 ‘a jelly that Claire made’ (harric21.cha—line: 1248)

This again reflects what was ascertained by McKee et al. (1998) and demonstrates that what in child language acquisition is marked for co-reference with the head of the Relative Clause, and is thus a wh-pronoun. The evidence presented further suggests that what behaves predominantly as a precursor to which in child language acquisition.

4.3 Summary
The analysis presented is in favour of a pronominal status of what, rather than a complementiser. The lack of pied-piping in children's early Relative Clauses is not surprising, especially when one considers the analysis of non-standard dialects above and the alternative methods employed by children acquiring French, in which pied-piping is obligatory (Labelle 1990). The agreement observable on what when it is employed by children mirrors the adult distribution of which and indeed the dialectal distribution of what, it is
constrained with regards to animacy, and this would not be the case if it were a complementiser.

In addition, the systematicity apparent with children who utilise *what* is interesting to note. The use of *what* as a default wh-pronoun supports their development of Relative Clauses and the constraints on these pronouns. Furthermore, it is apparent that the use of *what* by children in their early Relative Clauses accelerates the pace with which they acquire and use these constructions.

5. **Conclusions and Future Directions**

This short paper has defended the status of *what* as a wh-pronoun in Relative Clauses of non-standard English dialects and child language acquisition. It has emphasised the comparability of *what* to all wh-pronouns in other wh-constructions. Furthermore, it has challenged the fundamental oppositions against an analysis of *what* as a wh-pronoun; namely its inability to pied-pipe and its lack of co-reference with the head of the Relative Clause.

The reliability of pied-piping as a method to determine pronominal status in English has been questioned. The discussion of *what* in non-standard dialects suggested it is only the Standard dialect which permits wh-pronouns to be pied-piped. This is not a reflection of the language speakers of English actually use, where preposition stranding is favourable. This also accounts for the lack of pied-piping in children acquiring English. Further research on the assumed optionality of pied-piping in English with a consideration of non-standard dialects would be an interesting direction in which to continue.

I have shown that the inability of *what* to co-refer with the head of the Relative Clause is untrue. Both non-standard dialects and the children who employ *what* all show some constraint with regards to its distribution, specifically in relation to animacy. It appears that *what* occurs as a precursor to which in child language acquisition and is constrained comparably in non-standard dialects. This relationship between the *what* of child Relative Clauses and the *what* of non-standard dialects, then, appears more complex than previously assumed. It would be interesting to further explore this relationship and indeed the comparability of *what* and *which*, not only as relative pronouns, but also more generally across conditions involving wh-movement. Although they are both wh-pronouns their distribution outside of Relative Clauses has been shown to be distinct. Consequently, investigation into their comparability when employed in Relative Clauses would be insightful.

It would be interesting to explore the dialects which employ *what*-comparatives, and determine whether its employment occurs in related dialects to those which use *what*-relatives. Consideration of the histories of English dialects could also reveal interesting specifics about how and why *what* came to be used as a relative pronoun in non-standard English Relative Clauses and
Furthermore, why its distribution in both child language acquisition and non-standard dialects is so widespread.

To conclude, the status of what in non-standard English dialects and child language acquisition is undeniably a wh-pronoun. The resistance of the feature to dialect levelling and its widespread nature in child language acquisition suggests this feature has a more complex role in UG which would be interesting to explore. This short paper has discussed why the status of what as a wh-pronoun in Relative Clauses should not be disputed with a consideration of evidence from both sides of the literature. There is still much to be investigated on the topic of what as a relative pronoun, and it would appear that this non-standard dialect feature could reveal a great deal about many other aspects of the English language.

6. APPENDICES

Appendix A—Acceptability Judgements
1) The woman who lived over the road
2) The man what travelled abroad
3) The lady whose dog ate all the biscuits
4) The girl who the boy liked
5) The dog what's bone she stole
6) The lady to whom Lucy talked
7) The woman what Lucy visited
8) The man to what the boy visited
9) The stone which Lucy saved
10) The beach what Jason loved
11) The clock on what Mary relied
12) ?The diary what saved Lucy

Appendix B—Pied-piped Acceptability Judgements
1) The shoes which had diamonds on
2) The book on the cover of what was a nice picture
3) The watch which he received
4) The dog what ate all the biscuits
5) The meeting at what we discussed the issue
6) The letter what she had declared her love in
7) The biscuits what contained too much sugar
8) The table what she served dinner on
9) The lady commented on what a nice smile she had
10) She asked what piece of fruit she could eat
11) Which did she buy?
12) They asked her what dog she wanted
Appendix C—
Data collected from the CHILDES Manchester corpus
Aran
aran23a.cha line: 2729 age: 2;7.07
1) little holes what they live in
aran29a.cha line: 313 age: 2;9.02
2) the bird who laid those eggs
aran29a.cha line: 2259 age: 2;9.02
3) it was me who did it
aran29a.cha line: 2652 age: 2;9.02
4) which worm
aran29b.cha line: 1993 age: 2;9.02
5) that one who looks out the window
aran32b.cha line: 1254 age: 2;10.07
6) <you can be Norman_Price who shot> [/] you can shoot my eggs
aran34b.cha line: 118 age: 2;10.28
7) and it's the soap that hurts him
aran 34b.cha line: 1648 age: 2;10.28
8) I'm gonna [going to] be the robber who steal [*0es] the steam train

Appendix D—
Data collected from the CHILDES Wells corpus
Children who employed Relative Clauses without
what
Abigail21.cha line: 1452 age: 4;8
1) I mean the children that are xxx xxx
Benjamin21.cha line: 863 age: 5;0.24
2) the one that does the burps
Darren09.cha line: 255 age: 3;3.11
3) Mummy that dropped ball
Geoffrey21.cha line: 2431 age: 4;11.22
4) there's two dominics who are four
Gerald10.cha line: 360 age: 3;5
5) the thing that was shaped and bri that
Gerald10.cha line: 1239 age: 3;5
6) I've got an aeroplane that has some flags on it
Gerald21.cha line: 1678 age: 4;9.05
7) some slippers that say noel
Jonathan21.cha line: 971 age: 4;7.14
8) the people that made it

Children who employed Relative Clauses with
what
Frances09.cha line: 217 age: 3;3
1) a dame who lost her
Frances10.cha line: 594 age: 3;6
2) the book what you got
Frances10.cha line: 751 age: 3;6
3) the little girl who flied
Frances10.cha line: 836 age: 3;6
4) the little boy who was on Peter Pan
Frances10.cha line: 1019 age: 3;6
5) that doctor who looks after you
Frances21.cha line: 801 age: 4;10.08
6) I know which are
Harriette21.cha line: 1222 age: 4;10.03
7) these are sandwiches what I made
Harriette21.cha line: 1226 age: 4;10.03
8) these are cakes what I made
Harriette21.cha line: 1231 age: 4;10.03
9) these are sausages what I made
Harriette21.cha line: 1237 age: 4;10.03
10) those are little crispy things what I made
Harriette21.cha line: 1248 age: 4;10.03
11) a jelly that Claire made
Stella09.cha line: 316 age: 3;03.04
12) it's got three legs what we xxx xxx
Stella09.cha line: 338 age: 3;03.04
13) I'll show you things what (4)
Stella09.cha line: 454 age: 3;03.04
14) I'll show you which Mac I got
[/] you can shoot my eggs
aran34b.cha line: 118 age: 2;10.28
7) and it's the soap that hurts him
aran 34b.cha line: 1648 age: 2;10.28
8) I'm gonna [going to] be the robber who steal [*0es] the steam train
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