

Subject Deletion in Dutch: A Difference between Subjects and Topics

C. Jan-Wouter Zwart

1. In this article I discuss the subject deletion construction exemplified in (1b), and argue that the paradigm connected with it provides support for the hypothesis that the subject in non-topicalized declarative main clauses in Dutch is in [Spec,IP] (contra Den Besten 1990, following Zwart 1991).

- (1) a. Deze trein rijdt verder als intercity naar Groningen en zal alleen
 stoppen te Assen
 'This train goes on as intercity to Groningen and will only stop in Assen'
- b. ? Na Zwolle rijdt deze trein verder als intercity naar Groningen en
 zal alleen stoppen te Assen
 'After Zwolle this train goes on as intercity to Groningen and will only stop
 in Assen'

In the sentences in (1), two clauses are coordinated and the subject of the second clause is deleted under identity with the subject of the first clause.¹ (1b) is peculiar because in the first of the two coordinated clauses, the subject and the verb are in the inverted order typical of topicalizations in Dutch, which, I claim, is not the case in the second clause. Probably because of this asymmetry, (1b) is not perfect, but it certainly is not ungrammatical.²

2. First let us determine where the subject gap in the second member of the coordinated structure in (1b) must be located.

¹Following Van Valin (1986). Wunderlich (1988) assumes that the sentences in (1) reveal an asymmetric coordination of S and VP. This is very unattractive, since the second member of the coordination in sentences like (1) shows root phenomena like Verb Second and Subject-Verb Inversion. Wunderlich argues that the second member of the coordination in (1) does not contain an ellipsis because a finite verb is present in this part (p.298). This is a *petitio principii*.

²Sentences of this type can be heard frequently in certain styles of speech, for instance in the style typically used in public announcements. (1b) is a real-life example from an announcement by the Dutch railway company. Constructions of this type have been discussed before in traditional frameworks by Bakker (1968:Ch.IX), Den Hertog (1973³:II,37), Van den Berg (1963:46), and in the Principles and Parameters framework, which I adopt, by Fanselow (1991:IV.1.2), who refers to an unpublished paper on the subject by Höhle (1983).

Deletion of a subject under coordination can be considered as an instance of forward conjunction reduction. A salient property of conjunction reduction is that the gaps must be on the edge of the reduced constituent. In the case of (1), where the antecedent clause precedes the reduced clause, the gaps must be left-peripheral (cf. Dirksen & Kerstens 1987).³ In other words, when the reduced clause contains a preposed constituent, the sentence is ungrammatical:⁴

- (2) * Na Zwolle rijdt deze trein verder als intercity naar Assen en na Assen zal e alleen stoppen te Groningen
'After Zwolle this train goes on as intercity to Assen and after Assen will only stop in Groningen'

This makes it highly unlikely that in (1b) the subject gap be situated to the 'right' of the verb, as suggested e.g. by ANS (1984:1195).

Similarly, it is unlikely that the second clause in (1b) would actually contain two gaps, an empty topic and an empty subject. Empty topics are generally possible under conjunction reduction, but the empty subject would never be left-peripheral if an empty topic were present, because topicalization in Dutch triggers movement of the verb to COMP, so that the topic and the subject are not adjacent (Den Besten 1990). (3) is an example of topic conjunction reduction with inversion in the second clause.

- (3) a. In Zwolle wordt deze trein gesplitst en e wordt het achterste deel afgerangeerd
'In Zwolle, this train will be split and the rear will be shunted'
b. * In Zwolle wordt deze trein gesplitst en e het achterste deel wordt afgerangeerd

(3b) is a grammatical sentence without the empty topic and its contribution to the interpretation. Although it is hard to imagine that the shunting referred to in (3b) takes place in any other place than Zwolle, the second member of the coordination in (3b) does not convey this meaning. Thus, topic deletion under identity in coordination is only possible if subject-verb inversion takes place in the second member of the coordinated structure, and in that case subject deletion is excluded.

³I use the term 'antecedent' in the sense of 'deletion-triggering' or 'licensing', not in the sense of 'preceding'.

⁴There is a sharp contrast between (2) and (1b), which leads me to accept (1b) as grammatical.

That subject deletion and topic deletion do not cooccur in conjunction reduction can also be seen from sentences like (4a) and (5a), where a preposed adverbial construction in the first member of the coordinated structure has an *in situ* counterpart in the second member, which has a deleted subject. That the preposed adverbial construction in the antecedent clause is not present in empty form in the reduced clause can be concluded from the ungrammaticality of (4b) and (5b), where both adverbial constructions are combined.

- (4) a. ? In Zwolle wordt deze trein gesplitst en zal na Zwolle alleen
stoppen te Assen
'In Zwolle this train will be split up and (it) will after Zwolle only stop in
Assen'
- b. * In Zwolle zal deze trein na Zwolle alleen stoppen te Assen
'In Zwolle this train will after Zwolle only stop in Assen'
- (5) a. ? In 1113 werd hij bisschop van Châlons-sur-Marne en stierf in
1121 (Bakker 1968:169)
'In 1113 he became bishop of Ch.-s.-M. and died in 1121'
- b. * In 1113 stierf hij in 1121
'In 1113 he died in 1121'

The following empirical argument supports our hypothesis that the second member of the coordination in (1b) shows no subject-verb inversion. In Dutch, the verb has a special second person singular form for inverted constructions:

- (6) a. je gaat/*ga
you go
- b. daar ga/*gaat je
there go you

In subject deletion constructions, this special second person singular form is not allowed in the reduced clause:⁵

⁵This argument can also be found in Bakker (1968:217 fn 3a).

- (7) Als je niet verder kunt, dan keer je je om en gaat/*ga dezelfde weg terug
 'If you can't go any further, you turn around and go back the same way'

I will therefore assume that the reduced clause in (1b) has an uninverted order of words, in contrast to the antecedent clause, the first member of the coordinated structure.

To conclude, the following restriction on deletion of subjects and topics under coordination in Dutch seems correct:

- (8) Deletion of a category A in the second of two conjoined clauses under identity with an antecedent B in the first of the two conjoined clauses is only possible if the deleted category occupies the leftmost position in its clause.

3. It has been argued (e.g. by Van Oirsouw 1987:245) that the antecedent under identity with which conjunction reduction takes place must be peripheral to the antecedent clause in the same way as the deleted element in the reduced clause. However, we can tell from the grammaticality of sentences like (1b) that this is not the case in subject deletion constructions. In (1b), the empty subject is in the left periphery of the reduced clause, but its antecedent, *deze trein*, is not in the left periphery of the antecedent clause. On the other hand, there obviously are restrictions on the choice of the antecedent. Subject deletion under identity with a direct object must be excluded:

- (9) * Ik heb de trein naar Groningen genomen en e stopte alleen in Assen
 'I took the train to Groningen and (it) stopped only in Assen'

There appear to be two types of conditions which could effectively restrict the number of possible antecedents for subject deletion in coordination constructions, one having to do with structural position, and another one having to do with grammatical function. I will argue that the former type is to be preferred.

A grammatical function based condition on subject (and topic) deletion could run as follows:

- (10) Deletion of a category A in the second of two conjoined clauses under identity with an antecedent B in the first of the two conjoined clauses is only possible if A and B have the same grammatical function.

(10) correctly rules out (9) and allows both sentences in (1). (10) also rules in (11), where a preposed object in the second clause is deleted under identity with a preposed object in the first clause.

- (11) Die trein had ik makkelijk kunnen halen, maar e heb ik gemist omdat de St. Annastraat opgebroken was
 'That train I could have caught easily, but (that one) I missed because the St. Annastreet was up'

Condition (10) also correctly rules out a sentence like (12), where a preposed object is deleted under identity with a subject.

- (12) * Na Zwolle zal deze trein alleen stoppen te Assen en e moet je dus niet nemen als je in Meppel moet zijn
 'After Zwolle, this train will only stop in Assen and (that one) you don't want to take if you have to be in Meppel'

(10) makes the prediction that a subject in the second clause cannot be deleted under identity with a preposed object in the first clause, and *vice versa* (that is, that a preposed object in the second clause cannot be deleted under identity with a subject in the first clause). However, if we look at these constructions, they appear to have the same status as (1b).

- (13) a. ? Die trein had ik makkelijk kunnen halen, maar is veel te vroeg vertrokken (object - subject)
 'That train I could have caught easily, but (it) left far too early'
- b. ? Die trein is veel te vroeg vertrokken, maar had ik anders makkelijk kunnen halen (subject - object)
 'That train left far too early, but (that one) I could otherwise have caught easily'

The facts in (13) present a remarkable contrast with sentence (9), whereas both types of sentences ought to be equally bad according to the grammatical function based condition on deletion (10).

Let us now consider a condition on subject (and topic) deletion based on syntactic position. Such a condition could run as follows:

- (14) Deletion of a category A in the second of two conjoined clauses under identity with an antecedent B in the first of the two conjoined clauses is only possible if A and B occupy the same syntactic structural position.

Note that (14) does not refer to linear positions, such as 'leftmost' or 'second from left', but to positions of syntactic structure, such as 'specifier of CP' or 'specifier of IP' (henceforth, '[Spec,CP]' and '[Spec,IP]').

Now it is currently a matter of debate whether the subject in neutral ('subject first') word order main clauses in Dutch is in [Spec,IP] or [Spec,CP], an issue which I will return to in a minute.⁶ However, it appears to be clear that preposed objects are in [Spec,CP], and that in cases of preposing ('topicalization') the subject is in [Spec,IP]. Let us now see how well condition (14) accounts for the facts.

First, standard subject deletion cases like (1a) present no problem. Depending on one's analysis, both the antecedent and the empty subject are in [Spec,IP] or [Spec,CP]. Deletion of preposed constituents, as exemplified in (3a) and (11), presents no problem either, as in each case both the antecedent and the empty constituent are in [Spec,CP]. (9), of course, is correctly excluded, as the object in the antecedent clause is not preposed. These sentences are repeated here for convenience.

- (1) a. Deze trein rijdt verder als intercity naar Groningen en zal alleen
stoppen te Assen
'This train goes on as intercity to Groningen and will only stop in Assen'
- (3) a. In Zwolle wordt deze trein gesplitst en \bar{e} wordt het achterste deel
afgerangeerd
'In Zwolle, this train will be split up and the rear part will be shunted'

⁶See Schwartz & Vikner (1990) in response to Travis (1990), and Haegeman (1991) and Vikner & Schwartz (1991) in response to Zwart (1991). See also Rizzi (1991).

- (11) Die trein had ik makkelijk kunnen halen, maar e heb ik gemist omdat de St. Annastraat opgebroken was
'That train I could have caught easily, but (that one) I missed because the St. Annastreet was up'
- (9) * Ik heb de trein naar Groningen genomen en e stopte alleen in Assen
'I took the train to Groningen and (it) stopped only in Assen'

Next consider the question mark cases (1b) and (13).

- (1) b. ? Na Zwolle rijdt deze trein verder als intercity naar Groningen en zal alleen stoppen te Assen
'After Zwolle this train goes on as intercity to Groningen and will only stop in Assen'
- (13) a. ? Die trein had ik makkelijk kunnen halen, maar is veel te vroeg vertrokken
'That train I could have caught easily, but (it) left far too early'
- b. ? Die trein is veel te vroeg vertrokken, maar had ik anders makkelijk kunnen halen
'That train left far too early, but (that one) I could otherwise have caught easily'

The antecedent *deze trein* in (1b) is unambiguously in the [Spec,IP] position. Therefore, if (14) is correct, the empty subject in the reduced clause in (1b) must also be in [Spec,IP]. In (13a), the antecedent *die trein* is unambiguously in the [Spec,CP] position. Therefore, if (14) is correct, the empty subject in the reduced clause in (13a) must also be in [Spec,CP]. The empty object in the reduced clause in (13b) is in [Spec,CP], as the inversion shows. Therefore, its antecedent *die trein* must also be in [Spec,CP], if (14) is correct.

Accepting (14), we seem to be forced to the conclusion that the subject in subject-first constructions in Dutch can be in [Spec,IP] as well as in [Spec, CP]. This is an interesting result, the consequences of which I will point out below. First let us consider the ungrammatical construction (12).

- (12) * Na Zwolle zal deze trein alleen stoppen te Assen en e moet je dus
niet nemen als je in Meppel moet zijn
'After Zwolle, this train will only stop in Assen and (that one) you don't
want to take if you have to be in Meppel'

In (12), the antecedent *deze trein* is unambiguously in the [Spec,IP] position and the empty category in the reduced clause is unambiguously in [Spec,CP], as the inversion shows. Therefore, (14) correctly predicts that (12) is ungrammatical.

To conclude, condition (14) makes all the right predictions, if we assume that the subject in Dutch subject-first constructions can waver between the positions [Spec,IP] and [Spec,CP]. In what follows, I will argue that this is a very plausible assumption.⁷

4. According to the standard analysis of the Verb Second phenomenon of Dutch and other Germanic languages, the verb moves to the head of CP in subject initial finite main clauses, and the subject moves to [Spec,CP] (Den Besten 1990 and earlier work). I have argued elsewhere (Zwart 1991) that none of these movements is motivated well enough to meet the standards of the present syntactic framework, the Principles and Parameters approach (Chomsky 1981 and later work). In particular, the discovery of more functional heads between CP and VP puts on those who adhere to the standard analysis the burden of proof to show that none of these functional heads hosts the verb in subject-first constructions in Dutch. Similarly, it is unclear, from the present perspective, for what reason the subject has to move from the structural subject position ([Spec,IP]), where it receives Case, to a position which no general grammatical licensing requirement forces it to occupy ([Spec,CP]). In addition, the well-known paradigm in (15)-(16), first discussed in Koster (1978), is still most easily explained if we assume that the subject is in [Spec,IP] in (15a), and that preposing a weak pronoun (or: reducing a pronoun in topic position) is excluded (Travis 1984).⁸

⁷Throughout this article, I ignore the possibility that subjects are in the specifier position of other functional categories like TP or AgrP, using IP as a collective term for these categories.

⁸For attempts to reconcile the paradigm in (15)-(16) with the Den Besten analysis of Dutch sentence structure, see Holmberg (1986:123), Schwartz & Tomaselli (1991), Vikner & Schwartz (1991), Rizzi (1991). The latter work appears to contain the most promising attempt, where Rizzi argues that [Spec,CP] is an A-position iff Spec-Head Agreement occurs. In that case weak pronouns may appear in [Spec,CP], explaining (15) on the standard assumption that the verb has moved to COMP. If there is no Spec-Head Agreement in CP, as in (16), the [Spec,CP] position is an A'-
(continued...)

- (15) a. ik zie hem
I see him
b. 'k zie hem
- (16) a. hem zie ik
him I see
b. * 'm zie ik

To these considerations we can now add that accepting that the subject in subject-first sentences in Dutch is not always in [Spec,CP] gives us an immediate explanation (viz. (14)) for the grammaticality of the subject deletion in (1b), which would otherwise remain mysterious.

What's more, if we were to maintain the standard analysis of Dutch sentence structure, and did not accept (14), we would be hard pushed to explain the difference between (1b) and (12). In both sentences, the empty category in the reduced clause would be in [Spec,CP], yet (1b) is grammatical and (12) blatantly ungrammatical. The two cases could only be distinguished by appealing to grammatical function again, but, as we have seen, a condition based on grammatical function is not appropriate. The contrast between (1b) and (12) most clearly shows that there must be a difference between subjects and topics in Dutch.

⁸(...continued)

position, and non-operators are only allowed in such a position, Rizzi claims, if they are focalized, which is inherently impossible for weak pronouns. A problem with this approach is that certain non-operator elements in Dutch that do appear in [Spec,CP] are so weak that they can hardly be considered focalized, for instance particles like *dan* 'then' and *nu* 'now', and adverbs like *gisteren* 'yesterday'. It appears to be the case that there is a general argument-nonargument distinction in Dutch in that only the former need stress if topicalized. In conjunction with this, arguments do, but nonarguments don't, need very heavy stress if they want to be adjoined to IP in embedded clauses in Dutch (Neeleman & Weerman 1990). Another problem with Rizzi's account is that it doesn't work if (some of) the weak pronouns in Dutch must be regarded as clitics, as argued by Zwart (1991), Haegeman (1991), following much recent work on clitics in Romance. A third problem is that Rizzi's analysis relies on movement of the subject to [Spec,CP], which is still in need of independent motivation. The logic of Rizzi's argumentation seems to imply that maintaining the view that in Dutch the verb moves to COMP in all cases and the subject moves to [Spec,CP] in subject-first main clauses is something to be desired. If this turns out not to be the case, Rizzi's approach to the paradigm in (15)-(16) is at best indifferent to either standpoint in the discussion. Notice, finally, that Rizzi's analysis of [Spec,CP] as either an A-position or an A'-position potentially weakens Vikner & Schwartz' (1991) analysis of extraction out of embedded V2 clauses (as in **Womit glaubte sie das Kind hatte das Brot gegessen* 'With what believed she the child had the bread eaten'), since the [Spec,CP] position, which is occupied by the subject, would be an A-position and the extraction would not be blocked by Relativized Minimality, as they claim.

According to the alternative analysis of Dutch sentence structure (Travis 1984, Zwart 1991), the subject is in [Spec,IP] in subject-first main clauses, and the verb in INFL. In cases of Wh-Movement and topicalization, some constituent moves to [Spec,CP] and triggers movement of the verb to COMP. However, maintaining that the subject in Dutch can *only* be in [Spec,IP] in subject-first main clauses does not seem to make sense. If objects can be topicalized and moved to [Spec,CP], no mechanism could prevent this from happening, vacuously, to subjects as well. As such a movement is not forced by any grammatical licensing requirement, it could only take place as a last resort, i.e. to save constructions that would otherwise be ruled out (Chomsky 1989).⁹

Thus, we have seen that the position that the subject in Dutch subject-initial main clauses is always in [Spec,CP] is unmotivated, and that the position that it is always in [Spec,IP] is too strict. Therefore it comes as no surprise that the deletion phenomena in (1b) and (13) tell us that the subject wavers between [Spec,IP] and [Spec,CP]. Even stronger, this is what the 'subject in [Spec,IP] analysis' predicts, as I pointed out in Zwart (1991:89). In (1b), the subject is in the structural subject position, [Spec,IP]. Subject deletion is possible, because both the antecedent and the empty subject occupy the same structural position. In (13a) subject deletion is impossible if the subject of the reduced clause is in [Spec,IP], but possible if it moves to [Spec,CP]. This movement is of the required last resort type, it saves construction (13a). Similarly, (13b) would be ruled out if the antecedent subject were in [Spec,IP]. Movement of the subject to [Spec,CP] saves construction (13b), and is therefore allowed.

5. Summarizing thus far, (14) appears to be the correct condition restricting the number of possible antecedents for the type of deletion exemplified in (1). The paradigm connected with the sentences of this type can now be accounted for by the following condition on subject (and topic) deletion, which collapses (8) and (14):

- (17) Deletion of a category A in the second of two conjoined clauses under identity with an antecedent B in the first of the two conjoined clauses is possible if and only if
- (i) A occupies the leftmost position in its clause, and

⁹Or to achieve a special effect, comparable to standard topicalization. For speculations on this subject, see Zwart (1991).

- (ii) A and B occupy the same syntactic structural position.

This result cannot be achieved within the boundaries of the standard analysis of Dutch subject-initial main clauses, as developed in Den Besten (1990). In particular, sentence (1b) would remain unexplained if we were to adhere to this approach. The fact that the alternative analysis, first put forward in Travis (1984), and revived in Zwart (1991), leads to the simple generalization (17) can be considered a point in its favor.¹⁰

6. One might wonder how the descriptive generalization (17) relates to the standard format employed for describing across-the-board type phenomena, as it is defined in Williams (1978).¹¹ A rule is said to apply in an across-the-board (henceforth, ATB) fashion, if it simultaneously affects elements in all members of a coordinated structure. The affected elements must be parallel, in a formally defined sense. Williams shows that phenomena of deletion under coordination, such as conjunction reduction, are ATB phenomena.¹²

The parallelism requirement on deletion under coordination is expressed in terms of X'-theory in (17ii). In the ATB format, it is expressed in terms of labeled bracketing. Labeled bracketing representations are notational variants of tree structure representations, both expressing the hierarchical relations provided by X'-theory. Ultimately, then, we expect that discussion of the subject deletion facts in terms of ATB will lead to the same conclusions regarding the position of the subject in Dutch subject initial main clauses, as we have found before. We will see that this is the case.

In an ATB format, the labeled bracketed members of a coordinate structure are put on top of each other and divided by vertical lines into factors. Thus the sentence (18) is factorized as in (19).

(18) I came, saw, and conquered

(19) | [I | came] | ,
 | [I | saw] | and
 | [I | conquered] |

¹⁰Probably, (17) could be reformulated so as to cover more phenomena of deletion under identity in coordinated constructions. This is not the aim of the present study.

¹¹This point was raised by an anonymous reviewer.

¹²(17) cannot be completely replaced by conditions formulated in terms of ATB. The condition that the deleted element occupy the leftmost position in its clause must be formulated independently.

A coordinate structure is said to be simultaneously factorized if the bracketing in the factors in the ATB format is parallel, in the sense that all left conjunct brackets belong to the same factor.¹³ In that case, deletion (under identity, and within a factor) is possible, explaining (18).

Now let us look at Dutch subject deletion again.¹⁴ (1a) is comparable to (18), and its grammaticality follows from the ATB representation without demonstration. (3a) and (11) both get the following ATB representation, where *XP* stands for the preposed constituent, and *NP* for the subject.

$$(20) \quad \begin{array}{l} | [_{CP} XP | V | [_{IP} NP | \dots] | \text{and} \\ | [_{CP} XP | V | [_{IP} NP | \dots] | \end{array}$$

It follows from the parallel bracketing in the leftmost format that one of the XPs can be deleted under identity with the other. The ungrammatical (9) has the antecedent in the VP and the deleted subject in [Spec,IP] or [Spec,CP], making it impossible for the left conjunct brackets to be in the same factor, as shown in (21).

$$(21) \quad \begin{array}{l} | [_{CP/IP} ik | heb | [_{VP} de trein | \dots | \dots] | \text{en} \\ | [_{CP/IP} de trein | stopte | [_{VP} \dots] | \end{array}$$

Now let us look at the less trivial cases. (1b), a grammatical construction, should have a noninitial subject and an initial subject in the same factor, and at the same time have the left brackets of the conjuncts in one factor. This is impossible if the initial subject is in [Spec,CP], as shown in (22a). Thus, the required ATB representation is as in (22b).

$$(22) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{a. } | [_{CP} na zwolle | rijdt | [_{IP} deze trein | t | \dots] | \text{en} \\ | [_{CP} deze trein | zal | [_{IP} \dots] | \\ \\ \text{b. } | [_{CP} na zwolle | rijdt | [_{IP} deze trein | t | \dots] | \text{en} \\ | [_{CP} | | [_{IP} deze trein | zal | \dots] | \end{array}$$

¹³More exactly, if *F* is a factor and *C* a coordinated structure containing conjuncts C_1, \dots, C_n , then *F* is simultaneously factorized if for any i , $[_{C_i} \in F$ and $]_{C_i} \in F$, then for all j it is the case that $[_{C_j} \in F$ and $]_{C_j} \in F$ (Williams 1978:32). The term *factor* is borrowed from Peters & Ritchie (1973), and slightly adapted for use in the ATB format.

¹⁴For easy reference, the reader is referred to the listing of the examples in the final part of section 3.

Only in (22b) are the left brackets of the conjuncts in the same factor, which allows deletion of the subject. With *deze trein* in [Spec,CP] in the second clause, as in (22a), the conjuncts could not be simultaneously factorized and the subject deletion would be predicted to be ungrammatical.¹⁵ By the same token, the subject in the second clause of (13a) and the subject in the first clause of (13b) must be analyzed as occupying the [Spec,CP] position, to ensure that the subject is in the same factor as the preposed direct object in the respective cases. The following is the ATB format of (13a). The ATB representation of (13b) is identical, with the order of the conjuncts reversed.

(23) | [_{CP} die trein | had | [_{IP} ik | t | ...]] | maar
 | [_{CP} die trein | is | [_{IP} t | t | ...]] |

In (23), the left brackets of the conjuncts are in the same factor, hence the subject or the topic can be deleted. If we compare (22) and (23), we reach the same conclusion as before. The facts follow if we allow the subject to waver between the [Spec,IP] and the [Spec,CP] position.

Notice that it would not make sense to ascribe the marginal status of the sentences (1b) and (13) to a violation of the conditions on ATB rule application. Violations of this sort give rise to severe ungrammaticality, as can be seen from (9)/(21), and especially from (12)/(24).¹⁶

(24) | [_{CP} na zwolle | zal | [_{IP} deze trein | t | ...]] | | en
 | | | [_{CP} deze trein | moet | [_{IP} je | ...]] |

As before, it is the sharp contrast in grammaticality between (1b) and (12) that forces us to the conclusion that they are structurally different, hence, that the subject is in [Spec,IP] in both members of the coordinate structure in (1b). If not, (1b) would have to be analyzed as (22a), which is identical to (24). This would not reflect the difference in status between (1b) and (12).

7. To conclude, with respect to subject deletion in Dutch, the descriptive generalization

¹⁵(22b) reflects the assumption that all clauses are CPs, even if the CP level is not employed. Since the factorization is a function of labeled bracketing, the two conjuncts in (22b) will be parallel, even though no lexical material is present in [Spec,CP] or COMP.

¹⁶Non-ATB violations of the Coordinate Structure Constraint fall in this class of ungrammaticality as well.

in (17), and the analysis of the facts according to the ATB format both point in the same direction: the subject in subject initial main clauses in Dutch can be in [Spec,IP] as well as in [Spec,CP]. The standard analysis of verb movements in Germanic, according to which the verb always moves to COMP in main clauses, has no way to accommodate this finding (cf. Den Besten 1990, Vikner & Schwartz 1991). However, exactly this situation is predicted under the hypothesis that [Spec,IP] is the structural subject position in Dutch.

References

- ANS (1984) *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen/Leuven: Wolters.
- Bakker, D.M. (1968) *Samentrekkingen in Nederlandse syntactische groepen*. Leiden: University Press.
- van den Berg, B. (1963) *Onderzoekingen betreffende de zinsbouw in het Nederlands*. Den Haag: Van Goor.
- den Besten, H. (1990) *Issues in West Germanic Syntax*. PhD dissertation, University of Tilburg.
- Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1989) 'Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation', *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 10, 43-74.
- Dirksen, A. & J. Kerstens (1987) 'Naar een realistische theorie over samentrekking', *Glott* 10, 29-59.
- Fanselow, G. (1991) *Minimale Syntax*. Appeared as *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 32.
- Haegeman, L. (1991) 'Functional Heads and Clitic Placement in West Flemish'. Ms., University of Geneva.
- den Hertog, C.H. (1973³) *Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Amsterdam: Versluys.
- Höhle, T. (1983) 'Subjektlücken in Koordinationen'. Ms. University of Cologne.
- Holmberg, A. (1986) *Word Order and Syntactic Features*. PhD dissertation, University of Stockholm.
- Koster, J. (1978) *Locality Principles in Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Neeleman, A. & F. Weerman (1990) 'Scrambling as a D-Structure Phenomenon'. Paper presented at the Tilburg Workshop on Scrambling, October.

- van Oirsouw, R. (1987) *The Syntax of Coordination*. London: Croom Helm.
- Peters, S. & R. Ritchie (1973) 'On the Generative Power of Transformations'. *Information Sciences* 6, 49-83.
- Rizzi, L. (1991) 'Proper Head Government and the Definition of A-positions'. Paper presented at GLOW, Leiden. (Cf. *GLOW Newsletter* 26, 46-47)
- Schwartz, B. & A. Tomaselli (1991) 'Some Implications from an Analysis of German Word Order'. In: W. Abraham, W. Kosmeijer, & E. Reuland (eds) *Issues in Germanic Syntax*, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Schwartz, B. & S. Vikner (1990) 'All Verb Second Clauses are CPs', *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 43, 27-49.
- Travis, L. (1984) *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Travis, L. (1990) 'Parameters of Phrase Structure and V2 Phenomena'. In R. Freidin (ed.) *Proceedings of the 1986 Princeton Workshop on Comparative Syntax*.
- Van Valin, R. (1986) 'An Empty Category as the Subject of a Tensed S in English', *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 581-586.
- Vikner, S. & B. Schwartz (1991) 'The Verb Always Leaves IP in V2 Clauses'. Ms., University of Geneva and Boston University.
- Williams, E. (1978) 'Across-the-Board Rule Application'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 31-43.
- Wunderlich, D. (1988) 'Some Problems of Coordination in German'. In U. Reyle & C. Rohrer (eds) *Natural Language Parsing and Linguistic Theories*, Dordrecht: Reidel, 289-316.
- Zwart, C.J.W. (1991) 'Clitics in Dutch: Evidence for the Position of INFL', *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 33, 71-92.

Groningen, August 9, 1991
[revised Halloween, 1991]