3 Complementizer Agreement

In this section, the phenomenon of complementizer agreement (cf. section II.1.2.2) will be presented and discussed. The analysis of this phenomenon provides a second piece of evidence in support of the hypothesis that the functional projections in Dutch are head initial. This argument is based on the observation that certain Dutch dialects have one type of agreement for the complementizer and the verb in C, and another type of agreement for the verb that is not in C (I will refer to these dialects as double agreement dialects). In these dialects, the verb in subject initial main clauses has the second type of agreement. This leads to the conclusion that in the relevant dialects AgrS is situated to the left of the VP.

This section is organized in the following way. After a presentation of the relevant facts in section 3.1, previous analyses of complementizer agreement will be discussed in section 3.2. I will demonstrate, contra Hoekstra and Marácz (1989), that complementizer agreement is a reflex of abstract Agr-to-C movement, rather than movement of an overt agreement morpheme from Agr to C. Finally, in section 3.3 the phenomenon will be analyzed in minimalist terms.

3.1 Complementizer Agreement Phenomena in Germanic Dialects

Numerous dialects of Dutch, German, and Frisian display a phenomenon of complementizer agreement, where the complementizer is inflected for person and/or number and agrees with the subject. At the same time, the finite verb is also inflected. The inflectional morphemes used are generally identical, but not always (cf. Van Haeringen 1958 and below).

The paradigms are mostly defective. For instance, East Netherlandic has an agreeing complementizer only in the first person plural (1PL), South Hollandic only in 1PL and 3PL, Frisian only in 2SG, Munich Bavarian only in 2SG and 2PL. West Flemish has a complete paradigm (Goeman 1980, Haegeman 1990).

In large areas of the Netherlands (West Friesland, North Holland, South Holland, also in the Center and East of the country (Van Haeringen 1939, 1958), the agreement morpheme for PL is /G30 (schwa). In German dialects and in Dutch dialects spoken in the Northeast and the Southeast, as well as in Frisian, there is an agreement morpheme for

---

The status of the -\(st\) ending on the complementizer in Germanic dialects has been hotly debated for about at least a century now. The -\(s\)-element, which also shows up in the verbal agreement, appears to be inflectional, but it may be the case that the -\(st\) ending combines a complementizer agreement element and a subject clitic. See section 3.2. For recent discussion, cf. Van der Meer (1991) and De Haan (1992).
The Brabantish facts are from the dialect of my native town, Oss. They are representative of the situation in other Brabantish dialects, as far as I have been able to check (cf. Stroop 1987). The -de morpheme is not a clitic, because it cannot appear in subject initial main clauses, whether independently or in conjunction with a clitic doubling element, as in West Flemish. However, the presence of -de does make referential prodrop possible (dè liegde [that lie-2SG] `you're lying (that)').

Liliane Haegeman (p.c.) suggests that in (2b) the complementizer agreement morpheme is not zero but a phonologically reduced -t- morpheme. However, this -t- does not reduce in 3SG, where the context appears to be the same (2c). Possibly, one could argue that the j of the 3SGM subject clitic is underlyingly different from the j of the 2SG subject clitic, but I have not seen any analyses in support of this possibility.

In these dialects, the agreement morpheme on the complementizer is identical to the agreement morpheme on the verb. However, Van Haeringen (1958) reports on East Netherlandic dialects in which the complementizer agreement (c) and the verbal agreement (v) differ.

The same appears to be the case in Brabantish:°

Depending on the analysis of the phonological regularities connected with cliticization, the West Flemish 2SG may provide a third example where the complementizer agreement and the verbal agreement differ (cf. 2b vs 2c):°

° The Brabantish facts are from the dialect of my native town, Oss. They are representative of the situation in other Brabantish dialects, as far as I have been able to check (cf. Stroop 1987). The de morpheme is not a clitic, because it cannot appear in subject initial main clauses, whether independently or in conjunction with a clitic doubling element, as in West Flemish. However, the presence of -de does make referential prodrop possible (de liegde [that lie-2SG] `you're lying (that)').

° Liliane Haegeman (p.c.) suggests that in (2b) the complementizer agreement morpheme is not zero but a phonologically reduced -t- morpheme. However, this -t- does not reduce in 3SG, where the context appears to be the same (2c). Possibly, one could argue that the j of the 3SGM subject clitic is underlyingly different from the j of the 2SG subject clitic, but I have not seen any analyses in support of this possibility.
In dialects where the complementizer agreement and the verbal agreement differ, the verb has verbal agreement in subject initial main clauses, and complementizer agreement in subject-verb inversion constructions.

(9) a. Wij speul-t/*-e
    we play 1PLv/c
    East Netherlandic
    b. Waar speul-e/*-t wij?
    where play 1PLc/v we
    “Where do we play?”

(10) a. Gullie kom-t/*-de
     you come 2PLv/c
     Brabantish
     b. Wanneer kom-de/*-t gullie?
     when come 2PLc/v you
     “When do you come?”

(11) a. Gie kom-t/*-σ
     you come 2SGv/c
     West Flemish
     b. Kom-σ-d/*-t-j gie?
     come 2SGc/v you you
     “Are you coming?”

This is reminiscent of a peculiar agreement phenomenon in Standard Dutch, where the choice of the 2SG morpheme depends on whether the verb precedes or follows the subject (section II.1.1.1; cf. Goeman 1992):

(12) a. Jij loop-t/*-σ
     you walk 2SG
     Standard Dutch
     b. Daar loop-σ/*-t jij
     there walk 2SG you

I will argue that this parallelism is not coincidental.

However, let us first consider previous treatments of the Germanic complementizer agreement phenomena.5

3.2 Previous Analyses

3.2.1 Base Generation or Movement

The complementizer agreement phenomenon in Germanic has often been taken to indicate that in the relevant languages (Dutch, German, Frisian) C is an inflectional

5 The theoretical possibility that complementizer agreement is phonetically or phonologically determined has been discarded as early as Van Haeringen (1939), and will not be considered here (see also Hoeksema 1986).
This leads to an analysis in which the agreement features are generated in C (see section II.2.3 and references cited there; cf. also Goeman 1980).

There is an obvious connection with the standard analysis of verb movement in main clauses in these languages. According to this analysis, the verb moves to C in all tensed main clauses (Den Besten 1977). If C is analyzed as an inflectional category, it becomes understandable that the verb has to move to C whenever C is not occupied by the complementizer.

This analysis of verb movement in Germanic as attraction by a C hosting inflectional features was first proposed by Den Besten in a 1983 Appendix to his 1977 paper. This appendix summarizes the main points of Den Besten (1978). Den Besten proposes that verb movement in Dutch (and German) is actually tense movement: movement of a tensed verb to a tensed C.6

However, Den Besten (1989:93) is very careful not to confuse the tense feature in C with the agreement features in C. He notes that "these person endings [on agreeing complementizers] must be generated in a position separate from the complementizer position, (...) because deletion of a lexical complementizer does not force a person marking to delete as well".

The phenomenon Den Besten has in mind is best illustrated with the following example from Luxemburgish (Bruch 1973:106).

(13) ..mat wiem (datt) s de spazéiere gaang bas
with whom that 2SG you walk gone are "..with whom you went for a walk."

In (13) the complementizer is optional, but the agreement ending remains.

Den Besten analyzes the complementizer as a tense element (T) and the agreement ending as a person (P) element, and notes that the T-P ordering in the inflected complementizers is mirrored in the verbal morphology, where the person morpheme follows the tense morpheme:

(14) ze lach-t-en
they laugh PAST 3PL

Accepting Den Besten’s point that the complementizer agreement morphology is not generated on the complementizer, we must conclude that there is a separate inflectional head associated with person agreement. This leads to a different type of analysis, in which complementizer agreement reflects movement from this separate functional head to C. Such an analysis is proposed by Hoekstra and Marácz (1989).

---

6 This is essentially the same mechanism as movement for feature checking purposes in the Minimalist Program.
3.2.2 I-to-C Movement

Hoekstra and Marácz (1989) assume that C and I interact in the following way. C is the canonical locus for a "T-marker", a scope bearing element marking I for a specific tense feature. The relation between the T-marker in C and the tense feature in I can have two types of instantiation: either the T-marker binds tense, or tense moves to the T-marker (following Baker 1970). Languages may be parametrized with respect to tense movement. In view of this, Hoekstra and Marácz introduce the I-to-C Parameter.

Hoekstra and Marácz propose that this parameter divides the Germanic languages and dialects into two groups. The languages positively specified for the I-to-C parameter show complementizer agreement, the others do not.

In support of their analysis, Hoekstra and Marácz present and discuss three phenomena which they relate to a positive specification for the I-to-C parameter. These phenomena are: referential pro-drop, verb ellipsis in irrealis complement clauses, and complementizer cliticization. I will illustrate these phenomena below.

Hoekstra and Marácz' analysis raises the following question. If there is a parameter governing overt complementizer agreement, there must be a cluster of properties that to a certain extent correlate with the presence of complementizer agreement. More exactly, the phenomena Hoekstra and Marácz discuss should be present in those Germanic dialects that have overt complementizer agreement, and absent in all others. If such a correlation cannot be attested, it is unlikely that the I-to-C parameter determines the presence of overt complementizer agreement.

Let us therefore turn to the three phenomena Hoekstra and Marácz relate to the I-to-C parameter, and see whether these phenomena constitute a cluster setting the complementizer agreement dialects apart.

a. Referential Pro-drop

Some dialects showing overt complementizer agreement allow referential pro-drop. Below are examples from Frisian and West Flemish, both taken from Hoekstra and Marácz (1989).

\[(15)\] a. Komst (do) jûn? \\
Frisian come-2SG you tonight "Do you come tonight?"

b. .datst (do) jûn komst \\
that-2SG you tonight come-2SG "...that you come tonight."

\[(16)\] a. Goa-a-se (zie) goan werken? \\
West Flemish (cf. (2))
go 3SG she-CL she go work "Is she going to work?"

b. .da-a-se (zie) komt \\
that 3SG she-CL she come-3SG

It can be shown in the case of Frisian that in the absence of overt complementizer agreement referential pro-drop is not possible.
In the case of West Flemish this cannot be demonstrated, because West Flemish has a complete complementizer agreement paradigm. However, it is clear that referential pro-drop in West Flemish is related to subject cliticization rather than to complementizer agreement. If the subject clitic is left out and complementizer agreement retained, referential pro-drop is impossible. Consider the following 3PL examples:

(18) a. *Goe-n-ze (zunder) werk een?  
     go 3PL they-CL they work have  
     "Are they going to have a job?"

b. *Goe-n *(zunder) werk een?  
    go 3PL they work have  
    "Are they going to have a job?"

(19) a. ..da-n-ze (zunder) goan werk een  
     that 3PL they-CL they go-3PL work have  
     ".that they are going to have a job."

b. ..da-n *(zunder) goan werk een  
    that 3PL they go-3PL work have  
    ".that they are going to have a job."

In (18a) and (19a), the subject clitic ze is doubled by a full pronoun zunder `they’. This full pronoun can be dropped, but not if the subject clitic is absent, as in (18b) and (19b). Note that in these examples the complementizer agreement (-n-) is present, but unable to license referential pro-drop.

The same may be the case in Frisian. The status of the Frisian complementizer agreement morpheme has been a subject of debate for a long time (see Van der Meer 1991, De Haan 1992 for recent discussions). It has been argued that this morpheme is really a subject clitic, reduced to the extent that it became unrecognizable as such, which made the optional addition of a pronoun possible. The similarity of the complementizer agreement to the verbal agreement would then be accidental.

It may well be the case that something along these lines took place, but the presence of the -s- preceding the -to-/te/-t morpheme is unaccounted for in this scenario. It is likely, therefore, that the -sto- morpheme and its variants are combinations of an agreement morpheme and a subject clitic (Hoeksema 1986, Visser 1988, De Haan...
However, pro-drop in Frisian apparently may be licensed by the verbal 2SG agreement alone, witness examples like (i) (from De Haan 1992).

When we consider other Germanic dialects, there appears to be no correlation whatsoever between complementizer agreement and referential pro-drop. Hoekstra and Marácz (1989) mention the case of Zurich German as problematic for their generalization (cf. Cooper and Engdahl 1989). This dialect shows referential pro-drop, but no complementizer agreement:

(20) a. 

(.dass (d/du) in Züri wohnsch 

that you in Zurich live-2SG

"...that you live in Zurich."

b. 

(.öb (d/du) nach Züri chunnsch 

whether you to Zurich come-2SG

"...whether you come to Zurich."

Conversely, Hollandic dialects that show complementizer agreement never allow referential pro-drop.

(21) a. 

Kumme *(ze)?

come-PL they

"Are they coming?"

b. 

.öve *(ze) komme

whether-PL they come-PL

In short, there seems to be no significant correlation between overt complementizer agreement and referential pro-drop in the Germanic dialects. Certain dialects lacking overt complementizer agreement do have referential pro-drop, others that do have overt complementizer agreement lack referential pro-drop. Pending the analysis of the Frisian type referential pro-drop, it may even be the case that not a single example of referential pro-drop in Germanic is related to complementizer agreement.

7 However, pro-drop in Frisian apparently may be licensed by the verbal 2SG agreement alone, witness examples like (i) (from De Haan 1992).

Also, as pointed out to me by Josef Bayer (p.c.), even if there is historical evidence for the presence of a clitic element in the Frisian type inflected complementizer, this element does not function as a clitic anymore. Therefore, it may be the case that in certain languages and dialects, among which Frisian, pro-drop is licensed by agreement, and that in others (among which West Flemish) pro-drop is licensed by cliticization. Even so, it cannot be maintained that there is a correlation between pro-drop and complementizer agreement.
b. V-ellipsis

In Frisian infinitival complement clauses with an 'unrealized future' reading, the infinitive, along with the infinitival marker/preposition te 'to', can be left out:8

(22) \[ \text{Jan is fan doel om nei Ljouwert ta (te gean)} \]

John is of purpose for to Leeuwarden to to go

"John intends to go to Leeuwarden."

This is impossible in Standard Dutch.

(23) \[ \text{Jan is van plan om naar Leeuwarden toe *(te gaan)} \]

John is of plan for to Leeuwarden to to go

"John intends to go to Leeuwarden."

Hoekstra and Marácz offer the following explanation for the contrast in (22)-(23). In these constructions, an irrealis feature is present in the embedded INFL. This feature moves to C in Frisian, since Frisian is positively specified for the I-to-C parameter. The I-to-C movement of the irrealis feature turns C into a proper governor, licensing the ellipsis of the infinitival in (22). In Dutch, I-to-C does not take place, hence C is not turned into a proper governor, and ellipsis would result in a violation of the Empty Category Principle.9

Whatever the merit of this analysis, the point to be made here is that V-ellipsis is a phenomenon Hoekstra and Marácz (1989) fail to demonstrate in any other Germanic dialect, with or without complementizer agreement.

Many dialects of German do not allow inspection of the presence of V-ellipsis, because of a distinct preference for finite subordinate clauses (Alemannic, Bavarian, Luxemburgish).10 But the Dutch dialects that show complementizer agreement pattern with Standard Dutch rather than with Frisian with respect to the possibility of V-ellipsis, as far as I have been able to ascertain.

(24) \[ \text{..datte ze van plan benne om naar A. toe *(te gaan)} \]

that-PL they of plan are for to A. to to go

"..that they intend to go to A."

South Hollandic

V-ellipsis, then, appears to be a curious property of Frisian, not of complementizer agreement dialects:

---

8 In (22), the directionality is expressed by the circumposition nei...ta, the second element of which is not to be confused with the preposition/infinitival marker te.


10 Nevertheless, purpose clauses in Luxemburgish can be expressed in a fir ze 'for to' construction (Bruch 1973:103). I have found no examples of the Frisian type V-ellipsis, however.
c. Complementizer Cliticization

Hoekstra and Marácz (1989) note that Frisian has a phenomenon of complementizer cliticization which Dutch lacks. The phenomenon shows up in embedded questions and relative clauses:

(25) a. Hy freget wa (of) *(t) jûn komt Frisian
   he asks who if that-CL tonight comes
   "He's asking who's coming tonight."

   b. de frou dy *(t) jûn komt
   the woman that that-CL tonight comes
   "the woman who's coming tonight"

The complementizer clitic is absent in Standard Dutch:

(26) a. Hij vraagt wie (of) er vanavond komt St. Dutch
   he asks who if there tonight comes
   "He's asking who's coming tonight."

   b. de vrouw die vanavond komt
   the woman that tonight comes
   "the woman who's coming tonight"

The origin of the complementizer clitic is unclear. De Rooij (1965a:110f) notes that it is the functional equivalent of *dat* in (Southern) dialects of Dutch, in constructions like (27):

(27) Hij vraagt wie (of) (dat) er vanavond komt
   he asks who if that there tonight comes

But as far as I know, this *dat* is optional, unlike the complementizer clitic. A further difference is that *dat* is not allowed in relative clauses, unlike the complementizer clitic:

(28) de vrouw die *(dat) vanavond komt
    the woman who that tonight comes
    "the woman who's coming tonight"

In both Frisian and Dutch, *dat* occurs as the complementizer in non-wh complement clauses. This *dat* cannot be deleted:

---

11 The *die dat* combination in relative clauses occurs in the dialect of Ghent, and may be shortened to *die t* (Overdiep 1937:600). Also, constructions like *de vrouw die wat vanavond komt* appear to be possible in certain dialects. Such constructions are found in Limburgian dialects (Dumoulin and Coumans 1986:113), Bavarian (Bayer 1984a:215f, Fanselow 1991:314). Possibly the complementizer clitic can be analyzed as a reduced form of *dat* and *wat*, and perhaps also of *asdat*, as De Rooij (1965a:116) suggests.

12 I abstract away from the possibility that complementizerless embedded clauses are saved by verb movement, as is possible in German, and marginally so in Dutch and Frisian.
In (29a), *dat* cannot be replaced by the complementizer clitic:

(30) * Hy tinkt ‘t se jûn komt Frisian
   he thinks that-CL she tonight comes

These facts suggest the following analysis.

Let us assume that the Frisian complementizer clitic is a reduced form of *dat*. Let us also assume that the complementizer system is more complex than standardly assumed, following much recent work (Culicover 1991, Hoekstra 1992a, Müller and Sternefeld 1993, Hoekstra and Zwart 1993a). Constructions like (27) suggest that the complementizer system consists of (at least) a Wh-phrase, headed by *of*, and a second phrase, headed by *dat*. This is illustrated in (31):

(31) WhP
    XP    Wh'
    Wh    CP
    of   C
    C    AgrSP
    dat

In Chomsky (1992) structures are built up in a bottom-up fashion, by successive application of generalized transformations, instead of in a top-down fashion, through a system of phrase structure rules and transformations. It follows from economy of derivation that structures are kept as simple as possible. In other words, the levels CP and WhP are added only if their presence is needed for convergence. Since the embedded clauses in (29) have no Wh-character, the Wh-level does not have to be added in the derivation of these sentences. It follows that in (29), C is the highest node in the complementizer system. In (25), on the other hand, both the WhP and the CP must be present.

We can now make the following generalization: complementizer cliticization in Frisian is possible when Wh is present. The process can be described as movement from C to Wh. This movement is impossible when Wh is absent, which explains (30).

Let us now turn to Hoekstra and Marácz’s description of complementizer cliticization in terms of I-to-C movement. Hoekstra and Marácz offer an explanation for the fact that the complementizer clitic in (25) cannot be deleted (unlike the full
complementizer in Dutch). Their suggestion is that in Frisian the complementizer has to remain overt because I must be hosted by a lexical item after moving to C.\textsuperscript{13}

This analysis predicts that all dialects that have complementizer agreement must have something in C in relative clauses, either a clitic or a full complementizer.

This can easily be disproved. For instance, in West Flemish relative clauses, the complementizer can be left out (\(\epsilon\) indicates a phonetically empty element):

(32) \[ \text{den vent die } \epsilon \text{ hier geweest eet} \]

the man who here been has

"the man who was here"

West Flemish being a complementizer agreement language, we must assume, in Hoekstra and Marácz's analysis, that I-to-C takes place, and therefore that C cannot be emptied. Hoekstra and Marácz (1989:80) note that in this case the empty complementizer can be identified by spec-head agreement in CP, which is probably correct. But this leaves unclear why spec-head agreement does not also permit deletion of the complementizer clitic in Frisian in (25b).

In fact, there are many dialects in which complementizer agreement appears even if the complementizer is deleted. In addition to (13), consider the following facts from South Hollandic and Luxemburgish:

(33) a. \[ \text{jonges die-} \epsilon \text{ werk wille} \]

guys who PL work want-PL

"guys who want a job"

b. \[ \text{van die rame, waar-} \epsilon \text{ ze de gordijne mee spanne} \]

of these frames where PL they the curtains with draw-PL

"the type of frames which they draw the curtains with"

In these constructions, the complementizer agreement appears to be attached to the wh-phrase. In view of the fact that complementizer agreement regularly shows up on heads rather than on phrases, it must be assumed that in (33) and (34) there is an empty complementizer hosting the complementizer agreement.\textsuperscript{14} If so, one cannot claim that I-to-C movement requires C to be lexically filled, as Hoekstra and Marácz do.

In sum, the complementizer cliticization facts do not allow us to make any generalizations over complementizer agreement dialects.

\textsuperscript{13} This explanation is not incompatible with the structure of the complementizer system in (31), assuming that I-to-C movement targets the highest head in the complementizer system.

\textsuperscript{14} The presence of an empty complementizer in (32)-(33) is supported furthermore by the absence of verb movement in these constructions.
d. Conclusion
It seems fair to conclude that the four properties listed by Hoekstra and Marácz (1989) in connection with their I-to-C parameter do not constitute a cluster separating languages with overt complementizer agreement from languages without overt complementizer agreement.

This suggests that the I-to-C parameter as proposed by Hoekstra and Marácz has a very limited scope: it governs the presence or absence of overt complementizer agreement morphology only. This is an unsatisfactory state of affairs. A particular parameter setting generally has a number of tangible syntactic consequences, rather than a single morphological effect.

In section 4, I will argue that the I-to-C parameter is real, and that the syntactic consequences of the I-to-C movement (better: Agr-to-C movement) are pervasive. In particular, Agr-to-C movement will play a key role in the explanation of the verb movement patterns of Dutch, German, Frisian, and the Mainland Scandinavian languages. From this perspective, overt complementizer agreement is just a morphological reflex of abstract functional head movement, which happens to be suppressed in the standard varieties of Dutch and German (see Zwart 1993a).

First, however, let us consider the phenomenon of complementizer agreement from a minimalist point of view.

3.3 A Minimalist Analysis of Complementizer Agreement
The starting point of the analysis of complementizer agreement that I will propose in this section is the idea that complementizer agreement is a reflex of functional head movement (AgrS-to-C movement, cf. Hoekstra and Marácz 1989). I will mainly be concerned with two questions. First, how can the functional head movement that yields complementizer agreement be described in minimalist terms? This means that we must identify a trigger for movement in terms of morphological feature checking requirements, and that the movement must meet conditions of economy of derivation and representation. Second, how does the functional head movement that gives rise to complementizer agreement interact with verb movement? I will propose that AgrS-to-C movement has the effect that verb movement to AgrS becomes unnecessary.

This section has four subsections. In section 3.3.1, the feature checking requirement giving rise to AgrS-to-C movement is discussed. I will conclude that AgrS-to-C movement serves to help eliminate the N-feature of AgrS. In section 3.3.2, the properties of double agreement dialects are discussed. This will reinforce our earlier conclusion that the finite verb is not in C in subject initial main clauses. In section 3.3.3, the morphological aspects of complementizer agreement and the double agreement phenomenon are investigated. Finally, in section 3.3.4 the relation between complementizer agreement and verb movement is discussed.
3.3.1 AgrS-to-C Movement

Within the theoretical framework adopted in this book, complementizer agreement phenomena are problematic in two respects.

First, assuming that all languages have a functional domain with the structure in (35), we expect AgrS, not C, to be the locus of agreement (cf. Figure 1 in section I.2.2):

\[
[ CP \ [ AgrSP \ [ TP \ [ AgrOP \ [ VP \] ] ] ] ]
\]

Complementizer agreement is subject agreement. In the Minimalist Program, subject agreement features are located in the head position of a functional projection AgrS. These features must be checked off against the person/number features of the subject. Checking takes place in spec-head configurations exclusively. For this reason, the subject has to move to the specifier position of AgrS at some point in the derivation. From this point of view, it is surprising that subject agreement features show up morphologically in C.

A second problematic aspect of complementizer agreement is that it never seems to be specifier-head agreement. Thus, assuming that the complementizer is in C, we expect the subject to appear in the spec of CP when the complementizer shows subject agreement, contrary to fact:

\[ a. * \ldots\text{ik da-n-k komen} \quad \text{West Flemish} \]
\[ \text{I that 1SG I-Cl come-1SG} \]
\[ \ldots\text{that I come.} \]
\[ b. * \ldots\text{ze datte komme} \quad \text{South Hollandic} \]
\[ \text{they that-PL come-PL} \]
\[ \ldots\text{that they come.} \]
\[ c. * \ldots\text{doe of-s koms} \quad \text{Groningen} \]
\[ \text{you whether 2SG come-2SG} \]
\[ \ldots\text{whether you come.} \]

Similarly, when the verb shows the complementizer agreement, the subject always follows it. This can be seen in dialects where the verbal agreement (v) differs from the complementizer agreement (c) (from now on: double agreement dialects):

\[ a. \text{Wij *speul-e / speul-t} \quad \text{East Netherlandic} \]
\[ \text{we play 1PLc / play 1PLv} \]
\[ \text{"We are playing."} \]
\[ b. \text{Speul-e / *Speul-t wij?} \]
\[ \text{play 1PLc / play 1PLv we} \]
\[ \text{"Are we playing?"} \]

In (37b), the verb arguably occupies the C position. Accordingly, it shows complementizer agreement morphology. As can be seen, the subject never appears in the specifier position of the head hosting the verb when the verb shows complementizer agreement morphology. Thus, although complementizer agreement is subject agreement, it does not seem to be spec-head agreement.
The first of these problems could be solved by assuming that the complementizer dat is in AgrS, instead of in C. This, however, would leave the second problem intact. Such a solution would also lead to the conclusion that the verb is in AgrS in subject-verb inversion constructions only, assuming that a verb with complementizer agreement morphology is in the same position as the complementizer. This is not an interesting conclusion, for the following reason.

In double agreement dialects, the complementizer agreement shows up in topicals and aux-constructions. As in Standard Dutch, the topic/wh-element and the fronted verb are obligatorily adjacent:

(38) a. Daarom (*altijd) speule wij
    therefore always play-1PLc we
    “That’s why we play (all the time).”

b. Waarom (*altijd) speule wij?
    why always play we
    “Why are we always playing?”

If we take adjacency to be a diagnostic of a spec-head configuration, (38) indicates that the topic and wh-element are in the spec of the head occupied by the verb carrying complementizer agreement morphology. If this head is AgrS, the topic/wh-element would be occupying the spec of AgrSP. But the spec of AgrSP is the designated position for licensing the subject. Even if the subject does not have to appear in the spec position of AgrSP in overt syntax, it will have to move there at some point in the derivation. This is impossible if that position is occupied by other elements. This makes it unattractive to assume that the verb is in AgrS in (38).

Consequently, it is unattractive to assume that the agreeing complementizers are in AgrS. This leaves us with the two problematic aspects of complementizer agreement mentioned before: C is not a designated agreement position, and complementizer agreement is never spec-head agreement.

In agreement with Zwart (1991b), I will adopt the following solution to these problems:

---

15 It could be argued that the topic/wh-element is removed from the spec.AgrS position before the subject moves there, without leaving a trace. This requires a trigger for the additional movement of the topic/wh-element. If such a trigger exists, one wonders what the trigger for the movement of the topic/wh-element to spec.AgrS was.

16 Many analyses in the literature incorporate a more flexible approach to subject licensing. It is assumed, in these analyses, that the subject may be licensed in a lower specifier position or in the VP, under certain circumstances. This would leave the spec position of AgrS available for fronted non-agreeing elements like topics and wh-elements. As a matter of methodological principle, I will not consider this possibility before having tested a stricter version of the minimalist approach to syntax. This stricter version implies that the specifier position of a head α is a designated licensing position for checking the features represented in α. As a result, this specifier position can only be occupied by elements carrying the features corresponding to the features of α.
Complementizer agreement is a morphological reflex of AgrS-to-C movement.

AgrS-to-C movement is a case of functional head movement: the movement of a functional head independently of overt verb movement.\footnote{Independent functional head movement is also proposed in Chomsky (1992:10), Bobaljik and Carnie (1992).}

Consider how AgrS-to-C movement solves the two conceptual problems associated with complementizer agreement.

First, since complementizer agreement results from AgrS-to-C movement, the features involved in complementizer agreement can properly be represented in AgrS, the designated head for subject agreement.

Second, since agreement originates in a lower functional head (AgrS), we expect subject agreement to be checked in the specifier position of that head, not in the specifier position of C. In short, the AgrSP still is the designated projection for subject agreement, even though the head of AgrS moves to C.\footnote{Chomsky (1992:19) argues that functional head movement changes the status of the spec position of the lower functional projection (cf. also Bobaljik and Carnie 1992); I will discuss this proposal in section 4.3.}

Thus, the hypothesis that AgrS moves to C removes the problematic character of the Germanic complementizer agreement morphology. In section 4, I will argue that the AgrS-to-C hypothesis does more than that: it also explains the well known asymmetry between main clauses and embedded clauses in Dutch, German, Frisian, and Mainland Scandinavian. However, we first have to further investigate the properties of AgrS-to-C movement from a minimalist point of view.

Recall that in the minimalist approach, every movement has to be triggered by the need to eliminate morphological features. Moreover, the economy-related principle of \textit{Greed} prescribes that the moved element should benefit directly from the movement. We may wonder whether this applies to AgrS-to-C movement as well.

What morphological feature might be removed through the application of AgrS-to-C movement? Obviously, this morphological feature has to be represented in AgrS itself. If not, AgrS-to-C movement violates the \textit{Greed} principle. We may therefore make the following conjecture:

\begin{quote}
AgrS-to-C movement eliminates a feature of AgrS.
\end{quote}

Recall that AgrS hosts two features: a V-feature and an N-feature. The former has a counterpart in the features of the verb, the latter in the features of the subject noun phrase. Since complementizer agreement is subject agreement, it must be the N-feature of AgrS which is eliminated through AgrS-to-C movement (cf. Zwart 1991b).

However, at this point a problem arises. In the minimalist approach, N-features are eliminated through XP-movement, not through head movement. Thus, the N-feature of AgrS is standardly eliminated through movement of the subject to the specifier position of AgrSP. In complementizer agreement dialects, like in Standard Dutch, the subject...
moves to the specifier position of AgrSP in overt syntax. Why does this not suffice to eliminate the N-features of AgrS?

I would like to propose the following solution to this problem. In section I.3.2, I argued that feature checking invariably involves feature matching between sisters. The specifier is the designated position for checking the N-features of a head α, because it is the sister of the Projection of α (the first XP projection of α). I have assumed that the special status of the Projection of α is not expressed in bar-level status, but in feature content: the Projection of α may share the morphological features of α. If the Projection of α shares the N-features of α, movement of the relevant XP to the specifier position of α suffices to get the N-features of α checked.

In section I.3.2, I suggested that the N-features of α may not be automatically present on the Projection of α as well. There is some room here for parametric variation. If α is [+accessible], the N-features of α will also be present on the Projection of α. In that case, movement of the relevant XP to the specifier position of α suffices for N-feature checking. If α is [-accessible], the features of α will not automatically spread to the Projection of α. In that case, something has to happen to α in order to make it possible for the N-features of α to spread to the Projection of α, so that feature checking under sisterhood can take place.

This approach suggests that in certain constructions or languages, a functional head must be affected in some way before its N-features can be checked. In these constructions, movement to the specifier position of that head does not suffice.

It is a quite general phenomenon that movement of an XP to the specifier position of a functional projection α is accompanied by movement of the verb to the head of α.\textsuperscript{19} Still, it is not \textit{always} the case that XP movement is accompanied by head movement. For example, wh-movement to spec of CP triggers verb movement to C in English, but not in French:

\begin{tabular}{ll}
39 & a. \textbf{When did} John arrive? \textbf{English} \\
   & b. \* \textbf{When} John arrived/did arrive? \\
40 & a. \textbf{Quand} Jean est-il arrivé? \textbf{French} \\
   & \textit{When did John arrive?} \\
   & b. \* \textbf{Quand est-il} Jean arrivé? \\
   & \textit{When did John arrive?}
\end{tabular}

This state of affairs can be described in two ways.

First, one could analyze English C as having both a strong N-feature and a strong V-feature, and French C as having a strong N-feature and a weak V-feature. The strong N-feature of C would force the wh-element to move to spec of CP in both English and French (abstracting away from the possibility of \textit{wh-in-situ}). The strong V-feature of \textsuperscript{19}This phenomenon underlies e.g. the \textit{Wh-Criterion} of Rizzi (1990b), and the \textit{Neg-Criterion} of Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991).
C would force the verb to follow suit in English, but in French, verb movement to C would be excluded because of the weak V-feature in C.

Alternatively, one could assume that the N-features and V-features of C are specified in the same way in both English and French. In both languages, C would have a strong N-feature and a weak V-feature. However, the difference could be that C is [-accessible] in English and [+accessible] in French. This would explain the obligatory verb movement in (39), and the absence of it in (40).

There is one interesting difference between these two approaches that will become important in section 4. Only in the second approach is verb movement to a functional head with a weak V-feature possible. In the first approach, the relation between strength of V-features and verb movement is too direct to allow this. Let us therefore call the first approach the rigid approach, and the second approach the conditional approach.

Returning now to AgrS-to-C movement, I would like to propose that in complementizer agreement dialects AgrS has strong N-features and weak V-features, and that in addition AgrS is specified as [-accessible].20 As a result, the specifier position of AgrSP has to be filled by the subject, but movement of the subject does not suffice to get the N-features of AgrS checked. Since AgrS is [-accessible], the N-features of AgrS are not present on the Projection of AgrS (the sister of the specifier), and feature checking under sisterhood cannot take place. Therefore, something has to happen to AgrS to make the N-feature of AgrS spread to the Projection of AgrS.

What I would like to propose is that AgrS-to-C movement serves this purpose:

AgrS-to-C movement makes AgrS [+accessible]

Thus, as a result of AgrS-to-C movement, the N-features of AgrS spread to the Projection of AgrS (the sister of the specifier of AgrS). As a result, checking of the N-features of AgrS under the required condition of sisterhood can proceed.

Notice that if this is correct, AgrS-to-C movement obeys the principle of Greed. After all, it is the strong N-feature of AgrS itself that is going to be eliminated through the movement of AgrS to C. Accepting the conditional approach to feature checking, then, we may draw the following conclusion:

AgrS-to-C movement indirectly eliminates the N-feature of AgrS.

Thus, the proposed AgrS-to-C movement is a minimalist type of movement.

N-feature checking in complementizer agreement dialects can now be summarized in the following way. The N-feature of AgrS is strong. For this reason, the subject moves to the spec of AgrSP in overt syntax. However, the N-feature can only be eliminated if AgrS is [+accessible]. AgrS is specified as [-accessible], which would block N-feature checking unless AgrS is affected in such a way that it becomes [+accessible]. For this reason, AgrS moves to C, which makes AgrS [+accessible] (by
hypothesis). As a result, the N-feature of AgrS spreads to the projection of AgrS, and N-feature checking can take place under sisterhood. This accounts for our earlier observation that AgrSP remains the locus for checking the features of AgrS, even after AgrS-to-C movement has taken place.

In section 4, the interaction of AgrS-to-C movement and verb movement will be discussed in greater detail. I will argue that verb movement to AgrS is another way to make AgrS [+accessible]. This has the result that the verb must move to AgrS in all and only those constructions in which C is absent. This accounts for the asymmetry between main and embedded clauses in Dutch, and allows us to maintain the minimalist assumption that in subject initial main clauses the finite verb is in AgrS.

One aspect of the interaction of AgrS-to-C movement and verb movement will have to be dealt with now, however. This concerns the morphology of verbs in C, especially in the dialects we have called double agreement dialects.

### 3.3.2 Double Agreement Dialects

In double agreement dialects the complementizer agreement and the verbal agreement differ. As mentioned before, the verb in these dialects has verbal agreement in subject initial main clauses, and complementizer agreement in subject-verb inversion constructions. This is illustrated in the following examples, partly repeated from section 3.1.

(41) a. Wij speul-t/*-e we play 1PLv/c
   b. Waar speul-e/*-t wij? where play 1PLc/v we
      "Where do we play?"
   c. ..datte wij speult that-1PLc we play-1PLv

(42) a. Gullie kom-t/*-de you come 2PLv/c
   b. Wanneer kom-de/*-t gullie? when come 2PLc/v you
      "When do you come?"
   c. ..dadde gullie kom-t that-2PLc you come-2PLv

(43) a. Gie kom-t/*-a you 2SGv/c
   b. Kom-a/-j/*-t-j gie? come 2SGc/v you "Are you coming?"
   c. ..da-a/-j gie kom-t that 2SGc you come-2PLv "..that you are coming."
Does the analysis of complementizer agreement developed in section 3.3.1 carry over to the subject-verb inversion constructions in (41b), (42b), and (43b)?

In the analysis of complementizer agreement presented above, AgrS moves to C independently of verb movement. In the b-sentences in (41-43) however, the verb moves to C overtly (following Den Besten 1977). If the verb moves through AgrS on its way to C, there is no room for independent functional head movement from AgrS to C. This suggests that in subject-verb inversion constructions, AgrS-to-C movement is part and parcel of the movement of the lexical verb to C.

However, this yields a serious problem in double agreement dialects. Recall that in these dialects, one type of agreement shows up on the verb in subject initial main clauses and in embedded clauses (the verbal agreement), and another type of agreement shows up on the verb in subject-verb inversion constructions and on the complementizer (the complementizer agreement). This is illustrated in the following table (cf. (41)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>position of verb:</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>AgrS</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agreement:</td>
<td>c (-e)</td>
<td>v (-t)</td>
<td>v (-t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Minimalist Program, verbs are inserted in fully inflected form. Accordingly, morphology cannot change in the course of a derivation. If subject initial main clauses are AgrSPs, as we have assumed throughout, we can associate verbal agreement morphology with verb movement to AgrS, and complementizer agreement morphology with verb movement to C. But if verb movement to C goes through AgrS, the verbal agreement morphology apparently has to change into complementizer agreement morphology, which is not allowed.

At this point we may wonder whether there is any reason for V-c (the verb with complementizer agreement morphology) not to move to C across AgrS. This would obviously violate the Head Movement Constraint (see section I.3.1). According to this constraint, heads can only move to the next head up. In Chomsky (1992), the Head Movement Constraint is reduced to the shortest steps requirement of economy of derivation.

However, I have argued in section I.3.1 that economy of derivation does not involve a shortest steps requirement. The fact that head movement is as restricted as it is follows from the feature checking requirements that are independently established in the minimalist approach. If a lexical head α moves to a functional head β across an intervening functional head γ, the derivation will not converge if γ contains V-features that must be checked by α. In this core case of Head Movement Constraint violations, the Head Movement Constraint is completely redundant.

Suppose α is an inflected verb, β is C, and γ is AgrS. Movement of the verb to C across AgrS yields a crashing derivation, because this would leave the V-features of AgrS unchecked. Thus, the effects of the Head Movement Constraint are trivially derived.
Suppose next that AgrS moves to C by independent head movement before verb movement takes place. This yields a chain (AgrS, t), where AgrS is adjoined to C, and t is the trace in the original position of AgrS. We may assume that the V-feature of AgrS is present on both members of the chain (AgrS, t). In this situation, movement of the verb to C across AgrS does not yield a crashing derivation. The verb adjoins to AgrS in C and checks the V-features of AgrS under the required sisterhood condition. This derivation is not allowed by the Head Movement Constraint, but it is allowed by the minimalist principles which the Head Movement Constraint must be derived from. This supports our earlier conclusion that the shortest steps requirement is not part of economy of derivation.

Let us now return to the double agreement dialects. The problem we faced was to account for the appearance of complementizer agreement morphology on the verb in C. This is unexpected if the verb moves to C through AgrS. Instead, the morphology on the verb in C suggests that the verb moves to C directly, skipping AgrS. Such a movement was seen to violate the Head Movement Constraint. Assuming the preceding discussion to be essentially correct, this is not a problem, if it can be shown that the verb movement to C across AgrS is part of a minimalist derivation.

First, we have to wonder whether the verb movement to C is triggered by the need to eliminate morphological features. This topic will be treated more fully in section 5. Since AgrS moves to C, adjunction of the verb to AgrS serves to eliminate the V-feature of AgrS.

Secondly, we have to wonder whether the movement across AgrS (instead of through AgrS) is minimalist. Normally, this would not be the case, since movement across AgrS precludes checking AgrS’s V-features. However, in this case AgrS moves to C itself. As discussed above, this means that V may check AgrS’s V-features in C. So on both counts, verb movement to C across AgrS contributes to convergence.

A third question to ask is why movement across AgrS is preferred to movement through AgrS, instead of the other way around. The theory allows only one type of answer here: skipping AgrS must be the more economical derivation. Consider why this is in fact the case.

If economy of derivations does not contain a shortest steps requirement, it reduces to the requirement that the number of steps in a derivation be as small as possible. Assuming that AgrS-to-C movement turns C into a position where the V-features of AgrS can be checked, the V-features of C and AgrS can be checked in one step by moving the verb to C across the original AgrS position. Movement through AgrS is not barred by feature checking requirements, but would yield a derivation with more verb-movement steps. This is excluded by economy of derivation.21

---

21 One might argue that the addition of the verb movement step is compensated by the circumstance that independent functional head movement of AgrS to C is no longer necessary. If the verb moves to C through AgrS, AgrS gets a free ride to C. However, in choosing the most economical derivation we are not interested in the global number of steps, but in the question whether each step is necessary or superfluous. From this perspective, AgrS-to-C movement is irrelevant in determining the most economical V-to-C movement.
This answers the third question that the analysis of V-to-C movement in double agreement dialects poses. In sum, the proposed analysis, which involves a violation of the former Head Movement Constraint, is fully consistent with the Minimalist Program.

The agreement phenomena in double agreement dialects can now be derived in the following way. In these dialects, complementizer agreement is present on the complementizer and on the verb in inversion constructions. In subject initial main clauses, the verb shows another type of agreement, which we called verbal agreement. The verb must be generated in V in fully inflected form, either with complementizer agreement or with verbal agreement. A verb with complementizer agreement cannot move to AgrS, and a verb with verbal agreement cannot move to C. The derivation of subject initial main clauses therefore may not involve verb movement to C, and the derivation of inversion constructions may not involve verb movement to AgrS. This leads to two conclusions. First, subject initial clauses are not expanded up to the CP level. As a result, the verb can move only to AgrS, and the verbal agreement must appear. Second, the verb may not move through AgrS in inversion constructions. This follows from economy of derivation, as discussed above.22

In the next section, the morphological aspects of the double agreement phenomenon will be discussed in more detail.

3.3.3 Morphological Issues

We have now reached the following description of the agreement pattern in double agreement dialects. When the verb stays in V or moves to AgrS it shows verbal agreement morphology. When the verb moves across AgrS to C, it shows complementizer agreement morphology. In this subsection, I will try to be a bit more explicit about the relation between syntax and morphology in this pattern.

In the minimalist approach, elements enter the syntactic component in fully inflected form. This implies that in complementizer agreement dialects, there must be a paradigm of complementizers.23 A feature must be associated with each form of the paradigm. This feature has to match the feature of AgrS after AgrS-to-C movement.

It is tempting to suggest that complementizers universally carry features that have to match the features of lower functional heads. If this is correct, an explanation must be found for the fact the complementizer agreement is typologically rare. I will return to this issue in section 4.2.

---

22 The question arises whether topicalization of the subject in double agreement dialects would give rise to verbal agreement on the verb or complementizer agreement. The facts are that in these cases the verb always shows verbal agreement. This is also the case in the Standard Dutch 2SG, where the verb shows the double agreement pattern (JIJ gaat/*ga `YOU go`). The derivation of these constructions therefore must involve verb movement to AgrS before the verb moves on to C. Consequently, topicalization in these constructions does not involve independent AgrS-to-C movement.

23 Goeman (1980) reaches the same conclusion.
Notice that complementizer agreement never replaces the agreement on the verb. In this case, complementizer agreement is subject agreement, one could argue that the complementizer feature is an N-feature. However, this raises the previously mentioned issue why subjects cannot be licensed in the specifier position of CP.

I would like to suggest that the feature carried by the complementizer is not an independent N-feature, but a duplicate of the N-feature of AgrS. When AgrS adjoins to C, its features have to match the relevant features of C, carried by the complementizer. The duplicate feature may be automatically eliminated when the N-feature of AgrS is eliminated. This can be thought of as a result of the AgrS-to-C movement. Alternatively, we may assume that the duplicate feature is invisible at the interface levels, and hence need not be eliminated.

Viewed in this way, the presence of a particular duplicate feature does not represent a trigger for movement, but a condition for movement. Put differently, AgrS-to-C movement is possible on condition that the duplicate feature be non-distinct from the relevant feature of AgrS.

The concept of a duplicate feature allows us to set up a paradigm for verbs in double agreement dialects. As always, particular inflectional verb forms cannot be derived in the syntax. Hence, both the complementizer agreement verb form (V-c) and the verbal agreement verb form (V-v) must be present from the outset.

We can now say that the feature specification of V-c is equal to the feature specification of V-v, and that V-c in addition has the duplicate feature associated with the complementizer agreement. Thus, a particular V-v form like East Netherlandic speult will be [+present,[1PL,+agr]], and the corresponding V-c form speule will be [+present,[1PL,+agr]], where agr is the duplicate feature of the N-feature of AgrS. I will assume that when the verb has a paradigm of forms in which one form is [+agr] and another form is [+agr] the verb in C must take the marked [+agr] form. Thus, the condition on AgrS-to-C movement is that the duplicate feature of the element in C must be maximally non-distinct from the relevant feature of AgrS.

The mechanism of complementizer agreement can now be pictured as follows. AgrS moves to C, creating a chain (AgrS,t). This movement serves to make AgrS [+accessible], so that the N-features of AgrS can be checked. A condition on AgrS-to-C movement is that the features of the complementizer or the verb in C be maximally non-distinct from the features of AgrS. In double agreement dialects, this condition is not met when a verb with verbal morphology moves to C, because verbal morphology is

---

24 Notice that complementizer agreement never replaces the agreement on the verb. In this respect, complementizer agreement is fundamentally different from do-support. If the complementizer agreement feature is too weak to perform agreement on its own, it may also be weak enough not to count as an illegitimate object at the LF interface.

25 Notice that the duplicate feature is part of the person/number feature specification, not an independent feature. Thus, the two verb forms (one with verbal agreement morphology, one with complementizer agreement morphology) constitute a paradigm within the person/number paradigm. The feature specification follows Jakobson (1935), where the unmarked value is neither + nor -. Consequently, we can assume that the duplicate feature is present with the unmarked +agr specification in single agreement dialects.
associated with a feature [+agr] in double agreement dialects, and another verb form
with the duplicate feature [+agr] is available.

In complementizer agreement dialects that do not display the double agreement
pattern, the morphological technicalities are more straightforward, since the agreement
of the complementizer is directly linked to person or number. Thus, the South Hollandic
plural complementizer can be represented as [PL,+agr], and the singular
complementizer as [SG,+agr]. AgrS-to-C movement meets the non-distinctness
condition on complementizer agreement in a trivial way.

In single agreement dialects which do not show complementizer agreement, neither
the verb nor the complementizer shows a morphological paradigm in connection with
AgrS-to-C movement. Hence, we may characterize the verb forms and complementizers
as [+agr] in each case. As a result, AgrS-to-C movement is not excluded in these
dialects, since the unmarked specification of the duplicate feature does not violate the
non-distinctness condition on AgrS-to-C movement.

3.3.4 Complementizer Agreement and Verb Movement

In the analysis presented thus far, AgrS-to-C interacts with verb movement. In
embedded clauses, where AgrS-to-C takes place, the verb does not move to AgrS. In
subject initial main clauses, where AgrS-to-C cannot take place, the verb moves to
AgrS. This is especially clear in double agreement dialects, in which the morphology
of the verb varies depending on whether the verb moves to AgrS or to C.

I have proposed that AgrS-to-C movement and verb movement to AgrS serve the
same goal. Both operations have the effect that AgrS becomes [+accessible], i.e., the
Projection of AgrS may take over the features of AgrS. As a result, the N-features of
AgrS can be checked by feature matching between the subject in the specifier position
of AgrS and its sister, the Projection of AgrS (cf. section I.3.2).

This analysis makes the prediction that all complementizer agreement dialects show
the verb movement asymmetry between main clauses and embedded clauses illustrated
for Standard Dutch in section II.1.2.1. This prediction is borne out, as the following
facts show:

(44) a. Ze komme morge
    they come-PL tomorrow
b. ..datte ze morge komme
    that-PL they tomorrow come-PL
    "..that they come tomorrow."

(45) a. Ik komen vandoage
    I come-1SG today
b. ..dan-k vandoage komen
    that-1SG I-Cl today come-1SG
    "..that I come today."
In the dialects illustrated, the adverb follows the finite verb in main clauses (the a-sentences), but precedes it in embedded clauses (the b-sentences). In each of these sentences, a reversal of the verb-adverb order would be ungrammatical, just like in Standard Dutch.

At this point, recall the discussion of the syntactic properties of complementizer agreement dialects in section 3.2.2. It turned out that there is not a cluster of syntactic properties which all (or most) and only complementizer agreement dialects share, and which could therefore be associated with AgrS-to-C movement. As (44-49) bear out, there is a syntactic phenomenon associated with abstract AgrS-to-C movement which is invariant across complementizer agreement dialects, namely the absence of verb movement when AgrS-to-C takes place.

Notice, however, that AgrS-to-C cannot be restricted to constructions with overt complementizer agreement. Many complementizer agreement dialects do not show a full complementizer agreement paradigm. For example, the complementizer agreement of the Groningen type is restricted to 2SG. Yet the verb movement asymmetry is pervasive in all complementizer agreement dialects, regardless the person or number of the verb. This is accounted for on the assumption that the element in C has an unmarked \[\text{/G4C agr}\] duplicate feature when there is no sign of overt complementizer agreement. The presence of this feature still allows AgrS-to-C movement, since the unmarked feature is non-distinct from the N-feature of AgrS.

From here, it is only a small step to assume that dialects of Dutch without complementizer agreement, such as Standard Dutch, have AgrS-to-C movement as well. We may assume that in these dialects, the complementizer invariably carries the unmarked \[\text{/G4C agr}\] duplicate feature which allows AgrS-to-C movement. On these assumptions, the absence of verb movement in embedded clauses in Standard Dutch would be accounted for. This will be the starting point of the discussion of the verb movement asymmetry in Standard Dutch in section 4.
To conclude this subsection, recall that Standard Dutch is in a sense a double agreement dialect. This may be concluded from the agreement pattern in the second person singular (cf. Goeman 1992):

(50) a. Jij komt/*kom
    you come

b. Wanneer kom/*kurt jij?
    when come you

    “When do you come?”

c. ..dat jij /komt/*kom
    that you come

The two verb forms can now be analyzed as in double agreement dialects. In the verbal paradigm there is a subparadigm connected with the second person singular. According to this subparadigm, *kurt is [2SG,+agr] and *kom is [2SG,-agr]. As a result, only *kom is allowed in C, because *kom contains a duplicate feature that is maximally non-distinct from the features of AgrS.

3.4 Conclusion

In this section, I have described complementizer agreement as a morphological reflex of AgrS-to-C movement. It has also become clear that AgrS-to-C movement is an abstract functional head movement, which may take place independently of verb movement. AgrS-to-C movement has tangible effects in the syntax of verb movement, since it makes verb movement superfluous. This will be discussed more fully in section 4. If verb movement and complementizer agreement do interact in the way suggested here, it becomes unlikely that AgrS-to-C movement be restricted to dialects with overt complementizer agreement. In accordance with this, it has become clear that there is not an obvious cluster of syntactic properties which all and only overt complementizer agreement dialects share.

Another important conclusion that can be drawn from the analysis presented here is that Dutch has a separate functional projection for subject agreement, AgrSP. This confirms the starting point of this book, according to which the structure of the functional domain of Dutch is as assumed in the Minimalist Program. The analysis

---

26 It is not likely that the final -t in (50b) is elided, because of the impossibility of such elision in the third person in identical contexts (Wanneer kom/*kom Jan? ’when comes John?’). Also, under an elision analysis one predicts that the final -t will show up again when the 2SG pronoun is modified, e.g. in ook jij’ also you’. However, this is not the case. Remarkably, *wanneer kom ook jij [when come also you] and *wanneer komt ook jij [when come-t also you] are both excluded (while ook jij kom [also you come-t] and the imperative kom ook jij [come also you] are unproblematic), apparently because of a requirement that the 2SG verb form be able to pass as a 3SG verb form (considering the pair kom jij/komt hij [come you/comes he], and the grammaticality of wanneer moet hij/ook jij [when must he/also you] and wanneer kwam hij/ook jij [when came he/also you]; thanks to Eric Hoekstra for this observation). The ungrammaticality of *wanneer kom ook jij [when come-t also you] argues strongly against an elision analysis of the 2SG verb form kom. (In fact, wanneer kom ook jij [when come also you] is slightly better than wanneer kom ook jij [when come-t also you], in my judgment.)
presented here provides strong confirmation for the applicability of the Minimalist Program to the syntax of Dutch.

Finally, the analysis of double agreement dialects (which possibly include Standard Dutch) allows us to draw a conclusion as to the central issue of this chapter: the position of the functional heads in Dutch. In double agreement dialects, verbs in C carry special agreement, identical to the agreement on the complementizer. In subject initial main clauses, the verb has the ordinary verbal agreement. Hence, the verb cannot be in C in these constructions. Since the verb has clearly moved out of its basic position, and, furthermore, is obligatorily adjacent to the subject, the verb must be in a lower functional head in subject initial main clauses, presumably AgrS. AgrS, then, must be to the left of the VP in double agreement dialects. In the spirit of this section, this conclusion carries over to other dialects of Dutch, including Standard Dutch.