Agreement in Comp

SHLONSKY, Ur


Available at: http://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:83463

Disclaimer: layout of this document may differ from the published version.
Our discussion improves on the traditional treatment by reducing the number of stem classes from five to just two (viz., "L dominated or not dominated by N"), and the number of outcomes from three to two (assimilation and preservation) since we assume assimilation before deletion in Type E. The inclusion of /l/ into the class of triggers of assimilation makes it possible to define a natural class. The comparison with Old Swedish illustrates a common problem in the well-established practice of historical reconstruction, as well as how explicit theoretical models may help the historical linguist. The comparative/diachronic analysis, for its part, provides support for the plausibility of the abstract representations of phonological theory by showing that they are necessary for the explanation of observed changes.
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This paper hopes to contribute to the ongoing discussion of the structure of Comp. Much current work on such diverse topics as wh-movement, focalization, topicalization and the theory of agreement converges around the idea that CP, like IP, is a label for a more richly layered structure than in Chomsky’s original (1986) proposal (see, for example, Vikner (forthcoming) for references and discussion of several proposals.)

The present paper studies West Flemish finite complementizers which are endowed, as is rather well-known, with the striking property of being inflected (Bennis and Haegeman 1984; Haegeman 1990; Haegeman 1992). In the spirit of Pollock’s work on the inflectional system, I propose an explicit representation of Agreement (Agr) in Comp, incorporating the hypothesis that Agr is the head of a discrete maximal projection. I adopt, as a working assumption, the view that agreement, whether in Comp or elsewhere, is a relationship between a head and its coindexed specifier. In a nutshell, then, I propose a structure such as (1) below where Agr in the Comp system is labeled AgrC, in order to distinguish it from the highest Agr projection in the IP system. I further argue that the specifier of AgrC is an A-position, in virtue of being the specifier of and sharing φ-features with the head AgrC (Rizzi 1991), though neither a B-position nor a position to which Case is assigned.2

1. This paper could not have been written without the continued assistance of L. Haegeman. Parts of this work were presented at the GLOW meeting in 1992, at the University of Venice and at the 8th Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax. I am grateful to audiences at these meetings as well as to A. Belletti, A. Cardinali, M.T. Guasti, L. Rizzi and S. Vikner. An earlier version of this paper was distributed in Geneva Generative Papers (Shlonsky 1992b).


Terminology aside, the proposal endorses the view of Cardinali and Roberts (to appear) that some languages have an Agr projection which lies between CP and IP and plays an important role in their theories.
I hope to demonstrate that the adoption of (1) in tandem with other, rather natural assumptions, yields an adequate description of agreement in Comp in West Flemish and a plausible analysis of the distribution of subject clitics in this language. In addition, I show that some of the properties which distinguish subject-initial V2 clauses from non-subject-initial ones in West Flemish can be accounted for by making crucial use of the AgrCP projection. Finally, I discuss the more general consequences of this approach for the analysis of doubly-filled Comp phenomena.

The paper is structured as follows: sections 1 and 2 analyze the distribution of subject clitics in West Flemish. Section 3 addresses some technical questions regarding the order of clitics in the West Flemish CP and section 4 considers the implications of the split Comp hypothesis for doubly-filled Comp phenomena.

1. Comp in West Flemish embedded sentences

1.1 Agreement in Comp and subject clitic doubling

In embedded sentences, the West Flemish complementizers da (-wh) and of da or oo (+-wh) are inflected to agree with the subject of their clause in number and when the subject is pronominal, in person features as well. This is illustrated in (2) and (3) for da. Observationally, then, the subject in West Flemish agrees twice: once with the verb and once with the complementizer.

role in nominative Case assignment. However, both in terms of implementation as well as in some of the conclusions drawn, the two proposals should be kept distinct. It is, at same time, highly plausible and if so, desirable, that they be made fully compatible with one another but I shall not attempt to do so here.

3. Unless otherwise stated, all the West Flemish data as well as certain points of presentation are taken from Haegeman (1990). The surface form of agreement as well as that of subject clitics discussed below is obscured by a number of phonological alternations discussed in note 5. For the sake of clarity, therefore, I provide phonemic approximations throughout.

4. As they stand, sentences (3a, b, c, g) — marked by an asterisk in the text — are actually unacceptable and require an overt subject clitic, as indicated by the lack of parentheses in the relevant examples in (4). I abstract away from this fact which might possibly be dealt with in terms of phonological assimilation and reduction rules, as suggested by a reviewer.

5. Zwart (1991: 17, 18) observes that Comp inflection in West Flemish (and other dialects of Dutch) is formally distinct from verbal inflection and concludes that it is "somehow not ordinary Spec-head agreement ... and seem[s] to argue against the hypothesis that inflectional morphology is combined with the verb through movement and adjunction." This seems to me overstated. As far as West Flemish is concerned, L. Haegeman points out (personal communication) that the different forms of verbal and complementizer agreement are most likely due to the application of independently motivated rules of assimilation and truncation. Thus, assuming that the agreement morpheme [t] is truncated before a consonant and voiced before a vowel, can explain the alternation displayed by both the complementizer and the verb in (i)-(iv).

(i) [da -t Valère noar us goa-t] → [da Valère noar us goa-t]
that-3SG-MASC Valère to home go -3SG-MASC
'that Valère goes home'

(ii) [da -t Valère dienien vis goa-t vangen] → [da -t Valère dienien vis goa-t catch]
that-3SG-MASC Valère that fish goz-es-3SG-MASC catch
'that Valère goes to catch that fish'
→ [da Valère dienien vis goa vangen]”

(iii) [da -t Anna noar us goa-t] → [da idad Anna noar us goa-t]
that-3SG-FEM Anna to home go -3SG-FEM
'that Anna goes home'

(iv) [da -t Anna dedoosen goa-t anduden] → [da -t Anna the-days goa-t anduden]
that-3SG-FEM Anna the-days go -3SG-FEM indicate
'that Anna will indicate the dates'
→ [da idad Anna dedoosen good anduden]

Finally, word-final [t] can trigger voice assimilation prior to truncation. In the following example, [zæz] becomes [zæi] and [zoeken] surfaces as [soeken] under the influence of the agreement morpheme [t] which is subsequently deleted pre-consonantally.

(v) [da -t Zæz dienien boek goa-t] → [da -t Zæz [zæi] dienien boek goa-t seek]
that-3SG-MASC Zæz this book go -3SG-MASC seek
"that Zæz goes to seek this book"
→ [da idad zæi dienien boek goa soeken]
Definite subjects in West Flemish appear immediately to the right of the inflected complementizer (the unmarked word order in West Flemish is SOV). If the subject is a tonic pronoun it may be doubled by a clitic pronoun which agrees with it in person and number. This is shown in (4).

(4) a. da -n -k ik werk-en
   that-1SG-I I work-1SG
b. da -t j gie werk-t
   that-2SG-you you work-2SG
c. da -t -j ij werk-t
   that-3SG-MASC he work-3SG-MASC
d. da -t (ze) zie werk-t
   that-3SG-FEM she work-3SG-FEM
e. da -t (-t) tet werk-t
   that-3SG-NEUT it work-3SG-NEUT
f. da -n (-me) wunder werk-en
   that-1PL we we work-1PL
g. da -t -j gunder werk-t
   that-2PL-you-PL you-PL work-2PL
h. da -n (-ze) zunder werk-en
   that-3PL they they work-3PL

While the presence of the clitic is optional when the subject of the clause is an overt pronoun (modulo the discussion in note 4), it is obligatory when the subject is null, (5), and impossible when the subject is not a pronoun but an R-expression as in (6).

(5) da-t *(ze) werk-t
   dat-3SG-FEM she work-3SG-FEM
(6) *da -t ze Marie werk-t
   that-3SG-FEM she Marie work-3SG-FEM

1.2. Analysis

My initial claim is that the ϕ-features manifested on da are base-generated as the affixal head of AgrCP as in (7) below, where AgrC₀ to C₀, 6

(7) CP
   (Spec) C'
   C AgrCP
   da Spec AgrC'
   Spec AgrC
   IP

Secondly, I assume that the contents of AgrC₀ must be licensed by coindexation with an element bearing the same features in its specifier position. This requirement seems to hold quite generally of agreement heads.7 I take the clitic pronoun to be a base-generated DP in Spec of AgrCP. In other words, I argue that agreement in the West Flemish Comp system is not a direct manifestation of agreement with the clausal subject, but rather an instance of Spec–head agreement in AgrCP. The clausal subject, on the other hand, appears in its canonical position in Spec of IP. Agreement of the subject with the verb is realized in Infl, or, more precisely, in AgrSP, internally to the IP system, (which I omit for the sake of convenience). I propose (8) as the structure for (4d) and argue that it provides the configurational space needed to represent both agreement morphology and subject clitics in an OV language such as West Flemish.

---

6. A reviewer comments that the movement of the inflectional affix in AgrC to C is the opposite of the usual conception of inflection "where a lexical category moves into a higher functional head...". Under common assumptions, however, all movement of I to C (in for example V2 structures) constitutes movement of an inflectional head, namely AgrS, to C. One might try to reverse the hierarchical order of CP and AgrCP, placing the latter higher than the former and deriving the inflected C by incorporating C to AgrC. While this is consistent with the order of morphemes in the inflected Comp, it raises a host of tricky questions with respect to the position of the subject clitic, which, to recall, follows the inflected complementizer.

7. While it might be argued that spec-head feature sharing is derivable from Case theory, it seems quite clear that Case theory fails to capture its full generality, simply because Spec-head coindexing putatively holds even in configurations where no Case can plausibly be assigned, for example, between a [+wh] C₀ and its specifier (Rizzi (1990), (1991)) or a negative head and its specifier, (Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991)).
Since the subject clitic occupies a specifier position, it is not, properly speaking, a clitic, that is, an X\textsuperscript{0}, but rather an X\textsuperscript{max}. This seems to be otherwise necessary since, as shown in section 2 below, subject clitics serve as triggers for V2 in West Flemish. Let us assume that the clitic is the D\textsuperscript{0} head of the DP in Spec of AgrCP and that cliticization involves (head) movement of D\textsuperscript{0}.

1.2.1. Subject clitics and Case. The set of pronouns doubling the subject are weak, unstressed pronominal forms. (9) demonstrates that the order of the subject clitic and the subject strong pronouns is fixed: The strong pronoun cannot precede the clitic.

(9) *da -t zie ze werk -t
that-3SG-FEM she she work -3SG -FEM

I believe that the ungrammaticality of (9) follows from Case theory, under the assumption that Spec of AgrCP is not a Case position.\textsuperscript{8} Consequently, the only elements which may appear in Spec of AgrCP are those which either do not require Case or those which have, at their disposal, alternative means to be identified morphologically.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{8} This might be due to a strict interpretation of Baker's Government Transparency Corollary, which, as Roberts (1992) argues (see also Rizzi and Roberts 1989), holds only of government and not of agreement relationships. Alternatively, the unavailability of Case in Spec of AgrCP might follow from a principled setting of the Case Directionality Parameter (stated in terms of Agreement versus Government) so that (nominative) Case is never assigned under agreement in West Flemish. See note 10 for further discussion.

\textsuperscript{9} I assume that overt NPs must be morphologically identified by PF while heads of chains must bear Case in LF. For discussion, see Shlonsky (1987) among others, and below.

Clitic pronouns differ from tonic pronouns precisely in that they have alternative means to be identified morphologically. Following Baker, Johnson and Roberts (1989), assume that cliticization is a means of identification sufficient to satisfy the Case filter. Put differently, the morphologically-dependent status of these pronouns is the phonetic correlate of their being, at some level, syntactic affixes, that is, incorporating X\textsuperscript{0} elements.

If (9) has the structure (10), with zie base-generated in Spec of AgrCP and the clitic pronoun ze in Spec of IP, the sentence must be ruled out because the tonic pronoun zie has no Case: neither is it in a Case position nor is it a clitic. Indeed, it must be concluded that only clitics are allowed by Case theory to be base-generated in Spec of AgrCP.

(10) CP \\
(Spec) C' \\
C AgrCP \\
Spec \\
AgrC \\
-IP zie \\
Spec VP I \\
t, werk -t

However, a different derivation of (9) must also be considered. It involves moving the pronoun zie directly from its 0-position in VP over a clitic base-generated in Spec of Spec of IP, as illustrated in (11) below.

Although no Condition A violation is incurred by such movement — the (anaphoric) NP trace left by raising the VP subject zie to Spec of AgrCP is A-bound by the coindexed clitic in Spec of IP — Case theory rules it out. Neither the extraction site (in VP), nor the landing site (in Spec of AgrCP) are Case positions. Relativized Minimality (Rizzi (1990) is respected since NP-trace has a local antecedent in Spec of IP.

I follow Haegeman (1990, 1992); Rizzi and Roberts (1989) in assuming that while a head bearing Case features may not assign two Cases, it may assign one Case and host a clitic in need of identification, since the two modes of Case assignment are formally distinct. The ban on Case assignment twice in the same mode rules out (12), as discussed in Haegeman (1990), since both clitics would have to avail themselves of the same licensing mode, that is, incorporation.
In addition to being a non-Case position, Spec of AgrCP is a θ'-position. Since subject clitic pronouns are not bearers of θ-roles they need not meet any LF requirement on chains. I assume that the incorporation of clitics to C0 may therefore occur as late as the derivation of PF from S-structure (see section 3).

1.2.2. The position of clausal subjects. West Flemish subject clitics are, however, optional. Consider the structure and derivation of (4d) when no clitic is present. Since the contents of AgrC0 must be licensed by coindexation with Spec of AgrCP, some other element must fill that position. I propose that in the absence of a clitic in Spec of AgrCP, the actual subject, whether pronominal or not, moves into Spec of AgrCP, as in (13) below.

I take the trace of the subject in Spec of IP to be its Case position. Since no Case is assigned in Spec of AgrCP, no Case conflict can arise by moving the subject into it. I continue to assume, however, that Spec of AgrCP is a valid A-position, in virtue of being the specifier of an Agr node (cf. Rizzi 1991; Shlonsky 1992a).

If Spec of AgrCP is an A position but not a Case position, it must be explained why a chain headed by a DP moved from Spec of IP as in (13) is well-formed while a chain headed by a DP moved to Spec of AgrCP directly from the VP subject position as in (11) is not. Note that in (13), the DP raised to Spec of AgrCP is moved from a Case position, namely Spec of IP.

In the illicit case illustrated in (11), however, neither the head of the chain nor its tail occupy a Case position, as discussed above. On the assumption that the head of an A-chain must have Case, (13) meets the Visibility Condition while (9) is correctly ruled out since the head of the A-chain illustrated in (11) does not have Case.

If this suggestion is valid, it entails that NP traces are not Caseless by definition, as is usually assumed, but that their lack of Case is a consequence of the lack of Case available to the position they occupy. In raising or passive structures, NP movement is driven by the need for Case; NP movement to Spec of AgrCP, on the other hand, is driven by the need to realize a Spec-head configuration and thus to license the contents of AgrC.

There is a formal resemblance between this state of affairs and the options of word order and subject–verb agreement in Standard Arabic. When the verb precedes the subject (in VSO order) it does not agree with the subject in number. In (14a) below, the verb is singular while the subject is plural; agreement is impossible, (14b). When the subject precedes the verb, the verb must agree with it as the contrast between (15a, b) demonstrates.

    entered-sg the-boys the-house

    entered-pl the-boys the-house

    the boys entered-pl the-house

    the boys entered-sg the-house
Under one common view, VSO order is derived from an underlying SVO order by raising the verb to some functional projection c-commanding and hence governing the subject, which remains in situ (see for example, Wooford 1991). If Case can be assigned to the subject in the postverbal position through government, then the ungrammaticality of (14b) is not related to Case theory. Suppose that (14b) is ruled out because Agr requires coindexation with a specifier, independently of structural Case, as the contrast between (14b) and (15a) seems to indicate. It appears, then, that both Arabic (15a) and West Flemish (4d) without the subject clitic instantiate NP-movement which is not Case-driven.

Some evidence that in the absence of clitics, West Flemish subjects raise to Spec of AgrCP is provided by the observation that no element may intervene between C0 and the subject. This is shown in (16) with an adverb. The ungrammaticality of (16) follows if we take adverbial adjunction to be IP-bound, as seems otherwise warranted.

\[(16) \quad \text{\textasteriskcentered} \text{da -t morgen zie werk-t} \quad \text{that-3SG-FEM tomorrow she work-3SG-FEM}\]

However, it is also the case that other than (object) clitics, no material may intervene between the subject clitic and its doubled subject, as shown in (17).

\[(17) \quad \text{da -t ze (*morgen) zie werk-t} \quad \text{that-3SG-FEM she tomorrow she work-3SG-FEM}\]

I follow Haegeman (1990, 1992) in arguing that the ungrammaticality of (17) follows from Case theory. Up till now, I have left open the question of how nominative Case is actually assigned to the subject. I have only argued that no Case is assigned to Spec of AgrCP. Suppose, with Haegeman, that nominative Case is assigned in West Flemish by government. Suppose, further, that government by Agr0 is the only available mechanism to assign nominative Case in this language. Assuming that the structure of West Flemish clauses has AgrSP higher than TP (as in Belletti 1990), it follows that the only IP-internal position in which the subject is governed by AgrS is Spec of TP. However, if Spec of TP is an A- and never an A-position (Rizzi 1991, Roberts 1992), then the clausal subject cannot be Case marked by any Agr internal to IP. I thus endorse the view of Cardinaletti and Roberts (to appear) to the effect that the assignment of nominative Case makes crucial use of an Agr0 node external to IP, which I take to be AgrC0.

1.2.3. Pro-drop in West Flemish. Turning to (5), I suggest that the clitic is base-generated in Spec of AgrCP while the clausal subject in Spec of IP is a pro, governed by and formally licensed through Case-assignment from AgrC0, which is also its identifier, in Rizzi’s (1986) sense. There is an alternative analysis for (5), though, according to which the subject clitic is the actual thematic subject, moved from Spec of IP to Spec of AgrCP. While West Flemish fails to provide a clear indication which analysis is correct, I believe that consideration of comparative data from Frisian and Bavarian supports the pro-drop analysis.

Both Bavarian and Frisian display a more restricted paradigm of agreement on the finite complementizer than West Flemish (in the former, the agreeing affix can also appear on a wh-word, in the absence of an overt C0).11 Essentially, one finds agreement affixes only for the second person singular and plural in Bavarian and for the second person singular in Frisian, as shown in (18) and (19) below. Let us tentatively assume that complementizer agreement in these two languages is to be analyzed along the same lines proposed for West Flemish, that is, by positing an AgrCP.

\[\text{Agreement in Comp}\]
to the effect that Condition B can be met by pronominal subjects in Frisian. This is that the latter lack subject clitics altogether.

While neither Bavarian nor Frisian have subject clitics, both languages permit a referential null subject but only when Comp is inflected, that is only in the second person singular and plural in Bavarian and second person singular in Frisian.

In the absence of subject clitics, the null subject in (20) and (21) below cannot plausibly be a trace and is most probably a pro, as argued by Bayer (1984) and Hoekstra and Maracz (1991). This pro is formally licensed by government from AgrC\textsubscript{0} but can be identified only when AgrC\textsubscript{0} contains an overt affix. By analogy, Spec of IP in West Flemish (5) is also filled by pro. The difference between West Flemish on the one hand, and Bavarian and Frisian on the other, is that the latter lack subject clitics altogether.\footnote{The brief discussion of Bavarian and Frisian raises the question of what fills Spec of AgrCP, of what licenses the content of AgrC\textsubscript{0} in languages without subject clitics. I tentatively suggest that the subject clitic in Bavarian is syntactically present, though it remains phonetically unrealized.}

While neither Bavarian nor Frisian have subject clitics, both languages permit a referential null subject but only when Comp is inflected, that is only in the second person singular and plural in Bavarian and second person singular in Frisian.

In the absence of subject clitics, the null subject in (20) and (21) below cannot plausibly be a trace and is most probably a pro, as argued by Bayer (1984) and Hoekstra and Maracz (1991). This pro is formally licensed by government from AgrC\textsubscript{0} but can be identified only when AgrC\textsubscript{0} contains an overt affix. By analogy, Spec of IP in West Flemish (5) is also filled by pro. The difference between West Flemish on the one hand, and Bavarian and Frisian on the other, is that the latter lack subject clitics altogether.\footnote{The brief discussion of Bavarian and Frisian raises the question of what fills Spec of AgrCP, of what licenses the content of AgrC\textsubscript{0} in languages without subject clitics. I tentatively suggest that the subject clitic in Bavarian is syntactically present, though it remains phonetically unrealized.}

1.2.4. Subject clitics and binding theory. Consider, finally, that doubling by a clitic in West Flemish is only possible if the clausal subject is a pronoun. Recall that (6) is ungrammatical. This follows from binding theory, in the following way. The clitic pronoun doubling the subject is coindexed with the subject and c-commands it. Hence, it binds it in violation of Condition C of the binding theory.

The condition on pronouns, however, is weaker: They may not be bound in the least Complete Functional Complex containing them and their governor, where they can be free. Spec of IP in West Flemish is actually governed both by AgrS\textsubscript{0} (for binding purposes, though not for Case purposes) as well as by AgrCP. Thus, clausal subjects in West Flemish are simultaneously included in two Complete Functional Complex’s, namely IP and AgrCP. It seems reasonable to suppose that Principle B is satisfied as long as there is at least one Complete Functional Complex in which a pronoun has a binding-theory-compatible indexing. Such a Complete Functional Complex would be IP. A pronoun in Spec of IP is free within IP and hence does not violate Condition B even if c-commanded by and co-indexed with a clitic in Spec of AgrCP. This accounts for the fact that doubling of a pronominal subject is possible, while doubling of an R-expression is not.

It is not the case that only declarative complementizers are inflected in West Flemish. Haegeman (1992) shows that the Comp of indirect questions is also inflected, and subject clitics also appear in its presence, as in (22). We can take the agreeing affix in (22) to be another manifestation of an AgrC\textsubscript{0} incorporated into C\textsubscript{0}.

Interestingly, however, agreement in the Comp system in West Flemish as well as in Frisian and Bavarian, is restricted to finite complementizers: (23) is unacceptable with an affix on \textit{vu}.

In the terms of this paper, there does not appear to be any obvious reason why an AgrCP projection should not be available in non-finite clauses. Rather, what seems to be ruled out is an affix in AgrC\textsubscript{0}. If AgrC\textsubscript{0} is the Case assigning head for a clausal subject in Spec of IP and if non-finite clauses have PRO subjects, then an affix in AgrC\textsubscript{0} will govern PRO. Note that this hinges on the implication of Chomsky’s (1986) binding theory — discussed at some length in Kayne (1991) — to the effect that Condition B can be met by pronominal subjects in IP whereas PRO must be free both in IP and in CP (or AgrCP in the present system).

2. Comp in root clauses

In root clauses, West Flemish patterns like most other Germanic languages in requiring the leftmost verbal element to appear in second position. As in
embedded clauses, a pronominal subject can be doubled by a clitic. Indeed, the options illustrated for embedded clauses above are attested in root clauses as well. The difference between root and embedded clauses is that the clitic is attached to the verb in the former and to Comp in the latter. (I assume that the V2 trigger in yes/no questions is a null interrogative operator.)

(24) Werk-t -(ze) zie?
    work-3SG-FEM she she

As in embedded clauses, the clitic doubling option is not available to non-pronominal subjects, compare (6) above with (25) below.

(25) *Werk-t -ze Marie?
    work-3SG-FEM-she Marie

Note, moreover, that in root clauses with a fronted verb or auxiliary, only one portion of φ-features is manifested, not two, as (26) is unacceptable.¹³

(26) *Werk-t -t Marie?
    work-3SG-FEM-3SG-FEM Marie

As in other Germanic V2 languages, the V2 constraint in declaratives is satisfied when the subject precedes the verb. This is shown in (27) for both pronominal and non-pronominal subjects.

(27) a. Zie werk-t.
    she work-3SG-FEM
  b. Marie werk-t.
    Marie work-3SG-FEM

However, a subject clitic may also serve as the V2 “trigger” whether it doubles a pronominal subject, (28a), or not, (28b). This is evident if one considers the fact that no other element, for example, an adverb, may precede a clause-initial clitic, as shown in (29).

(28) a. Ze werk-t zie.
    she work-3SG-FEM she
  b. Ze werk-t.
    she work-3SG-FEM

(29) *Morgen ze werk-t.
    tomorrow she work-3SG-MASC

As in embedded clauses, the tonic pronoun cannot precede the verb and be doubled by a postverbal clitic, as in (30).

(30) *Zie werk-t zie.
    she work-3SG-FEM she

2.1. Analysis

2.1.1. Subject-initial verb second. Consider first the data in (27) and (28). I propose that subject-initial V2 in West Flemish is derived by moving the verb to AgrC⁰. I further argue that the pre-verbal subject, whether clitic, tonic pronoun or R-expression, occupies Spec of AgrCP.

Two constraints require that Spec of AgrCP be filled at S-structure. The first is the V2 constraint and the second is that an Agr head must be licensed by coindexation with an appropriate specifier.

Both constraints are satisfied when the subject occupies Spec of AgrCP. I argue that in (27), the subject is moved to Spec of AgrCP from Spec of IP, the clausal subject position. This is a case of A-movement, that is, movement from one A position to another, just as in (4) above without the clitic in parentheses.

The assumption that the clitic is base-generated in Spec of AgrCP yields (28a). Recall that Case is not assigned to Spec of AgrCP, and thus strong pronouns and R-expressions are prohibited from being base-generated there, because they will have no means to get Case at S-structure. Clitics, however, can be licensed through incorporation, as discussed above. In (28), cliticization is a lowering operation, but since it can be delayed to the derivation of PF from S-structure, no problem arises with respect to the Empty Category Principle (ECP). Note, moreover, that the clitic is adjacent to its host and may thus cliticize downwards (in the manner of French subject clitics in, for example, il mange la pomme ‘he eats the apple’, see section 3). The role of these preverbal clitic pronouns is, to stress again, to satisfy the V2 constraint and to license AgrC; they are pleonastic otherwise.

Finally, the ungrammaticality of (30) is due to Case theory, like that of (9) above.

2.1.2. Non subject initial verb second. Since Spec of AgrCP is an A-position, movement of a non-subject into it violates the Specified Subject Condition or Relativized Minimality, since the moved element crosses the clausal subject in Spec of AgrSP. Spec of CP, however, is an A-position so a relativized minimality violation is not incurred by moving an XP into it. I assume, then, that in non subject-initial V2 clauses, an XP preceding the verb is moved to Spec of CP and the inflected verb is raised to C⁰ via AgrC⁰. If a subject clitic is present, it occupies Spec of AgrCP. (32) illustrates the derivation of (31). Indeed, (32)
patterns with embedded clauses as far as the position of subject clitics is concerned. The only difference is that in these V2 structures, the clitic is attached leftwards to the verb in C0.

\[(31) \quad \text{Morgen werk-t -ze zie.}\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{Morgen} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{AgrCP} \\
\text{werk-t} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{AgrC} \\
\text{ze} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{zie} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{t_v} \\
\text{t_v}
\end{array}
\]

When a clitic is not present in the structure, the subject itself raises up to Spec of AgrCP, as in embedded clauses, yielding (33).

\[(33) \quad \text{Morgen werk-t Marie.}\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{Morgen} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{AgrCP} \\
\text{werk-t} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{Marie} \\
\text{AgrC} \\
\text{IP}
\end{array}
\]

2.2. Comments on the nature of verb second

The analysis of subject clitics and Comp agreement in West Flemish indirectly argues for a structural difference between V2 clauses headed by subjects and those headed by non-subjects. In this respect, this analysis is in agreement with the views of Travis (1984); Zwart (1991) and others. However, it parts with these authors' view that the structure of subject-initial V2 is accommodated internally to IP. In effect, I have proposed that all instances of V2 make use of a projection external to IP. My small contribution to the discussion of V2 is summed up in a proposal for the structure of Comp, specifically, for the proposal

14. In addition to ϕ-features, AgrS0 contains the verbal stem and a tense morpheme. More precisely, then, AgrC0 is identical to a component of AgrS0, but AgrS0 is not identical to any component of AgrC0. Thus, AgrC0 may delete under recoverability but deletion of AgrS0 would not be recoverable.
that Comp should be viewed as a cover term for a more elaborate structure, containing two heads and two specifier positions.

I have proposed for West Flemish, moreover, that the two specifiers have different properties: The higher one is an A-position while the lower one is an A-position. In this system, Spec of CP hosts all non-subject V2 triggers and verb movement proceeds to C0. Spec of AgrCP, on the other hand, is an A-position which can only host moved subjects, since movement of non-subjects to Spec of AgrCP would cross over the clausal subject in Spec of IP, in violation of the Specified Subject Constraint. West Flemish also allows subject clitics to be base-generated in, rather than moved to Spec of AgrCP.

3. The "cliticization" of subject clitics

Direct and indirect object clitics appear in a number of positions in West Flemish (cf. Haegeman 1991). I am concerned here only with the fact that an inflectional subclass of these pronouns may appear between a lexical C0 or a verb in C0 and the subject, as shown in (35) (non-subject clitics in bold).

\[(35)\]
\[
a. da -n t ze zunder gezeid ee -n\]
\[
that-3PL it them they said have-3PL
\]
\['that they have said it to them'\]
\[
b. een -n t ze zunder gezeid ee\]
\[
have-3PL it them they said
\]
\['Have they said it to them?'\]

In terms of the analysis proposed in this paper, the subject zunder is in Spec of AgrCP at S-structure (since it is not doubled by a clitic). Thus, the object and indirect object clitics appear between C0 and Spec of AgrCP. Standard views of clitics lead to positing two possible S-structure representations which both accommodate the data in (35) and are consistent with the structure of Comp proposed in this paper. Under one view, illustrated in (36a), object clitics are X0 elements adjoined to C0. According to the second view, object clitics are Xmax phrases scrambled and adjoined to AgrCP, (36b) (see Haegeman 1992, and for a broader discussion, Cardinaletti 1992). A combined representation is also not precluded, that is, one where the clitics are adjoined to C0 but associated with traces inside an Xmax adjoined to AgrCP.

\[(36)\]
\[
a. C^0 \quad D^0 \quad AgrCP
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{C0} \\
\text{D0} \\
\text{zet} \\
\text{t} \\
\text{Da}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{AgrCP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{ECP}
\end{array}
\]

Notice, in passing, that the relative position of AgrC0 incorporated into C0 and that of the object clitics is entirely predictable, under both (36a) or (36b). Since AgrC0 is morphologically subcategorized for and therefore substitutes into a slot in C0, while the object clitics do not and can, at best, adjoin to it, AgrC0 will always appear closer to the Comp stem.

Consider, now, the fact that the order [Comp"object clitics"subject clitic] is unacceptable, as shown in (37).

\[(37)\]
\[
*da -n t ze zunder gezeid ee -n\]
\[
that-3PL it them they said have-3PL
\]
\['that they have said it to them'

This state of affairs is somewhat puzzling given the morphological identity of the subject clitic and the indirect object clitic in (37). It is therefore unlikely that the order of elements in (37) is ruled out by some morpho-phonological constraint (a point brought to my attention by L. Haegeman). Rather, it seems that a syntactic explanation should be sought for.

I have argued above that the subject clitic is licensed or morphologically identified by incorporation. Put more precisely, a clitic in Spec of AgrCP can only be licensed by incorporating, that is, by X0 movement and adjunction to an appropriate host. Incorporation of a subject clitic differs in at least two ways from object and indirect object cliticization or scrambling. First, it is strictly local and secondly, it is driven by the need to be Case-licensed. Subject clitics never occupy Case positions in West Flemish so that incorporation to a host is their only means to get licensed. Object clitics, on the other hand, arguably originate or move through Case positions internal to IP. Movement of object clitics, whether as X0 or as Xmax phrases is not Case-driven.

Insofar as cliticization of a pronoun in Spec of AgrCP to C0 is a case of X0 movement, it must abide by the ECP. Crucially, its trace must be antecedent governed, which I take to be defined as in Rizzi (1990). Movement of an X0 from a position inside Spec of AgrCP across the object clitics in either (36a) or (36b) leaves a trace which fails to meet the minimality clause of the ECP, due to the presence of the intervening heads, whether these are directly adjoined to C0 as in (36a) or whether they head Xmax categories adjacent to (36b). Hence, the ungrammaticality of (37) and, more generally, the adjacency requirement holding of the sequence [C0 subject clitic], follows from the Head Movement Constraint, stated in terms of relativized minimality.

When there is no host in C0 for the subject clitic, as in for example subject-initial V2 structures, the subject clitic moves downwards to the inflected verb in AgrC0. In this case, no conflict arises if the inflected verb hosts object clitics, as shown in (38a). Moreover, it is clear that adjunction of the subject clitic to AgrC0, as in (38b), is inconsistent with the ECP, since the trace of the lowered pronoun is not properly governed. Following Kayne’s analysis of French subject clitics, one can view the operation lowering the West Flemish subject clitic as...
a PF operation and hence one which is not regulated by the ECP. (This argument implies that downward movement cannot occur in the syntax but only in the derivation of PF.)

(38) a. Ze ee-n t ze gezeid.  
    they have-3PL it them said  
    'They have said it to them.'

   b. AgrCP
      ze         AgrC'
      AgrS'     AgrCP
      AgrS'     AgrS'  ze
      ee-n       t

4. The doubly-filled Comp filter

In somewhat general terms, consider a related property of the West Flemish Comp system, namely, that doubly-filled Comps are possible, in fact obligatory in embedded questions. In this respect, West Flemish, along with other languages manifesting agreement in Comp, for example, Bavarian and Frisian differs from English.

(39) a. K vroagen min of hoe da -d Anna den oto gemoakt eet.  
     I wonder how that-3SG-FEM Anna the car fixed has  
     'I wonder how Anna fixed the car.'

   b. K vroagen min of wien da -t er den oto gemoakt eet.  
     I wonder who that-3SG-FEM there the car fixed has  
     'I wonder who fixed the car.'

The doubly-filled Comp Filter is not well understood and is often regarded as a language-specific filter. One exception to this view is Rizzi (1990), who argues that the doubly-filled Comp filter is a consequence of a feature mismatch between Spec of CP and C⁰ (see also Bader and Penner 1992), who reach conclusions similar to my own.

Let us compare English and West Flemish. What seems to be true of English is that a wh-operator cannot occur in Comp together with that. However, a non-subject wh-expression obligatorily co-occurs with an auxiliary in Comp in root questions, (40), and the two optionally co-occur in indirect questions in certain dialects of English (for example Hiberno-English, see McCloskey 1991; 1992). Strictly speaking, then, the doubly-filled Comp filter does not hold of English but of wh that combinations and thus cannot be taken to be a language-specific filter.

(40) How has Anna fixed the car?

If we now try to reconcile these observations about English with the West Flemish facts in (39), the following generalization emerges:

(41) A wh-expression can (must) co-occur with an agreement-bearing element in Comp.

How is this to be interpreted? Rizzi (1991) proposes to derive auxiliary movement to Comp in English subject-aux inversion from the Wh-Criterion. His idea is that a wh-operator must be coindexed with a [+wh] head at S-structure. An (unselected) C⁰ is not endowed with the feature [+wh]. This feature is generated in Agr (presumably AgrS) and transported to C⁰ by means of auxiliary movement. Crucial to the reconciliation of English and West Flemish is the claim that the feature [+wh] is generated in Agr and not in Comp.

Putting aside selection for a brief moment, suppose that wh-features may only be generated on an Agr head and that this Agr must then be moved into the head of CP in order to stand in a spec-head relationship with a wh-specifier. This is accomplished by incorporating AgrC⁰ to C⁰, in the manner discussed above. This gives rise to a doubly-filled Comp. The English Comp system is different from that of West Flemish in that minimally, AgrC⁰ is not activated in such cases (but see below). In order to bring an Agr head into the domain of Comp, AgrS⁰ is raised to C⁰.

There is one configuration where AgrC is activated in English and plays a crucial role in the procedure satisfying the Wh Criterion. In order to enable subject extraction to satisfy the ECP, Rizzi argues that Comp is specified [+Agr] and is thus transformed into a licit head-governor for a trace in Spec of IP. The apparatus posited for West Flemish allows a reformulation of this proposal in precise structural terms. Rather than endowing C⁰ with agreement features, suppose that subject extraction activates AgrC⁰ which, being an Agr-type head, may host the [+wh] feature. Wh-movement of the subject proceeds to Spec of

---

15. Doubly-filled Comps are also found, optionally or obligatorily, in embedded interrogatives of languages which do not manifest any agreement in Comp. Dutch is a case in point. It is suggestive to think of the Standard Dutch Comp system as being quite similar to that of West Flemish but for the overt manifestation of agreement in AgrCP. This difference might be at the source of other notable differences between the two languages, as discussed in Bader and Penner (1992).
In English embedded interrogatives, subject–aux inversion is impossible and a doubly-filled Comp is not permitted. The latter fact is due to inherent properties of that, which is neither an Agr head itself nor has a subcategorization slot for hosting such a head. To account for the former fact, Rizzi (1992) suggests that in addition to being generated on Agr, the [wh] feature can also be assigned to C0 through selection by an appropriate verb. A selected [+wh] C0 is thus endowed with the features necessary to satisfy the Wh-criterion without recourse to subject–aux inversion.

However, it cannot be the case that both options, that is, assignment to Agr or to Comp by selection are mutually exclusive. This is so since embedded subject–aux inversion is possible in certain dialects of English and the more general case of I-to-C movement in embedded interrogatives is attested quite widely across languages. Moreover, the West Flemish facts clearly indicate that AgrC is activated in embedded clauses.

I tentatively suggest that we distinguish the assignment of the feature [wh], which can indeed be implemented through selection by an appropriate verb, from the conditions under which a head endowed with the [wh] feature can enter into Spec–head coindexing. Let us suppose that Spec–head coindexing always crucially implicates an Agr head. The structural relation holding between a head and its specifier is a necessary condition for feature-sharing coindexing but not a sufficient one. Feature-sharing requires the presence of an Agr head though, not necessarily one which agrees in phi-features with its specifier. I fact, any Agr0 will do, as the intrinsic nature of such a head is that it is capable of coindexing with its specifier. Suppose that Agr0 is unique in this respect among X0 elements. Thus, if negative inversion in English involves focalization, as some have argued (see, for example, Culicover 1991), and if the focussed element must be in a Spec–head relation with a head bearing focus features, then raising of the auxiliary is necessary in order to bring an Agr head into the appropriate Spec–head configuration in order to permit such coindexing.

Turning to the distribution of AgrCP, we see that it is either activated by the ECP (to permit questioning of the subject in root interrogatives) or through selection by a complementizer such as West Flemish da. Now, a verb like wonder selects a [+wh] C0. Suppose that in Standard English, AgrCP can also be selected by a [+wh] C0. Once selected, AgrC0 incorporates into C0 enabling coindexation of the [wh] feature in Comp with its specifier.

Subject–aux inversion now becomes not only unnecessary, but impossible, since a [+wh] feature on AgrS would not have a unique wh-specifier in the Comp system (the wh-operator in Spec of CP is already coindexed with the wh-feature on C0). The application of subject–aux inversion in indirect questions would therefore fail to satisfy the Wh-Criterion.
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