Different agreement morphemes for different agreement configurations: evidence from complementizer agreement in West Germanic*
Michigan Linguistics Society Annual Meeting, October 15th, 2005

Jessica Rett
Rutgers University
hughesj@rci.rutgers.edu

I. A brief overview of complementizer agreement.

– In complementizer agreement (CA) constructions, the complementizer as well as the matrix verb inflect morphologically to agree with the subject.

– The agreement morpheme on the complementizer can be identical to the one on the verb (such is the case in same-agreement languages) or different (different-agreement languages).

1. a. ...datt-$\underline{e}$ we   komm-$\underline{e}$ same agreement in *South Hollandic[1]*
      that-LO we   come-LO
   b. ...dad-$\underline{de}$ gullie kom-$\underline{t}$ different agreement in *Brabantish*
      that-HI you   come-LO

– In some languages (ex. West Flemish), reduced forms of a weak subject pronoun can cliticize to the complementizer. These languages are distinct from CA languages because their complementizers will have different forms for, i.e., male and female 3rd-person singular pronouns, and because the 'argeeing' forms of these complementizers are in complementary distribution with the presence of strong subject pronouns. These languages will not be discussed here.[2]

– I'll first describe my analysis of different-agreement languages and then argue why same-agreement languages should be treated separately.

II. Different-agreement languages.

– Again, these are languages whose complementizer agrees with the subject in addition to the verb. However, in these languages, the agreement morphemes on the verbs and the complementizers differ.

2. a. ...da-$\underline{de}$ gullie kom-$\underline{t}$ *Brabantish*
      that-HI you   come-LO $C_{HI} + V_{LO}$

---

[1] All data are from Zwart 1997: 138-140 unless otherwise noted.
[2] See Bennis & Haegeman 1984, Ackema & Neeleman 2004 and Zwart 1997 for more thorough examinations of West Flemish cliticization to complementizers.

---

   b. Wanneer kom-$\underline{de}$ /*-$\underline{t}$ gullie?
      when   come-HI/*-LO you V_{HI}

3. a. ...datt-$\underline{e}$ wy speult   *East Netherlandic*
      that-HI we play-LO $C_{HI} + V_{LO}$
   b. Waor speul-$\underline{e}$ /*-$\underline{t}$ wy?
      where play-HI/*-LO we V_{HI}

4. a. ...datt-$\underline{e}$ wiej noar't park loop-$\underline{t}$ *Hellendoorn*
      that-HI we   to.the park walk-LO $C_{HI} + V_{LO}$
   b. Wiej loop-$\underline{t}$ noar't park
      we   walk-LO to.the park V_{LO}
   c. Volgens   miej lop-$\underline{e}$ wiej noar't park
      according.to me walk-HI we   to.the park V_{HI}

– (4a) demonstrates that when there is both a verb and a complementizer, the verb[3] receives LO agreement and the complementizer receives HI agreement.

– (4b) demonstrates that the verb receives LO agreement in normal SVO order (even when there is no complementizer).

– (4c) demonstrates that the verb receives HI agreement when a) there is no complementizer and b) the verb has raised out of the IP.

– Both Zwart (1997) and Carstens (2003) attribute the difference in the distribution of the two agreement morphemes to the relative position of the verb.

– Zwart suspects that "...The only factor distinguishing these forms is the position of the verb." He argues that the verb receives LO agreement when it stays in VP and HI when it moves to CP.

– Carstens argues that both T^o and C^o are probes.

5. a. $[_{TP} T^o_{\varphi, EPP} [_{vP} Subj ...]]$ *T^o agrees with subject*

   b. $[_{TP} Subj T^o_{\varphi, EPP} [_{vP} t_{subj} ...]]$ *subject raises to spec-TP*

   c. $[_{CP} C^o_{\varphi} [_{TP} Subj T^o_{\varphi, EPP} [_{vP} t_{subj} ...]]$ *C^o is merged, agrees with subject*

   ▪ If the verb stays low, it keeps its LO agreement (and the complementizer, if merged, receives its HI agreement).
   ▪ If the verb continues to raise to CP, it can adjoin to C^o, thereby receiving the HI agreement morpheme *in addition to* its LO agreement morpheme.
   ▪ Carstens derives the fact that only one morpheme surfaces by appealing to an independently-motivated morphological principle:

---

[3] Technically speaking, it's the combination of V^o and T^o that agrees, because it's the T^o, not the V^o, that's the probe. This will be made evident below.

6. *Morphological economy* (Kinyalolo 1991)

> In an adjoined structure, AGR on a lower head is inert iff its features are predictable from AGR on a higher head.

– Both analyses, by virtue of the fact that they correlate the nature of the agreement morpheme with the position of the probe, share two problems:

- They predict that in cases of subject topicalization, in which the noun is raised to a position above the raised verb, the verb will nevertheless receive high agreement (Zwart goes so far as to speculate that subjects can never be topicalized (p. 267)).
- They make a specific prediction with respect to *wh*-movement: if the subject is questioned and the verb raises to CP for verb-second, then the verb would receive HI agreement. My analysis predicts LO agreement, which I'll explain shortly.
- They fail to give any explanation for why the two agreement morphemes, HI and LO, should be distinct.
- Additionally, Zwart's analysis commits him to the position that verbs in the final position of embedded clauses are in situ. This goes against the standard analysis of inflection in German (Haegeman 2000), in which the verb raises to the tense head to receive inflection (unlike in English).[4]

III. The analysis.

– First, a new perspective of the distribution of the two agreement morphemes:

7. Syntactic configurations in different-agreement languages.

	HI	example no.	LO	example no.
Brabantish	C__ subj	(2a)	subj V__	(2a)
	V__ subj	(2b)		
East Netherlandic	C__ subj	(3a)	subj V__	(3a)
	V__ subj	(3b)		
Hellendoorn	C__ subj	(4a)	subj (PP) V__	(4a)
	V__ subj	(4b)	subj V__	(4c)

– (7) shows that whenever the subject is to the right of the probe, HI agreement surfaces. Whenever the subject is to the left of the probe, LO agreement surfaces.
– Any phrase demonstrating HI agreement is not in a spec-head configuration with the subject, which indicates that the probe is agreeing with the goal by probing downward in its c-command domain.

---

[4] See additionally Carstens 2003 and Wantanabe 2000 for a clear exposition of the problem with the in-situ assumption.

– LO agreement, however, is always assigned when the subject is to the left of the probe. Given that this probe must always be a verb (more precisely, V merged with T), it seems plausible that the probe and goal here are or have been in a spec-head relationship.

– These two different agreement relationships correlate with those distinguished in Baker (2005):

- All lexical items generate a functional projection, which acts as an agreement probe.
- The functional projection on verbs additionally licenses a specifier, whereas (the FPs on) adjectives (and Ns) do not.
- Given the assumption that these specifiers must be filled (EPP), and the assumption that agreement occurs in a closest c-command configuration, this means that verbs are the only lexical category that can agree in a spec-head relationship.
- Baker correlates this with the observation that only verbs, not adjectives, can agree in person features. He argues that the two are related.

– So the reason verbs receive LO agreement is because this is the morpheme that reflects agreement in both number and person phi-features. When verbs and complementizers receive HI agreement, they have agreed with the subject in a non-spec-head configuration, as this morpheme reflects agreement in only number phi-features.

– The agreement paradigms in different-agreement languages are so impoverished that it's impossible to give morphological evidence as to whether or not a given affix inflects for person. In Brabantish, CA is only visible in the 2nd-person plural; in East Netherlandic and Hellendoorn, it's only visible in the 1st-person plural.

8. …that-HI we play-LO   *(4a): overt complementizer, verb low*

a. $[_{VP} V [_{NP} subj]]$ → $[_{IP} I_{+EPP, +\phi} [_{VP} V [_{NP} subj]]]$ *I is merged*
b. → $_{IP} V+I_{+EPP, +\phi} [_{VP} t_V [_{NP} subj]]]$ *V adjoins to I*
c. → $_{IP} subj [_{I'} V+I_{+EPP, +\phi} [_{VP} t_V t_{subj}]]]$
          subj raises to Spec,IP +EPP & uninterpretable φ-features on I° are deleted
          (spelled out as LO)
d. → $[_{CP} C_{+\phi} [_{IP} subj [_{I'} V+I_{+EPP, +\phi} [_{VP} t_V t_{subj}]]]]$ *C is merged*
e. → $[_{CP} C_{+\phi} [_{IP} subj [_{I'} V+I_{+EPP, +\phi} [_{VP} t_V t_{subj}]]]]$
          C probes downwards in its c-command domain & uninterpretable φ-features are deleted
          (spelled out as HI)

9.   ...walk-HI we to.the park   *(4b): verb is high, subject low*

    a.   [$_{VP}$ V [$_{NP}$ subj]]   →   [$_{IP}$ I$_{+EPP, +φ}$ [$_{VP}$ V [$_{NP}$ subj]]]   *I is merged*

    b.   → [$_{IP}$ V+I$_{+EPP, +φ}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ [$_{NP}$ subj]]]   *V adjoins to I*

    c.   → [$_{IP}$ subj [$_{I'}$ V+I$_{+EPP, +φ}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]
        subj raises to Spec,IP +EPP & uninterpretable φ-features on I⁰ are deleted
        (spelled out as LO)

    d.   → [$_{CP}$ C$_{+φ}$ [$_{IP}$ subj [$_{I'}$ V+I$_{+EPP, +φ}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]]   *C is merged*

    e.   → [$_{CP}$ V$_{LO}$+C$_{+φ}$ [$_{IP}$ subj [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]]   *V adjoins to C*

    f.   → [$_{CP}$ V$_{LO}$+C$_{+φ}$ [$_{IP}$ subj [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]]
        V+C probes downwards & uninterpretable φ-features on C⁰ are deleted
        (spelled out as HI)

    g.   [morphology]: [V - LO - HI] → [V - HI]

10.   We walk-LO to.the park   *(4c): verb is high, subject is high*

    a.   [$_{VP}$ V [$_{NP}$ subj]]   →   [$_{IP}$ I$_{+EPP, +φ}$ [$_{VP}$ V [$_{NP}$ subj]]]   *I is merged*

    b.   → [$_{IP}$ V+I$_{+EPP, +φ}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ [$_{NP}$ subj]]]   *V raises and adjoins to I*

    c.   → [$_{IP}$ subj [$_{I'}$ V+I$_{+EPP, +φ}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]
        subj raises to Spec,IP +EPP feature and uninterpretable φ-features on I⁰ are deleted
        (spelled out as LO)

    d.   → [$_{CP}$ C$_{+φ}$ [$_{IP}$ subj [$_{I'}$ V+I$_{+EPP, +φ}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]]   *C is merged*

    e.   → [$_{CP}$ V$_{LO}$+C$_{+φ}$ [$_{IP}$ subj [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]]   *V adjoins to C*

    f.   → [$_{CP}$ subj [$_{C'}$ V$_{LO}$+C$_{+φ}$ [$_{IP}$ t$_{subj}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]]]
        Subj is topicalized to Spec,CP

    g.   → [$_{CP}$ subj [$_{CP}$ V$_{LO}$+C$_{+φ}$ [$_{IP}$ t$_{subj}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ [$_{VP}$ t$_V$ t$_{subj}$]]]]
        The uninterpretable features on C⁰ are deleted when it enters a spec-head relation with subj.
        (spelled out as LO)

    h.   [morphology]:   [V - LO - LO] → [V - LO]

–   I, too, use a form of Morphological Economy (6) to keep from getting two agreement suffixes on raised verbs.

–   I can account for the fact that the two agreement morphemes differ.

–   I (correctly) predict that topicalized subjects still trigger only LO agreement on the verb. Unlike the approaches in Zwart (1997) and Carstens (2003), I additionally predict that verbs in subject-*wh*-constructions, too, receive LO agreement.[5]

---

[5] I have had no luck finding instances of subject *wh*-constructions in the different-agreement CA literature. I'm waiting to hear back from sources.

IV. Same-agreement languages.

–   Although the current account predicts the difference in the morphology of the HI and LO morphemes, it additionally predicts that any morphological similarity between the two would be an accident.

–   Assuming that CA in same-agreement languages is derived from the same means as above, this means that the analysis predicts roughly 6 accidents (for the six attested cases of same-agreement CA: Frisian, Groningen, Luxemburgish, Munich Bavarian and South Hollandic).

–   However, there are reasons to think that same-agreement languages differ crucially from different-agreement languages. I argue that this difference results from same-agreement languages having only one syntactic probe (on the tense head).

11.   a.   …damid-ø   ich komm-ø   *Munich Bavarian*
        so.that-1sg I   come-1sg
    b.   …damid-sd komm-sd
        so.that-2sg come-2sg
    c.   …damid-ds komm-ds
        so.that-2pl come-2pl

–   Same-agreement languages pattern differently from different-agreement languages in that the agreement morpheme on the complementizer in same-agreement languages (and only in same-agreement languages) can be affixed to some other lexical category. Even when a complementizer is present.

12.   a.   …dat-st (do) jûn   kom-st   *Frisian*
        C-2sg you tonight come-2sg
    b.   Ik wit   net hoe-st   dat bedoel-st van der Meer (1991:64)
        I   know not how-2sg that mean
        I don't know how you mean that.

13.   …az-n   koin nait in et laand blievm will-n   *Groningen*
    when-3pl   cows not in the land   stay   want-3pl   Hoekstra & Smits 1998

14.   a.   …ob-s   du wëll-s   *Luxemburgish*
        whether-2sg you want-2sg
    b.   …mat wiem (datt) s   de spazéiere wëll ba-s   Zwart (1997:141)
        with whom (that)-2sg you walk   gone are-2sg
        …with whom you went for a walk
    c.   Géi wuer s de well-s   Zwart (1997:152)
        go   where 2sg you want-2sg

15.   a.   …datt-e we komm-e   *South Hollandic*
        that-pl we come-pl
    b.   …jonges die-e werk will-e   Zwart (1997:152)

guys who-pl work want-pl
guys who want a job
c.   …van die   rame, waar-<u>e</u>   ze   de gordijne mee spann-<u>e</u>
of   these frames where-pl they the curtains with draw-pl
the type of frames which they draw the curtains with

– These data, in the very least, demonstrate that a null C is generated with a probe, and the resulting agreement morpheme must cliticize to a nearby head (see Zwart 1997).

– But there are other reasons to think that this is not the case: Frisian demonstrates that, unlike CA in different-agreement languages, CA in same-agreement languages is sensitive to linear proximity to the verbal agreement.

16. a.   Heit sei dat-<u>st</u>   do soks net   leauwe moa-<u>st</u>.   *Frisian*
Dad said that-2sg you such things believe must-2sg   Zwart (1997:198)
b.   Heit sei dat /*dat-<u>st</u>   do moa-<u>st</u>   soks net   leauwe.
Dad said that /*that-2sg you must-2sg such things believe
Dad said that you should not believe such things.

– This seems phonological… The agreement morphemes *are* identical…

V. Conclusion.

– The reason there are two different agreement morphemes in different-agreement CA languages is because they each morpheme reflects agreement with different sorts of phi-features.
  ▪ The LO morpheme is the spell-out of agreement when the probe and goal are in a spec-head configuration. It thus reflects both number and person phi-feature agreement.
  ▪ The HI morpheme is the spell-out of agreement when the probe and goal are in a non-spec-head configuration (but the probe nevertheless c-commands the goal). It thus reflects only number phi-feature agreement.

– CA languages in which the morpheme on the verb and that on the complementizer do *not* differ (same-agreement languages) escape this analysis because agreement in these languages clearly isn't the result of two probes instigating two independent agreement relationships. The agreement morpheme on the complementizer is more likely the result of some phonological process. This is evidenced by the fact that the high agreement needn't occur on a complementizer and by the fact that it can't occur in close linear proximity to the verb.

– This analysis benefits from those before it (Zwart 1997, Carstens 2003) because it: a) explains why the two agreement morphemes differ; b) provides a more accurate description of the distribution of the two morphemes because it predicts LO agreement on the verb in subject topicalization and other such structures; and c) doesn't rely on the assumption that sentence-final verbs in German are in situ.

References.

Ackema, Peter and Neeleman, Ad. 2004. Context-sensitive spell-out and adjacency. Chapter 7 in *Beyond Morphology* (by Ackema & Neeleman). Cambridge: Oxford University Press.

Baker, Mark. 2003. *Lexical categories: verbs, nouns and adjectives.* Oxford: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, Mark. 2005. Agreement and category distinctions. Ms., Rutgers University.

Bennis, Hans and Haegeman, Liliane. 1984. On the status of agreement and relative clauses in West Flemish. In W. de Geest and Y. Putseys (eds.) *Sentential complementation: proceedings of the International Conference held at UFSAL (Brussels June, 1983).* Dordrecht/Cinnaminson. 34-53.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2004. Long-distance agreement in Hindi: some theoretical implications. *Studia linguistica* 58(1): 23-36.

Carstens, Vicki. 2001. Multiple agreement and case-deletion: against φ-(in)completeness. *Syntax* 4: 147-163.

Cartsens, Vicki. 2003. Rethinking complementizer agreement: agree with a case-checked goal. *Linguistic inquiry* 34:3, 393-412.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Martin, Michaels and Uriagareka (eds.) *Step by step: essays on Minimalist Syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 89-156.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: a life in language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1-52.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2000. Remnant movement and OV order. In P. Svenonius (ed.) *The derivation of VO and OV.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 69-96.

Hoekstra, Eric and Smits, Caroline. 1998. Everything you always wanted to know about complementizer agreement. In E. van Gelderen and V. Samiian (eds.) *Proceedings of the Western Conference on Linguistics (WECOL)* 10. Fresno: California State University.

Kathol, A. 1995. *Linearization-based German syntax.* PhD thesis, Ohio State University.

Kinyalolo, Kasangati K. W. 1991. Syntactic dependencies and the spec-head agreement hypothesis in Kilega. PhD thesis, UCLA.

Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 1997. Morphosyntax of verb movement: a Minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch. Dordrecht: Kluwer.