Ā-driven anti-agreement in Dutch inflectional morphology   **Sander Nederveen (UBC)**

Claim: This paper provides a new re-casting of the well-studied phenomenon of impoverishment of Dutch agreement morphology as an instance of anti-agreement. I claim that Dutch agreement without subject movement in the main clause (VS) is fully underspecified on the finite verb, whereas V2-conditioned SV-order triggers Ā-sensitive anti-agreement. This results in an SV-VS agreement alternation driven by Ā-sensitive anti-agreement (Ouhalla 1993; Baker 2008; Baier 2017; Baier and Yuan 2018; Baier 2018). Dialectal variation is accounted for, such that each Dutch dialect can different features that are sensitive to impoverishment, and the microvariation arising from variable sensitivity can be traced back to Ā-sensitive anti-agreement.

Background: Dutch has a SV-VS word order alternation in main clauses that results from Verb Second (V2) effects (1a-b); the SOV order in embedded clauses presents the underlying word order (Koster 1975; Den Besten 1983; Zwart 1993; De Haan 2001, (1c)). V2 results from verb movement to C^0 and Ā-movement of a topicalized constituent to spec-CP (Den Besten 1983; Zwart 1993; Schwartz and Vikner 1996; Holmberg 2015; a.o.).

(1) a. Morgen   lees-∅   jij   een boek
          Tomorrow read-2SG 2SG a   book
          'You will read a book tomorrow.'   Verb-Subject Order
     b. Jij   lees-t   morgen   een boek
          2SG read-2SG   tomorrow a   book
          'You will read a book tomorrow.'   Subject-Verb Order
     c. ...dat jij   morgen   een boek lees-t
          ...that 2SG tomorrow a   book read-2SG
          '...that you will read a book tomorrow.'   Embedded SOV

Previous proposals treat impoverishment of agreement morphology in Dutch as a surface phenomenon, such that it is the VS surface order that triggers impoverishment (Don et al. 2013; Ackema and Neeleman 2003, 2013a,b). For Ackema and Neeleman (2003 et seq.) impoverishment is prosodically motivated, whereas Don et al. (2013) argue that agreement on V in VS-contexts may cause redudancy which is they solve by invoking a post-syntactic morphological merger (Marantz 1984; Embick and Noyer 2001).

Proposal: In contrast to the aforementioned accounts, I claim that the pattern of impoverishment of Dutch inflectional morphology is reversed: impoverishment is found in SV contexts and is syntactically driven by Ā-sensitive anti-agreement. See below the inflection paradigm of Standard Dutch and the feature specification of the inflectional morphology and the singular pronouns (DM, Halle and Marantz 1994; Harley and Noyer 1999). The alternation is that in SV-order, second person singular has agreement marker *-t* whereas in VS-order, this is *-∅*.

		SV	VS		Inflection Features		SG Pronoun Features
	1	-∅	-∅		$\varnothing \longleftrightarrow$ [+PART, −PL]	1SG =	[+PART, +AUTH, −PL]
SG	2	-t	-∅		-en $\longleftrightarrow$ [+PL]	2SG =	[+PART, −AUTH, −PL]
	3	-t	-t		-t $\longleftrightarrow$ *elsewhere*	3SG =	[−PART, −AUTH, −PL]
PL		-en	-en				

In V2 clauses, the verb moves to C^0, which contains an Ā and EPP feature that triggers topicalization. When the subject moves, it copies the Ā-features, in (2).

(2) $[_{CP}$ SUBJ$_{\bar{A}}$ $[_{C^0:\bar{A};EPP}$ V] $[_{TP}$ ... $[_{VP}$ <SUBJ> $[_{V^0}$ [OBJ] <V>]]]]

For agreement, the verb probes for its subject and finds the DP goal in spec-CP. Each probe is Ā-sensitive (Baier 2018), and variation arises in the morphological component depending on whether there is an applicable impoverishment rule for the probe-goal pair in question. In Standard Dutch, Ā-driven anti-agreement is sensitive to [−AUTH, −PL]:

(3) $[\varphi] \rightarrow [\,] / [\_\_, -\textsc{auth}, -\textsc{pl}, \bar{\text{A}}, \text{V}]$

This rule deletes all features from the finite, agreeing verb that is specified for $[-\textsc{auth}, -\textsc{pl}]$ and also contains $[\bar{\text{A}}]$ after AGREE. In this case, the elsewhere form is inserted. As a result, anti-agreement applies to second and third person singular agreement on the verb. For second person, this results in the $-\varnothing/\text{-}t$ alternation, whereas the rule applies vacuously for third person inflection. When the object undergoes $\bar{\text{A}}$-movement, the subject will not engage with the $\bar{\text{A}}$-feature in C^0, and therefore fully underspecified agreement ensues in matrix-clause SV-configurations.

Subordinate Clauses: Subordinate clauses in Standard Dutch have SV-order (Koster 1975) and yet the second person singular shows the *-t* agreement marker, which I argue is the exponent of $\bar{\text{A}}$-sensitive anti-agreement. Baier (2017, 2018) has shown that $\bar{\text{A}}$-triggered anti-agreement should be considered independent from $\bar{\text{A}}$-movement itself. $\bar{\text{A}}$-features may be present without resulting in an overt movement operation. I propose this is true for Dutch subordinate clauses as well: the complementizer occupying C^0 lacks an EPP feature that triggers movement. However, C^0 still has its $\bar{\text{A}}$-feature. In subordinate clauses, the $\bar{\text{A}}$-probe still enters an AGREE-relationship with its closest goal, i.e., the subject:

(4) $[_{\text{CP}} \, \bar{\text{A}} \, [_{\text{C}^0:\bar{\text{A}}} \, \text{COMP} \,] \, [_{\text{TP}} \ldots [_{\text{VP}} \, \text{SUBJ}_{\bar{\text{A}}} \, [_{\text{V}^0} \, [\, \text{OBJ} \,] \, \text{V} \,] \,]]]$

As a result, in (4), the agreement relation between the subject and the verb involves copying of an $\bar{\text{A}}$-feature between the probe and goal, which then results in anti-agreement effects on the finite verb through the impoverishment rule in (3). This analysis thus predicts that across Dutch dialects, subordinate clauses without $\bar{\text{A}}$-movement invariably trigger anti-agreement.

Dialectal Microvariation: Across Dutch dialects, agreement alternations of the same type take place, albeit that the features sensitive to $[\bar{\text{A}}]$ differ. Two dialects from different parts of the Netherlands exemplify this (from Barbiers et al. 2005 and Don et al. 2013):

		SV	VS	Inflection Features					SV	VS	Inflection Features		
	1	-e	-e	-e	$\longleftrightarrow$	$[+\textsc{auth}, -\textsc{pl}]$		1	-e	-e	-e	$\longleftrightarrow$	$[+\textsc{auth}]$
SG	2	-en	-∅	-∅	$\longleftrightarrow$	$[-\textsc{auth}, +\textsc{part}]$	SG	2	-t	-∅	-∅	$\longleftrightarrow$	$[+\textsc{part}]$
	3	-t	-t	-t	$\longleftrightarrow$	$[-\textsc{pl}]$		3	-t	-t	-t	$\longleftrightarrow$	*elsewhere*
	1	-en	-en	-en	$\longleftrightarrow$	*elsewhere*		1	-t	-e	**Aalten,**		
PL	2	-en	-∅	**Bovensmilde,**			PL	2	-t	-∅	**Eibergen,**		
	3	-en	-en	**Giethoorn**				3	-t	-t	**Staphorst**		

The Bovensmilde/Giethoorn dialect has $\bar{\text{A}}$-sensitivity for $[-\textsc{auth}, +\textsc{part}]$. The rule in (3) deletes all features from a V that is specified for $[-\textsc{auth}, -\textsc{pl}]$ and also contains $[\bar{\text{A}}]$ after AGREE. In this case, the elsewhere form is inserted. The Aalten dialect has two feature sets that are sensitive to anti-agreement, namely $[+\textsc{pl}]$, and second person singular $[-\textsc{auth}, +\textsc{part}, -\textsc{pl}]$. In both those cases, a V specified for said features deletes them all and spells out the elsewhere form.

(5) a. $[\varphi] \rightarrow [\,] / [\_\_, -\textsc{auth}, +\textsc{part}, \bar{\text{A}}, \text{V}]$ Bovensmilde/Giethoorn

    b. $[\varphi] \rightarrow [\,] / [\_\_, +\textsc{pl}, \bar{\text{A}}, \text{V}]$ Aalten (PL)

    c. $[\varphi] \rightarrow [\,] / [\_\_, -\textsc{auth}, +\textsc{part}, -\textsc{pl}, \bar{\text{A}}, \text{V}]$ Aalten (2SG)

References: **Ackema & Neeleman**. 2003. Context-sensitive spell-out. *NLLT*. **Ackema & Neeleman**. 2013a. Person features and Syncretism. *NLLT*. **Ackema & Neeleman**. 2013b. Subset controllers in agreement relations. *Morphology*. **Baier**. 2017. Antilocality and antiagreement. *LI*. **Baier**. 2018. Antiagreement. *PhD, UC. Berkeley*. **Baier & Yuan**. 2018. Antiagreement with bound variables. *Proceedings WCCFL 35*. **Baker**. 2008. On the nature of the antiagreement effect: Evidence from wh-in-situ in Ibibio. *LI*. **Barbiers et al.** 2005. Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch dialects. *Amsterdam UP*. **De Haan**. 2001. More is going upstairs than downstairs: Embedded root phenomena in West Frisian. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*. **Den Besten**. 1983. On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. *On the formal syntax of the Westgermania*. **Don, Fenger & Koeneman**. 2013. Micro-variation as a tool for linguistic analysis. *Ms*. **Embick & Noyer**. 2001. Movement operations after syntax. *LI*. **Halle & Marantz**. 1994. Some key features of distributed morphology. *MIT WPL*. **Harley & Noyer**. 1999. Distributed Morphology. *Glot international*. **Holmberg**. 2015. Verb Second. *Syntax – Theory and Analysis. An international Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Research*. **Koster**. 1975. Dutch as an SOV language. *Linguistic Analysis*. **Marantz**. 1984. On the nature of grammatical relations. *MIT Press*. **Ouhalla**. 1993. Subject-extraction, negation, and the antiagreement effect. *NLLT*. **Schwartz & Vikner**. 1996. The verb always leaves IP in V2 clauses. *Parameters and functional heads*. **Zwart**. 1996. Dutch syntax: A minimalist approach. *PhD, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen*.