10

Verb second

'Verb second' refers to the phenomenon whereby the finite verb appears in the position following the first constituent in the clause. In Dutch, verb second is restricted to main clauses, and the first constituent may or may not be a subject:

(10.1) *The verb-second pattern*

a. SUBJECT-INITIAL MAIN CLAUSE
Tasman **heeft** Nieuw-Zeeland ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG New Zealand GE:discover-D
'Tasman discovered New Zealand.'

b. INVERSION CLAUSE
In 1642 **heeft** Tasman Nieuw-Zeeland ontdek-t
in 1642 have:3SG Tasman New Zealand GE:discover-D
'In 1642, Tasman discovered New Zealand.'

c. EMBEDDED CLAUSE
… dat Tasman Nieuw-Zeeland ontdek-t **heeft**
C Tasman New Zealand GE:discover-D have:3SG
'… that Tasman discovered New Zealand.'

This chapter reviews the various analyses of the verb-second pattern in Dutch through the years, starting from pregenerative structuralist thinking and up until the current minimalist stage of generative grammar.

10.1 Historiography

The essential elements of the classical generative analysis of the verb-second pattern in (10.1) are listed in (10.2).

(10.2) *The nature of the verbal positions*

a. There are two verbal positions, one clause-final (see (10.1c)) and one clause-initial (see (10.1a,b)).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

b. The clause-initial position is the same position as the complementizer position.

These elements of the analysis were essentially already in place in the pregenerative structuralist tradition in the Netherlands.

The relatedness of the two positions was acknowledged implicitly in De Groot (1949: 156) and explicitly in Merckens (1960: 236), who takes the position of the verb to be a linguistic sign (signaling subordination). This was modified by Van der Lubbe (1958: 78), who builds on De Groot's (1949: 112) analysis of the complementizer as the head (*kern*) of the embedded clause. This led Van der Lubbe to propose that the sign of subordination was in the conjunctive appearance of a complementizer and a verb in final position. Paardekooper (1961) then took the bold step of identifying the clause-initial verb position with the complementizer position, stating (1961: 296):

> … the distribution of the subject with respect to the finite verb, at least in inversion constructions, is exactly the same as its distribution with respect to the complementizer. Syntactically, then, the finite verb and the complementizer are closely related.

Paardekooper (1961) illustrated the syntactic relation between the finite verb and the complementizer with three sets of facts, showing (a) that weak subject pronouns must be right-adjacent to both the verb and the complementizer (10.3–4), (b) that full subjects can be separated from the verb and the complementizer by the same set of categories (10.5–6), and (c) that conditionals and optatives show a complementary distribution of the complementizer and the verb (10.7–8).

(10.3) a. … **als** je daarom morgen erg hard werk-t
C:COND 2SG.WK therefore tomorrow very hard work-2SG
'… if you work very hard tomorrow for that reason.'

b. *… **als** daarom (je) morgen (je) erg hard (je) werk-t
C:COND therefore 2SG.WK tomorrow very hard work-2SG
(intended: same as a.)

(10.4) a. **Werk** je daarom morgen erg hard?
work:2SG.INV 2SG.WK therefore tomorrow very hard
'Are you working very hard tomorrow for that reason?'

b. ***Werk** daarom (je) morgen (je) erg hard (je)?
work:2SG.INV therefore 2SG.WK tomorrow very hard
(intended: same as a.)

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

(10.5) a. … **als** je vriend daarom morgen erg hard
C:COND POSS:2SG.WK friend therefore tomorrow very hard
werk-t
work-3SG
'… if your friend works very hard tomorrow for that reason.'

b. … **als** daarom (je vriend) morgen
C:COND therefore POSS:2SG.WK friend tomorrow
(je vriend) erg hard (*je vriend) werk-t
very hard work-3SG
(intended: same as a.)

(10.6) a. **Werk-t** je vriend daarom morgen erg hard?
work-3SG POSS:2SG.WK friend therefore tomorrow very hard
'Does your friend work very hard tomorrow for that reason?'

b. **Werk-t** daarom (je vriend) morgen
work-3SG therefore POSS:2SG.WK friend tomorrow
(je vriend) erg hard (*je vriend)?
very hard
(intended: same as a.)

(10.7) *Conditionals*
a. **Kom-t** ie vlug, …
come-3SG SCL:3SG.M quick

b. **Als** ie vlug kom-t,…
C:COND SCL:3SG.M quick come-3SG
(both) 'If he comes quickly, …'

(10.8) *Optatives*
a. **Kwam** ie maar
come:PAST.SG SCL:3SG.M just

b. **Als** ie maar kwam
C:COND SCL:3SG.M just come:PAST.SG
(both) 'If only he came.'

Paardekooper (1961: 299) concludes that the complementizer is a part of speech (*zinsdeel*), anticipating the generative analysis of the complementizer as occupying a functional head position (C). Finally, Paardekooper (1961: 299–300) notes that the complementizer, like the verb, expresses tense and mood, and (in the complementizer agreement dialects; see (9.22)) person and number.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

Paardekooper's analysis was essentially reinvented in the 1970s by Den Besten (1977), who appears to have been unfamiliar with Paardekooper (1961) (see Koster 2008: 28).

As we saw in chapter 9, the earliest generative treatments of German involved a rule of Verb Placement fronting the finite verb in main clauses (Bach 1962: 209). This rule was adopted by Koster (1975) in the context of his analysis of Dutch as an SOV language (requiring the SVO order of the main clause to be derived by verb movement). In Koster's formulation, verb placement positions the finite verb at the left edge of the clausal category S (Koster 1975: 128, 131):

(10.9) *Verb Placement (Koster* 1975*)*

COMP [$_S$ X … X **V**] ⇒ COMP [$_S$ **V** X … X]

In Koster's analysis, the verb-second orders of (10.1a,b) result from movement of a subject or topic/wh-element into COMP (Koster 1975: 128). Since COMP hosts the complementizer in embedded clauses, Koster's analysis misses Paardekooper's point that the complementizer and the fronted verb are in a single position.

Den Besten (1977) then argued that the verb actually moves into COMP, and hence that Verb Placement was a substitution transformation (Den Besten 1977: 13; see section 9.2.1). Den Besten's arguments (1977: 9f) are similar to Paardekooper's, illustrated in (10.3–8), and, like Paardekooper (1961: 296), Den Besten (1977: 9) notes that these arguments relate to inversion constructions (10.1b) only:

> [The] evidence is neutral as regards the proper description of [(10.1a)] but that does not bother me, since the superiority of a grammar of Dutch that accounts for all verb preposings by means of a single rule that moves the finite verb from a VP-final position … to one specified position in COMP, is evident.

In unpublished work presented at the 1978 GLOW colloquium in Amsterdam, and discussed in Den Besten (1981: i-ii, 1989: 88f), Den Besten noted that the complementizer carries tense features, as well as person/number features in complementizer agreement dialects, and he proposed that what is really moved in verb placement is not the verb, but the tense feature, pied-piping the verb:

(10.10) *Verb Placement (Den Besten 1981: i)*

X TENSE Y [$_V$ TENSE] Z ⇒ X [$_V$ TENSE] Y [e] Z

Empirically, Den Besten (1989: 91) added some further observations of the type in (10.7–8), showing complementary distribution of the finite verb and the complementizer in exclamatives (10.11) (see also Bos 1963) and subjunctives (10.12):

(10.11) a. Ge-lach-en **dat** we heb-ben!
GE-laugh-N C 1PL.NOM have-PL

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

b. Ge-lach-en **heb-ben** we!
GE-laugh-N have-1PL 1PL.NOM
(both) 'How we laughed !'

(10.12) a. de bewering als **dat** Tasman Nieuw Zeeland
DEF.SG claim C C Tasman New Zealand
ontdek-t zou heb-ben
GE:discover-D AUX.MOD:PAST have-INF

b. de bewering als **zou** Tasman Nieuw Zeeland
DEF.SG claim C AUX.MOD:PAST Tasman New Zealand
ontdek-t heb-ben
GE:discover-D have-INF
(both) 'the claim that Tasman would have discovered New Zealand'

Den Besten (1977: 8) also showed a complementary distribution of the verb and the complementizer in interrogative clauses (illustrating the absence of the 'doubly filled COMP effect' in Dutch):

(10.13)
a. (ik vraag me af …) welk boek **of** hij wil lez-en
(I wonder …) which book C 3SG.M.NOM want:SG read-INF
'(I wonder …) which book he wants to read.'

b. Welk boek **wil** hij lez-en?
which book want:SG 3SG.M.NOM read-INF
'Which book does he want to read?'

The idea that verb placement moves the verb into COMP was adopted by Koster (1978a: 12) (see also Thiersch 1978 and Lenerz 1981: 173 for German), and has since been a standard element in the analysis of the verb-second pattern.

Den Besten's idea that verb placement is triggered by the tense feature was developed by Evers (1982) into an explanatory account of verb movement. Evers (1982: 13) proposed that finiteness is a feature that should have sentential scope in the semantic representation of the clause, and that this requirement explains movement of the finite verb into COMP (see Koeneman 2000 and Koster 2003 for later implementations of this idea). The analysis implies that the complementizer can take over from the verb as a tense-marked, scope-bearing element, obviating the need for verb movement (Evers 1982: 17).

In this connection, Evers (1982: 17–18) notes the relevance of a pattern of embedded verb second in Frisian, mentioned in De Haan (1983: 22) (see also De Haan and Weerman 1986). Frisian is a verb-second language showing the pattern in (10.1), but under certain conditions, the finite verb shifts to the second

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

position in the embedded clause. When that happens, the embedded subject cannot be a clitic:

(10.14) *Embedded verb second in Frisian (De Haan and Weerman 1986: 85)*

a. Pyt sei dat {hy / er} my sjoe-n hie
Pete say:PAST.SG C 3SG.M.NOM.STR/WK 1SG.OBJ see-N have:PAST.SG
'Pete said that he saw me.'

b. Pyt sei dat {hy / *er} hie my sjoe-n
Pete say:PAST.SG C 3SG.M.NOM.STR/WK have:PAST.SG 1SG.OBJ see-N
(same as a.)

Evers explains the ungrammaticality of the clitic subject in (10.14b) on the assumption that the weak pronoun must be enclitic to a tense-category. It then follows that *dat* in (10.14b) lacks TENSE, triggering the movement of the finite verb. (Evers suggests that the pattern is also present in Dutch, but without *dat* in the embedded verb movement construction, similar to German; in actual fact, the pattern occurs with *dat* in spoken Dutch and Frisian, as noted by De Vries 1910–1911: 63, Overdiep 1932, Zwart 1993a: 287–288, and the pattern without *dat* seems artificial; see (6.7) and section 6.3).

The standard analysis of verb second, then, involved movement of a finite verb into COMP/C in main clauses, with either a subject (10.1a) or a nonsubject (10.1b) moving into the position preceding the verb in COMP, later (Chomsky 1986a: 5) identified as the specifier position of CP. In embedded clauses, no verb movement takes place, either because the complementizer already does whatever the verb is supposed to do in COMP (express the scope of TENSE), or (in the CP analysis) because C is already occupied by the complementizer.

(10.15) *Standard analysis of the verb-second pattern*

a. SUBJECT-INITIAL MAIN CLAUSE (10.1a)
[$_{S'/CP}$ Tasman$_j$ [$_C$ heeft$_i$] [$_{S/IP}$ t_j [$_{VP}$ [Nieuw Zeeland ontdekt] t_i]]]

b. INVERSION CLAUSE (10.1b)
[$_{S'/CP}$ In 1642 [$_C$ heeft$_i$] [$_{S/IP}$ Tasman [$_{VP}$ [Nieuw Zeeland ontdekt] t_i]]]

c. EMBEDDED CLAUSE (10.1c)
[$_{S'/CP}$ [$_C$ dat] [$_{S/IP}$ Tasman [$_{VP}$ [Nieuw Zeeland ontdekt] heeft]]]

The standard analysis was not much affected by the introduction of the functional projections CP and IP, either because INFL seemed to be inactive in Dutch, or because it was tacitly assumed that the OV character of Dutch entails that IP is head-final (see the discussion in section 9.2.2). Either way, verb second could still be described as verb movement to C.

An alternative to the Den Besten analysis of verb second by Travis (1984, 1991) was either critically received (see Schwartz and Vikner 1989 and Vikner and

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

Schwartz 1996) or (more commonly) ignored. Travis (1984: 114f) noted that the standard analysis of verb second could not apply to Yiddish, a head-initial verb-second language closely related to High German. Being head-initial, Yiddish could not have a clause-final INFL, and generating INFL to the left of the subject position (essentially conflating INFL with COMP) made a number of wrong predictions regarding the distribution of subjects and objects in Yiddish. It therefore followed that INFL in Yiddish had to be located between the subject and the verb phrase (essentially as in (9.21a)).

The problems with conflating INFL and COMP in Yiddish were the following (Travis 1984: 115f). Since main clauses in Yiddish, just as in Dutch, have either SVO or XVSO word order, movement of the verb into INFL/COMP requires an additional rule preposing the subject or nonsubject (say, to Spec,IP/CP). Then it is strange that unstressed pronouns can undergo this rule only if they are subjects:

(10.16) *Pronoun preposing in Yiddish (Travis 1984:117)*

a. Es hot ge-ges-n dos broyt
3SG.INAN have:3SG GE-eat-N DEF.N.SG bread
'It ate the bread.'

b. *Es hot di froy ge-leyen-t
3SG.INAN have:3SG DEF.F.SG woman GE-read-D
(intended) 'The woman read it.'

Secondly, the rule of subject/nonsubject preposing must take place in embedded clauses as well. But then it is strange that preposing turns the embedded clause into an island for extraction only when a nonsubject is preposed:

(10.17) *Extraction out of embedded clauses in Yiddish (Lowenstamm 1977, Travis 1984: 118)*

a. Ikh veys nit vemen zi hot ge-ze-n zuntik
1SG.NOM know:1SG NEG who:OBJ 3SG.F have:3SG GE-see-N Sunday
'I don't know who she saw on Sunday.'

b. *Ikh veys nit vemen zuntik hot sie ge-ze-n
1SG.NOM know:1SG NEG who:OBJ sunday have:3SG 3SG.F GE-see-N
(intended: same as a.)

In (10.17a), *vemen* 'who' has moved to the edge of the embedded clause, across the subject *zi* 'she,' showing that embedded clauses in Yiddish are not islands for extraction *per se* (unlike embedded verb-second clauses in Frisian and the Mainland Scandinavian languages; see De Haan and Weerman 1986: 87 and Vikner 1995: chapter 4). But (10.17b) illustrates that such extraction is impossible when the embedded clause is introduced by a nonsubject (*zuntik* 'Sunday').

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

Travis (1984) argued that these observations find a natural explanation if IP in Yiddish is head-initial, and the finite verb moves to INFL in subject-initial main clauses and to COMP in inversion constructions. As a result, the subject is always in the same position (Spec,IP) and the SVO order involves no rule of subject placement (the argument does not assume the VP-internal subject hypothesis; see section 8.1). On the other hand, inversion requires preposing to COMP/Spec,CP. In (10.17b), then, *zuntik* 'Sunday' and *vemen* 'who' compete for the same position, explaining the ungrammaticality. In (10.17a), *zi* 'she' is in Spec,IP, and fronting of *vemen* 'who' is allowed. On this approach, the contrast in (10.16) follows if unstressed pronouns cannot be topicalized (Travis 1984: 119).

Travis (1984: 120f) then applied her analysis of Yiddish to German and Dutch, which show the same subject/object asymmetry illustrated for Yiddish in (10.16) (see (9.41) for Dutch). This led Travis to propose that German and Dutch, too, feature a head-initial IP and that verb movement in main clauses can be any one of two rules: verb-to-INFL in subject-initial main clauses and verb-to-COMP in inversion constructions.

(10.18) *Travis' analysis of the verb-second pattern*

a. SUBJECT-INITIAL MAIN CLAUSE (10.1a)

$[_{IP}$ Tasman $[_{INFL}$ heeft$_i$ $]$ $[_{VP}$ [Nieuw Zeeland ontdekt] t_i]]

b. INVERSION CLAUSE (10.1b)

$[_{CP}$ In 1642 $[_{C}$ heeft$_i$ $]$ $[_{IP}$ Tasman $[_{INFL}$ t_i $]$ $[_{VP}$ [Nieuw Zeeland ontdekt] t_i]]]

c. EMBEDDED CLAUSE (10.1c)

$[_{CP}$ $[_{C}$ dat] $[_{IP}$ Tasman INFL $[_{VP}$ [Nieuw Zeeland ontdekt] heeft]]]

In Travis' analysis of embedded clauses (10.18c), INFL remains empty, raising the question as to why German and Dutch are not like Yiddish in featuring embedded verb second. Travis (1984: 144) assumes that verb movement is a last-resort operation, needed to identify empty head positions. But a head is preferably identified via government by another lexical head (the Empty Category Principle [ECP] of Chomsky 1981: 250). In the case of INFL, it is identified in embedded clauses (10.18c) by the lexical complementizer in COMP, making verb movement unnecessary. Subject-initial main clauses, on the other hand, are mere IPs (10.18a), so that INFL can only be lexicalized by verb movement. Finally, inversion constructions (10.18b) are CPs, but without a lexical complementizer, again necessitating verb movement.

The essentials of Travis' analysis were later adopted by Zwart (1991c, 1993a, 1993b, 1997b), with minor technical differences in the characterization of the relation between C and INFL (C-to-INFL government in Travis 1984, INFL (AgrS)-to-C movement in Zwart 1993b: 322). INFL-to-C movement had been proposed by Hoekstra and Marácz (1989: 77) to account for the phenomenon of complementizer

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

agreement (see (9.22)) in Frisian, and was taken by Zwart to be a feature of all languages showing the pattern in (10.1) (Dutch and its dialects, German and its dialects, Frisian, and the Mainland Scandinavian languages). Crucially, complementizer agreement is incompatible with embedded verb movement in all relevant dialects (Van der Meer 1991, Zwart 1993a: 198):

(10.19) *No complementizer agreement with embedded verb movement (Frisian)*

a. Heit sei **dat-st** do soks net leauw-e **moa-st**
dad say:PAST.SG C-2SG 2SG such NEG believe-INF must-2SG
'Dad said that you should not believe such things.'

b. Heit sei **dat-(*st)** do **moa-st** soks net leauw-e
dad say:PAST.SG C-2SG 2SG must-2SG such NEG believe-INF
(same as a.)

This is expected if complementizer agreement is a morphological effect of AgrS-to-C movement, and if AgrS-to-C movement removes the need for verb movement.

Glossing over technical details (see section 10.2), we can say that both the Den Besten/Koster-analysis and the Travis/Zwart-analysis of the pattern in (10.1) essentially state that the verb must be realized in the highest head position, if available. In the Den Besten/Koster-analysis, the highest head is invariably C, and it is not available in embedded clauses (as C is occupied by the complementizer), blocking verb movement (10.1c). According to the Travis/Zwart-analysis, the same reasoning applies to embedded clauses (10.1c) and inversion constructions (10.1b), but in subject-initial main clauses (10.1a), the CP level is absent and the highest head is INFL/AgrS, which then attracts the verb.

The observation that verb movement is really about *lexicalization* of head positions suggested to Chomsky (2001: 37f), following Anderson (1993), that verb movement is not a rule of narrow syntax, but a 'phonological' phenomenon, having to do with the process of linearization of the elements of a syntactic structure (see section 10.2 for further discussion).

On this approach, the verb-second pattern of (10.1a,b) can be described as the outcome of a linearization rule, stating that the finite verb must be realized at the left edge of the right branch of the structure (Zwart 2005a), more or less as in (10.9). This captures the Den Besten/Koster-analysis if the structure is invariably CP, but also the Travis/Zwart-analysis if the structures vary in size. The absence of verb movement in embedded clauses (10.1c) follows if the linearization rule comes into effect only after the syntactic derivation is concluded (Zwart 2005a: 15). The difference between (10.14a) and (10.14b), then, is that in (10.14a) the syntactic derivation continues after the embedded clause has been construed, while in (10.14b), with embedded verb movement, the embedded clause constitutes a separate, complete derivation.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

Other linearization analyses of the verb-second pattern include Kathol (2000a: 147), in the framework of Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) and Anderson (2000), in the framework of Optimality Theory (OT).

A final alternative analysis of the pattern in (10.1) was proposed by Hallmann (2000), following a suggestion by Kayne (1994: 52). This analysis assumes a head-initial structure for IP (AgrSP, TP, AgrOP), and movement of the finite verb into INFL in all types of clauses. The verb-final order of embedded clauses (10.1c), then, is derived by moving the sister of INFL into the specifier position of IP. Variants of this remnant movement analysis were also proposed in Haegeman (2000), Koopman and Szabolcsi (2000: 129), Nilsen (2002) and Barbiers and Van Koppen (2006).

10.2 Theoretical embedding

The analyses of the verb-second pattern in section 10.1 are to be understood in the context of a developing theory of syntax. Changes in the analysis reflect, and sometimes drive, developments in theoretical syntax, both at the technical and at the conceptual level. This section briefly describes that interaction.

As noted in section 10.1, basic ingredients of the generative analysis of the verb-second pattern (see (10.1)) were already represented in Paardekooper (1961): the idea that the complementizer has a syntactic slot of its own, that the verb (in inversion constructions; see (10.1b)) occupies the complementizer position, and that the complementizer shares features of tense/mood and sometimes agreement with the finite verb. What was added in the generative version of this analysis is a sense of direction, with the verb being generated in a clause-final position, and ending up in the complementizer position as the result of a transformation involving movement.

The transformational approach to the verb-second pattern raised questions about the nature of the verb placement rule, mainly within the context of the typology of transformations of Emonds (1970) (see (9.10)). Adopting this theory led Koster (1975) to conclude that verb placement is a root transformation, moving the verb up in main clauses (10.1a,b), not down in embedded clauses (10.1c) (see section 9.2). Den Besten (1977) then observed that two types of fronting must be distinguished, one moving the verb into the complementizer position (based on the identical distribution of the verb and the complementizer noted already by Paardekooper 1961), and another moving the first constituent into a slot preceding the complementizer. In the context of the theory of Emonds (1970), this entailed that verb placement is not a root transformation but a substitution transformation, ultimately leading to a finer articulation of the COMP area into a specifier position

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

for fronted phrases (Spec,CP) and a head position for the complementizer and the verb in inversion constructions (C; see Chomsky 1986a: 5).

Den Besten (1977) felt justified in generalizing his analysis of verb second in inversion constructions (10.1b) to verb second in subject-initial main clauses (10.1a) on the then important consideration of rule economy: a grammar with a single rule V-to-C is better than a grammar with two verb-placement rules targeting different positions. In the Government and Binding stage of the generative theory (Chomsky 1981), specific movement rules were abandoned and replaced by the general movement rule 'Move α' ('move anything anywhere'), with the output of movement curbed by the requirements of several modules of the grammar (having to do with licensing of grammatical functions, argument roles, interpretation of semi-referential elements and empty categories, etc.). In this context, the articulation of the functional domain (yielding a regular alternation of specifier and head positions) gradually took shape, with functional heads playing a central role in the licensing of lexical heads and phrases and in the expression of parametric variation.

For the analysis of the verb-second pattern, the articulation of the functional domain implied that C was no longer the only functional head position that the finite verb could move to. Moreover, the argument of rule economy favoring the derivation of the verb-second pattern by a single rule (V-to-C) could no longer be formulated: there can be infinitely many instances of Move α, as long as they are motivated by the licensing requirements of the various modules.

In the analysis of Dutch, a common response to these developments was to squeeze the traditional analysis into the new framework, either by sticking to a traditional clause structure without IP, or by assuming a head-final IP, with INFL at the back end of the clause, adjacent to V (see the discussion of functional heads in section 9.2.2).

This response closed its eyes to the question of licensing requirements for the various phrases (subjects and nonsubjects) featuring in the verb-second pattern. In the Government and Binding framework, the concept of a structural subject position was developed, i.e. a designated licensing position for subjects closely connected to the features of tense and agreement. The tense and agreement features were (by definition) located in INFL, and licensing relations were restricted to the single local configuration of a head with its specifier. It followed that the default subject position had to be Spec,IP, suggesting that subject-initial main clauses (10.1a) are not CPs but IPs (Travis 1984).

The analysis of Travis (1984) turns the tables on what are cause and effect in the verb-second pattern. In the classical analysis, the derivation is driven by the need to put the verb in C (Evers 1981, 1982), and the verb-second effect is derived by a secondary operation of fronting across the verb in C (which did

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

not have a clear trigger). According to Travis' analysis, phrases move to their designated landing sites (subjects to an A-position Spec,IP, nonsubjects to an A′-position Spec,CP) and verb placement is a secondary operation, now in need of explanation.

In Travis (1984, 1991), the explanation for verb movement in main clauses (10.1a,b) and for the absence of verb movement in embedded clauses (10.1c) lies in the Empty Category Principle: empty heads must be governed or filled, and in embedded clauses empty INFL is governed by the complementizer. A new concept, economy, then predicts that movement will not take place in embedded clauses, as movement is a last-resort operation needed only when all else fails.

In the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995), the notion of government was abandoned, making recourse to the Empty Category Principle impossible. But other elements in the analysis of Travis (1984) could be maintained. Since in minimalism, all movements must be triggered, eliminating the trigger for verb movement in embedded clauses suffices to explain its absence (10.1c). Zwart (1993a) assumes that when the CP level is present in Dutch, INFL (AgrS) moves to C (a commonly invoked operation at the time), removing a potential landing site for the verb in embedded clauses.

In the transition from the Government and Binding framework to the Minimalist Program, views on the relation between inflectional morphology and syntax also shifted considerably, with some repercussions on the analysis of verb second. Initially, functional heads were taken to host inflectional morphemes, which could be lowered onto the verb in V (as in English) or which could attract the verb, yielding V-to-INFL movement (as in French). Neither option seemed available for Dutch embedded clauses (10.1c), unless it was assumed that IP is head-final and V-to-INFL takes place vacuously (i.e. without observable effect). Alternatively, one could assume a remnant movement analysis, where the finite verb moves to INFL in all types of clauses, and various-sized categories move around the verb to derive the pattern in (10.1) (see Hallman 2000).

In minimalism, functional heads are taken to host inflectional features (instead of morphemes), which are duplicated on the verb (in the relevant cases). The verb, then, is generated in fully inflected form, requiring its features to be checked (or matched) by the features in the functional heads. This checking could take place overtly (when the relevant features are 'strong') or (when they are 'weak') covertly, i.e. via a syntactic operation that is not spelled out. According to the analysis of Zwart (1993a), the relevant features in Dutch are weak, accounting for absence of overt verb movement in embedded clauses (10.1c), and the verb moves in main clauses only to assist in the licensing of the fronted categories (subject in (10.1a), nonsubject in (10.1b)).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

The checking analysis also led to problems, which could only be solved by assuming that inflectional morphology is created in a postsyntactic operation (as argued by Halle and Marantz 1993, Aronoff 1992, and others). The problem was that in some complementizer agreement dialects the subject agreement morpheme on the complementizer is different from the subject agreement morpheme on the verb. Interestingly, the verb in inversion constructions does show the complementizer agreement morphology (Van Haeringen 1958):

(10.20) *Double agreement dialect (East Netherlandic)*

a. Wy speul-**t**
1PL.NOM play-PL
'We are playing.'

b. Speul-**e** wy?
play-1PL.INV 1PL.NOM
'Are we playing?'

c. … dat-**te** wy speul-**t**
C-1PL 1PL.NOM play-PL
'… that we are playing.'

In double-agreement dialects, the morphology of the verb in subject-initial main clauses (10.20a) and the morphology of the verb in inversion constructions (10.20b) differ. While this is consistent with the Travis/Zwart analysis in which the verb is in INFL in one construction and in C in the other, it also argues against a checking analysis, because it is unclear how a verb generated with one inflectional morpheme (*-t*) could change to the other (*-e-*) in mid-derivation. As discussed in Zwart (1997b: chapter 5), this suggests a model of grammar in which the basic elements in syntax are features, which move around to create feature bundles that need to be interpreted by a postsyntactic component of Morphology. According to the Travis/Zwart analysis, the verb in (10.20b) is the spell-out of a different feature bundle from the verb in all other positions, as it includes the features of (at least) V, INFL (AgrS), and C, whereas the verb in other positions spells out a feature bundle that lacks the features of C.

Further developments in minimalism articulated a mechanism of licensing grammatical features via c-command (the probe–goal mechanism), where a feature in a functional head licenses a corresponding feature in a lexical category it c-commands. This mechanism was implemented by Carstens (2003) and Van Koppen (2005) in a new analysis of complementizer agreement, where the features of the subject (the goal) are licensed via c-command by corresponding features in

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

C (the probe). This analysis brought out some new observations on complementizer agreement, such as (10.21), where the complementizer agrees with only the first conjunct of a coordinated subject:

(10.21) *First conjunct complementizer agreement in Tegelen Dutch (Van Koppen 2005:40)*

… de-s	doow	en	ich	ôs	tref-fe
C-2SG	2SG.NOM	CONJ	1SG.NOM	1PL.OBJ	meet-PL

'… that you and I meet.'

In Van Koppen's analysis, C in (10.21) finds two suitable goals (the coordinated subject and the first conjunct of the coordinated subject), and first conjunct agreement ensues when one is selected over the other.

Other approaches to complementizer agreement (including Goeman 1980, 2000, Kathol 2000b, Ackema and Neeleman 2004: 240f, Zwart 2006) do not take the phenomenon to reflect mechanisms of syntactic agreement. Relevant observations in this connection involve the appearance of complementizer agreement on fronted wh-phrases and relative pronouns (10.22), already noted by Van Haeringen (1939: 165), and the absence of complementizer agreement with non-adjacent subjects (10.23) (Ackema and Neeleman 2004: 246).

(10.22) *Complementizer agreement on the specifier (South Hollandic Dutch)*

jonge-s	die-e	werk	wil-le
guy-PL	REL-PL	work	want-PL

'guys that are looking for a job'

(10.23) *Adjacency condition on complementizer agreement (Hellendoorn Dutch)*

a. Volgens miej lop-**e** wiej noar 't park
   according.to 1SG:OBJ walk-1PL.INV 1PL:NOM to DEF.N.SG park
   'I think we are walking to the park.'

b. Volgens miej loop-**t** op den wärm-st-en dag
   according.to 1SG.OBJ walk-PL up DEF.SG:OBJ hot-SUP-OBJ day
   van 't jaar ook wiej noar 't park
   of DEF.N.SG year also 1PL:NOM to DEF.N.SG park
   'I think that on the hottest day of the year, we too walk to the park.'

The fact that complementizer agreement is sensitive to linear adjacency (also suggested by (10.21)) indicates that it may not be a phenomenon of narrow syntax, but of the morphophonological component of the grammar. In this connection, Goeman (2000) and De Vogelaer and Van der Auwera (2006) explained the phenomenon of complementizer agreement as the outcome of a process of analogical

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012

extension, where the model for the agreeing complementizer was provided by the morphology of the inverted auxiliary when followed by a subject clitic.

Meanwhile, Anderson (1993) had argued (reviving somewhat rhetorically the ghost of Wackernagel 1892) that the verb-second effect should be also understood as a morphophonological phenomenon, essentially part of a theory of affixation that also governs the distribution of clitics. This led him to develop an analysis of verb second in the framework of Optimality Theory (Anderson 2000), where the distribution of the verb is the outcome of constraint ranking. One of the relevant constraints (EdgeMost) requires the verb to be leftmost in a certain domain, while the other (NonInitial) bars the verb from the initial position. If EdgeMost is ranked high, but NonInitial is ranked higher, the verb-second order ensues.

Somewhat in line with Anderson (1993), but pursuing a different course, Chomsky (2001) also proposed that verb placement is a 'phonological' operation. As the Minimalist Program developed, it became increasingly desirable that all syntactic operations be reduced to the single process of combining two elements (Merge) (see Epstein *et al.* 1998, Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch 2002). Merge is most restrictive when one of the terms merged is the structure as a whole, such that the syntactic derivation always extends the structure (the Extension Condition). But verb movement as currently understood involved adjunction of the verb to a functional head, which is by definition not the root of the structure. This makes verb movement a different type of operation, hence suspect. Moreover, Chomsky observed that verb movement has no semantic effects. In minimalism, syntactic operations take place to serve interpretability at the interface components, suggesting again that verb placement is different from syntax. Also, recourse to the notion 'second position' seemed inevitable in describing the verb-second pattern, but 'second position' is a linear notion, undefined in terms of syntactic structure.

Hence the most recent development in the analysis of verb second, where verb placement is a linearization process located in the transition from syntax to phonology. At the same time, it seems clear that syntactic structure is relevant to the analysis of verb second, since the verb, unlike other second-position elements, follows the first constituent and not the first word. This suggests that the syntactic derivation defines domains over which linearization rules may be defined. In Kathol (2000a), these domains are the traditional topological fields of (4.1), while in Zwart (2005a) the relevant domains are defined by the structure-building operation Merge. On that view, verb second is really verb first within the right branch of a constituent created by Merge.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 00:55:58, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.012