

Article

Complementizer Agreement and the Licensing of DPs: An account in terms of referential anchoring

Roland Hinterhölzl, Ca'Foscari, Venezia; rolandh@unive.it

Abstract: In this paper, I argue that the phenomenon of Complementizer Agreement in West Germanic and the distribution of DPs in German can be given a common explanation in terms of an approach in which context values are not freely assigned via an interpretive function operation, as is assumed in standard accounts of formal semantics, but become accessible in a specific functional head in the C-domain.

Keywords: complementizer agreement; clitic movement; scrambling; weak and strong definite determiners; anchoring to the discourse; context values;

1. Introduction

In this paper, I address the well-known issue that DP-arguments, dependent on their interpretation, occupy different domains in the clause in many languages. For instance, definite DPs in German occupy higher positions in the middle field than indefinite ones (cf. Kratzer 1989, Diesing 1992). It is assumed that indefinite DPs can be licensed in the V-domain, while definite ones move higher and are presumably licensed in the T-domain.¹

In addition, discourse anaphoric DPs and pronominal DPs move to even higher positions in the clause in German and can be argued to be licensed in the C-domain. Furthermore, there is the phenomenon of complementizer agreement in many Germanic dialects that is still lacking an intrinsic motivation. It is generally assumed that a C-head enters in an Agree relation with the finite verb (in T). However, this remains a stipulation. I will argue in this paper that complementizer agreement is a reflex of an intrinsic licensing relation between Fin⁰ and the temporal argument structure of the verb on the one hand and referential DPs, crucially including subject pronouns, on the other hand.

We may ask what the reason for the movement of definite DPs (and pronouns) is, given that the standard semantic account of the interpretation of referential expressions is in terms of assignment functions that assign a referential index to a DP from the context set. If this were correct, DP-licensing should be possible in any position of the clause.

Note that Case or Agreement with the finite verb cannot be taken to motivate these movement operations either, since also indefinite DPs have Case and can, as subjects in a presumed vP-internal position, enter in an Agree relation with T (or AgrS, according to one's favorite theoretical assumptions).

I will argue that the reason behind this distribution is that context-values are not freely assigned but become accessible only in the C-domain that, as advocated by Rizzi (1997), serves to connect the proposition with the context.

In particular, I will assume that context values, that is, values for established discourse referents, on the one hand and for the reference situation that is crucial for the temporal anchoring of the clause, on the other hand, are accessible in Fin⁰.

¹ I dedicate this paper to the pianist Silvia Pezzotta and to the beauty of language and music that makes up the essence of our human nature. The interested reader is referred to <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fCOKUUF0OyU> for a taste of Silvia's artistry.

Furthermore, I will argue that the more fine-grained distribution of indefinite DPs (in the V-domain), weak (definite) DPs (in the T-domain) and strong (definite) DPs (in the C-domain) follows from the (lack of) presuppositional requirements that the different determiners impose on the individual and the situation argument of the nominal head.

2. DP-types and their Role in the Discourse

Let us start out with a discussion of the different discourse roles of definite and indefinite DPs. It was proposed first by Irene Heim (1982) in her famous familiarity condition that indefinite DPs serve to introduce new discourse referents, while definite DPs serve to pick up (refer back to) referents that have been introduced in the previous discourse. While this is certainly correct for typical cases of the use of definite DPs, it has soon after been noticed that there are uses of definite DPs that also introduce a new discourse referent.

In fact, already Donnellan (1966) has pointed out that one needs to distinguish between the referential use of a definite description, which obeys Heim's familiarity condition, and the attributive use of a definite description, in which it is essential that there be a uniquely identifiable referent (typically not yet given in the existing discourse) in the situation that is at issue, as in (1). The referent of *the winner* in (1) is not known at the point of the utterance, but uniquely identifiable as soon as the race has been decided.

(1) Tomorrow there will be a 100m run in Vienna.

The winner will get a Porsche!

Thus, there are two different conditions, the familiarity condition and the uniqueness condition that both seem to be relevant for the use of the definite determiner. The dispute in fact goes back to Russell (1905) and Frege (1892). While the former proposed that the definite determiner purports an assertion as to the existence of a unique individual that fulfills the nominal predicate and is thus apt to account for the attributive use of a definite description, Frege (1892) held that a definite description imposes a presupposition that there exists an individual that fulfills the nominal predicate.

As far as (1) is concerned, Russell's treatment would foresee the complex assertion in (2), while Frege would argue that the presupposition of the definite description in (1) is fulfilled, since when there is a race there is a unique winner and (1) amounts to the assertion that this individual (the one that fulfills the presupposition) will get the Porsche.

(2) $\exists x$ winner (x) & will-get-a-Porsche (x)

I will assume in this paper that both are right and distinguish between the weak and the strong definite determiner in Germanic. It has long been noted that several Germanic languages/dialects have two full article paradigms (cf. Heinrichs (1954) for the Rhineland dialects, Scheutz (1988) and Schwager (2007) for Bavarian, and Ebert (1971) for the Frisian dialect of Fering). In Standard German, the distinction becomes apparent in certain preposition-article combinations, as is illustrated in (3).

(3) a.	Hans	ging in-s	Haus.	(D-weak)
	John	went into-the	house	
b.	Hans	ging in das	Haus.	(D-strong)
	John	went into the	house	

While (3a) can be uttered out of the blue, (3b) is only possible, if the relevant house has already been mentioned in the previous discourse. Thus, it seems that we have to deal with two different types of definite determiners that also differ in their semantics. Schwarz (2012) argues that one should not strive for a unified theory of the semantics of the definite determiner in Germanic since the weak definite determiner is subject to a uniqueness requirement, while such a requirement is apparently irrelevant for the strong definite determiner. The reader is referred to Schwarz (2012) for the details.

Following Frege (1892), I propose that the uniqueness condition is also relevant for the strong determiner but only in the definition of the presupposition that serves to discriminate the antecedent of the strong definite DP in the discourse.

Furthermore, I will make the following proposal to solve the question about the definition of the situation in which the uniqueness condition imposed by the definite determiner is supposed to hold. While in standard treatments of definite descriptions, as in Schwarz (2012) and others, it is assumed that a situation pronoun is introduced by the definite determiner and hence absent in indefinite DPs, I propose that this situation argument is introduced already by the nominal head and hence is also available in indefinite DPs.

In other words, every nominal referent is individuated with respect to a situation. But definite DPs, both weak and strong ones, impose a presupposition on the identifiability of this situation argument in the common ground (CG), while indefinite DPs come without any presupposition (on this argument). This means that the definite determiner indicates that the situation argument of nominal is in some sense given, while the indefinite determiner indicates via an implicature that the situation argument of the nominal is not given in this sense. Thus, both the weak and the strong definite determiner share the property of imposing the same usage condition on the definite description that is distinct from the usage condition of an indefinite description.

The difference between the weak and strong definite determiner only concerns the individual argument of the nominal. With the weak determiner it is asserted that there is unique individual in a situation given in the CG, while with the strong determiner it is presupposed that there is a unique individual identifiable in the CG which satisfies the nominal predicate in the situation given in the CG, as is illustrated in (4). In (4), conditions that operate as presuppositions are put before the dot of lambda-operator and are underlined, while conditions that are asserted appear after the dot of the lambda-operator.

- (4) a. $\llbracket D \rrbracket = \lambda P \exists s \text{ s in CG} . \text{ix } P(x, s)$ (weak definite determiner)
 b. $\llbracket D \rrbracket = \lambda P \exists s \text{ s in CG} \ \& \ \text{ix in CG} \ \& \ P(x, s) . x$ (strong definite determiner)

This means that if an indefinite DP is merged in the vP, its situation argument, being without any presupposition, can be identified with the event argument of the verb, while a definite DP cannot be licensed in the vP, since its presupposition requires that its situation argument is identified with a situation that is already in the CG. One specific situation that is already in the CG and becomes available in the T-domain is the reference situation that plays a crucial role in the temporal interpretation of the predicate, as we will see in the next section.

As far as pronouns are concerned, I propose that they also have a nominal core, namely the abstract nominal predicate *participant*, that relates an individual argument and a situation argument, as is illustrated for the personal pronoun in (5) and for a deictic pronoun in (6). The features in D are interpreted as presuppositional conditions on the individual referent that serve to discriminate the discourse antecedent in the context. The situation argument of personal pronouns is identified with the reference situation (s_R) (see below), while the situation argument of deictic pronouns is identified with the utterance situation (s_U). These feature specifications require pronouns to be licensed in the T-domain for their situation argument and to have access to the C-domain for their individual argument.

- (5) $he = [_{DP} D [_{NP} \text{participant}(x, s_R)]]$
 3SG, male

- (6) $we = [_{DP} D [_{NP} \text{participant}(x, s_U)]]$
 1PL

Summing up this section, we note that Diesing's account can explain why indefinite DPs need to be licensed in the v-domain, but fails to account for why definite DPs need to move out of the v-domain. The present account on the other hand, explains why indefinite DPs can be licensed in the v-domain and why definite ones need to move out of the v-domain to be licensed in the T- or C-domain. In particular, I will argue that weak definites are licensed in the T-domain, while strong (referential) definites are licensed in the C-domain.

3. The Reference Situation and the Anchoring of a Thetic Judgment

It is standardly assumed that a predicate is anchored via Tense (and Mood) to the context. The interested reader is referred to Karen Zagona (2013) and the references cited in there for further background on this issue. In particular, it is assumed that Tense (in a matrix clause) locates the verbal event with respect to the utterance time. Thus in (7), the speaker asserts that there is an event of visiting in the past (before the utterance time) in which an individual named John functions as agent (the visitor) and his mother functions as theme (the visatee of the event).

- (7) a. John visited his mother
 b. $\exists e \text{ visiting}(e) \ \& \ \text{past}(e) \ \& \ \text{agent}(e, \text{John}) \ \& \ \text{theme}(e, \text{his mother})$

However, this simple linking approach turns out to be insufficient, when we look at examples embedded in a discourse, as is illustrated in (8). Anaphorically linking *she* to *his mother* in (8a), and simply anchoring the event e_2 to the utterance time, the meaning of (8b) would be compatible with this event preceding, following or overlapping with e_1 as long as both events precede the utterance time (s), as is illustrated in (8c). This rendition is incomplete, since speakers typically interpret (8b) as a claim about John's mother being sick at the time of his visit. Moreover, also the adverbials in (8d) are interpreted with respect to John's visit.

- (8) a. John visited his mother. (e_1)
 b. She was sick (e_2)
 c. $e_1 < e_2 < s, e_2 < e_1 < s, e_1 \circ e_2 < s$
 d. She was sick one week before/earlier

The problem can be solved by introducing a reference situation. Here I am following Reichenbach (1947), according to whom Tense establishes a link between speech time and reference time, as is illustrated in (9). The event argument of the verb is then taken to be situated with respect to the reference time by Aspect, as is illustrated in (10).

- (9) The meaning of tense according to Reichenbach (1947)
 a. Past := $r < s$
 b. Present := $r \subseteq s$
 (10) The meaning of aspect according to Reichenbach (1947)
 a. Perfect := $e < r$
 b. Imperfect := $e \subset r$

(8) indicates that the event in (8a) serves as discourse antecedent for the interpretation of Tense in the clause in (8b) and for the temporal adverbials in (8d). Hence, I will propose that Tense is not a predicate of points of time or intervals, as is standard since the seminal work on Tense by Stowell (1996), but that Tense relates two situations, the utterance situation and the reference situation. Hence the temporal interpretation itself is secondary and is derived from a relation between situations making use of the running time of a situation (τ), as is illustrated in (11).

- (11) Situation-based account of Tense (SAT):
 Tense is a predicate that relates situation arguments
 Past (s_1, s_2) = s_1 precedes s_2 = $\tau(s_1) < \tau(s_2)$

Normally the predicate is anchored to the context by a definite subject, as in (12a). The result is a categorial judgment about a particular individual (or a particular set of individuals). Alternatively, the predicate can be anchored to the context via the reference situation, as in (12b). The result is a thetic judgment about a particular situation. It is argued in Hinterhölzl (2024) that *es* in German is not an expletive element but (being inserted in [Spec,TP] binds the reference situation argument of Tense. An anonymous reviewer asks why *es* in (12b) cannot be taken to be inserted in the C-domain, since it serves to distinguish between a judgment and a question, properties that are taken to be defined in the C-domain. I assume that sentence type (declarative or interrogative mood) is

defined in ForceP and that FinP together with TP serves to referentially anchor the proposition. 197
 198
 (12) a. Hubert Haider spricht 199
 Hubert Haider speaks 200
 b. Es spricht Hubert Haider 201
 It speaks Hubert Haider 202
 More importantly, *es* becomes obligatory if the subject semantically cannot serve as an anchor, because it is indefinite as in existential constructions, as in (13a), or if the predicate does not have an argument of itself, as with weather verbs, in which case the verb is predicated of the reference situation argument of Tense, as is illustrated in (13bcd). In (13d), *su* refers to the utterance situation. Both (13a) and (13b) thus constitutethetic judgments about a specific situation. 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 (13) a. Es gab einen Aufruhr 209
 It gave an uprising (there was an uprising) 210
 b. Es regnete 211
 It rained 212
 c. *su* (that is identified with the reference situation) $\in \{s \mid \text{rains in } s\}$ 213
 d. $\lambda P(s, su). \text{ is } P(s, su)$ (meaning of *es*) 214
 In English sentences with an indefinite subject, the adverbial *there* is inserted in Spec,TP. Also here I argue that *there* is not an expletive element but serves semantically as an alternative anchor in the clause, as is illustrated in (14). 215
 216
 217
 (14) a. John visited his mother 218
 b. There was a child crying in the garden 219
 c. I went to the local bar last night. Into the room walked a man with a green hat 220
 In the present account, *there* is a function that maps the reference situation onto its location and referring back to the situation of John's visit provides the situation with respect to which the predicate *was a child crying in the garden* is temporally and locally evaluated. In a similar vein, a PP, by denoting the resultant location of a predicate expressing a change of state (or location) can serve as *subject* / anchor in cases of locative inversion, as illustrated in (14c). In (14c), *into the room* refers to the room in the previously mentioned bar-situation from the previous night. Both (14b) and (14c) thus qualify asthetic judgments. 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 As already argued for by Milsark (1974), *there* cannot be treated as an expletive element that is replaced at LF by the real subject: this is shown by the observation that the subjects in (15) have different interpretations: while in (15a) the subject has a weak cardinal interpretation, the subject in (15b) has a strong proportional interpretation. The interested reader is referred to Hinterhölzl (2019) and the references given therein for a thorough account of the syntax and semantics of the expletive construction in English. 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 (15) a. There weren't many people in the room 235
 b. Many people weren't in the room 236
 It is interesting to note that strong quantifiers can anchor the predicate to the context, but need not do it, as is illustrated in (16). In (16), taken from Schwarz (2012) and also discussed in Hinterhölzl (2019), the subject *most senators* has a strong proportional reading but the sentence seems to characterize the political situation in (2004), constituting athetic judgment. 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 (16) What was the political situation in Congress 2004? 242
 Most senators were Republicans 243
 Arguably we have a case in which an attributively used DP is evaluated with respect to a given situation, hence the strong interpretation. I propose that the subject in this case is licensed in the T-domain by identifying its situation argument with the reference situation of Tense. The speaker in (16) does not make reference to a specific group of senators, but is simply stating that the majority of senators at that time were Republicans. 244
 245
 246
 247
 248

In conclusion, we propose that indefinite DPs and weak quantifiers are interpreted in the v-domain, while attributively used definite DPs and strong quantifiers (if not discourse-anaphoric) are interpreted in the T-domain. Furthermore, I propose that referentially used definite DPs and anaphoric strong quantifiers need access to the C-domain to be fully licensed. In particular, I propose that discourse-anaphoric DPs need to enter into a licensing relation with the head Fin⁰. 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254

In the following section, we will study the distribution and the licensing of subjects in Cimbrian. These data will provide us with an interesting parallel to the patterns found in complementizer agreement in languages / dialects that allow for double agreement. 255
 256
 257

4. Subjects in Cimbrian: A case study 258

Let us take a look at the distribution of subjects in Cimbrian, a German dialect spoken in the village of Lusema, Trentino. The field work has been carried out by Federica Cognola and the data has been published in Cognola and Hinterhölzl (2020). The interested reader is referred to this article for a more complete picture of the complex interaction between V2, question formation and the licensing of subjects in this variety. As is illustrated in (17), there is a complementary distribution between preverbal subjects and the presence of a subject pronoun or *da* ('here, there') cliticized on to the verb. In (17), *da* is spelled out as *-ta* when cliticized on the verb. The subject in (17f) is unmarked with respect to its information structural role (it can be new or given information): 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267

- (17) a. Bas **haft-arj** herta gekoaft dar Lucaj? d.*Dar Luca **haft-arj** herta gekhoaft in libar
 what has-he always bought the Luca the Luca has-he always bought a book
 b. Bas **hat-ta** herta gekoaft dar Luca? e.*Dar Luca **hat-ta** herta gekhoaft in libar
 what has-da always bought the Luca the Luca has-da always bought a book
 c.*Bas **hat** herta gekoaft dar Luca? f. Dar Luca **hat** herta gekhoaft in libar
 what has always bought the Luca the Luca has always bought a book
 "What has always Luca bought?" "Luca has always bought a book."

This characterization can also be found in various publications about the role of *da* in Cimbrian (Bidese & Tomaselli 2005 and subsequent work, Kolmer 2005, Grewendorf & Poletto 2015): *da* and a subject clitic are ruled out in all cases in which the subject precedes the finite verb; *da* or a subject clitic are obligatory in all cases in which the subject follows the finite verb. 268
 269
 270
 271
 272

As I will argue below, movement of a constituent into the preverbal domain interferes with the licensing of subjects. This is due to the V2-nature of the language where [Spec, FinP] constitutes a bottleneck for movement into the C-domain.² In other words, the wh-phrase *bas* in (17) has to pass through [Spec, FinP] to reach [Spec, ForceP] to license the speech act of a question. Subjects in this case can be licensed in a lower position when they are doubled by *da* or by a subject clitic pronoun: if doubled by *da*, the subject is focused (new-information or contrastive focus), if doubled by a pronoun, the subject is a topic. Main stress in (18a) falls on the sentence final subject, while the sentence final subject in (18b) is optional and unstressed.³ 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281

² The bottleneck effect was introduced by Haegeman (1996) and Roberts (2004) to account for the V2-property in an extended C-domain, with the bottleneck assuring that maximally one constituent can be moved from the T-domain into the C-domain that hosts the finite verb in languages observing the V2-rule.

³ An anonymous reviewer points out that (18a) and (18b) constitute two quite different constructions: a low, not-raised subject which is obligatory and a right-dislocated subject where the subject DP is optional. I propose that both constructions derive from a low extended subject containing a correlate: one a focussed, stressed subject, and the other a discourse anaphoric destressed subject. Right-dislocation in (18b) is necessary when the language, as it happens also in Italian, does not allow for destressing in situ or for scrambling, as it happens in German.

(18) a.	Haüt iz=ta khent dar nono	282
	today is-da arrived the grandfather	283
b.	Haüt izz=arj khent (dar nono)	284
	today is=he arrived (the grandfather)	285
c.	*Haüt iz khent dar nono	286
	today is arrived the grandfather	287
	"The grandfather arrived today."	288
	We may wonder what the role of clitics and <i>da</i> is in the licensing process of the lower	289
	subject in (17ab). Let us first discuss what is said about <i>da</i> in the literature. <i>Da</i> is only ho-	290
	moophonous with the locative <i>da</i> (here) (see Grewendorf&Poletto 2015:402), Kolmer (2005),	291
	Bidese & Tomaselli (2016 and previous work). As is illustrated in (19), <i>da</i> cliticized onto the main	292
	verb can occur with an instance of locative <i>da</i> .	293
(19)	Bas hat-ta gatont a khin da? (Grewendorf & Poletto 2015:402)	294
	what has-da done a boy there	295
	"What has a boy done there?"	296
	<i>Da</i> differs from English <i>there</i> , realising [Spec,TP], since <i>da</i> is compatible with definite	297
	and indefinite NPs and nothing can intervene between <i>da</i> and the finite verb in main	298
	clauses and between <i>da</i> and the complementiser <i>bo</i> .	299
	Furthermore, it is uncontroversial that <i>da</i> is hosted in the lower portion of CP, i.e.	300
	FinP (see Rizzi 1997, Benincà 2001, 2006) and that its position with respect to the finite	301
	verb is fed by V-to-C movement (see Bidese & Tomaselli 2005 and subsequent work and	302
	Grewendorf & Poletto 2011 for an analysis of Cimbrian as a V2 language).	303
	The idea that I would like to develop in the following section is that clitics and <i>da</i> , by	304
	undergoing head movement to Fin ⁰ , serve to license the subject when the latter is unable	305
	to undergo movement to [Spec,FinP] for syntactic (another element moves through	306
	[Spec,FinP]) or semantic reasons (the subject is indefinite).	307
5. The special role of clitic pronouns and <i>da</i> in anchoring the utterance to the context		308
	In this section, I will argue that clitics and <i>da</i> serve to referentially anchor the subject	309
	to the context. In particular, I propose that definite DPs in contradistinction to indefinite	310
	ones have an extra layer, an additional functional head that licenses a correlate DP in its	311
	Specifier, as in (20).	312
	Indefinite, weak DPs lack the respective layer and must thus combine with an adver-	313
	bial alternative anchor, as happens with the English existential <i>there</i> construction.	314
(20)	[_{DP} [_{DP} <i>da</i> / <i>cl</i>]] [_{D⁰} [_{NP} N]]	315
	Referential subjects can always anchor the predicate and get access to the value of	316
	their discourse antecedent, if they move into a prefinite position, that is, into [Spec, FinP]	317
	in Cimbrian, as illustrated in (21). Furthermore, I propose that if a referential DP is moved	318
	into [Spec,FinP], no correlate is generated in [Spec,DP] for reasons of economy, explaining	319
	the ungrammaticality of (21b).	320
(21) a.	Dar Mario hat gekhoaft in liber	321
	the Mario has bought the book	322
b.	*Dar Mario _i hat-ta/hat-arj gekhoaft in liber	323
	the Mario has-da/has-he bought the book	324
	"Mario bought the book"	325
	Non-definite subjects can anchor the utterance to the context, if the DP has a strong	326
	interpretation (QN or WhN), as is illustrated in (22). Also in this case a correlate clitic or	327
	<i>da</i> are excluded for reasons of economy.	328
(22) a.	Belz khinn hatt bokhennt soin tatta?	329
	which child has met his father	330
b.	*Belz khinn hatt-ta bokhennt soin tatta?	331
	which child has-da met his father	332

	"Which kind met his father?"	333
	With non-definite subjects without any NP overtly realised (bare QPs and simple wh-	334
	elements), two cases need to be distinguished: a) non-subject questions trigger always the	335
	presence of a clitic or <i>da</i> depending on whether the lower subject is to be interpreted as a	336
	topic or as a focus, as is illustrated with a focused subject again in (23).	337
(23)	Bas hat-ta herta gekoaft dar Luca?	338
	what has-da always bought the Luca	339
	Here the idea is that since the subject is blocked by wh-movement to move into	340
	[Spec,FinP], the correlate sub-extracts from the subject DP which remains in a lower posi-	341
	tion and undergoes head movement to Fin ⁰ to connect the subject with a specific referen-	342
	tial value from the context set, where the features of the clitic serve to discriminate the	343
	relevant discourse antecedent.	344
	With subject questions, <i>da</i> is optional depending on the interpretation of the subject,	345
	as is illustrated in (24) and (25). Since the wh-subject is moved through [Spec,Fin] it alone	346
	can anchor the utterance, if it has a definite interpretation, as in (25). If it has an indefinite	347
	interpretation, adverbial <i>da</i> must be inserted in [Spec,TP] and undergo head movement to	348
	Fin ⁰ .	349
	The data in (24) and (25) are taken from an empirical investigation - interviews with	350
	native speakers of Cimbrian in Luserna carried out by Federica Cognola and reported in	351
	Cognola & Hinterhölzl (2020). The interested reader is referred to this paper for the details	352
	of this study. In (24) and (25), the native speaker's judgments are given by an evaluation	353
	on the Likert scale between 0 (ungrammatical) and 5 (fully grammatical). Since the context	354
	in (24) triggers an indefinite interpretation on the wh-subject, only the version with <i>da</i> is	355
	possible. Since the context in (25) triggers a definite interpretation on the wh-subject (who	356
	of us), the version without <i>da</i> is fully grammatical.	357
(24)	Context: You are watching TV and hear the telephone ringing. You ask:	358
a.	Ber riüft-ta o? → 4,8/5	359
	who calls-da up	360
b.	Ber riüft o? → 2/5	361
	who calls up	362
	"Who is calling?"	363
(25)	Context: You and your friends have to book a room for the weekend. You do not	364
	know who is supposed to call the hotel. You ask:	365
a.	Ber riüft-ta o? → 2,5/5	366
	who phone-da up	367
b.	Ber riüft o? → 4,8/5	368
	who phone up	369
	"Who of us is going to make the call?"	370
	An anonymous reviewer asks why it is that only subjects interact with clitic pronouns	371
	and <i>da</i> in Cimbrian, while it has to be assumed that all referential DPs (of objects and	372
	prepositional objects) need to have access to Fin ⁰ . The latter assumption is correct. I pro-	373
	pose that Fin ⁰ enters in an Agree relation with all referential constituents contained in TP	374
	and values them, but will only attract the referential subject, since it constitutes the highest	375
	argument in the structure. Given that it is movement of the subject into [Spec,FinP] that	376
	interferes with wh-movement via the bottleneck effect, it is subjects that interact with	377
	the presence / absence of clitic pronouns and <i>da</i> in Cimbrian. When the subject is non-referen-	378
	tial (i.e., indefinite) it will remain in a lower position and the sentence will be anchored	379
	via the reference situation argument of Tense, as a thetic judgment. I will leave the issue	380
	of the anchoring of referential adverbials aside here.	381
	To sum up what we have found so far, referential DPs cannot be interpreted within	382
	vP, without any additional operation that connects them with the C-domain (see (17b)	383
	above repeated here as (23)). I have proposed that referential DPs have an extra layer. A	384
	definite strong DP, when unable to move to [Spec,FinP] for syntactic reasons, is licensed	385

by movement of a correlate adnominal *da* or a pronominal correlate; the choice is language-and or function-specific (topic vs. focus). Note also that some languages allow clitics also with focused constituents as in Spanish and Romanian. Some questions remain. In the following section, I will address the question of what happens in cases where the subject is not anchored via an anaphoric link?

6. The role of frame adverbials

Frame adverbials play a special role as well in the anchoring process of statements. First note that IP-related temporal (and locative) adverbs express a relation between the reference situation and the event time /location, as we have already seen in (8d) above.

Frame adverbials crucially have a different interpretation, they shift or restrict the reference situation itself, as is illustrated in (26) and (27). While speaker A in (26) talks about Christmas in the past, speaker B shifts the reference point with the expression *in not many years* to a future reference situation. Likewise, in (27), the adverbial *with no job* restricts the set of people that would be happy, giving rise to a strong proportional reading of the quantifier *few*.

(26) A: Last year Christmas was fun. We had 5 days of free holidays

B: In not many years Christmas will fall on a Wednesday again

(27) With no job few people would be happy

An initial check with Cimbrian data indicates that generic statements in Cimbrian always appear without *da* or a subject clitic, but this has not been investigated in detail in Cognola & Hinterhölzl (2020). If this observation is verified on a larger set of data, it would imply that the subject is anchored in a different way.

Here I will limit myself with motivating this claim with English data. As is illustrated in (28), a frame adverbial like *in Australia* restricts the set of swans to Australian ones. I would like to propose that in this case the situation argument of the adverbial binds the situation argument of the nominal subject leading to the interpretation indicated in (28c). Since the subject is interpreted with respect to a new (but anchored) reference situation, definite DPs can only have a weak interpretation. This bleeds the necessity of entering into a relation with Fin^0 for the assignment of a context value for the individual argument of the subject. Thus, I conclude that subjects in the presence of frame adverbials do not need to have to be anchored by Fin^0 , since they receive a bound interpretation.

- (28) a. Swans are white
 b. In Australia swans are black
 c. G_x in Australia (s_i) & swans (x, s_i) \rightarrow black (x)

In the following section, we will see that the pattern of subject licensing in Cimbrian is replicated in systems of complementizer agreement in West Germanic dialects.

7. Complementizer Agreement in West Germanic

As van Koppen (2016) shows, complementizer agreement (CA) is a complex and manifold issue in West Germanic. This is illustrated in (29–31). If the subject is focused, some dialects show CA, as Austrian Bavarian in (29), some dialects lack CA, as in Hellendoorn Dutch (30), and there are dialects in which the sentence is ungrammatical with or without CA, as in Frisian (31).

(29) Warum-st grod DU mein Freind net griasst ho-st, vasteh i a net.

Why-2P.SG.PRT you my friend not greeted have-2P.SG. understand I too not
 'Why you of all people didn't greet my friend, I don't understand either.'

(Bavarian, Gmundendialect, Gruber 2008:53)

(30) dat / * darr-e [zölf's wiej] de wedstrijd wint

that / that-Agr even we the game win (Hellendoorn Dutch, van Koppen 2012)

(31) a. *Hy leaude dat-st moarm do komme soest

he believes that-2P.SG tomorrow you come should-2P.SG

b. *Hy leaude dat moarm do komme soest

he believes that tomorrow you come should-2P.SG

(Frisian, Germen de Haan p.c., Fuß 2008:85)

Van Koppen (2012) argues that there are two types of CA to be distinguished. In a type A) dialect, that is found in dialects like Tegelen Dutch, the agreement suffix is similar to the agreement suffix on the verb and CA is insensitive to subject movement and to subject modification. In a type B) dialect, as in Hellendoorn Dutch, the agreement suffix differs from the agreement suffix on the verb, displaying the phenomenon of so-called double agreement (DA). Furthermore, in these dialects the agreement suffix is of pronominal origin and CA is sensitive to subject movement and subject modification. I will illustrate the variable nature of DA that occurs in various West Germanic dialects with van Koppen's (2002) data from Hellendoorn Dutch.

(32) illustrates that if the subject is moved into a preverbal position, DA (-e) is ruled out, while if the subject stays in a lower position, as in a yes-no question that requires V1-order, DA is necessary. (33) illustrates that if the subject is modified by a focus-particle, DA is ungrammatical. (34) shows that in the presence of a frame adverbial DA is excluded, while (35) shows that if a focused subject is moved to a higher position and has a definite reading, as is the case for the first person pronoun *wiej* DA is again excluded.

(32) a. Wiej binn-t /*binn-e den besten!

we are the best!

b. Binn-e /*binn-t wiej den besten?

Are we the best?

(33) dat / * darr-e [zölf's wiej] de wedstrijd wint

that / that-Agr even we the game win

(34) dat / * darr-e [op den wärmsten dag van't joar] wiej tegen oonze wil ewärkt hebt

that / that-Agr on the warmest day of the year we against our will worked have

(35) WIEJ denkt Jan dat / *darr-e die pries ewönnen hebt, niet ZIEJ

we think Jan that / that-1P.SG that prize won have, not they

'WE John thinks won that prize, not THEM.'

(Hellendoorn Dutch, Van Koppen 2012:138)

Let us now have a look at the present accounts of CA in West Germanic. Because of the special properties of DA, two types of accounts have been proposed in the literature. For dialects of the type A, where neither movement of the subject nor subject modification have an effect on the appearance of CA, it is assumed that CA is based on an Agree-relation between a C-head and the subject. For type B dialects, Fuß (2016) proposes a prosodic account in terms of string adjacency. In particular, Fuß (2016) assumes post-syntactic movement of agreement features that depends on strict string adjacency between the subject and Fin^0 , accounting for the intervention effect of frame adverbials as in (34) above. However, such an account cannot be extended to the dialects of type A (in which CA occurs in presence of intervening elements), as is argued by Haegeman & van Koppen (2012) and the agreement-based account cannot be extended to dialects of type B. Thus, neither account can explain the phenomena in all the diverse languages / dialects that display CA.

Before we sketch an alternative account that explains CA in both types of dialects, let us provide a description of the relevant data of CA in relation to the facts of subject licensing in Cimbrian. It is immediately clear that the data in Cimbrian and CA in West Germanic exhibit very similar patterns that arguably call for a unified account. Let us thus consider whether the facts of CA can be explained in terms of anchoring the subject to the context. This implies that CA agreement should be seen as an alternative anchor (of the subject) like clitics and *da* in Cimbrian.

First we note that, if we identify the position of the complementizer (and the Wackernagel position) with Fin^0 in the C-domain, then an alternative anchor is expected, since the subject is prevented for syntactic reasons to move into [Spec,FinP] - since no element can precede the complementizer in Germanic - to anchor the clause in embedded

clauses. For matrix clauses, we have seen in (32) and (35) that if the subject moves into or through [Spec,FinP], no alternative anchor is needed.

Furthermore, we note that CA in Hellendoorn Dutch seems to behave like subject clitics in Cimbrian (rather than *da*) in being incompatible with focus. This is in line with the observation that the agreement morpheme in type B dialects is related in form to subject pronouns. Finally, (34) illustrates that a frame adverbial in type B dialects bleeds CA, since frame adverbials, as we have discussed above, allow for the anchoring of the subject without any clitic via binding.

In conclusion, I would like to make the following proposal. By considering referential anchoring, a uniform syntactic account becomes feasible where the two types of CA are related by a diachronic process of reanalysing movement as Agreement (cf. Wratil 2016 on DA in Carinthian and Kansas Bukovina Bohemian) along the following lines:

A) Type B dialects involve movement of a subject clitic or of a correlate of the subject into Fin⁰ to anchor the predicate. That is why in cases of subject movement and subject modification no (overt) CA-morpheme appears. Dialects may then be taken to differ as to whether they allow subject clitics with focused subjects, as I propose is the case of Austrian Bavarian (see the data in (29) above), or resort to a (silent) adnominal *da*. Dialects may not allow subject clitics with focused subjects but also lack adnominal *da*, then the sentence is expected to be ungrammatical with or without CA, as is the case in Frisian (see the data in (31) above).

B) Type A dialects are characterized by the loss of DA that can be explained in the present account in the following terms: the clitic is reanalyzed as verbal inflection but the Agree-relation between Fin⁰ and the subject remains and is interpreted as feature evaluation, as specified in (36) with the following consequence: no intervention or modification effect is expected and the agreement morpheme is assimilated (or identical) to the agreement morpheme on the finite verb.

(36) if a Term A agrees with a function $f(x)$, x a free variable, x is evaluated with respect to the value assigned to A

8. Conclusions

I have been presenting arguments that complementizer agreement is more than a quirky formal effect that appears in some West Germanic dialects, where we may ask what it is good for. Instead, I have argued that CA can be taken to serve a purpose, namely, to anchor the subject in the context.

Furthermore, I have argued that the distribution of indefinite and of strong and weak definite DPs in the clause follows from assumption that these DPs need to enter in a licensing relation with Fin⁰ in the C-domain, based on the assumption that context values of discourse referents and values pertaining to the utterance situation become accessible in this position. This approach thus throws new light onto phenomena like clitic movement to a high position in the clause that occurs in many languages, as well as onto scrambling of definite DPs into higher positions in the middle field (that may be identified with positions in the lower C-domain) in German. These operations then seize to be quirky formal properties of these languages, but can be taken - like CA, as we argued in the previous section - to serve to license definite DPs in the context.

Acknowledgments: In this section, you can acknowledge any support given which is not covered by the author contribution or funding sections. This may include administrative and technical support, or donations in kind (e.g., materials used for experiments).

Conflicts of Interest: Declare conflicts of interest or state “The authors declare no conflict of interest.” Authors must identify and declare any personal circumstances or interest that may be perceived as inappropriately influencing the representation or interpretation of reported research results. Any role of the funders in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results must be declared in this section. If there is no role, please state “The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the

collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results”.

Appendix A

The appendix is an optional section that can contain details and data supplemental to the main text—for example, explanations of experimental details that would disrupt the flow of the main text but nonetheless remain crucial to understanding and reproducing the research shown; figures of replicates for experiments of which representative data is shown in the main text can be added here if brief, or as Supplementary data. Mathematical proofs of results not central to the paper can be added as an appendix.

Appendix B

All appendix sections must be cited in the main text. In the appendices, Figures, Tables, etc. should be labeled starting with “A”—e.g., Figure A1, Figure A2, etc.

Notes

- ¹ This is a note example.
- ² This is a note example.
- ³ This is a note example.

References

- Biberauer, Theresa (2016). There is a lot going on here: (earlier) English (and other) expletive syntax revisited. Diachronic syntax workshop, Venice, October 2016.
- Biberauer, Theresa & van der Wal, Janneke (2014). Expletives beyond English. Ms University of Cambridge.
- Biberauer, Theresa (2010). Semi null-subject languages, expletives and expletive pro reconsidered. DOI: 10.1017/CB0978051177084.005
- Bidese, Ermenegildo & Padovan, Andrea (2012). Erodierte Sprachstrukturen und Grammatiktheorie: zur Morphosyntax der semi-speakers in der zimbrischen Sprachenklave Lusèrn und ihrer Bedeutung für die Sprachtheorie. In C. Di Meola, A. Hornung, L. Rega (eds.), *Perspektiven Vier: Akten der 4. Tagung Deutsche Sprachwissenschaft in Italien* (Rom, 4.-6.2.2010), Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2012, p. 161-173.
- Bidese, Ermenegildo, Padovan, Andrea & Tomaselli, Alessandra (2012). A binary system of complementizers in Cimbrian relative clauses. In *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*. Vol. 90, Lund: Lund University, 1-20.
- Bidese, Ermenegildo & Tomaselli, Alessandra (2005) "Formen der 'Herausstellung' und Verlust der V2-Restriktion in der Geschichte der zimbrischen Sprache" in Bidese, E., Dow, J. R., Stolz, T. (a cura di), *Das Zimbrische zwischen Germanisch und Romanisch*, Bochum: Brockmeyer, p. 71-92
- Bidese, Ermenegildo & Tomaselli, Alessandra (2018). Developing pro-drop. The case of Cimbrian. In Cognola, Federica & Casalicchio, Jan (eds.) *Understanding pro-drop. A synchronic and diachronic perspective*.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2010). On a (wh-)moved topic in Italian, compared to Germanic. In *Advances in comparative Germanic syntax*, Artemis Alexiadou, Jorge Hankamer, Thomas McFadden, Justin Nuger, and Florian Schaeffer (eds.), 3–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carnap, Rudolf (1928). *Der Logische Aufbau der Welt*. Meiner, 1998.
- Cognola, Federica (2013 a). Syntactic Variation and Verb Second. A German dialect in Northern Italy. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cognola, Federica (2013b). The mixed OV/VO syntax of Mòcheno main clauses: on the interaction between high and low left periphery. In Theresa Biberauer and Michelle Sheehan (eds.), *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Orders*. Oxford University Press, 106-135.
- Cognola, Federica & Bidese, Ermenegildo (2016). On language acquisition and language change. Is transmission failure favoured in multilingual heritage contexts? In: Bidese, Ermenegildo & Cognola, Federica & Moroni, Manuela (eds), *Theoretical Approaches to Linguistic Variation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cognola, Federica & Hinterhölzl, Roland (2016). On the interaction between V2, subjects and wh-movement in a comparative perspective. Paper presented at the 22. GLAC Conference, University of Iceland.
- Cognola, Federica & Hinterhölzl, Roland (2020). Syntactic and semantic restrictions in the licensing of subjects in Cimbrian main clauses. *Linguistische Berichte* 263, 1 - 33.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2005. *Situations and Individuals*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Frege, Gottlob. 1892. Über Sinn und Bedeutung. *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Philosophische Kritik* 100: 113 - 126.

18. Fuß, Eric. 2005. The Rise of Agreement. A Formal Approach to the Syntax and Grammaticalization of Verbal Inflection. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 593–594
19. Fuß, Eric. 2008. "Multiple agreement and the representation of inflection in the c-domain." *Linguistische Berichte*, 213:77–106. 595
20. Fuß, Eric. 2016. Complementizer agreement (in Bavarian): Feature inheritance or feature insertion? In: *Bavarian Syntax. Contributions to the Theory of Syntax*, edited by Günther Grewendorf and Helmut Weiß, Amsterdam: Benjamins. 597
21. Grewendorf, Günther & Poletto, Cecilia (2015), Relative clauses in Cimbrian, in: Di Domenico, Elisa et al, *Structure, Strategies and Beyond. Studies in Honor of Adriana Belletti*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 393–416. 598–599
22. Gruber, Bettina. 2008. Complementizer agreement: New evidence from the Upper Austrian variant of Gmunden. Master's thesis, University of Vienna. 600–601
23. Haegeman, Liliane. 1996. Verb second, the split CP, and null subjects in early Dutch finite clauses. *Geneva Generative Papers* 4: 135–175. 602–603
24. Hartmann, Jutta (2008). Expletives in Existentials: English *there* and German *da*. LOT Dissertation Series 181. Utrecht: LOT. 604
25. Hinterhölzl, Roland (2019). Subjects, Topics and Anchoring to the Context. *Syntax* 22: 2-3, Special Issue, 199 - 228. 605
26. Hinterhölzl, Roland (2024). Giving content to expletive *es* in German. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 27:2, 1 - 31. 606
27. Hinterwimmer, Stefan and Cornelia Endriss (2008). Topic Interpretation in Determiner and Adverbial Quantification. In C. Davies, A. R. Deal and Y. Zabbal (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 36*. GLSA Publications, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 607–608
28. Haegeman, Liliane. 1996. Verb second, the split CP, and null subjects in early Dutch finite clauses. *Geneva Generative Papers* 4: 135–175. 609–610
29. Kallulli, Dalina (2008). There is Secondary Predication in There - Existentials. In Proceedings of the 26th WCCFL, Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie (eds.), Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project. 279 - 287. 611–612
30. Kolmer, Agnes (2005). L'espletivo *da* come espletivo della posizione del soggetto enclitico pronominale nel Cimbri di Luserna, in Breu, Walter (ed), *L'influsso dell'italiano sulla grammatica delle lingue minoritarie. Problemi di morfologia e sintassi*. Rende: Centro Editoriale e Libreria Università della Calabria, 55–92. 613–615
31. van Koppen, Marjo. (2012). The distribution of phi-features in pronouns. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30: 135 - 177. 616
32. van Koppen, Marjo. (2016). Complementizer Agreement. Ms., University of Utrecht. 617
33. Kratzer, Angelika. (1989). An investigation in the lumps of thought. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12: 607 - 653. 618
34. Kratzer, Angelika (1996). Severing the external argument from its verb. In Johan Rooryck & Lauri Zaring (eds.): *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 109 - 137. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 619–620
35. Reichenbach, Hans (1947). *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. New York: MacMillan Co. 621
36. Rizzi, Luigi, and Ur Shlonsky (2006). Strategies of subject extraction. To appear in *Interfaces + Recursion=Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View From Syntax-Semantics*, Hans M. Gärtner and Uli Sauerland (eds.), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 622–623
37. Roberts, Ian G. (2004). The C-System in Brythonic Celtic Languages, V2, and the EPP. In *The Structure of CP and IP*, ed. Luigi Rizzi, 297–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 624–625
38. Russell, Bertrand (1905). On denoting. *Mind* 14:479–493. 626
39. Wratil, Melanie 2016. The rise and fall of double agreement. In Günther Grewendorf & Helmut Weiß (eds.), *Bavarian Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 627–628
40. Zagona, Karen (2013). Tense, aspect and modality. *The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Part V, Syntax and the internal interfaces, pp. 746 - 792, Cambridge: CUP. 629–630
- Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content. 631–632–633