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Why V-to-T and the crosslinguistic variation

• Since the first work on the syntax of V the following correlation has been proposed:

  V to T if verbal morphology is rich

• The parameter concerns the attracting property of the relevant functional head (T).

• Recall: Parameters are not phenomena or processes. I.e. in this case, the parameter does not directly concern the V-movement process per se but the formal property of the head that triggers it (T).
Why V-to-T and the crosslinguistic variation

• During the 19-nineties different attempts have been made to try to characterize in a precise formal way the relevant notion rich

• The history of Germanic languages has played a central role in this enterprise (cfr. Holmberg & Platzack 1990, Roberts 1993, Vikner 1997, Holmberg & Roberts 2013 for more recent overview)

• The fundamental insight appeared to be that the relevant richness concerns the person agreement morphology in the verbal inflection

number of different person morphology
V-to-T and the crosslinguistic variation

• Lack or loss of rich agreement morphology would deprive the relevant attracting head of its movement-attracting property.

• Hence, no verb movement process is triggered in these circumstances.

• The contrast between Icelandic and Modern Danish as well as the contrast internal to the history of Swedish, which has lost rich person agreement morphology nicely illustrate the hypothesis.

(1)

a ... að hann keypti **ekki** bokina  
...... that he bought not the book  

b ... at  han ***ikke*** købte bogen  
...... that he not bought the book

\[\text{(Is)}\]
\[\text{(D)}\]

\[\text{c ... at Gudz ord kan ey vara j honom (ASw)}\]
\[\ldots that God’s word can not be in him\]

\[\text{d ...at Guds ord *inte* kan vara i honom (MSw)}\]
\[\ldots that God’s word not can be in him\]
V-to-T and the crosslinguistic variation

a. Þú veist [ að ég skil þall ekki japónsku ], [Icelandic] 
   you know that I understand at all not Japanese

b. Du vet [ att jag inte alls förstår japanska. ], [Swedish]
   you know that I not at all understand Japanese
   ‘You know that I don't understand Japanese at all.’

ég      skil         jag      förstår
þú      skilur      du       förstår
hann    skilur      han      förstår
við     skiljum     vi       förstår
þið     skiljið     ni       förstår
þeir    skilja      de       förstår
V-to-T in the History of English

- In Middle English (ME) and Early Modern English (EME), V to T is active as witnessed by the order V-Neg and V-Avv, ungrammatical in contemporary English:

  - (2) a Wepyng and teres counforteth not dissolute laughers
    weeping and tears confort not dissolute laughers
  - b Bycause they come not up and offre
    because they come not up and offer
  - c They were ful soore adredde and wist not what it was
    they were full sore afraid and knew not what it was
  - d The Turks...made anone redy a grete ordonnaunce
    the Turks made soon ready a great ordonance (weapons)

    (c1482: The Delectable Newsse of Glorious Victorye of the Rhodyans agaynest Turkes, Roberts 1993:253)
V-to-T in the History of English

• Further example from Holmberg & Roberts (2013), where the syntax-morphology relation is discussed and reviewed in detail:
  
  (3)  
  a I gave not this accompt to you  (1557: J. Cheke, Letter to Hoby, Roberts 1999, 290)
  
  vs Modern English
  
  b I did not give this to you
  
  c He soon got ready

• Order V neg in Shakespeare:
  
  (4) a Love alters not with his brief hours and weeks (Sonnet 116)

• And also, still, more recently:
  
  (4) b They knew not each other’s opinion (Jane Austen, Persuasion, 1818)
Not a strong correlation

• The correlation between:
  • Richness of the person inflection in the verbal paradigm and V movement is not however a strong correlation.

• The implication appears to hold in one direction:
  • Rich agreement morphology \rightarrow V movement

• The other direction does not always hold (see examples following)
  • V movement \rightarrow Rich agreement morphology
Examples

• See e.g. in the Swedish dialect Kronoby and Faroese (Bobaljik (2001; 2008)), where the verb can move in the lack of any explicit agreement morphology:

•

• (5) He va bra et an tsöfft int bootsen (Kronoby)
  it was good that he bought not the book

• a Tey nýttu fleiri orð, sum hon hevði ikki hoyrt fyrr (Faroese)
  they used several words which he had not heard before

• b Tey nýttu fleiri orð, sum hon ikki hevði hoyrt fyrr
  they used several words which he not had heard before
Examples

• See also the difference between lexical vs auxiliary verb in the first English – French contrast (discussed in ho3).

• Zooming on English:

  • *Mary speaks not vs ✓ Mary has not spoken
  • *I/you speak not ✓ I/you have not spoken

• I.e.: no difference as for morphological richness. The distinction is between lexical verbs and auxiliaries.
Examples

• See also the French-Italian contrast with non-finite verbal morphology: the form is the same and does not express any agreement (person) morphology, yet the verb moves high (in Italian) or can move to a lower head (in French):

• (6) Gianni (non) vorrebbe parlare mai/spesso dei suoi problemi
  • G. would (not) like to speak ever/often of his problems
• (7) a Jean aimerait souvent parler de ses problèmes
  • J. would like (to) often (to) speak of his problems
  • b Jean aimerait parler souvent de ses problèmes
  • J. would like to speak often of his problems

Cases of apparent optionality as the previous one of Faroese and the French one here as well may in fact indicate different internal grammars of the speakers.
Person agreement and verb raising

• The relation between richness in person agreement morphology and verb raising is thus not direct.

• The relevant relation between verbal inflectional morphology and Verb syntax (i.e. V-movement) holds in a wider sense:
  • It also includes overall richness in Tense specifications as a relevant factor (Biberauer & Roberts proposal 2010).

• Hence, languages with no inflectional (agreement) morphology altogether, i.e. analytic languages like e.g. Chinese and Thai are expected not to have any form of Verb movement.

• This is in fact the case, as indicated by the following Chinese examples
Person agreement and verb raising

- (8) a Ta zai dasheng chang ge
- he Prog loud sing song
- “he was singing loudly”
- 
- b Wo mei-you qiaoqiao de hui jia
- I not-Perf quiet DE return home
- “I did not go home stealthily”
- 
(Huang et al. 2009)
V-to-T/Verb raising and acquisition

- Children are ready to acquire even very complex morphological verbal inflectional paradigms as well as their absence:

- Cfr.: agglutinating Finnish, with its 48 different forms and several other affixes for aspect, causation etc.; fusional Italian with its 43 different forms for finite verbal paradigms; analytic Chinese with complete absence of inflectional paradigms....

- Children do not show special difficulties and they are also ready from early on to master the syntactic consequences of the different properties of the different inflectional heads leading to Verb movement or not.
V-to-T-to-C

- A head within the C domain may also be the final target head of V movement
- In this case movement goes further (higher up) than T

- Such movement correlates with **finitness**.
  (Recall: Finiteness is a property of the C system with an effect on the verbal morphology in T: V>C>T, ho2)

- Consider two cases in better detail:
  - V2 phenomenon (9): e.g. in German root finite clauses (and other Germanic languages excluding English)
  - Residual V2 (Aux2), (10)/(11): in English root interrogatives
V2 (German)

• (9) a  .... dass Peter [das Buch] *liest*       //      gelesen *hat*
• .... that Peter the book reads       //    read     has
•      C     DP/S    DP/O     V_{fin}       V_{pstprt}       Aux_{fin}

• Root clause: V_{fin} in ‘second’ position

• b  Peter  *liest*  das Buch      //  Peter  *hat*  das Buch  gelesen
•       Peter  reads  the book      //  Peter  has  the book  read
•      DP/S       V_{fin}       DP/O       DP/S       Aux_{fin}       DP/O       V_{pstprt}

• c  Das Buch  *liest*  Peter      //  Das Buch  *hat*  Peter  gelesen
•       The book  reads  Peter      //  The book  has  Peter  read
•      DP/O       V_{fin}       DP/S       DP/O       Aux_{fin}       DP/S       V_{pstprt}
Das Buch liest Peter  //  Das Buch hat Peter gelesen

Das Buch reads Peter  //  The book has Peter read

The book liest Peter  //  The book hat Peter gelesen
T to C (English)

**Residual V2:** Rizzi’s 1996 term underscores the fact that the phenomenon is the same as the systematic V2 in German and Germanic, but limited to interrogative structures. Hence, in this sense, ‘residual’. And also diachronically ‘residual’, as V2 used to be systematic in early stages of English and started being lost during the latest Middle English period.

Yes/No:

(10) a John came \[\text{CP} \text{Did} [\text{TP} \text{John} __ \text{come}]]?

b John has come \[\text{CP} \text{Has} [\text{TP} \text{John} __ \text{come}]]?

c \[\text{CP} [\text{C has/did}] ... [\text{TP} \text{John} <[T \text{has/did}] > \text{come}]\]
T to C (English)

**WH-Q:**

e. John said something (/what)

f. [CP What did [TP John ___ say <what>]]?

g. John has said something (/what)

h. [CP What has [TP John ___ said <what>]]?

[CP What [chas/did] ... [TP John <[t has/did]> said/say <what>]]
In the expanded CP domain where C is split in different heads expressing different values, as in the cartographic CP, the question of which head is targeted in T-to-C arises.

Given the relation with Finitness >> Fin, the lowest head of the CP domain (cfr. ho2).

Much recent work addresses this issue (Wolfe 2018, Samo 2018)
The structure of the clause

We now focus on the descriptive part of the clause. And its interaction with the functional spine.