

Mood, Features, and Verb Movement

Madoka Murakami, Jissen Women's University, Tokyo and University of Siena

This paper discusses V features, nominative case, and V movement in Chomsky's (2001) minimalist program, explains the facets of the English subjunctive and imperative, and contrasts the difference of V movement between English and other European languages.

I propose that V movement can be solved in the unitary I system where I is a bundle of features, without recourse to Agr(P) parameterization based on richness of agreement morphology (Pollock (1989), Vikner (1997), among many others). The feature matrices [–Tense, +Agr] and [+Tense, –Agr] will be argued for the subjunctive and imperative respectively. The auxiliary *do*, a dummy tense carrier, can be inserted into [+Tense] of indicatives and imperatives, while untensed I cannot accommodate *do* in subjunctives or infinitives:

- (1) Indicative / Imperative: I did see a ghost. / Do come to my house.
 (2) Subjunctive / Infinitive: I insist that he (*do) go. / You make me (*do) feel good.

The imperative *do* never inflects for agreement even if its overt nominative subject is third person singular or archaic second person *thou*, hence [–Agr]:

- (3) Imperative with subject: Everybody do/*does sit down.

Shakespr. Imp. with *thou*: Now do/*dost thou watch, for I can stay no longer.

On the other hand, [+Agr] is a dependent case checker which must be activated by another head under head-to-head adjacency (Raposo (1987)); the complementizer *that* is necessary for subjunctives to connect the chain of Agr activation, and check and value nominative case:

- (4) Subjunctive: I asked [CP [C *that*] [IP he [I +Agr] take the medicine]].
- Agree

head-to-head activation
- Cf. *I asked ϕ he take the medicine.

Furthermore, a finite V carries [+Tense, +Agr] in present-day English, but [+Tense, +Agr, +Mood] in earlier English, due to the fact that mood was morphologically realized on the Old English verb by the subjunctive morpheme *e*, which disappeared in Middle English, causing English Vs to move or not move depending on which mood they belong to. The claim is that V movement can be accounted for in terms of the numerical strength of V features: *The more, the stronger*. Thus all Vs used to raise over *not* with three plus features in older English:

- (5) Obsolete: I know not t_V .

In present-day English, main verbs remain in situ, with two positive features:

- (6) Indicative with main V: John often kisses Mary.

Cf. *John kisses often t_V Mary.

However, two plus features sufficiently allow *be* (and perfective *have*) to move from V to I:

- (7) Indicative with *be*: You are always t_V lenient.

But even *be* cannot move with only one positive feature in either subjunctives or imperatives:

- (8) Subjunctive: I insist that you not be lenient.

Cf. *I insist that you be not t_V lenient. (archaic)

- (9) Imperative: Do not be lenient.

Cf. *Be not t_V lenient. (archaic)

The three degrees of V feature strength are summarized here:

T	Agr	M	# of +	
+	+	+	3	All Vs raise in earlier English and other European languages
+	+		2	Only <i>be</i> and perfective <i>have</i> raise in English indicatives
	+		1	No Vs raise in English subjunctives
+			1	No Vs raise in English imperatives

This hypothesis not merely reveals the history of V movement in English, but also highlights the different verbal behavior between English and other European languages. As far as I have investigated such languages as French, Italian, German, Dutch, Icelandic, Greek, Polish, and Lithuanian, the hypothesis seems to work: All finite verbs move from V to I, regardless of the mood to which they belong; since mood morphology is integrated in the European verbal paradigms, so they are positively specified for M as well as T and Agr. The examples from (10) to (16) are in the subjunctive mood (parentheses around adverbs mean that either one of the two positions is possible in (13), (14), and (15)):

- (10) French: Il faut que Jean aime toujours t_V Marie.
it needs that John love+T+Agr+M always Mary
- (11) Italian: Penso che Rita paghi sempre t_V tutto.
I-think that Rita pay+T+Agr+M always all
- (12) Icelandic: Jón segir að hann borði oft t_V tomata.
John said that he eat+T+Agr+M often tomatos
- (13) Greek: Thelo o Janis (panta) na agapa (panta) t_V ti Maria.
I-want the John (always) +M love+T+Agr (always) the Mary
- (14) Polish: Powiedział, że Jan (naprawdę) kochałby (naprawdę) t_V Marię.
he-said that John (really) love+T+Agr+M (really) Mary
- (15) Lithuanian: Norėčiau, kad Jonas (visada) myletų (visada) t_V Marija.
I-wish that John (always) love+T+Agr+M (always) Mary

As I have never admitted other functional maximal projections than IP and CP, the position to which V raises is uniformly I. In the case of Polish subjunctives, however, it seems necessary to introduce another head 'M' between C and I, in order to accommodate 'floating' *by*+Agr:

- (16) Polish: Powiedział, że (my) [_M by-śmy] to [_I zrobili- $t_{by\text{śmy}}$] t_V .
he-said that (we) +M+Agr it do+T

Assuming the traditional head-final VP/IP structure for German and Dutch (Pintzuk (1999); *pace* Zwart (1997)), V-to-I raising may look vacuous, but the main Vs are obviously located in C position after successive raising in the following interrogatives:

- (17) German: Sagte er so t_V t_I ?
say+T+Agr+M he so
- (18) Dutch: Werken zij hard t_V t_I ?
work+T+Agr+M they hard

I will discuss problematic cases such as Italian imperatives and Danish subordinate clauses. Under this hypothesis, however, what basically triggers V movement is not any version of the impoverishment of agreement morphology, but the existence of mood morphology.

References

- Chomsky, Noam (2001) "Derivation by Phase," In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), 1-52, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Pintzuk, Susan (1999) *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*, Garland Publishing Inc., New York.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989) "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP," *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 3; 365-424.
- Raposo, Eduardo (1987) "Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese," *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 1; 85-109.
- Vikner, Sten (1997) "V⁰-to-I⁰ Movement and Inflection for Person in All Tenses," In *The New Comparative Syntax*, L. Haegeman (ed.), 189-213, Longman, London and New York.
- Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter (1997) *Morphosyntax of Verb Movement – A Minimalist Approach to the Syntax of Dutch*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.