

## **The V-to-I parameter revisited**

### **Kristine Bentzen, University of Tromsø**

This paper takes a closer look at the nature of the V-to-I parameter. I will argue that the traditional V-to-I movement comes in (at least) two distinct types, which are linked to two different syntactic phenomena: finiteness licensing and predication licensing. Both these phenomena display parametric variation across languages, and I thus argue that the V-to-I parameter should be split into two different parameters. It is well-known that Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian (MSc) differ with respect to verb placement in embedded non-V2 contexts: Icelandic displays verb movement across negation and adverbs, the MSc languages do not (cf. Holmberg&Platzack 1995, Vikner 1995). This has been linked to the richness of inflectional verbal morphology in the respective languages. Whereas Icelandic has a fairly rich verbal morphology, e.g. showing person differences in both numbers in all tenses, the MSc languages have a poor verbal morphology, with the same form for all persons and numbers within one tense. Over the years, a couple of counter-examples to this generalization have gained a certain fame. The initial observations from the Kronoby dialect of Swedish (Platzack&Holmberg 1989) and the Tromsø dialect of Northern Norwegian (Iversen 1918) have recently been confirmed by more extensive fieldwork: Both the Northern Ostrobothnian dialect (NOB, including Kronoby) and various Northern Norwegian dialects referred to as Regional Northern Norwegian (ReNN) display optional verb movement in non-V2 contexts despite lacking “sufficiently rich” morphology (cf. Bentzen 2007). However, a closer look at the verb movement patterns found in Icelandic and in ReNN/NOB shows that the two are distinct in certain ways. In Icelandic, verb movement in non-V2 contexts crosses negation, and has to cross all adverbs in clauses with multiple adverbs, as illustrated in (3). In ReNN and NOB, on the other hand, this type of verb movement cannot cross negation, but may intervene between multiple adverbs, as shown in (4) (cf. Wiklund et al. 2007).

These two types of non-V2 verb movement are not a special quirk of the Scandinavian languages; the same split is found within the Romance languages. French patterns with Icelandic, in that all verb movement has to cross negation and cannot intervene between multiple adverbs, as shown in (5). Spanish and Italian, on the other hand, pattern with ReNN and NOB in that verb movement cannot cross negation but may intervene between multiple adverbs, as in (6).

I here suggest that these two verb movement patterns correspond to two different parameters, rather than to one V-to-I parameter. Whereas non-V2 verb movement in French has been associated with [+F] in I, Icelandic non-V2 movement has been linked to a strong AGR feature in I (cf. Pollock 1989, Holmberg&Platzack 1995). However, the patterns in these two languages seem very similar, and I thus argue that they follow from the same licensing requirement, namely finiteness [Fin] licensing. Furthermore, I take this feature to be associated with the projection FinP. The [Fin] feature needs to be licensed, but there is parametric variation with respect to how this is done; through *Move* or *Agree*. I propose here that in Icelandic and French, [Fin] cannot be licensed through *Agree* because of some kind of blocking effect. Thus, [Fin] must be licensed through overt movement of the finite verb to FinP, yielding the word order where the verb always precedes negation and all adverbs. I will call this verb movement *long non-V2 verb movement*. In ReNN and Spanish, on the contrary, such a blocking effect for *Agree* is not present, and the verb may enter into an *Agree* relation with [Fin] in FinP while positioned in a lower projection. This gives the orders where the verb may intervene between adverbs. The parametric difference here is thus whether or not [Fin] may be licensed through *Agree*. Turning to the verb movement found in ReNN and Spanish, I suggest that this is triggered by predicate licensing. Bentzen (2007) has shown that predication (or the EPP) in Norwegian may be associated with various projections in the IP domain. Furthermore, it is demonstrated that whereas predication in standard Norwegian only can be licensed through so-called *spec-raising*, where the subject moves alone to the specifier of the projection carrying the [Pred] feature, ReNN also has the option of licensing [Pred] through *spec-pied-piping*, where the subject pied-pipes the whole vP in this movement (cf. also Biberauer&Richards 2006). The latter option yields verb movement in non-V2 contexts in ReNN, which we may call *short non-V2 verb movement*. A similar approach may be proposed for non-V2 verb movement in Spanish and Italian. Here too, subjects may occur in various positions in the IP domain, suggesting that predication may be associated with various projections. And as in ReNN, the option of pied-piping the whole vP when licensing predication appears to be available, resulting in short verb movement. The parametric difference here is thus whether or not [Pred] may be licensed by *spec-pied-piping*, i.e. by movement of the whole vP. The two parameters, their settings, and their variation across languages are illustrated in (7).

- (1) Ég veit af hverju Hedda kaupir oft sko (Icelandic)  
 (2) Jeg vet hvorfor Hedda ofte kjøper sko. (Norwegian)  
*I know why Hedda buys often buys shoes.*  
 'I know why Hedda often buys shoes.'
- (3) a. ... fyrst einkverjir stúdentar {skiludu} ekki {\*skiludu} verkefnum. (Icelandic)  
*as some students handed.in not handed.in assignments*  
 b. ... fyrst einkverjir stúdentar {skiludu} sennilega {\*skiludu} oft {\*skiludu} verkefnum.  
*as some students handed.in probably handed.in often handed.in assignments*
- (4) a. ... ettersom nån studenta {\*leverte} ikke {leverte} oppgaven. (ReNN)  
*as some students handed.in not handed.in assignments*  
 b. ... ettersom nån studenta {levere} sannsynligvis {levere} ofte {levere} oppgava.  
*as some student s handed.in probably handed.in often handed.in assignments*
- (5) a. Jean ne {mangeait} pas {\*mangeait} les gâteaux. (French)  
*Jean NEG ate not ate the cakes*  
 'Jean didn't eat the cakes.'  
 b. Marie {mangeait} malheureusement {\*mangeait} souvent {\*mangeait} tous les gâteaux.  
*Marie ate unfortunately ate often ate all the cakes*  
 'Marie unfortunately often ate all the cakes.'
- (6) a. Juan {\*comió} no {comió} tarta. (Spanish)  
*Juan ate not ate cake*  
 'Juan didn't eat cake.'  
 b. Algunos estudiantes {malinterpretaron} a menudo {malinterpretaron} completamente  
*some students misinterpret often misinterpret completely*  
 {\*malinterpretaron} la tarea.  
*misinterpret the assignment*
- (7) Two parameters involving non-V2 verb movement:  
 a. [Fin] licensing: (i) Through *Move*: Icelandic, French  
 (ii) Through *Agree*: ReNN, NOb, Spanish, Italian, Norwegian, Swedish  
 b. [Pred] licensing: (i) Through *spec-pied-piping*: ReNN, NOb, Spanish, Italian  
 (ii) Through *spec-raising*: Norwegian, Swedish

### References:

**Bentzen, K. (2007).** *Order and Structure in Embedded Clauses in Northern Norwegian*. PhD diss. University of Tromsø. **Biberauer, T. & M. Richards. (2006).** 'True optionality: When grammar doesn't mind.' In *Minimalist Ideas*, Boeckx (ed.). **Holmberg, A. & C. Platzack. (1995).** *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. **Iversen, R. (1918).** *Syntaksen i Tromsø bymaal*. **Platzack, C. & A. Holmberg. (1989).** 'The role of AGR and finiteness.' *WPSS* 43. **Pollock, J-Y. (1989).** 'Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. **Vikner, S. (1995).** *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. **Wiklund, A. et al. (2007).** 'Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement.' *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10.