

Against the Asymmetric CP-V2 Analysis of Old English

Hee-Cheol Yoon

(Duksung Women's University)

Yoon, Hee-Cheol. 2004. **Against the Asymmetric CP-V2 Analysis of Old English**. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 4-2, 117-149. The paper is to argue against the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis of Old English, according to which finite verbs invariably undergo movement into a clause-final T within subordinate clauses and reach the functional head C within main clauses. The asymmetric CP-V2 analysis, first of all, faces difficulty in explaining a wide range of post-verbal elements within subordinate clauses. To resolve the problem, the analysis has to abandon the obligatoriness of V-to-T movement or introduce various types of extraposition whose status is dubious as a legitimate syntactic operation. Obligatory V-to-T movement in Old English lacks conceptual justification as well. Crosslinguistic evidence reveals that morphological richness in verbal inflection cannot entail overt verb movement. Moreover, the operation is always string-vacuous under the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis and has no effect at the interfaces, in violation of the principle of economy. The distribution of Old English finite verbs in main clauses also undermines the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis. Conceptually speaking, a proper syntactic trigger cannot be confirmed to motivate obligatory verb movement to C. The operation not only gets little support from nominative Case marking, the distribution of expletives, or complementizer agreement but also requires the unconvincing stipulation that expletives as well as sentence-initial subjects result from string-vacuous topicalization. Finally, textual evidence testifies that Old English sometimes permits non-V2 ordering patterns, many of which remain unexplained under the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis.

Key Words: verb movement, V-2 constraint, verbal inflections, rightward operations, Universal Base Hypothesis

1. Introduction

The assumption has been widely held that the distribution of Old English finite verbs is asymmetric depending on clausal types (van Kemenade (1987), Roberts (1993), *inter alia*). In main clauses, they frequently occupy the second position even when preceded by non-subject elements as in (1a). On the other hand, they often appear in a final position in subordinate clauses as in (1b).

- (1) a. *Ðis tacn worhte se hælend ærest on his menniscnysse*
 (CH II, 4:22-3)
 this token made Jesus first in his incarnation
- b. ... *Ðæt þu wundra wyrcest* (CH II, 1:272)
 that you wonders perform

Concerning the aforementioned variation in the surface positions of finite verbs, which is often called an asymmetric V-2 pattern, traditional analyses based on generative grammar have relied on two major hypotheses.¹⁾ First, they assume that asymmetric V-2 languages such as Old English, German, and Dutch have a head-final structure for both VP and TP. The assumption presupposes that finite verbs first undergo rightward movement to the clause-final T before they reach the highest head C in main clauses. The asymmetry of verb movement between main and subordinate clauses is largely attributed to a lexical complementizer whose presence prevents finite verbs in the clause-final T from undergoing further movement into C. Second, each step of verb movement is supposed to have an independent motivation. V-to-T movement, even if string-vacuous under the head-final analysis of asymmetric V-2 languages, is understood

¹Traditional analyses here refer to the CP-V2 hypothesis of V-2 languages according to which finite verbs uniformly move into the highest functional head C at least in main clauses (den Besten, 1989).

as an operation associated with the morphological richness of verbal paradigms in those languages. T-to-C movement represents the compulsory lexicalization of C triggered by syntactic requirements on Case/agreement relations or by intrinsic properties of C. According to the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis, both verbs in (1a,b) should first move into the clause-final T as schematized in (2).²

- (2) a. [[se hælend [ærest on his menniscnysse þis tacn t_i]_{VP}
 *worhte*_i]_{TP}
 b. [Ðu [wundra t_i]_{VP} *wyrcst*_{t_i}]_{TP}

The finite verb *worhte* in (2a) moves further into the highest head C on independent grounds. The finite verb *wyrcst* in (2b) remains in a clause-final position due to the merge of the lexical complementizer *þæt* blocking verb movement into C.

Old English finite verbs, however, appear in much more diverse positions than the ones exemplified in (1). First, unlike other asymmetric V-2 languages, Old English allows finite verbs within subordinate clauses to precede syntactically light elements including single adverbs, particles, participles, and pronominal complements. Second, Old English finite verbs are not restricted to the second position within main clauses: they can occupy the first, the third, and even the final position of a main clause. The V-2 analysis of Old English can hardly predict non-second positions of finite verbs, since all other V-2 languages, both symmetric and asymmetric, prohibit any syntactic element from intervening between a topic and a finite verb within main clauses (Vikner, 1995:42).

This paper raises various empirical and conceptual issues against the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis of verb movement in Old English. In section 2, empirical evidence is suggested

²Operations other than V-to-T movement are omitted here.

undermining the assumption that finite verbs in Old English undergo obligatory movement to a clause-final T. It is argued that a rightward operation of extraposition cannot rescue the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis, since the operation not only lacks syntactic motivations but also leaves unexplained miscellaneous types of post-verbal elements in Old English. In section 3, crosslinguistic examination is made to invalidate a logical correspondence between verb movement and morphological richness in verbal inflection. In section 4, empirical and theory-internal evidence is suggested indicating that finite verbs in Old English do not necessarily reach the highest functional head C in main clauses. In section 5, Conclusion and some alternatives are briefly mentioned.

2. Verb Movement within Subordinate Clauses of Old English

2.1. Adverbs and Verb Movement

According to Emonds' (1976) pioneering analysis, V-to-T movement can be confirmed in the relative order between finite verbs and sentence adverbs. Given the position of sentence adverbs is fixed between VP and T, finite verbs cannot precede them without overt movement to the head T. Consider the following examples from French and Modern English, both of which belong to indisputable head-initial languages.

- (3) a. (que) *Marie parle souvent le français*
 b. (que) **Marie souvent parle le français*
- (4) a. (that) **Mary speaks often French*
 b. (that) *Mary often speaks French*

The examples reveal that the adverb *souvent* in (3) should follow

the finite verb *parle* while the adverb *often* in (4) should precede the finite verb *speaks*. Thus, the contrast between (3) and (4) can be illuminated by the assumption that only French has verb movement to T across sentence adverbs.

On the other hand, sentence adverbs in presumably head-final languages always appear before finite verbs within subordinate clauses as shown in (5) from Dutch.³

- (5) a. dat Jan *waarschijnlijk* dat boek *gekocht*
 that Jan probably that book bought
 b. *dat Jan *gekocht* dat boek *waarschijnlijk*

The head-final analysis of Dutch presupposes that the adverb *waarschijnlijk* in (5) occupies the leftmost position of VP. If the adverb is supposed to occupy the rightmost position of VP, the derivation of (5a) requires extraposition of the DP *dat boek* as well as rightward V-to-T movement. In addition, an additional stipulation that extraposition cannot target TP is needed to block the derivation of (6).

- (6) *dat Jan *waarschijnlijk gekocht* dat boek

Sentence adverbs, therefore, provide no tangible evidence for the presence of V-to-T movement in head-final languages. Their positions should be fixed around the left periphery of VP with finite verbs always moving into the clause-final T.

The same issue can be raised against the head-final analysis of Old English. Let us first consider the distribution of negative adverbs, which have been believed to mark the left boundary of VP in many Germanic languages.⁴ Although *ne* is the most

³*Dat boek* in (5a) can be scrambled before the adverb *waarschijnlijk* as the following.

(i) dat Jan dat boek *waarschijnlijk gekocht*

⁴It is controversial whether negative elements project their own functional

frequent form to mark negation in Old English, it appears immediately before finite verbs and often coalesces into them in every type of clause (Mitchell, 1985:§1599). In contrast, *næfre* is more safely classified as a separate negative adverb, in a sense that its syntactic behavior does not depend on finite verbs. Textual evidence from Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* reveals conflicting patterns with respect to the distribution of *næfre* within subordinate clauses, which contradicts the head-final analysis of Old English. Along with the expected order in which *næfre* precedes finite verbs as in (7a), post-verbal *næfre* as shown in (7b) is attested in seven out of twenty seven occurrences.⁵

- (7) a. swa þæt hi *næfre* siððan þær gesewen *næron*
 (CH II, 32:109)
 so that they never afterwards there seen were
 b. se þe ne *bið* hire *næfre* ætbroden (CH II, 29:17)
 one that not is (to) her-dat never taken-away

The frequency of post-verbal *næfre* increases in conjunctive clauses, which are supposed to share the same ordering patterns with subordinate clauses (van Kemenade (1987), Davis (1997:67-99), Pintzuk (1999:224-227)). The adverb *næfre* occupies a post-verbal position in six out of sixteen occurrences as

projection as Haegeman & Zanuttini (1991) assumes. Even if their proposal is accepted, it has no significant influence on the argument made here: a negative adverb becomes a specifier of Neg(ative) projection whose head finite verbs can move through.

⁵Mitchell (1985:§1626) comments that *næfre* can appear even before nominative subjects within subordinate clauses as shown in (i) below.

- (i) þær ðær *næfre* ær ne becom nan ðing ðes gecyndes
 (CH II, 22:183-4)
 where never earlier not came-to-pass nothing of this kind

Given that the predicate *becuman* in (i) is unaccusative, it is unlikely that *næfre* is relevant to the V-2 pattern within a subordinate clause and occupies a specifier of CP. Presumably, it keeps a base position around *vP* with an empty pronominal subject in a specifier of TP.

exemplified in (8).

- (8) Ac seo lufu ne *ateorað næfre* (CH I, 18:121)
But the love not ceases never

It is therefore inevitable that the head-final analysis should resort to an idiosyncratic operation of rightward negative adverb movement for the post-verbal occurrences of *næfre* as in (7b) and (8). Otherwise, finite verbs, which should undergo obligatory movement into the clause-final T, cannot precede *næfre* within subordinate clauses.

VP-adverbs in Old English also show inconsistent distribution within subordinate clauses. Unlike Dutch and German counterparts, they can occupy both pre-verbal and post-verbal positions as exemplified below.

- (9) a. Ne forseah crist his geongan cempan þeah ðe he
lichamlice on heora slege andwerd nære (CH I, 5:93-4)
Not neglected Christ his young warriors though he
bodily in their slaughter present not-were
- b. ... þa ylcan wundru þe ða apostoli ða worhton
lichamlice (CH I, 21:163-4)
those same wonders that the apostles then performed
bodily

Two possible accounts can be considered for contrastive positions of VP-adverbs in Old English. First, Cinque (1999:28-30) suggests that a range of functional categories can be projected between VP and TP to host adverbial modifiers in their specifiers including the manner adverb *lichamlice* in (9). Second, single adverbs can be merged as an argument of a predicate even if they are not affected by the operation of movement (Chomsky, 1995:331). Under the head-final analysis, Chomsky's account

implies that the adverb *lichamlice* in (9) is merged in different directions: it is merged to the left in (9a) while to the right in (9b). Notice, however, that both aforementioned accounts cannot accommodate V-to-T movement in (9b). Once finite verbs undergo movement into the clause-final T, they invariably follow VP adverbs whose structural position should be below T. Post-verbal adverbs in Old English, therefore, testify that even the head-final analysis should sometimes permit finite verbs to remain within VP. Otherwise, the head-final analysis has to introduce a language-particular rightward operation to extrapose VP adverbs beyond finite verbs in the clause-final T.

2.2. Post-verbal Elements and Extraposition

Post-verbal elements within subordinate clauses of asymmetric V-2 languages are related to the fundamental issue whether a rightward operation of extraposition can be syntactically justified. With the absence of a distinctive morphosyntactic or semantic trigger, extraposition is more likely to be dependent on phonological or stylistic factors such as heaviness or balance. However, those factors still fail to explain extraposition of single adverbs in Old English as seen in (7b), (8), and (9b). The same argument can be made against post-verbal particles and personal pronouns within subordinate clauses as in (10).

- (10) a. buton ða lareowas screadian symle ða leahtras þurh
 heora lare *aweg* (CH II, 5:59-60)
 unless those teachers prune always those sins by
 their teaching away
- b. Swa swa min fæder sende *me* (CH I, 14: 46-7)
 Just as my father sent me

Proponents of the head-final analysis have frequently suggested that extraposition can be a legitimate and well-constrained

syntactic operation based on Case requirements.⁶⁾ For instance, Case requirements within VP are supposed to force clausal complements to appear in a post-verbal position in allegedly head-final languages as in (11) from Old English.

- (11) *ðonne hi gelyfað þæt we godas sind* (CH I, 31:142-3)
when they believe that we gods are

The head-final analysis assumes that the clausal complement in (11) is first merged to the left of the finite verb *gelyfað*. However, it has to move rightward to a non-Case marking position, due to its failure to receive Case. The idea comes from Stowell's (1981) Case Resistance Principle, according to which clausal arguments are ineligible for Case-marking.⁷⁾

Extraposition based on Case Resistance, nevertheless, has both empirical and theoretical weaknesses. First of all, it cannot predict post-verbal elements within subordinate clauses, except for clausal complements. On the other hand, it leaves the question unanswered why clausal complements cannot undergo extraposition in such head-final languages as Korean, Japanese, and Bengali. Beerman, Leblanc, and Riemsdijk (1997:1-6) summarize two traditional arguments against a syntactic operation of extraposition. First, some general principles for syntactic operations are inapplicable to extraposition. For example, the general theory of movement such as the ECP and

⁶Some efforts have been made to prove that a syntactic operation of extraposition contributes to semantic interpretation. Baltin (1987), for instance, argues that extraposition plays a crucial role to avoid regression problem in the interpretation of so-called Antecedent Contained Deletion Constructions as in *John kissed everyone that Sally did* [_{VP} *e*]. However, Hornstein (1994) and Fox (2000) suggest the minimalist alternatives of ACD constructions without introducing extraposition.

⁷Büring and Hartmann (1997) further refine Stowell's principle into the following generalization.

(i) Finite sentences may not be governed by V or I.

Subjacency is irrelevant to the Right Roof Constraint imposing an upward boundary on extraposition. Second, extraposition affects some syntactic elements which would otherwise remain unsusceptible to syntactic operations. Relative clauses are illustrative of the idiosyncrasy of extraposition, since they resist any other operation including topicalization and scrambling.

Extraction out of clausal complements offers another piece of evidence against extraposition. If clausal complements are right-adjoined to the clausal-head T (or TP) as a result of extraposition, they occupy a non-theta marked position and therefore should become a barrier against the extraction of every internal element. Old English, however, permits extraction out of clausal complements as in (12).⁸⁾

- (12) *þæra_i he sæde þæt he syxa sum ofsloge t_i syxtig on twam dagum* (Orosius, 15/5-6)
of-them he said that he of-six one killed sixty in two days
(he said that he killed sixty of them with five others in two days)

Even if prosodic features can be relevant to extraposition, they cannot be appropriately defined for the operation. Heaviness can be a candidate, in that clausal complements are invariably displaced rightward from their base positions under the head-final analysis. Nevertheless, noun phrases modified by clauses reveal inconsistency concerning extraposition, in spite of their heaviness as exemplified in (13).

- (13) a. ... *þæt heofenan rice wære gelic sumum hiredes ealdre se ðe ferde on ærnemerigen and wolde hyrian wyrhtan into*

⁸⁾The translation of *syxa sum* into *with five others* in (12) is from Whitelock (1967).

his wingeard (CH II, 5:3-6)

that kingdom of heaven was similar to-someone of
family's chiefs who went in dawn and wanted (to)
hire workers in his vineyard

b. ... þæt we urne lichaman þe gode is gehalgod on þam
halwendum fulluhte mid unþæslicum plegan 7 hileaste
gescyndan (CH I, 32:95-7)

that we our body that to-god is sanctified in the
sanctuary baptism with inappropriate game and folly
put to shame

2.3. Modal Complexes and Verb Raising

Ordering patterns of a modal complex undermine the postulation of extraposition in Old English. The head-final analysis assumes that a modal complex has the base order of [[Object V_{main}] V_{modal}]. It is furthermore argued that Verb Raising or Verb Projection Raising, both of which constitute subtypes of extraposition, enables infinitival main verbs and their objects to follow finite modal verbs within subordinate clauses (van Kemenade, 1987). Those operations represent a process of clause-union by which complements of infinitival verbs can move into a higher clause beyond their clausal boundary. Considering that they are originally motivated for the head-final analysis of verbal complexes in other West Germanic languages such as Dutch and West Flemish, Verb Raising and Verb Projection Raising seem less vulnerable than extraposition of phonologically light elements.

If we allow free arrangements between modal verbs, infinitival main verbs, and complements of main verbs, six ordering patterns can be attained within subordinate clauses. Pintzuk (1999:25), however, indicates that only five out of six possible orderings are attested from her corpora of Old English. Complements of infinitival main verbs can intervene between

two neighboring verbs only when modal verbs precede infinitival main verbs. The list (14) summarizes ordering patterns in a modal complex and shows how they are analyzed under the head-final assumption (Roberts, 1997:416).⁹

- (14) a. S V_{main} V_{modal} O: DP-extrapolation
 gif ðu buton geleafan æt us leornian wylt ða halgan
 gerynu ðurh heardum swinglum (CH II, 18:81-2)
 if you without belief from us (to) learn want those
 holy secrets through hardchastisement
- b. S O V_{modal} V_{main} : Verb Raising
 gif we us selfe nellað fordon (CH I, 19:181)
 if we ourselves not-wanted (to) destroy
- c. S V_{modal} O V_{main} : Verb Projection Raising
 þæt he wolde manna bearn on þissere tide geneosian
 (CH I, 22:197-8)
 that he wanted man's offspring in this time (to) visit
- d. S O V_{main} V_{modal} : Underlying Structure
 hwæþer we on reste oððe on wite þone gemenelican
 dom andbidan sceolon (CH I, 40:185-6)
 whether we in rest or in punishment the common
 judgement expect should
- e. S V_{modal} V_{main} O : Verb Raising & DP-extrapolation
 þ fela wytegan 7 ryhtwise men woldon geseon
 cristes tocyme (CH I, 9:38-9)
 that many prophets and wise men wanted (to) see
 Christ's advent
- f. *S V_{main} O V_{modal}

According to the list, DP-extrapolation out of an infinitival clause is pertinent to the ordering pattern of both (14a) and (14e). Consequently, Old English becomes the only one among

⁹The distribution of PPs is disregarded here.

presumably head-final Germanic languages that permits a complement of an infinitival verb to undergo extraposition. It is, however, evident that Verb Raising, that is, extraposition of an infinitival clause, cannot be a prerequisite for extraposition of a complement of an infinitival verb. In (14a), the complement *ða halgan gerynu* moves beyond the finite modal verb *wylt* without resort to Verb Raising. In other words, transparency between modal and infinitival clauses can be guaranteed in Old English without Verb Raising or Verb Projection Raising, which undermines the assumption that clause-union motivates extraposition of an infinitival clause. Moreover, the absence of the ordering pattern (14f) forces the head-final analysis to employ an ad-hoc constraint that only a higher clause should be a landing site for a complement of an infinitival verb. Otherwise, extraposition into an infinitival T as in (14f) cannot be ruled out.¹⁰⁾

2.4. Unaccusative Predicates and V-2 in Subordinate Clauses

The assumption that Old English is an asymmetric V-2 language predicts that nominative subjects should always occupy a pre-verbal position within subordinate clauses. On the other hand, they are supposed to appear in a post-verbal position within main clauses whenever a non-subject topic or a *wh*-phrase introduces a clause. The contrast can be easily confirmed in *wh*-questions as exemplified below.

¹⁰Pintzuk (1999:27-28) proposes that infinitival main verbs in a modal complex should have a status of VP rather than TP. She furthermore assumes that the landing site of extraposition should be limited to TP. In (14f), the complement of the infinitival main verb cannot undergo extraposition, since the operation illegitimately targets an infinitival clause, that is, VP. However, she gives no accounts of why infinitival clauses should be VPs and what is responsible for the constraint on the landing site of extraposition.

- (15) a. *Ɗæra assena hlaford axode hwi hi untigdon his assan*
(CH I, 14:69)
The lord of asses asked why they untied his asses
- b. *hwi stande ge þus starigende wið heofenas weard*
(CH I, 21:21-2)
why stand you thus staring towards heaven

Yet, a small group of predicates can take post-verbal nominative arguments within subordinate clauses as shown in (16).

- (16) a. *gif him bið oftogen his bigleofa* (CH I, 19:113)
if him-dat is withdrawn his food-nom
- b. *þæt him ne gelimpe se egeslica cwyrde*
(CH II, 34:122-3)
that him-dat not befall the terrifying discourse-nom

It should be noticed that in spite of nominative Case markings, neither of the post-verbal arguments in (16) has the thematic role of agent. Those predicates sometimes take no nominative argument at all as shown in the examples below.¹¹⁾

- (17) a. *Nu cwyrþ se trahtnere þæt rihtlice is gecweden þæt he sæte æfter his upstige* (CH I, 21:227-8)
Now says the interpreter that truly is said that he sat after his ascension
- b. *7 nyste hu hyre were gelumpen wæs* (CH I, 22:96)
and not-knew how (to) her husband-dat befallen had

Van Kemenade (1997:334-8) therefore defines as unaccusatives a group of predicates that can have post-verbal nominative arguments within subordinate clauses.

¹¹*Wæs* in (17b) is used to represent perfect rather than passive.

Now consider structural positions appropriate for post-verbal nominative arguments in unaccusative constructions. According to the asymmetric V-2 analysis, the application of extraposition seems inevitable to place nominative arguments after finite verbs. However, all the other Germanic languages that have been traditionally considered head-final cannot permit nominative arguments to appear in post-verbal positions within subordinate clauses. Head-initial languages, on the other hand, allows nominative arguments in some unaccusative constructions to occupy post-verbal positions as the following example from Danish shows.¹²⁾

- (18) (at) der ventes *mange mennesker* (Allan et al. (1995:322))
that there are-waited many people

In consideration of the fact that Danish has no V-to-T movement within subordinate clauses (Roberts (1993), Vikner (1995)), the post-verbal nominative argument in (18) represents its base position as an internal argument in unaccusative constructions. The analysis also agrees with the traditional assumption of head parameters that head-initial languages including Danish merge an internal argument into a post-verbal position while head-final languages into a pre-verbal one. Consequently, the head-final hypothesis of Old English should admit exceptions to the direction of merge to explain post-verbal nominative arguments in unaccusative predicates, which inevitably leads to the denial of head parameters. Otherwise, it needs a language-specific operation to extrapose nominative arguments beyond unaccusative predicates into the clause-final T.

¹²Inflectional ending *-s* in *ventes* represents so-called s-passive in Mainland Scandinavian languages.

3. Conceptual Issues Against Obligatory V-to-T Movement in Old English

In spite of the aforementioned empirical problems, obligatory V-to-T movement in Old English has been argued to get justification from rich verbal inflections. Since Roberts (1985), many proposals have been made to determine to what extent verbal paradigms should be inflected to force an overt operation on finite verbs. It is, however, still obscure whether they have made a substantial success or even whether verbal inflections can motivate overt V-to-T movement. Let us first investigate Faroese, which has three distinctive endings in present indicative; *i* for 1st singular, *ir* for 2nd/3rd singular, and *a* for plural. French also has the same number of verbal endings in present indicative; *e/es/ent* for 1st and 3rd singular/2nd singular/3rd plural, *ons* for 1st plural, and *ez* for 2nd plural.¹³ Although both languages have the same number of distinctive endings for present indicative, Faroese has no overt movement for finite verbs as shown in (19) where the negative adverb *ikki* marks the boundary of VP (Vikner, 1995:148).

- (19) a. ... (at) dreingirnir als ikki *voru* osamdir
 that boys-the at-all not were disagreed
 b. *... (at) dreingirnir *voru* als ikki osamdir

Concerning the contrast between Faroese and French, Vikner (1997:200) suggests that overt V-to-T movement can happen as long as person morphology is distinctive in all tenses. Both Faroese and French have distinctive person endings in present indicative, but only the latter can distinguish person in past

¹³Pronunciation rather than spelling is the criterion here to count the number of distinctive endings (Vikner, 1997:192). Since the endings *e*, *es*, and *ent* have the same pronunciation, French has three distinctive endings in present indicative.

indicative. French has three different endings (*ais/ ait/ aient* for 1st and 2nd singular /3rd singular /3rd plural, *ons* for 1st plural, and *ez* for 2nd plural) while Faroese has two endings without person distinction (*i* for singular and *u* for plural).¹⁴

It should be noticed that the verbal inflectional paradigms of Faroese are quite similar to those of Modern Dutch as listed in (20) (Vikner, 1997:197).

(20)	Faroese	Modern Dutch	
	Infinitive	hoyra (hear)	horen (hear)
	Present Indicative		
	1st sing.	Eg hoyr-i	ik hoor
	2nd sing.	tu hoyr-ir	je hoor-t
	3rd sing.	hann hoyr-ir	hij hoor-t
	1st plur.	vit hoyr-a	we hor-en
	2nd plur.	tit hoyr-a	ju hor-en
	3rd plur.	tey hoyr-a	ze hor-en
	Past Indicative		
	1st sing.	Eg hoyr-d-i	ik hoor-d-e
	2nd sing.	tu hoyr-d-i	je hoor-d-e
	3rd sing.	hann hoyr-d-i	hij hoor-d-e
	1st plur.	vit hoyr-d-u	we hoor-d-en
	2nd plur.	tit hoyr-d-u	ju hoor-d-en
	3rd plur.	tey hoyr-d-u	ze hoor-d-en

The table shows that both languages have the same number of verbal distinctions in every tense and make no person distinction in past indicative. Vikner's suggestion therefore predicts that Modern Dutch as well as Faroese should dispense with overt

¹⁴Vikner furthermore argues that his suggestion overcomes the shortcomings of both Roberts' (1993) idea depending on distinctive number morphology and Rohrbacher's (1994) definition requiring distinctive 1st and 2nd person morphology at least in one tense. However, he admits that his accounts as well as others' are not applicable to Yiddish in which past tense is exclusively marked by auxiliaries rather than by inflectional endings.

V-to-T movement, which contradicts the traditional asymmetric V-2 analysis of Modern Dutch.

Richness in verbal inflections explains the contrast between indisputable VO languages such as French and Faroese but does not work well for presumably head-final languages (Vikner, 1997:191-2). In contrast with Modern Dutch, some head-final languages exhibit person distinction in both present and past indicative. Modern Frisian has *e* for 1st and 3rd singular and *est* for 2nd singular in past indicative. Modern German also has *e* for 1st and 3rd singular, *est* for 2nd singular, *en* for 1st and 3rd plural, and *et* for 2nd plural in past indicative. However, no fundamental differences are observed in the position of finite verbs between Modern Dutch, Modern German, and Modern Frisian. Finite verbs in those languages regularly occupy a clause-final position within subordinate clauses. In other words, those languages always have string-vacuous V-to-T movement under the head-final hypothesis, irrespective of the number of distinctive endings or the presence of person distinction in every tense.

Old English offers another piece of evidence that inflectional richness cannot motivate overt V-to-T movement in presumably head-final languages. In contrast with Modern Dutch, Old English shows person distinction in both present and past indicative as exemplified below by the inflectional paradigms of the verb *hieran* (hear).

(21)	Present Indicative	Past Indicative
1st sing.	ic hier-e	ic hier-d-e
2nd sing.	þu hier-st	þu hier-d-est
3rd sing.	he hier-þ	he hier-d-e
1st plur.	we hier-aþ	we hier-d-on
2nd plur.	ge hier-aþ	ge hier-d-on
3rd plur.	hi hier-aþ	hi hier-d-on

The asymmetric V-2 analysis should ignore their differences in the richness of verbal morphology in order to maintain the assumption that both Old English and Modern Dutch share overt verb movement to a clause-final T.

Even if V-to-T movement in Modern Dutch can be attributed to the vestige of more complex verbal morphology in an earlier period, it is still arguable whether such a string-vacuous operation can be sustainable under the minimalist framework. Chomsky (1995:294) assumes that all syntactic operations should be associated with the requirement of interpretation at the interface levels PF and LF and proposes the economy condition as the following.¹⁵⁾

- (22) α enters the numeration only if it has an effect on output.

Under the earlier version of the minimalist framework, overt verb movement is understood as a feature checking or deletion process triggered by a strong verbal feature in T (Chomsky, 1995:196).¹⁶⁾ The operation deletes the strong feature and produces a visible effect at PF, that is, the rearrangement of the linear position of a verb. If T has a weak verbal feature, the principle of economy demands that the operation should be covert without resort to a costly option of overt movement.

¹⁵Fox (2000:75) proposes a slightly different condition as the following.

(i) Word Order Economy

Overt optional operations cannot be string-vacuous (i.e., they must reverse the relative order of the two—perhaps phonologically overt—expressions).

Yet, in his footnote 66, he admits the possibility that the condition (i) restricts certain instances of obligatory movement.

¹⁶Following Chomsky's (1995) later version of the minimalist framework, a feature responsible for verb movement becomes the [+Affix] feature. However, the change of a feature has no significant effect on the argument against string-vacuous operations.

Suppose that α is a strong verbal feature in T to force obligatory V-to-T movement in head-final languages. The condition (22) requires that the insertion of α should contribute to interpretation either at PF or at LF. Yet, the operation to delete α , that is, V-to-T movement, is always string-vacuous and has no effect at PF. Neither is the operation relevant to semantic interpretation at LF. Consequently, string-vacuous V-to-T movement is equivalent to the covert insertion of an overt feature, which is intolerable in terms of the economy condition under the minimalist framework.

The arguments made in this section demonstrate that verbal inflections cannot provide conceptual justification for obligatory V-to-T movement in presumably head-final languages. In terms of the richness of verbal paradigms, there exists a marked contrast between Modern Dutch and Old English. The asymmetric CP-V2 hypothesis, however, disregards their disparity and assumes obligatory V-to-T movement for both languages. Even if some stipulation is made to introduce V-to-T movement irrespective of verbal inflections, the operation is always string-vacuous in head-final languages and violates the economy condition requiring that any operation should have some effect at the interfaces.

4. Verb Movement in Main Clauses of Old English

4.1. V-1 Constructions in Old English

Old English has several constructions in which finite verbs occupy a sentence-initial position as shown below.

(23) a. *yes/no* question

Wenst þu þ he nyste hwæt se blinda wolde?

(CH I, 10:98-9)

believe you that he not-knows what the blind wanted

b. imperatives

Beoð gemyndige hwæt seo sylfe soðfæstnyss on ðam halgum godspelle behet (CH I, 3:134-5)

Be mindful what the same truth in the holy gospell promised

c. V1 declaratives

Wearð þa stephanus ben fram gode gehyrd 7 saulus wearð alysed (CH I, 3:110-111)

Became then Stephans prayer by God heard and Saul became redeemed

d. condition

Gewite þ ungesewenlice ut þonne fylð adune þ gesewenlice (CH I, 10:123-4)

(If) depart the invisible (soul) out then falls down the visible (body)

Each V-1 construction in (23) is generally assumed to carry some semantic force or mood that cannot be found in plain declarative sentences.

According to Sigurðsson (1990:45), V-1 declaratives exemplified in (23c) are prompted by discourse cohesion involving such factors as presupposition, maintained situation, consequence, explanation, and cause.¹⁷⁾ His idea can be confirmed in the context where (23c) appears.

- (24) stephanus soðlice gebigedum cneowum drihten bæd þ he saulum alyse: *Wearð* þa stephanus ben fram gode gehyrd 7 saulus wearð alysed (CH I, 3:109-111)
Stephan truly (with) bending knees (to) the Lord prayed that he Saul redeem: Became then Stephans prayer by God heard and Saul became redeemed

¹⁷Sigurðsson (1990:62) indicates that V-1 declaratives are largely obsolete in most Germanic languages except for Icelandic and Yiddish.

In (24), the sentence beginning with the finite verb *wearð* states the consequence caused by the preceding sentence, that is, Stephan's praying. All the V-1 constructions in (23) therefore receive a unified account that displacement of finite verbs into a sentence-initial position has an underlying semantic or functional motivation.

4.2. Arguments Against Obligatory Verb Movement to C

In comparison with V-1 constructions, it is harder to determine the trigger for verb movement to the second position. The asymmetric CP-V2 analysis argues that finite verbs in main clauses move not for topicalization but for independent syntactic reasons and supposes that their landing site should be the functional head C, irrespective of preceding elements. Many attempts have been made to illuminate the nature of C attracting finite verbs, even if they all agree that the lexicalization of C contributes to the Case marking of nominative subjects through government in V-2 languages.

It is however evident that nominative Case marking cannot be a sole trigger for verb movement to the functional head C in V-2 languages. First, verb movement is not a universal condition for nominative Case marking in main clauses. Modern English, for instance, can have subjects Case marked or checked without overt verb movement. Second, oblique noun phrases and expletive subjects after finite verbs as in (25) weaken the assumption based on nominative Case marking.

- (25) a. Ða þeahhwæðere ofþuhte þam ælmihtigum gode ealles
 manncynnes yrmða (CH I, 13:10-11)
 Then however caused-regret (to) almighty God-dat all
 mankind's miseries
- b. gif we teoðiað þas gearlican dagas þonne beoð þær

six 7 þrittig teoðincgdagas (CH I, 11:191-2)
 if we tithe those yearly days then are there
 six and thirty (thirty six) tithing-days

As long as the requirement of nominative Case marking forces verb movement to C, it is unlikely that *ofþuhte* in (25a) and *beoð* in (25b) undergo movement for the Case marking of *þam ælmihtigum gode* in (25a) and *þær* in (25b). The minimalist framework also denies the role of government for Case relations between nominative subjects and verbs. The introduction of government for Case relations implies that the CP-V2 analysis adopts two different strategies for nominative Case marking: spec-head agreement for non V-2 languages and government by C for V-2 languages. Without indisputable evidence, bifurcation of Case marking inevitably violates methodological economy which requires as few assumptions as possible.

The assumption seems more promising that some feature in C attracts finite verbs in V-2 languages. Possible candidates, inter alia, include the finiteness feature [+F] (Platzack, 1995), dominant functional headness (Hulk & van Kemenade, 1995), tense/agreement features (Tomaselli, 1995), and the predication feature [+I] (Rizzi, 1996).¹⁸ In spite of the differences in details, all the above proposals agree that V-2 languages have verb movement for the lexical realization of those features in C. Non V-2 languages, on the other hand, are assumed to have a different locus of those features. In place of C, I becomes the host of the features such as finiteness, dominant functional headness, tense/agreement, and predication.

Major arguments for the aforementioned features are based on nominative Case marking and the distribution of an empty expletive. Since nominative Case marking through government cannot be held any longer, let us now examine whether empty

¹⁸See Viker (1995:51-64) for a comprehensive review of those features.

expletives in V-2 languages as shown below support the introduction of those features in C.¹⁹)

- (26) a. *Það* hefur komið strákur: Icelandic
 (**pro* hefur komið strákur)
 There has come a-boy
- b. Í gær hefur *pro* komið stákur
 (*Í gær hefur *það* komið stákur)
 Yesterday has come a-boy
- (27) a. *Es* ist ein Junge gekommen: German
 (**pro* ist ein Junge gekommen)
 There is a boy come
- b. Gestern ist *pro* ein Junge gekommen
 (*Gestern ist *es* ein Junge gekommen)
 Yesterday is a boy come

The contrast observed in (26) and (27) demonstrates that only overt expletives (*það* in Icelandic and *es* in German) can precede finite verbs in main clauses. If the assumption is to be maintained that the functional head C carrying one of those features attracts a finite verb for lexicalization and licenses an empty expletive, it needs an extra stipulation that lexical expletives should undergo movement into a specifier of CP, that is, topicalization in spite of the fact that they are not qualified to become a topic. Empty expletives, on the other hand, should remain in a specifier of TP to be licensed by a lexicalized C. Moreover, the assumption cannot be applied to Old English, where lexical as well as empty expletives can appear after finite verbs in main clauses as in (28)((28a)=(25b)).

¹⁹The examples in (26) and (27) are from Schwartz & Vikner (1996:20). Chomsky (1995:288-9) argue that a phonological constraint rather than a syntactic operation is responsible for the complementary distribution between lexical and non-lexical expletives in V-2 languages.

- (28) a. gif we teoðiað þas gearlican dagas þonne beoð þær six
 7 þrittig teoðincgdagas (CH I, 11:191-2)
 if we tithe those yearly days then are there thirty six
 tithing-days
- b. þa wearð *pro* gesewen niwe steorra (CH I, 15:174)
 then became seen (a) new star

The post-verbal expletive *þær* in (28a) contracts the assumption that lexical expletives in V-2 languages appear in a specifier of CP.

In terms of the minimalist framework, a syntactic operation of verb movement to C implies the presence of some feature in C to be checked or deleted during computation. As seen in 4.1, verb movement to C in V-1 constructions is associated with a proper interpretation of a clause. In contrast, obligatory verb movement to C in V-2 constructions seems irrelevant to semantic interpretation and needs an independent morphosyntactic trigger, since clause-initial topics and *wh*-phrases are enough to provide information on the semantic force or mood of a clause. Haegemann (1990) indeed suggests that evidence for a morphosyntactic trigger can be confirmed in some V-2 languages where a lexical complementizer agrees with a nominative subject and a finite verb as exemplified below.

- (29) dan-n-k ik kom-(e)n (West Flemish)
 that-1st sing.-subject clitic I com-1st sing.

The complementizer *dan* and the finite verb *kom* in (29) share the inflectional marker *-n* for person and number agreement.

The assumption is nevertheless arguable that agreement between complementizers and finite verbs justifies overt verb movement to C in V-2 languages. Under the minimalist framework, syntactically significant agreement relation is asymmetric and irreflexive: a verb agrees with its argument, not

vice versa (Chomsky, 2000). As far as subject-verb agreement in nominative-accusative languages is concerned, the functional head T is supposed to have an uninterpretable feature of agreement while nominative subjects have an uninterpretable feature of Case. Raising of a nominative subject to a specifier of TP is enough to check all the features associated with subject-verb agreement. Therefore, the complementizer in (29) has no compelling reason to override T in agreement with the subject.²⁰⁾

4.3. Verb Movement and Topicalization in Old English

The argument against obligatory verb movement to C receives further support from topicalization. Once the functional head invariably becomes the final landing site of finite verbs in main clauses, all the elements preceding finite verbs are assumed to reach a structural position higher than C. The stipulation is consequently required that a sentence-initial subject, whether pronominal or full NP, undergoes topicalization to appear in a specifier of CP. However, the stipulation still fails to explain the presence of sentence-initial expletive elements as exemplified below.

- (30) a. expletive *Þær*
Þær næs nan geþafung for þan þe (CH I, 9:148).
 There not-was no consent because
- b. quasi-expletive *hit*
Hit gelamp ða Þæt ða apostoli (CH II, 33:213)
 It happened then that the apostles
- c. empty expletive *pro*
pro bið on bigspellum gesæd Þæt (CH II, 6:17)
 is in fables said that

²⁰See Zwart (1993:318-322) for an extensive discussion of complementizer agreement under the minimalist framework. He considers complementizer agreement as a morphological reflex of V-to-C movement rather than its trigger.

As long as obligatory verb movement is maintained, all the expletive elements in (30) should occupy a specifier of CP, in spite of the fact that they lack a semantic content and cannot be susceptible to topicalization.

Textual evidence also shows that the position of finite verbs is inconsistent in topic-initial sentences. Unlike other V-2 languages, Old English sometimes permits a string of a topic and a subject to precede a finite verb in main clauses. Concerning the violation of the V-2 constraint in topicalization, the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis has insisted that cliticization should be responsible for non V-2 patterns in Old English (van Kemenade (1987), Kiparsky (1995), Fischer et al. (2000), *inter alia*), arguing that only clitic elements such as personal pronouns and a small group of adverbs can intervene between topics and finite verbs in main clauses. In fact, the linear order between pronominal subjects and finite verbs can vary as exemplified in (31).

- (31) a. For ðyssere twynunge *nolde we* hreppan his ðrowunge
(CH II, 34:15-6)
Because of this ambiguity not-wanted we (to) touch his suffering
- b. Sumne dæl þises andgites *we trahtnodon* hwene ær
(CH II, 22:165-6)
Some part (of)-this meaning we interpreted somewhat previously

The personal pronoun *we* follows the finite verb *nolde* in (31a) while it precedes the finite verb *trahtnodon* in (31b). The same fluctuation is observed when a full NP subject follows a topic in main clauses as shown below.

- (32) a. *ƿis tacn worhte se hælend ærest on his menniscnyse*
 (CH II, 4:22-3)
 this token made the Savior first in his incarnation
- b. *ƿa lufe ure scyppend us gewutelode ƿurh hine sylfne*
 (CH I, 35:144-5)
 the love our Creator us showed through him self

The examples in (31) and (32) demonstrate that two ordering patterns co-exist for topicalization in Old English, irrespective of the status of subjects: the one with subject-verb inversion ((31a), (32a)) and the other without it ((31b), (32b)). In other words, the discrepancy in the final landing sites of finite verbs produces the variation in the ordering patterns of topic-initial sentences.²¹ Finite verbs reach the highest functional head C in (31a) and (32a) while their movement is restricted to a lower functional head in (31b) and (32b).²² All in all, the arguments suggested in section 4 indicate that the functional head C cannot be a canonical position for Old English finite verbs in main clauses, contrary to the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis.

²¹As an alternative, we can consider the CP-layer hypothesis (Culicover (1991), Puskas (1997)), according to which an operator and a non-operator are located within a different functional projection and only the former induces subject-aux inversion. However, the operatorhood-based account cannot be applied here for the following reasons. First, no evidence can be confirmed to functionally distinguish the sentence-initial elements in (31) and (32), except for their ordering patterns. Second, even if the CP-layer hypothesis is adopted, the final landing site of the finite verbs cannot be uniform (the highest functional head in (31a) and (32a) and a lower functional head in (31b) and (32b)).

²²Evidence against obligatory T-to-C movement in Old English main clauses is also attested in the following example where the finite verb appears in a clause-final position.

- (i) *Soðlice min lareow crist sumne cniht ðe gewilnode ƿæ ecan lifes*
pisum wordum lærde (CH I, 4:58-9)
 truly my teacher Christ some youth who wished the eternal life
 (with) these words taught

5. Conclusion

Both empirical and conceptual evidence in this paper argues against the traditional assumption that Old English is an asymmetric V-2 language with verb movement to a clause-final T in subordinate clauses and subsequent movement to C in main clauses. The asymmetric CP-V2 analysis fails to explain diverse surface positions of finite verbs as well as the optionality of V-to-T and T-to-C movement. The analysis moreover depends on syntactically unmotivated operations or generalizations to justify the obligatoriness of V-to-T and T-to-C movement and the head-final structure of VP and TP. To sum up, the distribution of Old English finite verbs needs an alternative analysis to receive a proper explanation.

Possible candidates to replace the asymmetric CP-V2 analysis include the double base hypothesis (Pintzuk (1999), Kroch & Talyor (1997)) and the uniform head-initial analysis of Old English (Roberts (1997), Yoon (2002)). The double base hypothesis maintains that except for *wh*-movement and negative inversion, Old English finite verbs always move into T whose projection can be either head-initial or head-final in Old English. Syntactically light elements within subordinate clauses, for instance, result from the head-initial VP/TP rather than extraposition. The double base hypothesis however presupposes that a canonical position for topics is a specifier of TP and needs the controversial stipulation that subjects invariably remain with VP when they do not appear in a sentence-initial position. Furthermore, the issues concerning language acquisition remain unresolved; how a native speaker of Old English could learn that unlike other projections, VP and TP have double base structure (head-initial or head-final) in Old English.

In contrast, the uniform head-initial analysis argues that all the projections in Old English are head-initial. Finite verbs undergo

obligatory movement into the highest functional head C in *wh*-movement, negative inversion, and V-1 constructions within main clauses. With regard to topicalization, the analysis assumes that finite verbs optionally move into C. Optionality of verb movement to C reflects the transitional property of Old English, in that some instances of topicalization in Old English already dispense with accompanying verb movement to C and pave the way for topicalization in Modern English. Non-operatorhood of topics is possibly responsible for the optionality of verb movement to C and its eventual loss.

Besides the aforementioned constructions involving verb movement to C, lack of a native speaker's intuition and paucity of crucial evidence make it difficult to determine whether Old English finite verbs move into T or not. Under the uniform head-initial analysis, a pre-verbal complement results from leftward movement into a specifier of *vP* and testifies that its predicate remains within *vP*. Indisputable evidence for verb movement to T in Old English is confirmed in the occurrences where a finite verb precedes an immovable adverb marking the boundary of *vP* such as the negative adverb *næfre*.²³⁾ As far as extant Old English corpus are concerned, those occurrences are restricted to *beon* and some unaccusative predicates. The uniform head-initial analysis therefore yields the conclusion that verb movement to T in Old English is quite similar to Modern English counterpart since the predicates whose semantic contents are relatively light are only susceptible to the operation.

²³However, the explanation of the simple (S)-V-O pattern can be complicated, since the operation to move a complement into a specifier of *vP* is optional in Scandinavian languages as well as in Old English. Three possibilities can be considered here; (i) Object Shift and V-to-T movement, (ii) no movement at all beyond *vP*, and (iii) V-to-T movement only.

References

- Allan, R., P. Holmes, and T. L. Nielsen. 1995. *Danish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Baltin, M. 1987. Do antecedent-contained deletions exist? *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 537-577.
- Beerman, D., D. LeBlanc, and H. van. Riemsdijk, eds. 1997. *Rightward Movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Besten, H. den. 1989. *Studies in West Germanic Syntax*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Büring, D. and K. Hartmann. 1997. The Kayne munity. In D. Beerman, D. LeBlanc, and H. van. Riemsdijk, eds., *Rightward Movement*, 59-80. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, eds., *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89-148. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Culicover, P. W. 1991. Topicalization, inversion, and complementizers in English. *OST Working Papers*. University of Utrecht.
- Davis, G. 1997. *The Word-Order of Ælfric*. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: Edwin Mellen.
- Emonds, J. E. 1976. *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax*. New York/London: Academic Press.
- Fox, D. 2000. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Fischer, O., A. van Kemenade, W. Koopman, and W. van der Wurff. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haegeman, L. 1990. Subject pronouns and subject clitics in West-Flemish. *The Linguistic Review* 7, 333-363.
- Haegeman, L. and R. Zanuttini. 1991. Negative heads and the Neg criterion. *The Linguistic Review* 8, 233-51.
- Hornstein, N. 1994. One cheer for Minimalism: The case of antecedent contained deletion. Ms., University of Maryland.
- Hróarsdóttir, Þ. 2000. Interacting movements in the history of Icelandic. In S. Pintzuk, G. Tsoulas, and A. Warner, eds., *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*, 296-321. Oxford University Press.
- Hulk, A. and A. van Kemenade. 1995. Verb second, pro-drop, functional projections and language change. In A. Battye and I. Roberts, eds., *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 227-256. Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, R. S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The

MIT Press.

- Kemenade, A. van. 1987. *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kemenade, A. van. 1997. V2 and embedded topicalization in Old and Middle English. In A. van. Kemenade and N. Vincent, eds., *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, 326-352. Cambridge University Press.
- Kiparsky, P. 1995. Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax. In A. Battye and I. Roberts, eds., *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 140-169. Oxford University Press.
- Koopman, W. 1998. Inversion after single and multiple topic in Old English. In J. Frisiak and M. Krygier, eds., *Advances in English Historical linguistics*, 135-150. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kroch, A. and A. Taylor. 1997. Verb movement in Old and Middle English: Dialect variation and language contact. In A. van. Kemenade and N. Vincent, eds., *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, 297-325. Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, B. 1985. *Old English Syntax*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Pintzuk, S. 1999. *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*. New York: Garland.
- Platzack, C. 1995. The loss of verb second in English and French. In A. Battye and I. Roberts, eds., *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 200-226. Oxford University Press.
- Pukas, G. 1997. Focus and CP domain. In L. Haegeman, ed., *The New Comparative Syntax*, 145-164. London/New York: Longman.
- Rizzi, L. 1996. Residual verb second and the Wh-criterion. In A. Belletti and L. Rizzi, eds., *Parameters and Functional Heads: Essays in Comparative Syntax*, 63-90. Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, I. 1985. Agreement parameters and the development of English modal auxiliaries. *Natural languages and linguistic theory*. *Natural Languages and Linguistic Theory* 3, 21-58.
- Roberts, I. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: A Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, I. 1997. Directionality and Word Order Change in the History of English. In A. van. Kemenade and N. Vincent, eds., *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, 397-426. Cambridge University Press.
- Rohrbacher, B. 1994. The Germanic languages and the full paradigm: A theory of V to I raising. Doctoral Dissertation. Umass.
- Schwartz, B. D. and S. Vikner. 1996. The verb always leaves IP in V2 clauses. In A. Belletti and L. Rizzi, eds., *Parameters and Functional Heads: Essays in Comparative Syntax*, 11-62. Oxford University Press.
- Sigurðsson, H. A. 1990. V1 declaratives and verb raising in Icelandic. In J. Maling and A. Zaenen, eds., *Syntax and Semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax*, 41-70. San Diego: Academic Press.

- Stowell, T. 1981. Origins of phrase structure. Doctoral Dissertation. MIT.
- Tomaselli, A. 1995. Cases of verb third in Old High German. In A. Battye and I. Roberts, eds., *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 345-369. Oxford University Press.
- Vikner, S. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford University Press.
- Vikner, S. 1997. V⁰-to-I⁰ movement and inflection for person in all tenses. In L. Haegeman, ed., *The New Comparative Syntax*, 189-213. London/New York: Longman.
- Whitelock, D., ed. 1967. *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader: In Prose and Verse*, 5th ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Yoon, H-C. 2002. Word order and structure of Old English: With special reference to Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*. Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Edinburgh.
- Zwart, C. J-W. 1993. Verb movement and complementizer agreement. MIT Working Papers 18, 296-341.

Hee-Cheol Yoon
Department of English Language and Literature
Duksung Women's University
419 Ssangmun-dong, Dobong-gu
Seoul, 132-714, Korea
Phone: 02) 901-8197
E-mail: hcyoon@duksung.ac.kr

received: February 7, 2004
accepted: May 27, 2004