Verb Raisers, Verb Second and Holmberg's Generalization

The standard (symmetric) analysis of verb second (V2) (cf. e.g. Holmberg and Platzack 1995) is that the finite verb (Vf) head-moves to the highest functional projection in the clause, CP. Then some other constituent, for instance the subject or an adverbial, must move to the specifier of that same projection. These two movement steps, in addition to a general ban on adjunction to CP, ensure that Vf will always end up in the second position of the clause. The purpose of the present work is twofold: first, to give empirical evidence from Mainland Scandinavian that V2, in fact, cannot involve head-movement, but rather results from movement of a phrasal category; secondly, an XP-movement account will be developed that, among other things, derives Holmberg's Generalization (cf. Holmberg 1997) for Scandinavian argument shift and cross-Germanic variation concerning embedded V2 orders under 'bridge verbs'.

The problematic data for the head-movement account involve examples like the following, where a focus particle can, but need not precede the finite verb (cf. Egerland 1998).

()   (1)   Jeg bare   <u>så'n</u>   ikke.
()   I   only saw him not
()   (2)   Jeg   <u>så'n</u>   bare ikke.
()   I   saw him only not

In (1), the focus is on the verb, or the rest of the clause, but crucially not on the subject, so the particle and the subject cannot plausibly be taken as a constituent. It will also be demonstrated that the focus particle cannot be a clitic on the finite verb (contra Egerland, *op.cit.*); that the verb cannot be *in situ* (it must precede the negation); and that the weak pronoun *'n* is not a clitic on the verb. Finally, the contrast between examples like (3-4) and those in (1-2) shows that the finite verb and the pronoun is a constituent.

()   (3)   *Jeg <u>'n</u> bare <u>så</u> ikke.
()   'I him/it just saw not'
()   (4)   *Jeg <u>så</u> bare <u>'n</u> ikke
()   'I saw just him/it not'

The proposed analysis will seek to combine two independent strands of research on the class of auxiliaries referred to variously as 'restructuring verbs' or 'verb raisers' (henceforth 'VR'), namely that of Cinque (1998a,b) and that of Koopman and Szabolcsi (forthcoming). All of sentential adverbials, verbal affixes and auxiliaries are treated as instances of VR. Therefore, we are lead to expect that these kinds of elements should enter into the same basic ordering patterns within and across languages. In fact, this expectation is fulfilled, as all of these categories enter into 'mirror-ordering' patterns within and across languages (Barbiers 1995, Cinque 1999, Koopman and Szabolcsi *ibid.*). This move allows us to simplify both Cinque's and Koopman and Szabolcsi's theories while maintaining their advantages. Each VR comes with the following structure:

()   (5) $[_c [_{lc} [_{ld} [_{pred} \text{VR} (c_2)]]]]$

where 'c_2' is the projection of a VR_2, the complement of VR in (5). A pred attracts the pred of its complement. This can take place, either by pied-piping the entire complement c, or by extraction of the embedded pred. DP and c move into specifier positions lc and ld, the licensing positions for c and DP, respectively. Finally, either the phrase in spec-pred, or pred itself moves to c. The specifier positions c, lc, ld and pred can be thought of as multiple specifiers of VR. Derivations obey the Extension Condition (Chomsky 1995) and no sub-extraction from a specifier is allowed. Weak pronouns, such as the Norwegian *'n* ('he/him') and *'a* ('she/her') will be treated as separate VRs. Below is a sample derivation of the sentence (6). For expository reasons, the following conventions will be applied: English words are used in the derivation; phonetically

empty material is omitted; and the internal structure of XPs moved into a specifier is deleted. The base position of *therefore* is ignored in the derivation.

(6)   Derfor   svarte   'n 'a ikke.
         therefore answered he her not

(7) $[_c [_{pred}$ answer$]]$ merge *her*->

(8)   her $[_c [_{pred}$ answer$]]$ pred to pred->

(9) $[_{pred} [_{pred}$ answer$]$ her$]$ pred to c (extract)->

(10) $[_c [_{pred}$ answer$][_{pred}$ her$]]$ merge *-ed*->

(11)   -ed $[_c [_{pred}$ answer$][_{pred}$ her$]]$ pred to pred->

(12) $[_{pred} [_{pred}$ answer$]$-ed $[_c [_{pred}$ her$]]]$ c to lc->

(13) $[_{lc} [_c$ her$][_{pred} [_{pred}$ answer$]$-ed$]]$ pred to c->

(14) $[_c [_{pred}$ answer-ed$][_{lc} [_c$ her$]]]$ merge *he*->

(15)   he $[_c [_{pred}$ answer-ed$][_{lc} [_c$ her$]]]$ pred to pred ->

(16) $[_{pred} [_{pred}$ answer-ed$]$he $[_c [_{lc} [_c$ her$]]]]$ c to lc->

(17) $[_{lc} [_c$ her$][_{pred} [_{pred}$ answer-ed$]$he$]]$ pred to c->

(18) $[_c [_{pred}$ answer-ed he$][_{lc} [_c$ her$]]]$ merge *not*->

(19)   not $[_c [_{pred}$ answer-ed he$][_{lc} [_c$ her$]]]$ pred to pred (pied piping)->

(20) $[_{pred} [_c [_{pred}$ answer-ed he$][_{lc} [_c$ her$]]]$not$]$ c to lc->

(21) $[_{lc} [_c$ answer-ed he her$][_{pred}$ not$]]$ pred to c->

(22) $[_c [_c$ answer-ed he her$][_{lc} [_{pred}$ not$]]]$ merge Top and topicalize
                                                       therefore->

(23)   [therefore Top $[_c [_c$ answer-ed he her$][_{lc} [_{pred}$ not$]]]]$

The proposed system will be shown to shed new light on the properties of embedded V2 orders across Germanic. In Mainland Scandinavian, embedded V2 requires an overt complementizer (24), whereas the two are incompatible in German (25).

(24)   Han sa *(at) han har ikke drept henne.
        he said that he has not killed   her

(25)   Er sagte (*dass) er habe die Frau nicht getötet.
        he said that   he have-conj the woman not killed

It will be proposed that the German complementizer *dass* is always merged to the embedded predicate, whereas the Mainland Scandinavian *at* can also be merged with the matrix predicate (cf. Kayne 1998). When the complementizer is merged with the embedded predicate, it will interfere with V2. In fact, the complementizer itself will raise. If it is merged with the matrix predicate, no such interference is expected. This difference will be shown to derive another difference between Mainland Scandinavian and German, namely that an embedded V2 clause is always interpreted *de re* in Mainland Scandinavian, but never so in German.

The perspective taken on complementizers can explain the so-called '*that-t* Filter'. It can now be made to follow from the general ban on sub-extraction from specifiers. Finally, the meliorating effect of sentential adverbs on *that-t* violations will be explained.