

Verb movement and the philosopher's stone*

Caroline Heycock, Anthony Alderson, Jonathan Brennan,
Golda Fischer, Victoria Gall, Nicole Gregoire, Teo Juvonen,
Tom Kelly, Sophie Krauss, Jennifer Pope, Sofia Sanchez-Romero

January 2003

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Background: verb movement in the VO Germanic languages	2
3	Faroese	4
3.1	Data and methods	4
3.2	Results	5
3.2.1	The special case of “because” clauses	6
3.2.2	Embedded Root Phenomena and CP Recursion	6
3.2.3	Some details concerning the variation within verb complement clauses	7
4	So ...	8

1 Introduction

In this paper we report on some data concerning the position of finite verbs in two Scandinavian languages: Faroese and Danish.

Faroese is currently of particular interest to people who are interested in how the syntax of a language can change over time, as it appears recently to have undergone a change in the placement of the verb that happened already in all the Mainland Scandinavian Languages (Danish, Swedish, Norwegian) some time ago (and that happened also in English). In fact there is some dispute as to whether this change has gone to completion in Faroese or not. In this paper we add one more data point to the collection of data already gathered by Höskuldur Thräinsson; and in addition we provide a minimal comparison with Danish, one of the Mainland Scandinavian languages.

Basically, the change concerns the placement of the verb with respect to negation (and other sentence-medial adverbs):

- (1) a. ... vita að hann **hefði ekki** fengið fyrra bréfið. *Icelandic*
... to-know that he had not received first letter
... to know that he had not received his first letter
- b. ... vide, at han **ikke havde** omddag et sit første brev. *Danish*
... to-know that he not had received his first letter
... to know that he had not received his first letter
- (2) a. And the Lord said unto Cain, “Where is Abel thy brother?” And he said, I **know not**.

*We gratefully acknowledge the help of Gunnar Hoydal, who provided us with an electronic version of his translation of *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, and also the assistance of Sonja Jógvansdóttir and Thora Björn, who acted as native speaker consultants for Faroese and Danish respectively.

- b. And the Lord said to Cain, “Where is your brother Abel?” And he said, I do **not know**.

Faroese seems to have been moving from the old order (represented here by Icelandic, to which it is closely related) to the new order (represented here by Danish, with which it is in fairly intense contact).

In Section 2 we summarise the theoretical background to this change; then in Section 3 we present some new data from Faroese and Danish.

2 Background: verb movement in the VO Germanic languages

Since Emonds 1976 and the development of his analysis in Pollock 1989, it has widely been assumed that languages may differ in whether the verb moves from VP to Infl (or some other functional head lower than C but higher than Neg) in overt syntax. Thus in English the (main) verb remains within the VP, while in French it moves to Infl, as shown by its position relative to the negative marker *pas*, and also certain VP-initial adverbs. A topic of much theorising in the last 15 years has been the nature of this parameter, and how it is “set.”

A familiar observation relating to this question is that movement of the verb out of VP correlates with “rich” inflectional morphology. Most commonly, the relevant morphology has been taken to be number and person agreement (with various proposals concerning the correct definition of “rich” agreement (see e.g. Roberts 1993, Rohrbacher 1992, Vikner 1995); more recently, Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998, Bobaljik 2002 have proposed that the relevant question is whether the morphology forces the existence of two distinct functional heads—one for Tense and one for (Subject) agreement.

Accounts of the relation between overt morphology and overt verb movement to Infl have also differed on the question of the “strength” of the correlation. These differences in turn motivate (or are motivated by) different theories concerning the nature of the parameter involved, and how it can be set. At one extreme, Rohrbacher (1992), for example, proposes that the relation between “richness” of agreement morphology and Verb-Neg order is a biconditional:

- (3) rich agreement morphology \leftrightarrow V-to-Infl More recently, Roberts 1999 has proposed a weaker version:
- (4) rich agreement morphology \rightarrow V-to-Infl

The idea here is that the agreement morphology is a *trigger* for acquiring the (marked) value of the parameter that results in the overt movement to Infl. Even if this morphological trigger is absent, however, a child could still acquire the same value of the parameter if there is enough syntactic evidence for it.

The theory proposed in Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998, Bobaljik 2002 also relies on a unidirectional implication:

- (5) distinct morphology for agreement and tense \rightarrow V-to-Infl

Here the essential idea is that the verb movement out of VP occurs necessarily if distinct Agreement and Tense heads are present in the structure. If there are distinct morphemes, there must be two syntactic heads (under the authors’ assumptions, essentially those of Distributed Morphology), hence the left-to-right implication; but given the possibility of phonologically null morphemes, these heads may be present without overt morphological realisation, hence the absence of the right-to-left implication.

Alexiadou and Fanselow 2000 have weakened the linkage between morphology and syntax still further than either Roberts or Bobaljik & Thráinsson. They claim essentially that the association of V-Neg order with rich (suffixal) agreement is merely the result of a conspiracy of historical contingencies. In rough summary: suffixal verbal agreement arises through the reinterpretation of a subject pronoun cliticized to a verb. Hence the *genesis* of a rich agreement system is logically dependent on the leftward movement of the verb. So *at that historical moment* almost the same one-way implication as (4) holds:

- (6) suffixal agreement morphology \rightarrow V-to-Infl

But because this explanation, unlike that of Roberts, is in terms of the historical origins of verbal agreement, there is no immediate source of explanation for the differential maintenance of the V-Neg order in

subsequent generations depending on the maintenance of the agreement morphology. A priori, as they acknowledge, it should be as easy (or difficult) to lose the verb movement to Infl in a system with rich morphological agreement as in a system with none.

Bobaljik 2002 discusses the evidence gathered by a number of researchers that there exist dialects of Swedish and Norwegian which share the inflectional paradigm of the standard language but which still allow verb movement to Infl—counterexamples therefore to the existence of a biconditional. He further makes the point that although loss of morphology in Danish and English correlates with their loss of V-to-Infl, in both cases there appears to be a significant time-lag. And finally, to the extent that we have evidence that some Faroese speakers show variation in the placement of the verb but do not show matching variation in their morphology, this language also does not support the biconditional.

Of course, if verb movement to Infl is a grammatical option regardless of morphology, the evidence that this option is typically lost at some point after a morphological paradigm has changed needs to be explained. Essentially, the question that has to be asked is how the evidence for verb movement to Infl become so poor that subsequent generations hypothesise instead a grammar with no such overt movement? Alexiadou & Fanselow propose that an Adv-V order arising from Stylistic Fronting of the adverb is reinterpreted by children who have lost Stylistic Fronting from their grammar. Further, it is claimed that Stylistic Fronting depends on pro-drop, which in turn depends on richness of agreement morphology. Roberts on the other hand makes a particular proposal for English that relies crucially on the status of English modals and auxiliary *do*; as far as we are aware there is no natural extension to the Scandinavian languages, so an alternative explanation must be sought for these cases.

One difference between the Scandinavian languages and English that may be crucial in this regard is that of course the former family of languages is still verb-second (V2). That is, in main clauses (with the exception of yes-no questions and certain other verb-initial cases) the finite verb follows an initial XP, whether the subject or some other element. For the moment at least we adopt the analysis due originally to den Besten 1983 in assuming that this order arises from movement of the finite verb to Comp (and some XP to Spec,CP), and we also follow him in assuming that both of these movements take place even in subject-initial main clauses.

The modern Mainland Scandinavian languages, then, have verb movement to Comp but not verb movement to Infl, while Icelandic, for example, has both.¹ As a result, the finite verb precedes negation in main clauses in *all* the Scandinavian languages, since the finite verb is in Comp. With respect to Roberts' view of the triggering of the "marked" value of the parameter forcing V-to-Infl, this means that a learner cannot use data demonstrating the existence of V-to-C as evidence "triggering" the postulation of the marked value of the parameter forcing V-to-Infl movement.² It is perhaps worth noting that the possibility of V-to-C in the absence of independent V-to-Infl poses a problem for the Alexiadou & Fanselow account of the origin of the association between verbal agreement morphology and V-to-Agr. According to their claim, suffixal agreement results from a reinterpretation of one or the other of the structures in (7) (their (42)).

- (7) a. [Infl verb] [vP subject ...]
 b. [Comp verb] [IP subject ...]

Thus, they say, "it becomes clear why a correlation such as [(6)] holds—not because of a principle of UG, but because rich suffixal agreement could not arise in a language without verb movement." The problem is that this argument relies on the assumption that the kind of "verb movement" in (7b) guarantees the independent existence in the language of the kind of verb movement in (7a). Since we know that this is not the case, there seems no reason not to expect the genesis of a language with V-to-Comp, rich morphological agreement, but no V-to-Agr.

¹ An alternative formulation is that in Mainland Scandinavian V-to-Infl is only possible when the verb moves on to Comp; the choice between these formulations must be a matter of theory, as there appears no empirical distinction.

² In (Roberts 1999) it is argued that the loss of V-to-Infl in English came about because the marked value of the parameter was not "expressed" (there was no evidence for it) in sentences containing modals and auxiliary *do*; this, it is claimed, must have "undermined the syntactic expression of the marked parameter value" enough for learners to fail to acquire it. But note that in the Scandinavian languages at least *no* main (V2) clause expresses the parameter (since V-to-(Infl-to)Comp does not imply independent V-to-Infl). It seems then guaranteed that such languages will lose V-to-Infl if they lose the morphological trigger of rich agreement. Under the Alexiadou & Fanselow account, even this would not help them; thus Icelandic (if it really does have both V-to-Infl and V-to-Infl-to-C) is the real mystery for acquisition under this combination of assumptions.

3 Faroese

Returning to Faroese: what has been changing in this language is not the availability of V-to-Comp, but the possibility of V-to-Infl. It is uncontroversial that there are no speakers of Faroese currently who have a system which is 100% like Icelandic in this respect. The question is rather whether there is still variation for some speakers between structures where the finite verb remains in the VP and ones in which it moves to Infl. Thráinsson (1999) has gathered data from a number of texts from the earliest available (around 1400) to some written by speakers born in the 1960s. Here we are essentially adding one data point to this collection—but we also include a comparison with a Danish (and a Swedish) text which shows a surprising pattern.

3.1 Data and methods

The initial comparison that we made was based on the Faroese and the Danish translations of *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. Clearly there is a risk in picking a translation, but we hoped that the very different syntax of English negation (given the necessity for *do*-support) would mean that the translator would be unlikely to be influenced by the language from which he was translating. The reason for choosing a translation was to give us the closest comparison between the two texts.

We looked at the first 11 chapters of the text. We were fortunate that the translator, Gunnar Hoydal, was generous enough to send us an electronic version of the entire Faroese text so that we could search it without having to resort to the much slower and less accurate technique of scanning+OCR.

As should be clear from the above, in order to establish whether the language of this speaker allowed V-to-Infl, it is necessary to find

- **subordinate clauses** (so that the possibility of V-to-Infl movement is not masked by subsequent V-to-C), which contain
- a **finite verb** and
- the **negative marker** *ikki* or some other adverb that occurs at the left edge of the VP.

In fact, because many of the other adverbs can occur in a number of different positions, we limited ourselves to looking at subordinate clauses with the negative marker *ikki*. We first searched for the word itself, then discarded all the main clauses and infinitival clauses. The remaining cases we broke down into the following categories:

1. Relative clauses:

We originally distinguished among the relative clauses according to the position of the “gap” and whether or not there was a relative pronoun, but these distinctions proved to be irrelevant

- (8) ... okkurt, ið ikki skikkaði sær, sum tað átti
... anything, that not behaved itself as it ought
... anything that didn't act in the way it should

2. Indirect questions

- (9) Eg skilji ikki, hvi tey à fyrsta ári ikki sleppa at eiga ein gandakust
I understand not why they in first year not are allowed to own a magic broom
I don't understand why the first years can't have their own magic broom

3. Conditional clauses

- (10) Hvat so, um tey ikki siggja teg?
what so if they not see you
So what if they can't see you?

4. **Adverbial clauses** (except those introduced by *tí* (because/for))

- (11) ... tey siga, at táu ið hann ikki fekk dripið Harry Potter, misti Voldemort sína megi
... they say that when he not got killed Harry Potter lost V his powers
They say that when he didn't manage to kill Harry Potter, Voldemort lost his powers.

5. **Result clauses and purpose clauses** introduced by *so* (so) or *so at* (so that)

- (12) Harry, Ron og Hermione fluttu seg saman, so at Snape ikki skuldi síggja eldin
Harry Ron and Hermione moved SELF together so that S not should see the-fire
Harry, Ron and Hermione moved together so that Snape wouldn't see the fire.

6. **Extent clauses:**

These were clauses following *so+Adjective/Adverb*, as in *He was so tall that he could not get in through the door*.

- (13) Trøini vóru so víð, at hann sá ikki Snape.
the-trees were so thick that he saw not Snape
The trees were so thick that he did not see Snape.

7. **Adverbial clauses introduced by *tí* (for, because)**

- (14) Hann fór upp og læt seg í sí nar vanligu buksur, tí hann vildi ikki fara á
he got up and put on his usual trousers because he wanted not go to
tokstøðina í gandaklæðum.
the-station in his wizard's robes
He got up and pulled on his jeans because he didn't want to walk into the station in his
wizard's robes.

8. **Declarative complement clauses** subdivided as to whether they were the complement of a verb, an adjective, or a preposition; it was also noted whether the embedded verb was negated, questioned, or modalised.

- (15) ... hann royndi at siga teimum, at hann visti ikki
... he tried to say them that he knew not
... he tried to tell them that he didn't know

There were also a few (4) negated clauses that seemed to be subordinate but which we did not know how best to categorise; these have been lumped together.

When we had found the relevant examples in the Faroese text, we then searched for the corresponding sentences in the Danish text. Even though the two texts are translations of the same original, there is evidently variation in the sentence types picked for the translations. As a result, around 40% of the relevant Faroese examples did not correspond to relevant Danish examples. Clearly to maximize the data from Danish we should have searched independently in that text (so finding negative subordinate clauses that had no correspondence in the Faroese text), but as will be seen the nature of the data does not motivate this burden of work (which would have been particularly labour-intensive as we had no readily accessible electronic version of the Danish text).

3.2 Results

The totals for the two languages are given in Table 1: It appears that there is a sharp distinction between the two languages. As expected, Danish overwhelmingly prefers the Neg-V order (the finite verb remains within the verb phrase), which occurs in 95% of the total of 65 subordinate clauses with negation. Faroese shows the same preference, but it is significantly weaker: 61% of the Neg-V order to 39% (more than a third) of the V-Neg order.

	Faroese				Danish			
	V-Neg		Neg-V		V-Neg		Neg-V	
Total	42	(39%)	66	(61%)	3	(5%)	62	(95%)

Table 1: V-Neg and Neg-V order in subordinate clauses: totals

	Faroese				Danish			
	V-Neg		Neg-V		V-Neg		Neg-V	
Total	34	(34%)	66	(66%)	0	(0%)	62	(100%)

Table 2: V-Neg and Neg-V order in subordinate clauses, excluding *because* clauses: totals

3.2.1 The special case of “because” clauses

In fact one should discount the 3 cases in Danish that show the V-Neg order in supposedly subordinate clauses. They all occur after *for*. This word is used to translate English *because*; but in a number of languages words with this approximate meaning introduce clauses that have the syntax of main clauses (for example, in German *denn* (for), in contrast to *weil* (because) is obligatorily followed by clauses showing V2 rather than verb-final word order). It seems reasonable then to assume that these clauses in Danish also are syntactically main clauses, and that the V-Neg order is the result of V2. With this adjustment the Neg-V order becomes categorical in all subordinate clauses in our data.

It is less clear what status to give to the (corresponding) Faroese clauses introduced by *tí*; there were 8 such cases in our data, all with the V-Neg order. Petersen, í Lon Jacobsen, Hansen, and Thráinsson 1998 note that “main clause word order” (V-Neg) is “much more generally acceptable” in these clauses than in other adverbial clauses and mention the parallel to German *denn*. However, they seem to imply that the Neg-V word order, which is unequivocally a subordinate order, is considered acceptable (and this was confirmed by Sonja Jógvansdóttir, personal communication), which is not true for *denn* in German. Lockwood 1977(p.85), however, cites it as a coordinating conjunction, without further comment or exemplification. If we take the conservative approach of excluding these cases as main clauses, the revised figures are as given in Table 2.

3.2.2 Embedded Root Phenomena and CP Recursion

If we consider only the totals, then, we might conclude that this Faroese writer at least still produces a significant number of clauses that show the “old” system of verb movement to Infl. However, closer inspection shows that the distribution of the V-Neg cases is very uneven. Table 3 gives the totals—still omitting *because*-clauses—broken down into the categories that we considered: Out of 27 relative clauses, not one displays the V-Neg order.³ And in fact, virtually all the cases of V-Neg order are found in the extent clauses (8 out of 10) and in complement clauses to verbs (23 out of 44). But now of course we may wonder whether here too the V-Neg orders might instead be the result of verb movement to Comp (V2) rather than verb movement to Infl.

It has been noted for a number of other Germanic languages that V2 may occur sporadically in some apparently subordinate clauses even in the presence of an overt complementiser. The best known case is the possibility of V2 in the Mainland Scandinavian languages after so-called “bridge” verbs (roughly characterised semantically as verbs of assertion) when they occur in positive declarative, non-modalised sentences. One analysis that has been given for such cases is to claim that for some reason these verbs in these contexts take a version of the complementiser that subcategorises for a second CP (rather than an IP); thus V2 may occur after the complementiser. If this is what is happening in Faroese, we can begin to

³It should be noted that relative clauses (or indirect questions) with the gap in subject position and Neg-V order may not give incontrovertible evidence that the verb has remained in the VP, as this order can also arise if the speaker allows *ikki* in clause-initial position (for example, by virtue of Stylistic Fronting, as in the analysis of Alexiadou and Fanselow 2000). 16 out of the total of 27 relative clauses (but neither of the two indirect questions) in our Faroese data had the gap in subject position.

Type of clause	Faroese		Danish	
	V-Neg	Neg-V	V-Neg	Neg-V
Relative	0	27	0	18
Indirect question	0	2	0	1
Conditional	0	3	0	0
“when”	0	6	0	3
“since”	0	1	0	1
Purpose & result	1	5	0	3
Extent	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0	4
Complement clause after adjective	1	6	0	5
Complement clause after verb	23 (68%)	11 (32%)	0	23
Not categorised	1	3	0	4
Total	34 (34%)	66 (66%)	0 (0%)	62 (100%)

Table 3: V-Neg and Neg-V order in subordinate clauses, excluding *because* clauses

explain the sharp contrast between the categoricity of the Neg-V order in relative clauses and the variability in these verb complement clauses, since “CP-recursion” has never been claimed to be possible in relatives: we may hypothesise that in fact the verb never moves to Infl and that all the V-Neg orders that we find are the result of movement to the Comp of a second CP.

What about the extent clauses, though? Although these do not allow “CP-recursion” in Danish (Iatridou and Kroch 1992), they do in Frisian, as documented in de Haan and Weerman 1986; and in fact their status in English is somewhat questionable (Heycock 2005, *contra* Hoeksema and Napoli 1993). So we might conclude that here too a derivation where the verb moves to Comp is at least available (although this cannot be the only possible derivation, given the two examples with incontrovertibly subordinate clause word order.⁴

3.2.3 Some details concerning the variation within verb complement clauses

As mentioned, in the Mainland Scandinavian languages “embedded V2” (EV2) is said to be possible only after a subset of verbs. Unfortunately there is some dispute as to the exact class of verbs involved, and whether there is variation from one language to another. But, very roughly, EV2 is reported to be ruled out at least in the following circumstances:

1. after factive verbs (but *know* seems to be an exception)
2. after inherently negative verbs such as *doubt*, *deny*
3. after verbs introducing irrealis complements, such as *hope*
4. after verbs in sentences that are
 - (a) negated
 - (b) modalised
 - (c) interrogative

Do any of the cases of V-Neg order occur in these contexts?

The data are rather sparse to come to very firm conclusions. There does seem to be a tendency for the contexts enumerated above to favour the Neg-V order. For example, the most common embedding verb in our data was *sigja* (say), with 10 instances, of which 3 occurred in negative sentences. Exactly these three were followed by a complement with Neg-V order, while none of the positive instances were. Also there

⁴If the complementiser *at* is absent, the V-Neg word order is obligatory (Zakaris Hansen, personal communication). However only 1 out of the 8 cases of the V-Neg order in our data is of this type.

are two instances of verbs meaning *to ensure*; both are followed by the Neg-V order, as is the one instance of *hope*.

On the other hand, there is one instance of the verb *to fear*: its complement shows the unexpected V-Neg order. The token appears in a pseudocleft; it is unclear whether this should affect the status of its complement, however⁵.

- (16) TaD, sum Harry óttaDist mest fyri, var, at hann skuldi ikki finna stovuna við spegilinum
 that that H feared most for was that he should not find the-room with the-mirror
 aftur.
 again
 What Harry feared most was that he might not be able to find the mirror room again.

There is also one token of the verb *gloyma* (to forget), which is an inherently negative factive verb and which therefore should not allow EV2: but it is followed by V-Neg order:

- (17) Hon gloyumir altíð , at eg eti ikki livurpostei
 she forgets always that I eat not liverpaste
 She always forgets that I don't eat corned beef.

Also there is an instance of *vita* in a negative counterfactual—a context which should disbar EV2—which nevertheless is followed by the V-Neg order:

- (18) Hevði Harry ikki vitað , at tey folkini dugdu ikki skemt av nøkrum slag, ...
 had H not known that they people knew not joke of any kind
 If Harry hadn't know that the Dursleys had no sense of humour ...

So it seems that some of the instances of V-Neg order are occurring in contexts which are unexpected based on the generalisation from the other Germanic languages.

4 So ...

In addition to this handful of examples where the V-Neg order occurs in contexts where EV2 is usually excluded, there is another reason to be less than entirely happy with an account in terms of EV2 which makes Faroese have an identical syntax to Danish in the relevant respects. The proposal that “bridge” verbs allow CP complements (and therefore embedded V2) was made on the basis of Danish (as well as Swedish and Norwegian). But at least for these two writers, the *probability* of this option being taken up is enormously larger for Faroese than it is for Danish.

So what is the solution to the paradox?

- Are these writers simply unrepresentative, and the difference between the texts within the bounds of variability in the two languages?

For written Danish, at least, checking a larger corpus seems to confirm that EV2 is very rare in contemporary written Danish; in a 26 million word corpus Tony Kroch reports finding 4,500 object complement clauses with negation, of which around 100 appear to have the V-Neg order: that would be around 2%. This is in fact a rather generous estimate, since some of these are false hits due to inaccuracies of the tagger, and some may be reported speech (direct quotation) (Tony Kroch, personal communication.)

⁵The corresponding example in Danish has the expected Neg-V order; however it is not a pseudocleft. The Swedish sentence is a pseudocleft like the Faroese, but shares the Neg-V order of the Danish example:

- (i) Det Harry var mest rædd f.Ør var att han inte skulle hitta tillbaka ...
 that Harry was most afraid of was that he not should find back
 What Harry feared most was that he might not be able to find ...

There is some indication that the Faroese data are not outliers, either. In his data from texts of various periods, Höskuldur Thráinsson gives data for 9 authors born between 1900 and 1960 (it must be noted that the data for each individual author are sparse). These authors vary a great deal in the proportion of V-Neg order in relative clauses and indirect questions (but there is a general trend down); but the lowest proportion of this order in the complement to “bridge” verbs is 40%, and for 6 out of the 9 it is 100%.

- Is Embedded Verb Second simply freer in Faroese than in the Mainland Scandinavian languages? If so, is this completely unconnected with the recent change in V-to-Agr, or is it the result of speakers reanalysing V-Neg in their input?

One possibility (under which there would be no connection) is that EV2 is characteristic of the vernacular, and that as a result of relatively recent adoption of Faroese as an official written language vernacular forms are more acceptable in writing than they are in e.g. Danish. It is worth noting that a preliminary comparison with the Swedish translation of the same text seems to indicate that V-Neg orders are entirely absent here, just as in the Danish text (but this work is not completed). For this language there exists a study of the rate of EV2 in verb complements in a spoken corpus which shows a rate of V-Neg order of around 60% (Christer Platzack, personal communication, citing Jørgensen 1978).

One way to test this hypothesis would be to gather spoken data from Faroese to compare with comparable spoken data from the other languages. A further check would be to see if there is any independent evidence for a higher degree of EV2 in Faroese: i.e. are there more non-subject-initial embedded clauses than in Danish?

- Are some of the instances of V-Neg order in verb complement clauses actually attributable to V-to-Agr? If so, why is it never seen elsewhere? Is the output of the V-to-Agr grammar being *suppressed* wherever it does not have an alternative analysis? Under this scenario, it should be noted, the amount of V-Neg order in verb complement clauses is remarkably high, since if Danish is a guide to how common EV2 actually is, *none* of the V-Neg orders in the Faroese are expected to be cases of EV2. But it could be of course that the right answer is a combination of this scenario with the last one outlined above (which by itself of course leaves as a problem the (admittedly infrequent) cases of V-Neg order in environments where EV2 is normally excluded).

And two more minor points are perhaps worth making:

- If verb complement clauses are so frequently actually syntactically main clauses, with V-to-C, then potential data “expressing” the marked V-to-Agr parameter are indeed few and far between. Could this explain why this movement has been/is being lost?
- A question largely unrelated to the diachronic issue: what is the right analysis of EV2 where it is *not* the result of V-to-Agr? There are a number of problems with the kind of analysis in terms of CP-recursion given in e.g. Iatridou and Kroch 1992; including, as they acknowledge, the possibility in Frisian (and now, as we have seen in Faroese as well) of V2 in extent clauses. An alternative solution might be found along the lines of the proposal for Frisian in de Haan 2001, according to which the relevant clauses are not in fact embedded at all (thus more akin to the *for*-type clauses that were discussed above). The interesting question then is exactly what the syntax is of such clauses; in particular, where they attach in the structure.

References

- Alexiadou, A. and G. Fanselow (2000). On the correlation between morphology and syntax: The case of V-to-I. Revised version of a talk presented at the Germanic Syntax Workshop in Groningen, May 2000. Ms, Universität Potsdam.
- Bobaljik, J. (2002). Realizing Germanic inflection: Why morphology does not drive syntax. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 6(2), 129–167.

- Bobaljik, J. and H. Thráinsson (1998). Two heads aren't always better than one. *Syntax* 1(1), 37–71.
- de Haan, G. (2001). More is going on upstairs than downstairs. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4, 3–38.
- de Haan, G. and F. Weerman (1986). Finiteness and verb fronting in Frisian. In H. Haider and M. Prinzhorn (Eds.), *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*, pp. 77–110. Dordrecht: Foris.
- den Besten, H. (1983). On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In W. Abraham (Ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, pp. 47–131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Draft version circulated in 1977.
- Emonds, J. (1976). *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Heycock, C. (2005). Embedded root phenomena. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Volume 2, Chapter 23, pp. 174–209. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hoeksema, J. and D. J. Napoli (1993). Paratactic and subordinative *so*. *Journal of Linguistics* 29, 291–314.
- Iatridou, S. and A. Kroch (1992). The licensing of CP-recursion and its relevance to the Germanic verb-second phenomenon. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 50, 1–25.
- Jørgensen, N. (1978). *Unterordnade satser och fraser i talad svenska: Funktion och byggnad (Embedded sentences and phrases in spoken Swedish: Function and Structure)*. Lund: Ekstrand.
- Lockwood, W. B. (1977). *An Introduction to Modern Faroese*. Tórshavn: Føroya Skúlabókagrunnur.
- Petersen, H. P., J. í Lon Jacobsen, Z. S. Hansen, and H. Thráinsson (1998). Faroese: An overview for students and researchers. Draft manuscript, Tórshavn and Reykjavik.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1989). Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.3, 365–424.
- Roberts, I. (1993). *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax : a Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, I. (1999). Verb movement and markedness. In M. DeGraff (Ed.), *Language Creation and Language Change*, Chapter 10, pp. 287–327. MIT Press.
- Rohrbacher, B. (1992). V-to-AGR raising in Faroese. In *Proceedings of FLSM* 3.
- Thráinsson, H. (1999). Loss of verb movement. Talk given at the University of Edinburgh, April 1999.
- Vikner, S. (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.