
Abstract**Successive Cyclicity in Linearisation of V3 in Old English****KOBAYASHI Shigeyuki**

Old English has many word-order patterns related to surface verb positions, in which V3 has always been a controversial one. In this paper, making a syntactic analysis of V3 in OE (e.g. Fischer et al., Ringe and Taylor 2014), I discuss the analyses of linearisation of the two types of V2, as seen in by Müller (2007).

Ringe and Taylor (2014) classify V2 constructions in OE into the operator-fronting type and the non-operator-fronting type, wherein V3 is a variant of the latter. In non-operator-fronting V2 constructions, analysis showed that the subjects take a lower position in the TP while in V3 constructions, the subjects take a higher position in the TP. Corresponding to Ringe and Taylor's analysis, Fischer et al. (2000) analysed the construction of V3 in OE, positioning the higher subject in the FP between CP and TP. However, the details of the FP are left unresolved. Cardinaletti and Roberts (2002) analysed V3 in OE and other languages, assuming that pronouns followed by finite verbs are proclitic and that they are moved to the higher AgrP (Agr1P) to join with the finite verbs from T via the lower AgrP (Agr2P), where Agr1P is not limited to the site of the subject. The features that correspond to this are not precisely specified.

Müller analysed the two types of V2 word order, adopting Fox and Pesetsky (2005)'s theory of 'Cyclic Linearisation'. He classified V2 into SOV languages like Modern Germanic and SVO like Danish, which can be considered equivalent to the non-operator-fronting type V2 in OE. If Müller's analysis is on the right track, V3 in OE should be treated in successive cyclicity as well.

The pronoun subjects in German can move through the edge of *v*P to μ P, a higher projection between TP and *v*P as assumed by Müller, from the original position. His analysis considers TP as a 'phase', invoking the idea of 'the relevant phase' by Gallego and Uriagereka (2006) (Müller 2011), which is however not recognised a phase from the standard perspective within the recent framework of

the minimalist theory (e.g. Citko 2014), although it matches Ringe and Taylor's assumption that non-operator types V2 and V3 do not have CP projections.

I propose, based on the abovementioned assumptions, that pronouns in V3 followed by finite verbs in OE move from vP via its edge to μP under TP, joining finite verbs to it, and then merging with TopP, thus dispensing with CP projection. The TP will be spelt out without problems because it will be 'the relevant phase'.