OV/VO syntax in Mòcheno main declarative clauses, Federica Cognola

1 Introduction

This work[1] is concerned with OV/VO alternations in main declarative clauses of Mòcheno, a Tyrolean dialect spoken in the Fersina valley in Eastern Trentino (North of Italy)[2]. This language has lived in a long situation of isolation from German varieties and in contact with Romance dialects, developing a series of innovations especially at the syntactic level not to be found in the other Tyrolean dialects.

I will try to make sense of OV/VO word orders in Mòcheno claiming on the one hand that the pattern of variation can be accounted for language-internally, refuting therefore the idea of the presence of two grammars (Romance and German) or of the influence of the Romance varieties on the German one (which is not able to make predictions). Starting from the descriptive generalisation that OV/VO syntax depends on what shows up in the high periphery, I will adduce other evidence in favour of the claim that the variation pattern can be accounted for by hypothesising that i) OV/VO word orders are the result of the interaction of low and high periphery and ii) the two peripheries are linked through movement.

2 V2 and the high left periphery

Before introducing the main topic of this article, it is worth saying few words on the syntactic characteristics of Mòcheno. This dialect is a V2 language of the old Romance type (Cognola 2007); this means basically that it displays a fine-grained high periphery (Rizzi 1997) whose structure is the one identified by Benincà (2001), Benincà/Poletto (2004) and Benincà (2006) and given in (1):

(1) [Force [TS [scene setting [wh-rel [DS [LI [I Focus V2 [II Focus V2 [wh-interr V2 [Fin]]]]]]]]]]

The V2 constraint can be satisfied only by XPs showing up in the focus field.

In the examples in (2) it can be seen that Mòcheno is actually a V2 language since if an XP shows up in a Spec position of the focus field, verb-subject inversion is obligatory: (2a) is a case of contrastive focalization of the direct object (from here on DO) and (2c) is a case of a low adverb moved to the high periphery.

(2)   a. A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot der Mario kaft gester
         a book and not a pen has the Mario bought yesterday
         b. *A PUACH UND NET A PENNA der Mario hot kaft gester
         'Mario bought a book and not a pen'
         c. Ollbe hot der Nane kaft de oier afn morkt
         always has the John bought the eggs on-the market
         d. *Ollbe der Nane hot kaft de oier afn morkt
         'John has always bought the eggs at the market'

In the following examples I give some cases of V3 (3a) and V4 (3b), which are ruled out in standard German but possible in Mòcheno with base-generated XPs.

(3)   a. Gester za tschaina hone de pasta gezen
         yesterday for dinner have-CL PRON the pasta eaten
         'Yesterday for dinner I had pasta'
         b. Der Mario, gester petn Nane i hon gem a puach en sell tepp
         the Mario gester yesterday with-the John I have given a book to that crook
         'Mario, yesterday with John I gave a book to that crook'

To sum up, we can say that Mòcheno can be analysed as a V2-language of the old Romance type: this means basically that verb-subject inversion is triggered only by XPs with operator-like properties moved to a Spec position of the Focus field. Cases of V3 and V4 are admitted with XPs base-generated in the Topic and Frame fields.

In what follows I will introduce the pattern of variation concerning OV and VO syntax.

3 OV/VO alternations

As far as OV/VO word orders in main declarative clauses are concerned, this language allows for both OV (4a) and VO (4b) apparently with no difference in meaning, according to the judgements of my informants.

(4)   a. Gester hone s/a puach kaft
         yesterday hav-CL PRON the/a book bought
         b. Gester hone kaft s/a puach
         'I bought the/a book yesterday'

The two sentences in (4) do not display the same syntactic properties though; as shown in (5a), in fact, only with OV syntax is it possible to focalise the DO whereas OV is ruled out if the focalised DO follows the past participle as in (5b).

(5)   a. Gester hone A PUACH UND NET A PENNA kaft
         yesterday have-CL PRON a book and not a pen bought
         b. *Gester hone kaft A PUACH UND NET A PENNA
         'I bought a book and not a pen yesterday'

In this work I reject the hypothesis that the pattern shown by the previous examples can be made sense of by allowing the possibility of having both head-final and head-initial projections, and I assume, following the antisymmetric theory (Kayne 1994), the base order of all projections to be head initial.

Also the hypothesis of morphological-case-driven movement appears to be weak both on general grounds[3] and on account of the fact that Mòcheno has no case morphology on DPs, as can be seen in (6a,b).

(6)   a. Der Mario hot der Nane pakemmt
          the Mario-NOM/ACC has the John-NOM/ACC met

---

[3] This is actually not a very strong argument since in old English the verb kept moving to TP even when verb morphology was lost (Roberts 1993). With regard to the relation between word order and morphology, Chiara Polo (2005) has convincingly showed that OV word orders in Latin do not depend on morphology, since DOs in VO constructions always had accusative morphology; according to her VO has rather to be interpreted into relation to information structure.

'Mario met John'
b. Der Mario hot a puach en Nane gem
the Mario has a book to-the John given
'Mario gave John a book'

In what follows I will try to make sense of Mòcheno OV/VO word orders making use of the hypothesis of the presence of a VP periphery (from here on low left periphery) of the clause (Belletti (2001, 2004), Jayaseelan (2001), and Poletto (2006)) showing that OV syntax in Mòcheno involves the use of the low left periphery and is possible as long as i) the Spec of low FocusP has not been saturated by an XP generated below the periphery moving to a Spec of the high Focus field; ii) the past participle remains in a low position; iii) the XP triggering verb-subject inversion has been moved to the high Focus field from a position above the low left periphery.

The derivation is to be seen in the structure below in (7):

(7) $[_{FocusP} [_{SpecFocus} \textbf{XP}] [_{Focus0} \textbf{auxiliary}] [_{AgrSP} [_{SpecAgrS} \textbf{subject}] [_{Agr0} \textbf{auxiliary}]$
       $[_{TopicP} [_{SpecTopicP} \textbf{YP}] [_{Topic0}] [_{FocusP} [_{SpecFocus} \textbf{ZP}] [_{Focus0}] [_{VP} [_{SpecV}] [_{V0} \textbf{past}$
       $\textbf{participle}] [_{DP}]]]]]]$

VO syntax is obligatory iff: i) Spec low FocusP has been saturated by an XP generated below the periphery moving to a Spec of the high Focus field; ii) this stepwise movement (Rizzi 2004b) forces the past participle to rise to the edge of the phase, that is above the low periphery leaving TopicP below[4].

The derivation is given in (8):

(8) $[_{FocusP} [_{SpecFocus} \textbf{XP}] [_{Focus0} \textbf{auxiliary}] [_{AgrSP} [_{SpecAgrS} \textbf{subject}] [_{Agr0} \textbf{auxiliary}]$ $[_{AspP}$
       $[_{SpecAsp}] [_{Asp0} \textbf{past participle}] [_{TopicP} [_{SpecTopicP} \textbf{YP}] [_{Topic0} \textbf{past participle}] [_{FocusP}$
       $[_{SpecFocus} \textbf{XP}] [_{Focus0} \textbf{past participle}] [_{VP} [_{SpecV}] [_{V0} \textbf{past participle}] [_{DP}]]]]]]$

In what follows I will adduce evidence in favour of the analysis just sketched for Mòcheno OV/VO syntax showing first that in Mòcheno OV syntax is really to be derived via movement of XPs to Spec positions of the low left periphery and that when Spec low FocusP has been saturated OV syntax is not possible anymore.

[4]In this work I will refer to the area above the low periphery as 'edge of the lower phase' in which the head of an AspP dedicated to the past participle in VO syntax is to be found.

4

4 OV syntax involves the use of the low left periphery

If we take into consideration low adverbs when looking at sentences displaying both OV and VO word orders, we immediately see that with VO syntax the DO has to show up after all low adverbs (9a,c) whereas in OV syntax DO and low adverbs are mixed up (9b,d).

(9)   a. Gester hot der Luca schua gonz galezen (*gonz) s puach (*gonz)
        yesterday has the Luca already completely read the book
        b. Gester hot der Luca schua s puach gonz galezen
        'Luca read the whole book yesterday'
        c. Gester hot der papa schua schia puzt (*schia) s houz (*schia)
        yesterday has the dad already well cleaned the house
        d. Gester hot der papa schua s houz schia puzt
        'Yesterday dad cleaned the house well'

The pattern found with VO syntax[5]:

(10)   LOW ADVERBS - PPs - PAST PART – DO

The pattern found with OV syntax:

(11)   LOW ADVERB - DO - LOW ADVERBS - PPs - PAST PART

Following Cinque (1999), who claims that adverbs occupy fixed Spec positions in the IP layer, patterns (10) and (11) are enough proof in order to say that DO always leaves VP with OV syntax. Below we will also see that the position to which DOs move in OV syntax is to be found above the area where non-argumental PPs show up that, following Schweikert (2004) and Cinque (2006), I assume to be immediately above the VP layer.

---

[5] In this work, for reasons of space, I will not try to make sense of how VO syntax is technically to be derived.

Roughly speaking (see Cognola 2008 for more on this), the area to which DOs move with OV syntax is to be found below the low adverb *schua*, 'already' and above *schia*, 'well'; non-argumental PPs are to be found below low adverbs.

(12)   a. Gester hot der Luca schua s puach gonz galezen
        yesterday has the Luca already the book completely read
        'Yesterday Luca read the whole book'
        b. Gester hot de mama schua s houz schia puzt
        yesterday has the mum already the house well cleaned
        'Yesterday mum cleaned the house well'

ALREADY - DP - WELL
*DP - ALREADY – WELL

It is important to notice that the DO with OV syntax cannot in any case precede the adverb 'already' (13a,b), whereas – as we will see later on – 'well' and 'gonz' can precede it giving rise to marked orders. Anyway, in unmarked sentences (that is if the low adverb is not focalised itself, which is in principle not ruled out) low adverbs have to follow DOs (presumably showing up in a Spec position of the low left periphery) (13c,d) and their relative order is gonz-schia (13d,e)[6].

(13)   a. Gester hone schua a puach kaft
        yesterday have-CL PRON already a book bought
        b. *Gester hone a puach schua en de boteig kaft
        'I already bought a book yesterday in the shop'
        c. Gester hot de mama schua s houz gonz putzt
        yesterday has the mum already the house completely cleaned
        d. Gester hot de mama schua s houz schia putzt
        yesterday has the mum already the house well cleaned
        e. *Gester hot de mama schua s houz schia gonz putzt
        'Yesterday mum cleaned the whole house well'

---

[6] Sentences with 'gonz' preceding 'schia' are somehow marked (but in any case grammatical), since it would be more natural to use the QP 's gonze houz'. Anyway, the important point is that the relative order of the low adverbs is 'gonz-schia' and not the other way round.

If we take into consideration also a non-argumental PP, its unmarked position with OV syntax is below the low adverb 'schia' and above the past participle, as shown in (14).

(14)   De mama hot schua s hauz schia petn stapsauger putz
        the mum has already the house well with the hoover cleaned
        'Mum has already cleaned well the house with the hoover'

The structure we can derive from the examples seen so far is the one given in (15).

(15)   ALREADY - TOPIC - FOCUS - COMPLETELY - WELL - PPs – PASTPART

This structure is strikingly similar to the one identified for standard German by Hinterhölzl (2006) who claims that the positions in which DOs show up are AgrOPs. My assumption, on the contrary, is that at least in Mòcheno the area between 'already' and 'well' contains the low left periphery.

In the following section I will bring evidence in favour of this last claim of mine basing myself mainly on the test of contrasting.

4.1 More on the low left periphery

The hypothesis that the area between 'already' and 'well' in which DOs show up in Mòcheno OV syntax is really the low left periphery seems to find confirmation in the following examples in which the DO can be contrasted only if showing up above low manner adverbs[7].

(16)   a. *Gester hot der papa schia petn staupsauger S HAUS UND NET DER
        AUTO puzt
        yesterday has the dad well with the hoover the house and not the car cleaned
        b. Gester hot der papa S HAUS UND NET DER AUTO schia petn staupsauger
        putzt
        'Dad properly hoovered the house and not the car yesterday'

---

[7] It would not be possible to contrast the DO also if it showed up in VO syntax. My claim for the VO cases is that no XP following the past participle can be contrasted since it is either a Topic or is in its base position.

In the following structure (17) I give the derivation of (16b) with the DO moving from Spec PredP (where it is presumably to be found in (16a)) to Spec low FocusP[8].

(17)   [$_{AspP}$ [$_{SpecAsp}$ **schua**] [$_{Asp0}$] [$_{TopicP}$ [$_{SpecTopicP}$] [$_{Topic0}$] [$_{FocusP}$ [$_{SpecFocus}$ **s houz**] [$_{Focus0}$] [$_{AspP}$ [$_{SpecAsp}$ **schia**] [$_{Asp0}$] [$_{PredP}$ [$_{SpecPred}$ ~~**s houz**~~] [$_{Pred0}$] [$_{V P}$ [$_{SpecV}$] [$_{V 0}$ **putzt**] [$_{DP}$ ~~**houz**~~]]]]]]]]

Also a non-argumental PP could in principle be contrasted (that is moved to Spec low FocusP), since we saw in (14) that in Mòcheno its base position seems to be below the periphery. As shown in the examples below this prediction is borne out since the PP can be contrasted only if showing up before the low adverb 'well' (18b), whereas this is ruled out if it follows (18a).

(18)   a. *Gester hot der papa schua s hauz schia PETN STAUPSAUGER UND NET PETN STROZ putzt
         yesterday has the dad already the house well with the hoover and not with the cloth cleaned
         b. Gester hot der papa schua s hauz PETN STAUPSAUGER UND NET PETN STROZ schia putzt
         'Yesterday dad cleaned well the house with the hoover and not with the cloth'

In (19) I give the structure of (18b) with the PP moving from its base position to Spec FocusP; the DO is in Spec TopicP.

(19)   [$_{AspP}$ [$_{SpecAsp}$ **schua**] [$_{Asp0}$] [$_{TopicP}$ [$_{SpecTopicP}$ **s houz**] [$_{Topic0}$] [$_{FocusP}$ [$_{SpecFocus}$ **petn staupsauger**] [$_{Focus0}$] [$_{AspP}$ [$_{SpecAsp}$ **schia**] [$_{Asp0}$] [$_{PP}$ [$_{SpecP}$ ~~**petn staupsauger**~~] [$_{P0}$] [$_{PredP}$ [$_{SpecPred}$ ~~**s houz**~~] [$_{Pred0}$][$_{V P}$ [$_{SpecV}$] [$_{V 0}$ **putzt**] [$_{DP}$ ~~**houz**~~]]]]]]]]

[8] Following Hinterhölzl (2006), I claim that also in Mòcheno there is evidence in favour of the presence of a projection called PredP below low manner adverbs and immediately above VP. In my analysis this projection represents the first step of the derivation of DOs; only if moving to a Spec position of the low periphery can they become real arguments. Evidence in favour of the presence of predicate DOs come for example from idiom chunks, which are the only constructions showing always OV syntax. Only real arguments can enter the pattern of OV/VO alternations shown so far.

One last point concerns the possibility of contrasting low adverbs that in principle should not be ruled out, since at least 'gonz' and 'schia' show up below the Topic and Focus projections. As shown in (20) in Mòcheno it is possible to contrast a low adverb both with the order DO-low adverb (20a) and low adverb-DO (20b); I take this to mean that a low adverb can show up both in Spec low FocusP and in Spec low TopicP[9].

(20)   a. Gester hone s houz SCHIA UND NET PRESAPOC/*UND NET DER AUTO petn staupsauger putzt
yesterday have-CL PRON the house well and not superficially cleaned
'Yesterday I hoovered the house properly and not superficially'
b. Gester hone schia S HAUZ UND NET DER AUTO/*UND NET PRESAPOC petn staupsauger putzt
'Yesterday I properly hoovered the house and not the car'

In (21) I give the structure of (20a): 'schia' is in Spec FocusP and DO in Spec TopicP.

(21) $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$ **schua** $]$ $[_{Asp0}]$ $[_{TopicP}$ $[_{SpecTopicP}$ **s hauz** $]$ $[_{Topic0}]$ $[_{FocusP}$ $[_{SpecFocus}$ **schia** $]$ $[_{Focus0}]$ $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$ ~~**schia**~~$]$ $[_{Asp0}]$ $[_{PP}$ $[_{SpecP}$ **petn staupsauger** $]$ $[_{P0}]$ $[_{PredP}$ $[_{SpecPred}$ ~~**hauz**~~$]$ $[_{Pred0}]$ $[_{VP}$ $[_{SpecV}$ $]$ $[_{V0}$ **putz**$]$ $[_{DP}$ **hauz**$]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$

In (22) I give the structure of (20b): 'schia' is in Spec TopicP and DO in Spec FocusP.

(22) $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$ **schua** $]$ $[_{Asp0}]$ $[_{TopicP}$ $[_{SpecTopicP}$ **schia** $]$ $[_{Topic0}]$ $[_{FocusP}$ $[_{SpecFocus}$ **s hauz** $]$ $[_{Focus0}]$ $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$ ~~**schia**~~$]$ $[_{Asp0}]$ $[_{PP}$ $[_{SpecP}$ **petn staupsauger** $]$ $[_{P0}]$ $[_{PredP}$ $[_{SpecPred}$ ~~**hauz**~~$]$ $[_{Pred0}]$ $[_{VP}$ $[_{SpecV}$ $]$ $[_{V0}$ **putz**$]$ $[_{DP}$ ~~**hauz**~~$]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$

The data presented so far have shown that OV syntax in Mòcheno can be accounted for assuming that DOs move either to the Spec of low Topic or low FocusP, whereas the past participle remains in a very low position.
The low phase of the clause has in Mòcheno the following structure:

---

[9]The same pattern is valid also for the adverb 'gonz'.

(23)   ALREADY - TOPIC - FOCUS - COMPLETELY - WELL - PPs – PREDP-
         PAST PART

After having shown that OV syntax in Mòcheno actually involves the use of the low
left periphery and having sketched its structure and position in the clause, in the
following section I will show that the possibility of having VO syntax in Mòcheno is
tightly linked to the structure given in (23) and in no sense optional.

5 VO patterns

I begin this section with a first descriptive generalisation:

(24)   The possibility of using the low periphery and having therefore OV syntax is
         linked to the type of XP showing up in the high periphery

In what follows I will try to illustrate this claim taking into consideration i) sentences
beginning with a focalised XP and ii) sentences beginning with the adverb *gester*,
'yesterday'.

5.1 Sentences beginning with a focalised XP

Sentences beginning with a focalised XP base-generated below the low periphery are
obligatory VO. As I show in (25a,b), it is not possible to have OV word order if the DO
is contrastively focalised in the high focus field; this is also valid for the case of
contrastive focalization of a non-argumental PP, (25c,d)[10].

(25)   a. A MOTZ PLIAMBLER UND NET A PFLONZ hone kaft afn morkt/gester
            a bunch flowers and not a plant have-CL PRON bought on-the market/
            yesterday
         b. *A MOTZ PLIAMBLER UND NET A PFLONZ hone afn morkt/gester kaft

---

[10] I will not take into consideration here the case of contrastive focalization of the indirect object
(IO) in the double object construction, that represents apparently a counter example to my claims,
since OV syntax in this case is obligatory. My claim is that this especial pattern can be made sense
of assuming that IO cannot move on its own to Spec low FocusP, as it is clearly hint at by the data
of mixed syntax (IO cannot cross DO).

'I bought a bunch of flowers and not a plant yesterday at the market'
c. PETN STROZ UND NET PETN STAUPSAUGER hone puzt s hauz
with the cloth and not with the hoover have-CL PRON cleaned the house
d. *PETN STROZ UND NET PETN STAUPSAUGER hone s hauz putzt
'I cleaned the house with the cloth and did not hoover it'

The pattern found in the previous sentences follows straight from my account of OV/VO word orders: i) XPs targeting a Spec position in the high Focus field and generated below the low periphery have to move first to the corresponding position of the low periphery; ii) the activation of low FocusP by an XP on its way to the high periphery causes movement of the past participle to the edge of the phase; iii) with VO syntax also Spec low TopicP is in principle available and can be occupied by an XP following the past participle.

In (26) I give the structure of (25a) with the PP showing up in its base position, but recall that it could also appear in SpecTopicP.

(26) $[_{FocusP}$ $[_{SpecFocus}$ **A motz pliamber**] $[_{Focus0}$ **hon-e**] $[_{AgrSP}$ $[_{SpecAgrS}$] $[_{Agr0}$ ~~hon~~] $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$] $[_{Asp0}$ **kaft**] $[_{TopicP}$ $[_{SpecTopicP}$] $[_{Topic0}$][$_{FocusP}$ $[_{SpecFocus}$ ~~motzpliamber~~] $[_{Focus0}$] $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$] $[_{Asp0}$] $[_{PP}[_{SpecP}$ **afn morkt**] $[_{P0}$] $[_{VP}$ $[_{SpecV}$] $[_{V0}$ ~~kaft~~] $[_{DP}$ ~~motz-pliamber~~]]]]]]]]]

5.2 Main interrogative clauses

Evidence in favour of the analysis proposed above comes from wh- main interrogative clauses, that show obligatory VO with any type of wh element except for the one corresponding to 'why'. In (27) I give some examples of this[11].

(27)   a. Pet bem hos-o kaft a puach?
with whom have-CL PRON you bought a book
b. *Pet bem hos-o a puach kaft?
'With whom did you buy a book?'
c. Bos hos-o kaft en de boteig?

---

[11] Intentionally I give only sentences with pronominal subjects which always show subject-verb inversion. In the case we has a DP the pattern would be less straightforward, since both subject verb inversion and NP right dislocation are admitted. I will not go into this.

1

what has-CL PRON bought in the shop
d. *Bos hos-o en de boteig kaft?
'What did you buy in the shop?'
e. Ber hot kaft a puach?
who has bought a book
f. *Ber hot a puach kaft?
'Who bought a book?'

As was the case with contrastively focalised XPs, the derivation involves: i) movement of the wh-element first to Spec low FocusP as first step of the derivation; ii) this intermediate step forces the past participle to rise to the edge of the phase; iii) an XP following past participle in VO syntax is either in Spec TopicP or in its base position.

In (28) I give the structure of (27c)

(28) $[_{FocusP}$ $[_{SpecFocus}$ **bos** $]$ $[_{Focus0}$ **hos-o** $]$ $[_{AgrSP}$ $[_{SpecAgrS}$ $]$ $[_{Agr0}$ ~~hos~~ $][_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$ $]$ $[_{Asp0}$ **kaft** $]$
$[_{TopicP}$ $[_{SpecTopicP}$ $]$ $[_{Topic0}$ **kaft**$]$ $[_{FocusP}[_{SpecFocus}$ **bos** $]$ $[_{Focus0}$ **kaft**$]$ $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$ $]$ $[_{Asp0}$ **kaft**$]$
$[_{PP}$ $[_{SpecP}$ **en deboteig** $[_{P0}$ **kaft** $]$ $[_{PredP}$ $[_{SpecPredP}$ $[_{Pred0}$ $]$ $[_{VP}$ $[_{SpecV}$ $]$ $[_{V0}$ **kaft** $]$ $[_{DP}$ **bos** $]$ $]$
$]]]]]]]$

Further arguments in favour of this analysis come from why- and yes/no main interrogative clauses.

As already said, the only wh- main interrogative clauses optionally showing OV syntax are the ones introduced by 'why'. This follows straightforwardly from Rizzi's (2001) claim that 'why' is base generated in the CP layer in the head position of a projection called InterrogativeP in whose Spec 'if' is to be found. 'Why' does not move through low FocusP. Notice that with 'why' the NP subject shows up after the wh-element (and is presumably to be found in a Topic position) and does not need to be dislocated to the right as is the case of (27).

(29)   a. Babai der Nane hot er kaft a puach?
         why the John has-CL PRON bought a book
         b. Babai der Nane hot er a puach kaft?
         'Why did John buy a book?'

1

In (30) I give the structure of why-main interrogative clauses with the past participle showing either above VP or at the edge of the lower phase[12].

(30) [$_{InterrP}$ [$_{SpecInterr}$ [$_{InterrO}$ **babai** [$_{TopicP}$ [$_{SpecTopicP}$ **der Nane**] [$_{Topic0}$][$_{FocusP}$ [$_{SpecFocus}$ [$_{Focus0}$ **hot-der**] [$_{AgrSP}$ [$_{SpecAgrS}$ ~~der Nane~~] [$_{Agr0}$ ~~hot~~] [$_{AspP}$ [$_{SpecAsp}$] [$_{Asp0}$ **KAFT**] [$_{TopicP}$ [$_{SpecTopicP}$] [$_{Topic0}$] [$_{FocusP}$[$_{SpecFocus}$ **a puach**] [$_{Focus0}$] [$_{AspP}$ [$_{SpecAsp}$] [$_{Asp0}$] [$_{PP}$ [$_{SpecP}$ [$_{P0}$ [$_{PredP}$ [$_{SpecPredP}$ ~~a puach~~] [$_{Pred0}$] [$_{VP}$ [$_{SpecV}$] [$_{V0}$ **KAFT**] [$_{DP}$ ~~a puach~~]]]]]]]]]]

With yes/no main interrogative clauses no such pattern is to be found, since no wh-element, that is no low Focus is activated by an XP on its way to the CP layer; therefore both OV and VO are possible.

(31)   a. Hoso kaft a puach?
         have-CL PRON bought a book
         b. Hoso a puach kaft?
         'Did you buy a book?'

Notice that OV syntax is obligatory with special main interrogative clauses (both yes/no and wh).

(32)   a. Benn hot der Mario a bain za tschaina trog?!!
         when has the Mario a wine to dinner brought
         'When has Mario ever come to dinner with a bottle of wine?!!'
         b. Ber hot a puach en de Maria gem?!!
         who has a book to the Maria given
         'Who has ever bought Mary a book?!'

This last point seems to hint at the fact that the wh-element showing up in special interrogative clauses do not share the same properties as wh-elements of real interrogatives which block Spec low FocusP, as already noted in the literature (among others Obenhauer 1994, 2004).

---

[12] VO syntax is derived also in this case through past participle movement to the edge of the lower phase, see the possibility of contrasting DO in the following example: Babai der Nane hot der kaft A PUACH UND NET A PENNA?

1

To summarise we can say that in a construction in which the high focus is surely occupied either by a focalised argumental XP or by an interrogative wh-element, VO syntax is obligatory, that is, the DO can never be interposed. OV syntax is possible as long as the low periphery is available, that is iff i) no focalised XP is extracted from below the low periphery, ii) the wh-element is base generated as is the case of 'why', iii) the low periphery is not involved, as with yes/no main questions.

In the last section I will come back to the case I began with, that is the one of sentences beginning with 'gester', trying to make sense on the basis of the proposed analysis why they allow both OV and VO syntax.

5.3 Sentences beginning with 'gester'

As shown in (5) repeated here as (33), sentences beginning with the adverb *gester*, 'yesterday', allow for both OV and VO syntax; notice that the adverb triggers verb-subject inversion in both cases[13].

(33)   a. Gester hone A PUACH UND NET A PENNA kaft
        yesterday have-CL PRON a book and not a pen bought
        b. Gester hone kaft a puach
        c. *Gester hone kaft A PUACH UND NET A PENNA
        'I bought a book and not a pen yesterday'

The possibility of having both OV/VO syntax with a sentence beginning with 'yesterday' is somehow unexpected after what we have seen so far, but it can be accounted for by claiming, following Benincà/Poletto (2004), that this adverb can be generated in at least three positions in the structure.

As shown in (34), 'gester' can be generated in a lower position above the VP layer where also adverbial PPs and bare NPs are to be found according to Schweikert (2004) and Cinque (1999, 2006); in TP; in CP in the topic frame and functions as a scene-setter.

---

[13]'Gester' can theoretically also not trigger inversion; in that case I claim, following Benincà/Poletto (2004), that it is used as a scene setter and occupies a Spec position in CP.

(34) [ScenesettingP [SpecScenesetting **GESTER**][SceneSetting0] [FocusP [SpecFocus [Focus0 **auxiliary**] [AgrSP [SpecAgrS **subject**] [Agr0 ~~auxiliary~~][TP [SpecT **GESTER**] [T0] [AspP [SpecAsp] [Asp0] [TopicP [SpecTopicP] [Topic0] [FocusP [SpecFocus] [Focus0] [AspP [SpecAsp] [Asp0] [DP [SpecD **GESTER**] [D0] [PredP [SpecPredP] [Pred0] [VP [SpecV] [V0 **past participle**] [DP]]]]]]]]]]]

VO syntax is possible only if the 'gester' showing up in CP and triggering V2 is the one generated above VP in the area where adverbial PPs and bare DPs (Schweikert 2004, Cinque 2006) are to be found. The adverb moved from that position has to pass through Spec low FocusP on its way to the CP layer, forcing the past participle to rise to the edge of the lower phase. The impossibility of contrasting a DO with VO syntax in sentences beginning with this 'gester' depends on the fact that below the past participle only a Topic projection is available, since Spec lowFocusP has been saturated by the XP moving to CP and *high focus-low focus. Of course one could also think that the DO remains in Spec PredP.

Cases of VO syntax with sentences beginning with 'gester' have the same derivation as (25c) with a focalised adverbial PP.

In (35) I give the structure of (33b).

(35) [FocusP [SpecFocus **Gester**] [Focus0 **hon-e**] [AgrSP [SpecAgrS] [Agr0 ~~hon~~][AspP [SpecAsp] [Asp0 **kaft**] [TopicP [SpecTopicP **a puach**] [Topic0 ~~kaft~~][FocusP [SpecFocus **gester**] [Focus0 ~~kaft~~] [AspP [SpecAsp] [Asp0 ~~kaft~~] [DP [SpecD ~~gester~~] [D0 ~~kaft~~] [PredP [SpecPred ~~a puach~~] [Pred0 ~~kaft~~] [VP [SpecV] [V0 ~~kaft~~] [DP ~~a puach~~]]]]]]]]]]]]

OV syntax with sentences beginning with 'gester' is possible only if the adverb is the one generated in T or higher in CP. I assume that it moves as well to a Spec position of the Focus field since it triggers inversion, but this position has to be different from the one occupied by an XP extracted from the area below the low periphery. The fact that no Spec position was saturated in the derivation, allows for the DO to move to one of the Specs of the low periphery whereas the past participle remains lower down in the structure. Notice that elements generated above the periphery can trigger inversion but they cannot target the same position as XPs moved from below the periphery, otherwise it would not be possible to contrast the DO in the lower phase, given the incompatibility between high focus and lower focus. They are probably moved to a Spec position for themes to be found in the focus field, whereas foci extracted from below are moved to a real Focus projection.

1

In (36) I give the strucure of (33a) with focalization of the DO.

(36) $[_{FocusP}$ $[_{SpecFocus}$ **Gester** $]$ $[_{Focus0}$ **hon-e** $]$ $[_{AgrSP}$ $[_{SpecAgrS}$ $]$ $[_{AgrS0}$ ~~**hon**~~ $]$ $[_{TP}$ $[_{SpecT}$ ~~**gester**~~ $]$ $[_{T0}$ $]$ $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$ $]$ $[_{Asp0}$ **kaft** $]$ $[_{TopicP}$ $[_{SpecTopicP}[_{Topic0}$ ~~**kaft**~~ $]$ $[_{FocusP}$ $[_{SpecFocus}$ **a puach** $]$ $[_{Focus0}$ ~~**kaft**~~ $]$ $[_{AspP}$ $[_{SpecAsp}$ $]$ $[_{Asp0}$ ~~**kaft**~~ $][_{PredP}$ $[_{SpecPred}$ ~~**a puach**~~ $]$ $[_{Pred0}$ ~~**kaft**~~ $]$ $[_{VP}$ $[_{SpecV}$ $]$ $[_{V0}$ ~~**kaft**~~ $]$ $[_{DP}$ ~~**a puach**~~ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$ $]$

6 Conclusions

In this work I tried to propose an account for OV/VO word order alternations in a Tyrolean dialect spoken in a Romance area claiming that the variation pattern can be easily made sense of starting from the hypothesis of the presence of a low and a high left periphery connected through movement.

OV syntax always involves the use of the low left periphery, which is not to be found immediately above VP as generally assumed in the literature, but below the low adverb 'already' and above 'well'. OV syntax is possible if the XP triggering subject-verb inversion is generated in a position above the low periphery. With OV syntax the past participle does not move or moves very little.

VO syntax is possible only if Spec low FocusP is saturated by an XP moving to a Spec of high FocusP. The stepwise movement of an XP on its way to the CP layer forces the past participle to rise to the edge of the lower phase: what follows can be either in Spec low TopicP or in its base position and therefore cannot be contrasted.

References

Belletti, Adriana (2001): "Inversion as focalization", in: A.Hulk and J.Y.Pollock (eds.), *Inversion in Romance and the theory of Universal Grammar*. Oxford University Press

(2004): "Aspects of the low IP Area", in: L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2.* Oxford University Press, New York/Oxford

/Ur, Shlonsky (1995): "The order of verbal complements: A comparative study", in: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 13, 3

Benincà, Paola (2001): "The Position of Topic and Focus in the left Periphery", in: G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pagg. 41-64

(2006): "On the Functional Structure of the Left Periphery of Medieval Romance", in: R. Zanuttini, H. Campos, E. Herburger e P. Portner (eds.), *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-linguistics Investigation*. Georgetown University Press, Washington

/Cecilia, Poletto (2004): "Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers", in: L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*. Oxford University Press, New York

Cinque, Guglielmo (1999): *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford University Press, New York

(2006): "Complements and Adverbial PPs: Implication for Clause Structure", in: G. Cinque, *Restructuring and Functional Structure. The Cartography of Syntactic Structure, Volume 4*. Oxford University Press, New York. pages 145-166

Cognola, Federica (2007): "Ordini delle parole e movimento wh- in mòcheno", paper presented at the XIIIth Giornata di dialettologia, University of Padua

(2008): "Ordini OV/VO nelle frasi dichiarative del Mòcheno", talk delivered at the University of Padua, 7th January

Diesing, Molly (1997): "Yiddish VP Order and the Typology of Object Movement in Germanic", in: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15

Hinterhölzl, Roland (2006): *Scrambling, Remnant Movement and Restructuring in West Germanic*. Oxford University Press, New York

Jayaseelan, Karattuparambil (2001): "IP-internal Topic and Focus Phrases", in: *Studia Linguistica* 55.1

Kayne, Richard S. (1994): *The antisymmetry of syntax*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

1

Obenauer, Hans Georg (1994): *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Effects d'intervention et mouvements des quantifieurs.* Thèse d'Etat, Université de Paris VII

(2004): "Non standard wh-questions and alternative checkers in Pagotto", in: H. Lohnstein and S. Trissler (eds): *The left periphery of Germanic Languages*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin

Poletto, Cecilia (2002): "The left periphery of V2-Rhaetoromance dialects: a new perspective on V2 and V3", in: S. Barbiers, L. Cornips e S. van der Kleij (eds.): *Syntactic Microvariation*. Meertens Institute, Amsterdam

(2006): "Old Italian Scrambling: the low left periphery of the clause", in: M. Frascarelli (ed.), *Proceedings of the 31st Meeting of Generative Grammar*, Mouton de Gruyter

Polo, Chiara (2004): *Word Order Between Morphology and Syntax*. RGG Monography. Unipress, Padova

Rizzi, Luigi (1997): "The fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in: L.Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht

(2001): "The Position of Inter(rogative)P in the Left Periphery of the Clause", in: G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Elsevier, Amsterdam

(2004a): "Locality and Left Periphery", in: A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structure, Volume 3*. Oxford University Press, New York

(2004b): "On the Form of Chains: Criterial Positions and ECP Effects", available on the internet under: wwww.ciscl.unisi.it

Roberts, Ian (1993): *Verbs and diachronic Syntax: a comparative history of English and French*. Dordrecht/Kluwer Academic Publishers

Rowley, Anthony (2002): *Liacht as de sproch: grammatica della lingua mòchena*. Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto mòcheno di cultura, Palù del Fersina

Schweikert, Walter (2004): "The Order of Prepositional Phrases in the Structure of the clause". PhD dissertation, University of Venice