RESILIENT GRAMMARS:
ON VO/OV IN GERMANIC LINGUISTIC ISLANDS IN NORTHERN ITALY

CECILIA POLETTO & GÜNTHER GREWENDORF
Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main

ABSTRACT

In this work we consider some residual cases of OV order in Cimbrian and show that this is due to the interaction between verb movement, a language specific property, and the syntax of bare quantifiers. This has consequences on a general theory on the change of the basic word order, since it shows that the passage from OV to VO can involve different structures in different languages depending on other properties, hence it is not possible to trace a common path in the diachronic change for all languages that have undergone this mutation.

[1] INTRODUCTION

In this work we concentrate on Cimbrian, a Germanic variety spoken in Northern Italy. Cimbrian used to be spoken in the whole Asiago Plateau, the area of the so called seven communities and thirteen communities (among them Giazza, Roana) as well as Luserna in the Trento province, where it is still relatively well preserved and spoken by a community of about 300 speakers. The geographical area Cimbrian used to cover extends between Trento, Verona and Vicenza, but nowadays most varieties are at best residual languages or have totally disappeared from the active competence of the inhabitants of the area.

Since the only well-preserved variety still in daily use nowadays is the one of Luserna, we will discuss data from this variety (and compare it to the one found in the literature when necessary), where the attempts to preserve it include courses at school, publications festivals etc. When not otherwise indicated, the data stem from our own field work in Luserna extended over the years.[1] When necessary, we will compare Cimbrian with Plodarisch,[2] another linguistic island spoken in Northern Veneto at the border with Friaul, which has a comparable

---

[1] We thank the collaborators of the Cimbrian Institute and particularly Fiorenzo Nicolussi and Andrea Nicolussi Golo for their help and patience in checking data with us.
[2] Also for Plodarisch the data stem from our own field work. We thank the family Kratter for their help.

sociolinguistic situation.

The reason why Cimbrian is particularly interesting is that, although it has maintained the verb second property up to now, it is possibly the only German dialect with a VO structure, which clearly looks like a case of massive language-contact induced change. The sociolinguistic situation of Luserna, where speakers have native competence of Cimbrian, standard Italian (which is the so-called 'Dachsprache') and the Trentino/Veneto Northern Italian non-standard varieties spoken in the neighbouring villages lends itself to such a hypothesis. Luserna speakers use Cimbrian within the community (in colloquial situations even outside the family), Trentino/Veneto with speakers from other villages (for instance at the weekly market) and standard Italian in formal situations.

Cimbrian has maintained the V2 property typical of all German varieties (see Grewendorf & Poletto 2011), although with peculiar features, which are similar to those found in Old Italian (see Poletto 2014). However, it is striking that the language is a regular VO language with only some interesting residues of OV, which we will discuss. The aim of this work is to show that a) there is actually no direct evidence that the VO property of Cimbrian is borrowed from Italian b) the VO property of Cimbrian displays interesting differences with respect to the neighbouring Italian varieties, which c) will bring us to conclude that language contact applies to syntax in a peculiar way. So, it might be true that Cimbrian is VO due to the pressure of Italian, but it is certainly not true that Cimbrian has borrowed the type of VO typical of Romance (and in particular of Italian) tout court. This means that syntactic change due to language contact does not simply borrow syntactic properties as they are and transfers them from the lending language to the borrowing language, i.e. syntactic borrowing does not work like lexical borrowing, where the lexeme is taken from one language and used in the other as well. Since syntax is a unitary system where "tout se tient", it would be very surprising indeed that languages just take a piece of a foreign grammar and, so to speak, "swallow it whole". Since the system is an integrated derivational machine, the new property must also be integrated.

One general problem when talking about language contact is that one needs to prove that the change has occurred as a consequence of the contact, i.e. one needs criteria. According to Poplack & Levey (2010), it is only possible to prove that the change of property P has occurred in a language A as the consequence of language contact with a language B when the following conditions are met:

(i) We can identify a previous stage of A where the property which is supposed to be borrowed did not exist. A stronger version of this condition would be to say that at no stage of evolution of A previous to the contact with B property P is attested.[3]

(ii) The change must have occurred in an appropriate span of time, for instance, it is not plausible that such a basic property as VO/OV has changed in the span of one generation.

This means that in order to assume that the VO order of Cimbrian has been influenced by Italian, we would have to verify conditions a) and b), i.e. provide incontrovertible historical evidence for a stage previous to the contact where Cimbrian was OV. This is clearly not possible, since the first attestations of Cimbrian we have are from the beginning of the XVII century, and at this point Cimbrian already displays VO. However, we will see that this is not even necessary, since we can show that Cimbrian has a type of VO which is NOT the one of the neighbouring Italian varieties. Even though Italian might have influenced Cimbrian, it has done so in an indirect way, and not by "lending" a piece of its grammar to Cimbrian. Furthermore, Cimbrian has retained some very resilient properties typical of Germanic, like the position of clitic pronouns, which remain in enclisis, and some OV orders with bare quantifiers that are not attested in the neighbouring Italian varieties.

[2] VO VERSUS OV

The first logical move to make when examining the problem of VO versus OV is to establish criteria which clearly define a language as VO or OV. Several proposals have been made in the typological literature (see for instance Dryer 1997, Dryer 2007). The problem with typological criteria is that even standard German does not always fit into them as an SOV language; for instance the fact that SOV languages generally have postpositions is by and large not met by German (which has only a couple of residual postpositions or specific constructions).[4] The same holds for subordinators, which in SOV languages like Lezgian (described in Dryer 2007, p. 62 ff.) or Japanese can occur in sentence final position. This is never the case in standard German. Also criteria like the structure of comparison (see Dryer 2007, p. 63) with standard comparison

---

[3] Notice that also Heine and Kuteva (2005:8) warn against language contact as the cause of linguistic change in absence of strong sociohistorical and linguistic evidence that this is the case.

[4] See for instance the preposition *nach* 'towards', which can occur in postnominal position as a postposition in some contexts/expressions like *meiner Meinung nach*, 'in my opinion' when it has a non-spatial meaning.

preceding the comparison marker are not met by German. Therefore, using typological criteria is not fine-grained enough to determine the difference between standard German and Cimbrian.[5] Also in the generative literature there are some proposals for criteria to determine the SVO/SOV status of a language, see among others those proposed on the basis of Germanic by Fuß (2005) and Fuß & Trips (2002) according to whom a VO-language must meet the criteria in (1):

(1)   (i)   It shows verbal particles in postverbal position.
        (i)   It shows light elements in postverbal position (pronouns and light adverbials which cannot undergo right dislocation).
        (ii)   It never shows the sequence *finite verb - object - main verb*.

These criteria are also problematic because they give us the wrong results for Romance languages, which are nonetheless standardly considered as VO languages both in the generative and typological literature.

The first criterion cannot be applied, since Romance languages do not generally display verbal particles. It is however true that precisely in the North-Eastern area, i.e. Veneto and Trentino a small set of prepositions can be combined with the verb also in semantically non transparent contexts, so that one might analyze them as verbal particles (see Benincá & Poletto 2006 for Veneto, Cordin 2011 for Trentino) and it is true that they generally occur after the past participle:

(2)   [Venetian]
        El me ga dito su.
        He to-me has told up
        'He told me off'

However, it is not clear what the status of these elements is, whether they are already completely grammaticalized as particles or not. Therefore, we can conclude that the first test is not applicable to all languages. Furthermore, and rather paradoxically, these verb+preposition constructions are often assumed to be due to language contact with Germanic, so we would have a somewhat circular criterion. Therefore, we consider this criterion as non-applicable.

The second test is also very problematic in Romance, since clitics and weak pronouns never occur in postverbal position. Notably clitics are in proclisis to the inflected verb, not in enclisis, but also weak pronoun as Italian *loro* studied

---

[5]   There is actually a debate in the typological literature concerning the OV status of German, which we will not enter here.

by Cardinaletti (1998) occur between the auxiliary and the past participle in what could be viewed as a typical OV position. The third criterion is also problematic for Romance: if you consider a language like French, where bare object quantifiers do occur in front of the past participle, one would reach the rather awkward conclusion that French is not a VO language.

(3)   [French]
   a.   Je n'ai rien vu.
         I not have nothing seen
         'I have seen nothing'
   b.   '%Je n'ai vu rien.'[6]

Therefore, the situation is rather complex and it is not really possible to use the criteria that have been

[3]   CIMBRIAN AS A VO LANGUAGE: ANALOGIES WITH ITALIAN

The very first naïve observation that can be made looking at Cimbrian, is that it is clearly a VO language like Romance and unlike German, because the direct object is located on the right of both the auxiliary and the past participle:

(4)   [Cimbrian]
   a.   Haüte die Mome hat gekoaft die Öala al Mercà/kam bir/in die Buteghe.
         today the mother has bought the eggs at the market/in the bar/in the shop
         'Today mum bought eggs at the market/in the bar/ in the shop'
   b.   Haüte die Mome hat gebäscht di Piattn.
         today the mother has washed the dishes
         'Today mum washed the dishes'
   c.   *Haüte di Mome hat di Piattn gebäscht.
         today the mother has the dishes washed

Notice that even if Cimbrian is a V2 language which allows for V3 structures with topics, the contrast with German represented in (5) emerges in the fact that the direct object, as well as PPs, occurs after the past participle and not before (see the reverse grammaticality pattern in 4b,c and 5,b,c).

---

[6]   This sentence is generally considered possible only if the quantifier is focused.

(5)   [German]
  a.   Heute hat die Mutter die Eier am Markt/im Laden gekauft.
        Today has the mother the eggs at.the market/at.the shop bought
        'Today mum bought eggs at the market/in the bar/ in the shop'
  b.   *Heute hat die Mutter gespült die Teller.
        Today has the mother washed.up the dishes
        'Today mum washed the dishes'
  c.   Heute hat die Mutte die Teller gespült.
        Today has the mother the dishes washed.up

Differently from German, Cimbrian of Luserna also shows the sequence *finite verb
- main verb - object* in embedded clauses introduced by a complementizer, as can
be seen in (6). In this sense Cimbrian is also analogous to Romance in having the
past participle before direct and indirect objects. Notice that this cannot be ana-
lysed as a case of embedded V2 because in German varieties the complementizer
bans verb movement (as we have also shown in Grewendorf and Poletto 2011)

(6)   [Cimbrian]
  a.   I boas ke di Mome hat gekoaft di Öala al Mercà.
        I know that the mother has bought the eggs at the market
        'I know that today mum bought eggs at the marker'
  b.   Dar issese darzürnt obrom gestarn honne i get an Libar in Peatar.
        he is-refl angry since yesterday have I given a book to Peter
        'He got angry since yesterday I gave a book to Peter'
  c.   S Beibe bo da-r-en hat geet an Liber.
        the woman who there-he-her has given a book
        'The woman to whom he gave a book'
  d.   Sa homar gevorst zega bas-to tüast hoint abas.
        they have-me asked to-say what-you do tonight
        'They asked me what you are going to do tonight'

If we consider more complex verbal forms, like those occurring with modals,
auxiliaries and past participles, we can also observe that Cimbrian still has the
same VO order typical of Romance. Furthermore, Cimbrian does not display the
phenomenon "infinitive pro participle" typical of German (and Dutch) where
under a modal both the main verb and the auxiliary have an infinitival form:

(7)   [Cimbrian]
    a.   Sa hom khött ke dar Gianni hat geböllt gian pit se.
         'they have said that the John has wanted go with them'
         'They said that Gianni wanted to go with them'
    b.   *Sa hon khött ke dar Gianni hat gian geböllt.
         'they have said that the John has go wanted'

(8)   [Italian]
    a.   Mi hanno detto che Gianni ha voluto andare con lei.
         To.me have said that John has wanted to.go with her
         'They said that Gianni wanted to go with them'
         [German]
    b.   Sie haben mir gesagt, dass Hans mit ihr hat gehen wollen.
         they have to.me said that John has with her has go want
         'They said that Gianni wanted to go with them'

We can conclude that the order of the verbal cluster is of the Romance type and not of the German type.

Furthermore, Cimbrian has another striking property, which is not common to all Romance, but typical of Italian, i.e. Cimbrian has postverbal subjects.

(9)   [Cimbrian]
    a.   Haüte geat vort dar Giani.
         Today goes out the Gianni
         'Today Gianni goes out'
    b.   Haüte geata vort niamat.
         'Today goes out noone'
         'Today nobody goes out'
    c.   I khoch-mar-en i in vormas. ("i" is focused)
         I cook-me-it I the lunch
         'I am cooking myself lunch'

(10)   [Italian]
    a.   Oggi va via Gianni.
         Today goes away Gianni
         'Today Gianni goes out'
    b.   Oggi non va via nessuno.
         Today not goes aways nobody
         'Today nobody goes away'
    c.   Me lo cucino io, il pranzo.
         me it cook-I, the lunch
         'I am cooking myself lunch'

(9) shows that Cimbrian has the possibility of having postverbal subjects of different types, definite DPs, quantifiers and full pronouns, just like Italian. This is rather striking, since Cimbrian is not a pro drop language like Italian and generally the possibility to have postverbal subjects is considered a consequence of the possibility to have pro in the preverbal subject position (see Lenerz 1977, Grewendorf 1989, Haider 1993).

[4] RESILIENT PROPERTIES: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CIMBRIAN AND ITALIAN

[4.1] *Enclitic pronouns*

So far, we have seen that the position of DP objects is on the right of the past participle, a typical VO property. Other types of objects behave differently from regular DPs. This is true both in Germanic languages and in Romance, where clitics maintain the OV order of Latin and occur in proclisis to the inflected verb.

One of the most stable properties of minority German varieties in Northern Italy is the position of pronouns. Although Cimbrian has VO with DP objects, it lacks another typical property which is characteristic of the Romance VO type: it does not have proclitic object pronouns in finite clauses.[7] In Cimbrian, clitics can only follow the finite verb or the complementizer (see (11c) and (11d) as it is the case in standard German: in embedded clauses the pronoun is enclitic onto the complementizer, in main clauses to the inflected verb in C

(11)   [Cimbrian]
    a.   Der   Tatta   hat-se   gekoaft.
          The   father   has them   bought
          'The father bought them'
    b.   *Der   Tatta   se   hat   gekoaft.
           the   father   them   has   bought
    c.   Da   soin   vortgont   ena   az-ta-s   niamat   barn.
          they   are   away-gone   before   that-part-it   nobody   noticed
          'They always went before anyone noticed'
    d.   *Da   soin   vortgont   ena   az   niamat   barn-da-z.
          they   are   away-gone   before   that   nobody   noticed-part-it
    e.   Bia   hoaster   (se)   er?
          how   calls-he   (himself)   he?
          'What's his name?

---

[7]   There is only one modern Romance variety known to have regular enclisis with inflected verbs, and this is the Borgomanerese (Piedmontese) dialect described by Tortora (2014). The same is true of infinitival clauses, but this is a topic we will not investigate here.

Cimbrian pronouns are still Wackernagel clitics, which attach in enclisis to either the inflected verb or the complementizer in C°. The same is true of Plodarisch:[8]

(12)   [Plodarisch]
        (I bin sicher) as Mario muist's schon hobn geton.
        (I am sure) that Mario must.it already have done
        'I am sure that Mario must have already done it'

It thus looks like Cimbrian displays the most basic characteristics of a VO-language but there are some interesting resilient patterns which have apparently not surrendered to the pressure of the Romance grammar.

[4.2] *Preparticipial quantifiers*

In addition to pronouns, another type of objects that have maintained a conservative pattern are bare quantifiers. In (13) we see that it is possible to have quantifier objects in the postparticipial position like definite object DPs.

(13)   [Cimbrian]
        I hon gesek niamat.
        I have seen nobody

Surprisingly, Cimbrian also allows the quantifier phrase to intervene between the finite auxiliary and the participle, which is at variance with what we said about the VO-constraint:

(14)   I hon niamat gesek.
        I have nobody seen
        'I have seen nobody'

The option in (14) is not limited to the expression *niamat*, it represents a more general phenomenon that has to do with the specific nature of the object phrase. This can be seen from the examples (15) - (18):[9]

 (15)   a.   I bil seng niamat.
              I want see nobody
              'I do not want to see anybody'
        b.   I bil niamat seng.
              'I want nobody see'

---

[8]   See below for a discussion of the verb position in Plodarisch.
[9]   The same is true also for other sentence types, see the following interrogative clause:
       Hasto gesek niamat?
       Hasto niamat gesek?

(16) a.   I hon gesek eparummas.
            I have seen somebody
      b.   I hon eparummas gesek.
            I have somebody seen

(17) a.   I hon gesek aniaglas.
            I have seen everybody
      b.   I hon aniaglas gesek.
            I have everybody seen'

(18) a.   I bil aniaglas seng/seng aniaglas.
            I want everbody see/see everybody
      b.   I bil eparummas seng/seng eparummas.
            I want somebody see/see somebody

These observations suggest the generalization that objects represented by quantifiers permit the order *finite verb - object - participle*, which is otherwise illicit in a VO-language.

It looks like this generalization does not concern a specific phenomenon of the VO-language Cimbrian. Another Germanic VO-language which allows preposing of quantified objects is Icelandic. While Old-Icelandic until the 18. century predominantly shows OV-order with various preverbal complements (nominal objects, PP-objects, adverbials, particles etc.), the OV order declines from the 18. century on. In the 19. century, only a few remainders of the old OV-order can be observed (cf. Hróarsdóttir 2000, p. 155 f.). Modern Icelandic has fully developed VO-order in the VP and only allows the sequence [*VP auxiliary - main verb - object*]. However, there is an important exception to this constraint: While nominal phrases cannot occur in front of the past participle, the preparticipial position is an option for quantified phrases and is obligatory for negated phrases, as illustrated by the examples in (19) and (20):

(19)   [Icelandic]
      a.   Strákarnir höfðu hent miklu grjóti í bílana.
            'the-boys had thrown many stones on the-cars'
            'The boys had thrown many stones to the cars'
      b.   Strákarnir höfðu miklu grjóti hent í bílana.
            'the-boys had many stones thrown on the-cars'
            (Svenonius 2000, p. 261)

(20)   a.   *Strákarnir höfðu hent engu grjóti í bílana.
              'the-boys had   thrown no stones on the-cars'
              'The boys have thrown no stones to the cars'
        b.   Strákarnir höfðu engu grjóti hent í bílana.
              'the-boys had no stones thrown on he-cars'
              (Svenonius 2000, p. 260)

In English, an analogous phenomenon can be observed. English too has developed from an OV- to a VO-language and this change has come to an end in the late Middle English period. Although late Middle English already shows general VO-order, quantified and negated objects are allowed to precede the infinite verb:

(21)   [Middle English]
        He haþ on us mercy, for he may al Þynge do.
        'he has with us mercy since he can allethings do'
        'He has mercy with us since he is allmighty'
        (Trips 2002, p. 203)

In early Middle English, which is in the transition from OV to VO, OV-order with a quantifier located in front of the non finite form of the verb, already occurs more often with quantified phrases than with non-quantified NPs.

    It has been observed (cf. Rögnvaldsson 1987; Svenonius 2000, among others) that several Scandinavian languages, including Icelandic, show a phenomenon known as "Quantifier Movement" e.g. scope, moves a quantified expression leftward across VP-internal material to a VP- external position. As can be seen from the Icelandic example (22), the landing site of Quantifier Movement must be a VP-external position (which according to Fox and Pesetsky 2005, p. 31, is slightly lower than the landing site of Object Shift):

(22)   [Icelandic]
        Hann mun mikið hafa vilja [lesa __].
        he will much have wanted read
        'He has wanted to read much'
        (Trips 2002, p. 203)

In Romance languages, a similar phenomenon can be found. Unlike earlier stages of Romance, the modern Romance languages generally show VO-order.

    However, French also allows preposing of quantifiers, but notice that the expected VO-order is ungrammatical with bare quantifiers:

(23)   [French]
       a.   Je n'ai rien vu.
             'i not-have nothing seen'
       b.   *Je n'ai vu rien.
             'I not-have seen nothing'
             (Cinque 1999)
       c.   J'ai tout vu.
             'I have everthing seen'
       d.   %J'ai vu tout.[10]
             'I have seen everything'

Notice however that there is an interesting difference between Germanic languages like Icelandic and Middle English and the Romance language French, since in French only bare quantifiers can occupy the preparticipial position, while quantified expressions cannot.

(24)   [French]
       a.   *Je n'ai aucun garçon/pas tout ça vu.   *OV
             I not=have any boy/not all that seen
             'I have not seen any boy/all this'
       b.   Je n'ai vu aucun garçon/pas vu tout ça.   VO
             'I not=have seen any boy/not seen all that'

Cimbrian displays the same restriction found in French, i.e. only bare quantifiers can be found in a pre-participial position:

(25)   [Cimbrian]
       a.   I hon gesek kumman Pua.
             I have seen no boy
             'I have seen no boy'
       b.   *I hon kumman Pua gesek.
             'I have no boy seen'

We can conclude that a) several languages display a different pattern when the object contains a quantifier. Quantifiers are generally more easily found in OV position than definite objects both in Germanic and Romance.

There is a distinction between Icelandic and Middle English on the one hand and French and Cimbrian on the other, since the latter only allow for bare quantifiers to occur in preparticipial position. In standard Italian as well as in

---

[10]   In general, it is possible to have a postparticipial bare quantifier only when it is focused, otherwise the normal position is the preparticipial one.

the varieties in contact with Cimbrian the past participle occurs on the left of manner adverbs (like 'well'), contrary to French:

(26)   [Veneto]
        El ga capio ben.
        'He has understood well'

(27)   [standard French]
        Il a bien compris.
        'He has well understood'

(28)   [standard Italian]
        Ha capito bene.
        'Has understood well'

Notice that also standard Italian and Veneto display a higher position of bare quantifiers (at least of the universal one *tutto/tutti*) with respect to normal objects, although this does not result in reversing the word order with respect to the past participle.

   As already discussed by Cinque (1999) the bare quantifier *tutto* 'everything' is located on the left of manner adverbs, while definite object DPs and quantified objects are located to its right:

(29)   [standard Italian]
        a.   Ho capito tutto bene.
              Have understood all well
              'I understood everything well'
        b.   Ho capito bene il libro.
              Have understood well the book
              'I understood the book well'
        c.   Ho capito bene tutto il libro.
              Have understood well all the book
        d.   *Ho capito il libro bene.
              Have understood the book well
        e.   *Ho capito tutto il libro bene
              Have understood all the book well

(30)   [Veneto]
        a.   Go capio tuto ben.
              have understood all well
              'I understood everything well'

b.   Go capio ben el libro.
     have understood well the book
     'I understood the book well'
c.   Go capio ben tuto el libro.
     have understood well all the book
     'I understood the book well'
d.   *Go capio el libro ben.
     Have understood the book well
     'I understood the book well'
e.   *Go capio tuto el libro ben.
     Have understood all the book well
     'I understood well all the book'

This means that the Italian varieties in contact with Cimbrian have indeed a higher position of bare quantifiers, though this is not immediately visible.

We conclude that the pre- or postparticipial position of quantifiers depends on the raising point of the past participle. This means that Cimbrian and French have low past participles, while standard Italian and Veneto have higher past participles, but all of them move bare quantifiers to the left.

There is a more general problem here: as we have seen, the Germanic and the Romance phenomenon of quantifier preposing is different: Germanic languages are more tolerant and also quantified expressions can pied-pipe their lexical restriction to the higher position, while this is not the case in French and Cimbrian.

More generally, our observations can be summarized as follows. In addition to the lack of proclitic pronouns in finite clauses, the VO-language Cimbrian shows a further property which looks prima facie atypical in a VO-language: the pre-participial position of quantified objects.

On the other hand, we have seen that the Germanic languages have a slightly different property, since OV is allowed also with quantified expressions and not only with bare quantifiers. This means that the property of Cimbrian is neither identical to the contact varieties, which have VO, nor to the one of the Germanic languages, which prepose also quantified expressions.

[4.3] *Separable prefixes*

A third property of Cimbrian which represents a phenomenon typical of OV-languages concerns separable prefixes. In main clauses of the OV languages like German, separable prefixes are located in the right sentence bracket.

(31) [German]
      Heute spült die Mutter die Teller ab.
      today washes the mother the dishes (up)
      'Today mum washes the dishes'

(32) *Heute spült die Mutter ab die Teller.

In German embedded clauses and with composed tenses, the prefix precedes the verb:

(33)   [German]
      a.   Der Vater hat kritisiert, dass die Mutter die Teller abspült.
            the father has criticized that the mother the dishes washes-pref
            'Dad criticized, that mum washes the dishes'
      b.   Der Vater hat die Teller abgespült.
            the father has the dishes washed-pref
            'Dad has washed the dishes'

This is different from the VO-language English, where with so-called "phrasal verbs", which is the VO-counterpart of separable prefixes in German, the nominal elements can occur on the right or on the left of the particle, while the pronouns generally occur on the left of the particle (at least with a specific class of verbs):

(34)   [English]
      a.   I gave up the job.
      b.   I gave it up.
      c.   What did you give up?

In Cimbrian main clauses, separable prefixes show the postparticipial position typical of VO-languages (35a). However, preparticipial order, which is typical of OV-languages, is also possible (35b).

(35)   [Cimbrian]
      a. I hon   gehort   au Arbat ka Tria.
          I have finished-pref the work   in Trento
      b. I hon   augehort   die Arbat ka Tria.
          I have finished-pref the work   in Trento
          'I have finished the work in Trento'

Notice that even with the preparticipial option, an object is not allowed to intervene between the finite verb and the participle (as expected in a VO-

language):

(36)   *I   hon   di   Arbat   au-gehört.
        I   have   the   work   finished-pref
        'I have finished the job'

In embedded clauses, the same options exist for separable prefixes as in main clauses:

(37)   a.   Dar Mann   bo   da   hat   o-geheft   a   naüga   Arbat.
            the man   who   where   has-part started-pref a   new   work
       b.   Dar Mann   bo   da   hat   geheft-o   a   naüga   Arbat.
            the man   who   where   has-part started-pref a   new   work
            'The man who has started a new job'

(38)   a.   I gloabe ke dar Hons is gont-vort.
            I think that the John is gone-away
            'I think that H. has gone away'
       b.   I gloabe ke dar Hons is vort-gont.
            I think that the John is away-gone

(39) shows that in main clauses and in embedded clauses introduced by the complementizer *ke*, the separable prefix is not allowed to precede the finite verb:

(39)   a.   *Dar   Hons o   hat   gerieft.
            The   John   has-pref   called
            'H. has called'
       b.   *Dar   hat   khoett ke   dar   Hans   o hat   gerieft.
            he   has   said   that   the   John   has-pref   called
            'He said that H. has called'

However, when we consider other types of complementizers and not only *ke*, the impossible order becomes possible. Relative clauses (among others) are introduced by a complementizer of the former type, and in relative clauses, separable prefixes can occur in front of the finite verb:

(40)   Dar Mann bo   da o hat   geheft a naüga Arbat.
       the man   that   has-part-pref started a new   work
       'The man who started a new job'

Our observations about separable prefixes show a further OV-residue in the syntax of Cimbrian: the option of placing these prefixes in a position preceding

the participle indicates that Cimbrian of Luserna has not yet completed its change to a VO-language. This hypothesis receives independent support from the fact that Roana, a variety of Cimbrian which has almost finished its development into a VO-language, only allows separable prefixes to occur in the postparticipial position typical of a VO-language.

(41)   [Cimbrian of Roana]
　　a.   Haüte dar Gianni is gont-vort.
　　　　today the John is gone-away
　　b.   *Haüte dar Gianni is vort-gon.
　　　　today the John is away-gone
　　　　'Today Gianni went out'

It emerges from these observations that the change from an OV- to a VO-language takes the position of finite auxiliaries as its starting point (for an explanation of this phenomenon, see Fuß &Trips 2002), while the position of clitic pronouns, quantified objects, and separable prefixes appear to be the most resistent OV-phenomena, which are the latest to surrender to the inevitable typological change.

[4.4] *Verb movement and IP adverbs*

The order of prefixes and the position of bare quantifiers shows that the Cimbrian inflected verb does not raise in the TP area. In order to be more precise, let us use the standard test to determine the exact position of the inflected verb, i.e. the position of adverbs.

　　Since it would be extremely time consuming to test all the sequence of adverbs that Cinque (1999) argues for, we will concentrate here on those that are relevant to show the height of verb movement in Cimbrian. We start from Cinque's (1999) hierarchy, here repeated under (42):

(42)   [Asp habitual *usually* [Asp repetitive I *again* [Asp frequentative I *often*
　　　[Asp celerative I *quickly* [T anterior *already* [Asp terminative *no longer*
　　　[Asp continuative *still* [Asp perfect *always* [Asp retrospective *just* [Asp
　　　proximative *soon* [Asp durative *briefly* [Asp generic/progressive
　　　characteristically [Asp prospective *almost* [Asp sg completive I *completely*
　　　[Asp pl completive *tutto* [Voice *well* [Asp celerative II *fast, early* [Aspsg
　　　completive II *completely* [Asp repetitive II *again* [Asp frequentative II
　　　often]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]

We consider the manner adverb *garecht* 'well', the aspectual adverbs *herta*

'always' and *za* 'already', and the modal adverb *furse*[11] 'perhaps', which is located higher than the highest AspP. Starting from the lowest adverb we have tested, i.e. the adverb *garecht*, corresponding to the Specifier of Voice in (42), we notice that it always occurs on the right of the inflected verb, like in Italian:

(43)   I bill asto åhefst garecht di arbat.
        I want that you start well the work
        'I want you to start your job well'

As for the *herta*, main verbs can either occur to the left or to the right of the adverb. On the assumption that adverbs do not move, originally based on Pollock (1989) and Cinque (1999), we can conclude that the inflected verbs can but need not move higher than the aspectual adverb:

(44)   a.   Dar libar bo da ze lesan herta.
              The book who there they read always
              'The book that they read always'
        b.   Dar libar boma herta lesst worma geat in pett.
              The book that.we always read wenn we go in bed
              'The book that we always read before we go to bed'

(45)   a.   … az ar za årüaft.
              … that he already phoned
        b.   … *az ar årüaft za.
              … that he phoned already
              '… that he already phoned'

The aspectual adverb *za* 'already' always occurs to the left of the inflected verb: The same is observed with the modal adverb *furse* 'perhaps' which always occurs on the left of the inflected verb:

(46)   a.   … az ar furse årüaft.
              … that he perhaps phones
        b.   … *az ar årüaft furse.
              … that he phones perhaps
              '… that perhaps he will phone'

Since modal adverbs are located higher than aspectual adverbs like 'already', as

---

[11]   Furse is clearly a borrowing from the Italian neighboring varieties. Borrowing of adverbs is rather common in contact situation, see for instance the Central Ladin adverb s*chnel* meaning 'quickly' which is an evident borrowing from the Pustertal dialects.

shown in (42), and considering that *za* always occurs to the left of the verb, it is expected that *furse* does as well.

This means that the inflected verb raises much less than the Romance verb: essentially the position of the inflected verb in Cimbrian corresponds to the raising span of the past participle in the Northern Italian varieties (see Cinque 1999 chapter 2), which occurs after *za* but can occur before or after the adverb corresponding to 'always'. Mapping the adverbs we have considered onto Cinque's hierarchy, we can conclude that tenses have to raise higher than VoiceP, can raise higher than PerfectaspectP containing adverbs like 'always' but cannot raise higher than TanteriorP whose specifier contains the adverb 'already'. We will come back to this conclusion after having considered the movement span of complex tenses.

The VO system of Cimbrian is not the one of the Romance languages, where the inflected verb must raise higher than the adverb *already* and can raise higher than the adverb *perhaps*, as shown in (47):

(47) a.   ... che Gianni telefona giá alle cinque.
           ... that Gianni calls already at five
           '... that Gianni already calls at five'
      b.   ... che Gianni telefona forse alle cinque.
           ... that Gianni calls maybe at five
           '... that maybe Gianni will call at five'

[5]   CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this work we have examined the peculiar system of Cimbrian, the only German dialect which has become a VO language. In Cimbrian, we see that the last residues of the OV grammar are concentrated in the position of bare quantifiers, which remain in OV order also in an otherwise VO grammar.

However, Cimbrian has maintained a typical Germanic property, which is most probably also related to the V2 effect, i.e. they still have enclitic and not proclitic pronouns, like Romance. We conclude that some properties are more resilient than others and this raises the question of the reason why this is so, a question we will answer in future work.

DEDICATION

We dedicate this work to Janne, whose vital energy, passion for our work and engagement in creating new methods has always been an inspiration. Her courage in finding new ways to systematize data and means to investigate the language faculty will remain as a model to us all. We will sorely miss her.

REFERENCES

Benincá, Paola & Poletto, Cecilia 2006. Phrasal Verbs in Venetan and Regional Italian. In *Language Variation – European Perspectives*, edited by Marc van Oostendorp, 9–23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cardinaletti, Anna 1998. On the deficient/strong opposition in possessive systems. In *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*, in Artemis Alexiadou & Chris Wilder, 17–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cinque, Guglielmo 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A crosslinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cordin, Patrizia. 2011. *Le costruzioni verbo-locativo in area romanza: Dallo spazio all'aspetto*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1997. On the Six-Way Word Order Typology. *Studies in Language* 21: 69–103.

Dryer, Matthew S. 2007. Word order. In *Language typology and syntactic description*, edited by Timothy Shopen, 2nd ed., 1:61–131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Danny & Pesetsky, David. 2005. Cyclic Linearization of Syntactic Structure. *Theoretical linguistics*. 31. 1-45. 10.1515/thli.2005.31.1-2.1.

Fuß, Eric. 2005. *The Rise of Agreement.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fuß, Eric & Carola Trips. 2002. Variation and change in Old and Middle English. On the validity of the Double Base Hypothesis. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4: 171-224.

Grewendorf, Günther. 1989. *Ergativity in German.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Grewendorf, Günther & Cecilia Poletto. 2011. Hidden verb second: the case of Cimbrian. In *Studies on German-language islands*, edited by Michael T. Putnam, 301–346. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haider, Hubert. 1993. *Deutsche Syntax – generativ*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Heine, Bernd and Tanja Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hróarsdóttir, Thorbjörg. 2000. *Word Order Change in Icelandic: From OV to VO.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Lenerz, Jürgen. 1977. *Zur Abfolge nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Linder, Karl Peter. 1987. *Grammatische Untersuchungen zur Charakteristik des Rätoromanischen in Graubünden.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2014. *Word Order in Old Italian.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(3): 365–425.

Poplack, Shana & Stephen Levey. 2010. Contact-induced grammatical change. In *Language and Space – An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation: Volume 1 – Theories and Methods*, edited by Peter Auer & Jürgen Erich Schmidt, 391–419. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur. 1987. OV Word Order in Icelandic. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of Teachers of Scandinavian Studies in Great Britain and Northern Ireland*, edited by R.D.S. Allan & Michael P. Barnes, 33–49. University College of London.

Svenonius, Peter. 2000. Quantifier movement in Icelandic. In *The derivation of VO and OV*, edited by Peter Svenonius, 255-292. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Trips, Carola. 2002. From OV to VO in Early Middle English. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tortora, Christina 2014. *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanerese.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CONTACTS

Cecilia Poletto
Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main
poletto@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Günther Grewendorf
Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main
grewendorf@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de