

Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie occidentale
Vol. 51 – Settembre 2017

[online] ISSN 2499-1562
[print] ISSN 2499-2232

Scrambling as *verum focus*

German ‘Scrambling’ meets Romance ‘Anaphoric Anteposition’

Federica Cognola
(Università degli Studi di Roma «La Sapienza»;
Università degli Studi di Trento Italia)

Abstract In this paper I demonstrate that in Mòcheno, a German dialect spoken in Northern Italy, scrambling, i.e. the movement of any constituent above sentential adverbs and below the finite verb, is permitted like in Continental Germanic languages. Unlike in these languages, however, leftward movement is not triggered by specificity or scope-fixing (A-scrambling) or by the need to check any topic or contrastive/new-information focus discourse-features (A'-scrambling). By relying on information structure, the syntax of modal particles and the distribution of scrambling in sentences with fronted operators, I provide evidence that scrambling in Mòcheno triggers a *verum focus* reading on the truth value of the sentence and involves a type of focus movement to a FocusP in CP. That scrambling can be associated with *verum focus* is a *unicum* among Continental Germanic languages, which I show follows from a reanalysis of the properties of Germanic focus scrambling under the influence of Romance anaphoric anteposition.

Summary 1 Introduction. – 2 Scrambling in Mòcheno. – 2.1 Specificity and Scope-Fixing Effects. – 2.2 The Informational Status of Scrambled XPs. – 2.3 Scrambling and *verum focus*. – 2.4 Partial Conclusions. – 3 Proposed Analysis. – 3.1 On the Realization of *verum focus*. – 3.2 On the Presence of a TP Periphery. – 3.3 Mòcheno Scrambling and Romance Anaphoric Anteposition. – 4 Conclusions.

Keywords Emphatic focus. Modal particles. Verb Second. Information structure.


1 Introduction

In this paper,¹ I examine the syntactic and semantic properties of scrambling in the German dialect Mòcheno, a minority language spoken by about

1 Parts of this paper were presented at the workshop “Word Order Variation and Typology: the German middle field in a comparative and diachronic perspective” at the 2011 DGFS Tagung in Göttingen, at at CIDSMS 2013 in Cambridge. I thank the audiences of these conferences, two anonymous reviewers and Theresa Biberauer, Walter Brey, Eva Maria Remberger and Roland Hinterhölzl for useful feedback. I would also like to thank my main informant from Palù del Fersina, L.T., for his patience during the data collection, Rachel Murphy for editing the English and Alessandra Giorgi for her editorial forbearance. All errors are obviously my own.

DOI 10.14277/2499-1562/AnnOc-51-17-12

Submission 2016-04-12 | Acceptance 2016-07-11

© 2017 |  Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License

217

580 people in three villages in the Fersina valley (Eastern Trentino, Italy).²

With the term 'scrambling',³ I refer here to the possibility that constituents be moved above aspectual adverbs, a typical property of Continental Germanic languages, as exemplified in (1) using German data.⁴

- (1) a. *Hans hat diese/eine Zeitung immer gelesen*
 Hans has this/ a newspaper always PTCP-read
- b. *Hans hat immer diese /eine Zeitung gelesen*
 Hans has always this/ a newspaper PTCP-read
 'Hans always read this/a newspaper read.'

As shown in (2), scrambling is possible in Mòcheno: a constituent (direct or indirect object, henceforth: DO and IO or an adverbial PP) can scramble over aspectual adverbs.⁵

- (2) a. *En de boteig hòt=er de/a zaitung òllbe kaft*
 in the shop has=SUBJ.CL.3.SG.M the/a newspaper always bought
 'In the shop he always bought a/the newspaper.'
- b. *De zaitung hòt=er en de Maria òllbe kaft*
 the newspaper has=SUBJ CL.3.SG.M to the Mary always bought
 'The newspaper he always bought for Mary.'

2 The syntax of Mòcheno, which strongly differs from that of standard German, has been traditionally analysed as the result of direct borrowing from the contact Romance varieties (Heller 1979, Zamboni 1979, Togni 1990, Rowley 2003). For evidence against this view, see Cognola 2013a, 2013b).

3 In the literature, this construction is also called *long scrambling* to distinguish it from *short scrambling*, i.e. movement of verb arguments out of VP. In German, several permutations of the word orders of scrambled constituents are permitted, whereas in other languages with scrambling, like Dutch, permutations are ruled out. For this, I refer the reader to Zwart 1993; Hinterhölzl 2006; Neeleman, van de Koot 2008; Haider 2010 and references cited there.

4 The examples are glossed according to the Leipziger Glossing Rules (available at <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>) to which I added some specific glosses for Mòcheno, listed below:

IND.OBJ.CL.3.SG: Indirect object clitic pronoun, third person singular
 OBJ.CL.3.SG.F: Direct object clitic pronoun, third person singular, feminine
 OBJ-CL.3SG.N: Direct object clitic pronoun, third person singular, neuter
 PRT: Particle
 SEP-PREF: Separable prefix
 SUBJ-CL.2.SG: Subject clitic pronoun, second person singular
 SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M: Subject clitic pronoun, third person singular, masculine
 SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M: Subject strong pronoun, third person singular, masculine
 SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.F: Subject strong pronoun, third person singular, feminine

5 The fact that scrambling is possible in Mòcheno is remarkable, since this construction is fully ruled out in similar Germanic dialects spoken in the area like Cimbrian.

- | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|
| c. | <i>Spuach</i> | <i>hòt=er</i> | <i>en de boteig</i> | <i>òlbe</i> | <i>kaft</i> |
| | the book | has=SUBJ CL.3.SG.M | in the shop | always | bought |
| | 'The newspaper he always bought in the shop.' | | | | |

This paper analyses the properties of scrambling in Mòcheno and compares them with those of scrambling in standard German and with Romance anaphoric anteposition. This comparison is extremely interesting from the perspective of comparative syntax, since it allows us to extend our knowledge of the syntax of German dialects by studying a hitherto neglected variety. It allows us, furthermore, to empirically test a strong generalization on scrambling put forward by Haider and Rosengren (1998), who have proposed that scrambling is a property of OV languages – a position restated in Haider (2010).⁶

The hypothesis that scrambling is a property of OV languages can be empirically tested in Mòcheno – a relaxed V2 language with mixed OV/VO syntax (Cognola 2013b), as shown in (3).⁷

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| (3) | a. | <i>Gester</i> | <i>hòt=er</i> | <i>s/a puach</i> | <i>kaft</i> |
| | | yesterday | has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M | the/a book | bought |
| | b. | <i>Gester</i> | <i>hòt=er</i> | <i>kaft</i> | <i>s/a puach</i> |
| | | yesterday | has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M | bought | the/a book |
| | | 'Yesterday he bought the/a book.' | | | |
| | c. | <i>Er</i> | <i>hòt</i> | <i>mer</i> | <i>pfrok,</i> |
| | | SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M | has | me-DAT | asked |
| | | <i>benn</i> | <i>as</i> | <i>der Mario</i> | <i>s puach</i> |
| | | when | that | the Mario | the book |
| | | | | bought | has |
| | d. | <i>Er</i> | <i>hòt</i> | <i>mer</i> | <i>pfrok,</i> |
| | | SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M | has | me-DAT | asked |
| | | <i>benn</i> | <i>as</i> | <i>der Mario</i> | <i>hòt</i> |
| | | when | that | the Mario | has |
| | | | | the book | bought |

6 As correctly pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, scrambling is known to also exist in Old Romance languages, which were VO languages (Poletto 2014). This is another counterargument to Haider and Rosengren's generalisation.

7 Differently from German (den Besten 1983, Tomaselli 1990, Haider 2010 among others), in Old Romance V2 languages the movement of the finite verb to the left periphery (assumed to be the core property of the V2 rule) co-exists with multiple access to CP, which gives rise to V3 and V4 word orders (see Benincà 2006; Poletto 2002; Ledgeway 2007; Bidese, Cognola, Padovan 2012; Cognola 2013a; Wolfe 2015 among others). As shown in Cognola 2013a, Mòcheno is also a partial (in the sense of Roberts, Holmberg 2010) and asymmetric (in the sense of Benincà 1994) *pro*-drop language, although it displays subject clitics similar to those of Northern Italian dialects (Brandi, Cordin 1989; Poletto 2000 among others).

e.	<i>Er</i>	<i>hòt</i>		<i>mer</i>	<i>pfrok,</i>
	SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M	has		me-DAT	asked
	<i>benn</i>	<i>as</i>	<i>der Mario</i>	<i>hòt</i>	<i>kaft</i>
	when	that	the Mario	has	bought
					the book
					'He asked me when Mario bought the book.'

Unlike other Germanic languages with mixed OV/VO syntax (i.e. Yiddish, in which, according to Diesing 1997, 381 ff, the syntactic position of DOs is determined by specificity), in Mòcheno the distribution of OV/VO word orders is governed by the interaction between syntax and information structure. More specifically, OV is obligatory if the fronted constituent is a simple-preposed topic and the XP preceding the non-finite verb is a new-information focus (4a-b). VO is the only possible word order when an operator (interrogative *wh*-element or contrastive focus) is fronted and the XP following the past participle is a topic (4c-d).

(4)	For whom did he buy the book?				
a.	<i>Spuach</i>	<i>hòt=er</i>	<i>ver de mama</i>	<i>kaft</i>	OV
	the book	has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M	for the mum	bought	
b.	<i>#Spuach</i>	<i>hòt=er</i>	<i>kaft</i>	<i>ver de mama</i>	VO
	the book	has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M	bought	for the mum	
					'He bought it for the mum.'
c.	<i>Bos</i>	<i>hòt=er</i>	<i>kaft</i>	<i>ver de mama?</i>	VO
	what	has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M	bought	for the mum	
d.	<i>#Bos</i>	<i>hòt er</i>	<i>ver de mama</i>	<i>kaft?</i>	OV
	what	has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M	for the mum	bought	
					'What did he buy for mum?.'

Haider and Rosengren's (1998) analysis predicts that scrambling can only occur in sentences with OV word order in Mòcheno, i.e. only in main declarative clauses with a simple-preposed topic. As this paper shows, their prediction is borne out. However, this result adds further evidence to what seems to be a descriptive generalization rather than a formal account, because it does not explain why scrambling is ruled out in VO sentences (which are an option in the language).

In order to provide a formal account of the distribution of scrambling in Mòcheno, this paper first investigates the triggers for object movement within the language. I will show that Mòcheno scrambling is an instance of A'-movement and is never triggered by specificity and scope-fixing, unlike German A-scrambling. Unlike in German, where A'-scrambling involves constituents with a topic or (typically contrastive) focus discourse function (Bayer, Kornfilt 1994; Frey 2001; Grewendorf 2005; Hinterhölzl 2006 among others), in Mòcheno scrambling is associated with *verum focus* in Höhle's (1992) sense. Following Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal's (2009)

work suggesting that Spanish anaphoric anteposition is an instance of focus fronting that leads to a truth reading of the whole proposition (*verum focus*), I discuss the hypothesis that Mòcheno scrambling targets the same FP of the high left periphery involved in anaphoric anteposition in Spanish (and possibly in Romance languages), showing that these two leftward movements can be given a common analysis. The syntactic differences between the two languages will be shown to depend on the fact that Mòcheno is a V2 language, whereas Spanish is not: this means that the finite verb can move higher in CP in the former language but not in the latter. According to this theory, the syntactic position of the finite verb within the high left periphery, i.e. V2 not OV, is a necessary condition for scrambling.

The structure of the paper is the following. In section 2, I discuss the empirical properties of scrambling in Mòcheno and compare them with those of German scrambling, showing that the two languages differ in this regard. In section 3, starting from the resemblance between the properties of Mòcheno scrambling and those of Spanish anaphoric anteposition, I propose an analysis of Mòcheno scrambling as the movement of a focus to the left periphery leading to a *verum focus* reading of the whole sentence. In section 4, I summarise the results reached in the paper.

2 Scrambling in Mòcheno

2.1 Specificity and Scope-Fixing Effects

It is well-known that scrambling in German can be triggered by specificity and by the need to fix scope relations in syntax. In this case, scrambling is an instance of A-movement, since it is clause-bounded, it does not give rise to weak cross-over effects or scope reconstruction (Hinterhölzl 2006; Neeleman, van de Koot 2008 among others).

The role of specificity in the scrambling phenomenon is detectable in the distribution of definite and indefinite DOs in German (see Kratzer 1995, Diesing 1997, Hinterhölzl 2006 among others). In the examples in (5), I show that the unmarked position of definite verb arguments (inherently specific) is before aspectual adverbs (5a), whereas the unmarked position of indefinite arguments (non specific) is after aspectual adverbs (5b).

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| (5) | a. | <i>Mario</i> | <i>hat</i> | <i>die Zeitung</i> | <i>immer</i> | <i>gekauft</i> |
| | | Mario | has | the newspaper | always | PTCP-bought |
| | b. | <i>Mario</i> | <i>hat</i> | <i>immer</i> | <i>eine Zeitung</i> | <i>gekauft</i> |
| | | Mario | has | always | a newspaper | PTCP-bought |
- ‘Mario has always bought the/a newspaper.’

Indefinite DOs can scramble above aspectual adverbs and then they get a specific reading. In (6a), the DO has a non-specific reading, whereas in (6b) a specific book (always the same) is being referred to.

- (6) Talking about what John typically loves to do on holiday:
- a. *Am Meer hat er immer ein Buch gelesen*
 at-the sea has he always a book PTCP-read
 'At the seaside he always reads books.'
 John is particularly fond of Harry Potter's books. He received the last book of the series before going on holiday. John's mother says:
- b. *Am Meer hat er ein Buch immer gelesen*
 at-the sea has he a book always PTCP-read
 'At the seaside he always reads a (particular) book.'

Although definite DOs scramble in unmarked clauses, they can also appear after aspectual adverbs. In this case, they receive a contrastive focus reading, as shown in (7a). This reading is also possible for indefinite DOs when they appear in the lower portion of the clause below aspectual adverbs (7b).

- (7) a. *Er hat immer die Zeitung gekauft, (nicht ein Buch)*
 he has always the newspaper PTCP-bought (NEG a book)
 'He has always bought the newspaper, not a book.'
- b. *Er hat nicht eine Zeitung gekauft, (sondern ein Buch)*
 he has neg a newspaper bought (but a book)
 'He did not buy a newspaper, but a book.'

Let us consider now the distribution of definite and indefinite DOs with respect to aspectual adverbs in Mòcheno. As shown in (8a), the unmarked position of both definite and indefinite DOs is below aspectual adverbs. Scrambling is possible (8b) but leads to a marked reading, in which, all will be demonstrated below, the truth of the whole proposition is emphasised (*verum-focus* reading, Höhle 1992).

- (8) a. *Der Mario hòt òllbe/schua/efter s/a puach kaft*
 the Mario has always/already/oft the/a book bought
 'Mario has always/already/oft bought the/a book.'
- b. *Der Mario hòt s/a puach òllbe/schua/efter kaft*
 the Mario has the/a book always/already/oft bought
 'Mario did always/already/oft buy the/a book.'

The distribution of scrambled constituents does not seem to be ruled by specificity in Mòcheno. This hypothesis is further confirmed by the data in (9), where I replicate the German examples in (6). As shown in (9a),

an indefinite DO following a aspectual adverb can have both +/-specific readings in Mòcheno. The version with scrambling of the direct object (9b) is only grammatical in the *verum-focus* reading, where the indefinite DO can either be specific or non specific.

- (9) a. *Kan meir* *hòt=er* *òllbe* *a puach* *galesn*
 at-the see has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M always a book PTCP-read
 'At the seaside he always reads books.'
- b. *Kan meir* *hòt=er* *a puach* *òllbe* *galesn*
 at-the see has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M a book always PTCP-read
 'At the seaside he did always reads books.'

Another effect of specificity in the scrambling phenomenon manifests itself in bridging constructions (Hinterhölzl, van Kemenade 2012). In German, an NP in a coordinated sentence cannot refer back to another NP of a higher sentence when it appears below aspectual adverbs (10a); co-reference is possible, however, when the NP in the lower sentence scrambles over aspectual adverbs (10b).

- (10) a. *Mario hat [sein altes Haus]_j verlassen.*
 Mario has his old house left
Er hat letzte Woche [die Hütte]_{k/j} abreißen lassen
 he has last week the hut demolish let
- b. *Mario hat [sein altes Haus]_j verlassen.*
 Mario has his old house ways left
Er hat [die Hütte]_{k/j} letzte Woche abreißen lassen
 he has the hut last week demolish let
 'Mario left his old house. Last week he demolished the hut.'

In (11), I examine whether the effects of scrambling in bridging exemplified in (10) can also be detected in Mòcheno. As shown in (11), a DO appearing below a aspectual adverb in a coordinated clause can, but does not have to, refer back to the NP in the higher clause.

It is ungrammatical to scramble the DO appearing in the lowest sentence (11b). These data indicate that in Mòcheno the coreference between two NPs in bridging is not parasitic on scrambling, as in German, but is available whether or not the XPs have moved over aspectual adverbs.

- (11) a. *Der Mario* *hòt* *[s haus]_j* *sei* *galok*
 the Mario has the house to be PTCP-left
Dora *hot=er* *gester* *[de baraca]_{j/k}* *zomschlong*
 then has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M yesterday the hut demolished

b.	<i>*Der Mario</i>	<i>hòt</i>	<i>[s haus]_j</i>	<i>sei</i>	<i>galok</i>
	the Mario	has	the house	to be	PTCP-left
	<i>Dora</i>	<i>hòt=er</i>	<i>[de baraca]_{j/k}</i>	<i>gester</i>	<i>zomschlong</i>
	then	has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M	the hut	yesterday	demolished
	'Mario left his house. Then he demolished the hut.'				

The data in this section have shown that scrambling in Mòcheno is not triggered by specificity and scope fixing, unlike in German. In Mòcheno both +/-specific readings are available in the lowest portion of the clause below aspectual adverbs. I take this to indicate that the positions of German and Mòcheno scrambling are not the same.

In the next subsection, I investigate whether or not scrambling in Mòcheno involves A'-movement through an analysis of the informational status of the scrambled XP.

2.2 The Informational Status of Scrambled XPs

2.2.1 Topics

Let us consider if scrambled constituents can be analysed as topics, i.e. presuppositional (D-linked, Pesetsky 1987) constituents realising old/given information that can either be accessible or nonaccessible in the discourse (see López 2009; Cruschina 2010; Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007; Frascarelli 2000; Benincà, Poletto 2004). Following the cartographic approach adopted in this paper, I assume that all the discourse-features connected to topicality are encoded in dedicated functional projections and are checked through movement in overt syntax (Rizzi 1997; Cinque 1999; Cinque, Rizzi 2008 among others).

In (12b), I show that a constituent ("the flour") appearing before a aspectual adverb cannot be a D-linked, discourse accessible constituent, introduced by the *wh*-interrogative in (12a). This topic must appear in the left periphery, see (12c).⁸

- (12) a. *Ber hòt òllbe kaft s mel en de boteig?*
 who has always bought the flour in the shop
 'Who has always bought the flour in the shop?'
- b. **En de boteig hòt (òllbe) s mel (òllbe) der Mario kaft*
 in the shop has always the flour always the Mario bought

⁸ The distribution of topics in (11) is independent of the syntax of the DP subject, which has to appear in a FocusP of the vP periphery when it is a new-information focus in Mòcheno, like in these examples (see Cognola 2013a on this). The same distribution of topics is also attested with pronominal subjects.

- c. *S mel* *en de boteig* *hòt* *òllbe* *der Mario* *kaft*
 the flour in the shop has always the flour bought
 'Mario has always bought the flour in the shop.'

As pointed out by Roland Hinterhölzl (personal communication), in German the D-linked, discourse accessible constituent realised by the definite DO can be scrambled and appear before the NP subject (which is the new-information focus). In Mòcheno this is ruled out and the topic must appear in the high periphery, irrespectively of the presence of the adverb 'always' (13).⁹

- (13) a. *Wer* *hat* *das Mehl* *im Geschäft* *gekauft?*
 who has the flour in-the shop PTCP-bought
 'Who bought the flour in the shop?'
 b. *Im Geschäft* *hat* *das Mehl* *Hans* *gekauft*
 in-the has the flour Hans PTCP-bought
 'It was Mario who bought the flour in the shop.'

As shown in (14), a scrambled XP cannot be a D-linked, non-given constituent in Mòcheno. As in the examples above, these constituents must appear in the sentence-initial position.

- (14) (Context: my friend was supposed to buy a book, but was always finding an excuse for not buying it. Finally he buys the book and I can say to another friend who knows the facts)
 a. *#Er* *hòt* *spuach* *schua* *kaft*
 SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M has the book already bought
 b. *Spuach* *hòt=er* *schua* *kaft*
 the book has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M already bought
 'He has already bought the book.'

Neither can the scrambled XP be a contrastive topic (Cruschina 2010, 47; Vallduví 1992; Benincà, Poletto 2004; Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007). This is shown in (14).

- (15) a. A: Has Mario already delivered the stuff?
 b. B: *#Er* *hòt* *spuach* *schua* *en de* *Maria*
 SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M has the book already to the Mary
gem, *ont* *de priaf_j* *birt=er* *en Luca*
 give and the letter AUX-FUT=SUBJ=CL.3.SG.M to Luca
morm *gem*
 tomorrow give

9 The fact that the DP subject could be in Spec,TP in the German examples in (13) is irrelevant here, since the aim of this section is to simply show that German and Mòcheno differ as far as the syntactic and discourse properties of scrambling are concerned.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| c. | B: <i>Er</i> | <i>hòt</i> | <i>schua</i> | <i>gem</i> | <i>s puach</i> |
| | SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M | has | already | given | the book |
| | <i>en de Maria,</i> | <i>envese</i> | <i>de priaf_j</i> | <i>en Luca_k</i> | |
| | to the Mary | whereas | the letter | to Luca | |
| | <i>birt=er=se_j=n_k</i> | | | <i>morm</i> | <i>gem</i> |
| | AUX-FUT=SUBJ=CL.3.SG.M=OBJ.CL.3.SG.F=IND.OBJ.CL.3.SG | | | tomorrow | give |
| | 'He has already given Mary the book and tomorrow he will give Luca the letter.' | | | | |

The data discussed in this subsection indicate that scrambled XPs are not topics in Mòcheno.

In the following subsection, I examine whether or not scrambled XPs are associated with a focus reading.

2.2.2 Contrastive and New-Information *foci*

Let us begin by examining the syntax of new-information and contrastive foci in Mòcheno. As shown in (16), a scrambled DO is not a new information focus (Belletti 2004, Cruschina 2006), since new-information foci must appear below aspectual adverbs in Mòcheno.

- | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| (16) a. | <i>Bos</i> | <i>hòt=er_j</i> | <i>òllbe</i> | <i>kaft</i> | <i>der Mario_j</i> | <i>en de boteig?</i> |
| | what | has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M | always | bought | the Mario | in the shop |
| | 'What did Mario always bought in the shop?' | | | | | |
| b. | <i>#Der Mario</i> | <i>hòt</i> | <i>s mel</i> | <i>òllbe</i> | <i>kaft</i> | <i>en de boteig</i> |
| | the Mario | has | the flour | always | bought | in the shop |
| c. | <i>En de boteig</i> | <i>der Mario</i> | <i>hot</i> | <i>òllbe</i> | <i>s mel</i> | <i>kaft</i> |
| | in the shop | the Mario | has | always | the flour | bought |
| | 'Mario always bought the flour in the shop' | | | | | |

The scrambled XP is not a contrastive focus either. This is exemplified in (17), where I show that the contrastive focus can appear in the lower area of the clause below aspectual adverbs (17c), possibly in the vP periphery (Belletti 2004) or in the high left periphery (17d).

- | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|
| (17) a. | <i>Boast,</i> | <i>der Mario</i> | <i>hòt</i> | <i>òllbe</i> | <i>de zaitung</i> | | |
| | know-PRS.2SG | the Mario | has | always | the newspaper | | |
| | <i>en de boteig</i> | <i>kaft</i> | | | | | |
| | in the shop | bought | | | | | |
| | 'Do you know that Mario has always bought the newspaper in the shop?' | | | | | | |
| b. | <i>#Na,</i> | <i>en de boteig</i> | <i>der Mario</i> | <i>hòt</i> | <i>s proat</i> | <i>òllbe</i> | <i>kaft</i> |
| | no, | in the shop | the Mario | has | the bread | always | bought |
| c. | <i>Na, S PROAT</i> | <i>hòt=er</i> | <i>òllbe</i> | <i>kaft</i> | <i>en de boteig</i> | | |

- no, the bread has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M always bought in the shop
(net de zaitung)
 NEG the newspaper
- d. *Na, en de boteig hòt-er òllbe sproat kaft*
 no, in the shop has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M always the bread bought
(net de zaitung)
 NEG the newspaper
 'No, it was not the newspaper that Mario always bought in the shop, but the bread.'

The above data indicate that new-information and contrastive foci involve overt movement in syntax in Mòcheno, but they do not involve the area associated with scrambling.

The discussion so far has demonstrated that scrambling in Mòcheno is not triggered by specificity or scope fixing and is not compatible with a topic or a new-information or contrastive focus reading of the scrambled XP. In order to establish the exact contribution of scrambling, I examine more closely the contexts in which scrambling is felicitous in this language.

2.3 Scrambling and *verum focus*

In this subsection I provide evidence that scrambling in Mòcheno is associated with *verum focus*, i.e. with a focus on the truth value of the whole sentence, rather than on a specific constituent (Höhle 1992, Féry 2007, Krifka 2007 among others).

In order to demonstrate that scrambling in Mòcheno is associated with *verum focus*, I start by giving a clear context in which a sentence with scrambling is felicitous (18). Speaker A claims that Mario is a penny-pincher because he has never bought anything in the small village shop (*boteig*) known to be very expensive (18a). Speaker B answers that this is not true, since Mario has always bought the newspaper in the expensive village shop: as shown in (18b), the NP "the newspaper" is scrambled.

- (18) a. *A: Der Mario ist an sporer. Er*
 the Mario is a penny-pincher SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M
hòt nia eppaz en de boteig kaft
 has never something In the shop bought
 'Mario is a penny-pincher: he has never bought anything in the shop.'
- b. *B: Ma, der Mario hòt de zaitung òllbe kaft en de boteig*
 but the Mario has the newspaper always bought in the shop
 'But, Mario did always buy the newspaper in the shop!'

The example in (18) shows that scrambling is only possible in Mòcheno in a very restricted context, not in all main declarative clauses (differently from German). I suggest that this context involves a *verum focus*, i.e. a focus on the truth of the whole proposition rather than on a single constituent. Scrambling of a constituent is therefore a way of emphasising the truth of the whole sentence, as evidenced by the paraphrase in (19).

- (19) *Der Mario hòt de zaitung òllbe kaft en de boteig*
 the Mario has the newspaper always bought in the shop
 'It is true that Mario has always bought the newspaper in the shop'

As regards information structure, a sentence that involves scrambling is structured as in (19). The scrambled XP realises new information, whereas all the rest is background information. Following Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009), I assume that the scrambled XP realising new information is a narrow focus on sentence polarity (see also Breibarth, De Clercq, Haegeman 2013).

- (20) background - V - new - background

In will now examine two arguments that support the hypothesis that Mòcheno scrambling involves the leftward movement of an operator (focus) triggering the *verum focus* reading of the whole sentence: the distribution of modal particles and the syntactic restrictions of scrambled XPs.

2.3.1 Discourse Particles

The first piece of evidence for the hypothesis that scrambling in Mòcheno triggers the *verum focus* reading of a sentence regards the distribution of discourse (or modal) particles.

As is well-known, discourse particles can express the *verum focus* reading in different languages (see Hernanz 2010; Leonetti, Escandell-Vidal 2009 for Spanish; Zimmermann 2011 for German; Cardinaletti 2011; Coniglio 2008; Cognola, Schifano forthcoming a, b for Italian).

In Mòcheno, the particle expressing the *verum focus* reading of a sentence is *bol*, which is formally related to German *wohl* but semantically (and syntactically) different. Mòcheno *bol* has the same semantics and the same behaviour as the Italian discourse particle *sì* (see Coniglio 2008), since it *bol* asserts the truth of the proposition (21a) and it can license ellipsis with the same value (21b).¹⁰

¹⁰ Unlike in English, in Mòcheno the auxiliary verb corresponding to *do* cannot license ellipsis. For an overview of the properties of the *tun+inf* periphrasis in German dialects, which are shared by Mòcheno, see Angster 2005.

- (21) a. *De mama hòt bol zok, as=se kimp*
 the mum has PRT said that=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.F comes
 'Mum did say she would come'
- b. *Der Mario kimp net, ma der Luca bol <kimp>*
 the Mario comes NEG but the Luca PRT comes
 'Mario does not come, but Luca does'

The idea that *bol* is a discourse particle connected with *verum focus* is further confirmed by the data in (22), where I show that the same effect of emphasizing the truth of a proposition achieved by scrambling is reached by inserting the modal particle *bol*.

- (22) a. *A: Der Mario ist an sporer. Er*
 the Mario is a penny-pincher SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M
hòt nia eppaz en de boteig kaft
 has never something in the shop bought
 'Mario is a penny-pincher: he has never bought anything in the shop.'
- b. *B. Ma, der Mario hòt bol òlbe de zaitung kaft*
 But the Mario has PRT always the newspaper bought
en de boteig
 in the shop
 'But, Mario did always buy the newspaper in the shop!'

The insertion of *bol* and the possibility of XP scrambling are in complementary distribution: when *bol* appears in the sentence, the movement of a constituent above the aspectual adverb is ruled out (23).¹¹ This further confirms the connection between the discourse particle *bol*, scrambling and *verum focus*.

- (23) a. *A: Der Mario ist an sporer. Er*
 the Mario is a penny-pincher SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M
hòt nia eppaz en de boteig kaft
 has never something in the shop bought
 'Mario is a penny-pincher: he has never bought anything in the shop.'
- b. *B.*Ma, der Mario hòt (bol) de zaitung (bol)*
 but the Mario has PRT the newspaper PRT
òllbe (bol) kaft (bol) en de boteig
 always PRT bought PRT in the shop

¹¹ It would only be possible to insert *bol* in the higher portion of the clause where it would only scope over *der Mario* and not on the whole sentence.

This subsection has provided evidence for the hypothesis that scrambling in Mòcheno triggers a *verum focus* interpretation of the whole sentence. In the following subsection, I further develop this hypothesis and consider the interactions between scrambling and focus movement. The predictions of the proposed account are that i) scrambling is ruled out in all sentences with a fronted operator, since one sentence cannot have two foci in Mòcheno (Cognola 2013b, Calabrese 1982) and ii) only one constituent can be scrambled.

2.3.2 Syntactic Restrictions

The hypothesis that Mòcheno scrambling is a type of A'-movement to a FocusP which triggers a *verum-focus* reading of the whole sentence leads to the prediction that scrambling should interfere with fronted operators.

As exemplified in (24), this prediction is borne out for wh-main interrogative clauses: scrambling is impossible in these sentences.¹²

- (24) a. *Ber hòt de zaitung òllbe kaft?
 who has the newspaper always bought
- b. Ber hòt òllbe kaft de zaitung?
 who has always bought the newspaper
 'Who did always buy the newspaper?'
- c. *Bo hòt=er s puach schua/òllbe kaft?
 where has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M the book already/always bought
- d. Bo hòt=er schua/òllbe kaft s puach?
 where has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M already/always bought the book
 'Where has he already/always bought the book?'

The same restriction on scrambling is found in sentences with a fronted contrastive focus (25).

- (25) a. *EN DE BOTEIG hòt=er de zaitung òllbe kaft
 in the shop has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M the newspaper always bought
 (net en de libreria)
 NEG in the bookshop
- b. EN DE BOTEIG hòt=er òllbe kaft de zaitung,
 in the shop has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M always bought the newspaper
 (net en de libreria)
 NEG in the bookshop
 'It was in the bookshop where he has always bought the newspaper, not in the bookshop'

¹² In Mòcheno, OV word order is also ruled out in sentences with a fronted operator in the absence of scrambling because OV always involves a focus reading of the constituent preceding the past participle (see Cognola 2013b).

Scrambling is impossible in sentences in which an operator is fronted: this follows directly from the hypothesis that scrambling involves focus movement and two foci cannot appear simultaneously in the same sentence.¹³

The second prediction to be tested is that two scrambled XPs cannot co-occur, in the same way that two moved operators are ruled out in the left periphery in Mòcheno (Cognola 2013a). As exemplified in (26), this prediction is also borne out: only one XP can precede aspectual adverbs.¹⁴

- (26) a. A: *Der Mario ist an sporer. Er*
 the Mario is a penny-pincher SUBJ-STRONG.3.SG.M
 hòt nia eppaz en uanz kaft
 has never something to someone bought
 ‘Mario is a penny-pincher: he has never bought anything for anyone.’
- b. B: **Ma, der Mario hòt de zaitung en de Maria*
 but der Mario has the newspaper to the Mary
 òllbe kaft
 always bought
- c. B: **Ma, der Mario hòt en de Maria de zaitung*
 but der Mario has to the Mary the newspaper
 òllbe kaft
 always bought

2.4 Partial Conclusions

In this section, I have investigated the properties of scrambling in Mòcheno from a comparative perspective. I first showed that Mòcheno scrambling does not pattern with German A-scrambling, since scrambled XPs do not display any special properties connected with specificity and scope fixing, as they do in German. I then explored the hypothesis that scrambling in Mòcheno is an instance of A'-movement and showed that scrambled constituents are not compatible with topic, contrastive or new-information focus interpretations. By considering the distribution of the discourse particle *bol*, the distribution of scrambling in sentences with a fronted operator, and the possibility of having two scrambled constituents in the same sentence, I demonstrated that scrambling in Mòcheno involves A'-movement of one XP and is associated with a *verum focus* interpretation of the truth value of the whole sentence.

¹³ In sentences with a fronted operator, *bol* is also excluded in Mòcheno, i.e. the *verum focus* reading of the sentence is fully ruled out, as expected.

¹⁴ NP subjects pattern with other XPs as far as scrambling is concerned, i.e. they can be scrambled, but cannot co-occur with other constituents preceding aspectual adverbs. This follows from Cognola's (2013a) analysis of Mòcheno as a pro-drop language in which Spec,TP (or AgrSP) can only host *pro*.

3 Proposed Analysis

The aim of this section is to provide an analysis of scrambling in Mòcheno, and to contribute to explaining why in this language scrambling is associated with *verum focus* (a *unicum* among Continental Germanic languages). I show that the realisation of *verum focus* through XP movement is ruled out in German (which has focus scrambling, but no *verum-focus* scrambling), but has been reported for Romance (Leonetti, Escandell-Vidal 2009). By comparing Mòcheno scrambling and Romance anaphoric anteposition, I show that in both Mòcheno and Romance moved XPs target a FocusP in CP.

3.1 On the Realization of *verum focus*

In the literature it has been shown that languages differ in their strategies of realising *verum focus*. In German, the truth of a proposition can be either emphasised through the insertion of a discourse particle or by a pitch accent on the finite verb (Höhle 1992, Krifka 2007, Féry 2007). As shown in (27), in *verum focus* sentences, scrambling is ruled out (Roland Hinterhölzl, personal communication).

- (27) a. *Mario HAT (doch) seinem Bruder das Haus geschenkt*
 Mario has PRT his-dat brother the house given
 b. **Er hat (doch) das Haus seinem Bruder geschenkt*
 he has PRT the house his-DAT brother given
 ‘Mario/he did give his brother the house.’

In English, the truth of the whole proposition is emphasised by the insertion of a do-support.

- (28) *She does come*
 ‘It is true that she comes.’

Spanish, beside the insertion of a discourse particle, can realise *verum focus* syntactically by fronting a constituent expressing new information to a FocusP of the left periphery, as shown in (29) (from Leonetti, Escandell-Vidal 2009, 179).

- (29) a. *Algo tiene que saber*
 something has to known
 ‘She does know something.’
 b. *Lo mismo digo yo*
 the same say-PRS.1SG I
 ‘I do say the same.’

The fronting construction triggering the *verum focus* reading of the whole proposition in Spanish is called “anaphoric anteposition” (Benincà 1988, Cinque 1990). In the Romance languages, this construction is characterised by the fact that the fronted phrase must either directly resume an identical phrase in the immediately preceding discourse or be inferentially linked to such a phrase (Cinque 1990), the property that Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009) call “emphatic value”. In Spanish, this construction is analysed as involving the fronting of an operator, whereas in Italian it is assumed to involve a kind of topicalization (Benincà 1988, Cinque 1990). As shown in the previous section, Mòcheno patterns with Spanish, since in both languages *verum focus* involves operator movement.

The fact that in Spanish anaphoric anteposition targets the Spec of a FocusP of the high left periphery is clear. Whether the same analysis can be applied to Mòcheno scrambling is more uncertain, since it is not clear whether the scrambled XP appears in the high left periphery or in a lower peripheral area. I discuss below some data that contradict the claim that scrambling can involve the vP or the TP periphery.

3.2 On the Presence of a TP Periphery

Anderssen and Bentzen (2012) propose that Norwegian object shift (Holmberg 1986) is as an instance of topicalization to a clause-medial (IP-internal) position. The Norwegian data are given in (30): in this language, a pronoun can move across the negation and aspectual adverbs.

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| (30) | a. | <i>Jon</i> | <i>så</i> | <i>den</i> | <i>ikke</i> |
| | | Jon | saw-PST | it | NEG |
| | b. | <i>Jon</i> | <i>så</i> | <i>ikke</i> | <i>den</i> |
| | | Jon | saw-PST | NEG | it |
- ‘Jon did not see it.’

Anderssen and Bentzen (2012) provide evidence for the hypothesis that weak pronouns only move when they are familiar topics as defined by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and they target an IP-internal TopicP. This hypothesis implies that there must be a TopicP (and presumably a FocusP) above TP and below the left periphery and that this TP periphery is different from the vP periphery found immediately above vP (Belletti 2004). As discussed by Cognola (2008, 2013b), the vP periphery is found below aspectual adverbs and above low adverbs (Cinque 1999): therefore, the TopicP assumed to be involved in object shift must be located in a different area from that identified as the vP periphery, since pronouns move past aspectual adverbs.

In the light of this proposal, it might be tempting to account for the Mòcheno data by assuming that in this language scrambling involves the movement of a constituent to the Spec of an IP-internal FocusP, as illustrated in the structure in (31).

(31) $[_{TopicP} \text{Der Mario}_k [_{FocusP} [_{FinP} t_k \text{hòt}_j [_{TopicP} [_{FocusP} \text{de zaitung} [_{TP} \text{pro } t_j [_{FP} \text{òllbe} [_{VP} \text{kaft } t_k]]]]]]]]]]]]$

I believe that an analysis of Mòcheno scrambling as IP-internal topicalization must be rejected, for two reasons. Recall that in Mòcheno scrambling is ruled out in all sentences with a fronted operator (32).

(32) a.	*Ber	hòt	de zaitung	òllbe	kaft?
	who	has	the newspaper	always	bought
b.	*Bo	hòt=er	s puach	schua/òllbe	kaft?
	where	has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M	the book	already/always	bought
c.	*ENDE BOTEIG	hòt=er	de zaitung	òllbe	kaft
	in the shop	has=SUBJ-CL.3.SG.M	the newspaper	always	bought
	<i>(net en de libreria)</i>				
	NEG in the bookshop				

The fact that scrambling cannot occur in wh-main interrogative clauses is unexpected if we analyse scrambling as movement to an IP-internal position, since this hypothesis predicts the movement of a constituent to a hypothetical IP-internal TopicP, as illustrated in (33).

(33) $[_{TopicP} [_{FocusP} \text{Ber}_k [_{FinP} t_k \text{hòt}_j [_{TopicP} \text{de zaitung}_m [_{FocusP} [_{TP} \text{pro } t_j [_{FP} \text{òllbe} [_{VP} \text{kaft } t_m]]]]]]]]]]]]$

A possible hypothesis might be that in Mòcheno only one FocusP is present in the IP periphery, whereas in other Germanic languages a TopicP is also available, but I find no convincing evidence for this theory. It could also be assumed that scrambled constituents move to the Spec of a FocusP in the vP periphery. However, this hypothesis does not hold given what we know about the syntactic position of the vP periphery in Mòcheno, which, as discussed in Cognola (2008, 2013b), follows aspectual adverbs and precedes low adverbs.

The evidence discussed in this subsection leads me to conclude that scrambling in Mòcheno is a type of A'-movement which does not target the Spec of an FP in the vP periphery or in the TP periphery (the existence of which in Mòcheno is uncertain), and must be analysed differently. I suggest that Mòcheno scrambling can be directly compared with Romance anaphoric anteposition – a construction which targets the high left periphery of the clause and favors a *verum focus* reading of a sentence.

3.3 Mòcheno Scrambling and Romance Anaphoric Anteposition

Given the evidence discussed above contradicting an analysis of Mòcheno scrambling as a construction targeting a TP or vP periphery and the strong resemblances between Mòcheno scrambling and Spanish anaphoric anteposition, I claim that both types of movement can be analysed in the same way: as the movement of one XP to the Spec of a FocusP of the high left periphery, as shown in (34).

- (34) a. $[_{TopicP} \text{Der Mario hòt}] [_{FocusP} \text{de zaitung}] [_{FinP} \text{t}_k] [_{TP} \text{pro t}_j] [_{FP} \text{òllbe}] [_{VP} \text{kaf t}_k]$
 b. $[_{TopicP} \text{lo mismo}] [_{FocusP} \text{pro digo}] [_{VP} \text{t}_k]$

Note that, as in Spanish, in Mòcheno it is possible to front an “emphatic” constituent without any resumption in IP, leading to a *verum focus* interpretation of the sentence (demonstrated by the compatibility of *bol*).¹⁵

- (35) a. *Du* *pist* *do* *gaben.*
 SUBJ-STRONG.2.SG be-PRS.2.SG there PTCP-been
Eppas muas=o *(bol) zechen hom*
 something must=SUBJ-CL.2.SG PRT seen have
 ‘You were there. You did see something.’
 b. *Du birst net alua sai.*
 SUBJ-STRONG.2.SG AUX-FUT-PRS.2.SG NEG alone be
De Sabrina birst=o (bol) vinnen.
 the Sabrina AUX-FUT=SUBJ-CL.2.SG PRT see
 ‘You will not be alone. You do see Sabrina.’

This type of fronting construction is incompatible with fronted operators (36) and is limited to a single constituent.

- (36) a. **Du birst net alua sai.*
 SUBJ-STRONG.2.SG AUX-FUT-PRS.2.SG NEG alone be
Bo de Sabrina birst=o (bol) vinnen?
 where the Sabrina aux-fut=subj-cl.2.sg PRT see
 b. **Du birst net alua sai.*
 SUBJ-STRONG.2.SG AUX-FUT-PRS.2.SG NEG alone be
De Sabrina morm birst=o (bol) vinnen
 the Sabrina tomorrow AUX-FUT=SUBJ-CL.2.SG PRT see

¹⁵ This type of fronting (anaphoric anteposition) must be added to the constructions targeting the high left periphery in Mòcheno, since it was not dealt with in Cognola 2012b.

The fronted XP cannot have a contrastive-focus reading, as shown in (37).

(37)	<i>*Du</i>	<i>birst</i>	<i>net</i>	<i>alua</i>	<i>sai.</i>
	subj-strong.2.sg	AUX-FUT-PRS.2.SG	NEG	alone	be
	<i>De Sabrina</i>	<i>birst=0</i>	<i>(bol)</i>	<i>net</i>	<i>de Maria.</i>
	the Sabrina	AUX-FUT=SUBJ-CL.2.SG	PRT see	NEG	the Maria

On the basis of these facts, I propose that this type of fronting involves the structure in (38).

(38) [_{TopicP} [_{FocusP} de Sabrina_k birst=0_j [_{FinP} t_k t_j [_{TP} pro t_j [_{FP} bol [_{VP} vinnen t_k]]]]]]]]]]

Now, my hypothesis is that Mòcheno scrambling and Spanish anaphoric anteposition are the same phenomenon: a particular type of focus movement to the high left periphery. This obviously does not account for the asymmetries in the position of the finite verb between the two languages. I suggest that these asymmetries are due to the fact that Mòcheno is still a V2 language (Cognola 2012b), whereas Spanish is not. This means that in Spanish the finite verb only moves to the left periphery in a limited number of constructions (see Rizzi [1991] 2004), whereas in Mòcheno the finite verb must move to CP in all main clauses. Following Poletto (2002), Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007), Roberts (1997), Biberauer and Roberts (2015), Wolfe (2015), I suggest that the finite verb can appear in different heads of CP in different V2 languages. For Mòcheno, the idea is that the finite verb moves to the lowest head of the left periphery when the lowest constituent is a contrastive focus (see Cognola 2013b).

(39) [_{TopicP} [_{FocusP} A PUACH_k [_{FinP} t_k hòt=se_j [_{TP} pro t_j [_{FP} òllbe [_{VP} kaft t_k]]]]]]]]]]

When the lowest XP is a *verum focus* I suggest that the finite verb can raise higher to the head of TopicP.

(40) [_{TopicP} Der Mario hòt_j [_{FocusP} de zaitung_k [_{FinP} t_k t_j [_{TP} pro t_j [_{FP} òllbe [_{VP} kaft t_k]]]]]]]]]]

The structures in (39) and (40) imply that there is an asymmetry in the position of the finite verb between sentences involving a contrastive focus and sentences involving a *verum focus*.

I am still unable to find an explanation for this asymmetry, and I tentatively suggest that it might be connected to the intonational contour of the *verum focus* construction. In Mòcheno, as in Spanish, the *verum focus* lacks emphatic stress (unlike contrastive and informational foci), but, unlike topic constructions, it is not doubled by a clitic nor is a pause possible between the *verum focus* and the rest of the clause. Therefore, *verum-focus* constituents exhibit mixed intonational properties of foci and

topics, and this might reflect itself in the syntax of the finite verb. More specifically, the idea is that the finite verb has to raise to the head of the FP hosting the constituent bearing emphatic stress (39); if this is lacking, the finite verb can raise to a head in the Topic area.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, I have discussed the distribution of scrambling in the German dialect Mòcheno. I showed that, despite appearances, Mòcheno and German scrambling are different phenomena, since the former is not triggered by specificity, scope-fixing or contrast.

Giving examples of both information structural and syntactic properties, I showed that Mòcheno scrambling triggers a *verum focus* interpretation of the whole sentence. As regards information structure, scrambled constituents are not compatible with any topic reading and cannot be new-information or contrastive foci. Scrambling is only possible when the moved XP is a narrow focus in a sentence without informational partition in its explicit content (i.e. only the scrambled XP is new information and all the rest is background) and it is inferentially linked to the context ("emphatic value" in Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal's 2009 terms). Following Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009), I proposed that the *verum focus* reading is triggered by the movement of the constituent expressing new information to the Spec of a FocusP, which is backed up by the syntactic restrictions displayed by the moved constituents (it cannot co-occur with fronted operators; multiple scrambling, i.e. multiple foci, are ruled out) and by the distribution of modal particles expressing *verum focus* in sentences with scrambling.

In the second part of the article, I proposed a formal account of Mòcheno scrambling centered on the idea that this construction involves the movement of one constituent to the same FocusP of the high left periphery as Spanish anaphoric anteposition. Evidence for this analysis comes from the distribution of scrambled XPs, which cannot be accounted for by assuming that the TP or vP periphery are involved, and from the syntax of the finite verb, which can move to the left periphery in main declarative clauses in the V2 language Mòcheno, but not in Spanish – a non-V2 language.

The mixed OV/VO language Mòcheno provides interesting data in support of Haider and Rosengren's (1998) generalization that scrambling is a property of OV languages. In Mòcheno, scrambling is ruled out in sentences in which OV word order is not permitted.¹⁶ However, the Mòcheno

¹⁶ This result indirectly confirms Cognola's (2012a) analysis of OV word orders in Mòcheno, which are shown to involve XP movement out of vP to a FocusP of the vP periphery found below aspectual adverbs (short scrambling). The fact that both types of scrambling, i.e. short

data, unlike those discussed by Haider and Rosengren (1998) and Haider (2010), cannot be accounted for by head directionality, since this would not explain why i) scrambling and all other OV word orders (i.e. those in which the constituents appear below aspectual adverbs) are impossible in all sentences with a fronted operator; ii) scrambling is restricted to sentences with *verum focus* reading; iii) scrambling resembles Spanish anaphoric anteposition.

My analysis accounts for all three facts by assuming that scrambling is possible due to type of V2 rule displayed by Mòcheno and the interactions between verb movement within the high left periphery and type of fronted constituent. These data from a non-standard language like Mòcheno indicate that the V2 rule is a much more pervasive property than previously thought, since it affects scrambling (and is involved in the distribution of OV/VO word orders, see Cognola 2012a). Whether or not the analysis proposed for Mòcheno is applicable to other languages needs to be further investigated.

The Mòcheno data in this article contribute to our understanding of the relationship between Romance constructions involving the high left periphery and German scrambling, a connection that has already pointed at by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1997), who compare scrambling and clitic left dislocation constructions. The Mòcheno data indicate that not only is there a connection between Germanic scrambling and constructions expressing topicality in other languages, but the relation may also involve anaphoric anteposition and scrambling. If Leonetti and Escandell-Vidall's (2009) analysis and the analysis proposed here are correct, both anaphoric anteposition and scrambling involve the movement of a constituent to a FocusP of the high left periphery, then what makes scrambling differ from other focus constructions is its 'emphatic' value, its referentiality, which is encoded in the lower area of the high periphery. How this referentiality can be connected to specificity, which is crucial in German scrambling, is a question that awaits further research.

and long scrambling, leading to OV word order are i) triggered by the need to check focus features and ii) are ruled out in all sentences with a fronted operator, is fully predicted by the analysis given in Cognola.

Bibliography

- Alexiadou, Artemis; Anagnostopoulou, Elena (1997). "Toward a Uniform Account of Scrambling and Clitic Doubling". Abraham, Werner; van Gelderen, Elly (eds.), *German: Syntactic Problems-Problematic Syntax*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 142-61.
- Anderssen, Merete; Bentzen, Kristine (2012). "Norwegian Object Shift as IP-internal Topicalization". *Nordlyd*, 39, 1-23.
- Angster, Marco (2005). *La perifrasi tue + infinito nel titsch di Gressoney* [BA Dissertation]. Torino: Università degli Studi di Torino.
- Bayer, Josef; Kornfilt, Jaqueline (1994). "Against Scrambling as an Instance of Move-Alpha". Corver, Norbert; van Riemsdijk, Henk (eds.), *Studies on Scrambling*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 17-60.
- Bidese, Ermenegildo; Cognola; Federica; Padovan, Andrea (2012). "Zu einer neuen Verb-Zweit-Typologie in den germanischen Sprachen". Anreiter, Peter; Hajan, Ivo; Kienpointner, Manfred (Hrsgg.), *In Simplicitate Complexitas. Festgabe für Barbara Stefan zum 70. Geburtstag*. Wien: Praesens, 69-86.
- Belletti, Adriana (2004). "Aspects of the Low IP Area". Rizzi, Luigi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 16-51.
- Benincà, Paola (1988). "L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate". Renzi, Lorenzo; Salvi, Giampaolo, Cardinaletti, Anna (a cura di), *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*, vol. 1. Bologna: il Mulino, 115-94.
- Benincà, Paola (1994). *La variazione sintattica*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Benincà, Paola (2006). "A Detailed Map of the Left Periphery of Medieval Romance". Zanuttini, Raffaella; Campos, Hector; Herburger, Elena; Portner, Paul (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 53-86.
- Benincà, Paola; Poletto, Cecilia (2004). "Topic, Focus and V2: Defining the CP Sublayers". Rizzi, Luigi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 52-75.
- Biberauer, Theresa; Roberts, Ian (2015). "Rethinking Formal Hierarchies: A Proposed Unification". Shlonsky, Ur (ed.), *Beyond Functional Sequence*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 295-313.
- Brandi, Luciana; Cordin, Patrizia (1989). "Two Italian Dialects and the Null Subject Parameter". Jaeggli, Osvaldo; Safir, Ken (eds), *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrech: Kluwer, 111-42.
- Breibarth, Anne; De Clercq, Karen; Haegeman, Liliane (2013). "The Syntax of Polarity Emphasis" [online]. Breibarth, Anne; De Clercq, Karen; Haegeman, Liliane (eds.), *Polarity Emphasis: Distribution and*

- Locus of Licensing*, Special Issue, *Lingua*, 128, 1-8. DOI 10.1016/j.lingua.2013.02.004.
- Calabrese, Andrea (1982). "Alcune ipotesi sulla struttura informazionale della frase in italiano e sul suo rapporto con la struttura fonologica". *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 5, 65-115.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2011). "German and Italian Modal Particles and Clause Structure". *Linguistic Review*, 28, 493-531.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990). *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo; Rizzi, Luigi (2008). "The Cartography of Syntactic Structures". *CISCL Working Papers*, 2, 43-59. URL http://www.ciscl.unisi.it/doc/doc_pub/STiL-2008-vol2.pdf (2017-05-19).
- Cognola, Federica (2008). "OV/VO Syntax in Mòcheno Main Declarative Clauses". *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 33, 83-97.
- Cognola, Federica. (2013a). *Syntactic Variation and Verb Second. A German Dialect in Northern Italy*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cognola, Federica (2013b). "The Mixed OV/VO Syntax of Mòcheno Main Clauses: On the Interaction Between High and Low Left Periphery". Biberauer, Theresa; Sheehan, Michelle (eds.), *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Orders*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 106-35.
- Cognola, Federica; Schifano, Norma (forthcoming a). "On *ben* in Trentino Regional Italian". *Selected Proceeding of the Going Romance*.
- Cognola, Federica; Schifano, Norma (forthcoming b). "On the Marking of Negative Presupposition in Regional Varieties of Italian". Adina Dragomirescu (ed.), *Romance Syntax. Comparative and Diachronic Perspective*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Coniglio, Marco (2008). "Modal Particles in Italian". *Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 18, 91-129.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2006). "Informational focus in Sicilian and the left periphery". Frascarelli, Mara (ed.), *Phases of Interpretation*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 363-85.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2010). "Syntactic Extraposition and Clitic Resumption in Italian". *Lingua*, 120, 50-73.
- den Besten, Hans (1983). "On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Delective Rules". Abraham, Werner (ed.), *On Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 47-131.
- Diesing, Molly (1997). "Yiddish VP Order and the Typology of Object Movement in Germanic". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 15, 369-427.
- Féry, Carole (2007). "Information Structural Notions and the Fallacy of Invariant Correlates". Féry, Caroline; Fanselow, Gisbert; Krifka, Man-

- fred (eds.), *The Notions of Information Structure*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag, 161-84.
- Frascarelli, Mara (2000). *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. Academic Publishers. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 50.
- Frascarelli, Mara; Hinterhölzl, Roland (2007). "Types of Topics in German and Italian". Schwabe, Kerstin; Winkler, Susanne (eds.), *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 87-116.
- Frey, Werner (2001). "About the Whereabouts of Indefinites". *Theoretical Linguistics*, 27, 137-61.
- Grewendorf, Günther (2005). "The Discourse Configurability of Scrambling". Sabel, Joachim; Saito, Mamoru (eds.), *The Free Word Order Phenomenon*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 75-135.
- Haider, Hubert (2010). *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haider, Hubert; Rosengren, Inger (1998). "Scrambling". *Sprache und Pragmatik*, 49, 1-104.
- Heller, Katrin (1979). "Alcuni problemi linguistici del dialetto dei mocheni sulla base di testi dialettali". Pellegrini, Giovan Battista; Gretter, Mario (a cura di), *La valle del Fersina e le isole linguistiche tedesche del Trentino*. San Michele all'Adige: Museo degli usi e costumi della gente trentina, 113-20.
- Hernanz, Maria Luisa (2010). "Assertive *bien* in Spanish and the Left Periphery". Benincà, Paola; Munaro, Nicola (eds.), *Mapping the Left Periphery*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 19-62.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland (2006). *Scrambling, Remnant Movement and Restructuring in West Germanic*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland; van Kemenade, Ans (2012). "The Interaction Between Syntax, Information Structure, and Prosody in Word Order Change". Nevalainen, Terttu; Closs Traugott, Elizabeth (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 803-21.
- Höhle, Tilman (1992). "Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen". Jacobs, Joachim (Hrsg.), *Informationsstruktur and Grammatik*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 112-41.
- Holmberg, Anders (1986). *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages* [PhD Dissertation]. Stockholms: Stockholms universitet.
- Kratzer, Angelika (1995). "Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates". Carlson, Gregory N.; Pelletier, Francis (eds.), *The Generic Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 25-175.

- Krifka, Manfred (2007). "Basic Notions of Information Structure". Féry, Caroline; Fanselow, Gisbert; Krifka, Manfred (eds.), *The Notions of Information Structure*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag, 13-55.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2007). "Old Neapolitan Word Order: Some Initial Observations". Lepschy, Anna Laura; Tosi, Arturo (eds.), *Histories and Dictionaries of the Languages of Italy*. Ravenna: Longo, 121-49.
- Leonetti, Manuel; Escandell-Vidal, Victoria (2009). "Fronting and *verum focus* in Spanish". Dufter, Andreas; Jacob, Daniel (eds.), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins, 155-204.
- López, Luis (2009). *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neeleman, Ad; van de Koot, Hans (2008). "Dutch Scrambling and the Nature of Discourse Templates". *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 11, 137-89.
- Pesetsky, David (1987). "Wh-in-situ: Movement and Unselective Binding". Reuland, Eric J.; Meulen, Alice (eds.), *The Linguistic Representation of (In)definiteness*. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, 98-129.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2002). "The Left Periphery of a V2-Rhaetoromance Dialect: A New Perspective on V2 and V3". Barbiers, Sjef; Cornips, Leonie; van der Kleij, Susanne (eds.), *Syntactic Microvariation*. Amsterdam: Meertens Institute, 214-42.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2000). *The Higher Functional Field. Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2014). *Word Order in Old Italian*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery". Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of Grammar. A Handbook of Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281-337.
- Rizzi, Luigi [1991] (2004). "Residual Verb Second and the wh-criterion". Belletti, Adriana; Rizzi, Luigi (eds.), *Parameters and Functional Heads*. Oxford; New York: Oxford: University Press, 63-90.
- Roberts, Ian (1997). "Directionality and Word Order Change in the History of English". Van Kemenade, Ans; Vincent, Nigel (eds.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 23-460.
- Roberts, Ian; Homberg, Anders (2010). "Introduction". Biberauer, Theresa; Holmberg, Anders; Roberts, Ian; Sheehan, Michelle, *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalistic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-57.
- Rowley, Anthony (2003). *Liacht as de sproch. Grammatica della lingua mochena. Grammatik des Deutschen Fersentalerischen*. Palù del Fersina: Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Culturale Mòcheno-Cimbro.

- Togni, Lucia (1990). *Per un'analisi di alcuni fenomeni linguistici del dialetto della valle del Fersina: un confronto con la sintassi tedesca* [Tesi di Laurea Magistrale]. Trento: Università degli Studi di Trento.
- Tomaselli, Alessandra (1990). *La sintassi del verbo finito nella lingue germaniche*. Padova: Unipress.
- Vallduví, Eric (1992). *The informational Component*. New York; London: Garland.
- Wolfe, Sam (2015). "The Nature of Old Spanish Verb Second Reconsidered". *Lingua*, 165, 132-55.
- Zamboni, Alberto (1979). "Fenomeni di interferenza nelle isole linguistiche tedesche del Trentino (con particolare riguardo all'area mochena)". Pellegrini, Giovan Battista; Gretter, Mario (a cura di), *La valle del Fersina e le isole linguistiche tedesche del Trentino*. San Michele all'Adige: Museo degli usi e costumi della gente trentina, 83-111.
- Zimmermann, Malte (2011). "Discourse Particles". Portner, Paul; Maienborn, Claudia; von Stechow, Klaus (eds.), *Semantics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 2011-2038. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, HSK 33.2.
- Zwart, Jan Wouter (1993). *Dutch Syntax: A Minimalist Approach* [PhD Dissertation]. Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

