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General course info:
The Germanic languages and the SOV/SVO difference

8 sessions (all Mondays, 3-5 PM):
Rooms: Jan 19, 26, Feb 9: LB 10 (in the Lecture Block)
Feb 2, 16, 23: G-R 06 (in the English Faculty)
Mar 2: G-R 04 (in the English Faculty)
Mar 9: To be rescheduled around Mar. 11-13

The hand-outs:
1. Introduction to Germanic Clause Structure
2. SOV/SVO and Verb Particles
3. SOV/SVO and Predicative Adjective Agreement
4. Two-verb Sequences and Germanic SOV-languages
5. SOV/SVO and Inmobile Complex Verbs
6. Accounting for Germanic Clause Structure - an OT Approach
7. Object Shift and Scrambling - an OT Approach

(The beginning or end of hand-outs will not necessarily coincide with the beginning or end of
particular sessions)

Notice the partial thematic overlap with the M.Phil. syntax seminar "Word Order in Syntactic
Theory" (Theresa Biberauer, Ian Roberts, & Michelle Sheehan), Tuesdays 2-4 PM, Graduate
Centre Seminar Room, Raised Faculty Building.

There is no required reading for this course, except for the hand-outs. Nevertheless, here are
three background papers and four (SynCom) overview papers, which can be downloaded from
the course web site, www.hum.au.dk/engelsk/engsv/papers/cambridge/.

The three background papers:
Diesing, Molly: 1997, "Yiddish VP Order and the Typology of Object Movement in
Vikner, Sten: 1997, "V°-to-I° Movement and Inflection for Person in All Tenses" in Liliane

The four overview papers:
(from Henk van Riemsdijk & Martin Everaert, 2005 (eds.): The Blackwell Companion
to Syntax, Blackwell, Oxford)
Chapter 43: Mittelfeld Phenomena (Scrambling in Germanic), by Hubert Haider
Chapter 46: Object Shift, by Sten Vikner
Chapter 75: Verb Clusters, Verb Raising, and Restructuring, by Susi Wurmbrand
Chapter 76: Verb Particle Constructions, by Martin Haiden

Vikner: Germanic SOV/SVO, part I, p. 2
Abstract

This hand-out will give an introduction to the overall clause structure of the Germanic languages and introduce the necessary concepts, including Verb second (V2), V°-to-I° movement and the difference between SVO-languages and SOV-languages (may often also be referred to simply as VO-languages and OV-languages).

This table lists the language variation to be illustrated in this introduction and to discussed in more detail and hopefully accounted for in the following hand-outs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V2 (section 2)</th>
<th>V°-to-I° (VO: 3, OV: 4)</th>
<th>VO or OV (4 &amp; 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. French</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Middle English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Icelandic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Faroese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Danish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Norwegian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Swedish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Yiddish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>VO / OV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ / - 2</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Swabian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ / - 2</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Swiss German</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ / - 2</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Frisian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ / - 2</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. West Flemish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ / - 2</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Dutch</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Afrikaans</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Clause structure

In the simplified generative analysis to be used here (and to be somewhat revised as we go), the clause structure of a completely arbitrary Germanic language (namely Danish) is as follows:

(2) A clause is a CP,
the complement of its head (= C°) is an IP, and
the complement of the IP’s head (= I°) is a VP.

(3) a. CP
   Spec C'
   C° IP
   Spec I'
   I° VP
   AdvP VP
   Spec V'
   V° VP
   VP AdvP
   Spec V'
   V° DP

b. F
   v n a
   Nu har den igen
   Now has den again

   V N A
   lagt æg her
   laid eggs here

c. k n a v
   om den igen har
   if it again has

   V N A
   lagt æg her
   laid eggs here

"Nexusfelt"
Nexus field

"Indholdsfelt"
Content field

The structure in (3a) is here compared to the Diderichsen “field” model for modern Danish (etc.), illustrated in (3b) for main clauses (Diderichsen 1946:162, 186) and in (3c) for embedded clauses (Diderichsen 1946:186).

VP thus corresponds to Diderichsen’s 1962 “indholdsfelt”.

IP thus corresponds to Diderichsen’s 1962 “nexusfelt” and “indholdsfelt” together.

This particular collapsing of the Diderichsen model for the main clause with the one for the embedded clause was suggested by Platzack (1985).

For more on parallels and differences between generative and non-generative approaches, see Bjerre et al. (2008) and references there.
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2. Verb Second (V2)

In all Germanic languages with the exception of Modern English, all main clauses have a special property, namely that they are "verb second" (V2), which means that the finite verb occupies the second position in the clause, irrespective of which constituent occupies the first position:

(4) Verb second = V2:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{one constituent} & \text{the finite verb} & \text{the rest of the clause} \\
1 & 2 & 3
\end{array}
\]

Danish, Icelandic, and German are thus V2, whereas English and French are not:

(5) a. Da. Den her bog har Peter læst
   b. Ic. Þessa bók hefur Pétur lesið
   c. Ge. Dieses Buch hat Peter gelesen
   d. En. *This book has Peter read
   e. Fr. *Ce livre a-t-il lu

(6) a. Da. Nu har Peter læst den her bog
   b. Ic. Nú hefur Pétur lesið þessa bók
   c. Ge. Jetzt hat Peter dieses Buch gelesen
   d. En. *Now has Peter read this book
   e. Fr. *Maintenant a-t-il lu ce livre

V2 thus is the result of two movements: A maximal projection (e.g. PP, AdvP, DP) moves into CP-Spec (i.e. the 1st position) and the finite verb moves into C° (i.e. the 2nd position):

(7) CP-XP C' C° IP
    C° IP
    IP
    C°
    IP
    AdvP VP Spec V'
    V° {VP/DP/PP/CP/...}

The idea is thus that the finite verb in V2 (main) clauses occupies the same position that the complementiser (e.g. that, if, because) occupies in an embedded clause, namely C°:

(8) En. a. ... that the children have not seen this film
    b. Only this film have the children ___ not seen _________

(9) Da. a. ... at børnene har set denne film
    b. Denne film børnene ___ set _________

(10) Ic. a. ... að börnin hafa séð þessa mynd
    b. Þessa mynd börnin ___ séð _________

(11) Ge. a. ... dass die Kinder diesen Film gesehen haben
    b. Diesen Film haben die Kinder ___________ gesehen ______
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A further indication that the finite verb in main clauses occupies the same position as the complementiser does in embedded clauses may be found in conditional clauses, where the subject is preceded either by a complementiser or by the finite verb, but not by both:

(12) Da. Hun så på ham, ...

She looked at him, ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C°</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ... som om han havde begået en stor forbrydelse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ... som havde han ____ begået en stor forbrydelse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. *... som om han begået en stor forbrydelse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. *... som havde om han begået en stor forbrydelse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... as if/had he (had) committed a great crime

(13) Ge. Sie schaute ihn an, ...

She looked him at, ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C°</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ... als ob er ein großes Verbrechen begangen hätten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ... als hätte er ein großes Verbrechen begangen ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. *... als ob hätte er ein großes Verbrechen begangen ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. *... als hätten ob er ein großes Verbrechen begangen ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... as if/had he a great crime committed (had)

(14) a. En. If I had had more time, ...

b. Da. Hvis jeg havde haft mere tid, ...

c. Ic. Efég hefði haft meiri tíma ...

d. Ge. Wenn ich mehr Zeit gehabt hätten, ...

(15) a. En. Had I ___ had more time, ...

b. Da. Havde jeg ____ haft mere tid, ...

c. Ic. Hefði ég ____ haft meiri tíma, ...

d. Ge. Hätte ich mehr Zeit gehabt ____, ...

(16) a. En. *If had I ___ had more time, ...

b. Da. *Hvis havde jeg ____ haft mere tid, ...

c. Ic. *Hefði ef ég ____ haft meiri tíma, ...

d. Ge. *Wenn hätten ich mehr Zeit gehabt ____, ...

(17) a. En. *Had if I ___ had more time, ...

b. Da. *Havde hvis jeg ____ haft mere tid, ...

c. Ic. *Hefði ef ég ____ haft meiri tíma, ...

d. Ge. *Hätte wenn ich mehr Zeit gehabt ____, ...

... I would have made an even longer hand-out

... ville jeg have lavet et endnu længere hand-out

... myndi ég hafa gert ennbá lengri úthendu

... hätte ich ein noch längeres Thesenpapier gemacht
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(8b) and (14a)/(15a)/(16a)/(17a) show that English also has V2 under certain circumstances, e.g. also in questions above):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP-Spec</th>
<th>C°</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(18) a. En. What</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>the children ___ seen ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. En. *What</td>
<td>the children have seen ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Da. Hvad</td>
<td>har</td>
<td>børnene ___ set ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Ic. Hvað</td>
<td>hafa</td>
<td>börnin ___ séð ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Ge. Was</td>
<td>haben</td>
<td>die Kinder gesehen ___ ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...and with topicalised negative elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP-Spec</th>
<th>C°</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19) a. En. Why</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>the children ___ seen the film ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. En. *Why</td>
<td>the children have seen the film ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Da. Hvorfor</td>
<td>har</td>
<td>børnene ___ set filmen ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Ic. Af hverju</td>
<td>hafa</td>
<td>börnin ___ séð myndina ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Ge. Warum</td>
<td>haben</td>
<td>die Kinder den Film gesehen ___ ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English, V2 requires that CP-spec contains either a negative element or a wh-element. In the other Germanic languages, V2 is not constrained in any such way.

Because V2 in some sense moves the finite verb out of the clause (and into the C°-position, to the left of the subject position), we have to look at sentences without V2 in order to be able to see in which other positions, the verb may occur in which languages. In English and French this is not complicated, as only main clause questions are V2 (in English also negative topicalisations), whereas in the other Germanic languages, we have to turn to embedded clauses.
3. V°-to-I° movement

French is a language with what is called V°-to-I° movement. This means that in French the finite verb moves from its position in V° to a functional position further left, namely I°. This movement can be detected if there is a e.g. medial adverbial present, in this case *souvent*:

In other words, in French the finite verb is base-generated in one position, to the immediate left of the object, and then moved across the sentence adverbial into another position, to the immediate right of the subject.

In modern English and modern Danish, finite main verbs do not undergo V°-to-I° movement:

Chomsky (1995:222) says about the ability of constituents to move in the syntax: "Minimalist assumptions suggest that this property should be reduced to morphology-driven movement." This was the objective of Vikner (1997/1999), where finite verb movement was linked to verbal inflectional morphology:

The generalisation in (24) accounts for the above difference in the positions of finite main verbs, assuming a clause structure as in (23) and (22) above.
Among all the Romance and Germanic SVO-languages, the only languages where inflectional differences for person are not found in every tense are modern English and four modern Scandinavian languages: Danish, Faroese, Norwegian, and Swedish, cf. (29) and (30) below.

These five languages are also the only SVO-languages without V°-to-I° movement, cf. (25) and (26) below.

**Which languages have V°-to-I° movement?**

Icelandic, Yiddish, and French all have V°-to-I° movement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C°</th>
<th>IPsp</th>
<th>I°</th>
<th>AdvP</th>
<th>V°</th>
<th>DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>*That</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>eats</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>tomatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Da.</td>
<td>*At</td>
<td>Johan</td>
<td>spiser</td>
<td>ofte</td>
<td>tomarer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Fa.</td>
<td>*At</td>
<td>Jón</td>
<td>etur</td>
<td>ofta</td>
<td>tomatir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Ic.</td>
<td>*Að</td>
<td>Jón</td>
<td>borðar</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>tómata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Yi.</td>
<td>Az</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>est</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>pomidorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>*Que</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>mange</td>
<td>souvent</td>
<td>des tomates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English, Danish, and Faroese (and also Norwegian and Swedish) all lack V°-to-I° movement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C°</th>
<th>IPsp</th>
<th>I°</th>
<th>AdvP</th>
<th>V°</th>
<th>DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>eats</td>
<td>tomatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Da.</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>Johan</td>
<td>ofte</td>
<td>spiser</td>
<td>tomarer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Fa.</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>Jón</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>etur</td>
<td>tomatir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Ic.</td>
<td>*Að</td>
<td>Jón</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>borðar</td>
<td>tómata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Yi.</td>
<td>Az</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>est</td>
<td>pomidorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>*Que</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>souvent</td>
<td>mange</td>
<td>des tomates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the languages without V°-to-I° movement have all only recently lost V°-to-I° movement. In English and in Danish, this change took place in the 15th and 16th centuries, Middle English and Old Danish were like French:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>ME.</td>
<td>He swore that he talkyd</td>
<td>neuer</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>wyth no man ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>He swore that he never</td>
<td>talked</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>anybody ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

((27a): 1460 William Paston I, Letter to John Paston I, 02.05.1460, Davis 1971:164)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>OD.</td>
<td>Æn beriær man threl for bondæns</td>
<td>øghæn. tha bøtæ han</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>But hits a man a slave for peasant-the's eyes, then pays he</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>bondæn tolf øræ foræ um threlæn</td>
<td>taker, ey, ater gen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>peasant-the twelve øre therefore if slave-the attacks not back again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Men slår en mand en træl for øjenene af bonden, da skal han bøde tolv øre derfor til bonden, hvis trællen ikke sætter sig til modværge"

(ca. 1300, Valdemars sjællandske lov, yngre redaktion, chap. 86, Uldaler & Wellejus 1968:54, l. 21-22)
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Which languages have person morphology in all tenses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English (20th C.)</th>
<th>Early modern English (16th C.)</th>
<th>Middle English (14/15th C.)</th>
<th>French (20th C.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>hear(en)</td>
<td>here(n)</td>
<td>entendre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>her(e)</td>
<td>entends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>hereth</td>
<td>entendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>hearing</td>
<td>hearing</td>
<td>hering</td>
<td>entendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>heard</td>
<td>heard</td>
<td>herd</td>
<td>entendu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st singular</td>
<td>I hear</td>
<td>I hear</td>
<td>I here</td>
<td>j' entend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd singular</td>
<td>you hear</td>
<td>thou hearst</td>
<td>thou herest</td>
<td>tu entend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd singular</td>
<td>he hears</td>
<td>he hears</td>
<td>he hereth</td>
<td>il entend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st plural</td>
<td>we hear</td>
<td>we hear(en)</td>
<td>we here(n)</td>
<td>nous entendons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd plural</td>
<td>you hear</td>
<td>you hear(en)</td>
<td>ye here(n)</td>
<td>vous entendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd plural</td>
<td>they hear</td>
<td>they hear(en)</td>
<td>þei here(n)</td>
<td>ils entendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different forms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (1s=2s=3s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st singular</td>
<td>hear-d</td>
<td>hear-d</td>
<td>her-d-e</td>
<td>entend-ais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd singular</td>
<td>hear-d</td>
<td>hear-d-[st]</td>
<td>her-d-est</td>
<td>entend-ais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd singular</td>
<td>hear-d</td>
<td>hear-d</td>
<td>her-d-e</td>
<td>entend-ait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st plural</td>
<td>hear-d</td>
<td>hear-d-(en)</td>
<td>her-d-e(n)</td>
<td>entend-i-ons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd plural</td>
<td>hear-d</td>
<td>hear-d-(en)</td>
<td>her-d-e(n)</td>
<td>entend-i-ez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd plural</td>
<td>hear-d</td>
<td>hear-d-(en)</td>
<td>her-d-e(n)</td>
<td>entend-aient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different forms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (1/2s=3s=3p)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Faroese</th>
<th>Yiddish</th>
<th>Icelandic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>høre</td>
<td>hoyra</td>
<td>hern</td>
<td>heyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>hør</td>
<td>hoyr</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>heyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>hør</td>
<td>hoyr(ið)</td>
<td>hert</td>
<td>heyrið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>hørende</td>
<td>hoyrandi</td>
<td>herndik</td>
<td>heyrandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>hørt</td>
<td>hoyrt</td>
<td>gehert</td>
<td>heyrt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st singular</td>
<td>jeg hører</td>
<td>eg hoyri</td>
<td>ikh her</td>
<td>ég heyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd singular</td>
<td>du hører</td>
<td>tú hoyrir</td>
<td>du herst</td>
<td>þú heyrir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd singular</td>
<td>han hører</td>
<td>hann hoyrir</td>
<td>er hert</td>
<td>hann heyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st plural</td>
<td>vi hører</td>
<td>vit hoyra</td>
<td>mir hern</td>
<td>við heyrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd plural</td>
<td>de hører</td>
<td>tey hoyra</td>
<td>zey hern</td>
<td>þei heyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different forms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st singular</td>
<td>hør-te</td>
<td>hoyr-d-i</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>heyr-ð-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd singular</td>
<td>hør-te</td>
<td>hoyr-d-i</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>heyr-ð-ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd singular</td>
<td>hør-te</td>
<td>hoyr-d-i</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>heyr-ð-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st plural</td>
<td>hør-te</td>
<td>hoyr-d-u</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>heyr-ð-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd plural</td>
<td>hør-te</td>
<td>hoyr-d-u</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>heyr-ð-uð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd plural</td>
<td>hør-te</td>
<td>hoyr-d-u</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>heyr-ð-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different forms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vikner: Germanic SOV/SVO, part I, p. 10
Consider furthermore the following examples from Icelandic, Yiddish, and French:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C°</th>
<th>IPsp</th>
<th>I°</th>
<th>AdvP</th>
<th>V°</th>
<th>V°</th>
<th>DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>Ic.</td>
<td>a. *Að Jón</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>hafi</td>
<td>borðað</td>
<td>tómata</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Að Jón</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>hafi</td>
<td>borðað</td>
<td>tómata</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. *Að Jón</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>hafi</td>
<td>borðað</td>
<td>tómata</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. *Að Jón</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>hafi</td>
<td>borðað</td>
<td>tómata</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Yi.</td>
<td>a. *Az Jonas</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>gegesn</td>
<td>pomidorn</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Az Jonas</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>gegesn</td>
<td>pomidorn</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. ??Az Jonas</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>gegesn</td>
<td>pomidorn</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. *Az Jonas</td>
<td>oft</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>gegesn</td>
<td>pomidorn</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>a. *Que Jean</td>
<td>souvent</td>
<td>ait</td>
<td>mangé</td>
<td>des tomates</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Que Jean</td>
<td>souvent</td>
<td>ait</td>
<td>mangé</td>
<td>des tomates</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. *Que Jean</td>
<td>souvent</td>
<td>ait</td>
<td>mangé</td>
<td>des tomates</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. *Que Jean</td>
<td>souvent</td>
<td>ait</td>
<td>mangé</td>
<td>des tomates</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(31a,b), (32a,b), and (33a,b) show (again) that Icelandic, Yiddish, and French have V°-to-I° movement and cannot leave the finite verb in V°.

(31c), (32c), and (33c) show that only one verb may take part in a V°-to-I° movement.

(31d), (32d), and (33d) show that only a finite verb may take part in a V°-to-I° movement.

There are two main differences between V°-to-I° movement and V2:

V°-to-I° movement applies in all finite clauses, whereas V2 only applies in main clauses and some embedded clauses.

In a clause with V°-to-I° movement but without V2, (34a), the first element is the subject and the second element the finite verb. In a clause with V2, (34b), the second element is also the finite verb, but the first element can be any maximal projection:

(34) a.

```
(34) a.
  IP
  |  DP
  |  Subj.
  |  V°-to-I° mvt.
  |  AdvP
  |  VP
  |  Spec
  |  V°
  {VP/DP/PP/CP/...}
```

b.

```
(34) b.
  CP
  |  C°
  |  IP
  |  V°-to-I°-to-C° mvt.
  |  AdvP
  |  VP
  |  Spec
  |  V°
  {VP/DP/PP/CP/...}
```

Vikner: Germanic SOV/SVO, part I, p. 11
At least in languages without V°-to-I° movement, V2 can only apply in main clauses and some embedded clauses, whereas if a language has V°-to-I° movement, it applies in all finite clauses:

(35) a. Da. * Johan ofte spiser tomater (main clause needs V2)
    b. Fa. * Jón ofta etur tomatir

(36) a. Da. Johan spiser ofte tomater (V2)
    b. Fa. Jón etur ofta tomatir

(37) a. Da. Tomater spiser Johan ofte (V2)
    b. Fa. Tomatir etur Jón ofta

The reason why the embedded clauses in (26) are subject clauses is that this is a context where main clause word order (i.e. V2) is NOT allowed in these languages, see (38) and also (25b,c). This is relevant because there are also many embedded contexts where both main, (39) & (40), and embedded clause word orders, (41), are possible, see (39)-(41).

(38) a. Da. *(At) tomater spiser Johan ofte (overrasker de fleste)
    b. Fa. *(At) tomatir etur Jón ofta (kemur óvart á tey flestu)

(39) a. Da. (Hun siger) at tomater spiser Johan ofte
    b. Fa. (Hon sigur) at tomatir etur Jón ofta

(40) a. Da. (Hun siger) at Johan spiser ofte tomatar
    b. Fa. (Hon sigur) at Jón etur ofta tomatir

(41) a. Da. (Hun siger) at Johan ofte spiser tomater
    b. Fa. (Hon sigur) at Jón ofta etur tomatir

Analyses have been suggested which argue that there can be no connection whatsoever between verbal inflection and V°-to-I° movement, e.g. Sprouse (1998), Alexiadou & Fanselow (2000). Such analyses have no expectations at all as to whether languages could exist that have both rich inflection and V°-to-I° movement, or just one or just the other or neither, nor as to which languages belong to which categories.

Alexiadou & Fanselow (2000) suggest the “historical development” as a reason for why V°-to-I° movement is lost when it is, but as this is not tied to anything related to inflection, the question why this historical development only occurs in the languages with weak inflection remains unanswered.

I agree with Alexiadou & Fanselow (2000:5.3, 2002:239) that in a language with V°-to-I° movement, stylistic fronting makes sentences possible that can be interpreted as not having V°-to-I° movement (Vikner 1995:161). However, the question remains why Danish children took this to imply that their language had no V°-to-I° movement whereas Icelandic children didn’t (and still don’t)? Why could it not have been the opposite, i.e. why wasn’t V°-to-I° movement lost in Icelandic but retained in Danish? The account suggested above has an answer to this question, but to Alexiadou & Fanselow (2000) and also to Sprouse (1998), it has to remain a coincidence.

(In a later version of their paper, Alexiadou & Fanselow (2002:240) do suggest a link, namely one between rich inflection and stylistic fronting, thus opening a back door to having a link between rich inflection and V°-to-I° movement).

Vikner: Germanic SOV/SVO, part I, p. 12
4. V°-to-I° movement and the OV-languages

The generalisation in (24) was explicitly said only to cover the VO-languages, (42), as opposed to the OV-languages in (43), cf. that non-finite verbs must occur after their objects in (43):

(42) Verb Object
a. En. John has eaten an apple
b. Da. Johan har spist et æble
c. Fa. Jón hevur etið eitt súrepli
d. Ic. Jón hefur borðað epli
e. Fr. Jean a mangé une pomme
f. Yi. Jonas hot gegesn an epl

(43) Object Verb
a. Du. Johan heeft een appel gegeten
b. Af. Johan het 'n appel geëet
c. WF. Johan ee nen appel gheten
d. Fs. Johan hat in apel iten
e. Ge. Johann hat einen Apfel gegessen
f. St. Dr Johann hodie an Abfl gessa
g. SG. De Johann hät än Öpfel gässe
h. Zü. De Johann hät en Öpfel ggässe
i. Be. Dr Johann het en Öpfu ggässe

John has an apple eaten

Those verbal inflectional paradigms from the OV-languages that are relevant for (24) are given in (45) on the following page.1 2

If the generalisation in (24) (i.e. an SVO-language has V°-to-I° movement if and only if person morphology is found in all tenses) was applied to the languages in (45), Dutch and Afrikaans should not have V°-to-I° movement (they both have at least one tense with no person morphology), whereas West Flemish, Frisian, German, Swabian and the Swiss German variants from Sankt Gallen, Zürich, and Bern should have V°-to-I° movement (they have person morphology in all tenses).

However, in the languages predicted to have V°-to-I° movement, the finite verb does not precede the sentential adverb in those embedded clauses where main clause word order is not possible. In fact, the finite verb does not even precede its own object, (44c-i):

(44) Adv Object Verb
a. Du. Dat Johan vaak tomaten eet (verrast de meeste mensen)
b. Af. Dat Johan gereeld tamaties eet (verras die meeste mense)
c. WF. Da Johan dikkerst tematen eet (verwondert de meeste mensen)
d. Fs. Dat Johan faak tomaten yt (die de measte minsken nij)
e. Ge. Dass Johann oft Tomaten isst (überrascht die meisten Leute)
f. St. Dass dr Johann oft Tomada isst (ieberrascht der maschde Leid)
g. SG. Dass de Johann ñpedie Tomaste äst (überrascht di meischte Lüt)
h. Zü. Dass de Johann hüüfig Tomaten isst (überrascht di mäischte Lüüt)
i. Be. Dass dr Johann hüüfig Tomaten isst (überrascht di meischte Lüt)

That John often tomatoes eats (surprises most people)

1The -n in the plural of West Flemish, which makes up the difference between 1st and 3rd plural vs. 2nd plural is not elided as is the case in many (other) variants of Dutch. The difference is thus a robust one (Liliane Haegeman, p.c.)

2The imperatives of hear in Swabian, Sankt Gallen, Zürich, and Bern are very rare, and most often replaced by the imperative of listen, Swabian horch/horched, Sankt Gallen los/loset, Zürich los/losed, Bern los/losed.

Vikner: Germanic SOV/SVO, part I, p. 13
(45) *hear*, infinitive, imperatives, participles, present and past indicative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>West Flemish</th>
<th>Frisian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>horen</td>
<td>hoor</td>
<td>uoren</td>
<td>hearre(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>hoor</td>
<td>hoor</td>
<td>eurt</td>
<td>hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>horend</td>
<td>horend</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>hearrend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>gehoord</td>
<td>gehoord</td>
<td>ghuort</td>
<td>heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present 1st singular</td>
<td>ik hoor</td>
<td>ik hoor</td>
<td>ik uoren</td>
<td>ik hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present 2nd singular</td>
<td>je hoort</td>
<td>jy hoor</td>
<td>gie uort</td>
<td>dû hearst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present 3rd singular</td>
<td>hij hoort</td>
<td>hy hoor</td>
<td>le uort</td>
<td>hy heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present 1st plural</td>
<td>we horen</td>
<td>ons hoor</td>
<td>wunder uoren</td>
<td>wy hearre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present 2nd plural</td>
<td>jullie horen</td>
<td>julle hoor</td>
<td>gunder uort</td>
<td>jimme hearre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present 3rd plural</td>
<td>ze horen</td>
<td>hulle hoor</td>
<td>zunder uoren</td>
<td>hja hearre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different forms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 1st singular</td>
<td>hoor-d-e</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>uor-d-e(ge)</td>
<td>hear-d-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 2nd singular</td>
<td>hoor-d-e</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>uor-d-e(ge)</td>
<td>hear-d-est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 3rd singular</td>
<td>hoor-d-e</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>uor-d-e(ge)</td>
<td>hear-d-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 1st plural</td>
<td>hoor-d-en</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>uor-d-e(ge)n</td>
<td>hear-d-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 2nd plural</td>
<td>hoor-d-en</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>uor-d-e(ge)</td>
<td>hear-d-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 3rd plural</td>
<td>hoor-d-en</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>uor-d-e(ge)n</td>
<td>hear-d-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different forms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Swabian</th>
<th>Sankt Gallen</th>
<th>Zürich</th>
<th>Bern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inf.</td>
<td>hören</td>
<td>hera</td>
<td>ghöre</td>
<td>ghööre</td>
<td>ghööre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Sg.</td>
<td>hör</td>
<td>(her)</td>
<td>(hör)</td>
<td>(ghöör)</td>
<td>(ghöör)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>hört</td>
<td>(hered)</td>
<td>(höret)</td>
<td>(ghööred)</td>
<td>(ghööret)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part.</td>
<td>hörend</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>ghöörend</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pst.</td>
<td>gehört</td>
<td>gherd</td>
<td>ghört</td>
<td>ghöört</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. 1sg.</td>
<td>ich höre</td>
<td>i her</td>
<td>ich ghöre</td>
<td>ich ghööre</td>
<td>i ghööre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. 2sg.</td>
<td>du hörst</td>
<td>du hersch</td>
<td>du ghörsch</td>
<td>du ghöörsch</td>
<td>du ghöörsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. 3sg.</td>
<td>er hört</td>
<td>r herd</td>
<td>er ghört</td>
<td>er ghöört</td>
<td>er ghöört</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. 1pl.</td>
<td>wir hören</td>
<td>mr hered</td>
<td>mer ghöret</td>
<td>mir ghööred</td>
<td>mir ghööre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. 2pl.</td>
<td>ihr hörst</td>
<td>r hered</td>
<td>eer ghöret</td>
<td>ir ghööred</td>
<td>dir ghööre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. 3pl.</td>
<td>sie hören</td>
<td>se hered</td>
<td>si ghöret</td>
<td>si ghööred</td>
<td>si ghööre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 1sg.</td>
<td>hör-t-e</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 2sg.</td>
<td>hör-t-est</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 3sg.</td>
<td>hör-t-e</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 1pl.</td>
<td>hör-t-en</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 2pl.</td>
<td>hör-t-et</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 3pl.</td>
<td>hör-t-en</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vikner: Germanic SOV/SVO, part I, p. 14*
Let us consider the different options, referring to German version(s) of (25) and (26):

\[(46) \enspace \text{Ge. a. } *\text{Dass Johann isst oft Tomaten (überrascht die meisten Leute)}\]
\[(46) \enspace \text{b. } *\text{Dass Johann oft isst Tomaten (überrascht die meisten Leute)}\]
\[(46) \enspace \text{c. } \text{Dass Johann oft Tomaten isst (überrascht die meisten Leute)} \quad (= (44e))\]

The ill-formedness of (46a), which must have the structure (47b) with the arrow (as embedded V2 is excluded), could be due to I° being final and/or to be due German not having V°-to-I° movement.

The ill-formedness of (46b) is caused by German being an OV-rather than a VO-language, i.e. the order inside the German or Dutch VP is DP-V° (and not V°-DP as in Danish or English).

The well-formedness of (46c) may either be the result of V°-to-I° movement if I° is final, as in (47a) with the arrow, or the result of lack of V°-to-I° movement, as in either of (47a,b) but WITHOUT the arrows:

\[(47) \enspace \text{a. CP} \quad \text{b. CP Spec V°}\]

In other words, if German lacks V°-to-I° movement, we have no evidence of the position of I° in German. This again makes it a distinct possibility that the only difference between the clause structure of Germanic OV-languages like German and that of Germanic VO-languages like English or Danish is the position of V°, as in (47b) vs. (34b).

Hand-out IV and hand-out V of this course will discuss two arguments for the finite verbs in (44)/(46c) being in V° rather than in a clause-final I°-position:

Hand-out IV is about cross-dialectal distribution of verb sequences, which vary depending on the language and on the verb class, but not depending on finiteness vs. non-finiteness.

Hand-out V is about a certain type of verbs that are unable to undergo V2, and which are only found in the OV-languages.

A further argument (based on Haider 1997a,b) is given in Vikner (2001: 117-122) involving sentential adverbials that have to c-command the finite verb.
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5. Why Yiddish might be either SVO or SOV

For most Germanic languages, it may be relatively easy to determine whether they are SVO or SOV, in that they have very strong preferences for either the SVO-order in (48a-c) or the SOV-order in (48d-f):

(48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SVO)</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Jeg har</td>
<td>læst</td>
<td>bogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ég hef</td>
<td>lesið</td>
<td>bókina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I have</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>the book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SOV)</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Ik heb</td>
<td>het boek</td>
<td>gelezen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Ik ha</td>
<td>it boekje</td>
<td>lêzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Ich habe</td>
<td>das Buch</td>
<td>gelesen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Yiddish, determining whether it is SVO or SOV is much more complicated, as both of the above orders are possible:

(49) Yi. a. Ikh hob gezen Moyshn
I have seen Moyshe

b. Ikh hob Moyshn gezen
(den Besten et al. 1986:125, (43))

It is therefore not surprising that there are many analyses that take Yiddish to be
- mixed OV/VO (e.g. Santorini 1993)
- VO (maybe with some remnants of OV), e.g. den Besten & Moed-van Walraven (1986:113), Diesing (1997:388), Sadock (1998), and Vikner (1995, 1997), and

In modern Yiddish texts, the word order would seem to be VO rather than OV in the vast majority of cases: In the first 411 sentences with mono-transitive verbs in the anecdote collection Royte pomerantsen (by Immanuel Olsvanger, published in 1947 by Schocken, New York), Santorini (1993:238) found VO order in 94% of the cases and OV order only in 6% of them.

Still, as mentioned above, the direct evidence for VO-order as the underlying order is nevertheless much less convincing for Yiddish than it is for English or for any of the Scandinavian languages, because the OV-order is not ungrammatical. In Yiddish all of (49a-b), (50a-b), (51a-b), and (52a-e) (where the objects are underlined) are grammatical, whereas in English or in the Scandinavian languages, only the strict VO versions would be possible, i.e. (49a), (50a), (51a), and (52a):

(50) Yi. a. Di Roymer hobn nit gekent aynnemen di festung
The Romans have not could capture the fortress
(The Romans were not able to capture the fortress)

b. Di Roymer hobn di festung nit gekent aynnemen
(Lockwood 1995:133)

(51) Yi. a. Avrom iz geven in Kasrilovke
Avrom is been to Kasrilovke

b. Avrom iz in Kasrilovke geven
(Hall 1979:255, (5a))
(52)  

(Yiddish)  

a. Maks hot nit gegeben Rifken dos bukh  
Max has not given Rebecca the book  

b. Maks hot Rifken nit gegeben dos bukh  
c. Maks hot Rifken dos bukh nit gegeben  
d. Maks hot dos bukh nit gegeben Rifken  
e. Maks hot dos bukh Rifken nit gegeben  

(Diesing 1997:402, (57))

(In den Besten and Moed-van Walraven 1986:126, (45), (47), an example parallel to (52c) is found to be “????” and one parallel to (52d) to be “??”.)

If the basic order in Yiddish was VO, then (49b) and (52b-e) would have to involve leftwards movement of an object, i.e. **scrambling**.

If the basic order in Yiddish was OV, then (49a) and (52a,b,d) would have to involve rightwards movement of an object, i.e. **extraposition**.

The two can be illustrated as follows. If the basic order in Yiddish is VO, then the VO-order in e.g. (49a) does not require any object movement at all, and the OV-order in e.g. (49b) can be derived by means of **scrambling**:

(53)  

(Yiddish)  

a. Ikh hob gezen Moyshn  
(no movement) (49a)  
b. Ikh hob Moyshn gezen ______  
(scrambling) (49b)

If, on the other hand, the basic order in Yiddish is OV, then the OV-order in e.g. (49b) does not require any object movement at all, and the VO-order in e.g. (49a) can be derived by means of **extraposition**:

(54)  

(Yiddish)  

a. Ikh hob Moyshn gezen  
(no movement) (49b)  
b. Ikh hob ______ gezen Moyshn  
(extraposition) (49a)

The problem is that it can be independently shown that Yiddish has both of these movements, cf. that (52b,d) could neither have been found in languages uncontroversially taken to be OV, like German, nor in languages uncontroversially taken to be VO, like English. That Yiddish has extraposition will be shown in 5.1 below, and that it has scrambling will be shown in 5.2.
5.1 Extraposition in Yiddish

Santorini (1993:231, 243, n3) argues that irrespectively of whether Yiddish is OV or VO, examples like the following three all show that Yiddish has extraposition:

(55) a. Geveyntlekh hot ongehoybn esn der balebos

Normally has begun eat the host

(Normally, the host would be the one who took the first bite)

b. Durkh a kleyn shtetl hot gedarft durkhforn der keyser

Through a small town has must through-drive the emperor

(The emperor had to drive through a small town)

c. Hot men derlangt oyfn tish fish

Has one served on-the table fish

(Fish was put on the table) (Santorini 1993:231, (1a), (2a,b))

The point is that the subject would normally have occurred immediately after hot `has’ in both (55a,b). As it is here in the sentence final position, it must have undergone extraposition, irrespective of whether Yiddish was OV or VO. As for (55c), the object fish would normally have occurred immediately before derlangt `put’ if Yiddish was OV and immediately after derlangt if Yiddish was VO, and in either case it would have to have undergone extraposition, to get to its actual position, the sentence-final position.

Furthermore, as shown in Vikner (1995), Yiddish does not require extraposed constituents to be particularly heavy, (59b), as opposed to English and Scandinavian, exemplified by Icelandic in (59a):

(56) a. Ic. ... að það hefur eínver borðað epli

... that there has someone eaten an apple

(Vikner 1995:189, (43b,c))

b. Yi. ... az es hot emetser gegesn an epl

... that there has eaten an apple

((57), (58) from Vikner 1995:200, (76), (77))

(57) Ic. ... að það hefur borðað þetta epli eínver strákur frá Danmörku

... that there has eaten this apple some boy from Denmark

(58) Yi. ... az es hot gegesn an epl a vingl fun Danmark

... that there has eaten an apple a boy from Denmark

(59) a. Ic. *... að það hefur borðað epli eínver

... that there has eaten an apple

(Vikner 1995:200, (75b,c))

b. Yi. ... az es hot gegesn an epl emetser

... that there has eaten an apple

(56) shows that both Icelandic and Yiddish allow transitive expletives, (57) and (58) show that both allow extraposition of a heavy subject in such a construction, and finally (59) shows that only Yiddish allows extraposition of a subject which is not heavy.
5.2 Scrambling in Yiddish

In the Scandinavian languages, there is a process called object shift (cf. hand-out VII later in the course). Object shift moves the object out of its base position inside the VP to a position to the left of an element (e.g. negation or adverbial) which is not part of the VP, as in (60b):

(60) Ic. a. Af hverju las Magnús aldrei bessa bók ?
   b. Af hverju las Magnús bessa bók aldrei ?
   Why read Magnús (this book) never (this book) ?

Object shift is only possible if the verb leaves VP, which a finite main verb does in main clauses (due to V2), (60), but which a non-finite main verb normally never does, (61):

(61) Ic. a. Af hverju hefur Magnús aldrei lesið bessa bók?
   b. *Af hverju hefur Magnús aldrei bessa bók lesið ?
   c. *Af hverju hefur Magnús bessa bók aldrei lesið ?
   Why has Magnús (this book) never (this bk) read (this bk) ?

In German, it is also possible to move the object out of its base position inside the VP to a position to the left of an element (e.g. negation or adverbial) which is not part of the VP, (62a). However, this movement in German is not dependent on the verb having left the VP, it is also possible with the main verb inside the VP:

(62) Ge. a. ??Max hat gestern gelesen dieses Buch
   b. Max hat gestern dieses Buch gelesen
   c. Max hat dieses Buch gestern gelesen
   Max has (this book) yesterday (this book) read (this book)

This is different from object shift in e.g. (61c), but it is just like Yiddish, (63a):

(63) Yi. a. Maks hot nekhtn geleyent dos bukh
   b. Maks hot nekhtn dos bukh geleyent
   c. Maks hot dos bukh nekhtn geleyent
   Max has (the book) yesterday (the book) read (the book)
   (based on Diesing 1997:390, (36b), 391, (38b), 395, (46))

The fact that the object movement in German and Yiddish does not depend on movement of the main verb is the main reason why German and Yiddish (and the other Germanic OV-languages) are taken not to have object shift, but scrambling.

If Yiddish is an OV-language, then (63a) must be a result of extraposition, and (63c) a result of scrambling. If Yiddish is a VO-language, then (63b,c) must both be a result of scrambling.

Diesing (1997:391) argues against an OV analysis of Yiddish that the example with the object in the position that should be the base-generated position, (63b), is the one with the most marked interpretation, i.e. that (63b) “does not correspond to a neutral positioning of the object, and therefore is unlikely to be the base order”. This does not have to follow, however, base-generated orders do not necessarily have to be the ones with the most neutral or least marked interpretation.

It might also in fact be used as an argument against Diesing: If the interpretation of (63b) is so peculiar, what should motivate scrambling to this position? This is the essence of one of Geilfuß’s (1991:176) arguments against a VO-analysis of Yiddish: Given that the object in (63b) is focussed, and given that focussed phrases have been argued not to be able to undergo scrambling in German (Stechow & Sternefeld 1988:466, Webelhuth 1992:194-199), then we should assume that the object in (63b) has not undergone scrambling. It therefore follows that the object in (63b) is in its base position.
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5.3 Conclusion concerning Yiddish

Yiddish thus has both scrambling and extraposition and both these processes can be assumed to take place relatively unrestrictedly. When trying to determine whether Yiddish is a VO- or an OV-language (or maybe both), we therefore need to look somewhere else than the direct ordering of the verbs and their objects.

Hand-outs II, III, and IV of this course will discuss three arguments for Yiddish being OV rather than VO.

Hand-out II will argue, against Diesing (1997), that the behaviour of particle verbs in Yiddish has far more in common with the OV-language German that with a VO-language like Danish.

Hand-out III will show that also when it comes to adjectival inflection, Yiddish behaves like the OV-languages Dutch, Frisian and German in having inflected attributive adjectives, but uninflected predicative adjectives, whereas those VO-languages which have inflected attributive adjectives (e.g. all the Scandinavian languages and all the Romance ones) also have inflected predicative adjectives.

Part of hand-out IV will show that whereas the ‘real’ VO-languages show no order variation whatsoever in sequences of two non-finite verbs, the OV-languages vary very much. Therefore, Yiddish would be rather exceptional within the VO-group but fit very well into the picture of the OV one.

A further argument (based on Sadock 1998), concerning the possibility in Yiddish of certain coordination constructions in which the second object is empty, is discussed in Vikner (2003).

6. Conclusion

We have seen that also Germanic clauses consist of (among other things) CPs, IPs and VPs. The Germanic languages display variation with respect to all three:

- The CP is the locus of the difference between
  V2-languages all the Germanic languages (except English)
  non-V2-languages English, French
- The IP is the locus of the difference between languages
  with V°-to-I° mvt. French, Icelandic, Yiddish
  without V°-to-I° mvt. all the other Germanic languages
- The VP is the locus of the difference between
  VO-languages English, French and the Scandinavian languages
  OV-languages Afrikaans, Dutch, Frisian, German, Swiss German

A table of these three properties for some of the languages was given in (1) above.

Tables (64)-(65) on the next page show a slightly different set of properties, namely
- horizontally: whether the main verb precedes or follows its complement (i.e. OV vs. VO),
- vertically: whether I° precedes or follows the verb phrase, and finally
- inside the cells: whether there is V°-to-I° movement or not.

I will focus on the differences between (64) and (65). (64) goes back to Koster (1975), Thiersch (1978), den Besten (1986:247), Webelhuth (1992:73-74), and also Vikner (1995:152-157) and Schwartz & Vikner (1996:46-50). (65) is the analysis I will be arguing for in this course, and it is based on Haider (1997a,b), Haider & Rosengren (2003), and Vikner (2001, 2003, 2005a).
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with the arrow (→←): French, Icelandic, Yiddish
without the arrow (→←): Danish, English, Faroese, Norwegian, Swedish

not found in Germanic (or Romance)

with the arrow (→←): Frisian, German, Swabian, Swiss German, West Flemish
without the arrow (→←): Afrikaans, Dutch
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