Benjamin Lowell Sluckin (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)

Revisiting V3 in Kiezdeutsch: a preverbal subject constraint across different types of V3

1. Introduction: This paper presents an interface account for the contact-induced actuation of an SV constraint in two V3 patterns in Kiezdeutsch (KD), an urban contact variety of German: (1) an XSV V3 pattern, and (2) V3 resumptive dislocation structures. This is inconsistent with V-to-C(/Fin) analyses of V2. **Claim:** KD V3 results from a competing non-V2 syntax involving a discourse-defective C. This change is instigated by sequential bilingual effects on the syntax-discourse interface during Child Language Acquisition (CLA) and rejection of the L1 model.

2. Data and Problem: KD possesses a well-documented V3 pattern (Frame-V3) following the schematic [FRAME-SETTER > SUBJECT$_{FAMILIAR\ TOPIC}$ > FINITE VERB] (1) (Wiese 2009 et al, Freywald et al 2015, te Velde 2016, Walkden 2017). This is ungrammatical in Standard German (SG) as it violates strict V2, which dictates that only one XP may precede the finite verb (V$_{FIN}$) in root contexts. A fronted object is disallowed in this pattern, yet OVS and XVS V2 structures are also perfectly acceptable in KD, since it is otherwise V2 like SG.

(1)   Danach   wir   haben uns   so totgelacht   [MuH17MA_07-1]
        Afterwards   we   have   REFL   so dead-laughed   SG*
        'After that we laughed ourselves to death'   KD√

SG permits V3 orders in dislocation structures with resumptive pronouns, yet these orders have been overlooked for KD. Through corpus analysis of KiDKo (Kiezdeutsch corpus, Wiese et al 2010), I show that the SV constraint in Frame-V3 extends to resumption strategies. In German Left Dislocation (GLD) (Frey 2004), a dislocated pragmatically-marked element has immediate resumption by a familiar topic weak D-element; both O>OVS (2a) and S>SVO (2b) occur in SG, but KD only allows S>SVO.

(2) a. **Den   Keks**, **den**   habe ich gegessen   (O>OVS)   SG√
        The.ACC biscuit RP.ACC have I   eaten   KD *
        ' The biscuit I ate'

   b. **Der   Junge**, **der**   hat den Keks   gegessen   (S>SVO)   SG √
        the.NOM boy   RP.NOM has the biscuit eaten   KD √
        'the boy, he ate the biscuit'

Another permissible V3 pattern in SG is Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD), i.e. resumption of a topic via long distance resumption (3a) and/or a strong D-element subject (3b) (Frey 2004). HTLD is very rare in KD but again a preference for S>SVO(3b) is present.

(3) a. **Den   Keks**, ich habe **den/ihn**   gegessen (O>SVO) SG√
        The.ACC biscuit I   have RP$_{WEAK}$/RP $_{STRONG}$ACC eaten   KD ?

   b. **Der   Junge**, **er**   hat den Keks gegessen   (S>SVO) SG√
        the.NOM boy   he$_{STRONG-PN}$ has the biscuit eaten   KD√

In sum, all KD V3 is obligatorily SV, requiring a preverbal topic subject. This is atypical for V2, in which V$_{FIN}$ obligatorily targets a C head (either Force or Fin), while another element moves higher in the left periphery. V3 may arise when cross-linguistically variable elements merge in a higher C-domain projection above the locus of V2, e.g. HT (Holmberg 2015). But the attested S$_{TOPIC}$V constraint in KD frame and resumptive V3 patterns indicates that such a V-to-C V2 syntax is inappropriate (*contra* Walkden 2017).

3. A Typological Anomaly: Wolfe's (2015) cartographic study of V2 languages elucidates variation via different V2 systems: Fin-V2 and Force-V2. In Fin-V2, V$_{FIN}$ lands in Fin°, allowing multiple elements to precede it since the entire periphery is available. Force-V2 languages, in which V$_{FIN}$ targets Force°, are stricter, since only spec-ForceP is an available landing site above V$_{FIN}$. In Force-V2, only V3 orders occur which are made possible by a higher clause-external FrameP, where dislocated arguments and Frame Setters merge (Benincà & Poletto 2004, Wolfe 2015, Haegeman & Greco 2017). Wolfe posits two types of Force-V2: Force-V2[1] allows Frame Setters in FrameP but not dislocations, while Force-V2[2] allows dislocated arguments but not Frame Setters. SG fits Force-V2[2] (4); Conversely, KD resembles

both Force-V2 systems allowing V3 with Frame Setters and LD/HT. Yet neither Fin-V2 nor Force-V2 can explain the SV constraint across KD V3. These facts give further grounds for a non-V2 solution to V3 in KD.

(4) $[_{FrameP}$LD/HT $[_{ForceP}$ XP $[_{Force}$ V$_{FIN}$ $[_{TopP}$ $[_{FocP}$$[_{FinP}$ ~~XP~~$[_{Fin}$~~V~~… **C-domain SG**

4. Analysis: The absence of X>OVS in KD V3 indicates a complementary distribution between the V3 syntax allowing Frame Setters and GLD/HTLD, and the V2 syntax allowing OVS but not frame/dislocated elements in initial position. I propose that KD has divided C-domain functions into two separate instantiations (*pace* Walkden), while SG has one C-domain (4). KD V2 matrix clauses take a standard split-CP (5) without FrameP, ruling out V3; This allows OVS, XVS, and SVO surface orders.

(5) $[_{ForceP}$ XP$[_{Force°}$V$_{FIN}$$[_{TopP}$$[_{FocP}$$[_{FinP}$ ~~XP~~$[_{Fin}$~~V~~… **V2 C-domain KD**

V3 arises from a defective 'collapsed C' without discourse projections but with a FrameP (6). This C does not always necessitate movement to the C-domain because it lacks EPP and +V features, but still bears clause typing, +T, and phi-features.

(6) $[_{FrameP}$ Frame/LD/HT$[_{CP}$ C$[_{TP}$ Subj$[_{T}$ V$_{FIN}$…. **Non-V2 C-domain KD**

I assume familiar topics are complex DPs; following proposals for Old English by Biberauer & van Kemenade (2011), a big DP is a way to implement this, i.e. a subject with a DP-shell **$[_{DP}$ $_D$Ø°$[_{DP}$subject]].** West Germanic SOV languages have VoiceP-to-SpecTP pied-piped movement with reordering in C (cf. Biberauer & Richards 2005/6). I argue that big-DP may override this movement since phi goals on Voice and outer-D are equidistant, sending the big-DP to spec-TP, leaving VoiceP in situ. In combination with Frame-C, and assuming v-to-T movement in this context (*contra* Vikner 2005), this conspiracy of factors produces the V3 structure in (7). The outer D then values *uval* uT features on C° (cf. Pesetsky & Torrego 2007).

(7) $[_{FrameP}$ Frame Setter/ HT/ GLD $[_{CP}$ C$[_{TP}$$[_{DP}$ D$[_{DP}$**Subject**]]$[_{T}$**V$_{FIN}$**$[_{vP}$ ~~DP~~ $[$~~v~~….

This predicts a V1 structure if Big-DP is absent, as VoiceP-to-specTP pied-piping will occur; the overt DP cannot incorporate into C, thus V-to-C movement must value features (8). This is confirmed in the data where a non-standard V1 pattern arises (9). This is reportedly pragmatically neutral (Wiese et al. 2009), and not introduced by *verba dicendi* unlike SG narrative inversion (Önnerfors 1997). This approach lies between V-to-T (Travis 1984) and unified V-to-C proposals for subject-initial V2, and V3 in KD (Walkden 2017 vs te Velde 2016), accounting for both the syntactic and pragmatic variation, i.e. obligatory S$_{TOPIC}$V in V3.

(8) $[_{FrameP}$ Ø $[_{CP}$ C**V$_{FIN}$**$[_{TP}$ $[_{vP}$ ~~DP~~**Subject**] ~~v~~ $[_{vP}$ [XP] ~~v~~]$[_{T}$]]]]

(9)   habe ich SPK7   mein Blatt geben   [MuH27WT_06]
         have I "speaker 7"   my   leaf   given   (VSO)   SG*
         'I gave my sheet of paper to SPK7'   KD √

5. Diachronic explanation and implications: I attribute the emergence of defective C to the sequential bilingual status of KD speakers, as exposure to German occurs after L1 speakers acquire V2. Indeed, the C-domain is considered vulnerable in early L1, L2 and bilingual language Acquisition (Platzack 2001, Müller & Hulk 2001). XSV frame-type V3 patterns are documented in early CLA before yielding to V2. In subsequent bilingual CLA, I suggest, speakers cannot resolve conflicting stages into a single grammar due to maturational effects. This is magnified by input factors, since speakers of multi-ethnic vernaculars often participate in *group second language acquisition* (Cheshire et al. 2011) relying on data from peers, but rejecting the L1 adult and adult L2 input (*contra* Walkden 2017). Finally, the constraints on KD V3 impedes evidence for V2 in resumptive structures. If Salvesen (2017) is correct that resumption structures are foundational for V2, this data could represent an early diagnostic and/or predictor for the loss of V2 in other diachronic data.

Selected References: Walkden, G. 2017. Language contact and V3 in Germanic varieties new and old. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 20(1). > Wolfe, S. 2015. *Microvariation in Medieval Romance Syntax: A Comparative Study*. PhD Thesis. Cambridge.