

V3 in multilingual urban varieties of Dutch

Marieke Meelen¹, Khalid Mourigh² & Lisa Cheng²

¹University of Cambridge, ²Leiden University

Introduction. Recently, some varieties of Germanic V2 languages have been reported to exhibit V3 orders alongside the standard V2 patterns (see, among others, Freywald, Cornips, Ganuza, Nistov, and Opsahl (2015), Wiese and Rehbein (2016) and Walkden (2016)). These new Germanic varieties have emerged in multilingual settings in large cities in Germany, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. In this talk we present new data to show that these V3 orders are found in Dutch urban varieties as well (*pace* Freywald et al. (2015:88)) and that they exhibit similar characteristics to those found in other multilingual settings. We then present a synchronic analysis in line with Wolfe's (2017) V2 typology. Finally, we conclude that a detailed analysis of the information structure of the V3 data from Dutch urban varieties will shed new light on cartographic and non-cartographic approaches to L2 acquisition and the diachronic development of these innovative structures.

Data & Linguistic Setting. We collected data from Moroccan Dutch teenagers (second-generation immigrants) who are L1 speakers of Dutch, but often speak Berber and Arabic at home. They grew up in an urban, multilingual environment alongside teenagers whose parents migrated to The Netherlands from Turkey, Surinam and the Antilles. All these teenagers acquired the regular V2 constraint in Dutch perfectly, but when speaking amongst their peers, they switch to a register with optional V3 word orders:

- (1) *Toen gingen we wegrennen. Toen ze vroegen ID.*
then went.PL we run.away.INF then they asked.PL ID
'Then we ran away. Then they asked for ID.' (V2 and V3 in consecutive sentences)

Just like in the urban varieties in Germany and Scandinavia (cf. Walkden (2016)), the sentence-initial constituent can be a DP, PP, AP or CP:

- (2) a. *Op een gegeven moment hij douwt zo'n mais in zijn kont.*
at a given moment he pushes such.a corn.cob in his butt
'At some point he pushes a corn cob in his butt.'
b. *Hier je bent verzekerd.*
here you are insured
'Here you are insured.'
c. *Wanneer we hem slaan hij gaat gelijk huilen.*
when we him beat he goes straight cry.INF
'When we beat him he immediately starts to cry.'

Again, just like in V3 structures in other urban varieties, the preverbal constituent is mostly an unstressed subject pronoun (of any person/number), as shown in (3a). However, we find some examples of stressed pronouns and full noun phrases as well, as shown in (3b) and (3c):

- (3) a. *Soms ik gooi iets op de grond.*
sometimes I throw something on the floor
'Sometimes I throw something on the floor.'
b. *Daarna jij ging mee.*
afterwards you.STRESSED went along
'Afterwards YOU went along.'
c. *Daarna de rest zegt ik ga niet.*
afterwards the rest says I go not
'Afterwards the rest says: I'm not going.'

Analysis. In the V2 typology sketched by Wolfe (2017), Standard Dutch is a ‘Force-V2 System 2’ language in which only hanging or left-dislocated topics can precede the preverbal constituent. If the sentence-initial constituent can be any type of frame-setter alongside hanging and left-dislocated topics, it would be a ‘Force-V2 System 1’. We argue that this extended option for the sentence-initial constituent is exactly the difference we observe between the Standard Dutch V2 and the urban V3 orders. From a diachronic point of view, following Walkden’s (2016) analysis, we assume that these teenagers now add an extra layer in the CP to accommodate the V3 structures because of a mixed input of Standard Dutch V2 and their parents’ SVO orders (a result of their imperfect L2 acquisition of Dutch). In a V3 sentence like (1), the frame-setter *toen* ‘then’ is in SpecCP2 and the preverbal constituent *ze* ‘they’ in SpecCP1, with V-to-C1 movement, as shown in (4):

(4) [_{CP2} Toen [_{CP1} ze [_{C1} vroegen_i] [_{TP} [_{VP} t_i ID]]]] ‘Then they asked for ID.’ (V3)

Walkden (2016) argues that CP1 actually conflates FamP and FinP, because all preverbal constituents in the corpora he investigated can be analysed as Familiar Topics. CP2 (hosting the frame-setter) conflates the higher cartographic layers in the C-domain (following Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007)): ForceP, ShiftP, ContrP and FocP. Some preverbal constituents found in our dataset, however, *cannot* be Familiar Topics: the preverbal subject *de rest* ‘the rest’ in (3c), for example, is contrastively focused. If we follow Walkden’s cartographic division with ContrP and FocP conflated in the outer CP2, we are forced to assume that both the sentence-initial frame-setter and the preverbal constituent end up in the outer CP2, which is problematic. Therefore, if we want to take a cartographic mapping of information-structural features to hierarchical layers seriously, we have to adjust the division of layers so that the lower CP1 contains ShiftP, ContrP, FocP, FamP and FinP for any type of preverbal constituent (not just Familiar Topics) and the outer CP2 hosts the frame-setter in ForceP. Alternatively, we could assume that the lower CP1 is actually ForceP and the newly added CP2 is an additional FrameP preceding ForceP (and thus the rest of the sentence), as shown in (5):

(5) [_{FrameP} Daarna [_{ForceP} de rest [_{Force} zegt_i] [_{TP} [_{VP} t_i ik ga niet]]]]
 ‘Afterwards the rest said: I’m not going.’

In light of Wolfe’s (2017) typology of V2 languages, this is plausible as it would mean a change from a ‘Force V2 System 2’ grammar (Standard Dutch) to a ‘Force V2 System 1’ grammar (Dutch urban varieties). Optional V3 orders are possible in this grammar, because of the additional FrameP that these teenagers postulated on the basis of a mixed V2/SVO input (following Walkden’s (2016) diachronic scenario). These new data from Dutch urban varieties therefore not only broaden our knowledge on ongoing syntactic changes in multilingual settings, they also provide evidence for a more detailed analysis formalising synchronic and diachronic variation in V2 languages.

Frascarelli, M., & Hinterhölzl, R. (2007). Types of topics in German and Italian. *On information structure, meaning and form*, 87-116.

Freywald, U., Cornips, L., Ganuza, N., Nistov, I., & Opsahl, T. (2015). Beyond verb second—a matter of novel information-structural effects? Evidence from Norwegian, Swedish, German and Dutch. *Language, Youth and Identity in the 21st Century*, 73-92.

Walkden, G. (2016). Language contact and V3 in Germanic varieties new and old. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 20.

Wiese, H., & Rehbein, I. (2016). Coherence in new urban dialects: A case study. *Lingua*, 172, 45-61.

Wolfe, S. (2017). Redefining the typology of V2 language: the view from Medieval Romance and beyond. In C. Salvesen (Ed.), *Linguistic Variation Special Issue: A Micro-Perspective on V2 in Germanic and Romance*.