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Non-canonical verb positioning in main clauses: Phenomena and research questions

Sonja Müller & Mailin Antomo

1 Motivation and phenomena: Verb-order variation in main and dependent clauses

In the last 15 years, the verb-second (henceforth: V2) phenomenon in the Germanic languages has received particular interest and a lot of research has been devoted to its occurrence in dependent environments. One main issue investigated in the various works on embedded V2 is to define the subset of dependent clauses which admit V2. For example, whereas a clause embedded by the verb glauben admits verb-fronting, the complement of a factive predicate such as ignorieren resists it as shown in the following examples.

(1) a. Maria glaubt, Peter ist in Spanien.
   Maria believes Peter is in Spain
   ‘Maria believes that Peter is in Spain.’

   b. *Maria ignoriert, Peter ist in Spanien.
      Maria ignores Peter is in Spain
      ‘Maria ignores the fact that Peter is in Spain.’

Besides the definition of the contexts that admit V2, another crucial aim of the investigations is to explain the principles underlying its occurrence. What the theory of grammar has to explain is why V2 is restricted to special licensing contexts and what properties are relevant for a context to license V2. Proposals concerning the licensing conditions of V2 in dependent clauses vary between purely structural accounts (cf. den Besten 1983), proposals linking the phenomena to register use (Freywald 2014), and accounts based on the observation that the two alternative constructions are functionally not equivalent. Approaches that focus on the semantic/pragmatic differences between alternatives with V2- or verb-final (henceforth: Vf)-order have tried to locate the difference in terms of assertional force (Gärtner 2002, Truckenbrodt 2006, Julien 2007), givenness (Pasch 1997), at-issueness (Holler 2009, Antomo 2016), differences in functional interpretation (Uhnmann 1998, Antomo/Steinbach 2010, Volodina 2011, amongst others) or differences in information density (Fabricius-Hansen 1999, Speyer 2015) (for an...
overview see Speyer/Reich 2016). Other instances of verb-order variation in embedded clauses are the alternation of verb-first (henceforth: V1) and Vf-order in conditional clauses or cases of asymmetric coordination.

However, not only dependent clauses display verb-order variation, there are also different options for positioning the finite verb in main clauses. For example, in German declarative clauses the finite verb is typically in the second position, however, there are instances of declaratives with V1-order, as in the following examples:

\[(2)\]

\[a.\] Hab ich ihr ganz frech noch en Kuß gegeben.

\[have \ I \ her \ very \ naughtily \ another \ a \ kiss \ given\]

‘Naughtily, I gave her another kiss.’

\[b.\] Bleibt ein dritter Einwand, nicht weniger gravierend.

\[remains \ a \ third \ objection, \ not \ less \ serious\]

‘A third objection, not less serious, remains.’

\[c.\] His death affected many. Hatte doch seine Ära den Wiederaufstieg /.../

\[had \ MP \ his \ era \ the \ comeback \ /.../\]

begründet.

\[established\]

‘As his era established the comeback.’

Reis (2000: 216) [after Önnerfors 1997b: 99ff.]

Önnerfors (1997b) differentiates between a narrative (cf. (2a)), an enumerating (cf. (2b)) and a causal (cf. (2c)) type of declarative V1-clause.

Another instance of verb-order variation in main clauses concerns independent clauses where the finite verb occurs in the final position. Typically, the canonical verb position in a German main clause is the first or second position, whereas embedded clauses show Vf-order. However, Vf-clauses can also occur as independent clauses. In German, four different types of independent Vf-clauses can be distinguished (cf. Meibauer 1989, Oppenrieder 1989, Altmann 1993, Truckenbrodt 2013), two interrogative types (example (3)) and two non-interrogative types as in (4):

\[(3)\]

\[a.\] Wen sie wohl einlädt?

\[who(-acc) \ she \ MP \ invites\]

‘I wonder who she will invite.’

\[b.\] Ober sich ein Handy kauft?

\[if \ he \ himself \ a \ mobile \ buys\]

‘I wonder if he will buy a mobile phone.’

\[2\] List of abbreviations used in the examples: acc = accusative marking, MP = modal particle.
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(4) a. Dass du zum Unterricht kommst!
   *that you to-the lessons come*
   ‘Oh, you are here for class!’ or ‘Come to the lesson!’

   b. Wenn ich im Lotto gewinnen würde!
   *if I the lottery win would*
   ‘If I won the lottery!’

Furthermore, there are independent Vf-clauses with two introducing elements, as described by d’Avis (1995), amongst others.

(5) a. Und OB ich dahin gehe!
   *and if I there go*
   ‘You bet, I will go there!’

   b. Und WEN ich getroffen habe!
   *and who(-acc) I met have*
   ‘Unbelievable, who I met there!’

Main clause use of subordinate-like constructions can be observed cross-linguistically (see Evans 2007, who, referring to this phenomenon, shaped the notion of insubordination).

More recently, increased attention has been paid to declarative clauses which are claimed to show verb-third (henceforth: V3) order. Typically, in German and other Germanic V2 languages, at most one constituent can precede the finite verb, resulting in a V2 structure. However, there are instances where more than one constituent precedes it.

(6) a. [Vermutlich] [er] empfiehlt ihr das Buch.
   *probably he recommends her the book*
   ‘Probably, he recommends the book to her.’ (Jacobs 1986: 112)

   b. [Nur] [vom Grafen] habe ich jeden Sohn bewundert.
   *only by-the count have I every son admired*
   ‘I only admired each of the count’s sons.’

   (Büring & Hartmann 2001: 246)

(7) [Der Universität] [zum Jubiläum] gratulierte auch
   *the university to-the anniversary congratulated also*
   Bundesminister Dorothee Wilms, die in den fünfziger Jahren
   *Federal Minister Dorothee Wilms who in the fifties years*
   in Köln studiert hatte.
   *in Cologne studied had*
   ‘Federal Minister Dorothee Wilms, who had studied in Cologne in the fifties, congratulated the university on its anniversary, too.’
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(8) a.  [morgen] [ich] geh arbeitsamt. (Wiese 2009: 787)
   ‘I will go to the employment office tomorrow.’

b.  ja, [dann] [ich] empfehle Ihnen das Hotel Loccumer-Hof. (Schalowski 2015: 72)
   ‘Well, I recommend the hotel Loccumer Hof to you then.’

(6) illustrates the V3-pattern consisting of a focus particle/an adverb or a connective + one further constituent (in the following referred to as type 1). In (7) (type 2), two constituents which are arguments of the finite verb precede the latter. And the two occurrences in (8) (type 3) are characterized as displaying the pattern (temporal) adverb + subject + finite verb.

All contributions in this volume are dedicated to the investigation of the three cases of non-canonical verb positioning in main clauses referred to above (i.e. main clauses with Vf-order, V1-declaratives and V3-clauses). The main issues concerning these non-canonical main clauses are summarized in the following section, whereas the final paragraph of this introduction gives an overview of the contributions.

2 Research questions

After section 1 introduced the phenomena which are subject of this volume, the following sections will point out some topics accompanying the study of these phenomena. The field of data that needs to be covered is quite wide. However, it seems to be the case that some questions come up with the study of all form types. Several questions can probably be raised every time one is confronted with variation, others are more closely related to these particular constructions.

2.1 Why are there alternatives?

One major topic is: Why does language offer word order variation of this kind at all? One subquestion, for instance, is: Are the alternatives equivalent? Existing studies which address this question show that it is rather unlikely that the structures are mutually interchangeable. Concerning V1-clauses, for instance, there is ample evidence that V2-declaratives are not replaceable by corresponding V1-declaratives under all conditions (Önnerfors 1997a: 185ff., Reis 2000: 222ff.). V1-declaratives do not have performative uses, e.g., as the clauses in (9) illustrate.

(9) a.  Ich entlasse Sie hiermit fristlos.
   *Entlasse ich Sie hiermit fristlos. (Önnerfors 1997b: 307)
   ‘I hereby fire you without notice.’

   I fire you hereby without notice

   ‘I hereby fire you without notice.’
For independent Vf-clauses, it has been assumed that they never have the same conditions of use as the corresponding V1- or V2-type. V1/V2-interrogatives, e.g. expect an answer, Vf-interrogatives, however, are deliberative and are not directed to an addressee in the same way (cf. (10)).

(10)  Stefan: I haven’t heard from Peter for years.
     Heiner: Me neither.
     Stefan: #Mag er immer noch kubanische Zigarren?
     likes he always still Cuban cigars
     Ob er immer noch kubanische Zigarren mag?
     if he always still Cuban cigars likes
     ‘I wonder whether he still likes Cuban cigars.’
     (Truckenbrodt 2006: 274, translation S.M.)

Müller & Bildhauer & Cook (2012: 120ff.) compare fronted verb phrases containing a non-finite verb to multiply filled prefields (cf. (11a) and (11b)).

(11)  a. [Ganz vom Tisch wischen] kann man das Thema
     completely from-the table wipe can one the topic
     freilich nicht.
     certainly not
     ‘Certainly, one cannot strike the topic off the roll completely.’

b. [Ganz] [vom Tisch] will er es aber nicht wischen.
     completely from-the table wants he it but not wipe
     ‘He does not want to strike it off the roll completely, though.’

Results from a corpus study and a subsequently calculated logistic regression point at factors which promote multiple filled prefields in contrast to the other (more canonical) structure.

Follow-up questions are then: What are the conditions under which which alternative occurs? Is it a matter of possibility of occurrence or do certain structures become even necessary (for example in order to fulfill certain communicative demands)? Are certain ‘deviating’ configurations always specialised variants of the unmarked forms? If one answers this question positively, one also has to answer in how far they are more specialised. Are there differences in meaning between them? If this applies, the question arises in which sense of meaning they differ. Or are there differences as far as their speech act conditions are concerned? This might apply to the uses of Vf-interrogatives e.g. as seen above. Or are different discourse conditions involved? Schwabe (2007: 3) e.g. shows that direc-

(12)  Polizist: Folgen Sie mir! (#Dass Sie mir BLOSS folgen!)
     policeman follow you me (#That you me MP follow)
     ‘Policeman: Follow me!’
     (Schwabe 2007: 3)
Another possibility to account for the existence of alternatives is that the differences are related to information structure. Önnerfors (1997a/b) follows this line of argumentation for the V1-declaratives, arguing that they lack a topic-comment-structure. One of the results of the corpus study on V3 by Müller & Bildhauer & Cook (2012) mentioned above is that if a constituent in the prefield carries focus, the opportunity increases that multiple fronting occurs. Especially V3-structures of type 2 and 3 (cf. (7) and (8)) have been studied from the perspective of their information structural contribution/possibilities. Müller & Bildhauer & Cook (2012) and Bildhauer & Cook (2010) work out certain patterns for type 2. As type 3 is rather restricted as a syntactic pattern, it has been analysed as a combination of frame setter/discourse structuring connective + topic (Wiese 2009: 787ff., Wiese et al. 2012: 114ff., Freywald et al. 2015: 88ff.).

A further question related to the broader topic of alternatives is: Are the non-canonical forms related to the occurrence of particular lexical material? Müller & Bildhauer & Cook (2012) find out that multiple fronting is also more likely if the adverb/adjective carries positive meaning (such as günstig, glücklich). Alternatively, the choice between options might also be a matter of style. Or different variants could also be specialised in that they occur in particular genres. Type 3 of the V3-constructions (adverbial + subject + finite verb) is associated with urban vernaculars in peer-interaction (Auer 2003: 259, Wiese 2009: 786ff., Freywald et al. 2015 e.g.) or with spoken language in general (Schalowski 2015: 70ff.). Type 1 and 2 have been claimed to be typical of the language in newspapers or reporting (Winkler 2014: 14). For V1-declaratives, it has been assumed that the narrative type mainly occurs in oral narrations (most famously in jokes) and the enumerating type in argumentations. The causal type, however, is only found in written contexts (Önnerfors 1997a: 100, 157).

A related question addresses the possibility of providing a uniform analysis. That means, is it possible to find the smallest common denominator within one class of verb-positioning? Or how many subtypes have to be differentiated? On the one hand, this could mean that one finds it for a subclass, such as all V1-declarative clauses or all V3-declaratives. On the other hand, one might be able to formulate it for the whole class, subsuming all structures which adhere to a certain verb positioning, such as all Vf-clauses or all V1-structures (including declaratives, interrogatives, exclamatives and so forth). Truckenbrodt (2013: 242f.) e.g. claims that in their primary usage, independent Vf-clauses are inherently anaphoric. Lenerz (1984: 153) (cf. also Reis 2000: 221ff.) e.g. sketches what could unite the different V1-types.

Little is known about such non-canonical constructions from a processing perspective. In the form of side remarks, one can read that e.g. V3-structures require a processing effort which needs to be justified in the sense of communicative advantages (Winkler 2014: 143). However, Wiese & Öncü & Bracker (2017) show that in non-verbal settings (which are less influenced by language-specific restrictions), orders of framesetter, topic and verbal action are chosen which conform to the V3-order by German speakers. The study thus suggests that from a
conceptual perspective, orders which are not compatible with the grammatical principles of a language might even be easier to process.

2.2 Syntactic modelling

Apart from these issues which are related to the interpretation and use of the structures, another topic is how to model the phenomena syntactically. For all three types, suggestions have been made. Regarding V3-structures, principally two types of approaches can be found in the literature: The first one assumes that one is only dealing with an apparent multiple filling of the prefield (cf. e.g. Müller, S. 2003, 2005a/b; building on work by Fanselow 1993, Hoberg 1997, Müller, G. 1998) and, therefore, the V2-restriction can be upheld. The second one argues for true V3-positioning and holds the view that two constituents are really positioned in front of the finite verb (cf. e.g. Jacobs 1983, Speyer 2008, Walkden 2017, Schalowski 2012). Winkler (2014: 155) offers structures for both views and argues that a decision is not possible at the current state of knowledge.

As regards V1-structures, approaches differ concerning the answer to the question whether the prefield is empty/filled by some null-element (Haftka 1993: 863, Diesing 1990: 56, Vikner 1995: 69) or whether the position is not projected at all (Önnerfors 1997a: 96, Coniglio 2012: 31).

Syntactic analyses concerned with Vf-clauses discuss whether they are elliptical, that means derived by deleting the matrix clauses. Most authors uphold the view that the occurrence of Vf-order is not derived by deletion (cf. Oppenrieder 1989, Schwabe 2006, Truckenbrodt 2013, Zimmermann 2013 e.g.). Arguments for that view are e.g. that there are formtypes for which there is no convincing source structure (e.g. und ob-/w-structures). Above that, it has been brought forward that the occurrence of modal particles in the independent Vf-clauses is not identical to the corresponding paraphrase consisting of main and subordinate clause.

(13) a. Wenn du mir *(doch) glauben würdest!
   ‘If only you believed me!’
   (Oppenrieder 1989:167)

b. Ich würde mich freuen, wenn du mir *(doch) glauben würdest.
   ‘I would be happy if you believed me.’
   (Oppenrieder 1989:167)

However, arguments in favour of the deletion analysis have also been proposed. There might be elements external to the clause which can be analysed as belonging to the matrix clause e.g., as nicht in (14).

(14) (Ich will) Nicht, dass er jetzt an die Ostsee fährt!
   ‘I don’t want him to go to the Baltic Sea now.’
   (Schwabe 2006: 22)
2.3 Beyond modern German

A last broader topic that is relevant in connection with non-canonical verb-positioning in main clauses is how similar licensing conditions are in other (Germanic) languages or in the historical development of single languages. V1 declaratives as alternatives to V2 declaratives can also be observed in other Germanic languages, e.g. in Yiddish:

my aunt is died. Am I stayed alone.
‘My aunt died. I am left alone.’ (Diesing 1990:56)

Concerning V3 in other Germanic languages, type 3 of the V3-structures (cf. (8)) also seems to occur in urban vernaculars of other Germanic V2-languages (cf. Freywald et al. 2015 for an overview). (16) and (17) show two examples from Norwegian and Swedish.

(16) [med limewire] [det] tar én to dager  (Norwegian)
with Limewire it takes one two days
‘Using Limewire it takes one or two days.’ (UPUS corpus, Lars)
(Freywald et al 2015: 84)

(17) [nu] [ingen] kan terra mej längre  (Swedish)
now nobody can threaten me any longer
‘Now nobody can threaten me any longer.’
(SUF corpus, Åsa (L37), free group conv.)
(Freywald et al 2015: 85)

This type of construction has been of interest in the light of relatively recent developments due to language contact in multilingual settings. A preferred question accompanying the uncovering of such phenomena (which are mostly rejected in Standard (written) German) is whether they are new or can already be attested throughout the history of a language. In case statements are made about its frequency in the literature, it is claimed to be rather infrequent. Diachronic studies, however, show that the construction used to be more frequent in fact. Such studies also show that it used to be constrained differently (cf. Speyer 2008 on Early High German; cf. also Petrova 2012: 173ff. on Middle Low German, Axel 2007: chapter 4.5 on Old High German).

There is also diachronic work on V1-declaratives (Old High German: Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2010, Middle High German: Coniglio 2012: 14ff.). From these studies, one gets the impression that there are more similarities to its use in modern German than for V3-structures.

The above subsections present some aspects of previous works on the three types of configurations that are of interest for the study of non-canonical verb positioning in main clauses. Of course, this overview of phenomena and research questions cannot be exhaustive within the limits of this introduction. There are more aspects which have already been discussed in the literature and there are
other aspects that will come up in the papers which are not mentioned at this point either. However, this brief overview is meant to raise some of the questions which are relevant within the field of data and research.

The following section will shortly summarize the contributions in this volume. Where applicable, relations to the questions raised in section 2 will become apparent.

3 The contributions in this volume

The contributions in this volume are roughly organized in the following way: The first part is dedicated to main clauses with Vf-order, the second part discusses V1-clauses, whereas the contributions in the final part aim at investigating V3-structures in different Germanic languages and varieties.

The discussion of independent Vf-clauses starts with the contribution “Warum After Work Clubs in Berlin nicht funktionieren. Zur Lizensierung von w-Überschriften in deutschen Pressetexten”, in which Rita Finkbeiner investigates the formal and interpretative properties of w-clauses with Vf-order in headlines. She shows that they do not fit into the established classes of independent Vf-clauses and she argues that, in addition to their formal properties, genre plays a crucial role as a licensing condition for the Vf-position in w-headlines. She argues that the function of Vf-clauses in headlines can best be described as projecting a discourse context within which they operate as meta-representational acts on textual acts. The claim that the usage of Vf-w-clauses in headlines is subject to genre restrictions is supported by the results of a corpus study. The general conclusion is that Vf-w-headlines can only be accounted for in a system of sentence types that includes an interface with genre. In a final step, Rita Finkbeiner discusses the possible implementation of an interface with genre within compositional and constructionist models of sentence mood.

Another type of Vf-clause is focused on in the contribution of Nathalie Staratschek, “Desintegrierte weil-Verbletzt-Sätze – Assertion oder Sprecher-Commitment?”. Based on the investigation of different variants of clauses introduced by causal weil (‘because’) in German, it is argued that the notions of assertion and speaker commitment must be kept apart. Whereas assertive operations lead to a reduction of the context set, instances of speaker commitment do not aim at an update of the discourse context, but, merely, can cause updates of a sub-context. Based on Lohnstein (to appear), the author shows that fronting of the finite verb serves to anchor the proposition in the actual discourse context. Therefore, disintegrated Vf-weil-clauses, which lack verb-fronting, do not constitute assertions, since they can only be anchored in alternative belief contexts like canonically integrated clauses with Vf-order.

In her contribution “Variable verb positions in German exclamatives”, Imke Driemel discusses the question of which factors govern the choice between V1-, V2- and Vf-exclamatives. She argues that the functional differences between
these alternatives cannot be traced back to differences with respect to assertional sentence force or at-issueness. Instead, she aims to show that the verbal position in exclamatives is linked to the addressee of the speech act. Crucially, verb movement triggers an addressee-related expectation of surprisal, whereas exclamatives with Vf-order lack this condition. Empirical evidence is provided in terms of differential behaviour in context tests as well as differential behaviour with respect to the modal particle denn.

In their paper “Verb position, verbal mood and root phenomena in German”, Frank Sode and Hubert Truckenbrodt in a programmatic way suggest a new vision on structuring different phenomena from the area of sentence types, finiteness, and sentence mood, namely – as the title suggests – V-to-C movement, root phenomena and verbal mood. Their key assumption is the existence of a feature-indexed doxastic or volitive attitude operator in the left periphery. Depending on the occurring verbal mood categories, the specification varies and different interactions with the finite verb arise. Their detailed and formalised account is applied to a number of phenomena at the syntax-semantics interface such as embedded V2-clauses, V1-parentheticals, reportative Konjunktiv, the interaction of the indicative with fronting of the finite verb and independent Vf-clauses. The precise analyses concerned with this range of phenomena have to be read in detail and can hardly be sketched at this point. Crucially, although the account is developed with respect to independent canonical structures and non-canonical subordinate clauses (which are both not in the focus of this volume), it also gives rise to new questions concerning main clauses which display Vf-order. Relevant issues here are e.g. whether the operators proposed by the authors interact with other attitude operators which have been suggested for other sentence moods (exclamative clauses) and whether the features in the left periphery can be assumed to be present regardless of which complementizer occurs.

In her contribution “Syntax and discourse structure: Verb-final main clauses in German”, Ulrike Demske analyses the syntax and pragmatics of Vf-structures introduced by a demonstrative in Early New High German. In the previous literature, these structures have been treated either as syntactically independent Vf-clauses (i.e. as a main clause) or as precursors of non-restrictive relative clauses (i.e. syntactically dependent on a host). The author ‘decides’ this discussion in the way that she assumes that there is good evidence that the Vf-clauses of this kind are in fact syntactically dependent. However, there are also occurrences which allow for syntactic independency. Although she admits that the relevant connectors are principally ambiguous between a demonstrative and a relative clause-reading, she refers to data for which an interpretation as a relative clause is not apt. Having established the view that there are syntactically independent Vf-clauses in Early New High German, Ulrike Demske is also concerned with the difference between V2- and Vf-clauses with a demonstrative connective. Rejecting the possibility that verb-positioning interacts with illocution, she argues that the relevant factor is the sentences’ discourse function in the sense of foregrounding and backgrounding. In a final step, she looks at the discourse relations associated with the
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Vf-clauses as well as with V1-clauses and comes to the conclusion that verb positioning also interacts with discourse in this way.

The second part of this volume, dedicated to the investigation of non-canonical V1-clauses, starts with the contribution of Janina Beutler on “V1-declaratives and assertion”. Janina Beutler aims to show that narrative V1-declaratives and V2-declaratives are distinct, inasmuch as only the latter carry assertions. Evidence for this distinction is provided by the investigation of V1- and V2-declaratives in question-answer-pairs, with respect to verum-focus and the insertion of the assertive modal particle ja. Furthermore, the author argues against the assumption of an ASSERT operator to identify a sentence as an assertion, but, instead, aims at a compositional derivation of illocutionary force.

Main clauses with V1-order are also in the focus of the contribution “Clause typing in main clauses and V1 conditionals in Germanic” by Julia Bacskai-Atkari, in which the author examines the left periphery of V1 polar interrogatives and V1 conditionals in German. She argues that, in German, the specifier of C can host zero elements, which, however, are licensed only under certain conditions. According to Julia Bacskai-Atkari, in V1 polar interrogatives and V1 conditionals the first position is filled by an empty operator/anaphor, which is semantically motivated. Furthermore, the author aims to show that verb movement occurs because the [fin] feature of the C head must be lexicalized, even if the specifier of C is not occupied overtly.

The final part of this volume deals with clauses with more than one constituent before the finite verb and is opened by the contribution “The hidden life of V3: An overlooked word order variant on verb-second” by Heike Wiese and Hans G. Müller. In their paper, the authors investigate the distribution and the formal and functional properties of V3-clauses. Based on the results of corpus analyses of spontaneous speech from multilingual and monolingual speakers, they show that V3 is a systematic pattern of German, also produced by monolingual adults. Moreover, they argue that V3 constitutes a pattern which is fully integrated into the general topological layout of German and makes further use of the forefield in terms of information-structural aspects allowing framesetters (as left-peripheral adjuncts) and topics (typically the subject) to precede the finite verb. Concerning diachronic issues, Heike Wiese and Hans G. Müller speculate that V3 might be a diachronically old option which survived in vernacular language use.

The subject of Ciro Greco’s and Liliane Haegeman’s article “Initial adverbial clauses and West Flemish V3” are certain V3-constructions in West Flemish and Standard Dutch. Whereas the combination of an initial temporal or conditional clause and a full-fledged subject initial V2 clause is principally acceptable in West Flemish, this pattern is ruled out in Standard Dutch. Pointing out that the V3-pattern under discussion deviates from the V3-structures associated with urban vernaculars, the authors give a thorough account of the grammatical and interpretive properties of the West Flemish V3 pattern. Ciro Greco and Liliane Haegeman propose a syntactic analysis whose most relevant assumption is that the initial constituent in the V3-structure is clause-external. Their account allows
them to analyse a number of V3-configurations in West Flemish as well as in Standard Dutch. Whereas the pattern temporal/conditional adverbial clause + subject-initial V2-clause is considered unacceptable by speakers of Standard Dutch, the patterns peripheral adverbial clause + subject-initial V2-clause and temporal/conditional adverbial clause + V2-clause with inversion are in fact licit V3-configurations. The observed microvariation between West Flemish and Standard Dutch is attributed to two factors: The authors postulate a locality condition which holds between the clause-external phrase and the main clause and which is met under V-to-C-movement. Because of the fact that the verb is not fronted in subject-initial V2-clauses in Standard Dutch, the locality condition gets violated in the respective V3-pattern and an ungrammatical configuration arises.

The contribution “V3 in Germanic: A comparison of urban vernaculars and heritage languages” by Artemis Alexiadou and Terje Lohndal is also about V3-structures. The authors carry out a comparison of the V3-structure found in and described for urban vernaculars such as Kiezdeutsch with the parallel pattern attested in a Germanic heritage language, American Norwegian. After introducing grammatical properties which have been attributed to Kiezdeutsch (and also other Germanic urban vernaculars), the authors compare them to their data from American Norwegian and in fact find many parallels. They discuss the question of how V3 orders emerge in the heritage language (hybrid system, default system, the result of cross-linguistic influence from English) and end this discussion with the assumption that influence from English is the most likely source. They, therefore, conclude that although the V3 patterns look similar on the surface in urban vernaculars and heritage languages, they have different sources. They argue that whereas the V3-structure is part of the grammar of a speaker of an urban vernacular, it stems from an influence of the majority language in case of a heritage speaker.

In the paper “Just how compositional are sentence types?”, Volker Struckmeier and Sebastian Kaiser argue that lexical material such as modal particles and prosodic properties should be taken into account to a greater extent when classifying sentence types. Although they give credit to existing compositional theories of sentence mood, they claim that these theories can only cover a fragment of the system. Even though they also acknowledge accounts which focus on prosody and modal particles, they argue that there is no system yet which comprises all intonation contours and particles in all sentence types. Furthermore, the authors hold the view that it is not even possible to add prosodic properties and modal particles to existing theories of sentence types. According to them, V1-, V2- and Vf-clauses are not homogeneous syntacto-semantic objects and sometimes there is no special intonational contour or the occurrence of a modal particle which is characteristic of the respective sentence type. Although – according to Volker Struckmeier and Sebastian Kaiser – existing compositional theories can only account for a fragment of all sentence types, they do not want to assume that a construction grammar approach is needed. They plead for formulating more ab-
tract commonalities between the same form types in order to keep up compositional approaches. However, they also admit that it is very hard to come up with such formulations. As they demand integrating prosodic properties, they also consider it desirable that a single semantic operation conforms exactly to all exclamative contours, e.g. However, they show that this endeavour might also be quite difficult.
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