This chapter presents an investigation of V2 violations in the German contact variety Kiezdeutsch, making comparison with spoken and written Standard German (SG). We undertake a corpus study analyzing the distribution of V3-inducing resumption strategies otherwise unproblematic in SG: adverbial resumption, Left Dislocation, and Hanging Topic Left Dislocation. Unlike for SG, little is known about resumption strategies in Kiezdeutsch, yet we find similar behavior for spoken SG and Kiezdeutsch. We attempt to reconcile such V3 with a well-known noncanonical V3 pattern in Kiezdeutsch following the order *Frame Setter* > *Subject*$_{TOPIC}$ > *finite verb*. We employ the framework proposed by Sam Wolfe in which strict-V2 systems have high locus of V2 in Force allowing V2 violations involving resumption and, for some languages, initial Frame Setters but not other violations. We suggest that microvariation in and between Kiezdeutsch and SG results from lexicalization of Frame Setters above ForceP in Kiezdeutsch and below it in SG.

Keywords

Kiezdeutsch V3; resumption strategies in Kiezdeutsch; German Force; V2

13

Noncanonical V3 and Resumption in Kiezdeutsch

Benjamin L. Sluckin and Oliver Bunk

1 Introduction

Standard German (SG) has a strict Verb Second (V2) constraint (den Besten 1983), that is, only one constituent may typically precede the finite verb (V_{FIN}) in matrix contexts. V2 is considered the result of movement of V_{FIN} to a head in the C-domain and movement of an XP to a higher specifier position (see Holmberg 2015). However, Kiezdeutsch, an urban contact variety of German spoken largely by multilingual adolescents in a multiethnic speech community, has received attention for a noncanonical V3 order (1) (Freywald et al. 2011, 2015; Hinterhölzl 2017a; te Velde 2017, Walkden 2017, Wiese 2006, 2009; Wiese and

Rehbein 2016; Wiese and Müller 2018), in which both a typically temporal initial adverb and a preverbal topic, most often a subject, precede V_{FIN}.

(1) [$_{ADV}$Morgen] [XP_{TOPIC} ich] [V_{FIN} gehe] Arbeitsamt.

tomorrow I go job.center

'Tomorrow, I'm going to the job center.' (Wiese 2006: 250)

In this chapter, we compare noncanonical V3 with resumptive structures which systematically violate V2 (Altmann 1981; Frey 2004c; Grewendorf 2002a, 2002b; Grohmann 1997, 2003) in SG. That is, they nevertheless involve V-to-C movement associated with V2 Frey 2004c; Grewendorf 2002a, b, 2009; Grohmann 1997, 2000, 2003). These structures include Left Dislocation (LD) (2a), Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD) of DP arguments (2a), and dislocation of adverbials (3), all of which involve a dislocated XP and a corresponding resumptive element in the root clause.

(2) a. Den Hund, **den** dürfen Sie nicht mit ins Kino bringen. **LD**

the dog him.RP can you not with in.the cinema bringen

'You must not bring the dog into the cinema.'

b. Den Hund, Sie dürfen **ihn** nicht mit ins Kino bringen. **HTLD**

the dog you may RP not with in.the cinema bring

'The Dog, you may not bring it into the cinema.'

(3) **Adverbial Resumption**

Wenn das Kind einschläft, **dann** werde ich mich freuen.

If the child in-sleeps then.RP will I REFL be.happy

'When the child falls asleep, then I'll be happy.'

To date, published analyses of the Kiezdeutsch C-domain have concentrated on the contrast between noncanonical V and stricter V2 typical of SG, yet LD, HTLD, and adverbial resumption have been overlooked (see Hinterhölzl 2017a, te Velde 2017, Walkden 2017). We contend that analysis of the Kiezdeutsch V2 property is only possible when V3 and

resumptive structures are considered together. To these ends, we conduct a comparative and empirical investigation of resumptive strategies and V3 in Kiezdeutsch and SG, asking the following questions:

i. Do resumption strategies in Kiezdeutsch follow or deviate from SG?

ii. What are the formal implications of the results for the Kiezdeutsch left periphery and an analysis of its V2 property?

We conclude that the coexistence of noncanonical V3 and resumption strategies in Kiezdeutsch indicates a formal difference between the dominant SG syntax and Kiezdeutsch not in the V2 property but the lexicalization of the Frame field.

The chapter is structured as follows: section 2 provides empirical background concerning noncanonical V3 in Kiezdeutsch and resumption strategies more widely. In section 3, we present data indicating that the same breadth of resumption strategies are available in Kiezdeutsch and spoken SG. Section 4 includes discussion and formal analysis of the data. In section 5, we conclude our findings.

2 Background

2.1 Resumption Strategies in German

German resumption strategies appear to evade V2. Broadly speaking, LD and HTLD can be divided into two categorial types:

i. Resumption of arguments (typically DPs) by a resumptive pronoun: henceforth termed *argument resumption*

ii. Resumption of adverbials by a resumptive adverb: henceforth termed *adverbial resumption*

While dislocated and resumptive adverbials can be analyzed in terms of LD and HTLD, we distinguish between adverbial and argument resumption for methodological reasons. As noted by Axel-Tober (this volume: section 5), diagnostics for LD and HTLD such as prosody or

agreement cannot be accurately employed for adverbials. Moreover, adverbial resumption is special in that different resumptives can resume the class of adverbial clause, depending on specificity, mood, semantic interpretation, or function of the dislocated adverbial; for HTLD and LD of arguments, the choice of variation is limited to either *d*- or *p*-pronouns, to be discussed later.

A holistic treatment of the data will indicate that Kiezdeutsch does not differ greatly from written or spoken varieties of SG for resumption, nor must we posit a syntactic preverbal subject requirement for V3 (contra te Velde; Alexiadou and Lohndal 2018). We first discuss LD and HTLD of DP arguments before moving on to adverbial resumption. We contrast resumption strategies with noncanonical V3 in Kiezdeutsch in section 2.2.

2.1.1 Argument Resumption: LD and HTLD in German

The sentence in (4a) shows HTLD, while that in (4b) shows LD. In both examples, the leftmost dislocated element topicalizes a referent from the preceding context and is then resumed by a resumptive pronoun (RP).

(4)	a.	der	Käse,	ich	kaufe	**ihn/den**	**HTLD**
		the	*cheese.NOM*	*I*	*buy*	*RP.ACC*	
	b.	den	Käse,	**den**	kaufe	ich	**LD**
		the	*cheese.ACC*	*RP.ACC*	*buy*	*I*	

'the cheese, I buy (it)/'

These structures differ in particular regards. In LD, the dislocate is syntactically integrated, and the RP is always a *d*-pronoun, for example, *der/den/dem, die/der, das/dem*, agreeing in Case and ϕ-features (Altmann 1981; Frey 2004c; Grewendorf 2009). From a linear perspective, we adopt the standard position that LD involves resumption by a *d*-pronoun which immediately precedes V_{FIN} in the prefield (4b). (See König and van der Auwera 1988; Zifonun, Hoffmann, and Strecker 1997.) Grohmann (2003: 142) states that an LD Topic and

its RP are always adjacent (but see Frey (2004c) for arguments that LD can involve a middlefield RP.

In HTLD (4a), however, the RP may be a *p*-pronoun., for example *er/ihn/ihm, sie/ihr, es/ihm,* or a *d*-pronoun in the prefield or the middlefield. The hanging topic (HT) need not agree with the RP in Case and can be nominative regardless of RP's θ-role; likewise, weakening of ϕ-agreement is also reported (see Altmann 1981; Frey 2004c; Grohmann 2003; Selting 1993; Shaer and Frey 2004). Thus, HTs are less integrated and a sort of adjunct (Grohmann 2003). Therefore, diagnostics for HTLD are lacking ϕ or Case agreement or a *p*-pronoun resumptive. Nonetheless, HTs can show Case agreement with the RP (Grohmann 2003; Frey 2004c; Samo 2019). This creates ambiguity between LD and HTLD involving prefield *d*-pronouns, as HTLD cannot be ruled out. It is thus challenging to diagnose a prefield *d*-RP agreeing in Case and ϕ-features as either LD or HTLD.

As discussed by Axel-Tober (this volume), a means of distinguishing ambiguous cases of LD and HTLD is to draw on prosody (Altmann 1981: 48, Grohmann 2003: 144). While HTLD involves a prosodic break between the HT and RP with flexible intonation, an LD dislocate and RP are prosodically inseparable. Greater prosodic integration is often considered indicative of greater syntactic integration. This state of affairs leads to the simple diagnostics given in table 13.1:

INSERT TABLE 13.1 HERE

We do not explore tests involving reconstruction and binding effects (see Frey 2004c; Grohmann 2003), as the data investigated here come from natural corpus data. A particular problem is that corpus data often lack detailed prosodic information which could disambiguate ambiguous instances of HTLD and LD. Thus, for the purposes of this study, we assume the following distinctions:

(5) **LD**: preverbal *d*-RPs which agree with the adjacent dislocate in Case and ϕ-features

(6) **HTLD:**

i. any *p*-RP in the prefield

ii. prefield *d*-RPs lacking full agreement with the dislocate

iii. middlefield *d*- and *p*-RPs regardless of their type and agreement characteristics

This decision is methodological, necessarily conservative, and makes no novel theoretical claims about the syntax of resumption. We now turn to a discussion of adverbial resumption strategies.

2.1.2 Adverbial Resumption

Consider the V2 and V3 examples in (7):

(7) a. Wenn ich intelligent wäre, würde ich mehr verdienen. **V2**
if I intelligent were would I more earn

b. Wenn ich intelligent wäre, **dann** würde ich mehr verdienen. **V3**
if I intelligent were then.RP *would I . . .*

c. Wenn ich intelligent wäre, **ich** würde mehr verdienen. **V3**
if I intelligent were I would . . .

'If I were intelligent, I would earn more.'

(adapted from Lötscher 2006: 347)

In (7a) an adverbial CP occupies the prefield, producing V2, and is fully integrated into the clause; in Lötscher's terminology (2006) such a sentence is considered INTEGRATIVE FRONTING. In contrast, (7b, c) produce V3 linearizations. In (7c) the main clause is independent of the adverbial clause, preserving its V2 structure, for which Lötscher (2006: 354) proposes that the CP is not integrated with the following clause (NONINTEGRATIVE FRONTING). In contrast, and most relevant, (7b) is linearly V3 and contains resumptive *dann* "then," which resumes the adverbial CP. Mirroring LD of DP arguments, the typical position for adverbial resumptives is the preverbal position (Zitterbart 2002: 621). For Lötscher (2006), (7b) represents a middle ground of integration between the adverbial as a full

constituent of the clause (7a) and its total separation in (7c). Resumptive *dann* functions as a linker between the main and adverbial clauses but lacks explicit lexical-semantic meaning.

More broadly, König and van der Auwera (1988: 111–115) consider integrative and resumptive fronting unmarked in German and Dutch conditional clauses, while nonintegrative fronting is marked requiring specific contexts. The V2-compliant integrative fronting is most frequent and is considered the canonical choice for German (Zifonun et al. 1997: 2349).

Let us now briefly turn to the specificity of the adverbial resumptive. Contrary to the binary choice of resumptive for DP arguments, that is, *p*- or *d*-pronouns, in adverbial resumption several possible resumptives exist with varying and overlapping function. Following Zifonun et al. (1997: 1493–1495), adverbial RPs can be categorized into three semantic classifications: specific, less-specific, and nonspecific; resembling Meklenborg's (2020b) distinction between special and general resumptives:

i. Specific RPs: RP invariably mirrors the semantics of the dislocated adverbial

ii. Less-specific RPs: may resume more semantic contexts than spatial-deixis of their lexical counterparts

iii. Nonspecific RP: pure resumptive in contexts of conditional and concessive, irrelevance conditional, and subordinate clauses; no reference to lexical counterpart

German possesses several specific but generally rarer causal RPs and a more frequent set of specific temporal RPs. The less-specific RPs are *dann* "then" and *da* "there." Finally, as introduced by Axel-Tober (this volume), resumptive *so* "so" is especially disconnected. Indeed, Axel-Tober's proposal that *so* is an expletive accounts for its classification as a nonspecific RP; however, Meklenborg (2020b) has suggested that it belongs to a class of generalized resumptives. Notably, Zifonun et al. (1997) report an inverse correlation between specificity and the likelihood of prefield resumption. A summary of RP specificity is given in table 13.2.

INSERT TABLE 13.2 HERE

However, potential differences between spoken and written language for adverbial resumption have garnered little attention. We shall show that some differences in usage exist. Let us briefly discuss noncanonical V3 violations in Kiezdeutsch and their place in this study.

2.2 V3 in Kiezdeutsch

As introduced, Kiezdeutsch is known for a noncanonical V3 matrix order (8a), prototypically following [temporal adverb–subject$_{TOPIC}$–V$_{FIN}$] (Freywald et al. 2015; Walkden 2017; Wiese 2006, Wiese 2009). However, the initial adverbial can also encode locative (8b) or modal (8c) meaning, as well as some instances of causal and conditional adverbial clauses. The initial adverbial has one of two functions: (1) a general deictic frame-setting function, including locative and speaker-oriented adverbials, and 2) a discourse-linking function, allowing for rhetorical relations between units of the conversation or a narrative (Schalowski 2017). The preverbal XP, typically a Topic subject, may be a pronoun or full DP (Freywald et al. 2015; Sluckin 2021; Walkden 2017; Wiese 2009; Wiese and Rehbein 2016).

(8) a. Dann ich gucke sie so an.
then I look her so at
'Then I look at her.' (KidKo-mu, MuH25MA_11[1])

b. Von andere Straßenseite die gucken uns alle so an.
from other street-side they look us all so at
'From the other side of the street, they are watching us.'
(KidKo-mu, MuH9WT_05)

c. und trotzdem es macht ganz schön einen schlechten Eindruck.
and nevertheless it makes very beautiful a bad impression
'and nevertheless it makes a bad impression.'
(KidKo-mu, MuH19WT_12, Speaker 38)

It has been claimed that the preverbal subject is always a Familiar Topic (Freywald et al. 2015; Walkden 2015), that is, a contextually given and d-linked constituent. However, Wiese (2006) and Sluckin (2021) have independently proposed that the Topic requirement is instead more basic, relating to a Sentence-Topic function (also Aboutness Topic/Subject of Predication; see Sluckin 2021) without a d-linking requirement. For example, (9) shows an indefinite pronoun as the preverbal subject, which is by definition not a Familiar Topic, as it is not given; however, it can be considered a Sentence/Aboutness Topic in the sense of Gundel (1985). (See also Frey 2004b; Sluckin 2021.)

(9) Bei uns in der Schule **einer** heißt "SPK15[2]."
By us in the school one calls Speaker-15
'At our school, someone is called "Speaker 15."'
(KiDKo-Mu, MuH12MD_08)

For Kiezdeutsch, Sluckin (2021) finds 199 (0.85 percent of matrix clauses) instances of V3, building on 159 (0.7 percent) found by Walkden (2017) and 165 (0.65 percent) by Wiese and Müller (2018) (from 23,506 matrix clauses). While there is a strong preverbal subject tendency, several instances of nonsubject DPs occur in the prefield: these are generally locative adverbs (10a), yet a handful of object DPs, such as (10b) (also reported by Schalowski 2017), *wh*-items (10c), and fronted predicates occur. Although rare, the sentence in (10c) shows an inherently focused preverbal *wh*-item with object function. While infrequent, we consider such instances numerous enough to conclude that there is no strict syntactic restriction against nonsubjects in V3 (see Walkden 2017), nor can definitive claims about a Topic requirement be made if the data is taken at face value.

(10) a. und dann **da** ist doch n die U-Bahn und so.
and then there is PRT a the subway and so
'and then there IS the subway and such.'

(KidKo-mu, MuH2WT_03, Speaker18)

b. danach dann[3] **das** schneiden die aus.
afterward then this *cut* *they out*
'Afterward then, they cut this out.'

(KidKo-mu, Mu9WT; see Schalowski 2017: 18)

c. Danach **was** sehe ich Netlog?
afterwards what see I Netlog
'And then what did I see on Netlog?'

(KidKo-mu, Mu9WT; see Sluckin 2021: 260)

While V3 is typically considered ungrammatical in SG, V3 in the form of Adv-S-V has been found at low levels among monolingual speakers. (See Bunk 2020; Schalowski 2017; Wiese and Müller 2018; Wiese and Rehbein 2016.) Indeed, preverbal subject Topics appear to have an inherent advantage where V3 occurs. Experimental data from monolinguals by Bunk (2020) showed that V3 of the type Adv-S_{TOPIC}-V_{FIN} is associated with faster reading times than Adv-Obj-V_{FIN}, suggesting a cognitive preference for preverbal subjects in V3. This may derive from extrasyntactic interface requirements (see Bunk 2020; Wiese et al. 2020), to which we return to in section 4. Nonetheless, monolingual speakers of German use considerably less V3 than Kiezdeutsch speakers (Sluckin 2021; Walkden 2017). Given typological variation across Germanic and beyond (Greco and Haegeman 2020, this volume; Haegeman and Greco 2018; Walkden 2017; Wolfe 2015c, 2018c, 2019) in the availability of V3 with Frame Setters in otherwise strict V2 languages, a level of pragmatic, syntactic, and phonological microvariation is plausible even among speakers of more standard German varieties (see Sluckin 2021).

3 Corpus Study: Resumption in Kiezdeutsch and Beyond

We now turn to a corpus investigation of resumption in Kiezdeutsch and three noncontact registers/varieties of German.

3.1 Methodology

We investigate the frequency of resumption strategies in four corpora representing three linguistic registers. The Kiezdeutsch corpora (KiDKo: Rehbein et al. 2014, Wiese et al. 2010–) contain around 333,000 tokens, making up the main corpus (KiDKo-mu) (c. 228,000 tokens and 23,506 matrix clauses) and a complementary corpus (KiDKo-mo) (c. 105,000 tokens and 8,945 matrix clauses). Both corpora contain informal spoken language of adolescents (14–17 years); KiDKo-mu is characterized by a multiethnic/multilingual speaker base, while KiDKo-mo is made up of data from primarily monolingual speakers largely from monoethnic German backgrounds in East Berlin. (See Wiese et al. 2012.) The Tübinger Baumbank des Deutschen/Spontansprache (TüBa-D/S) contains around 360,000 tokens, including 28,545 matrix clauses from spontaneous dialogues of telephone conversations involving adult monolinguals. The Tübinger Baumbank des Deutschen/Zeitungskorpus (TüBa-D/Z) contains around 1,787,801 tokens in 3,644 newspaper articles, including 98,897 matrix clauses.[4]

We searched the corpora for (a) adverbial resumption involving CPs and other adverbials, and (b) argument resumption. We filtered the results manually. We then annotated the data for the type of resumption, that is, argument or adverbial, and further subdivision into LD and HTLD for the former. Adverbial resumption was annotated for the semantic class of the dislocated element and the form of the resumptive element. We excluded utterances corrupted by repetitions, uninterpretable sequences, and marked interruptions that likely facilitate restarts.

Finally, we excluded TüBa-D/Z for argument resumption, as argument resumption strategies are typical primarily of spoken language (Shaer and Frey 2004: 469). Nonetheless, cursory investigation shows that where argument resumption occurs in TüBa-D/Z, it is not

consistent for spoken or written registers; instances can be separated into three types: frequent cases of LD or HTLD in quoted spoken language; resumption of a spoken quote—a type we have not found find in spoken corpora; or legitimate written cases. Since we aim to compare resumption strategies in spoken language with a focus on Kiezdeutsch, we judged it appropriate to limit comparison to comparable corpora for argument resumption, yet future work should investigate HTLD and LD in written sources. (See Axel 2007 and Petrova 2012 for diachronic perspectives.)

3.2 Results

We distinguished between argument and adverbial resumption. Table 13.3 gives an overview of the distribution of these structures in our corpora.

Insert Table 13.3 here

We found differences between the KiDKo corpora and TüBa-D/S concerning the relative frequencies of argument resumption. In TüBa-D/S, left-dislocated DPs appear at a similar frequency to adverbial dislocations. However, both KiDKo corpora show less argument than adverbial resumption strategies, although KiDKo-mu shows this most strongly. Nonetheless, we do not consider this variation to represent a parametric difference, as argument resumption is not rare enough to be written off. Moreover, in section 4.1.2 we shall discuss explicit examples which show that Kiezdeutsch speakers are capable of combining Frame Setters with argument LD/HTLD in a single grammar, as well as stacking HTLD and LD, Frame Setters, and adverbial dislocates. Hence, if argument resumption is somehow less available, we think an extrasyntactic motivation must be found. Notably, both KiDKo corpora are characterized by a narrative style and younger speakers, while TüBa-D/S is more transactional in nature and the speakers are older. We cannot explain these differences in frequency, yet the difference could be illuminated by future work concentrating on how register and age, and perhaps also how multilingualism affects linguistic choices concerning how and when speakers resort to

resumption. We now explore the properties and distributions of the different resumption strategies in the data.

3.2.1 Adverbial Resumption Data

Adverbial resumption is found as resumption of adverbial clauses (11a) and smaller PPs/AdvPs (11b) in all corpora, with the former outnumbering other types of resumption.

(11) a. Wenn Deutschland beim Finale verliert, **dann** ist es egal.
when Germany in.the finale loses RP is it indifferent
'When Germany loses in the final it doesn't matter.'
(KiDKo-Mu, Speaker 105)

b. Bei Videoclips , **da** gab es so einen Kerl
At Videoclips, there-RP gave it so a guy
'On Videoclips, there's a guy (there).'
(KiDKo-Mu, MuP6MD_13-2, Speaker 101)

For adverbial clauses, the choice of RP differed somewhat between the corpora. Among all dislocated adverbial clauses, we found *dann* and *da* to be most frequent across the corpora, as expected given their wide functional breadth; table 13.4 gives an overview.

INSERT TABLE 13.4 HERE

Strikingly, the nonspecific RP *so* was absent in all spoken data, yet in the written TüBa-D/Z *so* appears frequently, most often resuming concessive adverbial clauses. (See also Zifonun et al. 1997.) This is unsurprising if Meklenborg (2020b) is correct that resumptive *so* is a vestige of a historically more prevalent use, as written language is more conservative. Notably, concessive clauses only appeared in the written corpus, yet this may relate to a higher occurrence of concessive clauses in the higher registers associated with the journalistic language found in Tüba-D/Z, as opposed to syntactic differences; a lack of data is not evidence that concessives and resumption are formally incompatible in spoken language, yet they may be more marked. We leave this question open for further research. Overall, the

distribution of RP functions in written SG resembled that reported in the literature. (See Zifonun et al. 1997.)

Furthermore, *da* and *dann* resumptives show similar frequencies and functionality across the spoken corpora (KiDKo-mu/mo and TüBa-D/S). The predominant RP with conditional adverbials is *dann*, also appearing to a lesser extent with temporal clauses. Although less frequent overall, *da* is more spread across semantic classes than *dann*, resuming conditional, temporal, local adverbials, and causal adverbials, although it is overall less frequent. However, the KiDKo corpora show three instances of causal *dann* (12), which goes beyond the description by Zifonun et al. (1997).

(12) Nur, weil er in dieser komischen Sprache schreibt, **dann** kapiert das
only, because er in this strange language writes RP understands it
ja wohl keener.
PRT PRT nobody
'It's just, because he writes in this funny language, nobody will understand it.'
(KiDKo-Mu, MuH1WD)

While limited, these instances might indicate incipient semantic broadening of *dann* among younger speakers more generally in German.

3.2.2 Argument Resumption Data

LD and HTLD were present in all spoken corpora. The findings are summarized in table 13.5.

INSERT TABLE 13.5 HERE

The data from TüBa-D/S indicate a similar distribution of LD and HTLD. In contrast to TüBa-D/S, in both KiDKo corpora HTLD is rarer than LD; HTLD in Kiezdeutsch is half as frequent as LD. In total, HTLD constitutes 0.08 percent (19/23,506) of all matrix clauses in Kiezdeutsch and 0.09 percent in KiDKo-mo (8/8,945) matrix clauses; LD on the other hand constitutes 0.16 percent of matrix clauses in Kiezdeutsch (37/23,506) and 0.31 percent (28/8945) in KiDKo-mo. However, HTLD in TüBa-D/S is more frequent than in Kiezdeutsch

or its monolingual sister corpus, that is, 0.41 percent of all matrix clauses (118/28,545). It is not immediately clear why LD is so strongly preferred in the urban youth varieties compared to the more even distribution in TüBa-D/S, that is, 0.36 percent. However, it is plausible that both the integrated dislocates of LD and the shorter dependencies involved could provide a processing advantage (see Gibson 2000).

Furthermore, in both KiDKo corpora, LDs and HTLD primarily make up dislocated subjects, yet dislocated object DPs do occur in the data, mirroring the higher frequency of preverbal subjects in V3. Dislocated objects were more frequent in TüBa-D/S than in the KiDKo corpora; we leave further analysis of this contrast aside, yet we consider it likely related to the inherently topical nature of many subjects.

Overall, the spoken varieties did not diverge greatly for resumption phenomena for either adverbials or arguments, but variation appears in the relative frequencies of particular types. This could be down to (a) the types of corpora, and (b) the different behaviors of adolescent and adult speakers, possibly due to their different linguistic experiences and communicative goals, for example in-group and out-group marking. (See Bunk and Pohle 2019.) Resumption in Kiezdeutsch showed the same breadth of strategies as spoken SG. We have not found strong evidence that frequency differences in particular types of resumption between the corpora reflect any fundamental parametric differences in the syntax of resumption.[5] Let us turn now to a theoretical discussion.

4 Discussion

We now have an overview of the full range of V3 structures in written and spoken SG and Kiezdeutsch. Notably, the same overall resumption strategies appear across all spoken corpora. We now attempt a formal analysis capable of explaining all the facts.

4.1 Toward a Unified Analysis of V3 and Resumption Structures in Kiezdeutsch

We adopt a Rizz(ian) (1997) Split-CP, with a clause-external high Frame field, dubbed FrameP for simplicity (see Wolfe 2015c, 2019), above ForceP for root-external XPs (13), such as spatiotemporal Frame setting (scene-setting) adverbials and dislocated Topics. (See also Benincà and Poletto 2004.)

(13) FrameP > ForceP > TopP > FocP > TopP* > FinP

(Rizzi 1997; see Wolfe 2015c, among others)

There is variation in the literature on the exact nature of the FrameP projection in terms of its discourse value, its position, and indeed its integration in the narrow syntax.

FrameP has been considered a discourse framing projection responsible for anchoring the speech act in terms of participants, as well as locative and temporal deixis (see Benincà and Poletto 2004; Haegeman 2000b, 2006b; Wolfe 2015c, 2018c, 2019), while Haegeman and Greco (2018) and Greco and Haegeman (2020, this volume) propose that FrameP corresponds to an extra syntactic discourse entity outside the narrow syntax. In contrast, scholars such as Benincà (2006: 61) and Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) instead posit that the projection(s) encoding this framing function follow ForceP.[6]

It is beyond the goals of this chapter to weigh up every aspect of competing and complementary approaches to FrameP, yet we will show that a clause-external FrameP can better account for the variation at hand within the system to be adopted. It suffices for us to follow the idea that an array of dislocated arguments and particular adverbials, be they spatiotemporal Frame Setters (see Poletto 2002a, 2002b, 2005; Wolfe 2015c, 2018c, 2019) or adverbial clauses such as peripheral conditionals (Haegeman 2003, 2010; Haegeman and Greco 2018; Greco and Haegeman 2020, this volume) can also be considered to merge above Force in FrameP. We employ an approach in which both elements from the narrow syntax and those that are "beyond the sentence," in Greco and Haegeman's (2020) terms, are linearly compatible with FrameP. With this in mind, we turn now to Wolfe's (2015c, 2018a, 2019) typology of V2 and how Kiezdeutsch can be incorporated.

4.1.1 Kiezdeutsch as a Force V2 System

iv. We choose to frame this chapter in terms a typology of high and low V2 languages (Poletto 2002a, 2002b, 2013; Wolfe 2015c, 2018a, 2019), as employed by Meelen, Mourigh, and Cheng (2020) for V3 in urban multiethnic varieties of Dutch and for West Flemish by Haegeman and Greco (2018) and Greco and Haegeman (2020, this volume), albeit with some crucial differences from West Flemish. In short, more flexible V2 systems are associated with a low locus of the V2 property in Fin, while stricter V2 systems fall out from a higher locus In Force. Following Wolfe (2015c, 2018c, 2019), the range of "violations" has implications for the type of V2 system at hand. Wolfe's classification of V2 languages falls into three main types: Flexible Fin V2 languages which allow V3, V4, or even V5 with an initial Frame Setter followed by multiple Topics and/or Foci, e.g., Early Medieval Romance, Later Old Occitan and Sicilian Middle Low German, Early Old High German, Old English

v. ii. Force V2 languages allowing V3 with LD and HTLD and Frame Setters in the initial position, e.g., Later Old French, Spanish, Venetian; Later Old, Middle, New High German; Sumeiran and Vallader Rhaeto-Romance, West Flemish (see Haegeman and Greco 2018; Greco and Haegeman 2020, this volume) Strict Force V2 languages allowing V3 with LD and HTLD but not Frame Setters, e.g., Modern German and Dutch, San Leonardo Rhaeto-Romance

In low V2, V_{FIN} targets Fin, and an XP targets Spec,FinP (14a), satisfying Fin's EPP; this can produce V3, V4, and V5, since the entire left periphery remains available for external Merge above V_{FIN}, exemplified in Old Occitan (14b).

(14) a. [FrameP [ForceP__[TopP_[FocP__[FinP **XP** [Fin^{o} **V_{FIN}**] [TP . . .]]]]]]

b. [$_{\text{FrameP}}$ adoncs [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ [$_{\text{TopP}}$ illi [$_{\text{FocP}}$ ab amars critz [$_{\text{FinP}}$ [$_{\text{Fin°}}$ dizia . . .

Thus she with bitter cries said . . .

(Wolfe 2015c: 73, ex. (14b))

In contrast, high V2 is characterized by further movement of V_{FIN} to Force, and an XP to Spec,ForceP[7] (15a), leading to a high bottleneck (see Haegeman 1996; Roberts 2004) and leaving only Spec,ForceP available for the preverbal element, producing strict V2. Wolfe (2015c, 2018c, 2019) suggests that Force-V2 systems only allow V3 deviations of the types involving an initial Frame Setter, HT, or left-dislocated XP or clitic, exemplified in Sumeiran Rhaeto-Romance (15b). (See Fuß 2005: 181; Oetzel 1992: 17; Wolfe 2018c.) Yet some Force-V2 languages do not appear to permit initial Frame Setters in V3, instead only showing HTLD and LD (see Wolfe 2015c, 2019), such as standard accounts of German.

(15) a. [FrameP [ForceP **XP$_i$** [Force° **V$_{FIN}$**] [TopP [FocP [FinP t_i [Fin° v_t. . . [TP . . .]]]]]]]

b. [$_{\text{FrameP}}$ La seira anturn las nov] [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ Tina [$_{\text{Force}}$ sa prepara [. . .] per sorteir

the evening around the nine Tina REFL prepares to go.out

'In the evening around nine, Tina gets ready to go out'

(Wolfe 2019, ex. (16))

Now consider the findings that V3 linearizations in Kiezdeutsch are limited to Frame setting adverbials, HTLD, and LD/adverbial resumption. It is thus straightforward to apply a Wolfian high-Force-V2 system of the type allowing high Frame Setters above ForceP as an explanation of the Kiezdeutsch data, given that other types of V3, V4, and V5 are absent (16a). Consequently, we propose the following analyses for V3 distributions ((16b) for V3, (16c) for LD, and (16d) for HTLD; (16e) for adverbial resumption):

(16) a. [FrameP Frame Setter/HT/LD [ForceP **XP$_i$** [Force° **V$_{FIN}$**][TopP [FocP [FinP t_i [Fin° v_t. . .

b. [FrameP *dann* [ForceP *ich* [Force° *gucke*][TopP[FocP[FinP t_i[Fin° v_t . . . *sie so an* **V3**

then *I look her so at*

'Then I look at her.'

(KidKo-mu, MuH25MA_11)

c. [FrameP *der Rest*[ForceP *der* [Force° *war*][TopP[FocP[FinP t_i[Fin° v_t . . . *arschkalt* **LD**

the rest it.RP *was* *butt-cold*

'The rest, it was very cold.'

(KidKo-mu, MuH17MA)

d. [FrameP *Der Opfer* [ForceP *er* [Force° *schuldet* [TopP[FocP[FinP t_i[Fin° v_t . . . *mir* **HTLD**

The victim he.RP *owes* *me*

'The victim, he owes me.'

(KidKo-mu, MuH25MA_08)

e. [FrameP *Bei Videoclips* [ForceP *da* [Force° *gab* [TopP [FocP [FinP t_i [Fin° v_t [TP . . . es

At Videoclips, there.*RP* *gave* *it* . . .

'On Videoclips, there was (a guy there).' **Adverbial Resumption**

(KidKo-mu, MuP6MD_13-2, Speaker 101)

This basic analysis joins previous approaches for Standard German considering the particularly strict nature of V2 to be indicative of Force-V2 (Biberauer and Roberts 2015a, 2016; see Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007; Wolfe 2015c, 2019). We now briefly discuss two existing C-domain analyses of Kiezdeutsch V3 and show that the inclusion of resumption data is best suited to a Force-V2 system.

4.1.2 Previous Approaches and the Dislocation Problem

We have argued that SV in Kiezdeutsch V3 is a strong tendency but is not an obligatory syntactic requirement. Consequently, we leave aside approaches which consider V3 to result from subject-initial V2 involving V-movement only as far as T, a subject-related EPP in Spec,TP in subject-initial matrix clauses (see Travis 1984; Zwart 2005a), and adjunction of the Frame Setter either high in TP (te Velde 2017) or in Spec,CP (Westergaard, Lohndal, and Alexiadou 2019).

In contrast, Walkden (2017) and Hinterhölzl (2017a) instead propose V-to-C approaches for V3, yet they differ in crucial respects from our analysis. We believe that these approaches are challenged by HTLD, LD, and particularly stacking thereof in both Kiezdeutsch and the standard.

Firstly, Hinterhölzl (2017a) considers Kiezdeutsch V3 to result from V-movement only as far as Fin. For him, all types of Topics, including Frame Setters and presumably also HTs and LDed DPs, fall below Force. For Kiezdeutsch, a Fin-V2 analysis predicts a greater range of V2 violations than present in the data. In contrast, SG reportedly does show V-to-Force movement due to a phonological requirement that ForceP be occupied. This rules out V3 in SG. However, we cannot see how this analysis of SG permits V3 resumption unless resumptive contexts but not others involve V-movement only as far as Fin; we find such a solution unparsimonious, as we know of no plausible mechanism within a cartographic Split-CP approach by which the resumption strategies would block Fin-to-Force movement and thereby allow resumptive structures but not Frame Setter V3.[8]

Instead, Walkden (2017) proposes a double CP system in which the higher specifier hosts a range of discourse categories, including Shift Topics such as Frame Setters, aboutness Topics, and Foci, but the specifier of the lower CP is reserved only for Familiar Topics (17). We have already argued that a Familiar Topic requirement is too restrictive (See also Sluckin 2021).

(17) $[_{CP^1}$ Scene-Setter (Shift/Aboutness/Focus)$[_{C^1}[_{CP^2}$ Familiar Topic$[_{C^2}$ V_{FIN} . . .

Moreover, while Walkden's analysis is compatible with simple LD or HTLD, a problem arises in the stacking of HTs, LDed XPs, and Frame Setters without some caveat. The sentence in (18a) shows stacking of HTs, (18b) shows a Frame Setter preceding an HT, and (18c) shows a Frame Setter preceding an LDed DP. Walkden's claim that SG only has a single CP is challenged by LD, HTLD, and stacking thereof (18d), unless he adopts a system

involving optional CP recursion or ordered multiple specifiers associated with information-structural categories (See Lahne 2009).

(18) a. $HT_i > HT_j > RP_i > V_{FIN} > RP_j$ **Kiezdeutsch**

[HT SPK3]$_i$, [HT der Eimer]$_j$, **er$_i$** hat **ihn$_j$** hochgeholt

Speaker 3, the bucket, he.RP *has* it.RP *fetched*

'"Speaker-3" fetched the bucket.'

(KidKo-mu, MuH25MA_11)

b. Frame Setter > HT > RP > V_{FIN}

[FRAME Gestern] , [HT SPK13]$_i$, **sie$_i$** hat ja einen neuen Freund

yesterday speaker-13, she.RP *has PTCL a new boyfriend*

'Yesterday "Speaker-13" had a new boyfriend.'

(KidKo-mu, MuH25MA_12-1, Speaker 102,)

c. Frame Setter > LD > RP > V_{FIN}

[FRAME Gestern] , [LD das Spiel]$_i$, **das$_i$** war richtig gut.

yesterday the game that.RP *was really good*

'The game yesterday, it was really good.'

(KidKo-mu, MuP6MD_13-3, Speaker 105,)

d. [HT Der Alex]$_i$, [HT seine Mutter]$_k$, [LD den Wagen]$_j$, **SG**

The Alex, his mother, the car,

den$_j$ hat **sie$_k$** **ihm$_i$** gestern geschenkt.

it.RP *has* she.RP him.RP *yesterday given*

'Alex, his mother, the car, yesterday she gave (it) to him.'

(Grohmann 2003: 162)

The presence of Frame Setters, HTs, and LDed Topics in V4 orders (18a–d) but not other XPs is best explained via a high-Force-V2 system within Wolfe's typology, that is, one which allows Merge or Move of dislocates and Frame Setters in(to) a position above Force.

Moreover, the Kiezdeutsch data shows limited instances in which Frame Setters and HT co-occur. Interestingly, there are instances of both [HT > Frame Setter] (19) and [Frame Setter > HT], as shown in (18b).

(19) SPK13, danach **sie** macht so.
speaker-13, afterward she.RP *makes so*
'"Speaker-13," after that she goes like this.'

(KidKo-mu, MuH9WT 07)

We tentatively propose the possible orders in (20) for constituents in the Kiezdeutsch Frame field,[9] assuming recursion of FrameP, yet variation in the ordering of constituents in the Frame field would benefit from further research.

(20) The Kiezdeutsch Frame field
{Frame field [$_{\textbf{FrameP}}^{\textbf{1}}$ Frame-adverbial] > [$_{\textbf{FrameP}}^{\textbf{2}}$ HT*] > [$_{\textbf{FrameP}}^{\textbf{3}}$ Frame-adverbial] > [$_{\textbf{FrameP}}^{\textbf{2}}$ LD]}

A reviewer comments that our proposals incorrectly predict the existence of V4 or even V5 with multiple Frame Setters; in support of our proposal, we find at least 10 instances of V4 > involving stacked Frame Setters (21a, b).

(21) a. Irgendwann in Schule ich fange an zu schlafen
some.when in school I start at to sleep
'At some point, at school, I start to sleep.'

(KidKo-mu, MuH9WT_06-1, Speaker 102,)

b. Irgendwie eigentlich ich habe sie auch verstanden
somehow actually I have her also understood
'Somehow, I actually also understood her'

(KidKo-mu, MuH9WT, Speaker 54)

We now turn to address the specifics and implications of our assumption that dislocated XPs target FrameP.

4.2 The Mechanics of Resumption in Kiezdeutsch and Standard German

We assume that HTLD results from external Merge in FrameP, while LD results from movement (Grewendorf 2002a,CBML_BIB_000_0163 2002b, 2009; Grohmann 1997, 2000, 2003) from a clause-internal position. We take the fact that LDed topics cannot stack in V2 German but can in a non-V2 language like Italian (see Poletto 2002a) to derive from the interaction between movement and the V2 bottleneck in German, blocking LD of other constituents.

We are skeptical of a one-size-fits-all analysis for adverbial resumption. This is because dislocated adverbials can be both central and peripheral and often show LD-like behavior, yet diagnosing the difference between HTLD and LD analyses is difficult, as adverbial resumptives lack the *p*-pronoun versus *d*-pronoun distinction which helps distinguish prefield presumptives of LD and HTLD. Likewise, as discussed by Axel-Tober (this volume), prosodic diagnostics are unreliable given the weight of adverbial clauses. Regardless, we start from the position that movement is implausible for a range of dislocated adverbials, following Frey (2005) and Axel-Tober (this volume). We begin with analyses of argument resumption involving LD and HTLD, which sets the scene for a formal discussion of adverbial resumption.

4.2.1 Left Dislocation of DPs

A movement analysis is standardly considered to explain stricter requirements for agreement in Case and ϕ-features in LD (Grewendorf 2002a, 2002b, 2009; Grohmann 1997, 2000, 2003; but see Frey 2004c for a base-generational alternative). We employ a big-DP analysis (Grewendorf 2002a, 2002b, 2009) for German LD whereby the full DP and the *d*-pronoun RP merge together in a complex DP-shell; the full DP is nested under the RP (22).

(22) [DP *d*-pronoun [DP full-DP]]

The entire big-DP raises to the preverbal position before the nested full-DP is extracted to the LD position in FrameP. Under our analysis, the big-DP will move intact from vP through FinP to Spec,ForceP before the dislocate is extracted to FrameP (23b). We do not posit any differences between SG (spoken or written) and Kiezdeutsch for LD.

(23) a. [**LD** Die anderen Leute$_i$], [**die**$_i$] haben auch keine 700 Euro Kaution gehabt

The other people they.RP *have also no 700 Euro deposit had.PTCP*

'the other people also didn't have a €700 deposit' (KidKo-mu, MuP6MD_04)

b. [FrameP **LD**DP$_i$ [Frame [ForceP [DP **RP**[~~DP$_i$~~]] [Force V_{FIN} [Top . . . FocP [FinP [FinP ~~[DP **RP**[DP$_i$]~~

[TP . . . [vP ~~[DP **RP**[DP$_i$]~~ . . .

Certain aspects of our analysis, however, require further qualification: (i) the assumption that LD lands above ForceP instead of occupying a Topic-field internal position, and (ii) how the big-DP remains intact as it moves through FinP (contra Grewendorf 2002a, 2002b, 2009), that is, why does the RP not remain in Spec,FinP?

Regarding the locus of LD, Benincà and Poletto (2004) ascribe LD to the highest position of the Topic field below the Frame field, yet they avoid explicitly discussing the relation of the Frame field or Topic field to ForceP. We follow Wolfe (2015c, 2019) in placing LD above Force in FrameP in strict V2 systems, due to (a) the strictness of V2 and limited scope of V3 variations, that is, only Frame Setters, HTLD, LD, or some combination thereof, and (b) placing LD below Force would require the unparsimonious explanation that V_{FIN} targets Force in all contexts except LD, in which it would only target Fin. The locus of LD in Force-V2 languages must then be separate from other Topic and Focus projections above Force. Indeed, Poletto (2002a:106–107) suggests that LD in German(ic) occupies a higher position in the CP than it does in Romance or Central Rhaeto-Romance varieties, a position we understand as FrameP.

How then can the big-DP pass through FinP without being broken up? A possible solution draws on suggestions by Rizzi and Shlonsky (2006) that Spec,FinP must be vacated by any material passing through it, as it is not a criterial position. But what renders Spec,ForceP a criterial position? It is possible that the placing of the phonological requirement related to the generalized EPP feature on Force (see Hinterhölzl 2017a; Holmberg 2000) either renders Force criterial or makes being criterial unimportant on the root node of the clause.

4.2.2 Hanging Topic Left Dislocation

As introduced in section 2, we consider HTLD as prefield resumption by a *p*-pronoun (24a) or middlefield resumption by a *p*- or *d*-pronoun (24b).

(24) a. [$_{HT}$ Ich und meine Mutter$_i$] , [**wir$_i$**] müssen immer noch
I and my mother, we.RP *must always still*
das mit dem Pass erledigen
that with the passport carry-out
'My mother and I, we still have to get the passport done'
(KidKo-mu, MuH1WD_04)

b. [$_{HT}$ Immer die Kanackenbande$_j$],
always the Kanacken-gangs[10]
wir haben [**die$_j$**] immer fertiggemacht
we have them.RP *always finished-made*.PTCP
'Always the *Kanackenbande*, we always beat them up'
(KidKo-mu, MuH9WT_07, Speaker 104)

HTs are externally merged as nonconstituents of the matrix clause in the furthest left position of the C-domain (Frey 2005; Grewendorf 2002a, 2002b; Grohmann 2003; Shaer and Frey 2004). The HT thus merges above Force in FrameP and the RP in vP. For prefield resumption, the RP moves from vP to the prefield, reparsed for HTLD in (25a); if resumption

occurs in the middlefield, we assume the RP to remain in situ or to scramble in the functional domain, while some other XP moves to Spec,ForceP (25b). We apply the same analysis to both SG and Kiezdeutsch.

(25) a. [$_{\text{FrameP}}$ HT**DP**[$_{\text{Frame}}$[$_{\text{ForceP}}$ **RP** [$_{\text{Force}}$ V_{FIN} [$_{\text{FinP}}$ ~~RP~~ [$_{\text{Fin}}$ ~~V~~ [$_{\text{TP}}$. . .[$_{\text{vP}}$ ~~RP~~ [$_{\text{v}}$

b. [$_{\text{FrameP}}$ HT**DP** [$_{\text{Frame}}$ [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ $XP_{\text{TOPIC/FOCUS}}$ [$_{\text{Force}}$ V_{FIN} [$_{\text{FinP}}$ ~~XP~~ [$_{\text{Fin}}$ ~~V_{FIN}~~ [$_{\text{TP}}$. . .[$_{\text{vP}}$ **RP** [$_{\text{v}}$

4.2.3 Adverbial Resumption

For adverbial resumption, we assume that peripheral adverbial clauses (PACs), that is, those relating to discourse structure, for example counterfactual conditional, causal, adversative, and concessive clauses, and so on (see Haegeman 2000b, 2012), are externally merged in the leftmost position (see Haegeman 2012) high in the C-domain (see Endo 2019; Haegeman 2003, 2006b, 2012), as they cannot appear clause-internally (Axel-Tober this volume; Frey 2005, 2020b). In our terms, this position is FrameP as already introduced (see also de Clercq and Haegeman 2018; Greco and Haegeman 2020, this volume; Haegeman and Greco 2018; Wolfe 2015c, 2018c, 2019), given that any merge in a left-peripheral position lower than Force would likely rule out V3 on account of a bottleneck in ForceP. Liliane Haegeman points out that a distinction should be drawn between nonintegrated adverbial clauses (NiCs) and PACs, in that PACs can be integrated into the C-domain. We agree that at least a semantic distinction is necessary, yet we are unsure that this necessarily relates to a formal difference in terms of the generation point. (But see Frey 2020b for an integration of speech act, commitment, judgement and proposition phrases into the left periphery.) Among several possible solutions are Late Merge of NiCs in FrameP but "normal" merge of PACs there, or a complex movement approach to PACs from a CP-internal position through ForceP to FrameP leaving the resumptive in Spec,ForceP. The latter might account for PACs in V2 if they simply stay in situ. We do not have the space to investigate the workability of these solutions.

Thus, for the Kiezdeutsch sentence in (26) involving resumption of a PAC by *da*, we assume the higher structure in (27), in which the RP fills Spec,ForceP and values Force's Edge Feature.

(26) Weil ich bin dann voll für Holland , **da** kaufe ich eine holländische Fahne.
because I am then full for Holland, RP *buy I a Dutch Flag*
'Because I fully support Holland, I'll buy a Dutch flag.'
(KidKo-mu, MuH11MD_08-2)

(27) [$_{\text{FrameP}}$ **AdvP** [$_{\text{Frame}}$ [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ ***dann/da*** [$_{\text{Force}}$ V_{FIN} . . .

A further question is the merge site of the RP of PACs and its interaction with the C-domain. Axel-Tober (this volume) posits that resumptive *so* merges directly as an expletive in Spec,ForceP, yet this does not necessarily extend to *da* and *dann*. Although peripheral adjuncts are impossible in central positions and PACs cannot bind into the root clause (see Frey 2020b), TP-internal resumptives of such clauses do appear possible in SG, signaling that some anaphoric linking to the higher C-domain is possible, akin to RPs in HTLD. Consider the sentence in (28); here both prefield and middlefield instances of RP *da/dann* permit the conditional reading, while instances in the lexical domain are only locative/temporal. The middlefield reading also allows a spatiotemporal interpretation, while the prefield position does not.

(28) [Wenn er Kuchen mag]$_i$, (**dann/da$_i$**) wird er (**dann/da$_i$**) den ganzen Kuchen
if he cake likes then/there.RP *will he* then/there.RP *the whole cake*
($\text{dann}_{\text{TEMP}}$/$\text{da}_{\text{LOC/TEMP}}$) aufessen.
then/there up-eat
'If he likes cake, then he'll eat it all up.'

We consider *dann/da* an underspecified anaphoric linking adverb receiving either an adverbial resumptive or temporal reading, depending on the particular numeration; it is thus plausible that they move from a TP-internal position. (See Fuß 2008 for discussion of English

temporal *then* and Old English *þa* "there/then" and *þonne* "then" in these terms.) This proposal draws on claims that temporal adverbs such as *then* are merged in Spec,TP in languages without a subject-related EPP (see Alexiadou 2000). Recall also the observation that *da* often relates to a topic situation (Averintsvea-Klisch and Salfner 2007; Axel-Tober this volume; see also Klein 2008); we understand Situation Topics in the sense of a situational argument (see Bentley and Cruschina 2018; Hinterhölzl 2019) amounting to a Sentence/Aboutness Topic (Bentley and Cruschina 2018; Sluckin 2021; Sluckin, Cruschina, and Martin 2021) for which a position in the functional domain under Fin is available in German (see Frey 2003). A low source for resumptive *da* is thus unproblematic in our view. The adverbial RP will move through FinP before moving up to Spec,ForceP, giving the derivation in (29).

(29) [$_{\text{FrameP}}$ **AdvP** $_{\text{PAC}}$ [$_{\text{Frame}}$ [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ ***dann/da*** [$_{\text{Force}}$ **V** $_{\textbf{FIN}}$ [$_{\text{TopP}}$ . . . $_{\text{FocP}}$ [$_{\text{FinP}}$ ~~*dann*~~ [$_{\text{Fin}}$ V$_t$ [$_{\text{TP}}$ . . . ~~*dann/da*~~.

. .

When it comes to resumption of temporal and locative adverbials and central adverbial clauses (CACs) in German—that is, not only event-level adverbials, such as event time, but also factual conditionals—it is standard to assume generation in TP (Haegeman 2012). We are thus faced with two options: we might assume an HTLD-style base-generational approach in which the CAC or another lexical spatiotemporal adverb is merged in much the same way as an HT in FrameP; or we must consider the possibility of movement of central adverbials via a big-AdvP to the C-domain and ultimately onto FrameP.

However, if Kiezdeutsch allows typically central temporal adverbs, for example *morgen, dann*, and so on, and other central adjuncts to merge in FrameP in V3, it is possible that speakers have extended this innovation to central adverbials in resumption strategies à la HTLD. Indeed, Haegeman and Greco (2018) show that CACs can be merged in FrameP in West Flemish, which behaves like Kiezdeutsch in many respects, producing V3 akin to Kiezdeutsch. If CACs do merge high, an HTLD-like analysis is necessary. (See Axel-Tober

this volume; Frey 2005.) We remain open to both options, given that a combination of both types in the system is plausible and neither can be ruled out with the data at hand.[11]

4.3 Variation in the Availability of Noncanonical V3

We now return to the noncanonical V3 pattern. We have already shown that Wolfe's typology (2015c) straightforwardly accounts for Kiezdeutsch V3 such as (30), that is, the Frame Setter merges in FrameP, the preverbal XP moves to Spec,ForceP, and V_{FIN} moves via Fin to Force (31). We believe this grammar to hold for both Kiezdeutsch and potentially V3-producing speakers of German from monoethnic speech communities.

(30) Immer er schreit überall: "PKK!"

Always he shouts everywhere PKK

'He always shouts "PKK" everywhere!' (KidKo-mu, MuH21MT_04, Speaker 14)

(31) [$_{FrameP}$ *Immer* [$_{Frame}$ [$_{ForceP}$ *er* [$_{Force}$ *schreit* . . .

However, we are confronted with two questions: why do Force-V2 languages like SG not standardly allow V3 orders with initial Frame-setting adverbs (Wolfe 2015c, 2018c, 2019) when Kiezdeutsch does? And second, why do instances of V3 sometimes appear spoken SG, albeit less frequently?

Regarding the first question, Wolfe (2015c, 2019) hypothesizes that strict Germanic V2 languages might only lexicalize the Frame Field with LD/HTLD but not with Frame Setters. Building on this position, we suggest that the core difference emerges from variation in Frame Setters' merge sites either in FrameP or in a position below Force (see Frey 2003; Hinterhölzl 2017a).

In a system with Frame Setters under Force, a clause-initial Frame Setter simply participates in V2 by moving to Spec,ForceP from the lower position. However, two competing hypotheses exist for the locus of Frame Setters in German, either a position for Frame Adjuncts in the inflectional layer (Frey 2003) or as a property of the C-domain below Force (Hinterhölzl 2017a).

In favor of the first position is the fact that Frame Setters are not necessarily referential (Frey 2003: 168). Notably, nonreferential Frame adverbials/adjuncts must follow sentence adverbs, for example *erstaunlicherweise* "surprisingly." However, referential Frame Setters can precede such adverbs and fall clause-initially. Frey (2003) considers these facts to indicate a T-domain level origin under the scope of sentence adverbs but above all arguments. In contrast, Hinterhölzl (2017a: 212) argues that the fact that Frame adverbials lack reconstruction effects indicates a CP-origin, as Principle-C effects are absent, that is, the pronoun in the adverbial clause cannot be bound (see the contrast between (32a) and (32b)).

(32) a. Als Peter$_1$ nach Hause kam, hat er$_1$ seine Freundin angerufen.
when Peter to home came has he his girlfriend up.called
'When Peter arrived home, he called up his girlfriend.'

b. *Als er$_1$ Maria traf, war fast jeder Student$_1$ schon nach Hause gefahren.
when he Mary met was almost every student already to home driven
'When he met Mary, almost every student had already gone home.'

However, these approaches are not necessarily incompatible. There is evidence in both SG and Kiezdeutsch for middlefield scene-setting adverbials in situ. While Hinterhölzl's (2017a) reconstruction data is strong evidence for a CP origin (his F(rame)-Topic position under Force), his analysis potentially excludes low Frame Setters. Consider furthermore that the V2 property of Force is linked not to semantico-pragmatic features but simply to the combination of a feature probing the finite verb and an edge feature which induces movement of the closest XP to Spec,ForceP (see Wolfe 2015c, 2018c, 2019). Consequently, two merge sites for Frame Setters are necessary, as not all obligatorily fall in the preverbal position, nor do they always trigger V3 in Kiezdeutsch. We think that both positions are available, with the exception of PACs. We consider the C-domain position to be inherently relevant to Information Structure and linked to a contextually salient situation, while the lower position

can be discourse-neutral. Further work should distinguish the licensing factors between high and low merge sites more exactly, but this is beyond the scope of this chapter.

We assume then that C-domain Frame Setters in SG are typically lexicalized below Force (pace Hinterhölzl 2017a), but in Kiezdeutsch they are merged above Force in FrameP. Assuming Force-V2 for SG (contra Hinterhölzl 2017a), a C-domain Frame Setter can only result in V2, for it will move to Spec,ForceP. In contrast, the high merge site in FrameP above Force in Kiezdeutsch permits V3. We assume that standard V2 patterns with initial Frame Setters in Kiezdeutsch will result from movement from a lower position. We envisage the difference between the left peripheries of two varieties as follows (33):

(33) a. **Kiezdeutsch Left Periphery**

[FrameP Frame Setters/HT/LD [ForceP [TopP [FocP [TopP* [FinP

b. **Standard German Left Periphery**

[FrameP HT/LD [ForceP [TopP Frame Setters [FocP [TopP* [FinP

We now briefly discuss why more than a coincidental number of SG speakers also produce some V3. Indeed, work by Bunk (2020) and Wiese et al. (2020) has shown V3 to be more diffused than previously thought in the spoken language of "typical" monolingual Germans, albeit considerably less frequent in both KiDKo-mo and TüBa-D/S than in KiDKo-mu: 0.2 percent of matrix clauses in both KiDK-mo (Walkden 2017: 65) and TüBa-D/S, versus 0.85 percent of matrix clauses in Kiezdeutsch (Sluckin 2021: 257). While formal accounts have worked on the basis that V3 is unavailable beyond Kiezdeutsch, we are open to a level of microvariation in the speaker population (see Sluckin 2021); that is, some speakers must have access to Force-external Frame Setters, while others do not. Indeed, Liliane Haegeman reports that West Flemish also shows some microvariation regarding the availability of V3. We leave the question aside as to whether V3 in SG is incipient or a diachronic constant but point to work by Walkden (2017) and Sluckin (2021) for different diachronic scenarios. Indeed, the fact that UG appears to allow variation between Force-V2 systems which do or do not allow

V3 with Frame Setters (see Wolfe 2015c, 2018c, 2019) means that competition between a Force-internal and Force-external merge site is plausible.

What then drives adult speakers of SG to produce V3 with a high Frame Setter when they also have access to the lower position? We draw on experimental findings by Wiese et al. (2020) that the order Frame-Topic-V represents a natural order of information structuring beyond the syntactic constraints which might otherwise rule out V3. The German child acquiring the language must exclude this order (Sluckin 2021), yet a cognitive proclivity for V3 may explain why a speaker may not abandon initial Frame Setters entirely even after acquiring the lower position. This is ultimately a failure to completely resolve competition in the input and a single I-language leading to Grammar Competition (Kroch 1994).

Furthermore, an extrasyntactic [Frame-Topic-V] preference might explain instances of V3 produced by speakers without narrow-syntactic Force-external Frame Setters. This preference is borne out in the apparent processing advantage of Adv-S-V over other V3 orders reported by Bunk (2020). If speakers lacking a Force-external Frame Setter produce such V3, it may represent a last-resort operation of sorts. That is, when the speaker fails to include an otherwise necessary Frame Setter in the initial numeration, the speaker has two options: (a) the Frame Setter can be dropped altogether, or (b) the Frame Setter can only be merged in FrameP. Since UG allows such adverbials in FrameP, the position should be available as a last resort. In this sense, otherwise impermissible V3 in SG may result from a discourse-driven requirement associated with non-narrow-syntactic instances of Frame Setters added to the numeration later. (See Greco and Haegeman 2020, this volume, and Haegeman and Greco 2018 for this proposal for V3 in West Flemish; see also te Velde (2017) for a Late Merge proposal in TP for Kiezdeutsch.) This explanation is both complementary and an alternative to microvariation.

In sum, Kiezdeutsch has a larger set of parametrized options in the Frame Field than can be assumed for SG, yet interface biases and some level of microvariation involving a

Kiezdeutsch-like left periphery may combine to explain less frequent but observable V3 in the wider speaker population.

5 Conclusion

We have found that spoken SG and Kiezdeutsch display largely the same range of resumption strategies, albeit with variation in the frequencies of particular types. Notably, RP *so* was limited to the written corpora only. We argued that Wolfe's (2015c) typology of V2 languages could best explain differences between Kiezdeutsch and SG, concluding however that both were Force-V2 languages. The key difference between the varieties lies in the possible lexicalizations of a Force-external FrameP. In Kiezdeutsch, FrameP hosts LD, HTLD, and Frame Setters, while in other standard-like varieties of German Frame Setters are instead typically lexicalized below Force, ruling out V3. Less frequent instances of V3 in spoken SG may result either from microvariation—that is, the availability of high Frame Setters (but see Bunk 2020 for a Construction Grammar approach to V3 in spoken German)—and/or from extrasyntactic factors at the discourse-syntax interface (see Wiese et al. 2020).

The research for this chapter was supported in part by funding from the German Research Foundation (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* – DFG).[12]

Table 13.1

Straightforward diagnostics of LD and HTLD (based on Altmann 1981 and Grohmann 2003).

	LD	HTLD
D-pronoun RP	+	+
P-pronoun RP	-	+
Prefield RP	+	+
Middlefield RP	-	+
Prosodic break	-	+

Table 13.2

Resumptive pronouns in German according to Zifonun et al. (1997) and Zitterbart (2002)

	Specific	**Less specific**	**Nonspecific**
Conditional		*Dann*	*So*
Concessive			*So*
Temporal	*Seitdem, seither, soweit, so oft, so lang*	*Dann, da*	
Local		*Da*	
Causal	*Deshalb, deswegen, darum*	*Da*	

Table 13.3

Distribution of resumption types within the corpora

Corpus	**Argument resumption**	**Adverbial resumption**	**Totals**
KiDKo-Mu	56 (21.5%)	204 (78.5%)	260
KiDKo-Mo	36 (36.4%)	63 (63.6%)	99
TüBa-D/S	223 (48.4%)	238 (51.6%)	461

Table 13.4

Distribution of the most frequent resumptive pronouns

	Dann	***Da***	***So***	**Totals**
KiDKo-Mu	168 (95%)	9 (5%)	0 (0%)	177 (100%)
KiDKo-Mo	45 (85%)	9 (15%)	0 (0%)	54 (100%)
TüBa-D/S	147 (95%)	7 (5%)	0 (0%)	154 (100%)
TüBa-D/Z	325 (69%)	42 (9%)	102 (22%)	469 (100%)
Totals	685 (80%)	67 (8%)	102 (12%)	854 (100%)

Table 13.5

Relative distributions of LD and HTLD as a percentage of argument resumption

Corpus	LD	HTLD	Totals
KiDKo-Mu	37 (66.1%)	19 (33.9%)	56 (100%)
KiDKo-Mo	28 (77.8%)	8 (22.2%)	36 (100%)
TüBa-D/S	105 (47.1%)	118 (52.9%)	223 (100%)

[1] Reference codes such as MuH19WT refer to transcripts in KiDKo and can be broken down as follows: Mu = multiethnic corpus, H19 = code assigned to speaker, W = *weiblich* 'female' or M = *männlich* 'male', while the final letter denotes the home language of the speaker, eg. T for Turkish, D for *Deutsch* 'German', K for Kurdish, and A for Arabic.

[2] SPK refers to an interlocutor speaker in the transcript other than the anchor speaker of the transcript.

[3] It is not clear if *danach dann* "after then" is one or two constituents; while the adverbs may make up one complex XP, they may also be stacked Frame Setters.

[4] Tübinger Treebank of German/Spontaneous Speech; Tübinger Treebank of German/ Newspaper Corpus. For all corpora the query [cat = "VF"] was used to isolate matrix clauses.

[5] But see work by Sluckin (2021), who makes such a case for a subset of multilingual Kiezdeutsch speakers.

[6] This projection is labeled ShiftP by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) or F(rame)-TopP by Hinterhölzl (2017c).

[7] The raised XP may stay in Spec,FinP if an element is generated in a higher position, thus falling within the probing domain of Force's EPP feature.

[8] A possible alternative is that the D-head resumptive targets Force via internal or external Merge blocking Fin-to-Force movement, as has been proposed for pleonastic resumptive *die* in Ghent Flemish by de Clercq and Haegeman (2018); however, we cannot see why specific argument and adverbial resumptives should behave like pleonastic *die.* We refer to Sluckin (2021) for an inheritance-based and minimalist approach to bleeding of V-movement in V3 structures as a possible alternative.

[9] We leave the exact labeling of possible projections in the Frame field open, simply opting for FrameP[1] and FrameP[2] etc.

[10] *Kanacken* is a derogatory term used for people of Middle Eastern origin yet also employed at times by those it refers to. We have chosen not to translate this charged term into English.

[11] Unlike Haegeman and Greco (2018) and Greco and Haegeman (2020, this volume), we lack access to native judgments. Nor is it standard to posit V-to-T movement in German, which is a necessary ingredient of their analysis of V3 with preverbal subjects in West Flemish.

[12] Funding came from three DFG projects: Research Unit FOR 2537 (projects P6, 394838878 and P8; 313607803) and AL 554/8-1, DFG Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz-Preis 2014 awarded to Artemis Alexiadou as part of the Research Unit on (Experimental) Syntax and Heritage Languages (RUESHeL).