

Heike Wiese, Heiko F. Marten, Oliver Bunk (Hg.)

Arbeitspapiere „Sprache, Variation und Migration“: Studentische Arbeiten

Papier Nr. 6

From Adverbial to Discourse Connective

Multiple prefields in spoken German and the
use of *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’

Sören Schalowski (Universität Potsdam)

Potsdam, Mai 2017

From Adverbial to Discourse Connective

Multiple prefields in spoken German and the use of *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’

Sören Schalowski
(Universität Potsdam)

Zusammenfassung (deutsch)

Der Beitrag beschäftigt sich mit nicht kanonischen, mehrfachen Vorfeldern im gesprochenen Deutsch, in denen eine adverbiale Konstituente einer weiteren präverbalen Konstituente im deklarativen Hauptsatz vorangeht. Damit verstoßen die entstehenden AdvXV-Sätzen gegen die Verb-zweit-Beschränkung im Deutschen. Die folgende Untersuchung basiert auf Korpusanalysen und zeigt zunächst, dass die Wortfolge nicht Resultat von willkürlicher Variation ist. Anschließend steht folgende Frage im Fokus: Was sind die Lizenzierungsbedingungen für diese Konstruktion? Es wird gezeigt, dass zwei unterschiedliche Bedingungen das Auftreten von AdvXV-Konstruktionen motivieren: (i) die gleichzeitige syntaktische Markierung von Framesetter und Topik, (ii) die syntaktische Markierung von temporalen Diskurskonnectoren. Im letzten Fall werden die adverbialen Konnectoren „dann“ und „danach“ im Adv-slot der AdvXV-Konstruktion benutzt. Die Verwendung der Adverbiale in dieser nicht-kanonischen syntaktischen Position deutet darauf hin, dass „dann“ und „danach“ sich in der Entwicklung von einer lexialischer Kategorie zu einer diskurs-funktionalen Kategorie befinden und sich damit zu einem Konnektor auf Diskursebene entwickeln. Mit der Besetzung des linken Satzrandes befinden sich die Adverbialbestimmungen in AdvXV-Sätzen an einem Verbindungspunkt, wo sie zwei Diskurseinheiten miteinander verknüpfen. Diese Funktion wird in dieser satzinitialen Position explizit markiert.

Abstract (englisch)

This paper is concerned with a corpus-based investigation of non-canonical, multiple prefields in spoken German where an adverbial constituent linearly precedes another preverbal constituent in a declarative main clause, in short AdvXV. This construction violates the verb second constraint of German. After showing that this serialization is not an instance of random variation and that it has distinctive grammatical properties, the overall question will be: What are the licensing conditions of this construction? It will be shown that one has to distinguish between two triggers of the AdvXV construction: (i) the simultaneous syntactic marking of a frame setter and a topic, (ii) the syntactic marking of temporal discourse connectives. In the latter case the connective adverbs *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’ are used in the Adv-slot of AdvXV. Their use in this non-canonical syntactic position indicates the development of *dann* and *danach* from a lexical category to a discourse-functional category, namely to a connective at discourse level. Placement at the left edge in AdvXV, and therefore at the connecting point of two discourse units, marks this function explicitly.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
1 INTRODUCTION	2
2 PROPERTIES OF THE CORPORA USED	5
2.1 KIEZDEUTSCH CORPUS (KIDKO).....	5
2.2 TÜBINGEN TREEBANK OF SPOKEN GERMAN (TÜBA-D/S).....	5
2.3 COLLECTION OF UNRELATED INDIVIDUAL EXAMPLES.....	6
3 THE V2 PROPERTY OF STANDARD GERMAN	7
4 THE ADVXV CONSTRUCTION IN SPOKEN GERMAN	8
4.1 RELATED WORK: APPARENT MULTIPLE PREFIELDS	10
4.1.1 Grammar of apparent multiple prefields	10
4.1.2 Information structure of apparent multiple prefields	13
4.2 GENUINE MULTIPLE PREFIELDS: THE ADVXV CONSTRUCTION	15
4.2.1 Grammar of AdvXV.....	16
4.2.2 Information structure of AdvXV	19
4.2.3 Evidence from historical stages of German	24
5 THE DEVELOPMENT TOWARDS DISCOURSE CONNECTIVES: TEMPORAL ADVERBS IN ADVXV	26
5.1 SOME PROPERTIES OF DISCOURSE MARKERS	27
5.2 DANN ‘THEN’ AND DANACH ‘AFTERWARDS’ AS DISCOURSE CONNECTIVES	30
6 CONCLUSION	35
REFERENCES	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Distinction between AdvXV and apparent multiple prefields.	23
Table 2: Distinction between two types of AdvXV ($\text{AdvXV}_{\text{temporal}}$ and $\text{AdvXV}_{\text{frame-topic}}$)	34

Preface

This is Sören Schalowski's last paper: he died after completing a pre-final version. His friends Ulrike Freywald, Ines Rehbein, and Horst Simon have undertaken only editorial revisions. The paper was based on Sören's contribution to a workshop "Conjunctions vs. Contextualizers: Between Clauses and Discourse Units" at Charles University Prague (18-19 Nov 2011).

1 Introduction¹

Standard German² adheres to the verb second (V2) constraint according to which the prefield of a canonical declarative main clause has to be occupied by exactly one constituent, regardless of its syntactic function (Bierwisch, 1963) (1). The prefield is defined as the topological domain preceding the finite verb (Drach, 1937). It follows from the V2 constraint that declaratives containing more than one discrete preverbal constituent are normally judged as ungrammatical. However, in spoken German one can detect violations of the usually very robust V2 constraint where two discrete constituents occur sentence-initially (2). This V3 word order type will be referred to as AdvXV, meaning that an adverbial constituent (Adv) precedes another sentence constituent (X), both occurring in front of the finite verb of a declarative main clause.

- (1) [*Den Zionismus*] **gab** es allerdings schon früher.
the Zionism gave it however already earlier
'However, there was Zionism before.'
(German Corpora from the web (DECOW2012): 2611)
- (2) a. [*In anderen Städten*] [*das*] **gibt** es nicht.
In other cities that gives it not
'In other cities that doesn't exist.'
(TV report, 15 Oct 2012)
- b. [*dann*] [*ich*] **sehe** jetzt *Don Giovanni von Mozart*
then I see now Don Giovanni from Mozart
'Then I'll see Don Giovanni by Mozart now.'
(Tübingen Treebank of Spoken German (TüBa-D/S), s2852)

The German AdvXV construction was first examined in the context of second language acquisition where it was claimed that this pattern constitutes one of the developmental stages when acquiring German as a second language (Meisel et al., 1981; Clahsen, 1984; Pienemann, 2005), independent of a written or spoken register. This suggests that AdvXV might be a construction of an L2 grammar. However, the production of AdvXV in the urban vernacular Kiezdeutsch (Wiese, 2009, 2011a, 2012; Wiese et al., 2009; Wiese et al., 2012) by speakers with German as (one of) their native language(s) as well as by speakers outside a multilingual

¹ This work was supported by a grant from the German Research Association (DFG) awarded to the Collaborative Research Centre (SFB) 632 "Information Structure". Thanks are due to Heike Wiese and Leonie Cornips for advice as well as to two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments.

² By Standard German I am referring to conceptually written, hence planned and formal varieties of German (see the model of medial and conceptual orality and literacy proposed by Koch and Oesterreicher, 1994).

setting calls for an explanation of the occurrence of that construction that cannot be traced back to an incomplete L2 grammar.

In this paper, I will show that AdvXV deviates systematically from another construction where two constituents appear sentence-initially, namely cases of “apparent” multiple prefields (Müller, 2003, 2005a).

After drawing this distinction, I will examine the licensing conditions of AdvXV. I will show that this word order pattern can best be analysed at the interface between syntax and discourse pragmatics. I will argue that AdvXV can represent two different types of discourse-pragmatic constructions which are realized by this word order pattern.

One type of AdvXV is driven by an alignment between information structure and syntactic structure: the simultaneous marking of a frame setter and a topic within a single utterance (see (2a) above). This information-structural analysis has already been proposed for the occurrence of AdvXV in Kiezdeutsch (Wiese, 2009, 2011a, 2012; Wiese et al., 2009; Wiese et al., 2012). I will extend this analysis to the occurrence of AdvXV in spoken German in general (see section 4.2). Additional evidence for the suggested analysis is gathered from historical stages of German, i.e. Middle Low German (MLG) and Early New High German (ENHG). I will refer to this first type as AdvXV_{frame-topic}.

The second type of AdvXV results from the marking of a temporal connective at the discourse level (see (2b)), henceforth called AdvXV_{temporal}. This analysis is based on the different semantics of the lexical material that can occupy the Adv slot in AdvXV. Whereas frame setting adverbials only scope over the subsequent predication (2a), connective adverbials like *dann* ‘then’ establish a temporal relation between two discourse units (2b). I will take a closer look at this second type of adverbial and its use in the noncanonical AdvXV pattern and restrict myself to the two connective adverbs *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’ (see section 5). I claim that their occurrence in this non-canonical syntactic position indicates the development of these temporal adverbs from a lexical to a discourse functional category, namely a connective at discourse level. The placement of *dann* or *danach* at the left edge of a clause via AdvXV – and therefore in between the two connected utterances – marks their discourse function explicitly. In other words, as a result of their peripheral position, these two temporal adverbs obtain a discourse-pragmatic interpretation. By their syntax the two adverbs share many properties with discourse markers, which prototypically occupy the same syntactically peripheral slot. Just like the AdvXV_{frame-topic}-construction, the AdvXV_{temporal}-construction has also a correlate in the MLG period.

1 Introduction

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, I will introduce the three corpora of spoken German used for this study. Section 3 will briefly illustrate the V2 constraint of Standard German. In section 4, I will outline the word order variation detectable in the prefield of spoken German, the AdvXV construction. I will show that AdvXV behaves grammatically differently from another type of V2 violation where multiple constituents appear preverbally, the so-called “apparent” multiple prefields. In section 5 I will give a discourse-pragmatic motivation for the occurrence of AdvXV and justify the necessity to subdivide the AdvXV pattern into two different constructions.

2 Properties of the corpora used

Throughout the paper, whenever data of ‘spoken German’ are used this refers to three different sources containing spontaneous speech of German: first, the KiezDeutsch Corpus (KiDKo) (Wiese et al., 2012), second, the Tübingen Treebank of Spoken German (TüBa-D/S) (Stegmann et al., 2000), and, third, a small collection of linguistic examples culled from everyday conversations, academic discussions, radio interviews, TV shows, etc. These three sources constitute the empirical basis for the investigation of the AdvXV pattern.

2.1 KiezDeutsch Corpus (KiDKo)

The first corpus, the KiezDeutsch Corpus (KiDKo), is currently being constructed as part of the project “The KiezDeutsch Corpus. Analyses at the Periphery” at the University of Potsdam.³ The term *Kiezdeutsch* (lit. ‘hood German’) refers to new linguistic practices that have emerged among adolescents in multiethnic urban areas of Germany, such as Berlin (Wiese, 2009, 2012).⁴ KiDKo contains spontaneous conversations in multiethnic neighbourhoods, based on self-recordings of seventeen adolescent anchor speakers who live in Berlin-Kreuzberg, a multiethnic district of Berlin (corpus size: approx. 228,000 tokens). It is supplemented by self-recordings made by six adolescent anchor speakers of the same age from the monoethnic neighbourhood Berlin-Hellersdorf who have a comparable socio-economic background (corpus size: approx. 105,000 tokens). The anchor speakers recorded informal peer conversations with their friends. The recordings are transcribed and each audio file is aligned with its respective transcription.⁵

2.2 Tübingen Treebank of Spoken German (TüBa-D/S)

The second corpus, the Tübingen Treebank of Spoken German (TüBa-D/S), assembles spontaneous German dialogues. These dialogues are based on role plays from the domain of appointment scheduling (meetings, dinner, etc.). The audio files were manually transcribed and parsed. The TüBa-D/S has a size of approx. 36,000 sentences, corresponding to 380,000 tokens.

³ The project (PI: Heike Wiese) is part of the Collaborative Research Centre “Information structure” (SFB 632) at the University of Potsdam, Humboldt-University Berlin and Free University Berlin, funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

⁴ For a more detailed description of Kiezdeutsch see section 4.

⁵ For further details see: http://www.kiezdeutschkorpus.de/index_en.html.

2.3 Collection of unrelated individual examples

The third source of data is a loose collection of AdvXV instances which were gathered and documented from spontaneous speech production. The respective communication situations range from informal conversations, for example in private talk, in the public space, in talk shows and so on, to semi-formal discourse, such as radio/TV interviews, scientific presentations delivered at workshops or conferences and academic discussions. This additional data serves as a supplement, because AdvXV seems to be a phenomenon with rather low frequencies. Therefore it is necessary to maximize the empirical basis in terms of authentic production data in order to increase the validity of the grammatical analysis of this phenomenon.

3 The V2 property of Standard German

As briefly mentioned at the beginning, German belongs to the group of verb-second languages – just as most other Germanic languages do (e.g., Dutch, Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian). In V2 languages the finite verb typically occurs in the second position of declarative main clauses and one constituent linearly precedes it. Following Drach's (1937) topological analysis of German sentence structure, this preverbal position will be referred to as the prefield. Most commonly, the prefield is occupied by the subject (3a). However, this position is not restricted to subjects. It can be the host for a variety of constituents, such as objects (3b) and adverbials (3c).

- (3) a. [*Eine Gartenlaube*] **brannte** *in voller Ausdehnung*
an arbour burned in full expansiveness
'An arbour burned completely.'

(DECOW2012: 456)

- b. [*den Titel*] **mag** *ich gar nicht*
the title like I PTCL not
'I don't like the title.'
DECOW2012: 128313)

- c. [*Gestern*] **war** *meine Freundin Annette da*
yesterday was my friend Annette there
'Yesterday my friend Annette was here.'
(DECOW2012: 239389)

The only necessary condition is that it is exactly one single constituent that precedes the finite verb (Bierwisch, 1963). Thus, whenever a declarative main clause starts with a constituent different from the subject of the clause, the subject must follow the finite verb, like in (3b, c). If there is more than one preverbal constituent the sentence is ruled out in Standard German (4):

- (4) **[Gestern] [meine Freundin Annette] war da*
yesterday my friend Annette was there
'Yesterday my friend Annette was here.'

However, based on the investigation of the three corpora introduced above, I claim that structures of the AdvXV type such as in (4) cannot be categorically excluded from the grammar of German, as done by descriptive grammars of German (e.g. Zifonun et al., 1997; Duden, 2005).

4 The AdvXV construction in spoken German

The usage of AdvXV has already been observed and examined in the urban vernacular Kiezdeutsch. As mentioned above, Kiezdeutsch is usually spoken in multiethnic areas by speakers who are born and raised in a multilingual environment. Apart from the majority language of the country, German, this setting involves languages such as Turkish, Kurdish, Persian, Arabic, Bosnian, Croatian and Polish. It is important to note that Kiezdeutsch is also used by monolingual speakers of German who happen to live in these multiethnic areas. It has also been shown that specific grammatical characteristics that can be found in this urban vernacular are not due to specific linguistic backgrounds (Wiese, 2009; Freywald et al., 2011). Some illustrative examples are given in (5):

- (5) a. [*Gestern*] [*ich*] **war** *Ku'damm*.
yesterday I was Ku'damm
'Yesterday I was at the Ku'damm [= street in Berlin].'
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu9WT)⁶
- b. [*Ab jetzt*] [*ich*] **kriege** *immer zwanzig Euro*.
from now I get always twenty euros
'From now on, I'll always get twenty euros.'
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu17MA)
- c. [*Danach*] [*du*] **hast** *sie angeschrien*.
afterwards you have her at.shout
'Afterwards you shouted at her.'
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu11MD)

For the occurrence of AdvXV in Kiezdeutsch it has been proposed that the multilingual setting of this urban vernacular results in a greater tolerance towards variation and the violation of grammatical constraints, which leads to a productive extension of already existing grammatical structures or the development of new grammatical patterns. With respect to syntax this is said to have led to a weakening of the V2 constraint of German, allowing for multiple preverbal constituents serialized as AdvXV. This linearization is assumed to be driven by the expression of information-structural preferences (Wiese, 2009, 2011a; Wiese et al., 2009).⁷ In short, investigations on Kiezdeutsch as well as on comparable urban vernaculars of Germanic V2

⁶ The speaker symbols are structured as follows: Mu/Mo = multiethnic/monoethnic background | consecutive numbering of the anchor speakers | W/M = female/male | A/D/K/P/T = background family language: Arabic/German/Kurdish/Persian/Turkish.

⁷ In addition to word order changes, several innovative linguistic developments are attested at different grammatical levels in Kiezdeutsch, e.g., the usage of *so* (lit. 'so, like') as a focus marker (Wiese, 2011b) and the extension of the light verb pattern (Wiese, 2006). For an overview of linguistic developments and innovations in Kiezdeutsch see Wiese (2009).

languages across Europe (Freywald et al., 2015)⁸ assume that AdvXV is a construction that developed in a multilingual setting with loosened grammatical restrictions. This leads to a relatively high degree of grammatical variation, compared with the respective standard grammars.

In contrast to this view, I do not assume AdvXV to be exclusively associated with multilingual settings in German. Evidence comes from data of informal spoken German, produced by German native speakers outside a multilingual setting. Examples are given in (6):

- (6) a. [*jetzt*] [*ich*] **wollte** *Sie treffen* (...)
now I wanted you meet
'Now I wanted to meet you.'
(TüBa-D/S, s159)
- b. [*Im Winter*] [*das*] **war** *der erste Baum* (...)
in.the winter that was the first tree
'During winter that was the first tree.'
(Private conversation, 3 May 2010)
- c. [*Im Gehirn*] [*das Sprachverstehen*] **ist** *wechselseitig organisiert*.
in.the brain the speech.comprehension is reciprocally organized
'In the brain the processing of language is organized reciprocally.'
(Scientific talk, 5 June 2010)

Encountering instances of AdvXV outside a multilingual area does not contradict the idea that multilingual settings are conducive to linguistic variation and the development of new linguistic patterns. At the same time – and in accordance with the data investigated – I assume AdvXV to be a general construction of spoken German rather than a specific pattern of an urban vernacular. The multilingual setting might facilitate the usage of this construction in terms of frequency or specific lexical restrictions but it is not a necessary precondition for its occurrence. Therefore, all of the three corpora mentioned above are taken as equally valid resources for the investigation of AdvXV.

In the following I will examine the grammatical characteristics of the AdvXV pattern and compare them with the properties of an already 'familiar' type of V2 deviation in German, the so-called "apparent" multiple prefield. I will show that AdvXV can be best accounted for as an independent construction with a verb third word order (V3). Afterwards I will give a discourse-pragmatic explanation of AdvXV.

⁸ Freywald et al. (in press) examine AdvXV patterns in Dutch, German, Norwegian and Swedish urban vernaculars. All of these languages follow the V2 constraint in their standard varieties.

It is important to note that the claims I am going to make are not categorical. Since this paper is dealing with variation phenomena it is most likely that exceptions to the proposed analysis of AdvXV as well as of apparent multiple prefields can be found. Nevertheless, on the basis of empirical data it is possible to form data clusters that are best explained by the proposed analysis.

4.1 Related work: apparent multiple prefields

Before presenting my own analysis, I will briefly review some related work. It has been noted that German, despite its strict V2 word order, allows for specific linearizations where two or more constituents precede the finite verb in a declarative main clause: cases of apparent multiple prefields. This raises the question whether AdvXV is identical to these familiar linearizations or whether it exhibits systematic differences. To answer this question I will, first, outline the basic grammatical and information-structural properties of apparent multiple prefields and, second, compare them with the AdvXV construction.

4.1.1 Grammar of apparent multiple prefields

For apparent multiple prefields it is constitutive that several arguments and/or adjuncts appear in front of the finite verb in a declarative main clause (Engel, 1970; Eisenberg, 1999; Müller, 2003, 2005a, 2005b; Bildhauer and Cook, 2010; Bildhauer, 2011; Müller, et al. 2012). Examples are given in (7):⁹

- (7) a. [Die Kinder] [nach Stuttgart] *solltest du bringen*.
the children to Stuttgart should you bring
'You should bring the children to Stuttgart.'
(Engel, 1970: 81)
- b. [Der Universität] [zum Jubiläum] *gratulierte auch Bundesminister*
the university to.the anniversary congratulated also federal.minister

Dorothee Wilms (...)
Dorothee Wilms

⁹ With the exception of (7a), which is probably a self-made example (for no information regarding the source is given), all examples of apparent multiple prefields quoted here are authentic utterances by native speakers of German. The examples were obtained invariably from written newspaper texts by the respective authors. – This fact might point to differences in usage between apparent multiple prefields and the AdvXV construction with respect to register (formal vs. informal) and to mode of utterance (written vs. spoken).

‘The federal minister Dorothee Wilms (...) also congratulated the university to their anniversary.’
(Müller, 2005a: 300)

The sentences in (7) contain several preverbal constituents that are syntactically independent of each other: in (7a) an accusative object and a prepositional object and in (7b) a dative object and a prepositional object. Müller (2005a) mentions several other possibilities of combining multiple preverbal constituents: accusative object plus temporal adverbial (8a), instrumental plus temporal adverbial (8b), parts of idioms (8c) as well as complete idiomatic expressions (8d). It is also possible to have more than two preverbal constituents (8e).

- (8) a. [*Dauerhaft*] [*mehr Arbeitsplätze*] **gebe** *es erst, wenn* (...)
permanently more workplace give it only if
‘Permanently more jobs would only be available if (...).’
(Müller, 2005a: 300)
- b. [*Zum letzten Mal*] [*mit der Kurbel*] **wurden** *gestern die*
or.the last time with the crank were yesterday the

Bahnschranken (...) *geschlossen*
gates (...) closed
‘Yesterday the gates (...) were closed with the crank for the last time.’
(Müller, 2005a: 301)
- c. [*Den Kürzungen*] [*zum Opfer*] **fiel** *auch das vierteljährlich erscheinende*
the cutbacks to.the victim fell also the quarterly appearing

Magazin *aktuell, das* (...)
magazine aktuell which
‘The quarterly aktuell, which (...), fell victim to the cutbacks, too.’
(Müller, 2005a: 302)
- d. [*Dem Zeitgeist*] [*Rechnung*] **tragen** *im unterfränkischen Raum die privaten,*
the time.spirit bill carry in.the Lower.Franconian area the private,

städtischen und kommunalen Musikschulen.
municipal and communal music.schools
‘The private, municipal and communal schools of music in the area of Lower Franconia have regard to the spirit of the time.’
(Müller, 2005a: 304)

- e. [*Endlich*] [*Ruhe*] [*in die Sache*] **brachte** *die neue deutsche Schwulenbewegung*
 finally calm in the affair brought the new German gay.movement
zu Beginn der siebziger Jahre.
 at beginning of.the seventy years
 ‘It was the new German gay movement that calmed down the affair finally at
 the beginning of the seventies.’
 (Müller, 2005a: 303)

In (7) and (8) all preverbal elements represent non-subject constituents. In rare cases, an apparent multiple prefield is also possible with the subject of the clause accompanied by an adverb. In the passive construction in (9) it is the logical object of the predicate that is syntactically realized as the subject:

- (9) [*Richtig*] [*Geld*] **wird aber** *nur im Briefgeschäft verdient.*
 really money is however only in.the letter.business earned
 ‘However, heavy money is only being made in the postal delivery business.’
 (Müller, 2005a: 299)

But even a logical subject can appear in an apparent multiple prefield, like in (10):

- (10) [*Weiterhin*] [*Hochbetrieb*] **herrscht am** *Innsbrucker Eisoval.*
 further high.traffic reigns at.the Innsbruck icerink
 ‘It’s still all go at the Innsbruck icerink.’
 (Bildhauer and Cook, 2010: 72)

Prototypically, however, it is not the subject that takes part in this prefield construction. Rather, it tends to follow the verb, like in (7) and (8). Mostly multiple non-subject constituents are placed preverbally.

Based on these empirical observations Müller (2003, 2005a) suggests the following analysis for data like the one in (7) and (8) – and this is the “apparent” part of the notion multiple prefield: In the case of non-subject arguments and adjuncts occupying the prefield simultaneously one is not dealing with two (or more) discrete constituents. Rather, the preverbal material can be grouped together forming one large constituent, namely a single VP. This view entails the additional assumption that the head of this phrase is empty. This is illustrated by the minimal pair in (11):

- (11) a. [[*Auf dem Polterabend*] [*die Teller*] [*zerschlagen*]]_{VP} **hat** *Hans zu früh.*
 at the clatter.evening the plates smashed has Hans too early
 b. [[*Auf dem Polterabend*] [*die Teller*] [_]]_{VP} **hat** *Hans zu früh zerschlagen.*
 on the clatter.evening the plates has Hans too early smashed
 ‘At the eve-of-wedding party Hans smashed the plates too early.’

In (11a) the verb-dependent constituents occupy the prefield together with the verb they are dependent on. In (11b) the verb remains in its canonical position and only the adverbial and the direct object appear preverbally, but still dependent on the verb. To model this parallelism, a sentence-initial VP is assumed in both cases. The difference is that the verbal head in the apparent multiple prefield (= (11b)) is empty.¹⁰ Müller's analysis entails that apparent multiple prefields do not have a V3 order. On the contrary, in accordance with the V2 constraint the prefield is filled with exactly one complex VP-constituent.

4.1.2 Information structure of apparent multiple prefields

Apparent multiple prefields are licensed under specific discourse-pragmatic conditions (Bildhauer and Cook, 2010; Bildhauer, 2011; Müller et al., 2012); these are (i) presentational contexts and (ii) contexts where a proposition is evaluated.

Ad (i): In presentational contexts, an apparent multiple prefield is used to instantiate a new discourse referent as a designated topic of the on-going communication. This is illustrated in (12). Here, a new discourse referent is introduced that is directly picked up as the topic of the subsequent utterance (the respective phrases are highlighted by underlining).

- (12) a. Preceding context: *Spannung pur herrschte auch bei den Trapez- Künstlern.*
(...) Musikalisch begleitet wurden die einzelnen Nummern vom Orchester
des Zirkus Busch (...)

‘It was tension pure with the trapeze artists. (...) Each act was musically accompanied by Circus Busch's own orchestra.’

- b. *[[Stets] [einen Lacher] [auf ihrer Seite]] hatte die Bubi Ernesto Family.*
 always a laugh at their side had the Bubi Ernesto Family
 ‘Always good for a laugh was the Bubi Ernesto Family.’

- c. Following context: *Die Instrumental-Clowns zeigten ausgefeilte Gags und*
Sketche (...)
 ‘These instrumental clowns presented sophisticated jokes and sketches (...).’
 (Bildhauer and Cook, 2010: 71)

The designated topic, marked by the apparent multiple prefield construction, is the most topical referent. Prototypically it is the referent of the grammatical subject of the clause. It remains in

¹⁰ For a detailed discussion of apparent multiple fronting constructions either with an overt verbal head (11a) or with an empty head (11b) see Müller et al. (2012). Based on a corpus analysis the authors follow up on the question whether these two patterns are in free variation or if explanatory variables can be identified that give reason for the assumption that one construction is preferred over the other depending on the context.

the postverbal domain and the non-designated material is shifted into the preverbal domain to strengthen the presentational effect. The likelihood of subjects to be (designated) topics can account for the observation that non-subject phrases are more likely to be part of an apparent multiple prefield than subject phrases. Cases like (10), here repeated as (13) and complemented with context information, where the subject is part of the prefield, are licensed if the designated topic is a non-subject constituent:

- (13) a. Preceding context: *Gesucht? Schnelle Sprinter*
'Wanted: fast sprinters'
- b. [*Weiterhin*] [*Hochbetrieb*] **herrscht** *am Innsbrucker Eisoval.*
further high.traffic reigns at.the Innsbruck icerink
'It's still all go at the Innsbruck icerink.'
- c. Following context: *Nach der Zweibahntournee am Dreikönigstag stehen an diesem Wochenende die österreichischen Staatsmeisterschaften im Sprint am Programm.*
'Following the two-rink tournament on Epiphany-Day there's now the Austrian National Championship in Sprinting coming up at the weekend.'
(Bildhauer and Cook, 2010: 72)

In the case of *herrschen* 'to reign' with an existential reading it is feasible that the newly introduced local adverbial functions as a designated topic for the subsequent utterance. The local expression is placed in the postverbal domain whereas the subject is part of the preverbal VP-constituent.

Ad (ii): The second usage domain of apparent multiple prefields is the evaluation of an expressed proposition. An example is given in (14):

- (14) a. Preceding context: *Im Schlussabschnitt war den Berlinern das Bemühen durchaus anzumerken, vor ausverkauftem Haus ein Debakel zu verhindern.*
'During the last phase of the match, it was clearly visible that the Berlin players were struggling to fight off a debacle in the packed arena.'
- b. [*Dem Spiel*] [*eine Wende*] **konnten sie** *aber nicht mehr geben.*
to.the match a turn could they however not more give
'However, they didn't manage to turn the match around.'
- c. Following context: *Rob Shearer (46.) traf noch einmal den Pfosten, das nächste Tor erzielten aber wieder die Gäste.*
'In the 46th minute, Rob Shearer hit the post again, but it was the guests who scored the next goal.'
(Bildhauer and Cook, 2010: 72-73)

In contrast to (13b), in (14b) no new designated topic is presented in the postverbal domain. Rather, the subject *sie* ‘they’ can best be analyzed as an aboutness topic, referring back to *den Berlinern* ‘the Berliners’ in (14a). The apparent multiple prefield contains the constituents that belong to the comment domain which provides information about the topic *sie* ‘they’. We see here a reversed topic-comment structure, since prototypically the topic precedes the comment. Together with the aboutness topic the postverbal domain contains evaluative material that quantifies the extent to which the comment holds for the topic; in (14b) this function is fulfilled by the negation particle *nicht* ‘not’.

To summarize the grammatical and information-structural characteristics of apparent multiple prefields, non-subject constituents are more likely to take part in an apparent multiple prefield than subjects. A reason for this distribution can be found in the information-structural conditions of this word order pattern. It is used either to present a new designated topic for the subsequent sentence or to evaluate the comment given about a topic. In both cases the topical material remains in the postverbal domain. Since topics are likely to be encoded as subjects, subjects are typically placed postverbally within this construction. Both information-structural types of apparent multiple prefields share the property that it is the pragmatic (topical) status of the material remaining in the postverbal domain that licenses the occupation of the prefield by multiple non-topical constituents.

4.2 Genuine multiple prefields: the AdvXV construction

In this section I will outline the grammatical and discourse-pragmatic characteristics of the AdvXV pattern. This examination is based on a qualitative analysis of instances of AdvXV collected from the data sources introduced in chapter 2.2. Although superficially similar, I will show that AdvXV can be distinguished from apparent multiple prefields at both levels, grammar and information structure. This is going to reveal that AdvXV constitutes a real multiple prefield resulting in a V3 order. The grammatical as well as the discourse-pragmatic analysis of AdvXV in spoken German represents, in part, an extension of the analysis already proposed for this phenomenon in the urban vernacular Kiezdeutsch.

4.2.1 Grammar of AdvXV

Grammatically, AdvXV can be described with respect to (i) the prosodic status of the initial Adv-constituent, (ii) the syntactic and semantic properties of the initial Adv-constituent, and (iii) the syntax of the preverbal X-constituent.

At least since the work of Altmann (1981) it is well known that the prosody of a syntactically peripheral constituent is important for the degree of integration of this constituent into its host clause. Peripheral constituents can be counted as an independent prosodic unit with a lower level of syntactic integration if they bear their own stress pattern and are followed by a falling or rising intonational contour. I controlled for these factors as far as possible, given the accessibility and the quality of the auditory material within the corpora and the data collection I used. I aimed to include into my analysis only those AdvXV structures whose initial adverbial can be considered prosodically integrated into the host, i.e. only instances of AdvXV where the initial adverbial (a) does not bear a stress pattern of its own and (b) is followed by a progradient or only scarcely rising or falling intonation. With respect to its semantics the initial adverbial can express a variety of meanings: temporal (15a, b), local (15c), causal (15d), conditional (15e), and modal (15f). Adverbials with a temporal reading are the most frequent ones within the sample.

- (15) a. [*jetzt*] [*ich*] **wollte** *Sie treffen* (...)
 now I wanted you meet
 Now I wanted to meet you.'
 (TüBa-D/S, s159)
- b. [*Jedes Jahr*] [*ich*] **kauf** *mir bei Deichmann*.
 every year I buy me at Deichmann
 'Every year I buy (them) at Deichmann's [= a footwear store].'
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu9WT)
- c. [*In der Mitte des Zuges* (...)] [*Sie*] **können** *sie gerne benutzen*.
 in the middle the train you can it gladly use
 'In the middle of the train (...) you're welcome to use it.'
 (Announcement in a local train, 29 June 2011)
- d. [*Weil ich frech war*], [*sie*] **hat** *mich zur Tafel geholt*.
 because I cheeky was she has me to.the blackboard fetched
 'Because I was cheeky she has fetched me to the blackboard.'
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu17MA)
- e. [*Wenn der Mann das hört*] [*er*] **wird** *sagen* (...)
 if the man that hears he will say

‘If the man hears that, he will say (...).’
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu9WT)

- f. [*Eventuell*] [*beim Verumfokus*] **kann** *das* *vorkommen*.
possibly at.the verum.focus can that appear
‘Possibly, verum focus can exhibit that.’
(Plenary talk at a conference, 23 Feb 2011)

The examples in (15) also indicate the possible syntactic categories of the adverbials. The adverbial can be realized by an adverb phrase (15a, f), a determiner phrase (15b) a prepositional phrase (15c), or a complementizer phrase (15d, e).

One might expect that only relatively short and phonologically light adverbials can be hosted by the Adv-slot in AdvXV, thereby confronting the hearer as well as the listener with a more gentle violation of the V2 constraint. But as is shown by the data in (15), the adverbial constituents differ considerably in length and phonological weight. They range from rather light ones like *jetzt* ‘now’ in (15a) to heavy ones like *wenn der Mann das hört* ‘if the man hears that’ in (15e). The appearance of an initial adverbial is also documented for cases of apparent multiple prefields (8a, b). Therefore this cannot be taken as a grammatical criterion to distinguish this construction from AdvXV sharply.

What differentiates AdvXV from apparent multiple prefields, however, is the syntactic function of the X-constituent directly preceding the finite verb. Within my sample of AdvXV instances, it is almost always the subject of the clause that occupies the X-slot in AdvXV (apart from just a few exceptions, cf. (18)). In the vast majority, this subject is realized as a pronoun, like in (16):

- (16) a. [*dann*] [*ich*] **gebe** *dem Hotel Bescheid* (...).
then I give the hotel notification
‘Then I inform the hotel (...).’
(TüBa-D/S, s2275)

- b. [*Später*] [*alle*] **kommen** *zu mir*.
later all come to me
‘Later everybody will come to me.’
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu9WT)

Only in rare cases the subject is represented by a full lexical phrase, see (17):

- (17) a. [*Danach*] [*die Frau*] **ist so** *ausgerastet*.
afterwards the woman is PTCL freaked.out
‘Afterwards the woman freaked out.’
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu17MA)

- b. [*Letzte Woche*] [*die große Brosche*] **kam** ja auch wieder.
 last week the big brooch came PTCL also again
 ‘Last week the big brooch was presented again.’
 (TV show “Kalkofes Mattscheibe”, 6 Oct 2011)

In contrast to AdvXV, the subject constituent in apparent multiple prefields is typically realized in the postverbal domain. On the grammatical level this is one of the major differences between the two constructions. Furthermore, the preverbal appearance of the subject disqualifies the prefield to be analyzed as one large VP constituent in cases of AdvXV. In the model proposed by Müller (2003, 2005a) the subject is assumed to be VP-external. This captures why the subject does not undergo fronting in apparent multiple prefields. Thus, for AdvXV it has to be assumed that one is dealing with a proper V3 structure.

The foregoing characterization is valid for the prototypical realizations of each of the two constructions. But there is no categorical distinction. As illustrated in (10), there are examples of apparent multiple prefields with a subject in preverbal position. On the grammatical level these cases could also be classified as realizations of AdvXV. Likewise, one can observe instances of AdvXV with an object occupying the X-slot that could also be subsumed under the notion of apparent multiple prefields, cf. (18), where it is the direct object that occupies the X-slot of AdvXV:

- (18) a. [*Irgendwo*] [*Abstriche*] **muss** man machen.
 somewhere limits must one make
 ‘At some point, one has to lower one’s sights.’
 (Private conversation, 15 March 2011)
- b. [*danach dann*]¹¹ [*das*] **schneiden** die aus.
 afterwards then this cut they out
 ‘Afterwards then, they cut this out.’
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu9WT)

To sum up the grammatical characteristics of AdvXV, the Adv-slot can be filled with adverbial constituents of different semantic types realized by different syntactic categories. Temporal adverbials are most likely to occupy this slot. Concerning the X-slot, it is prototypically the subject of the clause that takes up this position. This distinguishes AdvXV from apparent multiple prefields where the subject is most likely to be realized in the postverbal domain. Nevertheless, one can also find grammatically ambiguous cases that fall in-between the prototypical instances of each of the two constructions. Examining the information-structural

¹¹ It is questionable whether *danach dann* ‘afterwards then’ should be considered as one or two constituents. Irrespective of this question, this example constitutes a violation of V2 resulting in (Adv)AdvXV.

properties of AdvXV allows for a clearer demarcation of the two word order patterns. On this basis even the grammatically unclear cases can be classified.

4.2.2 Information structure of AdvXV

I will now motivate and explain the occurrence of AdvXV in terms of discourse pragmatics. At the same time I will argue for a subdivision into two different kinds of constructions realized by the AdvXV pattern. Two different meanings of AdvXV can be distinguished depending on the lexical material which occupies the Adv-slot: (i) AdvXV_{frame-topic} can be used to realize information-structural preferences and to mark frame setters and aboutness topics simultaneously by syntactic means; (ii) AdvXV_{temporal} can be used for the syntactic marking of a temporal connective at the discourse level. I will outline the first type in this section before taking a closer and more extensive look at the role of AdvXV in the marking of a discourse-functional connective (see section 5).

Pursuing a discourse-pragmatic explanation of AdvXV is based on the observation that the left sentence periphery is often used to mark the discourse-pragmatic or information-structural status of certain constituents (Rizzi, 1997; Grohmann, 2003; Benincà and Poletto, 2004). Information-structural concepts that are important not only for the syntactic distribution are ‘focus – background’, ‘topic – comment’, frame setting, and contrast (Krifka, 2008). In the following, I am going to illustrate only the syntactic behaviour of topics and frame setters, since these notions are of special relevance for the explanation of the AdvXV type of variation in the German prefield.

German is not a discourse-configurational language. However, one can identify tendencies of constituents with a certain information-structural status to be realized in a specific syntactic position. This is illustrated in (19a) for the topic status of a constituent, namely the pronoun *ich* ‘I’:

- (19) a. [*Ich*] **war** *gedanklich bei meinem Landeanflug (...)*
I was in.my.mind at my landing.approach
‘In my mind I was at my approach for a landing (...).’
(DECOW2012: 41648484)
- b. [*Gedanklich*] **fühle** *ich mich ohne Pumpe irgendwie freier (...)*.
in.my.mind feel I myself without pump somehow freer
‘In my mind I feel myself freer without having a pump (...).’
(DECOW2012: 194862)

In the spirit of Reinhart (1981) the topic can be defined as the referent of a constituent (topic constituent) that the rest of the sentence (the comment) is about. In German, to mark the topic status of a constituent's referent, this constituent is typically placed in the prefield of the clause (Hockett, 1958; Molnár, 1993). This is in accordance with the intuition that in (19a) a comment is made about the topic *ich* 'I' rather than about *meinen Landeanflug* 'my approach for landing'. But it is not only the topic that tends to be realized in the prefield. This preference also holds for frame setters, for example *gedanklich* 'in (my) mind' in (19b). Frame setters delimit the applicability of the main predication. They provide the interpretative frame for the subsequent utterance (Chafe, 1976; Jacobs, 2001; Maienborn, 2001; Krifka, 2008). In (19b) it is the frame *gedanklich* in which the described feeling has to be interpreted.

Within the grammar of Standard German, topics as well as frame setters compete for the same syntactic position. Since the V2 constraint of German restricts the prefield to a single constituent one has to choose whether to put a frame setter or a topic into the syntactically distinguished prefield position.

Taking a closer look at the information-structural status of the two constituents filling the prefield in AdvXV, this violation of V2 can be analyzed as the simultaneous realization of the two information-structural preferences mentioned above: the syntactic marking of the frame setter and the topic of an utterance.

- (20) a. Preceding context:
Ich will nur Latschen, ich schwöre.
'I only want slippers, I swear.'
- b. [*Jedes Jahr*] [*ich*] **kaufe** mir bei *Deichmann*.
every year I buy me at Deichmann
'Every year I buy (them) at Deichmann's [= a footwear store].'
(KiDKo, transcript Mu9WT)
- (21) A: *Ich warte noch bis Monatsende.*
'I'll wait until the end of the month.'
- B: Auf was?
'For what?'
- A: [*Ab jetzt*] [*ich*] **kriege** immer *zwanzig Euro*.
from now I get always twenty euros
'From now on, I'll always get twenty euros.'
(KiDKo, transcript Mu17MA)

(20) and (21) are drawn from the KiezDeutsch Corpus. In both cases the adverbial that occupies the Adv-slot sets the frame in which the subsequent comment about the topic in the X-slot has

to be interpreted. In (20) the assertion that is made about *ich* ‘I’ holds for *jedes Jahr* ‘every year’. In (21) the assertion about someone who is gaining in pocket money is delimited to the time *ab jetzt* ‘from now on’. Depending on the semantics of the adverbial these frames can have a temporal ((20), (21)), local (15c), causal (15d) or conditional (15e) meaning. (15f) above indicates that the frame setter can also affect the modality of an utterance. The data also show the well-known fact that topics typically represent given information already mentioned in the preceding context (indicated by the underlining in the examples (20) and (21)).

The explanation proposed for the occurrence of AdvXV in Kiezdeutsch is that the multilingual setting results in a greater tolerance towards variation and the violation of grammatical constraints. One of those is the weakening of the V2 rule of Standard German. But this weakening does not result in an anything-goes situation. Instead, the violation of V2 is driven by the realization of information-structural strategies, namely the above-mentioned placing of both frame setter and topic in front of the finite verb (Wiese, 2009, 2011; Wiese et al., 2009; Wiese et al., 2012).

As already pointed out, this distribution of information-structural categories is not restricted to Kiezdeutsch but can also be found in AdvXV data observable in spoken German outside multilingual settings. The examples in (22) and (23) come from the supplementary collection of AdvXV examples from everyday conversations (see section 2).

- (22) a. General context:
Interview with a taxi driver about the subject “tip”.
- b. [*In anderen Städten*] [*das*] ***gibt*** *es nicht*.
in other cities that gives it not
‘In other cities it (= the tip) doesn’t exist.’
(Presenter of the TV show “Extra”, 15 Oct 2012)
- (23) a. General context:
Conversation about one’s bad mood when there is no sunlight.
- b. [*Im Winter*] [*du*] ***hast*** *ab drei Uhr kein Licht mehr*.
in.the winter you have from three o’clock no light more
‘During winter, there is no light from 3 o’clock on.’
(Private conversation, 4 July 2012)

Importantly, the speakers who produced this data did not grow up in a multilingual environment. This shows that grammatical phenomena like AdvXV which have first been observed in Kiezdeutsch are also part of contemporary German spoken in a monolingual environment. As a reason for the weakening of V2 in spoken German in general, I assume the interactive and time-constrained character of spoken language. This allows for a more liberal

use of discourse-pragmatic mechanisms like the packaging of information in the prefield of an utterance. This approach covers the occurrence of AdvXV in both data sets, spoken German in a mono- as well as in a multilingual setting. Beyond that, a multilingual setting might boost the frequency of this pattern or enable the insertion of specific lexical material, but is not a necessary condition for its usage.¹²

The relevance of discourse-pragmatic principles for the structure of spoken utterances is also reported for the rightward attachment of certain constituents to assign them a specific discourse-pragmatic status (Altmann, 1981; Vinckel, 2006; Averintseva-Klisch, 2009; Imo, 2011). Auer (1991) subsumes such structures under the notion of “expansion” and points to the discourse-pragmatic role of adverbials in a right-peripheral position.

The proposed information-structural analysis of AdvXV also makes it possible to distinguish this pattern from apparent multiple prefields at the discourse-pragmatic level. Whereas apparent multiple prefields are used to present new information as a designated topic for the subsequent sentence (like in (12)) or to evaluate and qualify the comment that is given about a certain topic (like in (14)), AdvXV does not have a presentational or an evaluative effect. Instead, AdvXV is used to establish an interpretative frame for the comment given about a topic. In contrast to the designated topic type of apparent multiple prefields, the topic in AdvXV usually presents given information that is mentioned in the preceding context. With respect to the topic-comment structure of the two different patterns, one is dealing with two inverse orders: In AdvXV the topic can be identified in the prefield followed by the comment in the postverbal domain. In apparent multiple prefields it is the commenting material that occupies the prefield and precedes the postverbal topic. The following table summarizes the distinctive grammatical and discourse-pragmatic properties of the two constructions (this synopsis will undergo further refinement later, see Table 2 in section 5).

¹² Similar frequency and generalization effects have been documented for the use of *so* ‘like’ as a focus marker in a monolingual vs. a multilingual setting (Wiese, 2011b).

		Grammar	Discourse pragmatics
AdvXV	preverbal	Adverbial constituent prototypically followed by the subject of the clause	Marking of a frame setter and a topic within one utterance
	postverbal	Non-subject arguments and other adverbials	Commenting about the topic
Apparent multiple prefields	preverbal	Different types of constituents, predominantly non-subjects	Non-designated material or the comment about the topic
	postverbal	Prototypically subject and evaluative expressions	Designation of a topic or evaluation of the comment

Table 1: Distinction between AdvXV and apparent multiple prefields.

The distinctive discourse-pragmatic characteristics of the two constructions also help to disentangle the grammatically ambiguous cases. Cases like (13), here repeated as (24), where an adverbial and the subject occupy the prefield (hence structurally AdvXV) behave information-structurally like apparent multiple prefields:

- (24) a. Preceding context:
Gesucht? Schnelle Sprinter
'Wanted: fast sprinters'
- b. [*Weiterhin*] [*Hochbetrieb*] *herrscht am Innsbrucker Eisoal*.
further high.traffic reigns at.the Innsbruck icerink
'It's still all go at the Innsbruck icerink.'
- c. Following context: *Nach der Zweibahntournee am Dreikönigstag stehen an diesem Wochenende die österreichischen Staatsmeisterschaften im Sprint am Programm*.
'Following the two-rink tournament on Epiphany-Day there's now the Austrian National Championship in Sprinting coming up at the weekend.'
(Bildhauer and Cook, 2010: 72)

In (24b) the preverbal subject cannot be identified as the (contextually given) topic as it should be in an AdvXV construction. Instead, (24b) can best be analysed as a presentational all-new sentence with *am Innsbrucker Eisoal* 'at the Innsbruck icerink' as the designated topic for the subsequent sentence. The same disambiguation can be conducted for cases such as (18), here repeated as (25).

- (25) a. General context:
A conversation about the editing of recorded material.
- b. [*danach dann*] [*das*] *schneiden die aus*.
afterwards then that cut they out

‘Afterwards then, they cut it out.’
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu9WT)

(25b) could be structurally analysed as an apparent multiple prefield because there are only non-subject arguments in the initial position. However, information-structurally (25b) behaves like AdvXV since the object *das* ‘that’ is a contextually given topic realized in the prefield. No presentational effect or propositional evaluation is implied.¹³

In a nutshell, I have shown so far that AdvXV can be considered a discrete construction of spoken German. It can be distinguished from another case where more than one constituent appear in sentence-initial position: apparent multiple prefields. This distinction can be drawn at the grammatical as well as the information-structural level.

4.2.3 Evidence from historical stages of German

Further evidence for the proposed information-structural analysis of AdvXV can be obtained from historical stages of German: Middle Low German (MLG) and Early New High German (ENHG). In MLG canonical declarative main clauses display the same V2 properties as those in contemporary German. However, violations of this constraint can be observed in MLG, too. Among others, these deviations display the same word order as the one observed in spoken contemporary German: AdvXV, cf. (26):

(26) [*Nicht langhe darna*] [*der sone*] *volghete na vor ludeke*.
not long after.that the son followed PTCL for Lübeck
‘Not long after that the son followed towards Lubeck.’
(Petrova, 2012: 174)

Petrova (2012) proposes an information-structural explanation for AdvXV in MLG that is comparable to the one given here for the occurrence of AdvXV in contemporary spoken German. She argues for a relatively fixed order of information-structural categories in the prefield of declarative main clauses where frame setters regularly occupy the initial position in the prefield, followed by the topic constituent, as is shown in (26).

¹³ Furthermore, the occurrence of objects in AdvXV can be taken as evidence against the assumption that it is an underlying SVO order that generates AdvXV structures. If one took the subject cases of AdvXV into consideration, their grammatical structure could be analyzed as parallel to the one of declarative main clauses in English with an initial adverbial, hence (Adv)SVO. Such an analysis would predict that it is impossible for objects to occupy the X-slot of AdvXV. But on the basis of (18), such an analysis must be rejected.

The same pattern can be found in ENHG. Beside the canonical V2 case, declarative main clauses can exhibit a non-canonical AdvXV order resulting from the distribution of information-structural categories: frame setter preceding topic (Speyer, 2008); this is illustrated in (27):

(27) [*Jm* 6886. *Jar*] [*der Großfu^erst DEMETRI*] **hat** *den ma^echtigen Tatarischen*
in.the 6886th year the grand.prince Demetri has the mighty Tartar

Khu^enig MAMAI geschlagen.

king Mamai beaten

‘In the 6886th year the grand prince Demetri has beaten the mighty Tatar king

Mamai.’

(Speyer, 2008: 479)

In the remainder of this paper I will turn to the question whether all instances of AdvXV collected from my different data sources behave semantically similar or whether differences in their interpretation can be identified. To answer this question I will focus on the semantic and discourse-pragmatic status of temporal adverbials occupying the Adv-slot.

5 The development towards discourse connectives: temporal adverbs in AdvXV

The previous section has shown that sentences like (23b), here repeated as (28b), can best be analyzed as a frame setter preceding a topic in the prefield of the utterance.

- (28) a. General context:
Conversation about one's bad mood when there is no sunlight.
- b. [*Im Winter*] [*du hast ab drei Uhr kein Licht mehr.*]
in.the winter you have from three o'clock no light more
'During winter, there is no light from 3 o'clock on.'
(Private conversation, 4 July 2012)

In this type of AdvXV_{frame-topic} construction the semantic scope of the frame element is limited to the predication of the rest of the utterance and delimits it in time. In contrast, the initial slot of AdvXV can also be occupied by adverbials of a semantically different type, as illustrated by (29b, d):

- (29) a. Preceding context:
Ich habe gestern gesehen bei Netlog, was sie geschrieben hat. Ich meinte nur so: "Ach so! Dein Ernst?"
'Yesterday I've seen on Netlog what she has written. I simply said like: "I see! Are you serious?"'
- b. [*Danach*] [*sie fängt an zu schreien.*]
afterwards she starts to shout
'Afterwards she starts shouting.'
- c. Intermediate context:
Ich meinte zu ihr: "Schrei nicht so!" und so. "Ja?"
'I told her: "Don't scream like that. Okay?"'
- d. *Und [dann] [sie sagt so:*
and then she says like

"Ich schreie so, wie ich will."
I scream such as I want
'And then she says like: "I scream as I like."
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu9WT)

The semantic difference between the AdvXV construction in (28b) and those in (29b, d) is that *danach* 'afterwards' and *dann* 'then' not only have scope over a single utterance. Instead of delimiting one single utterance the initial adverbs in (29b, d) temporally connect two discourse units. As connectives they constrain the interpretation process by guiding the hearer towards discourse and indicating temporal relations between discourse units understood as relational

propositions (Mann and Thompson, 1986; Rouchota, 1996; Pasch et al., 2003).¹⁴ Hence, I will refer to this type of AdvXV as AdvXV_{temporal}.

The occurrence of these connective adverbs in the Adv-slot of AdvXV is not directly predicted by the information-structural explanation given in the previous chapter because these adverbs do not entail a frame-setting interpretation. Therefore I assume the occurrence of these types of adverbs to be licensed by the expression of a different type of discourse-pragmatic relation. I claim that structures like (29b, d) are used to mark the discourse connective status of *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’ syntactically. As discourse linkers they appear in-between the sentences or discourse units they connect to each other. In this respect they can best be analysed as discourse markers, fulfilling the function of structuring the discourse and organizing the speaker-hearer interaction (Blakemore, 1987; Schiffrin, 1988; Fraser, 1990, 1999; Redeker, 1990; Traugott, 1995; Auer, 1996, 1997; Auer and Günthner, 2005; Taboada, 2006).

In the remaining part of the paper I will discuss some basic characteristics of discourse markers before providing evidence that these properties can best account for the distribution of the two temporal adverbs in AdvXV.

5.1 Some properties of discourse markers

The term “discourse marker” (Schiffrin, 1988; Auer and Günthner, 2005) refers to one of the notions that are used to denote non-truth-conditional linguistic elements that combine clauses, sentences, or utterances into a coherent text or discourse by guiding the hearer through the relations between the uttered propositions. Some equivalent labels are “pragmatic marker” (Fraser, 1990; Redeker, 1990), “discourse connective” (Blakemore, 1987), and “procedural marker” (Traugott, 1997),¹⁵ which, however, come with partly overlapping and partly contradicting definitions. In this paper I follow the definition proposed by Schiffrin (1988) and Redeker (1990) who suggest that discourse markers link the current sentence or utterance to the

¹⁴ Within the coherence-based approach it is assumed that connectives have conceptual meaning whereas a relevance-theoretic approach towards connectives claims that they encode procedural meaning and point the hearer to a certain contextual position. See Rouchota (1996) for discussion and for a comparison of these two different approaches.

¹⁵ See Taboada (2006) for a quantitative investigation of the use of discourse markers among other devices in the expression of rhetorical relations within spoken and written text.

immediate context.¹⁶ In the German context the term discourse marker is mostly used for those discourse-organizing elements that occupy a peripheral syntactic position before or after a sentence that, considered by itself, is independent (Auer and Günthner, 2005).¹⁷ Independence means that the sentence remains grammatical when the peripheral discourse marking material is elided. An example for a discourse marker is given by the minimal pair in (30b) and (31b):

- (30) a. Preceding context:
Ich weiß es nicht.
 ‘I don’t know.’
- b. [*Ich*] **werde** mir heute [*auf jeden Fall*] meine Kohle holen.
 I will me today in any case my coal fetch
 ‘Today I’ll fetch my dough, in any case.’
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu6MD)
- (31) a. Preceding context:
Wir müssen Mittag und Abendessen selber zahlen. Nur Frühstück ist mit dabei.
 ‘We have to buy lunch and dinner on our own. Only breakfast is included.’
- b. [*Auf jeden Fall*] [*ich*] **freue** mich schon.
 on every case I enjoy me already
 ‘In any case, I’m already looking forward (to it).’
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu1WD)

In (30b) the prepositional phrase *auf jeden Fall* ‘in any case’ appears in the postverbal domain and commits the speaker to the assertion that he or she has made and asserts its truth. In contrast to that, by occurring in a peripheral position like in (31b) *auf jeden Fall* gains a discourse pragmatic function that differs from its integrated counterpart. In this left-peripheral position it signals the return to the main part of the narration. Hence, the distinctive feature of these two different interpretations is the peripheral status of the phrase, with the peripheral one as the discourse marker.

The syntactically peripheral status can also be accompanied by a specific prosodic pattern of the discourse marker. It can form a prosodically independent unit carrying a main or secondary stress of its own and a falling contour (Auer and Günthner, 2005); it can even be separated by a pause (Fraser, 1990). But there are cases of syntactically peripheral discourse

¹⁶ Fraser (1999) gives a narrower definition of discourse markers, including only those expressions that connect two sentences or clauses together.

¹⁷ It has frequently been noted that the meaning of an adverb is highly correlated with its possible position within a sentence (Jackendoff, 1972; Ernst, 2007).

markers that do not display this phonological pattern. Therefore, the prosody can neither be taken as a necessary nor a sufficient condition for the status as a discourse marker.

Discourse markers have developed out of different lexical sources: adverbs (for example: *jedenfalls* ‘anyway’, *eigentlich* ‘in fact’), subordinating conjunctions (e.g. *obwohl* ‘although’) and coordinating conjunctions (e.g. *und* ‘and’), matrix clauses with verbs of saying and thinking (for instance *ich meine* ‘I mean’), and imperatives of verbs of saying and thinking (*sag mal* ‘tell me’) (Fraser, 1990; Traugott, 1995; Günthner and Auer, 2005). In (32) and (33) I give two more illustrative examples with the adverb *jedenfalls* ‘anyway’ and the coordinating conjunction *und* ‘and’:

- (32) a. [Ich] **würde** mich [jedenfalls] freuen (...)
 I would me anyway be.happy
 ‘I would be happy anyway.’
 (DECOW2012: 2852396)
- b. [Jedenfalls] [es] **erstaunt** mich (...)
 anyway it surprises me
 ‘Anyway, it surprises me.’
 (DECOW2012: 46011316)
- (33) a. *Wo legen wir Widerspruch ein [und] [wessen Daten] löschen wir einfach?*
 where lay we objection in and whose data delete wir simple?
 ‘Where do we raise an objection and whose data do we simply
 (DECOW2012: 474361)
- b. **schieb** die CD in Rechner, [und] [was] ist... nix
 push the CD in computer and what is nothing
 ‘I push the CD into the computer, and what happens? Nothing.’
 (DECOW2012: 708464)

The examples in (32) and (33) illustrate again the distributional as well as the semantic differences between the discourse markers and their homophonous, syntactically integrated counterparts. The integrated *jedenfalls* ‘anyway’ in (32a) has a modal meaning. It weakens the relevance of some preceding utterance. As a discourse marker, however, it marks the return to the main part of a narration (32b), comparable to *in jedem Fall* ‘in any case’ in (31b).

The conjunction *und* ‘and’ marks a logical semantic coordination in (33a). In contrast, (33b) cannot be interpreted as a proper semantic/syntactic coordination. In this case *und* ‘and’ functions as a signal of continuation, i.e. that the subsequent information has to be added to the previous one. On the semantic level it can be observed that the semantics of the effected lexemes gets bleached while at the same time it gains a richer pragmatic function when becoming a

discourse marker (Traugott, 1995, 1997; Auer and Günthner, 2005).¹⁸ The lexemes lose their relevance for the truth-value of the uttered propositions, as can be seen in (31)–(33). But at the same time they become important for understanding the pragmatic relationship between the subsequent utterance and the preceding discourse. This development goes hand in hand with an expansion of the scope carried by these elements: within a sentence > one sentence > over several sentences (Auer and Günthner, 2005). With respect to the development of discourse markers out of adverbials, Traugott (1995) puts it as follows: Diachronically the process starts with a predicate-modifying adverbial which develops towards a sentence adverbial and ends up as a discourse marker (this generalization is based on her investigation of the adverbial *indeed* in English).

Departing from the displayed properties of discourse markers I will show that *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’ in AdvXV_{temporal} are best analyzed as developing towards connectives at the discourse level.

5.2 *Dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’ as discourse connectives

As has been shown in the previous section, syntactically, the examined temporal connectives behave like discourse markers. The connective adverb *dann* ‘then’ occupies a syntactically peripheral position in AdvXV_{temporal}, as in (34)–(36):

- (34) a. Preceding context:
Gestern waren wir schon voll drauf. Mann!
 ‘Yesterday we’ve been totally on, man!’
- b. [*Dann*] [*die*] *sind* *weg*.
 then they are away
 ‘Then they disappeared.
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu11MD)
- (35) a. Preceding context:
 A: *Ich weiß, von wo du kommst.* – B: G. (= Park in Berlin)
 ‘I know where you come from.’ – ‘G. (= park in Berlin)’
- b. A: *Und [*dann*] [*da*] *ist doch die U-Bahn und so.*
 and then there is PTCL the underground and PTCL*

¹⁸ In the context of an increasing degree of pragmaticalization, Traugott (1995) points to the subjectification of discourse markers, meaning that they become increasingly associated with the speaker’s attitude towards discourse flow.

‘And then there is the underground.’
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu2WT)

- (36) a. Preceding context:
Also, ich habe ja eine Vorliebe persönlich für Oper.
‘Well, personally I have a fondness for the opera.’
- b. [*Dann*] [*ich*] **sehe** *jetzt Don Giovanni von Mozart.*
then I see now Don Giovanni from Mozart
‘Then I’ll see Don Giovanni by Mozart now.’
(TüBa-D/S, s2852)

The same holds for the connective pronominal adverb *danach* ‘afterwards’ (consisting of preposition + demonstrative pronoun) in (37b, c) and (38b):

- (37) a. Preceding context:
Sie hat mit der Blablabla Freundschaft geschickt.
‘She makes friends with blablabla.’
- b. [*Danach*] [*du*] **hast** *sie angeschrien.*
afterwards you have her at.shouted
‘Afterwards you shouted at her.’
- c. *Und [danach] [sie] hat zurück angeschrien.*
and afterwards she has back at.shouted
‘And afterwards she shouted back at you.’
(KiDKo, transcript: Mu11MD)
- (38) a. Preceding context:
Sie wird hier bald ihren Abschluss machen.
‘Soon, she will receive her degree here.’
- b. [*Danach*] [*ihr Traum*] **ist** *die Bühne.*
afterwards her dream is the stage
‘Afterwards her dream is the stage.’
(TV interview, ZDFinfo, 14 Aug 2011)

In all examples given above the adverbs express the chronological order of events and subdivide the discourse into smaller, temporally ordered units. They do so by appearing in-between the units they link to each other temporally. With the exception of (36b) the adverbs are used to structure the rhetorical relations within a narration. The temporally linked events can contain a continuing topic (see (36b)) or a topic switch (see (37b, c)), or they introduce new information (38b).

From the theory of discourse markers it is predicted that the development towards a discourse marking element goes hand in hand with a process of semantic bleaching accompanied by a

strengthening of the pragmatic function. Although more data is needed for a final answer to the question on semantic bleaching, the current data sample provides valuable hints about this process. If the semantics of *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’ is weakened it follows that its semantics has less influence on the truth-value of the utterance. This entails that the temporal modification within the utterance can be carried out by a different temporal adverb. This is borne out by data like (36). The sentence in (36b) exemplifies the discourse-connective function of *dann* ‘then’ in a straightforward way. The temporal modification within the clause is already provided by *jetzt* ‘now’. The adverb *dann* ‘then’ only expresses the temporal ordering relation between the two events at discourse level. Another example is given in (39) containing the sentence-internal adverbial *heute* ‘today’.

- (39) a. Preceding context:
Diesmal war es eigentlich okay.
 ‘This time it was okay, actually.’
- b. [*Dann*] [*heute*] ***habe*** *ich eigentlich auch nichts Besonderes gemacht.*
 then today have I actually also nothing special made
 ‘Then, today I didn’t do anything special, actually.’
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu1WD)

Comparable data can also be found for *danach* ‘afterwards’ with the discourse connective in a left-peripheral position and a predicate modifying adverbial in the subsequent utterance, see (40):

- (40) a. Preceding context:
Und sie hat mich besiegt.
 ‘And she’s beaten me.’
- b. *Und [danach] [am Ende] haben wir so einfach weitergeredet.*
 and afterwards at.the end have we like simply further.talked
 ‘Afterwards, we continued talking at the end.’
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu25MA)

Another interesting observation is that a lot of the temporal discourse connectives in the data set are preceded by the conjunction *und* ‘and’. The particle is not used as a logical semantic coordinator, however. Rather, these cases behave like *und* ‘and’ in (33b), where it needs to be analyzed as a discourse marker signaling continuation. An example is already contained in (40b). Further evidence is provided by (41b) and (42b).

- (41) a. Preceding context:
Und dann sagt sie, jetzt wird nie wieder eine Fahrt stattfinden.
 ‘And then she says that no excursion will ever be made again.’

- b. *und [dann] [nächstes Jahr] findet wieder eine statt.*
 and then next year takes again one place
 ‘And then, another one takes place next year.’
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu1WD)

(42) a. Preceding context:
Sie denkt, dass du über sie lästerst. Du weißt doch.
 ‘She thinks you slag her off. You know?’

- b. *und [dann] [sie] hat mir gesagt (...).*
 and then she has me told
 ‘And then she told me (...).’
 (KiDKo, transcript: Mu9WT)

The co-occurrence with *und* ‘and’ strengthens the sequencing effect of the temporal discourse connective *dann* by marking the continuation of the discourse and establishing a temporal relation to the previous discourse unit by the discourse connective.

By investigating their syntactic as well as their semantic and pragmatic behaviour I have shown that the adverbs *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’ develop towards connectives at the discourse level. This does not mean that these two adverbs cannot carry this connective function in a non-peripheral position, too.¹⁹ But occurring in the initial slot of AdvXV and therefore in-between the connected units marks this function explicitly in the syntax. This entails that every temporal connective in AdvXV is a connective at the discourse level. But this does not mean that every non-peripheral adverb is not. This asymmetric correlation has already been discovered by Auer (1996) for other types of discourse markers.

As is the case with instances of AdvXV with a frame-setting interpretation, the syntactic marking of a discourse connective can also be found in historical stages of German, see (43) for an example from MLG:

- (43) [Vortmer] [deme koninghe van bulgherien] **deden** se des geliken
 afterwards the king of Bulgaria did they the same
 ‘Afterwards they did the same to the King of Bulgaria.’
 (Petrova, 2012: 171)

Petrova (2012) analyses this connective construction with reference to the notion of frame setting. I proposed an alternative analysis by showing that connective temporal adverbs – at least in contemporary spoken German – behave differently from frame setters with respect to their scope and discourse function.

¹⁹ See Roßdeutscher and von Stutterheim (2006) for an investigation of the semantic and pragmatic differences arising from different canonical positions of *dann* ‘then’.

The need to map the discourse connective status of temporal adverbs onto the syntactic structure of an utterance by using a marked, non-canonical construction can also be found in other Germanic languages, e.g. English. Birner and Ward (1998) and Birner (2004) investigate a comparable development in English, where the temporal adverb then is realized in a non-canonical position to indicate that it expresses a temporal ordering relation at discourse level. Compared with German, the major difference with regard to non-canonicity is that the non-canonical use of *then* in declaratives yields inversion (i.e. a violation of the SVO base word order of English) (cf. (44b)), whereas the non-canonical use of *dann* in German declaratives does not cause inversion (which violates the V2 constraint) (cf., e.g., (42b) above).

- (44) a. Preceding context:
The braided trumpeters came into view, followed by the Life Guards on their black chargers.
- b. [*Then*] **came** the Guards' band.
 (Birner, 2004: 53)

Although grammatically different, both structures have in common that the same discourse-pragmatic meaning, namely temporal connectivity, is assigned to them.

Taking the two different discourse-pragmatic properties of AdvXV into consideration, the schematic illustration of the grammatical and discourse pragmatic differences between AdvXV and apparent multiple prefields, as outlined in Table 1 above, needs to be revised. A revised version is given in Table 2:

		Grammar	Discourse pragmatics
AdvXV_{temporal}	preverbal	preverbal left-peripheral connective temporal adverb	Marking of a temporal connective at discourse level
AdvXV_{frame-topic}	preverbal	Adverbial constituent prototypically followed by the subject of the clause	Marking of a frame setter and a topic within one utterance
	postverbal	Non-subject arguments and other adverbials	Commenting about the topic
Apparent multiple prefields	preverbal	Different types of constituents, predominantly non-subjects	Non-designated material or the comment about the topic
		Prototypically subject and evaluative expressions	Designation of a topic or evaluation of the comment

Table 2: Distinction between two types of AdvXV (AdvXV_{temporal} and AdvXV_{frame-topic})

6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed word order variation in declarative main clauses of spoken German. I have shown that – in contrast to the conventional view conveyed by the reference grammars of German – spoken German displays a type of violation of the V2 constraint where two discrete constituents appear in front of the finite verb. Prototypically it is an adverbial followed by a verb-dependent constituent which is predominantly the subject of the clause but not restricted to it, in short: AdvXV. It is essential to keep in mind that this type of variation, although reported to exist in multiethnic variants of speaking, is not restricted to this kind of linguistic setting, but can be found in spontaneous spoken German in general.

The AdvXV pattern can be distinguished from another type of V2 deviation in contemporary German, the case of apparent multiple prefields. I have shown that the two constructions differ with respect to their grammatical as well as their discourse-pragmatic properties.

In apparent multiple prefields the preverbal domain is the host of several non-subject constituents, and the subject of the clause is realized postverbally. The subject can be accompanied by different evaluative expressions. Pragmatically this pattern is used for the designation of a topic for the subsequent discourse or, in the presence of evaluative material, for the evaluation of a given comment on an already established topic.

In the AdvXV construction the subject is prototypically part of the preverbal domain and preceded by an adverbial constituent. Pragmatically, AdvXV is used to mark two different types of discourse-pragmatic constructions, AdvXV_{frame-topic} and AdvXV_{temporal}. The first construction allows for a transparent mapping of information structure onto the syntactic structure of a single utterance. That is, it allows for the simultaneous marking of a frame setter and a topic. The second type of AdvXV is used for the syntactic marking of a temporal connective at discourse level. Rather than framing one single utterance, the discourse connective links two relational propositions. These two different types of AdvXV constructions are dependent on the lexical material that is inserted into the Adv-slot. For both types of AdvXV I have shown that correlates can be detected in earlier stages of German (Middle Low German and Early New High German).

The conducted study points to the importance of spoken German in the investigation of synchronic word order variation in declarative main clauses. It emphasizes the relevance of discourse-pragmatics principles for the syntactic structure of spoken utterances. In demonstrating the grammatical and discourse-pragmatic properties of AdvXV as an instance of V3 this study sheds new light on the investigation and discussion of the V2 property of German.

6 Conclusion

Further it highlights a potential relationship between synchronic and diachronic word order variation.

References

- Altmann, Hans (1981). *Formen der Herausstellung im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Auer, Peter (1991). Vom Ende deutscher Sätze. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik*, 19: S. 139–157.
- Auer, Peter (1996). The pre-front position in spoken German and its relevance as a grammaticalization position. *Pragmatics*, 6: S. 295–322.
- Auer, Peter (1997). Formen und Funktionen der Vor-Vorfeldbesetzung im gesprochenen Deutsch. In: P. Schlobinski (Ed.), *Syntax des gesprochenen Deutsch*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. S. 55–91.
- Auer, Peter & Susanne Günthner (2005). Die Entstehung von Diskursmarkern im Deutschen – ein Fall von Grammatikalisierung? In: T. Leuschner, T. Mortelmans & S. De Groot (Eds.), *Grammatikalisierung im Deutschen*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. S. 335–362.
- Averintseva-Klisch, Maria (2009). *Rechte Satzperipherie im Diskurs. Die NP-Rechtsversetzung im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto (2004). Topic, focus and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In: L. Rizzi (Ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*. New York: Oxford University Press. S. 52–75.
- Bierwisch, Manfred (1963). *Grammatik des deutschen Verbs*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Bildhauer, Felix (2011). Mehrfache Vorfeldbesetzung und Informationsstruktur. Eine Bestandsaufnahme. *Deutsche Sprache*, 11: 362–379.
- Bildhauer, Felix & Philippa Cook (2010). German multiple fronting and expected topic-hood. In S. Müller (Ed.), *Proceedings of the HPSG10 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. S. 68–79.
- Birner, Betty J. (2004). Discourse functions at the periphery. Noncanonical word order in English. In: B. Shaer, W. Frey & C. Maienborn (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop*. ZAS Berlin, November 2003. Berlin: ZAS (= ZAS Papers in Linguistics 35). S. 41–62.
- Birner, Betty J. & Gregory Ward (1998). *Information status and noncanonical word order in English*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Blakemore, Diane (1987). *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chafe, Wallace L. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In: C. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press. S. 27–55.
- Clahsen, Harald (1984). The acquisition of German word order: A test case for cognitive approaches to L2 development. In: R. W. Andersen (Ed.), *Second languages. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. S. 219–242.

References

- Drach, Erich (1937, 1963⁴). *Grundgedanken der deutschen Satzlehre*. Frankfurt am Main: Diesterweg.
- Duden (2005). *Die Grammatik*. Herausgegeben von der Dudenredaktion. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- Eisenberg, Peter (1999). *Grundriss der deutschen Sprache. Band 2: Der Satz*. Stuttgart & Weimar: Metzler.
- Engel, Ulrich (1970). Regeln zur Wortstellung. In: Ulrich Engel (Ed.): *Forschungsberichte des Instituts für deutsche Sprache*, 5: S. 9–148.
- Ernst, Thomas (2007). On the role of semantics in a theory of adverb syntax. *Lingua*, 117: S. 1008–1033.
- Fraser, Bruce (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: S. 383–195.
- Fraser, Bruce (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31: S. 931–952.
- Freywald, Ulrike, Katharina Mayr, Tiner Özçelik & Heike Wiese (2011). Kiezdeutsch as a multiethnolect. In: F. Kern & M. Selting (Eds.), *Ethnic styles of speaking in European metropolitan areas*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins. S. 43–75.
- Freywald, Ulrike, Leonie Cornips, Natalia Ganuza, Ingvild Nistov & Toril Opsahl (2015). Beyond verb second – a matter of novel information-structural effects? Evidence from Norwegian, Swedish, German and Dutch. In: J. Nortier & B. A. Svendsen (Eds.), *Language, youth and identity in the 21st century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. S. 73–92.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. (2003). *Prolific domains. On the anti-locality of movement dependencies*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Hockett, Charles F. (1958). *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: McMillan.
- Imo, Wolfgang (2011). Ad hoc-Produktion oder Konstruktion? Verfestigungstendenzen bei Inkrement-Strukturen im gesprochenen Deutsch. In: A. Lasch & A. Ziem (Eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik III. Aktuelle Fragen und Lösungsansätze*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg. S. 239–254.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1972). *Semantic interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jacobs, Joachim (2001). The dimensions of topic-comment. *Linguistics*, 39: S. 641–681.
- Koch, Peter & Wulf Oesterreicher (1994). Schriftlichkeit und Sprache. In: H. Günther & O. Ludwig (Eds.), *Writing and its use. An interdisciplinary handbook of international research* [Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science, 10.1]. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. S. 587–604.
- Krifka, Manfred (2008). Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 55: S. 243–276.

- Maienborn, Claudia (2001). On the position and interpretation of locative modifiers. *Natural Language Semantics*, 9: S. 191–240.
- Mann, William C. & Sandra A. Thompson (1986). Relational propositions in discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 9: S. 57–90.
- Meisel, Jürgen M., Harald Clahsen & Manfred Pienemann (1981). On determining developmental stages in natural second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 3: S. 109–135.
- Molnár, Valéria (1993). Zur Pragmatik und Grammatik des Topik-Begriffes. In: M. Reis (Ed.), *Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. S. 155–202.
- Müller, Stefan (2003). Mehrfache Vorfeldbesetzung. *Deutsche Sprache*, 31: S. 29–62.
- Müller, Stefan (2005a). Zur Analyse der scheinbar mehrfachen Vorfeldbesetzung. *Linguistische Berichte*, 203: S. 297–330.
- Müller, Stefan (2005b). Zur Analyse scheinbarer V3-Sätze. In: F. J. d’Avis, (Ed.), *Deutsche Syntax. Empirie und Theorie*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. S. 173–194.
- Müller, Stefan, Philippa Cook & Felix Bildhauer (2012). Beschränkungen für die scheinbar mehrfache Vorfeldbesetzung. In: C. Cortès (Ed.), *Satzeröffnung. Formen, Funktionen, Strategien*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg. S. 113–128.
- Pasch, Renate, Ursula Brauße, Eva Breindl & Ulrich Hermann Waßner (2003). Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfen (Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln). Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Petrova, Svetlana (2012). Multiple XP-fronting in Middle Low German root clauses. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 15: S. 157–188.
- Pienemann, Manfred (2005). An introduction to Processability Theory. In: M. Pienemann (Ed.), *Cross-linguistic aspects of Processability Theory*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins. S. 1–60.
- Redeker, Gisela (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: S. 367–381.
- Reinhart, Tanya (1981). Pragmatics and linguistics. An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica*, 27: S. 53–94.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In: L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of grammar. Handbook of generative syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. S. 281–337.
- Roßdeutscher, Antje & Christiane von Stutterheim (2006). Semantische und pragmatische Prinzipien der Positionierung von dann. *Linguistische Berichte*, 205: S. 29–60.
- Rouchota, Villy (1996). Discourse connectives: what do they link? UCL Working Papers in *Linguistics*, 8: S. 1–15.

References

- Schäfer, Roland & Felix Bildhauer (2012). Building large corpora from the web using a new efficient tool chain. In: N. Calzolari, K. Choukri, T. T. Declerck, M. U. Dogan, B. Maegaard, J. Mariani, J. Odiijk & P. Stelios (Eds.), *Proceedings of the eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2012)*. Istanbul, ELRA. S. 486–493.
- Schiffrin, Deborah (1988). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Speyer, Augustin (2008). Doppelte Vorfeldbesetzung im heutigen Deutsch und im Frühneuhochdeutschen. *Linguistische Berichte*, 216: S. 455–485.
- Stegmann, Rosmary, Heike Telljohann & Erhard W. Hinrichs (2000). Stylebook for the German Treebank in VERBMOBIL. *Verbmobil Report 239*. University of Tübingen.
- Taboada, Maite (2006). Discourse markers as signals (or not) of rhetorical relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38: S. 567–592.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. (1995). The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at ICHL XII, Manchester.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. (1997). The discourse connective ‘after all’. A historical pragmatic account. Paper presented at the ICL, Paris.
- Vinckel, Hélène (2006). *Die diskursstrategische Bedeutung des Nachfelds im Deutschen. Eine Untersuchung anhand politischer Reden der Gegenwartssprache*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag.
- Wiese, Heike (2006). „Ich mach dich Messer“ – Grammatische Produktivität in Kiez-Sprache (‘Kanak Sprak’). *Linguistische Berichte*, 207: S. 245–273.
- Wiese, Heike (2009). Grammatical innovation in multiethnic urban Europe. New linguistic practices among adolescents. *Lingua*, 119: S. 782–806.
- Wiese, Heike (2011a). The role of information structure in linguistic variation: Evidence from a German multiethnolect. In F. Gregersen, J. K. Parrott & P. Quist (Eds.), *Language variation – European perspectives III. Selected papers from ICLaVE 5, Copenhagen*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins. S. 83–96.
- Wiese, Heike (2011b). So as a focus marker in German. *Linguistics*, 49: S. 991–1039.
- Wiese, Heike (2012): *Kiezdeutsch. Ein neuer Dialekt entsteht*. München: Beck.
- Wiese, Heike, Ulrike Freywald & Katharina Mayr (2009). Kiezdeutsch as a test case for the interaction between grammar and information structure. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam. URL: <http://pub.ub.unipotsdam.de/volltexte/2009/3837/>.
- Wiese, Heike, Ulrike Freywald, Sören Schalowski & Katharina Mayr (2012). Das KiezDeutsch-Korpus. Spontansprachliche Daten Jugendlicher aus urbanen Wohngebieten. *Deutsche Sprache*, 40: S. 97–123.

References

Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann & Bruno Strecker (1997). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.