# Information Structure and syntactic change of V3 orders in Dutch, English and Welsh contact situations

**Introduction.** This paper presents new data from verb-third (V3) word orders in varieties of Dutch, English and Welsh in order to refine the typology of verb-second (V2) languages with information-structural features and shed new light on syntactic change in contact situations. In recent years, some varieties of Germanic V2 languages have been reported to exhibit V3 orders alongside the standard V2 patterns for speaker from both an ethnic as well as monolingual background (see, among others, Freywald et al (2015) and Wiese & Rehbein (2016)). These new Germanic varieties have emerged in multilingual settings. In a new corpus of Urban Dutch (both Moroccan & monolingual in urban settings), there is evidence of similar V3 orders as well (*pace* Freywald et al (2015)):

(1)    a.   *Een keertje ik **was** gewoon aan het fietsen*
           one time   I  was just     on  the cylce.INF
           'One time I was just cycling.'          (Moroccan Urban Dutch)

        b.   *Hier je   **bent** verzekerd.*
           here you are   insured
           'Here you are insured.'          (Moroccan Urban Dutch)

        c.   *Dan   deze jongen of meisje **praat** geen Nederlands.*
           Then this boy   or girl   talks  no   Dutch
           'Then this boy or girl doesn't speak Dutch.'          (Monolingual Urban Dutch)

Older stages of English (cf. Walkden 2017) have been reported to exhibit V2 orders with V3 options as well, as does Middle Welsh (cf. Willis 1998):

(2)    a.   *æfter þison Moyses &   Aaron **eodon** in*
           after this   Moses  and Aaron went   in
           'after this Moses and Aaron went in.'          (Old English - Taylor 2014)

        b.   *Ac  o     'r   diwed ymauael a    **oruc**       Llud*
           and from the end    fight.INF PRT do.PST.3S Llud
           'And in the end Llud fought...'          (Middle Welsh - Llud 159)

**Analysis.** Walkden (2017) proposes an analysis based on a scenario of language contact: L2 speakers fail to acquire a single CP (assumed for 'strict V2' languages like Standard Dutch and German) and the mixed input the next generation is presented with leads to a forced split of the CP in their urban vernacular, e.g. Kiezdeutsch. The resulting split into 'CP1' and 'CP2' is proposed based on the information-structural status of the preverbal constituent as a familiar topic: CP1 conflates FinP and FamP for preverbal constituents (in the sense of Hinterhölzl & Petrova (2009)), whereas CP2 for sentence-initial scene-setters is multifunctional consisting of all higher projections: FocP, ContrP and ShiftP and ForceP. Although Urban Dutch shares almost all properties of the V3 phenomenon found in other European urban youth varieties, the preverbal constituent cannot always be described as a Familiar Topic. In (3a) and (3b), for example, a Shift or Contrastive topic would be more appropriate and examples of focused constituents are found in preverbal position as well.

(3)    a.   *Op een gegeven moment iemand   **zegt** tegen hem je   moet naar Fez*
           at  a    certain time     someone says to   him you must to    Fez
           'At some point someone says to him: you must go to Fez.'      [Urban Dutch - Shift Topic]

        b.   *daarna     de  rest **zegt** ik ga niet*
           afterwards the rest says I  go not
           'Afterwards the rest says: I'm not going.'          [Urban Dutch - Contrastive Topic]

Looking at Urban Dutch, Walkden's (2017) postulated distribution of information-structural projections in CP1 and CP2 would have to be revised to the following structure to accommodate a wider range of information-structural preverbal constituents in CP1:

(4) **Revision of Walkden's 2017 CP-split** - move both the CP1 and the CP2 boundaries higher, creating a split CP with CP2 as FrameP and CP1 as ForceP (comprising all lower CP heads):
[CP2 FrameP [CP1 ForceP > ShiftP > ContrP > FocP > FamP* > FinP

If we adopt the typology Wolfe (2015) proposes based on Romance shown in Table 1, the above revised structure with an additional FrameP is furthermore desirable since it would illustrate a logical diachronic development from a 'strict V2' one step back/left to a V2 language with Frame-setters (like later Old French or Old High German, Wolfe's 'Force V2 System 1'), with language contact forcing a move in the opposite direction of natural change from Fin-V2 to Force-V2 assumed by Wolfe (2015).

| (OV>?) V1 Cleft "V2" | Fin-V2 "1" Frame + Focus + Topic | Fin-V2 "2" Frame + Focus/Topic | Force V2 System 1 Frame + HT/LD | Force V2 System 2 HT/LD ('Strict V2') |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| "Pre Old English" –> | Old English? | | Moroccan Dutch | <– Standard Dutch |
| Old Welsh –> | | Middle Welsh? | Kiezdeutsch | <– Standard German |

Table 1: Extending Wolfe's (2015) Typology of V3 options in V2-languages to Dutch, English & Welsh

Old English and Middle Welsh, however, are usually classified as Fin-V2 languages (cf. Willis 1998, Roberts 2005, Walkden 2017); Old English allows a further complication of OSV orders and full DP/pronoun alternations (shown in (5a)), which is not possible in Middle Welsh. There is furthermore little evidence for a strict V2 constraint as a predecessor of either Old English or Middle Welsh: earlier stages of German and Celtic show both OV and V1 orders. Old Welsh, in fact, tends to prefer verb-initial orders to which the Middle Welsh non-strict V2 can plausibly be reconstructed through Spec-to-Head reanalysis of preverbal particles in former clefts (shown in (5b) and (5c), cf. Meelen 2016). The combination of which, I will argue, creates the opportunity for a grammar with a Fin-V2 constraint that is slightly stricter than the Old English OSV orders, leading to an extension of Wolfe's typology with an extra type of Fin-V2.

(5)    a.    *Fyr  ic **sende** on eorþan*
            fire I  send  to  earth
            'I send fire to earth.'                                    (Old English OSV - Walkden 2017)
       b.    *A    thrannoeth y    **talwyt**          y     ueirych idaw.*
            and next.day    PRT pay.IMPERS.PAST 3MS horses  to.3MS
            'And (it was) on the next day his horses were paid to him.'    (Old (cleft) > Middle Welsh - PKM 34.23)
       c.    [$_{CP}$ (COP) PP/AdvP [$_{CP}$ y + V [$_{TP}$ ... > [$_{CP}$ PP/AdvP y + V [$_{TP}$ ...    (Old > Middle Welsh reanalysis)

**Conclusion.** Although evidence from the exact contact scenarios and predecessors of both Welsh and English is still inconclusive, the Fin-V2 characteristics of these languages and possible V1 origin (at least for Welsh) suggest they followed a more natural path of development from (OV >) V1 > Fin-V2 (which later, in the case of Standard Dutch and German, evolves to an even stricter Force-V2 system). Walkden's CP-split as a result of imperfect L2 acquisition + mixed SVO/V2 input in contact scenarios is shown to work better for urban vernaculars than older stages of English and Welsh, but the exact split needs to be revised based on new evidence from information-structural factors in Urban Dutch. This paper thus shows that a careful examination of V2 languages with optional V3 orders such as Urban Dutch, Old English and Middle Welsh leads to concrete extensions of Wolfe's V2 typology and Walkden's Split-CP contact scenario. Both hypotheses can only be maintained if they are refined in the way suggested above with a revised location of the Split-CP and an additional Fin-V2 option.