Texas German and English word order constructions in contact

Ryan Dux
Sam Houston State University

After reviewing previous accounts of Texas German (TxG) syntax, I define the basic word order constructions of English and German and identify which are identical across the languages (i.e. diaconstructions). Next, I analyze 300 TxG utterances and determine whether their syntax corresponds more closely to German, English, or German-English diaconstructions. Finally, I discuss sentences exhibiting unusual word order and how they demonstrate the need for a (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar approach.

Keywords: word order, Texas German, code-switching, Diasystematic Construction Grammar

1. Introduction

This contribution provides a (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar account of Texas German (TxG) word order constructions, as well as how they compare and interact with English word order constructions in TxG discourse. Previous analyses (Boas 2009a, Fuchs 2018) suggest that TxG syntax largely corresponds to that of Standard German, as seen in the complex, yet well-formed sentence in (1). However, English lexical transference is frequent in TxG, and while English items are sometimes easily integrated into German syntax, as in (2), in other cases they may lead to significant syntactic interference, as in (3).

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.24.07dux
© 2018 John Benjamins Publishing Company

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

(1) *Da einses, was geändert war, ist, dass mehr fremde Leude in*
the only what changed was, is, that more foreign people in
Friedrichsburg warn (1–45–1–6–a)
Fredericksburg were [1]
'The only thing that has changed is that more foreign people (outsiders) are in Fredericksburg.'
Das Einzige, was sich geändert hat, ist, dass mehr fremde Leude in Friedrichsburg waren. (StG)

(2) *Du musst den Clutch drehen, for es Gear zu schiff.* (1–43–1–3–a)
you must the clutch turn in-order the gear to shift
'You must turn the clutch to shift the gear.'
Man muss die Kupplung treten, um den Gang zu wechseln. (StG)

(3) *Wir waren supposed kein Deutsch zu sprechen in die Schul.* (1-21-1-5-a)
we were supposed no German to speak in the school
'We were not supposed to speak German in school.'
Wir sollten in der Schule kein Deutsch sprechen. (StG)

This contribution seeks to increase our understanding of TxG word order, and, more generally, of word order constructions in contact languages. From an empirical perspective, I test previous findings on TxG word order (esp. Boas 2009a) on a much larger dataset, with a particular focus on utterances containing English lexical transference (code-switching, loan translation). From a theoretical perspective, I develop a constructional account of word order constructions and how they interact with other aspects of language (i.e. other construction types) such as the lexicon, semantics, and information structure. From a contrastive perspective, I identify how word order constructions compare across German and English, how they are used in TxG utterances, and how English lexical interference impacts the syntax of TxG utterances.

After introducing TxG and previous accounts of (Texas) German word order in Section 2, I develop a Construction Grammar approach to word order constructions in Section 3. Section 4 presents the methodology of the analysis, focusing on the definition of German word order constructions and the identification of clause types with identical word order in German and English – potential "diaconstructions" in Höder (2012, 2014, this volume). The analysis in Section 5 tests whether TxG speakers maintain German syntax or prefer English word order

1. Examples from the Texas German Dialect Archive (see Section 2.1) are anonymized and associated with file numbers denoting the interviewer, informant, the number of the interview with that informant, the file identifier, and a letter to indicating whether the file contains only audio or both audio and video (Boas 2009a: 22).

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

constructions or German-English diaconstructions, drawing on both non-English TxG utterances and those including lexical transference from English verbs, and concluding with a (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar account of several examples exhibiting highly unusual syntax. Section 6 summarizes the findings and points to avenues for future research.

2. Previous accounts of Texas German word order

2.1 Texas German(s)

TxG refers to the dialect(s) spoken by Germans immigrants to Texas and their descendants. The large-scale migration of Germans to Texas began in the 1840s and accelerated throughout the 19th century, so that by 1940 the TxG population was estimated to be 159,000 (Kloss 1977). Most immigrants came from the western and northern regions of present-day Germany, but other regions contributed to the TxG population, resulting in a situation of dialect contact and (partial) dialect leveling. Although TxG was widely spoken well into the 20th century, few children learned the language after 1940, resulting in a situation of drastic language shift. Today, only an estimated 5,000 to 6,000 speakers remain, nearly all of whom are in their 70s or older. In an effort to document the language before it is entirely lost, the Texas German Dialect Project (TGDP; Boas 2009a; www.tgdp.org) was initiated by Hans C. Boas in the early 2000s. To date, project affiliates have conducted interviews with over 650 TxG speakers, which involve linguistic translation tasks, open-ended ethnographic interviews, and biographical surveys eliciting sociolinguistic and attitudinal information. A large portion of the interview data is available online through the Texas German Dialect Archive, which forms the basis for the present analysis (see Boas et al. 2010 for an overview).

TxG is largely mutually intelligible with modern Standard German (StG),[2] but exhibits many characteristics of German contact varieties, including numerous borrowings from English (Boas & Pierce 2011, Dux 2017) and simplifications in phonology (Boas et al. 2004, Pierce et al. 2015) and morphosyntax (Boas 2009b, Boas et al. 2014). The only investigation of TxG word order (Boas 2009a) suggests it has undergone few changes in the current contact situation, but that analysis draws on a limited amount of data and highly coarse-grained word order

2. Although TxG is not identical to StG, the two varieties are largely mutually intelligible and previous analyses point to the maintenance of (Standard) German word order in TxG. Where non-standard or dialectal German constructions that differ from "proper" StG are discussed, this will be noted in the discussion.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

categories. Here, I seek to provide a richer and more nuanced view of TxG word order constructions in contact with English using principles of (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar. First, I briefly discuss the general properties of German word order in order to better explicate the findings of Boas (2009a).

2.2 German word order

The most prevalent and theory-neutral formulation of German word order is the topological field model (see Eisenberg [2006: 394–420], Eisenberg & Gallmann [2016: 871–899], and Imo [2016: 199–226]), which represents German sentences by means of fields and brackets, shown in Table 1, that are filled by specific phrase types.

Table 1. Topological fields in German word order

Prefield (VF)	Left Sentence Bracket (LS)	Middle Field (MF)	Right Sentence Bracket (RS)	Final Field (NF)

The left sentence bracket (German: "linke Satzklammer", LS) and right sentence bracket ("rechte Satzklammer", RS) generally define the position of verbal elements, while the prefield ("Vorfeld", VF), middle field ("Mittelfeld", MF) and final field ("Nachfeld", NF) define positions of non-verbal elements.

In yes/no questions and certain subjunctive sentences, the prefield is left empty and the left bracket hosting the finite verb is the first constituent of the sentence, resulting in a V1 ordering, as in (4a) below. Declarative sentences and *wh-* questions exhibit V2 ordering, with the finite verb in the left bracket and any other verbal elements (e.g., infinitives, participles, separable verb prefixes) in the right bracket (4b). Subordinate clauses exhibit VE (verb-end) ordering, in which the subordinating conjunction fills the left bracket and all verbal constituents occur in the right bracket, with the finite verb following any non-finite verbs (4c).[3] In V2 sentences, both the prefield and middle field host non-verbal constituents, and in V1 and VE sentences, the middle field hosts non-verbal constituents. The final field may optionally include further constituents in all three of the major sentence types, typically in colloquial registers or with heavy clausal constituents (e.g. infinitival or relative clauses), in a phenomenon known as *Ausklammerung*

3. I use the term "non-finite verb" or "non-finite form" to refer to infinitive verb forms (*machen* 'to make'), participles (*gemacht* 'made'), as well as separable verbal prefixes (*macht aus* 'makes **out**').

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

('extraposition'). These major word order types are summarized in Table 2, in which obligatory items are italicized and infrequent items are in parentheses.[4]

Table 2. German word order types

Sentence type	Prefield	Left bracket	Middle field	Right bracket	Final field
V1		*Finite Verb*	Constituents	Non-finite Verb	(Constituent)
V2	*Constituent*	*Finite Verb*	Constituents	Non-finite Verb	(Constituent)
VE		*Conjunction*	Constituents	Non-finite Verb, *Finite Verb*	(Constituent)

Sentences demonstrating each of the three major word order types are given in (4).

(4) a. V1: *Hat Hans ein Lied gesungen?*
'Did Hans sing a song?'
b. V2: *Hans hat ein Lied gesungen.*
'Hans has sung a song.'
c. VE: *…, dass Hans ein Lied gesungen hat.*
'…, that Hans has sung a song.'

2.3 Word order in TxG

Before discussing the theoretical treatment of word order in the next section, I briefly present the findings of Boas's (2009a: 218f.) investigation of word order in New Braunfels German.[5] His analysis draws on four criteria used in Louden's (1988) account of Pennsylvania German word order, namely the word order of subordinate clauses, infinitival (*zu* ('to')) complements, and of prefixed verbs in main and subordinate clauses. These clause types are selected because they differ in word order across German and English, as demonstrated in (5)–(8).

(5) Subordinate clause
a. …, dass Jan das Zimmer *putzt*.
b. …, that Jan *cleans* the room.

4. The ordering of non-verbal constituents is relatively free, though some restrictions and tendencies, particularly related to phrase length and information structure, govern their placement. The combination of the main sentence types and non-verbal constituents results in a much higher number of word order configurations than the three identified here (e.g. Wöllstein-Leisten et al. [1997: 55] identifies 28 different configurations). While a complete account of German word order is beyond the scope of this paper, a richer classification of word order types is given in Section 4.

5. Boas (2009a) focuses on the TxG of speakers in New Braunfels, one of the earliest-established and most prominent German settlements in the TxG dialect area.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

(6) *zu*-Clause
  a. Jan beginnt, das Zimmer *aufzuräumen*.
  b. Jan begins *to clean up* the room.

(7) Prefix verb in Main Clause
  a. Jan *räumt* jeden Tag das Zimmer *auf*.
  b. Jan *cleans (up)* the room *(up)* every day

(8) Prefix verb in subordinate clause
  a. …, dass Jan das Zimmer *aufräumt*.
  b. …, that Jan *cleans (up)* the room *(up)* every day

Boas finds relatively little English influence on TxG word order in most, but not all cases. Specifically, TxG speakers use German word order most frequently for infinitival clauses (as in (6a) above; with the *zu* + Infinitive Verb in final position), prefixed verbs in main clauses (as in (7a) above; with the conjugated stem in second position and the prefix in clause-final position), and prefixed verbs in subordinate clauses (as in (8a) above; with the prefix preceding the stem in clause-final position). For subordinate clauses, however, Boas finds a discrepancy in word order depending on the subordinating conjunction used: clauses introduced with *dass* and "*wh-*" complementizers (e.g., *wo, wann, wer* ('where, when, who')) maintain the German word order as in (5a) above, with the finite verb in clause-final position. In contrast, subordinate clauses introduced with *weil* ('because') or *bis* ('until') tend to occur with English-like ordering as in (5b) above, with the finite verb in second position (or more accurately, between the subject and direct object, as in SVO languages). The findings of Boas (2009a: 218f.) are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Boas's (2009a: 218f.) findings on TxG word order

Clause/verb type	Word order	# examples used
Subordinate clauses (*weil, bis*)	primarily SVO (English)	12
Subordinate clauses (*dass, wh-*)	primarily SOV (German)	19
Infinitival (*zu*) complements	SOV (German)	5
Prefixed verbs – declarative	SOV (German)	5
Prefixed verbs – subordinate	SOV (German)	4

Boas's account of TxG word order, however, is rather limited for various reasons. For one, it draws on a limited amount of data – with only 45 total sentences from 25 different speakers. The binary classification of word order types between SVO (English) and SOV (German) is also too coarse-grained to account for the full range of word order constructions used in TxG and English, and a more sophisticated classification of word order types may give a more detailed picture of TxG

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

word order and its relation to StG and English.[6] The analysis could also be expanded to account for the word order of utterances including English lexical items, particularly conjunctions and verbs, as code-switching and loan translation have been shown to be prevalent in TxG speech (Boas & Pierce 2011, Dux 2017) and have been found to influence syntax in other German speech islands (see Clyne [1994] for Australian German and Fuller [1997] for Pennsylvania Dutch). Boas himself claims that "further research […] should investigate the frequencies for each item, including the different contexts in which the two types of word order are found" (2009a: 221).

3. Word order in (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar

Turning to the theoretical treatment of (German) word order, mainstream generative syntactic approaches to German word order draw on large-scale typological features (i.e. SVO vs. SOV languages) and posit that languages have a 'basic' underlying word order and non-canonical word orders are derived through transformations of the basic order. In the case of German syntax, the VE sentence type (SOV) is assumed to be the basic order for German sentences, while the V2 and V1 orders are derived through transformations on the basic SOV order.[7] There are, however, several issues with such an approach. For one, the binary classification of a language as either SOV or SVO is difficult to ascertain when the full range of its structures is taken into account, suggesting that languages may prefer one type or another but the types do not determine the syntax of all possible structures, (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993: 51). Furthermore, there are no empirically valid tests for determining whether a language is SVO or SOV (see Ziem & Boas 2017). The binary distinction also is not detailed enough to account for all orderings of constituents across contexts and clause types. More generally, the assumption that an

6. Fuchs (2018) documents the word order of a much higher number of TxG examples, but also only uses the binary V2/VE (SVO/SOV) distinction and focuses primarily on subordinate clauses and the potential reasons for divergences between TxG and StG syntax. For related studies on word order in other German speech islands, see Burridge 1992, Louden 1992, Nützel 1998, Riehl 2004, and Hopp & Putnam 2015.

7. Specific analyses of word order have been proposed in numerous syntactic theories, such as Government and Binding/Minimalism (Reis 1980, den Besten 1983, Webelhuth 1992), Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (Jacobs 1986, Uszkoreit 1987), Lexical Functional Grammar (Berman 2003), and Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Kathol 2000, Meurers 2000, Müller 2005). Further analyses have been proposed for non-canonical word order phenomena, including infinitive clauses (Haider 1986), left dislocation (Haider 1990), topicalization (Fanselow 1989, Haider 1990), passives (Grewendorf 1989), and relative clauses (Rimsdijk 1985).

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

entire language has a specific order overlooks the interactions between purely syntactic principles and other aspects of language, such as lexicon and pragmatics.[8]

Constructional approaches[9] differ from those above in that they are surface-oriented and thus cannot assume (a priori) that a given surface form is derived through transformations of a more basic form which does not surface as such. They also do not assume a strict distinction between the various 'modules' of language (e.g. syntax vs. semantics) found in mainstream frameworks, but instead recognize and appreciate the interaction of different constructions types in language production.

Most work in CxG focused on peripheral constructions that were not easily accounted for in generative frameworks, beginning with highly idiomatic constructions such as *let alone* (Fillmore et al. 1988) and only recently progressing to more 'prominent' constructions that are nonetheless highly irregular, such as resultatives (Boas 2003) or ditransitives (Goldberg 1995, Kay 2005). To date, there are very few CxG studies investigating word order constructions in their own right (Leino & Kuningas 2006), though some work has been done on their historical development (Barðdal et al. 2015) and acquisition (Goldberg 2006).

Taking the CxG approach that all linguistic structures are constructions (i.e. form-meaning pairings), word order constructions – like all constructions – pair a given form with a specific type of meaning. In this case, the form side of word order constructions specifies the (relative) ordering of phrase types and grammatical functions, while the meaning side indicates (at least) the clause type, such as polar question, main-declarative clause, or subordinate clause. For example, German has a word order construction associating polar question(s) with the V1 order discussed above. This can be formally represented as in Figure 1.

German polar question word order construction
Form = [Vfin, Subject, (…), (Vinf)]
Meaning = polar question

Figure 1. Representation of German polar question word order construction

The construction specifies that the semantics of a polar question must be structured formally such that the finite verb occurs first and is followed by the subject

8. In fact, the World Atlas of Language Structures categorizes 189 of 1377 languages (13.7%), including German, as "lacking a dominant word order" (Dryer 2013).

9. For an overview of Construction Grammar, see Boas & Höder (this volume), as well as Goldberg (1995, 2006), Croft (2001), Boas & Sag (2012), and Hoffmann & Trousdale (2013).

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

(with commas representing sequential order), and – if they occur – that non-finite verb forms are in clause-final position.[10]

Word order constructions thus differ from other construction types only in that they are extremely frequent, have highly abstract meanings, and are very schematic in that they do not specify which or how many lexical items (or constituents) can fill their open slots. This observation points to another important concept in CxG, namely the interaction of constructions in language production. The highly schematic word order constructions interact with the constructional properties of lexical items filling their schematic slots and with discourse-level properties, such as information-structure and pragmatic context. For instance, the finite verb may be a modal or a prefix verb, which would then require the clause-final placement of the non-finite main verb or prefix, respectively.

On this constructional view, word order constructions are not parameter-based, across-the-board characterizations of entire languages, as is the case with the SOV/SVO distinction in generative-transformational frameworks. Rather, they are on par with all other construction types (lexical, idiomatic, argument-structure) in their nature (as form-meaning pairings) and interact with phonological, pragmatic, and lexico-grammatical features of the elements (or constructions) which fill them.

In a constructional view of language contact, the linguistic knowledge of speakers in multilingual communities (such as in TxG) is not necessarily compartmentalized according to (each of) the languages they command.[11] Instead, these speakers command a full inventory of constructions they are exposed to in any language – a *constructional repertoire*. An important tenet of Diasystematic CxG

10. The question arises whether the construction in Figure 1 may also need to specify the relative positions of objects and adverbial phrases (which should occur in the middle field but are only marked with ellipses in parentheses here). However, it is more likely that the ordering of these elements can be captured by a separate construction from the V1 construction defined here, since their ordering is not specific to the V1 polar question construction, but applies uniformly to the other word order categories discussed in this paper (thanks to Steffen Höder for this observation).

Theoretically, German also has a construction that pairs the same formal characteristics (i.e. V1 word order) with other functions, such as commands and subjunctives. The different interpretation of V1 sentences can be attributed to the form of the verb in 2nd position (e.g. imperative for commands) and different intonation patterns (e.g. *Wäre er doch gekommen?* vs. *Wäre er doch gekommen!* 'If only he had come.').

11. The prominent assumption of traditional work in CxG – that language is the sum of its constructions – is extended in Diasystematic CxG, which argues that there are no a priori languages and speakers only have constructions. Höder (2014, this volume) reformulates this assumption by proposing that a multilingual speaker may (in some cases) not mark a construction as belonging to one language or another.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

is that constructions are not inherently language-specific: constructions are form-meaning pairings in every language and differ cross-linguistically primarily in that a given meaning may be associated with a different form due to conventions of the particular language community. As such, multilingual interlocutors may indeed associate a construction with one (or a subset) of the languages they use, but this is not necessarily the case. Höder (2014, this volume) proposes a distinction between *idioconstructions* – which speakers associate with a specific language (or more aptly, with a specific communicative context) – and *diaconstructions* – which speakers view as similar/identical across multiple languages (or communicative contexts). Höder argues, for example, that polar question constructions in German and Danish are viewed as diaconstructions by German-Danish bilingual speakers in North Germany, because they fulfill the same function and exhibit the same form (i.e. finite verb in initial position, etc.). One question that arises in light of these observations is whether multilingual speakers prefer to use diaconstructions over language-specific idioconstructions, given that diaconstructions are likely more frequently encountered and used and thus more entrenched in the speakers' multilingual constructional repertoires.

4. German word order constructions and German-English diaconstructions

In this section, I first offer a refined classification of German word order types (constructions) and identify overlapping word order constructions in German and English – potential "diaconstructions" in the sense of Höder (2014, this volume). This classification guides the analysis in Section 5, in which I document the word order of numerous examples of different clause types in order to determine whether TxG speakers show a preference for German- or English-specific (word order) idioconstructions or the diaconstructions overlapping in German and English. Finally, I account for several utterances with highly irregular syntax using concepts of (Diasystematic) CxG, in order to examine how word order constructions interact with other construction types in the TxG-English language contact situation.

4.1. German word order constructions

The previous discussion of German word order types showed that there are three major types for the placement of verbal elements, namely V1, V2, and VE. More general categorizations of syntactic properties across languages distinguish languages in terms of the relative placement of subject, verb, and object (e.g. SVO vs. SOV). It was argued that these broad-scale categorizations are too coarse-grained

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

to account for the full range of German word order constructions, let alone a detailed comparison of clause types with identical word order across German and English – "diaconstructions" in (Diasystematic) CxG terms. Before discussing the analysis of TxG word order, I thus provide a more detailed (though not full-fledged) classification of German word order construction types – in order to more accurately and succinctly describe the word order of TxG utterances – and identify such overlapping diaconstructions – in order to determine whether TxG speakers prefer to use these rather than German-specific idioconstructions.

The German word order constructions are defined with respect to their function (e.g. declarative vs. interrogative) and/or clause type (main vs. subordinate), as well as to the number of verbs within the clause and the occurrence and placement of (non-subject) phrases. These are then cross-classified according to their grammaticality in StG, distinguishing between "proper" and colloquial or non-standard constructions. The constructions are labeled to indicate the position of the finite verb ("V1", "V2", "VE"), whether there is a bracket structure separating finite and non-finite verb forms ("B"), and whether there is *Ausklammerung* of constituents (" + AK"). Other labels are described below where needed.

V1-type word order constructions serve the function of forming polar questions, imperatives, and subjunctive/irrealis clauses. When these clauses contain only one (finite) verb, the construction specifies that this verb occurs in clause-initial position. This construction is labeled "V1" and exemplified in (9). When multiple verbs occur in the clause, the finite verb again occurs in first position and non-finite forms occur in clause-final position.[12] This construction is labeled "V1B", where the "B" stands for the bracket structure separating finite and non-finite verb forms (10). While the V1 and V1B constructions are considered proper in StG, colloquial registers (in some contexts) allow non-verbal elements (typically adverbial phrases) to occur after the clause-final non-finite verbs (*Ausklammerung* 'extraposition'). Verb-first sentences exhibiting *Ausklammerung* are labeled "V1B + AK". These constructions are non-standard but acceptable in colloquial registers, which is indicated by the asterisk preceding the label in (11). In sum, (at least) three word order constructions can be employed for the formation of polar questions, imperatives, and subjunctive/irrealis clauses: V1 for clauses with a single verb, or V1B and V1B + AK for those with multiple verbs.

12. This analysis focuses primarily on word orders defined by the position of finite and infinitive verbs, with some (peripheral) observations about the placement of adverbial elements, verbal prefixes, and the core grammatical relations (e.g. subject, direct object). It does not account for other syntactic phenomena, such as the combination of clauses, word order within the noun phrase, the relative ordering of adverbials, or 'non-canonical' orderings found in colloquial speech (e.g. dislocation, topicalization).

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

(9) **V1** ***Singt*** *Hans?* (1 verb)

(10) **V1B** ***Hat*** *Hans* ***gesungen?*** (2 + verbs)

(11) ***V1B + AK** ***Hat*** *Hans* ***gesungen*** *in der Kirche?* (2 + verbs)

V2-type word order constructions serve the function of forming main declarative clauses and *wh*-questions. They differ from V1-type constructions in that the finite verb occurs in the second position, but otherwise they largely parallel V1-type constructions discussed above. Main declarative clauses with a single verb specify only that it occurs in second position and are labeled "V2" (12). Such clauses with multiple verbs require, in StG, that the non-finite forms occur clause-finally to form a bracket structure ("V2B", (13)), and may also exhibit *Ausklammerung* in colloquial registers ("V2B + AK", (14)). In another, less frequently-occurring construction identified in the data, the non-finite verb occurs in clause-initial position preceding the finite verb. This construction is labeled "ViV2" (where the "i" stands for infinitive) and is marked as non-standard as it is most frequent in colloquial or literary registers (15). The V2-type word order constructions are summarized as:

(12) **V2** *Hans* ***singt****.* (1 verb)

(13) **V2B** *Hans* ***hat*** *(ein Lied)* ***gesungen****.* (2 + verbs)

(14) ***V2B + AK** *Hans* ***hat*** *(ein Lied)* ***gesungen*** *in der Kirche.* (2 + verbs)

(15) ***ViV2** ***Gesungen hat*** *Hans (in der Kirche).* (2 verbs)

VE-type constructions are most commonly associated with subordinate clauses and infinitival clauses and specify that all verbs occur in clause-final position. The construction "VE" refers to clauses that include one or more verbs in clause-final position, with the finite verb following any non-finite verbs (16). In certain registers and contexts, there is *Ausklammerung* of adverbial elements, in the "VE + AK" construction (17). Some dialects allow for the placement of the finite verb before non-finite forms (most frequently when there are three verbs), as in (18), and this construction is represented as "VEfi" (where "fi" represents the ordering of finite and non-finite verbs).

(16) **VE** *dass Hans (ein Lied)* ***gesungen hat****.*

(17) ***VE + AK** *dass Hans (ein Lied)* ***gesungen hat*** *in der Kirche.*

(18) ***VEfi** *dass Hans (ein Lied)* ***hat gesungen****.*

Note that there are instances in which the word order is identical across certain instances of V2- and VE-type constructions (when the complementizer for the VE-types is ignored), particularly when there is no direct object to distinguish

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

between SOV and SVO. Specifically, a clause such as that in (19) contains only the subject and verb, in that order, and can thus be viewed as either V2 or VE + AK. This is also the case for clauses such as (20), which differ from (19) only in that an adverbial phrase is extraposed. In the data analysis, I treat such orderings as instances of the V2 construction when they occur in main declarative clauses, but as VE or VE + AK when they occur in subordinate clauses.[13]

(19) *(dass) ich **singe**.* (ambiguous between V2 and VE)

(20) *(dass) ich **singe** in der Kirche.* (ambiguous between V2 and VE + AK)

The German word order constructions exemplified in (9)–(18) are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. German word order constructions

WO Cx	Function(s) and examples	# verbs (if relevant)
	Function: Polar question, imperative, subjunctive	
V1	*Singt Hans (ein Lied)?*	1 verb
V1B	*Hat Hans (ein Lied) gesungen?*	2 + verbs
*V1B + AK	*Hat Hans (ein Lied) gesungen in der Kirche?*	2 + verbs
	Function: Main declarative clause	
V2	*Hans singt (ein Lied).*	1 verb
V2B	*Hans hat (ein Lied) gesungen.*	2 + verbs
*V2B + AK	*Hans hat (ein Lied) gesungen in der Kirche.*	2 + verbs
*ViV2	*Gesungen hat Hans (in der Kirche).*	2 verbs
	Function: Subordinate clause	
VE	*dass Hans (ein Lied) gesungen hat.*	
*VE + AK	*dass Hans (ein Lied) gesungen hat in der Kirche.*	
*VEfi	*dass Hans (ein Lied) hat gesungen.*	

4.2 English-German word order diaconstructions

Having established a list of German word order constructions, it is now possible to identify potential diaconstructions for German-English bilinguals, which exhibit

13. Word order can also be identical between V2B and VEfi in examples such as: (*dass*) *ich habe gesungen*, and between V2B + AK and VEfi + AK, as in: (*dass*) *ich habe gesungen in der Kirche*. I categorize these cases as instances of V2B and V2B + AK, respectively, rather than the VEfi-type constructions, because VEfi constructions are extremely rare in TxG and most German varieties.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

the same word order across the two languages, such as the sentence *Hans singt*. Earlier, I hypothesized that TxG speakers may prefer to use these diaconstructions because they use English more frequently than TxG on an everyday basis and these constructions may thus be more entrenched in their mental 'constructicon' (i.e., the inventory of grammatical constructions the speaker commands) and therefore more accessible than German (idio-)constructions that differ from English.

Four major principles of English word order inform the comparison of German and English word order constructions and allow for the identification of utterance types that may be potential diaconstructions, as they exhibit identical word order in both languages. As I present these, I discuss to which of the German constructions they may apply.

(A) *Subject precedes verb*

The first principle of English word order is that (as a SVO language) the subject precedes the verb in declarative and subordinate clauses. Therefore, the German V2-type and VE-type constructions may only represent diaconstructions when the subject precedes the verb, which is not a requirement of all German constructions of these types. English polar questions and certain subjunctive constructions exhibit subject-auxiliary inversion, in which the subject occurs between the finite verb and non-finite verbs, so German V1-type constructions may represent German-English diaconstructions if the subject directly follows the finite verb (and no constituents occur after the subject and before non-finite verbs; see B below).

(B) *All verbs occur together*

The second major English word order principle is that all verbal elements appear together, so the German bracketed construction types are only identical when no constituents (for V2- and VE-type constructions) or only the subject (for V1-type constructions) occur between the finite and non-finite verb. This principle does not apply in cases of "subject-auxiliary inversion" as with polar questions or subjunctives with auxiliary verbs, e.g. *Had I done that*.…

(C) *Finite verbs precede non-finite verb forms*

English word order requires that the finite verb occur before non-finite verb forms, so the German VE-type constructions are only identical to English when there is only one verb, unless the StG requirement that the finite verb follows non-finite forms is not followed (as in the VEfi construction in (18) above).

(D) *Polar questions require* do *support*

Finally, English polar questions require the auxiliary *do* when there is only one main verb, whereas main verbs in German polar questions are inflected and in first

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

position (*Does he sing? ~ Singt er?* 'sings he?').[14] As such, polar questions with only one verb cannot represent diaconstructions between English and StG, except in infrequent isntances in which the main verb is omitted and only a modal or auxiliary verb appears (e.g. *Kann er?* 'can he?'). However, the V1-type construction for polar questions may represent diaconstructions when two verbs are present (i.e. a modal or auxiliary verb is used along with the main verb: *Kann er singen?* 'can he sing?'), provided the above principles are fulfilled. V1-type constructions for imperatives (*Sing ein Lied*! 'Sing a song!') or subjunctives (*Hätte ich gesungen…*, 'Had I sang…') may represent diaconstructions when only a single main verb is used.

Table 5. Potential German-English word order diaconstructions

	WO Cx	Function(s) and examples	# verbs (if relevant)	What principles must be filled for diaconstruction
		Function: Polar question, imperative, subjunctive		
(21a)	V1	*Kann Hans? / Sing ein Lied! / Hätte er gesungen!* *Can Hans? / Sing a song! / Had he sang!*	1 verb	ABCD
(21b)	V1B	*Hat Hans gesungen?* *Has Hans sung?*	2 + verbs	ABCD
(21c)	*V1B + AK	*Hat Hans gesungen in der Kirche?* *Has Hans sung in church?*	2 + verbs	ABCD
		Function: Main declarative clause		
(21d)	V2	*Hans singt (ein Lied).* *Hans sings (a song).*	1 verb	A
(21f)	V2B	*Hans hat gesungen.* *Hans has sung.*	2 + verbs	AB
(21g)	*V2B + AK	*Hans hat gesungen in der Kirche.* *Hans has sung in church.*	2 + verbs	AB
(21h)	*ViV2	*Gesungen hat Hans (in der Kirche).* -no English equivalent	2 verbs	X
		Function: Subordinate clause		
(21g)	VE	*dass Hans singt.* *that Hans sings.*		ABC
(21h)	*VE + AK	*dass Hans singt in der Kirche.* *that Hans sings in church.*		ABC
(21i)	*VEfi	*dass Hans hat gesungen.* *that Hans has sung.*		AB

14. Some German dialects employ a similar construction with the verb *tun* (*Tut er singen?* ('Does he sing?')), but no such examples were found in the primary data analysis.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

It is noteworthy that the German-English diaconstructions do not correspond directly to the German-specific constructions defined above, but rather to sub-types of them, depending on the clause's function, number of verbs, and occurrence of non-subject phrases. Table 5 summarizes which of the German constructions (from Table 4 above) may be diaconstructions and, if so, which of the constraints/principles for English word order must be followed for identical word order across the languages. The table shows, for instance, that the V1B + AK construction is only identical when no elements such as objects or adverbials separate the subject and non-finite verb forms (Principle B), the finite verb precedes the non-finite forms (Principle C), and the clause is in imperative or subjunctive voice, or the main verb is omitted in polar questions (Principle D).

5. Analysis of TxG word order

5.1 Data selection and limitations

I now present the results of the TxG word order analysis, beginning with 50 sentences each for *müssen*, *dass,* and *weil* clauses with TxG verbs and then moving on to 141 clauses (of various types) with English-origin or loan translated verbs. The results are presented according to the word order constructions and potential diaconstructions proposed in Table 4 and Table 5, respectively.

The data were accessed using the concordance function of the Texas German Dialect Archive (http://tgdp.org/dialect-archive), which allows one to search for specific expressions and/or characters in transcribed interview segments. For the analysis of clauses with German-origin verbs in Section 5.2, I entered the specific German word characterizing the clauses under analysis, namely *dass, weil,* and *muss*.[15] I then extracted the first two to three relevant sentences for 23 to 25 different speakers (or only one sentence, when no more were available), in order to decrease effects of interspeaker variation. To get the English-verb data analyzed in Section 5.3, I searched for a closing square bracket ("*]*"), as instances of English transference are marked with brackets in the TGDP transcriptions. I then extracted all sentences with English code-switched or loan-translated verbs for 15 speakers who produced a significant amount of annotated interview material, suggesting they are still competent speakers of TxG with minimal levels of

15. The string *muss* was searched due to technical issues with entering umlaut characters at the time of the search. While this search only captures some forms of the verb, but it should not affect the analysis, assuming that verbal inflection does not affect word order.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

attrition.[16] Incomplete sentences and those exhibiting significant hesitation or lack of clarity were excluded from the analysis.

My approach employs more detailed categories of word order types than the traditional SVO/SOV distinction employed in previous work on TxG word order, and it focuses on identifying idio- and diaconstructions and assessing their use in the German-English contact situation of TxG. As such, this study is more qualitative than quantitative, and although nearly 300 total clauses are analyzed, more data is required to verify the findings of this analysis and address other issues arising from this investigation. Furthermore, the analysis does not focus on the ordering of German verbal prefixes/particles or of adverbial elements, which are only mentioned if they influence the data categorization. Future research must investigate these aspects of word order, determining their characteristics in TxG speech and, more generally, their relation to the word order constructions investigated here.

5.2. TxG clauses with German-origin verbs

Müssen *('to have to')*

I begin with the analysis of main clauses with *müssen*, in order to assess the degree to which TxG speakers maintain the German bracket structure, in which the finite verb (modal verb in this case) is in second position and the infinitive main verb is clause-final. The construction expected for such clauses in StG is V2B: with the modal *müssen* in second position and the main verb(s) in final position. Colloquial German also allows for the extraposition of adverbial elements (construction V2B + AK). Potential "diaconstructions" in which the StG and English word orders align include instances of the V2B (21f) or V2B + AK (21g) constructions which do not contain any elements in the Middle Field between the conjugated modal and the main verbs. The results and examples are provided in Table 6.[17]

Indeed, all of the 50 sentences exhibit word order characteristic of German: 42 have the V2B expected in StG (22), while eight exhibit the colloquial V2B + AK constructions (24).

16. Most of the data in the primary analysis come from a related investigation of English verbs in TxG (Dux 2017).

17. In the following tables, the first column lists the word order construction used, the second lists the number of examples with that construction, the third column shows the percentage of examples exhibiting this word order, and the final column provides an example. Diaconstructions with identical word order are marked with (*dia.*) after their label, while utterances exhibiting word order that is not identical across the languages do not have this label.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Table 6. Word order of TxG *müssen* clauses

Cx	#	%		Example
V2B	41	82%	(22)	Un man musst Sonntags nach die Kirche gehen. and one must Sundays to the church go 'And one must go to church on Sundays.' (1–45–1–10–a)
V2B (dia.)	1	2%	(23)	Ich muss zurickgehn I must back-go 'I must go back.' (1–25–1–6–a)
V2B + AK	8	16%	(24)	Und Wasser mussten ma pumpen bei Hand. and water must.PAST we pump by hand 'And we had to pump water by hand.' (1–2–1–4-a)

Only one sentence (23) exhibits a potential "diaconstruction" with word order characteristics of both German and English. This sentence displays the V2B construction with no elements separating the modal and main verb, as in (21f) above. However, the main verb includes a prefix/particle, which exhibits the StG ordering of verb-prefix, rather than the English ordering with the prefix/particle following the main verb. As such, when only the verbs are taken into account, this example is a potential diaconstruction, but the syntax of the prefixed verb suggest that this example is less like English and more like German.[18]

In sum, all of the 50 main clauses with *müssen* exhibit word order characteristic of German, with 84% exhibiting the StG bracketed word order and 16% including extraposition. This suggests that the bracketed structure with support and main verbs is highly stable in TxG, and there is no evidence that TxG speakers prefer German-English diaconstructions when forming main declarative clauses with *müssen*.[19]

Dass *('that')*

I now turn to subordinate clauses, beginning with those headed by *dass*. The word order expected in StG is VE: all verbs appear clause-finally with the finite verb following non-finite verbs. Other non-standard or colloquial constructions

18. As noted above, this analysis does not address the ordering of verbal prefixes. However, it should be noted that only one utterance with a prefixed verb (of several dozen found in the analyzed data) exhibited non-StG ordering. For instance, within the *müssen* data, eight of the 39 single-verb sentences involve prefixed verbs, all of which exhibit StG ordering: the prefix precedes the clause-final main verb, as in (23).

19. Of course further analysis of other modal verbs and auxiliaries may exhibit wider variation than *müssen*.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

that occur in this dataset are VE + AK – which is not uncommon in colloquial German – and V2 and V2B – which are considered non-standard or "incorrect" (Duden 2006, Fuchs 2018).

Potential diaconstructions with these clauses include clauses with V2 order and only one verb as in (21d) above, clauses with only the subject and a single finite verb, in that order (21g), and clauses with [subject – finite verb – non-finite verb] ordering (21h) – in which case it can be viewed as a V2B construction or a VE construction with inverted finite and non-finite verbs. The results are summarized in Table 7.

36 of the 50 *dass* clauses analyzed exhibit the VE ordering expected in StG (25), and three have the VE + AK construction, which is also acceptable in colloquial German (27). Ten *dass* examples exhibit V2-type constructions, including five with the V2 construction (28) and five with the V2B construction (29). One other clause was labeled V1B (30), which is not expected in StG or colloquial registers and may be the result of a production error in rapid speech. Seven of the 50 examples represent potential diaconstructions: five of these exhibit V2 with only one verb following the subject (28; cf. 21d). Two are classified as VE constructions

Table 7. Word order of TxG *dass* clauses

WO Cx	#	%		Example
VE	34	68%	(25)	[…], dass ich Deutsch **sprechen konnte**. that I German speak could '… that I could speak German.' (1–62–1–17–a)
VE dia.	2	4%	(26)	[…], dass se wussten, wer de Unterschied **war**. that they knew who the difference was '… that they knew what the difference was.' (1–7–1–3–a)
VE + AK	3	6%	(27)	[…], dass du n gleich nach Haus **kommen dust** na de Schul. that you then direct to house come do after the school '…that you come right home then after school.' (1–21–1–4–a)
V2 dia.	5	10%	(28)	[…], dass wir **gehen** nach Hause. that we go to home '…that we go home' (1–42–1–16–a)
V2B	5	10%	(29)	[…], dass sie **wollen** ein Schullehrer **haben**. that they want a schoolteacher have '…that they wanted to have a schoolteacher.' (1–36–1–2–a)
V1B	1	2%	(30)	[…], dass **war** ein flood hier **gewesen** that was a flood here was '…that there had been a flood here.' (1–33–1–26–a)

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

(26) (but could also be viewed as V2 constructions, as they have no constituents besides the subject and finite verb), as in (21g) or (21d) above.

In sum, subordinate *dass* clauses in TxG most frequently exhibit the VE or VE + AK word order constructions expected in StG, which comprise 78% of the data. V2 ordering, however, is not infrequent in the data, comprising 20% of all analyzed examples. However, despite having V2 ordering, the bracket structure is primarily maintained in subordinate clauses. A total of seven examples (14%) exhibit potential diaconstructions with identical word order across German and English.

Weil *('because')*

I now turn to *weil*-clauses in order to assess the word order constructions used by TxG speakers with a different subordinating conjunction. In StG, the "proper" word order construction for *weil* clauses is also VE, but they may also appear in the VE + AK construction and occur more frequently in the non-standard V2 or V2B constructions than *dass* clauses (Duden 2006, Fuchs 2018). Potential diaconstructions are similar to those discussed for *dass* clauses above, as well as V2B + AK sentences with no elements in the middle field, as in (21f) above. The results for the analysis of TxG *weil* clauses is given in Table 8.

Unlike *dass* clauses, only 14 of the 50 examples exhibit the VE word order expected in StG (31), while 36 examples exhibit V2 word order, with 12 in the V2 construction (32)–(33): 19 in the V2B construction (34)–(35), and five in the V2B + AK construction (36)–(37).

Among the clauses exhibiting V2-type constructions, 14 exhibit word order identical to that of English and thus represent potential diaconstructions. Nine of these have V2 with one verb (33; cf. 21d), three have V2B with no elements other than the subject and two verbs (35; cf. 21f), and two have V2B + AK with no elements separating the subject and verb(s) (37; cf. 21g). That the ratio of diaconstructions to non-diaconstructions for V2 examples (9/12) is much higher than that for V2B and V2B + AK examples (5/24) points again to the stability of the German bracket structure in TxG, whereby finite verbs are separated from non-finite forms.

In sum, *weil* clauses differ more significantly from StG than *dass* clauses and *müssen* sentences. They occur more frequently in V2-type constructions than in the expected VE construction. These clause types also more frequently exhibit potential diaconstructions, at a rate of 28%, than the other clauses investigated thus far (2% for *müssen;* 14% for *dass* clauses). This is likely due to the preponderance of V2-type orderings over VE-type orderings, which are less susceptible to being diaconstructions (see discussion at the end of this section).

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Table 8. Word order of TxG *weil* clauses

Cx	#	%		Example
VE	14	28%	(31)	[…], weil ich Deutsch **sprechen kann**. because I German speak can '…because I can speak German.' (1–2–2–9-a)
V2	3	6%	(32)	[…], weil er **muss** Mondach nach die Arbeit. because he must Monday to the work '…because he has to go to work on Monday.' (1–44–1–1-a)
V2 dia.	9	18%	(33)	[…], weil die **waren** Deutschen. because they were German '…because they were German.' (1–59–1–2-a)
V2B	16	32%	(34)	[…], weil meine Mutter **hatte** uns immer **was geneht**. because my mother had us always something sewed '…because my mother always sewed us something.' (1–34–1–14-a)
V2B dia.	3	6%	(35)	[…], weil die **hamm gesag**, […]. because they have said '…because they said, …' (1–28–1–8-a)
V2B + AK	3	6%	(36)	[…], weil ich **konnt** Deutsch **sprechen** mit de. because I could German speak with them '…because I could speak German with them.' (1–27–1–12-a)
V2B + AK dia.	2	4%	(37)	[…], weil ich **hab gearbeit** fir mein Bruder. because I have worked for my brother '…because I worked for my brother.' (1–21–1–10-a)

Because

The discussion of the German-origin complementizers *dass* and *weil* begs the question of what types of word order constructions are used with English-origin complementizers. While a detailed discussion of such utterances is beyond the scope of this paper, here I briefly discuss a cursory analysis of TxG clauses introduced with English *because*. A search of the TGDA corpus reveals 89 clauses introduced with *because* and followed by TxG discourse. All 89 of these occur with V2-type word order constructions, rather than the VE-type constructions expected with subordinate clauses in StG.[20] Similar observations of SVO-type word order with *because* clauses have been made by Fuller (1997) for Pennsylvania German, who argues that the use of the English lexical item *because* triggers English-type word order within German (dialect) discourse (see also Wild [1994] for similar

20. The *because* clauses investigated are not categorized according to the specific (dia)constructions presented in Table 4 and Table 5.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

findings on Fulda German spoken in Hungary). If this is in fact the reason for divergence from StG word order, then it stands to reason that the transference of other English-origin lexical items may also lead to an increase in the use of diaconstructions or other types of syntactic interference.

5.3 TxG utterances with English verbs

I now investigate TxG utterances that include lexical transference (Clyne 2003) from English, in order to determine whether (and if so, how) the code-switching or loan translation of English verbs influences TxG word order. In addition to the evidence from TxG *because* clauses, previous research on German speech islands such as Australian German (Clyne 1994) or Pennsylvania Dutch (Fuller 1997) has also shown that most instances of non-standard word order occur in utterances containing English lexical influence. The sentences used in Boas's (2009a) investigation of TxG word order did not include data with English lexical interference, which is prevalent in TxG data (Gilbert 1972, Boas & Pierce 2011, Dux 2017), further motivating the analysis of such utterances. These types of data also serve as a testing ground for (dia-)constructional analyses, as the constructional properties of English lexical items must be embedded into German grammar and may interact in unexpected ways. The analysis focuses on transferred verbs, because verbs (or verbal lexical constructions) often exhibit more grammatical complexity, such as complex argument realization patterns or conventionalized verb-object collocations, and may thus more easily lead to syntactic interference than other parts of speech (see Dux 2017).

The primary data include 141 sentences from the TGDA corpus.[21] These are subcategorized into 105 code-switches, 24 loan translations, and 12 loan hybrids (cf. Haugen 1950), which are compound verbs (typically verb-prefix combinations) including both German and English morphemes (e.g. *aufpicken* ('pick up'), lit. up-pick).[22] I first present the combined results of all transfer types, grouping them according to clause types (infinitive, polar question, subordinate, main), before briefly discussing differences between each type.

21. The data selection method is introduced in Section 5.1. The present data was taken from Dux (2017), which included 189 examples of English transferred verbs in TxG. The number of examples is smaller in this study, because examples were excluded if they were incomplete sentences or did not contain enough information to make a judgment about the word order construction employed. Some of the excluded examples are discussed in Section 5.5.

22. See Backus & Dorleijn (2009) and Dux (2017) for more on the relation between these types of lexical transference.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Infinitival clauses

Only one infinitival clause occurred in the data. This clause includes a loan hybrid prefixed verb in the expected VE structure with the infinitival marker *zu* following the (German-origin) prefix and preceding the (English-origin) main verb. As such, it does not represent a German-English diaconstruction.

(38) *Es ist leichter, in Englisch* ***loszurattlen***. (VE; 1–51–1–15-a)
it is easier in English away-to-rattle
'It is easier to rattle away in English.'

Polar questions

Two polar questions occurred in the data, including one code-switch and one loan translation. The code-switching example contains two verbs and exhibits the V1B word order construction (39), while the one-verb loan translation example occurs in the V1 construction (40).

(39) ***Willst*** *du die Farm* ***runne*** *[…]?* (V1B; 1–21–1–7–a)
want you the farm run
'Do you want to run the farm?'

(40) ***Gleichen*** *Sie Kochkäse?* (V1; 1–8–1–2–a)
like you cooked-cheese
'Do you like cooked cheese?'

Both examples exhibit word order expected for polar questions in StG and differ from that found in English. Specifically, in (39) the direct object separates the subject and the non-finite verb, whereas in English the main verb must directly follow the subject and precede the direct object. In (40), the only (and main) verb is in first position, while English requires that such clauses employ the auxiliary *do* and the main (non-finite) verb follows the subject. As such, these two examples do not represent German-English diaconstructions.

Subordinate clauses

A total of 10 subordinate clauses occur in the data, whose word order constructions are documented in Table 9.

Seven of these (5 CS, 1 H, 1 LT)[23] exhibit the expected VE construction (41), and one code-switching example exhibits the non-standard VEfi construction (42). Two code-switching examples exhibit the VE + AK structure (43), with

23. When presenting the results in this section, I use the abbreviations CS (code-switching), H (loan hybrid), and LT (loan translation) to indicate how many examples of each transfer type are used in a given construction type.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Table 9. Word order of TxG subordinate clauses with English verbs

Cx	#	%		Example
VE	7	70%	(41)	[…], was se nicht *geliked hat*. what she not liked has '… which she did not like.' (10–171–3–33-a)
VEfi	1	10%	(42)	Wo Pearl Harbor *attacked is worden* …. where Pearl Harbor attacked is was '…when Pearl Harbor had been attacked.' (1–55–1–25-a)
VE + AK	1	10%	(43)	[…], oder wenn man sich nicht *behaved hat* mit die Klassen or when one oneself not behaved has with the classes '…or if you didn't behave yourself in class.' (1–8–1–4-a)
VE + AK dia.	1	10%	(44)	Und denn wenn wir auch *believed* in Santi-Clause […] and then when we also believed in Santa Clause 'And then when we also believed in Santa Clause…' (1–40–1–18-a)

one showing word order that is identical across German and English (44). Thus, only one of the 10 subordinate clause Example (44) represents a German-English diaconstruction.

Main clauses

I now turn to the 128 TxG main clauses with English verb transfers, summarized in Table 10. 21 examples show the expected V2 ordering (15 CS, 1 H, 5 LT) (45), including 15 examples (11 CS, 4 LT) with overlapping English-German word order (46). Among the 92 sentences with V2B ordering (68 CS, 8 H, 16 LT) (47) are 6 code-switches representing German-English diaconstructions, as in (48). Eleven examples (9 CS, 1 H, 1 LT) show the non-standard V2+AK construction (49), with three of these code-switched examples representing German-English diaconstruction (50). Two (CS) examples exhibit the infrequent ViV2 construction with the participle in first position before the finite verb (51). Two other (CS) examples exhibit unusual word order, with one exhibiting a V1B construction (52) that is acceptable in spoken German but not (proper) StG and one exhibiting a VE type construction that is ungrammatical in this context in StG (53). In summary, main clauses are the most frequent clause type in this dataset (128 total examples) and also the most frequent with potential German-English diaconstructions, with 24 such examples, or 18.8% of all main clauses investigated.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Table 10. Word order of TxG main clauses with English verbs

Cx	#	%		Example
V2	6	5%	(45)	Un denn ceasar Reis *liken* se. and then Caesar rice like they 'And then they like Caesar rice.' (10–171–3–27-a)
V2 dia.	15	12%	(46)	Das *nemmt* beinah ein Jahr that takes nearly a year 'That takes nearly a year.' (1–78–1–5-a)
V2B	86	67%	(47)	Der *wollt* nich nach die Stadt *move* … he wanted not to the city move 'He did not want to move to the city.' (1–40–1–4-a)
V2B dia.	6	5%	(48)	Wir *sind* alle *gebaptized*, […]. we are all baptized 'We have all been baptized.' (1–85–1–5-a)
V2B + AK	8	6%	(49)	Wir *haben* Tomates *geraised* zum Verkaufen we have tomatoes raised to sell 'We raised tomatoes to sell them.' (10–171–3–21-a)
V2B + AK dia.	3	2%	(50)	Un ich *bin retired* von der Air force reserve […]. and I am retired from the Air Force reserve 'And I am retired from the Air Force reserve.' (1–78–1–6-a)
ViV2	2	2%	(51)	Und *gebaptized sind* wir alle hier in die Kirche. and baptized are we all here in the church 'And we have all been baptized in the church here.' (1–85–1–5-a)
V1B	1	1%	(52)	*Kannst* du so frame. can you so frame 'You can frame it this way.' (1–85–1–2-a)
VE	1	1%	(53)	Die community nach Doss *gemoved is*, […]. the community to Doss moved is 'The community has moved to Doss.' (1–55–1–1-a)

5.4. Summary of TxG word order

The results of word order constructions used in TxG utterances with English verbs are summarized in Table 11. The columns are separated according to code-switches (CS), loan hybrids (H), and loan translations (LT). The rows are separated according to clause type, with the first of each row pair listing the total number of examples with a given clause type and the second listing the number of these exhibiting diaconstructions.

With respect to clause types, infinitival clauses, and polar questions are highly infrequent in the data (3/141) and exhibited no instances of potential

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Table 11. Summary of word order in TxG utterances with English verbs

	CS	H	LT	Total	% dia.
Infinitive total	0	1	0	1	
Infinitive dia.	0	0	0	0	0%
Polar total	1	0	1	2	
Polar dia.	0	0	0	0	0%
Subordinate total	8	1	1	10	
Subordinate dia.	1	0	0	1	10%
Main total	96	10	22	128	
Main dia.	20	0	4	24	18.8%
Total	**105**	**12**	**24**	**141**	
Total dia.	**21 (20%)**	**0 (0%)**	**4 (16.7%)**	**25 (17.8%)**	

diaconstructions. Subordinate clauses are also infrequent, and only one of the ten subordinate clauses analyzed displays a potential diaconstruction, as in (44) above. Main clauses, on the other hand, are the most frequent clause type overall and the most frequent in exhibiting potential diaconstructions.[24]

Turning to the summary of each type of lexical transference, the results show that none of the loan hybrid examples – which combine a German prefix with an English root, or vice versa – exhibit diaconstructions. This is likely due to the stability of German syntax for prefix verbs, whereby prefixes are either placed in the final field (with one finite verb in second position) or before the finite verb in final position, and its difference from English ordering (cf. (6)-(7) above). TxG utterances with code-switching, in contrast, exhibit diaconstructions most frequently among the three transfer types, with 21 of 105 examples (20%) representing diaconstructions. Loan translation examples exhibit diaconstructions nearly as frequently as code-switching examples, with four of 24 examples (16.7%) showing word order identical across the two languages. However, as will be shown in the next section, TxG utterances with loan translation from English frequently exhibit constituent ordering and other structural properties that are highly unusual and unable to be subsumed under the word order categories/constructions defined at the start of this section.

Turning to the summary of all analyzed TxG sentences, Table 12 shows how many examples exhibit StG vs. non-StG ordering (e.g. V2-type ordering with subordinate clauses, or instances of *Ausklammerung*), as well as how many examples

24. In the summary of the full results below, I discuss why main clauses are more likely to exhibit diaconstructions where German and English word order is identical than other clause types.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Table 12. Summary of analysis – Standard vs. Non-standard and Diaconstructions

Clause type	StG	StG Dia.	Non-StG	Non-StG Dia.	Dia. total
müssen (50)	42 (84%)	4 (2%)	8 (16%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
dass (50)	36 (72%)	2 (4%)	14 (28%)	5 (10%)	7 (14%)
weil (50)	14 (28%)	0 (0%)	36 (72%)	14 (28%)	14 (28%)
German Total (150)	**92 (~61%)**	**3 (~2%)**	**58 (~39%)**	**19 (~13%)**	**22 (~15%)**
English Total (141)	**123 (~87%)**	**21 (~15%)**	**18 (~13%)**	**4 (~3%)**	**25 (~18%)**

of each type can be characterized as diaconstructions. The first column lists the number and percentage of examples for a given clause type that exhibit word order expected in StG, the second column lists the number and percentage of examples exhibiting both StG word order and representing a diaconstruction. The fourth and fifth columns show the number exhibiting non-standard word order and both non-standard word order and diaconstructions, respectively. The final column lists the total number of examples for the respective clause type which represent diaconstructions. The top four rows describe the German-language data, while the final row describes the English-verb data.

Among the German-verb examples, main clauses with *müssen* occur most frequently in word order constructions expected in StG (namely V2B) and least frequently in diaconstructions. Subordinate *dass* clauses occur somewhat less frequently in the expected StG construction (namely VE) and more frequently in diaconstructions (14%) than *müssen* clauses. In contrast, subordinate *weil* clauses are the least frequent in the expected StG word order (VE) and most frequent in diaconstructions, not only among the German-verb data, but also in comparison with the English-verb data. This discrepancy can be attributed to the high frequency of *weil* with V2 ordering in TxG, as also attested by Boas (2009a) and Fuchs (2018), and to the high susceptibility of V2-type ordering to coincide with that of English relative to V1-type and VE-type ordering.

This explanation is further supported by a critical comparison of the German-verb and English-verb datasets. At first glance, the comparison does not (strongly) support the hypothesis that TxG utterances with English verbs are more frequent in non-StG constructions and in the diaconstructions proposed in Table 5: 87% of the English-verb examples but only 61% of the German-verb examples exhibit StG constructions, and the English-verb examples are only slightly more frequent in diaconstructions (17.7%) than all German-verb examples (14.7%) but much less frequent than *weil* examples (28%).

These figures, however, are skewed due to the data selection method employed in the analysis and the general character of word order constructions in German and English. Specifically, the English-verb data comprise a significantly higher

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

percentage of main clauses (~91%) and also include main clauses with a single verb, which were not included in the German-verb data. Main clauses are associated with V2-type constructions in StG, and V2-type constructions are more susceptible to allowing identical ordering with English than other construction types. As pointed out in Table 5 and the surrounding discussion, in order to exhibit word order identical across German and English, V2 constructions only require that the subject precede the verb (Principle A), and V2B and V2B + AK constructions further require that no constituents occur in the middle field to separate the finite and non-finite verbs (Principle B). In contrast, VE-type constructions require not only that these two principles are filled, but also that the finite verb precede non-finite verbs (Principle C). V1-type constructions for polar questions are even less susceptible to exhibiting diaconstructions, as they must not only fulfill the aforementioned principles, but also Principle D, which accounts for the English requirement of *do*-support in the formation of polar questions with only a single verb.

In addition to the susceptibility of V2 constructions to be identical across the two languages, the brief discussion of *because* clauses also suggests that TxG utterances with English lexical items exhibit more non-StG ordering than the primary dataset investigated here. Furthermore, the analysis of English-verb subordinate clauses showed that three of the 10 sentences (30%) exhibited non-StG ordering, a figure closer to that for German-verb *weil* clauses and much higher than the combined German-verb *dass* and *weil* clauses. Furthermore, the examples discussed in the following section were not included in the main analysis, but show how English lexical transference can affect German syntactic structures more drastically. In sum, a closer and more sophisticated analysis may in fact support the hypothesis that English-verb TxG utterances differ more drastically from StG and result in more frequent use of word order diaconstructions than TxG utterances with German verbs.

5.5. (Diasystematic) constructional account of divergent TxG syntax

While the word order properties of the TxG utterances discussed above could be categorized according to the German word order constructions identified in Section 4.1, several examples exhibit syntax that cannot clearly be ascribed to English or German. These examples require a more nuanced perspective of syntactic structures, with an appreciation for their relation to other aspects of language (e.g. semantics, lexicon, etc.) and the potential influence of English interference. In this section, I show how a Diasystematic CxG approach supports such an analysis: The basic principles of CxG allow for a more explicit account of how constructions of different types interact within a single utterance, and the Diasystematic CxG perspective helps us understand how multilingual speakers draw on their

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

full constructional repertoire and must somehow map the (lexical) constructions of one language (here, English) onto the (grammatical) constructions of another language (here, TxG). This section only provides a survey of different types of 'non-standard' utterances and potential explanations for their irregularity, and it should not be taken as a full-fledged account or categorization of such utterances.

Multiple lexical transference

One category of TxG utterances differing significantly from StG subsumes utterances that include multiple instances of English lexical transference, yet largely maintain German-style syntax, as in (54).

(54) *Du musst den Clutch drehen, for es Gear zu schiff.*
you must the clutch turn in-order the gear to shift
'You must turn the clutch to shift the gear.'
StG: *Man muss die Kupplung treten, um den Gang zu wechseln*.

This example comes off as rather unusual to a (non-English-speaking) StG speaker not because of its structural properties per se, but because of the high number of English lexical items. This is seen in the code-switching of *clutch*, *gear*, and *shift*, as well as the loan-translation of *du* 'you (inf.)' (StG *man* 'one') and *drehen* ('turn') (StG: *treten* ('step on/kick')). Despite the slight structural interference in that the infinitival clause is introduced by *for*[25] rather than the expected *um* ('in order to'), the general syntax of the utterance largely follows that expected in StG. From a constructional perspective, such utterances can be understood as instances of German syntactic (i.e. word order) constructions whose schematic slots are filled in with English lexical items (i.e. lexical constructions). These cases only differ from normal instances of lexical transference with respect to the amount of transferred material.

(Inaccurate) complex German structures

Other examples represent another type of divergent TxG utterance, namely those in which complex German structures (e.g. infinitival or relative clauses) are formed inaccurately (from the perspective of StG). One such type of utterance is given in (55).

(55) *denn is er in saloon gegang zum sein […] etwas Bier drinken.*
then is he in saloon gone to his some beer drink
'Then he went into the saloon to drink some/his beer.'
StG: Dann ist er in die Kneipe gegangen, um sein/etwas Bier zu trinken.

25. The word *for* in this example, and in Example (55) below, can be viewed as either a loan translation or a code-switching of English *for*, depending on its pronunciation.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Like the previous example, (55) also exhibits multiple lexical transference, seen in the code-switching of *saloon* and (potentially) of *drinken* (which could also be a phonological variation on German-origin *trinken*). In this example, however, the structural formation of the infinitival clause appears to influence the foreign-sounding character of the utterance. Specifically, in StG, the clause should begin with the complementizer *um*, the infinitival marker *zu* should precede the infinitive verb, and *zum* should not appear with the *-m* case ending.[26]

Like the two sentences above, (56) includes both English lexical interference as well as multiple complex structures, which are formed even more inaccurately (from the perspective of StG) than that above.

(56) *Und wie sonst hat man extra Welli wo se hiren konnst, for*
and as otherwise has one extra some-people, where you hire could, for
die zu schern.[27]
them to sheer
And otherwise one had some extra (people) whom one could hire to sheer them.
StG: Und sonst hatte man zusätzliche (Leute?), die man anstellen konnte, die Schafe zu scheren.

The first embedded clause (*wo se hiren konnst*) is a relative clause introduced with the non-inflected *wo* ('where/which') rather than the inflected relative pronoun *die* ('whom' plural, accusative). It also includes the code-switched *hiren* (StG *anstellen/beauftragen*) and a subject form (*se*, StG *Sie*, 'you' formal) that differs from that in the main clause it depends on (*man*, 'one'). The final infinitival clause also differs from StG in that it is introduced with *for* rather than *um*, and in that the equivalent German verb, *anstellen* ('hire') does not employ an infinitival complementizer.[28] Examples such as (55)-(56) demonstrate how speakers combine specif-

26. This utterance is also divergent due to the hesitation and restarting within the infinitival clause of *sein* and *etwas*, which is a feature characteristic of natural rapid speech and not directly related to the interaction of constructions.

27. Though it is pronounced and transcribed rather unusually, the word *Welli* is translated as StG *welche* ('some (people)'), as it likely refers to the people who could be hired. In any case, the meaning of this word does not affect the word order analysis.

28. Another example of inaccurate formation of complex structures is seen in: *Denn hab ich so viel Stimmen gekricht wie die andere drei zusammen was gegen mich gelaufen.* (1–42–1–12-a). Here, the final relative clause from StG in several respects: the clause is introduced with *was* ('what/which') rather than the inflected relative pronoun (i.e. *die*), it employs the verb *(ge)laufen* ('run') which is loan-translated from the English collocation 'run for election', and the inflected perfect auxiliary (*haben* or *sind*) should appear in clause-final position but is omitted altogether by the speaker.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

ic features (e.g. word order, complementizer choice) of both German and English constructions in the formation of complex syntactic structures.

Transferring complex verb constructions with lexicogrammatical interference

While the syntax of the examples above differs somewhat from StG, it is not clear that the transference of English lexical constructions is responsible for this difference. Instead, the high number of lexical transfers themselves or the inaccurate (though not purely English-based) formation of complex structures – or a combination thereof – gives them a foreign character. In contrast, other TxG utterances more clearly exhibit syntactic effects of transferred English lexical constructions.

One way that this comes about is the code-switching or loan translation of an English lexical item (especially verbs or adjectives) along with its associated grammatical "baggage" – such as its collocational or argument realization properties – which are imposed onto German grammar. This is demonstrated in (57)–(58), in which English verbs are simply code-switched while the surrounding constituents are formed using features of both German and English constructions.

(57) *Ich like's zu essen.* (10–171–3–28–a)
I like it to eat
'I like to eat it.'
Ich mag es essen. (StG)

(58) *Wir waren supposed kein Deutsch zu sprechen in die Schul.* (1–21–1–5–a)
we were supposed no German to speak in the school
'We were not supposed to speak German in school.'
Wir sollten in der Schule kein Deutsch sprechen. (StG)

In (57), the speaker uses the English verb *like* and combines specific features of the English "*like* + VP" construction and the German "*mögen* + VP" construction, as shown in Figure 2:

ENG: [SBJ + *like* + *to* V + OBJ]	*I like to eat it.*
TXG: [SBJ + *like* + OBJ + *zu* V]	*Ich like es zu essen.*
STG: [SBJ + *mögen* + OBJ + Vinf]	*Ich mag es essen.*

Figure 2. 'like' constructions in TxG, StG, and English

ENG: [SBJ + be + supposed + *to* V + OBJ + ADV]	*We were supposed to speak no German in school.*
GER: [SBJ + *sollen* + ADV + OBJ + Vinf]	*Wir sollten in der Schule kein Deutsch sprechen.*
TxG: [SBJ + *sein* + *supposed* + OBJ + *zu* V + ADV]	*Wir waren supposed kein Deutsch zu sprechen in die Schul*

Figure 3. 'supposed to/sollen' constructions in TxG, StG, and English

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

In the English *like* construction, the subject is followed by the verb *like*, which is followed by an infinitival main verb (e.g. *to eat*) that precedes the object. The most closely related StG construction uses the verb *mögen* ('to like'), which occurs in second-position (following the subject, in canonical cases) and is followed by the object (*es* ('it')), but it differs from English in that the main verb (*essen* ('to eat')) occurs in its bare infinitive form rather than with the infinitival marker *zu*.[29] In forming the TxG utterance in (57), the speaker employs the word order from the StG construction but follows the English construction in omitting the dummy object es and in using the infinitival marker *zu*.[30]

In (58), the English "semi-modal" construction with *supposed to*, along with its grammatical features, is imposed upon TxG structures, resulting in an utterance with both English- and German-style syntax. English has a "supposed to do X" construction, which contains slots for the following constituents, in this order: [subject – support verb (*be*) – semi-modal (*supposed*) – main verb with the *to* infinitival marker – any objects – any adverbial phrases]. In StG, the construction with the most similar meaning employs *sollen* as a (normal) modal verb and the bracket structure (V2B), with the object following any adverbial phrases in the middle field and the main verb in its bare infinitival form in clause-final position.

Here again, the TxG speaker combines aspects of both constructions. For one, the support verb of the English construction is loan-translated into German (*waren*), the modal *supposed* is code-switched from English, and the English infinitival marker is translated into German (*zu*). The placement of object (*kein Deutsch* ('no German')) before the main verb adheres to the StG construction, but the placement of the adverbial phrase (*in die Schul* ('in school')) after the main verb adheres to the English construction.

Loan Translation of more general and 'central' constructions

While the grammar of utterances such as those above are closely linked to the properties of the lexical constructions for *like to* and *supposed to*, other TxG

29. German may also express this meaning with the verb *gefallen* ('to please'), but this verb exhibits a different argument structure, namely that the liked entity is subject and the experiencer is a dative object. TxG speakers also frequently use loan-translated *gleichen* ('to like') in this context. See Keel (2014) and Dux (2017) for more on how the concept of 'to like' is expressed in German-American varieties.

30. A similar case is seen in the utterance *Die wären sehr hart gewesen to clear* (1–51–1–2-a), in which the German verb *hart* is loan-translated from English *hard* ('difficult'), the infinitival marker *to* is directly code-switched from English, and the word order combines properties of both English and German syntax.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

utterances exhibit grammatical properties that represent broader and more central structural differences between German and English. A detailed account cannot be offered here, but some grammatical features that may undergo constructional interaction in TxG utterances include the use of *make* as a causative verb in English (59), the correspondence between German dative experiencer and English subject experiencer (60), and the use of prefixed and particle verbs (61).

(59) *Das hat mich denken machen vor 'ne masse Dinge.* (1-55-1-5-a)
That has me think make before a mass-of things
'That made me think about a lot of things.'
Das brachte mich dazu, über viele Sachen nachzudenken. (StG)

(60) *weil ich langweilig war* (1-85-1-6-a)
because I bored was
'because I was bored.'
weil es mir langweilig war. (StG)

(61) *weil ich find aus davon anyway.* (1-21-1-4-a)
because I find out of-that anyway
'because I will find out about that anyway.'
weil ich das sowieso herausfinden werde. (StG)

Multiple transference and interference in a single clause

To conclude this section, I describe the two highly divergent examples in (62)–(63). These examples demonstrate how a single utterance may exhibit multiple types of traditionally recognized language contact phenomena (e.g. code-switching, loan translation) and of multilingual constructional interference described in the preceding pages (e.g. inaccurate structure formation, structural interference). Such examples cannot be fully described within approaches that focus on a single type of language contact phenomenon or that assume a division between so-called language modules, but require a more unified and comprehensive approach, such as that offered by Diasystematic CxG.

(62) *ICH like's hier besser because ich hab immer mein Deutsches verpasst*
I like-it here better because I have always my German-ADJ missed
'I like it here better, because I always missed my German.'
Ich mag es hier besser, weil ich immer mein Deutsch vermisst habe.
(10–171–3–18–a)

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

(63) *Aber sonst tue ich noch ganz gut, except tu' die (Maria) auch phonen,*
but otherwise do I still quite good, except do the Maria also phone,
wenn ich langweilig wär.
when I bored am
But otherwise I'm still doing quite well, except I call Maria, when I am/get bored.
Aber sonst geht es mir ganz gut, ausgenommen, dass ich auch Maria anrufe, wenn es mir langweilig ist.[31] (1–85–1–6–a)

Example (62) exhibits lexical transference in the code-switching of the verb *like* and the conjunction *because* and in the loan translation of *verpasst* ('to miss'), which is used in StG for missing appointments or transportation (e.g. buses) but not in the sense of longing or lacking something one previously had. The object *es* ('it') has also been contracted and attached to the verb *like*, as frequently occurs in rapid German speech but not in English. Syntactically, the second clause exhibits V2 word order (which is not expected in StG but common for *because* clauses in TxG), but it maintains the German bracket structure with the non-finite verb in clause-final position. The noun *Deutsches* is also assigned a German adjective ending which is not used in StG when referring to a language.

Example (63) exhibits lexical transference in the code-switching of the conjunction *except* and the verb *phonen*. The initial clause shows the loan translation of the English expression 'be doing well', in the sense of being in a good state, which would be expressed in StG with the verb *gehen* and a dative experiencer (*es geht mir gut*). The final clause exhibits similar structural interference, as the dative experiencer expected in StG (*mir ist langweilig*) is expressed as nominative subject as in English (*I am bored*). Furthermore, the middle clause employs the 'habitual *tun*' construction found in some non-standard German dialects, and its subject (*ich* 'I') appears to have been omitted, likely due to the naturalistic speech setting.

These two examples demonstrate quite clearly how speakers draw on their *constructional repertoire,* which does not always compartmentalize individual constructions to specific languages. Instead, multilingual speakers may employ and combine individual constructions of all types (e.g. lexical, syntactic, morphological, phraseological), which are typically associated with one "language" or another. From a diachronic perspective, it may well be the case that prolonged use of such combined structures can lead to significant structural differences between a contact language and non-contact varieties of the same language (as may be seen in the development of languages that are disconnected from their donor dialect over centuries, such as the German dialects of sectarian Pennsylvania Dutch).

31. The name "Maria" is used in place of the actual personal name uttered by the speaker for reasons of privacy.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Such structural changes, however, are not due to a "parametric" shift of large-scale typological character (such as SOV to SVO), but can instead be attributed to the interaction of more item-specific constructions, including those associated with individual lexical items.

6. Conclusion

This paper presented a detailed analysis of Texas German (TxG) word order drawing on recent developments in research on (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar. In Section 2, I discussed how previous research on word order – both in Texas German and of broader datasets – relies primarily on broad categories such as SOV/SVO which may be relevant in large-scale typological comparisons but cannot adequately account for the full range of word order phenomena among bilingual speakers of closely related languages. I then described how word order is accounted for in Construction Grammar in Section 3. In Section 4 I identified German word order constructions (focusing primarily on verb placement) that are more specific than those employed in previous studies (e.g. verb-second vs. verb-final), as well as German-English word order "diaconstructions" in which constituent ordering is identical in the two languages and the broader syntactic principles of each language that play into the comparison of word order constructions.

The analysis in Section 5 sought to assess previous findings on TxG word order, which are largely confirmed: subordinate clauses headed by *dass* largely maintain the expected German word order with the finite verb in clause-final position, those headed by *weil* are more frequent with the finite verb in second position, and speakers almost always maintain the relative placement of finite and non-finite verbs found in German. The analysis also tested the hypothesis that TxG speakers would use the cross-linguistically identical diaconstructions more frequently than German-specific constructions, especially when verbs are code-switched or loan-translated from English. The data suggested that German-specific constructions are preferred overall, but German-English diaconstructions are slightly more frequent in clauses with English verbs than in those with German-origin verbs. However, a closer analysis showed how the data selection method may have skewed the results, as certain clause types are more likely to exhibit diaconstructions than others. The paper concluded by discussing several utterances with structures that cannot clearly be ascribed to English or (Texas) German and showing how a (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar approach helps to account for how German and English structures interact within a single utterance.

The application of (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar principles to contrastive analyses of word order offers a radically new perspective on cross-linguistic

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

grammatical research compared to traditional syntactic analyses, which seek to describe entire languages and/or traditional clause types (e.g., declarative, interrogative) using a limited set of predetermined syntactic categories (e.g., V2, SVO, SOV). The TxG data, particularly the utterances discussed in Section 5.5, emphasize that word order – the trademark feature of syntax in modular frameworks – cannot be treated independently but exhibits intricate interactions with other traditional "modules" of language, most notably the lexicon, pragmatics, and phraseology. These findings thereby support the non-modular approach of Construction Grammar. Of course, a constructional approach such as that demonstrated here certainly increases the complexity of word order analyses, as seen for instance when one compares the 10 word order types identified in Section 4 against the traditional three-way distinction between V1, V2, and VE. (Furthermore, the 10 word order types would increase substantially if the ordering of other elements besides subject and verbs is accounted for). However, the word order of the TxG data discussed here demonstrates that TxG speakers' linguistic knowledge is not compartmentalized clearly into such categories but depends on numerous non-syntactic factors. Thus, the increased complexity and multidimensionality of (Diasystematic) Construction Grammar methods is necessary if we seek to fulfill the ultimate goal Construction Grammar research, namely an adequate and empirically account of "the entirety of language" – including messy data such as that produced by bilingual Texas German speakers.

The present analysis must, of course, be applied to a much wider range of data to arrive at a full and empirically valid account of TxG word order. Such an analysis should also account more systematically for sociolinguistic variables, such as speakers' age, fluency level, and degree of exposure to English, TxG, and StG. Another avenue of future research is the identification of other types of potential (German-English) diaconstructions, such as those involving verbal inflection, case assignment, or phonology. Another important question arising from this analysis of (German) word order is the relation between word order constructions identified here (focusing on the placement of verbal elements and core grammatical functions) and other aspects of word order, such as those involving with prefix/particle verbs the relative placement of adverbial phrases.

References

Backus, A., & Dorleijn, M. (2009). Loan translations versus code-switching. In B. Bullock, & A. Toribio (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-Switching* (pp. 75–94). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511576331.006

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Barðdal, J., Smirnova, E., Sommerer, L., & Gildea, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.18

Berman, C. (2003). *Clausal Syntax of German*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Boas, H. C. (2003). *A Constructional Approach to Resultatives*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Boas, H. C. (2009a). *The Life and Death of Texas German*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Boas, H. C. (2009b). Case loss in Texas German: The influence of semantic and pragmatic factors. In J. Barðdal, & S. Chelliah (Eds.), *The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in the Development of Case* (pp. 347–373). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Boas, H. C., & Sag, I. (Eds.). (2012). *Sign-based Construction Grammar*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Boas, H. C., & Pierce, M. (2011). Lexical developments in Texas German. In M. Putnam (Ed.), *Studies on German Language Islands* (pp. 129–150). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.123.06bao

Boas, H. C., Ewing, K., Moran, C., & Thompson, J. (2004). Towards determining the influence of internal and external factors on recent developments in Texas German phonology. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*, 10(1), 47–59.

Boas, H. C., Pierce, M., & Brown, C. L. (2014). On the variability of Texas German *wo* as a complementizer. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals*, 67(4), 589–611.

Burridge, K. (1992). Creating Grammar: examples from Pennsylvania German. In K. Burridge, & W. Enninger (Eds.), *Diachronic Studies on the Languages of the Anabaptists* (pp. 199–242). Bochum: Universitätsverlag Brockmeyer.

Clyne, M. (1994). What can we learn from Sprachinseln?: Some observations on Australian German. In K. Mattheier, & N. Berend (Eds.), *Sprachinseln* (pp. 105–122). Frankfurt: Lang.

Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511606526

Croft, W. (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198299554.001.0001

Den Besten, H. (1983). On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In W. Abraham (Ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania: Papers from the 3rd Groningen Grammar Talks* (pp. 47–131). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.3.03bes

Dryer, M. S. (2013). Order of subject, object, and verb. In M. Dryer, & M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (Retrieved from http://wals.info/chapter/1, Accessed on 2017–07–28.)

Duden. (2006). *Duden: Die Grammatik*. Dudenredaktion (Ed.). Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

Dux, R. (2017). Classifying language contact phenomena: English verbs in Texas German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*, 29(4), 379–430.

Eisenberg, P., & Gallmann, P. (2016). *Der Duden in 12 Bänden: 4 – Die Grammatik*. Mannheim, Germany: Bibliographisches Institut & FA Brockhaus AG.

Eisenberg, P. (2006). *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik: Band 2: Der Satz*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Fanselow, G. (1989). Coherent infinitives in German: Restructuring vs. IP-Complementation. In C. Bhatt, E. Loebel, & C. Schmidt (Eds.), *Syntactic Phrase Structure Phenomena in Noun Phrase and Sentences* (pp. 1–16). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.6.02fan

Fillmore, C. J., Kay, P., & O'Connor, M. C. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of *let alone*. *Language*, 64(3), 501–538. https://doi.org/10.2307/414531

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Fuchs, K. (2018). Word order in dependent clauses in Texas German. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 84, 1-19.

Fuller, J. (1997). *Pennsylvania Dutch with a Southern touch: a theoretical model of language contact and change* (PhD dissertation). University of South Carolina –Columbia.

Gilbert, Glenn. (1972). *Linguistic Atlas of Texas German*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Goldberg, A. (1995). *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goldberg, A. (2006). *Constructions at Work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grewendorf, G. (1989). *Ergativity in German*. Dordrecht: Foris. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110859256

Haider, H. (1986). Fehlende Argumente: Vom Passiv zu kohärenten Infinitiven. *Linguistische Berichte*, 101, 3–33.

Haider, H. (1990). Topicalization and other puzzles of German syntax. In G. Grewendorf, & W. Sternefeld (Eds.), *Scrambling and Barriers* (pp. 93–112). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.5.06hai

Höder, S. (2012). Multilingual constructions: a diasystematic approach to common structures. In K. Braunmüller, & C. Gabriel (Eds.), *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies* (Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism 13) (pp. 241–257). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.13.17hod

Höder, S. (2014). Constructing diasystems. Grammatical organisation in bilingual groups. In T. A. Åfarli, & B. Mæhlum (Eds.), *The Sociolinguistics of Grammar* (Studies in language companion series 154) (pp. 137–152). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.154.07hod

Höder, S. (This volume). Grammar is community-specific: Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar.

Hoffmann, T., & Trousdale, G. (Eds.). (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195396683.001.0001

Hopp, H., & Putnam, M. T. (2015). Syntactic restructuring in heritage grammars: Word order variation in Moundridge Schweitzer German. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 5(2), 180–214. https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.5.2.02hop

Hopper, P., & Traugott, E. C. (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Imo, W. (2016). *Grammatik: Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Jacobs, J. (1986). The syntax of focus and adverbials in German. In W. Abraham, & S. De Meij (Eds.), *Topic, Focus, and Configurationality. Papers from the 6th Groningen Grammar Talks, Groningen* 1984 (pp. 103–127). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.4.06jac

Kathol, A. (2000). *Linear Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kay, P. (2005). Argument structure constructions and the argument-adjunct distinction. In H. C. Boas, & M. Fried (Eds.), *Grammatical Constructions: Back to the Roots* Constructional Approaches to Language (pp. 71–98). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.4.05kay

Keel, W. D. (2014). German settlement varieties in Kansas. In A. W. Farris-Trimble, & J. A. Barlow (Eds.), *Perspectives on Phonological Theory and Development : In Honor of Daniel A. Dinnsen* (pp. 155–172). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lald.56.13kee

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Kloss, H. (1977). Die deutsche Schriftsprache bei den Amischen. In L. Auberger, H. Kloss, & H. Rupp (Eds.), *Deutsch als Muttersprache in Kanada: Berichte zur Gegenwartslage* (pp. 97–98). Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Kuningas, J., & Leino, J. (2006). Word orders and Construction Grammar. In M. Suominen, A. Arppe, A. Airola, O. Heinämäki, M. Miestamo, U. Määttä, J. Niemi, K. K. Pitkänen, & K. Sinnemäki (Eds.), *A Man of Measure; Festschrift in Honour of Fred Karlsson on his 60th Birthday* (pp. 301–309). Turku, Finland: The Linguistic Association of Finland.

Louden, M. (1992). German as an object-verb language: A unification of typological and generative approaches. In I. Rauch, G. F. Carr, & R. L. Kyes (Eds.), *On Germanic Linguistics: Issues and Methods* (pp. 217–231). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110856446.217

Meurers, W. D. (2000). *Lexical generalizations in the syntax of German non-finite constructions. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340* (p. 145). Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.

Müller, S. (2005). German: A grammatical sketch. In A. Alexiadou, & T. Kiss (Eds.), *Syntax – ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*, 2nd Edition. Berlin: de Gruyter

Nützel, D. (1998). *Morphosyntactic variation and change in Haysville (Indiana) East Franconian*. (PhD dissertation) Purdue University.

Pierce, M., Boas, H. C., & Roesch, K. (2015). The history of front rounded vowels in New Braunfels German. In J. Bondi Johannessen, & J. C. Salmons (Eds.), *Germanic Heritage Languages in North America* (pp. 118–131). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/silv.18.05pie

Reis, M. (1980). On justifying topological frames: 'positional field' and the order of non-verbal constituents in Berman. *Documentation et Recherche en Linguistique Allemande Contemporaire*, 22/23, 59–85.

Riehl, C. M. (2004). *Sprachkontaktforschung* Tübingen: Narr.

van Rimsdijk, H. (1985). Zum Rattenfängereffekt bei Infinitiven in deutschen Relativsätzen. In W. Abraham (Ed.), *Erklärende Syntax des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Uszkoreit, H. (1987). *Word order and Constituent Structure in German*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Webelhuth, G. (1992). *Principles and Parameters of Syntactic Saturation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wöllstein-Leisten, A., Heilmann, A., Stepan, P., & Vikner, S. (1997). *Deutsche Satzstruktur – Grundlagen der syntaktischen Analyse*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Ziem, A., & Boas, H. C. (2017). Towards a constructicon for German. In *Proceedings of the AAAI 2017 Spring Symposium on Computational Construction Grammar and Natural Language Understanding* (Technical Report SS-17–02) (pp. 274–277). Stanford University.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.

Copyright © 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

Constructions in Contact : Constructional Perspectives on Contact Phenomena in Germanic Languages, edited by
Hans C. Boas, and Steffen Höder, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa
Created from utxa on 2022-12-15 13:47:40.