

Chapter 16

V3 in urban youth varieties of Dutch

Marieke Meelen

University of Cambridge

Khalid Mourigh

Leiden University

Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng

Leiden University

In this paper we compare new data from Dutch urban youth varieties to emerging varieties in other Germanic languages like German and Norwegian. We argue that, unlike previously thought, V3 word orders can be found in urban youth varieties of Dutch as well and present data from our new corpus. The V3 patterns in our dataset share most characteristics of the optional V3 innovations observed in other Germanic urban youth varieties: the sentence-initial constituent is a frame-setter of any category and the preverbal constituent is mainly the subject that functions as a *familiar topic*. We adopt Walkden's (2017) analysis and extend it by adding an additional FrameP so that preverbal constituents that do not function as familiar topics could be accounted for as well. Following Wolfe's cline of possible V2-languages, we argue that the Dutch urban youth varieties can best be analysed as "Force-V2 system 1" grammars with V-to-Force movement + an additional FrameP. They thus differ from Standard Dutch, which is argued to be a "Force-V2 system 2" based on the fact that only hanging or left-dislocated topics can be found in sentence-initial position of superficial V3 patterns. This data thus presents an interesting case of syntactic change in the opposite direction: from strict V2 to V2 with optional V3 orders.



1 Introduction

Main clauses in Modern Dutch are characterised by the verb-second (V2) constraint (cf. Zwart 1997). Just like in Modern German and Scandinavian languages, the finite verb linearly follows a variety of sentence-initial constituents, as shown in (1) for subjects, objects and adjuncts.¹

(1) Standard Dutch

- a. Ian *vierde* zijn verjaardag gisteren.
Ian celebrated his birthday yesterday
- b. Zijn verjaardag *vierde* Ian gisteren.
His birthday celebrated Ian yesterday
- c. Gisteren *vierde* Ian zijn verjaardag.
Yesterday celebrated Ian his birthday
'Ian celebrated his birthday yesterday.'

All three options are grammatically correct in Standard Dutch, but the choice of sentence-initial constituent is pragmatically conditioned. Verb-third (V3) orders as seen in the English translation of example (1c), are not allowed in Standard Modern Dutch:

(2) Standard Dutch

- *Gisteren Ian *vierde* zijn verjaardag.
yesterday Ian celebrated his birthday
Intended: 'Ian celebrated his birthday yesterday.'

Recently, some varieties of Germanic V2 languages have been reported to exhibit V3 orders alongside the standard V2 patterns (see, among others, Freywald et al. 2015, Wiese 2013, Wiese & Rehbein 2016 and Walkden 2017). These new Germanic varieties have emerged in multilingual settings in large cities in various countries in Europe.² Various examples of these unexpected V3 or XSV orders in these

¹Throughout this article the inflected verbs in the examples will be indicated in *italics*. Unless specified otherwise, all examples are from a small corpus of a Dutch urban youth variety compiled by Khalid Mourigh in 2013–2017, recorded in Gouda (see also §2 and the Appendix).

²The term “urban youth varieties” will be used for these varieties of Dutch throughout this paper, because it has the least pejorative connotation and it captures the sociolinguistic characteristics of being spoken by young people in urban, multilingual settings. Other terms for these varieties of Danish, Norwegian, Swedish and German, such as “ethnolect”, “multiethnolect”, “Kiezdeutsch” (‘neighborhood German’) or “Kebab Norwegian” are problematic because they do not characterise the exact nature of the varieties and often have strong derogatory overtones (cf. Walkden 2017; Aarsæther 2010).

languages that usually exhibit the V2 constraint have been cited by Freywald et al. (2015) and Walkden (2017):³

- (3) a. German urban youth variety (Wiese 2009: 787)
 morgen ich *geh* Arbeitsamt
 tomorrow I go jobcentre
 ‘Tomorrow I will go to the job centre.’
- b. Norwegian urban youth variety (Opsahl 2009: 133)
 nå de *får* betale
 now they get pay
 ‘Now they have to pay.’
- c. Danish urban youth variety (Quist 2008: 47)
 normal man *går* på ungdomsskolen
 usually one goes to youthclub
 ‘Normally you attend the youth club.’
- d. Swedish urban youth variety (Ganuza 2008: 53)
 då alla *börja(de)* hata henne
 then everyone started hate her
 ‘Then everyone started hating her.’

Appel (1984), Appel & Muysken (1987: 91) and Schwartz & Sprouse (2000) have reported that adult L2 learners of Dutch produce adverb-subject-verb orders (XSV or AdvSV) as well:

- (4) Dutch L2 learner (Appel 1984)
 En dan hij *gaat* weg.
 and then he goes away
 ‘And then he goes away.’

³Since the preverbal constituent is usually the subject of the sentence, Freywald et al. (2015) refer to them as “XSV” with any type of constituent “X” preceding the subject and the verb. In our present corpus, we only find preverbal subjects as well. Walkden (2017), however, presents some examples of light adverbials in the German urban youth variety “Kiezdeutsch”. The lack of light adverbials like *hier* ‘here’ and *da* ‘there’ in our present corpus is presumably the result of our small dataset rather than the result of a structural restriction. The Dutch adverbs (*hier* and *daar*) are functionally equivalent to their German counterparts and we therefore have no reason to assume urban varieties of Dutch differ in this respect from Kiezdeutsch. The Dutch urban dialect could in theory be different, however. Therefore, we continue to use the term “V3” to refer to these innovative word order patterns.

However, according to Freywald et al. (2015), there are very few violations of the V2 constraint found in three case studies of Dutch they examined: bilateral interviews with a mixed groups of young people from Lombok (Cornips 2002), interviews with four male adolescents of Surinamese, Creole descent (Cornips & De Rooij 2013) and in- and out-group conversations in the classical Labovian method with speakers from a Dutch, Moroccan–Dutch, and Turkish–Dutch background. The only three examples are the following (cited by Freywald et al. 2015: 86–87):

- (5) a. Utrecht/TCULT corpus, Badir
toen we *hadden* eerst twee autos
then we had first two cars
'Then, we first had two cars (and later only one).'
- b. Utrecht/TCULT: Badir
daarom ik *heb* dat probleem niet
that's why I have that problem not
'That's why I don't have that problem.'
- c. Adam-Nijmegen/etnolects project: Hassan, see Lukassen (2011)
daarom Nederland *is* niet echt meer van eh
that's why the Netherlands is not really more like eh
'That's why the Netherlands is no longer more like eh ...'

They conclude from this that the Dutch urban youth variety, unlike its V2 neighbours in Germany, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, “does not allow loosened grammatical restrictions in respect to the XSV order” (Freywald et al. 2015: 88).

In this article we first present new data from a Dutch urban youth variety spoken by Dutch teenagers with a Moroccan heritage in Gouda (§2 and §3). We argue that these new data show that this Dutch urban youth variety indeed exhibits violations of the strict V2 constraint. V3 orders are attested in our dataset and we suggest this is an indication that Dutch urban youth varieties show the same characteristics as their Germanic neighbours (§3). We then proceed to consider these V3 orders in their syntactic context. Although our present dataset is still quite limited, we will present a tentative synchronic analysis, elucidating this optional variation in the context of the Standard Dutch C-domain (§4.1). We then sketch a possible scenario of language change and how this relates to the diachronic analyses that have been proposed for this phenomenon in other Germanic urban vernaculars (section §4.2). Finally, we define some areas of future work, based on the need for different types of data collection and other syntactic deviations from Standard Dutch that affect the C-domain (§5).

2 Linguistic setting

The present study is based on a corpus of oral interviews conducted by one of the authors with Moroccan Dutch teenagers in Gouda. Gouda, which is a rather small city with 71,105 inhabitants, has the largest Moroccan Dutch population in the Netherlands with 6,892 members. About half of the Moroccan population in Gouda belong to the second generation, meaning that they were born in the Netherlands and have at least one parent who was born in Morocco. According to the people interviewed in Gouda, most members of the local Moroccan Dutch community originate from the region of Nador in North Morocco, more specifically from Ayt Said, making this linguistically a tight-knit group.

This means that a large percentage of its members have Riffian Berber as their heritage language (98.5% of the population of the countryside of Ayt Said speaks Tarifiyt Berber⁴). Dialectal Arabic also plays an important role as a lingua franca in general. While it is not used for everyday communication, Standard Arabic still plays an important role in religious life and in the media. People who were born and raised in the Netherlands primarily use Dutch in daily life (already in the 1980s, cf. De Ruiter 1989). With their parents they often speak Berber or (dialectal) Arabic, or they code-switch between one of these languages and Dutch. Therefore, Berber and Arabic can be considered heritage languages (cf. Montrul 2016).

The total corpus consists of roughly thirteen hours of interviews with thirty-one people (see the Appendix for a full overview of speaker codes we use in our examples, including interview settings and language backgrounds, based on Mourigh 2017). The interviews were conducted in groups of at least two people with the interviewer always present. All interviews were conducted with male teenagers except for two teenage girls who have the same ethnic background. The teenagers share a similar socio-economic and educational background. At the time of recording they either attended secondary school (VMBO) or lower vocational training (MBO). The interviews were conducted at different places in informal settings such as the hallway of a sports club, a cultural centre, close to the school and in the town centre. All interviews were conducted in Dutch with occasional code-switching to Berber or Arabic.

The interviews inevitably suffer from the observers' paradox, and even though the interviewer shares the ethnic background of the interviewees, he does not share other characteristics such as age and place of residence. The interviewer

⁴Statistics from www.hcp.ma, last accessed on 13 December 2017. Tarifiyt Berber is one of the three major Berber languages spoken in Morocco.

had the impression that many interviewees were quite comfortable. However, the lack of certain lexical elements, such as Berber and Arabic discourse markers, which are typical for Moroccan Dutch discourse indicate that their speech was somewhat influenced (Kossmann 2017). This might also be a reason for the infrequent occurrence of V3 order in the corpus. In general, even in the corpora of other Germanic urban varieties, V3 occurrences are quite rare, both in interviews and in self-recordings (cf. Ganuza 2008).

In addition to the corpus, from which most of the examples were drawn, some data originate from videoclips that Moroccan Dutch youngsters themselves put on YouTube.⁵ These are not from Gouda and therefore indicate that it is a more widespread phenomenon.

3 Describing the V3 data

In this section we present the data that show deviations from the Standard Dutch V2 pattern. We describe this data in terms of the initial constituent (the “X” in XSV orders), the preverbal constituent (the subject) and, finally, the distribution of possible V3 orders. Before moving on to the aberrant V3 orders in these urban varieties, however, we must discuss the superficial V3 orders that are in fact allowed in the Standard Dutch V2 grammar.

The occurrence of such V3 orders in our urban vernacular data would not be unexpected if these sentences are acceptable in Standard Dutch. Therefore sentences like examples (6a) and (6b) with hanging topics are excluded:

(6) Standard Dutch

- a. Noord-Wales, dat is echt een mooie plek om op vakantie te gaan.
North Wales, that is really a lovely place to on holiday to go.INF
‘North Wales, that’s a really lovely place to go on holiday.’
- b. Die boeken, die moet je zorgvuldig behandelen.
those books those must you carefully treat.INF
‘As for those books, you should treat those with care.’

Greco & Haegeman (2020) discuss another type of V3 order in Standard Dutch that appears in the context of circumstantial frame-setters. Frame-setting topics

⁵Data taken from videos on the following channels: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=acFL0W3Y1ZY> and <https://www.youtube.com/user/Youstoub>, last accessed on 13 December 2017.

are usually adjuncts in sentence-initial position. They set the scene and/or delimit the space or time in which the event described in the following comment takes place. These frame-setters can be combined with non-subject initial orders or non-declaratives, as shown in examples (7a) and (7b), respectively.

(7) Standard Dutch

- a. Als je haar iets vraagt, nooit antwoordt ze op tijd.
if you her something ask.2SG never reply.3SG she on time
'If you ask her something, she never replies on time.'
- b. Als er morgen een probleem is, MIJ moet je niet bellen.
if there tomorrow a problem is me must you not call
'If there is a problem tomorrow, don't call ME!'

Because these are allowed in Standard Dutch⁶ as well, this paper about the Dutch youth varieties from Gouda is not concerned with these types of V3 orders. In the following sections we will present the data and describe their characteristics in terms of type of initial constituent, preverbal constituent and distribution in a wider context.

3.1 The sentence-initial constituent

There seems to be no categorial restriction on the initial constituent in the Dutch urban vernacular dataset. There are determiner phrases (DPs), prepositional phrases (PPs), adverbial phrases (APs) or entire clauses (CPs) shown in examples (8a), (8b), (8c) and (8d) respectively:

- (8) a. MD-A
Een keertje ik was gewoon aan het fietsen
one time I was just on the cycle.INF
'One time I was just cycling.'

⁶Greco & Haegeman (2020) note that sentences with subject-initial V3 orders and *circumstantial* frame-setters are acceptable in the West-Flemish dialect of Dutch, but not in Standard Dutch.

- (i) OK in West-Flemish; but * in Standard Dutch
*Als mijn tekst klaar is, ik zal hem opsturen.
when my text ready is I shall it send
'When my text is ready, I will send it.'

They argue, however, that these V3 orders systematically differ from the V3 orders innovated by young Germanic speakers in urban settings discussed in the present paper. We will leave this discussion for future research.

- b. YouTube video Maisdokter
Op een gegeven moment hij *douwt* zo'n mais in zijn kont.
at a given moment he pushes such.a corn.cob in his butt
'At some point he pushes a corn cob in his butt.'
- c. MD-I
Hier je *bent* verzekerd.
here you are insured
'Here you are insured.'
- d. MD-B
Wanneer we hem slaan, hij *gaat* gelijk huilen.
when we him beat he goes straight cry.INF
'If we beat him he immediately starts to cry.'

This lack of categorial preference for the sentence-initial constituent corresponds to the V3 patterns found in urban varieties of Norwegian, Swedish and German. Walkden (2017) illustrates this with examples from Kiezdeutsch in particular, but the same seems to hold for the new V3 patterns observed in Norwegian and Swedish urban youth varieties.

3.1.1 Sentence-initial frame-setters

Although our dataset is limited, we still find such categorial variety. All these initial constituents are adjuncts indicating a specific time or location. This is exactly what has been observed in other Germanic urban youth varieties (see Freywald et al. 2015: 84 and Walkden 2017). Freywald et al. (2015) characterise this type of initial constituent as “an interpretational frame or anchor” for the immediately following proposition. This type of “frame-setter” (cf. Chafe 1976) thus provides a certain limitation in terms of time or place.⁷ As Walkden (2017) points out, it is important to note that this type of frame-setter may also occur as the initial constituent in regular V2 structures in the standard varieties of Germanic V2 languages. Example (9), in Standard Dutch, would have subject-verb inversion as expected in V2 languages:⁸

⁷Freywald et al. (2015) add a “conditional” function to temporal or locational functions of these frame-setters. However, in light of the possible V3 orders with conditional frame-setters in Standard Dutch discussed above, we leave the “conditional” specification in Dutch urban vernaculars out of the present discussion.

⁸The use of the diminutive *keertje* ‘small time’ is actually a further characteristic of non-standard Dutch.

- (9) Standard Dutch
 Een keertje *was* ik gewoon aan het fietsen
 one time was I just on the cycle.INF
 ‘One time I was just cycling.’

3.1.2 Other sentence-initial constituents

Apart from these adjuncts of time and location, there are some other types of initial constituents in V3 structures in our dataset. These can be grouped into three categories, which we briefly discuss below. These examples are less straightforward, because the direct equivalent with subject-inversion in Standard Dutch does not exist. We therefore do not take these into consideration in our analysis in §4.

The first group consists of examples with *omdat* ‘because’, as shown in (10a) and (10b):

- (10) a. MD-K
 Omdat ik *vind* het niet goed.
 because I find it not good
 ‘Because I don’t think it’s right.’
 b. MD-K
 Omdat hij *is* Marokkaan natuurlijk.
 because he is Moroccan obviously
 ‘Obviously because he is Moroccan.’

These examples are difficult because *omdat* introduces a subordinate clause in Standard Dutch. Subordinate clauses have SOV order and therefore the Standard Dutch equivalent of (10a) and (10b) would have SOV order following *omdat*:

- (11) Standard Dutch
 a. ... *omdat* ik het niet goed *vind*.
 because I it not good find
 ‘... because I don’t think it’s right.’
 b. ... *omdat* hij Marokkaan *is* natuurlijk.
 because he Moroccan is obviously
 ‘... obviously because he is Moroccan.’

In the examples from the Dutch urban youth varieties dataset, *omdat* seems to behave like another Dutch conjunction with the same meaning: *want* ‘because’.

The conjunction *want* is typically followed by matrix-clause V2 syntax, as shown in example (12):

- (12) Standard Dutch
Want ik *vind* het niet goed.
because I find it not good
'Because I don't think it's right.'

If the conjunction *omdat* in the Dutch urban youth varieties indeed has the syntactic specifications of Standard Dutch *want*, the superficial V3 order we observe here is not unexpected. If *want* is followed by subordinate-clause syntax, not the lack of V2 with subject-inversion, but the lack of SOV order is unexpected. According to Zwart (2011: 123–125), *omdat* can be followed by V2 in the contexts of bridge verbs like *zeggen* 'to say' as well. We therefore do not consider *omdat*-clauses in our urban varieties corpus as part of our proper V3 dataset. We will briefly discuss the implications for subordinate clauses in §5 below.

The second group of examples with superficial V3 orders in the Dutch urban youth varieties involve code-switching from Dutch to Berber and/or Arabic.

- (13) a. MD-E
he, weet je, *bhal* jij *gaat* naar hun
hey know you *bhal* you go to them
'Hey, you know, *bhal* you go to them.'
- b. MD-I
eentje hoor je van die: *qa* ik *heb* vandaag uh
one hear you of those *qa* I have today uh
'You hear one of those: *qa* I have today uh'

There are also examples of code-switches or Arabic/Berber interjections with V2 and the expected subject-verb in the urban youth varieties, as shown in example (14).

- (14) From YousToub channel
En inshallah *haal* je goede cijfers.
and inshallah get you good grades
'And, *inshallah*, you'll get good grades.'

These sentences with Berber or Arabic discourse markers, however, cannot be compared to Standard Dutch either; we leave them out of the present analysis.

Finally, there is one category of adverbials that do not normally occur in sentence-initial position in Standard Dutch, but that do occur several times in our dataset of superficial V3 orders in the Dutch urban youth varieties:

- (15) a. MD-L
 zogenaamd je *hebt* geen geld meer
 as-if you have no money anymore
 ‘As if you no longer have any money (left).’
- b. MD-R
 ... maar wel ik *begrijp* alles.
 but still I understand everything
 ‘...but I do understand everything’

The adverbs *zogenaamd* ‘as-if’ and *wel* ‘still, nonetheless’ cannot occur in sentence-initial position in Standard Dutch. In their Standard Dutch equivalents, they would follow the inflected verbs, as shown in examples (16a) and (16b), respectively:

- (16) Standard Dutch
- a. je *hebt* zogenaamd geen geld meer
 you have as-if no money anymore
 ‘As if you no longer have any money (left).’
- b. ... maar ik *begrijp* wel alles.
 but I understand still everything
 ‘... but I do understand everything’

Again, because these sentence-initial constituents with superficial V3 orders in our dataset do not have a direct equivalent, we cannot compare them to Standard Dutch V2. We will exclude these from our analysis presented in §4 below.

3.2 Preverbal constituent

The next crucial element in the superficial V3 orders is the preverbal constituent. In Standard Dutch V2 order, the preverbal constituent is the sentence-initial constituent and it can be an argument or adjunct of a wide variety of phrase types. The V3 orders in the Dutch urban youth varieties mostly exhibit arguments, or, more specifically, subject pronouns in all persons and number, as shown in examples (17a), (17b) and (17c):

- (17) a. 24 maart interview
Soms ik *gooi* iets op de grond.
sometimes I throw something on the floor
'Sometimes I throw something on the floor.'
- b. MD-C
één keer we *zaten* bij big Mo film te, televisie te kijken
one time we sat.PL at big Mo film to tv to watch.INF
'Once we were watching a film, tv at big Mo's.'
- c. MD-A
Toen ze *vroegen* ID.
then they asked.PL ID
'Then they asked for ID.'

The second-person singular pronoun has stressed and unstressed variants in Standard Dutch: *je* (unstressed) vs. *jij* (stressed). Both occur as the subject in our V3 dataset, as shown in examples (18a) (repeated from 8c) and (18b):

- (18) MD-I
- a. Hier je *bent* verzekerd.
here you are insured
'Here you are insured.'
- b. Daarna jij *ging* mee.
afterwards you went along
'Afterwards you went along.'

From a cross-linguistic perspective, the occurrence of the stressed pronoun *jij* 'you' is unexpected. Freywald et al. (2015: 84) observe that preverbal constituents in urban youth varieties in Germany, Norway or Sweden are "virtually always unaccented" (see also Walkden 2017). Cross-linguistically, the preverbal element is usually the subject of the clause, but as Walkden (2017) points out, this is a "strong tendency rather than a requirement". In the Dutch urban youth varieties dataset, we also find some examples of non-pronominal subjects in preverbal position:

- (19) a. MD-I
vroeger mensen *gingen* lopen
in.the.past people went.PL on.foot
'In the past people would go on foot.'

- b. MD-I
 daarna die, die leraar *heeft* niet meer lesgegeven
 afterwards that that teacher has no longer taught
 ‘Afterwards that, that teacher hasn’t taught anymore.’
- c. YouTube video Maisdokter
 Op een gegeven moment iemand *zegt* tegen hem je moet naar Fez
 at a certain time someone says to him you must to Fez
 ‘At some point someone says to him: you must go to Fez.’
- d. MD-I
 daarna de rest *zegt* ik ga niet
 afterwards the rest says I go not
 ‘Afterwards the rest says: I’m not going.’
- e. YousToub
 Vaak het probleem *is* dat ze met de jaren verwachten ze meer.
 often the problem is that they with the years expect.PL they more
 ‘Often the problem is that they – as the years go by – expect more.’

According to Freywald et al. (2015), a common denominator of these preverbal constituents lies in their information-structural nature: they are all *familiar topics* that refer to a contextually given or salient discourse referent. Not all examples in the Dutch urban youth varieties data presented in (19) contain familiar topics, however. The subjects of examples (19a) and (19b) could indeed be argued to be linked to the *common ground*, either because they are generic concepts (like *mensen* ‘people’) or because they have been explicitly mentioned in the preceding discourse (like *die leraar* ‘that teacher’). The teacher is the topic of the preceding sentences (all in Berber), in which a boy is being beaten by his teacher, but later comes back to seek revenge and hits the teacher.

The subject of example (19c), *iemand* ‘someone’, is technically inert and would function more as a *shift topic* than a familiar topic. The referential status of the subject in (19d), *de rest* ‘the rest’, can be inferred from the context, but it clearly indicates a contrast between this subject and the topic in the immediately preceding discourse. Example (19e) is a copular clause in which *het probleem* ‘the problem’ in preverbal position could be argued to be the predicate, with the *dat*-clause as its subject. The analysis of these types of copular clauses goes beyond the scope of the present paper, but the fact that a noun phrase like *het probleem* ‘the problem’ can occupy the preverbal position cannot be ignored. This phrase is certainly not a familiar topic. We will come back to these subtle information-structural differences in §4 below.

3.3 Distribution of V3 orders

The V3 orders in our data do not occur in every main clause. Just like in other Germanic urban youth varieties, the V3 orders are optional deviations from the regular V2 patterns. V3 orders can be found immediately preceding or following regular V2 sentences uttered by the same speaker in the same type of context. Example (20) immediately follows another clause with the same sentence-initial constituent *toen* ‘then’. The first clause exhibits regular V2 order, whereas the second clause is V3:

- (20) MD-A
Toen *gingen* we wegrennen. Toen ze *vroegen* ID.
then went.PL we run.away.INF then they asked.PL ID
‘Then we ran away. Then they asked for ID.’

The V3 orders do not occur very often and when they do, they are found alongside very similar sentences with Standard Dutch V2 order. Since our current data consists of non-elicited sentences only, we cannot check the (un)grammaticality of certain types of V3 orders in different contexts. This is difficult to verify in general, because we are dealing with a non-standard variety of the language which is subject to stylistic variation. The young people who speak this variety often change to Standard Dutch in the presence of people who are not from their peer group.

Ganuza (2008: 109–130) discusses the same sociolinguistic conditions for her focus group speaking Swedish urban varieties. Walkden (2017), based on previous work on Kiezdeutsch by Wiese and Swedish urban varieties by Ganuza, notes that there are three contexts in which these types of V3 orders are not allowed. These are sentences in which the preverbal constituent is the object (rather than the subject), *wh*-interrogatives and subordinate clauses. All examples in our current urban vernacular dataset of Dutch have preverbal subjects and none of the examples are *wh*-interrogatives. This might be due to a limited dataset, but since these options seem to be excluded in other urban vernaculars, the same generalisation might hold for the Dutch urban vernacular. We have already briefly mentioned our examples with subordinate clauses introduced by *omdat* ‘because’. Walkden (2017) notes that there are occasional examples of V3 in clauses introduced by the German *weil* ‘because’, but that “this is a context in which it is well known that main clause word order may occur in colloquial usage” (Walkden 2017), which is reminiscent of the above-mentioned *omdat*-clauses in Dutch we left out of our proper V3 dataset for now (see also Antomo & Steinbach 2010 and Reis 2013).

4 Analysis

Although our current dataset is still fairly limited, we will attempt to offer a preliminary synchronic analysis of these V3 orders in Dutch urban youth varieties. Until we collect more data, this analysis is necessarily preliminary, but it will help our attempts to sketch a diachronic analysis of ongoing syntactic change in Dutch.

4.1 Synchronic analysis

It is important to emphasise that the synchronic analysis of the V3 patterns should be compatible with a V2 grammar as well, because these V3 orders are only *optional* variants of the Standard Dutch V2. In other words, all speakers with innovative V3 patterns also (indeed, mostly) utter V2 sentences that are the norm in Standard Dutch. Although the V2 constraint observed in various languages shares two crucial characteristics (verb-movement to the C-layer accompanied by the merger of a phrasal constituent, cf. Holmberg 2013 and Wolfe 2015), V2 languages can differ in the way they exhibit these characteristics. Apart from a traditional distinction based on whether V2 is limited to main clauses (as in Dutch, German and Mainland Scandinavian) or appears in subordinate clauses as well (as in Icelandic or Yiddish) (cf. Holmberg 2013), languages also appear to differ in terms of their CP structure.

Recently, the typology of different types of V2 languages was further developed by Wolfe (2019) on the basis of the availability of pro-drop and optional V3 orders. In this typology of V2 languages, Wolfe (2019: 31) distinguishes three types of V2 systems named after the landing site of the verb, based on the landing site of the finite verb (Fin or Force):

Fin-V2: Frame-setter + topic + focus (Old English, Middle Low German, etc.)


Force-V2 system 1: Frame-setter + topic/focus (Later Old French, Spanish, etc.)

Force-V2 system 2: Frame-setter_{HT/LD} + topic/focus (Modern Dutch and German, etc.)

Standard Dutch is classified by Wolfe (2019) as a “Force-V2 system 2” language, because regarding V3 orders, Standard Dutch can only accommodate hanging (HT) or left-dislocated (LD) topics as a sentence-initial constituent. V3/XSV orders found in urban youth varieties are ungrammatical in the standard language.

- (21) a. Standard Dutch – HT
 Kaapstad, dat is echt een mooie plek om op vakantie te gaan.
 Cape Town, that is really a lovely place to on holiday to go.INF
 ‘Cape Town, that’s a really lovely place to go on holiday.’
- b. Standard Dutch – *V3, but probably OK in urban varieties
 *In de zomer Kaapstad is echt een mooie plek om op vakantie
 in the summer Cape Town is really a lovely place to on holiday
 te gaan.
 to go.INF
 intended: ‘In summer, Cape Town is really a lovely place to go on
 holiday.’

The Standard Modern Dutch V2 order with V-to-Force movement is shown in (22):

- (22) 
- (23) Standard Dutch
 Toen vroegen ze ID.
 then asked.PL they ID
 ‘Then they asked for ID.’

As described in §3.1 above, the sentence-initial constituents in the superficial V3 orders in Germanic urban youth varieties function as a frame- or scene-setter. The initial constituents are not arguments, but adjuncts with a temporal or locational meaning such as *toen* ‘then’, *een keer* ‘one time’ or *hier* ‘here’. The superficial order of constituents in these sentences is thus: Frame – Subject – Verb. In line with Walkden (2017), we assume general V-to-C movement in standard modern Germanic V2 clauses in general and therefore Standard Dutch as well. If the inflected verb moves to a C-head and the subject moves to its specifier, the easiest analysis for the urban vernacular V3 sentences would involve an extra structural layer to host this frame-setting sentence-initial constituent. Independent evidence for extra structural layers in the C-domain is abundantly found in Romance languages, upon which Rizzi (1997: 283) based his split CP:


- (24) [Frame... [Force... [Topic... [Focus... [Fin... [TP...]]]]]

Variations on this were further developed by Benincà & Poletto (2004: 71) and by Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007: 112–113), who later apply this to early Germanic (Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2009):

(25) ForceP > ShiftP > ContrP > FocP > FamP* > FinP

As Roberts (1996a) already observed, analysing V3 orders in Old English, we need to postulate at least one extra layer in the CP if we assume V-to-C movement always occurs in these V2 languages. Roberts (1996b) assumed a distinction between Fin and Focus/Force as the landing site of the finite verb in these cases. Until we have evidence for a further split, we will assume a simple split of the CP into two layers. Note that the so-called “bottle-neck effect” in strict V2 languages like Standard Dutch and German uses locality to prevent movement of more than one constituent into the C-domain (cf. among others Roberts 2004 and Mohr 2009). From this perspective a V2 language with multiple constituents in the C-domain is unexpected and needs to be explained. We follow Walkden’s (2017) assumption, based on earlier work by Rizzi (1997) and Haegeman (1995), which states that certain heads may be associated with criteria requiring them to enter into a spec-head configuration with an appropriate XP. This then motivates interpretively-driven movement such as topicalisation, focalisation, wh-questions, etc. Languages with syncretised left peripheries, such as Standard Dutch, only allow one criterion to be active, resulting in the movement of one (and only one) constituent to the C-domain. With Walkden (2017), we assume that V3 orders arise when not one but two of these criteria are to be satisfied.

Since the sentence-initial constituent in Dutch urban youth varieties is always clearly a frame- or scene-setter, it seems appropriate to add an additional FrameP on top of the Standard Dutch ForceP to accommodate the V3 orders in urban youth varieties. Compare example (22) above to the innovative V3 option from our dataset of Dutch urban youth varieties with similar V-to-Force movement, but an added FrameP to host the temporal frame-setter *toen* ‘then’ in (26):

- (26) 
- (27) Standard Dutch – familiar topic
Toen ze vroegen ID.
then they asked.PL ID
‘Then they asked for ID.’

Wolfe's typology assumes a cartographic CP-structure based on Rizzi (1997) with a FrameP on top of ForceP, followed by TopP, FocP and FinP. Since urban youth varieties of Dutch allow various kinds of frame-setters (e.g. *daarna* 'afterwards', *soms* 'sometimes', etc.) and only one preverbal topic/focus, the grammar of these varieties can therefore be best described as "Force-V2 system 1" in Wolfe's typology. Speakers with optional V3 orders have access to two registers of Dutch: Standard Dutch with strict V2 ("Force-V2 system 2") and urban varieties with optional additional frame-setters ("Force-V2 system 1"). We assume that style-shifting occurs in more formal contexts, e.g. writing, speaking to non-peers, etc. Wolfe's V2 typology is ultimately a diachronic typology. In the next section, we will turn back to his typology in the light of our diachronic analysis.

4.2 Diachronic analysis

Old English was already analysed as a V2 language by Van Kemenade (1987). In 1996, Ian Roberts makes inferences based on this and work on Gothic by, among others, Kiparsky (1994) and observed that "residual V2" in Present-day English is a misleading term for the actual state of affairs. Comparing characteristics of Old English V2 and V3 orders, it appears that "Full V2" of Modern German and Dutch is better described as an innovation: a stage of "strict V2" that English has never reached. Roberts (1996b) suggests that the V2 and V3 orders in Old English can be analysed with a "split-Comp" structure allowing multiple landing sites for the verb in the left periphery.

To our knowledge, Walkden's (2017) paper on Germanic urban youth varieties (or "urban vernaculars" as he calls them) presents the only comprehensive diachronic analysis of these innovative types of V3 orders. In addition to the urban vernacular data, he draws on insights from, among others, Roberts (1996b) to develop a similar account for the situation in Old English. Walkden's analysis is based on a scenario of imperfect L2 acquisition of the standard V2 language by speakers from a different linguistic background (e.g. immigrants from Turkey, Morocco, etc. moving to Germany, or, in our case, the Netherlands). He proposes three separate stages for the development of optional V3 orders (cf. Walkden 2017):

Stage 1: L2 learners of standard Germanic V2 fail to acquire verb movement to C, resulting in SVO orders

Stage 2: L1 learners (e.g. children of first-generation immigrants) attempt to reconcile mixed input of SVO and V-to-C, resulting in a split-CP (CP1 & CP2) that allows for the observed optional V3 structures in the urban vernaculars

Stage 3: V3 structures are propagated across communities and successive generations increase their use

These diachronic developments are straightforward and they fit the overall sociolinguistic situation with first- and second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands as well. Through socio-historical circumstances, certain areas of the country had a high proportion of L2 learners. Let us go through the implications for the analysis of the Dutch urban vernacular V3 sentences stage by stage.

Stage 1 of the analysis hinges on the failure of the acquisition of verb movement to C. This is necessary for the subsequent stage in which the second generation attempts to make sense of a mixed SVO/V-to-C input. The question is whether this scenario of failure of the acquisition of V-to-C movement is likely for the Moroccan immigrants in the Netherlands. The native language of this first-generation L2 learners is Berber or Moroccan Arabic, although all of them have a good understanding of Standard Arabic as well. Both Berber and Arabic are VSO languages with optional SVO orders. Verb movement in pragmatically neutral matrix clauses in these languages is usually argued to be limited to V-to-T or V-to-AgrSP (cf. amongst others Benmamoun (1992), Jouini (2014) and Shlonsky (2000) for Arabic and Choe (1987) for Berber). In both languages, sentence-initial frame-setters can occur with following VSO orders as well. In a corpus study of child-directed Dutch, MacWhinney & Snow (1985) observed that only 23% of the input was non-subject initial. Although this is apparently enough for Dutch L1 learners to acquire the V2 constraint (see also Yang (2000: 114) for a full discussion), L2 learners might initially interpret the non-subject initial orders in a way that is compatible with the grammar of their first language. We would thus hypothesise that they do not postulate a phi-probe in the C domain resulting in V-to-C movement because they do not require this phi-feature on C to yield XVS orders in their native language. With the next generation, they use their mixed input, leading to Stage 2 in Walkden's proposal. Although at home they might also speak Berber or Moroccan Arabic, Dutch is frequently used in the Moroccan community; there are multiple dialects and languages that are not always mutually intelligible. Since our current number of examples of V3 order are still fairly limited and we have not collected any specific acquisitional data of these L2 learners yet, we leave a further exploration of this hypothesis for future research.

Assuming *Stage 1* has resulted in the failed acquisition of V-to-C movement, in *Stage 2* the next generation consisting of L1 learners of Dutch attempt to reconcile their mixed SVO/V2 input. They acquire V-to-C successfully and their language, the urban youth variety under discussion, has a V2 grammar. To reconcile this

V2 grammar with the SVO input as well, they are forced to postulate a split of the CP to accommodate additional frame-setters.

In *Stage 3* this split is then postulated to be propagated throughout the community. The V3 orders in our data are not limited to a single speaker, but found in interviews with various teenagers from Gouda. In addition to this, we found several examples of these V3 innovations in YouTube videos of young speakers with a Moroccan heritage from other parts of the country. This is a clear indication that the new split-CP grammar has spread amongst teenagers with a Moroccan background in the Netherlands at the very least. The young people with optional V3 orders seem to be aware of the fact that this grammar is associated with a specific register, as they are able to switch to a purely V2 grammar in formal contexts or simply when talking to Dutch speakers outside of their Moroccan Dutch community.⁹

4.3 V3 innovations in a diachronic typology of V2

Recall Wolfe's typology of V2 languages from §4.1, which we present in Figure 16.1. Wolfe (2019) argues that older Germanic varieties provide more options for V3 orders. Early Medieval Romance and Early Old High German allowed both topics and foci in sentence-initial position and are thus classified as a "Fin-V2" system. In later Old French and Spanish and New High German, on the other hand, only a frame-setter and either a topic or a focus constituent was found sentence-initially, making them "Force V2 system 1" languages. In both Germanic and Romance, Wolfe thus observes a change from Fin-V2 to Force-V2 (and within Force-V2 from system 1 to system 2, which ultimately happened in Modern Dutch and German).

From this perspective, the optional V3 orders in the Dutch urban varieties could indicate that this variety of Dutch is in transition (again) from a Force-V2 system 2 (back) to system 1. Would this typology be appropriate for the scenario of language contact and change proposed by Walkden (2017)? A crucial aspect of Walkden's scenario is that the CP cannot be split in the standard V2 language. The simple non-cartographic synchronic analysis with a single CP in Standard

⁹As we have only collected data from young people with a Moroccan background, at this stage we cannot comment on how widespread this phenomenon is outside the Moroccan community in the Netherlands. In addition, more data is needed on the socio-linguistic parameters associated with the possible switch in register. This, however, goes beyond the scope of the present paper and we leave this for future research.




Figure 16.1: V3* in V2 languages (Wolfe 2019: 31)

Dutch splitting into a CP1 and CP2 would therefore work. In the grammar of Dutch urban youth varieties, the outer CP2 is reserved for any type of frame-setter and the inner CP1 hosts the verb and any type of preverbal constituent. These labels need no further specification, although the outer CP2 could be seen as a FrameP since it always hosts a frame- or scene-setter. This consistency provides a good argument for the mapping of information-structural features to a further-defined hierarchical structure in the left periphery, at least for FrameP and ForceP.

If we were to assume the CP of Standard Dutch is already split into further layers of ForceP, FocP, FinP etc. and we thus take a cartographic approach, Walkden's diachronic scenario can only work if the verb in Standard Dutch is in the left-most possible position. If the verb were in a lower position, the need to postulate more structure to reconcile the SVO/V2 input would not arise, so the split sketched by Walkden would not be motivated. The left-most position would be Force in a "ForceP system 2" type of language, which is indeed the position in which the verb lands according to Wolfe (2019). If Walkden's scenario is correct this implies there might be diachronic evidence in addition to Wolfe's synchronic V3 analysis to motivate V-to-Force movement in Standard Dutch. The forced split of the CP (or ForceP) Walkden describes could result in the creation of extra structure in the form of a FrameP that can host any type of frame-setter in a "Force-V2 system 1" type of grammar.

Walkden (2017), however, suggests this split CP conflates information-structural layers as follows:

- CP2 = ForceP, ShiftP, ContrP and FocP (for sentence-initial frame-setters)
- CP1 = FamP and FinP (for preverbal subjects)

CP2 does not include FrameP in this system, forcing the sentence-initial frame-setter to occur lower in the structure, in ForceP, ShiftP or ContrP. CP1 is reserved for FamP and FinP as these host the preverbal subject that are (almost) always familiar topics in the data Walkden discusses. Recall, however, that preverbal subjects in Dutch urban varieties are not always familiar topics:

(28) Standard Dutch

a. Shift topic

Op een gegeven moment iemand zegt tegen hem je moet naar Fez
at a certain time someone says to him you must to Fez
'At some point someone says to him: you must go to Fez.'

b. Contrastive topic

daarna de rest zegt ik ga niet
afterwards the rest says I go not
'Afterwards the rest says: I'm not going.'

c. Shift topic?

Vaak het probleem is dat ze met de jaren verwachten ze meer.
often the problem is that they with the years expect.PL they more
'Often the problem is that they – as the years go by – expect more.'

These types of contrastive or shift topics in preverbal position would be in CP2 in Walkden's split CP if we take the information-structural labels of the split CP seriously. Walkden's mechanism of change can thus only be extended to the Dutch urban varieties if the CP is split differently. We therefore propose the following split:

- CP2 = FrameP (for sentence-initial frame-setters)
- CP1 = ForceP (for preverbal subjects with any information-structural status)

To conclude, we adopt Walkden's diachronic scenario resulting in a situation in which second-generation L1 speakers of Dutch solve their ambiguous SVO/V2 input by creating additional structure in the C-domain. If we confine ourselves to an analysis of Dutch only, it would suffice to postulate a single CP in Standard Modern Dutch that is subsequently reanalysed by the speakers of urban

youth varieties as a simply binary split into CP1 and CP2. From a cross-linguistic perspective, however, it might be desirable to adopt a cartographic layering of the CP that can account for the observed differences in terms of pro-drop, optional V3 orders and the landing site of the verb, as proposed by Wolfe (2019). If we combine Walkden’s diachronic scenario with Wolfe’s (2019) typology of V2 grammars, the Dutch urban youth varieties are moving away from a “Force-V2 system 2” (Standard Modern Dutch) to a “Force-V2 system 1” with an additional FrameP. Although Wolfe’s typology is also based on diachronic syntactic changes, both the Romance and Germanic languages he studied have moved from “Fin-V2” to “Force-V2 system 1” and, in the case of Dutch and German, all the way to “Force-V2 system 2”. The innovative V3 orders in urban youth varieties present an interesting case of syntactic change in the opposite direction, i.e. from “Force-V2 system 2” to “Force-V2 system 1”.¹⁰

5 Future work

Some issues discussed in the present paper provide interesting pathways for future work. The generalisations and analyses presented here are based on a small dataset. It would first of all be important to extend our dataset in both qualitative and quantitative ways. The quality of our current data is limited to interview settings with young people from Gouda and some videos in which Dutch teenagers with a Moroccan heritage present themselves and discuss their lives. As mentioned by Freywald et al. (2015), these methods do not necessarily get the best results, because young people change to a more formal (i.e. more Standard Dutch) register whenever an interviewer is present. In our future attempts at data collection, we will therefore aim to leave the recorder with the young people and let them speak without any interference.

From a synchronic point of view, there are some more observations in our current dataset that warrant further discussion. One pattern that is repeatedly found in these urban youth varieties, but not in Standard Dutch, is *dat*-deletion, as shown in (29a):

- (29) a. MD-C
 Denk je hij weet Gouda uit zijn hoofd?
 think you he knows Gouda from his head
 ‘Do you think (that) he knows Gouda by heart?’

¹⁰A reviewer speculates this type of change in the opposite direction might be associated with language contact and L2 acquisition, whereas change from “Force-V2 system 1” to “Force-V2 system 2” might be “the more natural ‘endogenous’ change”. This is an interesting suggestion that we would like to explore in future research.

b. Standard Dutch

Denk je dat hij Gouda uit zijn hoofd weet?
think you that hij Gouda from his head knows
'Do you think (that) he knows Gouda by heart?'

Both the deletion of the complementiser and the lack of subordinate word order (SOV in Standard Dutch) need to be addressed in any future discussions on the C-domain of these urban youth varieties.

From a diachronic perspective, there are numerous strands for future research, especially from a cross-linguistic perspective. To mention just one in Dutch alone: a more thorough study of the process of L2 acquisition would be beneficial to provide further evidence for the scenario sketched by Walkden (2017).

6 Conclusion

In this paper we compared new data from Dutch urban youth varieties to emerging varieties in other Germanic languages like German and Norwegian. We first of all argued that, unlike previously thought, V3 word orders can indeed be found in urban youth varieties of Dutch as well. We supported this with evidence from a small dataset consisting mainly of interviews with teenagers with a Moroccan heritage living in Gouda, in the west of the Netherlands. Some further examples from Dutch-Moroccan teenagers from other parts of the country presenting themselves on YouTube and online forums suggest this phenomenon is not limited to this community in Gouda. The V3 patterns in our dataset share most characteristics of the optional V3 innovations observed in other Germanic urban youth varieties: the sentence-initial constituent is a frame-setter of any category and the preverbal constituent is mainly the subject that functions as a familiar topic.

There are, however, a couple of examples in our current dataset that do *not* function as familiar topics. We adopted Walkden's (2017) analysis and extended it by adding an additional FrameP so that preverbal constituents that do not function as familiar topics could be accounted for as well. This type of analysis fits well into Wolfe's (2019) typology of V2 languages. Following Wolfe's cline of possible V2-languages, we argued that the Dutch urban youth varieties can best be analysed as "Force-V2 system 1" grammars with V-to-Force movement + an additional FrameP. They thus differ from Standard Dutch, which is argued to be a "Force-V2 system 2" based on the fact that only hanging or left-dislocated topics can be found in sentence-initial position of superficial V3 patterns.

Abbreviations

2	second person	LD	left dislocation
3	third person	PL	plural
HT	hanging topic	SG	singular
INF	infinitive		

Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's seventh *framework programme* for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no. 613465 and from the European Research Council advanced grant for the project *Rethinking comparative syntax* (ID 269752).

Appendix

Table 16.1 shows the dates and locations of interviews in conducted with young speakers of Moroccan Dutch in Gouda. More details about the speakers and the corpus in general can be found in Mourigh (2017).

Table 16.1: Background of speakers from Mourigh (2017)

Speaker	Interview Date	Location	Heritage language	Duration	Age
MD-A	20-11-2014	City centre	Berber	45 min	18
MD-B1	02-10-2014	Sports club	Berber	23 min	17
MD-B2	02-10-2014	Sports club	(same speaker)	8 min	17
MD-B3	16-10-2014	Sports club	(same speaker)	36 min	17
MD-C	02-10-2014	Sports club	Arabic	23 min	15
MD-E1	26-10-2014	Park	Arabic	35 min	17
MD-E2	15-06-2015	City centre	(same speaker)	60 min	17
MD-H	26-10-2014	Park	Arabic	40 min	17
MD-I	15-06-2015	City centre	Berber	60 min	21
MD-K	30-10-2014	Community centre	Berber	90 min	14
MD-L	30-10-2014	Community centre	Berber	90 min	15

References

- Aarsæther, Finn. 2010. The use of multiethnic youth language in Oslo. In Pia Quist & Bente Ailin Svendsen (eds.), *Multilingual urban Scandinavia: New linguistic practices*, 111–126. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Antomo, Mailin & Markus Steinbach. 2010. Desintegration und Interpretation: Weil-V2-Sätze an der Schnittstelle zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 29(1). 1–37.
- Appel, René. 1984. *Immigrant children learning Dutch: Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of second-language acquisition*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Appel, René & Pieter Muysken. 1987. *Bilingualism and language contact*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, focus, and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 2)*, 52–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benmamoun, Elabbas. 1992. Structural conditions on agreement. In *Proceedings of NELS*, vol. 22, 17–32.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 27–55. New York: Academic Press.
- Choe, Jae W. 1987. LF movement and Pied-Piping. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(2). 348–353.
- Cornips, Leonie. 2002. Etnisch Nederlands. In Hans Bennis, Guus Extra, Pieter Muysken & Jacomine Nortier (eds.), *Een buurt in beweging. Talen en culturen in het Utrechtse Lombok en Transvaal*, 285–302. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Cornips, Leonie & Vincent A. De Rooij. 2013. Selfing and othering through categories of race, place, and language among minority youths in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. In Peter Siemund, Ingrid Gogolin, Monika Edith Schulz & Julia Davydova (eds.), *Multilingualism and language diversity in urban areas: Acquisition, identities, space, education (Hamburg Studies on Linguistic Diversity 1)*, 129–164. John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/hsl.1.07cor.
- De Ruiter, Adrianus Cornelis Jacob. 1989. *Young moroccans in the netherlands: An integral approach to their language situation and acquisition of Dutch*. Utrecht University. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Frascarelli, Mara & Roland Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of topics in German and Italian. In Kerstin Schwabe & Susanne Winkler (eds.), *On information structure, meaning, and form: Generalizations across languages*, 87–116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.100.07fra.

- Freywald, Ulrike, Leonie Cornips, Natalia Ganuza, Ingvild Nistov & Toril Opsahl. 2015. Beyond verb second—a matter of novel information-structural effects? Evidence from Norwegian, Swedish, German and Dutch. In Jacomine Nortier & Bente Ailin Svendsen (eds.), *Language, youth and identity in the 21st century*, 73–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139061896.006.
- Ganuza, Natalia. 2008. *Syntactic variation in the Swedish of adolescents in multilingual urban settings: subject-verb order in declaratives, questions and subordinate clauses*. Stockholm University. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Greco, Ciro & Liliane Haegeman. 2020. Frame setters and microvariation of subject-initial Verb Second. In Rebecca Woods & Same Wolfe (eds.), *Rethinking verb second*, 61–89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. Root infinitives, tense, and truncated structures in Dutch. *Language Acquisition* 4(3). 205–255. DOI: 10.1207/s15327817la0403_2.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland & Svetlana Petrova (eds.). 2009. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110216110.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2013. Verb second. In Tibor Kiss & Artemis Alexiadou (eds.), *Syntax — Theory and analysis: An international handbook*, vol. 1, 342–383. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110377408.342.
- Jouini, Kemel. 2014. *Parameters and micro-parameters in Arabic sentence structure*. Victoria University of Wellington. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1994. Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax. In Adrian Battye & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause structure and language change*, 140–170. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kossmann, Maarten. 2017. Key and the use of Moroccan function words in Dutch internet discourse. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 22(2). 223–248.
- Lukassen, Lysette. 2011. *Zinsintroducerende elementen en woordvolgorde in het Nederlands: Interferentie effecten van het Marokkaans en het Turks*. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. (BA thesis).
- MacWhinney, Brian & Catherine Snow. 1985. The Child Language Data Exchange. *Journal of Child Language* 12. 271–296.
- Mohr, Sabine. 2009. V2 as a single-edge phenomenon. In Kleanthes K. Grohmann & Phoevos Panagiotidis (eds.), *Selected Papers from the 2006 Cyprus Syntaxfest*, 141–158. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Montrul, Silvina. 2016. *Heritage language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mourigh, Khalid. 2017. *Gouda Moroccan Dutch corpus*. Ms., Leiden University.

- Opsahl, Toril. 2009. "Egentlig alle kan bidra!": En samling sosiolingvistiske studier av strukturelle trekk ved norsk i multietniske ungdomsmiljøer i Oslo [A collection of sociolinguistic studies of structural features associated with Norwegian as spoken among youth in multiethnic settings in Oslo]. University of Oslo. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Quist, Pia. 2008. Sociolinguistic approaches to multiethnolect: Language variety and stylistic practice. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 12(1-2). 43–61.
- Reis, Marga. 2013. "Weil-V2"-Sätze und (k) ein Ende? Anmerkungen zur Analyse von Antomo & Steinbach (2010). *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 32(2). 221–262.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Roberts, Ian. 1996a. Remarks on the Old English C-system and the diachrony of V2. *Linguistische Berichte Sonderhefte* 7. 154–167. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-322-90776-9_6.
- Roberts, Ian. 1996b. Remarks on the Old English C-system and the diachrony of V2. In Ellen Brandner & Gisella Ferraresi (eds.), *Language change and generative grammar*, 154–167. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Roberts, Ian. 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP* (The Cartography of syntactic Structures 2), 297–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schwartz, Bonnie D. & Rex Sprouse. 2000. When syntactic theories evolve: Consequences for L2 acquisition research. In John Archibald (ed.), 156–186. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shlonsky, Ur. 2000. Remarks on the Complementizer layer of Standard Arabic. In J. Lecarme, J. Lowenstamm & U. Shlonsky (eds.), *Research in Afroasiatic Grammar: Papers from the Third conference on Afroasiatic Languages, Sophia Antipolis, 1996*, vol. 202, 325–343.
- Van Kemenade, Ans. 1987. *Syntactic case and morphological case in the history of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Walkden, George. 2017. Language contact and V3 in Germanic varieties new and old. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 20. 49–81. DOI: 10.1007/s10828-017-9084-2.
- Wiese, Heike. 2009. Grammatical innovation in multiethnic urban Europe: New linguistic practices among adolescents. *Lingua* 119(5). 782–806. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.002.
- Wiese, Heike. 2013. From feature pool to pond: The ecology of new urban vernaculars. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies* 104. 1–29.

- Wiese, Heike & Ines Rehbein. 2016. Coherence in new urban dialects: A case study. *Lingua* 172–173. 45–61. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2015.10.016.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2015. *Microvariation in Medieval Romance Syntax: A Comparative Study*. University of Cambridge. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Wolfe, Sam. 2019. Redefining the typology of V2 languages: The view from Medieval Romance and beyond. *Linguistic Variation* 19(1). 16–46. DOI: 10.1075/lv.15026.wol.
- Yang, Charles D. 2000. Internal and external forces in language change. *Language variation and change* 12(3). 231–250.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1997. *Morphosyntax of verb movement: A minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-011-5880-0.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2011. *The syntax of Dutch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

