Abstract

A large number of local German language communities, language islands (Sprachinseln), were founded in different parts of Russia between 1765 and the second half of the nineteenth century. The continuity of development in the German-speaking communities was sharply interrupted by the Second World War. As a result, the specific variety of Russlanddeutsch ‘Russian German’ (rg) is in the process of dying out. This study investigates a sample of current spoken German in Eastern Siberia using the digitalized Siberian German Corpus (sgc) at the University of Gothenburg. The investigation attempts to establish (i) which word order variants are realized specifically in clauses with the German discourse marker nun ‘well’ and its Russian counterpart nu ‘well’, and (ii) what the effect of language contact could be. The results of the analysis show a large variety of word order phenomena in the examples containing Russian nu. Verb-first orders are common in the data investigated. These variants also contain subject pro-drop. Furthermore, it is shown that a high degree of language contact is involved in these word order variants with the Russian nu. Different types of borrowing (including lexical transference) are frequent features of this contact variety.
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1 Introduction

The more than 240-year-old history of the Russlanddeutsche ‘Russian Germans’ is a history of various cultural and linguistic contacts. This is particularly
true for the contact between the German source dialects and Russian as the language of the neighbours. Until very recently, the influence of Russian as a contact language had not been explicitly considered in research. But it is becoming more and more interesting nowadays, not least because most of Russia’s ethnic Germans emigrated to Germany after the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991. German public perception is often that the so-called Aussiedler (ethnic German immigrants from Russia) speak a “veraltetes, konservatives oder […] slawisches Außendeutsch”¹ (Berend, 2013: 81). Those stereotypical (often also stigmatizing) comments on the language of German speakers from Russia give evidence for several contact linguistic phenomena.

The general aim of the research presented here is to show what happens to the syntactic structure of a German variety when it is mixed with Russian by bilingual ethnic German speakers living in Siberia. More specifically, we want to investigate specific word order phenomena based on the digitalized Siberian German Corpus (sgc), see below under 4. By way of illustration, consider the following example:

(1) nu, sin mir fohre in kaspesche meer

   well are we gone in Caspian Sea

‘Well, we went to the Caspian Sea.’

In example (1) the utterance starts with the Russian discourse marker *nu* (on the function of *nu* see 5.1) followed by the finite verb *sin* ‘are’, the personal pronoun *mir* (1pl) ‘we’, the past participle *fohre* ‘gone’ and the spatial adverbial *in kaspische meer* ‘to the Caspian Sea’. The use of the preposition *in* without the German definite article, instead of German *ans* (‘to the’) could be the influence of Russian, which does not have a definite article. In addition, the possibly contact-induced word order phenomena are of interest: (i) the verb-first order *sin mir*, and (ii) the extraposition of *in kaspische meer* after the verbal bracket *sin mir fohre*. A learner of German, using a German standard grammar, would probably find grammatical information for a different sentence structure such as *Wir sind ans Kaspische Meer gefahren*. Example (1) could possibly confirm the stereotype of “Slavic external German” to use Berend’s term (2013: 81).

The following empirical study investigates linguistic data from the sgc. The focus is on word order variants. We will look in detail at the following questions: Which word order variants are realized in clauses with the Russian discourse marker *nu* and its German counterpart *nun*? And how much and in what way is language contact involved? Approaching data from natural

¹ ‘archaic, conservative or Slavic external German’, translation by C.A.
To avoid “the troublesome terminology around ‘code-switching’” (Clyne, 2003: 70) we follow Clyne (2003) and use ‘lexical transference’ for all types of lexical borrowing and ‘code mixing’ for all types of morphological and syntactic transfer from Russian.

What is Russlanddeutsch ‘Russian German’? Historical and Sociolinguistic Background

Russian German emerged in the second half of the eighteenth century when German-speaking farmers from Central Europe emigrated to the Volga region at the invitation of the Russian empress Catherine II. She proclaimed open immigration for foreigners wishing to live in the Russian Empire in 1763, marking the beginning of a much larger presence for Germans in Russia. German colonies in the lower Volga river area were founded almost immediately. A large number of local German language communities, Sprachinseln ‘language islands’, were founded in different areas of Russia between 1765 and the end of the nineteenth century. These kinds of communities existed near St. Petersburg, in the Volga area, in the Black Sea region, on the Crimean peninsula, and in the South Caucasus. The homes of those who emigrated to Russia are located far from each other: in the Southwest of present-day Germany (the states of Baden-Württemberg and Rhineland-Palatinate), Alsace, Bavaria and Hesse, and Danzig/West Prussia (now Poland). These settlements occurred in units of relatively closed German-speaking communities, and they existed for a long period of about 200 years. A large number of different dialects existed in these communities. Depending on the origin of the dialects, a typical (more or less homogeneous) dialect variety emerged in each community. These dialects were the most important means of communication in the language islands, irrespective of whether or not they originated from a source dialect or already mixed dialects (cf. Berend, 2006: 79). Standard German did not exist apart from mostly religious literature in written German (the immigrants took their bibles and psalm books with them). Whereas Russian was the first foreign language at school in the German communities, only between one and two percent of the German-speaking population spoke Russian actively. However, the long-term presence of Russian speakers in the neighbourhood meant that Russian was introduced by lexical transference and several types of code mixing,2 which

---

2 To avoid “the troublesome terminology around ‘code-switching’” (Clyne, 2003: 70) we follow Clyne (2003) and use ‘lexical transference’ for all types of lexical borrowing and ‘code mixing’ for all types of morphological and syntactic transfer from Russian.
became progressively a typical feature of the Russian German varieties (cf. Berend, 2006: 79). The language situation in the German-speaking communities was relatively stable in the first phase of their existence. For more than one and a half centuries these settlements corresponded to the type of language islands found in Eastern Europe. The small, linguistically and culturally closed settlements had a very low level of integration with their neighbours.

The continuity of development in the German-speaking communities was sharply interrupted by the Second World War. In the autumn of 1941, the entire German population was deported to Siberia and Kazakhstan. The German-speaking communities were abruptly dissolved and the sociolinguistic situation of the Russian German speakers changed dramatically. Berend (2006: 80) calls this second phase of Russian German the “Mehrsprachigkeitskatastrophe” (‘disaster of multilingualism’). Within only one generation the German speakers changed their communication from a monolingual German variety to German Russian bilingualism. At this time the self-designation as Russlanddeutsche (Russian Germans) was already common. Probably, the term is a literal translation of the Russian russkije nemcy and refers in the first place to the ethnic background of the speakers. Russian German (RG) is also used as an umbrella term for the German varieties spoken in Russia and the states of the former Soviet Union (cf. Bär and Müller, 2012). But practically speaking, the history of the Russian German varieties reflects an extremely complex language contact scenario: (i) different German dialects of Central European origin, (ii) the formation of mixed dialects in different regions of the former Soviet Union and the (iii) language contact with Russian in a long-term perspective. It is important to stress that a clear allocation of the German varieties in Russia to distinct dialect areas in Central Europe is very difficult if not impossible (cf. Berend, 2006: 82).

Today, the German language islands in Russia are all exposed to intensive language contact. Most of the German language islands are considered to be contracting—if not dying—varieties with respect to changes in their lexical

---

3 In reality the situation was much more complex. Parts of the German population were deported to other German-speaking communities in the East of the Soviet Union. These speakers could maintain their German dialect competence longer, and the sociolinguistic factors differ from the first group (cf. Berend, 2006: 81–86).

4 This is the result of an intensive emigration to Germany in the last 20 years. Whereas in 1989 about two million citizens of the former Soviet Union gave German as their native language, by 2002 the situation had totally changed. Less than half a million citizens of Russia refer to themselves as Germans, but not all of them are German speakers. They mostly have Russian as their first language (cf. Berend, 2006: 83–84).
and morphosyntactic systems. Otherwise, language islands have been an important research field in German dialectology for a long time. The research on German language islands in Eastern Europe in particular has functioned as a kind of methodological test field in German dialectology. It has consisted of interdisciplinary research with historical and ethnological approaches to language islands in the regions of German colonization in Eastern Europe. Studies on language islands were mainly motivated by an interest in reconstructing language shift. The intensive research on German language islands in Russia is based on the methods of the German Marburg School (cf. Wenker, 1881). Starting in the Soviet Union in the 1920ies, this research has represented a lively research field at German departments from St. Petersburg in the West to Alma-Ata in the East of Russia. The main purpose has been the reconstruction of different dialects and a comparison with the source dialects in Germany (cf. Čerkazyanova, 2009).

3 The Theoretical Focus on Word Order and Language Contact

It is striking that the influence of Russian as a contact language has not been explicitly considered in earlier research on RG. In fact, although influences of contact languages are often implicitly acknowledged, they have rarely been part of the linguistic analysis as such. Data on elements of Russian origin are often missing in the existing RG corpora. Preferring the description of socio-linguistic aspects of the RG varieties, Djatlova (2011) still gives a list of structural features of spoken German in Siberia. She mentions typical syntactic patterns like pro-drop of the subject pronoun, verb-first order in declarative sentences, double negation and several other word order irregularities, which are probably induced by language contact with Russian.

3.1 The Crucial Relation of Contact Linguistic Parameters in General

When linguists (including the author) investigate human language learning ability they sometimes forget that the lives of the people influence the very nature and properties of their languages in many different ways. History is basically connected to place and time. When we compare the lives of the German speakers who left Central Europe for North America and for Russia at the time, namely at the end of the eighteenth century, we are amazed to see the complexity of differences in their lives and—most relevant for our subject matter—in the contact varieties they speak. Muysken pointed out that “we need to investigate the linguistic effects of language contact at various levels of aggregation and at different time depths” (Muysken, 2010: 267). He proposes
arranging the research in several “scenarios” for language contact in order to investigate multilingual speakers in their social settings and with the various languages in their repertoire. The range goes from the bilingual individual (“person level”) with a time depth of 0–50 years to the “micro level”, the bilingual community, and to the “meso level”, the geographical region, and ends with the larger areas of the world (“macro level”) with vague or no contact scenarios (cf. Muysken, 2010: 268). Each level of aggregation requires a typical research discipline: the bi/multilingual individual, for instance a school child or an adult, is investigated with the help of recordings, tests, and experiments following a psycholinguistic approach, whereas the macro level is investigated by typological data by means of a typological approach, etc.

In the case of RG we are dealing with linguistic communities within a time depth about 240 years of language contact. The specific contact condition of language islands is the long-term insularity of the German dialects from the contact language Russian (which of course was present all the time) and the sudden dissolution of most of the language islands at the beginning of the Second World War. Our linguistic observations are based on a linguistic corpus, which includes German speakers coming from German villages in the Volga region (near Saratov) who now live thousands of kilometers away in Siberia (near Krasnoyarsk). However, this study investigates the present state of language but not the language shift. This is especially relevant for the contact linguistic parameters of borrowing and grammatical convergence.

Borrowing is the language contact scenario in its purest form and highly frequent. Borrowed elements are words, associated derivational elements and idiomatic meanings of phrases. Borrowing is subject to various structural constraints, “[...] resulting from the need to preserve pragmatic and syntactic constraints in the recipient language [...]” (Muysken, 2010: 272). Furthermore, the language contact scenario of grammatical convergence under prolonged more or less stable\(^5\) bilingualism (Muysken, 2010) is the most crucial parameter for our investigation. It involves not only semantic and functional categories, but also word order phenomena. “We do not know what constraints there are in the process, it may be structurally quite pervasive over time” (Muysken, 2010: 273). When we again consider example (1) and relate the data to the language contact scenarios ‘borrowing’ and ‘grammatical convergence’ we can conclude the following:

\(^5\) In the case of RG there was limited bilingualism for a long time and later the vital pressure to learn Russian.
– There is lexical borrowing involved—the use of the Russian discourse marker *nu*, but we cannot say anything about the time depth of transference.

– There is grammatical convergence involved—word order phenomena as verb-first order and extrapolation after the verbal bracket (*Verbbklammer*), but we cannot say much about the constraints of the syntactic process.

– There is morphosyntactic transference involved—among other things the dropping of the German definite article and the subject pronoun. We will argue later that this is interference from Russian. Here also we do not know anything about the time depth of transference.

20 years ago, Clyne (1994) compared German language contact phenomena in the final phase of long stage language islands in Australia with those in present-day open urban settlements. His data has facilitated the identification of enclave phenomena as opposed to the general impact of language contact in Australia (cf. Clyne, 1994: 105). The results of his comparison concerning the use of definite articles, discourse markers and word order are still of interest for our study. He was able to show

the stability of use and of integration of the transfers (especially [...] the generalized assignment of *die* as the article [...] the overgeneralization of *svo* [...]). Discourse markers in general are adopted from English. [...] The most important difference between the enclave and open bilingual situations is long-term maintenance in the former.

*clyne, 1994: 119*

The German language islands in the United States show similar contact-induced features such as the near-loss of the system of modal markers and other German discourse-marking strategies, for instance in Texas German, which was the subject of earlier investigations (Salmons, 1990). Fuller (2001) investigated English-origin discourse markers in Pennsylvania German, and Boas and Weilbacher (2007) investigated German discourse markers in Texas German. Burridge (2007) showed the accelerating influence of language contact on word order phenomena in Pennsylvania German, which is especially interesting for our study:

A striking feature of PG [Pennsylvania German] constituent order, however, is the appearance of elements outside the verbal brace, bringing the discontinuous verbal constituents closer together and PG [Pennsylvania German] syntax, therefore, closer to E [English].

*burridge, 2007: 182*
What can we learn from this for the study of spoken German in Siberia? Although we find approximately the same time depth and similar scenarios of borrowing and grammatical convergence in studying language contact, we have a different pair of contact languages. (There are of course many other differences such as the identity of the speakers, etc.) For the following study it is important to stress that these languages in contact—Russian and German—require different linguistic conditions than the language pair German and English.

3.2 The Specific Case of German-Russian Language Contact with the Focus on Word Order

We assume with Myers-Scotton (2002) and MacSwan (2009) that there are specific structural restrictions on contact languages, i.e. not “anything structural” is possible in contact speech (cf. Myers-Scotton, 2002: ix), and that nothing constrains language contact phenomena apart from the requirements of the mixed grammar (cf. MacSwan, 2009: 325).

In line with these claims, a basic assumption of the present study is that certain syntactic phenomena are possible for certain language pairs, i.e. the German variety in Siberia is constrained by Russian. Given the more distant genetic relationship between German (Germanic) and Russian (Slavic) compared to the closer genetic relationship of German and English, it is not surprising that the basic principles of grammar have evolved differently in the two languages. However, the investigation does not aim to contrast German and Russian syntactic phenomena at large. Rather, we aim to establish syntactic patterns in this current spoken German variety, which is used in an environment dominated by Russian. In addition, it is necessary to stress here that we are investigating spoken German in Siberia as a relatively autonomous linguistic entity, which has the characteristic feature of language contact with Russian. RG is a specific variety of German.

To understand the specific word order phenomena in RG it is useful to make a few basic remarks on German word order from a contrastive perspective. In the seminal comparative typology of English and German, Hawkins (1986) argues:

For German a decision on basic order is more difficult, because of the frequency of both verb-final and verb-second position, correlating with subordinate and main clause status respectively.

HAWKINS, 1986: 131

---

6 As mentioned above, we are aware of the complex sociolinguistic conditions of RG: the existence of different source dialects, mixed dialects and the absence of Standard German. In this study we shall not discuss this diversity in detail.
Following the spirit of Hawkins (1986), König and Gast (2009) developed a concept of contrastive analysis as a complement of typological study. They oppose the general view that German has a relatively free word order, whereas the order of elements in English is fixed. The German sentence is organized by a number of strict rules such as the position of a topic in main clauses or the position of both finite and non-finite verbs (cf. König and Gast, 2009: 159). The major contrast between English and German word order is SVO vs. TVX\(^7\) in main clauses and SVO vs. SOV in subordinate clauses (cf. König and Gast, 2009: 181).

In the discussion of German and Russian contact phenomena in this investigation mention should be made of the *World Atlas of Linguistic Structures* (*WALS*, Dreyer and Haspelmath, 2013). In *WALS* we can compare the basic word order features of German and Russian from an areal typological point of view (cf. Dreyer, 2013):

As we can see in Table 1, German and Russian are both verb-second languages with relatively free constituent orders, but German has the characteristic feature of verb-final order (SOV) in subordinate clauses and the typical verbal bracket, which Russian does not have, partly because of the lack of perfect and past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>svo(^8) and sov (subordinate clauses)</td>
<td>svo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv (subject and verb)</td>
<td>sv (subject and verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no dominant order of object, oblique and verb</td>
<td>vo (verb and object)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) The topic (T)—so called topic fronting—is a focal constituent as a subject, object, adverbial etc.: “[…] in the main clause of German, its constituent order can loosely be described as TVfinX (Topic > finite Verb > X [the rest]).” (Cf. König and Gast, 2009: 167) For the following contact analysis, this short sketch of German basic word order should be sufficient, see also footnote 8.

\(^8\) It is widely agreed that the basic German word order between subject and object is subject-before-object (SO). But German also allows a range of sentences with object-before-subject (cf. Bader and Häussler, 2009: 717). As we know, word order variation is properly a matter for theoretical linguistics. However, the relevant linguistic literature concerned with German is too extensive to be cited here. But despite the fundamental interest in word order variation found in the literature on German, corpus studies are still sparse. This approach is employed
perfect tense. Russian has just one past tense. The Russian sentence in (2a) can be translated differently as illustrated in (2b):

(2) a. Priexali roditeli utrom
    arrive-PST-PL  parents-NOM-PL  ADV
    ‘The parents came/have come in the morning.’


The German verbal bracket caused by the perfect tense is particularly striking, as shown in example (2b). We shall observe that several verbal predicates in RG often have a constituent outside the verbal bracket. This could be triggered by Russian word order constraints as shown in example (3):

(3) hat nich gefunde weg
    FINIT  ADV  PTCP  N-OBJ
    has not found way
    ‘He didn’t find the way.’

In addition to the areal typological approach, there has been an increasing interest in the languages of language islands from a theoretical point of view. The focus centers on generative and structural studies, serving as a supplement to the majority of sociolinguistic research as in Putnam (2011):

Approaching complex data from these diverse dialect-enclave communities through a theoretical framework enables linguists to better understand and model the status of grammar of the speakers of these individual Sprachinsel languages.

PUTNAM, 2011: 2

For future research it would be a reasonable goal to study the syntactic features of Sprachinsel languages more systematically and in comparison with each other.⁹

__in a recent corpus study by Bader and Häussler (2010), who show that the OS order is related to lexical semantic properties of verbs and their arguments. Another important contribution is the corpus study on word order variation in German subordinate clauses by Kempen and Harbusch (2004). In a further recent quantitative corpus study, Heylen (2005) tested the relevant syntactic and semantic factors of word order variation. Fundamental approaches are the investigation of German word order by Hoberg (1981), Höhle (1986) and Uszkoreit (1987).⁹ RG has already been investigated in comparison with German in Brazil (cf. Rosenberg, 2003).__
4 Research Corpus and Quantitative Data

In this investigation we have analyzed examples from the electronic corpus Sibirientyska (‘Siberian German Corpus’, SGC) at the University of Gothenburg (Andersen and Forsberg, 2012). The corpus consists of transcriptions of German spoken in the region of Krasnoyarsk (Russia). It should be stressed here that the speakers are L1 speakers of mixed German dialects from the Volga region, who first learned Russian in their late childhood. The SGC contains about 34,000 running words (ca. 2100 sentences). Borrowings from Russian and finite/infinite verb forms are annotated. The transcriptions and annotations of the SGC have been carried out in collaboration with the Astafyev University in Krasnoyarsk.

The SGC contains 4351 (100%) tokens of finite verbs, 276 (6.3%) tokens are finite verbs in verb-first order, 3942 (90.5%) tokens are finite verbs in verb-second order, and 134 (3.07%) tokens are finite verbs in final position. We can deduce from these data that this sample of RG has a basic verb-second order, which is not a surprise bearing in mind the typological features mentioned above. Nevertheless, we can notice that the verb-final order in the subordinate clauses is relatively rare and the verb-first order is noticeably high. Based on these data we looked at the frequency of the auxiliaries haben ‘have’ and sein ‘be’, which are a part of the compound tenses in German but not in Russian.

As we can see in Table 2, the temporal auxiliaries haben and sein are most frequent in the SGC; they are even more frequent than the total amount of finite verb types—only the full verbs kommen ‘come, arrive’, sagen ‘say’ and gehen ‘go’ are among the ten most frequent verb tokens. Among the modal auxiliaries müssen ‘must’ is most frequent. For the research strategy in our investigation the high frequency of the temporal auxiliaries was a decisive factor. As the corpus is based on narrative speech (most of the speakers talk about their former lives in the Soviet Union) it can be assumed that the speakers tell their stories in the perfect tense, and this has consequences for the word order—namely the construction of the verbal bracket.

In order to place the SGC data for the following analysis it is useful to have a look at the so-called topological model of German word order. This provides an instructive but theory-neutral way to refer to different parts of the German clause types (cf. the seminal work of Drach, 1937). The terminology of the

---

10 See also the research project “Syntax in contact” (http://www.sprak.gu.se/kontakta-oss/larare/andersen-christiane/syntax-in-contact/).

11 German has six tenses, but only two of them are simple (Present and Preterite).
Table 2  The ten most frequent tokens of finite verbs in sgc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tokens of finite verbs</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finite verbs (all)</td>
<td>4351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite verbs (types)</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haben, hab/p/e, hot, hun, hat, humr, han, hamr</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sind, /i/s/t, simr, bin</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wars, varn, /w/v/ar/e/n, vor, wird</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must, mustn, muss/te</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko/mr, kome, kam</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zat, sag, sage/n, sagte, doch</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geht, gehen, kein</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sol/l</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will, wollte</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konnte</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are different (transcription) variants of the tokens in the sgc. But we shall not discuss the reasons of the different transcription manners here.

German Stellungsfeldermodell ‘position field model’ is established in Table 3 (cf. Zifonun et al., 1997: 1503).

The basic structure of the sentence is formed by the left and right bracket. In Table 3 the right bracket consists of non-finite verbs in the main clauses. The left bracket contains the finite verb in main clauses. This makes German a verb-second language. In subordinate clauses the left bracket contains the complementizer (subjunction), and the finite verb is final in the right bracket. This is of course only a simplified model of the basic word order in German clauses. As mentioned above (cf. Hawkins, 1986) German word order rules are much more complex. But the topological model is sufficient for our purposes to show the specific pattern of the German verbal bracket. Russian lacks this construction as shown in example (2) above.

The prefied (Vorfeld) is empty in verb-first main clauses. Verb-first main clauses have already been investigated in contrast with English by Hawkins (1986). He discusses the typical verb-first order in German yes/no questions, imperatives, exclamations, and—less typically—in stylistic inversions in modern colloquial German as Kommt da plötzlich jemand hereingeschneit ‘comes then suddenly someone bursting-in’, i.e. then suddenly someone comes bursting in. This pattern was more productive in earlier stages of German, and
Table 3  The topological model of German word order (‘(that) we have gone to the Caspian Sea’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Prefield</th>
<th>Left bracket</th>
<th>Middlefield</th>
<th>Right bracket</th>
<th>Postfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main clause (verb-second)</td>
<td>Wir</td>
<td>sind</td>
<td>ans Kaspische Meer</td>
<td>gefahren.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main clause (verb-first)</td>
<td>Sind</td>
<td>wir ans Kaspische Meer</td>
<td>gefahren</td>
<td>ans Kaspische Meer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause (verb-final)</td>
<td>dass</td>
<td>wir ans Kaspische Meer</td>
<td>gefahren</td>
<td>sind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the earlier productivity is still preserved in folksongs (cf. Hawkins, 1986: 205). But the special case of verb-first clauses expressing lively narrative speech has also been observed in modern spoken German by Auer (1993). These investigations are of interest for the following analysis, due to the fact that the quantitative data in the SGC already suggest specific word order constructions: (i) the appearance of elements outside the right bracket, as shown in examples (1) and (3) and (ii) the high frequency of the verb-first order besides the dominant verb-second order.

5 Analysis of Word Order Phenomena in the Siberian German Corpus

To illustrate the quantitative data above it is necessary to have a closer look at the distribution of the data in a SGC sample as in example (4):

---

13 The postfield (Nachfeld) is the position after the right bracket. This position is optional for all clause types (cf. Zifonun et al., 1997: 1644). Hawkins (1986: 143–154) discusses this as ‘extraposition’. The postfield is often occupied by nominal constituents in spoken German (cf. Andersen, 2012), and so it is in the SGC as in example (1). In recent years, extrapositions after the right bracket have attracted greater theoretical interest in syntactic and pragmatic research (cf. for instance Inaba, 2007; Vinckel, 2006), but this is not the subject matter of the following analysis. However, we aim in this investigation to place our data in the appropriate terminological system.
(4) Emma ich bin gebore in Engels an der Wolga.
Emma I am born in Engelsk on the Volga
‘Emma, I was born in Engelsk on the Volga.’

Unne nach Sibirje komme bin ich komme war ich acht jahre unne
and to Siberia come am I come was I eight years and
‘I came to Siberia when I was eight years old and...’

haben wir gewohnt in Vinotsinske.
have we lived in Vinozinsk
‘we lived in Vinozinsk.’

In Vinotsinske haben wir gewohnt neun monat.
in Vinozinsk have we lived nine month
‘We lived in Vinozinsk for nine moths.’

A haben potom sind wir nach nen sever
but have then are we to a north
‘But then we went to the north...’

mit de ganze familie kak in der trudarmee.
with the whole family like in the labor army
‘with the whole family like in the labor camp.’

The discourse sequence in example (4) contains a range of contact-induced data. The geographical nouns Sibirje (Russian NOM Sibir ‘Siberia’) and Vinotsinske (Russian NOM Vinotsinsk ‘Vinozinsk’) are used with a Russian noun declension. But the suffix -je in Sibirje is already borrowed from German.

The noun trudarmee is a mixed noun from Russian trud ‘work’ and German Armee ‘army’, the Russian noun sever ‘north’ is used with the German indefinite article nen. Furthermore, we find the Russian discourse marker a ‘but’ and the Russian adverbs potom ‘then’ and kak (‘like’). We also find the characteristic feature of extraposition of elements outside the verbal bracket in haben wir gewohnt in Vinotsinske ‘we lived in Vinozinsk’ with a simultaneous presence of verb-first order haben wir. It is important to stress here that characteristic features of word order mostly appear together with other features of lexical transference and code mixing.

As mentioned above, the German speakers in Central Europe label RG stereotypically as ‘Slavic external German’. Indeed, the untrained discourse listener could easily get the impression that the discourse is in fact carried out in
Russian. This impression is naturally caused by several phonological, lexical and structural contact-induced phenomena. These definitely include word order phenomena. As the SGC consists of spoken language, discourse markers appear frequently. Particularly obvious is the appearance of both German and Russian discourse markers in the corpus. Matras (1998) claims that the donor language is pragmatically dominant. As a consequence, the discourse making system can be borrowed. Moreover, it is especially relevant for this study that Texas German as well as Pennsylvania German have largely adopted the discourse-marking systems of the donor language English (cf. Salmons, 1990 for Texas German; Fuller, 2001 for Pennsylvania German).

Thus, we claim that the appearance of the obviously contact-induced discourse-marking system in the SGC also motivates the approach to the study of word order. In particular, it appears that the Russian discourse marker nu ‘well’ is frequent in the initial position of an utterance. A surprising observation was the simultaneous use of the German counterpart nun ‘well’ in the position similar to the corresponding Russian discourse position.14 It was found in this corpus that the Russian nu appeared 59 times and the German nun 34 times. As a consequence, the question arises: What happens to word order phenomena in those dialogue sequences where nu and nun are used as discourse markers? Does a different word order appear when using the Russian element as opposed to its German counterpart? In the following the basic functions of Russian nu and German nun are compared.

5.1 The Function of Russian Nu and German Nun

Russian nu is one of the most frequently used discourse markers in spoken Russian (Zemskaja, 1987: 93), occurring mainly in initial position in utterances, as in example (5). Together with confirming adverbs, it often appears in responses and feedback as in examples (6) and (7):

(5)  Nu rasskazyvaj!
     well  tell-IPFV-IMP-SG
     ‘Well, tell us!’

(6)  Nu chorošo!
     well  good-ADV
     ‘OK!’

14 Another frequent pair of discourse markers in the SGC is Russian a ‘but, and’ (21 tokens) and German aber ‘but’ (57 tokens). I decided to investigate nu/nun ‘now, well’. Russian nu is more frequent than Russian a.
These functions are well described in dictionaries and grammars. The discourse functions of Russian *nu* had already been investigated systematically in a corpus of spoken Russian. Kuosmanen and Multisilta (1999) were able to show that *nu* was often used in combination as a separate linguistic entity. It appears at the beginning of an answer or a response, at the beginning of an addition and comment on the present situation and it appears when shifting from one event of narration to another (Kuosmanen and Multisilta, 1999: 52). These functions were also found in the 59 examples in our corpus. As this investigation is concerned with the word order in combination with Russian *nu* and German *nun* it seems unnecessary at this stage of the investigation to discuss the different functions in detail. But it is important for this study that *nun* and *nu* seem to appear as German and Russian counterparts in the same discourse function.\(^{15}\)

We do not really know if the functions of *nun* were similar in the source dialects brought to Russia by the German colonists compared to those of present-day German (dialects). But for the sake of argument it is assumed that the discourse marker *nun* has the same functions described in present-day German. This is also assumed for the functions of *nu* in present-day Russian. However, German *nun* has a wider functional domain than Russian *nu*. It is not only a German discourse marker but also a temporal adverb with the meaning of ‘now, at this moment’.\(^{16}\) But it is striking that in our corpus the occurring tokens of German *nun* are all discourse markers.

If using the discourse marker *nun* in Central European present-day German it follows the verb-second order, and it is not integrated in the sentence structure (cf. Duden, 2005: § 882; Zifonun et al., 1997: 1577). These discourse markers are also called *Startsignale* ‘starting signals’, signaling that the speaker wants

---

\(^{15}\) Fuller (2001) investigated pairs of discourse markers in Pennsylvania German. She argues that there “is no apparent pragmatic distinction between the English- and German-origin forms” (Fuller, 2001: 367). We do not know if this is also true for the Russian- and German-origin forms. But note that the Russian *nu* in examples (5-7) can easily be translated with the German *nun*.

\(^{16}\) It can even be used as a subjunction meaning *because and after*. These cases were not relevant for this investigation.
to continue the turn (cf. Duden, 2005: §882). From the topological sentence perspective, *Startsignale* appear in the left periphery before the prefield, i.e. they are not integrated in the sentence structure, see example (8):

(8) *Nun, das möchten ich genauer wissen.*

```
DM DEM-OBJ FINIT PRO-SBJ ADJ-COMP INF
well this want I more precisely know

‘Well, I want to know this more precisely.’
```

The discourse marker *nun* is isolated from the sentence by a comma signalling a pause in spoken German, followed by the object pronoun (*das ‘this’*) in the prefield, the finite verb (left bracket) *möchten* in second position, the subject (*ich ‘I’*), the adverb (*genauer ‘more precisely’*) in the middlefield, and finally the infinitive of *wissen ‘know’* (right bracket).

(9) *Nun möchten ich das genauer wissen.*

```
ADV FINIT PRO-SBJ DEM-OBJ ADJ-COMP INF
now want I this more precisely know

‘Now I want to know this more precisely.’
```

Furthermore, there is also a verb-second order with *nun* in which it is used as a temporal adverb as shown in example (9). Here, the adverb *nun* occupies the prefield before the finite verb without a pause in spoken German or a comma in the written form.

Finally, it is necessary to mention that *nu* is even a lexical item in Central European German: It can be used in local areas for ‘now’ and in East Middle German for ‘yes’, but it has obviously lost ground in the modern standard and it is certainly regional to an extent. There is also evidence from etymology that *nu* is of Indo-European origin (cf. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm*; Duden online). It is obvious that the Russian *nu* and the German non-standard *nu* are of the same linguistic form. For the RG speakers it has been convenient to adapt the Russian *nu* and its discourse functions. But these functions mentioned above differ from the functions of *nu* in the SGC. (The speakers do not use *nu* with the function of ‘now’ and ‘yes’.) I have checked the examples in question with Russian native speakers. There seems to be no doubt that *nu* in the SGC is used as the Russian discourse marker *nu*.

After having explained the selection of the data we will now have a look at word order phenomena in the chosen examples.
5.2 Word Order Phenomena with Nu and Nun

Every single corpus example with *nu* and *nun* was investigated and described in a schematic word order sketch starting with the initial *nu* and *nun* followed by the next word position before and after the finite verb. The 93 examples show a wide range of word order variants, where the word order variation with initial Russian *nu* is clearly more heterogeneous than in the examples with initial German *nun*.

5.2.1 Word Order Variation with Nun

The discourse marker *nun* (34 tokens) is used less often than its Russian counterpart *nu* (59 tokens) and, most interestingly, it also shows less variation of constituent types before and after the finite verb. Surprisingly, all examples with *nun* in the sgc have verb-second structures, as illustrated in examples (10–12):

(10) *nun, sieben kinder herausziehen, ist nicht leicht*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>FINIT</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>well seven</td>
<td>pull out</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Well, it is not easy to bring up seven children.’

(11) *nun, das haben se gleich gemerkt*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>DEM-OBJ</th>
<th>FINIT</th>
<th>PRO-SBJ</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>PTCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>well this</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>immediately</td>
<td>noticed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Well, they noticed it immediately.’

(12) *nun, so sind sie grad trocken die die waffle*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>FINIT</th>
<th>PRO-SBJ</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>DET</th>
<th>DET</th>
<th>N-SBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>well so are they</td>
<td>just dry</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the wafers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Well, they are dry, the wafers.’

In example (10), an infinitive clause as syntactic subject occupies the position before the finite verb *ist* ‘is’, followed by the adverb *nicht* ‘not’ and the predicative *leicht* ‘easy’. The usage of *herausziehen* ‘pull out’ is deviant from Standard German, but it is unclear whether it is a lexical item of the dialect or contact-induced by Russian. In example (11), the pronominal object *das* ‘this’ occupies the position before the finite verb, followed by the pronominal subject *se* ‘sie’. The initial position in example (12) is occupied by the adverb *so* ‘so’. The plural form of *Waffel* ‘wafer’ differs from the Standard, and again it is not clear if it is
a form of the dialect or contact-induced by Russian. (The speaker seems to be looking for the right word – die die ‘the the’.) It is worth noting that the sgc examples with the German discourse marker nun do not contain borrowed lexical items from Russian.

5.2.2 Word Order Variation with Nu
The examples containing the Russian counterpart nu show a higher heterogeneity concerning the word order type, the variety of constituents before and after the finite verb and concerning the high rate of contact-induced phenomena. Most of the examples with nu surprisingly contain a verb-first order.

There are several examples in the corpus where nu is followed by a finite verb in verb-first order with the structure DM–FINIT–N–SBJ as illustrated in example (13):

(13) nu, is di praut apiholn vorn
    DM FINIT DET N-SBJ PTCP PASS
    well is the bride taken been
    ‘Well, the bride was taken.’

Numerous further examples were found with nu followed by the finite verb in verb-first order and a dropped pronoun in subject position as in example (14):

(14) nu, mustn houn love paar stun
    DM FINIT ADV INF ADJ N
    well must home go some hours
    ‘Well, we had to go home for some hours’

In the following example (15), the pronominal subject is missing but also the finite verb (haben ‘have’), while the perfect participle mitgenomme ‘taken with’ is realized:

(15) nu, geschirr mitgenomme nu, produkte humr polutschait
    DM N-OBJ PTCP DM N-OBJ FINIT-PL PTCP
    well crockery taken well food have-we got
    ‘Well, we took with us our crockery, well, food we have got.’

(16) nu, sin mol di lait hinikangn
    DM FINIT PART DET N-SBJ PTCP
    well are just the people gone
    ‘Well, people just went.’
Example (15) is particularly striking, because Russian borrowings appear here: the noun *produkte* ‘food’ and the Russian *polutschait* ‘got’. The Russian noun *produkty* ‘food-pl’ is of foreign origin in both languages. But the German noun *Produkt* means ‘product’ and not ‘food’ while the Russian verb *polučat’ ‘get-IPFV-INF’ gets the German verb inflection morpheme `-t`.17 There is reasonable evidence that the code mixing cases in this utterance might have a two-fold effect on the contact-induced word order phenomena in the sentence: borrowing of lexical and morphological units on the one hand and pro-drop in subject position on the other. (We shall come back to this in the discussion of the results.) In addition, we find a verb-first order in example (16). It is interesting here that the particle *mol ‘just’ is inserted after the finite verb *sin ‘are’.*

Only a minority of examples with initial Russian *nu* contain verb-second order, and their syntactic structures show a wide variety of different constituents in the initial position after *nu*, as is illustrated in examples (17–22).

(17)  
\[
\begin{array}{lllllllll}
nu & un & vi & ze & geze & hade, & zat & er \\
DM & CONJ & ADV-COMP & PRO-SBJ & PTCP & FINIT & FINIT & PRO-SBJ \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Well and when they had eaten, he said.’

In example (17), *nu un* ‘well and’ build a functional unit followed by the subordinate clause *vi ze geze hade* ‘when they had eaten’. The use of *nu* in combination with other German or Russian discourse markers could change the basic function of *nu*.

(18)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
nu, & er & is & jez & fort \\
DM & PRO-SBJ & FINIT & ADV & ADV \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Well, he has gone now.’

(19)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
u, & zo & lebe & is & jez & jeinich & un & kut \\
DM & ADV & N-SBJ & FINIT & ADV & ADJ & CONJ & ADJ \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Well, life is normal and good now.’

---

17 Mixing Russian lexical units with German grammatical morphemes is a relatively common phenomenon in the SGC. It has also been observed in earlier studies (Berend, 2013; Djatlova, 2011; Moskaljuk, 2013). But it still has not been investigated sufficiently. The morphological case description above is not complete but should be sufficient for our purposes.
In example (18), after *nu* the pronominal subject is in the initial position and the finite verb in the second position. In example (19), the structure is again verb-second. The adverb *so* ‘so’ follows *nu* before the subject noun *lebe* ‘life’. In addition, the subject noun *lebe* is realized without a definite article, probably contact-induced by Russian.

(20) *nu, in kolchos hat ze noch kschafft*

DM PREP N-ADV FINIT PRO-SBJ PART PTCP

‘Well, she still worked in the collective farm.’

In example (20), we find again a verb-second structure: *in kolchos* ‘collective farm’ is a local adverbial occupying the position before the finite verb. The noun *kolchos* is borrowed from Russian, and again the definite article is not realized. Here we can reconstruct the time of the borrowing. It was approximately borrowed from Russian in the late twenties when agriculture was nationalized.

### 6 Summary and Discussion

As proposed in the introduction, the study investigated word order phenomena in the German variety spoken in Siberia on the basis of the linguistic corpus *sgc*. In a first step, all verb forms were counted and sorted by their frequencies and positions in the utterances. As a result, it appeared that the forms of *haben* ‘have’ and *sein* ‘be’ were the most frequent. It was concluded that in most of the cases the perfect was used when telling stories about past events. Furthermore, it was noted that the verb-final position in the subordinate clauses is relatively rare and the verb-first order is remarkably high. It was also observed that German and Russian discourse markers were often integrated in utterances. However, in the *sgc*, the Russian discourse marker *nu* and its German counterpart *nun* appeared simultaneously as *Startsignal* before the *Vorfeld* ‘prefield’. Based on this observation it was assumed that something structural could happen in those utterances where this pair of discourse markers appears (cf. Myers-Scotton, 2002). The word order of all corpus examples with *nu* and *nun* were systematically described with the results summarized in Table 4.

In this investigation it was established that both Russian *nu* and German *nun* were used as discourse markers initiating utterances. We could observe a large number of word order variants and word order phenomena in the
examples from the SGC. First of all, this is evidence for a high degree of linguistic creativity in this contact variety. But the word order variation differs clearly between utterances with *nu* and *nun*.

The most obvious result of this investigation is the small variation of word order phenomena in utterances with German *nun* (see Table 4). The typical complement of the verb form is a pronoun as grammatical object. Furthermore, one example of a heavy subject was found in the form of an infinitive sentence (see example 10). Three examples occur with the adverb *so* ‘so’ after *nun*. The examples following the word order *DM–OBJ–FINIT–SBJ* correspond to the function of *nun* described in the German reference grammar (Duden 4, 2005). This could perhaps indicate that the word order structure with initial *nun* is relatively limited and less productive than that of the utterances with initial *nu*.

The word order variation in utterances with the Russian *nu* shows quite a different picture (see Table 4). First of all, we found a larger variety of complements of the verb forms in utterances with verb-second order: pronouns, adverbs and nouns with the grammatical functions of subject, object or adverbial in the *Vorfeld* ‘prefield’ after initial *nu*.

But the prominent word order structure with *nu* turned out to be the verb-first order with a subject following the finite verb: *DM–FINIT–SBJ*. In addition, only in those examples with *nu* were the pro-drop of the subject and finite verb form found. We also found several cases of lexical transference in utterances with *nu*, as illustrated in examples (15) and (20).
Furthermore, the verb-first order (see examples 1 and 13–16) does not seem to change the function of nu. This indicates that there is a subject-verb inversion in these sentences.

Obviously, this needs an explanation. As mentioned above, both German and Russian are verb-second languages, and both languages use subject-verb inversion for several purposes. In German grammars (cf. Duden, 2005; Zifonun et al., 1997) and in German learner grammars (cf. Andersson et al., 2002), verb-first order is associated with imperative sentences, alternative questions, different types of conditional clauses, and with spoken German indicating narrative discourses as in example (21) (cf. Hawkins, 1986: 205; Duden, 2005: 1222):

(21) **Kommt ein Mann in die Wirtschaft...**  
Comes a man in the pub  
‘A man comes into the pub...’

These phenomena show first of all that the contact variety RG is a spoken variety of German indicating narrative discourses as in example (21). On the other hand, subject-verb inversion is a very common syntactic phenomenon in Russian when used with verbs that express different types of speech acts, i.e. events, processes, and movements, as in example (22):

(22) **Proizošla ošibka.**  
Occur-pst-sg error-sg  
‘An error has occurred.’

The reversed word order gives another perspective on the event as illustrated in example (23) (cf. Gabka, 1976: 234):

(23) **Ošibka proizošla.**  
error-sg occur-pst-sg  
‘An expected error has occurred.’

Now, concerning the word order variants with nu and verb-first order, it is argued that this is a frequently used syntactic structure in the SGC, and we can observe similarities with spoken German and also with Russian word order. In addition, those examples have several instances of lexical borrowing in the same utterance. There is reasonable evidence that the contact with Russian intensifies this structural phenomenon. Taking into account that the RG speakers do not know Standard German, it is more probable that contact-induced factors from Russian are strongly involved. (On the other hand, it does not
explain the similarities to spoken Standard German. This remains an open issue.)

The wide range of word order variants in utterances with *nu* shows another unexpected phenomenon. In utterances with verb-first structure, subject pro-drop was found (see example 14). There were also examples (as in 15) with a finite verb missing and also with a null subject. On the other hand, subject pro-drop is not allowed in all Germanic standard languages, but it can occur in a number of non-standard Germanic vernaculars. Rosenkvist (2009) argues that “referential null subjects” are only acceptable in German dialects like Bavarian and Swabian in conjunction with the second person singular (cf. Rosenkvist, 2009: 164). The pro-drop phenomenon has already been discussed in theoretical linguistics as a facultative absence of pronominal subjects (cf. Haider, 1994: 372). Weiß (cf. 1998: 116–132) has explicitly discussed pro-drop phenomena as a feature of the theoretical syntax of Bavarian. Indeed, there is reason to believe that pronominal pro-drop could be a defining feature of spoken non-standard vernaculars and thus for the German variety in Siberia. However, in the examples from the SGC, the subject pro-drop was only found in conjunction with the first person plural and not with the second person singular as in Rosenkvist (2009).

Pro-drops of subjects and objects are usual in Russian, because the gender and number of verb complements are clearly defined by the Russian verb form (cf. Gabka, 1976). Russian is also regarded as a pro-drop language from a typological perspective (cf. Haspelmath, 2001: 1492–1510) and in theoretical linguistics (cf. Perlmutter and Moore 2002). For this reason, it is argued that the pro-drop phenomenon is clearly intensified by the influence of Russian.

7 Conclusion: RG as a Contact Variety

Based on Myers-Scotton (2002) and MacSwan (2009) we assumed that word order is a contact-induced phenomenon and—more generally—that the German variety spoken in Siberia is a contact variety of German and not an “archaic, conservative Slavic external German” (see above in section 1.) In conclusion we would like to put forward some final observations on the language contact approach used in this study:

(i) We think that Russian morphosyntactic structures affect the structure of the German contact variety. This has already been clearly observed from a sociolinguistic perspective (outlined in section 2). The contact with Russian is very likely one possible source of the verb-first order, the dropping of the subject pronoun and missing finite verbs in utterances with Russian *nu*. We argue that
there are structural features in RG, which converge with Russian. On the other hand, there are also instances in which the structures do not converge. The SGC has verbal brackets almost exclusively in narrative clauses using the perfect forms. But why is there no structural interference from Russian, which has no perfect tense, using the past tense instead? The contact with Russian could not undermine the typical word order feature of verbal bracket in German. Burridge (2006) arrives at a similar conclusion in her investigation of Pennsylvania German in contact with English: “Yet there are also many instances where the language hasn’t converged, the most obvious being (i) PG shows no sign of adopting verb-third order (XSV) in main clauses [...]” (Burridge, 2006: 198). Further research is needed into the question as to why some linguistic features are more resistant to change than others.

(ii) Verb-first order is also a regular possibility in other contact varieties of German. In Kiezdeutsch ‘(neighbour-)hood German’, verb-first order is used regularly in declarative clauses. These verb-first clauses are neither elliptical nor used with special verb forms, and they are not restricted to special speech acts (cf. Wiese, 2012: 84–86): Guckst du’n bisschen traurisch ‘look you a bit sad’ (you look a bit sad). Kiezdeutsch is a multiethnic German variety with characteristics that differ from standard German, systematically constituting new grammatical patterns and elaborating on existing ones (cf. Wiese and Duda, 2009: 43). We obviously find verb-first order induced by language contact in both varieties (RG and Kiezdeutsch), in spite of the fact that the contact languages are different. Further research on word order phenomena in contact is necessary to determine whether verb-first order can become a structural characteristic in different contact varieties of German.

(iii) Together with different types of borrowing (including lexical transference) we have observed the lack of definite articles as an accompanying feature in RG. We argued that this could be the influence of Russian, which does not have a definite article. Interestingly enough, the lack of definite articles was also observed in Texas German despite the fact that the contact language English has a definite article. Salmons (1994) shows data from Texas field work as nach Rever ‘to river’ (down to the river) or ich muß nach Badezimmer ‘I must to bathroom’ (I’ve gotta go to the bathroom) and argues that these determiner-less prepositional phrases sufficiently mark the syntactic relation and might be an effect of case loss in German-American dialects (cf. Salmons, 1994: 66). At this stage of the investigation it is difficult to say if the lack of the definite article in RG is a side effect of case loss and/or further contact-induced phenomena. But it is definitely a contact-induced feature of RG.

As mentioned above (outlined in section 3.2), there are specific structural constraints brought about by the contact languages. This investigation has
shown that the language pair German – Russian triggers diverse word order phenomena, but that they are not predictable. This is important theoretical evidence for further research on contact varieties. According to Hawkins (1983), there are some variables in cross-language data, which can inform theory construction. One of them involves the possible and impossible combinations of word orders. One single language sample can attest to the possibility of some combination, but only large language samples can prove its impossibility (cf. Hawkins, 1983: 10). It would clearly be desirable to include word order phenomena of RG in further cross-linguistic typology.

Abbreviations

ADJ adjective, ADV adverb(ial), DET determiner, INF infinitive, INF-SENT infinitive sentence, IPFV imperfective, DEM-OBJ demonstrative object, DM discourse marker, FINIT finite verb, FINIT-PL finite verb with pronoun clitic, N noun, N-OBJ noun object, N-SBJ noun subject, NOM nominative, CONJ conjunction, COMP-SENT subordinate clause with subjunction, OBJ object, PASS passive form, PART particle, PREP preposition, PRO-SBJ personal pronoun subject, PRO-OBJ personal pronoun object, PST past tense, PTCP participle perfect, SBJ subject, SG singular, ØFINIT missing finite verb, ØSBJ missing subject
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