The postfield in *Cité Duits:* Syntactic variation in in-group speech

Nantke Pecht
Albert Ludwigs Universität, Freiburg
nantkepecht@gmx.de

In the coal miners' district of Tuinwijk, Belgian Limburg, a hybrid German-Dutch-Limburgian way of speaking among the children of the immigrant coal miners, labeled *Cité Duits*, developed in the 1930s. This way of speaking has been maintained until the present, but has hardly been investigated (cf. Auer & Cornips 2014). By analyzing audio data consisting of spontaneous-like occurring interactions (approx. 240 minutes), this paper explores the social conditions leading to this way of speaking and selected syntactic patterns that are characteristic of this in-group speech. The focus of the paper is on the use of the 'postfield', i.e. the positioning of verb-free elements after the closure of the potential right verbal bracket. The paper shows that *Cité Duits* has developed particular syntactic constructions that occur neither in spoken German nor Dutch. The findings suggest that the social context played a crucial role for the development and maintenance of these structures.

1. Introduction[1]

Due to globalization-induced processes of social change, Western societies have become more and more heterogenic, and an increased number of speakers grow up acquiring a linguistic repertoire with more than one language variety being involved (cf. Blommaert, 2010, p. 6 f.; Ag & Jørgensen, 2013, p. 527). The district of *Tuinwijk* in Eisden, Belgian Limburg portrays a particular example of a culturally and linguistically heterogeneous community. This former coalminers' neighborhood surged at the beginning of the 20th century, with people of fourteen nationalities and numerous languages coming to live together. The children of the immigrant coal miners, born in the 1930s, created a way of speaking at a young age which they

---

themselves label *Cité Duits*.[2] This unique way of speaking has hardly been investigated: Initial findings based on audio recordings of male speakers suggest that we are dealing with a German-Dutch-Limburgian way of speaking (cf. Auer & Cornips, 2014; Cornips & Auer, 2014). The remaining speakers are about eighty years of age, and it is presumed that Cité Duits represents a dying contact variety which "verdwijnt met de mensen die het spreken"[3] (Kohlbacher, 2013, p. 1).

The use of the 'verbal bracket' can be considered as a typical feature of Germanic languages such as Dutch and German. Nonetheless, the two differ in some ways with regard to the deployment of the postfield, i.e. the positioning of verb-free elements after the closure of the potential right verbal bracket. In German, the removal of a non-phrasal constituent from the verbal bracket usually leads to a marked structure (cf. Vinckel-Roisin, 2011, p. 379 f.), whereas in Dutch certain verb-free elements can occur in the middle as well as in the postfield (cf. Zwart, 2011, p. 52 f.; Lattewitz, 1997, p. 162; De Sutter & Van de Velde, 2008, p. 6 f.; Verhagen, 1986, p. 62 f.). Bearing these aspects in mind, this leads to the question of how much syntactic variation the postfield allows in a mixed way of speaking such as Cité Duits.

Hence, this paper will investigate how specific syntactic constructions are used in spontaneous-like occurring interactions by speakers of Cité Duits. Following the topological field model introduced by Drach (1937), the focus of the paper will be on the use of the postfield. Which elements are placed after the closure of the right verbal bracket, and do they show certain morphosyntactic characteristics? By analyzing selected examples, it will be demonstrated that Cité Duits constitutes unique linguistic features that cannot be traced back to one of the contact varieties.

This paper is organized as follows. The second section introduces the community where Cité Duits has emerged, due to the fact that it is spoken exclusively among speakers who grew up in the district of Tuinwijk. The third section outlines the use of the postfield in German and Dutch, since they differ in several aspects from each other with regard to the use of the right verbal bracket. The following section (4) will then continue with an overview of the research questions and methods applied in this study, and the informants and their contribution of data will be highlighted. The aim of the main part of the paper (5) is to present a qualitative analysis of selected syntactic constructions as used in the in-group speech of the informants. Focusing on the use of the postfield in Cité Duits, selected examples as produced by different speakers and in different moments will be examined regarding syntactic and morphosyntactic features. The final sections (6, 7) situate Cité Duits within the sociolinguistic debate of 'place making' by arguing that the social conditions under which this way of speaking has developed played a crucial role for the emergence and preservation of these structures.

---

[2] It needs to be pointed out that *Cité Duits* has nothing in common with *Citétaal*, the latter being used by adolescents in Limburg and "characterised by a Dutch basis, but with very clear residuals from the original immigrant languages (in particular Italian, Moroccan and Turkish)" (Ceuleers & Marzo, 2011, p. 454).

[3] E. "It will disappear with its speakers."

2. The historical background: The emergence of the *Cité*

The origin of the *Cité* - i.e. the neighborhood of Tuinwijk, Eisden (B) - is closely related to the geographic and social infrastructure of the area. Coal mining did not set out in the Revier de Campine (B) until the beginning of the 20th century: Between 1907 and 1939, seven locations were constructed, namely Eisden, Winterslag, Beringen, Waterschei, Zwartberg, Zolder and Houthalen. Due to its peripheral position, Eisden soon counted the highest proportion of non-Belgian workers (in 1930 about 52%). The labor force was recruited from various European countries, amongst them Hungary, Austria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Portugal, Italy, Slovakia and Poland (cf. Delbroek, 2008; Kohlbacher, 2013, p. 4f.). In order to accommodate the workers and their families, the district of Tuinwijk was built by the mining companies, i.e. a working class housing estate consisting of its own shops, a school, day care and sports centers. Only active coal miners were allowed to rent property, which resulted in a homogenous working-class environment where little or no interaction with the Belgian residents from the town of Eisden took place (cf. Ganzelewski & Slotta, 1999, p. 94f.; Kohlbacher, 2013, p. 4f.). The whole regional economic structure was related to coal mining, and the work itself was an almost exclusively male domain:

> The mining industry, as the economic driver in the region, and the Church, as its moral and cultural counterpart, agreed about the place of women in society: a good wife should stay at home. Women were associated with the 'three K's': *Keuken, Kinderen en Kerk.* (Stuyck, Luyten, Kesteloot, Meert & Peleman, 2008, p. 73)

Women were not only excluded from mining work, but the public space remained under male dominance as well (cf. Stuyck et al., 2008, p. 73f.). Since schooling remained within the district, an *eilandsituatie* ('island situation') surged, i.e. a socially and linguistically isolated community (cf. Kohlbacher, 2003, p. 134f.). The children born in Tuinwijk grew up speaking Flemish, Walloon and a further mother tongue of their parents. Under these circumstances, they developed a new, unique way of speaking, named *Cité Duits*. However, due to the separation of boys and girls at that time, it is likely that this way of speaking is confined to male speakers.[4] Before going into details, the next subsection introduces some characteristics of the postfield in Dutch and German.

3. The use of the postfield in German and Dutch

In German, the positioning of verb-free elements after the right verbal bracket has always been regarded as a violation of the 'norm', especially by prescriptive grammars

---

[4] Audio recordings have only been conducted among male informants and it still remains to investigate if and in which ways CD has spread to other members of the community, e.g. women.

(cf. Vinckel, 2006, p. 2; Lambert, 1976, p. 18 f.) – certain lexicons still define the postfield as a field that "normally remains empty in German" (Bußmann, 2002, p. 455 [translation N.P.]). In Dutch, on the other hand, it is more common to place a constituent in the postfield (cf. Zwart, 2011, p. 72 f.; De Sutter & Van de Velde, 2008, p. 6 f.). Empirical research has shown that particularly prepositional phrases (PPs) occur more frequently in the postfield in Dutch than in German, where this order is regarded as marked (cf. De Sutter & Van de Velde, 2008, p. 6-9, 12). Nonetheless, spoken language is presumably more flexible (cf. Scherpenisse, 1986, p. 137; also Vinckel, 2006, p. 2). In the following, the major differences between German and Dutch regarding the postfield will be highlighted. The unmarked structures are provided on a separate line (StG/StD).[5]

(1) a. D. *Ik heb het boek nog niet gezien **van de nieuwe hoogleraar.***[6]
     b. G. *Ich habe das Buch noch nicht gesehen **von dem neuen Professor.***
     c. StG. *Ich habe das Buch **von dem neuen Professor** noch nicht gesehen.*
     d. E. 'I have not seen the book yet from the new professor.'

(2) a. D. *Zij wil praten **over haar vader***.
     b. G. **Sie will reden **über ihren Vater.***
     c. StG. *Sie will **über ihren Vater** reden.*
     d. E. 'She wants to talk about her dad.'

Broadly speaking, prepositional phrases can be quite easily removed from the middle to the postfield, but the two languages show different tendencies. The PPs in (1a) *van de nieuwe hoogleraar* and (1b) *von dem neuen Professor* may occur in the middle as well as in the postfield. While the Dutch structure in (1a) is an accepted sequence of elements, the order in (1b) seems to occur mainly in informal spoken German language, but is not regarded as entirely grammatical (cf. Zifonun, Hoffmann & Strecker, 1997a, p. 1657 f.; Zwart, 2011, p. 52 f.). The PP *über ihren Vater* (2b) is unlikely to appear after the verbal bracket in German, leading to a very marked structure. In Dutch, some PPs are more likely to be placed after the right verbal bracket: adjuncts may occur in the middle as well as in the postfield, whereas some complements are harder to extrapose than others. PPs such as in (2a), which are selected by the verb with a fixed meaning, are more likely to be placed in the middlefield, even though they may occur in the postfield in spoken language.

    Noun phrases without any kind of expansion are unsuitable for the postfield in both languages: the post-positioning of a NP does not occur very often. The placement after the bracket is possible when these are coordinated phrases, i.e. enumerations (cf.

---

[5] The Limburgian dialect is not taken into account, since it differs from Dutch with regard to lexis and morphology, but not in terms of word order regarding the postfield (cf. Cornips, 2009).
[6] Sources of the examples: 1a: Jansen, 1979, p. 84; 2a,b: Lattewitz, 1997, p. 162; 3a,4a: Zwart, 2011, p. 52,78. Translated and adapted by N.P.

Verhagen, 1986, p. 187; Zifonun et al., 1997a, p. 1659 f.). Furthermore, the placement of adjectives and adverbs differs from each other in both languages. Whereas they are considered as the 'least appropriate elements' for the postfield in German (cf. Zifonun et al., 1997a, p. 1660), certain adverbs may be placed after the closure of the verbal bracket in Dutch (cf. Zwart, 2011, p. 52). Consider the following:

(3) a. D. *Tasman is waarschijnlijk snel vertrokken **gisteren.***
 b. G. *?Tasman ist wahrscheinlich schnell verschwunden **gestern.***
 c. StG. *Tasman ist **gestern** wahrscheinlich **(gestern)** schnell verschwunden.*[7]
 d. E. 'Tasman probably disappeared quickly yesterday.'

(4) a. D. **Tasman is doorgevaren **snel.***
 b. StD. *Tasman is **snel** doorgevaren.*
 c. G. **Tasman ist weitergesegelt **schnell.***
 d. StG. *Tasman ist **schnell** weitergesegelt.*
 e. E. 'Tasman sailed on quickly.'

Even though examples such as (3b) and (4c) are considered a 'deviation' from the norm in German, it has been proven that the sequence in (3b) is not uncommon in informal spoken conversation (cf. Auer, 1991, p. 146; example 14). Free adverbial complements may occur in spoken language sometimes after the verbal bracket; adverbs as in (4c) are usually placed in the middlefield (cf. 4d). On the other hand, in Dutch, temporal adverbs such as in (3a) (*gisteren*) can be easily placed in the postfield; the same is true for most frequency- and modal adverbs (cf. Barbiers, 2009, p. 4). Nonetheless, not all adverbs may be positioned in the postfield (cf. 4a). Research has shown that "manner adverbs […] cannot appear there", since these "adverbs are not linked to an overt element inside the clause" (Zwart, 2011, p. 78; also cf. Barbiers, 2009, p. 4).

4. Research questions and methods

4.1 The purpose of the paper

As illustrated up to this point, the use of the postfield differs in some aspects in German and Dutch. Whereas the removal of a constituent from the verbal bracket normally leads to a rather marked syntactic structure in German, only occurring in constructions with PPs carrying a facultative function, Dutch is more flexible. Next to PPs, specific adverbials may also be placed in the postfield; solely NPs and certain adverbs are constrained to the position in the middlefield. This paper aims to investigate how a way of speaking containing linguistic features from both languages

---

[7] Both constructions are possible in StG. 'Gestern' may also appear sentence-initially, but then inversion of the subject and verb is required.

and the Limburgian dialect makes use of the postfield. The following research questions will be examined:

1. Which syntactic elements occur in the postfield in Cité Duits?
2. Do these constructions show specific morphosyntactic features?
3. Which role does the social context in which Cité Duits has surged play for the development and maintenance of these structures?

Constructions that can be unambiguously identified as code-switching will not be cited. The paper exclusively analyzes verb-free elements in the postfield which contain neither an infinitive nor a finite verb, such as in the following example:[8]

> (5) *die jetz sin verHEIrat* **mit an POLnische,**
>   pro.3.p.sg. now be_3.p.pl. married prep. a Polish
>   'he is now married to a Polish [woman]'

In addition, all selected examples show prosodic integration, i.e. the intonation contour after the verbal bracket continues without an intonational break (cf. Kern & Selting, 2006, p. 321). According to Kern and Selting, these constructions may bear a focus accent on an element within the preceding structure, while the postponed element either receives a second focus accent or no focus accent at all. Rather untypical are prosodic integrated constructions where the only primary accent is placed on a syllable of the postponed element, while the preceding structure remains unaccented (cf. Kern & Selting, 2006, p. 323ff.).

   The analysis is divided into two parts. Firstly, it will be shown what kind of elements are positioned in the postfield in Cité Duits, i.e. primarily with regard to syntax and morphology. It will be demonstrated that Cité Duits shares certain syntactic structures with spoken German and Dutch, but furthermore, has developed particular constructions that are not typical in any of the contact varieties involved. Taking into account recent approaches of sociolinguistic theory, the second step concerns the relationship between the language use of the former coal miners and language external factors.

4.2   The speakers

The participants under investigation include a linguistically and culturally mixed group of former male coal miners who worked in the coal mine of Eisden (B) for about forty years.[9] Even though their parents originated from different European countries, all of them were born and raised in the 1930s in the neighborhood of Tuinwijk. Recordings with female speakers have not yet been executed. The group members do not only speak Cité Duits, but are highly fluent in Flemish, Walloon and the mother language of

---

[8] Clause-like elements after the right verbal bracket such as *da warn viel LEUte,* ***die in de GRUbe arbeite*** (Lo. 10.10.13) are not taken into account, nor are comparative constructions with *wie* and *als* ('as') since they are often considered to be clause-like (cf. Vinckel, 2006, p. 3); e.g. *ich hab MEHR gehabt,* ***wie ein CHEF porio:n _ in talje*** (L. 0314_140913).
[9] One of the informants worked as a school teacher within the district.

their parents, which is often influenced by the local dialect of their heritage country. Regarding the multilingual composition of the group with Italian, Portuguese, Czech, Hungarian and German being spoken, it is possible that the variety spoken at home in early childhood might have affected language acquisition and use. Nonetheless, it needs to be pointed out that the informants are Belgian born speakers who attended a French-Dutch school in the district and who have spoken Flemish in their daily lives, whereas Cité Duits has been used as in-group speech among former schoolmates and colleagues (cf. Pecht, 2013; Kohlbacher, 2014). All speakers have remained in the same area, and continued to speak Cité Duits with each other after the closure of the mine in the 1980s.

4.3 The data

The data analyzed form part of a larger pool of data (approximately four hours) consisting of spontaneous-like occurring interactions between the aforementioned group on 13th, 14th and 18th March 2012, conducted by Leonie Cornips, and on the 10th of October 2013 together with Peter Auer. The recordings took place in an informal setting, i.e. an authentic room in the coal miners' museum in Eisden, a well-known environment for the speakers. In total five different speakers participated; usually four men speaking Cité Duits were recorded at the same time. The recording devise was placed in the middle of the table and the field worker tried not to intervene so that the speech of the group would be influenced as little as possible (cf. Labov 1994, p. 19ff.). In a second step, the data was transcribed with ELAN.

5. The use of the postfield in Cité Duits

5.1 Prepositional phrases

Which elements occur after the closure of the right verbal bracket in Cité Duits? The analysis will begin by addressing research questions 1 and 2. The selected examples have been transcribed based on the GAT 2 conventions for conversational analysis by Selting et al. (2009), and will be followed by a gloss and a broad translation into English. For two-rowed examples, the gloss is kept to the third and fourth line. The elements placed in the postfield will be printed in bold.

(6) (R. 0314_140913)
```
  01    ja un MEIne eltern,
  02    mei vatter war gestorben in VIERzig; ne?
  01    yes und  my   parents
  02    my dad be_pret.3.p.sg. die_part. prep   forty        no
          'my parents, my dad died in nineteen-hundred-forty'
```

(7) (J. 0314_140913)
```
   01    we hadde (doch) gester gesproche vom ben WEL, ne?
   01    we  had   still  yesterday talk_part.   prep. Ben Wel  not
```
        'yesterday we did talk about Ben Wel, didn't we?'

(8) (Y. 10.10.13)
```
   01    und die hat geFAHre           naar de STA:si.
   01    and pro.3.p.[pl./sg.?] have_3.p.sg. drive_part. prep. the station
```
        'and he went to the train station'

(9) (L. 0314_140913)
```
   01    die jetz sin verHEIrat mit an POLnische,
   01    pro.3.p.sg. now be_3.p.pl. married prep. a  Polish
```
        'he is now married to a Polish [woman]'

In the preceding examples (6-9), a PP appears after the closure of the right verbal bracket, respectively. While some dialectal varieties of German also tend to place mainly PPs in the postfield (cf. Patocka, 1997, p. 332), Cité Duits differs insofar as it postpones facultative *and* obligatory PPs. In the first example (6), we observe a structure that might occur in Dutch as well as in spoken German, containing a syntactic facultative PP (*in vierzig*) after the right verbal bracket (cf. Valbu, 2004, p. 702 f.). However, since pronounced in German, it is striking that the construction contains a preposition (*in*) before the adverbial complement. Whereas the use of the preposition *in* is completely grammatical in Dutch (cf. D.: 'gestorven <u>in</u> veertig'), it appears to be redundant and leads to a marked structure in German (cf. G.: 'mein Vater ist ∅ 1940 gestorben'). Thus, it is likely that the use of specific prepositions in Cité Duits might go back to Dutch grammar.

    In the second example (7), the postfield contains an obligatory PP, a structure that is not frequently found in German, and is also regarded as rather marked in Dutch (cf. ch. 3). Focusing on the elements in the postfield, it can be observed that a personal name is introduced with the preposition 'vom'. One possible interpretation is that we are dealing with an application of the dative case, i.e. the fusion of the German preposition 'von' and the definite article 'dem'. The finding is insofar remarkable as grammatical gender and case are normally not marked in Cité Duits (cf. Auer & Cornips, 2014). Furthermore, personal names are normally indefinite in Standard German, i.e. 'von' is unmarked. If we are dealing with an example of the dative case, it is applied even though not required.[10] Nonetheless, it is possible that we are facing individual variability, and that not all features are used in the same way across the speakers (cf. Pecht, 2013).

    Regarding the following example (8) with the PP *naar de stasi* placed in the postfield, it can be seen that the sequence is allegeable in terms of the Dutch syntax, but less likely to be found in German (cf. De Sutter & Van de Velde, 2008, p. 6f.). However, due to the use of the auxiliary verb (*hat*), the utterance cannot be interpreted

---

[10] However, in informal German the use of the definite form is acceptable (cf. Duden, 2009, p. 398).

as clear-cut. Both in Dutch and German, the verb 'fahren' ('to drive'), appearing here in the right verbal bracket, may be used with the auxiliary 'to have' and 'to be'. In the latter, 'to be' is typically used for directions, and 'to have' for locality and temporality (cf. Eisenberg, 2013, p. 101; also Valbu, 2004, p. 368 f.). At the same time, it is not evident whether the pronoun 'die' in the prefield goes back to Dutch or German and therefore, represents a subject or object pronoun. As we will see later (cf. 9), the speakers sometimes adhere to the Dutch 'die' when referring to the 3.p.sg.mas. (G.: 'er'). In this case, the use of the auxiliary verb deviates from the unmarked German structure, where 'to be' is expected. On the other hand, it might be the case that 'die' constitutes an object, but a 3.p.sg. pronoun from the middlefield has not been realized ('er'/'he'), as illustrated in the following:

(8) a.   01   *und die hat [er] geFAHre **naar de STA:si.**
          01   and pro.3.p.pl. have_3.p.sg. [pro.3.p.sg.] drive_part. prep. the station
                 'and [he] brought them to the train station'

In the case of (8a), the auxiliary verb was chosen according to 'normative' language use. The data suggest that further verbs occur with the auxiliary 'to be' and 'to have'. Thus, the structure in (8) remains ambiguous.

The structure (9) exhibits a similar syntactic pattern as in (7): the PP *mit an polnische* in the postfield displays an obligatory complement, since 'verheiratet sein' exacts a further argument such as a PP (cf. Zifonun, Hoffmann & Strecker, 1997b, p. 2141). As in example (7), we observe a phonetic reduction of the final consonants (cf. 'we hadde<u>n</u> geste<u>rn</u> gesproche<u>n</u>'), leading in the latter example to a non-realization of case and gender (cf. (9) G.: 'mit ein<u>er</u> polnisch<u>en</u> Frau'). Even though it shows mainly features of the German language in terms of lexis and phonology, the syntactic structure in (9) with regard to the postfield corresponds rather to the Dutch word order, where it is possible to place the PP either in the middle- or the postfield (cf. D.: 'hij is nu getrouwd **met een Poolse vrouw'**/'hij is nu **met een Poolse vrouw** getrouwd'). Interestingly, the syntactic pattern on the left side deviates from both German and Dutch: Germanic languages except English normally adhere to the V2 order in declarative clauses, i.e. the finite verb stays in second position (cf. Ganuza, 2010, p. 31; Freywald, Cornips, Ganuza, Nistov & Opsahl, 2013, p. 1). In (9), we observe that *die jetz sin verheirat* leads to the order 'subject-adverb-verb' instead of 'adverb-verb-subject', a structure that is highly unexpected.[11]

---

[11] Word order patterns where the finite verb remains in a different position have also been found in the language use of Swedish, Norwegian, German and Danish adolescents across Europe (cf. Dirim & Auer, 2004; Freywald et al., 2013; Ganuza, 2010; Opsahl & Nistov, 2010; Svendsen & Røyneland, 2008; Wiese, 2013), leading to Ad-S-V, but not to S-Ad-V as in example (9).

5.2 Adverbs and adjectives

Not only do PPs occur in the postfield, but also other constituents. In the following, it will be demonstrated which further elements appear after the closure of the right verbal bracket. Likewise, there is no prosodic break between the preceding structure and the postponed element.

(10) (Y. 0313_151301)
```
01   ich hab poLENta gegesse früher auch,
02   = bei uns ham se immer mit MILCH,
01   I   have polenta  eat_part.    earlier  also
02   at  our  have_[3.p.pl.] pro.3.p.pl. always with milk
```
      'I used to eat polenta as well. At home they made it with milk'

(11) (J. 0313_151301)
```
01   in italie sitze(n) se allemal zu WARte schon.
01   in  Italy    sit_3.p.pl.  pro.3.p.pl.  all   to  wait_inf. already
```
      'in Italy they are all sitting and waiting already'

(12) (L. 0314_140913)
```
01   ich wuss WOHL,
02   dat er konnt SINge gut.
01   I   knew  somehow
02   that he could_pre. sing_inf. well
```
      'I knew that he could sing well'

The preceding constructions (10), (11) and (12) are similar in that they both contain an adverb (or two) in the postfield. As mentioned earlier, Dutch is in general more flexible than German, allowing the placement of certain adverbs after the right verbal bracket (cf. Barbiers, 2009, p. 4). In German, these adverbs are considered unsuitable for placement in the postfield (Zifonun et al., 1997a, p. 1660). Interestingly, the movement of the adverbs from the middle- to the postfield as shown in (10), (11) and (12) is allowed in neither German nor Dutch.

    Whereas temporal adverbs can be easily postponed, the combination of two adverbs as in (10) (*früher auch*) leads to a rather marked word order (cf. Barbiers, 2009, p. 4). As in German, both adverbs are normally placed in the middlefield in Dutch, or they may occur separated with the latter in the middle- and the former adverb placed in the postfield (cf. D.: 'ik heb **ook** polenta gegeten **vroeger**'). In the second example (11), the adverb *schon* corresponds to the Dutch 'al', leading to an unusual structure in Dutch when placed directly after the verb *warte* ('to wait'). Even though most of the lexis and the infinitive construction *zu warte* show parallels to the Dutch language, the syntactic sequence of elements depicts a unique pattern which is not likely to occur in Dutch or German. Usually, the adjacent placement of the adverb to the verb in phrase-final position is avoided, since it leads to a problematic structure in terms of interpretation, referring to the whole phrase in this position (cf. Lattewitz, 1997; Verhagen, 1986, p. 191 f.).

In (12), we observe that the sequence of the verbal elements (*konnt singe*) follows the Dutch, and not the German order (cf. D.: 'kon zingen'; G.: 'singen konnte'). Furthermore, the obligatory predicative complement *gut* has been moved to the postfield, a structure that is very unlikely to be found in German or Dutch (cf. Barbiers, Auwera van der, Bennis, Boef, De Vogelaer & Ham van der, 2008; Barbiers, 2009). Even though the construction contains mainly lexical elements from German, it shows syntactic features from Dutch, as well as individual syntactic features that cannot be tied back to either one of the languages.

5.3 Noun phrases

Ultimately, two more utterances deriving from different speakers shall be examined:

(13) (L. 0314_140913)
```
01   reKLETT   so   heisst   <<all,p>   wir   ham   immer   gesacht
     reklett>.
01   drag chain   so   call_3.p.sg.           we   have_3.p.pl. always   say_part. drag
     chain
        'it is called a drag chain, we have always said drag chain'
```

(14) (Y. 0313_1524481)
```
01   maar du bist ein (SLÄCHter) gewesen,
02   lass ma GUcken deine hände.
01   but  you be_2.p.sg. a     butcher be_part.
02   let  even  see_inf.   your hands
        'but you were a butcher, let's see your hands'
```

In both (13) and (14), a noun phrase (NP) exhibiting a syntactic obligatory complement appears after the right verbal bracket. Whereas in (14), the morphological plural-marking of the noun *deine hände* follows the grammatical pattern of German (G.: 'Hände'; D.: 'handen'), the sequence of elements is noteworthy, since the placement of noun phrases without any kind of expansion after the closure of the verbal bracket is rather uncommon (cf. Verhagen, 1986, p. 187; Zifonun et al., 1997a, p. 1659 f.).

The construction (13), aside from the removal of a syntactic obligatory element to the postfield, is highly interesting with regard to its morphosyntactic features. We can see that in the phrase *reklett so heisst*, an obligatory pronoun has not been realized (cf. G.: 'reklett, so heisst *es*'). A similar feature can be observed in the utterance (8) where presumably a pronoun from the middlefield has been dropped. The non-realization of pronouns in Cité Duits is quite interesting, since this phenomenon is rather untypical in such a position: While the phonetic reduction of pronouns has indeed been documented in spoken German, these pronouns belong in the prefield in most cases (cf. Günthner, 2006; 2009). Due to the low quantity of examples examined, it is impossible to determine whether this feature represents a recurrent phenomenon of this

way of speaking, and if it is restricted to the 3.p.sg. However, the examples suggest that Cité Duits does not make use of pronouns in the same way as Standard varieties do (cf. also (9)).

5.4 Preliminary results

The findings adumbrate that the speakers use certain syntactic constructions that are not typical in German, but do occur in Dutch, as well as constructions that are normally not applied in any of the contact varieties involved. Moreover, certain morphosyntactic features can be observed, such as the non-realization of pronouns and the alteration of auxiliaries that are quite unusual in the respective Standard languages. Next to facultative and obligatory PPs, the postfield contains adverbs, adjectives and NPs. In contrast to some of the PPs, the NPs and adjectives are obligatory for the respective constructions. With the postfield representing a facultative field (cf. Engel, 2009, p. 172), the placement of these constituents after the closure of the verbal bracket is quite remarkable. It leads to syntactic sequences that are found in neither German, nor Dutch nor the Limburgian dialect.

Even though only a small number of examples have been examined, it seems that the speakers use similar syntactic constructions. Individual variation seems limited, appearing mainly as morphological features, albeit the speakers grew up with a different mother tongue from their parents. Concerning speaker Y., who acquired a Slavic language in early childhood, alongside Flemish and Walloon, we notice that he postpositions obligatory PPs, adverbs and NPs. Secondly, he alternates between the auxiliary verbs. This feature has also been observed among other speakers in non-postfield constructions such as in the following:

(15) R. 0314_140913
```
   01    ja VATter hat gestorbe,
   01    yes father have_3.p.sg. die_part.
         'yes, father has died'
```

In (15), the auxiliary 'haben' ('to have') is applied by R., whereas 'sein' ('to be') is the unmarked choice. Hence, this feature seems to occur across the speakers and is not strictly limited to Ys' speech. For L., who has a Portuguese-Italian language background, the use of pronouns (examples 9, 13) and of specific syntactic patterns - also regarding the left periphery - is striking. Whereas speakers normally do not mark grammatical case and gender (cf. Auer & Cornips 2014), we observe that speaker J. uses the dative case in one of his utterances (7), suggesting that individual variation needs to be taken into account. Like the other speakers, he places PPs and adverbs after the right verbal bracket. The findings suggest that the postfield is applied across all informants.

6. The expression of a local identity

In contrast to the official languages spoken in the ethnic and linguistic heterogeneous district of Tuinwijk, Cité Duits has always displayed an additional linguistic resource possessing a primarily social function. As mentioned earlier, the so-called *eilandsituatie* involved the linguistic and social isolation of the inhabitants of the Cité. Accordingly, Cité Duits developed as a "locally bounded" speech (Auer & Cornips, 2014). Several studies allude to the relation between groupinternal language use and the local identification of the speakers (cf. Eckert, 2008a, b; Bucholtz & Skapoulli, 2009; Cornips & de Rooij, 2013). As Eckert points out:

> Local identity is never an association with a generic locale but with a particular construction of that locale as distinct from some other. Local identity claims are about what it means to be from 'here' as opposed to some identified 'there.' (Eckert, 2008b, p. 462)

Hence, a local identity is constructed and serves to underline 'the other'. As Cité Duits developed in early childhood, it can be assumed that the adolescents who grew up in the Cité were already at a young age able to switch between more than one language variety. These children created an individual way of speaking within the working class district that differentiated them from Belgian society. In addressing research question 3, the following sequence among the researcher (R) and the speaker (Y) is revealing (10.10.13). It is followed by an English translation:

```
01  Y:  hier hamma früger viel eh FREMde gewohnt hier, ja.(-)
02      hier auf de <<frz. Aussprache> ciTE> -
03      (10 Sek. Auslassung))
04      <<f> italiEner,
05      PO:lake,
06      R:U:sse, > (-) ((hustet)) (-)
07      OSterreicher alles, (-)
08      HOllandaars <<p> (  )>,
09      VIEL hier. hh°
10      un wir hamma uns ALLmaal verstehn,
11      !AL!le verstehn hamma (un) wir uns. (--)
12      (( 6 Sek. Auslassung))
13  R:  wie habt ihr denn in der SCHUle gesprochen,
14      = in der PAUse,
15      im PAUsenhof ?
16      (( 8 Sek. Auslassung))
17  Y:  <<frz. Aussprache> ciTE> duits, ja.

01  Y:  Lots of foreign people used to live here, yes.
02      Here in the Cité.
03      ((10 sec. omission))
04      Italians,
05      Poles,
06      Russians,
07      Austrians, everything,
```

```
08        Dutch,
09        a lot here.
10        And we all got along very well.
11        We all got along.
12        ((6 sec. omission))
13   R:   What language did you use at school,
14        during the break,
15        in the school yard?
16        ((8 sec. omission))
17   Y:   Cité Duits, yes.
```

This sequence suggests that the international composition of the residents did not lead to the isolation of certain nationalities, but to the establishment of their own community that created a distinct form of communication by adhering to a third language – a language that was neither the mother tongue of the speakers nor spoken by the Belgian majority society that lived outside the Cité. Among the adolescents of the district, Cité Duits became a lingua franca, and this individual speech community surged with Cité Duits primarily being an instrument of social interaction. The attitude of the speakers towards this way of speaking is illustrated in the following extracts, remarks made by one of the inhabitants who still lives in Tuinwijk until the present:[12]

> Wir, die Jugend, hatten eine schöne Jugendzeit. Und im Nachahmen der Erwachsenen ist die Jugend meistens erfolgreich. Wir waren es. Und so entwickelte sich eine Sprache die unser Vater ‚Strassendeutsch' nannte, und wir uns hüteten es in seiner Gegenwart zu sprechen.

> 'We, the young people, had a wonderful adolescence. And in imitating the adults the young are usually successful. We were. And this is how a language developed which our father called 'street-German' and we were careful to not speak it in his presence.'

> Auf dem Schulhof wurde unser Cité Deutsch verboten. Es hatte damals, nach 1944 und vier Jahre deutsche Besatzung, auch was zu tun mit der anti-deutsche Stimmung. Aber wir sprachen es trotzdem.

> 'On the schoolyard, our Cité Duits was strictly forbidden. At that time, after 1944 and four years of German occupation, it also had something to do with the anti-German atmosphere. But we spoke it all the same.'

Regarding the political situation at that time, Cité Duits developed as a contradiction to society: It was highly criticized by educational institutions and became a forbidden language for the young speakers. It might be possible that the negative connotation of the German language during the war and the interwar period resulted in an attitude of

---

[12] The following statements belong to Kohlbacher 2014. Personal message, Jan. 30, 2014. Original without adaptations, translated by N.P.

protest among the young speakers, and therefore reinforced its use. By taking into account the statements made by the informants it can be seen that this in-group way of speaking was positively connoted among the youngsters, and that the use among the speakers has been maintained in specific contexts. In addition, the speaker J. states:

> Mein Bruder, jetzt fasst 51 jahre wohnhaft in Süd Kalifornien spricht es noch immer wenn er z.b. mit einen Jugendfreund, auch schon fasst 60 Jahre in Canada, telefoniert, unterhalten sie sich au Cité Deutsch, mit englischen Fachwörter.

> 'My brother has been living about 51 years in Southern California and still speaks it. For example, when he talks to a friend on the phone that has been living in Canada about 60 years, they use Cité Duits with some English terms.'

Thus, its usage still seems to carry a strong connotation of group identity until the present moment, and is closely related to personal experiences within a certain milieu (cf. Rampton, 2011, p. 287). The use of Cité Duits did not solely serve as a strategy to distinguish themselves from the older generation, but also from the people 'outside' the neighborhood. Since all speakers were able to adapt their linguistic behavior (cf. Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985, p. 182ff.), it is very likely that specific structures were first systematically used as a violation of the norm and later maintained as a symbol of group affiliation (cf. Pecht, 2013, p. 162f.).

7. Conclusion and discussion

It has been demonstrated that Cité Duits possesses individual linguistic features that deviate from the respective contact languages. Next to facultative and obligatory PPs, the postfield in Cité Duits contains adverbs, adjectives and NPs. Whereas the structures with a PP in the postfield are quite common in Dutch, the syntactic sequences as shown in (10) - (14) are unlikely to be found in Dutch, German or the Limburgian dialect. Moreover, morphosyntactic features and syntactic patterns such as V3 instead of V2 (cf. 9) have been observed that are not typical for the respective contact varieties. It can be assumed that similar syntactic constructions developed and were later maintained as part of the speech, with Cité Duits being closely related to the community of Tuinwijk and the district. The findings suggest that the social context played a crucial role for the development and maintenance of these patterns. At the same time, it has become clear that Cité Duits contains much more variation than Standard varieties, and that the boundaries between two languages or varieties are not always clear-cut. However, since this analysis is based on the speech of a few male individuals, it remains to be investigated whether and how this way of speaking is used among other speakers of the community, and how it is applied in different groups and changing situations.

References

Ag, A. & Jørgensen, J.N. (2013). Ideologies, norms, and practices in youth poly-languaging. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism 17* (4), 525-539.

Auer, P. & L. Cornips (2014). *Citéduits - a polyethnic industrial style*. Sociolinguistics Symposium 20, University of Jyvaskyla, Finland. June 18, 2014.

Auer, P. (1991). Vom Ende deutscher Sätze. In: *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik 19*, 139-157.

Barbiers, S. (2009). *Verb clusters and the grammar of the right-periphery*. Meertens Instituut and Utrecht Universität.

Barbiers, S., Auwera van der, J., Bennis, H.J., Boef, E., De Vogelaer, G., & Ham van der, M.H. (2008). *Syntactische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten Deel II*/Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects Volume II. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, M. & Skapoulli, E. (2009). Youth language at the intersection: From migration to globalization. In: *Journal of Pragmatics 19*(1), 1-16.

Bußmann, H. (2002). *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Kröner.

Cornips, L. & Auer, P. (2014). *The construction of local identities through hybridity*. Meertens Instituut (KNAW), Amsterdam, International workshop on dialect coherence. Are language varieties coherent? January 16, 2014.

Cornips, L. & de Rooij, V. (2013). Selfing and othering through categories of race, place, and language among minority youths in Rotterdam,The Netherlands. In: Siemund, Gogolin, Davydova & Schulz (eds.). *Multilingualism and Language Diversity in Urban Areas: Acquisition, identities, space, education* (pp. 129-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cornips, L. (2009). Empirical Syntax: Idiolectal variability in two- and three-verb clusters in regional standard Dutch and Dutch dialects. In: Dufter, A. Fleischer, J. & Seiler, G. (eds.). *Describing and Modeling Variation in Grammar* (pp. 203-224). Berlin: de Gruyter.

De Sutter, G. & Van de Velde, M. (2008). *Do the mechanisms that govern syntactic choices differ between original and translated language? A corpus-based translation study of PP placement in Dutch and German*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from
www. lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/corpus/UCCTS2008 Proceedings/papers/de_Sutter and_de_Velde.pdf.

Delbroek, B. (2008). Op zoek naar koolputters. Buitenlandse mijnwerkers in Belgisch-Limburg in de twintigste eeuw. In: *Tijdschrift voor sociale en economische geschiedenis 5*(3), 80-103.

Dirim, I. & Auer, P. (2004). *Türkisch sprechen nicht nur die Türken. Über die Unschärfe Beziehung zwischen Sprache und Ethnie in Deutschland*. Berlin etc.: de Gruyter.

Drach, E. (1937). *Grundgedanken der deutschen Satzlehre*. Frankfurt am Main: Diesterweg.

Duden (2009). *Duden. Die Grammatik (Band 4)*. Mannheim etc.: Dudenverlag.

Eckert, P. (2008a). Where do ethnolects stop? In: *International Journal of Bilingualism 12*(1, 2), 25-42.

Eckert, P. (2008b). Variation and the indexical field. In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics 12*(4), 453-476.

Eisenberg, P. (2013). *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik Band 2: Der Satz*. Stuttgart: Verlag J.B. Metzler.

Engel, U. (2009). *Syntax der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Berlin: Schmidt.

Freywald, Cornips, Ganuza, Nistov & Opsahl (2013). Beyond verb second - a matter of novel information structural effects? Evidence from Norwegian, Swedish, German and Dutch. In: Nortier, J. & Svendsen, B. A. (eds.). *Multilingual urban sites. Structure, Activity and Ideology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ganuza, N. (2010). Subject-Verb Order Variation in the Swedish of Young People in Multilingual Urban Areas. In: Quist, Pia & Svendsen, B. A. (eds.). *Multilingual Urban Scandinavia: New Linguistic Practices* (pp. 31-48). Bristol: Short Run Press Ltd.

Ganzelewski, M. & R. Slotta (1999). *Die Denkmal-Landschaft „Zeche Zollverein". Eine Steinkohlezeche als Weltkulturerbe?!*. Bochum: Deutsches Bergbau-Museum.

Günthner, S. (2009). Extrapositionen mit *es* im gesprochenen Deutsch. In: *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik 37*, 15-46.

Günthner, S. (2006). Grammatische Analysen der kommunikativen Praxis - 'Dichte Konstruktionen' in der Interaktion. In: Deppermann, A., Fiehler, R. & Spranz-Fogasy, T. (eds.). *Grammatik und Interaktion. Untersuchungen zum Zusammenhang von grammatischen Strukturen und Gesprächsprozessen* (pp. 95-121). Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

Jansen, F. (1979). On tracing conditioning factors of movement rules: extraposition of PP in spoken Dutch. In: Van de Velde, M. & Vandeweghe, W. (eds.). *Sprachstruktur, Individuum und Gesellschaft* (pp. 83-92). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kern, F. & Selting, M. (2006). Konstruktionen mit Nachstellungen im Türkendeutschen. In: Deppermann, A., Fiehler, R. & Spranz-Fogasy, T. (eds.). *Grammatik und Interaktion* (pp. 319-347). Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

Kohlbacher, J. (2014). *Personal message*. 30 Jan. 2014. E-mail.

Kohlbacher, J. (2013). *Lezing over het Cité Duits*. Winterslag, Juni 2012.

Kohlbacher, J. (2003). Das organisierte Leben in der Bergarbeitersiedlung Eisden. In: *Tagungsband*, 6. Int. Bergbau-Workshop 2003, Rescheid (pp. 134-137).

Labov, W. (1994). *Principles of linguistic change. Volume 1: Internal factors*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Lambert, P. J. (1976). *Ausklammerung in modern Standard German*. Hamburg: Buske Verlag.

Lattewitz, K. (1997). Adjacency in Dutch and German. Groningen Dissertations. In: *Linguistics 19*. Groningen: Grodil.

Le Page, R. B. & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marzo, S. & Ceuleers, E. (2011). The use of Citétaal among adolescents in Limburg: The role of space appropriation in language variation and change. In: *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 32*(5), 451-464.

Patocka, F. (1997). *Satzgliedstellung in den bairischen Dialekten Österreichs*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.

Pecht, N. (2013). Siehs' du, du wars (…) besser wie du hast gedacht: Du has' Französisch gesprochen! In: *Taal en Tongval 65*(2): 149-170. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Rampton, B. (2011). From 'Multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'Contemporary urban vernaculars'. In: *Language & Communication 31*, 276-294.

Scherpenisse, W. (1986). *The connection between base structure and linearization restrictions in German and Dutch*. Frankfurt am Main u.a.: Peter Lang.

Selting, M. et al. (2009). Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). In: *Gesprächsforschung. Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion 10*, 353-402.

Stuyck, K., Luyten, S., Kesteloot, C., Meert, H. & Peleman, K. (2008). A Geography of Gender Relations: Role Patterns in the Context of Different Regional Industrial Development. In: *Regional Studies 42*(1), 69-82.

Svendsen, A. B. & Røyneland, U. (2008). Multiethnolectal facts and functions in Oslo, Norway. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism 12*(1, 2), 63-83.

Valbu (2004). Schumacher, H., Kubczak, J., Schmidt, R., & de Ruiter, V. (2004). *VALBU - Valenzwörterbuch deutscher Verben*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Verhagen, A. (1986). *Linguistic Theory and the Function of Word Order in Dutch*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Vinckel, H. (2006). *Die diskursstrategische Bedeutung des Nachfelds im Deutschen. Eine Untersuchung anhand politischer Reden der Gegenwartssprache*. Wiesbaden: Springer Verlag.

Vinckel-Roisin, H. (2011). Wortstellungsvariation und Salienz von Diskursreferenten: Die Besetzung des Nachfeldes in deutschen Pressetexten als kohärenzstiftendes Mittel. In: *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik 39*, 377-404.

Wiese, H. (2013). From feature pool to pond: The ecology of new urban vernaculars. In: *Working papers in Urban Language and Literacies 104*, 1-29.

Zifonun, G., Hoffmann, L. & Strecker, B. (1997a). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache Bd. 2*. Berlin etc.: de Gruyter.

Zifonun, G., Hoffmann, L. & Strecker, B. (1997b). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache Bd. 3*. Berlin etc.: de Gruyter.

Zwart, J. (2011). *The Syntax of Dutch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Abbreviations

Ad   adverbial
CD   Cité Duits
D   Dutch
Eng   English
G   German
inf   infinitive
p   person
part   participle perfect
pl   plural
prep   preposition
pro   pronoun
S   subject
sg   singular
StD   unmarked structure in 'standard Dutch'
StG   unmarked structure in 'standard German'
V   verb
?   syntactic construction that is questionable
*   syntactic construction that is unlikely to occur in the respective variety