

Chapter 11

Information packaging and word order dynamics in language contact

Oliver Bunk^a, Shanley E. M. Allen^b, Sabine Zerbian^c, Tatiana Pashkova^b, Yulia Zuban^c & Erica Conti^a

^aHumboldt-Universität zu Berlin ^bUniversity of Kaiserslautern-Landau

^cUniversity of Stuttgart

Word order is one of the linguistic resources speakers use to express specific meanings and present information. The literature considers information structure a major driving force behind word order and word order variation. The chapter argues that this is particularly true in language contact settings, enhancing the emergence of new word order patterns. We review studies that were conducted in the RUEG group, covering a) language-specific phenomena (referent introduction in English, V3 clauses and the placement of modal particles in German, and object-verb/verb-object patterns in Russian) and b) a cross-linguistically available construction – left dislocation in English, German, and Russian.

1 Introduction

In a world of increasingly dynamic global migration and communication, language contact has become an important and pervasive phenomenon in linguistic research. The interaction of different languages can result in the emergence of new linguistic forms and the shaping of language use and communication. One area of particular interest in studying language contact is the relationship between information packaging and word order. Information packaging involves two key concepts: information structure and information status. Information structure refers to how speakers encode and present information in a sentence



and includes notions such as focus and topic (see Krifka & Musan 2012). Information status means the status of referring expressions as referentially and/or lexically given or new in discourse (see Baumann 2006). Both concepts affect the packaging of information in spoken and written texts in order to respond to the immediate communicative needs of the interlocutor (see Chafe 1976).

The impact of language contact on information packaging and word order is a topic of ongoing research and debate. Information structure and status have been identified as one of the main causes of word order variation in languages with relatively free word order, such as German (Musan 2002), Russian (Jasinskaja 2016), and Turkish (Özsoy 2019), as well as languages with fixed word order, such as English (Ward & Birner 2004). Across different languages, word order has been shown to be influenced by specific information packaging principles including the given-before-new principle, the end-focus principle, the end-weight principle, and the complexity principle (see Hilpert 2021).

For example, according to the given-before-new principle (Halliday 1967, Hilpert 2021), discourse-given referents tend to appear before discourse new referents across different languages, such as English and Russian (Haviland & Clark 1974, Bock & Irwin 1980, Arnold et al. 2000, Slioussar 2007, 2011). In Russian, this pattern may lead to word orders with inversion ((XP) V S) or dislocation (XP S V), differing from the default subject-verb-object (SVO) pattern (e.g., King 1995, Kallestinova 2007, Bailyn 2012). In German, constituents can scramble within the clause to change their information status (e.g., Musan 2002). English uses specific syntactic constructions for highlighting and focusing. For example, locative inversion and existential *there* structures highlight the introduction of new information postverbally (Ward & Birner 2004).

The differences in word order flexibility and the different strategies in conveying information syntactically are particularly interesting from a cross-linguistic perspective, and language contact settings can be expected to enhance our understanding of the dynamic relationship between word order and information packaging. Various studies point to different factors influencing word order variation in bilinguals. For particular word order patterns, some studies suggest cross-linguistic influence as the explanatory factor (Polinsky 2018). However, for other phenomena, there is no evidence of such cross-linguistic influence. Rather, bilingual speakers seem more dynamic in language use than monolingual speakers (Wiese et al. 2022). This claim is based on the idea that exposure to multiple languages and linguistic systems allows bilinguals to draw on a wider range of linguistic resources, resulting in a more flexible and adaptive approach to language use (Wiese & Rehbein 2016). In particular, bilinguals may be more likely to adapt information packaging and word order in response to language contact,

as they can switch between different linguistic systems and draw on a range of linguistic resources to encode information, leading to either new emerging word order patterns or more frequent use of noncanonical patterns. In this chapter, we delve into the relation between information packaging, encompassing information structure and status, and word order, which seems to be dynamic in language contact situations and bilingual speakers.

This chapter presents studies within the RUEG group¹ investigating word order phenomena related to information packaging in English, Russian, and German. We consider different contact settings, namely 1) settings in which these languages are used as majority languages by monolinguals and by speakers of different heritage languages (i.e., Germany, the US, and Russia) or 2) settings in which two of these languages, German and Russian, are used as heritage languages (i.e., Germany and the US). We start by discussing the empirical basis of the analyses and findings for specific phenomena in English (referent introduction), German (V3 and modal particles), and Russian (word order in main/embedded clauses and OV/VO patterns). Then, we turn to the dynamics of information packaging from a cross-linguistic perspective, discussing a noncanonical word order pattern that occurs in all three languages, namely left dislocation constructions. To our knowledge, no study has systematically looked at the use and structure of left dislocation in different languages across different speaker groups (i.e., monolingual and bilingual) and different communicative settings. Thus, our study is one of the first to attempt such an endeavor and provides a broad perspective on noncanonical variation at the interface of word order and information packaging. Finally, we summarize our results and discuss implications for further research.

2 Word order variation in English, German, and Russian

English, German, and Russian exhibit various word order patterns related to information packaging. The languages differ concerning word order flexibility, making these language contact settings particularly interesting. As a language with flexible word order, Russian has a default SVO pattern, but all other alternations are possible, fulfilling information structural needs (e.g., Sirotinina 2003, Slioussar 2007, 2011). German is an SOV language with a V2 constraint, leading

¹The Research Unit *Emerging Grammars in Language Contact Situations: A Comparative Approach* (FOR 2537, 2018–2024, <https://hu.berlin/RUEG>), funded by the DFG, investigated linguistic dynamics in monolingual and multilingual speakers' repertoires. The present article presents results from the subproject P8 (PIs: Shanley E. M. Allen, Oliver Bunk, Sabine Zerbian), focussing on information structural dynamics in contact situations.

to finite V2 in declarative main clauses and finite verb last in subordinate clauses. English is strict SVO with residual V2. In the following sections, we present findings pronounced in bilingual speakers, indicating that this group is particularly prone to word order variation triggered by information packaging.

2.1 Data basis

The empirical basis for the analyses is the RUEG corpus² (Lüdeling et al. 2024). The data were elicited using one common experimental set-up (Wiese 2020), which allows for a systematic comparison of language in different communicative situations. Participants were asked to picture themselves as a witness to a car accident that they had just watched in a short video clip. They were tasked to describe the accident in four communicative situations, differing in mode (spoken vs. written) and formality (formal vs. informal). Table 1 illustrates these four contexts.

Table 1: Communicative situations simulated in the Lang-Sit set-up (Wiese 2020)

	Formal	Informal
Spoken	voice recording to the police	WhatsApp® audio message to a friend
Written	witness report to the police	WhatsApp® text message to a friend

The corpus comprises data from adolescent and adult speakers from different countries and with different language biographies. Speakers were from Germany, Greece, Russia, Turkey, or the US. They were either monolingually or bilingually raised.³ Monolinguals spoke the majority language of their respective countries, i.e., German, Greek, Russian, Turkish, or English. Bilingual speakers were tested in Germany and the US. In Germany, bilingual speakers were speakers of the majority language (German) and Greek, Russian, or Turkish as their heritage language. In the US, bilingual speakers were speakers of the majority

²<https://hu.berlin/RUEG-corpus>

³We consider monolingually-raised speakers as speakers who grew up with one language as their family language. Bilingually-raised speakers are considered speakers who grew up with another family language in addition to the majority language. These speakers were either born in Germany, Greece, Russia, Turkey, or the US with the respective majority languages or migrated to these countries before the age of four years.

language (English) and German, Greek, Russian, or Turkish as their heritage language. Table 2 gives an overview of the subcorpora (RU-RUEG = Russian subcorpus, EN-RUEG = English subcorpus, DE-RUEG = German subcorpus; h=heritage, mo=monolingual), including the numbers of speakers per group.

Table 2: Numbers of speakers in the different subcorpora

Speaker group	Number of speakers
RUEG-RU	
mo-Russian (RUS)	67
h-Russian (GER)	60
h-Russian (US)	69
RUEG-EN	
mo-English (US)	64
h-German (US)	34
h-Greek (US)	65
h-Russian (US)	65
h-Turkish (US)	59
RUEG-DE	
mo-German (GER)	64
h-German (US)	36
h-Greek (GER)	45
h-Russian (GER)	61
h-Turkish (GER)	65

While the RUEG corpus was the basis for all of our investigations, we used additional corpora for German, to conduct comparative analyses across different language contact scenarios. We provide information on these corpora in the respective sections.

2.2 Referent introduction in English

Even though English word order is canonically SVO, it can be changed according to pragmatic constraints, resulting in specific information packaging constructions (Huddleston 2002). For example, the given-before-new principle (Biber et al. 2021, Hilpert 2021) discussed in the introduction leads to a conflict for new subjects in English: a new subject referent has to be placed first because of SVO

word order, but ideally, it would be placed closer to the end of the clause because the referent is new.

To resolve this tension, speakers can use several non-SVO constructions that put the original SVO subject referent after the finite verb, for instance, existential *there* (1a), presentational *there* (1b), locative inversion (1c), and passivization (1d). The referent might remain the syntactic subject (1c) or take a different syntactic role – a notional subject in (1a) and (1b) or an object of a preposition in (1d).

- (1) Original clause: **A woman** was unloading her groceries on the other side of the street.
 - a. There was **a woman** unloading her groceries on the other side of the street.
 - b. There stood **a woman** unloading her groceries on the other side of the street.
 - c. On the other side of the street was **a woman** unloading her groceries.
 - d. <I saw some groceries.> They were unloaded by **a woman**.

There is some evidence that bilingual speakers use information packaging constructions differently compared to monolingually-raised English speakers, possibly because of cross-linguistic influence. For example, speakers of Singapore and Jamaican English use fewer existential *there* constructions than speakers of monolingual varieties (Winkle 2015).

Our pilot findings in majority English showed differences and similarities between bilinguals and monolinguals. Unlike monolinguals, bilinguals used locative inversion for new subjects. Both groups used existential *there* to a similar extent.

Based on these previous findings, Pashkova et al. (submitted) focused on the syntactic structures that are used for the introduction of new subjects in majority English. We asked if English bilinguals use more non-SVO constructions for the introduction of new subjects as compared to English monolinguals. We hypothesized that English bilinguals with heritage Russian and heritage Turkish, languages with flexible word orders, would use more non-SVO structures in English, possibly because of the cross-linguistic influence from the heritage languages. To evaluate the hypothesis, we compared the syntactic structures used for new vs. given subjects produced by 82 English bilinguals (40 heritage Russian and 42 heritage Turkish) vs. 40 English monolinguals. Each subject was annotated for its information status (new vs. given) and for the syntactic structure it was used in. Subsequently, the syntactic structures were divided into SVO-type structures (SVO and copular clauses without inversion) and non-SVO-type

structures (existential and presentational *there*, locative and non-locative inversions, right and left dislocations, passives, questions, *it*- and pseudo-clefts). The results of the analysis indicated no difference between the frequency of use of non-SVO structures by English bilinguals and monolinguals. In contrast, there was a difference between new and given subjects in the frequency of non-SVO structures: new subjects were more likely to appear in such a structure than given subjects. There was no interaction between the information status of the subject and speaker group (English bilinguals vs. monolinguals). These results show that all speakers in our sample, regardless of their bilingualism, preferred to use non-SVO structures for new subjects more than for given subjects. The data indicate that new subjects appear more frequently in constructions referring to information status (i.e., non-SVO), and both bilinguals and monolinguals similarly follow this trend. Cross-linguistic influence, as suggested by other studies, does not seem to play a major role. Rather, dynamics in information packaging appear to influence word order patterns in both speaker groups.

2.3 V3 and modal particles in German

In contrast to English, German is a more flexible language, allowing for a range of word order patterns. German is generally considered an SOV language with a V2 constraint, placing the finite verb in the second position in declarative clauses. Various constituents, such as subjects, objects, or adverbials, can occupy the preverbal position. V2 is considered a rigid constraint in German by the vast majority of the literature, and deviations from V2 are often claimed to be ungrammatical (see 2):

- (2) * Gestern Johann hat getanzt.
 yesterday Johann has danced
 ‘Yesterday, Johann danced.’ (Roberts & Roussou 2002: 137)

However, V3 patterns occur systematically in everyday language use, as (3) exemplifies:

- (3) danach er lässt den ball fallen
 after.that he lets the ball fall
 ‘after that, he drops the ball’ (RUEG corpus, DEbi58MT_isD)

These instances show an adverbial-subject-finite verb linearization (but see Sluckin 2021 for other V3 orders, such as adverbial-adverbial-finite verb orders, sparsely occurring) and are not only reported for German (see Wiese 2013), but

also for other V2 languages in language contact settings. V3 occurs in urban contact dialects in Sweden (see Kotsinas 1992), Denmark (see Quist 2000), Norway (see Opsahl 2009), and the Netherlands (see Meelen et al. 2020). It is also documented in contexts where Germanic languages are spoken as minority languages, including German in Namibia and the US (see Tracy & Lattey 2010, Sewell 2015, Wiese & Müller 2018), heritage Norwegian (see Alexiadou & Lohndal 2018, Kinn & Larsson 2021, 2022), heritage Low German (see Rocker 2022), heritage Swedish (Kinn & Larsson 2021, 2022), heritage Danish (Kühl & Petersen 2018) and heritage Icelandic (Arnbjörnsdóttir et al. 2018). V3 is also reported for monolingual German speakers (see Schalowski 2017, Wiese & Müller 2018, Bunk 2020). Wiese & Müller (2018) find that multilingual speakers use more V3 structures than monolinguals, indicating that word order variation concerning the V2 constraint is particularly dynamic in this speaker group.

Wiese et al. (2022) looked at the distribution of V3 sentences across speaker groups in the RUEG corpus. Based on the corpus version 0.4.0 (Wiese et al. 2021), the study highlights that most V3 sentences were produced by bilingual speakers in Germany and the US. However, V3 also occurred in monolingual speakers. A closer look at the speakers in Germany revealed that bilingual speakers with Turkish as their heritage language produced the vast majority of the V3 sentences. Wiese et al. (2022) argue that these findings speak against contact-linguistic transfer because Greek and Russian tend to have SVO, which might more easily allow for V3, while Turkish is predominantly SOV, making transfer to V3 in German less likely compared to the other two languages. However, for heritage German in the US, cross-linguistic effects might be at play, as these speakers produced V3 that also involves non-subjects (see Wiese et al. 2022). In a follow-up study using the much larger database of the corpus version 1.0 (Lüdeling et al. 2024), we found a similar distribution of V3 (see Bunk & Rocker in preparation).

Information structure plays a crucial role in the emergence and use of German V3 patterns (see Wiese 2009, Schalowski 2017, Wiese & Müller 2018, Bunk 2020). The adverbial-subject-finite verb linearization is closely tied to a “frame-setter > (aboutness) topic > comment” order and this pattern appears to hold in non-verbal contexts, i.e., contexts in which participants are asked to retell a story using only toys and word cards (see Wiese 2020) as well as in second language speakers (Bunk & Gamper forthcoming). Wiese & Rehbein (2016) argue that bilinguals more frequently use V3 since they are exposed to more linguistic variation, leading to a less strict inventory of grammatical rules, which they apply more productively to form noncanonical patterns. However, V3 also occurs in monolingual speakers, and psycholinguistic evidence suggests that these speakers a)

process V3 as an integral part of German grammar and b) judge adverbial-subject-finite verb orders as more grammatical than adverbial-object-finite verb, arguing for a representation of the former but not the latter structure (see Bunk 2020). Taken together, these studies point to a cognitive preference for “frame-setter > (aboutness) topic > comment” orders as a way of information packaging.

From these previous findings, it seems that V3 spotlights the interaction of information structure and word order. Concurrently, it sheds light on the external interface of syntax and discourse (see Sorace 2011). The initial adverbial functions as a frame-setter at the information structural level, as a discourse marker at the discourse structuring level (see Schalowski 2017), or takes both functions simultaneously (see Bunk 2020). Bunk & Rocker (in preparation) investigate the distribution of V3 types (frame-setting V3 vs. discourse-connecting V3 vs. ambiguous cases) in the RUEG corpus, the Kiezdeutsch-Korpus (KiDKo, Wiese et al. 2010), the DNaM corpus (Zimmer et al. 2020), and a collection of V3 sentences from heritage Low-German in the US (Rocker 2022), focusing on spoken language. While RUEG comprises data from the US and Germany, KiDKo contains data from multilingual and monolingual adolescents from Germany. DNaM includes data from adult and adolescent speakers of the German-speaking community in Namibia. All corpora slightly differ in size and number of speakers, however normalized numbers allowed for a comparison of the data. The corpora permit investigating different contact scenarios with different statuses of German: 1) as a majority language (Germany), and 2) as a minority/heritage language (US and Namibia). While in the US, German is on the decline and influenced by majority English, the speech community in Namibia still uses German as a vital language. We were interested in potential differences in the impact of other (majority) languages due to these diverging statuses of German.

The data were annotated for the type of adverbial (frame-setter, discourse-connector, ambiguous) in all corpora. We found that frame-setting and discourse-connecting V3 structures were used at similar rates in the RUEG and DNaM corpus and that only a few cases were ambiguous. KiDKo exhibited only a few discourse-connecting V3 sentences, while most were framesetting or ambiguous. We argued that differences between KiDKo and RUEG/DNaM are due to contextual factors, such as the oppositions between dialogue vs. monologue and free conversation vs. narration. However, we found that (*und*) *dann* (‘(and) then’) is the preferred adverbial in V3 across all corpora (see Wiese & Müller 2018 for a detailed discussion of *dann* (‘then’) in KiDKo, see Sewell 2015 for the prevalence of temporal adverbs licensing V3 in heritage German in Wisconsin German). We were also interested in the role of prosody in disambiguating frame-setting from discourse-connecting adverbials in V3, and found that prosodic boundaries might

provide a disambiguating cue for the interlocutor (Bunk & Rocker in preparation, Zerbian, Zuban, et al. 2025 [this volume] for a detailed summary).

Another case where information structure and discourse structure impact word order, particularly in the peripheries, is modal particles (henceforth MPs). MPs indicate “to the hearer the mood or attitude of a speaker” (Bross 2012: 183). Bunk et al. (2024) focus on the MPs *eben* and *halt*, investigating their distribution across speaker groups, function, and syntactic structure.

Eben and *halt* are often considered synonyms (e.g., Hentschel 1986, Diewald 2007), marking a proposition as definite and irrevocable, indicating irreversibility and resignation (Helbig 1988). However, others acknowledge subtle differences in meaning (see Thurmair 1989, Thielmann 2015, Blühdorn 2019). MPs are typically restricted to the so-called “middlefield”, the position between a finite and non-finite verb or verbal parts (Höhle 1986). Both finite and non-finite verbs and verbal particles form the “left sentence bracket” and “right sentence bracket” surrounding the middlefield. Table 3 provides an example of MPs in their canonical position in the middlefield.

Table 3: MPs in their canonical position in the middlefield

Prefield	L. verb bracket	Middlefield	R. verb br.	Postfield
Der Mann	hat	halt/eben den Ball	in der Hand.	
the man	has	MP/MP the ball	in his hand	
'The man has the ball in his hand.'				

In this study, we investigated *halt* and *eben* in the RUEG corpus, KiDKo, and the DNam corpus, again, to tease apart the influence of the societal macro context and the status of German on the use of the two MPs. The corpora comprise data from Germany (RUEG, KiDKo), the US (RUEG), and Namibia (DNam).

In line with previous studies on the distribution of *halt* and *eben* (e.g., Elspaß 2005), our data show that all speech communities prefer *halt* over *eben*, except for bilingual speakers of heritage German in the US. Here, we only encountered one occurrence of *halt* and no occurrence of *eben*. Interestingly, we found several cases where both MPs appear at the edge of the sentence and not in the middlefield. Peripheral *halt* and *eben* were more frequently used by multilingual than monolingual speakers, where we found only one instance of noncanonical particle placement in the right periphery. Thurmair (2020) argues that *halt* can only appear in the right periphery but not in the left periphery, losing its function as a MP and rather functioning as a discourse particle, toning down the importance of the preceding information. Imo (2008) finds *halt* in the left periphery,

where it still functions as a MP. In our data, *halt* was used as both discourse and modal particle in the left and the right periphery, predominantly frequent in the multilingual speaker groups. Thus, our data indicate that multilinguals not only use *halt* more frequently in a noncanonical position but also with a wider functional spectrum, including the highlighting of important information. However, there might also be sociolinguistic factors at play. While Namibia considers multilingualism the norm, Germany and the US are characterized by monoglossic ideologies. The absence of MPs in the US might indicate a strong influence of English as majority language due to these monoglossic ideologies. Previous studies indicate that these differences in macro contexts lead to different types of contact linguistic varieties (Wiese et al. 2022) and linguistic structures (Bunk et al. 2024, forthcoming). Thus, an external factor of linguistic variation such as different language contact settings might lead to different linguistic structures as an external factor of linguistic variation.

2.4 Word order in Russian

Of the three languages considered here, Russian is the most flexible concerning word order. Russian is reported to have a basic SVO order in pragmatically-neutral contexts (i.e., in broad focus contexts). However, Russian allows remarkable word order variation that is highly governed by information structure/status (Švedova 1980, Kovtunova 2002, Sirotinina 2003, Kallestinova 2007, Slioussar 2007, 2011, 2012).

Several studies investigate word order in heritage Russian in Germany. However, these studies do not explicitly investigate the impact of information structure. For example, Brehmer & Usanova (2015) report that bilinguals differed from monolingually-raised speakers of Russian by producing significantly more V-final linearizations in both main and embedded clauses. The authors explain the results in embedded clauses by referring to the influence from the majority language German, which has finite V-final in embedded clauses, whereas the results in main clauses might be due to pragmatic unmarking, in other words, V-final orders being used in a wider range of contexts (for details see Brehmer & Usanova 2015).

In contrast to Brehmer & Usanova (2015), Zuban et al. (2021) and Martynova et al. (2025) found that bilinguals with heritage Russian in Germany were similar to monolingual speakers of Russian regarding the choice of different word orders in both main and embedded clauses, not taking information structural factors into consideration. Zuban et al. (2021) investigate word orders of subject, verb, and (direct or indirect) object (i.e., SVO, OVS, SOV, OSV, VOS, VSO) of 16

adolescent bilinguals residing in the US and Germany and 8 age-matched monolingual speakers of Russian in the Russian subcorpus of the RUEG corpus. The data were manually annotated for clause type (main/embedded), verb type (e.g., auxiliary, copula, finite, gerund, infinitive), and word order pattern. The word orders included in the analysis contained a nonoblique subject, a finite verb, and an object (either direct or oblique). The overall dataset consisted of 783 clauses. The study revealed that bilinguals with heritage Russian in Germany were similar to monolingual speakers regarding their word order repertoire and word order distribution in both main and embedded clauses.

Martynova et al. (2025) examined the choice of OV/VO orders by 24 adolescent bilingual speakers in the US and Germany and monolingual speakers of Russian. The overall dataset consisted of 1,010 clauses. The data were manually annotated for clause type (main/embedded), verb type (e.g., auxiliary, copula, finite, gerund, infinitive), word order pattern (either OV or VO), and object realization (nominal or pronominal). Contrary to Zuban et al. (2021) and Brehmer & Usanova (2015), the study focused on the position of the object in relation to the verb, such that the word orders included in the analysis were OV and VO with either a finite or a non-finite verb and at least one object (direct or oblique). In addition, the study by Martynova et al. (2025) explicitly considered the influence of object realization (noun/pronoun) on OV/VO choice.

The study by Martynova et al. (2025) revealed that bilinguals in Germany were similar to monolingual speakers of Russian. Further, clause type and object role influenced the choice of OV vs. VO order in the bilingual and monolingual speakers similarly. Specifically, and in accordance with the literature on Standard Russian, the probability of OV over VO orders significantly decreased in embedded clauses compared to main clauses. Furthermore, and again in line with the literature on Standard Russian, objects realized by pronouns were associated with OV orders, while objects realized by nouns were associated with VO orders in narrations of both speaker groups.

As already pointed out, the findings in Zuban et al. (2021) and Martynova et al. (2025) contradict those of Brehmer & Usanova (2015). These differences could be due to 1) different text types (semi-spontaneous narrations in different registers in Zuban et al. (2021) and Martynova et al. (2025); vs. written narrations in Brehmer & Usanova (2015)), 2) differences in data annotation, and/or 3) differences in the data grouping and analysis.

As for the influence of information packaging on word order of heritage speakers in Germany, some studies such as Zuban et al. (2021) and Brehmer & Usanova (2015) acknowledge that word orders produced by heritage speakers are not always used to express the expected information structure or status. However, the above-mentioned studies do not explicitly focus on information packaging and

do not provide any quantitative results to support their observations. In the following paragraphs, we discuss one study that has examined the expression of information status by heritage speakers of Russian in Germany (Zuban 2023).

In formal speech in monolingual Russian, in accordance with the given-before-new principle, given referents canonically occur before new referents and new referents appear postverbally and clause-finally (Slioussar 2007, 2011). In informal speech, this given-new order can be violated (e.g., Sirotinina 2003), leading to a noncanonical new-given order. Zuban (2023) examined the syntactic and prosodic expression of referents with the order new-given produced in the RUEG corpus. The study analyzes the data of 120 speakers of the following groups: heritage speakers of Russian in the US ($N = 40$: 20 adolescents and 20 adults), heritage speakers of Russian in Germany ($N = 40$: 20 adolescents and 20 adults), and monolingual speakers of Russian ($N = 40$: 20 adolescents and 20 adults). The study focuses (among other things) on two questions: 1) whether heritage speakers of both groups and monolingual speakers in Russia produce noncanonical orders of referents (i.e., new before given referents in one clause), and 2) whether the frequency of the order of referents new-given is similar across the three speaker groups.

The data were manually annotated for word order based on Bailyn (2012) and Villavicencio (2002). Information status of the 23 most frequent referents was manually annotated according to the RefLex scheme (Riester & Baumann 2017) and language-specific principles such as the position of a referent in a clause or the expression of a referent by lexical or morphosyntactic means. Four types of referents were annotated: new, bridging, unused, and given (see their definitions in Riester & Baumann 2017: 5). The study shows that heritage speakers in Germany and monolingual speakers produced referents with the order new-given, as shown in the “target” in (4):

(4) Context:

i: v tot moment idët čelovek s mjačom (-) gde (-) u nego iz ruki (-)
otpuskaetsja mjač i vykatyvaetsja na dorogu

‘and: at that moment there is a person walking with a ball where the ball is dropped from his hand and rolls out onto the road’

Target:

potom sobaka (-) uvidela mjač

	S_{new}	V	O_{given}
then	dog	saw	ball

‘then a dog saw the ball’

Expected word order:

potom mjač uvidela sobaka

O_{given} V S_{new} (RUEG corpus, DEbi74MR_isR)

Overall, heritage speakers in Germany produced 52 instances of new-given combinations out of 408 clauses with different discourse-new referents (i.e., new, unused, and bridging), while monolinguals had 22 combinations of new-given out of 292 clauses with different discourse-new referents. The numerical difference of new-given combinations between the two speaker groups was statistically significant, i.e., heritage speakers in Germany produced significantly more combinations of new-given referents than monolingual speakers.

In the US, research generally reports on the increase of SVO and the reduction of word order flexibility in productions of Russian-English bilinguals (e.g., Isurin 2005, Kagan & Dillon 2006, Polinsky 2006, Isurin & Ivanova-Sullivan 2008, Laleko & Dubinina 2018). However, Zuban et al. (2021) found that other factors, such as clause type, may modulate the reduction of word order flexibility and the increase of SVO. They found that bilingual speakers in the US were similar to Russian monolinguals in main clauses but not in embedded ones, where they predominantly produced SVO orders. Zuban et al. (2021) argue that these results are not caused by transfer since transfer effects should emerge in both main and subordinate clauses. Rather, higher complexity of embedded clauses compared to main clauses led heritage speakers to the increased use of SVO word order (see Zuban et al. 2021 for a detailed discussion).

Martynova et al. (2025) found that, like bilingual speakers in Germany, bilinguals in the US and monolingual speakers of Russian are similar regarding their preference for OV and VO orders. Furthermore, the two groups of speakers were similar concerning clause type and object realization (noun vs. pronoun). Again, the different results in Martynova et al. (2025) and Zuban et al. (2021) are most likely due to the differences in the investigated phenomenon.

Regarding information packaging, some studies in the US report that word orders produced by heritage speakers are sometimes “contextually inappropriate”, i.e., they do not always express the intended information structure or information status (e.g., Laleko & Dubinina 2018, Kisselev 2019). This terminology of “contextually inappropriate” is highly problematic as it considers the monolingual formal language to be a norm for heritage speakers although the latter usually do not have exposure to formal instruction in their heritage language (see Wiese et al. 2022 for a discussion). Several studies suggest differences between bilingual and monolingual speakers and hint at different dynamics regarding information packaging. For instance, “contextually inappropriate” dislocation was

found to comprise from around 12% up to 30% of all word orders with dislocation in the data of bilinguals while monolingual speakers were reported to always produce “contextually appropriate” dislocation (Laleko & Dubinina 2018: 203, Kisselev 2019: 164). Importantly, both bilinguals and monolinguals produced word orders with dislocation. With respect to new-given orders in heritage Russian in the US, we found that heritage speakers of Russian in the US produced referents with the order of constituents new-given (61 instances out of 437 clauses) significantly more frequently than monolingual speakers (see Zuban 2023, 2024). The results were thus in line with the findings from heritage Russian in Germany as reported above.

Taken together, the results from our studies provide valuable insights into the issue of word order choices in heritage Russian. At first glance, bilinguals prefer the same word orders as monolingual speakers (Martynova et al. 2025, Zuban et al. 2021). However, once information packaging is added to the equation, the differences between bilinguals and monolinguals become obvious (Zuban 2023, 2024). Concurrently, the results of Zuban (2023, 2024) confirm the predictions of the Interface Hypothesis, according to which phenomena that lie at the external interface of syntax and discourse are predicted to show increased variability under language contact (Sorace 2011). The exact reasons behind this variability are less clear. However, the constant exposure of bilingual speakers to the various linguistic structures of their majority language and heritage language as well as different quantity and quality of input in the heritage languages might lead to the outcomes of heritage speakers that differ from monolingual speakers (see Sorace & Serratrice 2009, Zuban et al. 2023).

This section has summarized studies conducted within RUEG, showing that word order phenomena are modulated through information structure and status. These studies indicate that monolingual and bilingual speakers produce non-canonical patterns for specific information packaging purposes, for example regarding referent introduction in English. Some phenomena even highlighted that the relationship between information structure and word order seems particularly pronounced in bilingual speakers, such as V3 orders and modal particles in German and the order of new and given referents in Russian.

These findings provide valuable insights into the relationship between information packaging and word order in English, German and Russian, discussing isolated syntactic phenomena, with the major unifying factor being the influence of information packaging on word order. As will be shown below, focussing on a pattern occurring across these languages allows for a more systematic analysis of the interaction of information structure and word order under language contact. Taking this perspective, we might be able to pinpoint cross-linguistic effects

as well as more general, language external factors that might impact the interaction of information packaging and word order. In the next section, we look at left dislocation (LD) constructions as a case in point for such an endeavor.

3 Left dislocation constructions: A comparative view

3.1 LD in English, German, and Russian

Left dislocation (henceforth LD) is defined as “a construction in which a constituent (e.g., a noun, a full pronoun, etc.) that appears before/to the left of its predicate has, within the same sentence, a (nonreflexive) coreferential pronoun” (Duranti & Ochs 1979: 378).

The construction is reported for most documented languages and is thus considered a universal phenomenon (Lambrecht 2001, Westbury 2016). This makes LD constructions particularly revealing regarding the effects of language contact on syntax and information packaging, especially when the languages involved differ concerning word order flexibility and exhibit slight grammatical and functional differences in LD constructions (see Westbury 2016 for an extensive overview of grammatical and functional features of LD across different languages). Several studies in the RUEG group investigated LD constructions in Russian (Zerbian, Barabashova, et al. 2025), English (Pashkova et al. submitted), and German (Conti 2022, Sluckin & Bunk 2023), both in monolingual speakers and bilingual speakers. (5) exemplifies LD constructions in English, Russian, and German:

- (5) a. English
My father, he’s Armenian. (Prince 1997: 2)
- b. Russian
Moskv-a, ona gorodam mat’.
Moscow-NOM she cities mother
‘Moscow is the mother of cities.’ (King 1995: 103)
- c. German
Die Brigitte die kann ich schon gar nicht leiden.
the Brigitte she can I MP MP not like
‘Brigitte, I don’t like her at all.’ (Altmann 1981: 48)

LD constructions are a specific type of topic constructions where the dislocated constituent is topicalized through its initial position and resumption (see, among many others, Altmann 1981).

LDs (re)introduce or (re)activate discourse referents (see Westbury 2016) or promote topics (see Gregory & Michaelis 2001, Frey 2005). On the level of discourse pragmatics, they are used as floor-seeking devices (see Duranti & Ochs 1979). Even though there is no systematic analysis of LD in different communicative situations or registers, several studies have pointed out that LD tends to occur in informal (Geluykens 1992) and spoken language (Shaer & Frey 2004, Guryev et al. submitted). In spoken discourse, LD is particularly frequent in narrations and discourses with present interlocutors (Bousquette et al. 2021).

Similar LD types have been categorized using different terminology in different languages, causing confusion from a cross-linguistic perspective. For example, Frey (2005) indicates that the term “left dislocation” is misleading when comparing German with English. While in English, the resumptive occurs in the canonical position of the dislocated constituent in the following syntagma, in German, the resumptive appears right after the dislocated constituent. However, resumptives in German may also appear in other positions in the following syntagma. In this case, the construction is called “Hanging Topic (Left Dislocation) Construction” (HTLD; Altmann 1981, Selting 1993, Frey 2005). Frey (2005) refers to constructions such as in (6c) as “Contrastive Left Dislocations” (CLD). (6) illustrates the different constructions.

- (6) a. Maria, I know her. (English LD)
- b. Maria, die kenne ich. (German CLD)
- c. Maria, ich kenne sie. (German HTLD)

Various subtypes of LD constructions differ regarding their grammatical structure. In German CLD, NPs, PPs, CPs, APs, and AdvPs can be dislocated (Dewald 2012). These constituents are resumed by a *d*-pronoun (*der*, *die*, *das*) or an adverbial (see Sluckin & Bunk 2023 on adverbial resumption). HTLD in German is less restricted than CLD concerning the resumptive. It can occur as a *d*-pronoun, personal pronoun, a phrase, or it can be absent (see Altmann 1981, Dewald 2012). HTLDs are usually restricted to left dislocated NPs or PPs (Selting 1993). Russian and English LD constructions typically involve NPs that are resumed by a subject or object pronoun (King 1995, Kallestinova 2007). LD constructions in the three languages also differ concerning prosodic realization. While the left dislocated element is usually separated from the rest of the clause by a pause in Russian (Bailyn 2012), English (Frey 2005), and German HTLD, German CLDs lack such a pause and are prosodically integrated in the following syntagma (Altmann 1981, Selting 1993, Dewald 2012). In our analysis, we subsume all these different constructions under the term “left dislocation” (LD) for English, Russian, and German. In order to account for grammatical and functional differences between the

constructions, we annotated LD constructions concerning different grammatical features using a joint annotation scheme (see Section 3.2).

Even though LD is a widespread construction in the languages of the world, only a few studies have systematically investigated LD from the perspective of language contact. Generally, studies indicate that bilingual speakers have “robust knowledge of LD constructions” and “behave like monolingual native controls as regards production, interpretation, and use” (Bousquette et al. 2021: 11). In their investigation of heritage Norwegian and heritage German in the US, Bousquette et al. (2021: 17) find that “specific constraints on LD appear to have been weakened”. Overall, however, bilinguals patterned with monolinguals. Similar results have been found for adverbial resumption in Germany in informal German and Kiezdeutsch (Sluckin & Bunk 2023). Both varieties display similar patterns, even though Kiezdeutsch generally allows for more word order variation than the German of monolinguals, for example concerning verb placement (see Wiese & Rehbein 2016), which we already discussed above.

For Canadian French and English, Nagy et al. (2003) report that anglophones in Montreal use a distinct type of LD (“subject doubling”) in their French, but the construction is also known from the varieties of Canadian English spoken in Ontario, giving it a “distinctly French flavor” (Tagliamonte & Jankowski 2019: 1). Usually, this construction is rare in English but frequent in French. While at first glance, this observation might indicate cross-linguistic effects, the construction is also found in speech communities with less direct influence from French. Thus, Tagliamonte & Jankowski (2019: 13) conclude that the construction does not come from French but that “French is influencing the use of English”.

For Russian, Laleko & Dubinina (2018) investigate different word order patterns in bilingual and monolingual speakers of Russian in the US. Their study looks at different word order patterns, though not specifically including the LD constructions described here. They found that bilinguals produced fewer non-canonical patterns than monolinguals, indicating decreased word order flexibility in Russian.

In the following, we present first results from our comparative study on LD in language contact and contextualize findings from ongoing or published studies on LD in English, German, and Russian in language contact to gain further insights into LD constructions from a cross-linguistic perspective.

3.2 Data annotation

The empirical basis is the RUEG corpus as described above. LD constructions were identified in the RUEG corpus manually and annotated using a joint anno-

tation scheme allowing for systematic, cross-linguistic analyses. We thoroughly examined the corpus to identify all instances of LDs according to the definition provided at the beginning of Section 3. Subsequently, we proceeded to annotate each LD based on five features: 1. referent, 2. pronoun type (personal, possessive, partitive), 3. noun phrase type (simple noun phrase, noun phrase with a preposition, noun phrase with coordination, noun phrase with a relative clause), 4. presence of intervening material (present or absent), and 5. function (new introduction, reintroduction, set, clarification).

3.3 Findings

Overall, our data show that all speaker groups in Germany and the US use LDs, and the construction is almost always used in spoken contexts. However, the groups differ concerning the number of LDs used by particular groups in the respective countries. Differences also emerged for LD use in formal vs. informal communicative situations. Table 4 gives a general overview of the number of LDs normalized against the number of CUs.⁴

While the overall figures do not indicate major differences at first glance, our statistical analyses revealed interesting results. For Russian, bilinguals in both the US and Germany used a significantly higher number of LDs in total than monolinguals (see Zerbian, Barabashova, et al. 2025). This is in contrast to the literature reporting a decreased word order flexibility in bilinguals (e.g., Laleko & Dubinina 2018). In addition to the number of LDs, more bilingual speakers (again in both the US and Germany) than monolinguals produced LDs at all. Formality was not a significant factor for the groups investigated, i.e., there was no difference between formal and informal contexts, pointing to register leveling in these groups (see Özsoy et al. 2022).

In German, monolinguals and bilinguals did not differ significantly from each other. LDs were produced at similar rates. However, formality had a minor influence when comparing monolinguals and bilinguals speaking Turkish as a heritage language. German monolinguals produced fewer LDs in the informal than in the formal context, while bilinguals of heritage Turkish produced fewer in the formal than in the informal setting. These results were only marginally significant; further investigations with a larger data set might thus enlighten this aspect. Interestingly, bilinguals used a structure not yet attested in the literature. They occasionally (9 times) produced an LD structure with a personal pronoun, where a *d*-pronoun would be expected, as discussed in the literature. (7) provides an example:

⁴We define a communication unit (CU) as an “independent clause with its modifiers” (Hughes et al. 1997: 53).

Table 4: Overall frequencies of LDs across speaker groups

	Left dislocations	CUs	LDs per CU
RUEG-RU			
mo-Russian (Russia)	26	2780	0.009
h-Russian (Germany)	90	3374	0.030
h-Russian (US)	103	3222	0.030
RUEG-EN			
mo-English (US)	24	2734	0.009
h-German (US)	15	1499	0.009
h-Greek (US)	19	2879	0.007
h-Russian (US)	41	3170	0.013
h-Turkish (US)	30	2864	0.010
RUEG-DE			
mo-German (Germany)	19	3727	0.005
h-German (US)	2	1633	0.001
h-Turkish (Germany)	20	3627	0.006
h-Russian (Germany)	12	3639	0.003
h-Greek (Germany)	4	2251	0.002

- (7) dieser mann er spielt mit äh ball
 this man he plays with uhm ball
 ‘this man, he plays with the ball’ (RUEG corpus, DEbi59MT_isD)

Like LD in German, the number of LDs in English was similar between monolinguals and bilinguals – slightly above or under 1% out of all CUs. However, speaker groups differed in using LDs in formal vs. informal situations. We found different patterns of use between bilinguals with the heritage languages Greek and Turkish on the one hand and bilinguals with heritage German, heritage Russian, and monolinguals on the other hand. In the formal situations, speakers of the heritage languages Greek and Turkish used fewer LDs than monolinguals, while bilinguals with heritage German and heritage Russian did not differ from monolinguals. In the informal context, bilinguals with heritage Turkish produced more LDs than monolinguals, while bilingual speakers with heritage Greek, heritage German, and heritage Russian did not differ from monolinguals. Finally,

bilinguals with heritage Greek and heritage Turkish approached the formality distinction differently from English monolinguals: these bilinguals had slightly more LDs in the informal than in the formal setting, while monolinguals had a reverse pattern: they had slightly more LDs in the formal setting than in the informal one. Bilinguals with heritage German and heritage Russian did not differ from monolinguals.

3.4 Discussion

The study on LD in the three languages leaves us with valuable insights and many questions. For one, cross-linguistic influence might explain some of the results, such as the more frequent use of LD in heritage Russian compared to monolinguals, and the new pattern in German of replacing the resumptive *d*-pronoun with a personal pronoun. Bilingual heritage Russian speakers might use the noncanonical structure more frequently than monolingual English speakers since, in both their languages, LD is a plausible option for topic promotion or (re)introduction. The general flexibility of Russian word order compared to Turkish, Greek, and German might amplify the use of LD in such contexts. Statistical analyses are needed to further explore whether heritage speakers' majority language aligns with their heritage language regarding LD, in other words, whether in this case speakers use LDs more regularly.

Cross-linguistic transfer, however, does not explain the distributional patterns across different communicative contexts: while formality was not a relevant factor for heritage Russian in Germany, bilinguals with heritage Turkish produced slightly more LDs in informal than in formal contexts, while monolinguals produced more LDs in formal than in informal situations. Interestingly, we found a similar pattern in the US. Again, bilinguals with heritage Turkish (and heritage Greek) produced fewer LDs in formal contexts than monolinguals or bilinguals with heritage German and heritage Russian, who, in turn, produced fewer LDs in informal than in formal situations. This finding is rather surprising, as it concerns particular speaker groups. While for Russian, linguistic factors might be at play, as Russian word order flexibility appears to provide speakers with a wider range of grammar patterns, in heritage Greek and heritage Turkish, potential reasons for the distribution of LDs in formal and informal settings might be extralinguistic factors. In the final section, we suggest how sociolinguistic factors might provide further insights into LD use in language contact and that these factors might influence linguistic structure.

4 Conclusion and outlook

This chapter aimed to provide an overview of studies conducted within RUEG exploring the relationship between information packaging and word order in language contact settings. These studies suggest that both monolinguals and bilinguals make use of noncanonical structures that are influenced by information structure and status. In English, monolinguals and bilinguals used non-SVO to introduce new subjects, while in Russian, both groups used noncanonical new-before-given word orders. In German, noncanonical V3 and peripheral modal particles are used by both bilinguals and monolinguals and in all of these languages, LDs occur in both monolingual and bilingual groups.

Many of our studies also imply that bilingual speakers are flexible regarding word order and its interaction with information structure and status. In Russian, bilinguals use LDs more frequently, contrary to the decrease in flexibility in bilinguals with heritage Russian, as often claimed in the literature. In addition, they apply noncanonical new-before-given word order more frequently than monolinguals. Even though some previous studies did not find any differences in word order between monolinguals and bilinguals (e.g., Martynova et al. 2025), or these differences were not found across all the investigated conditions (e.g., Zuban et al. 2021), the picture changes when considering how new vs. given referents are presented. In German, V3 is used more frequently by bilingual speakers, and bilinguals place the modal particles *halt* and *eben* more frequently in the sentence peripheries, taking on the functions of discourse particles and highlighting important information.

Our data also indicate that bilingual speakers are not only more dynamic but tend to be more sensitive to communicative situations, as we have seen for the preference of LD in informal situations in most bilingual groups, except for Russian. These effects cannot be explained by cross-linguistic transfer, as we would expect differences in all communicative situations for specific speaker groups. Considering sociolinguistic factors might further illuminate these findings. Bunk (2024) found that many German bilingual speakers with heritage Turkish and heritage Russian produced fewer noncanonical patterns and more features associated with formal, standard-like German on several linguistic levels (lexicon, phonetics, discourse-pragmatics) in the formal situations compared to monolinguals. For example, speakers tend to articulate non-morphemic *-t* in the auxiliary *ist* ('is') more frequently than their monolingual peers. In spoken language, speakers often drop non-morphemic *-t* due to a regular phonological process. This variant, however, deviates from written standard German and may not be associated with formal language. Bunk (2024, in press) argues that a reason for

such patterns may be linguistic pressure that multilingual speakers experience in a societal macro context that is characterized by widespread monoglossic ideologies. Multilingual speakers might feel the need to align with the majority society linguistically to be accepted as members of that society and to avoid Othering. This conclusion is further supported by qualitative sociolinguistic interviews, in which speakers reported the need to excel over monolinguals regarding standard language use in order to be considered valid members of the German society Bunk (2024, in press). An example for such a notion, uttered by a bilingual speaker with Russian as their heritage language in Germany, is given in (8):

- (8) sagen wir mal, man sieht ausländisch aus, [...] man wird einfach anders wahrgenommen, wenn das Deutsch perfekt ist
 'let's say you look foreign, [...] you are simply perceived differently if your German is perfect' (CS_hR, 3:56)

The interview data illustrate strong monoglossic ideologies, standard language ideology, and perceived linguisticism as indicated in (8). These ideologies are present in both the US and Germany, which is typical for countries of the Global North (Lippi-Green 1997, Blackledge 2000). Hence, they might affect the use of noncanonical patterns, such as LDs, in bilingual speakers in these countries. However, this interpretation of the data does not explain why speaker groups differ from each other. Two possible factors come to mind: a) different experiences of discrimination due to socialization, and b) different ideologies towards multilingualism and the standard variety of the majority language between the speaker groups.

If the societal macro context plays a role, we would not expect fewer LDs in formal contexts than in informal contexts in bilinguals and more LDs in formal contexts than in informal contexts by monolinguals in societies that perceive multilingualism as normalcy, e.g., Namibia. In an ongoing study, Conti & Bunk (in preparation) compare the use of LDs in German in Germany, the US, and Namibia, investigating this question further. However, we found other patterns that support this idea in the use of modal particles (see Bunk et al. 2024 and Section 2.2), and bare NPs (Bunk et al. forthcoming). Additionally, Wiese et al. (2022) show that the societal macro context seems to influence the overall structure of languages strongly. Even though this perspective does not explain all of our data, it might explain the fewer occurrences of LDs in formal situations in some bilingual speakers of heritage Turkish and heritage Greek in the US and heritage Turkish in Germany compared to monolinguals. While more in-depth studies are needed to determine language ideologies that are present in the soci-

etal macro-context, such as through systematic discourse analysis of public discussions or policy papers, these findings indicate that linguistic ideologies might be an important factor to consider when analyzing linguistic structures in language contact, in particular regarding noncanonical variation.

The case of left dislocation shows that in addition to looking at language-specific phenomena, systematic cross-linguistic analyses of similar patterns are important to illuminate the interaction of information packaging and word order variation. We further suggest that integrating sociolinguistic factors such as the societal macro contexts and ideologies towards multilingualism into our models of grammatical variation might further deepen our understanding of linguistic dynamics in heritage speakers' language use.

Acknowledgements

The research for this paper was funded by the DFG (Research Unit FOR 2537, P6 (394838878) and P8 (313607803)). We thank the editors of this volume, two anonymous external reviewers, and three internal reviewers (Cem Keskin, Luca Szucsich, and Rosemary Tracy) for their valuable feedback. For all remaining errors and shortcomings, the authors, of course, take full responsibility. We would also like to thank all research assistants involved in the projects: Daria Alkhimchenkova, Erica Conti, Amelie Ellerich, Isabell Furkert, Yuliia Ivashchyk, Alexander Lehmann, Birte Pravemann, Sharon Rauschenbach, Guendaline Reul, Myrto Rompaki, Alina Schöpf, Madeleine Spitzer, Chris Allison, Ricarda Bothe, Mert Can, Ryan Carroll, Franziska Cavar, Leah Doroski, Mary Elliott, Hannah Lee, Mark Murphy, Mariia Naumovets, Simge Sargin Kısacık, Jasmine Segarra, Golshan Shakebaee, Selena Song, Shreya Srivastava, Fiona Wong and Charlott Thomas for their support. We additionally thank Lea Coy for help with pre-publication formatting. Finally, we thank the whole RUEG team and the Mercator fellows for numerous fruitful discussions, feedback, and great support.

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis & Terje Lohndal. 2018. V3 in Germanic: A comparison of urban vernaculars and heritage languages. In Mailin Antomo & Sonja Müller (eds.), *Non-canonical verb positioning in main clauses* (Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 25), 245–264. Hamburg: Buske.

- Altmann, Hans. 1981. *Formen der Herausstellung im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen* (Linguistische Arbeiten 106). Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.
- Arnbjörnsdóttir, Birna, Höskuldur Thráinsson & Iris Edda Nowenstein. 2018. V2 and V3 orders in North-American Icelandic. *Journal of Language Contact* 11(3). 379–412. DOI: 10.1163/19552629-01103002.
- Arnold, Jennifer E., Anthony Losongco, Thomas Wasow & Ryan Ginstrom. 2000. Heaviness vs. newness: The effects of structural complexity and discourse status on constituent ordering. *Language* 76. 28–55.
- Bailyn, John F. 2012. *The syntax of Russian* (Cambridge syntax guides). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Baumann, Stefan. 2006. Information structure and prosody: Linguistic categories for spoken language annotation. In Stefan Sudhoff, Denisa Lenertova, Roland Meyer, Sandra Pappert, Petra Augurzky, Ina Mleinek, Nicole Richter & Johannes Schließer (eds.), *Methods in empirical prosody research* (Language, Context and Cognition 3). Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110914641.153.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey N. Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 2021. *Grammar of spoken and written English*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/z.232.
- Blackledge, Adrian. 2000. Monolingual ideologies in multilingual states: Language, hegemony and social justice in Western liberal democracies. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 1(2). 25–45. DOI: 10.1558/sols.v1i2.25.
- Blühdorn, Hardarik. 2019. Modalpartikeln und Akzent im Deutschen. *Linguistische Berichte* 2019(259). 275–317. DOI: 10.46771/23660775002591.
- Bock, Kathryn J. & David E. Irwin. 1980. Syntactic effects of information availability in sentence production. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 19(4). 467–484. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-5371(80)90321-7.
- Bousquette, Joshua, Kristin M. Eide, Arnstein Hjelde & Michael T. Putnam. 2021. Competition at the left edge: Left-dislocation vs. topicalization in H-Germanic. In Arnstein Hjelde & Åshildedt Søfteland (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 10th Workshop on Immigrant Languages in the Americas (WILA 10)*, 11–21. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Brehmer, Bernhard & Irina Usanova. 2015. Let's fix it? Cross-linguistic influence in word order patterns of Russian h-speakers in Germany. In Hagen Peukert (ed.), *Transfer effects in multilingual language development* (Hamburg Studies on Linguistic Diversity), 161–188. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bross, Fabian. 2012. German modal particles and the common ground. *Helikon: A Multidisciplinary Online Journal* (2). 182–209.

- Bunk, Oliver. 2020. „Aber immer alle sagen das“: *The status of V3 in German: Use, processing, and syntactic representation*. Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. (Doctoral dissertation). DOI: 10.18452/22085.
- Bunk, Oliver. 2024. What does linguistic structure tell us about language ideologies? The case of majority language anxiety in Germany. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics: Language ideologies: Old questions, new perspectives*. Naomi Truan & Esther Jahns (eds.). 91–116. DOI: 10.1515/eujal-2023-0049.
- Bunk, Oliver. In press. The anxious heritage speaker? Language anxiety and insecurity in multilingual contexts. In Artemis Alexiadou, Claudio Scavaglieri, Christoph Schroeder & Heike Wiese (eds.), *The construction of multilinguals as others: Do we practice what we preach?* Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Bunk, Oliver & Jana Gamper. Forthcoming. *The V2 myth: Evidence for a functional motivation of V3 in L2 German*.
- Bunk, Oliver & Maïke H. Röcker. In preparation. *The status of initial adverbials in V3 sentences: A comparative corpus study on prosodic realization*.
- Bunk, Oliver, Antje Sauermann & Fynn Raphael Dobler. 2024. Sociolinguistic variation in Kiezdeutsch and Namdeutsch: The case of the modal particles *halt* and *been*. In James M. Stratton & Karen V. Beaman (eds.), *Expanding variationist sociolinguistic research in varieties of German*. New York: Routledge.
- Bunk, Oliver, Britta Schulte & Heike Wiese. Forthcoming. Bare NPs in German: Results from a comparative corpus study. In Siegwalt Lindenfelser, Angélica Prédiger & Renata Szczepaniak (eds.), *Deutsche Sprachminderheiten in der Welt: Empirische Studien zur Sprachvariation und Sprachideologie* (Germanistische Linguistik). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 27–55. New York: Academic Press.
- Conti, Erica. 2022. *German left dislocations across communicative situations: A comparative corpus study*. Berlin: MA thesis.
- Conti, Erica & Oliver Bunk. In preparation. *Left dislocation in German varieties: A comparative view*.
- Dewald, Anika. 2012. *Versetzungsstrukturen im Deutschen*. Köln: Universität zu Köln. (Dissertation).
- Diewald, Gabriele. 2007. Abtönungspartikel. In Ludger Hoffmann (ed.), *Handbuch der deutschen Wortarten* (De Gruyter Lexikon), 117–142. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.
- Duranti, Alessandro & Elinor Ochs. 1979. Left-dislocation in Italian conversation. In Talmy Givón (ed.), *Discourse and syntax*, 377–416. New York: Academic Press.

- Elspaß, Stephan. 2005. Zum Wandel im Gebrauch regionalsprachlicher Lexik. Ergebnisse einer Neuerhebung. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 72(1). 1–51.
- Frey, Werner. 2005. Pragmatic properties of certain German and English left peripheral constructions. *Linguistics* 43(1). 89–129.
- Geluykens, Ronald. 1992. *From discourse process to grammatical construction: On left-dislocation in English* (Studies in Discourse and Grammar 1). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/sidag.1.
- Gregory, Michelle L. & Laura A. Michaelis. 2001. Topicalization and left-dislocation: A functional opposition revisited. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(11). 1665–1706. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00063-1.
- Guryev, Alexander, Victoriya Trubnikova & François Delafontaine. Submitted. *Left-dislocation constructions in Russian: A functionalist approach in terms of “macro-syntactic routines”*.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English: Part 2. *Journal of linguistics* 3(2). 199–244.
- Haviland, Susan E. & Herbert H. Clark. 1974. What’s new? Acquiring new information as a process in comprehension. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13(5). 512–521. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-5371(74)80003-4.
- Helbig, Gerhard. 1988. *Lexikon deutscher Partikeln*. 1. Aufl. Leipzig: VEB Verl. Enzyklopädie.
- Hentschel, Elke. 1986. *Funktion und Geschichte deutscher Partikeln*: Ja, doch, halt und eben (Reihe Germanistische Linguistik 63). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Hilpert, Martin. 2021. Information structure. In Bas Aarts, April MacMahon & Lars Hinrichs (eds.), *Handbook of English Linguistics*, 229–248. New York: Wiley.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1986. Der Begriff „Mittelfeld“: Anmerkungen über die Theorie der topologischen Felder. In Walter E. Weiss, Herbert E. Wiegand & Marga Reis (eds.), *Kontroversen, alte und neue: Akten des VII. Internationalen Germanisten-Kongresses Göttingen 1985*, 329–340. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Huddleston, Rodney. 2002. Syntactic overview. In Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, 43–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781316423530.003.
- Hughes, Diana L., LaRae McGillivray & Mark Schmidek. 1997. *Guide to narrative language: Procedures for assessment*. Eau Claire, WI: Thinking Publications.
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2008. Individuelle Konstrukte oder Vorboten einer neuen Konstruktion? Stellungsvarianten der Modalpartikel halt im Vor- und Nachfeld.

- In Anatol Stefanowitsch & Kerstin Fischer (eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik II* (Stauffenburg Linguistik), 135–156. Tübingen: Stauffenburg-Verl.
- Isurin, Ludmila. 2005. Cross-linguistic transfer in word order: Evidence from L1 forgetting and L2 acquisition. In James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad & Jeff McSwan (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 1115–1130. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Isurin, Ludmila & Tania Ivanova-Sullivan. 2008. Lost in between: The case of Russian hspeakers. *Heritage Language Journal* 6(1). 72–104.
- Jasinskaja, Katja. 2016. Information structure in Slavic. In Caroline Féry & Shinichiro Ishihara (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of information structure* (Oxford handbooks in linguistics), 709–732. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kagan, Olga & Kathleen Dillon. 2006. Russian eritage learners: So what happens now? *The Slavic and East European Journal* 50(1). 83–96. DOI: 10.2307/20459235.
- Kallestinova, Elena. 2007. *Aspects of word order in Russian*. Iowa City: University of Iowa. (Doctoral dissertation).
- King, Tracy Holloway. 1995. *Configuring topic and focus in Russian* (Dissertations in linguistic series). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Kinn, Kari & Ida Larsson. 2021. Pronominale demonstrativer: Nye perspektiver fra norsk og svensk. *Oslo Studies in Language* 11(2). 201–224.
- Kinn, Kari & Ida Larsson. 2022. Pronominal demonstratives in homeland and heritage Scandinavian. eng. *Nordic journal of linguistics* 45(3). 281–309.
- Kisselev, Olesya. 2019. Word order patterns in the writing of heritage and second language learners of Russian. *Russian Language Journal* 69. 149–174.
- Kotsinas, Ulla-Britt. 1992. Immigrant adolescents' Swedish in multicultural areas. In Cecilia Palmgren, Karin Lövgren & Göran Bolin (eds.), *Ethnicity in youth culture*, 43–62. Stockholm: University of Stockholm.
- Kovtunova, Irina I. 2002. *Sovremennyy russkij jazyk: Porjadok slov i aktual'noe členenie predloženij* [Modern Russian language: Word order and actual division of the sentence]. URSS.
- Krifka, Manfred & Renate Musan. 2012. Information structure: Overview and linguistic issues. In Manfred Krifka & Renate Musan (eds.), *The expression of information structure* (The expression of cognitive categories), 1–44. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kühl, Karoline & Jan Heegård Petersen. 2018. Word order in American Danish declaratives with a non-subject initial constituent. eng. *Journal of Language Contact* 11(3). 413–440.

- Laleko, Oksana & Irina Dubinina. 2018. Word order production in heritage Russian: Perspectives from linguistics and pedagogy. In Susan Bauckus & Susan Kresin (eds.), *Connecting across languages and cultures: A heritage language Festschrift in honor of Olga Kagan*, 191–215. Bloomington: Slavica.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 2001. Dislocation. In Gerold Ungeheuer (ed.), *Language typology and language universals*, 1050–1078. Berlin & Boston: Mouton.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997. What we talk about when we talk about Ebonics: Why definitions matter. *The Black Scholar* 27(2). 7–11.
- Lüdeling, Anke, Artemis Alexiadou, Shanley E. M. Allen, Oliver Bunk, Natalia Gagarina, Sofia Grigoriadou, Rahel Gajaneh Hartz, Kateryna Iefremenko, Esther Jahns, Kalliopi Katsika, Mareike Keller, Martin Klotz, Thomas Krause, Annika Labrenz, Maria Martynova, Onur Özsoy, Tatiana Pashkova, Maria Pohle, Judith Purkarthofer, Vicky Rizou, Christoph Schroeder, Anna Shadrova, Luka Szucsich, Rosemarie Tracy, Wintai Tsehay, Heike Wiese, Sabine Zerbian, Yulia Zuban & Nadine Zürn. 2024. *RUEG Corpus*. Version 1.0. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.11234583.
- Martynova, Maria, Yulia Zuban, Luka Szucsich & Natalia Gagarina. 2025. OV/VO word order in heritage Russian: Is transfer at play? *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 33. <https://ojs.ung.si/index.php/JSL/article/view/411>.
- Meelen, Marieke, Khalid Mourigh & Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng. 2020. V3 in urban youth varieties of Dutch. In András Bárány, Theresa Biberauer, Jamie Douglas & Sten Vikner (eds.), *Syntactic architecture and its consequences II: Between syntax and morphology*, 327–355. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4280657.
- Musan, Renate. 2002. Informationsstrukturelle Dimensionen im Deutschen: Zur Variation der Wortstellung im Mittelfeld. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 30(2). 198.
- Nagy, Naomi G., Hélène Blondeau & Julie Auger. 2003. Second language acquisition and “real” French: An investigation of subject doubling in the French of Montreal Anglophones. *Language Variation and Change* 15(01). 73–103. DOI: 10.1017/S0954394503151034.
- Opsahl, Toril. 2009. Wolla I swear this is typical for the conversational style of adolescents in multiethnic areas in Oslo. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 32(2). 221–244. DOI: 10.1017/s0332586509990059.
- Özsoy, A. Sumru (ed.). 2019. *Word order in Turkish* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 97). Berlin: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-11385-8.
- Özsoy, Onur, Kateryna Iefremenko & Christoph Schroeder. 2022. Shifting and expanding clause combining strategies in heritage Turkish varieties. *Languages* 7(3). 242. DOI: 10.3390/languages7030242.

- Pashkova, Tatiana, Hannah Lee, Mark Murphy & Shanley E. M. Allen. Submitted. *Left dislocations in heritage speakers' majority English in the US*.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2006. Incomplete Acquisition: American Russian. *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 14(2). 191–262.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2018. *Heritage languages and their speakers* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 159). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781107252349.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1997. On the functions of left-dislocation in English discourse. In Akio Kamio (ed.), *Directions in functional linguistics* (Studies in language companion series (SLCS)), 117–143. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Quist, Pia. 2000. Ny københavnsk “multietnolekt”: Om sprogbrug blandt unge i sprogligt og kulturelt heterogene miljøer [New Copenhagen “multi-ethnolect”: About language use among young people in linguistically and culturally heterogeneous environments]. *Danske Talesprog* 1. 143–211.
- Riester, Arndt & Stefan Baumann. 2017. *The RefLex scheme: Annotation guidelines* (SinSpeC: Working Papers of the SFB 732, no. 14). Stuttgart: Universitätsbibliothek der Universität Stuttgart.
- Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2002. The Extended Projection Principle as a condition on the tense dependency. In Peter Svenonius (ed.), *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax), 125–155. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rocker, Maïke H. 2022. *Variation in finite verb placement in heritage Iowa Low German: The role of prosodic integration and information structure*. State College: Pennsylvania State University. (PhD Thesis).
- Schalowski, Sören. 2017. From adverbial to discourse connective. Multiple pre-fields in spoken German and the use of *dann* ‘then’ and *danach* ‘afterwards’. In Heike Wiese, Heiko F. Marten, Philip Bracker & Oliver Bunk (eds.), *Arbeitspapiere Sprache, Variation und Migration: Studentische Arbeiten*, 1–45. Potsdam: Online Publication, Universität Potsdam. https://www.uni-potsdam.de/fileadmin/projects/svm/Arbeitspapiere/No6_Schalowski_2017.pdf.
- Selting, Margret. 1993. Voranstellungen vor den Satz: Zur grammatischen Form und interaktiven Funktion von Linksversetzung und Freiem Thema im Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 21(3). 291–319.
- Sewell, Alyson. 2015. Sociolinguistic and syntactic variation in Wisconsin German narratives. In B. Richard Page & Michael T. Putnam (eds.), *Moribund Germanic heritage languages in North America*, 224–250. Leiden: Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004290211011.

- Shaer, Benjamin & Werner Frey. 2004. "Integrated" and "non-integrated" left-peripheral elements in German and English. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 35(2). 465–502. DOI: 10.21248/zaspil.35.2004.238.
- Sirotnina, Olga Borisovna. 2003. *Porjadok slov v russkom jazyke [Word order in Russian]*. Izd. 2., stereotipnoe (Lingvističeskoe nasledie XX veka). Moskva: Ed. URSS.
- Slioussar, Natalija. 2007. *Grammar and information structure: A study with reference to Russian*. Utrecht: LOT Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics. (PhD Thesis).
- Slioussar, Natalija. 2011. Processing of a free word order language: The role of syntax and context. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 40(4). 291–306. DOI: 10.1007/s10936-011-9171-5.
- Sluckin, Benjamin Lowell. 2021. *Non-canonical subjects and subject positions*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. (PhD Thesis). DOI: 10.18452/23715.
- Sluckin, Benjamin Lowell & Oliver Bunk. 2023. Noncanonical V3 and resumption in Kiezdeutsch. In Karen de Clercq, Liliane Haegeman, Terje Lohndal & Christine Meklenborg (eds.), *Adverbial resumption in verb second languages*, 327–354. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197651148.003.0014.
- Sorace, Antonella. 2011. Pinning down the concept of "interface" in bilingualism. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 1(1). 1–33. DOI: 10.1075/lab.1.1.01sor.
- Sorace, Antonella & Ludovica Serratrice. 2009. Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language development: Beyond structural overlap. *The international journal of bilingualism: Cross-disciplinary, cross-linguistic studies of language behavior* 13(2). 195–210.
- Švedova, Natalija J. 1980. *Russkaja grammatika*. Place: Moskva.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. & Bridget L. Jankowski. 2019. Grammatical convergence or microvariation? Subject doubling in English in a French dominant town. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 4(1). 1–15. DOI: 10.3765/plsa.v4i1.4514.
- Thielmann, Winfried. 2015. Halt. *Deutsche Sprache* 72(1). 1–10. DOI: 10.37307/j.1868-775X.2015.01.02.
- Thurmair, Maria. 1989. *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen*. Tübingen: Max Niemayer Verlag. DOI: 10.1515/9783111354569.
- Thurmair, Maria. 2020. Zur Syntax von halt: Eine Modalpartikel im Nachfeld? *Sprachwissenschaft* 45(2). 241–273.
- Tracy, Rosemarie & Elsa Lattey. 2010. "It wasn't easy but irgendwie äh da hat sich's rentiert, net?": A linguistic profile. In Michaela Albl-Mikasa (ed.), *Dimensionen der Zweitsprachenforschung*, 53–73. Tübingen: Narr.

- Villavicencio, Aline. 2002. Learning to distinguish PP arguments from adjuncts. In Ming-Syan Cheng, Philip S. Yu & Bing Liú (eds.), *Proceeding of the 6th conference on Natural language learning - COLING-02*, vol. 20, 1–7. Association for Computational Linguistics. DOI: 10.3115/1118853.1118886.
- Ward, Gregory & Betty Birner. 2004. Information structure and non-canonical syntax. In Laurence R. Horn & Gregory Ward (eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics*, 152–174. Wiley. DOI: 10.1002/9780470756959.ch7.
- Westbury, Josh. 2016. Left dislocation: A typological overview. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 50(1). 21–45. DOI: 10.5842/50-0-715.
- Wiese, Heike. 2009. Grammatical innovation in multiethnic urban Europe: New linguistic practices among adolescents. *Lingua* 119(5). 782–806. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.002.
- Wiese, Heike. 2013. What can new urban dialects tell us about internal language dynamics? The power of language diversity. In Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds.), *Dialektologie in neuem Gewand: Zu Mikro-/Varietätenlinguistik, Sprachenvergleich und Universalgrammatik* (Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 19), 207–245. Hamburg: Buske.
- Wiese, Heike. 2020. Language situations: A method for capturing variation within speakers' repertoires. In Yoshiyuki Asahi (ed.), *Methods in dialectology XVI* (Bamberg Studies in English Linguistics 59), 105–117. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Wiese, Heike, Artemis Alexiadou, Shanley E. M. Allen, Oliver Bunk, Natalia Gagarina, Katerina Iefremenko, Maria Martynova, Tatiana Pashkova, Vicky Rizou, Christoph Schroeder, Anna Shadrova, Luka Szucsich, Rosemarie Tracy, Wintai Tsehay, Sabine Zerbian & Yulia Zuban. 2022. Heritage speakers as part of the native language continuum. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12. 5982. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.717973.
- Wiese, Heike, Artemis Alexiadou, Shanley E. M. Allen, Oliver Bunk, Natalia Gagarina, Kateryna Iefremenko, Esther Jahns, Martin Klotz, Thomas Krause, Annika Labrenz, Anke Lüdeling, Maria Martynova, Katrin Neuhaus, Tatiana Pashkova, Vicky Rizou, Tracy Rosemarie, Christoph Schroeder, Luka Szucsich, Wintai Tsehay, Sabine Zerbian & Yulia Zuban. 2019. *RUEG Corpus (Version 0.3.0) [Data set]*. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3236069.
- Wiese, Heike, Artemis Alexiadou, Shanley E. M. Allen, Oliver Bunk, Natalia Gagarina, Kateryna Iefremenko, Esther Jahns, Martin Klotz, Thomas Krause, Annika Labrenz, Anke Lüdeling, Maria Martynova, Katrin Neuhaus, Tatiana Pashkova, Vicky Rizou, Tracy Rosemarie, Christoph Schroeder, Luka Szucsich, Wintai Tsehay, Sabine Zerbian & Yulia Zuban. 2021. *RUEG Corpus*. Version 0.4.0. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3236068.

- Wiese, Heike, Oliver Bunk, Fynn Dobler, Ulrike Freywald, Sophie Hamm, Banu Hueck, Anne Junghans, Jana Kiolbassa, Julia Kostka, Marlen Leisner, Nadine Lestmann, Katharina Mayr, Tiner Özçelik, Charlotte Pauli, Gergana Popova, Ines Rehbein, Nadja Reinhold, Franziska Rohland, Sören Schalowski, Kathleen Schumann, Kristina T. Sommer & Emiel Visser. 2010. *KiDKo: Ein Korpus spontaner Unterhaltungen unter Jugendlichen im multiethnischen und monoethnischen urbanen Raum*. <http://kiezdeutschkorpus.de/en/>.
- Wiese, Heike & Hans Georg Müller. 2018. The hidden life of V3: An overlooked word order variant on verb-second. In Mailin Antomo & Sonja Müller (eds.), *Non-canonical verb positioning in main clauses* (Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 25), 202–223. Hamburg: Buske.
- Wiese, Heike & Ines Rehbein. 2016. Coherence in new urban dialects: A case study. *Lingua* 172–173. 45–61. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2015.10.016.
- Winkle, Claudia. 2015. *Non-canonical structures, they use them differently: Information packaging in spoken varieties of English*. Freiburg: Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg. (Dissertation). <https://freidok.uni-freiburg.de/data/10600>.
- Zerbian, Sabine, Kristina Barabashova & Yulia Zuban. 2025. *Left dislocations in monolingual and heritage Russian in Germany and the U.S.* DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/15507076-bja10035>.
- Zerbian, Sabine, Yulia Zuban, Marlene Böttcher & Oliver Bunk. 2025. Intonation in heritage languages. In Shanley E. M. Allen, Mareike Keller, Artemis Alexiadou & Heike Wiese (eds.), *Linguistic dynamics in heritage speakers: Insights from the RUEG group*, 413–448. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15775183.
- Zimmer, Christian, Heike Wiese, Horst J. Simon, Marianne Zappen-Thomson, Yannic Bracke, Britta Stuhl & Thomas Schmidt. 2020. Das Korpus Deutsch in Namibia (DNam): Eine Ressource für die Kontakt-, Variations- und Soziolinguistik. *Deutsche Sprache* 48(3). 210–232. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:mh39-100570> (27 April, 2023).
- Zuban, Yulia. 2023. *Unexpected use of referents in heritage Russian*. Poster presentation at Voices in Contexts, Cologne, Germany, October 12–13. <https://osf.io/xem4a/>.
- Zuban, Yulia. 2024. *Word order choice, expression of information status, and global intonation patterns in heritage Russian*. Stuttgart: Universität Stuttgart. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Zuban, Yulia, Maria Martynova, Sabine Zerbian, Luka Szucsich & Natalia Gagarina. 2021. Word order in heritage Russian: Clause type and majority language matter. *Russian Linguistics* 45(3). 253–281. DOI: 10.1007/s11185-021-09246-1.

Zuban, Yulia, Tamara Rathcke & Sabine Zerbian. 2023. Do different majority languages lead to different intonational grammars? A case study of yes/no-questions in heritage Russian. *Heritage Language Journal* 20(1). 1–43. DOI: 10.1163/15507076-bja10016.