

## **Danish and German ditransitive constructions in contact: an insight into South Schleswig Danish argument structure**

Sabrina Goll

Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel

Keywords: ditransitive construction, contact variety, South Schleswig Danish, Diasystematic Construction Grammar

Ditransitive constructions may be defined as “successful transfer of an object to a recipient, with the referent of the subject agentively causing this transfer” (Goldberg 1995: 33). Haspelmath (2013) distinguishes among others between (i) indirect-object construction (IOC) and (ii) double-object construction (DOC). The first includes constructions where the theme is “coded like the monotransitive patient, and the recipient is coded differently” (Haspelmath 2013), i.e. by case-marking or adposition of the recipient, whereas the second covers constructions where theme, recipient and patient are coded alike.

What if a language using primarily case-marking (IOC), i.e. German, is in contact with a language like Danish, where both adpositional marking (IOC) as well as DOC is possible? South Schleswig, the Northern part of Germany (Schleswig-Holstein), has been shaped by multilingualism. Among various varieties, for example Low German, Frisian and North German, Danish (i.e. Standard Danish as well as the contact variety South Schleswig Danish (SSD)) is used among members of the Danish minority. Characterized by the multilingualism of all speakers (German as L1 and Danish as early L2), the SSD system reflects the complex situation of long-term language contact.

My project aims to capture the linguistic system of SSD in its heterogeneity, particularly morphological and syntactic features, based on a dialectological approach. In order to get information on the morphosyntactic system of SSD as a whole, the project analyses questionnaire data from adult informants from the whole area of South Schleswig.

This paper focuses on the analysis of ditransitive constructions in SSD. Results of the questionnaire study (Goll forthc.) show that SSD indeed allows both constructions but with different distribution than Standard Danish depending on various factors. This can very well be explained with the help of the Diasystematic Construction Grammar (DCxG) approach (e.g. Höder 2014, 2016, 2018) and the preference for diaconstructions.

### **References**

- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goll, Sabrina (forthc.): Südschleswigdänisch. Eine strukturelle Bestandsaufnahme aus dialektologischer Perspektive. Dissertation.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2013. Ditransitive Constructions: The Verb 'Give'. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/105>, Accessed on 2019-07-12.
- Höder, Steffen. 2014. Constructing diasystems. Grammatical organisation in bilingual groups. In Tor A. Åfarli & Brit Mæhlum (eds.), *The sociolinguistics of grammar*, 137–152. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Höder, Steffen. 2016. Niederdeutsche Form, unspezifische Struktur. Diasystematische Konstruktionen in der deutsch-dänischen Kontaktzone. In Helmut Spiekermann, Line-Marie Hohenstein, Stephanie Sauerlich & Kathrin Weber (eds.), *Niederdeutsch: Grenzen, Strukturen, Variation*, 293–309. Wien/Köln/Weimar: Böhlau.
- Höder, Steffen. 2018. Grammar is community-specific: Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar. In Hans Boas & Steffen Höder (eds.), *Constructions in contact. Constructional perspectives on contact phenomena in Germanic languages*, 37–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.