Code-switching to avoid paradigm gaps: Verb integration in Austrian BCMS

Marko Simonović (University of Graz, University of Nova Gorica) rkicma@gmail.com

Boban Arsenijević (University of Graz) boban.arsenijevic@uni-graz.at

The BCMS of Bosnia, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia has two productive patterns of loan verb integration: *-a-* is the main verbaliser in the west, while *-ova-* is more common in the east.

(1)   West   East   West   East
                 lajk-<u>a</u>-ti   lajk-<u>ova</u>-ti   invajt-<u>a</u>-ti   invajt-<u>ova</u>-ti
                 like-*a*-INF   like-*ova*-INF   invite-*a*-INF   invite-*ova*-INF

BCMS speakers who recently moved to Austria (henceforth homeland BCMS speakers) apply the same mechanisms to German verbs, isolating the stem and applying the same verbalisers.

(2)   German   Homeland BCMS   Homeland BCMS
         anpass-en   anpas-<u>a</u>-ti   anpas-<u>ova</u>-ti
         adapt-INF   adapt-*a*-INF   invite-*ova*-INF

However, heritage BCMS speakers from Austria use a different integration strategy, employing the full infinitive form of the German verb, to which one of the native verbalisers, theme vowel *-i-*, is added. This verbalizer is absent from loanword integration in homeland BCMS.

(3)   German   Heritage BCMS
         anpass-en   anpasen-<u>i</u>-ti
         adapt-INF   adapt-i-INF

While the homeland BCMS *ati* and *ovati* patterns induce no stem allomorphy, the heritage BCMS *eniti* pattern causes stem allomorphy in the passive participle forms. In Homeland BCMS, all verbs in *eniti* (e.g. *oženiti* 'marry') have the passive participle in -*e*[ɲ]*en (e.g. ože*[ɲ]*en* 'married'*)*. The selection of the *eniti* pattern as the integration strategy hence appears to contradict the claim from Simonović (2015) that the loanword integration pattern is selected from patterns that involve the least possible amount of stem allomorphy. Simonović claims that the borrowing mechanism is especially sensitive to the allomorphy in the portion of the stem that is incorporated from another language (in this case *anpasen*). It is arguably for this reason that in Heritage BCMS the passive participle forms in -*e*[ɲ]*en* of the German-origin verbs are blocked, even for speakers who report only using the *eniti* pattern in all other forms. Instead, the generally preferred strategy, especially in spontaneous production, is to use the German passive participle form. Other strategies, illustrated in (5), are acceptable only to some speakers: applying the Homeland BCMS integration patterns to the German infinitive or the German stem. Here the source German verb is *anmelden* 'register'.

(4)   Svi studenti su bili uredno angemeldet / [%]anmeldenovani / [%]anmeldovani / [%]anmeldani / [%]anmeldenani *anmelde[ɲ]eni.
         'All students were registered regularly.'

Both the phonetics and the morphology of the passive participle are fully German, so there is no doubt that this form is a code-switch. A code-switch between an auxiliary and a participle is predicted to be ungrammatical by all syntactic theories of code-switching we are aware of (see López et al. 2017 for an overview).

López et al. (2017) argue for a theory of code switching in terms of phase theory. The main idea is that bilingual speakers have two separate PFs and that every chunk of material gets sent to one of the PFs, where it gets pronounced. This predicts that phase heads which send their complements to one of the PFs will determine the possible loci of code-switching.

Our account adopts the tools proposed by López et al. (2017), extending the model to cases where the unity of phases at the Spellout to PF conflicts with Lexical Conservatism (Steriade 1997, Simonović 2015). Lexical Conservatism blocks the winner of the phonological computation of the passive participle

form (the form with a consonant alternation *anmelde[ɲ]en) because this winner introduces an additional segmental allomorph of the verbal stem (*anmelde[ɲ]).

The LC-effect leads to ineffability. In a monolingual situation, this would in turn lead to a paradigm gap and a synonymous verb or paraphrase would be used. However, in a bilingual situation the problematic chunk of structure can be sent to the other PF. The unity of the phase is compromised: not the whole phase complement sent to the BCMS PF is returned/redirected, but only the part whose Spellout was unsuccessful, in this case the passive participle. The resultant paradigm is presented in (6) with the German forms in bold.

(5)   Heritage BCMS paradigm of *anmeldeniti* 'register'

Finite

Present				Imperative	
	Sg	Pl			
1	anmelden-i-m	anmelden-i-mo	1		anmelden-i-mo
2	anmelden-i-š	anmelden-i-te	2	anmelden-i	anmelden-i-te
3	anmelden-i	anmelden-e	3		

Non-finite

Infinitive					
anmeld-en-i-ti					
Past Participle			Passive Participle		
Masculine Sg	Feminine Sg	Neuter Sg	Masculine Sg	Feminine Sg	Neuter Sg
anmeld-en-i-o	anmeld-en-i-la	anmeld-en-i-lo	**angemeldet** *anmelden-jen	**angemeldet** *anmelden-jen-a	**angemeldet** *anmelden-jen-o
Masculine	Feminine	Neuter	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
anmeld-en-i-li	anmeld-en-i-le	anmeld-en-i-la	**angemeldet** *anmelden-jeni	**angemeldet** *anmelden-jen-e	**angemeldet** *anmelden-jen-a

References

López, Luis, Artemis Alexiadou and Tonjes Veenstra. 2017. Code-Switching by Phase. Languages 2, 9.

Simonović, Marko. 2015. Lexicon immigration service: Prolegomena to a theory of loanword integration. Ph.D thesis, Universiteit Utrecht.

Steriade, Donca. 1997. Lexical conservatism. In: Linguistics in the morning calm. Linguistic Society of Korea Hanshin Publishing House. Selected Papers from SICOL 1997, 157–179.