

Code-switching to avoid paradigm gaps

Verb integration in BCMS

Marko Simonović
Boban Arsenijević

Hyperspacing
the
verb



Issue: Productive verb integration pattern in Heritage BCMS

Regular BCMS paradigm, but **German** Passive Participle.

- (1) Sve studente **anmelden**-i-m.
All.ACC students.ACC register-TH-PRES.1SG
'I register all students.'
- (2) Sve studente sam **anmelden**-i-o.
All.ACC students.ACC AUX.1SG register-TH-PAST
'I registered all students.'
- (3) Svi studenti su **angemeldet**.
All.NOM students.NOM AUX.PL register.PASS
'All students are registered.'

Issue: Productive verb integration pattern in Heritage BCMS

The participle form **angemeldet** is not preferred as such.

- Strongly dispreferred in the Past Participle.

(2) Sve studente sam **anmelden-i-o** ?? **angemeldet.**

All students AUX.1SG register-TH-PAST register.PST/PASS
'I register all students.'

(3) Svi studenti su ***anmelden-i-eni** **angemeldet.**
All students AUX.PL register-TH-PASS.PL register.PST/PASS
'All students were registered.'

Roadmap

- Verb integration in Homeland BCMS
- Verb integration in Austrian Heritage BCMS
- What is wrong with the mixed Passive Participle?
 - Lexical Conservatism
- What are the verbal patterns to choose from?
- How are bilinguals different
 - Two PFs and the choice between them
- Conclusions

Verb integration in Homeland BCMS

Theme vowel *a* (more in the West) or *ova* (more in the East).

With **German** roots:

German

schwärz-en

smuggle-INF

West

šverc-a-ti

smuggle-*a*-INF

East

šverc-ova-ti

smuggle-*ova*-INF

With **English** roots:

like

West

lajk-a-ti

like-*a*-INF

East

lajk-ova-ti

like-*ova*-INF

Verb integration in Homeland BCMS

Homeland BCMS speakers spontaneously apply these patterns to new **German** verbs:

German

anmeld-en
register-INF

anmeld-a-ti
register-*a*-INF

anmeld-ova-ti
register-*ova*-INF

anpass-en
adapt-INF

anpas-a-ti
adapt-*a*-INF

anpas-ova-ti
adapt-*ova*-INF

Verb integration in Homeland BCMS

No mixed paradigm.

- (1) Sve studente **anmeld**-a-m/**anmeld**-uje-m/.
All.ACC students.ACC register-TH-PRES.1SG
'I register all students.'
- (2) Sve studente sam **anmeld**-a-o/**anmeld**-ova-o.
All.ACC students.ACC AUX.1SG register-TH-PAST
'I registered all students.'
- (3) Svi studenti su **anmeld**-a-n-i/**anmeld**-ova-n-i.
All students AUX.PL register-TH-PASS-PL
'All students are registered.'

Verb integration in Austrian Heritage BCMS

- Theme vowel *i*.
- The base = **German** Infinitive.

German

anmeld-en

register-INF

Heritage BCMS

anmelden-i-ti

register-i-INF

Homeland BCMS

anmeld-a-ti/anmeld-ova-ti

register-a-INF/register-ova-INF

anpass-en

adapt-INF

anpassen-i-ti

adapt-i-INF

anpas-a-ti/anpas-ova-ti

adapt-a-INF/adapt-ova-INF

What was the issue again?

Regular BCMS paradigm, but **German** Passive Participle.

- (1) Sve studente **anmelden**-i-m.
All.ACC students.ACC register-TH-PRES.1SG
'I register all students.'
- (2) Sve studente sam **anmelden**-i-o.
All.ACC students.ACC AUX.1SG register-TH-PAST
'I registered all students.'
- (3) Svi studenti su **angemeldet**.
All.NOM students.NOM AUX.PL register.PASS
'All students are registered.'

Corpus data

- Kajgo (2020) corpus of colloquial Austrian heritage BCMS (80K words, young adult bilinguals' chat and voice messages).
- Out of 273 code-switch verbs, **not a single Passive Participle**.
- Among strictly BCMS verbs, Passive Participle is the fifth most frequent form (after the Present, the Infinitive, the Past participle and the Imperative).
- A clear sign of avoidance of mixed Passive Participles.

Avoidance of code-switch passive participles

- When heritage speakers need the Passive Participle, they avoid German bases, and rather use the BCMS verb.
- When explicitly asked to build the Passive Participle in BCMS from a German verb, they resort to German morphology.

What is wrong with the mixed Passive Participle?

Svi studenti su ***anmelden**-i-en-i **angemeldet**.
All students AUX.PL register-TH-PASS-PL register.PST/PASS
'All students were registered.'

The realisation of the blocked form would be *anmelde[n]eni*.
How do we know?

Svi studenti su ocen-i-en-i [ot̩se̯neni].
All students AUX.PL grade-TH-PASS-PL
'All students were graded.'

What is wrong with the mixed Passive Participle?

Root allomorphy!

Verbs with the theme vowel *-i-* get *-en-* in the Passive Participle:

- /ot̃seni+en/ → /ot̃sen^jen/ → [ot̃sejen]
- Root allomorphy inevitable for stems in non-palatal consonants.

What is wrong with the mixed Passive Participle?

Lexical Conservatism (Steriade 1997):

- family of constraints which require every new allomorph to copy a phonological property of the listed allomorph.
- Simonović (2015) “the most LC-friendly existing paradigm will host loanwords”.

What are the options anyway?

Moravcsik (1975: 111-112) “the borrowing language employs its own means of denominal verbalization to turn the borrowed forms into verbs before using them as such”.

Buljan (2016): three patterns for denominal verbs:

–i–, **–a–** and **–ov–a–**

- Familiar list?
- **–i–** is the only one with root allomorphy!

What are the options anyway?

No root allomorphy with -a- or -ova-. See these Homeland forms:

- (1) Sve studente **anmeld**-a-m/**anmeld**-uje-m/.
All.ACC students.ACC register-TH-PRES.1SG
'I register all students.'
- (2) Sve studente sam **anmeld**-a-o/**anmeld**-ova-o.
All.ACC students.ACC AUX.1SG register-TH-PAST
'I registered all students.'
- (3) Svi studenti su **anmeld**-a-n-i/**anmeld**-ova-n-i.
All students AUX.PL register-TH-PASS-PL
'All students are registered.'

What are the options anyway?

Frequency based on 5353 most frequent verbs

- Tie between **a-a** and **i-i**
- **ova-uje** far behind

TH	%	TH	%
a, a	31.94%	/, ne	2.39%
i, i	30.02%	a, i	1.16%
a, je	8.14%	e, e	0.78%
iva, uje	6.13%	va, je	0.39%
/, e	5.70%	a, e	0.17%
nu, ne	4.84%	e, i	3.44%
ova, uje	4.69%	/, ne	2.39%
e, i	3.44%	a, i	1.16%

What are the options anyway?

- Class *i-i* particularly strong in simplex verbs (root + theme vowel, potentially a prefix, but no suffixes).
- Among the 3500 most frequent simplex BCMS verbs, there are **805 a-a verbs** and **1601 i-i verbs** (no *ova-uje* verbs, as they contain a suffix).

How are Heritage BCMS speakers different

Lexical Conservatism (Steriade 1997):

- family of constraints which require every new allomorph to copy a phonological property of the listed allomorph.
- Simonović (2015) “the most LC-friendly existing paradigm will host loanwords”.

Simonović (2015) correctly predicts the choice of the integration pattern for Homeland BCMS, but fails to predict it for Heritage BCMS.

How are Heritage BCMS speakers different


Key difference:

Heritage BCMS speakers are bilinguals and have two PFs at their disposal (López et al. 2017).

If a form turns out ineffable on one PF, it gets sent to the other one.

How are Heritage BCMS speakers different

Ineffability of the native Passive Participle for *anmeldeniti*.

/anmelden+i+en/	LEXCON	IDENTIO(front)	REALISE
 a. ∅			*
b. anmeldejen	*!		
c. anmeldenen		*!	

Conclusions

Community bilingualism (and hence the availability of two PFs) allows for the emergence of mixed paradigms (not surprisingly).

However, the availability of two PFs makes it possible for frequent patterns which would otherwise be ignored due to LC-violations.

THANKS!

HERZLICH DANKENIMO!

References

1. Buljan, G. 2016. Ima li mjesta za preobrazbu u denominalnoj tvorbi hrvatskih glagola?. *Suvremena lingvistika*, 42 (82), 155-190.
2. Kajgo, Ana. 2020. Zašto mi mischenimo eigentlich? Sprachverhalten bei in Österreich lebenden BKS-lern. MA Thesis, University of Graz.
3. Moravcsik, Edith. 1975. Borrowed verbs. *Wiener Linguistische Gazette* 8.
4. Simonović, Marko. 2015. Lexicon immigration service - Prolegomena to a theory of loanword integration. (280 p.). LOT Dissertation Series 393.
5. Steriade, Donca. 1997. Lexical Conservatism. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm, Selected Papers from SICOL 1997*, 157-179. Hanshin Publishing House.