ARBEITSGRUPPE 3 | *WORKSHOP 3*
Raum | *Room*: S 22, Seminargebäude

Coexistence, competition, and change: Structural borrowing and the dynamics of asymmetric language contact

Hiwa Asadpour[1,2], Carolina Plaza-Pust[1] & Manfred Sailer[1]
[1]Goethe University Frankfurt, [2]JPSP International Fellow University Tokio
asadpour@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de, pust@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de,
sailer@em.uni-frankfurt.de
https://blog.studiumdigitale.uni-frankfurt.de/dalc/dgfs-2023-ag3-coexistence-competition-and-change/

Aims and background: The workshop aims at bringing together various lines of research in the investigation of the dynamics of asymmetric language contact and change. Typically, language contact situations are characterized by variation, competition, and coexistence of linguistic features at different levels of linguistic analysis and their interfaces. These dynamics become apparent not only in the linguistic behaviour of bilingual speakers and signers (code-switching, code-mixing, code-blending, and cross-linguistic influence), but also in the evolution of spoken and sign languages over time (language change, emergence of new varieties, mixed languages, pattern transfer or calque). By approaching the dynamics of language contact from different theoretical perspectives, we aim to contribute to a better understanding of the outcomes of language contact. Our focus will be on contact phenomena at the syntactic level.

Possible topics: Issues that will be addressed include but are not limited to:

- What do we know about the interplay of internal and external factors affecting the outcomes of language contact?
- Does lexical borrowing open a door to structural borrowing under specific circumstances?
- What factors contribute to the diffusion of or resistance to the importation of structural features?
- How do we distinguish between variation and change?

- How do traditional linguistic theories cope with the dynamics of language contact?What do dynamic models contribute to our understanding of language contact and change?
- Are borrowing hierarchies universal or conditioned by the languages involved?What is the scope and what are the limits of syntactic creativity in asymmetric language contact?

Potentially interested: We particularly encourage submissions addressing these topics from different theoretical frameworks, methodological approaches, and subfields of linguistics, including but not limited to formal linguistics, typology, areal linguistics, sign language linguistics, historical linguistics, bilingualism research, contact linguistics, and postcolonial linguistics.

Coexistence, competition, and change: Perspectives on structural borrowing and the dynamics of asymmetric language contact

Hiwa Asadpour[1,2], Carolina Plaza Pust[2] & Manfred Sailer[2]
[1]JSPS Research Fellowport, University of Tokyo,
[2]Goethe-University Frankfurt
asadpour@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de, pust@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de,
sailer@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Typically, language contact situations are characterized by variation, competition, and coexistence of linguistic features at different levels of linguistic analysis and their interfaces. These dynamics become apparent not only in the linguistic behaviour of bilingual speakers and signers (code-switching, code-mixing, code-blending, and cross-linguistic influence), but also in the evolution of spoken and sign languages over time (language change, emergence of new varieties, mixed languages, pattern transfer or calque).

In this workshop we bring together various lines of research in the investigation of the dynamics of asymmetric language contact and change. In the introduction to this workshop, we will elaborate on our aim to contribute to a better understanding of the outcomes of language contact by approaching the dynamics of language contact from different empirical and theoretical perspectives.

After a brief sketch of the insights we have gathered in our different areas of expertise (contact-induced aspects of minority languages and areal linguistics, bi-modal language acquisition and contact, and a constraint-based modelling of the interfaces of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics; https://blog.studiumdigitale.uni-frankfurt.de/dalc/) we will introduce the main topics focused in this workshop on structural borrowing and the dynamics of asymmetric language contact.

Cross-modal contact and its impact on sign language typology

Victoria Nyst
Leiden University
v.a.s.nyst@hum.leidenuniv

Signed and spoken languages both have elaborate means to encode spatial information. As sign languages (SLs) use a visual-spatial modality, this allows them to represent spatial information in a direct, iconic way. This results in strikingly similar constructions across SLs in the form of complex depictive or classifier constructions. These constructions participate in Serial Verb Constructions (SVCs) in various SLs, incl. Adamorobe SL in Ghana (Nyst 2007), and Dutch SL (Couvee & Pfau 2018). Research on Nicaraguan SL shows that serialization is a first step in the formation of these constructions, preceding the systematic inclusion of classifier handshapes in them (Kegl et al. 1999). In Adamorobe SL SVCs predominantly make use of a closed set of directional verbs that are neutral with respect to transitivity (Nyst 2007). Transitivity is expressed by a preceding manner verb (cf. TAKE GO 'send' and RUN GO 'run off'). Similar to the dominant spoken language Akan surrounding it, AdaSL use two dedicated light verbs to mark transitivity in SVCs. This suggests that not only modality, but also contact with SVCs in a spoken language influences the nature of SVCs in SLs.

To shed light on the role of modality, contact, and age on the typology of SVCs in SLs, I present new data on the emerging SL of Bouakako, Côte d'Ivoire (Tano 2016). This SL and its surrounding spoken language both use (pseudo-) SVCs (cf. Vogler 1987). Using the methodology of Couvee & Pfau (2018), a corpus-based comparison is made with Dutch SL and Adamorobe SL. I will add to this an observation on the influence of separable verbs and verb particles on the lexicalization of spatial verbs in Dutch SL and other SLs in contact with West Germanic languages.

I conclude with a summary of the implications of the observations on Adamorobe SL, Bouakako SL, Dutch SL, and Danish SL for our understanding of the impact of language contact on the typology of spatial language in SLs.

References: • Couvee, S., & Pfau, R. (2018). Structure and grammaticalization of serial verb constructions in Sign Language of the Netherlands—A corpus-based study. Frontiers in psychology, 9, 993. • Kegl, J., Senghas, A., & Coppola, M. (1999). Creation through contact: Sign language emergence and sign language change in Nicaragua. Language creation and language change: Creolization, diachrony, and development, 179-237. • Nyst, V. (2007). A descriptive analysis of Adamorobe sign language (Ghana). Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics. LOT: Utrecht. • Tano, A. (2016) Etude d'une langue des signes émergente de Côte d'Ivoire : l'example de la langue des signes de Bouakako (LaSiBo). Utrecht: LOT

Who passed it to whom? Exploring the areality of temporal adverbial clauses

Jesús Olguín Martínez
University of California, Santa Barbara
olguinmartinez@ucsb.edu

Traditionally, it has been proposed that rare syntactic patterns have high genetic stability and strong resistance to being borrowed in language contact situations (Nichols 1992: 181). However, it is becoming ever clearer that speakers can transfer rare syntactic patterns from one language to another without actual substance. Unfortunately, our current understanding of this theoretical domain with respect to clause-linkage is still in its infancy.

Many temporal clause-linking patterns (e.g. 'when', 'while', 'until') that are cross-linguistically rare occur in areal clusters, suggesting that language contact has played an important role in their cross-linguistic distribution. The clusters composed of rare features seem to be the result of event-based triggers, that is, historical events that led patterns to spread due to intensive language contact (Bickel 2017). The areality of temporal clause-linking devices is the result of pattern replication. In this scenario, no phonetic substance is involved but rather the transfer of patterns or structural templates (Matras & Sakel 2007).

In this talk, I develop a series of methodological steps for investigating the directionality of spread of various rare temporal clause-linkage patterns: identifying the source and the details of chains of contacts where possible. The steps are based on intra-genealogy variance analyses, systematically informed by what is known from social/cultural history. By intra-genetic variance analyses is meant the analysis of the internal diversity of the families composing the areal clusters. By social-cultural history is meant prehistoric or recent migration patterns and types of bilingualism. This is essential if one wants to estimate historical stability, transition probabilities, and direction of spread of a pattern (Bickel 2008). Special attention is paid to verb-doubling constructions used for indicating 'while' in South Asian languages, 'until' constructions in Mesoamerican languages spoken in the Huasteca area, and adverb(ials) meaning 'only' used for indicating 'as soon as' in languages spoken in Mali.

References: Bickel, Balthasar. 2008. A refined sampling procedure for genealogical control. *Language Typology and Universals* 61: 221-233. Bickel, Balthasar. 2017. Areas and universals. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of areal linguistics*, 40-55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Introduction. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1-14. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter. Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Dynamics of focusing particularizers in English: *just* the interplay of internal and external factors?

Olena Andrushenko

Universität Augsburg / Kyiv National Linguistic University
olena.andrushenko@philhist.uni-augsburg.de

Late emergence of particularizers in English (XV-XVII cen.) (Nevalainen 1991; Traugott 2006) and their dominant representation by Latin lexemes that entered the language through French (Cougil Alvares 2003; Andrushenko 2022) have triggered the thought about the means of conveying this function at the earlier stages of the language and why this specific shift occurs only in Late Middle English (ME). Where is the interplay of intra- and extralinguistic (the unquestionable abundance of French borrowings) factors in this process? These considerations have initially arisen while investigating a prototypical ME particularizer *just* (OF *juste* < Lat. *iustus*) functioning as a focusing adverb. Meanwhile, the study of Old English (OE) shows that its sense can be rendered through numerous OE forms (*efne, ane, efne þa (ða), efne her, swa swa* and *efne swa*) ranging from 9.36.% to 29.69% of their general usage in texts. Yet, Early ME records demonstrate either the abrupt drop (*efne*) or fading (*ane*) of the particularizer function among the highlighted lexemes making room for a new lexical unit *just* to be introduced in the language. The second issue to speculate on, why Lat. *iustus* failed to emerge at much earlier stages of English, since the word is found in 331 Latin sentences translated into OE. Or why is it not the case for another Latin adverb *tantum* "just" finding feet in 123 sentences and their OE translations? Another aspect to consider among internal factors and specific timeframes is how the rigidity of word-order and its correlation with sentence information structure might have affected the introduction of the unified prototypical particularizer in Late ME.

References: • Cougil Alvarez, R. M. (2003). On the diachronic evolution of focusing adverbs in English. The particularisers just, exactly, precisely. In E. Seoane Posse, M. J. López Couso, P. F. López, I. M. Palacios Martínez (Coords.), Fifty Years of English Studies in Spain (1952-2002): A Commemorative Volume. Servicio de Publicaciones, Santiago de Compostela, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, pp. 301–310. • Nevalainen, T. (1991) BUT, ONLY, JUST: Focusing Adverbial Change in Modern English 1500- 1900, Societe Neophilologique, Helsinki. • Traugott, E. C. 2006. The semantic development of scalar focus markers. In A. van Kemenade, B. Los (Eds.) The Handbook of the History of English. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 335-359. • Aijmer, K. (2002) English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus. John Benjamins Publ., Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2002. • Andrushenko O. (2022). The scope of just: Evidence from information-structure annotation in diachronic English corpora. CEUR Workshop Proceedings. 3171, pp. 677–696.

Deontic and epistemic verbal periphrases in spoken Continental and Insular Balearic Spanish

Malte Rosemeyer[1] & Andrés Enrique-Arias[2]
[1]Freie Universität Berlin, [2]Universitat de les Illes Balears
malte.rosemeyer@fu-berlin.de, andres.enrique@uib.es

Our talk studies the question of the distinction between variation and change in a situation of language contact, namely contact between Catalan and Spanish on Majorca. We study the variation between the use of two verbal periphrases present in both languages, *haber de* 'have of' and *tener que* 'have that' + infinitive. These periphrases can be used to express deontic (1) or epistemic (2) readings.

(1)   a. y **tenía que volver** a su sitio
        'and he had to return to his place'
    b. y esto lo hemos de defender
        'and we need to defend this'

(2)   a. en aquella época también **tenía que ser** un poco distinto de ahora
        'at that time it must have also been a bit different than today'
    b. sí **ha de llover** mucho
        'yes, it must be raining a lot'

Previous studies have found that in comparison to *tener que*, Spanish *haber de* is more likely to express epistemic readings (e.g., Garachana Camarero & Hernández Días 2020). In contrast, Catalan *haver de* frequently expresses deontic readings (Blas Arroyo 2016). We maintain that due to contact with Catalan, the opposition between *haber de* and *tener que* in Balearic Spanish is governed to a lesser degree by preferences in terms of modal meanings than in Mainland Spanish. This claim is substantiated by a quantitative analysis of over $n = 5,900$ occurrences of these periphrases in these varieties, taken from corpora of sociolinguistic interviews in Mainland Spanish, the Spanish spoken in Palma de Mallorca, and rural varieties of Spanish spoken by elderly Majorcans.

References: • Blas Arroyo, J. L. (2016). La relevancia del contacto de lenguas como factor condicionante en un proceso de cambio lingüístico en español: la perífrasis haber de + infinitivo. In C. De Benito Moreno & Á. S. Octavio de Toledo y Huerta, *En torno a 'haber'. Construcciones, usos y variación desde el latín hasta la actualidad*. New York, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 79-110 • Garachana Camarero, M. & A. Hernández Díaz (2020). From semantics to grammar. Lexical substitution in the evolution of verbal periphrases *haber / tener* + infinitive. In J. Fernández Jaén & H. Provencio Garrigós, *Historical Linguistics. Current Theories and Applications*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 78-108.

The borrowed auxiliary.
On the periphrastic passive in Danish and Swedish

Dominika Skrzypek, Marta Woźnicka & Alicja Piotrowska
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań
dosk@amu.edu.pl, marado@amu.edu.pl, alicja.piotrowska@amu.edu.pl

The periphrastic passive voice construction in modern Danish and Swedish is formed with auxiliary *bli* 'become/stay' and past participle. It has evolved from a formally identical construction with auxiliary *varda* 'become', which originally was a mutative construction (Toyota 2009). Further developments lead to its grammaticalisation as a periphrastic passive and to suppression of *varda* by *bli*. The latter is a loanword from Middle Low German (MLG), introduced to Danish and Swedish in early 1300s in time of a highly intensive, asymmetrical contact between the languages, in which MLG had a dominant position and which took place in Scandinavia as well as outside its boarders. The verb was originally used in the lexical meaning 'to stay' (Skrzypek 2020). Gradually, *varda* and *bliva* converged in terms of meaning (Lundquist 2014) and constructional potential (Skrzypek in preparation).

The question we want to address is to what extent the MLG verb *bliven* was borrowed in Danish and Swedish with its constructional potential, i.e., whether it was used in the same array of constructions in Old Danish (ODa) and Old Swedish (OSw) as in MLG. The constructions are here understood as form-meaning pairings, and the study will be conducted within the framework of CxG.   Based on a corpus of representative MLG, ODa and OSw texts we will establish the constructional potential of *bli* in all languages and analyse its dynamics between 1300 and 1550. We will further consider the circumstances which have led to its convergence with the indigenous *varda* and the resulting grammaticalisation of the periphrastic passive construction.

References: • Lundquist, Björn. 2014. Bliva and varda. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal* 1:270–79. • Skrzypek, Dominika. 2020. The Swedish bli-passive in a diachronic perspective. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow* V(2):301–34. • Skrzypek. Dominika. *Variation and change in passive auxiliaries. The history of the periphrastic passive in Swedish*. Ms in preparation. • Toyota, Junichi. 2009. Passive as a tense-aspectual construction revisited: the case of Germanic languages. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 49:200–14.

The role of registers in the dynamics of language contact

Heike Wiese
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
heike.wiese@hu-berlin.de

In settings of language contact, speakers can access linguistic repertoires that transcend language borders. Compared to speakers from linguistically less diverse settings, this gives multilingual speakers a broader range of linguistic options and potential lexical and grammatical interactions, making contact settings particularly dynamic in terms of language variation and change. However, even under "monolingual" conditions, speakers make selective choices from their repertoire dependent on the communicative situation, leading to register-differentiated language use. Accordingly, it has been suggested to regard everyone as multilingual in the sense that they choose from a differentiated linguistic repertoire (e.g., Roeper 1999 for generative grammar, Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 2006 for sociolinguistics, Tracy 2014 for language acquisition, McSwann 2017 for contact linguistics).

In my talk, I examine the implications of these parallels, exploring the role of registers in the dynamics of language contact. I discuss patterns of language mixing vs. language separation as register markers, the interaction of noncanonical grammatical patterns with register in bi- and monolinguals (cf. Wiese et al. 2022), and the impact of the societal macro context on heritage language registers, and on the emergence of urban contact dialects in informal settings (Kerswill & Wiese 2022).

To account for the role of registers, I propose a model that includes communicative situations in lexical entries, captures registers as systematic linguistic choices associated with such situations, and understands languages as social indeces (cf. Wiese 2021). I show that this allows for a unified approach to multilingual and monolingual repertoires while capturing the special dynamics of language contact.

From a broader perspective, this approach is in line with recent calls to understand contact settings as the normal condition of human language use and to overcome deficit-oriented perspectives on multilinguals in favour of a more inclusive approach to native speakers (e.g., Wiese et al. 2022, Rothman et. al. to appear).

References: • Kerswill, P. & H. Wiese (2022). *Urban Contact Dialects and Language Change*. Routledge. • Le Page, R. B. & A. Tabouret-Keller (2006). *Acts of Identity*. CUP. • MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 54(1), 167-201. • Roeper, T. (1999). Universal bilingualism. *Biling.: Lang. Cogn.* 2, 169-186. • Rothman, J. et al. (to appear). Monolingual comparative normativity in bilingualism research is out of "control". *Appl. Psycholinguist.* • Tracy, R. (2014). Mehrsprachigkeit: Vom Störfall vom Glücksfall. In M. Krifka et al., *Das mehrsprachige Klassenzimmer*, Springer, 13-33. • Wiese, H. (2021). Communicative situations as a basis for linguistic systems. *WPULL* 287. • Wiese, H. et al. (2022). Heritage speakers as part of the native language continuum. *Front. Psychol.* Special Issue "The notion of the native speaker put to test".

The post-predicate position in Turkish in language contact situations: Resistant to change?

Kateryna Iefremenko, Cem Keskin & Christoph Schroeder
Universität Potsdam
iefremenko@uni-potsdam.de, keskin@uni-potsdam.de,
schroedc@uni-potsdam.de

In our talk, we discuss to what extent Turkish, a canonically (S)OV language, resists or allows shifting to (S)VO in language contact situations. The research literature on this matter is inconsistent (Doğruöz and Backus 2007, Onar Valk 2015 versus Bayram 2013, Keskin in review versus Schroeder et al. in press) and it is not clear whether this is because different explanatory approaches were used or whether the investigated dynamics are related to different factors in the respective contact situations. We rely on corpus data and consider a diverse set of contact situations, namely (i) heritage language contact in (a) Germany and (b) the U.S., (ii) contact with Kurmanji in Turkey, and (iii) contact with South Slavic languages in the Balkans. We entertain several explanatory variables and their interplay. First, we investigate whether duration of contact influences speakers' tendency to place constituents post-verbally. Second, we examine the effect of sociolinguistic parameters such as speech community size (Keskin in review). Third, we explore the effect of dependent type, based on the suggestion that word order change begins with the position of subordinate clauses (Keskin in review, Bayram 2013, Onar Valk 2015) and is subsequently followed by obliques, followed by accusative-marked objects (Keskin in review). Fourth, we consider the role of information structure in the resistance to change to (S)VO (Schroeder et al. in press). And finally, we explore the possible impact of the contact languages, i.e. South Slavic (flexible VO), Kurmanji (OVX), English (VO), and German (OV with V2 effects).

References: • Bayram, F. (2013). Acquisition of Turkish by heritage speakers: A processability approach (Doctoral dissertation). Newcastle University. Retrieved July 28, 2022, from https://theses.ncl.ac.uk/jspui/handle/10443/1905 • Doğruöz, S. & Backus A. (2007). Postverbal elements in immigrant Turkish: Evidence of change? International Journal of Bilingualism 11(2): 185-220 • Keskin, C. (in review). On the directionality of the Balkan Turkic verb phrase: Variationist and theoretical perspectives. Languages. • Onar Valk, P. (2015). Transformation in Dutch Turkish subordination? Converging evidence of change regarding finiteness and word order in complex clauses. (NUR 616 ed.). LOT Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics. • Schroeder, C., Iefremenko K. & Öncü M. (in press). The postverbal position in heritage Turkish. A comparative perspective with a focus on non-clausal elements. In: Kalkavan-Aydın, Zeynep & Şimşek, Yazgül (eds.). Zweisprachigkeit Deutsch-Türkisch. Studien in Deutschland und in den Nachbarländern. Münster: Waxmann.

Pro-drop realization in heritage Greek, Russian and Turkish is modulated by typological differences

Maria Martynova[1], Onur Özsoy[2,1], Vasiliki Rizou[1], Natalia Gagarina[1,2], Artemis Alexiadou[2,1] & Luka Szucsich[1]

[1]*Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin,* **[2]***Leibniz-Center General Linguistics (ZAS)*
martynma@hu-berlin.de, oezsoy@leibniz-zas.de, rizouvas@hu-berlin.de,
gagarina@leibniz-zas.de, artemis@leibniz-zas.de, szucsicl@hu-berlin.de

Greek, Russian and Turkish are different types of null subject languages. Greek is a strict pro-drop language. Russian is claimed to be either a partial or a non-pro-drop language with abundant subject ellipsis. Turkish is a topic pro-drop language where overt subjects are necessary in underspecified contexts. Despite the typological differences, these heritage-varieties show similarities in pro-drop realization. Previous studies found that overt pronominal subjects are more frequent in heritage-varieties (Dubinina & Polinsky, 2013; Haznedar, 2010; Tsimpli et al., 2004). Based on this, we derive the following research questions:

RQ1: Does Greek, Russian and Turkish heritage speakers' (HSs) expression of (pro)nominal reference align with monolingual speakers' productions?

RQ2: How do heritage Greek, Russian and Turkish diverge in their realization of (pro)nominal reference?

We predict changes in pro-drop realization in HS based on the Interface Hypothesis. To prove this, we conducted a study on the RUEG corpus (Wiese et al., 2021) containing manually annotated data of 548 speakers. For each language, we ran binomial generalized linear mixed-effects models with independent variables Country (Germany, USA, the homeland), Formality (formal vs. informal), and Mode (spoken vs. written), and random effects by participant. Our results indicate significant medium effects for Country, Formality and Mode which confirms our preregistered hypotheses. Due to typological differences, we found effects of pro-drop in HS of less strict languages, Turkish and Russian, unlike in Greek HS. Our study offers cross-linguistically comparable data that can be generalized on dynamic heritage communities in Germany and the USA. This unique study design provides evidence of heritage languages' pro-drop use with respect to the different communication settings.

References: • Dubinina, I., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Russian in the USA. In M. Moser (Ed.), Slavic Languages in Migration (pp. 1-29). University of Vienna Press. • Haznedar, B. (2010). Transfer at the syntax-pragmatics interface: Pronominal subjects in bilingual Turkish. Second Language Research 26 (3), 355–378. • Tsimpli, I., Sorace, A., Heycock, C., & Filiaci, F. (2004). First language attrition and syntactic subjects: A study of Greek and Italian near-native speakers of English. International Journal of Bilingualism 8(3), 257–277. • Wiese, H., et al. (2021). RUEG Corpus. https://zenodo.org/record/5808870

Nominative nouns as address forms in Georgian: Interplay of internal and external changes

Nino Amiridze

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

nino.amiridze@gmail.com

In Georgian (Hewitt 1995), vowel-final nominal stem is used both in reference and in addres.

(1) a. deda   k'itxulobs c'ign-s.   (cf. Old G. *deda-j* [mother-NOM])
     mother.NOM   *she.reads.it book*-DAT
     'The mother reads a book'

   b. deda,   male   dabrundi!   (cf. Old G. *deda-o* [deda-VOC])
     mother.VOC   *soon   return*.IMPER
     'Mother, come back soon!'

With consonant-final stems, NOM is used in reference only (2). However, spoken Georgian of the late 20th c. illustrates NOM forms used in address as well (3).

(2) a. k'ac-i /   *k'ac-o   ašenebs   saxl-s.
     man-NOM *man*-VOC *he.is.building.it   house*-DAT
     'The man is building a house.'

   b. k'ac-o /   *k. ac-i,   aašene   saxl-i!
     man-VOC *man*-NOM *build.it   house*-NOM
     '[Hey,] man, build a house!'

(3) avališvil-i, /   avališvil-o,   dapastan!
   Avalishvili-NOM   *Avalishvili*-VOC   *to.the.blackboard*
   (a strict order)   (a regular address)
   '[Hey,] Avalishvili, to the blackboard!'

On the data collected from online discussion websites it will be argued that using NOM with consonant-final nouns in address in Georgian is a pattern borrowing (Sakel 2007) from Russian. Thus, the use of reference forms in address in Georgian is a result of (A) a language internal change, involving the deletion of NOM and VOC markers with vowel-final stems, and (B) an external, contact-induced change, which made it possible to use NOM-marked consonant-final nouns in address.

References: • Hewitt, B. G. (1995). *Georgian: A structural Reference Grammar*, London Oriental and African Language Library. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. • Sakel, J. (2007). Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In Y. Matras & J. Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 15-29.

In search of contact-induced patterns in the Russian speech of the Evenki: Analyzing fieldnotes from the 1910s

Alexandre Arkhipov & Natalia Stoynova
University of Hamburg
alexandre.arkhipov@uni-hamburg.de, stoynova@yandex.ru

This paper attempts to reconstruct a contact-influenced variety of Russian used by bilingual speakers of Evenki (Tungusic) in the early 20th c. Our data come from manuscripts by Konstantin Rychkov (1910s). They contain texts in several Evenki dialects with parallel translation into Russian, made by Rychkov with the assistance of his bilingual Evenki consultants. The language of this translation differs from Standard Russian, showing structural similarities with Evenki. Their nature is unclear; two scenarios are probable:

a) Rychkov tried to create a literal translation of the Evenki text (not reflecting any specific variety of Russian).

b) Rychkov consistently recorded contact-influenced Russian speech of his Evenki consultants.

Some features attested in Rychkov's translations are characteristic of monolinguals' Russian dialects, including features which vary across texts collected in different locations. This suggests reflecting natural local speech to some degree. However, there is also evidence for word-by-word translating.

We focus on several peculiarities of Rychkov's Russian, including nonstandard word-order, valency, and polysemy patterns.

Analyzing their possible motivations, we rely mainly on the correspondence between Russian translations and their Evenki sources.

For instance, an expansion of the nonstandard word order pattern GEN+N, typical of Evenki, seems to be an artifact of word-by-word translation, because the word order in the NP follows Evenki consistently.

In contrast, the nonstandard argument structure of the verb *dostič'* 'to reach' is not a result of a literal translation, because the Evenki-like valency pattern in Russian translation is attested not exactly in those places as in the Evenki text.

References: • Rychkov (Rakaj) Konstantin Mixajlovich (1882-1923), ethnographer, linguist. *The Archives of the Orientalists of IOM RAS*, Coll. 49, inv. 1, items 4, 5, 6a, b, v, http://www.orientalstudies.ru/rus/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10326&Itemid=149

Contact-induced change and passivization in low-resourced languages of Iran

Hiwa Asadpour[1], Soudabeh Eslami[2], Mansoureh Delaramifar[3] & Masoumeh Zarei[4]

[1]JSPS International Fellow, University of Tokyo, Japan & Goethe University Frankfurt, [2]University of Tübingen, [3]University of Sistan and Baluchestan, [4]Allameh Tabataba'i University

asadpour@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de, soudabeh.eslami@student.uni-tuebingen.de, delarami.m@gmail.com, zareimasoumeh26@gmail.com

This study examines passivization in minority languages of Iran such as Zanjani and Shahsevan Azeri (Turkic), Sistani Persian and Garusi Kurdish (Iranian) which are under the superstrate of Persian as the official language of this country and are also exposed to intra-regional linguistic contact. The aim is to discuss different features relevant to passive constructions and to find evidence for the role of language contact in forming the passive structures of the languages of the region. We want to track which features are regionally restricted and which ones are distributed in a larger span of space. The methodology is based on fieldwork study and the data is collected through visual questionnaires. The clauses with passive construction which are extracted from the recorded voices will be the basis for the analysis and the study of contact-induced change in a selection of languages in Iran. The following examples illustrate the passive formation of the English clause of "the child who is being pulled" in these languages:

(1)	Persian	an	baççe'i	ke	keşid-e	mi-şav-ad
		that	*child*	*who*	*pull.PST-PRF*	*PROG-become.PRS-3SG*
(2)	Sistani	am	goçaka	ke	kaşid-a	me:-şo
		that	*child*	*who*	*pull.PST-PRF*	*PROG-become.3SG*
(3)	Garusi	ew	zařuege	ke	di-kiş-iřili	
		that	*child*	*who*	*PROG-pull-PASS.3SG*	
(4)	Zanjani	o	uşağ	ki	çek-il-ir	
		that	*child*	*who*	*pull-PASS-PROG.3SG*	
(5)	Shahsevan	o	uşaq	ke	çek-el-er-e	
		that	*child*	*who*	*pull-PASS-PROG-3SG*	

As mentioned above, in general, Persian (1) and Sistani Persian (2) diathesis is analytic, i.e., a combination of an auxiliary with a main verb, whereas Garusi Kurdish (3) uses a synthetic passivization, i.e., the verb form changes and different suffixes attach to the stem of the verb. Similar to Garusi Kurdish, the construction of passive in Zanjani (4) and Shahsevan (5) Turkic is synthetic. They are also characterized by adding the passive suffix to both transitive and intransitive stems.

Forms of multimodal language contact: multimodal constructions across signed languages

Felicia Bisnath
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
fbisnath@umich.edu

Contact phenomena emerge when language users exploit similarities in matter (e.g. words, sounds) and pattern (e.g. syntactic frames) between languages and combine them (Matras & Sakel 2007; Baptista 2020). This is traditionally studied from a unimodal perspective and in the auditory–vocal modality (cf. Azar et al. 2020), which emphasises sequential use of resources; however signed languages show simultaneous, cross-modal contact, e.g. *fingerspelling* and *mouthing* (e.g. Adam 2012). This paper investigates 4 kinds of mouthing constructions – *congruent*, *morpho-phonological*, *morpho-syntactic* and *free* – in 37 signed languages. Mouthing can be used to understand what motivates the combination of resources from different modalities. First, the number of modalities referenced varies: *free* references 1 modality (i.e. spoken), *congruent*, *polysemous* and *morpho-syntactic* 2 (signed+spoken), and *initialised* 3 (signed+spoken+written). When 2 modalities are referenced it is done to (i) supply the same content in different forms (*congruent*), (ii) identify a general meaning and specify it (*polysemous*) or (iii) identify a head and a dependent (*morpho-syntactic*). In all constructions, partial matter matching occurs as some lip and tongue articulations from spoken language words are incorporated, but not necessarily their acoustics. This matching occurs around lexical (*congruent*, *polysemous*) and phonetic/phonological (*initialised*) properties. The *initialised* case is novel as it matches signed language phonology (handshape), written representation of spoken phonology (letter), and spoken phonetics (oral articulation). *Morpho-syntactic* mouthing is best classed as a type of pattern matching as there seems to be sensitivity to grammatical categories in the tendency to map a head and its dependent to the hands and mouth respectively. These constructions represent cross-linguistically robust ways that resources referencing different modalities are combined in signed language use, broadening the picture of matter and pattern matching in language contact.

References: • Adam, R. 2012. Language contact and borrowing. In R. Pfau, M. Steinbach & B. Woll (eds.), *Sign Language: An International Handbook*, 841–861. De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110261325.• A., Zeynep, A. Backus & A. Özyürek. 2020. Language contact does not drive gesture transfer: Heritage speakers maintain language specific gesture patterns in each language. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 23(2). 414–428. https://doi.org/10.1017/S136672891900018X. • Baptista, M. 2020. Competition, selection, and the role of congruence in Creole genesis and development. *Language* 96(1). 160–199. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2020.0005. • Matras, Y. & J. Sakel (eds.). 2007. *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 38). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Variation vs. change
Language variation on the eve of language shift

Jessica Kantarovich
University of Chicago
jkantarovich@uchicago.edu

Languages whose speakers are shifting to a different majority language—that is, endangered languages—are often underdescribed. Reconstructing morphosyntactic variation (historical and contemporary) is a particularly difficult task in these scenarios, due to the low number of available consultants and a tendency to document the most conservative speakers who show the fewest effects of language contact. Even in investigations of language obsolescence (Dorian 1981), regular and stable multilingual speech behavior that predates shift is not targeted.

It is tempting to relegate all variation that differs from the normative variety as due to the instability of the language (disrupted acquisition, attrition), yet we know that variation is the norm and need not have contact as a source, even in endangered languages (Nagy 2017; Kasstan 2017). In this paper, I consider the case of Chukchi, a moribund Indigenous language of Siberia with no more than several hundred conversational speakers remaining. Previous documentation of Chukchi has downplayed the extent of grammatical variation in the language (Dunn 1999); however, in my own fieldwork with the current speakers, I have encountered considerable morphosyntactic variation among older speakers that cannot be explained by shift-induced dysfluency. Here, I consider variation across the following domains and show that they can be reconstructed to pre-existing variation before the onset of severe language shift in the 1950s: (1) variation in inflectional suffixes on the polysynthetic verb; (2) variation in the productivity of noun incorporation; (3) variation in use of the antipassive; and (4) frequency and regularity of code-mixing with Russian.

References: • Dorian, N. C. (1981). *Language death: The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. • Dunn, M. (1999). A grammar of Chukchi. Doctoral Dissertation, Australian National University, Canberra. • Kasstan, J. (2019). Emergent sociolinguistic variation in severe language endangerment. *Language in Society*, 48(5), 685–720. • Nagy, N. (2017). Documenting variation in (endangered) heritage languages: How and why?. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 13, 33–64.

Contact-induced change and structural variation in the passive constructions of Nayini

Roohollah Mofidi[1] & Hiwa Asadpour[2]

[1]*Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin, Iran,* **[2]***JSPS International Research Fellow, University of Tokyo & Goethe University, Frankfurt*
mofidi@hum.ikiu.ac.ir, asadpour@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de

This study investigates the structural variation in the passive constructions of Nayini (Central Iranian language). The data include interviews with 30 native speakers by means of picture story-telling and film re-narration. Among the total tokens, 94 instances of passive construction were identified, which reveal three patterns of passive formation: a) the passive marker *-š*, preceded by the verbal root (and causative marker *-en* for some verbs) and followed by tense-agreement morphology (79.8%, see example [1a]); b) a devoted passive root *ker-* 'do', followed by the passive marker *-š* and tense-agreement morphology (11.7%, see example [1b]); and 1c) the past participle plus the inflected auxiliaries *gert-* or *bo*, both 'become' (8.5%, see example [1c]).

(1a) *u-von-š-ay*
PFV-cut-PASS-PST.3SG
'It was cut.*'*

(1b) *pak e-ker-š-æ*
clean IPFV-do.PASS-PASS-3SG
'It is cleaned.*'*

(1c) *bor-id-æ   gert-ay*
cut-PST-PTCP become-PST[3SG]
'It was cut.*'*

Pattern (1a) employs a suffix-like marker (*-š*), whose category is to be further investigated. Pattern (1b), employing the same marker, is doubly-marked for passive by its verbal root as well, and it is lexically restricted: the opposition of present/past/passive is only observed in *kir/ka/ker* 'do' (as opposed to other roots maintaining a present/past opposition). Finally, pattern (1c) is a contact phenomenon with a lexical-functional asymmetry. The past participles, as the lexical part of the construction, are borrowed as adjectives from Persian, the only other language spoken in the region. The borrowed root *bor-* in (1c) is opposed to the native root *von-* in (1a). However, the functional part of the construction, i.e. auxiliary, is not borrowed. Rather, the native change-of-state verbs *gert-* or *bo* are employed, which are conceptually the equivalents of Persian passive auxiliary *šod*. On the contrary, the patterns (1a) and (1b) are contact-resistant, not replicating any lexical or functional element of Persian. Firstly, the verbal roots in (1a) and (1b) differ from Persian roots, and secondly, the morpho-syntactic characteristics of *-š* are not observed in Persian, neither as a suffix, nor as an auxiliary.

References: • Borjian, H. (2009). Median succumbs to Persian after three millennia of coexistence: Language shift in the Central Iranian Plateau. *Journal of Persianate Societies* 2(1), 62–87. • Dabir-Moghaddam, M. (2013). *Radešenāsi-ye zabānhā-ye Irāni*. Tehran: Samt.

Superlative *ever*:
A cross-linguistic lexically anchored structural borrowing

Manfred Sailer & Nicolas Lamoure
Goethe-University Frankfurt
sailer@em.uni-frankfurt.de, nlamoure@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Superlative-*ever*, (1), is borrowed into many languages, including Dutch, French, German, and Spanish. These languages only borrow *ever* as an emphatic superlative marker, not in other functions, (2).

(1)   Ik was waarschijnlijk de meest rare   patiënt ever.
        I was probably   the most   strange patient ever
        'I was probably the strangest patient ever.' [nl, nlTenTen20]

(2)   *Würdest du   ever ...? (Androutsopoulos 1998:542)
         Would   you ever ...? *[de, constructed]*

I consider data from internet corpora, adding introspective judgments where needed. The corpora of the considered languages contain complete English noun phrases with superlative-*ever*, as well as fully native noun phrases with an analogous native superlative domain widener. We also find mixed noun phrases, (3).

(3)   worst pesadilla   ever
        worst nightmare ever *[Spanish, esTenTen18]*

As emphatic particle that can also be intonationally separated, superlative-*ever* is a plausible candidate for borrowing (Matras 2011). However, I will argue that *ever* is not borrowed as a single lexical item but within a construction that partially overlaps between English and the target language. This provides an explanation for the commonalities and differences in *ever*-borrowing in the considered languages. I will model this in an HPSG-adaptation of the frameworks in Hoeder (2012) and Wiese (2021).

References: • Androutsopoulos, J. (1998). Deutsche Jugendsprache. Frankfurt a.M.: Lang. • Hoeder, S. (2012). Multilingual constructions: A diasystematic approach to common structures. In K. Braunmüller & C. Gabriel (eds): Multilingual individuals and multilingual societies. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 241-257. • Matras, Y. (2011). Universals of structural borrowing. In S. Peter (ed): Linguistic universals and language variation. Berlin: De Gruyter. 204-233. • Wiese, H. (2021). Communicative situations as a basis for linguistic systems. WPULL 287.

Language Contact between PJM and Spoken Polish
– a Corpus-based Study

Joanna Wójcicka[1] & Anna Kuder[2]
[1]University of Warsaw, [2]Universität zu Köln
j.filipczak@uw.edu.pl, akuder@uni-koeln.de

This paper explores the issue of language contact between spoken Polish (sP) and Polish Sign Language (PJM).We analyze a subset of the PJM Corpus (Rutkowski et al., 2017), featuring recordings of native PJM signers. Our sample consists of 2 tasks performed by 10 participants (179 min). Data is tokenized and glossed (N=8.200), tagged for clause-like units (CLUs) (Johnston, 2019), argument structure and semantic functions. 3.032 CLU tags were identified and analyzed for potential influence of sP. 7% of CLUs (N=214) were tagged as containing calques from sP and divided into three groups:

- syntactic structures calques;
- idiomatic sP constructions calques;
- different occurrences of code-blending.

77% of all observed cases of sP influence were identified as belonging to the first group and divided further into four categories:

- copying whole phrases from sP;
- overtly articulating sP functional elements;
- conveying sP functional elements by mouthing;
- copying word order of sP sentences.

50% of the syntactic borrowings were identified as overt markings of pronouns, prepositions or conjunctions. We hypothesize that PJM clauses adopt those sP elements when there is a need to concatenatively express spatial, temporal and causal relations without the of the use of the signing space.

Our talk provides examples and detailed analysis of the described dataset. The observations can be explained by the natural language contact phenomena such as codeswitching, code-mixing, code-blending (Herbert & Pires). Corpus data shows that PJM, even when used by competent native signers, is influenced by sP, since its users are bimodal bilinguals.

References: • Rutkowski, P., A. Kuder, J. Filipczak, P. Mostowski, J. Łacheta & S. Łozińska, (2017). The design and compilation of the Polish Sign Language (PJM) Corpus. In P. Rutkowski (ed.), *Different faces of sign language research*. University of Warsaw: Faculty of Polish Studies. 125–151. • Johnston, T. (2019). *Auslan Corpus Annotation Guidelines*. August 2019 version, manuscript, Macquarie University, Australia. • Herbert, M. & A. Pires (2017). Bilingualism and bimodal code-blending among deaf ASL-English bilinguals. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 2 (14).

The apparent paradox of Bare Nouns in Basque-French contact

Maia Duguine & Aritz Irurtzun
CNRS-IKER
maia.duguine@iker.cnrs.fr, aritz.irurtzun@iker.cnrs.fr

In (Standard) Basque, overt determiners/quantifiers are mandatory for argument DPs, which cannot be bare nouns (BNs). We uncover argumental BNs (ABNs) employed in Navarro-Labourdin Basque –a variety in contact with French– which lack a referential reading:

(1)   Gin-tonic/Kleenex   galdegin   du.
        gin-tonic/kleenex   ask   AUX
         'They asked for a gin and tonic/Kleenex'.

ABNs emerge while neither Basque or French allows them. This paradox is solved with **an analysis where a 'borrowed' French noun is inserted in the proper name structure of Basque**.

Contact. ABNs tend to involve recent loanwords from French, in a situation of intense contact, with frequent code-switching/mixing and a long history of borrowing where loanwoards are typically grammaticalized as 'marked' lexical items (Jauregi and Epelde 2011).

Degree of nativization. The further the segmental content of the loanword is from the phonological properties of Basque, the higher probability it has to be used as ABN.

Names. ABNs involve what are originally rigid designators, borrowed/used as genericized trademarks or kind-denoting proper nouns, inserted in a DP with no overt D. Names can be used as predicates in different constructions, giving different referential possibilities (cf. i.a. Burge 1973). We propose that these ABNs involve nouns which are incorporated as products' names (proper nouns). But rather than individual-specific, they are 'style' or 'kind'-denoting (Hinzen 2007).

Native syntax + late insertion. There is no syntactic innovation or transfer, but rather late insertion of vocabulary items from a second language in a proper name configuration (Grimstad et al. 2014).

References: • Burge, T. (1973). Reference and proper names. The Journal of Philosophy 70, 425–439. • Grimstad, M.B., T. Lohndal & T.A. Åfarli. (2014). Language mixing and exoskeletal theory: A case study of word-internal mixing in American Norwegian. Nordlyd 41, 213–237. • Hinzen, W. 2007. An Essay of Names and Truth. Oxford: Oxford University Press. • Jauregi, O. & I. Epelde. 2011. Bokal sudurkariak gaurko lapurteran. Lapurdum 15, 29–42.

A multidisciplinary & interactional approach to codeswitching in Cabo Verdean bilinguals

Sophia Eakins
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
seakins@umich.edu

Conversation Analysis (CA) considers codeswitching inseparable from the conversational context in which it occurs: each utterance must be considered in relation to what precedes and follows it (Auer 1984a; Wei 2002). Relying heavily on this 'sequential implicativeness of language,' CA often analyzes *points of alternation* between speakers e.g. determining whether there was a shift or maintenance in the language of interaction (LOI) across speaker turns (Auer 1984a; Dahmen 2022). Emulating recent psycholinguistic work (Fricke & Kootstra 2016), this study examines sequential implications in codeswitching and in priming.

In an effort to paint a more holistic picture of the interactional nature of bilingual speech, the present paper brings both cognitive and conversational perspectives to the analysis of bilingual data. Broadly, the research question is: What are the factors conditioning the interactional choices of bilingual interlocutors?

To explore this question, I analyzed 1.5 hours of conversations between Cabo Verdean Creole-English bilinguals, with a focus on points of speaker alternation during codeswitching. To examine cognitive influence, I calculated the rate of inter-speaker LOI shift (Fricke & Kootstra 2016). Then, I examined the conversational context of a sample of these data points (Auer 1984a; Dahmen 2022).

Results of the cognitive analysis showed variation between the conversations, but that speakers had a broad preference for maintaining the LOI. The conversational analysis showed that both language shift *and* maintenance could serve conversational goals. Through novel integration of quantitative and qualitative analyses to conversational codeswitching, this paper shows the LOI is governed by both social and cognitive factors.

References: • Auer, P. (1984a). Bilingual conversation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Dahmen, J. (2022). Bilingual speech in Jaru–Kriol conversations: Codeswitching, codemixing, and grammatical fusion. International Journal of Bilingualism, 26(2), 198–226. • Fricke, M., & Kootstra, G. J. (2016). Primed codeswitching in spontaneous bilingual dialogue. Journal of Memory and Language, 91, 181–201. • Wei, L. (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. Language in Society, 31(2), 159–180.

Flagging-drop Typology and Contact-Induced Change

Hiwa Asadpour

JSPS International Research Fellow, University of Tokyo & Goethe University, Frankfurt

asadpour@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de

This study deals with the typology of flagging-drop characteristics and its relevance on word order variation in the languages of Northwest Iran with focus on Target semantic roles. Target is a cover term for the semantic roles of physical and metaphorical Goals of MOTION, CAUSE-MOTION, SHOW and LOOK verbs, Recipients of GIVE verbs, Addressees of SAY verbs, as well as Resultant-states of CHANGE-of-STATE verbs that share the same adpositions or cases and they have the tendency to appear in postverbal position (Asadpour 2021, 2022). The data in this study include a corpora of monologue narrative free speech from published sources (Kıral 2001; Khan 2008; Öpengin 2016) and personal fieldwork. Considering the position of Targets and various types of flagging forms, the questions are whether the preference postverbal bare Targets, i.e. Targets without any marking in the sample languages of Northwestern Iran such as Armenian, Azeri Turkic, Jewish Neo-Aramaic, Mukri Kurdish, and Northeastern Kurdish are due to contact-induced change or internal language development. Does the position of constituents and more specifically the Target trigger the choice of flagging such as full or reduced flagging as well as bare? Or is there a preference for a specific type of flagging in either of the positions? In general and based on the results, three stages can be defined for possibility of change in this morphological marking. Stage I is considered to be the early stage of change in the type of flagging, i.e. full flagging, stage II is considered to be change in progress, i.e. reduced flagging and stage III is considered to be an established phase, i.e. no flagging (bare).

References: • Asadpour, Hiwa. (2022a). Word order in Mukri Kurdish – the case of incorporated Targets. In Hiwa Asadpour and Thomas Jügel (eds.), Word Order Variation: Semitic, Turkic, and Indo-European Languages in contact, Studia Typologica 31. 63–88. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. • Asadpour, Hiwa. (2021). Typologizing Word Order Variation in Northwestern Iran. PhD Thesis. Frankfurt: Goethe University Frankfurt. • Khan, Geoffrey. (2008). The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Urmi. pp. 624. Piscataway: Gorgias. • Kıral, Filiz. (2001). Das gesprochene Aserbaidschanisch von Iran: eine Studie zu den syntaktischen Einflüssen des Persischen, Turcologica 43, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. • Öpengin, Ergin. (2016). The Mukri Variety of Central Kurdish: Grammar, Texts, and Lexicon (Beiträge zur Iranistik 40). Wiesbaden: Reichert. • Öpengin, Ergin. (2016). The Mukri Variety of Central Kurdish: Grammar, Texts, and Lexicon (Beiträge zur Iranistik 40). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Variation in argument encoding under asymmetric language contact: Evidence from Southern Tungusic and the variety of Russian used by their speakers

Natalia Stoynova
University of Hamburg
stoynova@yandex.ru

Argument structure is a convenient field for studying grammatical outcomes of language contact and shift. This paper deals with variation in argument encoding in the speech of the Nanai and Ulcha (Southern Tungusic, the Amur region).

Both Nanai and Ulcha are highly endangered. They are no longer transmitted to children, all speakers are fluent in Russian.

Non-standard argument encoding is attested both in the modern Nanai and Ulcha and in the Russian variety used by their speakers. I will analyze and compare these two cases. The following questions will be discussed:

→ Do non-standard valency patterns always copy Russian/Tungusic ones or are other processes at play: language attrition (in Tungusic), incomplete acquisition (in Russian), language-inherent variation? Not all changes attested in contact settings are contact-induced (Poplack & Levey 2010). This is also the case for our data.

→ How are they distributed across speakers? The expectation is that Russian-like valency patterns are more likely in the Nanai/Ulcha speech of (younger) speakers with dominant Russian, while Tungusic-like patterns are more likely in the Russian speech of those with dominant Nanai/Ulcha ("source-language agentivity", Winford 2005). Our data follow this trend, although with deviations.

→ Are valency patterns exhibiting variation the same in contact-influenced Russian and in contact-influenced Tungusic? A partial overlap takes place.

The study is based on our field data: 1) texts in Nanai and Ulcha (102,817 tokens); 2) texts in Russian produced by the same speech community (54,318 tokens).

References: • Poplack, Sh., and S. Levey. 2010. Contact-induced grammatical change: a cautionary tale. In: Auer, P. & J. Schmidt. *Language and Space: An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation*. Vol. I. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 391–419. • Winford, D. (2005). Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22(2), 373–427.

LAZIM in TİD: Lexical Borrowing Comes with the Structure

Serpil Karabüklü

University of Chicago

serpilkarabuklu@gmail.com

Sign languages have several mechanisms to borrow lexical items from the surrounding spoken languages. This study shows that some lexical borrowings also bring structural changes into the grammar. The modal sign LAZIM (necessary) in Turkish Sign Language (TİD) was borrowed to translate Turkish 'lazım' (Taşçı & Göksel, 2014). In Turkish, 'lazım' can be either deontic or epistemic (1). In TİD, LAZIM is used alone in deontic contexts (2) but is accompanied by another sign OL (be), also borrowed from Turkish, in epistemic contexts (2) (Karabüklü et al., 2018).

(1)   Ali'nin   ev-de/gel-me-si   *(ol-ma-sı)/* ol-ma-sı   lazım.
      Ali-gen.   home-loc./ come-nom.-poss.   be-nom.-poss.   necessary
      'Ali must be home / must come (based on my deduction/ his parents' rules)'

(2)   ALI COME LAZIM / OL LAZIM
      'Ali must (have) come (based on rules/ what I know)'

Experimental evidence from ratings of modal signs by 16 participants supports the claim that TİD has adjusted the semantics of borrowed LAZIM (M=1.87, sd=1.47 on 7-point slider) to deontic and created the OL LAZIM (M=3.28, sd=2.28) construction for expressing epistemic (Karabüklü, 2022). Furthermore, 'ol' in Turkish is only used after nominal predicates (1) while TID OL is used after both nominal and verbal predicates (2). OL which can be signed alone, encodes the change of state (3) whereas Turkish 'ol' is the morphological realization of the copula in the embedded sentences (1). Based on OL's pattern, I analyze epistemic interpretation of OL LAZIM via the semantic computations of OL and LAZIM separately. OL conveys the change of state and LAZIM attaches the structure above and binds the situation argument of OL, thus yielding the epistemic interpretation. Thus, lexical borrowing brought the structure along with itself but yielded structural adaptation to disambiguate the semantics of LAZIM.

(3)   IX-POSS-1 MOM BEFORE MEAL TASTE^GOOD++, NOW MEAL TASTE^BAD OL, SHOCK
      'Mom's meal tasted good, now it happens to taste bad, I'm shocked.'

References: • Karabüklü, S. (2022). *Modal Signs and Cooccurring Nonmanual Markers in TİD*. Purdue University: Diss.• Karabüklü, S., Bross, F., Wilbur, R. B., & Hole, D. (2018). Modal signs and scope relations in TİD. Proceedings of FEAST, 2, 82–92. •Taşçı, S. & Göksel, A. (2014). The morphological categorization of polymorphemic lexemes: A study based on lexicalized fingerspelled forms in TİD. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi.* (pp. 165-180).

Coexistence, competition, and change: Perspectives on structural borrowing and the dynamics of asymmetric language contact
Final discussion

Hiwa Asadpour[1,2], Carolina Plaza Pust[2] & Manfred Sailer[2]
[1]JSPS Research Fellow, University of Tokyo,
[2]Goethe-University Frankfurt
asadpour@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de, pust@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de,
sailer@em.uni-frankfurt.de

In this final session we aim to open the forum for a discussion on some of the general issues addressed in this workshop in which we will have addressed structural borrowing and the dynamics of asymmetric language contact from different theoretical perspectives.

Issues that might be addressed include but are not limited to:

- What do we know about the interplay of internal and external factors affecting the outcomes of language contact?
- Does lexical borrowing open a door to structural borrowing under specific circumstances?
- What factors contribute to the diffusion of or resistance to the importation of structural features?
- How do we distinguish between variation and change?
- How do traditional linguistic theories cope with the dynamics of language contact?
- What do dynamic models contribute to our understanding of language contact and change?
- Are borrowing hierarchies universal or conditioned by the languages involved?
- What is the scope and what are the limits of syntactic creativity in asymmetric language contact?