

Syntactically-conditioned morphological blocking: *ge*-prefix blocking vs. IPP-constructions in Gottscheerisch

Andrew Hoffman & Mike Putnam – Penn State University

1 Objectives & Research questions

- To investigate the (diachronic) structure and distribution of IPP (and related) constructions in Gottscheerisch
 - American community (e.g. in Cleveland, OH & Queens, NY)
 - Austrian community (e.g. in Graz & Klagenfurt)
- RQ₁: How can we best account for *GE*-prefix blocking?
- RQ₂: Is there a potential correlation with what we observe in Gottscheerisch and general diachronic language development (Kupisch & Polinsky, forthcoming)?

2 IPP-constructions: An overview

1. Ik heb ge-werk-t
I have GE-work-T
'I have worked.'
2. Ik ben ge-kom-en
I am GE-come-N
'I have come.'

[Dutch; Zwart (2007, 77)]

- *Infinitivus pro Participio* ('infinitive instead of participle') – in verb clusters, the appearance of an infinitive verb form instead of an otherwise expected participle form, e.g. in Ger.
 - Ich **habe**_{AUX} das **gewollt**_{PTCP} 'I (have) wanted that'
 - Ich **will**_{MOD} das **machen**_{INF} 'I want to do that'
 - Ich **habe**_{AUX} das **machen**_{INF} **wollen**_{IPP} 'I wanted to do that'
- IPP-constructions begin appearing in 13th century MHG & ENHG texts (e.g. w/ 'do' and 'hear'), extend progressively to other verbs through the 17th century (Kurrelmeyer, 1910)

- IPP < *GE*-less participles (e.g. Lachmann 1836, Grimm 1898, Behagel 1923)
 - IPP from reanalysis of *GE*-less strong past participles as infinitives, pattern later extended to non-strong verbs
 - IPP as 'allomorph' of the past participle also factors into IPP theories (e.g. Wurmbrand 2004, Zwart 2007)
- IPP as true infinitive
 - IPP < assimilation to/analogy with embedded infinitive (e.g. Erdmann 1886, Kurrelmeyer 1910)
 - Formal/semantic syncretism (e.g. Dal 1971, Ponten 1973)
 - Supported by early texts, e.g. Dutch *doen* instead of *gedaan* (Jäger, 2018)
- NOTE: These are low frequency constructions (in both standard and non-standard varieties), e.g. in Lipold (1984), only 32/412 Gott. clauses contain the relevant morphosyntactic environment

3 (Morpho)Semantics of the *ge*-prefix

- Diachronically, *GE*- entailed aspectual perfectivity
- Historically, *GE*- could attach to both participles and infinitives, e.g. *ich hân gesehen* 'I have seen' vs. *ich mac gesehen* 'I can see'
- Currently it only marks past tense (Musan, 2002; Pross and Roßdeutscher, 2019)
- NOTE: In many Bavarian varieties, *GE*-less past participles are quite common (even outside IPP contexts), e.g. Gott. *kham(ən)*, *gəkham* 'come.PTCP' and *(gə)belt*, *(gə)bölt*, *bel(lən)* 'want.PTCP' (Tschinkel, 1976)

4 Data from Gottscheerisch

- 1920s (through 1970s)

3. IPP

bei schei scho wiel hont müss-n zoul
because they already much have must-IPP pay-INF

‘because they already had to pay a lot’

4. Supine Participle (GE-less)

Ar hot in bell-t zoig-n
he has them (*GE-)want-T show-INF

‘he wanted to show them’

cf. e.g. Ger. *es ist gezeigt* (*ge)worden ‘it has been shown’

5. Ambiguous

ouwr schei hontn gouär et zä Boartä louß-n kam
but they have.him really NEG to words let-N/IP? come-INF

‘but they didn’t let him get a word in’

- Lipold (1984)

6. IPP

dos mišoaxaine proat hot ži mear heiß ub mis-en pren-en
the mixed bread has she more hot PRT_i must-IPP burn_i-INF

‘she had to blanch the rye-wheat bread at a higher temperature’

7. GE-Participles

mon hot dōrt aōf a štele atine balde ge-müß-t pren-en
one has there on a place in forest GE-must-T burn-INF

‘you had to burn at a spot there in the forest’

- 2018-2020

8. IPP

jedər hot ottər inin miəs-n gea-n in žain klassə
everybody has then PRT_i must-IPP go.in_i-INF in his class

‘everyone had to go to their class then’

5 Examples from other varieties of German

- IPP (e.g. Hutterite German)

9. die guards ham se aber well-en aufholt-en
the guards have them but want-INF stop-INF

‘the guards wanted to stop them however’ (Brednich, 1981, 22)

- GE-Participle (e.g. Zarzer German)

10. n et ar et ge-well-t awäige-gea-n
and has he NEG GE-want-T across-go-INF

‘and he did not want to go across’ (Lessiak et al., 1944, 210)

- Supine Participle (e.g. Thuringian)

11. A hads mus-d mache
he has.it (*GE-)must-T make-INF

‘he had to do it’

- PPI (e.g. Frisian)

12. Hy soe it dien wollen ha
he would it do.PTCP want.PTCP have.INF

‘he would have liked to do it’ (Jäger, 2018)

5.1 cf. Slovenian

13. Želim to prebrati
I.wish that read.INF

‘I want to read that’

14. Želel sem to (prebrati)
wish.PTCP AUX that (read.INF)

‘I wanted (to read) that’

15. Šel sem to prebrat
go.PTCP AUX that read.SUP

‘I went to read that’

6 Evidence from diachrony

- Kupisch and Polinsky (forthcoming)
 - HL “attrition / divergent acquisition” = “innovation / grammaticalization” in language change
 - Grammatical patterns in HLs can be predicted on the basis of diachronic change
 - HLs can *amplify* known patterns of (diachronic) change
 - Changes in HL parallel other (slower) changes
- Category of IPP verbs grows slowly over centuries
- Multiple competing constructions exist alongside one another > regularization
- Three stages of IPP/participle-constructions in Gottscheerisch
 - 1920s: IPP & supine participles (variation with ambiguity)
 - 1980s: IPP & GE-participles (variation without ambiguity)
 - 2020s: IPP (no observed variation)

7 Analysis

- Recent studies provide evidence that the IPP - and morphology more generally - *follows* syntax (Zwart, 2017; Salzmänn, 2019; Putnam and Hoffman, 2021)
 16. heantar dər khriəg aüs-išt-gə-pröxx-n
before the war PRT_i-is-GE-break.out_i-N
‘before the war broke out’ (Tschinkel, 1976)
 17. damite mon aöfhin hot ge-mex-t geə-n aöf dan
therewith one PRT_i has GE-can-T go.up_i-INF on the
maelar
charcoal.pile
‘so that one could go up onto the charcoal pile’ (Lipold, 1984)
- Schmid (2005) classifies the IPP as a ‘repair strategy’
- Both Austrian and American Gottscheer communities have converged on a uniform preference for IPP (possibly with a similar, albeit unattested, stage in the US cf. to Austrian Gottscheers in the 1980s?)

- ‘Recent’ change(s) in Gottscheerisch parallel historical developments that have taken place over centuries (cf. Kupisch and Polinsky (ming))
- Similarly, (formal) variation within Gottscheerisch mirrors the kinds of variation seen in other (related) dialects

8 Conclusion

- RQ₁: How can we best account for *ge*-prefix blocking?
 - *The uptick in the use of ge- in the 1980s as a way to reduce ambiguity and increase iconicity*
 - *There is a lack of historical evidence for this, as it represents a later innovation among the Gott. expellees living in Austria (participants of Lipold 1984)*
- RQ₂: Is there a potential correlation with what we observe in Gottscheerisch and diachronic development (Kupisch & Polinsky, to appear)?
 - Fairly radical changes took place over a short time period (‘extreme’ conditions); for AT Gottscheers, this ‘simplifies’ the mental grammar (i.e. share one system for AT German & Gott.); no clear contact motivation for the change in US context (but diachronic perspective would suggest a possible route towards IPP, cf. Standard German, Hutterite)
 - Ambiguity in forms gives way to regularity (see Jäger (2018))
 - HL tendency towards minimizing ambiguity and variation (Putnam et al., 2021)

References

- Brednich, R. W. (1981). *The Bible and the Plough: The Lives of a Hutterite Minister and a Mennonite Farmer*, Volume 37. Canadian Centre for Folk Culture Studies.
- Jäger, A. (2018). On the history of the IPP construction in German. In A. Jäger, G. Ferraresi, and H. Weiß (Eds.), *Clause structure and word order in the History of German*, pp. 302–323. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kupisch, T. and M. Polinsky (forthcoming). Language history on fast forward: Innovations in heritage languages and diachronic change. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–12.
- Kurrelmeyer, W. (1910). Über die Entstehung der Konstruktion Ich habe sagen hören. *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* 12, 157–173.
- Lessiak, P., E. Kranzmayer, and A. Richter (1944). *Die deutsche Mundart von Zarz in Oberkrain: A. Grammatik*. Böhlau.
- Lipold, G. (1984). *Gottschee in Jugoslawien – System, Stil und Prozeß – Phonologie einer Sprachinselmundart*. Tübingen: Max Niemayer.
- Musan, R. (2002). *The German Perfect: Its semantic composition and its interactions with temporal adverbials*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Pross, T. and Roßdeutscher (2019). Towards a correlation of form, use and meaning of German *ge*-prefixed predicative participles. *Glossa* 4(1), 1–31.
- Putnam, M. T. and A. D. Hoffman (2021). Overextension in Gottscheerisch (negative) imperatives: Proclisis at the edge of the first phase. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 24(2), 189–215.
- Putnam, M. T., L. Schwarz, and A. Hoffman (2021). The morphology of heritage languages. In M. Polinsky and S. Montrul (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of heritage languages and literatures*, pp. 613–643. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salzmann, M. (2019). *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 22(1), 1–53.
- Schmid, T. (2005). *Infinitivus Pro Participio as a repair strategy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tschinkel, W. (1976). *Wörterbuch der Gottscheer Mundart*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Zwart, J.-W. (2007). Some notes on the origin and distribution of the IPP-effect. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 45, 77–99.
- Zwart, J.-W. (2017). An argument against the syntactic nature of verb movement. In L. B. Bailey and M. Sheehan (Eds.), *Order and structure in syntax I: Word order and syntactic structure*, pp. 29–47. Berlin: Language Science Press.