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Languages

• Need cases where we have an empirical understanding of
  • the changes that have occurred in the ‘copying’ language;
  • the sociolinguistic circumstances of contact, and
  • the language from which grammatical constructions have been ‘copied’

• Not many documented cases satisfy these conditions
Introduction

• An example of contact-induced constructional change
  
  • British English: *I have known his family all my life*
    
    • present perfect with a span of time that reaches to the present

  • Colloquial Irish English: *I know his family all my life*
    
    • not acceptable in British English
      
      • reflecting the lack of forms corresponding to the present perfect in the Irish Gaelic of speakers who shifted to English (Hickey 2013:102)
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• Constructional copying happens in two different circumstances:
  • bilingually induced change, where bilinguals copy from one of their languages into the other and
  • shift-induced change that results from imperfect adult language learning during rapid shift.
Languages

• Colloquial Upper Sorbian
  • has copied constructions through Sorbian/German bilingualism.
    • Lenka Scholze’s 2007 PhD thesis, published as Scholze 2008, provides ample information
    • earlier work by Frido Michałk and Walter Breu
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Languages

• Colloquial Upper Sorbian
  • has copied constructions through Sorbian/German bilingualism.
    • Lenka Scholze’s 2007 PhD thesis, published as Scholze 2008, provides ample information
    • there is earlier work by Frido Michałk and Walter Breu

• Rural Irish English
  • has copied constructions from Irish Gaelic in the course of language shift
Contact-induced constructional change

- A typology based on the degree to which a construction is altered as a result of contact:
  - an existing construction is used more frequently
  - an existing construction is used for a new function
  - an existing construction is formally modified, i.e. constructional calquing;
  - an existing construction is structurally altered to more closely match a corresponding ML construction, i.e. metatypy occurs.
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Contact-induced constructional change

• A typology based on the degree to which a construction is altered as a result of contact:
  • an existing construction is used more frequently
  • an existing construction is used for a new function
  • an existing construction is formally modified, i.e. constructional calquing
  • an existing construction is structurally altered to more closely match a corresponding ML construction, i.e. metatypy occurs.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

- 5th–6th centuries: Slavic speakers settled eastern region of present-day Germany.

- As the language diversified, the language of the northern part of the region became Polabian, the southern Sorbian.
Western Slavic languages in the 9th and 10th centuries (approximate)
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

Present-day extent of Sorbian (approximate)
Contact-induced constructional change

• A typology based on the degree to which a construction is altered as a result of contact:
  • an existing construction is used more frequently

• an existing construction is formally modified, i.e. constructional calquing;
• an existing construction is structurally altered to more closely match a corresponding ML construction, i.e. metatypy occurs.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StdUS</th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>běše</th>
<th>jemo</th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>stara</th>
<th>žona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUS</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>běše</td>
<td>jemo</td>
<td>jena</td>
<td>stara</td>
<td>žona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>war</td>
<td>einmal</td>
<td>eine</td>
<td>alte</td>
<td>Frau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>it.NOM</th>
<th>be.3sIPF</th>
<th>once</th>
<th>a.NOM.F</th>
<th>old.NOM.F</th>
<th>woman.NOM.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

- *jena* serves both as numeral ‘one’ and as indefinite article, here in a presentative construction
There was once an old woman.' (Breu 2012:281)

- *jena* serves both as numeral ‘one’ and as indefinite article, here in a presentative construction

- StdUS reflects the most frequent Slavic situation: no indefinite article in a presentative construction.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StdUS</th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>bęše</th>
<th>jemo</th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>stara</th>
<th>žona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUS</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>bęše</td>
<td>jemo</td>
<td>jena</td>
<td>stara</td>
<td>žona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>war</td>
<td>einmal</td>
<td>eine</td>
<td>alte</td>
<td>Frau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

- **jen** serves both as numeral ‘one’ and as indefinite article, here in a presentative construction:

- StdUS reflects the most frequent Slavic situation: no indefinite article in a presentative construction.

- In CUS **jen** is **obligatory**,
There was once a old woman.

- *jen* serves both as numeral ‘one’ and as indefinite article, here in a presentative construction:

- StdUS reflects the most frequent Slavic situation: no indefinite article in a presentative construction.

- In CUS *jen* is *obligatory*, on the model of German *ein*. 
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StdUS | Ø      | běše    | jemo    | Ø      | stara   | žona   
CUS   | To     | běše    | jemo    | jena   | stara   | žona   
Ge    | Es war | einmal  | alte    | Eine   | alte    | Frau   

‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

- *jena* serves both as numeral ‘one’ and as indefinite article, here in a presentative construction:

- StdUS reflects the most frequent Slavic situation: no indefinite article in a presentative construction.

- In CUS *jena* is **obligatory**, on the model of German *ein*.

- Other Slavic languages sometimes use the numeral ‘one’ in this construction, so the variant of the construction with ‘one’ has displaced the more common variant that lacks it.
Contact-induced constructional change

• A typology based on the degree to which a construction is altered as a result of contact:
  • an existing construction is used more frequently
  • an existing construction is used for a new function
There was once an old woman. (Breu 2012:281)
### Colloquial Upper Sorbian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StdUS</th>
<th>CUS</th>
<th>Ge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>běše</td>
<td>běše</td>
<td>war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jemo</td>
<td>jemo</td>
<td>einmal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>jena</td>
<td>eine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stara</td>
<td>stara</td>
<td>alte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žona</td>
<td>žona</td>
<td>Frau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| it.NOM be.3sIPF once a.NOM.F old.NOM.F woman.NOM.F |
| it.NOM be.3sPST once a.NOM.F old.NOM.F woman.NOM. |

‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

- StUS has no clause-initial pronoun
‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

- StUS has no clause-initial pronoun
- CUS uses *to* ‘it’ + ‘be’ here
‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

• StUS has no clause-initial pronoun

• CUS uses *to ‘it’ + ‘be’* here, imitating Ge *es ‘it’ + ‘be’*
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

StdUS  Ø  běše  jemo  Ø  stara  žona
CUS  To  běše  jemo  jena  stara  žona
        it.NOM  be.3sIPF  once  a.NOM.F  old.NOM.F  woman.NOM.F

Ge  Es  war  einmal  eine  alte  Frau
        it.NOM  be.3sPST  once  a.NOM.F  old.NOM.F  woman.NOM

‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

• StdUS has no clause-initial pronoun
• CUS uses to + ‘be’ here, imitating Ge es + ‘be’
• CUS to is the neuter singular form of the neutral demonstrative.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

**CUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>jo</th>
<th>te</th>
<th>blido.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it. NOM</td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
<td>the. NOM.Ns</td>
<td>table. NOM.Ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Das</th>
<th>ist</th>
<th>der</th>
<th>Tisch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that. NOM.N</td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
<td>the. NOM.Ms</td>
<td>table. NOM.Ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘That is the table.’

**Cz**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>je</th>
<th>student.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it. NOM</td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
<td>student. NOM.M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That’s a student.’

**Po**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>jest</th>
<th>mój</th>
<th>brat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it. NOM</td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
<td>my. NOM.M</td>
<td>brother. NOM.M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘That’s my brother.’
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUS</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>jo</th>
<th>te</th>
<th>blido.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it.NOM</td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
<td>the.NOM.Ns</td>
<td>table.NOM.Ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ge</th>
<th>Das</th>
<th>ist</th>
<th>der</th>
<th>Tisch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that.NOM.N</td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
<td>the.NOM.Ms</td>
<td>table.NOM.Ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘That is the table.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cz</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>je</th>
<th>student.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it.NOM</td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
<td>student.NOM.M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That’s a student.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Po</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>jest</th>
<th>mój</th>
<th>brat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it.NOM</td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
<td>my.NOM.M</td>
<td>brother.NOM.M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘That’s my brother.’

- *to* is referential
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  To  běše  jemo  jena  stara  žona
it.NOM  be.3sIPF  once  a.NOM.F  old.NOM.F  woman.NOM.F

Ge  Es  war  einmal  eine  alte  Frau
it.NOM  be.3sPST  once  a.NOM.F  old.NOM.F  woman.NOM
‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

CUS  To  jo  te  blido.
it.NOM  be.3sPRS  the.NOM.Ns  table.NOM.Ns
‘That is the table.’
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS

\textit{To} \textit{běše} \textit{jemo} \textit{jena} \textit{stara} \textit{žona}

\textit{it.NOM} \textit{be.3sIPF} \textit{once} \textit{a.NOM.F} \textit{old.NOM.F} \textit{woman.NOM.F}

GE

\textit{Es} \textit{war} \textit{einemal} \textit{eine} \textit{alte} \textit{Frau}

\textit{it.NOM} \textit{be.3sPST} \textit{once} \textit{a.NOM.F} \textit{old.NOM.F} \textit{woman.NOM}

‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

CUS

\textit{To} \textit{jo} \textit{te} \textit{blido}.

\textit{it.NOM} \textit{be.3sPRS} \textit{the.NOM.Ns} \textit{table.NOM.Ns}

‘That is the table.’

- In the construction that CUS has copied, CUS \textit{to} and Ge \textit{es} are non-referential dummies.
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CUS  \textit{To} \textit{běše} \textit{jemo} \textit{jena} \textit{stara} \textit{žona}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
  it.NOM & be.3sIPF & once & a.NOM.F & old.NOM.F & woman.NOM.F \\
\end{tabular}

Ge  \textit{Es} \textit{war} \textit{einemal} \textit{eine} \textit{alte} \textit{Frau}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
  it.NOM & be.3sPST & once & a.NOM.F & old.NOM.F & woman.NOM \\
\end{tabular}

‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

CUS  \textit{To} \textit{jo} \textit{te} \textit{blido}.
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
  it.NOM & be.3sPRS & the.NOM.Ns & table.NOM.Ns \\
\end{tabular}

‘That is the table.’

- In the construction that CUS has copied, CUS \textit{to} and Ge \textit{es} are non-referential dummies.

- Use of the existing CUS \textit{to} ‘it’ + ‘be’ construction, where \textit{to} is referential, …
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  
$\textbf{To} \quad \text{běše} \quad \text{jemo} \quad \text{jena} \quad \text{stara} \quad \text{žona}$  
it.NOM \quad be.3sIPF \quad once \quad a.NOM.F \quad old.NOM.F \quad woman.NOM.F

Ge  
$\textbf{Es} \quad \text{war} \quad \text{einstmal} \quad \text{eine} \quad \text{alte} \quad \text{Frau}$  
it.NOM \quad be.3sPST \quad once \quad a.NOM.F \quad old.NOM.F \quad woman.NOM

‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

CUS  
$\textbf{To} \quad \text{jo} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{blido}$  
it.NOM \quad be.3sPRS \quad the.NOM.Ns \quad table.NOM.Ns

‘That is the table.’

• In the construction that CUS has copied, CUS $\textbf{to}$ and Ge $\textbf{es}$ are non-referential dummies.

• Use of the existing CUS $\textbf{to}$ ‘it’ + ‘be’ construction, where $\textbf{to}$ is referential, has been extended to the ‘there is’ presentational function, where $\textbf{to}$ becomes non-referential...
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS

To běše jemo jena stara žona
it.NOM be.3sIPF once a.NOM.F old.NOM.F woman.NOM.F

Ge

Es war einmal eine alte Frau
it.NOM be.3sPST once a.NOM.F old.NOM.F woman.NOM
‘There was once an old woman.’ (Breu 2012:281)

CUS

To jo te blido.
it.NOM be.3sPRS the.NOM.Ns table.NOM.Ns
‘That is the table.’

• In the construction that CUS has copied, CUS to and Ge es are non-referential dummies.

• Use of the existing CUS to + ‘be’ construction, where to is referential, has been extended to the presentational function, where to becomes non-referential.

• This is a new function for the CUS to + ‘be’ construction, to judge from the Polish and Czech examples on the previous screen.
Contact-induced constructional change

• A typology based on the degree to which a construction is altered as a result of contact:
  • an existing construction is used more frequently
  • an existing construction is used for a new function
  • an existing construction is formally modified, i.e. constructional calquing
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  To  so  hrimoce.
it.NOM  REFL  thunder.3sPRS

Ge  Es  donnert.
it.NOM  thunder.3sPRS
‘It is thundering.’
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  To  so  hrimoce.
    it.NOM REFL thunder.3sPRS

Ge  Es  donnert.
    it.NOM thunder.3sPRS

‘It is thundering.’

CUS  To  jo  dźěwećich.
    it.NOM be.3sPRS nine.o’clock

Ge  Es  ist  neun  Uhr.
    it.NOM be.3sPRS nine o’clock

‘It is nine o’clock.’
## Colloquial Upper Sorbian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUS</th>
<th>To so hrimoce.</th>
<th>To jo dźěwećich.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it.NOM REFL thunder.3sPRS</td>
<td>it.NOM be.3sPRS nine.o’.clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Es donnert.</td>
<td>Es ist neun Uhr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it.NOM thunder.3sPRS</td>
<td>it.NOM be.3sPRS nine o’.clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It is thundering.’</td>
<td>‘It is nine o’clock.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>Ø prší.</td>
<td>Ø Je děvet hodin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rain.3sPRS</td>
<td>be.3sPRS nine o’.clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It is raining.’</td>
<td>‘It is nine o’clock.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Pada śnieg.</td>
<td>Ø Jest godzina piątą.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall.3sPRS snow.NOM.M</td>
<td>be.3sPRS o’.clock five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It’s snowing.’</td>
<td>‘It is five o’clock.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expletive *to*

**CUS**

*To* bu fajge bóło, [nic hin-hić].

- *it.NOM* be.3sSBJV cowardly be.PTCP.sN NEG DEIC-go.INF

**Ge**

*Es* wäre feige, [nicht hin-zu-gehen].

- *it.NOM* be.3sIPF.SBJV cowardly

‘It would be cowardly not to go.’
### Colloquial Upper Sorbian

**Expletive to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUS</td>
<td>To bu fajge bóło, [nic hin-hić].</td>
<td>It would be cowardly not to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Es wäre feige, [nicht hin-zu-gehen].</td>
<td>‘It would be cowardly not to go.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>Ø je možno to změnit.</td>
<td>‘It is possible to change it.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Ø Ø szkoda mówić.</td>
<td>‘It’s pointless to discuss it.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Language in use consists of intersecting constructions
• Contact may affect just one construction represented in a given clause or sentence
Language in use consists of intersecting constructions

Contact may affect just one construction represented in a given clause or sentence

CUS has copied the impersonal construction *es + weather verb* from German,

but retains the CUS argument structure construction of the verb ‘thunder’, which is reflexive
## Colloquial Upper Sorbian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUS</td>
<td><em>To</em></td>
<td>that.NOM.N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jo</em></td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>te</em></td>
<td>the.NOM.Ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>blido.</em></td>
<td>table.NOM.Ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge</td>
<td><em>Das</em></td>
<td>that.NOM.N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ist</em></td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>der</em></td>
<td>the.NOM.Ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tisch.</em></td>
<td>table.NOM.Ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td><em>To</em></td>
<td>that.NOM.N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>je</em></td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>student.</em></td>
<td>student.NOM.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td><em>To</em></td>
<td>that.NOM.N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jest</em></td>
<td>be.3sPRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>mój</em></td>
<td>my.NOM.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brother.NOM.M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *to is referential*
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  Čora   jo   so   Ø  hrimotało.
yesterday  be.3sPRS  REFL  thunder.PTCP.N

Ge  Gestern  hat  Ø  es  gedonnert.
yesterday  have.3sPRS  it.NOM  thunder.PTCP

‘Yesterday it thundered.’

CUS  dókejš  Ø   jo   zno   śwěťtlo …
because  be.3sPRS  already  bright

Ge  weil  es  schon  hell  ist …
because  it.NOM  already  daylight  be.3sPRS

‘because it is already daylight…’

• In the constructions where CUS has extended the use of to on the model of Ge es, to only occurs clause-initially.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS Čora jo so hrimotało.
yesterday be.3sPRS REFL thunder.PTCP.

Ge Gestern hat es gedonnert.
yesterday have.3sPRS it.NOM thunder.PTCP

‘Yesterday it thundered.’

CUS dókejš Ø jo zno śwěťło …
because be.3sPRS already bright

Ge weil es schon hell ist …
because it.NOM already daylight be.3sPRS

‘because it is already daylight…’

• In the constructions where CUS has extended the use of to on the model of Ge es, to only occurs clause-initially.

• If an adverb or a conjunction assumes clause-initial position, to does not occur.
The clause structures of the CUS and Ge adverbial clause constructions with ‘because’ don’t match.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

**CUS**

Ø  mi  so  dere  dźo.
  me.DAT  REFL  well  go.3sPRS

‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes itself to-me well.’)

**Ge**

Es  geht  mir  gut.
  it.NOM  go.3sPRS  me.DAT  well

‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes to-me well.’)

• The CUS expression is a translation of the Ge
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  Ø  mi  so  dere  dźo.
     me.DAT  REFL  well  go.3sPRS
‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes itself to-me well.’)  

Ge  Es  geht  mir  gut.
     it.NOM  go.3sPRS  me.DAT  well
‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes to-me well.’)

• The CUS expression is a translation of the Ge
  • with a dative experiencer as in Ge
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  Ø  mi  so  dere  dżo.  *To  so  mi  dere  dżo.
me.DAT  REFL  well  go.3sPRS
‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes itself to-me well.’)

Ge  Es  geht  mir  gut.
it.NOM  go.3sPRS  me.DAT  well
‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes to-me well.’)

- The CUS expression is a translation of the Ge
  - with a dative experiencer as in Ge
  - but the impersonal construction represented by German es is encoded in Slavic manner by a reflexive pronoun, not by to
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  Ø  mi  so  dere  dźo.  
     me.DAT  REFL  well  go.3sPRS  
‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes itself to-me well.’)

Ge   Es  geht  mir  gut.  
     it.NOM  go.3sPRS  me.DAT  well  
‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes to-me well.’)

Cz   Jak  se  máš?  

Po   Jak  się  masz?  
     how  REFL  have.2sPRS

• The CUS expression is a translation of the Ge
  • with a dative experiencer as in Ge
  • but the impersonal construction is encoded in Slavic manner by a reflexive pronoun, not by to

• Polish and Czech metaphor uses the verb ‘have’ with a reflexive pronoun
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  Ø  mi  so  dere  džo.  *To so mi dere džo.
    me.DAT  REFL  well  go.3sPRS
‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes itself to-me well.’)

Ge    Es  geht  mir  gut.
    it.NOM  go.3sPRS  me.DAT  well
‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes to-me well.’)

• Despite being a translation, this phrase has not been affected by the extension of the *to construction.
  • probably because it is very frequently used
  • frequently used items are less susceptible to change (Bybee 2007).
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  Ø  mi  so  dere  dżo.  *To  so  mi  dere  dżo.  
me.DAT  REFL  well  go.3sPRS

‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes itself to-me well.’)

Ge  Es  geht  mir  gut.  
it.NOM  go.3sPRS  me.DAT  well

‘I am well’ (lit. ‘It goes to-me well.’)

• Despite being a translation, this phrase has not been affected by the extension of the to construction.
  • probably because it is very frequently used
  • frequently used items are less susceptible to change (Bybee 2007).

• Compare the preservation of the British English greeting How do you do? in the face of the rise of the progressive, as in How are you doing? (Tottie 1991).
Contact-induced constructional change

• A typology based on the degree to which a construction is altered as a result of contact:
  • an existing construction is used more frequently
  • an existing construction is used for a new function
  • an existing construction is formally modified, i.e. constructional calquing
  • an existing construction is structurally altered to more closely match a corresponding ML construction, i.e. metatypy occurs.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

- Constituent order in clauses
- **Link** (= Topic), **Focus** (Vallduví 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cz</th>
<th>Pavel</th>
<th>zabil</th>
<th>Petra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavel.NOM</td>
<td>killed</td>
<td>Petr.ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Pavel killed Petr.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petra</th>
<th>zabil</th>
<th>Pavel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petr.ACC</td>
<td>killed</td>
<td>Pavel.NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Petr was killed by Pavel.’/‘It was Pavel who killed Petr.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavel</th>
<th>Petra</th>
<th>zabil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavel.NOM</td>
<td>Petr.ACC</td>
<td>killed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Pavel killed Petr.’/‘Killed was what Petr did to Pavel.’
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

Cz  My  
we  AUX.1pPRS  REFL.ACC  study-PTCP.p

‘We studied/were studying.’

\textit{Učil-a}  \textit{se}-s?  \textit{(se-s < jse se)}
study-PTCP.f  AUX.2sPRS-REFL

Were you studying?

- There is a complication in Czech: auxiliaries are second-position (Wackernagel) clitics

- The history of auxiliary cliticisation in Polish is somewhat complicated, but it is likely that Czech is more conservative in this regard (Borsley & Rivero 1994, Migdalski 2004)
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  To  ja  z  ruku  šo wółpokwem  S...O...V
that.ACC  I  with  hand.sINS  all  wash.up
‘I’ll wash all that up by hand.’

CUS  zo  tam  jen  pólcaj  prede  towowawta  stój.
that  there  a.NOM  policeman  in.front.of  the  car.GEN.N  stand.3sPST
‘(he saw) that a policeman was standing there in front of the car.’

• Unlike all other Slavic languages, by default a CUS clause is verb-final.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  *To ja z ruku *šo  *wólpokwem*  S...O...V
that.ACC  I  with  hand.sINS  all  wash.up
‘I’ll wash all that up by hand.’

CUS  *zo tam jen pólcaj prede towa awta*  *stój.*
that  there  a.NOM  policeman  in.front.of  the  car.GEN.N  stand.3sPST
‘(he saw) that a policeman was standing there in front of the car.’

• Unlike all other Slavic languages, by default a CUS clause is verb-final.

CUS  *Čora jo so hrimotało.*  SAux...O...v
yesterday  be.3sPRS  REFL  thunder.N.PTCP
‘Yesterday it thundered.’

• An **auxiliary** is in **second** position (as in Czech)
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  To  ja  z  ruku  šo  wólpokwem  S...O...V
that.ACC  I  with  hand.sINS  all  wash.up
‘I’ll wash all that up by hand.’

CUS  zo  tam  jen  pólcaj  prede  towo  awta  stój.
that  there  a.NOM  policeman  in.front.of  the  car.GEN.N  stand.3sPST
‘(he saw) that a policeman was standing there in front of the car.’

• Unlike all other Slavic languages, by default a CUS clause is verb-final.

CUS  Čora  jo  so  hrimotało.  SAux...O...v
yesterday  be.3sPRS  REFL  thunder.N.PTCP
‘Yesterday it thundered.’

• An **auxiliary** is in second position (as in Czech)

• Its **dependent lexical verb** is in final position.
German

Ge  Gestern  *sah*  ich  im  Park  einen  Mann.
yesterday  saw.1sPST  I  in.the.sDAT.M  park  a.sACC.M  man
‘Yesterday I saw a man in the park.’

• Main (independent) clauses are verb-second (V2).

X  V  (S)…O  ...

*sa*
German

Gestern *sah* ich im Park einen Mann.

‘Yesterday I saw a man in the park.’

- Main (independent) clauses are verb-second (V2).

Gestern *habe* ich im Park einen Mann *gesehen*.

‘Yesterday I saw a man in the park.’

- If there is an auxiliary, it occupies V2 position and the dependent lexical verb is clause-final.

X V (S)...O

X Aux (S)...O v
German

Der Mann, den ich gestern im Park **sah**…

The man, REL.sACC.M I yesterday in.the sDAT.M park saw.1sPST

‘The man I saw in the park yesterday …’

- Subordinate clauses are **verb-final**.
The man I saw in the park yesterday …

- Subordinate clauses are verb-final.

The man I saw in the park yesterday …

- If there is an auxiliary in a subordinate clause, it occupies final position and usually follows the dependent lexical verb.
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  S...O...V or SAux...O...v
Ge  Main:  S...V...O or SAux...O...v
Ge  Subord: S...O...V or S...O...v Aux

• If we compare the structures of the two languages (ignoring Ge V2, which doesn’t greatly affect the comparison), we see that

  • CUS SOV matches the Ge subordinate clause construction, and
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS  S...O...V  or  SAux...O...v

Ge  Main:  S...V...O  or  SAux...O...v

Ge  Subord:  S...O...V  or  S...O...vAux

• If we compare the structures of the two languages (ignoring Ge V2, which doesn’t greatly affect the comparison), we see that

• **CUS SOV** matches the Ge subordinate clause construction, and

• **CUS SAuxOV** matches the Ge main clause construction
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

CUS \[ S\ldots O\ldots V \text{ or } SAux[\ldots O\ldots ]v \]

Ge Main: \[ S\ldots V\ldots O \text{ or } SAux[\ldots O\ldots ]v \]

Ge Subord: \[ S\ldots O\ldots V \text{ or } S\ldots O\ldots vAux \]

- Sorbian, like German, has a *Satzklammer*, a clausal bracket construction \[ SAux[\ldots O\ldots ]v \] with
  - the auxiliary in second-position and
  - the dependent lexical verb at the end
- These constituents bracket most of the rest of the clause.
• How did the Sorbian lexical verb come to be positioned at the end of the clause?
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

- More likely that Sorbian copied a Ge main clause construction than a subordinate clause construction.
- This would have been the Ge SAuxOV main-clause construction, as its auxiliary position matched that of Sorbian S(Aux)OV.

CUS: $S\ldots O\ldots V$ or $SAux\ldots O\ldots V$
Ge Main: $S\ldots V\ldots O$ or $SAux\ldots O\ldots V$
Ge Subord: $S\ldots O\ldots V$ or $S\ldots O\ldots VAux$
Colloquial Upper Sorbian

• More likely that Sorbian copied a Ge main clause construction than a subordinate clause construction

• This would have been the Ge SAuxOV main-clause construction, as its auxiliary position matched that of Sorbian S(Aux)OV.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CUS} & \quad S\ldots O\ldots V \quad \text{or} \quad S\text{Aux}\ldots O\ldots V \\
\text{Ge Main:} & \quad S\ldots V\ldots O \quad \text{or} \quad S\text{Aux}\ldots O\ldots V \\
\text{Ge Subord:} & \quad S\ldots O\ldots V \quad \text{or} \quad S\ldots O\ldots V\text{Aux}
\end{align*}
\]

• Since in early West Slavic there was flexible clause order, the clitic Auxiliary being the only fixed position, it was natural for speakers to treat SAuxOV as a variant of SOV, later expanding use of the latter by analogy.
Shift-induced change:

- Shift that entails imperfect language learning by adults.
- Such cases are relatively rare.
• 1169 Anglo-Norman invasion: English entered Ireland
  • Language of majority continued to be Irish Gaelic, a Celtic language.

• around 1750: English began to spread among people of Irish descent—British were economically and politically dominant

• 1750–1900: Language shift: bilingualism in Irish and English became established first in and around Belfast and Dublin and spread outwards from the cities, leading to language shift (McCafferty 2004)
Contact-induced constructional change

• A typology based on the degree to which a construction is altered as a result of contact:
  • an existing construction is used more frequently
  • an existing construction is used for a new function
  • an existing construction is formally modified, i.e. constructional calquing
  • an existing construction is structurally altered to more closely match a corresponding ML construction, i.e. metatypy occurs.
Rural Irish English

• An existing construction is used more frequently

  BrEn  It’s John who went to Derry yesterday. (i.e. not David etc)

• Clefting is used in British English for contrastive focus
Rural Irish English

• An existing construction is used more frequently
  
  **BrEn**  *It’s John who went to Derry yesterday.* (i.e. not David etc)

• Clefting is used in British English for contrastive focus
  
  **BrEn**  *John went to Derry yesterday.* (i.e. not David etc)

• British English also uses intonation for this purpose, with a high falling tone

• Irish regularly uses clefts for this purpose, resulting in a higher incidence of clefts in rural Irish English than in British English (Harris 1991:198).
Rural Irish English

- An existing construction is used for a new function
- Irish English clefts differ from Standard English clefts both functionally and syntactically, on the model of Irish.
Rural Irish English

• An existing construction is used for a new function

• Irish English clefts differ from Standard English clefts both functionally and syntactically, on the model of Irish.

A father asks his son, ‘What has happened to you?’ The son answers,

IrEn  It was Mícheál Rua who gave me a beating. (Filppula 1986)

IrGa  Mícheál Rua  a  bhuail  mé
       Mícheál Rua  REL  beat  me

• In Irish, clefting is used not only for contrastive focus. It is also used for sentence focus, where all the information is new. It also occurs in this function in Irish English (Harris 1991:198).
Rural Irish English

• An existing construction is used for a new function

• Irish English clefts differ from Standard English clefts both functionally and syntactically, on the model of Irish.

A father asks his son, ‘What has happened to you?’ The son answers,

IrEn  It was Mícheál Rua who gave me a beating. (Filppula 1986)

IrGa  Mícheál Rua  a  bhuail  mé
      Mícheál Rua  REL  beat  me

• In Irish, clefting is used not only for contrastive focus. It is also used for sentence focus, where all the information is new. It also occurs in this function in Irish English (Harris 1991:198).

• In British English this is pragmatically infelicitous, as it presupposes that there has already been mention of the son receiving a beating
Rural Irish English

• An existing construction is formally modified, i.e. constructional calquing

• In Standard English clefts the elements that may be extracted as focal constituents are limited to
  • subject NP
  • object NP
  • complement of preposition
  • certain types of adjunct

• Verbs, subject complements, and manner adjuncts cannot be extracted.
Rural Irish English

IrGa  Is ag déanamh a chuid ceachtannaí atá Tadhg.
is at doing his portion lessons REL.be Tim

IrEn  It’s doing his lessons that Tim is. (Focus = non-tensed VP; Harris 1991:197)
‘Tim is doing his lessons’/‘What Tim is doing is his lessons.’
**Rural Irish English**

IrGa  *Is ag déanamh a chuid ceachtannaí atá Tadhg.*  
is at doing his portion lessons  
REL.be Tim

IrEn  *It’s doing his lessons that Tim is.*  
(Focus = non-tensed VP; Harris 1991:197)  
‘Tim is doing his *lessons*’/‘What Tim is doing is his *lessons*.’

IrGa  *Is caochta atá sé*  
is drunk  
REL.be he

IrEn  *It’s drunk he is.*  
(Focus = subject complement: Harris 1991:198)  
‘He’s *drunk.*’/‘What he is is *drunk.*’
Rural Irish English

IrGa  Is ag déanamh a chuid ceachtannáí atá Tadhg.
   is at doing his portion lessons REL.be Tim

IrEn  It’s doing his lessons that Tim is. (Focus = non-tensed VP; Harris 1991:197)
   ‘Tim is doing his lessons’/‘What Tim is doing is his lessons.’

IrGa  Is caochta atá sé
   is drunk REL.be he

IrEn  It’s drunk he is. (Focus = subject complement: Harris 1991:198)
   ‘He’s drunk.’/‘What he is is drunk.’

IrGa  Níg o=maith a chonaic sé iad
   is.not well REL see.PST he them

IrEn  It’s not well he saw them. (Focus = manner adverb; Harris 1991:198)
   ‘He didn’t see them well.’
Rural Irish English

IrEn  *They are after [doing the work].*  
They have (just) completed the work.’ (Hickey 2010:156, 2013:95)

IrGa  *Tá siad tar éis [an obair a dhéanamh]*  
bePRS they after the work COMP do.VERBAL.NOUN  
‘They have done the work.’ (McCafferty 2004:114)

IrEn  *She’s after [selling the boat].*  
‘She has just sold the boat.’ (Harris 1991:205)

IrGa  *Tá sí tréis [an bán a dhíol]*  
bePRS she after the boat COMP sell  
‘She has sold the boat.’ (Harris 1991:205)
Rural Irish English

• An existing construction is structurally altered to more closely match a corresponding ML construction, i.e. metatypy occurs.
Conclusions

• Contact-induced constructional change is evidently constrained by two sets of factors (Muysken 2013)
• Contact-induced constructional change is evidently constrained by two sets of factors (Muysken 2013)
  • Features of the languages in contact: the typological distance between them and whether they are morphosyntactically and semantically transparent (Johanson 2002:44–47)
Conclusions

• Contact-induced constructional change is evidently constrained by two sets of factors (Muysken 2013)
  • Features of the languages in contact: the typological distance between them and whether they are morphosyntactically and semantically transparent (Johanson 2002:44–47)
  • Speakers’ recognition of congruence between their two languages, which determines where copying can occur to render them yet more congruent.
Conclusions

- Outcomes of
  - Bilingually induced change:
    - large-scale lexical calquing, increased complexity, and occasionally metatypy
Conclusions

• Outcomes of
  • Bilingually induced change:
    • large-scale lexical calquing, increased complexity, and occasionally metatypy
  • Shift-induced change:
    • phonological copying and occasionally decreased complexity
Thank you