Chapter 11

Modeling accommodation and dialect convergence formally: Loss of the infinitival prefix *tau* ‘to’ in Brazilian Pomeranian

Gertjan Postma

Various pathways with their respective outcomes of multi-dialect interaction have been described in the literature: leveling in the sense of the erasure of linguistic communal differentiation, interdialect formation with compromise forms or fudging, and reallocation of doubles to distinct functions. In this paper we re-evaluate a well-known, but often ignored mechanism and outcome: retreat to default settings, the rise of the unmarked, i.e. whenever the result of the change is not a sum or subset of the input forms, but an innovative pattern. Two related models are developed, one for koineization and one for accommodation, that can serve as an evaluation scheme for a language change. The case study pursued is the loss of the infinitival prefix *tau* ‘to’ in Pomeranian, a West Germanic language, extinct in Europe, but still spoken in isolated communities in Brazil. While the original Pomeranian dialects in Europe had a considerable variation in this particular domain, Pomeranian in Brazil has converged to a remarkably uniform new construction, which was not present in Pomerania in the days of emigration. We show that underlying structures remain constant in all Pomeranian dialects, European as well as Brazilian Pomeranian, but the spellout pattern in Brazil is the cross-linguistic default.

1 Introduction

Dialectology and sociolinguistics do not only have a value in themselves, they also offer a window to the formal aspects of language and may function as a
methodology to reveal underlying structures of natural language. Especially lan-
guage contact in which the result transcends the input variants and where the
final state is no obvious function (addition, selection, split, superposition, etc.) of
the initial state, is a valuable tool for formal research. In this study we report on
dialect convergence of a set of mutually intelligible dialects and its outcome. We
discuss a grammatical change in a language island in Brazil: the loss of the infiniti-
tival prefix *tau* ‘to’ in Pomeranian, a West Germanic language. We will argue that
the dialectology and sociolinguistics of this minority language provide evidence
for the T-to-C movement in infinitival constructions, as was argued for in Peset-
sky & Torrego (2007). First we give a brief overview of the various mechanisms
of convergence that have been discussed in the literature, as well as other mecha-
nisms of language change, especially convergence and accommodation. Then, as
a background, we give a description of the nature of the complementizer and the
infinitival prefix in Pomeranian. In §3 we discuss a possible source of the change:
the original Pomeranian dialects in Europe had considerable variation in this
particular domain. The pattern of this variation is investigated as well as the un-
derlying syntactic pattern. We list two mechanisms of resolving this variation:
convergence of the various dialects to a new koine and accommodation to Por-
tuguese and repeat the arguments, developed in our 2016 study. The arguments
that lead in our previous publication to the conclusion that accommodation to
Portuguese is not likely to have given direction and impetus to the change, but
rather dialect-internal convergence within the Pomeranian diasystem, still hold.
But these must be balanced by new considerations of occurrence frequency.

2 Contact-induced language change

While traditional diachronic linguistic has focused on language change by in-
herent processes, such as (phonological) erosion and inherent instabilities of lin-
guistic cycles (e.g. Jespersen’s cycle), modern sociolinguistics has made contact-
induced language change a major object of investigation. For instance, the ar-
rival of considerable numbers of immigrants usually changes the dynamics of
a community thoroughly and its language with it. Colonization, e.g. the settle-
ment of various dialect speakers in a foreign country, usually gives rise to new
social dynamics, a new society, and a language with new properties. Two ex-
treme cases are noteworthy: the circumstance of huge immigration of mutually
unintelligible speakers, outside the immediate realm of a roof language, may ini-
tiate a creolisation process: the emergence of a completely new structure, albeit
with words of various source languages (Bickerton 1981). The other end of the
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spectrum is the circumstance of a linguistically inhomogeneous but mutually intelligible group of immigrants, which by some social factor is isolated from the environment. This creates a so called language island, where the various source dialects converge to a new koinè (Frings 1936, Rosenberg 2005). Finally, there is the more moderate circumstance when an (immigrant) group has moderate contact with the dominant group "outside", the superstrate. In such interactions two processes can be observed: the influence of the minority language on the dominant language, usually by the switch of immigrants to the dominant language (substrate effect, Van Coetsem’s source-language agentivity), and the influence of the dominant language on the minority language (accommodation, prestige, Van Coetsem’s recipient-language agentivity (van Coetsem 1988). It may be clear that an actual situation never realizes one of these processes in pure form. Accommodation goes together with convergence, creolisation is not always clearly separable from convergence.

2.1 Accommodation

Accommodation is omnipresent in linguistic interactions. When an American hears a speaker who pronounces /o/ in socks lower, i.e. identical to sacks, he nevertheless perceives it as /o/ if it is embedded in a broader context (Labov 1994: 68-70). The process is automatic and usually unconscious. This is accommodation in perception. Accommodation in production is a speaker’s adaptation to a hearer in a specific situation. This can be in lexis when one speaks to young children. It can be changes in phonology if one talks with friends in a bar, etc. It is also possible to accommodate in syntactic structures. When accommodation becomes systematic, and conventionalized, it is a source of language change, for instance if it occurs in a linguistic group in interaction with another linguistic group.

Though accommodation is used in the literature in various senses, I will reserve it in this paper to the situation where a group of speakers changes its language in order to become acceptable or intelligible to another group, usually the dominant, more prestigious group, i.e. it is asymmetric. It is also possible to accommodate the superstrate language to some minority group, i.e. to a substrate. For instance, if Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands use more often periphrastic constructions to realize the V2 constraint in Dutch, it might be seen as an accommodation strategy to retain the basic SOV structure in accommodation to the more rigid SOV order in their Turkish mother tongue (Van de Craats 2009).
2.2 Koineisation

While accommodation is conceptually an asymmetric process – one language accommodates to another – koineisation is, at least conceptually, a process whereby language variants influence each other. The process is, conceptually at least, symmetric (Gumperz & Wilson 1971). The mechanism involved is convergence. Koineisation may give rise to a Sprachbund, but it most typically occurs in Sprachinseln, language islands: settlements with colonist of various dialect regions. Such (German) language islands were studied “as relics from the past” (Rosenberg, op. cit. 222) from the 19th century onwards, though the explicit mechanisms of the changes only received attention in the 20th century. Rosenberg notices that the language islands are not homogeneous, neither linguistically nor socially. “(...) they were often inhabited by settlers of different origins, i.e. by speakers of different dialects” (Rosenberg 2005: 223). Below we mention four mechanisms by which the process of koineisation can come about: leveling, interdialect formation, reallocation, and retreat to the default settings. The first and the last mechanism can be considered simplification (L1-L2 language contact), the other two mechanisms are complexification in the sense of Trudgill 2011: they typically occur with 2L1 language contact (bilingualism).

2.2.1 Leveling

Most researchers mention leveling as the major process of new dialect formation in closed immigrant groups. It is the process of eliminating prominent stereotypable features of the input dialects Dillard (1972). Notice that all stereotypable features and locally specific features are typically the first to be eliminated (Thelander 1980, Hinskens 1996). The process is symmetrical, despite the fact that the result is eliminating a certain feature from one of the two dialects in interaction. In many cases, it leads to reduction of inflectional paradigms and morphology in general.

2.2.2 Interdialect formation

Interdialect formation is the rise of compromise forms. In the case of two dialects, this can be by simple optionality of two forms, by neutralization of the feature that defines the two forms, or by superposing the two forms. Chambers & Trudgill (1998) mentions the case of [ʌ] and [ʊ] in strut in East Anglia, which merge around the isogloss to [ɤ]. A clear example of the superposing process, mentioned in Hinskens (1996: 366) is the emergence of superheavy syllables on the borderline of Limburgian dialects. The eastern dialect has [x] drop
in _nacht_ [naxt] 'night' under compensatory lengthening of the vowel ([na:t]). The dialect west of the isogloss has [naxt]. On the borderline, new forms such as [na:xt], i.e. with both [x] and the long vowel can be observed. In the latter case, the superposed form is clearly a transitional phenomenon, under the assumption that superheavy syllables are marked. A more complex syntactic example is given in Postma (2014), where on the borderline of two Limburgian dialects with two types of Verb-second (the German type with uniform C-V2, and the Dutch type with C-V2 and T-V2), complex V-AGR-T forms emerge, such as _klöp-s-de_ ‘knock.2sg-ED’. This can be explained if the interdialect complies with both types of V2: the V complex moving to C skipping T, where AGR is the so-called COMP-inflection. This mechanism clearly works on underlying rules, rather than on surface forms. Once again, these superposed forms are marked and often transitional (cf. Cornips 2006).

2.2.3 Reallocation

Just like the previous mechanism, reallocation gives rise to complexification. Reallocation takes two or more inputs from source dialects and redistributes these over two or three sub-contexts. As an illustration, I give a simple lexical example. In the Italian immigrant city of Jundiai in Brazil, people use both the Portuguese word _pavor_ [pa’vor] 'fear’ and the Italian word _paura_ [pa’ura] 'fear’ in their _Caipira_ version of Portuguese, but limit _paura_ for the meaning 'strong fear’. Britain (1997) and Taeldeman (1989) provide more complex phonological cases where two alternates from source dialects distribute in a contact dialect. The distribution is _rule-governed_. These are, of course, the more interesting cases linguistically, because they potentially shed light on underlying linguistic processes.

2.2.4 Retreat to the default

The final mechanism that I would like to mention, is retreat to the default. If two dialects, one with a marked, the other with an unmarked setting in some feature come in contact, the result tends to the unmarked setting. For instance if there are two features involved, say, F₁ and F₂, and if we call + the marked and ø the unmarked value, contact of a dialect with [+F₁, øF₂] and a dialect with [øF₁, +F₂] might give rise to the new variant [øF₁, øF₂]. Dependent on the nature and abstractness of F₁ and F₂, the contact variant might have a rather different appearance without obvious connection to the properties of the source dialects. In Postma (2004, 2012), I give a case of two variants of late Middle Dutch (MD), that lack a reflexive pronoun, i.e. these dialects circumvent the Binding
Theory, albeit for different (marked) mechanisms. Cross-linguistically, the reflexivity of pronouns is dependent of feature underspecification, typically number, but also person, or case (Reuland & Reinhart 1995), while referential pronouns are (fully) specified. By a marked parameter setting, however, the referential pronoun, MD *hem ’him’ had number underspecification in the Southern Dutch dialects (meaning either ’him’ or ’them’) and could be used as a reflexive, while it had ACC/OBLIQUE underspecification in the Northern dialects (cf. Hoekstra 1994 for modern Frisian). Both settings are marked settings, cf. Table 1.

Table 1: Feature analysis of a koineisation process in Dutch reflexive constructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Feature Setting</th>
<th>Markedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Southern MD</td>
<td>NP₁ ... hemᵢ</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>+ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Northern MD</td>
<td>NP₁ ... hemᵢ</td>
<td>no yes</td>
<td>0 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. koine</td>
<td>*NP₁ ... hemᵢ / NP₁ ... sickᵢ</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F₁ = Number neutralization in pronouns; F₂ = ACC/OBL neutralization in pronouns.

What we observe then is that both marked strategies are lost in the contact-induced variant. The contact dialect then comes in need of a special, underspecified, reflexive pronoun. It then actively borrows it from neighboring German dialects, first sick, later sich. It was in need of the borrowed form, rather than accommodating to it. The result with a reflexive is a result of contact between two variants without reflexive. It may be clear that the grammatical system is a creative force which transcends the dialectal input. We might call this tendency towards default variant in contact ”micro-creolisation”. What this shows, is that convergence to the default can not only be the result in cases of a set of unrelated source languages without mutually intelligibility, but also in closely related mutually intelligible dialects.

In the next sections, we present a case of contact of many minimally distinct Pomeranian dialects, which merge in a language island in Brazil. We will investigate if retreat to the default is active in this case.

---

1It is slightly more complicated. In the case of oblique, it is the feature inventory that is marked, not the setting. We refer to the paper for the details.
3 European Pomeranian (EP)

3.1 Background

Pomeranian is the dialect (or set of dialects) of Coastal Germanic roughly between the Oder river and the Vistula river, an area which is called Hinterpomern. Until 1945 it was first part of Prussia, later Germany, but lays in present-day Poland. The dialect of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern in present-day Germany is rather different (henceforth Mecklenburgian) and should be discussed separately from Hinterpommersch, henceforth simply Pomeranian. The map in Figure 1 below, slightly adapted from Brockhaus (2012: 128) gives an impression of the Pomeranian area, indicated with ‘Ostpommersch’.

Figure 1: Coastal Germanic in the first decades of the 20th century (after Brockhaus 2012).

Pomerania was Germanized in a geographically scattered way during the so-called Ostsiedlung, the ”going East” of settlers, land developers, and merchants coming from Flandres, Holland, and Frisia and later from the core Saxon areas. The newly emerged variant of Low Saxon, Pomeranian, has been in close contact to High-German and Slavonic, especially Slovincian/Kashubian. The origin from the North Sea area might explain the consistent Ingwaeonisms in the language, characteristics of the North Sea Germanic area, such as loss of /n/ before spirants, development of a -s plural in nouns. The linguistic roof of High German through religion and education explains the many German loans, e.g. in the

---

2Slavonic influence on Pomeranian can be ignored from the 13th century onward, except for Slovincian. In the 20th century, Slovincians were, like the Pomeranians, predominantly Lutheran, and were together with them expelled from the new Polish areas in 1945.
ordinals (*fünft* instead of the expected *fiːwd* 'fifth'), in kinship terms (*grosmuter* instead of the expected *groutmuder* 'grandmother', etc.). Virtually all Pomeranians in Europe were Lutherans.  

A distinguishing feature of the Pomeranian *vis à vis* Mecklenburgian in the west and Low Prusian in the east, is the existence of two infinitival forms: an infinitive in *-a* ([ə] or [ɐ]), and one in *-en* ([ən] or [ŋ], Wrede 1895:295). Two types of infinitives are further encountered in Frisian and North Frisian (Hoekstra 1997: 4-5). In Pomeranian, the infinitive in *-a*, which we call infinitive-1 (*INF1*), is used in clauses under modals, under causatives (*låta* 'let'), *daua* 'do', verbs of motion (*gåa* 'go'), and control predicates, as exemplified by the Wenker-sentence 16b in (1). The example is taken from location 20, the village of Schloenwitz (present-day Słonowice) in the municipality Schivelbein (see map). This schwa-infinitive (*INF1*) is used without complementizer and without infinitival prefix.

(1) European Pomeranian (19th century (Schloenwitz))

Du must eista no 'a inn wass-a
you must first still a bit grow.*INF1
'you must first still grow a bit'

The infinitive in *-en*, which we will call infinitive-2 (*INF2*), is used in embedded infinitivals with a leading complementizer, as exemplified in the Wenker-sentence 16a in (2), again taken from the village of Schloenwitz.

(2) European Pomeranian (19th century (Schloenwitz))

Du bust nog ni groot naug um 'n Flasch Wiin ut-tau-drink-en
you are yet not big enough *COMP a bottle wine* *PRT-to-drink.*INF2
'you are not big enough to drink out a bottle of wine'

In this paper we study the changes in infinitival syntax of such rationale clauses.

---

3 Data for the entire Pommern Province in the year 1932: Lutherans (90.7%), other Protestants (1.3%), Catholics (6.7%), Jews (0.5%). For the region of emigration (cf. the map in Figure 2), the ratio of Lutherans ranges from 97% - 98.9%. Cf. GLFP (1932).

4 Neither Vor-Pommersch (to the West) nor Low Prusian (to the East) participates in this characteristic feature.

5 Alemannic dialects also have two infinitival forms, one in *-a/e* and one in *-i(nt)* (Bayer & Brandner 2004). The syntactic distribution is rather different from the *-ə/ɐ vs -en* infinitive in Coastal Germanic. See also Höhle (2006).

6 The Wenker-sentences are a set of 40 sentences that Georg Wenker used in a questionnaire for dialect research in 1880 in 40,000 locations in Germany. The sentences have also been elicited in The Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Austria, and Switzerland.

7 In the glosses, the following abbreviations are used: *INF1* (infinitive in *-e*), *INF2* (infinitive in *-en*), *PRT* (particle), *COMP* (complementizer), *SG* (singular), *PL* (plural), *REFL* (reflexive), *DAT* (dative), *ACC* (accusative).
4 Variation in the Infinitival Syntax of European Pomeranian

Rationale clauses in European Pomeranian can be studied using the Wenker sentences,\(^8\) that were elicitated around 1880.\(^9\) Using the online database, I checked more than 300 locations in coastal Pomerania i.e. in municipalities Schivelbein, Regenwalde, Belgard, Colberg-Cörlin, Cöslin, Greifenberg, and Schlawe, as the emigration into Espirito Santo was mainly fed from this coastal area (cf. Granzow 2009:167). The various municipalities are indicated in Map Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Municipalities (Kreise) covered in the search on infinitival constructions.](image)

It turns out that there is variation in the realization of this construction in European Pomeranian with respect to the infinitival prefix \(\text{tau} \) ‘to’. Apart from (3a) where, as in Standard German, Dutch and Frisian, both \(\text{um} \) and \(\text{tau} \) are realized, (e.g. \(\text{um} \) and \(\text{zu} \) in German, \(\text{om} \) and \(\text{te} \) in Dutch/Frisian), we observe two alternative patterns in Pomeranian. In one of these, the ‘to’-prefix \(\text{tau} \) remains unrealized (3b), and in another variant, \(\text{um} \), the ‘for’ complementizer, remains unrealized (3c).\(^10\)

---

\(^8\)Cf. Demske (2011). The Margburg digitalization project, led by Jürg Fleischer, made Wenker sentence 16 available through a grid of 1250 datapoints (of the 40,000 data points).

\(^9\)The Wenker sentences are not available in digital format, but scans of the questionnaires can be inspected at www.regionalsprache.de.

\(^10\)These are not necessarily different dialects, as optionality might be involved.
(3) European Pomeranian (1880, Schloenwitz, Lankow, and Schlenzig, resp.)

a. du bust nog nich grot naug üm an Flasch Wiin ut-tau-drinken
b. du bust nog nich grot naug üm an Flasch Wiin ut-ø-drinken
c. du büst no ni groot naug ø ain Flasch Winn
  you are yet not big enough comp a bottle wine
  ut-tau-drinken
  PRT-to-drink.INF2
  'you are not big enough to drink out a bottle of wine'

The fourth conceivable option with both üm ‘for’ and tau ‘to’ unrealized, is not found. We summarize the patterns in Table 2 for the entire coastal area. From now on we will gloss üm as ‘for’ and tau as ‘to’.

**Table 2: Occurrences of infinitive constructions in European Pomerenian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>FOR ... TO</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>ø ... TO</td>
<td>rare</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>FOR ... ø</td>
<td>rare</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>*ø ... ø</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complementizer üm ‘for’ can remain empty only if the verbal prefix tau ‘to’ is not empty; conversely, the verbal prefix tau can be empty only if the complementizer üm is not. This is cast in a cross table in Table 3 on the basis of the Wenker sentences of 312 locations in Pomerania.¹¹

**Table 3: Cross table of occurrences of infinitival constructions in European Pomerenian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+FOR</th>
<th>−FOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+TO</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−TO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹The six places where the Wenker sentence 16 has been translated by a finite embedded clause (du bist noch nicht groß genug daß du eine Flasche Wein austrinken kannst) were ignored. They occur scattered over the area and it does not seem a structural effect.
This shows a structural absence of the \([\varnothing \ldots \varnothing]\) pattern with p-value of 0.09 in Fisher’s test. To be more precise: The hypothesis \(H_0\) that the absence of the \([\varnothing \ldots \varnothing]\) pattern is a mere result of the (low) Probability \((\text{for} = \varnothing)\) • the (low) Probability \((\text{to} = \varnothing)\) is rejected with a p-value of 0.09.

We therefore conclude that both positions T and C must "see" each other at some level of representation (Bennis & Hoekstra 1984: 55). This suggests that the \(\text{tau}\)-marker in Pomeranian, at least in these rationale clauses, concerns the syntactic type of the infinitival marker as described in Brandner (2006). Following standard assumptions on these markers, we assume that \(\text{for}\) (\(\text{um, om, üm}\) ...) sits in C (Koster & May 1982: 133, Vanden Wyngaerd 1987: 108) while \(\text{to}\) (\(\text{zu, te, to, tau, ...}\) sits in T (Evers 1990, Sabel 1996).\(^{12}\)\(^{13}\) Since we are dealing with constructions that have a lexicalized complementizer in continental Germanic, we assume that there is T-to-C movement at some level of representation and that the complementizer C must be lexical at that level. We, therefore, assume the assumptions in (4), taken from Hoekstra (1997: 106,116) developed for (Fering) Frisian. The lexicalization requirement of C already holds in West Germanic for main and embedded finite clauses and (4)b is a natural extension to non-finite sentential constructions.

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \text{a. } C \ldots T \Rightarrow C' [C+T] \ldots T \\
& \quad \text{b. } [C'] \text{ is overt in all types of clauses in Pomeranian}^{14}
\end{align*}
\]

Notice that T-to-C movement in infinitival constructions is independently motivated from a theoretical perspective, cf. Pesetsky & Torrego (2007), who derive the T-movement chain from basic syntactic principles. In the next section we will provide evidence that these assumptions also hold in Brazilian Pomeranian.

\(^{12}\)Bennis (1987) argues that so-called prepositional adjunct clauses have P in the C position.

\(^{13}\)Arguments have been raised against treating ZU in German as a functional head (I or T), see e.g. Haider (2010: 273–274). Brandner (2006) argues that one should distinguish morphological ZU from syntactic ZU. If this is correct, dialects with only syntactic ZU cannot be excluded. There is no evidence in Pomeranian that a morphological \(\text{tau}\) should be distinguished. On the contrary, most of the evidence forwarded in Postma (2014) only follows under the assumption of an exclusively syntactic \(\text{tau}\) in Pomeranian.

\(^{14}\)It would be attractive to extend this to West Germanic infinitivals without \(\text{um}\) in general, as in Bayer (1984). We only defend the claim for Pomeranian here. Kayne (1999) argues that all Romance complementizers are complex: a W head that have attracted the infinitival prefix \(\text{di.}\)
5 Brazilian Pomeranian (BP)

5.1 Background

While Pomeranian is not used anymore in cohesive communities in Europe since 1945, it is still in full use in various parts of Brazil, with many children not learning Portuguese at all until schooling at age six or so. These communities derive from immigration as early as 1850, and have been rather isolated until recently. In this article we will use the variant spoken in the state of Espírito Santo, in the municipality of Santa Maria de Jetibá and surroundings.\(^{15}\) We simply call it Brazilian Pomeranian, though there might be differences with the variants in the South (in the states of Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul) or in the Amazon region (Rondônia), which left the Northern parts of ES in the 1970s. This community is rather big. Virtually all Brazilian Pomeranians are Lutherans (Droogers 2008). Although Pomeranian was never used in the liturgy until quite recently (first in High German, since 1942 in Portuguese), the religion is an important factor of social cohesion that safeguards the language in Brazil (Schaffel 2014). Within the various groups of Germanic immigrants, the Pomeranians have become the dominant group, both economically, religiously, and sociologically. For instance, virtually all Dutch immigrants that arrived at the same time and who were Calvinists, have converted to Lutheranism and speak Pomeranian now.

Recently, a collection of Brazilian Pomeranian tales was published under the title *Upm Land* (Tressmann 2006b, henceforth *UmL*), as well as a dictionary of Brazilian Pomeranian (Tressmann 2006a). The data used in this paper are mainly from this corpus of tales, provided by a variety of authors and registered by Anivaldo Kuhn and Ismael Tressmann. The orthography that is used is the one developed in Tressmann (2006a). Apart from this corpus\(^{16}\) we completed our data by two interviews in March 2013 (Elizana Schaffel) and September 2013 (Elizana Schaffel and Tereza Gröner).

5.2 The infinitival syntax of Brazilian Pomeranian

As said above, the distinction between the two infinitives has been fully retained in ES.\(^{17}\) The complementizer in infinitive-2 constructions, however, is never realized as *üm*, but as *taum* ([tɑ̃m]/[tam]). Interestingly, the verbal prefix is always null, indicated with ø. So while the *tau* prefix position is systematically zero, the

\(^{15}\) Santa Maria de Jetibá, Caramuru, Garrafaão, Melgaço, and Domingo Martins.

\(^{16}\) Cf. Postma (2014) for the details.

\(^{17}\) Under influence of High German (in older speakers) or Hunsrückisch (in some areas), deviations from the Pomeranian pattern occur: overgeneralized n-forms and overgeneralized e-forms, respectively. These are not present in the corpus used in this study.
complementizer position has changed from üm to taum. We give some examples in (5), rationale clauses, taken from UmL (78, 114, 115).

(5) Brazilian Pomeranian

a. Dai lüür sin arm un häwa kair gild [taum sich air huus ø
The people are poor and have no money for.to refl a house ø
buugen].
build.inf2
'The people are poor and have no money to build themselves a house'

b. Dai blumasuuger is air seir hübsch tijr. Hai hät aina langa
The flowersucker is a very elegant animal. He has a long
snåbel [taum dai saft uuta bluma ø suugen].
beak for.to the juice out-the flowers ø suck.inf2
'The hummingbird is a very elegant animal. It has a long beak to suck
the juice out of the flowers'

c. Dai ima maga seir geirn dai maluulabüsch eer bluma [taum
the bees like.pl very much the malula bushes their flowers for.to
sich eera hoininig ø måken].
refl their honey ø make.inf2
'The bees like the malula-bushes’s flowers very much to make honey'

In contrast to the situation in European Pomeranian, there is virtually no variation left in Brazilian Pomeranian. There is no variation in the complementizer position, which is always taum. Only in 3 of the 127 cases (2%) in the corpus does the original tau shows up, but it is not adjacent to the verb, i.e. we may assume that it has always moved up to the C-position.18 There is no variability

18 For further reference, we give these three cases. Only in one case (i) is tau a true complementizer. In the other cases (ii-iii), tau assigns a deviant dative case to the embedded object under surface adjacency, similar to English For me to go... Apparently, the intervening subject PRO does not block case assignment to the object in BP.

(i) [Tau-ø dai köirn afstampen] gewt dat aina stampküül.
—- to the.acc grains crush.inf2 is there a pounder
—- 'There is a pounder to crush the grains'

(ii) Suurdaig dörwt ni feigla [tau dem daig anmåken ] < taum de daig anmåken
—- Sour dough may not fail to the.dat dough produce.inf2 < to the.acc dough produce
—- 'Sour dough may not be absent upon making dough'

(iii) [Tau dem rijs weglegen] mud man em mita slusa forwåra < taum de rijs weglegen
—- to the.dat store.inf2 must one him with-the peel stock.inf1
—- 'In order to store the rice, one needs to store it with the chaff'.
These are not performance errors, as informants accept both variants. We leave these sentences for further research.
in the lexicalization of the lower infinitival prefix position, either: it is without exception without spellout. We may conclude that Brazilian adjunct infinitivals have obligatorily lexicalization of C and no low spellout of T in these infinitival constructions.

One way of understanding this innovation is to postulate that Brazilian Pomera-nian has reanalyzed taum, which was originally a P+CASE complex [tau+m], into [tau+um], i.e. as a C+T-complex of tau and um. It is then an overt realization of the rule in (4) that we inferred from European Pomermanian dialect set. So, the surface variability of lexicalizing C and T in European Pomermanian has been replaced by a surface rigidity in Brazilian Pomermanian. The underlying formal rigidity of spelling out the C-T chain in European Pomermanian has been retained and recaptured by an overt marking of the head of the C-T chain.

(6)  a. in [C₁ ...... T₁ ..] , the chain must be lexicalized in EP
    b. in [C+T]₁.....Ø₁ , the C+T complex must be lexicalized in BP

The scheme in (6) shows that the variability in spellout in EP has been replaced by one spellout form, under retention of the more abstract underlying syntax.

The taum+inf2 construction had a precursor in European Pomermanian, illustrated in (7). It is the nominalized use of the -en form, illustrated by Wenker sentence 20, given for Schloenwitz.

(7)  European Pomermanian ( 19th century (Schloenwitz))
    Hai deer so, as hann-e in taum dörsch-en bistellt
    He did so, as if he had him for-the DAT thershing invited
    ’...as if he had invited him for the thershing’

In this construction, tau is a preposition enriched with a dative marker (taum < tau+(de)m). This construction allows modification but it must be done adjecti-vally, by PPs, or under incorporation: no direct object arguments between taum and the nominalized verb are possible, because the deverbal noun cannot assign case.19 The infinitival construction in -en has been reinterpreted in Brazilian Pomermanian as a verbal construction20 in which the verb in the -en infinitive does assign Accusative case, e.g. air huus ’a house’ in (5)a, dai saft ’the juice’ in (5)b and eera hoinig ’their honey’ in (5)c. Since syntactic categories that receive

---

19 Incorporated objects are possible even when no accusative is available. Incorporated objects do not need Accusative Case cross-linguistically (Baker 1988). The dimension of case assignment is often ignored in the literature (cf. for instance Demske 2011).

case cannot assign case, cf. the Case Resistance Principle (Stowell 1981) or the Unlike Category Constraint (Hoekstra 1984), the case assigning preposition tau(m) was obligatorily reanalyzed into a non case assigning tense head.

The question is now what caused this change, which is minimal with respect to the surface string but with considerable structural consequences. Why does only the complementizer position receive lexicalization in Brazilian Pomeranian? Is it an accident that the superstrate language Portuguese does not have an infinitival prefix and systematically lexicalizes C in this context (para ‘for’)?

6 Other contact varieties

In the previous section, we showed that the BP verbal tau(m) construction is a Brazilian innovation. It does not occur in the Wenker material of the Pomeranian areas in Europe. But we also showed that the C-T link also had deep structural parallels in the dialect continuum of European Pomeranian. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that we encounter similar constructions in other West Germanic dialects. In this section we review some of these.

6.1 Middle English

The oldest West Germanic counterpart to the tau(m) construction of Brazilian Pomeranian is found in Middle English. We can compare this construction with the Middle-English split infinitive (where the verbal prefix to has undergone T-to-C in forming a complex for-to complementizer (8), taken from Visser (1963: par. 982), see also Mustanoja (1960).

(8) Middle English (Pecock, Repr. 219)

a. A nurish or a modir is not bounde forto alwey and for euere ø fede her children.
   ‘a nurse or a mother is not bound to always and for ever feed her children.’

b. He eoden (...) forto fully that folk and godes lawe techen he went (...) for.to fully that people and god’s law ø teach.INF
   ‘he went in order to fully teach God’s law to that people’

c. if it schulde ples god forto bi miracle make a fier and a watir if it should please god for.to by miracle ø make a fire and a water togidere together
   ‘if it would please God to combine fire and water’
If we identify Eng. for with Pom. um and Eng. to with tau, the parallel is striking. Admittedly, it is not certain that for actually resides in C. It might sit in a lower position (Gelderen 1998). Nevertheless, the processes share the raising of the infinitival prefix away from the verb and clustering with a higher functional morpheme. The question is what triggered this change. English went through a process of dramatic changes in the Middle English period with respect to word order and morphology. But it is also tempting to tie it to external influence. Did these changes emerge under French influence from the south? Was it accommodation to a dominant language like French without infinitival prefix?

6.2 Pella (Wisconsin)

The taum-construction is also found in a Low-German recording from Pella (WI), available from the Databank für Gesprochenes Deutsch. Though without metadata documentation, the recording seems Pomeranian to my ear, and my transcription of the same Wenker sentence 16 in (3a)-(3c) and (5) in this variety is presented in (9).  

(9) Pella Pomeranian (DGD-IDS, MV-E138)  
Du büst no nit groot nauch to ‘n bottel ut-ø-drinken.  
you are yet not big enough TO a bottle PRT-ø-drink.INF

Notice that C is lexicalized with simple tau rather than taum. This is evidence for the movement of T to C. These data might feed the idea that the split infinitive originates from Europe. However, as T-to-C is, by hypothesis, a formal option of UG that can arise at various moments, we should not exclude the possibility that the split tau + V-en construction has arisen as a consequence of language contact between Germanic with a prefix (European Pomeranian) and a language without such prefix (Modern English).  

---

21IDS database, http://dgd.ids-mannheim.de. File: MV--E_00138_SE_01_A_01_DF_01.WAV, time 00:02:01.0. Similarly:  
du bis no ni groot nauch to ... ain flash wiin ut-ø-drinke:  
File MV--E_00136_SE_01_A_01_DF_01.WAV, time 00:01:54.0. Louden (2009: 175) reports the more traditional [um ... ø]-pattern in Hamburg (Marathon county (WI)):  
(i) Du bist noh nit groot genaug, um et Glas Wien ut-ø-drinken.

22Modern English lost to as a prefix, as to can be separated from the verb by adverbs (“split infinitives”).  
(i) My mother asked me to quickly ø-go to the market.  
It is unclear to which functional projection it has raised. It has not raised as far as C.
6.3 Altschlage

In the Pomeranian area that was checked (the regions Schivelbein, Regenwald, Belgard, Colberg-Cörlin, Cöslin, Greifenberg, Schlawe), we found one case with a raising of the *tau* prefix, though without deletion of the lower copy, given in (10).

(10) Altschlage (W 00148)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Du b"ust no nie grot nouch to ne Flasch Wiin ut tau drinken} \\
\text{you are yet not big enough for a bottle wine empty to drink.}\inf2
\end{align*}
\]

We might see this as a precursor of a high spellout of *tau* in the chain. Altschlage is present-day Sława (Świdwin)). It used to be a Wendish settlement. Slavic languages lack an infinitival prefix, and it lexicalizes the complementizer. In this case, accommodation to a language with infinitival prefix is not very plausible as the prefix is retained. Only the chain as such is lexicalized, which is a universal structure. It maximally shows a kind of agreement between the C position and the T position. It might be used as evidence for the abstract movement of T to C, but not for accommodation.

6.4 Alemannic

The *taum* construction also occurs in the Wenker material in the Alemannic dialects of Switzerland and Austria (Vorarlberg) (Seiler 2005), as illustrated in (11a) and (11b), respectively.

(11) Alemannic (Fläsch (Graubünden) and Krumbach, resp)

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \text{du bisch noh z Klii zum a Fläscha Wi us-o-trinka} \\
b. \text{du binscht no nit gros gnug, zum a flöscha wing us-o-trinken}
\end{align*}
\]

Direct influence of Alemannic on Brazilian Pomeranian is improbable. Though there is a Swiss community in the Pomeranian area in Espirito Santo, its earliest immigration to the Santa Leopoldina area consisted of 30 Catholic families (Franceschotto 2014: 155). The Pomeranian community and the *Suiça* community were segregated by religion: Lutheran versus Catholic.\(^23\) As to the origin in Europe, it must be noticed that Alemannic is in close contact with Rhaeto-Romance and vice versa. For instance the V2 properties in Rhaeto-Romance are probably

\(^{23}\)In 1860, there was a big Catholic church in the center of the area, and a small Protestant chapel at the edge, which were in conflict to a point that the governor of the state had to intervene (de Tschudi 1860: 139).
due to language contact with Germanic. If so, the \textit{taum} construction could be a sign of language contact in reverse direction. Notice that this contact has happened before the split in religion during the reformation. There is evidence that there is T-to-C as early as in Middle Alemannic of around 1470.\footnote{Examples from MHG bible of \textasciitilde 1470 in an Alemannic/Schwabian dialect:(i)vnd er gabe in [zew-\textit{berden offen}] and he gave him to become open(ii) Du gibst nit deinen heiligen [ze \textit{sehen die zerbrochenkeit}] you give not your saints to see the broken-ness'The infinitival prefix \textit{ze} 'to', being a bound morpheme, pied-piped the verb, creating VO contexts.} Such contacts with Romance in the Vorarlberg are also reported, as it has been germanized from the 9\textsuperscript{th} – 16\textsuperscript{th} century (Klausmann & Krefeld 1995: 4).\footnote{I thank one of the reviewers for drawing my attention to this.}

6.5 Schwabian

A similar construction is reported in Schwabian, cf. Hoekstra 1997: 23, who analyzes the floating 'to' as head movement to C or to Asp. We give three examples in (12).

(12) Schwabian (Müller 1996)

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. dass'\textsuperscript{r} extra hoimkomma isch [zom schnell des Päckle that he expressly home come is \textit{FOR.TO} quickly the parcel auf-ø-macha] open make
\textquoteleft that he came specially home to open the parcel quickly\textquoteright
\item b. dass'\textsuperscript{r} mir a weng Zoet brauchat [zom des neie Haus en dr that-PRT we a little time needed \textit{FOR.TO} the new house in the Garteschtross en Tiebenga zom/z' baua] Garte-street in Tübingen \textit{FOR.TO/TO} build
\textquoteleft that we needed little time to build a new house in Garte Street in Tübingen\textquoteright
\item c. dass'\textsuperscript{r} [kurz den Zättl zom aus zom/z' fülla] ogfanga hat.
\textquoteleft that he quickly the form \textit{FOR.TO} out \textit{FOR.TO/TO} fill begun has \textquoteleft that he began to quickly fill out the form.'
\end{enumerate}

Schwabian is not in direct contact with Romance, though it, of course, participates in the wider Alemannic linguistic space which is in contact with Italian and French. The lack of direct contact, however, makes the accommodation scenario improbable.
6.6 Tyrolese

The taum-construction can be found in the Wenker sentence 16 in some villages in Tyrol, as given in (13).

(13) Tyrolese (Reith b. Brixlegg)

Du bischt no nit grousz gnuag zum a flosch win aus-ø-drink’n
‘you are not big enough yet to drink a bottle of wine’

Direct influence of Tyrolese on Brazilian Pomeranian is improbable. There is a community Tirol in Espirito Santo not far from the Pomeranian area, but the inhabitants are separated by religion (Catholic versus the Lutheran Pomeranians). Segregation on the basis of religion has always been strong (Schabus 2009), even until the present day. As to the origin of the construction in Europe, the construction might have emerged in Tyrol in Europe by contact with Romance, in this case Rhaeto-Romance.

6.7 Twentieth century European Pomeranian

There is also the possibility that the taum construction is native from Pomerania. In Stritzel (1974: 69), a Pomeranian grammar from the 1930’s, a similar construction for the village of Grossendorf is reported, given in (14a). Furthermore, there is at least one example (an idiomatic expression) in a Pomeranian dictionary (cf. 14b, taken from Laude & Schnibben 1995).

(14) 20th c European Pomeranian (Großendorf and Kowalk, resp.)

a. daŋ is də sɛNSTɔ tɪd [tum draxːən stɪjən lɔtʰtɔn]
then is the nicest time for.to drake rise ð let.INF2
‘then it is the best time to let climb the dragon/kite’

b. dat is jə tam up d’ boim kleppre
that is prt for.to upto the tree ð climb.INF
‘that is to become desperate’.27,28

26 Present-day Wielka Wieś (Woiwodschaft Pommern).
27 Notice the form in -e, where one would expect INF2. Kowalk (Kowalki, no Wenker location) patterns with the villages Zeblin (Cybulino, W00453), Groß Leistikow (Lestkowo, W50506), Barfussdorf (Zolwia Bloc, W51121), Köpik (Kopice, W50482), Drammin (Dramino, W50731), Liepnitz (Lipnica, W00374) in two Pomeranian properties: they have no the INF2 form and displaying strong adjectival endings. Kowalk’s neighboring village Groß-Tychow (Tychowo, W00346) displays n-infinitive and weak endings.
28 A reviewer draws attention to the fact that this expression also exists in Standard German: "Das ist ja zum auf die Bäume klettern". The Pomeranian example may be a translation of the Standard German saying.
This might be a sign of an older presence of the *taum* construction, but it may also be a later, parallel development. It is certainly not evidence that the construction was already in Pomerania in the days of the Pomeranian emigration to Brazil.

### 6.8 Flemish in Brazil

An extremely interesting case is the mixed speech of the Dutch immigrants from the Flemish part of the province of Zeeland (Zeeuws-Flemish). These settlers were Calvinist but converted to Lutheranism and are now part of the Pomeranian community. In multilingual speakers (Flemish, Pomeranian, Portuguese), one can observe constructions, like the ones in (15), where the infinitival prefix *te* has been attached to the complementizer *om*. These are obvious constructions under a strong Pomeranian influence (calques), as might be derived from the typical do-support, and from the participial without prefix *ge* in *kommen* ‘come’ instead of the expected form *gekomen*. The fact that Flemish *te* has overly moved to *om* in C is a welcome confirmation of our analysis of Pomeranian *taum as um+tau*. What makes this construction special is that the order of the lexical ingredients in *om-te* is reversed with respect to the *taum* construction, where the prefix is initial.

(15) (Zeeuws)Flemish in Brazil

a. dat es dan vier dagen om-te naar Santa Leopoldina komen
   that is then four days FOR.TO near Santa Leopoldina Ø come.INF
   en dan vier dagen weer om-te terug komen
   and then four days again FOR.TO back Ø come.INF
   ‘It is then four days to go to SL and four days to come back’

b. as jinne krank worden deed, dan was gien auto om-te die weg
   if one ill get did, then was no car FOR.TO those away Ø bringen.
   bring
   ‘if somebody got ill, there was no car to bring them away’

c. om-te dan goed bikieken waar ons folk komen es
   FOR.TO then well Ø look.INF where our folks come is
   ‘to see well in what situation our people has arrived’

These structures are, therefore, more similar to the Middle English constructions discussed in §6.1. The more conservative linear order *om-te* is also what
we expect, as Flemish lacks a precursor like Pomeranian \textit{taum} + N, illustrated in (7) above. The Standard Dutch counterpart \([ten + N]\) is a high-register structure, and absent in Dutch dialects. Without doubt, language contact with Pomeranian is responsible for the emergence of this overt T-to-C movement. Important to note is that the overt movement of T-to-C can be observed in the Garrafaão area (with a high density Pomeranian speakers), not in the Holandinha area (with a low number of Pomeranians), cf. (16).

(16) Dutch and Pomeranian Varieties in ES

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. om frunne te maken \hspace{1cm} Flemish in Holandinha
  \item b. om-te frenne \ø maken \hspace{1cm} Flemish in Garrafaão
  \item c. taum farijn \ø måken \hspace{1cm} Brazilian Pomeranian
\end{itemize}

‘to make manioc flour’

Apparently, the presence of Portuguese is not a sufficient trigger for the change we are discussing in this paper, while the presence of Pomeranian did cause such a change in this variant of Flemish.\textsuperscript{29} Hence, accommodation is not a sufficiently explanatory factor. We rather must think in terms of variation: while the internal variation of these Flemish variants was not rich enough to cause a change to overt T-to-C, the Flemish-Pomeranian melting pot was sufficiently rich for dialect convergence towards both the \textit{taum}-construction and the \textit{om-te} construction.

7 Dialect convergence or contact-induced accommodation?

In the previous sections, we discussed a range of West Germanic varieties that have lost the infinitival prefix and realized it, or rather its functional head, higher up in the syntactic hierarchy. We are now in the position to evaluate the various scenarios that might have led to the innovation, shared by Middle English and modern Alemannic. These dialects behave parallel to Pomeranian in Brazil in that they lexicalize the T-chain high. The null hypothesis is that all these parallel cases receive a parallel explanation. There is the accommodation scenario, which hypothesizes that the \textit{taum} construction emerged in Brazilian Pomeranian in contact with Portuguese, which lacks the infinitival prefix, just like French, Slavic, and modern English. Alternatively, we have the koinéisation scenario in

\textsuperscript{29}Their Flemish is a rather uncertain heritage Flemish, while their Pomeranian is robust, just as the Pomeranian of the Pomeranians. These people are Pomeranians with an additional heritage Flemish.
Gertjan Postma

a newly created melting pot community. This scenario fundamentally reduces the number of variants furnished by the source dialects. This explanation has the variability in the source dialects as a fundamental ingredient. It is obviously an advantage of the latter scenario that it puts the variability discussed in §3 on a fundamental footing. Long-term, structural accommodation is only possible upon intensive contact. If we now see to what extent there has been actual contact in all these cases, the balance is not completely positive, as we can see in Table 4.

Table 4: Various Germanic contact varieties with complex for-to complementizers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Loss of prefixal to</th>
<th>Contact with prefix-less language</th>
<th>Sufficient contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle English</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Anglo-Norman</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pella(WI)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altschlage</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>doubtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alemannic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rhaeto-Romance/Franco-Provençal/French</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwabian</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrolese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Ladin</td>
<td>yes (Western part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th c EPom</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPom</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemish in Hollandinha</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemish in Garrafão</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>BrPomeranian</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us discuss the table briefly. Language contact between Middle English and Anglo-Norman is uncontroversial in both directions (Mustanoja 1960, Dalton-Puffer 1996, Ingham 2012, Rothwell 2001, Steiner 2010). In the case of Altschlage, there is no positive evidence of the contact with Slavic, but it cannot be excluded, as it was a Wendic settlement. This might have triggered a C+T complex, as the high to in (10) indicates. However, the lower copy tau is not silent. If language contact was involved, it apparently did not occur on surface level. We leave this case open. For Pella (WI), language contact have been present beyond doubt.

30 The influence of French on Middle English in the domain of the lexicon is better studied than for syntax and morphology. For some curious reason, the influence of (Anglo)French on Middle English is not as well studied as the influence of Middle-English on (Anglo)French. It is often downplayed as in Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 306ff), but see Ingham (2009) for noteworthy remarks on this issue.
but it is not clear if there has been a Pomeranian cohesive community. There are too few speakers to evaluate this single fact.\(^{31}\) But contact with English has been strong. For Schwabian, direct contact with a prefix-less language is absent, though it can have happened indirectly through Swiss sister dialects. For Brazilian Pomeranian, contact with Portuguese is present in modern times, as has been shown by Schaffel (2014: 177, graph 4), though 50% of the older present-day speakers are still monolingual. If accommodation were the causing factor, we would expect that the \textit{taum}-construction would be less used by older speakers. There is no evidence of this kind.\(^{32}\) Taking all these doubts into account, we conclude that there is too little evidence to either support or to reject the accommodation hypothesis.

This brings us to evaluating the koineisation scenario with its four mechanisms as discussed in §2. The options in section §2.2.1–3 only fit with some artificiality on the facts under scrutiny. One could argue that instead of lexicalizing a chain optionally in a scattered way, as the European Pomeranian dialects do, Brazilian Pomeranian opts for lexicalizing T higher up jointly with C (\textit{taum}=\textit{tau}+\textit{um}). This strategy can be seen as a very particular variant of leveling (i.e. loss of most source variants): in this case loss of all variants. However, Brazilian Pomeranian did not just lose the three input variants of the scheme in (5), it also created a new one (6) on the basis of the underlying syntactic skeleton. So, leveling is an insufficient mechanism to capture what happened. One could also argue that it is a very particular kind of interdialect formation: the emergence of new forms that are intermediate of the input dialects. To what extent lexicalizing two positions higher up in the syntactic hierarchy instead of scattered lexicalization of a coindexed chain is a case of "intermediate", is of course open to debate. Finally, one could argue that it must be interpreted as a very particular version of \textit{fudging}: the combination or superposition of two ingredients taken from distinct dialects: lexicalization of the higher member of the C-T chain (dialects with \textit{um}) and silence of the lower member of the C-T chain (dialects with \textit{tau}-drop) is re-analyzed as \textit{movement}: the lower copy is spelled out high as C+T: \textit{taum} emerges. This is what comes closer to what has happened. But probably the most apt interpretation of the facts is, that it should be explained as \textit{retreat to the default}

\(^{31}\)The Wenker-sentences given in Louden (2009: 175) make a distinction between two infinitives 1 and 2, as in EP and BP. The infinitival \textit{tau} is silent and the complementizer is \textit{um}, as in Lankow (4)b above.

(i) Du bist noh nit groot genaug, \textit{um} et Glas Wien \textit{ut-ø-drinken}

\(^{32}\)In 4 interviews by Anivaldo Kuhn in 2003 of a ~75 years old Pomeranian, the \textit{taum}-construction already occurs abundantly: 30 times (on ~4000 words) of which 15 with an actual lexical split [\textit{taum} xxx V-\textit{en}] (of which 5 bare nouns/actjectives might have been incorporated into the verb). The interviews are in Seibel (2010: 507-556).
Most world’s languages lack an infinitival prefix comparable to tau/to/zu. Absence of it seems to be the default. And Brazilian Pomeranian complies with it. Moreover, the majority of the world’s languages do lexicalize complementizers in purpose infinitivals, and Brazilian Pomeranian patterns with it as well. Finally, as Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) have argued on formal grounds, there is always an overt or covert T-to-C movement in infinitivals. And this is precisely what taum is, the lexicalization of T+C. So, on all points does Brazilian Pomeranian pattern with the default setting, while this default setting was not present in the source variants. So, theoretically, the dialect convergence scenario seems to have strong cards. Is there then any empirical evidence that can be decisive?

In the next section we make a feature analysis of the constructions and design two models on its basis.

8 Modeling accommodation and dialect convergence formally

In this section we make a formal implementation of the two scenarios by which Brazilian Pomeranian infinitival construction [taum ... ø] can be explained: accommodation to Portuguese and/or dialect convergence to the default settings. We take the mechanism of retreat to the default, discussed in §2.2.4, as our starting point.

8.1 Modeling dialect convergence

As we have seen in Table 2, European Pomeranian shows at least 3 variants of this infinitival construction, while one was structurally absent. These variants were the input for the newly created lingua franca in Brazil. In the first columns of Table 5, we characterize these 3 + 1 variants in terms of their spellout patterns of functional morphemes in the second column. Logically, there are $2^3 = 8$ possible patterns.

33The claim that the infinitive is without prefix does not only hold for rationale clauses, but for infinitival clauses in general. In the perspective of retreat to the default, this does not come as a surprise, cf. (i).

(i) ik fersuik ais [aira nå hu gåa]
   I try to early to house go
   ‘I finally try to go home early’

In most of the cases, the German/Dutch construction corresponds to a bare infinitive or a finite clause in BP.

34It is often difficult to separate prepositions and complementizers in this context. For a discussion and tests, cf. Bennis (1987).
patterns in total. For completeness, we have added the remaining possibilities below the separator.\(^{35}\)

Table 5: Chain analysis of infinitival constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Pattern</th>
<th>Underlying Pattern</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. um ... tau</td>
<td>um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. um ... ø</td>
<td>um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ø ... tau</td>
<td>um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ø ... ø</td>
<td>um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(EP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. taum ... ø</td>
<td>um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tau ... tau</td>
<td>um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Alt-Slage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. tau ... ø</td>
<td>um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BP/Pella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. taum ... tau</td>
<td>um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Schwab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classification in terms of its surface appearance does not display the underlying grammatical factors, however. There are three grammatical features involved, which all concern the spellout of chains. First, there is a ±lexicalization of the for-chain, which is a singleton chain with or without spellout. Secondly, there is a ±lexicalization of the to-chain, which is a binary chain (“movement”). It does or does not have a chain spellout. Thirdly, the to-chain, which is a movement chain, can have a high spellout (overt movement) or a low spellout (covert movement). This is ruled by the delete-process of chain reduction, as described in Nunes (1995). This is captured by ±low-delete. In columns 3-5 of Table 6, we describe the parameter settings of these input variants with values yes/no. Finally, we must project these features in a consistent way on markedness of the settings: marked (+) or default (0). Let us assume that lexicalizing a chain is the default (applied to for and to-chain equally). Let us furthermore assume that overt movement is the default i.e. delete of the lower copy is the default. We indicate the corresponding markedness values of the input in gray-shade. These are the EP input varieties upon entering Brazil. The BP parameter output is in the fifth row (dashed) in (row e).

Let us now show the convergence mechanism in progress. As to the for-chain lexicalization (shaded P1 column), the input dialect set contains two dialect types with a default setting (row a and b) and one dialect type with a marked setting (row c). Upon interaction, the outcome in (row e) opts for the default value. As to

\(^{35}\)The extra patterns include those of Altschlage (cf. (10)), the BP pattern (i) in note 18 and Pella Pomeranian (cf. (9)), and the Schwabian variant mentioned by Müller (1996) in (12b)
Table 6: Convergence Model - Feature analysis and markedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival construction</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>P1=for chain</th>
<th>P2=to chain</th>
<th>P3=low delete</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. um-(\tau)... (\tau)</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. um-(\tau)... (\tau)</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. um-(\tau)... (\tau)</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. um-(\tau) ... (\tau)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. um-(\tau) ... (\tau)</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. um-(\tau) ... (\tau)</td>
<td>Alt-Sl</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. um-(\tau) ... (\tau)</td>
<td>BP/Pella</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. um-(\tau) ... (\tau)</td>
<td>Schwab</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lexicalization of the to-chain (shaded P2 column), the input set contains two dialect types with default setting (row a and c) and one dialect type with marked setting (row b). The outcome in (row c) opts for the default setting. Finally, as to the chain spellout (low of high) in the last column, we observe interaction of one dialect type with default setting (row b) and two dialect types with marked settings (row a and c). Once again, the outcome is the default setting. In sum, for the three relevant parameters, retreat to the default setting describes the dominant outcome in Brazil adequately. This default setting of the three features as well as the marked settings were already present in one of the input dialects. We, therefore, can describe the process as a purely Pomeranian-internal effect: dialect mixing can produce Brazilian Pomeranian under retreat to the default if present in the linguistic input. This might be taken as evidence that the Pomeranian lingua franca in Brazil has resorted to the default setting in all three relevant parameters upon language contact with conflicting input in three parameters.

One might wonder why the majority choice of European Pomeranian [for ... to] did not impose itself in Brazil. Under the assumption that the figure of 83% in Table 5 is valid for the immigrants as well, it might come as a surprise that the emigrants followed a completely different path, especially considering the fact that the European [for ... to]-variant is identical to the Standard German variant, a prestige variety that was taught in the parochial schools to some of the community members. There are three points to consider here. In the first place, the interaction (convergence) of two closely related dialects takes place on parameter level, not on surface level. This is precisely the point we want to
make: the default setting approach can produce something new, which cannot be explained by considerations of dialect dominance. So the outcome in BP converging to the new [FOR-TO ... ø] is a strong argument in favor of the parameter approach. Secondly, neither the dominant EP variety nor HG with [FOR ... TO] realize the default setting according to the analysis in Table 5. Hence, even these varieties might decline if they would be sufficiently shuffled upon social changes. Third, in the case of, say, two or three care takers with slightly different dialects, we have the situation of 2L1 or 3L1 and the interaction takes place according to the scheme in Table 5, not on the level societal statistics. That said, we do think that societal statistics is relevant: they play a role in the case of accommodation, as we will see in the next section.

### 8.2 Modeling accommodation

By a simple modification of the model of §8.1, we can turn it into a model of accommodation, as we will see in an instance. Since we use universal claims of what is default and what is marked, the only locus for a different implementation is the parameter describing covert and overt movement. We captured this dimension in §8.1 by checking if the lower link of the chain was deleted or not, which was default or not default, respectively. However, it can also be checked if the upper link is deleted or not, of course with the reverse markedness assignments. Let us, therefore, consider a parameter P4 that describes the lexicalization of the higher copy. For this P4, upper link deletion is marked (instead of lower-link deletion being the default). The core cases of overt and covert movement then still project on the same markedness as they did in the convergence model of the previous section. Only in the case of double spellout or non-spellout does the new parameter give distinct results. The two models are compared in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convergence Model using P3</th>
<th>Accommodation Model using P4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>low DELETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. tau ...tau</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. tau ...tau</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. tau ...tau</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. tau ...tau</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P3 is low DELETE; P4 is high DELETE.
With the Model-2 implementation, we arrive at the evaluation Table 8. To see how it works, let us inspect Row-a and Row-b in Table 8 with respect to P4 (the features P1 and P2 remain unchanged). Row-a has [um ... tau], which is, as to the \( \tau \)-string: [\( \tau \) ... \( \tau \)], which is the case of Table 6c with markedness value +. The next case in Row-b is [um ... \( \varnothing \)], which is, as to the \( \tau \)-string, [\( \tau \) ... \( \tau \)], which is the case of Table 6d with markedness +, etc. Only the P4 column differs from the Convergence Model of Table 5. Once again, the Brazilian Pomeranian \([\tau u_m \ldots \varnothing]\)-pattern realizes the default setting (000), which BP now shares with the Schwabian \([\tau u_m \ldots \tau]\)-pattern. This model has two absolute default settings: the BP \([\tau u_m \ldots \varnothing]\) in Table 8e and the Schwabian \([\tau u_m \ldots \tau]\) in Table 8h.

Table 8: Accommodation Model - Feature analysis and markedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival construction</th>
<th>Parameter Settings</th>
<th>Markedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>P1=FOR chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>Alt-Sl</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>BP/Pella</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. um-tau ... tau</td>
<td>Schwab</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important consequence is that the four source dialects, Table 8abcd, are homogenous in P4 (with a marked setting), while all high-contact varieties in Brazil, Pella(WI), and Alt-Schlawe, are homogenous with an unmarked setting. In this model, the flip in the P4-value can *not* be produced by internal dialect convergence (there is no variation in the P4 parameter) and must be due to an external trigger of the P4-flip. If one can prove that the Portuguese pattern \([par_a \ldots \varnothing]\) does not realize the case of Table 8b, but either Table 8e or Table 8g, then the flip in P4 might have been caused by language contact and accommodation to Portuguese. Let us assume that there is such evidence.

The question is then if we can find independent evidence to choose between the two models in Table 6 and Table 8, i.e. we must choose between the features P3 and P4. We will now show that frequency values of the dialects provides us
with such independent evidence. To see how, one should realize that it is plausible that a higher level of markedness corresponds to a lower occurrence of the variant and vice versa. So let us define the total markedness, $\mu$, of a language variant as the sum of its markedness values. In the table below we have represented the Dialect Convergence Model (Model 1) with P1, P2, P3 and the Accommodation Model (Model 2) with the features P1, P2, P4. In the columns headed by $\mu$, we added the respective sums of the marked settings.

Table 9: Comparison of the Convergence Model and the Accommodation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Surface Pattern</th>
<th>Freq. in %</th>
<th>Convergence</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. um ... tau</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0 0 + 1</td>
<td>0 0 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. um ... $\emptyset$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 + 0 1</td>
<td>0 + + 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. $\emptyset$ ... tau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 0 + 2</td>
<td>+ 0 + 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. $\emptyset$ ... $\emptyset$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+ + 0 2</td>
<td>+ + + 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. taum ... $\emptyset$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tau ... tau</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>+ 0 + 2</td>
<td>+ 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. tau ... $\emptyset$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 0 0 1</td>
<td>+ 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. taum ... tau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 0 + 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P1–4 are the features involved (see the text); $\mu$ is the total markedness.

In order to evaluate the two models with more ease, we displayed the values of the total markedness $\mu$ and the occurrence rates of the varieties into the markedness graphs under Figure 3 and Figure 4. These graphs have the total markedness $\mu$ on the vertical axis. The horizontal axis is the time axis with before and after the language contact, convergence in Figure 3 and accommodation in Figure 4. In both graphs we observe a local minimum before and after the interaction. Moreover, the local minimum before the interaction is higher than the local minimum after the interaction. So, what happens in both models is a decrease in markedness. However, the models differ in what feature(s) cause(s) this decrease. In the model in Figure 3, all three features are involved and choose the value of the lowest markedness. Hence, this can be interpreted as a convergence model. However, if we put the occurrence rates in the graph (as a % subscript), we must
conclude that the occurrence rates do not correlate in any way with the level of markedness.

In the markedness graph in Figure 4, on the other hand, we observe two sets of dialects with respect to their value of \( P4 \). The flip in \( P4 \) coincides with their identification as low and high contact varieties. Interestingly, the value of their markedness neatly correlates with their relative frequencies. The absent [ø ... ø]-pattern has the highest markedness of \( \mu = 3 \). The most general [for ... to] pattern is a local minimum of 1. The general [for.to ... ø] in BP has markedness 0.

We may, therefore, use the occurrence rates of the varieties and their relation to markedness as independent evidence that the \( P4 \)-feature provides a better model of the change that Pomeranian underwent upon its settlement in Brazil, than the convergence model with the \( P3 \) parameter. It might also be taken as evidence that \( P4 \) is a better measure of the difference in markedness of covert-overt movement in general.

If we take the occurrence rates into account, we come to a different conclusion than our 2016 study: what has happened in the emergence of BP, is not dialect convergence within Pomeranian itself, triggered by the high level of \textit{variation} present in the input dialects, but accommodation to an external language, Portuguese.
9 Conclusions

The sociolinguistic observations on Pomeranian, with language variation in Europe and convergence to a uniform construction in Brazil, provides evidence for an underlying syntactic C-T chain in natural languages, as was argued for in Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) on formal grounds. While European Pomeranian shows variation in the lexicalization of this [FOR ... TO] chain with a three-fold optionality, Brazilian Pomeranian displays obligatory lexicalization of the higher link of the chain and obligatory silence of the lower link. This configuration is reanalyzed as an overt movement relation of T to C, which is the default option in natural language. There are language-internal arguments that the new construction is a result of dialect-convergence to the default setting of the parameters involved. However, when we take the external occurrence rates into account, the data indicate that the similarity in this respect between Brazilian Pomeranian and (Brazilian) Portuguese might be analyzed as accommodation of Brazilian Pomeranian to the dominant language Portuguese.
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