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(standard) German licenses *da-* and *wo*-Komposita:

1. Ich warte **auf** den **Bus**.
   I wait P the.ACC bus
   ‘I wait on the bus.’

2. Ich warte **darauf**.
   I wait da-r-P
   ‘I wait on it.’

3. **Worauf** wartest du?
   wo-r-P wait you
   ‘What are you waiting for/on?’
In dialectal & colloquial speech, German allows *d*-doubling and splitting (Paul, 1919; Behaghel, 1932; Fleischer, 2002, 2008; Spiekermann, 2010; Negele, 2012; Jürgens, 2013; Otte-Ford, 2016)

**Splitting**

(4) Da denke ich nicht (r)an.
    that think I not on
    ‘I’m not thinking about that.’

**Distance doubling**

(5) Da weiß ich nichts davon.
    that know I nothing that-of
    ‘I don’t know nothing ’bout that.’
Related data - splitting & doubling

P w/o overt complement

(6) Ich weiß nichts von.
   I know nothing about
   ‘I don’t know nothing ’bout that’

Important points:

- Although partial wh-movement exists (McDonald, 1989, 1995), w-doubling involving wo-Komposita is unattested

- These sorts of splitting & doubling examples are not attested in PD

- We don’t find ‘mixed’-chains doubling; i.e, of w- and d-elements ... at least in German ...
The empirical puzzle: Penn Dutch *pseudo-resumptives*

- Pennsylvania Dutch lacks *wo*-Komposita
- To compensate, *d*-resumption is required in ‘regular’ questions

(7) **Was** sin(d) die Schtanne g’macht **devun**?
    what are the stars made it-from
    ‘What are the stars made out of/from?’  [PD: default]

(8) **Von was** sin(d) die Schtanne g’macht?
    from what are the stars made
    ‘What are the stars made out of/from?’  [PD: topicalization]

(9) **Was** sin(d) die Schtanne g’macht **vun**?
    what are the stars made it-from
    ‘What are the stars made out of/from?’  [PD: P-stranding]
**Objectives:**
- Provide a (working) analysis of pseudo-relatives in Penn Dutch, which
- Contributes to our understanding of the syntax of $d$- & $w$-elements in Germanic

**Nanosyntax:**
- One Head-One Feature architecture (Kayne, 2005; Starke, 2009, 2011, 2014, et seq.)
The gist of the analysis

- Adpositions also have a complex underlying decompositional structure
- Pseudo-resumptives in PD bear a striking resemblance to *wo*-Komposita in Dutch & German
- The tentative analysis developed and pursued here can be extend to related phenomena in PD and Germanic more generally
What is Pennsylvania Dutch (PD)? (and why is it so important?)

- PD is a language that has "outgrown its name" (Keiser, 2012:1).
  - +300 years spoken on North American soil (and now in South America!)
  - Started in SE Pennsylvania, now spoken throughout the Midwest and Ontario
  - ≈ 400,000 L1 speakers of PD today
  - Predominantly spoken as the L1 of the Old Order Amish (OOA) and other conservative Mennonite groups
  - NB: For an easily accessible history of the language, see Louden (2016)
- PD ain’t going nowhere anytime soon...
  - The Amish population doubles in every generation (average family size 8.6 members)
  - If they keep this pace, by 2315 there will be more Amish in the US than any other ethnic or religious group!
There are no exclusively monolingual speakers of PD

The OOA exist in a state of **diglossic bilingualism** (Grosjean, 2001, 2008)

- Although the vast majority of OOA are sequential bilinguals (acquiring PD first), English is omnipresent in their daily lives
- Bifurcation of modes and sociolinguistic domains:
  - **PD**: home, family, church, local community
  - **English**: non-Amish neighbors, work (outside of the home), ‘worldly’ topics

Thus, PD speakers are "deep bilinguals" (to quote López, 2020)

- It makes little sense to attempt to distinguish between *loanwords* and *borrowings* (a la Poplack (2018) and related work) in PD
- Their syntax, as well as their lexicon, is truly **hybrid**
Key traits:

- Verbklammer (exception: extraposed PPs)
- Asymmetric V2 (largely) intact
- Reduction in case system:
  - Older generations exhibit a 3-case distinction: Nom, Acc, Dat
  - Younger generations exhibit a 2-case distinction: Nom, Acc/Oblique
Brief overview of pseudo-resumptives

- In the following section we’ll (briefly) review the general properties of pseudo-resumptives in PD.
- These data have been collected through a variety of methods, i.e., anecdotal evidence, translation requests, judgment tasks, analysis of recorded narratives & free speech, over the course of several years.
- There are notable ways in which they differ from German, its dialects, and other West Germanic languages.
Not all Ps behave the same...

**mit** ‘*with*’

(10) **Wer** hot er geschwetzt mit?
who(m) has he talked *with*
‘Who did he talk *with*?’

(11) **Mit** **wer** hot er geschwetzt?
with who(m) has he talked
‘Who did he talk *with*?’

(12) ***Wer** hot er geschwetzt **damit?**

- **Mit** appears to allow P-stranding (and bans the pseudo-resumptive)
- Fleischer (2008; §3.4) highlights the exceptional behavior of *mit* in a number of German dialects (incl. High & Low Alemannic and Swabian; see also van Riemsdijk (1975))
Not all Ps behave the same...

**auf ‘on’**

(13)  **Wer** hoscht du gewart druff?
     who(m) have you waited it-on
     ‘Who did you wait on/for?’

(14)  **Auf wer** hoscht du gewart?

(15)  ***Wer** hoscht du gewart uff?

- The pattern of **auf** contrasts with **mit** by not allowing p-stranding
- **mit** exhibits exceptional behavior
(16) **Was** wascht du n [warte druff?  
what were you PROG it-on  
‘What were you waiting on?’

(17) **Wer** wascht du n [warte druff?  
who(m) were you PROG it-on  
‘Who(m) were you waiting on?’

(18) **[Auf wer/was]** wascht du n [warte?  
on who(m)/what were you PROG wait  
‘Who(m) were you waiting on?’

- German requires pied-piping here with animates (**Auf wen**). ....
- No animacy effects in PD (for **auf**, at least)
- The topicalized *w*-element allows pied-piping with both animates and inanimates (18)
(19) \[\text{Welle Schtann}\] hot er gedraumt de\text{wege}?
which star has he dreamed it-of/about
‘Which star did he dream about?’

(20) \[\text{Wege welle Schtann}\] hot er gedraumt?
about which star has he dreamed
‘Which star did he dream about?’

(21) \*[\text{Welle Schtann}\] ... wege? (P-stranding)
(22)  **[Welli Gael]** hat er geschwetzt zu die Sally *dewege*?
    which horses has he talked to (the) Sally it-about
    ‘Which horses did he talk to Sally about?’

(23)  **[Weller Mann]** hat er argued *mit*?
    which man has he argued with
    ‘Which man did he argue with?’

(24)  **[Weller Mann]** war er *n* argue-*a mit*?
    which man was he PROG argue with
    ‘Which man was he arguing with?’
(25) Des sin(d) die Schtanne, as der Himmel gemacht is these are the stars RP/C the sky made is devun.
it/of
‘These are the stars that the sky is made out of.’

(26) Des sin(d) die Schtanne, *vun die ... (no pied-piping)

(27) Des sin(d) die Schtanne, *die ... vun (no P-stranding)
PD: Relative clauses/Clefts

(28) Es iss die Frau, as mir gedraumt henn dewege. it is the woman RP/C we dreamt have it-about ‘She is the woman that we have dreamt about.’

(29) *wege as ... (no pied-piping)

(30) *as ... wege (no P-stranding)

...but...

(31) Er iss da Mann, as mir geschwetzten hen mit gestern he is the man RC/P we talked have with yesterday Owet.
evening
‘He’s the guy that we talked with last night.’
(32)  **Was** denkscht (du) hot er gedraumt *de*wege?  
what think (you) has he dreamt it-about  
‘What do you think he dreamt about?’

(33)  ?*Wege/weeich* was denkscht (du) hot er gedraumt?

(34)  *Was* denkscht (du) hot er gedraumt wege?

**Worth noting:** PD also does not allow intermediate (i.e., partially moved) *wh*-items as found in other varieties of German.
Adjunct \textit{wh}-items do not license pseudo-resumptives

(35) \textbf{Ferwas} bischt sell an duh?
why are(you) that PROG do
‘Why are you doing that?’

(36) \textbf{*Ferwas} bischt sell an duh defoor?
why are(you) that PROG do it-for
Intended: ‘Why are you doing that?’

(37) \textbf{Was} bischt sell an duh defoor?
what are(you) that PROG do it-for
‘What are you doing that for?’

Based on the claim that adjunct \textit{wh}-items are merged in the C-domain, we see that the connection between \textit{w-} & \textit{d}-elements involve a movement chain.
Intermezzo: Summary of PD data

- PD lacks wo-Komposita
- A da-Komposita is required (for most Ps) when wh-movement out of this structure takes place
  - Spoiler alert! - Some of the youngest ‘heritage speakers’ of PD allow P-stranding!
- Doubling of the d-element is unattested in PD
- Pied-piping is allowed (though marked) under certain conditions (topicalization)
One Feature-One Head (OFOH) Architecture (Kayne, 2005; Cinque, 2008; Putnam, 2020)

Features are unary and additive
(41) on the table

(42) thereon

Illustration (from Noonan (2017))
Noonan (2017): R-stranding

(43)

```
RP
   /\  \\
da/wo R'
      /\  \\
R    PP
     /\   \\
auf [DP e]
```

- Key distinction between Dutch & German:
  - Dutch: R-pronoun is pronounced iff Spec,RP is pronounced
  - German: R is pronounced (/r/) in the content of a right-adjacent vowel adposition (right-leaning)

- Noonan (2017) provides an excellent point of departure, but her study focuses exclusively on PP_{LOC}
Noonan (2017): *d*-doubling in German

\[(44)\]

```
CP_{pp}  
    pro  C'_{pp}  
    {d/w/h}  FinP_{pp}  
    t_{pro}  Fin'_{pp}  
    {a/o/i}  DP_{place}  
    t_{pro}  D'_{pp}  
    (d)  TP_{pp}  
    t_{pro}  T'_{pp}  
    {r/R}  PP_{loc}  
    {auf/∅}  t_{pro}
```
(45)  **Worauf hast du gewartet?**

w-on have you waited

‘What did you wait on?’

(46)  

```
    xPP₂
       t_pro  xPP₁
          w  xFinP
             o  xDP
                t_pro  DP
                   {d/w}  DirP(TP)
                      (r)  pP
                         √  DP
                            t_pro
```

Mike Putnam  (Penn State University)
(47)

xPP_2
  \[\text{was}\]
  \[xPP_1\]
  \[d\]
  \[xFinP\]
  \[a\]
  \[xDP\]
  \[\text{was}\]
  \[\text{DP}\]
  \[\text{was}\]
  \[\text{DirP(TP)}\]
  \[\text{(d)}\]
  \[\text{(r)}\]
  \[pP\]
  \[\sqrt{\text{DP}}\]
  \[\text{was}\]

- xPP_1 cannot lexicalize \{w\} in PD
- \textit{was} (or \textit{wer}) is phonologically realized (not as \textit{pro})
- \textit{w}-elements have a complex internal structure, too (Hachem, 2015)
(48) **Von was** sin(d) die Schtanne g’macht?  
from what are the stars made  
‘What are the stars made out of/from?’  

[PD: topicalization]

(49) 
```
   xPP_{pp}
      
  von was  xFinP_{pp}
      
    φ
      
    DP
        
  von-was
      PP
```

Mike Putnam  (Penn State University)
The exceptional status of *mit*

(50) \textbf{Wer} hot er gechwetzt mit?  
who(m) has he talked with  
‘Who did he talk with?’

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Preliminary idea:} Internal structure of *mitP* contains an extra projection (xmitP) that permits ‘stranding’
\item This proposal needs to be exhaustively fleshed out, and could be applied beyond PD (Fleisher, 2008)
\item NB: See Walkden (2018) for a similar proposal re: prepositional stranding in Old English and early West Germanic
\end{itemize}
(51) Des sin(d) die Schtanne, as der Himmel gemacht is these are the stars RP/C the sky made is (de)vun.

it-of

‘These are the stars that the sky is made out of.’

- Younger ‘heritage’ speakers of PD, i.e., those who are no longer actively using PD on a regular/daily basis, show optional behavior
- On the surface, this resembles P-stranding (which we can interpret as R-stranding, following Noonan (2017))
(52)

```
(52)  xPP₂
    /   
   /    /
was xPP₁
    /   /
   /    /
  (d) xFinP
    /   /
   /    /
  (e) DP
    /   /
   /    /
  ⌀ RP
    /   /
   /    /
  (r) PP
    /   /
   /    /
{vun,⌀} was
```
PD compensates for its lack of wo-Komposita w/ pseudo-resumptives ($\text{w-element + da-P}$)

This corresponds to a complex series of functional heads

PD licenses a more complex left periphery of xPP than standard German

Recent development: Younger ‘heritage’ speakers of PD have reduced the left periphery of xPP, producing structures that (optionally) resemble R-stranding

- Economy of structure arguments? (Scontras et al., 2018; Putnam, 2019, 2020)
The road ahead

- Re PD: More detailed analysis of individual adpositions and environments
- Beyond PD: Integrate these findings into work on dialectal German and Germanic more generally re: the syntax of $d$- & $w$-elements
Thanks!
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