Increase in Complexity in Language Contact: person dependent **V-AGR-T** and V-T-AGR structures on the border of two Dutch dialects

Languages in contact may produce either an increase or a decrease in complexity (in the sense of Kusters 2003). According to Trudgill (2012), the existence of these opposing tendencies does not form a contradiction: different types of language contact are involved. *Decrease* in complexity, as emphasized in (generative) acquisition studies, proceeds by more superficial language contact, as in L2 contact, (e.g. surface accommodation). *Increase* in complexity, on the other hand, comes about in situations of intense language contact, typically when two language communities in contact share sufficient bilingual (2L1) speakers. In such circumstances, increase in phonological inventory, increase in morphological oppositions, and increase in syntactic redundancy is observed. At first glance, a superposition of surface phenomena of the input dialects seems to be involved.

In this talk we report on contact induced complexification that is not mere additive with respect to the input varieties but creates new surface forms/phenomena. It turns out that, in those cases, the additive effect does not proceed on the level of surface forms but on the level of grammatical rules of the two contact varieties: grammatical superposition of rules. It will provide a new perspective on what level linguistic varieties 'see' each other in situations of intense language contact.

The phenomenon at hand is the rise of **V-AGR-T** orderings in past tense verbal forms next to the more common V-T-AGR ordering in Dutch dialects. The phenomenon dominantly occurs on the borderline of the Limburgian (L) and Gelders (G) dialects in the Netherlands. Whereas standard Gelders (1c) and standard Limburgian (1b) only display V-T-AGR orderings, the contact dialects display **V-AGR-T** structures in 2nd person contexts, cf. (1a).

(1) a dich **leev-z-de** langer   (SU+**V-AGR-T**, Grubbenvorst dialect)
         you live-2sg.past longer
         'you lived longer'

     b du leef-dje-s   langer   (SU+V-T-AGR, general Limburgian)
         you live-past-2sg longer
         'you lived longer'

     c. wei leef-de-n langer   (SU+V-T-AGR, general Gelders)
         we live-past-AGR
         we lived longer

     d dan leev-de-z   -e   langer   (V-T-AGR+SU, Grubbenvorst dialect)
         then live-past-2sg you(encl) longer
         'then you lived longer'

The first indication that these deviant **V-AGR-T** orders are not just a morphological quirk, but correlate with external syntax, is that such orderings are only present in direct contexts, not in inverted contexts (1d).

As nothing in the morphological V-Tense-AGR string distinguishes these contexts, we must add a diacritic that it sits in C. If inversion structures also sit in C, we have to add more of the syntactic environment. Secondly, they show up not just between Limburgian and Gelders, but also between Limburgian and Brabantish and between Gronings and Drentish. Now, Gelders, Brabantish, and Drentish share the property of having double agreement paradigms (direct and inverse), while in Limburgian and Groningen the forms in direct and inverse contexts are equal. So, the phenomenon is a more wide spread effect (red dots on Map in 2). And secondly, these orderings apparently occur on a much deeper isogloss that divide the dialects in the Netherlands: the dialects with double verbal paradigms (direct AGR_T and inverse AGR_C, west of the black line) and dialects with a single paradigm (uniform $AGR_{T/C}$, (north)east from the black line).

(2)
(3)

Two dialect areas and spurious metathesis under their isogloss

As Zwart (1993) argues, double paradigms come about by the structure dependency of T-to-C. In direct SV-contexts, there is no T-to-C, in inverted contexts there is T-to-C. Postma (2012) argues that Zwart's structures only holds for double-paradigms dialects, not for Frisian, Limburgian, and German, which have uniform V-to-C. We therefore conclude from the dialectological pattern, that the **V-AGR-T** orderings emerge on the contact line between optional T-to-C and obligatory V-to-C. The relations are schematized in (3).

Dutch dialects with AGR_C and AGR_T are dialects in which T-to-C is not generalized, e.g. T-to-C is absent in (some) direct SV clauses. We, therefore, assume that **V-AGR-T** dialects combine properties of both dialect areas: they realize V-to-C (generalized V2, German-type dialects) **and** block T-to-C (Dutch-type dialects) in some contexts, providing the structure as in (4), which provides the correct surface order.

(4)   [$_{CP}$du V-AGR [$_{TP}$ ~~du~~ [$_T$-de] [$_{VP}$ ~~V~~]]]   T-stranding
                ↑_____|

Skipping T violates the head movement constraint (HMC). However, as Zwart (1993) has argued, the HMC is not a basic principle, but derives from principles of economy. So, apparently, the marked structure in (4), which in stable dialects in the Netherlands is disfavored, shows up in intense contact situations between Grammar A and Grammar B. Contrary to superficial language contact where language users may accommodate to the *output* of a nearby dialect, in intensive contact situations, speakers accomodate to two *grammars*.

We then develop a theory of Surface and Deep Accomodation in language contact. We here sketch the relevant Deep Accommodation only. Suppose that various outputs α_{1-n} satisfy Grammar A and various outputs β_{1-n} satisfy Grammar B (ordered in increasing markedness), then, without contact, only α_1 and β_1 will be realized. In an intense contact situation (in the sense of Trudgill), some realization with higher markedness will be available that satisfies both Grammar A and Grammar B. This can explain why in Deep Accommodation circumstances, new marked structures can show up that do not form part of the externalized output of either of the contact varieties.

References • Bickerton, Derek. (1981). *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor. • Kusters, Wouter (2003). *Linguistic Complexity. The influence of social change on verbal inflection*. Leiden. • Postma, Gertjan (2012). Clause-typing by [2] – the loss of the 2nd person pronoun du 'you' in Dutch, Frisian and Limburgian dialects. In: Camacho-Taboada, Victoria, Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández, Javier Martín-González and Mariano Reyes-Tejedor (eds.), *Information Structure and Agreement*. 217–254. • Trudgill, Peter (2012). *Sociolinguistic Typology. Social Determinants of Linguistic Complexity*. Oxford. • Zwart, J-W (1993). *Dutch Syntax* - A Minimalist Approach. PhD disertation, Groningen University.