

Is das der Hammer, das du den Traktor gebrochen hast mit? Preposition Stranding in Wisconsin Heritage German

Joshua Bousquette

1. Introduction

This paper examines preposition stranding (p-stranding) in Wisconsin Heritage German (WHG). English-to-German translation tasks conducted with eight English-WHG bilingual heritage speakers (HSs) show a majority of forms licit also in Standard German, employing, for example, pied-piping. However, five speakers show English-like p-stranding, which is not typical of German; these forms account for 1/3 of all utterances. Such English-like structures in a heritage language (HL) are attested in other varieties in contact with English, including Acadian French (King 2000) and Heritage Spanish (Pascual y Cabo & Gómez Soler 2015); and the cross-linguistic transfer of other, long-distance dependencies from English into the HL have previously been attested in this community (Bousquette et al. 2013, 2016a, 2016b). The current study supports this previous scholarship, in suggesting that HSs have simultaneous access to syntactic structures from both the HL and the L2, either due to simultaneous access to either of the two grammars; or from syntactic transfer from the socially-dominant L2 into the HL. Still, while there appears to be some degree of susceptibility in the grammar in the form of p-stranding occurring outside the verbal bracket, the majority of the data nevertheless conform to licit German structures, suggesting an overall stability of the HL grammar. These data include evidence that HSs may show some preference for negotiated forms that are consistent with the language-specific parameters set by each of the two grammars.

The article begins with an overview of the typological differences between English and German, with respect to preposition stranding, in section 2. This is followed by an introduction to the consultants, and an overview of the elicitation methodology, in section 3. Section 4 contains the presentation of the data, and some preliminary analysis. Section 5 provides a short discussion, and a conclusion.

2. Preposition stranding / Pied Piping

Preposition stranding in English results from the extraction of a noun phrase (NP) complement from a prepositional phrase (PP). Typically topicalized in questions or relative clauses, the extracted NP then leaves a trace (t_i) in the complement of the PP; on the surface, the preposition is ‘stranded’ at the end of the clause, as in (1).

- (1) English (König & Gast 2012: 217)
*Who_i did he buy a present [PP for t_i]?
‘Who did he buy a present for?’*

*Joshua Bousquette, University of Georgia, Bousquet@uga.edu. Thanks are due first to my fellow field researcher, Alyson Sewell. A special thanks to the editors of this volume, Karoline Kühn and Jan Heegård Petersen; and to the two reviewers and the audience of The Workshop on Immigrant Languages in the Americas, who provided invaluable feedback on this project. All remaining faults belong to the author.

A similar sort of extraction from a PP in German is ungrammatical (2). In Standard German, the entire phrase (XP) is topicalized, as the NP complement *wen* ‘whom’ follows its topicalized PP head, in (3). This topicalization of the PP with its embedded NP is referred to as ‘pied-piping’.

- (2) German (König & Gast 2012: 217)
 **Wen_i hat Karl [PP für t_i] ein Geschenk gekauft?*
 who has Karl for a present bought
 ‘Who did Karl buy a present for?’
- (3) German (König & Gast 2012: 217)
 [_{PP} Für *wen*]_i hat Karl t_i ein Geschenk gekauft?
 for whom has Karl a present bought
 ‘For whom did Karl buy a present?’

These findings are confirmed by field work conducted in 2012, with dialect speakers of East Franconian (Northern Bavarian) and Oberpfälzisch (Upper Bavarian). This control data and subsequent examples in the data set concerns subordinate clauses. Both varieties are related to the heritage varieties spoken in Wisconsin, in terms of shared syntactic features and immigration patterns. Examples were rated on a 5 point Likert-like scale, in which a rating of 1 was ‘totally natural, something I’d say or hear said’, and 5 was ‘something I’ve never heard and would never say’. Example 4a (‘Is that the women who you have spoken to?’) was presented to contemporary dialect speakers, and rated accordingly; examples 4b and 4c were preferred alternatives to 4a, as presented by consultants. Consultants’ proposals in 4b and 4c were rated as a 1, since they were production data. Results are presented in table (1) below.

Table 1: Acceptability ratings of p-stranding in Bavaria (Bousquette 2013: 66, 103-104).

Example Sentence	Average Rating	Number of Speakers
(4a) <i>Is des de Frau, wo_i du gesprochen hast [PP mit t_i]?</i>	4.97	15
(4b) <i>Is des de Frau, [PP mit der]_i-st (du) t_i gesprochen/gret hast?</i>	1	3
(4c) <i>Is des de Frau, [PP mit der]_i-(re) du t_i gesprochen/gret hast?</i>	1	5

The results suggest a resounding rejection for the p-stranding example in (4a), with all but one consultant giving the lowest possible evaluation. In contrast, both of the suggested alternatives, (4b) and (4c), show pied piping, suggesting that it was, in fact, the p-stranding that was cause for the categorical rejection of the utterance. These results support the prohibition of p-stranding in Standard German (2); and also show that any evidence of p-stranding in WHG would be a post-immigration development, and not an autochthonous or parallel development shared with related European non-standard varieties.

The investigation here, therefore, is concerned with a typological distinction between two languages. Of particular interest is the effect of the socially-dominant L2 (English) on the syntax of the HL (German). And indeed, there is evidence of straight-forward English-like p-stranding in WHG (5).

- (5) Wisconsin Heritage German
Ist das der Hammer wo_i-s du das Fenster hast
 Is that the hammer REL.2.SG you the window have
kaputtgeschlagen [PP mit t_i]? (WG)
 broken with
 ‘Is that the hammer that you broke the window with?’

It is worth noting in (5) that other fundamental aspects of German syntax persist, including V2, which has been shown to be stable in WHG, even among HSs who use the HL infrequently (cf. Sewell

2015). We also note the use of non-standard *wo* as an animate¹, relative pronoun (cf. Boas et al. 2014), with 2.SG *-s* inflection in a complementizer agreement (C-agr) context, which is maintained in heritage varieties of Franconian spoken in the United States, including Wisconsin (Bousquette 2014, cf. Born 1994 for Frankenmuth East Franconian; and Nützel 2009, for Haysville East Franconian). This non-standard phenomenon is characterized by the position-specific inflection of topicalized elements in a subordinate clause. Lastly, the relative ordering of auxiliary and participle in verb clusters in relative clauses is typical of Rhenish or Central Franconian varieties, in which the auxiliary precedes the participle even in verb-final contexts; this pre-immigration word order is also maintained in other Heritage German communities, as in Moundridge Schweitzer German (Joo, forthcoming 2018; cf. Dubenion-Smith 2010). Still, despite the maintenance of otherwise categorically German-like word order, non-canonical p-stranding obtains. Moreover, syntax has long been assumed to be one of the more stable domains in language change. It is here that heritage languages may shed light on which aspects of grammar are indeed more or less susceptible to change or cross-linguistic transfer.

Recent literature, including scholarship on heritage languages, has proposed a certain pliability of the grammar, in which even so-called ‘core’ aspects of the grammar might not be so stable, and where interfaces are not the only locus of change (cf. Sorace 2011; Montrul & Polinsky 2011; Benmamoun et al. 2013). In addition to the suggestion that parts of the syntax might also be vulnerable to cross-linguistic transfer, this yields two important insights: first, that language change occurs not only through acquisition across generations, but also within the grammar of an individual across the lifespan, as the L2 gradually supplants the HL/L1 as the dominant and most frequently activated grammar; and second, that inter- and intra-speaker variation is to be expected within a bilingual community of HSs. Bousquette et al. (2016a), for example, employ floating constraints in an optimality theoretic model to account for such variation in parasitic gapping (p-gaps) in WHG. This flexibility in the relative ordering of constraints was restricted to a sub-set of the grammar, where HSs licensed p-gaps in untensed clauses headed by manner or temporal adverbials. Crucially, p-gapping was highly restricted in tensed clauses headed by conditional complementizers or relative pronouns. In this sense, HL bilinguals may draw on even competing structures from both the HL and the L2, but do so in a systematic way, where syntactic licensing of null elements is domain-specific, and not in free variation. What follows, then, is that p-stranding in WHG is similar in that HSs have access to both p-stranding and pied piping constructions, but also would be expected to evidence some degree of influence from language-specific constraints.

Much ink has been spilled identifying the cause of cross-linguistic transfer from English into the HL, often times citing proficiency as the cause, either through attrition or incomplete acquisition (e.g. Benmamoun et al. 2013); or when the speaker is unable to maintain language mode (Grosjean 2008). However, a growing body of literature suggests that non-standard and even superficially English-like structures are either characteristic of pre-immigration varieties, or obtain from language-internal processes, including: systematic V3 in narration tasks using sequential/temporal markers in WHG (Sewell 2015); NP1 agreement in copula constructions, and non-nominative case in assumed identity constructions in WHG (Bousquette, forthcoming); the emergence of a prepositional case in Kansas Volga German (Keel 2015); the maintenance of non-standard C-agr and the inflection of the number ‘two’ in Haysville East Franconian (Nützel & Salmons 2011); the stability of grammatical gender in Heritage Scandinavian (Johannessen & Larsson 2015, forthcoming); and the possible development of a two-way, mixed gender system in American Scandinavian due to koinéization, paralleling earlier, similar developments in European Scandinavian (Johannessen & Larsson forthcoming). Broadly speaking, there is a growing body of literature on heritage languages that show a maintenance – or even development – of non-standard features in the HL that are not present in the European Standard Language. The paucity of unmodified forms adopted from English into the HL supports the HL maintenance narrative, with post-immigration innovations reflecting to a large degree either inherited, parallel, or ongoing changes in the HL; or language contact phenomena that balance both the HL and the L2 grammars in the bilingual HL speaker and community.

¹ The size of the data set does not permit generalizations regarding animate versus inanimate NPs.

3. The current study: Consultants and methods

The current study analyzes data collected during an English-to-German translation task conducted with 8 WHG-English bilingual HSs in eastern Wisconsin, recorded in 2014. The group of consultants includes 3 women and 5 men, all of whom were 70+ years of age at time of recording. All individuals were proficient speakers of a non-standard heritage variety that licenses C-agr, and all speakers are Wisconsin-born, and have similar family immigration histories. The heritage variety does include a number of lexical borrowings reflective of L2 influence, which is typical of adult HSs, whose L2 has become dominant over the course of their lives (cf. Putnam & Sánchez 2013). However, fundamental aspects of the grammar, including V2, remain robust, regardless of frequency of activation of the HL (Sewell 2015). To the greatest extent possible, every attempt was made to control variables that might affect results in the area of syntax.² Therefore, the consultant pool was restricted to speakers who license C-agr. Many – but not all – speakers of WHG in this geographic area license C-agr, but those that do have identifiable ties to the same pre-immigration regions (specifically, the Rhineland, Mosel valley, Eifel region; central Franconia, and infrequently Bavaria), and the same social circles (frequently, but not exclusively, Catholic) (Bousquette 2014). A separate but related study on agreement structures in this community confirms that there are meaningful differences between Rhenish speakers with C-agr and speakers without C-agr originating from other regions (Bousquette, forthcoming 2018).

In terms of the elicitation protocol, example sentences were randomized, so that each speaker translated a sub-set of 11 sentences containing an instance of p-stranding, in addition to a number of other examples designed for related studies, or which served as distractors.

Table 2: Elicitation sentences containing P-stranding.

Beneficiary/Recipient
Is she the girl you read the story to?
No, not the man you gave the money to!
Is he the man/woman you gave the book to?
Is that the woman/man you should give the book to?
Are those the children you told the story to?
Commutative
Is he the guy/woman you spoke with?
Is he the guy you went to the store with?
Look! There's the man I talked to yesterday!
Is that the man you used to work with?
Is he the cousin you went to school with?
Instrumental
Is that the hammer you broke the tractor/window with?

Translations were then transcribed, and subsequently categorized into German-like pied piping or English-like p-stranding (though two additional patterns were attested, in which the non-licit English syntax was reanalyzed into one of two related, licit German structures). Results are discussed in greater detail in section 4.

² Despite the dual activation of both the HL and L2 during the translation task, it is assumed that speakers would only rarely – if at all – produce non-licit structures in their HL. Despite the possibility of priming effects, translation remains a viable and practical elicitation method for HLs and non-standard varieties for which there is no standard orthography.

4. The current study: Data

The data appear as four distinct structural types, including: 1) p-stranding characteristic of English; 2) pied piping, characteristic of German; 3) dative constructions, in which the benefactor/recipient is coded with case (in German), rather than with a preposition (in English); and 4) VP restructuring of the English stranded preposition as a verbal prefix, consistent with German separable prefix verbs. General results are summarized in table (3) below.

Table 3: Results.

Speaker	P-Stranding	Pied-Piping	Dative NP	VP Restructuring	Total
ET	0	2	2	2	6
AJ	1	0	0	0	1
DR	2	0	1	2	5
AS	0	0	2	2	4
RS	4	0	3	0	7
EG	0	0	1	3	4
WW	4	0	1	2	7
WG	2	0	1	2	5
Total	13	2	11	13	39
Total %	33.3%	5.1%	28.3%	33.3%	100%

Percentages are given relative to the total number of responses, and the discrete categories are organized by whether these constructions are typical of either Standard American English, or Standard German. While these relative values are in some ways skewed by the elicitation sentence, we should note that 13/39 or 33.3% of responses involve English-like p-stranding, which is not licit in Standard German; and only 2/39 or 5.1% of responses show the expected German-like pied-piping. Still, some degree of reanalysis of the English prompt into related licit German structures accounts for more than half of the responses (24/39; 61.5%), such that the majority of all forms are consistent with Standard German parameters (26/39; 66.6%).

In looking at aggregate data across speakers, we see that English-like PP stranding is rather common, being used by 5/8 speakers. Standard German pied-piping is attested only in one speaker, while 7/8 speakers expressed English PP case as an unmarked/underspecified dative; and 6/8 restructured the verbs as separable prefix verbs, rather than verb-preposition pairings. In general, then, the Standard German form is the minority form in the data set; however, this does not suggest wholesale adoption of English p-stranding, as this accounts for only 1/3 of the data, and 7/8 speakers used some construction that was licit in Standard German.

The aggregate results also show inter- and intra-speaker variation in the use of structures available in either the HL or the L2. Three speakers (ET, AS, EG) used only structures that are consistent with Standard German grammar, while one speaker (AJ) used only an English-like p-stranding construction. On both sides, the numbers are too small to make assumptions about categorical dominance of one grammar over the other, but in the very least, it is clear that HSs exist within the same community that employ both English and German typologies. Perhaps more telling of this bilingual community is that four of the eight HSs use a mix of p-stranding and licit German syntactical structures, suggesting equal availability of language-specific structures for bilingual HSs, in support of Pascual y Cabo & Gómez Soler (2015), and is reminiscent of the floating constraints proposed by Bousquette et al. (2016a). Additionally, the restructuring of English p-stranding constructions into licit German structures is consistent with Bousquette et al. (2013, 2016b), in that it requires a simultaneous activation of each language-specific grammar, and an understanding of the language-specific parameters of both the input

and output language in a translation task. Each of these four categories will be discussed individually in greater detail below.

4.1. P-stranding

P-stranding in WHG is an example of ‘seeping’ from the socially-dominant L2 into the heritage variety, à la p-gaps (Bousquette et al. 2013, cf. Grosjean 2008), or from the simultaneous availability of even competing structures from either language spoken by the HS (Pascual y Cabo & Gómez Soler 2015). Presented below is one English prompt containing p-stranding (6), and two responses from consultants containing p-stranding (7), (8).

- (6) English
Is that the hammer that_i you broke the tractor [PP with t_i]?
 ‘Is that the hammer that you broke the tractor with?’

- (7) Wisconsin Heritage German
Is das der Hammer das_i du den Traktor gebrochen hast
Is that the hammer that you the tractor broken have
[PP mit t_i]? (DR)
 with
 ‘Is that the hammer that you broke the tractor with?’

- (8) Wisconsin Heritage German
Is das der Cousin wo_i du [PP mit t_i] nach die Schul
Is that the cousin REL.2.SG you with to the school
bist gegangen? (WW)
 are gone
 ‘Is that the cousin who you went to school with?’

In the two examples given, we see that the stranded P may be at the end of the clause – as in (7) – or may appear higher in the clause (8). Dialects of Ripuarian and Rhenish Franconian do license structures similar to (8), in which the stranded preposition appears within the verbal frame, and these are among the pre-immigration varieties identified in the data set (Fleischer 2002: 171; Bousquette 2014). Examples like (7), in which the preposition is stranded outside of the verbal frame, are exceedingly rare: Fleischer (2002: 172) notes only four dialects of German that license this type of p-stranding, and none of them were spoken by the ancestors of these WHG speakers. We may more plausibly consider (7) as transfer from English, and (8) as a possible dialectal feature of WHG. In the data set overall, 6/8 speakers ‘stranded’ prepositions as in (7), with 1/6 showing examples like (8). We may therefore assign the majority of the p-stranding cases in WHG to cross-linguistic transfer, with the caveat that a minority of the p-stranding forms might show pre-immigration dialectal syntax.

4.2. Pied-piping

As noted above, English allows for p-stranding, whereas German prohibits extraction of an NP from a PP complement, requiring pied-piping – or, the fronting of the entire PP and its NP complement. However, while the licensing of p-stranding in both languages exhibits typological differences, pied-piping is possible in both languages – though it is somewhat archaic or formal sounding in English. In this sense, evidence of pied-piping in WHG would not be unexpected, because the construction is licit in both grammars. Presented below is an example of the English structure (9), along with an expected Standard German equivalent with pied piping (10).

- (9) English
Is that the hammer that_i you broke the window [PP with t_i]?
 ‘Is that the hammer that you broke the window with?’
- (10) Standard German
Ist das der Hammer [PP mit dem]_i du t_i das Fenster
is that the hammer with which you the window
zerbrochen hast?
 broken have
 ‘Is that the hammer with which you broke the window?’

Both examples from this WHG corpus come from the same speaker, given below in (11) and (12).

- (11) Wisconsin Heritage German
Is hie de Kousine [PP ø wo]_{i-s} du t_i in de Schul
is he the cousin who you in the school
bist jange? (ET)
 are gone
 ‘Is he the cousin with whom you went to school?’
- (12) Wisconsin Heritage German
Is dat de Hammer [PP ø wo]_{i-s} du t_i de fink
is that the hammer which you the window
verbrach hast? (ET)
 broken have
 ‘Is that the hammer with which you broke the window?’

Though the preposition itself is not overtly realized, the structure of (11) and (12) is identical to the pied piping structure³ in (10), with respect to the position of the trace (t_i). Admittedly, though, the two examples of this structure both come from a single speaker (ET), and this paucity of data precludes any broader generalizations about this type of syntactic construction in the HL community.

4.3. Benefactor and Recipient Datives

In English, the recipient/benefactor is expressed either through neutral word order, as the indirect object (e.g. He gave *her* the book); or through the use of a preposition to mark the theta role of beneficent/recipient (e.g. He gave the book *to her*, or in (13) below).

- (13) English
Is that the man_i you gave the book [PP to t_i]?
 ‘Is that the man you gave the book to?’

In Standard German, however, this relationship is marked using the dative case. Some examples in WHG follow a German-like pattern, when the PP complement in the English prompt is a beneficiary/recipient (see Table 2). However, contrary to Standard German, WHG underspecifies for case with the non-standard, animate relative pronoun *wo*. The WHG example in (14) below therefore has the same word order and underlying structure as the Standard German equivalent in (15).⁴

³ Under the Extended Projection Principle (EPP; Chomsky 1982), we would assume that some non-overt element exists in the specifier position of the embedded CP, heading the subordinate clause; the raising of the NP object of the preposition would not be motivated without some kind of CP operant at the head of the clause.

⁴ As in section 4.2, we would invoke EPP to motivate movement of the NP to a topical position in (14), in this case, to be assigned a theta role.

- (14) Wisconsin Heritage German (NP analysis)
Is dat de Kerl [NP_{DAT} wo]_{i-S} du t_i den Buch geben hast? (ET)
 is that the man REL.2.SG you the book given have
 ‘Is that the man whom you gave the book?’
- (15) Standard German
Ist das der Mann [NP_{DAT} dem]_i du t_i das Buch gegeben hast?
 is that the man whom you the book given have
 ‘Is that the man whom you gave the book?’

In this sense, the English preposition *to* and the Standard German dative both mark the same theta role, as recipient. In WHG, the underspecified dative is structurally identical to the Standard German, and the presence of both the nominative pronoun *du* (you.NOM.2SG) and the inflection on C-agr *wos* (REL.2SG) further disambiguate any possible confusion regarding the subject in the clause.

4.4. VP Complements / VP restructuring

As noted throughout this work, English allows extraction of an NP complement from a PP (16), but German does not, requiring pied piping (17).

- (16) English
Is that the woman who_i you talked [PP to t_i]?
 ‘Is that the woman who you talked to?’
- (17) German
Ist das die Frau, [PP mit der]_i du t_i gesprochen hast?
 is that the woman with whom you spoken have?
 ‘Is that the woman with whom you have spoken?’

However, 13 examples in the corpus show a restructuring of the English prompt, incorporating the English PP head into the German separable prefix verb. This effectively converts a PP into an NP, as in (18); this is most common among the commutative examples (see Table 2).

- (18) Reanalysis of English P as German ADV in separable prefix V
 [[PP[NP]]VP]] >> [NP[VP]]

Analogous to *mit jemandem arbeiten* ‘to work with someone’ becoming *jemanden mitarbeiten* ‘to collaborate (with) someone’, this sort of restructuring of the verb + PP complement as a separable prefix verb turns ‘mit jemandem schwätzen’ into ‘jemanden mitschwätzen’ (19), and ‘mit jemandem schaffen’ into ‘jemanden mitschaffen’ (20).

- (19) Wisconsin Heritage German
Is dat de Frau wo_{i-S} du [VP t_i 'mitgeschwat hast]? (ET)
 is that the woman REL.2.SG you with-spoken have
 ‘Is that the woman who you talked-to?’
- (20) Wisconsin Heritage German
Ist das der Mann wo_{i-S} du [VP t_i hast 'mitgeschaffi]? (WG)
 is that the man REL.2.SG you have with-worked
 ‘Is that the man who you worked-with?’

The PP complement, which is un-extractable in Standard German, becomes a VP complement in (19) and (20), which is extractable in both German and English (e.g. in *wh*-movement, topicalization, etc.). The non-standard word order in the verb cluster in (20) helps us to establish that this *mit* ('with') is a verbal prefix: because it falls between the auxiliary and the participle, it must be assumed that it is part of the verbal cluster. In (20), the position of the auxiliary to the left of the past participle allows us to locate *mit* within the verbal cluster, and to assign it as part of the participle (cf. (5) above). In addition to the prosody of (19) in which the prefix *mit* bears stress, we have sufficient evidence from (20) for the proposed reanalysis in (18), and can therefore extend that same analysis to (19), and to the other 11 examples in the corpus.

It is here suggested that this sort of restructuring is possibly a repair strategy in the syntax to align ungrammatical *p*-stranding structures in the English prompt with German constraints that prohibit the structure.

5. Conclusion

Analysis of the current data provides evidence that there is some L2 influence attested in examples of *p*-stranding, consistent with Pascual y Cabo & Gómez Soler (2015) and King (2000). We must subsequently consider the broader implications of this data in Heritage German, as well as in previous studies on Heritage Spanish and Heritage French: first, that so-called 'core' aspects of the (heritage) grammar are susceptible to change, including language-specific parameters of phrasal extraction, and the licensing of null/trace elements; and second, that the adoption of *p*-stranding from the L2 into the HL involves an increased cognitive load due to the increase in null/trace elements, relative to the monolingual standard language, or as compared to the pre-immigration variety. Overall, though, these data are consistent with the general picture of Germanic Heritage Languages in North America, in that the grammar reflects an underlyingly German(ic) syntax, with structurally limited language transfer phenomena from the socially dominant L2. Together with evidence of *p*-gapping in this community (Bousquette et al 2013, 2016a, 2016b), this evidence of *p*-stranding suggests that a broader restructuring of syntax is possible in extended language contact settings.

Still, while the data show adoption of L2 syntactic structures, the majority of forms nevertheless show licit structures in a German grammar, including (modified) pied piping (section 4.2), and the marking of the beneficiary/recipient theta roles using case instead of preposition marking (section 4.3). Most striking, perhaps, is the restructuring of prepositions in the English prompt as verbal prefixes in the German translation (section 4.4), which modifies English PP-extraction to be congruent with German constraints, which only permit VP extraction. The sum of the evidence supports Pascual y Cabo & Gómez Soler (2015), who argue that HSs have access to both grammars simultaneously, such that both *p*-stranding and pied piping are available to them. The evidence presented here also supports previous research in this WHG community, that the simultaneous activation of both the HL and the L2 results in negotiated forms that are licit in both grammars.

References

- Benmamoun, Elabbas, Silvina Montrul & Maria Polinsky. 2013. Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics* 39(3–4). 129–181.
- Boas, Hans C., Marc Pierce & Collin L. Brown. 2014. On the Variability of *wo* as a Complementizer. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung / Language Typology and Universals* 67(4). 589–611.
- Born, Renate. 1994. *Michigan German in Frankenmuth: Variation and Change in an East Franconian Dialect* (Studies in German Literature, Linguistics and Culture). Columbia: Camden House.
- Bousquette, Joshua. 2013. *C-Agreement in Modern Dialects of West Germanic: A model of reanalysis and renewal*. University of Wisconsin–Madison. PhD Dissertation.
- Bousquette, Joshua. 2014. Complementizer Agreement in eastern Wisconsin: (Central) Franconian features in an American heritage language community. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung / Language Typology and Universals* 67(4). 561–588.
- Bousquette, Joshua. (Forthcoming, 2018). You take the low road and I'll take the high road: Variation in agreement structure in Wisconsin Heritage German. *Journal of Language Contact* 11(3).

- Bousquette, Joshua, Benjamin Frey, Nick Henry, Daniel Nützel, Michael Putnam, Joseph Salmons & Alyson Sewell. 2013. How deep is your syntax – Filler-gap dependencies in heritage language grammar. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 19(1). 19–30.
- Bousquette, Joshua, Michael T. Putnam, Joseph Salmons, Benjamin Frey & Daniel Nützel. 2016a. Multiple Grammars, Dominance, and Optimization. *Optimality Theoretic Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics: From uni- to bidirectional optimization* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics), Géraldine Legendre, Michael T. Putnam, Henriette de Swart & Erin Zaroukian (eds.), 158–176. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bousquette, Joshua, Benjamin Frey, Michael Putnam, Joseph Salmons & Daniel Nützel. 2016b. Parasitic Gapping in Bilingual Grammar: Evidence from Wisconsin German. *Heritage Language Journal* 13(1). 1–28.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 6). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dubenion-Smith, Shannon A. 2010. Verbal complex phenomena in West Central German: Empirical domain and multi-causal account. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 22(2). 99–191.
- Fleischer, Jürg. 2002. *Die Syntax von Pronominaladverbien in den Dialekten des Deutschen: eine Untersuchung zu Preposition Stranding und verwandten Phänomenen* (Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik 123). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Grosjean, François. 2008. *Studying bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johannessen Janne Bondi & Ida Larsson. 2015. Complexity matters: gender agreement in Heritage Scandinavian. *Frontiers in Psychology, Language Sciences, The Grammar of Multilingualism*. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01842
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi & Ida Larsson. (Forthcoming, 2018). Stability and change in grammatical gender: pronouns in Heritage Scandinavian. *Journal of Language Contact* 11(3).
- Joo, Hyoun-A. forthcoming (2018). Breaking up verb clusters: Two-verb constructions in Moundridge Schweitzer German. *Journal of Language Contact* 11(3).
- Keel, William. 2015. Noun Phrase Case Shift in Volga German Varieties on the Great Plains of Kansas. *Moribund Germanic Heritage Languages in North America: Theoretical Perspectives & Empirical Findings* (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 8), Richard B. Page & Michael T. Putnam (eds.), 133–152. Leiden: Brill.
- King, Ruth. 2000. *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing: a Prince Edward Island French case study*. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 209). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- König, Ekkehard & Volker Gast. 2012. *Understanding English-German Contrasts* (3rd edition) (Grundlagen der Anglistik und Amerikanistik 29). Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. 2011. Why not heritage speakers? *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 1(1). 58–62.
- Nützel, Daniel. 2009. *The East Franconian Dialect of Haysville, Indiana: A Study in Language Death*. Regensburg: Edition Vulpes.
- Nützel, Daniel & Joseph Salmons. 2011. Language Contact and New Dialect Formation: Evidence from German in North America. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 5. 705–717.
- Pascual y Cabo, Diego & Inmaculada Gómez Soler. 2015. Preposition Stranding in Spanish as a Heritage Language. *Heritage Language Journal* 12(2). 186–209.
- Putnam, Michael & Liliana Sánchez. 2013. What's so incomplete about incomplete acquisition? A prolegomenon to modeling heritage language grammars. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 3(4). 476–506.
- Sewell, Alyson. 2015. Sociolinguistic and Syntactic Variation in Wisconsin German Narratives. *Moribund Germanic Heritage Languages in North America: Theoretical Perspectives & Empirical Findings* (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 8), Richard B. Page & Michael T. Putnam (eds.), 224–250. Leiden: Brill.
- Sorace, A. 2011. Pinning down the concept of "interface" in bilingualism. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 1(1). 1–33.

Selected Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Immigrant Languages in the Americas (WILA 8)

edited by Jan Heegård Petersen
and Karoline Kühn

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2018

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Immigrant Languages in the Americas (WILA 8)
© 2018 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-473-7 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Bousquette, Joshua. 2018. *Is das der Hammer, das du den Traktor gebrochen hast mit?* Preposition Stranding in Wisconsin Heritage German. In *Selected Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Immigrant Languages in the Americas (WILA 8)*, ed. Jan Heegård Petersen and Karoline Kühn, 18-27. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3427.