

# GRAMMATIK i FOKUS 36, 2022

## ***PROGRAM***

Torsdagen den 10e februari och fredagen den 11e februari 2022  
Thursday, 10th February & Friday, 11th February 2022

Zoom länk: <https://lu-se.zoom.us/j/64814061905>

### Torsdagen den 10e februari

**13.00–13.05** **Symposiet öppnas / Opening remarks**

13.05–13.35 *Ken Ramshøj Christensen & Anne Mette Nyvad* (Aarhus Universitet): **On frequency effects on acceptability. Should we care?**

13.35–14.05 *Therese Landh* (Uppsala universitet): **Om svenska preteritumformer och deras produktivitet**

**14.05–14.15** **Paus**

14.15–14.45 *Jan-Ola Östman* (University of Helsinki) & *Tomas Lehecka* (Åbo Akademi University): **What grammarians think lay people should know about language**

14.45–15.15 *Nigel Vincent* (University of Manchester): **Suppletion, syntax and silence**

**15.15–15.30** **Paus**

15.30–16.00 *Ulla Stroh-Wollin* (Uppsala universitet): **En tvåvägsmodell för spridningen av bestämd artikel**

16.00–16.30 *Eva Klingvall* (Lund university) & *Fredrik Heinat* (Linnaeus University): **Quantifier reference in production**

**16.30–16.40** **Paus**

16.40–17.10 *Sten Vikner* (Aarhus Universitet) & *Jürg Fleischer* (Forschungszentrum Deutscher Sprachatlas, Philipps-Universität Marburg): **Are there OV languages that also allow VO? About *und*-infinitives in South Schleswig**

17.10–17.40 *Christiane Müller, Anne Mette Nyvad & Ken Ramshøj Christensen* (Aarhus University): **Variability in English adjunct islands**

## Fredagen den 11e februari

- 9.00–9.30 *Gerd Carling* (Lund University): **How grammar coevolves with culture: the case of noun categorization**
- 9.30–10.00 *Ann-Charlotte Gutsjö*: **A model for establishing what substantives belonged to the ũ-declension in Old Church Slavonic**
- 10.00–10.30 *William Miki Thorsen* (Aarhus University): **Negative polarity items in Danish and English**
- 10.30–10.45 Paus**
- 10.45–11.15 *Loren Billings, Victor Bogren Svensson & Arthur Holmer* (Lund University): **Clitic clusters in northern Austronesian**
- 11.15–11.45 *Victor Bogren Svensson* (Lund University): **Reduced voices**
- 11.45 **Symposiet avslutas / Closing remarks**

## "On frequency effects on acceptability. Should we care?"

Ken Ramshøj Christensen & Anne Mette Nyvad, Aarhus Universitet

It is sometimes argued that (certain types of) lexical frequency and constructional frequency play a crucial role in language processing (e.g. Gries & Divjak 2012; Reali & Christiansen 2007). Other have argued that grammatical principles interact with and often override such effects (e.g. Bornkessel, Schlesewsky & Friederici 2002; Yang 2015; White & Rawlins 2019).

We present preliminary results from an ongoing survey with 200+ participants. We asked people to evaluate the acceptability of a number of sentences of different types with and without extraction, including complement clauses, relative clauses, and parasitic gaps, and ungrammatical sentences.

We predicted that acceptability and structural complexity to be negatively correlated (the more complex, the less acceptable). Specifically, extraction from relative clauses and parasitic gaps are score high on structural complexity but somewhat low on acceptability (perhaps even intermediate level), independent on frequency. Both are infrequent, parasitic gaps presumably almost non-existent, but both are assumed to be grammatical. The level of acceptability is predicted to be somewhat but not dramatically affected by lexical frequency. Crucially, ungrammatical sentences are predicted to be immune to such effects.

The results show a pattern that is consistent with grammatical principles and processing constraints (Christensen & Nyvad 2014; Nyvad, Christensen & Vikner 2017). Extraction reduces acceptability compared to canonical word order, and so does adjunction compared to complement clauses. Frequency, on the other hand, seems to be less important, though it does have an effect.

Bornkessel, Ina, Matthias Schlesewsky & Angela D. Friederici. 2002. Grammar overrides frequency: Evidence from the online processing of flexible word order. *Cognition* 85(2). B21–B30.

Christensen, Ken Ramshøj & Anne Mette Nyvad. 2014. On the nature of escapable relative islands. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 37(1). 29–45. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000055>.

Gries, Stefan Thomas & Dagmar Divjak (eds.). 2012. *Frequency effects in language learning and processing* (Trends in Linguistics : Studies and Monographs 244:1). Berlin ; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Nyvad, Anne Mette, Ken Ramshøj Christensen & Sten Vikner. 2017. CP-recursion in Danish: A cP/CP-analysis. *The Linguistic Review* 34(3). 449–477. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2017-0008>.

Reali, Florencia & Morten H. Christiansen. 2007. Processing of relative clauses is made easier by frequency of occurrence. *Journal of Memory and Language* 57(1). 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2006.08.014>.

White, Aaron Steven & Kyle Rawlins. 2019. Frequency, acceptability, and selection: a case study of clause-embedding. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004596>.

Yang, Charles D. 2015. For and against frequencies. *Journal of Child Language* 42(02). 287–293. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000914000683>.

## Om svenska preteritumformer och deras produktivitet

*Therese Landh, Institutionen för nordiska språk, Uppsala universitet*

Bland svenskans verbkonjugationer brukar man säga att den första, med stamslut – och därmed imperativform – på *-a*, är den enda produktiva. Nybildade svenska verb följer alltid detta mönster; det heter alltså *googla!*, *streama!*, *mejla!*, *svajpa!*. Övriga konjugationer drar inte till sig nybildningar, men kan få nya medlemmar om verb byter konjugation. Exempelvis har ett svagt verb av andra konjugationen som *strida* blivit starkt – *stridde* har blivit *stred* (Landh 2019) – och man stöter ibland på svaga former som *skärde* och *bärde* istället för de ursprungliga *skar* eller *bar*.

Trots att den första konjugationen är den enda som är produktiv i den bemärkelsen att den konsekvent inlemmar nybildningar brukar de övriga konjugationerna inte betraktas som oregelbundna. Den andra och tredje konjugationen följer i princip samma böjningsmönster som den första (med *-(e)r* för presens, *-de/-te* för preteritum etc.), och de flesta starka verb böjs enligt särskilda mönster.

Enligt en relativt färsk princip för språkinlärning, den så kallade *Tolerance Principle* (Yang 2016), går det att räkna ut när det är ekonomiskt för språkinläraren att postulera en produktiv böjningsregel snarare än att lagra individuella böjningsformer i lexikon. Principen har visat sig hålla i ett dussintal olika fallstudier, exempelvis vad gäller tyska substantivs pluralformer och engelska verbs dåtidsformer. För engelskan gäller regeln 'add *-d* for past tense' (*walk-walked*) och de undantag som finns (exempelvis *sing-sang* och *fly-flew*) är så pass få att det är mest ekonomiskt för språkbrukaren att lagra de oregelbundna dåtidsformerna en och en i lexikon.

Det är rimligt att tänka sig att även svenskans svaga preteritumformer bildas regelmässigt med hjälp av suffixet *-de*, men hur står det egentligen till med de starka formerna? I detta föredrag presenterar jag en pilotstudie inom ramen för mitt avhandlingsprojekt. Jag undersöker de olika preteritumtypernas förekomst i ett mindre textmaterial för att på sikt möjliggöra analys av hur *Tolerance Principle* fungerar för svenska, där starka former utgör en mycket större del av preteritumfloran än vad som är fallet i engelskan.

## **Referenser**

Landh, T., 2019. Kvalitet eller kvantitet? En studie i potentiella morfologiska begränsningar när svenska verb blir starka. Magisteruppsats. Stockholms universitet, Institutionen för svenska och flerspråkighet.

Yang, C., 2016. The Price of Linguistic Productivity: How Children Learn to Break the Rules of Language. The MIT Press.

# What grammarians think lay people should know about language

Jan-Ola Östman & Tomas Lehecka

University of Helsinki | Åbo Akademi University

Over the last decade, many fields of science have seen an increased interest in lay people's perceptions and understanding of scientific facts and phenomena. In particular, studies have focused on common misperceptions with respect to the most pressing challenges of our time, such as social inequality, public health, and climate change (e.g. Rosling et al. 2018, de Figueiredo et al. 2020). There is a plethora of anecdotal evidence suggesting that lay people hold many false beliefs about language (e.g. Bauer & Trudgill 1998, Parkvall 2009, Davies 2012), but these misperceptions have not been subjected to detailed empirical investigation. Our current research project seeks to address this challenging point by conducting a large-scale survey into the nature and prevalence of language-related misperceptions among the general public.

In order to survey what lay people know about language, one needs first to decide what questions their knowledge should be tested with. In other words, what should the general public know about language for their own benefit or for the benefit of society? To this end, we carried out a global survey among linguists (n = 552) where we asked linguists to write down questions about language that they think everyone should know the answer to. We received 3,349 open text responses which we have annotated and categorized thematically.

The results of the survey to linguists show that views about what is important for the general public to be aware of vary between linguists from different parts of the world, and between linguists who are active in different subfields of linguistics. In this contribution, we focus, in particular, on comparing the views of "grammarians" (i.e. linguists who work in subfields such as morphology, syntax etc.) against linguists from other subfields. We show, for example, that grammarians consider, on average, the relationship between standard language and dialects a more important issue than what linguists from other subfields do. Similarly, grammarians mention questions about sign language more frequently than what other linguists do.

The aim of our talk is to raise discussion about the "universals" of important language-related issues and facts, and what role grammatical knowledge plays among them.

## References

- Bauer, L., & Trudgill, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Language myths*. Penguin UK.
- Davies, W. V. (2012). Myths we live and speak by. *Standard languages and multilingualism in European history*, 1, 45-69.
- De Figueiredo, A., Simas, C., Karafillakis, E., Paterson, P., & Larson, H. J. (2020). Mapping global trends in vaccine confidence and investigating barriers to vaccine uptake: a large-scale retrospective temporal modelling study. *The Lancet*, 396(10255), 898-908.
- Parkvall, M. (2009). *Lagom finns bara i Sverige*. Schibsted.
- Rosling, H., Rosling, O. & Rosling Rönnlund, A. (2018). *Factfulness: Ten reasons we're wrong about the world – and why things are better than you think*. New York: Flatiron Books.

## Suppletion, syntax and silence

NIGEL VINCENT

*The University of Manchester*

Suppletion is a phenomenon that is at once marginal and central. It is marginal in the sense that for any given syntactic category (with the possible exception of pronouns) in any language the proportion of items which display suppletive morphology is very low. And yet the treatment of suppletion has become a central question in debates about the relation between morphology and syntax. According to Halle & Marantz (1993: 113) and Distributed Morphology (DM), the empirical marginality matches its theoretical insignificance, while for Paradigm Function Morphology (PFM) alternations such as French *vais, vont, allons, aller, irai*, etc. demonstrate the need to postulate the paradigm as core theoretical construct and in consequence the superiority of a monostratal model (Maiden 2018: ch 11 and contrast Pomino & Remberger 2019). More recently, Kayne (2019, 2020) has proposed the use of silent heads as a solution to the problems posed by suppletive patterns, thereby taking a step towards the more extreme view in which morphology as an independent component does not exist and all morphology is subsumed within syntax (Collins & Kayne 2020). In a formally different but conceptually related way Starke (2020) denies the existence of irregular morphology and deploys a range of nanosyntactic techniques to address patterns of apparent irregularity. What these latter approaches have in common is that they are derivational, a property which they share with DM, and therein lies the problem since patterns of suppletion demonstrate the need to recognise descriptively and model theoretically patterns that can only be stated in transderivational terms. We will argue instead for a monostratal approach to morphology, syntax and the relations between them. The empirical domain on which we will focus concerns the history and structure of GO verbs in Romance and Germanic.

- Collins, Chris & Richard Kayne. 2020. Towards a theory of morphology as syntax. MS. Dept of Linguistics, NYU. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005693>
- Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser (eds) *The View from Building 20. Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 111-176.
- Kayne, Richard. 2019. What is suppletion? On \**goed* and *went* in Modern English. In Vincent & Plank (eds), 434-454.
- Kayne, Richard. 2020a. A note on the silent GO that underlies an instance of apparent suppletion in Spanish. *Isogloss* 6/4: 1-12.
- Kayne, Richard. 2020b. On a more demanding approach to suppletion. MS. Dept of Linguistics, NYU. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005618>
- Maiden, Martin. 2018. *The Romance Verb. Morphomic Structure and Diachrony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pomino, Natascha & Eva-Maria Remberger. 2019. Verbal suppletion in Romance synchrony and diachrony: the perspective of Distributed Morphology. In Vincent & Plank (eds) 471-97.
- Starke, Michal. 2020. U(niversal) M(orphology). [https://michal.starke.ch/talks/2020-11\\_nels/nels\\_starke.mp4](https://michal.starke.ch/talks/2020-11_nels/nels_starke.mp4)
- Vincent, Nigel & Frans Plank (eds). 2019. *The Diachrony of Suppletion. Transactions of the Philological Society* 117.3.

## En tvåvägsmodell för spridningen av bestämd artikel

Bestämda artiklar utvecklas normalt ur demonstrativa pronomen, vilket kan förstås så att demonstrativer som används för anaforisk referens först tappar sin deiktiska karaktär, varpå de kan spridas som rena definitmarkörer till andra referentiella kategorier. Detta är också min principiella utgångspunkt. Litteraturen erbjuder emellertid olika sätt att identifiera vilka (semantiskt definita) referentiella kategorier man ska räkna med och därmed olika sätt att beskriva spridningen från en kategori till en annan.

Grammatikaliseringsmodellen i Skrzypek et al. 2021 (som bygger på grammatikaliseringssteorin enligt Heine 2002) utgår i princip från kategorier som Hawkins (1978) räknar med. Modellens *direct anaphora*, *indirect anaphora* och *unique reference* motsvaras av Hawkins *anaphoric uses*, *associative anaphoric uses* respektive *larger situational uses* (där den sista typen avser användning av bestämd artikel då referenten är unikt identifierbar utan särskild förankring i den tidigare diskursen). Till dessa kategorier, som beskriver successiva steg i utvecklingen fogas i modellen även generiskt bruk av bestämd artikel. Spridningen av den bestämda artikeln (i vardande) skulle därmed följa gången i (1).

(1) deictic NPs > direct anaphora > indirect anaphora > unique reference > generic NPs

En annan modell ges av "the scale of uniqueness" i Löbner 2011. Löbner utgår ifrån att substantiv kan delas in i fyra olika typer beroende på om de besitter eller inte besitter lexikalt inherent unikhet ( $[\pm U]$ ) och/eller lexikalt inherent relationalitet ( $[\pm R]$ ), där +R innebär en inneboende relation till en "possessor". Exempel på de olika kategorierna är *sol* [+U, -R], *kung* [+U, +R], *finger* [-U, +R] och *träd* [-U, -R]. Hypotesen finner stöd i det faktum att språk är mindre benägna att använda bestämd artikel tillsammans med substantiv med inherent U- och R-drag än substantiv utan dessa drag, ungefär enligt den mycket förenklade varianten av "the scale of uniqueness" i (2).

(2) deictic NPs > dir. anaphora [-U, -R] > ind. anaphora  $[\pm R]$  > [+U] NPs > proper names

Den implikativa ordningen i (2) anses även visa den diakrona spridningen av bestämd artikel när en sådan utvecklas.

Jag menar att ingen av modellerna i (1) och (2) fullt ut kan förklara den bestämda artikelns expansion till nya referentiella kategorier. Jag vill i stället föreslå att spridningen sker utmed två olika vägar, en "semantisk", som tar hänsyn till lexikala U- och R-drag, och en "pragmatisk", som gäller när sådana drag saknas. Jag tycker mig också finna visst stöd för denna ordning i mina studier av artikelbruket i de tidiga nordiska språken.

### Referenser

- Hawkins, John A. 1978. *Definiteness and indefiniteness: a study in reference and grammaticality prediction*. London: Croom Helm.
- Heine, Bernd. 2002. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Löbner, Sebastian. 2011. Concept Types and Determination. *Journal of Semantics* 28, 279–333.
- Skrzypek, Dominika, Alicja Piotrowska & Rafal Jaworski. 2021. *The Diachrony of Definiteness in North Germanic*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

## Quantifier reference in production

Eva Klingvall, Lund University & Fredrik Heinat, Linnæus University

In this talk, we discuss DISCOURSE SALIENCE patterns of negative quantifying expressions (e.g. *inte många*, *few*, *inte riktigt alla* ‘not many’, ‘few’, ‘not quite all’) in Swedish, from both a hearer (comprehender) and a speaker (producer) perspective. What is salient to a hearer is not necessarily the same as what is salient to a speaker. For hearers, sentence TOPICS are often more salient than non-topics (COMMENTS), while for speakers, FOCUSED material is often more salient than BACKGROUNDED material (e.g. Chiarcos, 2010; Molnár and Vinckel-Roisin, 2019). The hearer perspective has been extensively studied in the context of pronoun resolution. Unstressed personal pronouns, i.e. highly unmarked forms, are generally interpreted to refer back to the referent that is most topical (e.g. Ariel, 1990; Gundel et al., 1993).

In three sentence completion experiments, we investigated what discourse referent participants selected as discourse topic when they wrote a continuation of a sentence involving a negative, quantified expression. For such quantifying expressions, both the set of entities for which some property is true, the REFERENCE SET, and the set of entities for which the property is *not* true, the COMPLEMENT SET, are available for anaphoric reference. Research on English has shown that speakers generally prefer to refer back to the COMPLEMENT SET although both sets are possible (e.g. Moxey and Sanford, 1987; Sanford et al., 2007):

- (1) Not many kids were outside in the morning.
- a. They were building a snow castle. REFSET
  - b. They stayed inside instead. COMPSET

By looking at (i) which set speakers referred back to, and (ii) what linguistic form they used to refer to this set, we investigated what discourse topic speakers selected and how this selection reflected both hearer and speaker salience of discourse entities. In Experiments 1 and 2, the participants read the sentence in (2a), prompting them to write a continuation with a noun-phrase subject, while in Experiment 3, they read the sentence in (2b), prompting them to write a continuation with a clausal subject.

- (2) a. QE föräldrar var på klassmötet igår **och de ...**  
‘QE parents were in the school meeting yesterday and they/the/those ...’
- b. QE föräldrar var på klassmötet igår **och att de ...**  
‘QE parents were in the class meeting yesterday and that they/the/those ...’

In Experiments 1 and 2, the linguistic form of the anaphor indicated that the COMPLEMENT SET was the most hearer-salient set for all negative quantifiers except *få/färre* (‘few/fewer’). However, for all quantifiers, it was the REFERENCE SET that was most salient from the speaker perspective. In Experiment 3, in contrast, the COMPLEMENT SET was the most salient set from both the hearer and the speaker perspective. The quantifier *få* again showed a different behaviour. Experiment 3 thus showed that the speaker salience pattern is also dependent on whether the subject of the continuation is an entity or a proposition.

## Referenser

- Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing noun-phrase antecedents*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chiarcos, Christian. 2010. Mental salience and grammatical form. Toward a framework for salience in natural language generation. Ph.d. thesis, University of Potsdam, Potsdam.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg, and Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69:274–307.
- Molnár, Valéria, and Hélène Vinckel-Roisin. 2019. Discourse topic vs. sentence topic. Exploiting the right periphery of German verb-second sentences. In *Architecture of topic*, ed. Valéria Molnár, Verner Egerland, and Susanne Winkler, 293–333. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Moxey, Linda M., and Anthony J. Sanford. 1987. Quantifiers and focus. *Journal of Semantics* 5:189–206.
- Sanford, Anthony J., Eugene J. Dawydiak, and Linda M. Moxey. 2007. A unified account of quantifier perspective effects in discourse. *Discourse Processes* 44:1–32.

## Are there OV languages that also allow VO? About *und*-infinitives in South Schleswig

Sten Vikner (Afdeling for Engelsk, Aarhus Universitet, Denmark)

&

Jürg Fleischer (Forschungszentrum Deutscher Sprachatlas, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany)

In the variants of German, Low German and North Frisian spoken in the very northernmost parts of present-day Germany (i.e. South Schleswig), we find infinitive constructions introduced by *und* 'and' where the infinitive verbs come before their complements:

*Ich will sehen und lernen mir das.*

(I will see and learn myself that/Jeg vil se og lære mig det)

(p. 29 in Fredsted, Elin. 1983. Spiser man mon børn i Flensborg? *Mål og Måle* 9.1, 27-31.)

*De stackels Jung süht keen Weg un retten sin Leven.*

(The poor boy sees no way and save his life/Den stakkels dreng ser ingen måde og redde sit liv)

(p. 96 in Asmussen, Klaus-Peter. 2019. *De smuckste Deern vun 'e Welt, ... un anner Märkens nü vertellt up Sleswigsche Geestplatt*. Märkens up Platt 17. Norderstedt: Books on Demand.

even though the verbs in these three languages usually follow their complements. In other words, it seems that these three languages, which are otherwise OV-languages (object before verb, as in ... *weil sie nie Tee trinkt*), here allow a VO-construction (verb before object, as in ... *fordi hun aldrig drikker te* = ... *because she never drinks tea*).

We will discuss the *und*-infinitive, its distribution and its origin, and we will propose an analysis of it which doesn't just see it as a "copy" of the Danish construction but instead as a kind of V2 construction (similar to **finite** main clauses in German/Low German/North Frisian and in Danish).

We completely agree with earlier discussions that this is a contact phenomenon between Danish and German/Low German/North Frisian in South Schleswig. This is shown by the use of *und* as an infinitive marker, as this is very likely to be influence from Danish - where the infinitive marker *at* and the coordinating conjunction *og* are most often pronounced the same, namely [ɔ].

On the other hand, as we will show, the word order in German (and North Frisian) *und*-infinitives is nevertheless very different from the word order in Danish infinitives, and that indicates that what we are looking at here is not just small "pockets" of Danish VO-grammar within the German (or North Frisian) OV-grammar. Instead, *und*-infinitives will be argued to be the result of the integration into the German OV-grammar of input originally generated by the (Danish) VO-grammars of non-native speakers of German (following the analysis originally suggested by Hoekstra 2011, 72–74).

Hoekstra, Jarich. 2011. "Rapider Sprachwechsel und syntaktische Trägheit im nordfriesisch-niederdeutsch-dänischen Sprachkontakt". In *Gute Sprache, Schlechte Sprache - Sprachnormen Und Regionale Vielfalt Im Wandel*, edited by Michael Elementaler and Ulrich Hoinkes, 63–76. Bern: Peter Lang.  
<https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-01395-5>.

## Variability in English adjunct islands

Christiane Müller, Anne Mette Nyvad & Ken Ramshøj Christensen  
(Aarhus University)

Adjunct clauses are traditionally assumed to be strong islands for extraction across languages, based on data such as (1) from English.

- (1) \*Who<sub>i</sub> did Mary cry [after John hit   <sub>i</sub>]?  
(Huang 1982: 503)

However, the universal island status of adjunct clauses has been challenged by reports that the Mainland Scandinavian (MSc.) languages allow extraction from finite adjuncts. Recent studies on Swedish and Norwegian show a more nuanced picture, indicating that adjunct clauses in the MSc. languages display a non-uniform behavior when it comes to their island sensitivity. Specifically, the possibility of extraction in these languages appears to be affected by various factors, including the type of adjunct clause (Bondevik et al. 2020; Müller 2017), the type of extraction dependency (Kush et al. 2018, 2019), and presence or absence of contextual facilitation (Kush et al. 2019). These findings seem to call for a re-evaluation of the situation in English regarding the islandhood of adjunct clauses.

In order to adequately assess whether English finite adjunct clauses really are uniformly strong islands, as reported in the traditional literature, we conducted an acceptability judgment study that tested extraction in the form of relativization from three different types of finite adjunct clauses in English (*if*-, *when*-, and *because*-clauses) in the presence of supporting context. We found that the three types of adjunct clauses showed a rather non-uniform pattern with regard to their acceptability: Extraction from *when*- and *because*-clauses both resulted in significantly lower ratings than extraction from *if*-clauses, which appeared to pattern with non-island *that*-clauses instead, in that they yielded ratings above the middle range. These findings suggest that at least for relativization, *if*-adjuncts are not invariably strong islands in English.

The variation in acceptability found as a function of the choice of complementizer is difficult to explain with a purely syntactic account and suggests that extra-grammatical factors may be key in understanding island structures traditionally assumed to be purely syntactic in nature.

### References

- Bondevik, I., Kush, D., & Lohndal, T. (2020). Variation in adjunct islands: The case of Norwegian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 1–32.
- Huang, C.-T. J. (1982). *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Kush, D., Lohndal, T. & Sprouse, J. (2018). Investigating variation in island effects: A case study of Norwegian Wh-extraction. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 36(3), 743–779.
- Kush, D., Lohndal, T. & Sprouse, J. (2019). On the island sensitivity of topicalization in Norwegian: An experimental investigation. *Language* 95(3), 393–420.
- Müller, C. (2017). Extraction from Adjunct Islands in Swedish. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 35(1), 67–85.

## How grammar coevolves with culture: the case of noun categorization

Gerd Carling, Lund University

The presentation will focus on the extent to which linguistic and other cultural features are vertically or horizontally transmitted in relation to human population history, and how such processes lead to the coevolution of grammatical and other cultural traits. Features of grammar may vary in their inherent propensity to become transmitted vertically (by lineage) or horizontally (via contact). As an example, grammatical gender is commonly transmitted within language families, whereas classifiers are more prone to spread by contact (Allasonnière-Tang and Dunn 2020; Allasonnière-Tang et al. 2021; Carling and Cathcart 2021). We find a similar behavior for cultural features: in particular, systems of kinship are strongly inclined towards vertical transmissibility (Guglielmino et al. 1995), and they can be reconstructed to earlier states of language families (Fortunato and Jordan 2010; Jordan et al. 2009). We use typological data for 3044 languages worldwide for gender, noun class and classifier systems, which we test for geographic and phylogenetic cohesion. We find that more grammaticalized features, i.e., gender and noun class, are more likely to be transmitted by lineage, whereas classifier systems are more likely to be transmitted by contact. By contrasting to climatological data, we find that it is highly likely that the global patterns of distribution for these systems (gender/noun class and classifiers) are caused by migrations and contact events during the mid-Holocene period (Allasonnière-Tang et al. 2021). In relation to this result, we suspect that the expansion of these linguistic systems by migration may pertain to mid-Holocene change in cultural systems (e.g., agriculture), which may coevolve with other cultural changes in for instance kinship systems. The presentation will consider various models and methods for testing the scenario of grammar-culture coevolution, using large data sets.

Allasonnière-Tang, Marc and Dunn, Michael (2020), 'The evolutionary trends of grammatical gender in Indo-Aryan languages', *Language Dynamics and Change*, 11 (2), 211-40.

Allasonnière-Tang, Marc, et al. (2021), 'Expansion by migration and diffusion by contact is a source to the global diversity of linguistic nominal categorization systems', *Nature Humanities & Social Science - Communications* 8:331.

Carling, Gerd and Cathcart, Chundra (2021), 'Reconstructing the evolution of Indo-European grammar', *Language* 97(3), 561-98.

Fortunato, Laura and Jordan, Fiona (2010), 'Your place or mine? A phylogenetic comparative analysis of marital residence in Indo-European and Austronesian societies', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 365 (1559), 3913-22.

Guglielmino, C. R., et al. (1995), 'Cultural Variation in Africa: Role of Mechanisms of Transmission and Adaptation', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 92 (16), 7585-89.

Jordan, Fiona M., et al. (2009), 'Matrilocal residence is ancestral in Austronesian societies', *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 276 (1664), 1957-64.

Abstract for a presentation at the symposium “Grammar in focus” number 36, at the University of Lund, Sweden on February 10 and 11, 2022.

**A model for establishing what substantives  
belonged to the ŭ-declension in Old Church Slavonic**

**Abstract**

Despite more than 200 years of research, various views are expressed about Old Church Slavonic (OCS) substantives, regarding to what declension some of them belonged. This is especially a problem when it comes to the ŭ- and o- declensions, a subject with serious disagreement among scholars; the influence the ŭ- and o- declensions had on each other makes it difficult to establish whether a particular substantive in OCS belonged to the ŭ-declension, and later became confused with the o-declension, and is therefore found with the case endings of the o-declension, or if the substantive belonged to the o-declension and was influenced by the ŭ-declension, and is therefore found with the case endings of the ŭ-declension in OCS sources.

After much consideration, I have constructed a “model” of how to confirm what substantives belonged to the ŭ-declension. Most scholars try to establish the ŭ-declension substantives in terms of preservation of the ŭ-declension case endings, or preservation of the -v- or -ov-, or that the corresponding substantives in other European languages belong to the ŭ-declension etc.; my idea is instead to analyse the grammatical changes of the definite ŭ-declension substantives, how and in what order the various cases endings change, and in this way describe the process that definitely decides that a substantive belonged to the ŭ-declension in OCS.

For the presentation, I have chosen the *Codex Suprasliensis* from the 10<sup>th</sup> century, the largest extant OCS manuscript (285 parchment folios x 2 sides), which is a collection of saints’ lives and homilies, as an illustration. The model will be tested not only on the definite ŭ-declension substantives, but also on eight substantives that the scholars really disagree on; some say they belonged to the ŭ-declension, some to the o-declension, in one case even to the ja-declension. The model shows that at least five of these substantives did belong to the ŭ-declension in OCS.

-----  
/Ann-Charlotte Gutsjö, independent researcher  
email: [anncharlotte.gutsjo@gmail.com](mailto:anncharlotte.gutsjo@gmail.com) and [acgutsjo@yahoo.se](mailto:acgutsjo@yahoo.se)  
Telephone: 0768-525504

# Negative Polarity Items in Danish and English

William Miki Thorsen (Dept. of English, Aarhus University)

In this talk, I will discuss *Negative Polarity Items* (NPIs) in Danish and English. NPIs are words or expressions that require a (negative) context to be grammatical, e.g., *ever* in (1)-(2) below:

(1) I have never *ever* visited Lund.

(2) \*I have *ever* visited Lund.

However, NPIs are licensed in a wider range of contexts than just sentential negation. A non-exhaustive list includes questions, if-clauses, superlative noun phrases, and negative quantifiers. The English NPI phenomenon has been discussed in detail since the 1960s, while Danish NPIs remain largely unexplored. The focus of my talk will be a subset of the Danish NPIs:

In Danish, the four NPIs *endnu* ‘yet’, *heller* ‘either’, *overhovedet* ‘at all’, and *slet* ‘at all’ form a uniquely strict class. These NPIs a) overwhelmingly prefer either sentential negation (e.g., *ikke/aldrig* ‘not/never’) or negative quantifiers (e.g., *ingen/intet* ‘no’) as their licensing context, and b) most naturally directly precede their licenser:

Det er *slet* ikke så svært at leve med diabetes ... (KorusDK)  
It is at.all not so hard to live with diabetes

‘It is not difficult to live with diabetes *at all*...’

Unlike the English *at all*, *slet* cannot occur after its licenser. Furthermore, when the strict Danish NPIs occur before their licenser, they must immediately precede said licenser:

\*Det er ikke så svært at leve med diabetes *slet* ...  
\*Det er *slet* faktisk ikke så svært at leve med diabetes ...  
It is at.all actually not so hard to live with diabetes

My analysis is that these strict NPIs are still c-commanded by sentential negation or a negative quantifier even though the NPI immediately precedes its licensing element, as c-command is a symmetric relation.

## Clitic clusters in northern Austronesian

Loren Billings, Victor Bogren Svensson, & Arthur Holmer  
*Lund University*

In many northern Austronesian languages both arguments of a transitive clause are reflected by clitic pronouns that are variously realized on the first phrase of the clause, the first head of the clause, or specifically the first verbal element. If both clitics are hosted by the same element, then the order in which they are realized relative to each other varies among these languages, based on several criteria: thematic role, syntactic relation, grammatical person, topicality, and phonological weight. (Grammatical number and gender have not been shown to be relevant, the latter not found at all.)

The talk presents data on approximately 80 languages from Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Malaysia within the framework of the ongoing research project *Mapping clitics: From cartography to geography*, and illustrates the various orders that have been found to date, formalized in terms of ranked Optimality-theoretic constraints.

If the ordering is based on thematic roles or syntactic relations, it holds for all combinations of clitics in a language, and no interaction of constraints is needed. The two constraints that have been identified are SUBJECT-1ST (found only in Seediq, Mantauran Rukai, and both Kalamianic languages) and the far more common ACTOR-1ST (e.g., Kavalan and Sarangani Bla'an). In most of these languages if there is a cluster of pronominal clitics, then the subject cannot be the Actor (and vice versa). In such languages, SUBJECT-1ST and ACTOR-1ST thus directly work against each other.

If the ordering is based on grammatical person, it often combines two constraints that are ranked with respect to each other. These can be conveniently described in terms of the features [ $\pm$ speaker] and [ $\pm$ addressee] (also used to distinguish between inclusive and exclusive first-person plurals). For the Austronesian languages investigated so far, only the ranking ME-1ST » YOU-1ST is attested (e.g., in Pngawan Atayal and Maranao), though in Algonquian languages of North America the ranking YOU-1ST » ME-1ST suggests that ME-1ST » YOU-1ST is not a universal. A rare variant of this ordering type is found (e.g., in Sgaliq Atayal and Iranun of Sabah) where YOU-1ST and ME-1ST are ranked in a conjoined local tie, resulting in the pattern only where *any* speech-act participant (first or second person) must precede a third-person pronoun within the clitic cluster.

Other criteria such as topicality (TOPIC-1ST, superordinate in two Manobo languages) or the number of syllables (LIGHT-1ST, unviolated in many languages of Central Philippine, including Tagalog, and much of Palawanic) interact with other constraints in fairly complex patterns that together capture all the orders found so far. Here Tagalog is illustrative: LIGHT-1ST » TOPIC-1ST » ACTOR-1ST. In other words, if there is a monosyllabic pronoun, then it must go first; otherwise, an especially topical (disyllabic) pronoun is cluster-initial; in all other clusters, the pronoun encoding the Actor goes first.

The presentation will also illustrate the attested rankings and how they are distributed geographically as well as within the Austronesian language family (determined based on other subgrouping evidence). This will allow us see whether there are any areal clusters of pronoun-ordering types and if the constraint rankings correlate with genealogical affiliation (or even if these two parameters are independent of each other).

Abstract for Grammar in Focus 2022  
Victor Bogren Svensson, Lund University  
*Reduced Voices*

Western Austronesian languages can be subdivided into two separate typological classes, Philippine-Type and Indonesian-Type languages (Himmelman 2005). Philippine-Type languages retain a four-way 'voice' system (also referred to as Austronesian Alignment or Austronesian Focus System). In contrast, Indonesian-Type languages only have a two-way contrast. Beyond differences in the 'voice' systems, other properties also vary between the two types. Philippine-Type languages tend to have a verb-initial basic word order, phrase-initial case markers, productive infixation, complex TAM-morphology, etc. (Reid & Liao 2004). These properties are generally not found in Indonesian-Type languages (Himmelman 2005).

Within the Philippine-Type, there are languages that have a reduced 'voice' system, exhibiting a three-way 'voice' contrast (instead of a four-way contrast, Blust 2001). The purpose of this study is to investigate this group of languages. The aims are twofold; Firstly, I will show that there is a great deal of variation in how the voice systems can become reduced, showing that 'Reduced Focus Languages' (term taken from Blust 2001) do not form a homogenous category. Secondly, I will discuss to what extent a reduction of the voice system correlates with a change in any of the other properties associated in more prototypical Philippine-Type languages.

By comparing 'Reduced Focus Languages', we can get a deeper understanding of how the four-way voice contrast can be reduced, thereby also shedding light on the controversial issue of the nature of the Austronesian Focus System (Guilfoyle, Hung & Travis 1992, Aldridge 2004, Erlewine, Levin & van Urk 2017, Chen 2017). Furthermore, by looking at other properties and how they correlate with the reduction of the voice system, this study might also be of relevance to diachronic linguistics, as it might further our understanding of the historical shift from the Philippine-Type to the Indonesian-Type.

#### References:

- Aldridge, Edith. 2004. *Ergativity and Word Order in Austronesian Languages*. Ithaca: Cornell University dissertation.
- Blust, Robert. 2001. "Notes on the history of 'focus' in Austronesian languages." *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*. Pacific Linguistics.
- Chen, Yen-hsin. 2017 *A Reexamination of the Philippine-Type Voice System and its Implications for Austronesian Primary-Level Subgrouping* University of Hawai'i at Mānoa dissertation.
- Erlewine, Michael, Theodore Levin, and Coppe van Urk. 2017. Ergativity and Austronesian-type voice systems. In J. Coon, D. Massam, and L. Travis (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*. Oxford University Press.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. "The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: typological characteristics." *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar* 110-181.
- Guilfoyle, Eithne, Henrietta Hung, and Lisa Travis. 1992. Spec of IP and Spec of VP: Two subjects in Austronesian languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10:375–414.
- Reid, Lawrence and Hsiu-Chuan Liao. 2004. "A Brief Syntactic Typology of Philippine Languages." *Language and Linguistics* 5, no. 2:433-490.