

CxGN 1

Constructions in the Nordics
Konstruktioner i Norden
Konstruksjoner i Norden

Workshop, Kiel University, 24–25 October 2019



Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel

Institut für Skandinavistik, Frisistik und
Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ISFAS)

Venue

Kiel University
Internationales Begegnungszentrum (IBZ)
Kiellinie 5
Kiel, Germany

Organizers

Steffen Höder (Kiel University)
Benjamin Lyngfelt (University of Gothenburg)
Julia Prentice (University of Gothenburg)

Local team

Steffen Höder (Kiel University)
Laura Steggewentze (Kiel University)

Website

constructionsinthenordics.org

Contact

email: info@constructionsinthenordics.org

Funding: Kiel University, Fund for Internationalisation

Contents

Welcome.....	4
Call for papers.....	5
Programme.....	6
Abstracts.....	8
Hans-Olav Enger (Oslo) & Tor Arne Haugen (Volda).....	8
Peter Andersson & Kristian Blensenius (Gothenburg).....	10
Johan Pedersen (Copenhagen).....	12
Anton Granvik (Gothenburg).....	14
Viktoria Strandberg (Gothenburg).....	16
Shiro Shibata (Osaka).....	18
Torodd Kinn (Bergen).....	20
Joel Olofsson (Trollhättan) & Julia Prentice (Gothenburg).....	22
Barthe Bloom (Jena).....	24
Aileen Urban (Kiel).....	26
Fredrik Valdeson (Stockholm).....	29
Camilla Håkansson (Gothenburg).....	31
Daria Mordashova (Moscow).....	33
Natalia Perkova (Stockholm/Uppsala).....	36
Practical information.....	39

Welcome

In the past decades, Construction Grammar (CxG) and related frameworks, such as Cognitive Linguistics or usage-based linguistics in general, have seen an increase in popularity in the Nordic countries as well as in studies on the Nordic languages. However, while Nordic researchers regularly participate in international conferences, CxG events specifically related to the Nordics are rare.

The *Constructions in the Nordics* workshop – the first in an intended series – aims at giving Nordic constructionists a platform to learn more about each other's work and form new collaborations. We want to gather both CxG researchers in the Nordic countries, regardless of what languages they are studying; and linguists applying constructionist approaches to any of the Nordic languages, regardless of where they are.

Researchers at Kiel University fall into the latter category. The local Department of Scandinavian Studies (part of the Institute of Scandinavian Studies, Frisian Studies and General Linguistics) is one of the largest Nordic departments outside the Nordic countries, and one of the three departments in Germany with a professorship in Scandinavian linguistics. At the same time, Kiel University is *almost* Scandinavian: It is geographically closer to Denmark than to Hamburg, it is located in the capital of the federal state of Schleswig-Holstein which recognizes Danish as an autochthonous minority language, and it was the second oldest university in the Danish monarchy for over 200 years.

CxGN 1 is intended as a multilingual workshop. Please feel free to use any of the Continental Scandinavian languages or English during presentations, discussions, coffee breaks, lunches, drinks, and dinner.

On behalf the organizing team, I wish all of us two pleasant, successful, and inspiring days – if you have any questions, please let us know.

Welcome to/Velkommen til/Välkomna till Kiel!

Steffen

Call for papers

This workshop, the first of an intended series, is a forum for both constructionist researchers in the Nordic countries, regardless of what languages they are studying, and linguists applying constructionist approaches to any of the Nordic languages, regardless of where they are.

In recent decades, **Construction Grammar (CxG)** has developed into a firmly established, but also an increasingly multifaceted approach to the study and description of language. This includes not only different strands of CxG theory, but also a wide range of linguistic phenomena that are investigated from a constructionist perspective, including work on lexical and grammatical structures as well as language change, linguistic variation, language contact, and language acquisition and even various forms of application in the fields of language technology and language teaching.

CxG and related frameworks, such as Cognitive Grammar or usage-based linguistics in general, have also seen an increase in popularity in the **Nordic countries** as well as in studies on **Nordic languages**. While Nordic researchers participate regularly in international conferences, CxG events specifically related to the Nordics are rare, a theme session at the 2017 *Svenskans beskrivning* in Uppsala being a notable exception.

Aiming at giving the **vibrant but somewhat scattered Nordic CxG community** a platform to learn more about each other's work and form new collaborations, *Constructions in the Nordics* is planned as a **series of CxG workshops**, starting out at Kiel University in 2019 and continuing at the University of Gothenburg in 2020. At these workshops, we want to gather both CxG researchers in the Nordic countries, regardless of what languages they are studying; and linguists applying constructionist approaches to any of the Nordic languages, regardless of where they are.

We welcome **30-minute presentations** in English, Danish, Norwegian or Swedish.

Programme

Wednesday, 23 October 2019	
19:00	Welcome drinks <i>Lagom</i> , Düsternbrooker Weg 38
Thursday, 24 October 2019	
9:00	Registration opens <i>Internationales Begegnungszentrum</i> , Kiellinie 5
9:30	Opening remarks
9:45	Pannekakekonstruksjonar i skandinavisk <i>Hans-Olav Enger (Oslo) & Tor Arne Haugen (Volda)</i>
10:25	Pejorativity in pseudocoordination: examples from Swedish <i>Peter Andersson & Kristian Blensenius (Gothenburg)</i>
11:05	Coffee
11:20	Are there Spanish (near) equivalents to the Germanic <i>be</i> -construction? Morphological schematization and the (missing) typological link <i>Johan Pedersen (Copenhagen)</i>
12:00	Spanish <i>señal</i> 'sign(al)' as a shell noun: on the interplay between syntactic constructions and discourse function <i>Anton Granvik (Gothenburg)</i>
12:40	Lunch <i>Lagom</i> , Düsternbrooker Weg 38
14:10	Left-dislocation and hanging scene: A construction grammar account of two sentence-level constructions in contemporary Swedish <i>Viktoria Strandberg (Gothenburg)</i>
14:50	Att pressa ur sig <i>sig</i> eller inte ha med sig <i>sig</i> : Rollen av konstruksjonell betydelse i argumentrealisering <i>Shiro Shibata (Osaka)</i>
15:30	Coffee
15:45	Can the NPN nut be cracked? <i>Torodd Kinn (Bergen)</i>
16:25	Three enormous beers ago – the entrenchment of semi-schematic constructions in L2 Swedish <i>Joel Olofsson (Trollhättan) & Julia Prentice (Gothenburg)</i>
19:00	Workshop dinner <i>Längengrad</i> , Schwedenkai 1

Friday, 25 October 2019	
9:30	Life at the intersection: The relations between <i>han mannen</i> , <i>mannen</i> and <i>den mannen</i> <i>Barthe Bloom (Jena)</i>
10:10	Innovative patterns in language contact of the Scandinavian languages <i>Aileen Urban (Kiel)</i>
10:50	Coffee
11:05	Nya perspektiv på kollostruktionsanalys: En kollexemanalys av svenskans dubbelobjektskonstruktion <i>Fredrik Valdeson (Stockholm)</i>
11:45	Konstruktioner i den förklarande textaktiviteten <i>Camilla Håkansson (Gothenburg)</i>
12:25	Lunch <i>Lagom</i> , Düsternbrooker Weg 38
14:00	Constructions and language change: towards an emergent Scandinavian completive <i>Daria Mordashova (Moscow)</i>
14:40	On productivity and idiomacity: the case of Circum-Baltic presuppositional comitatives <i>Natalia Perkova (Stockholm/Uppsala)</i>
15:20	Coffee and general discussion
16:20	Closing remarks

Abstracts

Pannekakekonstruksjonar i skandinavisk

Hans-Olav Enger (Oslo) & Tor Arne Haugen (Volda)

Såkalla pannekakesetningar har vorte mykje diskuterte i nordisk syntaksforskning, sjå t.d. Enger (2004, 2013), Haugen og Enger (2014, u.u.), Josefsson (2009, 2014) og Wechsler (2013). Dette er setningar som bryt med den grammatiske kongruensen mellom subjekt og predikativt adjektiv. Såkalla pannekakekongruens har vi når eit predikativt adjektiv står i nøytrum sg. trass i at subjektet tilhøyrer eit anna genus/nummer, slik som i det klassiske eksempelet i (2) under.

Konstruksjonsomgrepet blei trekt inn i debatten av Josefsson (2009), som innanfor eit generativt rammeverk argumenterer for at (1) og (2) er realiseringar av heilt ulike konstruksjonar. Haugen og Enger (2014), som for første gong i debatten bygger på systematiske korpusundersøkingar, argumenterer for at ein bør rekna med 3-4 ulike, men beslekta pannekakekonstruksjonar:

- (1) *Sennep er gult*
- (2) *Pannekaker er godt*
- (3) *Konjakk er sunt*
- (4) *Røyking er usunt*

Konstruksjonen i (1) inneheld eit predikativt adjektiv som normalt ikkje kan ta eit prosessuelt subjekt, medan konstruksjonane i (2)–(4) inneheld predikative adjektiv som kan ta eit prosessuelt subjekt. Her har vi høvesvis eit subjekt i ubestemt fleirtal i (2), eit massesubstantiv i (3) og eit verbalsubstantiv i (4). I innlegget vil vi argumentere for at eit kognitivt, leksikogrammatisk konstruksjonsomgrep er best eigna til å gjere greie for dei ulike konstruksjonane og tilhøvet mellom dei. Med utgangspunkt

i Langackers Kognitiv grammatikk og Talmys (2000) konseptuelle struktureringsystem analyserer vi dei konseptuelle skilnadene mellom dei ulike konstruksjonane.

Konstruksjonen i (4), der subjektet er eit verbalsubstantiv, har fått mindre merksemd før systematiske korpusundersøkingar blei gjennomført, og denne konstruksjonstypen, som er den mest frekvente av pannekakekonstruksjonane, gjev også grunnlag for ein hypotese om at det historiske opphavet til konstruksjonar med pannekakekongruens er konstruksjonar med predikativt adjektivt og infinitiv som subjekt, jf. også Wellander (1973: 194). I tillegg til konseptuelle analysar presenterer vi ei diakron korpusundersøking som støttar ein hypotese om at predikative adjektiv som tillèt prosessuelle subjekt (inkludert infinitivar), opptre langt tidlegare med pannekakekongrens (2)–(4) enn adjektiv av av typen i (1), som ikkje tillèt prosessuelle subjekt.

Referansar

- Enger, H.-O. 2004. Scandinavian pancake sentences as semantic agreement. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 27, 5–34.
- Enger, H.-O. 2013. Scandinavian pancake sentences revisited. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 36, 275–301.
- Haugen, T. A. & H.-O. Enger. 2014. Scandinavian pancake constructions as a family of constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics Studies* 1, 171–196.
- Haugen, T. A. & H.-O. Enger. u.u. The semantics of Scandinavian pancake constructions.
- Josefsson, G. 2009. Peas and pancakes: On apparent disagreement and (null) light verbs in Swedish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 32, 35–72.
- Josefsson, G. 2014. Pancake sentences and the semanticization of formal gender in Mainland Scandinavian. *Language Sciences* 43, 62–76.
- Langacker, R. W. 2008. *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wechsler, S. 2013. The structure of Swedish pancakes. In P. Hofmeister & E. Norcliffe (eds.): *The core and the periphery: Data-driven perspectives on syntax inspired by Ivan Sag*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Wellander, E. 1973. *Riktig svenska*. 4. utg. Stockholm: Norstedt.

Pejorativity in pseudocoordination: examples from Swedish

Peter Andersson & Kristian Blenselius (Gothenburg)

In this talk, we will present results from a study of pseudocoordination in Swedish, focusing on historic pejorativity in constructions with *gå* 'go/walk' as the first verb. We will also discuss pejorative uses of pseudocoordination with posture verbs (e.g. *sitta* 'sit') as first verbs.

A pejorative nuance in *gå och V* 'go/walk and V' is noted already in e.g. the Swedish Academy grammar (SAG, vol. 4 p. 905), but further research of this phenomenon is lacking. However, in a recent study, Andersson & Blenselius (2018) note that *gå och V* 'go/walk and V' is frequently supported by pejorative contexts in historical Swedish. See for example (1) below, from the 19th century, illustrating a goal-oriented motion.

- (1) *Er pappa har gått och gift sig med en*
your father has walked and married REFL with a
hvit kvinna af allrivarsta slaget.
white woman of worst the.kind

'Your father has married a white woman of the worst kind'

Using an exemplar-based view on language change, we show how frequent exemplars of *gå och V* allow marginal features to serve as the model for novel expansions of the construction over time and allow pejorative inferences to become part of the construction.

Now, pejorativity can also be found with some types of posture-verb pseudocoordination (which was also noted very briefly by Henriksson 2006: 140, 143). We argue that the centrality of aspectual semantics in Swedish pseudocoordination, which has been pointed out in previous studies, is overrated and that instead of determining some kind of progressive aspect, one of the most prominent semantic contributions of this type of pseudocoordination seems to be the locative lexical meaning of the posture verb. The component of (stative) location can be associated with inactivity, which may be undesired for various reasons (e.g. in the pejorative *Du bara sitter där!* 'You're just sitting there!'). This

may be a reason why we find pseudocoordinations like the one in (2) below, taken from the Swedish Academy grammar (SAG).

- (2) *Tro mig eller ej! Han satt och tappade den brinnande
believe me or not he sat and dropped the burning
cigaretten på min nya fina matta.
cigarette on my new nice carpet*

'Can you believe it! He dropped the burning cigarette on my nice new carpet.'

SAG (vol. 4 p. 905) notes that in (2), "the whole coordination is interpreted as a bounded¹ event" (our translation). This is quite the opposite of a progressive interpretation, but the characterization seems correct: the meaning of the sentence in (3) is most likely neither an iterated dropping event, nor an "in-the-middle-of-dropping" event. Based on an ongoing study, we will explore the distribution of pejorative posture-verb pseudocoordination in Swedish. Finally, challenges in the analysis of pragmatic meaning in constructions and constructional change will be discussed.

References

- Andersson, P. & K. Blenselius. 2018. Matches and mismatches in Swedish [*gå och V*] 'go/walk and V'. An exemplar-based perspective. *Constructions and Frames* 10, 147–177.
- Henriksson, H. 2006. *Aspektualität ohne Aspekt? Progressivität und Imperfektivität im Deutschen und Schwedischen* (Lunder Germanistische Forschungen 68). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- SAG = Teleman, U., S. Hellberg & E. Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. Vol. 1–4. Stockholm: Norstedts ordbok.

¹ SAG does not use the terms *aspect* or *(im)perfective*. However, *bounded* is (also) used in the sentential-aspect sense, corresponding to 'perfective'.

Are there Spanish (near) equivalents to the Germanic *be*-construction? Morphological schematization and the (missing) typological link

Johan Pedersen (Copenhagen)

Constructionist approaches to clausal constructions posit a distinction between lexical meaning and constructional meaning. We may refer to *schematization* when lexical meaning productively is converted into constructional meaning via processes of generalization and/or grammaticalization. At word level, we observe different kinds of schematization. Spanish has developed schematization in terms of, e.g., extended use of morphological derivation (*prevenir* 'to prevent'; [PRE-verb] / 'constructional meaning') and phrasal prepositional compounding (*cuenta del banco* 'bank account'; [NP₁ DE NP₂] / 'constructional meaning').

As for Danish and other Germanic languages it is characteristic that they have productive skeletal compounding (*bankkonto* 'bank account'; [NP₁NP₂] / 'constructional meaning'). In addition, derivative morphological marking on the verb (e.g. *reorganisere* 'to reorganize'; cf. the Spanish example above) in the case of the *be*-marker, has developed into a simultaneous schematization of the argument structure at clause level: *se på noget* 'to look at something' (intransitive situation) → *bese noget* = *be*-look something 'to check something' (transitive situation). In this case, the morphological schematization implies that instead of the intransitive framing, the morphological construction (*be*-V) provides the transitive core meaning ('X directs action toward the affected entity Y'). In constructionist approaches to grammar, the role of such closed-class grammatical morphemes are considered analogous to the skeletal construction. The verb stem plays the role of the clausal verb, and the semantic integration of morpheme and verb stem is analogous to the integration of construction and verb (Goldberg 1995: 22–23). For instance, Michaelis & Ruppenhofer (2001) proposed such a constructionist account for the German applicative *be*-, and Lewandowski & Mateu (2014) have recently suggested a similar analysis of the corresponding *prze*-marker in Polish.

The crucial shift is when a prefix, such as the Danish *be*-marker, in addition to its role as a derivative marker at word level, schematizes the argument structure at the clause level. The present study addresses the question whether there are Spanish (near) equivalents to the Germanic *be*-construction that somehow reflects such a shift.

As a preliminary result, it seems that the role of morphological schematization in Spanish is restricted to the derivative morphological construal at the word level, or secondary morphological construal at the clause level. In previous studies, it was argued that cross-linguistically skeletal schematization at the clause level, that is, argument structure constructions of the Goldbergian type (Goldberg 1995), may have different roles in their interplay with the verb (Pedersen 2019).

As a general hypothesis, these studies suggest that the principal typological characteristics that differentiates Spanish (Romance) from Germanic clausal constructions, is the (lacking) development of schematization (morphological or skeletal), at word level and at the clausal level.

References

- Goldberg, A. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lewandowski, W. & J. Mateu. 2014. A constructional analysis of unselected objects in Polish: The case of *prze-*. *Linguistics* 52, 1195–1236.
- Michaelis, L & J. Ruppenhofer. 2001. Valence creation and the German applicative: The inherent semantics of linking patterns. *Journal of Semantics* 17, 335–395.
- Pedersen, J. 2019. Verb-based vs. schema-based constructions. A contrastive perspective. *Linguistics* 57, 473-530.

Spanish *señal* 'sign(al)' as a shell noun: on the interplay between syntactic constructions and discourse function

Anton Granvik (Gothenburg)

Spanish 'sign(al)' belongs to the group of abstract nouns often used as shell nouns (cf. Schmid 2000). This paper discusses the use of *señal* as a shell noun from medieval up to present-day Spanish. The aim is to address the question of how the syntactic construction affects the encapsulating function of *señal*, i.e. its status as a shell noun.

Shell nouns are typically studied from two perspectives. From a discourse perspective, they are defined as "nouns which open up a semantic gap to be filled by information from the linguistic context." (Schmid 2018: 114). From a syntactic perspective a noun acquires an encapsulating function when it is inserted into certain syntactic structures, such as nominal complement clauses (*the fact is that ...*) (Schmid 2018: 114).

The questions I attempt to answer in this paper are: In what syntactic constructions is *señal* used over the centuries and how do they affect the function of the shell noun complex? Is it possible to posit a general shell noun construction? Or is it more accurate to talk of a network of constructions within which "shell nouns thrive" (Schmid 2018: 115)?

The analysis is based on data retrieved from the 62 million word diachronic *Corpus del nuevo diccionario histórico del español*, including texts from the 11th century up to 2005. 4234 concordances were extracted using the search strings [*señal que* 'sign that'], [*señal de* 'sign of'], [*señal SER* 'sign is'] and [*esta/esa/aquella señal* 'this/that sign'], yielding practically all uses where *señal* is combined with a complement clause. In total almost 800 cases were identified and analyzed in detail.

The analysis shows that *señal* is most frequently combined with a finite clause (introduced by either *que* 'that' or *de que* 'of that'). However, in the medieval period the encapsulating function is almost exclusively found in the construction *la señal es que* 'the sign is that'. Over time, the *señal (de) que* + finite clause pattern becomes more associated with the encapsulating function, but, as shown in (1), in this pattern *señal* does not

always establish a relation of experiential identity with the complement clause; instead, the relationship is that of a predicate and its argument (direct object) and the encapsulation is established between *señal* and another discourse element. In (1) there is no explicit identification at all; in (2) there seems to be an experiential identity between *señal* and the preceding text fragment, but the two elements are syntactically unrelated.

- (1) *De cualquier modo, allí vi yo la señal de que no estaba hecho ya para andar en andanzas.* (CDH, 1953)

'In any case, there I saw the sign [indicating] that he was no longer up for such adventures.'

- (2) – *Pienso que esto ha de ser –murmuró en tanto alzaba con sus torpes manos el hierro de la aldaba– el fin de nuestra edad. Las primeras señales de que ese fin se acerca.* (CDH, 1978)

'I think this must be –s/he whispered raising the iron of the doorknob with his/her fumbling hands–the end of our era. The first signs that that end is near.'

References

- CDH = Instituto de Investigación Rafael Lapesa de la Real Academia Española. 2013. *Corpus del Nuevo diccionario histórico del español*. <web.frl.es/CNDHE>.
- Schmid, H.-J. 2000. *English abstract nouns as conceptual shells. From corpus to cognition*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schmid, H.-J. 2018. Shell nouns in English – a personal roundup. *Caplletra* 64, 109–128.

Left-dislocation and hanging scene: A construction grammar account of two sentence-level constructions in contemporary Swedish

Viktoria Strandberg (Gothenburg)

Sentence level constructions were discussed in the very beginning of the establishment of the CxG-framework (Fillmore et al. 1988), and since then a lot of research has been made on argument structure (Goldberg 1995, Perek 2015). However, the most abstract sentence patterns for main and subordinate clauses in the Scandinavian languages has not yet been thoroughly investigated and widely accepted in the CxG community, which has also been pointed out by researchers from other fields, claiming that CxG is mainly interested in the periphery of language phenomena (Michaelis 2012). Convinced that CxG is capable of accounting for abstract sentence patterns, I want to show that this is possible by presenting my master's thesis (Strandberg 2019), in which the two constructions left-dislocation (LD-CXN) and hanging scene (HS-CXN) are investigated and described as attribute-value matrices in a Sign-Based Construction Grammar (Sag 2012).

LD-CXN is a grammatical structure appearing in many languages and occurs when a main or subordinate clause is preceded by a phrase corresponding to a pronominal or an adverbial copy inside that clause, see (1). The fact that the first phrase in (1) is preceding the clause, not constituting a part of it, makes the example acceptable in Swedish and other verb-second languages, where only one phrase may be placed before the finite verb. Therefore, in written Swedish, the HS-CXN in (2) may seem odd. In this example, there is no adverb inside the clause corresponding to the initial adverbial phrase, which has the information-structural status scene. HS-CXN often occurs in spoken Swedish and consists of an initial adverbial phrase constituting the scene for the main clause, which is mostly not inverted.

- (1) [*Torun*]_{LD} [*hon*]_{COPY} *hade aldrig åkt tunnelbana i hela sitt liv.*
"Torun, she had never taken the subway in her entire life."

(2) [När vi träffades,]_{FIA} han hade ju aldrig tiggat på tunnelbanan i hela sitt liv.

“When we met, he had never begged on the subway in his whole life.” (Example from Swedish TV)

A number of Swedish studies has investigated LD-CXN, i.e. the Swedish Academy grammar (SAG 1999, see also Platzack 2010, Josefsson 2012, Holmberg 2019 to appear), but the characteristics of LD-CXN accounted for in SAG and other studies are not in line with the result in Strandberg (2017, 2019), showing that there is more variation to be accounted for, and that a majority of LD-CXNs in Swedish can be summarized in three sentence patterns. HS-CXN on the other hand is only scarcely mentioned in the literature but can also be described as a construction in the same way as LD-CXN. As HS-CXN shows a lot of resemblance with ungrammatical Swedish main clauses where the verb-second rule is not followed, it needs to be fully investigated to show why it is not ungrammatical. In this talk, I will account for the results in Strandberg (2019), and thereby show the relevance of CxG-accounts of sentence-level constructions for the theoretical development of CxG-theory and for the practical constructicography work.

References

- Bresnan, J. et al. 2016. *Lexical-functional syntax*. Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Fillmore, C., P. Kay & M. C. O'Connor 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: the case of *let alone*. *Language* 64, 501–538.
- Goldberg, A. E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holmberg, A. 2019 (to appear). On the bottleneck hypothesis of V2. In T. Biberauer & S. Wolfe (eds.), *Reconsidering verb second*.
- Josefsson, G. 2012. What's first? On the left periphery in Swedish declaratives. In J. Brandtler et al. (eds.) *Discourse and grammar. A festschrift in honor of Valéria Molnár*, 411–431. Lund: Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University.
- Michaelis, L. A. 2012. Making the case for construction grammar. In H. C. Boas & I. A. Sag (eds.), *Sign-based construction grammar*, 31–67. Stanford: CSLI.
- Perek, F. 2015. *Argument structure in usage-based construction grammar. Experimental and corpus-based perspectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Platzack, C. 2010. *Den fantastiska grammatiken. En minimalistisk beskrivning av svenskan*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

- SAG = Teleman, U., S. Hellberg & E. Andersson 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.
- Sag, I. A. 2012. Sign-based construction grammar: an informal synopsis. In H. C. Boas & I. A. Sag (eds.), *Sign-based construction grammar*, 69–202. Stanford: CSLI.
- Strandberg, V. 2017. *Syntaktiska perspektiv på initiala annex i talspråket. Kandidatuppsats i svenska språket*. Göteborg: Institutionen för svenska språket, Göteborgs universitet.
- Strandberg, Viktoria. 2019a. *Initiala annex i en teckenbaserad konstruktionsgrammatik*. Magisteruppsats i svenska språket. Göteborg: Institutionen för svenska språket, Göteborgs universitet.
- Strandberg, Viktoria. 2019b. *Initiala annex i en teckenbaserad konstruktionsgrammatik*. Göteborg: Institutionen för svenska språket, Göteborgs universitet.

Att pressa ur sig *sig* eller inte ha med sig *sig*: Rollen av konstruktionell betydelse i argumentrealisering

Shiro Shibata (Osaka)

Detta bidrag behandlar verbpartikelkonstruktion med dubbla objekt, som i exemplen (1–2):

- (1) Nu ska jag *få på mig smink och kläder*.
- (2) Men nu har jag *fått i mig massor med mat ...*

Denna konstruktion kan instansieras med en uppsättning lexikala verb. Den är en typ av argumentstrukturkonstruktion i och med att argumenten och betydelserna frambringas av själva kategorikedjan <V Prt NP_{Lokativ} NP_{Tema}>, istället för enbart verbet (Lyngfelt 2007; Shibata 2019). Ofta instansieras det lokativa argumentet med ett reflexivt pronomen. Detta argument kan i vissa fall vara ”utelämnat”, medan i andra fall inte:

- (3) Nu ska jag *få på _ smink och kläder*.
- (4) *Men nu har jag *fått i _ massor med mat ...*

Syftet med detta bidrag är att förklara denna skillnad i argumentrealisering. Mitt förslag är att tillskriva skillnaden till två olika konstruktioner med, respektive utan skärpa på det lokativa reflexiva argumentet. Den ena konstruktionella varianten med det "utelämningsbara" argumentet (t ex *skruva på sig skorna, kränga av sig morgonrocken och köpa med sig mat*) kan betraktas som *indirektmedialkonstruktion* med minskad semantisk bitransitivitet. Det lokativa argumentet konvergerar i betydelsen med det agentiva argumentet till den grad där det inte längre behöver realiseras i uttrycket. (jfr Kemmer 1993). Å andra sidan är konstruktionen med det obligatoriska lokativa argumentet bitransitiverande konstruktion (t ex *tjata till sig en korv, halsa i sig kaffe och krysta ur sig ett inlägg*). Den uttrycker en ökad bitransitivitet: ett aktivt verkande av agenten i förhållande till det lokativa reflexiva argumentet, vilket i sin tur kräver syntaktisk markering av det reflexiva argumentet (jfr Barðdal, Kristoffersen och Sveen 2011).

Mot bakgrund av detta har jag utfört genomgående fallstudier i subkonstruktioner [V på sig NP]-konstruktionen och [V i sig NP]-konstruktionen. I fallstudierna undersöktes förekomster av konstruktionerna huvudsakligen i bloggkorpus *Bloggmix 2010* via *Korp*. Resultatet av dessa fallstudier överlag stödjer den föreslagna korrelationen mellan betydelsen av konstruktioner och utelämningsbarheten av det lokativa reflexiva argumentet.

Referenser

- Barðdal, J., K. E. Kristoffersen & A. Sveen. 2011. Scandinavian Ditransitives as a family of constructions: With a special attention to the Norwegian 'V-REFL-NP' Construction. *Linguistics* 49, 53–104.
- Kemmer, S. 1993. *The middle voice*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lyngfelt, B. 2007. Mellan polerna. Reflexiv- och deponenskonstruktioner i svenskan. *Språk och stil* 17, 86–134.
- Shibata, S. 2019. *The "Double Object" Verb-Particle Constructions in Swedish: A Constructional-Grammatical Description*. Masteruppsats, Osaka: Osaka University.

Can the NPN nut be cracked?

Torodd Kinn (Bergen)

NPN constructions are found in many languages. Examples from Norwegian are given in (1)–(2).

- (1) *Hvert intervju ble skrevet ned ord for ord*
each interview became written down word for word
'Each interview was written down word by word'
- (2) *Elev etter elev hoppet over stanga*
pupil after pupil jumped over the.bar
'Pupil after pupil jumped over the bar'

Some NPN constructions function as adverbials (adjuncts), as in (1), while others have nominal (argument) function, as in (2). Most such expressions are composed of a bare singular count noun followed by a preposition followed by the same bare singular count noun. While NPNs have exactly two nouns, the typical semantics involves several entities: many words resp. pupils in (1)–(2).

In the research literature on NPNs, Jackendoff (2008) is central. His Parallel Architecture approach is similar to construction grammar, as is Poß's (2010) HPSG dissertation, with a chapter on Dutch NPNs. Other researchers work from angles related to Minimalism, e.g. Pi (1995), Postma (1996), Travis (2001), Haik (2013), Pskit (2015), several of which assume that the first noun of NPN is a reduplicative copy of the second. Yet other works are in formal semantics, e.g. Beck & von Stechow (2007), Zwarts (2013) on *from N to N*, and such works tend to focus on quantificational aspects of the construction.

Jackendoff (2008: 8) presents the English NPN construction as a "prime example of [...] a 'syntactic nut' – an entrenched noncanonical structure". Anomalies (in Jackendoff's view) are the required identity of the two nouns and the lack of a determiner. The latter is taken to show that the nouns are not full noun phrases and cannot function as arguments. Jackendoff tentatively concludes that "if there is any head at all in N after N, it is the preposition, and the construction as a whole [...] is an NP

headed by P" (p. 21). He would preferably analyse the first noun as a copy of the second (p. 26).

This contribution aims to show that NPNs are less anomalous than assumed. First, bare singulars do to some extent occur as arguments, in English (Stvan 2007) as well as Norwegian (Borthen 2003, Halmøy 2016). The nouns can be given a simple conceptual analysis using a notion developed by Langacker (e.g. 2005), viz. that of 'virtual entities', used inter alia to analyse quantification. This analytic tool allows the discrepancy of two nouns standing for many entities to be handled in an elegant and natural manner.

What superficially looks like [NP N [PP P NP]] can and should therefore be analysed as such, at least in the case of nominally functioning NPNs. Adverbial NPNs are adverbial NPs, semantically connected to the clause through an implicit relation which varies between subconstructions. This is a synchronic (though not diachronic) anomaly, but is common to NPNs and well-known structures such as the temporal adverbial in *He sat there ten minutes*.

References

- Beck, S. & A. von Stechow. 2007. Pluractional adverbials. *Journal of Semantics* 24, 215–54.
- Borthen, K. 2003. *Norwegian bare singulars*. Trondheim, NTNU dissertation.
- Haïk, I. 2013. Symmetric structures. *Corela* 11, 1–26.
- Halmøy, M. 2016. *The Norwegian nominal system. A Neo-Saussurean perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Jackendoff, R. 2008. 'Construction after construction' and its theoretical challenges. *Language* 84, 8–28.
- Langacker, R. W. 2005. Dynamicity, fictivity, and scanning. The imaginative basis of logic and linguistic meaning. In D. Pecher & R. A. Zwaan (eds.), *Grounding cognition. The role of perception and action in memory, language and thinking*, 164–97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pi, C.-Y. T. 1995. The structure of English iteratives. In P. Koskinen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 1995 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association* (Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics), 434–45.
- Poß, M. 2010. *Under construction. Cognitive and computational aspects of extended lexical units*. Utrecht, LOT.
- Postma, G. 1996. *Zero semantics. A study of the syntactic conception of quantificational meaning*. The Hague: Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.

- Pskit, W. 2015. The categorial status and internal structure of NPN forms in English and Polish. In A. Bondaruk & A. Prazmowska (eds.), *Within language, beyond theories*, vol. 1, 27–42. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Stvan, L. S. 2007. The functional range of bare singular count nouns in English. In E. Stark, E. Leiss & W. Abraham (eds.), *Nominal determination. Typology, context constraints, and historical emergence*, 171–87. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Travis, L. deM. 2001. The syntax of reduplication. In M. Kim & U. Strauss (eds.), *Proceedings of Northeast Linguistics Society (NELS) 31*, 454–69. Georgetown: GLSA.
- Zwarts, J. 2013. From N to N: The anatomy of a construction. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 36, 65–90.

Three enormous beers ago – the entrenchment of semi-schematic constructions in L2 Swedish

Joel Olofsson (*Trollhättan*) & Julia Prentice (*Gothenburg*)

In construction grammar the central concepts of grammatical analysis are constructions, that is “conventional, learned form-function pairings at varying levels of complexity and abstraction” (Goldberg 2013:17). These constructions are proposed to be more or less entrenched in the minds of speakers (e.g. Bybee 2010; Schmid 2017).

The question asked in this paper is to what extent semi-schematic constructions about time are entrenched in the mind of L1 and L2 speakers of Swedish. Consider the following examples.

- (1) *Jag tog examen för två år sedan.*
 1SG take-PST degree-DEF for two year ago
 ‘I graduated [two years ago]’

(2) *Oktoberfesten, som för tre enorma öl sedan tedde sig som en helvetesscen av flamländska konstnären Hieronymus Bosch.*

for three enormous beer-PL ago

'The October fest, which looked like a hell-scene of the Flemish artist Hieronymus Bosch [three enormous beers ago]'

Both examples in (1) and (2) instantiate the [*för* ANTAL TID *sedan*] 'TIME ago' construction, which is used to refer to something that happened in the past (cf. Loenheim et al. 2016). The preposition *för* 'for' and the adverb *sedan* 'then/ago' represent the lexically filled slots of the construction, while ANTAL 'amount' and TID 'time' can be filled with approximately any numeral and time. The construction can even be used productively with lexical units that do not express time, such as *enorma öl* in (2). Hence, the meaning of the expression is not fully compositional (and comprehensible by the individual constituents).

High frequent examples, such as (1), are proposed to be stored and easily accessed in language use (cf. Bybee 2010; Schmid 2017). On the contrary, rare examples such as (2) are likely not stored.

In this talk, we will present an a phrasal decision task carried out on L1 and L2 speakers of Swedish. The task was to as fast as possible decide if the stimuli expression reflects time, such as highly frequent instance in (1) and low frequent in (2), or not.

The results show that frequent instances of a semi-schematic time construction, as in (1), are processed faster than nonce expressions in both L1 and L2 groups as well as with high decision accuracy. For the L1 group, the rare instances, as in (2), are processed with intermediate speed as well as with relatively high accuracy. For the group of L2 participants, rare instances have low decision accuracy and longer reaction times than nonce expressions.

Thus, data indicates that rare/productive uses of the constructions are considered time expressions by the L1 group, but to a smaller extent considered as such by the L2 group.

In this talk we will argue that the experimental data can show that time constructions are entrenched in the minds of speakers, but to different extent between the L1 and the L2 group.

References

- Bybee, J. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldberg, A. 2013. Constructionist approaches. In T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*, 15–31. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Loenheim, L. et al. 2016. Constructicography meets (second) language education. On constructions in teaching aids and the usefulness of a Swedish constructicon. In S. de Knop & G. Gilquin (eds.), *Applied Construction Grammar*, 327–355. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Schmid, H.-J. 2017. A Framework for Understanding Linguistic Entrenchment and Its Psychological Foundations. In H.-J. Schmid (ed.), *Entrenchment and the psychology of language learning: How we reorganize and adapt linguistic knowledge*, 9–35. Washington: De Gruyter Mouton.

Life at the intersection: The relations between *han mannen*, *mannen* and *den mannen*

Barthe Bloom (Jena)

In spoken Norwegian the third person pronouns *han* and *hun* can be used in determiner position with common nouns with human reference, exemplified in (1). This use of the pronoun has been called the psychologically distal demonstrative (henceforth: PDD) (Johannessen 2006). The current study argues that noun phrases containing this pronoun (e.g. *han mannen*) exist at the intersection of those containing the adnominal demonstrative *den* (e.g. *den mannen*), and noun phrases neutrally marked for definiteness with the suffix *-en/-a* (e.g. *mannen*). In particular, this study considers the co-occurrence of these constructions with various modifiers as evidence for their interconnectedness.

(1) *det var litt langdrygt med han mannen* (dalsbygda_03uk)

The connections between the constructions are evident in the functional resemblance of *han mannen* with both *mannen* and *den mannen*. For example, *han mannen* is used to denote psychological distance (Johann-

essen 2008), that is, the referent is not personally known to either the speaker or the addressee, and/or the speaker has a negative attitude towards the referent. This function is typically associated with demonstratives (Vindenes 2017: 123–25). Additionally, *han mannen* is used for specific reference – a function shared with the definite suffix (Julien 2005: 35ff.). Moreover, *han mannen* is used for tracking (2a) and recognitional reference (2b), which are types of reference associated with demonstratives (Himmelmann 1996: 226ff.). Yet, it serves as a device for associative anaphoric reference (2c) as well, which is explicitly a feature of definite articles and not of demonstratives (Himmelmann 1996: 210f.).

(2a) *og da kom # kona til eldste bror min som var # hjemme der # også ei anna [(...)] og hun heter F1 hun der kona til bro-_clears-throat_ (andoeya_ma_05)*

(2b) *så kom jeg i kontakt med # hun dama som var her # (roeros_03gm)*

(2c) (...) *som var et eldre ektepar og han mannen var blind da (luster_06uk)*

Based on data from the Nordic Dialect Corpus (Johannessen et al. 2009), this study further investigates the relations of the PDD with these two neighboring constructions, focusing on co-occurrence information. Sequential characteristics of the constructions are identified by means of colostruational analysis (Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003), in order to get a reliable picture about the elements attracted to and repulsed by each construction. Subsequently it is tested whether the pronominal determiner slot filler (*han/hun, den*, or empty) can be predicted based on these cues.

It is shown that the PDD has features of both the neutral definiteness marker *-en/-a* and of adnominal *den*. On the one hand, the PDD resembles adnominal *den* since both are, for example, easily reinforced by an adverbial demonstrative (*her/der*). On the other hand, noun phrases containing *han/hun* are similar to noun phrases with only a definite suffix, because they both regularly are followed by a possessive pronoun (most frequently *min/mi*). In this regard *han mannen* exists at the intersection of *mannen* and *den mannen*.

References

- Dahl, Ö. 2015. *Grammaticalization in the North. Noun phrase morphosyntax in Scandinavian vernaculars* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 6). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Himmelman, N. P. 1996. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses. In B. A. Fox (ed.), *Studies in anaphora*, 205–54. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Johannessen, J. B. 2006. Just any pronoun anywhere? Pronouns and ‘new’ demonstratives in Norwegian. In T. Solstad, A. Grønn & D. Haug (eds.), *A Festschrift for Kjell Johan Sæbø: In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the celebration of his 50th birthday*, 91–106. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Johannessen, J. B. 2008. Psykologiske Demonstrativer. In J. B. Johannessen & K. Hagen (eds.), *Språk i Oslo. Ny forskning omkring talespråk*, 63–77. Oslo: Novus.
- Johannessen, J. B. et al. 2009. The Nordic Dialect Corpus – an advanced research tool.” In K. Jokinen & E. Bick (eds.) *Proceedings of the 17th Nordic Conference of Computational Linguistics NODALIDA 2009*.
- Julien, M. 2005. *Nominal phrases from a Scandinavian perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Stefanowitsch, A & S. T. Gries. 2003. Collostructions: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8, 209–43.
- Vindenes, U. 2017. Complex demonstratives and cyclic change in Norwegian. Oslo: Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo.

Innovative patterns in language contact of the Scandinavian languages

Aileen Urban (Kiel)

In multilingual practices, a great variety of phenomena occur that are of interest to linguists. Many of these phenomena have already been addressed in linguistic research, with codeswitching being the one most works have focused on. Different approaches, such as Myers-Scotton’s (2010 [2002]) Matrix Language Frame model and Muysken’s (2000)

Code-Mixing model, have been used to explain the mechanisms of codeswitching. Those frameworks might offer a plausible explanation for utterances as the one in example (1), taken from the Corpus of American Norwegian Speech (CANS)², by treating *sue* and *suing each other* as alternations in the otherwise Norwegian utterance.

(1) No-En (CANS)

kanskje kommer til *sue* og de gjør vel ikke slik i Norge
maybe will and they do probably not such in Norway
suing each other

'Maybe you will be getting sued and they probably don't do this in Norway, suing each other?'

However, multilingual speakers sometimes also produce utterances that entail phenomena which do not easily fit the categories available in the frameworks, as example (2) illustrates.

(2) Sw-En

han hade to gå ut i ladugården och spela fiol
he had go out in barn-DEF and play violin
'He had to go outside to play the violin in the barn.'

At first sight, the English particle *to* could be interpreted as an insertion. Looking on the whole phrase *han hade to gå ut*, however, it becomes evident that the English construction *have to* + INFINITIVE serves as a template since there is no genuinely Swedish construction that entails *ha* as an obligative. Moreover, it is problematic to categorize this example as, for instance, a lexicosyntactic transfer in Clyne's (2003) terms because the construction appears to entail a mismatch in its lexical and phonological filling. This (ad hoc) transfer, if it can be labelled that way, must be considered incomplete – a possibility that has not been discussed so far.

This categorization problem of contact phenomena is closely linked to the traditional view on multilingual speech processing in general. Although recent findings from psycholinguistic research on multilingualism suggest that multilingual speakers process their languages interact-

² CANS entails also data on American Swedish.

ively instead of processing them separately (cf. e.g. Grosjean 2008; Bialystok et al. 2009; Kroll, Bobb & Hoshino 2014; Kroll et al. 2015), this fact is not wholly accounted for in traditional research on multilingual practices such as those by Myers-Scotton and Muysken that were named above. The holistic view on multilingual speech processing, however, is accounted for from a constructional perspective in Diasystematic Construction Grammar (DCxG; e.g. Höder 2012, 2014, 2018).

DCxG has been successfully applied to different types of contact phenomena, mostly as part of contact-induced diachronic change. However, when it comes to spontaneous multilingual speech processing, including phenomena such as codeswitching (CS), a (D)CxG model faces additional problems that cannot be wholly solved within existing approaches. If constructions indeed capture a speaker's grammatical knowledge in toto, as Goldberg (2006: 18) assumes, patterns from spontaneous multilingual practices, too, should be treated as part of a speaker's grammatical knowledge. Therefore, my work aims to develop a DCxG-based model that includes spontaneous multilingual practices.

In my presentation, I will mostly explore innovative patterns like example (2), i.e. patterns that in traditional frameworks would be considered peripheral cases. I will do so on the basis of corpus material offering authentic utterances from Scandinavian languages in different contact scenarios.

Corpus

CANS = *Corpus of American Norwegian Speech*. Oslo University. <tekstlab.uio.no/norskiamerika/korpus.html>.

References

- Bialystok, E. et al. 2009. Bilingual minds. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 10, 89–129
- Clyne, M. 2003. *Dynamics of language contact. English and immigrant languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldberg, A. E. 2006. *Constructions at work. The nature of generalization in language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, F. 2008. *Studying bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Höder, S. 2012. Multilingual constructions. A diasystematic approach to common structures. In K. Braunmüller & C. Gabriel (eds.), *Multilingual individuals*

- and multilingual societies* (Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism 13), 241–257. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Höder, S. 2014. Constructing diasystems. Grammatical organisation in bilingual groups. In T. A. Åfarli & B. Mæhlum (eds.), *The sociolinguistics of grammar*, 137–152. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Höder, S. 2018. Grammar is community-specific. Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar. In H. C. Boas & S. Höder (eds.), *Constructions in contact. Constructional perspectives in contact phenomena in Germanic languages* (Constructional Approaches to Language 24), 37–70. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kroll, J. F., S. C. Bobb & N. Hoshino. 2014. Two languages in mind: Bilingualism as a tool to investigate language, cognition, and the brain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 23, 159–163.
- Kroll, J. F. et al. 2015. Bilingualism, mind and brain. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1, 377–394.
- Muysken, P. 2000. *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2010 [2002]. *Contact linguistics. Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nya perspektiv på kollostruktionsanalys: En kollexemanalys av svenskans dubbelobjektskonstruktion

Fredrik Valdeson (Stockholm)

Kollostruktionsanalys (Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003) har varit en flitigt använd metod inom korpusbaserad konstruktionsgrammatik under de senaste 15 åren. Med hjälp av kollostruktionsanalys är det möjligt att undersöka relationen mellan en konstruktion och de ord som ingår i den (s.k. *kollexem*). Grundidén är att de kollexem som uppvisar högst kollostruktionsstyrka (dvs. som är starkast knutna till konstruktionen) kan ge en indikation om konstruktionens semantik som helhet.

I mitt föredrag redovisar jag en kollostruktionsanalys (närmare bestämt en s.k. kollexemanalys, se Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003) av svenskans dubbelobjektskonstruktion [NP V NP NP], baserad på material från kor-

pusarna Bonniersromaner I och II samt Norstedtsromaner 1999 (samtliga tillgängliga via Språkbankens Korp-verktyg, se Borin m.fl. 2012). Sedan tidigare föreligger kollostruktionsanalyser av dubbelobjektskonstruktion i engelska (Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003) och nederländska (Coleman 2009). Båda dessa studier utgår ifrån tidigare teoretiskt orienterade analyser av dubbelobjektskonstruktionens semantik i de respektive språken (Goldberg 1995 respektive Geeraerts 1998), och genom att testa vilka verb som är starkast knutna till konstruktionen kan resultaten från de teoretiska analyserna prövas (och i båda fallen bekräftas).

För svenskans del föreligger en utförlig semantisk kategorisering av bi-transitiva verb i Teleman m.fl. (1999: 315–318), redovisad i form av ett antal betydelsegrupper, t.ex. ägobyte (ex. *skänka ngn ngt*), påverkan (*inge ngn ngt*) och produktion (*bygga ngn ngt*). Teleman m.fl. konstaterar också att det indirekta objektet ofta har rollen mottagare. Svenskans dubbelobjektskonstruktion uttrycker alltså prototypiskt någon form av överföring eller ägobyte, i likhet med dess engelska motsvarighet (jfr Goldberg 1995).

Resultaten från kollexemanalysen visar att det finns påtagliga skillnader i hur starkt knutna verb från olika betydelsegrupper är till konstruktionen, och det räcker alltså inte att enbart granska de verb som har högst kollostruktionsstyrka för att bilda sig en uppfattning om konstruktionens semantiska räckvidd. Bland de verb som uppvisar högst kollostruktionsstyrka återfinns dels verb vars semantik tydligt sammanfaller med konstruktionens prototypiska betydelse av överföring och ägobyte (t.ex. *ge*, *skänka*, *erbjuda* och *servera*), dels ett flertal verb som snarast uttrycker motsatsen till konstruktionens semantik (dvs. någon form av frånhändande eller liknande, t.ex. *kosta*, *bespara*, *avkräva*, *beröva*, *avundas* och *undanhålla*).

Gemensamt för många av de verb som återfinns bland de verb som har allra lägst kollostruktionsstyrka (eller som rentav uppvisar negativ kollostruktionsstyrka) är att de inte i sig själva uttrycker någon form av överföring eller ägobyte. Här återfinns exempelvis verb från betydelsegruppen produktion (t.ex. *laga*, *koka*, *blanda*, *bygga*, *sticka*). När dessa verb används i dubbelobjektskonstruktion är det alltså konstruktionen som sådan som bidrar med överföringsaspekten av betydelsen hos uttrycket som helhet.

Det förefaller som att kollexem med hög kollostruktionsstyrka (åtminstone teoretiskt sett) är oberoende av själva konstruktionens semantik. Dessa verb kan antas ha dubbelobjektskonstruktionen som ett lexikalt lagrat syntaktiskt mönster (jfr Langacker 2009), och deras förekomst i konstruktionen behöver således inte egentligen förklaras utifrån konstruktionens semantik. De verb som uppvisar lägst kollostruktionsstyrka har däremot inte dubbelobjektskonstruktionen lexikalt lagrad, vilket gör att de måste vara möjliga att kombinera med dubbelobjektskonstruktionens semantik för att kunna ingå i densamma.

Referenser

- Borin, L., M. Forsberg & J. Roxendal. 2012. Korp – the corpus infrastructure of Språkbanken. I *Proceedings of LREC 2012*, 474–478. Istanbul: ELRA.
- Colleman, T. 2009. The semantic range of the Dutch double object construction: A collostructional perspective. *Constructions and Frames* 1, 190–221.
- Geeraerts, D. 1998. The semantic structure of the indirect object in Dutch. I W. Van Langendonck & W. Van Belle (red.), *The dative*, vol. 2: *Theoretical and contrastive studies*, 185–210. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Goldberg, A. E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. 2009. Constructions and constructional meaning. I V. Evans & S. Pourcel (red.), *New directions in cognitive linguistics*, 225–267. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Stefanowitsch, A. & S. T. Gries 2003. Collostructions: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8, 209–243.
- Teleman, U., S. Hellberg & E. Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*, vol. 3: *Fraser*. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien.

Konstruktioner i den förklarande textaktiviteten

Camilla Håkansson (Gothenburg)

Det finns ett allt större intresse för att undersöka språkinlärning och konstruktionsgrammatik (bl.a. Ellis 2013) medan forskning om konstruk-

tionsgrammatik i undervisning, åtminstone i en svensk kontext, än så länge är begränsad. Ett exempel på praktisk tillämpning av konstruktionsgrammatik är Håkansson, Lyngfelt & Barsch (2019) där två metoder, mönsterigenkänning och typfall, jämförs och testas i undervisning med vuxna inlärare av svenska. I min presentation vill jag visa ytterligare ett användningsområde för konstruktionsgrammatik i språkundervisning och beskriva konstruktioner kopplade till den förklarande textaktiviteten.

I styrdokumenterna för ämnet svenska/svenska som andraspråk finns som kunskaps- och färdighetsmål att behärska olika texttyper, exv. förklarande text. För att lära sig att skriva en sådan text behöver elever känna till vilka språkliga mönster som utmärker textaktiviteten. En textaktivitet är de grundläggande framställningsformer som används för att skapa en viss texttyp och är ett begrepp med koppling till systemisk funktionell grammatik och genrepedagogik (Holmberg 2009). Konstruktionsgrammatik har vanligtvis inte använts för att beskriva textaktiviteter men är ett alternativ för att kunna fånga språkliga mönster där form och funktion kombineras.

Något som utmärker den förklarande textaktiviteten är kausala bisatskonstruktioner. I undervisning uppmärksammas dock oftast de enskilda orden i stället för den konstruktion som orden uppträder i. Ett exempel på detta är (1) där fokus i undervisningen hamnade på subjunktionen i stället för på hela den kausala bisatskonstruktionen. Här kan ett konstruktionsperspektiv bidra med utförligare beskrivningar av det aktuella mönstret.

- (1) Den förebyggande funktionen innebär att straff ska göra personer mindre benägna att begå brott, *eftersom människor ser tydliga konsekvenser av brottsligheten.*

I (1) finns fler relevanta konstruktioner för undervisningen, t.ex. adjektivisk presensparticip, [X innebär att-SATS] och [benägen att VP]. Exempelen är hämtade från en datainsamling till en pilotstudie för ett avhandlingsprojekt om konstruktioner och textaktiviteter. Studien genomfördes på en storstadsskola där man sedan två år tillbaka implementerar genrepedagogisk undervisning. En vanlig arbetsmetod inom genrepedagogik är *Cykeln för undervisning och lärande* (Martin & Rose 2008), där eleverna stegvis genom fyra olika faser leds fram mot det individuella textskrivandet. I pilotstudien följdes undervisningen i svenska/svenska som

andraspråk för årskurs 6 under en lektionsserie om förklarande text. Resultatet visar dels konstruktioner som uppmärksammas i undervisningen och dels de konstruktioner som läraren inte explicitgör men som förekommer i undervisningen, i elevernas samtal och i deras texter. Materialet i studien utgörs av observationer, fältanteckningar, ljudinspelningar och elevtexter.

Referenser

- Ellis, N. 2013. Construction grammar and second language acquisition. I Hoffmann, T. & G. Trousdale (red.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*, 348–378. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmberg, P. 2009. Text, språk och lärande. Introduktion till genrepedagogik. *Symposium 2009. Genrer och funktionellt språk i teori och praktik*, 13–27. Stockholm: Stockholms universitets förlag.
- Håkansson, C., B. Lyngfelt & M. Brasch. 2019. Typfall och mönsterigenkänning. Konstruktionsbaserad andraspråksundervisning i praktiken. I M. Bianchi et al. (red.), *Svenskans beskrivning 36. Förhandlingar vid trettiosjätte sammankomsten. Uppsala 25–27 oktober 2017*, 107–117. Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet.
- Martin, J. R. & D. Rose. 2008. *Genre relations: mapping culture*. London: Equinox.

Constructions and language change: towards an emergent Scandinavian completive

Daria Mordashova (Moscow)

This paper accounts for a set of constructions, which carry the meaning of ‘completion’, ‘reaching the limit’ – so-called completives – in three Scandinavian languages: Norwegian (Bokmål), Danish and Swedish. The category of completive indicates that an action has been performed thoroughly or to completion (see Bybee et al. 1994: 54, Heine & Kuteva 2004: 18), as in ‘to shoot someone to death’ or ‘to eat up’.

The present study concentrates on completive constructions with the same lexical source, which is the adjective meaning ‘finished’ or ‘ready’

(Norwegian *ferdig*, Danish *færdig*, Swedish *färdig*). The research is based mainly on corpus analysis (see References), which proved its effectiveness for revealing data on two different types of constructions. The first one is adjectival: the adjective, accompanied by the preposition *med* ‘with’, governs the verbal infinitive (1). However, the preposition might be omitted, cf. example (2) from Norwegian.

(1) Danish

Det var endnu lys aften, da han var færdig med
 it be.PST still light evening when he be.PST finished with

at analyser-e syge-journal-er-ne.

INF.PTCL analyze-INF sick-journal-PL-DEF

‘It was still light evening when he finished analyzing the hospital charts’.

(2) Norwegian

Er dere ferdig-e å be nå?

be.PRS you finished-PL INF.PTCL pray.INF now

‘Have you finished praying?’

The second construction involves further grammaticalization: from an adjective to a verbal particle, which can be used in postposition (3) or as a prefix (4) to the main verb.

(3) Swedish

I skola-n-s historia, som han dessvärre inte hann

in school-DEF-GEN history which he unfortunately NEG be_in_time.PST

skriv-a färdig, är han själv en av de betydelsefull-aste

write-INF finished be.PRS he self one of ART important-SUPERL

gestalt-er-na.

figure-PL-DEF

‘In the school’s history, which he, unfortunately, did not finish, he himself is one of the most important characters’.

(4) Danish

Når opgav-en er færdig-skrev-et, læse-s den

when exercise-DEF be.PRS finished-write-PP read-PRS.PASS PRON

grundigt igennem.

carefully through

'When the exercise is finished, it is read through carefully'.

The constructions in question exhibit the features of incipient grammaticalization (in the sense of [Hopper 1991]), which is accompanied by divergence of the lexical source and the grammaticalized item and ongoing de-categorialization of the lexical source. The evidence for these processes is found in the corpus data, displaying high variability of adjectival forms and gradual loss of agreement features (5).

Danish

(5a) <...> *før stuehus-et var bygge-t færdig-t.*

before house-DEF be.PST build-PP finished-N

'<...> before the house was built up'.

(5b) *Værk-et var ikke bygge-t færdig før i 1906, <...>.*

work-DEF be.PST NEG build-PP finished before in 1906

'The work was not finished before 1906, <...>'.

In the talk I am going to describe the properties of the constructions and the ways to fill in the slots in their argument structure, as well as to formulate the constraints on their use. I am also going to perform a cross-linguistic comparison of the continental Scandinavian languages with regard to the degree of grammaticalization of the constructions in question and propose the mechanism of change for both construction types.

Abbreviations

ART – article, DEF – definite, GEN – genitive, INF – infinitive, N – neuter, NEG – negation, PASS – passive, PL – plural, PP – past participle, PRON – pronoun, PRS – present tense, PST – past tense, PTCL – particle, SUPERL – superlative degree

References

- Bybee J. et al. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, B. & T. Kuteva. 2004 [2002]. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopper, P. J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 1: *Focus on theoretical and methodological issues*, 17–35. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

KorpusDK (Danish corpus). <ordnet.dk/korpusdk>.

Leksikografisk bokmålskorpus LBK (Norwegian corpus). <www.hf.uio.no/iln/tjenester/kunnskap/sprak/korpus/skriftsprakskorpus/lbk/index.html>.

Korp (Swedish corpus). <spraakbanken.gu.se>.

On productivity and idiomacity: the case of Circum-Baltic presuppositional comitatives

Natalia Perkova (Stockholm/Uppsala)

In my talk, I'm going to discuss a special type of comitative constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages illustrating how the principles of Construction Grammar can be applied to a) the description of a construction with dedicated marking in a particular language (Latvian), b) to its functional equivalents in the languages of the same area, c) to the explanation of language contact patterns in the relevant domain. The construction in focus is called *presuppositional comitative*, as it specifically is related to the pragmatic backgroundness of the comitative participant. It can be argued that markers of such constructions operate as presuppositional triggers. In (1), the marker *kaasa* is used in the clause with negation, but the presupposition that the female character is going to a certain place is preserved. Her brother is assumed to not follow her.

Some formal components of a presuppositional comitative are typically shared with basic comitative constructions, as they share the same general semantic and syntactic properties, denoting plurality of participants expressed in a syntactically asymmetric way (Arkhipov 2009). While in Latvian the basic comitative construction and the presuppositional comitative are characterized by distinct case patterns and comitative markers, in other languages the formal pattern of a presuppositional is partly or fully inherited from a basic comitative construction. The pragmatic markedness of one of the co-participants is related to its poten-

tial omissibility in at least some of the Circum-Baltic languages, cf. German *Wir kommen mit* 'We are going with you / coming along.'

As Construction Grammar (Hoffmann & Trousdale 2013) pays much attention not only to the interplay of form and meaning, the latter including pragmatic functions, which is often characterized by certain idiomaticity (Fillmore et al. 1988), but also to the limits of productivity of constructions (Barðdal 2008), this linguistic framework seems to be particularly useful for the description of presuppositional comitatives. More particularly, I will show how the Latvian presuppositional comitative with a dedicated marker *līdzī* is compatible with a certain set of semantic classes of predicates and more general syntactic patterns (intransitive, transitive, ditransitive, and possessive), and how the productivity of the construction can be described on the basis of the corpus data.

Constructions with intransitive verbs, most particularly with verbs of motion, seem to be quite compositional, while the same markers occur in other syntactic patterns, characterised by more idiomatic semantics, more precisely of *accompanied caused motion*. The contexts of 'taking along' can serve as a good example, see (2) with the Estonian, Finnish and Latvian dedicated markers of presuppositional comitatives. The predicate 'to take' itself implies only the motion of the taken object from a certain place to the sphere of the causer. However, in (2) the causer is supposed to move further with the taken causee, so that they co-participate in this motion. Markers still work as presupposition triggers: the matrix predicate 'to forget' here implies that the candles were not

taken along; still, the presupposition of motion is triggered even under negation, as it is true that the causer moved somewhere. This idiomatic character of a subset of presuppositional comitatives is very remarkable, and in some Circum-Baltic languages (Finnic, Latvian and Russian) this idiomaticity characterizes not only transitive syntactic patterns, in contrast to the SAE languages.

References

- Arkhipov, A. 2009. Comitative as a cross-linguistically valid category. In P. Epps & A. Arkhipov (eds.), *New challenges in typology: transcending the borders and refining the distinctions* (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs 217), 223–246. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Barðdal, J. 2008. *Productivity. Evidence from case and argument structure in Icelandic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Fillmore, C. J., P. Kay & M. C. O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: the case of *let alone*. *Language* 64, 501–38.
- Hoffmann, T. & G. Trousdale. 2013. *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Examples

(1) Estonian

Ta ütles, ärgu tulgu ma temaga kaasa.

she said NEG go:JUSS I.NOM she:COM PCOM

‘She said that I shouldn’t follow her, [because she wanted to stay alone beside the deceased].’ (Jaan Kross. *Keisri hull*)

(2a) Estonian

Me olime unustanud küünlaid kaasa võtta.

we forgot candles PCOM take:INF

(2b) Finnish

Olimme unohtaneet ottaa mukaamme kynttilöitä.

we.forgot take:INF PCOM candles

(2c) Latvian

Mēs bijām aizmirsuši paņemt līdzi sveces.

we forgot take:INF PCOM candles

‘We forgot to take candles with us.’ (Jaan Kross. *Keisri hull*)

Practical information

You'll need cash

Unlike the Nordic countries, there are still many places in Germany where you'll have to pay in cash. There are ATMs in banks (typically *inside* the building) and public places such as the central station.

Travelling to Kiel

By plane: Hamburg Airport is the nearest international airport. Take the *Kielius* bus to get from and to Hamburg Airport and Kiel Central Station. Connections and tickets (in German or English): bahn.de/autokraft/view/angebot/kielius_en.

By train: Kiel Central Station (*Kiel Hbf*) is served by regional, IC, and ICE trains. Connections and tickets (in German, English, or Danish): bahn.de.

By ferry: If you're travelling from (West) Sweden, consider taking the ferry from Gothenburg to Kiel (stenaline.se/vara-linjer/goteborg-kiel). From the Oslo area, the ferry from Oslo to Kiel (colorline.no) is an option.

Public transport in Kiel

Connections for local buses (in German, English, or Danish): bahn.de.

Tickets are paid in cash only. One-way tickets within the city are € 2.60, whole-day tickets € 7.80.

Some **hotels** offer free bus tickets for visitors.

Welcome drinks

When:

Wednesday, 23 October, 19:00

Where:

Lagom, Düsternbrooker Weg 38

How to get there:

Walking from Kiel Central Station (*Kiel Hbf*) takes about 30 minutes. Buses 41, 42, and 43 stop at *Schwanenweg*.

Workshop venue**Where:**

Internationales Begegnungszentrum (IBZ), Kiellinie 5.

How to get there:

Walking from Kiel Central Station (*Kiel Hbf*) takes about 25 minutes. Buses 41, 42, and 43 stop at *Kiel Kunsthalle*, buses 32, 61, and 62 stop at *Kiel Schlossgarten*.

Workshop dinner**When:**

Thursday, 24 October, 19:00

Where:

Längengrad, Schwedenkai 1. The restaurant is on the 4th floor of the building.

How to get there:

Walking from Kiel Central Station (*Kiel Hbf*) takes about 10 minutes. Buses 81, 91, 501, and 502 stop at *Schwedenkai*.

WIFI

You have access to the *eduroam* network at the workshop venue.