



BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

Contents

Andréasson & Lyngfelt: A constructionist model of clausal syntax in Swedish	3
Barðdal & Sandal: Dependent-Marked Anticausatives in Old Norse-Icelandic: How to Model Productive and Unproductive Alternations	5
Christensen & Jensen: Constructional features of attributive clauses in spoken Danish	6
Höder: 'Code-switching' without distinct codes: Multilingual practices from a diasystematic perspective	8
Jaworska: German and/or Scandinavian? Norwegian sin-genitive as constructional contamination	10
Kołaczek, Piotrowska & Skrzypek: <i>Funderande över detta kilade han bort mot dörren</i> - topikaliserade presensparticip i modern svenska	12
Lyngfelt, Andréasson, Bäckström, Blesenius, Höder & Ljunglöf: The Network Model of the Swedish Constructicon	14
Mikkelsen, Endresen & Horbowicz: At what level of abstraction are modals meaningful?	15
Opsahl, Nettet & Enger: Konkurrerende kongruenskonstruksjoner	17
Paetzke: Rethinking extravagance: modelling structural, cognitive, and communicative aspects in Present-Day Swedish	19
Piotrowska & Dolata: The development of the genitival prepositional construction [NP PREP NP] _{poss PP} in Danish and Swedish (1600–2000)	20
Prentice, Bouma & Olofson: Doing 'time' in an additional language. Usage patterns of time constructions in Swedish L1, textbook, and learner corpus data	22
Strandberg: Direkta anföringskonstruktioner i talad svenska med partiklarna <i>ba</i> och <i>såhär</i>	23
Svensson: Konstruksjonsbasert undervisning og -læring – eksempler på tilnærminger for norsk og latgalisk	24
Valdeson: The constructional behaviour of ditransitive verbs in Finland Swedish – an archaism or a case of pro-diasystematic change?	26

A constructionist model of clausal syntax in Swedish

Maia Andréasson

University of Gothenburg
maia.andreasson@svenska.gu.se

Benjamin Lyngfelt

University of Gothenburg
benjamin.lyngfelt@svenska.gu.se

Keywords: *argument structure, clausal constructions, constituency, Swedish, syntax model, word order*

In this talk, we present a constructionist model of clausal syntax in Swedish. The model consists of an overall account of clausal and clause forming constructions, ranging from the most general schemas to highly specific structures, and a basic model for how they may be combined with other constructions to form sentences (Andréasson & Lyngfelt, in prep.).

Swedish syntax poses some challenges to language learners and linguists alike, particularly as regards word order, for instance V2 (verb-second), subordinate clause non V2 order, the possibility of pronominal object shift, etc. (e.g., Andréasson 2007; Ganuza 2008). We handle these challenges by combining relevant parts of traditional syntactic accounts of Swedish (e.g., Platzack 1987a,b; Telemann et al. 1999; cf. Diderichsen 1946), with insights from constructionist linguistics (e.g., Fillmore 1988; Fillmore & Kay 1995; Diessel 2019, 2023; Herbst & Hoffmann 2024).

Key features of the approach are a restrictive treatment of phrasal hierarchy, on which clausal constituents must be supported by standard constituency tests (Börjars et al. 2003), and an account of clause formation based on the interplay between clausal constructions and verbal argument structure constructions (Goldberg 1995). This approach yields a flat clause structure in clauses with simple predicates and motivates the assumption of verb phrases only in clauses with complex predicates. Thus, the account differs from existing syntax models for English (e.g. Fillmore & Kay 1995), on which basic clause structure consists of the combination of a noun phrase and a verb phrase. As for combination of constructions into larger constructs, we treat this in terms of conceptual blending (Fauconnier & Turner 2002).

The proposed syntax model will be applied in the Swedish Constructicon (Lyngfelt et al. 2018; Blensénus & Lyngfelt 2025), which is a reference constructicon resource for Swedish, and thus makes a contribution to practical constructicography as well as to constructionist theory and the understanding of Swedish syntax.

References

- Andréasson, Maia. 2007. *Satsadverbial, ledföljd och informationsdynamik i svenskan* [‘Sentence adverbials, word order and information dynamics in Swedish’]. Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Swedish, University of Gothenburg.
- Andréasson, Maia & Benjamin Lyngfelt. In prep. Clausal constructions and clause formation in Swedish. A constructionist syntax model.
- Blensénus, Kristian & Benjamin Lyngfelt. 2025. Network relations in the Swedish constructicon. In Dana Dannélls, Kristian Blensénus & Lars Borin (eds.). *Sixty years of Swedish computational lexicography*, 261–287. Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Börjars, Kersti, Elisabet Engdahl & Maia Andréasson. 2003. Subject and object positions in Swedish. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG03 Conference*, 43–58. Stanford: CSLI.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1946. *Elementær dansk grammatik* [‘Elementary Danish grammar’]. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Diessel, H. (2019). *The grammar network: How linguistic structure is shaped by language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diessel, H. (2023). *The constructicon. Taxonomies and networks*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier Gilles & Mark Turner. 2002. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind’s Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1988. The mechanisms of “Construction Grammar”. *The Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14, 35–55.
- Fillmore, Charles J. & Paul Kay. 1995. *Construction Grammar coursebook*. CSLI Lecture Notes. Stanford: CSLI. (Manuscript)
- Ganuza, Natalia. 2008. *Syntactic variation in the Swedish of adolescents in multilingual urban settings: Subject-verb order in declaratives, questions and subordinate clauses*.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions. A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Herbst, Thomas & Thomas Hoffmann. 2018. Construction grammar for students: A constructionist approach to syntactic analysis (CASA). *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association*, 6, 197–218.
- Lyngfelt, Benjamin, Linnéa Bäckström, Lars Borin, Anna Ehrlemark & Rudolf Rydstedt. 2018. Constructicography at work. Theory meets practice in the Swedish constructicon. In: Benjamin Lyngfelt, Lars Borin, Kyoko Ohara & Tiago Timponi Torrent (eds.), *Constructicography: Constructicon development across languages*, 255–302. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Platzack, Christer. 1987a. Bisatser, huvudsatser och andra satser [Subordinate clauses, main clauses and other clauses’]. In Ulf Teleman (ed.), *Grammatik på villovägar* (pp. 79–86). Stockholm: Svenska språknämnden.
- Platzack, Christer. 1987b. Huvudsatsordföljd och bisatsordföljd [‘Main clause word order and subordinate clause word order’]. In Ulf Teleman (ed.), *Grammatik på villovägar* (pp. 87–96). Stockholm: Svenska språknämnden.
- Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik* [‘The Swedish Academy Grammar’]. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Dependent-Marked Anticausatives in Old Norse-Icelandic: How to Model Productive and Unproductive Alternations

Jóhanna Barðdal

Ghent University

johanna.barddal@ugent.be

Catrine Sandal

Independent Researcher

catrinesandal@gmail.com

The causative–anticausative alternation is well known within both the typological literature and in language-specific research (Haspelmath 1997, *inter alia*). The concept has its roots in the Soviet scholarship, i.e. in the typological school of Saint Petersburg, during the 1960’ (Kulikov 1998: 139). The major characteristics of this alternation is that the causative is mostly taken to be the primary verbal form, while the anticausative is derived from the causative with a special morphological marker on the verb, hence the term *anticausative*. Such alternations are basically head-marking and not dependent-marking alternations.

In contrast, examples of dependent-marked anticausatives, where the morphological marking is found on the arguments, have so far not been discussed in the typological or functional literature. This presentation deals exactly with this latter type of anticausatives, where the anticausative alternant maintains the object case marking of the causative, thus found on the subject of the anticausative. Two examples from Old Norse-Icelandic are the following:

Transitive: Nom-Acc

- (1a) *Nú* *lýstir* *maður* *sel,* *þá*
now strikes man.NOM seal.ACC then
‘Now it happens that a man strikes a seal, then ...’ (Gulapingslög, ch. 91)

Intransitive: Acc

- (1b) *og* *eldingar,* ... *að* *kirkjuna* *laust*
and lightnings that church.the.ACC got.struck
ok *hún* *brann* *öll*
and she burned all
‘and lightnings ... that the church got struck and all of it burned down’ (Maríu saga, ch. 77)

Dependent-marking anticausativization of this type is not confined to Old and Modern Icelandic, but has been argued to be reconstructable to Proto-Indo-European, due to documentation of such examples across seven different branches of Indo-European, including Slavic (Old Czech), Latin, Ancient Greek, Hittite and Vedic Sanskrit (Barðdal et al. 2020).

On traditional and generative accounts of grammar, alternations as in (1) would be conceptualized as a rule deriving one from the other synchronically (Zaenen & Maling 1990). On a constructional approach, however, the two would be regarded as separate argument structure constructions standing in a systematic relation with each other, with the intransitive denoting an event that has occurred spontaneously with no causer, while the transitive is a causative with an explicit agent. Thus, on a constructional account, it is of no importance which of the alternants is “basic” and which is “derived”, as the goal of the analysis would be to account for the systematic alternation. However, on a diachronic account aiming to explain the emergence of this alternation, it is important whether the intransitive anticausative is derived from the causative or whether the transitive causative is derived from the intransitive. For head-marked anticausatives, this is not a problem since either the causative or the anticausative verb is morphologically marked, while the other alternant is unmarked.

In order to address the issue of historical origin, and thus the productivity of the alternation, a dataset consisting of 90 pairs from Old Norse-Icelandic has been compiled, in part based on Sandal (2011). Through a systematic comparison of these pairs, the emergence of the alternation will be modelled with the construction grammar formalism, including changes in the productivity of the alternation.

References

- Barðdal, Jóhanna, Leonid Kulikov, Roland Pooth & Peter Alexander Kerkhof. 2020. Oblique Anticausatives: A Morphosyntactic Isogloss in Indo-European. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 56(3), 413–449.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1987. *Transitivity Alternations of the Anticausative Type*. Universität zu Köln (Arbeitspapier Nr. 5 (Neue Folge)).
- Kulikov, Leonid. 1998. Passive, Anticausative and Classification of Verbs: The Case of Vedic. In Leonid Kulikov & Heinz Vater (eds.), *Typology of Verbal Categories: Papers Presented to Vladimir Nedjalkov on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, 139–153. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Sandal, Catrine. 2011. Akkusative subjekt og antikausativitet i norrønt [Accusative Subjects and Anticausativity in Old Norse]. University of Bergen M.A. Thesis.
- Zaenen, Annie & Joan Maling. 1990. Unaccusative, Passive and Quirky Case. In Annie Zaenen & Joan Maling (eds.), *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, 137–152. Cambridge, Ma: Academic Press.

Constructional features of attributive clauses in spoken Danish

Tanya Karoli Christensen
University of Copenhagen
tkaroli@hum.ku.dk

Torben Juel Jensen
University of Copenhagen
tjuelj@hum.ku.dk

Keywords: *ordering constructions, attributive clauses, syntactic paradigms, syntactic alternation, filler–slot relations*

Attributive clauses are a type of clause construction that functions as a post-modifier of a constituent in a matrix clause, most often a noun phrase but sometimes an adjective, adverbial or predicate. In Danish, attributive clauses are assumed to follow the so-called subordinate clause word order pattern, that is: Subject – Sentence adverbial – Finite verb (Adv>V), as in (1).

- (1) *så har de jo lige pludselig en ekstra løn* (Lanchart)
som de aldrig nogensinde har budgetteret med
that- they- never ever-SENTENCE have-FINITE VERB budgeted with
CONJ SUBJECT ADVERBIAL
'then they suddenly get a salary that they have never budgeted for'

However, as part of a larger study of word order in subordinate clauses (subclauses), based on the LANCHART corpus of spoken Danish (Gregersen 2009; LANCHART n.d.), we find that in certain subsets of attributive clauses there is surprisingly high proportions of the so-called ‘main clause word order’, where sentence adverbials are placed after the finite verb (V>Adv), as in (2).

- (2) *han hev sådan et bundt plov-mænd op* (Lanchart)
 der var bare rullet sammen
 that-SUBJECT were-FINITE VERB just-SENTENCE ADVERBIAL rolled together
 ‘he pulled out a bundle of five hundred kroner notes that were just rolled up’

The use of main clause word order in subclauses is well-described for complement clauses and adverbial clauses, often described as part of the wider category of Main Clause Phenomena (MCP; Green 1976) (see e.g. Jensen and Christensen 2013; Christensen and Jensen 2015, 2022). Since the traditional terms for the two word orders are misnomers, we follow Hansen & Heltoft (2011) in calling them respectively the ‘declarative’ (V>Adv) and ‘neutral’ (Adv>V) word order construction, thus highlighting that they are both form-meaning pairings.

Our study shows that attributive clauses overall display a relatively low proportion of declarative word order, namely 11% (compared to 64% for complement clauses and 58% for adverbial clauses) (Jensen and Christensen 2024). However, this figure conceals substantial variation, and we find that certain semi-schematic constructions in the matrix clause license declarative word order to a much higher degree than expected given traditional descriptions. We discuss two often overlapping aspects of these constructions: Firstly, they are instances of a syntactic dependency construction where a cataphoric ‘explicative’ constituent in the matrix clause demands a subclause, e.g. *så* ‘so’, *sådan* ‘such’ and *den/det* ‘the/that’ as in (3). Secondly, a considerable subset has semantically ‘light’ matrix clauses that may be viewed as “utterance launchers” or parentheticals (Biber et al. 1999, 1075; Wang 2016), as in (4).

- (3) *hendes område er så specielt så hun bliver aldrig arbejdsløs* (Lanchart)
 ‘her field is so specialized that she will never be unemployed’
 (4) *det er så også det at på det tidspunkt sagde man faktisk Des endnu* (Lanchart)
 ‘it is also the [case] that at the time people actually still said You [polite 2nd person]’

Considering the set of constructions interacting in these settings, we conclude by discussing the implications with respect to the general motivating factors for choosing one or the other word order, i.e. the semantico-pragmatic contrast between the two word orders seen as (ordering) constructions (Kuningas and Leino 2006; Leino 2022).

References

- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Christensen, Tanya Karoli & Torben Juel Jensen. 2015. Word order variation and foregrounding of complement clauses. In Eivind Thorgersen, Stian Hårstad, Brit Mæhlum & Unn Røyneland (eds.), *Language Variation – European Perspectives V. Selected papers from the Seventh International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 7)*, Trondheim June 2013, 69-86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Christensen, Tanya Karoli & Torben Juel Jensen. 2022. When Variants Lack Semantic Equivalence: Adverbial Subclause Word Order. In Tanya Karoli Christensen & Torben Juel Jensen (eds.), *Explanations in Sociosyntactic Variation*, 171-206. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, Georgia M. 1976. Main clause phenomena in subordinate clauses. *Language* 52 (2), 382-397.
- Gregersen, Frans. 2009. The data and design of the LANCHART study. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 41, 3-29.
- Hansen, Erik & Lars Heltoft. 2011. *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog*. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab.
- Jensen, Torben Juel & Tanya Karoli Christensen. 2013. Promoting the demoted: The distribution and semantics of “main clause word order” in spoken Danish complement clauses. *Lingua* 137, 38-58.
- Jensen, Torben Juel & Tanya Karoli Christensen. 2024. Ledstilling i attributive ledsætninger. *Ny forskning i grammatik* 31, 71-87.
- Kuningas, Johanna & Jaakko Leino. 2006. Word Orders and Construction Grammar. *Finnish Journal of Linguistics A Man of Measure: Festschrift in Honour of Fred Karlsson on his 60th Birthday*, 301-309.
- LANCHART. n.d. *The LANCHART Corpus*. Copenhagen: Centre for Language Change in Real time (LANCHART). <https://lanchart.hum.ku.dk/online-resources/the-lanchart-corpus/>.
- Leino, Jaakko. 2022. Formalizing paradigms in Construction Grammar. In Gabriele Diewald & Katja Politt (eds.), *Paradigms regained: Theoretical and empirical arguments for the reassessment of the notion of paradigm*, 37-66. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Wang, Haixia. 2016. The (X) thing is: From a matrix clause to a discourse marker. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 52 (3), 555-577.

‘Code-switching’ without distinct codes: Multilingual practices from a diasystematic perspective

Steffen Höder
Kiel University
s.hoeder@isfas.uni-kiel.de

Keywords: *Diasystematic Construction Grammar, multilingual practices, code-switching*

In recent years, Diasystematic Construction Grammar (DCxG) has gained popularity as a usage-based constructionist framework for analysing phenomena related to language contact and multilingualism. This approach is based on the idea that multilingual speakers and communities do not organise their linguistic knowledge into separate constructional networks for each language, but rather into a single constructicon. From this perspective, any construction is either to some extent language-specific (an idioconstruction) or language-unspecific (a diaconstruction) within the individual or communal constructicon. It is therefore assumed that multilingual speakers form and process their utterances by combining language-specific with language-unspecific constructions.

While this approach can be applied straightforwardly to monolingual utterances, it is less obvious how multilingual practices such as functional ‘code-switching’ should be modelled in DCxG. Drawing

on earlier work on DCxG in general (Höder 2018) and on code-switching in particular (Urban 2021, Järvinen & Lyngfelt 2024), this talk discusses a theoretical proposal that (a) conceptualises code-switching in terms of an interplay between idioconstructions and diaconstructions, in line with general DCxG assumptions and Järvinen & Lyngfelt's concept of constructional integrity, (b) allows for specific constructions that capture the entrenchment and community-specific conventionalisation of recurring patterns in multilingual utterances, (c) includes in its model what has been termed the multilingual's language modes (Grosjean 2024), (d) covers different functional types of multilingual practices, ranging from types related to the community-wide association between domains and languages to more locally functional types such as conversational code-switching (Gumperz 1982). The proposal is exemplified using multilingual corpus data from various Nordic corpora including the Corpus of American Nordic Speech (CANS) and the Corpus of American Danish (CoAmDa) as well as from other multilingual resources.

References

- Grosjean, François. 2024. *On bilinguals and bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Höder, Steffen. 2018. Grammar is community-specific: Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar. In Hans C. Boas & Steffen Höder (eds.), *Constructions in contact. Constructional perspectives on contact phenomena in Germanic languages* (Constructional Approaches to Language 24), 37–70. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Järvinen, Sivi & Benjamin Lyngfelt. 2024. Suomessa på grund av corona niillä on visiiri kaikilla. En konstruktionsgrammatisk analys av kodväxling mellan finska och svenska. In Denny Jansson, Ida Melander, Gustav Westberg & Daroon Y. Falk (eds.), *Svenskans beskrivning. Förhandlingar vid trettioåttonde sammankomsten, Örebro 4–6 maj 2022*, vol. 1, 272–289. Örebro: Örebro universitet.
- Urban, Aileen. 2021. Idioconstructions in conflict. Ad hoc generalization in multilingual speech processing. In Hans C. Boas & Steffen Höder (eds.), *Constructions in contact 2. Language change, multilingual practices, and additional language acquisition* (Constructional Approaches to Language 30), 17–53. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

German and/or Scandinavian? Norwegian sin-genitive as constructional contamination

Julia Jaworska

SWPS University

Jjaworska1@swps.edu.pl

Keywords: *Middle Norwegian, constructional change, language contact, Diasystematic Construction Grammar, possessor doubling*

The Norwegian sin-genitive (1) has attracted significant scholarly attention due to two features: its “ungrammatical” possessor doubling with a reflexive pronoun and its debated origins (Norde 2012, Nesse 2002, Torp 1992, Overton 1967, Knudsen 1967). Researchers have proposed several origins of this construction, viewing it as:

- a Low German loan,
- a Jutlandic loan,
- a result of language-internal development.

Norde (2012) suggests a multiple-source origin, arguing that while the possessor-doubling emerged through internal development, it was later modified through contact with Low German in the Late Middle Ages - a process she terms ‘partial grammatical replication’ (Heine & Kuteva 2005).

- (1) *Kari sitt hus* (Norde 2012)
Kari her.REFL.NEUT.SG house
‘Kari’s house’

The presence of possessor-doubling constructions in Norwegian and their surface similarity to German constructions suggests an alternative explanation: constructional contamination. In this process, the implementation of a target structure changes due to its surface similarity to a contaminating structure (Pijpops & Van de Velde 2016). This study examines whether the Norwegian sin-genitive represents a constructional contamination of German (2) or Scandinavian (3) possessor-doubling constructions with non-reflexive possessive pronouns, especially due to the similarity of the Norwegian reflexive pronoun “sin” and the German non-reflexive “sein”. To explore this question, one must analyze genitive types in German and Scandinavian varieties to identify potential cross-influences. This analysis will reveal how these influences reconfigured the linguistic network—or bilingual constructicon—of language users in late medieval towns, as understood through Diasystematic Construction Grammar (Höder 2018). Additionally, I will examine the evolution of sin-pronoun usage in Western Norwegian written materials to identify likely triggers of constructional change. The data combines existing research on genitives and possessor-doubling constructions with new data on sin-pronoun usage from an emerging corpus of Middle Norwegian possessive constructions (1350-1450) from Bergen and Voss. These possessive constructions have been annotated and extracted for diachronic analysis to track their development.

- (2) *dem Vater sein Haus* (Norde 2012)
the.DAT father his house
‘the father’s house’

- (3) *huset hennes Kari* (Norde 2012)
House-DEF her Kari
'Kari's house'

Following Norde's perspective on the emergence of the Norwegian sin-genitive, I will analyze the preceding changes in possessive constructions within a multilingual context using Diasystematic Construction Grammar, following Pijpops & Van de Velde's (2016) guidelines on measuring constructional contamination. Preliminary corpus data supports the hypothesis that the sin-genitive emerged from multiple sources, with both internal possessor-doubling development and Low German influence contributing to the reconfiguration of the network.

References

- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Höder, Steffen. 2018. Grammar is community-specific: Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar. In Hans C. Boas & Steffen Höder (eds.), *Constructions in contact. Constructional perspectives on contact phenomena in Germanic languages* (Constructional Approaches to Language 24), 37–70. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Knudsen, Trygve. 1967. *Kasuslære II: Dativ, genitiv*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Norde, Muriel. 2012. On the origin(s) of the possessor doubling construction in Norwegian. In Henk van der Liet & Muriel Norde (eds.), *Language for its own sake: Essays on Language and Literature offered to Harry Perridon* (327–358). Scandinavisch instituut, Universiteit van Amsterdam. (Amsterdam Contributions to Scandinavian Studies 8).
- Overton, Paul H. 1967. Periphrasis with "sin" to express possession in New Norwegian and West Norwegian dialects. *Scandinavian Studies* 39(3), 249–258.
- Pijpops, Dirk, & Freek Van de Velde. 2016. Constructional contamination: How does it work and how do we measure it? *Folia Linguistica* 50(2), 543–581.
- Torp, Arne. 1992. Der sogenannte "Garpegenitiv"—Ursprung, Alter und Verbreitung im heutigen Norwegisch. in Lennart Elmevik & Kurt E. Schöndorf (eds.), *Niederdeutsch in Skandinavien III* (151–166). Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 6.

Funderande över detta kilade han bort mot dörren – topikaliserade presensparticip i modern svenska

Natalia Kołaczek

Adam Mickiewicz University
in Poznań
natalia.kolaczek@amu.edu.pl

Alicja Piotrowska

Adam Mickiewicz University
in Poznań
alicja.piotrowska@amu.edu.pl

Dominika Skrzypek

Adam Mickiewicz University
in Poznań
dominika.skrzypek@amu.edu.pl

Nyckelord: presensparticip, topikalisering, svenska, kollexemanalys

I vår studie undersöker vi användning av konstruktioner som består av ett topikaliserat presensparticip, med eller utan bestämning i form av en prepositionsfras, efterföljt av ett finit verb: [PrPart V Subj X] och [PrPart Prep V Subj X]. I dessa participkonstruktioner uttrycks olika tidsrelationer mellan participen och huvudverben (jfr exemplen (1–4)), relationerna kan också ha bl.a. kausal (jfr (3)), deskriptiv (jfr (5)) eller predikativ (jfr (6)) tolkning (se Blensenius 2009 och Czachor 2024). Alla exempel kommer från det analyserade materialet från Språkbankens korpusar.

- (1) *Stapplande gick han mot dörren, framåtlutad och släpig som en mycket gammal människa.*
- (2) *Viftande med sin hatt gick han i spetsen för folkmassan [...]*
- (3) *Brinnande av feber drömde han om att sätta yxan i skallen på farbror Gustaf [...]*
- (4) *Krasande far bitarna i golvet.*
- (5) *Tröstande strök jag henne över kinden.*
- (6) *Stående fortsatte de sitt morgonkaffe*

Spetsställning av participkonstruktioner verkar vara sällsynt – den verkar frånvarande i texter fram till början av 1800-talet, få exempel på sådana strukturer nämns i kapitlen om particip och participfraser i SAG (1999). Dessutom kan möjligheten till topikalisering i modern svenska påverkas av participets självständighet i förhållande till huvud verbet (jfr Blensenius 2009). Konstruktionen där presensparticip föregås av ett finitverb (t.ex. *Han kilade bort mot dörren funderande över detta*) tolkas alltså som ommarkerad.

Studien baseras på material excerperade ur tre korpusar: Bonniersromaner I (1976–77) och Bonniersromaner II (1980–81) samt SUC-romaner (StorSUC), som ingår i Språkbankens korpusinsamling Korp (Borin, Forsberg & Roxendal 2012).

Syftet med studien är att utforska variationen inom konstruktionerna och konstruktionernas multifunktionalitet. Vi ämnar besvara följande frågeställningar:

- Vilka particip och verb är starkare knutna till de öppna luckorna och attraheras av konstruktionerna?
- Vilka är relationer mellan participen och huvudverben?
- Vilka är länkar mellan konstruktioner analyserade på en mer specifik nivå?

För att få en djupare inblick i hur konstruktionerna med topikaliserade presensparticip fungerar i modern svenska och för att identifiera eventuella mönster tillämpar vi en kollexemanalys (Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004). Kollexemanalysen kommer att användas för att mäta hur starkt knutna särskilda verb och presensparticip är till sina respektive luckor i konstruktionerna. Vi använder även samvarierande kollexemanalys (*covarying collexeme analysis*; Stefanowitsch & Gries 2005) för att få

en bättre förståelse om hur lexikala element i de två luckorna (presensparticip och huvudverb) korrelerar med varandra.

Även om konstruktionerna inte är frekventa verkar de vara produktiva, dvs. konstruktionernas luckor tenderar att fyllas med många och nya lexikala enheter (jfr Olofsson 2019). Vi förväntar oss att hitta exempel på både hapaxer och befästa enheter och kombinationer av particip och huvudverb. Med tanke på konstruktionernas multifunktionalitet och relationen mellan deras frekvens och produktivitet kan de analyseras på en mer specifik nivå, som minikonstruktioner: konventionaliserade mönster knutna till vissa grupper av verb eller particip (jfr Boas 2008 och Olofsson 2019).

Referenser

- Blensenius, Kristian. 2009. Springa flåsande och andra progressiva participkonstruktioner i svenskan. *Språk och Stil* NF 19, 172–201.
- Boas, Hans. 2008. Determining the structure of lexical entries and grammatical constructions in Construction Grammar. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 6, 113–144.
- Borin, Lars, Markus Forsberg & Johan Roxendal. 2012. Korp – the corpus infrastructure of Språkbanken. In *Proceedings of LREC 2012*, 474–478. Istanbul: ELRA. http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2012/pdf/248_Paper.pdf.
- Czachor, Malgorzata. 2024. Polskie imiesłowy czynne: kontekst, wieloznaczność i przechodniość [Polska aktiva particip: kontext, tvetydighet och transitivitet]. Opublicerad doktorsavhandling. 10.13140/RG.2.2.18601.71525.
- Gries, Stefan & Anatol Stefanowitsch. 2004. Extending collocation analysis: A corpus-based perspective on “alternations”. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9(1), 97–129. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.9.1.06gri>.
- Olofsson, Joel. 2019. Frekvens som mått på produktivitet : En konstruktionsgrammatisk undersökning av förflyttningskonstruktioner i svenskan. *Språk och stil* NF 29, 168–202. <https://doi.org/10.33063/diva-399809>.
- SAG = Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik* 1–4. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien, Norstedts.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Stefan Gries. 2005. Covarying collexemes. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 1(1), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt.2005.1.1.1>.

The Network Model of the Swedish Constructicon

Benjamin Lyngfelt

University of Gothenburg
benjamin.lyngfelt@svenska.gu.se

Maia Andréasson

University of Gothenburg
maia.andreasson@svenska.gu.se

Linnéa Bäckström

Halmstad University
linnea.backstrom@hh.se

Kristian Blensenius

University of Gothenburg
kristian.blensenius@gu.se

Steffen Höder

Kiel University
s.hoeder@isfas.uni-kiel.de

Peter Ljunglöf

University of Gothenburg /
Chalmers University
peter.ljunglof@cse.gu.se

Keywords: *association, constructicon, network, relation, Swedish, taxonomy*

One of the constituting ideas of Construction Grammar is the conception of language as a (cognitive) network of constructions (e.g., Diessel 2023). This paper is concerned with the endeavor of adapting this idea to applied practice in a reference constructicon database, in particular as implemented in the Swedish Constructicon (SweCcn).

The network model of SweCcn incorporates relations *between* constructions, relations *within* constructions, and external relations to other resources (Blensenius & Lyngfelt 2025). We will mainly focus on relations *between* constructions, which are handled in terms of taxonomies and (horizontal) associations (cf. Diessel 2023), but we will also address the other dimensions. Taxonomies are built both top-down, from very general constructions; and bottom-up, from the highly specific constructions that make up the majority of the existing construction entries (Bäckström et al. in prep.). Non-taxonomic relations are handled in terms of *associations* by shared properties, which are sorted in four types: grammar, semantics/pragmatics, construction elements, and other (Blensenius & Lyngfelt 2025). Notable among the external relations are connections to the cross-linguistic construction database MoCCA (Lorenzi et al. 2025), designed to align constructions in different languages via language-neutral comparative concepts (Croft 2022).

The construction network is complemented by a syntax model, accounting for the combination of constructions into (sentence) constructs (Andréasson & Lyngfelt, in prep.). While not part of the construction network *per se*, it is key to the overall coherence of the system.

Finally, we will briefly comment on the relation between the proposed network model and the constructionist idea of language as a cognitive construction network (cf., e.g., Herbst 2019; Schmid 2020; Hilpert et al. to appear). In which respects do or don't the two kinds of network conceptions correspond to each other? The practical network implementation of SweCcn clearly builds on constructionist theory; to what extent and in what ways may this applied endeavor also inform the theory back?

References

- Andréasson, Maia & Benjamin Lyngfelt. In prep. Clausal constructions and clause formation in Swedish. A constructionist syntax model.
- Bäckström, Linnéa, Steffen Höder & Benjamin Lyngfelt. In prep. Taxonomies and argument structure in the Swedish Constructicon.

- Blensenius, Kristian & Benjamin Lyngfelt. 2025. Network relations in the Swedish Constructicon. In Dana Dannélls, Kristian Blensenius & Lars Borin (eds.). *Sixty years of Swedish computational Lexicography*, 261–287. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Croft, William. 2022. *Morphosyntax: Constructions of the world's languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 2023. *The constructicon. Taxonomies and Networks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herbst, Thomas. 2019. Constructicons: A new type of reference work? *Lexicographica* 35, 3–14.
- Hilpert, Martin, Benjamin Lyngfelt & Tiago Timponi Torrent. To appear. The constructicon: Language as a cognitive network of constructions. To appear in *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 3rd. ed.
- Lorenzi, Arthur, Peter Ljunglöf, Benjamin Lyngfelt, Tiago Timponi Torrent, William Croft, Alexander Ziem, Nina Böbel, Linnéa Bäckström, Peter Uhrig & Ely Matos. 2024. MoCCA: A model of comparative concepts for aligning constructicons. *Proceedings of the 20th Joint ACL-ISO Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation at the Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING) 2024*, 93–98.
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 2020. *The dynamics of the linguistic system: Usage, conventionalization and entrenchment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

At what level of abstraction are modals meaningful?

Using a “stacked” distinctive collexeme analysis to identify clusters of lexically specific combinations of Norwegian modal verbs and their arguments

Olaf Mikkelsen

UiT The Arctic University of
Norway
olaf.a.mikkelsen@uit.no

Anna Endresen

UiT The Arctic University of
Norway
anna.endresen@uit.no

Paulina Horbowicz

Adam Mickiewicz University of
Poznan, Poland
e-mail

Keywords: construction grammar, corpus linguistics, distinctive collexeme analysis, modality, constructiCon

The idea that constructions are pairings of forms and meaning is a basic tenet of Construction Grammar, and most construction-grammarians agree that there are no meaningless constructions (Boas, Leino & Lyngfelt 2024). As pointed out by Cappelle (2024), however, there remains limited exploration and testing of this idea. The present study looks at the modals *vil* (‘will’) and *skal* (‘shall’) in Norwegian, relates the notion of meaningful(/less)ness to that of schematicity and asks whether it is possible to think of a schema that is both abstract enough to encompass all of the different meanings, without becoming meaningless.

A sample of 95 211 instances of *skal INF* and *vil INF* was drawn from the Norwegian Blog Corpus (Mikkelsen 2021) and annotated for subject type, modal and lexical verb. The resulting three columns served as input for a distinctive collexeme analysis (Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004). Since this method requires only two columns (construction and verb) as input, subject type and modal were

stacked together in a single column (subject+modal). The advantage of the resulting "stacked" collexeme analysis is that the output it produces is more detailed. For instance, the analysis reveals that most of the top collocates for *jeg+vil* ('I will') belong to two clusters: hedging expressions like *jeg vil tro* ('I guess') or speech-act-expressions like *jeg vil takke* ('I would like to thank'). Similarly, the top collocates of *det+skal* ('it shall') can be grouped into concessive expressions like *det skal nevnes* ('truth be told') or expressions of hidden intention like *det skal feires* ('it's time to party'). Such clusters can be found across the different subject-modal combinations, with different sometimes overlapping functions, and at varying degrees of specificity.

These results warrant a discussion of how modals are entrenched in the minds of speakers of Norwegian and, subsequently, how they should be represented in the digital ConstructiCon currently being built for Norwegian (NorKon 2024). Following Hilpert & Flach (2023) we argue that modals can be understood as networks of associative connections in the sense of Schmid (2020). We explore how such local networks are represented in terms of symbolic, syntagmatic, paradigmatic and pragmatic associations within the wider grammar network (Diessel 2019) and showcase how they can be visualized in the Norwegian ConstructiCon.

References

- Boas, Hans C., Jaakko Leino & Benjamin Lyngfelt. 2024. Constructionist views on Construction Grammar. *Constructions and Frames* 16(2): 169–190.
- Cappelle, Bert. 2024. *Can Construction Grammar Be Proven Wrong?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 2019. *The grammar network*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gries, Stefan Th. & Anatol Stefanowitsch. 2004. Extending collocation analysis: a corpus-based perspective on 'alternations'. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9(1): 97–129.
- Hilpert, Martin & Susanne Flach. 2023. "Modals in the network model of Construction Grammar." In Depraetere, Ilse, Bert Cappelle & Martin Hilpert (Eds). *Models of Modals: From Pragmatics and Corpus Linguistics to Machine Learning*. Berlin: De Gruyter: 254–69.
- Mikkelsen, Olaf. 2021. The Norwegian Blog Corpus (NBC). Available at <https://github.com/omikke/NBC>
- NorKon 2024 – The Norwegian ConstructiCon. A digital network of Norwegian constructions. Available at <https://constructicon.github.io/norwegian/>
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 2020. *The dynamics of the linguistic system: Usage, conventionalization and entrenchment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Konkurrerende kongruenskonstruksjoner

Toril Opsahl
Univ. i Oslo
toril.opsahl@iln.uio.no

Tore Nesset
Univ. i Tromsø
tore.nesset@uit.no

Hans-Olav Enger
Univ. i Oslo
h.o.enger@iln.uio.no

Nøkkelord: kongruens, syntaks, semantikk, avstand, individuering

Valget mellom kongruenskonstruksjoner – og dermed kongruens generelt – påvirkes av flere faktorer (Corbett 2006), ikke minst syntaktisk struktur. I norsk kongruerer attributive adjektiver i regelen syntaktisk; predikative adjektiver kan alternativt kongruere semantisk i en del tilfeller:

- (1) *Et syk-t barn*
- (2) **Et syk barn*
- (3) *Barnet er syk-t*
- (4) *Barnet er syk*

I 1 og 3 kongruerer predikativet syntaktisk – *sykt* står i nøytrum fordi *barn* er nøytrum. Felleskjønnsforma *syk* er ugrammatisk i 2, men akseptabel i 4 (iallfall for en del norsktalende, jf. også Dubois-Kotter 2024). Dette skyldes syntaktisk struktur; når adjektivet står predikativt, som i 2, er det mer rom for semantisk kongruens. Animator tar i regelen predikativ i felleskjønn, og det henger sammen med betydning.

Mange antar at også faktisk, lineær avstand kan spille en rolle for kongruens. Se det tyske eksempel 5:

- (5) *Und er liebt Henriette Vogel, das Mädchen*
og han elsker Henriette Vogel, den.N jenta
das in derselben Nacht wie er geboren wurde
rel.N i samme natt som han født ble
und die mit ihm im Bordell aufwächst
og **rel.F** med han i bordellet vokser opp
'Og han [Kaspar Hauser] elsker Henriette Vogel, den jenta som ble født i samme
natt som han, og som vokser opp i bordellet sammen med han'

Syntaktisk fyller pronomenene *das* og *die* samme funksjon her. At *die* blir valgt mot slutten av 5, skyldes at det er større avstand tilbake til antesedenten *das Mädchen*, og det gir rom for semantisk kongruens.

Lineær avstand kan ikke alltid forklare at semantisk kongruens blir valgt. Jf. 6 og 7.

- (6) *Et syk-t og kanskje dessverre døende barn*
- (7) **Et syk og kanskje dessverre døende barn*

Det er større avstand mellom adjektivet *syk* og substantivet *barn* i 7 enn i 4. Når semantisk kongruens likevel er uakseptabelt i 7, må det snarere skyldes syntaktisk struktur. Det er brei enighet om at

syntaktisk struktur spiller en rolle for kongruens, men noe skepsis til at avstand skulle gjøre det (f.eks. Åfarli & Vangsnes 2020).

Kanskje kan syntaktisk kompleksitet også spille en rolle. Om lineær avstand kan spille en rolle, er det fordi arbeidsminnet påvirkes. I 5 glemmer kanskje skriveren hvilket substantiv som er valgt for å betegne Henriette Vogel, men husker fortsatt hvem hen skriver om. Om det kommer en komplisert syntaktisk struktur mellom subjekt og predikativ, kan det ha samme effekt som lineær avstand?

Vi har foretatt informantundersøkelser med norske adjektiver i singular eller plural. Vi har gransket kongruenskonstruksjoner med variasjon i eksempler som 8–10:

(8) *Familien hennes var adjektiv*

(9) *Familien, som er fra Oslo,
som er en gammel by,
var adjektiv*

(10) *Familien til mamma Mari og
pappa Pål og dattera Kjersti
var adjektiv*

Subjektet er her et substantiv i entall; grammatisk kongruens tilsier entallsform av adjektivet. Samtidig betegner substantivet *familie* en ‘flerhet’, adjektivet står predikativt, og i 9 er det avstand og komplisert syntaks. Dette burde åpne for semantisk kongruens, flertall. I 10 blir de ulike medlemmene av familien navngitt, altså individuert – kan det ha en effekt? Vi har forsøkt å finne ut hva en del norske studenter vil velge.

Undersøkelsen vår er ennå ikke avsluttet, men de foreløpige resultatene for vårt materiale er blant annet:

- Avstand har en effekt
- Kompleksitet har ingen effekt
- Individuering har effekt

Vi analyserer de to konkurrerende kongruenskonstruksjonene som deler av et stort konstruksjonsnettverk («konstruktikon») der valget mellom konstruksjonene avhenger av mange faktorer. Vår analyse gir evidens for en bruksbasert tilnærming («usage-based approach»), siden arbeidsminnets begrensninger ser ut til å påvirke valg av konstruksjon. Analysen vår gir også støtte til en grunnleggende hypotese i konstruksjonsgrammatikk, idet en semantisk faktor som individuering kan se ut til å ha direkte relevans for syntaktiske konstruksjoner (jf. Nessel og Kuznetsova 2015: 387).

Referanser

Corbett, Greville G. 2006. *Agreement* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dubois-Kother, Yelena. 2024. *Var fruentimmeret gal?* En undersøkelse av adjektivkongruens med animate nøytrer. MA-avhandling, Universitetet i Oslo.

Neset, Tore & Kuznetsova, Julia. 2015. Constructions and language change: from genitive to accusative objects in Russian. *Diachronica* 32(3), 365–396.

Åfarli, Tor Anders & Vangsnes, Øystein A. 2020. Formell og semantisk adjektivkongruens i norsk. *Oslo Studies in Language* 11(2), 527–540.

Rethinking extravagance: modelling structural, cognitive, and communicative aspects in Present-Day Swedish

Sarah Paetzke

Kiel University

s.paetzke@isfas.uni-kiel.de

Keywords: usage-based approach, extravagance, triangulation, empirical methods

Extravagance is a pragmatic phenomenon related to Keller's (2014 [1990]) maxims of action and formulated by Haspelmath (1999: 1055) as 'talk in such way that you are noticed'. Given the increasing popularity of pragmatics within usage-based constructionist approaches, it is unsurprising that extravagance has also gained interest in recent studies (e.g. Baumann & Mühlenbernd 2022; Hartmann & Ungerer 2023; Ungerer & Hartmann 2024), particularly in studies on language change from the perspective of Diachronic Construction Grammar (e.g. De Wit, Petré & Brisard 2020; Eitelmann & Haumann 2022). Still, the term extravagance is open to interpretation and, moreover, strikingly underoperationalised (Ungerer & Hartmann 2020). While current research focuses on diachronic aspects, the present project aims to rethink extravagance as a synchronic phenomenon which is influenced by structural, cognitive, and communicative factors. To achieve this, the project employs triangulation in both its theoretical and methodological approaches as well as in relation to the data. Theoretically, it is mainly based on usage-based Construction Grammar; however, it is imperative to consider additional aspects (including indexicality, individual variation and innovation, and linguistic creativity) in order to capture the complexity of the mechanisms studied. Methodologically, the project employs a variety of methods, such as corpus analysis, experimental settings, and questionnaires. Empirically, the project focuses on Present-Day Swedish constructions with varying degrees of schematicity, with the objective of determining the role of schematicity and the network character of the construction in relation to extravagance. The talk aims to present the current state of this project. It will briefly outline the theoretical framework and possible models for operationalising extravagance. The primary focus of the talk is on potential designs for the empirical testing of extravagance, including possible Swedish constructions that could be used within these designs to assess the structural, cognitive, and communicative dimensions of extravagance in Present-Day Swedish.

References

Baumann, Andreas & Roland Mühlenbernd. 2022. Less of the same. Modeling *horror aequi* and extravagance of negative frequency dependence in linguistic diversification. In Andrea Ravignani et al. (Hgg.), *Proceedings of the Joint Conference on Language Evolution (JcoLE)*, 50–57. Nijmegen: Joint Conference on Language Evolution (JcoLE).

- De Wit, Astrid, Peter Petré & Frank Brisard. 2020. Standing out with the progressive. *Journal of Linguistics* 56, 479–514.
- Eitelmann, Matthias & Dagmar Haumann (Hgg.). 2022. *Extravagant morphology. Studies in rule-bending, pattern-extending and theory-challenging morphology* (Studies in Language Companion Series 223). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hartmann, Stefan & Tobias Ungerer. 2023. Attack of the snowclones. A corpus-based analysis of extravagant formulaic patterns. *Journal of Linguistics* 60 (3), 599–634.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. Why is grammaticalization irreversible?. *Linguistics* 37, 1043–1068.
- Keller, Rudi. 2014. *Sprachwandel. Von der unsichtbaren Hand in der Sprache*. 4th Ed. [1st Ed. 1990]. Stuttgart: UTB.
- Ungerer, Tobias & Stefan Hartmann. 2020. Delineating extravagance. Assessing speaker’s perceptions of imaginative constructional patterns. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 34, 345–356.
- Ungerer, Tobias & Stefan Hartmann. 2024. Constrastive is the new black. A cross-linguistic study of a “snowclone” in English, German, and Spanish. *Quaderns des Filologia: Estudis Lingüístics* XXIX: 217–235.

The development of the genitival prepositional construction [NP PREP NP]_{poss PP} in Danish and Swedish (1600–2000)

Alicja Piotrowska

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
alicja.piotrowska@amu.edu.pl

Weronika Dolata

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
werdol3@st.amu.edu.pl

Keywords: possession, prepositional construction, genitival construction, Swedish, Danish

In both Danish and Swedish we find a genitival prepositional construction, [NP PREP NP]_{poss PP}, similar to the English *of*-genitive. We use the term genitival, or in short *poss PP* (possessive prepositional phrase), to describe it since it functions as an alternative to the s-genitive (see example (1a)), as opposed to other locative or partitive prepositional constructions (1b).

- | | | | | |
|--------|---|---|--|---------------------------------|
| (1) a. | <i>taket på huset</i>
‘the roof on the house’ | – | <i>husets tak</i>
‘the house’s roof’ | [NP PREP NP] _{poss PP} |
| b. | <i>boken på bordet</i>
‘the book on the table’ | – | <i>*bordets bok</i>
‘*the table’s book’ | [NP PREP NP] _{loc} |

The aim of the study is to trace the development of the genitival prepositional construction in Early Modern Danish and Swedish (1a) and to compare it against the background of other prepositional constructions (1b). The comparison will include: 1) the prepositions used in the PREP slot, and 2) the types of referents in the NP slots with regard to their animacy and definiteness, in order to uncover whether any conventional patterns appear. Since the construction allows various prepositions in the PREP slot, their locative/partitive/directional meanings are still present in the construction. The

hypothesis is then that the preposition *av/af* ‘of’ indicating origin, partitive or agentive relations will be particularly attracted to the genitival construction in both languages as it seems less entrenched in its locative/origin meaning than, for example, *på* ‘on’ or *i* ‘in’ (Teleman et al. 1999: 702). Furthermore, as the possibility of using locative or partitive constructions as a template for relations usually expressed through the s-genitive becomes more pronounced over time in Danish and Swedish, more animate referents are hypothesized to be allowed in the poss PP construction. An additional aim of the study is to determine how productive the poss PP construction is in each period.

The study is based on a newly compiled corpus of Danish and Swedish texts written between 1600 and 2000. The timeline of the corpus texts was determined based on previous studies (Piotrowska 2021, 2024), which show that there are very few poss PPs in the texts originating before 1600. The size of the corpus is 400,000 words, divided equally between the two languages and the four centuries. All instances of the prepositional construction of type [NP PREP NP] are annotated by hand with respect to various factors. The sample for this study includes 2,936 instances of the prepositional constructions in Swedish (out of which 1,016 are identified as genitival). The Danish part of the corpus is currently being annotated, but we expect a similar number of instances to be included.

In order to gain a better understanding of the poss PP construction, a collostructional analysis (Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003; Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004) will be used to measure the attraction of particular prepositions by the genitival prepositional construction and the reliance of the construction on particular prepositions (Schmid & Küchenhoff 2013). The collostructional analysis will also be used to measure the attraction of particular types of referents ($\pm$ animate, $\pm$ definite) by the poss PPs.

References

- Gries, Stefan Th. & Anatol Stefanowitsch. 2004. Extending collostructional analysis: A corpus-based perspective on “alternations”. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9(1), 97–129. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.9.1.06gri>.
- Piotrowska, Alicja. 2021. Animacy and other determinants of genitive variation in Swedish: s-genitive vs. prepositional construction. *Lege Artis-Language Yesterday Today Tomorrow* 6(1), 109–157.
- Piotrowska, Alicja. 2024. *Variation in Nominal Possessive Expressions: Case Studies from Danish and Swedish* (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 22). Leiden: Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004682184>.
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg & Helmut Küchenhoff. 2013. Collostructional analysis and other ways of measuring lexicogrammatical attraction: Theoretical premises, practical problems and cognitive underpinnings. *Cognitive Linguistics* 24(3), 531–577. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2013-0018>.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Stefan Th. Gries. 2003. Collostructions: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8(2), 209–243. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.8.2.03ste>.
- Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik. 2 Ord*. Stockholm: Norrstedts.

Doing ‘time’ in an additional language. Usage patterns of time constructions in Swedish L1, textbook, and learner corpus data

Julia Prentice
Göteborgs universitet
julia.prentice@svenska.gu.se

Gerlof Bouma
Göteborgs universitet
gerlof.bouma@svenska.gu.se

Joel Olofsson
Högskolan Väst
joel.olofsson@hv.se

Keywords: *Time constructions, additional language learning, usage patterns, corpus data, conventionalization*

Time expressions are frequently used and carry important interactional functions. They are also often not fully compositional, thus highly relevant for the investigation of the challenges that learners of an additional language (AL) face when learning conventionalized linguistic patterns. To meet these challenges, we see a need for empirical studies of the relationship between time constructions’ conventionalized patterns of usage in the speech community and their entrenchment in AL learners’ minds.

In this paper we focus on the former from the perspective of usage-based construction grammar. We present a corpus study that investigates the usage patterns of Swedish time constructions in three different types of corpus data: the textbook corpus COCTAILL in Språkbanken Text (710K token, Volodina et al. 2014), the Swedish learner Corpus SweLL (Volodina et al. 2019, 147K token) and L1 corpus data from 44 corpora available through Språkbanken Text (23 news corpora and 21 blog corpora, 822M token in total). The aim of the study is twofold. Relating statistical usage patterns like frequency, contingency, prototypicality (Ellis, Römer & O’Donnell 2016) and productivity in the three data sets to each other is a first step towards identifying Swedish time constructions which are relevant to investigate further in an AL learning context. At a later stage of the project the usage patterns are also going to be related to experimental data as one potential factor affecting entrenchment of the investigated constructions in the emerging multilingual constructicon (cf. Höder, Prentice & Tingsell 2021) of AL learners of Swedish.

Initially, we compared frequencies of time constructions (including both single words and multiword expressions) in the three data sets. This comparison indicates that time constructions are most frequent in the L1 data set (17414/1M token), relatively less frequent in the textbook data in COCTAILL (10071/1M token) and least frequent in the learner data set in SweLL: (8340/ 1 M token). Looking at the most frequent types, we see great overlap between the three datasets. The top 10 is dominated by one- or two-word, fully fixed expressions such as idag ‘today’, nu ‘now’, igår ‘yesterday’, samtidigt ‘at the same time’, hela tiden ‘all the time’. However, we also see differences, especially contrasting the learner data with the two L1 data sets. For instance, we can see non-idiomatic uses such as lång tid ‘long time’ (idiomatic: länge) and overuse relative to the L1 datasets of expressions, such as idag ‘today’ and nuförtiden ‘nowadays’.

These are first indications of differences regarding the use of time constructions in the different data sets. In the following steps we are going to analyze productivity of use for the most frequent semi-schematic time constructions in all three data sets by comparing type-token frequencies. Furthermore, we will conduct an analysis of the aforementioned usage patterns for time constructions in the corpora, in order to identify relevant candidates for an in-depth investigation of what effects the entrenchment of AL time constructions.

References

- Ellis, N. C., Römer, U., & O'Donnell, M. B. (2016). Usage-based approaches to language acquisition and processing: Cognitive and corpus investigations of constructiongrammar. Malden, MA: Wiley
- Höder, S., Prentice, J. & Tingsell, S. (2021). Additional language acquisition as emerging multilingualism. A Construction Grammar approach. In Höder, S. & Boas, H. (eds.), *Constructions in Contact 2. Language change, multilingual practices, and additional language acquisition* (pp. 310–337). John Benjamins.

Direkta anföringskonstruktioner i talad svenska med partiklarna *ba* och *såhär*

Viktoria Strandberg
Göteborgs universitet
viktoria.strandberg@gu.se

Sedan åtminstone 1980-talet har adverbet *bara* använts framför direkta anföringar i talad svenska, främst i den förkortade partikelformen *ba*. Denna partikel har jämförts med finita verb (Kotsinas 1994, Lundin Åkesson 2005), eftersom den kan kombineras med enbart ett subjekt, till exempel *man* i (1) nedan. Forskning från 1990- och 2000-talet har visat att *ba* inte kan kombineras med finita verb (Kotsinas 1994, Eriksson 1997, Lundin Åkesson 2005, Svensson 2009). I samtida tal- och skriftspråksmaterial har jag däremot hittat kombinationer av *ba* och finita verb, som *hade* i (2) nedan. Detta tyder på att anföringskonstruktioner med *ba* har förändrats de senaste årtiondena.

(1) Man *ba* ”du har inga problem”

(2) Jag *hade ba*: MARRY ME

En annan syntaktisk egenhet hos *ba* är att det kan föregås av ledföljden *adverbial + subjekt* (Lundin Åkesson 2005), se (3) nedan där *först man* föregår *ba*. En sådan ledföljd är oväntad eftersom svenskan är ett V2-språk, och ett finit verb vore väntat efter ett inledande adverbial som *först* i (3). Ett *ba* som föregås av adverbial, subjekt och verb som i (4) nedan bidrar således till V3-ledföljd: här hamnar det finita verbet *hade* på tredje plats efter adverbialet *skulle nån säga så till mej* och subjektet *jag*. Även anföringspartikeln *såhär* kan följa samma mönster, se (5), men förekommer också med V2-ledföljd, se (6). I det senare exemplet står adverbialet *då* integrerat i en V2-sats, och inte framför den som i (5).

(3) Först man *ba*: Shit va snygga!

(4) Skulle nån säga så till mej jag *hade ba* ”VA MENAR DU”

(5) När jag kom hem jag var *såhär* ”det här är fan andra gången”

(6) Då började jag känna *såhär* ”du visste ju att den här kampanjen skulle komma”

I mitt föredrag presenterar jag en analys av anföringar med *ba* och *såhär* som konstruktioner i konstruktionsgrammatisk mening (Fried & Nikiforidou 2025). Med ett konstruktionsperspektiv kan den oväntade V3-ledföljd, som både *ba* och *såhär* kan ge upphov till, ses som ett konventionaliserat konstruktionsmönster tillgängligt för just *ba* och *såhär* men inte för satskonstruktioner i allmänhet. En konstruktionsanalys kan även visa att *såhär* kan förekomma i två konstruktionsmönster med antingen V2- eller V3-ledföljd.

Analysen grundar sig i en samling av *ba*- och *såhär*-konstruktioner från korpusen Sociala medier i Korp (Borin m.fl. 2012) och en talspråkskorpus bestående av tretton samtalspoddar (t.ex. Strandberg 2024). Talspråksexemplen analyseras även interaktionslingvistiskt (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018),

och i föredraget lägger jag även fram ett förslag på hur interaktionella aspekter kan formaliseras som en del av en konstruktions pragmatiska egenskaper.

Referenser

- Borin, L., M. Forsberg & J. Roxendal. 2012. Korp – the corpus infrastructure of Språkbanken. *Proceedings of LREC 2012*. Istanbul: ELRA, pages 474–478.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. & M. Selting 2018. *Interactional Linguistics. Studying Language in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eriksson, M. 1997. *Ungdomars berättande. En studie i struktur och interaktion*. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Fried, M. & K. Nikiforidou 2025. Construction Grammar. Introduction. I: Fried, Mirjam & Kiki Nikiforidou (red.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Construction Grammar*, s. 1–20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kotsinas, U.-B. 1994. *Ungdomsspråk*. Uppsala: Hallgren & Fallgren.
- Lundin Åkesson, K. 2005. The multifunctional 'ba': a finiteness marker in the guise of an adverbial. *Working papers in Scandinavian Syntax*.
- Strandberg, V. 2024. Varför V3 nu? Temporala och konditionala bisatser som fria initiala annex. *Språk och interaction* 6(1).
- Svensson, G. 2009. *Diskurspartiklar hos ungdomar i mångspråkiga miljöer i Malmö*. Lund: Lunds universitet.

Konstruksjonsbasert undervisning og -læring – eksempler på tilnærminger for norsk og latgalisk

Snorre Karkkonen Svensson
Valodu māja – House of Languages
snorre@valodumaja.lv

Keywords: Norwegian, Latgalian, Multisensory Approach in SLA

Selv om konstruksjonsgrammatikk har vært gjenstand for forskning i flere tiår, er den fortsatt bare i mindre grad blitt anvendt i praktisk fremmed- og andrespråksundervisning. De siste årene har konstruksjonsgrammatikk og andrespråkslæring og -undervisning imidlertid fått mer oppmerksomhet teoretisk f.eks. gjennom *Applied Construction grammar* (2016) og *Directions for Pedagogical Construction Grammar* (2022). Svensson (2010) tar til orde for bruk av konstruksjonsgrammatikken i en norsk andrespråkskontekst og Gølin Kaurin Nilsen har i sin doktorgradsavhandling (2021) brukt konstruksjonsgrammatisk tilnærming i analysen av norske andrespråkstekster, og sistnevnte nevner praktisk nytte for undervisning som en motivasjonsgrunn til avhandlingen. Foreløpig er det imidlertid rom for mer ustrukturt bruk av konstruksjonsgrammatikk i praktisk undervisning, utvikling av læringsmateriell og språktesting for norsk.

Dette innlegget tar for seg noen problemstillinger og mulige tilnærminger til presentasjon av konstruksjoner i en pedagogisk kontekst, i utarbeidelsen av fagplaner og læringsmateriell, bl.a. med henblikk på Det europeiske rammeverket, autentisk språk og bruk av korpus, tverrspråklig tilnærming, frekvens, konstruksjonssynonymi og stilnivå.

En pedagogisk tilnærming som demonstreres, er multisensorisk undervisning (Svensson, 2016) og innlegget viser hvordan bl.a. bruk av farger, bokstaver, illustrasjoner og håndbevegelser kan brukes for å hjelpe innlæringen av konstruksjoner. Dette eksemplifiseres gjennom pedagogisk materiale for lærere og innlærere som er under utvikling eller er utarbeidet ved Språkenes hus (Valodu māja) for to språk: Ett språk som språktypologisk er mer analytisk – norsk bokmål og ett mer syntetisk – latgalisk. Latgalisk er den mindre brukte av de to latviske skriftspråkstradisjonene, og har aldri tidligere vært gjenstand for konstruksjonsgrammatisk behandling, og dessuten bare minimalt vært i fokus som fremmedspråk.

For skandinavisk er fokus på konstruksjoner i undervisning blitt behandlet i Prentice et. al 2016, men dette innlegget skisserer hvordan et konstruksjonsgrammatisk fokus også kan implementeres i arbeidet med andre språkferdigheter annet enn grammatikk (f.eks. uttale, lesing, skriftlig og muntlig tekstproduksjon). Dessuten presenteres forslag til prinsipper for hvordan konstruksjonsgrammatisk tilnærming kan formidles til lærere og innlærere uten teoretisk bakgrunn og med begrenset kjennskap til lingvistisk terminologi, og hvordan mer tradisjonelt læringsmateriell kan omarbeides for å få et større konstruksjonsgrammatisk fokus.

References

- Nilsen, Gølin Kaurin. 2021 *Substantivfrasens kompleksitetsutvikling i innlærerspråk: En konstruksjonsgrammatisk analyse av skriftlig produksjon fra A1- til B2-nivå*. Stavanger: University of Stavanger, 2021 (PhD thesis UiS, no. 625)
- Prentice, Julia, Lisa Loenheim, Benjamin Lyngfelt, Joel Olofsson & Sofia Tingsell. 2016. Bortom ordklasser och satsdelar: konstruktionsgrammatik i klassrummet. *Svenskans beskrivning* 34. Lund, 385–397.
- Svensson, Snorre Karkkonen. 2010. Konstruksjonsgrammatikk – hva har du å gi oss? In: Johansen, Hilde, Anne Golden, Jon Erik Hagen & Ann-Kristin Helland (eds.) *Systematisk, variert, men ikke tilfeldig. Antologi om norsk som andrespråk i anledning Kari Tenfjords 60-årsdag*, 213–226. Oslo: Novus forlag.
- Svensson, Snorre Karkkonen. 2016. *Multisensorisk uttaleundervisning – en pedagogisk ressurs for lærere*. Fagartikkel. Borre: Høgskolen i Sørøst-Norge. Fakultet for humaniora og utdanningsvitenskap.

The constructional behaviour of ditransitive verbs in Finland Swedish – an archaism or a case of pro-diasystematic change?

Fredrik Valdeson
Södertörn University
fredrik.valdeson@sh.se

Keywords: *ditransitives, prepositions, Finland Swedish, Sweden Swedish, collostructional analysis*

In Finland Swedish, ditransitive verbs occur with the preposition *åt* (*ge ngt åt ngn* ‘give sth. to sb.’) more frequently than in Sweden Swedish (Silén 2008). The use of *åt* in contexts where it is not found in Sweden Swedish has been criticized as incorrect and as the result of language contact with Finnish (e.g. Reuter 2000). As discussed by Martola (2007:295–296), however, it is not quite certain whether this trait is primarily an archaism or the result of language contact. *Åt* was much more frequent with ditransitive verbs in nineteenth-century Swedish in general (Valdeson 2024), which provides a strong case for arguing that the Finland Swedish use of the preposition is more of an archaism. At the same time, many aspects of how the preposition is used in Finland Swedish is also reminiscent of the distribution of Finnish allative case, which points in the direction of language contact as an explanatory factor, indicating that the Finland Swedish *åt* use may have arisen due to pro-diasystematic change (cf. Höder 2018).

The most likely answer is that the Finland Swedish use of *åt* is a bit of both. This still leaves us with the question of whether the present-day Finland Swedish use of *åt* is more similar to the situation in older Swedish, the use of allative case in present-day Finnish or, possibly, more to the present-day Swedish use of *åt*. I will try to provide an answer to this question by combining collostructional analysis with cluster analysis, using the methodology of Mukherjee & Gries (2009). I treat ditransitive use of *åt* as a construction with certain semantic constraints, which I refer to as the Swedish *ditransitive åt construction* – in present-day Sweden Swedish, the construction is mainly used to denote events in which a subject referent acts upon the referent of the direct object in a way which benefits the referent of the prepositional object (e.g. *bygga ett hus åt ngn* ‘build a house for sb.’). I compare the use of the ditransitive *åt* construction in present-day Finland Swedish with that in present-day Sweden Swedish and Swedish from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as well as that of allative case in the so-called ANTAA-construction in present-day Finnish (cf. Leino 2001). I use simple collexeme analysis to obtain a semantic profile of the constructions and then apply cluster analysis to decide how closely related the constructions are in terms of their semantics.

The results will provide a good indication of whether archaistic language use or Finnish influence is the main reason behind the use of *åt* in present-day Finland Swedish. On a more theoretical level, I will discuss whether the results point towards multilingual present-day speakers of Swedish and Finnish having formed a diaconstruction over the ANTAA-construction and ditransitive *åt* construction (cf. Höder 2018) or if it is more relevant to speak of the ditransitive *åt* construction as a construction that has simply retained its productivity and semantic range in Finland Swedish while its use has decreased in Sweden Swedish.

References

- Höder, Steffen. 2018. Grammar is community-specific: Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar. In Hans C. Boas & Steffen Höder (eds.), *Constructions in contact. Constructional perspectives on contact phenomena in Germanic languages* (Constructional Approaches to Language 24), 37–70. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Leino, Pentti. 2001. Konstruktio. In Pentti Leino, Suvi Honkanen, Lari Kotilainen, Jaakko Leino & Maija Vilkkumaa (eds.), *Roolit ja rakenteet: Henkilöviitteinen allatiivi Biblian verbikonstruktioiden*, 402–455. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Martola, Nina. 2007. *Konstruktioner och valens: Verbfraser med åt i ett jämförande perspektiv* (Nordica Helsingiensia 9). Helsingfors: Institutionen för nordiska språk och nordisk litteratur, Helsingfors universitet.
- Mukherjee, Joybrato & Stefan Th. Gries. 2009. Collostructional nativisation in New Englishes: Verb-construction associations in the International Corpus of English. *English World-Wide* 30(1), 27–51.
- Reuter, Mikael. 2000. Skänk honom en slant (Reuters ruta 12/4 2000). *Hufvudstadsbladet*. <https://www.sprakinstitutet.fi/sv/publikationer/sprakspalter/reuters_rutor_1986_2013/2000/skan_k_honom_en_slant>
- Silén, Beatrice. 2008. Konstruktionsval vid verbet *ge* i finlandssvenskt och sverigesvenskt talspråk. *Språk och stil* NF 18, 112–142.
- Valdeson, Fredrik. 2024. *The Diachrony of Ditransitives in Late Modern Swedish* (Brill's Studies in Historical Linguistics 22). Leiden: Brill.