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Abstracts of Plenaries
There is no “Icelandic A and B” nor “Faroese 1 and 2”

Höskuldur Þráinsson
University of Iceland

The so-called Principles and Parameters approach to linguistic variation (cf. Chomsky 1981) has had a very important and positive impact on linguistic thinking about how languages can and cannot vary. But it has also led to a common but unwarranted assumption about linguistic variation, which can be described as follows: If Speaker A finds Sentence X acceptable but Speaker B does not, then Speaker A speaks the A-variant of the relevant language and Speaker B speaks the B-variant and these are discrete and clearly distinct variants. Thus it has sometimes been maintained that Icelandic A and B are distinct syntactic dialects of Icelandic (see e.g. Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson 1996, Gärtner 2003) and Faroese 1 and 2 are separate dialects of Faroese (see e.g. Jonas 1996, Bobaljik and Höskuldur Thráinsson 1998). But recent research on language variation suggests that this is not a typical situation. Intra-speaker variation is much more prevalent in language than often assumed and in that sense suggested “dialects” blend into each other. In this talk I will first demonstrate this by presenting data from research on variation in Icelandic and Faroese syntax. Then I will show that similar intra-speaker variation is also found in phonological “dialect” features in Icelandic, often independent of linguistic situation or style of speech. Finally, I will comment on the relevance of these facts for the way we think of language acquisition and knowledge, referring in particular to ideas proposed by Yang (2002).
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Internal and external effects in the linguistic history of Scandinavia: a view from Iceland

Kristján Árnason
University of Iceland

Haugen (1970) defines three problems in Scandinavian language history: the problem of the beginnings, the problem of the dialects, and the problem of the languages. The problem of dialects refers to inherent development with a set of characteristics, some of which arise in “Inner Scandianvania”, and are “rejected by the outer parts”. A case in point is the tonal distinction, lacking in the west and east. But recent metrical investigations suggest that some such distinction may have survived in Iceland down to the 16thc (Haukur Þorgeirsson 2013). And there are obviously some West Nordic innovations, which do not gain ground in the east, cf. a list of features common to West-Norwegian, Faroese and Icelandic.

The “problem of beginnings” and the “problem of languages” are of a different sort, in fact socio-historical, as much as linguistic. They define a split from a common ancestral “language” or norm into seven modern “languages”, each with its own standard, and as the case may be, dialects. These norms have a clear effect on the development of morphology and syntax, and the central problem is how these norms arise. Where do “Old Norse”, “Danish”, “Swedish” etc. come from? The initiating factor in the “Disintegration of the Danish Tongue” (Karker 1977) was the decision by the Danish authorities to commission Saxo Grammaticus to write the history of the Danes in Latin. And then came the Hansa …

Referring to Labov’s distinction between internal and external effects in linguistic change, and borrowing some insights from socio-historical linguistics (e.g. Auer 2005, Kloss 1952), I will be looking at the scene from the North-West, using as a starting point some phonological changes occurring in Icelandic and Faroese and parts of Norwegian (Kristján Árnason 2011).
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Abstracts of Papers
The Icelandic Quantity Shift and Monosyllabic Lengthening

Aðalsteinn Hákonarson
University of Iceland

The Icelandic quantity shift (QS) refers to a group of sound changes affecting vowel length (1).

(1) a. V > V: in open syllables, e.g. *tala > ta:*la
b. V > V: in monosyllabic words ending in a single C, e.g. *her > he:*r

c. V: > V in closed syllables, e.g. *bóndi > bó:ndi

Evidence from poetry has been taken to suggest that the QS took place mainly in the 16th century (Þórólfsson 1929a, Árnason 1980): In poems from that time, original light syllables (open syllables with short vowels) come to occupy strong rhythmic positions from which they were previously barred. Presumably, the syllables had become heavy as a result of change (1a). However, the rhythmic organization of common Icelandic meters only provides direct evidence for changes in vowel length that affect syllabic quantity, cf. (1a). The vowels affected by (1b–c) occupied heavy syllables before as well as after the QS. Hence, the traditional dating of the Icelandic QS is based on evidence which only bears directly on (1a).

In this paper it will be argued that certain innovations in rhyme, which first appear in poetry from the late 14th century, are most straightforwardly interpreted as evidence for the changes in (1b) and (1c). Previously, the rhymes in question, é : e and vá : o, have been interpreted as evidence that poets no longer objected to rhyming long and short vowels if their quality was sufficiently similar (Þórólfsson 1929b, Benediktsson 1979).

Our reinterpretation suggests that short vowels followed by a single consonant lengthened earlier in monosyllables (1b) than in polysyllabic words (1a). This is not entirely surprising for the same sequence of events is commonly assumed in the case of parallel changes in Swedish and Norwegian (e.g. Riad 1992) and in many High-German dialects (e.g. Naiditsch & Kusmenko 1992 and Seiler 2009). The evidence for the Icelandic QS is, however, different in nature from that cited in relation to the other languages. It casts light on a feature of the development of length in monosyllables (1b) that remains unclear for the other languages and may help explain why the chronological pattern where change (1b) precedes (1a), observed in many instances of the Germanic QS, is so common (although not universal).
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Case Syncretism in Texas German

Alexander Lorenz
University of Texas at Austin

This paper analyzes case syncretism in Texas German, a dialect that is expected to vanish within the next 30 years (Boas 2009). Existing research on case syncretism in Texas German has produced a variety of results, yet only a few researchers have systematically analyzed specific patterns such as two-way prepositions. This paper therefore adds to the ongoing discussion on case syncretism in German Speech Islands by focusing on a specific phenomenon in the development of Texas German in New Braunfels.

The first part of the paper briefly introduces earlier analyses of case syncretism in Texas German by Eikel (1949), Gilbert (1965), Salmons (1983), Boas (2009), and Roesch (2012), including examples of the decreased use of the genitive, dative, and accusative case. Additionally, internal (loss of case in donor dialects) versus external factors (language contact with English) influencing this development are discussed.

The second part of the paper takes a closer look at case assignments following two-way prepositions. The specific sentences with two-way prepositions under investigation are:

1. Die Katze sitzt wieder vor der Tür.
   'The cat is sitting in front of the door'
2. Da ist ein freier Platz zwischen seinem und unserem Platz.
   'There is a vacant lot between his and our place'
3. Die Hüte hängen alle an einem Nagel.
   'The hats are all hanging on one nail'

This paper adds three additional two-way prepositions to Boas’ (2009) analysis of five prepositions in the New Braunfels area. The paper rounds up the discussion on case assignment after two-way prepositions and shows that the loss of cases has progressed immensely in the past few decades. The data indicates a trend towards a two-case system following two-way prepositions. However, the data also shows an increase in variability of case assignments and that many speakers do not use any determiners to assign case.
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Inside and Outside the Icelandic DP  
— Some Notes on Adjectival Inflection

Alexander Pfaff  
University of Tromsø/CASTL

Icelandic adjectives come with two sets of adjectival inflection: *weak* and *strong*. Strongly inflected adjectives occur in predicative contexts, or adnominally in indefinite noun phrases; weakly inflected ones only occur adnominally in definite noun phrases. There is, however, one context that is not obviously captured by this characterization; consider the following contrast:

(1) a. gul.i b. i bill – inn gul.ur bill – inn yellow.WK car – the yellow.STR car – the

Both noun phrases in (1) are definite as indicated by the suffixed article. Thus the strong inflection in the b-example is unexpected. Moreover, it has been noted that this morpho-syntactic difference has semantic concomitants:

(2) If a noun phrase of the type [“the yellow car”] is not meant to identify ‘the yellow car’, but only to identify a car, which happens to be yellow, Icelandic marks this with the strong form of the adjective. Compare the restrictive adjective in [(1a)] to the non-restrictive one in [(1b)]. (Delsing 1993:132, fn. 25)

This paper claims that the contrast in (1) is primarily a structural one that entails the properties of the respective adjectives, both morphological (weak vs. strong) and semantic (restrictive vs. non-restr.). More specifically, I argue that (i) weak inflection is triggered/licensed in a specific context, whereas strong inflection is merely the default spellout (i.e. the elsewhere case):

(3) a. Weak inflection is triggered by a c-commanding definiteness morpheme/article b. Strong inflection occurs iff weak inflection is not triggered

(ii) the strong adjective in (1b) is merged outside DP, hence outside the c-command domain of the definite article, thus weak inflection is not triggered and the default strong inflection occurs. (iii) this structural assumption has semantic consequences: being merged outside DP, the strong adjective must be assumed to combine with a referential expression (of type <e>). This automatically captures the often observed lack of restrictivity, cf. (2), and other semantic properties of noun phrases like (1b).
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Almost all modern Germanic languages exhibit some kind of syllabically conditioned rhotic allophony, from vocalized and non-vocalized alternates in varieties of German to alternations between trilled and approximate rhotics in dialects of Frisian. This paper investigates the origin of the complementary distribution of rhotics in Germanic languages and argues that rhotic allophony was indeed characteristic of PGmc.

The development of the PIE duplet *uper ~ *uperi ‘over’ makes a good case study for reconstructing rhotic allophony because it involves a near minimal pair which sets the rhotic in contrastive prosodic positions: the rhotic in PIE *uper falls in a coda, while the one in PIE *uperi is situated in a syllable onset.

It is my contention that the distinction between a coda rhotic and an onset rhotic is significant to account for the development of PIE *[c] into PGmc. There is general consensus that reflexes of unstressed PIE *[c] had one of two fates in PGmc. Due to a sound change referred to as pre-rhotic lowering, PIE *[c] shifted to PGmc. *[a] before a rhotic, e.g. PIE *kʷoteros > PGmc. *hwabar- ‘which of two’ (cf. Gothic hwabar, Old Norse hwabar, Old Saxon hwethar). In all other contexts, a sound change referred to as non-prominent e-raising caused PIE *[e] to raise to PGmc. *[i], e.g. PIE *mūses > PGmc. mūzi ‘mice’ (cf. OE mēs, ON myss which underwent i-umlaut).

The PIE *uper ~ *uperi duplet is significant because it shows that pre-rhotic lowering only caused PIE *[c] to shift to PGmc. *[a] before a rhotic in coda position (PIE *uper > PGmc. *ubar, cf. OHG ubar and ON ofarr) and not before all rhotics, as generally assumed. Rhotics in an onset did not trigger pre-rhotic lowering. In this context, non-prominent e-raising occurred. Thus, PIE *uperi was reflected as PGmc. *uir(i), cf. OHG ubir and ON yfir.

The argument that a coda rhotic in PGmc. affects a vowel differently from a rhotic in onset position informs our understanding of the relative chronology of apocope in Germanic language history. For example, apocope of the final two segments in PIE *kʷoteros ‘which of two’ produced a coda rhotic. That rhotic subsequently became the input to pre-rhotic lowering and resulted in PGmc. *hwabar-. On the other hand, the final vowel in PIE *uperi was retained into PGmc. Consequently, the rhotic was kept in onset position and pre-rhotic lowering was blocked. Such examples point to a relative chronology, consistent with claims in the scholarly literature, that an earlier wave of apocope deleted non-high vowels (in reflexes of words like PIE *kʷoteros) and a later wave applied to high vowels (in reflexes of words like PIE *uperi). I argue that pre-rhotic lowering was a sound change that occurred between the earlier and later waves of apocope.

Beyond clarifying the context for pre-rhotic lowering and gaining insight into PGmc. apocope, the claim that PGmc. rhotics stood in complementary distribution begins to connect the existence of rhotic allophony in present-day Germanic languages to an alternation that existed in antiquity.
Gender constitutes a grammatical category similar to Determiner, Number, Preposition, etc. and is subject to a grammatical cycle and renewal. This paper will show that there is a grammatical cycle for classifiers and gender which operates on the same principle as that of other functional heads, namely the linguistic cycle as outlined in van Gelderen (2011) based on the principle of feature economy:

Minimize the semantic and interpretable features in the derivation:

Adjunct > Specifier > Head > Affix > zero
semantic > [iF] > [uF] > [uF] > zero

Van Gelderen discusses how this cycle operates as subject and object agreement cycles, pronominal copula cycles, case and determiner cycles, tense/mood/aspect cycles and negative cycles. It can be shown that gender is in fact a grammatical category and is subject to its own gender cycle. Languages such as English only show the adjunct phase of the cycle when using numeral classifiers such as “one head of cattle”. Classifier languages such as Mandarin show the specifier or head stage when using sortal classifiers. A language with noun classes such as Old High German which shows noun class and gender on the noun suffix is in the affix stage. Germanic provides an interesting historical example as it has lost its gender affix but undergone renewal by developing articles (heads) that show gender. In Scandinavian these are reaffixed to the noun. The Chinese and Germanic languages will provide the main examples and comparison in this paper.
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Deriving passives without passive Voice

Antonio Fábregas
University of Tromsø

Michael Putnam
Pennsylvania State University

GOAL. The main goal of this presentation is to explore a purely derivational analysis of the contrast between active and passive voice that does not use flavors of Voice, such as VoicePass. We show how such an approach can account for the contrast between the complex passive (Aux+Participle) and simple passive (Verb + ‘Passive’ marker) in Norwegian; see (1).

(1) a. Han ble gitt en bok. 
   he BECAME given a book
   ‘He was given a book’

b. Han må gi-s en bok. 
   he must give-S a book
   ‘He should be given a book’

We adopt a configurational, neo-constructional position; avoiding the postulation of presyntactic lexically-specified bundles of features that differentiate among flavors of the same functional head. This architecture eliminates the possibility of the modeling the passive-active alternation via feature bundles and flavors of functional heads (such as VoiceP).

PROPOSAL. We start from a configuration like (2), which we propose is common to both actives and passives. We assume that agents are always merged as PPs in Spec,vP, and we treat Voice as a relational head that profiles the event in a Figure-Ground configuration, where its specifier is a Figure and its complement is interpreted as the ground.

(2) [VoiceP Voice [P PP [DP]] v [VP]]

The external argument receives an agent interpretation only in two configurations: (i) under PP, where the role is assigned by v through P, or (ii) as DP in Spec,VoiceP, where it is interpreted as agent ‘by default’, being the most salient theta-role in the event. In the active voice (3), Spec,VoiceP is occupied by the DP, which becomes the highest DP and further moves to Spec,TP. The P layer is spelled out as part of the verbal exponent (cf. Starke 2014).

(3) [VoiceP [DP] Voice [P [DP..,[PP [DP]]] v [VP]]]
agent-by-default

In our analysis the simple -s passive-marker in Spec,VoiceP is a defective pronominal element. The whole event is interpreted as Ground, without any element profiled in the structure. The closest DP attracted to TP is the internal argument [agent is PP].

(4) [VoiceP [-s] Voice [P [PP [DP]] v [VP V DP]]]

In the complex passive, we propose (following Collins 2005) that a Participial head has been introduced between vP and VP; forcing movement of PartP to Spec,VoiceP for interpretability reasons. This step ensures that the result component becomes the Figure of the event, which explains why complex passives have aspectual constraints and are blocked, among others, by transitive stative verbs. Since the exponent profile of the verb is distributed in two non-adjacent positions, VP is spelled out as a participle and the combination of Voice+v is spelled out as the auxiliary.


ALTERNATION BETWEEN COMPLEX AND SIMPLEX PASSIVE. Our account captures other relevant empirical facts, such as the impossibility in Norwegian of having long-passives with complex passives (vs. its grammaticality with simple passives), and the alternative uses of the auxiliary bli, the morpheme -s and the participle in other syntactic contexts.
Complex verbs in German: Univerbation, incorporation and back formation as word formation tools
Arash Farhidnia
Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands

German is a language which is extremely productive in verbal word formation. This fact finds expression in the vast number of verbs which are made by means of separable elements. Some of these verbs are the product of syntactical processes, others created by back formation of nouns. Looking at it in that way, we can assert that the word formation of verbs is an interface between syntax and morphology on the basis of which certain processes of language change can be better studied. But not all of these new created verbs are instantly paradigmatically fully available; for a long time it is often impossible to fully integrate them into the sentence. This becomes evident not only in uncertainties in the orthographical rules of contemporary German, but also in the inflectional gaps and defects of these verbs as well as in the restrictions to their syntactic behavior. While, for example, it is possible to separate fernsehen both morphologically and syntactically (fernzusehen – ferngesehen – sieht fern) where fern- as verbal particle becomes available to form similar verbs (e.g. fernsteuern, fernstudieren, ferntrauen), the syntactic separability, say, of the verb notlanden is still not possible (notzulanden – notgelandet, but not: *landet not), whereby at this point the verbal paradigm has a gap. On the other hand the unity of the verb is so preserved that not even the morphological separability which could be seen as a first step towards syntactization takes place: gehandhabt, but not: *handgehabt oder *hat hand (which handzuhaben now is possible).

My article aims at illuminating the multi-faceted and fascinating process of verb creation in German and tries to investigate from what sources the formation of verb is fed. It is based on the assumption that at the process of verb creation firstly noun compounds play a decisive role: they provide, via back formation and conversion, the starting point for verbs. On the other hand, we observe that verbs often emerge from syntactic processes, namely as a result of univerbation or incorporation, so that it is not necessary for them to go through a substantive stage. Ultimately, by my contribution I intend to investigate the two-fold interrelationship between the verb and its nominal as well as syntactical roots.
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Apocope and *i*-mutation in West Germanic root nouns: Frequency-driven and spatially gradual application of two sound laws

Arjen P. Versloot
University of Amsterdam & Fryske Akademy

Elzbieta Adamczyk
University of Wuppertal/University, Posnan, Adam Mickiewicz
University of Wuppertal/University, Posnan

The Modern English irregular plural forms of the type *foot*:feet derive from the Old English declensional class of the so-called root nouns, whose plural paradigms were characterised by the presence of the effects of two phonological developments: *i*-mutation and apocope of final unaccented vowel. While Modern Frisian testifies to the effects of these two processes in many lemmas affiliated originally with this declension, the Old Frisian evidence attests to a range of forms belonging to historical root nouns which lack *i*-mutation, e.g. OFris. mūs ‘mice’. The Old Frisian forms are reminiscent of the corresponding plural forms in Old Saxon and Old High German, which likewise lack *i*-mutation and inflectional endings in a few root noun lemmas, e.g. man ‘men’. Most Old Saxon and Old High German root nouns show the ending -*i* in the plural, e.g. OS burgi ‘cities’ or OHG fuozi ‘feet’, kuoi ‘cows’. The presence of the -*i* marker in these forms is generally considered to be the result of levelling to the *i*-stems (e.g. Braune & Reiffenstein 2004: 215–217). Such an interpretation becomes problematic in the light of the Old Saxon evidence, as under it the class of root nouns, which with respect to its inflectional profile is one of the most archaic classes in other West Germanic languages, emerges as the most innovative declensional pattern.

The focus of the present paper is on the unfolding and interaction of the two mentioned phonological processes in the paradigm of root nouns in West Germanic languages. The present findings come from a systematic analysis of historical corpus material in the adduced languages. Based on the analysis of the dissemination and chronology of their application across West Germanic, an alternative interpretation of the origin of the inflectional -*i* in root nouns in Continental Germanic is proposed. We hypothesize that the attested plural forms of root nouns in West Germanic languages are the result of a gradual spread of *i*-mutation (also Salmons 2008) and apocope from the north to the south, which occurred at a different speed. Both processes gradually encroached upon the potential targets in the lexicons of individual languages. As both *i*-mutation and apocope are the result of routinisation of articulation, which is favoured by high frequency of use, the implementation of both processes is controlled by the frequency profiles of individual lemmas.

Accordingly, in Old English, both processes worked as exceptionless sound laws and were fully implemented; the process of *i*-mutation affected all potential targets in the class of root nouns, prior to the loss of the final short -*i* in the relevant categories (hence *burgi* > *burgi* > *byrgi ‘cities’). In other West Germanic languages, the two processes did not reach every potential lexical target, resulting in lexical distributions along the lines of frequency-dependent implementation. In Old Frisian, the apocope of -*i* applied once *i*-mutation had only affected the more frequent lemmas, leaving other lemmas without inflectional ending and without *i*-mutated vowel, e.g. gēs ‘geese’ vs. mūs ‘mice’. In Old Saxon and Old High German, primary *i*-mutation came too late even for the high frequency nouns, e.g. OS, OHG man ‘men’. In both languages, apocope affected only the most frequent nouns, leaving the final plural ending -*i* intact (cf. OHG man ‘men’ vs. fuozi ‘feet’). Under the suggested interpretation, the ending -*i* in Old Saxon and Old High German root nouns is the original P Germ. ending -*i* in the plural, e.g. OS burgi, preserved in lower-frequency lemmas. This retained -*i* was the trigger for secondary *i*-mutation, which occurred in these Continental languages much later, producing modern High German plural forms, such as Füße ‘feet’ and Kühe ‘cows’.
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Measuring the effects of peer feedback on L2 German pronunciation gains

Ashley Roccamo
University of Southern California

Acquiring the pronunciation features of German is often a complicated process for native English speakers in a US context, due to the demands of producing new phones and learning when to use various allophones in German. As such, many American English-speaking second language (L2) learners of German struggle to acquire appropriate pronunciation on their own (Grosser, 1997; Jilka, 1999), despite wanting to learn how to do so (Gerndt, 2014). Because of the difficulty of learning this skill, L2 German learners are often frustrated by their level of pronunciation ability, but are not always sure how or what to improve (Gerndt, 2014). Explicit pronunciation instruction is one way to help L2 learners identify issues and improve their abilities, both in terms of overall comprehensibility of speech and in their realization of phones (Derwing, Munro & Wiebe, 1998; Flege, 1989; Hardison, 2004; Roccamo, 2015). In addition, recent research suggests that combining this explicit training with the process of giving pronunciation feedback to peers can help L2 learners significantly improve their own pronunciation abilities (Counselman, 2010; Lord, 2008; Ramirez Verdugo, 2006). Giving feedback focuses the learners’ attention on the target pronunciation features, and when combined with explicit training, will provide learners with the skills necessary to identify and improve errors in their own speech (Counselman, 2010; Ramirez Verdugo, 2006).

For this reason, the current study more thoroughly investigates how the process of providing peer feedback, rather than receiving it, influences L2 learners’ pronunciation abilities, focusing specifically on L2 learners of German. Twenty-six classroom learners of L2 German participated in an eight-week pronunciation training unit as a supplement to their regular class work. Training was divided into four two-week modules each focusing on different aspects of German pronunciation: lexical stress, palatal and velar fricatives, consonantal and vocalic /r/, and the monophthongization of [e] and [o]. At the conclusion of each module, participants completed a recording assignment with the aim of practicing the target features of the previous module. Crucially, each participant also provided feedback to one of their peers, focusing on that student’s pronunciation of the target features in the recording assignment.

Data consists of 1) pre- and posttest recordings of participants’ L2 German productions that were completed before and after the training unit and 2) the peer feedback each participant provided for their partner. The production data was subjected to two analyses: native speaker ratings on comprehensibility and accentedness, and ratings of phonetic accuracy. In addition, the peer feedback was double-rated for quality using a rubric adapted from Gielen et al. (2010) that focuses on the content, clarity, and justifications found in the feedback statements. Statistical analyses reveal how a student’s focus on providing quality feedback for their peers interacts with both their improvements in comprehensibility and accentedness of speech, as well as their ability to increase their phonetic accuracy in productions of each target feature.

Results of this study advance research on L2 German pronunciation instruction by furthering discussion about the benefits of enhancing typical instructional methods with peer feedback. Results are also of use to German instructors who are interested in helping their students improve their pronunciation and may wish to implement peer feedback activities in their classrooms. This combination of impact in the areas of research and instruction will lead to a better understanding of how best to improve L2 German learners’ pronunciation.
On the Syntax of Adverbial Clauses in Icelandic
Ásgrímur Angantýsson  
University of Iceland

Dianne Jonas  
Goethe University Frankfurt

In general, adverbial clauses in Icelandic are resistant to argument and adjunct fronting, but there are noted exceptions to this. Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson (1990:25) provide examples of non-subject fronting in adverbial clauses (1a) and Magnússon (1990:104,5-75,a) in (1b).

(1)  
a. Þegar komið var til Reykjavíkur […]  
when arrived was to Reykjavík
b. fyrst hurðina getum við ekki verðum við að brjóta gluggann  
since door-the can we not open we to break window-the
‘since we can’t open the door, we will have to break the window.’

In addition, it has been shown that some adverbial clauses resist argument fronting (Wiklund, Hrafnbjargarson, Bentzen, and Hróarsdóttir 2007) whereas adjunct extraction from some subject initial V2 adverbial clauses in Icelandic is possible (Hrafnbjargarson, Bentzen, and Wiklund 2010). Further, Angantýsson 2011 has observed that a verb third order is possible in some adverbial clauses with pronominal subjects. Subjunctive mood plays a role in some adverbial clauses as in (2), a result clause in (2a), a purpose clause in (2b) but not in others.

(2)  
a. Hann flýtti sér svo aðhann kom ekki of seint.  
He hurried self so that he came-IND not late
‘He hurried, so he wasn’t late.’
b. Hann flýtti sér svo aðhann kæmi ekki of seint.  
He hurried self so that he came-SUBJ not late
‘He hurried so he wasn’t late.’

The goal of this paper is to unify these observations and to provide a systematic overview and analysis of the the syntax of Icelandic adverbial clauses in terms of the whether they do or do not allow so-called main clause phenomena. The classification of adverbial clauses follows the typology of Haegeman (2012) where adverbial clauses are divided into two classes: central adverbial clauses that resist main clause phenomena and peripheral adverbial clauses that may permit such phenomena (XP-fronting etc.). In addition, the role of subjunctive mood, the possibility of stylistic fronting, extraction phenomena, and adjunct/argument fronting asymmetries are taken into account.
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Haugen (1953:238) states: “In the case of the Norwegians, as apparently among most immigrants [to the United States], the Church is the primary institution which provides the immigrants with a justification for the use of the language.” The church has also played a major role in the lives of many German immigrants and their families. According to the U.S. Census of Religious Bodies in 1906, there were 3,601,943 persons who attended places of worship in the United States in which services were conducted in German. Of that number, 1,746,065 persons attended places of worship in which services were only conducted in German. There were 77 denominations that reported the use of German in 13,036 different congregations, and 8014 congregations reported only using German. Salmons (2005) and Frey (2013) argue that the verticalization of institutions, including churches, played a crucial role in language shift away from German in the United States at the end of the nineteenth century and in the first half of the twentieth century. In particular, they point out that mergers in the Lutheran church and a shift in the language policy of the Roman Catholic church, the two denominations with the largest number of German speakers, are examples of greater verticalization and loss of local control that contributed significantly to language shift among German Americans in Wisconsin.

This paper will explore the use of German and language policy in the Presbyterian and Mennonite churches, two religious groups in the United States with very different ethnic backgrounds but surprisingly with comparable numbers of German speakers in 1906. In particular, it will be argued on the basis of these case studies that churches with a polity that vested more power in local church members were more responsive to local needs and more likely to implement language policies that facilitated the conduct of worship in German (see also, Frank 2011). In support of the argument, data from the U.S. Census, church documents, and field work among German-speaking Anabaptists in Pennsylvania and Kansas will be presented.
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Ælfric’s (ca. 955-1020) style has been primarily studied with respect to his lexical choices, the use he made of metre, assonance, alliteration, and paronomasias (Corona 2008, Sato 2012). With respect to discourse and information structure, work has been done on peak marking and referent tracking, but with a focus on pragmatic uses of single elements like pa (eg. Wårvik 1995) or uton (Steele 2001) rather than word order.

Different word order frequencies have been found between Ælfric’s homilies and his Saints Lives (Pintzuk 1999: 208), between his rhythmic prose and his non-rhythmic prose (Davis 1997), or between Ælfric’s work and other Old English texts (Koopman 2005, Ohkado 2004). These quantitative studies look at clauses in isolation and do not consider the wider discourse context of the orders that are found.

My paper shows that some of the word order differences between Ælfric’s homilies and Saints Lives proceed from genre (reason-clauses, which tend to have root-like order because of their assertive nature, are more frequent in exposition than in narrative) while other differences proceed from Ælfric’s manipulation of readers’ expectations, marking, for instance, the start of a new section by sentences like (1), where the first constituent is new rather than, as expected, given information:

(1) On twam þingum hæfde God þæs mannes sawle gegodod (ÆCHom I, 1, 20.1)

‘In two things has God the man’s soul enhanced’

Similarly, Ælfric uses the subject position after adverbial local anchors (ðurh dornæs), normally expected to host subject pronouns or other given material, to introduce new information that is particularly important (synna); while items like soðlice ‘truly’ and witodlice ‘certainly’ are extracausal disjuncts introducing new episodes (Lenker 2000):

(2) Soðlice ðurh dornæs synna beoð getacnode (ÆCHom II,14.1, 144.213)

‘Truly, through thorns syns are symbolized’

These findings fit in an approach that recognizes not only that Ælfric’s works need to handled with care if they are used for diachronic investigations, but also that word order variation – canonical versus less canonical – may be recruited by authors for their own (discourse) ends.

In Austria the Alps are significant geographical landmarks, more than 60% of the country’s surface consist of the Alpine Arch. The Alps are not just a geological entity but also a cultural construct (Bubenhofer/Schröter 2012: 264). Rak (2007: 111) thus suggests viewing texts about mountains and alpinism as rhetoric, as they narrate “conceptualizations, beliefs, evaluations and behaviors members of a social group share” (Bubenhofer/Schröter 2012, 265). However, mountains and human movement in and on them are rarely treated within linguistic research. We would like to present the research project *Alpenwort* at the University of Innsbruck. Based on the Swiss project *Text+Berg digital* (Bubenhofer et al., 2015) this ongoing project is building a large, linguistically annotated, Alpine heritage text corpus. The corpus *Alpenwort* will be digitally available for the research community in 2017. It contains 126 yearbooks of the Austrian Alpine Club Magazine (=Zeitschrift des Deutschen und Österreichischen Alpenvereins, ZAV) starting from as early as 1869 until 1998. 42,000 book pages were scanned processed with corpus linguistic methods. The ZAV is an extraordinarily interesting source because of its continuity but also because of its thematic diversity. In its first decades the magazine contributions reflect the ongoing touristic and cartographic exploration of the Alps and the economic and scientific discoveries involved. During the 20th century perspectives expanded to the mountains of the world. Globally relevant topics such as environment and nature protection are discussed as well as questions of regional identity and cultural heritage. The proposed paper first describes our efforts in building the corpus and we will illustrate how we resolved some of the challenges we faced during this process with tasks such as logical structure extraction, the correction of structural elements and OCR-correction will be discussed. Furthermore we will give a short overview of the next steps, such as tokenization, POS-tagging and Named Entity Recognition (NER). Lastly, a preliminary analysis of some recurrent patterns of language use in this corpus will be presented.
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Geolocating German on Twitter

Bettina Larl
University of Innsbruck

Languages, and thus Linguistics, have always been influenced by technological developments and new media forms and every development brought new methods and approaches of how language can or should be studied and explored. About 16% of the EU residents speak German as a native language and this makes it the widest spread language within the European Union. German is a pluricentric language with three standard varieties: German Standard German, Swiss Standard German and Austrian Standard German. The official borders between Germany, Austria and Switzerland also form the boundary between the three standard varieties (see: Ammon et al., 2004).

Because of easy access and informal communication methods, more and more oral markers find their way into written language, especially online (see: Deppermann & Linke, 2010). This is often showcased on social media platforms such as Twitter. Every tweet includes language output in the form of short messages, that can contain different regional characteristics. Tweets can be geolocated that means these language outputs can be assigned to the geographic location they were tweeted from.

The paper raises the question of if and how tweets in the German speaking areas mirror the location they originate from. Is there a connection between the language output and the geographic location tweets were sent from? Could, for example, lexical varieties be allocated to a specific region by geolocation information provided in tweets?

To research these questions a first sample of a large Twitter corpus will be explored. The corpus consists of tweets collected in collaboration with Eva Zangerle (Institute of Computer Science, University of Innsbruck). The data was tweeted within the Deutscher Sprachraum, mainly Germany, Austria and Switzerland. The collection period was 13 months, the corpus consists of about 45,000,000 tweets. This paper will use a corpus-linguistic as well as a geo-linguistic approach to research to investigate the proposed questions.
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How to fill a paradigm in Icelandic: an experimental study

Blake Allen and Gunnar Ólafur Hansson
University of British Columbia

The task speakers face when predicting unknown inflected forms of a word (the Paradigm Cell Filling Problem; Ackerman et al. 2009) requires a complex form of inference. Models of this inference often include simplifying hypotheses to render the problem tractable. The Single Surface Base Hypothesis (Albright 2002) holds that when performing inference, speakers can rely only on one single privileged form. By contrast, the traditional ‘principal part’ notion encodes the observation that in many languages the full paradigm can be reliably predicted only by referring to two or more designated cells. However, the adequacy of principal parts as a descriptive tool does not necessarily imply cognitive reality: whether speakers combine information from multiple forms to infer an as-yet unknown form remains to be shown. We report on an experimental study of Icelandic noun inflection that probed this and other issues of paradigm inference.

In Icelandic nouns, most case-number combinations exhibit suffix allomorphy, resulting in a rich set of inflectional classes. Individual cells differ in their predictiveness with respect to the overall paradigm; e.g. DatPl has -um for nearly all nouns and is thus uninformative. In descriptive works, GenSg and NomPl are often treated as the ‘principal parts’ of nouns (along with NomSg), from which the whole paradigm can typically be projected. We focus on one aspect of these predictive relations: the subset of AccPl exponents in (1) and the way the choice among these can be inferred from certain GenSg and NomPl exponents. For each GenSg/NomPl combination, one can generally predict with near certainty that the AccPl suffix will be as indicated.

(1)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GenSg: -s</th>
<th>NomPl: -ar</th>
<th>NomPl: -ir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GenSg: -ar</td>
<td>-ar</td>
<td>-ir (or -i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, these four AccPl exponents differ greatly in their frequency across the lexicon. This is partly due to some inflectional classes being more numerous than others, but also due to other classes sharing some of the same AccPl exponents. For example, AccPl -a also characterizes the extremely productive class defined by GenSg -a, NomPl -ar [weak masculines].

We conducted an experiment with 122 Icelandic speakers, using an online wug test paradigm (Berko 1958), but manipulating the information offered regarding other inflected forms. A set of nonce nouns was created and distributed across the four inflectional types shown above. Each noun was presented in anywhere from one to three inflected forms: {DatPl}, {DatPl, GenSg}, {DatPl, NomPl}, or {DatPl, GenSg, NomPl}. Subjects then filled in a test sentence by selecting their preferred AccPl form given the options in (1). Statistical analysis reveals that subjects do indeed combine information from all inflected forms known to them. At the same time, even in the maximally informative presentation condition, subjects fell far short of the near-100% accuracy that is in principle attainable. Rather, responses were strongly biased toward the relative lexical frequencies of the four AccPl exponents, even though words as a result often came to exhibit novel arrangements of exponents (non-existing inflectional classes). We describe how the findings are consistent with a simple yet powerful Bayesian model of inflectional inference.
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A Cursory Attempt at a Network Analysis of ‘es’ in the History of German

Carlee Arnett
University of California/Davis

Valerie Wuerz
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In Modern German, the word *es* has a variety of functions that potentially can be linked together in a semantic network. Working back from Modern German, this paper represents an attempt to find the earliest attestations of the various functions in the history of German. According to Grimm, *i₂* and *ëz* are found in Old High German, *i* in Old Saxon and *ëz* in Middle High German. Grimm’s dictionary categorizes *es* by function and provides historical examples. Pütz (1975) provides a more recent attempt at categorizing *es* in Modern German. Pütz sees the problem with *es* as the lack of a coherent syntactic explanation. He provides sentences like the following to show the range of functionality of *es*:

1. Das Kind kam an die Haustür und es klopfte.
2. Hier ist es kalt.
3. Es lebte ein König in Frankreich.
4. Es fehlt an Geld.
5. Es wurde getanzt.
6. Kinder, es wird jetzt gegessen!
7. Es regnet.
8. Heute ist es bekannt, dass er kommt.
9. Es gibt + accusative

It is quite possible that some of these functions in the list above overlap semantically or this is not an exhaustive list. Pütz also provides a detailed analysis of the placement of *es* in a sentence and its functions from the perspective of generative grammar. His analysis promotes the notion that *es* functions as a subject, a grammatical placeholder or a lead-in to a main or dependent clause. Pütz lays the groundwork for a radial category analysis by showing the various sentence types that occur with *es* and his analysis of the functions. Lenerz (1985) shows a distinction between subject-*es* and topic-*es*. My analysis will build on Pütz, Lenerz and Smith (1992) to describe the functions of *es* and show how they form a network. The use of historical data will give some insight into core uses and subsequent extensions. This semantic analysis will be done within the framework of Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 1991) and should provide the most complete semantic description of *es* to date.
The conceptualization of mind, soul and heart in Old Saxon Heliand. Some help from cognitive linguistics

Caterina Saracco
State University of Pavia/Bergamo

Alberto Agnesina
Episcopal Seminary “San Gaudenzio” of Novara

The cognitive search for the conceptualization of the mind, the soul and the body organs is not a new one and Eggers (1957) has already investigated the Old Germanic conceptualizations of the soul, tracing a parallel exploration of the OHG, OS and OE. Also Harbus (2002) wrote about the mind’s life in the Old English poetry, analyzing the size and diversity of the vocabulary used to connote the mind and its faculties in the Anglo-Saxon culture. Furthermore, we also know that in the Middle Ages the heart/breast was the seat not only of the man’s feelings and volition, but also the locus of the thought. Only in the modernity, thanks to a better knowledge of the human being’s anatomy, the seat of thought became the head.

The central aim of this paper is instead to contribute to the knowledge about the metaphorical image-schemas (Johnson, 1987) and the conceptual metaphors (see Kövecses 2010: 37-42) that can help us to sketch the meaning of the main expressions we will deal with: Old Saxon hugi “thought”, mōd “feelings” and herta “heart”. The last one, for example, is conceptualized by Saxons like an object with a surface that can be manipulated as in (1) or a container, in which negative emotions are stored as in (2). On the basis of their occurrences in the Heliand as free words and as members of Bahuvrīhi compounds, we argue that the imaginary of the Old Saxon mind is embodied in the heart region of the human body (“cardiocentrism”, without a dualist Cartesian separation between body and mind), but that the mind, the hugi, IS NOT the heart: thanks to the cognitive metaphorical image-schemas and the conceptual metaphors involved, we can trace the geographical collocations of hugi and mōd inside the breast. Thanks also to the particular nature of Heliand, a text with not only a political intent, but also with a missionizing-religious one, we are able to state from our analysis that OS mōd is a human soul, which is the source of all human feelings and volition, whereas OS hugi is a sort of divine soul/mind inside the man, a spiritual impulse, the divine desire of the Christian God. The different metaphors involved in the conceptualizations of hugi and mōd help us to single out two different entities inside the Saxon’s breast, but we can already see the mixture of their functions, a phenomenon which will cause the lost of the word hugi in English and German.

Examples:

(1) Heliand v. 1051 M/C: OS “[than habda he] herte sô gîherdid”, “[and then he had] strengthened so the heart”
(2) Heliand v. 4868 M/C: OS “sô harm uuârd imu an is hertan”, “so painful it became to him in his heart”
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On the change from verb-initial negative imperatives to negation-initial imperatives in Norwegian

Christine B. Østbø Munch
Queen Maud University College of Early Childhood Education

In negative imperatives in contemporary Norwegian (No) the most common word order is neg>V_{IMP} (Faarlund et al. 1997:953), see (1), whereas Old Norse (ON) and Middle Norwegian (MNo) had the opposite word order, exemplified in (2) for ON (Faarlund 2004:228).

(1) Ikke kom inn hit
dvel þu eigi at snúask til dróttins þins

‘Don’t come in here’

(2) delayIMP,2, youN not to turnREFL to lordGEN your

‘Do not hesitate to turn to your lord’

Cross-linguistically, the Norwegian word order in (1) is exceptional, since the negative marker *ikke* is identical to sentential negation and the verb has a distinct morphological shape (cf. Wurff 2007:51f). Furthermore, the initial position of negation in the imperative poses a problem for generative analyses of negative imperatives (cf. Platzack and Rosengren 1998; Zanuttini 1998; Jensen 2003; Zeijlstra 2006). As such, the change from verb-initial negative imperatives to neg-initial imperatives in the course of history of Norwegian appears unexpected.

Within a micro-cue based approach to language change (Westergaard 2014; cf. Lightfoot 1999) I will argue that the change hinges on two other structural changes in Norwegian: The “loss” of (i) imperative subjects and (ii) neg-initial declaratives. It is observed that neg-initial imperatives resist overt subjects to a greater degree than verb-initial negative imperatives (Jensen 2003 and references there). In ON an overt imperative subject is more frequent than a covert subject (Faarlund 2004:229), whereas in MNo a covert subject is more frequent than an overt one (Mørck 2004:444). Given that an overt subject was included in the cue for imperatives in ON, this would ensure that the verb raised high and thus preceded negation, see (3) [IMP \_IMP pron…]. When the imperative subject no longer was realized, there would be no trigger for the structure in (3), and hence weakened evidence for (high) verb-raising for the learner.

The second change is the loss of neg-initial declaratives (Munch 2013; cf. Lindström 2007). Given that ON and MNo had the cue (4) \([CP \text{ neg}]\) for neg-initial declaratives, I will argue that this prevented neg-initial imperatives because of 3rd factors (Chomsky 2005), such as efficient communication. When neg-initial declaratives no longer were common, the cue in (4) (or some variant of it) was reanalyzed as a cue for neg-initial imperatives in present-day Norwegian.

Evidence for the relation between these changes, comes from other North-Germanic languages, which have verb-initial negative imperatives and either neg-initial declaratives (Swedish, Icelandic and Faroese) and/or a relatively high rate of overt subjects/phi-features on the imperative verb (Icelandic and Faroese).

This paper investigates appearances of left dislocation (LD) by Northern German speakers. Northern German refers here to varieties of German used in historically Low German-speaking regions. Under the category of left dislocation fall a range of constructions that involve the appearance of a constituent in the left periphery of a clause and a coreferential element within the clausal frame, as exemplified below:

(1) a. die fahren jedes Jahr nach Bolivien ja weil ihr Vater der ist da in dieser Schule
b. aber die Fahrt die kostet ja schon

Previous work identifies LD as one of a number of “topic constructions” (Cinque 1983) that appear in spoken language along with transitions or abrupt shifts in discourse topic. Starting with Altmann (1981), two distinct types of LD—often referred to as contrastive left dislocation and hanging topic constructions—are identified in German and distinguished by factors such as the structure of the dislocated elements, prosodic integration, and the form and placement of a resumptive element. While research has continued to consider connections to discourse structure as well as the underlying syntactic structures of these constructions (e.g. Dewald 2014), the role of situational context beyond being “spoken language” has been largely neglected. Furthermore, dialect recordings show frequent use of LD by Low German speakers, but the syntax of northern varieties of German is historically understudied.

To better describe LD phenomena, I leverage data from the Sprachvariation in Norddeutschland (SiN) Project. The SiN Corpus comprises recordings from situations designed to elicit different styles of speaking, including interviews with a project researcher and table talk with other local participants. Case studies of individual speakers examine the role of structural, discourse, and pragmatic factors and shed light on patterns of distribution across registers. In addition, I explore how these factors align with established typologies of LD and highlight examples that have not been thoroughly treated in the literature, such as resumptive da or dann following a dislocated adverbial.

Qualitative and quantitative results provide insight into the presence of LD constructions at the level of the individual speaker and in Northern German more broadly. Moreover, this research contributes to our understanding of the syntax-pragmatics interface and supports ongoing work of the SiN Project to analyze the spectrum of spoken language between the (High German) Standard and Low German dialects.
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Old Icelandic relative clauses are introduced by a relative particle (\textit{sem} or \textit{er}) and often accompanied by what appears to be a demonstrative pronoun, \textit{sá}:

(1) \textit{synir Herodis \textit{pess} er \textit{c} börum látt fara} (\textit{Homiliubók} 237)

\textit{sons H-GEN SÁ. GEN PART [c]. NOM children let kill}

‘… sons of (that) Herod, who had the children killed.’

Faarlund (2004) considers \textit{sá} to be a demonstrative determiner of the N in the matrix clause, as it is in the same case as the matrix N. Åfarli (1995) treats this as a relative pronoun that shows case attraction. This paper investigates \textit{sá} in over 12,000 relative clauses from prose (\textit{IcePaHC}) and poetry (\textit{Greinir skáldskapar}), arguing that while \textit{sá} may be a demonstrative or correlative (anticipating a following relative clause) in archaic poetry, it is a true relative pronoun by the time of literary Old Icelandic.

Several results from the prose corpus support this conclusion. First of all, the \textit{sá} that precedes relative clauses does not behave semantically like an ordinary demonstrative, and can even be used with a N that is semantically indefinite (2):

(2) \textit{áttu pau \textit{son} \textit{bann} er Gunnbjörn hét} (\textit{Funnogi} 652)

\textit{had they son SÁ. ACC PART G. called}

‘they had a/(*that) son, who was called G’

Second, \textit{sá} has a different distribution in relative vs. non-relative contexts: demonstrative \textit{sá} usually precedes N, but when a relative clause is present, \textit{sá} immediately precedes the clause:

(3) \textit{Maður melti til hans \textit{sá} er gekk úr kvíni} (\textit{Sturlunga} 419.994)

\textit{man i said to him SÁ. NOMI PART went out pen-def}

‘A man who was leaving the pen said to him ...’

Third, punctuation in manuscripts indicates that relative \textit{sá} occurs after a prosodic break. All this evidence suggests that \textit{sá} is part of the relative clause rather than the matrix NP.

The facts are a bit different in Eddic poetry: \textit{sá} can precede the matrix N, and even when it follows the N it may be in the same line as the N rather than the relative clause:

(4) \textit{i ey \textit{þeirí} / er Algræn heittir;} (\textit{Hárðardjúð} 17)

\textit{in island SÁ. DAT PART A. is called}

‘in the/that island, which is called Algræn’

Assuming that poetic lines reflect some syntactic reality, examples like (4) hint that in this archaic poetry, \textit{sá} can still be in the matrix NP, i.e. as a demonstrative or correlative.

If I am correct that \textit{sá} is a relative pronoun in contexts like (1)-(3), then this Old Icelandic relative pronoun displays widespread case attraction, not constrained to free relatives or oblique cases as it is in Gothic (Harbert 1989). I argue that the pervasive nature of case attraction in the Old Icelandic prose corpus is due to \textit{sá}’s recent status as a relative pronoun: it has been reanalyzed from a demonstrative/correlative in archaic poetry (4) to a relative pronoun in literary Old Icelandic, but the case morphology has not caught up to its new syntactic status.
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“Kurz vor Schön”: Linguistic Attitudes and Perceptions of Berlinerisch, Magdeburgisch, Leipzigerisch and Standard German

Christopher Tabisz
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Based on previous work in linguistic attitudes on the Magdeburg regiolect, students appear to be negative toward the regiolect, specifically in the classroom setting, and teachers outright reject it at home, among friends and in the classroom (Tabisz, 2014). If the Magdeburg regiolect is perceived to be a less appropriate variety for schools, then these attitudes could have consequences for the speakers in the workforce.

The present study analyzes attitudes and perceptions of linguistic varieties of Magdeburg, Berlin, Leipzig and standard German. Interviewees were asked to listen to four recordings – one from each city – and answer questions. The questions opened with the interviewees’ personal connection to each variety and opinions of the variety itself before creating a mental image of the physical appearance and the personality of the speaker of each recording. The final section of the interviews was designed to elicit the interviewees’ attitudes about the fields of work that would be best and worst suited for the speakers of the four linguistic varieties.

The varieties of Berlin and Leipzig are included because (a) if young people from the Magdeburg area move away, they tend to study or find work in either Berlin or Leipzig; (b) Berlin’s linguistic past and present are similar to those of Magdeburg; (c) Leipzig and Magdeburg share many linguistic features; and (d) Berlin and Leipzig provide a comparison to other non-standard German varieties in the former GDR for the linguistic attitudes of the Magdeburg regiolect. A recording of standard German was also used for comparison.

In qualitative data analyzed so far, there is a connection between the appropriate careers for standard and non-standard German speakers and whether Germans speak standard or non-standard varieties. The interviews also indicated that the level of education might be connected to which linguistic variety a German speaks. However, it is surprising – although understandable – that there is a set of careers in the social realm that the interviewees believe to be well suited for speakers of non-standard varieties. The interviews indicate that speakers of the non-standard varieties in Magdeburg, Berlin and Leipzig can connect more easily with the general public of their cities and that the non-standard varieties themselves can create that proximity to the local population. Interviewees mentioned, for example, regional radio broadcasters and nurses as being educated individuals who use their linguistic varieties to connect with the public.

This research contributes to a body of knowledge that would help the general public understand the connections between an individual’s speech and their potential career path. The study brings to light the issues of linguistic prejudice that may influence which professions a speaker may be employed in.

References
The Interaction of Sievers’ Law
and West Germanic Gemination in Upper German
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The sound change known as West Germanic Gemination (WGG) is commonly described as the doubling of a consonant before a following *j (and some other consonants), with the two restrictions that the affected cannot be *r, and that the rule only applies after a short syllable (*sagaz > *saggaz ‘warrior’, but *sökjan > *sökjan ‘to seek’). These restrictions have been attributed to restrictions on syllable structure in the phonological literature on WGG.

One problem with such accounts is the presence of Old High German dialects in which these restrictions are violated, giving such examples as Upper German leittan ‘to lead’ < Germanic *laidjan and nerren ‘to save’ < *nazjan. This raises the possibility that the restrictions observed in the other West Germanic languages are not original, and that WGG applied more generally before repair strategies targeting super-heavy syllables or undesirable segment sequences created the apparent exceptions.

This paper seeks an explanation for these phenomena in the interaction of WGG and the older change of Sievers’ Law. By Sievers’ Law, a difference arose in Indo-European in the reflexes of *j after long and short syllables. Thus after long syllables, *j turned to *ij, while after short syllables, it remained *j. The distinctions between original and new, geminated long stems have been preserved in Old English (cynn ‘family’ < *kunnja vs. hierde ‘shepherd’ < *hirdijaz), but obscured in Old High German (kunni vs. hirti). This paper will examine in detail paradigmatic alternations occasioned by the collapse of Sievers’ Law in Old High German and the analogical processes by which geminates were introduced where they had not occurred.
How to Succeed in Germanic without Really Trying
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An enthralling, yet ill-known, fact about Germanic (and Indo-European in general) is that a large set of verbs with the meaning ‘succeed’ (and its opposite ‘fail’) occur with subject-like arguments in an oblique case. These verbs form a subset of predicates that take oblique subjects, well documented across the Germanic languages (cf. Barðdal 2004, among others).

These aforementioned verbs of success appear to find their etymological source in metaphorical extensions of verbs that fall into a variety of semantic fields: i) verbs of motion, ii) verbs of giving, iii) verbs of touching/contact, iv) verbs of aiming/reaching, v) verbs of growing, and vi) verbs of luck, among others (see examples below). While semantic change is difficult to analyze, the fact that these semantic extensions recur in our dataset is not unexpected. As Fortson (2005: 658) puts it, semantic extensions “reflect certain basic metaphorical extensions involving success documented in our material are universal or specific only for Germanic languages. Whether the semantic extensions involving success documented in our material are universal or specific only for Germanic remains to be investigated. However, in Germanic, and to some extent in the ancient Indo-European languages, such verbs are constructed with non-nominitive subjects.

(i) *swem* w*ol* gelinget der ist vrô (MHG) (v) *him* wiht ne speow (OE)

whom.dat well [< go] he is glad he.dat thing not [< grow]

‘whomever succeeds, he is glad’ (Frauend. 965.5) ‘he did not succeed at all’ (Beo. 2852)

The largest set of verbs in Germanic that take oblique subject-like arguments and indicate success are derived from verbs of motion (especially translational) accompanied by a preposition/prefix, e.g. Old Icelandic *ganga* ‘go (+ well)’, Faro. *ganga við ‘go with’, Old Swed. *ganga med ‘go with’—cognates from Proto-Germanic *gangan-/*gangan-*. “Motion success” verbs have analogues in other Indo-European languages, e.g. Lat. *succedē* (< ‘under’ + ‘step’), Skt. *sam-pad-* (< ‘together’ + ‘fall’), Grk. *sym-bainō* (< ‘with’ + ‘step’). Other categories of ‘success’ metaphors include “touch success” (e.g. Old Icelandic *taka* < *takan-/*tēkan- ‘touch’, Lat. *contingere* < ‘together’ + ‘touch’), “give success” (e.g. Old Icelandic *gefasti vel ‘give well’, Old Russ. *ou-dati-sja* < ‘at’ + ‘give’ + refl), “grow success” (OHG *ge/spuon* ~ OE *ge/spōcan* ~ OCS (ou-)*spēti* < PIE *spēh₁*- ‘to succeed’ [< ‘become fat’ (?)]) and “luck success” (Icelandic *heppnast* < *heppni* ‘chance’, *aðnast* < *aðna* ‘fortune’, *lá nast* < *lá* ‘luck’, German *glücken* ~ Mid. Dutch *ge/lucken*).

Based on the set of cognate success verbs across Germanic, we reconstruct an argument structure construction meaning ‘succeed’ for Proto-Germanic with a dative subject and a verb of motion (*gangan-/*gangan-*, *faran-*, *lingwan-*; for reconstructed forms, see Kroonen 2013), growth (*spōan-*, and luck (*galukjan-*). In their basic sense these verbs occur with a different predicate-argument structure, most notably with a nominative subject, but also involving other differences. These facts about Proto-Germanic are modeled in the form of a Constructicon to represent Proto-Germanic speakers’ knowledge of the interrelation between verbal polysemy and argument structure. The goal is to contribute to a better understanding of Proto-Germanic syntax, namely, the relation between semantic fields and morphosyntactic patterns, i.e. the interaction between semantics, morphology, and syntax.
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Staying Weird: Analogical Change in High-Frequency Forms
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Historical linguists have long argued that the well-known correlation between high token frequency and morphological irregularity primarily reflects a resistance to analogical change in the forms that speakers encounter and use most often (e.g. Paul 1886:170, 188; Bybee 2015:95–6). Surprisingly, however, when we look closely at the historical development of the paradigms of the most frequent and most irregular lexical items, we often find that they have undergone a great deal of change that most linguists would characterize as “analogical”.

In this talk, I examine developments affecting some of the most highly frequent and highly irregular items in the Germanic languages, including the Old High German demonstrative (dër, daʒ, diu); the personal pronouns in several older and modern Germanic languages and dialects; the verbs ‘to be’, ‘to do’, ‘to go’ and ‘to come’ in medieval and early modern German and English; and the verbs werden ‘to become’ and wissen ‘to know’ in late Middle High and Early New High German.

I argue that we can only make sense of the histories of such items if we recognize that the resistance imparted by high token frequency is restricted to one specific type of change – the type most directly associated with regularization – but that high frequency of occurrence may in fact be conducive to certain other types of change that are commonly classified as “analogical”. I conclude with a discussion of one kind of mechanism that appears to be behind many of these changes in high-frequency forms. Similar mechanisms have traditionally been associated with folk etymology, but – apparently due to the problems these mechanisms raise for Neogrammarian principles – their role in morphological change has only occasionally been recognized (e.g. Paul 1917:262–3).
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Reconstructing focus and constituent negation in West Germanic

David Willis
University of Cambridge

There has recently been a revival of interest in syntactic reconstruction, with a number of linguists arguing that, while the comparative method cannot strictly be applied in syntax, substantial non-trivial reconstructions of the syntax of proto-languages can be constructed (Walkden 2013, 2014). Within Germanic, reconstructions have been proposed for aspects of word order, the wh-system and null arguments. This paper will examine the evidence for one part of the negation system in Old English, Old Saxon and Old High German, namely the grammatical expression of narrow-focus negation, (1), and constituent negation, (2):

(1) Mary isn’t going TO PARIS this weekend. [stated/implied: she is going somewhere else]
(2) There are some pretty villages not far from here.

1. Old English (OE). Using corpus evidence of the York Corpus of Old English (YCOE), it will be argued that OE has three markers for narrow-focus and constituent negation, each of which favour difference semantic and syntactic environments. Nalles is used above all for constituent negation of non-adverbial elements (PPs, DPs, or CPs). Nā (in addition to sentential uses) is specialized for narrow-focus negation of non-adverbial elements. Finally nāwiht, (in addition to use as an indefinite ‘nothing’) is found above all for both narrow-focus and constituent negation of adverbials. Narrow-focus negation manifests negative concord, with sentential negator ne appearing in preverbal position, and the negative-focus marker preceding the focused element, while there is no such concord in constituent negation.

2. Old Saxon (OS). In the OS data (from the HeliPaD corpus, Walkden 2015), no cognate of nalles is present, and, in general, the contexts for it seem to be avoided. Instead potential contexts for constituent negation are avoided by use of an additional clefting clause introducing sentential negation (‘It wasn’t long before…’ instead of ‘Not long after…’). Similarly, nīo ‘never’ fails to appear in constituent and narrow-focus negative contexts, suggesting that Old Saxon expressed these using clefting, although the limited nature of the extant Old Saxon does not entirely preclude these being accidental gaps.

3. Old High German (OHG). OHG nalles is found in both narrow-focus and constituent negation (Jäger 2008: 92–103), and no other negative element fulfils these functions.

4. Reconstruction. Nalles is present in OE and OHG. It is phrasal in both languages (cf. OHG nals echent ‘not only’, OE nalles sewa svide ‘not so much’; compatibility with ellipsis), and in both languages can show negative concord if the scope of negation is sentential. The formation is very similar in both languages, hence unlikely to have arisen independently, hence its absence in OS can best be explained as a loss, with OS not reflecting the protolanguage in this respect. Nalles has a wider distribution in OHG than in OE. OE use of nāwiht for constituent negation of adverbials has no close parallel in the other languages and seems likely to be an innovation. It can plausibly be explained as the result of a reanalysis:

(3) We [VP [VP did nothing] better] today than yesterday. à We [VP [VP did] [DegP nothing [VP better]]] today than yesterday.

If we accept the standard etymology for nalles as ne ‘not’ + alles ‘entirely’ < ‘all (gen. sg.)’ (Braune & Reiffenstein 2011: 233), we need a plausible bridging context in which these items would be adjacent. Since alles in the sense ‘entirely’ presupposes a scalar context, adjectives and adverbs are the most likely bridging environment, perhaps in ellipsis contexts (ne.not alles.entirely near > nalles.not near). If so, this confirms the suggestion that the OHG pattern is closer to the proto-language than OE, which has undergone a second cycle of renewal by introducing nāwiht ‘nothing’ into precisely these contexts.
Deriving perfect and passive from a single form?
Past participial identity in Germanic

Dennis Wegner
University of Wuppertal

Although the phonological identity of past participles is traditionally eyed suspiciously, it remains unclear whether it is mirrored by substantial morphosyntactic identity (Ackema 1999) or the result of accidental homophony between two designated forms (Bierwisch 1990), the perfect participle and the passive participle.

(1) a. Rustin has seen Maggie. / Maggie was seen (by Rustin).
    b. Rustin heeft Maggie gezien. / Maggie werd (door Rustin) gezien.

It will be argued that the properties attributed to the past participial forms in the two constructions go back to a single set of features. In fact, rather than along the dimension of perfect and passive, periphrastic past participial constructions can be shown to differ solely in terms of whether they occur with have, be or become. This holds for the presence of shallow agreement as in (2) as well as for the more substantial morphological phenomena in (3).

(2) a. Hundurinn hefur bitið mannínm. / Maður var bitinn af hundin
    the.dog has bitten the.man / the.man was bite.AGR by the.dog
b. Dørene blev lukket av John. / Dørene er lukkede/lukket.
    the.doors become closed by John / the.doors are closed.AGR/closed

(3) a. I don’t know how he found out that she belonged to that lass, but find out he has. / It will never be known how Jarman was caught, but caught he was.
    dass er das Buch hat lesen müssen / dass das Buch gelesen werden muss
    that he the book has read.INF must / that the book read.PTCP become must
b. hy soe it dien/ dwaan wollen ha
    he would it do.PTCP/do.INF want.PTCP have (den Dikken & Hoekstra 1997: 1058)

As an external argument may never be realized in these languages without resorting to have – in periphrastic constructions as well as in bare uses – we may conclude that one of the crucial properties of past participial formation is the suppression of the external argument (if there is one). This will be assumed to be a consequence of (lexically) marking the proto-agent role for existential binding, which semantically rather than syntactically deals with the associated argument. This may, however, be rendered ineffective by have, which is able to retrieve the marked role and provide it for further syntactic purposes (argument realization) (see inter alia Toman 1986, Cowper 1989 and Ackema & Marelj 2012 for approaches to θ-inheritance).

However, have is not solely responsible for the realization of argument structure and flexible enough to combine with predicates that do not demand the retrieval of a semantic role in have-only languages (He has arrived). In fact, it also contributes to perfect semantics, as for instance shines through with atelic two-place unaccusatives, which select for have (rather than be) despite arguably not realizing an external argument (there is nothing proto-agentive in them).

(4) a. Der Frau hat das Kleid gefallen. b. Das Geld hat ihm zugestanden.
    the woman has the dress appealed.to the money has him conceded

This contingency on aktionsart carries over to be-perfects, which may only be realized with telic verbs, and bare uses may similarly not denote perfectivity with atelic predicates. Hence, it is argued that an interpretation is determined on the basis of a past participial form which may or may not denote a result based on the aktionsart of the underlying predicate (telic vs. atelic). Whenever completion (imposing an endpoint) is not effected on the basis of the participle’s aspectual information being brought together with the verbal aktionsart, we either resort to have (denoting posteriority) or get an imperfective reading (passive cases). Crucially, the proper realization of one, i.e. either (aktionsart-sensitive) completion or posteriority, suffices to derive the other via implication, whereas have-only languages may express both ingredients in the absence of a licit alternative (be being reserved for passive uses). Given the compositional interpretation of the perfect, but not the passive, the data in (3) follow naturally: whereas have contributes some perfect information, passivization solely hinges on the past participial form.
Explaining the success of the Germanic weak suffix in the face of a transparent strong inflection

Dirk Pijpops  QLVL, University of Leuven
Katrien Beuls  Artificial Intelligence Lab, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Freek Van de Velde  QLVL, University of Leuven

The Germanic languages boast two morphological strategies for past tense formation. The strong inflection is based on an ablaut in the verb’s stem (e.g. sing ~ sang, drive ~ drove) and is the oldest, largely descendant from the Indo-European mother tongue (Harbert 2007). The weak inflection, by contrast, adds a dental suffix to the stem (e.g. laugh ~ laughed), and constitutes a Proto-Germanic innovation. In the history of the Germanic languages, this dental suffix has had considerable success in taking over past tense formation, to the detriment of the strong inflection (Harbert 2007; Lieberman et al. 2007; Cuskley et al. 2014).

To account for this success, three explanations are given in the literature (Ball 1968: 164; Bailey 1997: 7–8). First, while each separate strong ablaut class is only applicable to a subset of verbs, the weak suffix can, in principle, be attached to any verb indiscriminately. Second, some verbs escaped ablaut formation altogether, for instance because they had a vowel that fitted in none of the ablauting patterns. Such verbs would then create a safe nest for the nascent weak inflection, free of competing strong forms. Third, the strong inflection was ravaged by the effects of several sound laws, which severely undermined its transparency. This would have rendered it vulnerable to competition from the seemingly more transparent weak inflection.

We will claim that the first explanation is already sufficient to account for the rise of the weak inflection. Moreover, it may explain why the weak inflection first took over the low frequency verbs and low frequency ablaut classes (Carroll, Svare and Salmons 2012). Since we then no longer need the irregularization of the strong inflection to explain these effects, this irregularization may be the result of the rise of the weak inflection, rather than its cause.

To support these claims, we have built an agent-based simulation. In this simulation, computational agents communicate with each other by referring to past events, thereby employing either the strong or weak inflection. The agents preferably use the forms that they hear most often from their fellow agents. The simulation was composed in Babel2, a framework for building agent-based models of language evolution (Steels 2012).

In the simulation, the only difference between the strong and weak inflection lies in the first explanation given above. Any other possible advantages for the weak inflection were excluded from the model. Under such conditions, it can be observed that a rise of the weak inflection will come to pass in both type and token frequency, accompanied by a Conserving Effect of both the verbs and the ablaut classes (Bybee 2006; Carroll, Svare and Salmons 2012). This rise even takes place if the weak dental suffix starts out as inferior in both type and token frequency to any individual strong ablaut class.
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Swimming against the Tide:  
Slovenian Influence on Gottschee German  
Donald F. Reindl  
University of Ljubljana

It is a maxim that language change in contact situations is often largely one-sided, with prestige languages exerting disproportional influence on lower-status languages. Such was the case for contact between standard German (as an administrative language) and Slovenian (as a local vernacular), whereby the latter was affected in multiple ways—less in phonology and morphology, but more in terms of syntax, and especially lexicon and stylistics. Conversely, due to isolation, a largely rural character, and encirclement by Slovenian, the German dialect of the Gottschee (Sln. Kočevje) enclave of southern Slovenia underwent numerous such influences from Slovenian. Earlier authors attributed some of these features to Slavic influence, although in certain cases some phenomena cannot be reliably distinguished from language changes that could naturally occur without contact influence. This contribution systematizes and evaluates the putative Slovenian influences on Gottschee German, especially using the criterion of markedness to evaluate the likelihood that they are spontaneous or contact-induced. In addition, in the lexical field, loanwords are assessed by semantic category. The results show that the influence of Slovenian on Gottschee German is demonstrable at multiple levels. Especially in the case of the lexicon, the influence between Slovenian and German in the local milieu has often been reciprocal, with elements exchanged between the two language systems in a multidirectional manner. Comparisons are also made with other local varieties of German, sometimes moribund or defunct, including the German dialects of Sorica (Germ. Żarz), Apače (Germ. Abstall), and Rut (Germ. Deutschrat).
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The Effects of Group Dynamics on Language Learning and Use in an MMORPG

Donald Vosburg
The Pennsylvania State University

The use of video games as a language learning tool, in particular Massively Multiplayer Online Roleplaying Games (MMORPGs), is continuing to grow, as has the field of research in the gaming-second language acquisition (SLA) genre; Research to-date has revealed benefits to the language learner (LL) as well as hindrances and remaining research gaps. The potential learning spaces that video games create provide an opportunity for educators to tap into a common form of entertainment as a means to engage our students in extracurricular learning. Godwin-Jones (2014) states, “If language learning can be tied to popular forms of gaming in a way that does not inhibit its enjoyment, that’s a winning situation for both students and educators (p. 9)”. While “language learning and language use have long been viewed as a major advantage of study abroad” (McGregor, 2012, p.1), some may not be able to afford the study abroad experience or are currently just not in the position to leave their home country. This often results in students receiving their main, and sometimes only, form of foreign language exposure and learning from the classroom, in which Wattana (2013) says that most LLs, “rarely receive sufficient opportunities to practice and interact in the L2 both inside and outside the language classroom,” and encouraging L2 learners to interact in the TL is a challenge (p. 2). I will briefly review why an environment, such as World of Warcraft (WoW), is potentially beneficial to the learner as a language learning tool that provides opportunity for language practice and acquisition. This presentation however focuses on the effect that community and division of labor dynamics (Activity Theory), and interpersonal, or in this case, a lack of interpersonal relationships, had on the learner group and their desire to communicate and use the foreign language while gaming in WoW over eight weeks. Participant interviews are discussed and accompanied by their in-game and pre-/post-assessment performance data in the form of word counts, English usage, and other data available for analyzing change in language use as supportive evidence of their reported willingness-to-communicate and practice in the German language. I will rely on the explanation of the performance data from the perspective of the participants, including their native-speaking language guides, as reported in their questionnaires and interviews. My analysis of this data reveals that despite a reported lack of group comradery, second language practice and increased confidence in use of the German language, and reduced reliance on the native language English, remained possible in this environment. Participations reported that it was the language practice gained while gaming that mostly lead to their language confidence and improved assessment scores. However, the long-term use of gaming as a SLA tool was revealed to be less appealing for those sharing no common interests beyond general language learning goals, as participants claimed that it was their lack of common interests that hindered them from fully participating and realizing the potential of learning in an online, gaming environment. Therefore those who wish to use gaming as a possible SLA-tool must carefully consider the pairing of learners and native speakers in order to create a more comfortable environment in which learners are more willing to practice their foreign language.
Adjectives are in Phrasal Positions

Dorian Roehrs
University of North Texas

Traditionally, it is assumed that adjectives are adjoined to N' (1a) (Radford 1988: 210, cf. also Jackendoff 1977: 105). Abney (1987) suggests that adjectives are in head positions inside the DP above NP (1b). Third, Cinque (1994, 2010) proposes that adjectives form phrases hosted in the specifier position of a recursive AgrP (1c):

(1)  
   a. [NP D [N AP [N AP [N N]]]]       (A as Adjuncts)  
   b. [DP D [AP A [AP A [NP N]]]]       (A as Heads)     

In this paper, I present more evidence against Abney’s proposal in (1b).

Assuming that adjectives are heads, Bošković (2005: 33) argues that the – in his terms – AP-over-NP analysis in (1b) accounts for the ban on left branch extraction in Germanic as adjectives do not form a constituent to the exclusion of NP (assuming phrasal movement):

(2) ??Rote habe ich nur Autos gesehen.
    red  have I only cars  seen

However, Bošković does not discuss arguments of adjectives at all, which by themselves are constituents; they are not heads but phrases and are expected to move (but see below). In fact, assuming that degree elements are in Spec,AP, note that the structure in (1b) leaves no room at all for arguments of an adjective. Observe though that Yiddish allows arguments to precede and to follow the adjective. The latter distribution is quite unexpected for the Germanic languages:

(3)  
   a. di [farn oylem nit varshtendlekhe] frage (Yiddish)
      the  for.the  people  not comprehensible  question
   b. di [nit varshtendlekhe farn oylem] frage (from Aptroot & Gruschka 2010:149)

While a different analysis for degree elements might be found making room for a preceding argument (3a), an adjective with a following argument still presents a problem (3b).

These issues disappear if one assumes that adjectives are located in (phrasal) adjunction or specifier positions. While this has not gone unnoticed, this paper explores the properties of the arguments of adjectives in more detail revealing the analysis of the adjectives themselves. Note first that German adjectives may take two arguments that can appear in different orders (4a-b):

(4)  
   a. ein [den meisten an Kenntnissen überlegener] Student (German)
      a to.the most in knowledge superior student
   b. ein [an Kenntnissen den meisten überlegener] Student

What has gone unnoticed is that if a second adjective is added in front, none of the arguments can move to precede that adjective:

(5)  
   a. * ein [den meisten]; netter [t an Kenntnissen überlegener] Student
      a the most nice  in knowledge superior student
   b. * ein [an Kenntnissen]; netter [den meisten t überlegener] Student

Dependents of a head noun can move out of indefinite DPs even in the presence of adjectives:

(6) [Von Peter], habe ich [einen jüngeren Bruder t] gesehen.
    of    Peter   have I a    younger  brother  seen

Crucially, though, none of the arguments of adjectives can extract:

(7)  
      to.the most meet I an  in knowledge superior student
   b. ?? [An Kenntnissen]; treffe ich einen [den meisten t überlegenen] Studenten.

The data in (5) and (7) follow from the assumption that sub-extraction out of complex adjuncts (1a) or specifiers (1c) leads to ungrammaticality implying that adjectives are in phrasal positions.
Rognvaldr jarl Kali Kolsson’s LV I and the Bugge-Sieversche Regel

Douglas P.A. Simms
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Diligent students of Old Norse with a copy of E.V. Gordon’s Introduction to Old Norse will recognize the dróttkvætt stanza attributed to Rognvaldr Jarl in the Orkneyinga saga, LV I, boasting of the poet’s feats and abilities. Verse two of the first half-stanza, íþróttir kank niú, is a well-known riff on Haraldr Harðráði’s earlier verse íþróttir kank átta (Gamv.4). Although it might seem of little import, Rognvaldr’s verse violates one of the strictest aspects of dróttkvætt meter. Disyllables with hiatus, such as gróa and búa, seem to have been excluded from standing in final position of a dróttkvætt verse, the so-called Bugge-Sieversche Regel (Gade 1995:30-4; Kristján Árnason 1991:111-23). Rognvaldr’s verse, however, offers counterevidence to this phenomenon, and challenges also Gade’s assessment that hiatus words like búa were not permitted to participate in internal rhyme schemes.

Hans Kuhn has suggested that Rognvaldr’s metrical aberration in LV 1,2 is to be explained as an idiosyncrasy of Orcadian skaldic poetry (Kuhn 1982). While it is possible that skaldic verse in the Orkney Islands differed from skaldic verse elsewhere, this violation of the constraint on cadence length is unique among the verses attributed to Kali Kolsson, in either lausavísur or elsewhere, even in the Háttalykill. In evaluating this verse’s relationship to the structure of dróttkvætt, one is tempted to either read niú such that it conforms to the rule or reassess the validity of the rule.

I would like to suggest a third possibility. As an alternative explanation, one can retain both the hiatus word in the cadence as well as the validity of the Bugge-Sieversche Regel. After reviewing the challenges niú puts to our understanding of Old Norse syllable structure, I would like to suggest that niú was a purposefully added metrical violation arising from the poet’s sense of irony, given its context. This view, however, requires that we look anew at the poem’s context and its intertextual connection with Harald’s verse (Gamv.4).
Addressing the Actuation Problem of the Icelandic New Transitive Impersonal

Edwin Ko
Georgetown University

Quirin Würschinger
LMU Munich

The New Transitive Impersonal (NTI) is an ongoing development in Icelandic, which is acceptable for most speakers of the younger generation, but unacceptable for most of the older generation (Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002, henceforth M&S). The NTI, consisting of (di)transitive verbs, displays passive morphology, but unlike canonical passives, the verbal object remains in-situ and is able to receive accusative case. The NTI exhibits both active- and passive-like properties such as allowing null subjects to bind onto anaphors and control subject-oriented adjuncts while permitting by-phrases. M&S (2002) have suggested that the first step of this development was the appearance of the impersonal construction of reflexive verbs with passive morphology, or Impersonal Reflexive (IR), an extension of impersonal passives of intransitive verbs. The first attested example of Icelandic IRs dates back to 1842 (Árnadóttir et al. 2011).

In this paper, we put forth the hypothesis that IRs, which exist in German, were introduced into Icelandic through German literature in the early to mid-19th century during the highly influential literary movement (i.e. Romanticism). According to Neijmann (2006), the proliferation of translations during this time had a significant role to play in the literary revival in Iceland. Moreover, most of the translators were educated abroad, being “highly influenced by contemporary trends in European literature” (Baker & Saldanha 2009:447). Diffusion of this construction into the speaker community would have been aided by the founding of many educational institutions during this period and the founding of the Icelandic Literary Society in 1816, which was Iceland’s most powerful publishing house at the time (Karlsson 2000). In fact, since the 16th century, there existed only one printing press in Iceland, which was controlled by the church and mainly published non-secular books (Neijmann 2006). The Society also began its own annual journal Skírnir in 1827, where the first example of IR was found, and was written in a “sophisticated literary style” (Árnadóttir et al. 2011) by mostly educated, upper-class men.

According to Schäfer (2013), IRs are not found in most languages, but do exist in German:

(1) Hier wurde sich (von den Römer) gewaschen.
Here have Refl.Acc (by the Romans) washed
‘The Romans washed here’

Furthermore, German IRs are not a recent development as Behagel (1924 II:24, as cited in Schäfer 2013) provides examples from Middle High German. An important distinction that we make here is that the German IR is a passive (with an empty subject), while the Icelandic RI is an active (with a proarb). This distinction is crucial because if RIs are truly the first step in this diachronic process, then it would explain why NTI has developed in Icelandic, but not in German. Therefore, in accounting for the social history of Iceland during the early to mid-19th century and the differences between the German and Iceland IR, we may be able to gain a better understanding of why the Icelandic NTI occurred now, and not earlier (or later).
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Breaking down the passive/active dichotomy
Einar Freyr Sigurðsson
University of Pennsylvania

1. Introduction. I argue that passive and active are labels for a collection of properties of VoiceP, where these properties may vary partially independently, yielding constructions that do not fit the traditional labels. I demonstrate how, when and why the dichotomy between actives and passives breaks down, focusing on two impersonal constructions in Icelandic, the progressive passive (ProgPass) and the Impersonal Modal Construction (IMC).

2. Background. Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir (2002) suggest that the ProgPass and the IMC may have served as a model for the New Transitive Impersonal (NTI) in Icelandic. Building on their insight, I argue that all three can be analysed in the same way, extending Legate’s (2014) analysis of the NTI. Even though it is usually assumed that the IMC takes a pro subject (e.g., Eythórsson 2008), I focus on cases where it does not (cf. (2) below).

3. Data. (1) and (2) show the ProgPass and the IMC, respectively. Both constructions have passive properties (e.g., by-phrases are allowed), but the main verb does not show passive morphology:

   (1) Er verið að afgreiða þig af einhverjun? (ProgPass)
       ‘Are you being served by anyone?’

   (2) Það þarf að rannsaka þetta betur af fræðimönnum. (IMC)
       ‘This needs to be investigated further by scholars.’

   In the talk, I discuss similarities between the NTI and these constructions (other than the ones mentioned above): A-movement of the object is blocked, secondary predicates, which are only possible with DPs (Landau 2010), are not allowed (in the case of the IMC, secondary predicates are not compatible with by-phrases), and binding of anaphors is possible.

4. Analysis. Legate (2014) argues for the NTI that a weak implicit argument (WIA; Landau 2010) is projected in SpecVoiceP (see also Sigurðsson 2011). WIA consists of ϕ-features only but lacks a D-feature and is therefore smaller than pro/PRO. WIA restricts but does not saturate the external argument position (Chung and Ladusaw 2004). I extend this analysis to the ProgPass and the IMC. Placing WIA in SpecVoiceP gives rise to accusative case assignment, binding of anaphors and the availability of by-phrases. The WIA also blocks A-movement but the lack of a D on WIA results in unavailability of secondary predicates.

   I furthermore propose that Voice can either have the requirement that its specifier be filled (Spec) or not (Ø), and that it introduces an external argument (Ext) or not (Ø):

   (3) a. VoiceP
       b. VoiceP

       DP/WIA
       Voice{Ext,Ø} ...eP...

   The diagram in (3b) shows the canonical passive, whose Voice introduces an external argument but it is not syntactically projected. In the ProgPass and the version of IMC that allows by-phrases, a WIA is projected in SpecVoiceP, see (3a). This is the same Voice type as for the active, even though the ProgPass and the IMC have various passive properties. Here the dichotomy between actives and passives breaks down. What being a “passive” comes down to, I argue, is then only existential binding of the external argument.

Many factors affect how difficult a sentence is to read. Gibson (2006, see also Gibson 1998) proposed that people combine (a) context-dependent syntactic expectations (top–down statistical information) and (b) context-independent lexical-category frequencies of words (bottom–up statistical information) in order to resolve ambiguities in the lexical categories of words.

Two factors are thus lexical access and processing of syntactic ambiguity. It is well known that Garden Path (GP) sentences cause significantly longer reading time at the point of ambiguity. Similarly, Code Switching (CS) in a sentence causes longer reading times, as words are easier to access in a context and code switching temporarily creates a change in lexical context. We are interested in using these phenomena to explore how lexical access and sentence processing interact.

We experimentally control the code switching to occur where a reader may detect a GP. One example from Norwegian to English at the GP: “Mannen som hører stemmer a nice saxophone”; the man who (hears voices)/(hears is tuning) a nice saxophone. It is predicted that (hears voices) is the first alternative until the noun phrase “a nice saxophone” is encountered. Will the code switch affect how fast the sentence is read and understood? Each sentence is delivered in four different conditions, marked by ±GP and ±CS. For example, a version without GP and CS is: “Mannen som hører stemmer spiller fint saxofon.” i.e. The man who hears voices plays saxophone well.

Data collected in autumn 2013 found a significant main effect of GP (p<0.05; 177ms slower) and a weakly significant CS effect (p<0.06; 153ms). The interesting finding was that when the sentence was both GP and CS there was no additive effect and the combination was 136ms faster than the sum of GP and CS (p<0.15). The lack of extra processing time with the added difficulty was surprising: the sentence is not built up incrementally guided by the lexical content. Code Switching might even prepare the reparse of the sentence.

Data is now collected to confirm the interaction of CS and GP in a more detailed experiment. The new data collection introduces a bilingual verbal memory task that will allow us to grade the level of bilinguality of our subjects. We will more closely match sentences word by word, in order to follow the reading process closer in time, and we will use more subjects.
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Resilient preverbal negation in historical Dutch

Eline Laperre
Queen Mary University of London

In most European languages, negation has developed according to Jespersen’s Cycle (JC), a three-stage process in which a preverbal negative marker is joined, and eventually replaced by a postverbal marker of negation (Dahl, 1979; Jespersen, 1917; Willis et al., 2013). Dutch appears to be no exception: in Old Dutch, negation was expressed by means of a preverbal marker ni (stage I of JC), which was in early Middle Dutch joined by a postverbal marker to create a bipartite construction ne/en…niet (stage II of JC). Eventually, the preverbal marker was dropped altogether, so that niet remained as the sole negative marker (stage III of JC). Interestingly, though, in a number of specific linguistic contexts, the preverbal negative marker ne/en could still be found on its own long after the standard marker of negation had become a bipartite construction, and later a single postverbal niet (Beheydt, 1998; Breitbarth, 2013; Postma, 2002; Stoett, 1923; van der Horst, 2008). An example, taken from van der Horst (2008: 517) is found below; the main marker of negation in (1) is the preverbal marker en, rather than the bipartite ne/en…niet that would have been the standard at the time.

(1) Ende ic en weet oft es gheloghen
    and I NEG know if it is lied
    ‘And I do not know if it is a lie’
    (Jacob van Maerlant, Naturen Bloeme, 13th c.: 252, 2323)

This resilient ne/en can be found in six linguistic contexts: (a) exceptive clauses or ‘unless’-clauses, (b) particular verbs such as mogen ‘can’, roeken ‘to care’ or weten ‘to know’, as shown in the example above, (c) certain adverbs such as meer ‘anymore’, (d) rhetorical questions, (e) fragment answers, or short answers denying a previous clause, as e.g. hi en si ‘he is not’, and (f) clauses in which the negative marker is expletive, and does not carry any overt negative meaning.

However, beyond description, little research has been dedicated to resilient preverbal negation in historical Dutch. In particular, the question of why preverbal negation remains resilient beyond stage I of JC remains largely unanswered. Van der Wouden (1994), for instance, provides a hypothesis for resilient expletive ne/en, while Burridge (1993) briefly addresses resilient ne/en with certain verbs and in clauses containing expletive negation. Breitbarth (2014) proposes a plausible explanation for the fate of ne/en in exceptives, but her study focuses on Low German, not Dutch. Furthermore, the existing studies are also often lacking in diachronic depth, or are simply not based on comprehensive data. An example of the latter is Postma’s (2002) study, which proposes a unified hypothesis for resilient preverbal ne/en in almost all of its contexts, but fails to provide adequate data to support his claim. Thus, more research is needed to explain why preverbal negation remains resilient in historical Dutch beyond stage I of JC.

My study aims to provide that research, by means of a comprehensive investigation of resilient preverbal negation in the history of two Dutch dialect regions, Holland and West-Flanders: in the former, preverbal negation has disappeared entirely today, while in the latter, it continues to be used (Barbiers et al., 2006). Using a corpus-based approach, I have compiled a diachronically diverse text sample that ranges from the 13th century until the 18th century, and contains material from two text genres, narrative and administrative texts. In the present paper, I will discuss the ongoing data collection process and present those patterns emerging from it, such as the prevalence of exceptives, as well as the ways in which the data from both dialect regions contrast with one another.
Distinguishing impersonal and prepositional passives in Mainland Scandinavian

Elisabet Engdahl
University of Gothenburg

Anu Laanemets
University of Copenhagen

Maling & Zaenen (1985) and Thráinsson (2007) argue convincingly that Icelandic lacks prepositional passives. Apparent examples like (1a) are shown to instead involve preposing of the complement of a preposition in an impersonal passive (1b); for independent reasons the expletive *hað cannot be realized post-verbally in (1a).

(1) a. þennan mann var (*hað) (oft) talad um. (Ic. Impersonal)
   this man.ACC was (it) (often) talked.NOM.NEUT about
   ‘This man people (often) talked about.’

b. hað var (oft) talad um þennan mann.
   it was (often) talked.NOM.NEUT about this man.ACC
   ‘People often talked about this man.’

With respect to the Mainland Scandinavian languages, Prepositional passives are considered normal in Norwegian whereas Herslund (1984) claims that Danish only has impersonal passives. Maling & Zaenen (1985) suggest that their analysis of Icelandic should apply to Danish and Swedish as well. A recent corpus investigation has shown that Danish, Norwegian and Swedish all use genuine prepositional passives, but very infrequently. However, an interesting finding is that a fairly large proportion of the Danish examples turn out to be structurally ambiguous between an impersonal and a prepositional passive analysis. The reason for the ambiguity is that the expletive der, which is used in impersonal passives, is also used in subject relative clauses. Consequently the relative clause in (2) can be analysed both as an impersonal passive (i) and as a prepositional passive (ii). As shown by the paraphrases, the interpretations are hard to tell apart.

(2) og dette er ting, der skal tenkes på (Da. Impersonal or Prep-pass)
   and this is things DER must think.S on
   i. ‘And these are things that one must think about.’
   ii. ‘And these are things that must be thought about.’

Corresponding examples in Norwegian do not show this ambiguity since the expletive pronoun det is distinct from the relativizer som, in most dialects.

In Swedish, certain s-passives can also be analyzed as ambiguous between an impersonal and a prepositional passive as shown in (3), given that the expletive subject is sometimes not realized post-verbally, cf. the Icelandic example in (1a).

(3) Detta har (det) inte talats om tidigare. (Sw. Impersonal or Prep-pass)
   this has (it) not spoken.S about earlier
   i. ‘There has not been any talk about this earlier.’
   ii. ‘This has not been spoken about earlier.’

In this talk we discuss the interpretational similarities between impersonal passives and certain uses of prepositional passives. It turns out that the absence of overt Agent phrases is an important factor. We also discuss criteria for distinguishing the two types of passive and end by suggesting that the structural similarities may have caused reanalysis and language change.
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Double Definiteness, Diachrony, and Danish

Elliott Evans and Rex A. Sprouse
Indiana University

Old Norse and all of the modern standard North Germanic varieties mark unmodified definite non-proper nouns with a definite suffix/enclitic (see Faarlund 2009 on suffix vs. enclitic). According to most accounts, when an attributive adjective is added, in Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish, the suffixal/enclitic article is retained, and in all but (Modern) Icelandic a free-standing definite article appears.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unmodified def. noun</th>
<th>Modified def. noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>Suffix/enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Norse</td>
<td>steinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>sten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faroese</td>
<td>steinur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>steinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>sten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While a number of (not directly comparable) formal analyses for the double definiteness effect in Norwegian and Swedish have been proposed within versions of Chomsky’s (1995, 2000) Minimalist Program (MP), here we consider two groups of approaches and what the history of definiteness marking in Danish can contribute to the discussion.

On virtually all MP accounts, both articles in the double definiteness construction of Norwegian and Swedish are required for syntactic and/or semantic reasons. For Faarlund (2009) and Schoorlemmer (2012), the lower (suffixal) article encodes definiteness and the higher (free-standing) article serves to license the adjective. For Julien (2002) and Stroh-Wollin (2015), on the other hand, a visibility condition requires that either D or Spec-DP be filled, and the higher (free-standing) article rescues a DP when the head noun is blocked from moving to this position by an intervening adjective.

In this paper, we show that double definiteness never arose in the history of Danish, substantiating an incidental comment by Haugen (1976: 299) with an empirical study of historical Danish texts. This means that Danish represents straightforward continuity of the Old Norse pattern, in which the suffixal/enclitic article and the free-standing article are in complementary distribution, and that not only Norwegian and Swedish, but also Icelandic represent innovative patterns. Thus, a comprehensive diachronic model must account not only for the innovation of double definiteness in Norwegian and Swedish, but also the retraction of the free-standing definite article in Icelandic (now restricted to high register (Sigurðsson 2006: 195f)).

We argue that this state of affairs is more readily compatible with analyses such as those of Faarlund (2009) and Schoorlemmer (2012) than with analyses such as those of Julien (2002) and Stroh-Wollin (2015), because the latter treat the Danish pattern as the result of additional ancillary stipulations when compared to Norwegian and Swedish, while the former authors’ accounts are readily compatible with the Danish pattern as more conservative. We also consider the ramifications of the historical retraction of the free-standing definite article in Icelandic for competing analyses.
Bavarian German r-Flapping: Evidence for a dialect-specific Sonority Hierarchy

Erin Noelliste
Indiana University

In certain varieties of Bavarian German (BG), where both liquids vocalize in the syllable coda, word-final sequences of /r'l/ are realized with a flapped r as the onset to a syllable where [l] is the nucleus. Representative data for BG r and l are given in 1.

(1) BG r and l

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bavarian German</th>
<th>Standard German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>[tɔɐ̯]</td>
<td>Tor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>[fɔɪ̯]</td>
<td>voll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r'l/</td>
<td>[kɛᵣ.l]</td>
<td>Kerl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples such as SG Kerl /kɛᵣl/ [kɛɐ̯l] are often cited as evidence for a German Sonority Hierarchy (see 2a, from Wiese 1996), where rhotics are more sonorous than laterals. Recent phonetic research on Romance languages, however, has argued for a Cross-Linguistic Impermutable Sonority Hierarchy, where the class of rhotics is divided into three sonority levels, with laterals between flaps and trills (see 2b, from Parker 2008). Neither of the hierarchies in 2a,b can account for the BG data in 1 for rl because words like Kerl are produced with two syllables.

In this paper, I will present data showing the distribution of /r/ and /l/, as well as sequences of /r'l/. The data were collected during the 2013-14 academic year in Styria, Austria. I will give an analysis which accounts for the BG data for rl using the Sonority Sequencing Principle (SSP) (Selkirk 1984) and a separate sonority hierarchy specific to BG (see 2c). The hierarchy in 2c separates liquids into two separate sonority levels, where flaps are less sonorous than laterals and trills. I will show that BG /r/ and /l/ are equally sonorous and cannot be syllabified together in the coda, as in Standard German; thus the rule of flapping is a repair, where /r/ becomes the less sonorous rhotic allophone [ɾ]. One theoretical contribution of this paper concerns the status of the German Sonority Hierarchy. I will show that for certain dialects (i.e. BG), where there are two allophones of /r/ which behave differently in terms of sonority, the class of rhotics needs to be divided into trills and flaps. Another theoretical contribution of this paper is to the cross-linguistic discussion of segment sonority. Although phonetic studies have shown that flaps behave as more sonorous than laterals and trills in Romance languages, the data presented in this paper show that the BG flap is less sonorous than the lateral (otherwise it could not be the onset to a syllable with the lateral as a nucleus, according to the SSP).

(2) a. German Sonority Hierarchy
vowels > glides > rhotics > laterals > nasals > obstruents
b. Cross-Linguistic Impermutable Hierarchy
…glides > rhotic approximants ([x]) >flaps > laterals > trills > nasals…
c. BG Sonority Hierarchy
vowels > glides > trills ([ʀ]), laterals > flaps > nasals > obstruents
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The Non-Monotonic Derivation of Scandinavian Object Shift

Fabian Heck
Leipzig University

Problem: As first noted by Vikner (1989) (also Chomsky 1993, Koizumi 1993, Kitahara 1997, among others), the existence of Object Shift (OS) in Scandinavian (see (1-a,b) for OS in Icelandic, Thrainsson 1986) poses a problem for the Minimal Link Condition ((2-a), Fanselow 1990, Rizzi 1990, Chomsky 1995): Since OS targets a position to the left of the subject (1-b) (presumably an outer Spec, Chomsky 1995), the MLC should prevent the subject from raising to SpecT across the object: the shifted object is closer to T than the subject (3). (First raising the subject and then applying OS violates the Strict Cycle Condition, Chomsky 1973, see (2-b).)

(1) a. Í gær las Pétur hana áreiðanlega ekki t. yesterday read Peter it doubtlessly not "Yesterday, Peter doubtlessly didn’t read it.”
   b. það stíngur smjörinu einhver í vasann t. there put the.butter someone in.his.pocket “Someone put the butter into his pocket.”

(2) a. Minimal Link Condition (MLC):
   If in \( \alpha \ldots [\ldots \beta \ldots [\ldots \gamma \ldots \ldots] \ldots] \) both \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \) are of the right type to establish a relation R with \( \alpha \), then \( \alpha \) can establish R only with \( \beta \) (but not with \( \gamma \)).
   b. Strict Cycle Condition (SCC):
   If \( \Sigma \) is the root of the current phrase marker, then no operation can take place exclusively within \( \Omega \), where \( \Omega \) is dominated by \( \Sigma \).

(3) \[ \text{TP} \ldots [\text{T} \text{TP} \text{vP} \text{Subj} [\text{vP} \text{vP} [\text{vP} \text{V} t ]] ] \]

Proposal: The problem can be avoided if the following (implicit) assumption is abandoned: syntactic derivations must be monotonic (i.e., each syntactic operation either increases or preserves the complexity of the tree). Accordingly, I argue that derivations can be non-monotonic, i.e., trees may temporarily shrink. Material is removed from the tree, stored in a separate workspace (WSP, a concept independently needed), and then remerged at some later step. I illustrate that accepting this premise not only opens the way to a derivation of OS that respects both the MLC and the SCC (see (4)) but also paves the way for deriving Holmberg’s (1986) generalization on OS from locality theory (without Chomsky’s 1993 concept of “equidistance”).

(4) a. TP
   \[ \text{T} \text{vP} \text{Subj} \text{vP} \text{vP} [\text{vP} \text{vP} [\text{vP} \text{V} t ]] ]
   b. vP
   \[ \text{Obj} \text{vP} \text{vP} [\text{vP} \text{V} t ] ]

Derivation: OS is procrastinated. T is merged ①, attracts the subject (respecting the MLC) and stores it in the WSP ②. Due to V-to-T movement, T is removed ③ and the TP-projection vanishes. OS respects the SCC ④. v+V is removed to the WSP ⑤, forming the T+v+V complex there (Bobaljik 1995). In the remaining steps (not shown), T+v+V is remerged, and the subject is remerged in SpecT.
1. Introduction. Recent work on the relationship between information structure and syntax in older stages of English has demonstrated that in this language the syntax of subjects was determined by information structure. In particular, the subject appeared in a preverbal position, when it is given information, and tended to follow the finite verb, when it is new-information (cf. Hinterhölzl & van Kemenade (2012)).

Since the verb in wh-questions and in declaratives introduced by a small class of pronominal adverbs precedes given subjects in OE, these data provide evidence for a relaxed V2 system, in which the finite verb moves to a higher position in the C-domain, arguably into ForceP, in questions and in declaratives introduced by ßa-adverbs (categorical V2), but remains in a lower position in the C-domain, arguably in FinP in all other clauses, giving rise to accidental V2. High discourse given subjects can then be argued to occupy either [Spec,FinP] or a dedicated topic position above it.

2. New data. In the talk we will discuss a series of novel data from two relaxed Germanic V2 languages, Möcheno and Cimbrian spoken in northern Italy (Bidese 2008, Bidese et al 2012, Cognola 2013), which replicate the distribution of NP subjects found in Old English, but provide some evidence for the exact position of preverbal given subjects.

2.1. Subject-verb inversion. In both languages, subject-finite verb inversion involves new or contrasted information. In Möcheno, the subject has to follow the finite verb when it is new-information, as shown in (1ab).

(1) Who has always bought the flour in the shop?
   a. En de boteig hót òllbe de mama kaft s mel
      in the shop has always the mum bought the flour
   b. #En de boteig de mama hót òllbe kaft s mel
      in the shop the mum has always bought the flour
      "It was the mum who has always bought the flour in the shop"

2.2. Lack of subject-verb inversion. In both languages given subjects cannot appear in subject-finite verb inversion, but have to precede the finite verb.

(2) What did Mario buy yesterday?
   a. Gestar dar Mario hat gekoaft in libar Cimbrian
      yesterday the Mario has bought a book
   b. #Gestar hatta dar Mario gekoaft in libar Cimbrian
      has-da the Mario bought the book
      "Mario bought a book yesterday."

2.3 High Subjects and wh-movement. It is important to note that in wh-questions the subject must stay in a low post-verbal position in these varieties, as illustrated in (6). Note that the subjects in (6) are typically given information due to the presupposition of a standard information seeking question like (3a): Luca bought something.

(3) a. *Bas hatt / hatta dar Luca gekoaft? Cimbrian
    what has/has-da the Luca bought
   b. Bas hatta / hatt=ar3 gekoaft dar Mario?, Cimbrian
    what has-da/has-he bought the Mario

3. Analysis. At first glance, the data in (3) would argue for the A*-status of given subjects and hence support the analysis of them occupying a dedicated topic position in the C-domain. Note, however, that post-verbal subjects in (6) must be either clitic-resumed or coupled with the expletive element da in Cimbrian, speaking in favor of an analysis in which given high subjects occupy an A-position that is [Spec,FinP]. This conclusion raises the point of why high given subjects should block wh-movement. We will discuss the merits and drawbacks of a possible solution to this problem and discuss its implications for the correct analysis of da in Cimbro. In particular, we propose that a criterial position in the sense of Rizzi (2006) not only blocks further movement of the constituent in its specifier but also blocks movement of other categories across it to a higher criterial position.
Some issues in the investigation of Danish in the Americas

Frans Gregersen, director
Danske Stemmer i USA og Argentina, Københavns Universitet
Danish Voices in the Americas, University of Copenhagen

A grant given by the A.P. Møller Foundation, the Carlsberg Foundation and the University of Copenhagen in 2014 has made it possible for a group of researchers at the University of Copenhagen LANCHART Centre to study the use of Danish by immigrants to the United States and Argentina in the previous century. For the USA there were sufficiently detailed recordings of good quality thanks to previous projects. For Argentina, however, no recordings could be identified. Thus we had to carry out extensive field work and the project has to date assembled data from more than 100 informants who speak various degrees of fluent Danish.

The purpose of this presentation is to introduce two major issues that we have encountered and solved during the preliminary work on the recordings. The first one has to do with the status of loans, borrowings and calques from the surrounding society’s language (in this case English and Spanish) and the baseline of reference for comparisons between the Danish spoken outside Denmark and the Danish spoken in Denmark. The second one has to do with the difference in status between Spanish and English in the Danish of today and the consequences for the project. In both cases the issue of borrowing remains central:

Obviously, modern Danish has borrowed a number of lexical items from English, cf. Rathje 2008. A discussion has raged about whether Modern Danish has also borrowed some syntactic constructions (Sørensen 1997, Galberg Jacobsen 1994) and the fact remains that it is extremely difficult to decide whether new ways of using Danish have or have not been inspired by similar constructions in English (calques). This makes comparisons between Danish spoken in the USA and Danish spoken in Denmark more complicated since a simple count of Danish versus English words will not do justice to the situation. On the other hand, we have to start with word counting. Here the crux is which words are possible in both languages (loans (and homographs in so far as they cannot be disambiguated using part of speech tagging)), i.e. Danish and English, and which are in fact hybrids, i.e. words with a Danish stem and English morphology or vice versa. A number of those decisions have to be taken already in the phase of transcription. The group has developed a system of transcription whereby it is comparatively easy to establish profiles for each speaker detailing the number of unambiguously Danish word forms used, the number of unambiguously English word forms used and the number of ambiguous word forms as well as hybrids used. Counted separately for each informant this should give us a reliable index for each speaker’s command of the two languages as repertoires. As to Spanish the situation is very different. Very few words have been borrowed directly from Spanish into the Danish spoken in Denmark and thus we may be sure that Spanish words used in the Danish of Argentina Danes stem from the present surroundings. But a new problem arises stemming from the common core of Latin words in European languages. Thus Danish – as is the case with all European languages - has a layer of word forms which stem from Latin and this layer is not perceived as loans (any longer? ever?). But that does not mean that you are completely free to create new word forms such as the Argentine Danish: funktionere (for Danish fungere cf. Swedish funktionera) = Eng. function, jubileret (for Danish pensioneret = Eng. retired). Examples (courtesy of PhD student NN) could be multiplied. Here we have completely Danish phonology but the word form does not ‘exist’ in Danish. It would be possible, but is has not occurred to any Dane (yet? ever?) to create it. The point is that the two different types of contact between Danish and English on the one hand and Danish and Spanish on the other make for quite different analyses and quite different resulting Danish lects.
Fortis-lenis neutralization in Upper Saxon and its implementation in the phonological grammar of German speakers with different dialectal backgrounds

Franziska Kruger
Indiana University

This study examines the neutralization of the fortis-lenis distinction for word-initial obstruents in Upper Saxon (USax), a German dialect. It also investigates mental representations for this dialect-specific merger in the phonological grammar of German speakers with different dialectal experiences. Participants are a group of USax speakers (n=6), a group of Standard German (SG, n=6) speakers mostly unfamiliar with the dialect and a group of SG speakers with long-term exposure to USax (n=7, avg. 7.8 years), i.e. dialect learners.

Speakers of SG produce a clear distinction between the word-initial obstruents in Pein /paɪn/ ‘agony’ and Bein /baɪn/ ‘leg’. The former is aspirated, the latter unaspirated. However, USax and other Middle German dialects are often described as having undergone complete neutralization to [p], [t], [k]. It has not yet been fully established if the neutralization is in fact complete in USax since thorough phonetic analyses are still lacking and none have explicitly investigated word-initial position. The acoustic analysis in the present study of [p]- and [pʰ]-initial words spoken in isolation indicated that speakers of USax (n=6) produce [p] with an average VOT of 16ms, while [pʰ] had a significantly longer VOT (avg. 28ms), which was still shorter than Standard German voiceless obstruents (avg. 60ms).

Having observed a distinction in the acoustic properties of fortis and lenis obstruents, the study further explores whether both categories have nevertheless merged in the mental phonological grammar of USax speakers. It also investigates how SG learners of USax as well as SG speakers without exposure to the dialect would process this contrast (merger). A cross-modal priming task was used to elicit learners’ reaction times to either [p]- or [pʰ]-initial words produced by a USax native speaker. Similar reaction times for both phonemes would indicate a merger, while a difference in reaction times would point towards a phonemic distinction of both obstruents. The preliminary analysis indicates that USax speakers maintain a distinction between fortis and lenis obstruents. By contrast, SG-listeners – with or without significant exposure to the dialect – showed a different pattern than USax speakers, indicating that they process the USax variants differently.

This investigation sheds new light on the status of fortis-lenis obstruents in a dialect described as having undergone complete lenition, and it provides further insights into phonological representations and how they might differ based on listeners’ experiences with dialectal variation.
Remnants of Western Yiddish in rural northwest Germany: New insights from the LCAAJ archive

Gertrud Reershemius
Aston University

In 2004, sources were discovered which prove that remnants of a variety based on Western Yiddish were still in use alongside Low German in the rural town of Aurich in northwest Germany as late as the 1930s and 40s (Reershemius 2007). Up to this point, no mention had ever been made of a vernacular spoken as an in-group vernacular among East Frisian Jews. The only other potential sources for this vernacular are three interviews conducted by field-workers for the Language and Culture Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry (LCAAJ) during the 1960s with informants from three rural towns from the region, currently only available as part of the LCAAJ archive at Columbia University in New York.

A research grant awarded by the British Academy allowed me to conduct research in the archive in August 2015. The proposed paper presents the analysis of the sound files and fieldwork questionnaires for the Low German speaking area in general and for East Frisia in particular. They first and foremost show that during the 1920s and 1930s a variety based on remnants of Western Yiddish was not only used in Aurich but in five clusters across the Low German language area. In line with Lowenstein's (2008: 237) observation, the fieldwork questionnaires provide rich data on the lexicon, aspects of phonology and folk practices. I discovered that some of the survey questions also elicited information about the multilingual repertoires of the informants: did they speak Low German? Did the way they spoke standard German indicate traces of Western Yiddish?
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Heads up! On DP internal movement in Icelandic

Gísli Rúnar Harðarson
University of Connecticut

Overview: This paper provides a new argument for a return to head movement approach for the postnominal article in Icelandic. I assume that the structure of the noun phrase involves a complex functional domain and I propose that the word order patterns and the resulting interpretations observed in definite DPs can be derived from this structure where other approaches have either under- or over-generated. Namely, these patterns are derived by head movement of the noun to the article and a separate topic movement of the adjective.

Word order in the Icelandic DP: In terms of linear order, there are three patterns that are of primary concern, labelled below as Patterns I, II and III respectively (following Pfaff 2015).

(1) a. ADJECTIVE > NOUN-ARTICLE > NUMERAL > GENITIVE > PP PATTERN I
   b. ARTICLE > NUMERAL > ADJECTIVE > NOUN > GENITIVE > PP PATTERN II
   c. NOUN-ARTICLE > NUMERAL > ADJECTIVE > GENITIVE > PP PATTERN III

These patterns have been described and discussed often before (e.g. Magnússon 1984, Sigurðsson 2006, Pfaff 2015). PATTERN I is for the most part the unmarked order, and PATTERN II has mostly been seen as a stylistic variant. PATTERN III, although often denied, has been shown to exist by Pfaff (2007 et seq.), who has also observed that the choice between the three patterns is not semantically neutral (Pfaff 2015).

The structure of the Icelandic DP: I follow various recent proposals in reinterpretimg Greenberg’s universal #20 as a condition on hierarchical structure (e.g. Cinque 2005, Abels and Neeleman 2012) as well as accounts of Icelandic traditional noun phrases that take PATTERN II to be the “base” from which other orders are derived. The structure of the Icelandic DP is as follows: numerals are adjoined to ωP and adjectives are in Spec-ωP. Genitives (and pronominal possessors) are merged in Spec-φP and PPs are in Spec-nP (or potentially lower).


The labels used in (2) follow from word structure indicated by evidence from compounding (Harðarson 2016). Similar projections proposed by Vangsnes (1999), Julien (2005) and Pfaff (2015) i.a. The constituency in (2) is further corroborated by evidence from ellipsis, (3), where the elided part corresponds to ωP and nP, and variable binding (4), which indicates that genitives asymmetrically c-command PPs.

(3) a. Ég tek stóru myndina hennar Astridar af Dorian Gray ef þú tekur litlu __.
   I take big picture.the PROP Astrid of D. G. if you take small
   I’ll take Astrid’s big picture of Dorian Gray if you’ll take the small one.

   b. Ég tek stóru myndina hennar Astridar af Dorian Gray ef þú tekur litlu __ hans Garps __.
   I take big picture.the PROP Astrid of D. G. if you take little PROP Garp
   I’ll take Astrid’s big picture of Dorian Gray if you’ll take Garp’s little one.

(4) a. mynd hvers stúdents af mómmu sinni
   picture [each student]GEN of mother REFL
   each student’s picture of their mother

   b. *mynd mómmu sinnar af hverjum stúdent
   picture [mother REFL]GEN of each student
   their mother’s picture of each student

Deriving the alternative orders: I propose (contra Vangsnes 1999 i.a.) that the postnominal article in Icelandic is a result of head movement of the noun to D. This allows for the preservation of the constituency in (2) and negates the need for ad hoc movement operations in the postnominal sphere. Contra, e.g., Sigurðsson 1993 i.a., I argue that fronting of the adjective and noun in PATTERN I are two separate operations. This is supported by the existence of PATTERN III, i.e. the noun can be fronted while the adjective is stranded, and differences in interpretation of adjectives between PATTERN I and III. Pfaff (2015) points out that in PATTERN III, the information contributed by the adjective is backgrounded and does not contribute to the uniqueness presupposition, whereas in PATTERN I it does. Hence I propose that PATTERN I is derived by the adjective undergoing DP-internal topic movement (cf. Bastos-Gee 2011).
Forging Agreement: on the relation between fake indexicals and agreement

Gísli Rúnar Harðarson
University of Connecticut

Susi Wurmbrand
University of Connecticut

Fake indexicals [fi] are 1st and 2nd person pronouns that are not interpreted as speaker/hearer but as bound variables [bv] as in (1).

(1) a. Ábeins ég gerir mitt/*hennar/*sitt besta. ‘Only I am doing my best.’
  only I do.1.sg my/*her/*refl best [No one else did their best.]

  b. Ábeins þú gerðir þú/*hans/*sitt besta. ‘Only you did your best.’
  only you did.2.sg your/*his/*refl best [No one else did their best.]

While Icelandic and English allow fis in (1), the two languages differ in relative clause contexts such as (2). In English, the embedded verb shows 3rd person agreement and both fis and 3rd person pronouns are possible to express a bv interpretation, (2a). In Icelandic, verb agreement can be either 3rd person, (2b), or the verb can agree with the matrix subject, (2c). Crucially, however, the person specification of the pronoun must match verb agreement to yield a bv interpretation.

(2) a. I am the only one who is doing my/her/his best. all: ✓ BV
  b. Ég er sá eini sem gerir sitt / *mitt besta. ✓ FI
    I am.1.sg dem one that do.3.sg refl / *my best
    ‘I am the only one who is doing her best.’

  c. Ég er sá eini sem gerir mitt / *sitt besta. ✓ FI
    I am.1.sg dem one that do.1.sg my / *refl best
    ‘I am the only one who is doing my best.’

Kratzer (2009) proposes that pronouns are bound by inflectional heads. Although the distribution in (2) at first sight seems to support this view of binding, we show in this talk that verb agreement is not the cause of binding but rather both verb agreement and binding are the result of an empty subject in relative clauses, which needs to be licensed by a c-commanding antecedent. Icelandic relative clauses do not occur with overt relative pronouns, but only with a complementizer. Nevertheless, relative clauses behave similar to relative clauses in English in that they constitute islands for extraction and contain gaps indicating that some form of relativization has taken place (Thrúinsson 2007). Since relative operators or pronouns are obligatorily covert in Icelandic, (2b,c) involve a silent subject (an empty operator or prn), which is then responsible for verb agreement.

(3) DP.1.sg ... [ DP.3.sg [REL.CLAUSE O.1.SG.SUBJECT T.1.sg ... ]]

To trigger agreement with the matrix subject in (2c), and not the head of the relative clause, we propose that binding is required between the matrix and the embedded subjects. Evidence for this analysis comes from constructions in which no binding can be established due to the lack of c-command, as shown in (4). In inverted clauses where the matrix subject does not c-command the relative clause, the option of agreement and a fi disappears, despite the fact that the matrix verb still obligatorily agrees with the pronoun (in contrast to English). Thus, it is not agreement that licenses a fi, but a c-commanding antecedent, exactly as is required in traditional binding theory.

(4) a. *[Sá eini sem O.1.SG.SUBJECT gerir mitt besta ] er ég. ✓ FI
    [dem one that O.1.SG.SUBJECT do.1.sg my best ] am.1.sg I.nom
    ‘The only one who is doing my best is me.’

  b. [Sá eini sem O.3.SG.SUBJECT gerir sitt besta ] er ég. ✓ BV
    [dem one that O.3.SG.SUBJECT do.3.sg refl best ] am.1.sg I.nom
    ‘The only one who is doing his/her best am I.’

This analysis has consequences for the mechanism of binding, as well as the distribution of null subjects (see, e.g., Holmberg 2005 et seq., who proposes that Icelandic is a partial null subject language), which will be addressed in the talk.
Spreading of tonal accent in West Norwegian: categorical or gradual?

Gjert Kristoffersen
University of Bergen

The rural dialects surrounding the city of Bergen in Western Norway are known for lacking the tonal accent contrast that characterizes most Norwegian and Swedish dialects. This is no longer the case. Due to influence from the Bergen dialect, which has had the contrast as far back as we have sources, tonal accents started to appear in the speech of people from the area born around 1950. Based on phonetic analysis of excerpts from sociolinguistic interviews with 31 speakers from a local community near Bergen, recorded in 1979 and 2010, I shall show how the appearance of tonal accent can be tracked in the speech of those born in the 1950s and 60s. The analysis will be supplemented by scripted recordings made of speakers of the same age group, but from several locations in the relevant area, made in 1970.

A question that arises here is whether this feature initially appears as more or less frequent occurrences that represent a fully-fledged, Bergen-like phonemic contrast, or whether the contrast develops gradually as a phonetic and initially hardly perceptible contrast. I shall show that the latter is the case, and that the full Bergen contrast only appears in speakers born in the 1990s. Unlike the previous generation, these have acquired the Bergen dialect more or less completely, while in their parents’ speech, much more of the traditional dialects has been preserved, even if the tonal accents have made their appearance.

An important aspect of the paper will be methodology. Quantitative studies of tone based on natural speech, here in the shape of sociolinguistic recordings, are rare, probably due to the difficulties in controlling for structural and emotional factors influencing intonational patterns. I shall show that a quantitative study of variable F0-realization is indeed feasible with respect to the Norwegian and Swedish tonal accents, probably due to strong and quite stable constraints imposed by the accentual system on how a stressed syllable can be realized tonally in the two languages. This makes it possible to investigate variable patterns in the speakers who belong to the generation where the contrast starts to appear, especially whether there are structural constraints that characterize the change. Are for instance the predictable parts of the distribution acquired before the more lexicalized patterns?
A new approach towards a systematic comparison of German-Language Islands

Hans C. Boas
The University of Texas at Austin

Todd Krause
The University of Texas at Austin

Since the middle of the 19th century, research on German-Language Islands (“Sprachinseln”) has gathered a significant amount of attention. While many works focus on providing extensive descriptions of individual German-Language Islands (e.g. Schmeller 1855, Dulson 1938, Haldeman 1872, Gilbert 1963, Jedig 1966, Louden 1988, Altenhofen 1996, Kaufmann 1997, Boas 2009, Keiser 2012), many other works consist of edited volumes with papers focusing on individual structural or social aspects of particular German-Language Islands (e.g. Berend & Jedig 1991, Burridge & Enninger 1992, Berend & Mattheier 1994, Keel & Mattheier 2003, Putnam 2011). While the many insights gathered by the multitude of research over the past century and a half is of great interest, it is not clear how the insights about a particular phenomenon observed in one German-Language Islands can systematically inform our understanding of the same or comparable phenomena in other German-Language Islands, thereby leading to greater synergy effects. This talk addresses this problem and proposes two specific solutions for overcoming this problem.

The first part of the talk briefly compares previous accounts of case syncretism, word order, and rounded vs. non-rounded front vowels in German-Language Islands in Brazil, Mexico, Texas, Wisconsin, Hungary, and Siberia. This comparison shows that the results of the different analyses are difficult to compare, because they investigate different types and amounts of data, and they do not apply similar methodologies in analyzing the data. In addition, the role of Standard German as a tertium comparationis is complicated, because it largely ignores the important influence of the donor dialects.

The second part of this talk briefly introduces the principles of Construction Grammar (Fillmore & Kay 1993, Goldberg 1995, Croft 2001) and shows how the notion of construction (a pairing of form with meaning) can be used to systematically analyze case syncretism, word order, and rounded vs. non-rounded front vowels in the data from the different German-Language Islands discussed in the first part of the talk. Building on ideas by Rosenberg (2003/2005), I propose a new systematic approach towards the analysis of linguistic phenomena in German-Language Islands and show how diachronic information, specifically about the donor dialects, can yield new insights about the formation and development of German-Language Islands.

The third part of this talk introduces the structure of a new online database that allows users to access data from various German-Language Islands from around the world. Using the notion of construction to systematically identify, record, and cross-index a variety of phonological, morphological, and syntactic phenomena in terms of constructions (pairings of form with meaning) allows users of this database to conduct systematic comparative German-Language Island research with the option of arriving at typologically interesting insights.
Did the Valkyries Maintain Individual To-Do-Lists?
Some Remarks on the Grammar and Use of Adhortatives

Hans-Martin Gärtner
Hungarian Academy of Sciences – Research Institute for Linguistics

In preparing the ground for a “pragmatic history of” Icelandic (cf. Taavitsainen & Jucker 2008), I will take a pragmalinguistic stance and demonstrate the fruitfulness of (re)visiting – bottom-up: [A]<[B]<[C] – relevant puzzles posed by adhortatives. [A] In the realm of adhortatives like Latin (1) Eamus!, French (2) Allons! and English (3) Let’s go!, Modern German and Modern Icelandic show diametrically opposed patterns, given that the former requires, (4) Gehen *(wir)! , while the latter bans, (5) Forum (*við)! (Thráinsson 2007:7,fn.4), the realization of an overt (pronominal) subject. Yet, in spite of intensive work on “argument drop” in general (e.g., Sigurðsson 2011) and subjects of “jussive” sentences in particular (e.g., Zanuttini et al. 2012), the contrast in (4)/(5) seems to have to be stipulated. (The option of deriving (5) from resistance of við to semantic binding (e.g., von Stechow 2004) is implausible since both binding of við can be shown to be straightforward with focusing operators.) As underlying “motivation” it may be suggested that subject drop in (5) has developed as a sentence type marker, differentiating adhortatives from (polar / V1) interrogatives (Morck 1993:415, citing Faarlund 1980). This would be blocked in the case of (4) due to 1pl/3pl syncretism, which makes the pronoun non-recoverable and thus bare adhortatives indistinguishable from bare polite imperatives (6) Gehen *(Sie)! . Both Old High German, (7) Gênés (færsl)! (cf. Kurrelmeyer 1900:9), and Old Norse adhortatives, (8) Forum (*við) á brott! (cf. Faarlund 2013:270), seem to allow optional subject drop, the former, of course, lacking the above syncretism, and the latter perhaps (in part) due to the fact that plural vér coexisted with dual við. [B] Zanuttini et al. (2012) guarantee the inclusive reading of adhortatives via binding of the 1pl subject by a jussive operator with person feature specification 1⊕2. At the same time they allow a promissive reading of Korean exclusive 1pl jussives via specification 1⊕3. As noted by van der Auwera et al. (2003:62) such construals are dubious in European languages (their example being French). The result of an exclusive interpretation of wir in, e.g., (9) Seißen wir “Let us be faithful to you!” is an optative appeal to higher forces to bring about such a state of affairs. It is unclear how to derive this if an adhortative structure must come with feature specification 1⊕2, even if binding of a null vocative is allowed (ZPP 2012:1251). [C] Further questions arise if one follows the assumption that “an exhortative [should be added] to both the speaker’s and the addressee’s To-Do List” (ZPP 2012:1266). Thus, it is unclear whether this would do (sufficient) justice to utterances by collectives like the Valkyries (10) Vindum, vindum veg daraðar! (“Let us weave a web of spears!”) (cf. von See 1959:6). It has been debated to what extent the Valkyries in essence are a collective (Egeler 2011), and speech act theory can contribute to this debate by scrutinizing the speech acts attributed to them. If one finds promises by or orders to an individual Valkyr, individual To-do Lists will have to be postulated in the ZPP framework. (Brynhild’s pledge to marry Sigurd would be a candidate of the former and Odin’s impositions, e.g., in Grímnismál, a candidate of the latter. But everything depends on the exact wordings and a precise pragmatic analysis.) The exploration will be further deepened by acknowledging "group speech acts" (Hughes 1984) and (irreducible) “we-intentions” (Searle 1990).

Split auxiliary system in heritage German: Restructuring at the syntax-semantics interface

Hyoun-A Joo
The Pennsylvania State University

Introduction. According to Sorace’s Interface Hypothesis (2011), structures at the interface of syntax and another linguistic domain are more difficult to acquire and more prone to attrition. Here we investigate one particular case of interface, namely split auxiliary systems at the syntax-semantics interface. The acquisition of the German split auxiliary system has been shown to be difficult for L1 German given that children (ages 4-5 and 7-8) seem to lack the semantic feature [locomotion] (Ran dall, van Hout, Weissenborn, and Baayen, 2003). How does the observed difficulty in the acquisition of the German split auxiliary system affect heritage German speakers whose first language is German but who became dominant in their second language? Studies on heritage languages show simplification and/or restructuring as common development (e.g., Hopp and Putnam, 2015, Montrul, 2009). The goal of the present study is to contribute insights to this body of research from an interface perspective. The results show that heritage German speakers largely maintain the split auxiliary system, although in a restructured form.

Experiment/Data. Auxiliary selection in German is an ideal test case for split intransitivity. Generally speaking, verbs that require sein ‘to be’ as auxiliary for present perfect tense are unaccusative and verbs that take haben ‘to have’ are unergative (see Keller and Sorace, 2003, for a detailed treatment). Randall et al. (2003) observe cross-linguistic differences in the conditions that determine where the split is made. Whereas Dutch speakers and German children seem to be led by the semantic feature [telicity], German adults seem to adhere to [locomotion]. The table below shows the semantic features they used in their study with an English verb for illustration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+ telic</th>
<th>- telic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ inherent</td>
<td>- inherent(+locomotion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stretch’</td>
<td>‘dance into the room’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappear’</td>
<td>‘roll into the room’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present study adapted the experimental design of Randall et al. (2003). Short videos that visualized real verbs featuring the semantic attributes under investigation were created. The participants were 14 heritage German speakers from the area around Moundridge, Kansas. The average age was 83. They learned German as their first language but switched to English when they started school. The reported amount of German spoken in their everyday life was close to zero. After watching each video clip they were asked to say what they just saw using present perfect tense. The occurrences of the auxiliaries sein and haben were counted and analyzed.

Results. Overall, 12 out of 14 participants displayed 78% accuracy in auxiliary selection (two only used haben and had to be excluded from the analysis). However, it seems that they do not use the semantic feature [locomotion] as a main cue to assign the auxiliary but rather adhere to [telicity]. In the [+telic] condition they select sein 72% of the time, and in the [-telic] condition they select haben 84% of the time. The data additionally suggest that the participants’ auxiliary choice is lexicalized. For example, ‘to dance’ appears with haben by default. However, ‘to dance’ can also select sein in combination with ‘into.’ Participants chose correctly haben for ‘dance in the room’ (95%) but showed insecurity for ‘dance into the room’ (only 50% sein). These results are interpreted as a case of restructuring of the split auxiliary system; what seems to guide auxiliary choice is the semantic feature [telicity] and the lexical item itself.
Weight effects and Heavy NP Shift

Ingunn Hreinberg Indriðadóttir
University of Iceland

Jóhannes Gíslason Jónsson
University of Iceland

Various studies on Heavy NP Shift (HNPS) in English show that the frequency of HNPS is not only determined by the heaviness of the displaced object, measured in the number of words. The relative heaviness of the object vs. the word string between the main verb and the object plays a significant role as well (Hawkins 1994, Wasow 1997, Stallings & MacDonald 2011). For instance, the heavier a verb-modifying PP is, the less likely it is that a direct object of a fixed length will be shifted to the right of the PP (cf. The radio listeners accepted without doubt / without any bit of concern / the whole story about the defects in the new Mazda).

In this talk, we will discuss relative weight effects with HNPS in Icelandic, comparing our results to those obtained for English. A study of this kind has not been undertaken before, although HNPS in Icelandic was first described more than 30 years ago by Rögnvaldsson (1982). We will base our conclusions on a series of pilot studies, including various production tests where participants read from a screen sentences with HNPS affecting subjects, direct objects and indirect objects, and an acceptability test where 409 speakers evaluated sentences on the scale of 1-5. All the sentences with HNPS contained a heavy NP immediately preceding a PP (or a direct object) and the relative length of NP vs PP was controlled for. In the production tests the sentences were divided so that the beginning of the sentence including the main verb appeared in the middle of the screen and the NP and PP appeared above and below it in a randomized order. The speakers put the sentences together in the way they thought best and read them, either spontaneously or from memory.

Our results show that the frequency of HNPS is significantly higher when the NP exceeds the relevant PP in length by at least three words but HNPS rarely occurs when the NP and the PP are equally long. HNPS is very infrequent when the NP is an indirect object and although all the participants use HNPS, the frequency varies substantially between individuals.

References
The purpose of this paper is to shed light on the sources of some Afrikaans modal particles and to point out certain generalities in their development. As may be expected from a language deriving from 17th century Dutch and strongly influenced by other languages spoken in Southern Africa, Afrikaans modal particles may be traced to Dutch but also to the contact languages. Among the Dutch and Afrikaans particles which resemble each other to a large extent in usage and form, are Du./Afr. maar ‘but’, Du. eigenlijk/ Afr. eintlik ‘actually’, Du. toch/ Afr. tog ‘nevertheless’, and Du. zo maar/ Afr. sommer ‘without more ado’, while adverbials such as nogal ‘quite’, straks ‘soon, a short while ago’, immers ‘after all’, daarom ‘therefore’, aanstonds ‘soon’, dadelijk ‘immediately’ and reeds ‘already’ merely served as input to the development of modal senses and pragmatic functions. The contact languages are represented by loans such as hoeka ‘of old’ and kamma ‘quasi’ from Khoi, and maskie ‘even if’ (now obsolete) from Creole Portuguese maski, Portuguese mas que. Various sources and factors contributed to form rêrig/regtig ‘really’: reduplication of Du. recht ‘right’ to form reg-reg, phonological reduction to rêrig and – through possible assimilation to German richtig – Afr. regtig.

Grammaticalisation is in evidence in the forming of doublets with phonological reduction in the modal variants, e.g. immers ‘after all’ – mos ‘as you know’, daarom ‘therefore’ – darem ‘admittedly’, dadelijk ‘immediately’ – dalk ‘perhaps’ and aanstonds ‘soon’– aans ‘perhaps’ (now obsolete). As far as semantic or pragmatic values are concerned, Dutch seems to target politeness (cf. eens, even and soms as mitigators) and persuasion (heus ‘really’, echt ‘truly’), while Afrikaans targets probability (dalk ‘perhaps’), make-believe (kamma ‘quasi’) or hearsay (glo ‘allegedly’), the assertion of the speaker’s point of view or validation of the addressee’s (rêrig ‘really’, darem ‘admittedly’), and knowledge shared between speaker and addressee (mos ‘as you know’).

As a general observation regarding the relationship between Dutch and Afrikaans it may be pointed out that an implicational relationship exists between the two languages, according to which Afrikaans is characterised by a further development in the modal and even emotive direction, or as a mitigator of requests, e.g. [- modal] in Dutch, but [± modal] in Afrikaans: straks (‘soon’ > ‘perhaps’), reeds (‘already’ > ‘apropos’) and nogal (‘quite’ > ‘rather’). Sommer, nogal and eintlik have developed emotive senses, while dalk ‘perhaps’ is commonly used as a mitigator of requests. As an exception, soms ‘from time to time’, developed modal and mitigating usages only in Dutch, but not in Afrikaans.

Over a period of time, temporal adverbials have served as a source of Afrikaans modal particles. Adverbials with future reference came to express ‘possibility’, e.g. aans ‘perhaps’ (now obsolete) which is derived from aanstonds ‘soon’, straks ‘perhaps’ from ‘in a short while’ and dalk ‘perhaps’ from Du. dadelijk/ Afr. dadelik ‘immediately’. Netnou ‘in a short while’ is employed in warnings, e.g. Netnou val jy! lit. ‘Shortly you fall!’ In contrast, hoeka ‘long ago, always’ and reeds ‘already’, both referring to the past, are employed to causally relate a proposition to a given state of affairs, e.g., when it starts raining, Ek het hoeka my sambreel gebring ‘See, I brought my umbrella.’
“I frog mi wos i do dua”:
Analysis of Orthography in Styrian Song Lyrics

Jacob Reis
The University of Texas at Austin

In this paper I discuss the patterns and differences in transcriptions of dialectal song lyrics, looking specifically at popular music originating in the southern Austrian state of Styria and lyrics as they appear on the Internet. Dialect orthography has been analyzed in several contexts, including literature and periodicals (Thirkell 1951, Macaulay 1991) and dialect choice has also been examined in the context of music (Larkey 2000, Berger & Carroll 2003, Grijp 2007). However, only rarely has dialect orthography in music been analyzed, as music and orthography have been considered logically mutually exclusive to this point, transcriptions of lyrics outside of sheet music becoming only recently popular. Nonetheless, this research yields interesting data. Consider the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 1: (Source: songtexte.com)</th>
<th>Ex. 2 (Source: magistrix.de)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wochenlang steh i scho do</td>
<td>Wochenlang steh i schon da,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wochenlang plog i mi o</td>
<td>wochenlang plag i mi ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spuil mia die Finger wund</td>
<td>i spiel mir die Finger wund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Und sing sogar "Do kummt die Sunn" | und sing sogar "Da kummt die Sunn"

My analysis relies on the comparative statistical analysis of multiple versions of the lyrics to the same song and the corresponding linguistic phenomena that we can conclude to be happening. For example, in the above two texts, based on theoretically the same piece of music, the elision of many word-final syllables is represented in both examples. i takes the place of ich in every case, a phenomenon well-documented in Southern German and Austrian dialects (cf. Keller 1961, Muhr et. al. 1995, Pfrehm 2014). Elision in the contexts of o vs. ab and scho vs. schon will be revisited in the paper, as these fall outside of the more ubiquitous i-ich phenomenon.

Representing the dialectal variant of the standard-German da, however, is not so straightforward. (1) represents it as do, (2) as da. This difference can also be described as systematic. That is, da, plag, ab, and sogar are written with o in (1), whereas (2) writes them all with a. Vowel rounding is the corresponding phenomenon that occurs in the dialect and is manifested in the song itself, but one rendition of the lyrics changes the orthography to match and the other does not. Elision and vowel rounding are two among several phenomena described in this paper.

The theories that I put forward for why any differences occur between transcriptions include (a) the idiosyncratic dialect variant of the transcriber, who may be recalling the song from memory in their own voice while writing; and (b) the transcriber may view the rounding of a in these positions as so systematic and/or widespread that it is not important enough to be transcribed differently from the standard orthography of German.

The present analysis offers a view into the choice and mindset that underlies orthographic choice in dialect transcriptions, especially where dialect is explicitly present and the audience intended is not necessarily scientifically motivated. The data that this study yields also ultimately permits a more detailed understanding of the Styrian dialect and dialectal music in general, subjects that are both traditionally ignored in favor of larger speaker groups and higher art forms, respectively.
Written or Sound Pattern?
Disambiguating Old Norwegian Vowel Harmony
Jade Jørgen Sandstedt
University of Edinburgh

Written evidence forms the primary basis for the study of historical sound patterns, but written patterns in the distant linguistic past are often inconsistent and variably influenced by competing orthographic and phonological factors. Discriminating between these at times opposing influences on writing is a challenging problem, but I propose a method for distinguishing phonologically-genuine sound patterns in medieval writing using comparative graphic and phonetic models. To illustrate its usage I have applied this method to a corpus study of some debated Old Norwegian vowel harmony patterns. Old Norwegian vowel harmony is a phenomenon in which stressed and unstressed vowels within a word show systematic agreement in relative height.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Morph parsing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>a) syn - i son subs.dat.m.sg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) hus - um houses subs.dat.n.pl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-High</td>
<td>c) bod - e bid subs.dat.n.sg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) bon - om prayers subs.dat.f.pl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) land - e land subs.dat.n.sg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) lærd - om learned adj.dat.m.pl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Old Norwegian progressive height harmony

A number of frequent and yet unexplained disharmonic vowel sequences have been attested in early 14th-century Old Norwegian charters and manuscript fragments (Hagland 1978, Halvorsen 1989, Sandstedt 2014). This appears to be a new innovation in its period and occurs following the vowels e and ø.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triggers (↓) / Targets (→)</th>
<th>Front [-ir]/[-er]</th>
<th>Back [-um]/[-om]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front /fest-/ ‘fasten’</td>
<td>fest-ir</td>
<td>fest-om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back /sagð-/ ‘said’</td>
<td>sagð-er</td>
<td>sagð-um</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Anti-parasitic height harmony in 14th-century Old Norwegian

As illustrated above, there appears to be an anti-similarity constraint on vowel backness, and this constitutes an example of anti-parasitic or anti-similarity vowel harmony, defined by the conditional agreement of a harmonic feature—in this case vowel height—on the disagreement of some other parasitic feature—in this case vowel backness (Wayment 2009). There is in other words a mismatch between height and backness correspondence, and this anti-identity effect constitutes an important and unique exception to the implicational universal that harmony of less similar segments implies participation by more similar segments (Hutcheson 1973, Hong 1994, Wayment 2009). If authentic this is a typologically and theoretically significant sound pattern, however the orthographic representation of both trigger and target vowels in these word types is considerably variable in much of the texts where it has been documented (Sandstedt 2014), and the phonological validity of these generalizations therefore remains in question. But by comparative study of harmony frequency both in correlation to differing orthographic and phonological variables in a variety of charter and manuscript material, I have been able to trace the source of this inconsistency and discriminate between phonologically consistent and orthographically correlated variation in support of the above anti-parasitic generalization. Using this approach, we gain a more detailed understanding of the relationship between graph and phone in Old Norwegian writing and a method for distinguishing orthographically-motivated written patterns from phonologically-genuine sound patterns, ultimately increasing the accuracy and quality of our linguistic generalizations.
The Role of Gallo-Romance Contact in the WGmc. Consonant Gemination

Jeannette K. Marsh
Baylor University

A growing number of scholars have suggested that palatalization was a significant feature of the West Germanic dialects—even of those dialects in which palatalized consonants were seldom represented in the orthography. Palatal influence is visible in i-umlaut, in West Germanic consonant gemination and the High German consonant shift, in the ich-/ach-laut distinction, and in the palatalization of velars in North Sea Germanic. In this paper I follow in the vein of those who have argued that the West Germanic processes conditioned by palatal coarticulation were reinforced by contact with speakers of Gallo-Romance in whose dialect palatal coarticulation was an established feature and one which was continuing to fuel waves of sound change during the period of their contact with Germanic speakers. Just prior to this series of Romance palatalizations, around the 1st-2nd c. AD, occurred a process of consonant gemination conditioned by factors remarkably similar to those of the West Germanic gemination, the most productive of which was an immediately following palatal glide. The influence of this gemination trigger remained active in western Romance, palatalizing and affricating the original geminates through the first half of the first millennium AD, the very period in which language contact between the Romans and western Germans was increasing. It is the potential of Gallo-Romance influence in this 4th-5th-century West Germanic “innovation” that I will focus on here.

Contact between Romans and West Germanic tribes was present from the first century AD and increased dramatically along the Rhine and into the areas of present-day northern France, Belgium, and the Netherlands in the 4th-6th centuries as the Franks established and then began expanding their rule. Archaeological evidence from settlements in this region reveal a mix of Gallo-Roman and Germanic cultures, and a growing number of scholars in this field now maintain that during this period Roman and Germanic cultures were assimilating to the point that the lines between them were blurred and ultimately lost. Both archaeological evidence and historical documents reveal masses of Germani living within Roman provinces and serving in the Roman military, necessitating a significant degree of bilingualism both among individuals and within whole communities. In addition to manifesting similar processes of gemination and palatalization during this period, it has been suggested that early Gallo-Romance developed a stress-timed prosodic system as a result of its contact with Germanic and that this change was responsible for French’s comparatively progressive nature vis-à-vis its more southerly relatives. In Germanic such stress-sensitive prosody is evident in the WGmc. Auslautgesetze, i-umlaut, palatalization, and syncope, while in Gallo-Romance it is suggested by the massive reductions that occurred between late Latin and Old French, e.g., Lat. oculos ‘eye’, sapiat ‘let it be known’ > Fr. œil, sache. It is clear that the two languages were undergoing similar changes that appear to have been precipitated by similar prosodic systems throughout the period of contact.

In this paper I build on previous work that suggests that the features of stress-timing, palatalization, and the presence of geminates in the phonological inventory of Germanic all fed into the process of WGmc. consonant gemination. This paper contributes to that work by examining the parallel developments of these features in Gallo-Romance and West Germanic in conjunction with the evidence of close social contact between speakers of the two languages. I will conclude that there is a strong likelihood of Romance influence in the development of West Germanic consonant gemination.
Are there meaning differences between verb cluster word orders?

Jelke Bloem
University of Amsterdam

It is often said that there is no meaning difference between the possible word orders of Germanic verb clusters (e.g., Barbiers 2008, Bader et al. 2009), but for Dutch two-verb clusters it has also been claimed that semantic factors do influence the choice between word orders, besides many other factors such as context (Coussé et al., 2008). There are two grammatical word orders for Dutch two-verb clusters:

1) Ik weet dat ik het gezien heb
   I know that I it seen have
   ‘I know that I have seen it.’ (2-1)
2) Ik weet dat ik het heb gezien
   I know that I it have seen
   ‘I know that I have seen it.’ (1-2)

Examining this pair of sentences shows no obvious meaning difference, but if this variation was truly meaningless, it would violate form-meaning isomorphism. Some theoretical approaches to language, such as construction grammar, claim that form and meaning are inextricably linked. In this view, because the different cluster order have different forms, they must also be distinct constructions (form-meaning pairs).

A specific semantic claim comes from Pardoen (1991), who has proposed a difference in interpretation between the two orders: 2-1 orders (Example 1) are assigned a stative interpretation, while 1-2 orders (Example 2) get a dynamic interpretation. Recent advances in corpus linguistics allow us to test such claims empirically. The increasing availability of very large corpora makes it possible to find many instances of verb clusters with particular lexical verbs. This allows us to compute associations between many lexical verbs and each of the two word orders, and to study the semantic properties of verbs that are strongly associated with an order.

In this study I conduct such an analysis based on the 145 million word Dutch Wikipedia section of the automatically annotated Lassy Large corpus. I excluded low-frequency verbs and controlled for other factors that are known to affect Dutch two-verb cluster order, such as the choice of auxiliary verb. Following the procedure of distinctive collexeme analysis (Gries and Stefanowitsch, 2004), I computed lexical associations between specific verbs and the two verb cluster orders outlined above using Fisher’s Exact Test, and found that a majority of verbs (51% at $\alpha = 0.05$) occur with one of the two orders significantly more often than would be expected by chance. I then analyzed the semantic properties of the lexical verbs that are most strongly associated with either the 1-2 or the 2-1 order by using semantic properties of verb senses from the Cornetto lexical-semantic database.

This analysis reveals a difference in the use of cognition verbs, as well as verbs with negative polarity: both are more strongly associated with the 1-2 order. Pardoën’s (1991) claim does not hold — no difference was found for the stative/dynamic feature. It is also notable that some verbs with similar meanings (such as geven ‘give’ and nemen ‘take’) have extremely similar word order preferences. These observations indicate that there might be a meaning difference after all, and the observed lexical and semantic associations lead me to conclude that both word orders should be viewed as distinct constructions.
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Reflexive Datives and Argument Structure

Jim Wood
Yale University

When the title of Martin Luther King Jr.’s I have a dream speech is translated into Icelandic, the result is (1):

(1) Ég á mér draum.
   I.nom have me.dat dream.acc

In (1), we see a reflexive dative pronoun mér, which appears in this case not to add anything to the meaning of the verb. Moreover, the dative is obligatorily reflexive: no other dative would work with this verb. In fact, this is a common state of affairs, cross-linguistically. Various languages have dative constructions where the dative must be coreferent with the subject. In Southern American English (SoAmE), we find “Personal Datives” (PDs) which look like ordinary pronouns, but which in fact behave syntactically like “SE reflexives” (Conroy 2007).

(2) He needs {him/*me} a new truck.
   (Southern American English; Horn 2013)

In Romance languages like Italian, a reflexive clitic may be added to so-called “ingestive” predicates like ‘eat’, ‘drink’ and ‘smoke’; non-reflexive clitics are not possible.

(3) Lui {si /*mi /*ti} mangia una pizza.
    he {refl.dat/*me.dat/*you.dat} eats a pizza
    ‘He eats a pizza.’
    (Italian; Campanini & Schäfer 2011)

The semantics of these constructions across languages can be quite different, but they share a common morphosyntactic signature: call them “Obligatorily Reflexive Datives” (ORDs). In this talk, we propose that ORDs share a common structural core that follows from an independently motivated theory of argument structure, along with the assumption from Eyþórsóson et al. (2015) that SE reflexives are not DPs, but φPs.

Recent work has suggested that argument introducers such as Appl, Voice, p, etc., come in two syntactic “flavors”: one flavor has a D-feature requiring a specifier of category D (e.g. Appl{D}), and the other has no such feature and does not license a specifier of category D (Appl{1}) (Myler 2014; Kastner 2014; Schäfer 2015; Wood 2015). The latter kind of head is thought to be unable to introduce a syntactic argument, but it can introduce semantics that affect the interpretation of the overall structure (cf. Wood & E. Sigurðsson 2014 on ‘get’-constructions). This leaves open the possibility that such a head could merge with an argument that also lacks a D-feature. Following Eyþórsóson et al. (2015), SE reflexives are of exactly this type: they consist solely of φ-features. Following Schäfer 2015, they start as unvalued φ-features, which probe upward to Agree with an antecedent (see Wurmbrand 2015). Given that we have argument introducers with no D-feature, and that a bundle of unvalued φ-features, with no D-feature, may be realized as a SE reflexive, we predict the existence of constructions where an indirect object must be reflexive.

(4) [VoiceP SUB{φ:3sg} Voice{D} [VP VERB [Appl{φ:__} [Appl{Appl{1} OBJ}]]]] 
    [VoiceP SUB{φ:3sg} Voice{D} [VP VERB [Appl{φ:3sg} [Appl{Appl{1} OBJ}]]]] 

The existence of ORDs thus does not have to be stipulated as a special kind of construction (pace We-belhuth & Dannenberg 2006), but instead follow from the primitives of an independently supported theory of argument introducers.
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The New Transitive Impersonal Construction in Icelandic

Joan Maling
Brandeis University

Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir
University of Iceland

Maling & Sigurjónsdóttir (2002) argued that so-called “impersonal passives” are in principle syntactically ambiguous, and can be interpreted in more than one way, either as canonical passives or as impersonal actives with a null, typically human subjects (see also Haspelmath 1990). Transitive “non-promotional” passives are a key example; the syntactic behavior of the Ukrainian -no/to construction shows that even those governing accusative objects may be categorized as a passive (contra Haspelmath (1990:35) and Blevins (2003), inter alia). The historical dimension is significant. As the Icelandic, the Irish and the Polish/Ukrainian cases tell us, the syntactic behavior of such constructions can change over time as a result of this ambiguity.

In this paper, we discuss the on-going development of a New Transitive Impersonal (NTI) construction in Icelandic, and compare the syntactic properties of the innovative Icelandic construction with the diachronic development of the Irish autonomous form and the Polish -no/to construction where the reanalysis has been completed. The NTI takes the form in (2); compare the standard passive illustrated in (1):

(1) Að lokum var stelpan valin í aðalhlutverkið (Standard passive)
   at end was girl.the-NOM chosen-FEM in lead.role.the

(2) Að lokum var valð stelpuna í aðalhlutverkið. (NTI)
   at end was chosen-NEUT girl.the-ACC in lead.role.the

Note that the NTI in (2) could be translated either as (a) a passive, or (b) an active with a null unspecified human (hence “impersonal”) subject.

a. In the end, the girl was chosen for the lead role.
   b. In the end, they chose the girl for the lead role.

The proper analysis of the NTI has been the subject of lively debate in recent years, but there is no disagreement that a major syntactic innovation is taking place, and that the construction is rapidly gaining ground. This system-internal change is not the result of borrowing, nor is it the result of phonological change or morphological weakening. The new variant does not replace the canonical passive, but co-exists alongside it. Subsequent studies to the Maling & Sigurjónsdóttir (2002) study have provided evidence that the NTI developed as an extension of the impersonal passive. Reflexive verbs first appear in the mid-19th C, becoming more frequent in the 20th C (Eythórsson 2008; Árnardóttir et al. 2011:50ff). Non-reflexive accusative objects first surface in the early 20th C in collocations (Einar Freyr Sigurðsson 2012):

(3) … sem tekið er þátt í af leikkóppum… (1908)
   …which taken is part-ACC in by players…

A surprising and unexpected result of the Sigurjónsdóttir & Maling 1999-2000 nationwide survey came from the adult controls (Maling & Sigurjónsdóttir 2002): about half of the 200 adult speakers accepted two of the diagnostics for active constructions — reflexives and subject-oriented adjuncts — in traditional impersonal passives of intransitive verbs. This variation shows that native (adult) speakers do not all necessarily come to the same grammatical analysis of every construction; on the contrary, speakers may come to radically different analyses of the same data as they acquire their mother tongue. The readily observable data underdetermines the analysis. It is only by pushing the speaker to judge more complex, or less common (even “vanishingly rare”) sentences that we can see the empirical consequences of choosing one syntactic representation over another.
German-English Contact in Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania: Evidence from Newspaper Advertisements

Joel Stark
University of Wisconsin-Madison

The oldest and sociolinguistically healthiest German-American linguistic variety is Pennsylvania German, a language that developed in the latter half of the eighteenth century and resembles most closely, lexically and structurally, German dialects of the eastern Palatinate. Into the nineteenth century, Pennsylvania German speakers, who were concentrated mainly in rural southeastern Pennsylvania, were literate in a form of standard German, one important reflection of which was a thriving German-language newspaper industry. By 1800, nearly a dozen German newspapers were published in rural Pennsylvania. Small towns such as Easton supported a single paper, while larger communities like Lancaster, York, and Reading had two competing papers.

While scholars, notably Knauss (1922), have analyzed the content of eighteenth-century newspapers serving Pennsylvania Germans, linguistic features of these publications have been less thoroughly examined. In this paper, I investigate advertisements from the three oldest weekly German-language newspapers from Pennsylvania's interior, the *Neue Unpartheyische Lancaster Zeitung* (founded in 1787), the *Neue Unpartheyische Readinger Zeitung* (founded in 1789), and *Der Unpartheyische Readinger Adler* (founded in 1796). In particular I consider structural and sociolinguistic evidence of German-English bilingualism, including English loan vocabulary and metalinguistic data. Selected data range from the year of each paper's inception to 1800.

Structurally, we see a number of English loanwords in advertisements for consumer products. Appearing in the *Readinger Zeitung* on January 10th, 1798, one reads:

*Englisches Porter Bier: In Botteln — beym Duzend zu haben, im Stohr, bey Grotjan und Comp.*

Metalinguistic evidence of bilingualism can be found in advertisements for missing persons, such as the following from the *Readinger Zeitung*, Feb. 7, 1798:


The data show that—despite the universal dominance of Pennsylvania German in the region—the English and Pennsylvania German communities had areas of sociolinguistic overlap. As evidenced structurally by loanwords, English played a constitutive role in the Pennsylvania German sociolinguistic environment, primarily in the areas of technology, consumer products, and government. Finally, metalinguistic evidence shows that bilingualism was embraced by both the Pennsylvania Germans as well as their neighbors of non-Germanic heritage.
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Heading North:

The syntactic status of Swedish negation

Johan Brandtler
Ghent University

David Håkansson
Uppsala University

This presentation is concerned with the diachronic and synchronic development of negation in Swedish. In (the standard varieties of) Modern Swedish (MS), the negative marker *inte* ‘not’ shows all the characteristics of a syntactic phrase, according to Zeijlstra (2004): i) negation may topicalize to [Spec,CP]; ii) negation may not cliticize to other clausal elements; iii) negation does not combine with other negative elements to yield negative concord.

Based on the syntactic distribution of Old Swedish (OS) *eigh* ‘not’, we argue that negation in OS was a syntactic head. Thus, we argue that negation in Swedish has undergone a diachronic change from Head to Spec. The direction of this development seems to be the opposite of van Gelderen’s (2008) Negative Cycle, according to which negatives develop from maximal projections to heads. However, we argue that the change in syntactic status is not due to a syntactic reanalysis (from Head to Spec), but instead stems from a lexical change of the negative marker: from the syntactic head *eigh* in Old Swedish to the maximal projection *icke* (< åkke) and *inte* (< änkte) in (Early) Modern Swedish.

We subsequently argue that MS *inte* ‘not’ has undergone syntactic reanalysis in some Finno-Swedish dialects, from maximal projection to head. The relevant dialects display three properties that distinguish them from standard MS: i) they allow negative V3 structures; ii) they display phonetic reduction and cliticization; iii) they display negative concord. Each characteristic is illustrated in (1) below.

(1) a.  *Ja int kan vara arg.*  (V3 structure)
     I NEG can be angry
     ‘I cannot be angry.’

b.  *Då’nt ja vet.*  (reduction/cliticization)
     because. NEG I know
     ‘Because I don’t know.’

c.  *Ja ä int rädd för ingan*  (negative concord)
     I am NEG afraid for nobody
     ‘I’m not afraid of anyone.’

Although the exact correlation is not yet known, there seems to be a substantial overlap between dialects that use a reduced form of *inte* (i.e. *int* and *i*?) and dialects that allow negative concord; see also Rosenkvist (2014).

In sum, we propose that the development of Swedish negation has gone through the following cyclic steps: (i) Old Swedish lost the head negation *eigh*, which was replaced by a phrasal negative element *inte*; ii) As the negative element successively underwent phonetic weakening, it could phonetically cliticize to other clausal elements (standard MS). (iii) In dialects where phonetic weakening has become especially widespread, phonetic cliticization has lead to syntactic reanalysis (from phrase to head), such that negation can syntactically cliticize to other head elements. (iv) The weakened negative element is reinforced by another negative element, tentatively attested by the existence of negative concord in these dialects. Note that step (iv) cannot be fully corroborated, as the distribution of negative concord in Swedish dialects is, to a large extent, still unexplored.
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What happened to Open Syllable Lengthening in Frisian?

Johanneke Sytsema
University of Oxford

OSL took place in all West Germanic languages at some stage. Lahiri & Dresher (1999) convincingly argued that OSL took place in the older stages of English, German and Dutch, although some of the evidence may be obscured by later developments such as trisyllabic shortening (English) or consonant gemination (German). OE hamoras (‘hammers’) lengthened after OSL to hāmores (pl) and shortened through TSS to hamores which remained short in Modern English hammers. In Dutch, the evidence is clearer, and indeed OSL is still visible in the plural of the plural of some nouns with short stem vowels, e.g. dag – dagen [daɣ - daɣən] ‘day’, schip – schepen ‘ship’. Frisian did not escape OSL in its older stages. Versloot (2008: 201) argues that OSL of Gmc. /a/, /o/, /i/ and probably /u/ took place at the beginning of the 14th century. Bremmer (2009: 115) states that in late Old West Frisian (OWFr.) OSL had taken place and was visible in orthography. However, in Modern Frisian, there is not as much evidence of OSL as in Dutch. In some cases, like Old Frisian (OWFr.) scip – skype ‘ship – ships’ OSL is attested in Old Frisian and shown in orthography (cf. Versloot 2008) whereas in Modern Frisian skip – skippen both singular and plural are short. In a number of cases where Dutch shows lengthening of an original short vowel in the plural e.g. schip – schepen, lot – loten, Frisian does not show evidence of lengthening of the original short vowel as in lot – lotten where shortness of the vowel in the plural form is indicated in orthography by doubling of the consonant. Hoekstra (2001a, 723-724) assumes that OSL did not affect OWSFr. /u/ < Gmc. /u/ and OWSFr. /i/ < Gmc. /i/ He assumes that these short vowels were either retained in Modern Frisian (e.g. in fûgel ‘bird’, slide ‘sledge’), or first lengthened and then shortened.

In this paper, we reconsider the Frisian evidence carefully and try to determine which of the two hypotheses above hold. We will argue that lengthening took place in Old Frisian but was later lost in high and mid vowel stems ending in a voiceless stop e.g. fet – fetten [fɛt] ‘vessel’. Lengthening remained in words with mid or low vowels, ending in a fricative hôf – hûven [hɔ:vən] < PGmc *hufa). After lengthening in the plural, reanalysis of the stem took place. OWSFr hova (nom.pl.) lengthened to hôven [hɔ:vən] following OSL. OSL also affected the disyllabic singular form hoves, hose, so that the entire paradigm apart from the nominative were now long. Te stem vowel was then reinterpreted as long and as a consequence the singular became hôf [hɔ:ʃ] so that in Modern Frisian lengthening of short vowels in open syllables is no longer evident.

Using evidence from 15th–17th century Frisian in the Frisian Language Database (Integreerder Taaldatabank http://tdb.fryske-akademy.eu/tdb/) we will demonstrate short and long forms are used interchangeably in 16th century charters, e.g. short hôf and the lengthened form hûeff are both found alongside each other, which suggests that these developments happened in the 16th century.
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Debating Luxembourgish: The Lived Experiences of Young People in a Multilingual Context

John Bellamy
University of Sheffield

Kristine Horner
University of Sheffield

Language ideological debates (Blommaert 1999) surrounding the status and function of Luxembourgish have often constructed the language as endangered in relation to the fact that it is spoken by a relatively small number of people on a global scale and continues to be used primarily as a means of oral communication in Luxembourg. It must be stressed that people who use Luxembourgish as a home language in Luxembourg are not subject to oppression for this reason and indeed it is often speakers of other languages who face discrimination as a consequence of language in education policy in the country. Such views dovetail with a more general phenomenon of discourses of endangerment (Duchêne and Heller 2007) and the language ideologies behind them. Luxembourgish is frequently regarded as the presupposed ‘mother tongue’ of the established population and, together with German and French, constitutes one of the three officially recognised languages of the country. However, the globalising context has fuelled uncertainties about the future of Luxembourgish, in particular linked to the ever increasing use of other languages, especially that of spoken French, in the public sphere, workplace settings and social circles.

This paper provides an analysis of metalinguistic interactional discourse of people between the ages of 18-30 who are living in Luxembourg. The data is taken from focus group sessions, where participants discuss their everyday language practices in multilingual Luxembourg. Focusing on the lived experience of multilingualism has been shown to be fruitful in examining the way in which individuals draw upon their linguistic repertoire as they negotiate everyday situations in a multilingual context (Busch 2014). In their metalinguistic comments and interactions, the participants in this study express a broad range of views on the role of Luxembourgish in their lived experience, although the views they present on this topic are not always consistent during the course of the discussion as they interact with the other participants and periodically shift their stance. This paper will provide an analysis of findings emerging from the focus groups, with a particular emphasis on how the Luxembourgish language is framed by the discussants, as well as how broader societal debates on Luxembourgish are reconstructed and negotiated in their discourse.
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Licensing V2-violations in German: prosodic remapping at the syntax-PF interface

John R. te Velde
Oklahoma State University

Numerous studies have argued, see Winkler (2014) for a recent synopsis, that V2-violations in German can be rendered acceptable, given the right context. Some approaches rely on pragmatic and discourse properties for licensing V2-violations. Other studies have argued that Narrow Syntax and the discourse level of sentences have no direct interface with each other and that the syntax-semantic interface does not have access to properties of the discourse beyond the sentence level, as might be the case with the elements base-generated at the left periphery in (1):

(1) Obgleich es schon spät war, es war nicht der Tag, ins Restaurant zu gehen.

‘Although it was already late, it wasn’t the day to go to the restaurant.’

Some left-dislocated structures, whether a clause or a phrase, are beyond the reach of the syntax at either interface and require the use of a resumptive pronoun, as in (2):

(2) Den Hans – den kennen wir aus der Schulzeit.

‘Hans – him we know from our school days.’

There are other V2-violations, however, that have discourse and prosodic properties that differ from those in (1) and (2) and can be accessed at the interfaces, see (3) from Winkler (2014):

(3) Den Nagel auf den Kopf trifft freilich Heinrich Haussler.

‘Heinrich Haussler certainly hits the nail on the head.’

Winkler shows that a verb projection raising account for (3) is undesirable because it over-generates; she proposes instead an account that employs information-structural licensing through a competition between constraints. Space restrictions don’t allow discussion of her proposal here.

In my proposal I argue alternatively that the prosodic properties of structures like those in (3) play a role in a process of the syntax-PF interface whereby two syntactic constituents are remapped as one prosodic phrase, which as such satisfies the V2-restriction. This proposal is not unlike another very recent one presented by Giorgi (2015), who argues that the heads projecting the phrases hosting the left-dislocated elements are prosodically oriented heads that are read at the PF-interface as instructions for the assignment of prosodic values.

Giorgi’s proposal requires a rich set of heads in the CP that I argue may not be justified for German. Instead, I proposed elsewhere (te Velde 2016) that cases of V2-violations can be made compliant with V2 if prosodic remapping occurs at the syntax-PF interface, rendering the elements left of the finite verb in (4) as a single prosodic phrase, which then satisfies V2:

(4) Manchmal wirgeh und in andere Städte (Kiezdeutsch, ZAS)

‘Sometimes we go also into other cities too.’

If we apply this analysis to Winkler’s data, we find that the constituents preceding the finite verb also form a single prosodic phrase, for example (3) again:

(5) Den Nagel auf den Kopf trifft freilich Heinrich Haussler

My conclusion, that prosodic remapping at the PF-interface licenses some V2-violations, is predicted by a grammar that must satisfy auditory-perceptual (PF) requirements.
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Definitely possessive: The role of the definite article in possessive structures in eastern varieties of Dutch

Jolien Scholten
UiL OTS, Utrecht University

**Introduction.** Eastern varieties of Dutch have a range of syntactic configurations that express a possessive relation, but do not contain any morphosyntactic possessive marking in the possessum DP. What these structures have in common is the presence of a definite article. The main aim of this paper is to show that the definite article is crucial in establishing a possessive relation in the relevant constructions, and to explore the option that the definite descriptions in question contain a variable that can be bound by another DP, thereby establishing a relation between the possessor and possessum.

**Possessive structures.** In eastern Dutch dialects, definite articles appear in various constructions with a possessive interpretation. This is for instance the case in external possessive constructions, in which the possessor can appear as a dative object 0 or as a nominative subject 0. In addition, the *band lek* construction (i.a. Van Bree 1981, Broekhuis & Cornips 1994) expresses a relation between the subject and the small clause subject 0.

1. **Marie** hef 'um vanmargen de hende met zalve behandeld.
   Mary has him this.morning the hands with cream treated
   ‘Mary treated his hands with cream this morning.’ (Vorden Dutch)

2. **Piet** hef vanmarge de hände met zalve behandeld.
   Piet has this.morning the hands with cream treated
   ‘Piet treated the (=his) hands with cream this morning.’ (Vorden Dutch)

3. **Jan** heeft [sc de band lek].
   John has the tire flat
   ‘John has a flat tire.’ (eastern Dutch dialects)

**Previous work.** Sentences like 0 have received much attention in the literature (see, among many others, Guéron 1985 and Vergnaud & Zubizarreta 1992, Le Bruyn 2014 for French/English, Lee-Schoenfeld 2007 for German). Some of these works address the structure in 0 as well. The presence of the definite article in the structures in 0 and 0 is often explained against a background of inalienable possession, since these constructions mostly occur with body parts, which are often categorized as inalienable nouns. However, these constructions have not been explained in the context of 0 before, which appears to be crucial in this case.

**New context.** With new data from fieldwork in Dutch dialects, this paper compares the structures in 0-0 and sheds new light on the role of the definite article by including 0 in the empirical domain. The *band lek* construction in 0 has the following characteristics: i) the adjective lek ‘flat’ appears postnominally, whereas adjectives normally appear prenominally; ii) the adjective does not carry inflectional morphology, contrary to other uses of adjectives; iii) the noun *band* ‘tire’ is introduced by a definite article, the central characteristic for this paper. *Jan* is interpreted as the owner of the tire. Even though inalienability probably plays a role in 0 and 0, shows that the absence of morphological possessive marking cannot be explained by inalienability alone: 0 is not restricted to inalienable nouns.

**Tentative proposal.** Assuming that the definite article has the same semantics in all three constructions, this means that an analysis of the definite article in terms of inalienability is not sufficient. This paper assigns an important role to the definite article in those cases. While technical details still need to be worked out, the gist of the analysis is that definite descriptions contain a variable that links the possessum to the DP that is interpreted as the possessor in the above cases. In that sense, this paper follows up on Vergnaud & Zubizarreta’s (1992) insight that the possessor binds the possessum.

A little-known alternation in German morphosyntax is the accusative-dative alternation with two-way prepositions where both cases can be used in reference to the same event (e.g. *Das Flugzeug prallte auf die ACC/die DAT Wasserfläche auf* ‘The plane crashed down on the water surface’). It has hitherto been assumed (e.g., Leys 1989, Smith 1995, Willems 2011) that the alternation serves a general, unitary function (e.g. emphasizing the path (ACC) or endpoint (DAT) of a movement, cf. Smith 1995). Recent corpus analysis (Rys et al. 2014, Willems et al. to appear), however, has shown that the functionally motivated use of the alternation can only partially account for the observed variation and even in case of functional use, it proves difficult to delimit a general, overarching function that explains all of the variation. This indicates that i) the alternation may serve different ‘local’ functions, i.e. relevant for only one or a small set of related verbs, that cannot be generalized to a single, overarching function and ii) case marking is not necessarily functional, but often guided by conventional usage norms.

This approach is illustrated by means of a corpus-driven case study of the ACC/DAT alternation with 19 German contact verbs (including *aufprallen, landen, einschlagen, anstoßen* etc.). First, for each verb, a sample of 300 sentences (extracted from the Deutsches Referenzkorpus Mannheim) was analyzed qualitatively to determine potential morphosyntactic, semantic and lexical factors that exhibit a preference for either case. Second, the effect of these factors was tested quantitatively using bivariate (chi square, fisher’s exact) and multivariate (classification tree analysis) analyses. Finally, the corpus data were compared with acceptability judgments from native speakers.

The results were as follows: i) The alternation is motivated by a wide variety of semantic and lexical factors, and is much more predictable than has hitherto been acknowledged. ii) Despite overarching tendencies (e.g., the DAT preference for the ‘X lands on Y’ sense of verbs such as *aufsetzen, niedergehen, landen*), case marking may also be governed by verb-specific factors (e.g., the quasi-obligatory use of ACC for the ‘X crashes down on Y’ sense of *niedergehen*). iii) For several verbs (e.g., *landen, niederkommen*), no case variation occurs, although such variation is to be expected based on observed variation with near-synonymous verbs (e.g. *aufsetzen, niedergehen*). iv) Although in general, judgment rates correlate positively with corpus tendencies, the acceptability test bears witness to contrasting intuitions among individual speakers, with speakers also regularly dismissing highly frequent occurrences as incorrect.
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Unusual Gender Assignment in the Lindisfarne and West-Saxon Gospels
Jonas Keller
University of Zurich

As one of only two Germanic languages, English has reduced its inherited three-part system of grammatical gender to a system of purely semantic gender assignment. This change primarily took place in the Middle English period. Already in later Old English texts, however, some confusion surrounding the grammatical gender of nouns can be observed. In such instances, dependent words, such as adjectives or demonstrative pronouns, do not match with the etymological gender of the noun. In the West-Saxon Gospels, for example, the phrase *æt þam wylle* ‘at the well’ can be found (Jn. 4:6) with a masculine demonstrative, even though etymologically *wylle* ‘well’ is feminine and should be accompanied by the demonstrative pronoun *þære*. This unusual gender assignment (UGA) can be understood as the earliest indication of the eventual decline of grammatical gender in English. The Lindisfarne Gospels are a northern English manuscript containing a gloss of the gospels, written in the Northumbrian dialect of Old English. The West-Saxon gospels on the other hand do not contain a gloss, but an independent translation of the Latin text into West-Saxon Old English, the dialect spoken in the southern kingdom of Wessex. Since both translations were produced in the second half of the 10th century and contain the same texts, they are ideal for comparing the frequency of UGAs. By doing so, conclusions can be drawn regarding the loss of grammatical gender in English. Should either text show a significantly higher number of UGAs, it can be assumed that the gender-confusion was greater in its area of composition and that therefore the loss of grammatical gender may have originated there. It is expected that the Lindisfarne Gospels will show a far higher number of UGAs than the West-Saxon Gospels, as a shorter preliminary study has already shown such a tendency.
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Once vigorously debated among Germanists, recent times have seen relatively less discussion of the so-called Ausgliederung or ‘breakup’ of Germanic. Some leading scholars seem to have given up hope on progress; Robinson (1992:247-263) concludes his detailed survey of Germanic subgrouping this way: “It seems unlikely that we will ever be able to impose more order on the relationships between the Germanic languages than has already been established”.

In some ways, one could argue that the field has been moving in the wrong direction, as with proposals that English is a ‘fourth branch’ of Germanic (Forster et al. 2004, 2006) or North rather than West Germanic (Emonds & Faarlund 2014, but Bech & Walkden 2015), for example. More mainstream Germanic subgrouping is still often fundamentally treated in terms of tree models, but as Heggarty (2015:603) concludes about the difficulties with a possible Anglo-Frisian branch: “The real ‘problem’ is the model.”

This paper focuses especially on West Germanic family-internal relations by first systematically applying the criterion of distinctly shared innovations and then deploying the notion of ‘linkages’ (Ross 1988, François 2015, Pelkey 2015). From prehistoric North-West Germanic linkages, we see notably distinct West Germanic innovations, followed by intersecting layers of regional innovations.

Germanists have not rigorously applied the standard method, summarized by Ringe & Eska (2013:256): “shared history can be established only by demonstrating shared innovations; moreover, the innovations in question must be unusual enough that they are not likely to have occurred more than once independently”. Drawing on Robinson’s 1992 list of features, I argue that this approach can capture the early split of East Germanic and the later development of North vs. West Germanic. To probe beyond that, we need tools sensitive to contact. Ross (1988:8) defines a linkage as “a group of communalects which have arisen by dialect differentiation” and François (2015:170-171) expands: “When a dialect continuum … evolves in such a way that its members lose mutual intelligibility, it becomes a linkage. A linkage thus consists of separate modern languages which are all related and linked together by intersecting layers of innovations; it is a language family whose internal genealogy cannot be represented by any tree.”

West Germanic presents such a case. Previous analyses often posit or imply splits followed by contact, while a linkage model builds in contact before and during differentiation. This layered approach is applied to the features under discussion. Results to this point show, among other things, English and Frisian as remarkably similar due in large part to likely independent parallel innovations, driven by parallel starting points and patterns of contact.
The Perfective-Durative Contrast in Gothic: Evidence for Language Contact

Joshua Bousquette
University of Georgia

This presentation examines the overt marking of perfective aspect in Gothic, and the asymmetries between the inherited Indo-European strong verbs and innovative Germanic weak verbs in this respect. While perfective aspect in the strong verbs is most frequently lexically specified, weak verbs typically mark aspect overtly through the use of the verbal prefix ga-. Preliminary analysis of class i and iv weak verbs suggest a significantly higher rate of morphological prefixation than what is attested for strong verbs inherited from IE. The increased morphological specification among the innovative Germanic verb classes is accounted for by language contact, necessitating a higher degree of morphological transparency, and less reliance on idiosyncratic, lexically specified aspect. Taken with attested early Germanic loans in Finnish (e.g. kuningas ‘king’), among other evidence, this presentation contributes to the reconstruction of the Germanic sociolinguistic situation, through analysis of linguistic features (cf. Frey & Salmons 2012).

Reconstructed IE shows a four-way system, differentiating past tense from present tense, and complete from incomplete aspect. In Germanic, these two systems collapse into a single, binary past/present system. Lexically perfective strong verbs largely remained unchanged, and did not require morphological marking of aspectual completion (e.g. qiþan ‘to say’; gibban ‘to give’; niman ‘to take’; finþan ‘to find, to learn of’, letan ‘to leave’). On the other hand, verbal classes i (causatives) and iv (inchoatives) are inherently imperfective. As such, even semantically perfective verbs like class iv gatairan ‘to destroy’, suggest an erosion of inherent aspect and subsequent overt morphological marking of the same. Aspectual marking of the perfective-durative contrast is also productive in a subset of the strong verbs, including those that are inherently perfective: so swalt “she was dying” (Luke 8:42) correlates with the Greek present (imperfective) ἄπεθανεν; but (so) gaswalt ‘she died’ (Luke 8:53) has a perfective reading, correlating with the Greek aorist (perfective) ἄπεθανεν (Lambdin 2006: 16). Morphological marking of aspect in the Gothic verbal system is thus not only productive, but is also consistent with the Greek Vorlage, replicating the same function as the IE aspectual system that was previously lost in Germanic. Crucially, though, this expanded use of ga- is not only compensatory following the loss of the IE aspect system, but is also indicative of an increased morphological transparency of aspectual marking at the expense of inherent lexical aspect, characteristic of language contact situations.

In terms of the sociolinguistic situation among the Goths, Frey & Salmons (2012) argued that the fundamentally Germanic syntax of Gothic – even during a period of language contact in 6th century Northern Italy – suggests an unbroken transmission of Gothic L1 acquisition. In looking at the aspectual marking in Gothic, we see linguistic features often resultant from language contact situations, helping us to more accurately reconstruct the sociolinguistic situation in early Germanic.
V2 in a sign language

Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson
University of Iceland

Elísa Guðrún Brynjólfsdóttir
Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing

One of the best known syntactic properties of the Germanic languages is verb second (V2). With the exception of English, all the Germanic languages require the finite verb to immediately follow the first constituent of the clause in main clause declaratives and wh-questions. In English, by contrast, V2 is restricted to wh-questions and examples of negative preposing (e.g. *Only in America could such a thing happen*). Languages of this kind are sometimes referred to as mixed or partial V2 languages, as opposed to full V2 languages like German or Icelandic.

Since the number of languages or dialects that exhibit V2 in some syntactic context is very low (see Holmberg 2015), it is always interesting to see new additions to this group. In this talk, we will argue that there is a dialect of Icelandic Sign Language (Íslenskt táknmál, ÍTM) that exhibits partial V2, building on the observations of Jónsson, Brynjólfsdóttir & Sverrisdóttir (2015).

Wh-in-situ is the main strategy for forming wh-questions in ÍTM (Brynjólfsdóttir 2012) but some young signers form wh-questions by leftward wh-movement and V2, as in (1) and (2) below. For these speakers, V2 appears to be obligatory with wh-movement.

(1) HVAD VERA TÁKNMÁL?
what be sign.language
What is sign language?

(2) HVENÆR OPNA BLÁR LÓN?
when open blue lagoon
When does the Blue Lagoon open?

Both of these examples are main clauses but we have also found V2 in examples that look like embedded questions. This is surprising since all the Germanic languages (except Afrikaans) do not have V2 in embedded questions. However, it remains to be determined if these examples are genuine examples of embedded clauses as the distinction between main and embedded clauses is rather obscure in sign languages.

V2 in ÍTM is a clear case of V2 borrowed from one language (spoken Icelandic) to another (ÍTM). It suggests that V2 is independent of finiteness since ÍTM is like other sign languages in not having tense-marking on verbs and no person or number agreement except for a small class of verbs. The ÍTM data also show that V2 in wh-questions is independent of V1 in yes/no-questions, as the latter is not found in ÍTM. Hence, the apparent correlation between V2 and V1 in questions in the Germanic languages may simply be accidental.

Assuming a split CP system along the lines of Rizzi (1997) and much subsequent work, we take verb raising in wh-questions in ÍTM to be triggered by a [+wh] feature in Foc. In the spirit of Holmberg (2003), we claim that V1 is impossible in yes/no-questions in ÍTM because of a non-overt question particle which moves from Pol to Foc. This particle is visible through the non-manual marking (raised eyebrows) that characterizes yes/no-questions in ÍTM and distinguishes them from the non-manuals of wh-questions in ÍTM (furrowed eyebrows). Its existence is also supported by the fact that some sign languages have an overt particle that is reserved for yes-no questions (see Zeshan 2013 for an overview).
Toward a Typology of Copular Sentences

Kajsa Djärv
University of Pennsylvania

This paper argues that copular constructions [CCs] in Polish and Swedish vary systematically with respect to interpretation, Case, and type of copular element (verbal/pronominal).

**Background:** In Polish, verbal CCs obligatorily take Instrumental (Inst) Case on the postcopular NP (NP2), whereas pronominal CCs require Nominative (Nom) Case on NP2 (Citko, 2008). This has been argued to track the predication/equation contrast. Relatedly, Sigurdsson (2006) argues that in Swedish, equative CCs allow only Nom (1a), whereas assumed identity CCs allow both Nom and Accusative (Acc) Case (1b).

(1a) Han är inte han/*honom.
    He is not he.nom/*acc.
    ‘He isn’t him.’

(1b) Jag låtsas inte vara dig/du.
    I pretend not be you.acc/nom.
    ‘I don’t pretend to be you.’

**Proposal:** Following Citko (2008) and Adger & Ramchand (2003), we argue that in both Swedish and Polish, the semantic contrast underlying the morpho-syntactic alternation in (1), is that between predication with respect to an eventuality versus non-eventive predication. That is, Polish pronominal CCs with Nom Case are infelicitous with clearly eventive predicates, but improve when coerced into non-eventive readings. Similarly in Swedish, eventive contexts require Acc Case (2a), and non-eventive ones Nom (2b). The apparent alternation stems from surface ambiguous contexts, such as that in (1b).

(2a) På semestern var jag dig/??du.
    On vacation was I you.acc/??dig.
    ‘On my holiday was I you.’

(2b) I mitt förra liv var jag du/??dig.
    In my last life was I you.nom/??acc
    ‘In my last life, I was you.’

To derive the syntactic facts, we propose two heads: Pred$_e$ which takes an eventive complement (NP, AP, PP, VP), and assigns an Initiator $\sigma$-role to NP1, and thus Predicative Case (Spelled Out as Inst or Acc); and Pred$_p$ which takes a property denoting NP-complement, does not assign such a $\sigma$-role to NP1, and thus cannot assign Case. Since NPs have a [uCase] feature, NP2 in (2b) receives Nom from $T^0$ inside a lower clause—by hypothesis, a silent Free Relative clause (cf. Heycock & Kroch (1999), Adger & Ramchand (2003), Pancheva (2009)), as a ‘last resort’.

**Predictions:** This analysis predicts that Acc/Inst NP2s should behave syntactically like direct objects, whereas Nom NP2s should pattern like overt Relative Clause subjects. This is borne out: For instance, Inst/Acc, but not Nom NP2s are available for extraction (3).

(3) [Dig/*du], vill jag inte vara t.
    you.acc/*nom want I not be.inf t.
    ‘You, I do not want to be.’ (Sigurdsson 2013)

Finally, we expect that the Nom NP2 (underlyingly a silent Free Relative clause) should be ambiguous between a ‘universal’ and a ‘singular definite’ interpretation (Jacobson, 1995). This, we argue, is what underlies the semantic contrast between ‘true’ Equatives (John is Superman.) and ‘inherent property’ predication (John is the nicest person I know.). We provide a detailed discussion of the semantic derivation and discuss further syntactic data to support this analysis.

**Conclusion:** We predict that the following syntactic and semantic properties will pattern together cross-linguistically: i. event semantics, verbal copula, Inst/Acc Case; ii. non-eventive (inherent property/equative) semantics, pronominal copula, Nom Case.

Documenting Dialect Death in Southern Indiana German
Karen Roesch
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis

Most colonial German varieties in Indiana are currently spoken by an aging population of speakers and are expected to disappear within the next two to three decades (Nuetzel & Salmons 2011). The Indiana German Dialect Project was established one year ago with the primary goal of recording, archiving, and analyzing the remnants of these endangered German varieties in Indiana. Very few previous studies exist on Indiana German varieties, the most notable of which is Nuetzel’s (2009) linguistic study of the East Franconian dialect in the Lutheran community of Haysville in Dubois County, Indiana.

This paper reports on current efforts to record, archive, and analyze remnants of Indiana German varieties spoken in Dubois County in southern Indiana. Dubois County was mainly chosen for as a beginning point due to the availability of historic comparative data provided by Nuetzel’s (2009) study. It also provides an interesting contrast to German varieties found in two Catholic German-speaking communities, Jasper and Ferdinand. Initial interviews have already suggested lexical, phonological, and structural differences that seem to interfere with comprehensibility. An example from Nuetzel & Salmons (2011) provides a look at the distinctive feature of verb agreement with the complementizer _wu_ in Haysville East Franconian which does not seem to be a feature in the German varieties found in Jasper and Ferdinand:

Example (1): Complementizer agreement (Nuetzel & Salmons 2011: 710)

_ich wass nett _wu_ bist_
I know not where-2sg-you are-2sg
I don’t know where you (sing.) are

A second example shows variation between Haysville and Jasper in the forms of _haben_:

Example (2): Forms of _haben_

a. Haysville (Nuetzel, interview transcription):
_Mir_ han unner Kinner Deitsch glern_

b. Jasper (Roesch, Interview (2/2015))
_Ja, ja, mir _hen_ immer g’spielt als Schul aus wor_

The paper is structured as follows: Section 1 gives an overview of the Indiana German Dialect Project and describes its scope, guiding research questions, and methodology. Section 2 provides a brief sociohistorical comparison of the three communities of Haysville, Ferdinand, and Jasper. Section 3 provides a biographical overview of the informants interviewed to date and Section 4 provides a first look at linguistic variation sociolinguistic interviews conducted in Jasper and Ferdinand, Indiana.
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Bare singular nouns in Middle Norwegian

Kari Kinn
University of Oslo

Old Norwegian (ON) allowed bare singular nouns (BSNs), whereas Modern Norwegian (ModN) in most contexts requires an indefinite article or a definiteness suffix. The ON and ModN facts are well established, but little is known about BSNs in the period in between, i.e. Middle Norwegian (MidN) (ca. 1370–1570). In this paper I will present new MidN data, discuss some implications of the findings, and propose a syntactic analysis. (Currently, BSNs cannot be automatically searched for in any digital MidN corpus. I have manually investigated ca. 100 charters from the Diplomatarium Norvegicum, available at http://www.dokpro.uio.no/dipl_norv/diplom_field_eng.html.) I will show that BSNs are found throughout MidN; their loss is thus a rather recent development. Cf. the late MidN example in (1):

(1) at Signe tager then arff allen… og eigj broder son
    ‘that... Signe gets all of the inheritance, not the nephew.’ (DN XI 708, 1562)

In terms of chronology, the diachronic development of BSNs resembles that of null arguments in Norwegian: the possibility of null arguments was also retained throughout the Middle Norwegian period, but is lost in Modern Norwegian (Kinn, 2016). This corroborates the idea of an inherent connection between the two phenomena (see e.g. Bošković 2008 and Barbosa 2013 with references).

In late MidN, the use of what appears to be a grammaticalised indefinite article (einn) is very common, and BSNs with indefinite interpretation seem to be restricted to certain semantic contexts, e.g. when a new person is introduced. Interestingly, BSNs with definite interpretation, like in example (1), occur in a wider range of contexts. This is somewhat unexpected: cross-linguistically, asymmetries regarding indefinite vs. definite BSNs tend to involve a freer distribution of the indefinite ones (Longobardi, 2001). I will propose a syntactic analysis whereby MidN, like ON (Lander and Haegeman, 2014), can establish definite interpretation without any (null or overt) functional category D. This accounts for the possibility of definite BSNs, and sets MidN apart from ModN, where D is obligatory (Julien, 2005). (I assume with Julien that the definiteness suffix in ModN is not generated in D, but obligatorily Agrees with it.) Potentially, it also offers an account for the diachronic parallelism between BSNs and null arguments (see e.g. Bošković 2008). I will adopt Julien’s (2005) proposal that the indefinite article is not generated in D, but in a lower position. Therefore, the indefinite article could arise independently of the developments relating to definite BSNs.
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An account of asyndetic verb-final clauses in Otfrid von Weissenburg’s Evangelienbuch

Katerina Somers
Queen Mary University of London

This paper offers an account of the asyndetic verb-final (Vfinal) clause in the ninth century Evangelienbuch. Below are two sample clauses:

a. Er uns ginádon sinen riat [thaz súlichan kúnning uns gihíalt]
   he us mercy his meted that such king-acc to-us preserved
   ‘He meted out to us his mercy in that he preserved such a king for us.’ (L 27)

b. [ih weiz] iz göt worahta
   I know it-acc God wrought
   ‘I know (that) God wrought it.’ (I 1,80)

The absence of a subordinator renders the clause-final placement of the verb surprising, particularly as works like Axel (2007) argue that the complementary distribution of complementizer and finite verb present in Modern German was well established before OHG. Axel (2007) & (2012) constitute the most comprehensive modern treatment of asyndetic Vfinal clauses in Old High German (OHG), and may be summarized as follows: those that function as independent clauses (a.) are not native to OHG, but effected by extragrammatical factors, whereas asyndetic Vfinal dependent clauses (b.) are authentic to OHG and exhibit a complementary distribution of a null complementizer and finite verb.

Drawing on a dataset of 746 clauses from Otfrid’s Evangelienbuch—with 73 asyndetic Vfinal clauses—I argue that all asyndetic Vfinal clauses, regardless of function, should feature in accounts of OHG syntax; that is, there is evidence to support the conclusion that both asyndetic Vfinal main and dependent clauses were productive clausal types for the poet. I also argue that their presence in the text is significant, in that they represent an older stage of Germanic in which clausal dependency was marked not just by Vfinal syntax and presence of some kind of subordinator. Though this view bears some resemblance to works, such as Lenerz (1985)—who concludes that OHG had Vfinal declaratives, which are structurally distinct from asyndetic Vfinal dependent clauses—I show that independent and more dependent asyndetic Vfinal clauses are distinguished primarily through grammatical mood, another marker of dependency in early Germanic. Finally, I argue that main and dependent asyndetic Vfinal clauses are two manifestations of one syntactic type and that they are not terribly different from more canonical-looking Vfinal clauses with initial subordinators. In fact, asyndetic and canonical Vfinal clauses both show a statistically significant preference for finite verbs that are lexical in nature and prosodically heavy, whereas unambiguously V2 clauses show a more even distribution of light function verbs and lexical heavy verbs. These data indicate that, in Otfrid’s idiolect at least, verbal syntax is sensitive to other factors that are wholly unrelated to clause linkage, whether that clause is main or dependent. Yet, the conditions for change are in place, in that correlations between verbal syntax, clause type and presence or absence of a subordinator or complementizer are also evident in the text, and they set the stage for a reanalysis of the relationship between them as more implicational in nature.
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Changes in German Vowel Length Marking in the 16th and 17th Century
Katrin Fuchs
University of Texas at Austin

My project addresses the standardization of vowel length marking in written German between 1550 and 1650 in four West German dialects. Due to cultural, religious, and linguistic factors, these dialects were reluctant to adopt the emerging standard language, which spread from the South and East to the West and North of the German-speaking areas (Hoffmann 2000: 125). However, major political and cultural changes during this time frame forced them to accept some standardization tendencies in their written language, including the marking of vowel length using <h> and vowel doubling. During the 16th century, the older West Middle German length markers <ı>, <y> and <e> (after /a/ and /o/) or the absence of length marking are replaced by vowel doubling, which came from the South German dialects (Ebert et al. 1993: 32) and by <h>, which came from the East German dialects. Consider the following example:

(1) Erstlichen hatt sie bekandt, das ir buell heisse Grienlin, sey vor zehen Jaren zu ir kommen.
First has she testified that her lover is called Grienlin was before ten years to her come.
‘First, she testified that her lover is called Grienlin, who (supposedly) came to her 10 years ago.’ (Macha 2005: Gengenbach, 1573)

(2) Dergleichen in ihren jungen Jahren […] gantz leichtfertig gewesen.
Similarly in her young years very promiscuous been.
‘Similarly, in her young years […] she was promiscuous.’ (Macha 2005: Altenahr, 1649)

In (1), an example from the year 1573, the bolded words show no marking for vowel length. 76 years later, (2) shows Standard German marking in the same lexemes.

I argue that there were significant developments towards language standardization during this time frame, largely connected to a spreading of the Standard variety among genres of every-day usage (newspapers, court records, letters, etc.) and writers from lower social classes. These developments contributed decidedly to the overall standardization process of German. To this end, my project includes a different genre than the usual literary and upper-class genres by using the corpus of witch hunt records (Macha et al. 2005), comprised of handwritten documents written by scribes of intermediate social status who were recording the statements of witnesses and defendants of mostly lower social status (Macha 1991: 40). This genre offers insights into the connection between spoken and written language due to the relative closeness to spoken language as well as connections between language, politics, and identity.
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All the King’s Runes
Katrín Axelsdóttir
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The so-called Third Grammatical Treatise (TGT) by the Icelandic poet and scholar Óláfr Þórarson hvitaskáld (c. 1210–1259) contains a section in which runes are compared to letters of other alphabets. This is the earliest extant work dealing with the subject of runology. In this section Óláfr quotes a sentence, written in runes, which he attributes to his master (“minn herra”) King Valdemar II of Denmark (1170–1241), at whose court Óláfr stayed in the winter of 1240–1241. The transcribed text runs like this, according to one of the two manuscripts of TGT, Codex Wormianus (AM 242 fol): *spængt mannz hokflypi tuui boll.*

The meaning of this sentence, which is a pangram (i.e. a sentence containing all the letters of an alphabet), has been considered obscure by many scholars. However, some attempts towards its elucidation have been made. It has been proposed that the sentence alludes to a hawk (perhaps referring to falconry) since one of the words, *hok*, might correspond to OIcel. *haukr*. Suggestions involving *haka* ‘chin’ have been made too. There is also a theory about a magic formula.

In this paper, a different interpretation is proposed, according to which the sentence is a reference to King Valdemar and Óláfr’s special interest, the runes. More specifically, it refers to the *b*-rune and its derivate ᛒ, a variant of the *p*-rune, discussed in TGT few lines later. It is suggested that the sentence is a riddle and that this riddle served as a mnemonic device — its purpose being to help people to memorize the extended medieval futhark current at the time, i.e. the sixteen standard runes of the younger futhark along with a few additional runes.
Representation of the Old Norse goddess name Gefjun in Icelandic manuscripts

Kevin French
University of Iceland

Etymology of mythological names has played a prominent role in the study of polytheistic religions, but traditional derivations must be reevaluated as new evidence comes to light. The Old Norse theonym Gefjun has traditionally been explained as derived from an unattested verb *gefja meaning ‘to give,’ and thus indicating a generous goddess of agriculture, which is supposedly supported by her role in Norse mythology (Sturtevant 1952; Battaglia 1991, 415-46; Simek 1993, 101-2 [Gefjon]; North 1997, 221-6). This derivation parallels the development of a large class of North and East Germanic deverbal feminine abstract substantives, formed from weak ō-verbs such as Gothic laþōn ‘invitation, call’, OLcc. laþun ‘invitation’ < *laþōniz, from a verb *laþō ‘to invite’ (Goth. laþōn, OLcc. lāda, OE laþian, etc; see Krahe and Meid 1969, III:117-8 [§98]). However, before proposing an unattested verb, let alone its meaning, it is prudent to investigate early attestations of the word Gefjun to see if distinctions manifest between it and this large class of deverbals.

In fact, when manuscript representation of Gefjun and ō-stem deverbal abstracts are compared, a distinction is revealed and therefore their proposed connection should be rejected. In the data gathered for analysis, including over 100 attestations of Gefjun and a large selection of deverbals, Gefjun appears with the second-syllable vowel written “o” in over 80% of attestations, while deverbal abstract substantives appear with “a” in the corresponding position at approximately the same rate. What's more, this representation of Gefjun persists even in manuscripts wherein the unstressed round vowel, variously written “o” and “u” without a discernible linguistically meaningful difference in Old Icelandic, is written “u” or “v” a majority of the time, such as Codex Wormianus AM 242 fol.

This situation is unexpected and requires explanation. A proposal is made that “ge-fjōn” (or its allographic variants) actually represents what should be normalized Gefjun, taking into consideration a tendency in Icelandic orthography to neglect to differentiate ọ from ọ when following the semivowel j (Finnur Jónsson 1905). A derivation is offered wherein Gefjun is formed by means of the thematicized Hoffmann “suffix” also known in Indo-European linguistics as the “Herrschersuffix,” described prominently by Wolfgang Meid (1957), along with brief discussion of the possibilities for what it means.
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The prefix loss in Early Nordic: A re-examination of the metrical evidence

Klaus Johan Myrvoll
University of Oslo

A characteristic of the Nordic branch of the Germanic languages is the loss of verbal and nominal prefixes, e.g., *ga-, *bi- and *und-. The equivalence of a word like OHG girūno m. ‘adviser’ is thus in Old Norse simply rúni m. ‘close friend’ < PG *ga-rūnan-. There is, however, no consensus within the scholarly community about how, why and when this change took place.

Important contributions to the discussion were given by Hans Kuhn (1929) and Ingerid Dal (1930a, 1930b). Both interpreted the so-called expletive particle of, um in Old Norse poetry as a remnant of the prefixes, since it in most instances precedes words that previously had a prefix. Whereas Kuhn believed that one of the prefixes levelled out the others, i.e. of, before it eventually was lost, Dal argued for a phonological merger of the prefixes into a schwa-vowel, which in writing was represented by of or um. Both of these hypotheses imply that the prefixes, or at least one of them, were in use up to the beginning of the Old Norse period (the 9th c.).

More recently, Michael Schulte has argued in a number of articles (2003a, 2003b, 2005) that the monomoraic prefixes (as *ga-, *bi-) were lost already before the Proto-Nordic period (ca. 150–500 AD), and that only bi- or tetramoraic prefixes as *und- were preserved for some time. Schulte bases this assumption on the fact that almost no prefixes are securely attested in the corpus of runic inscriptions. His hypothesis does, however, fall short of explaining the historically correct distributed expletive particle in the earliest skaldic poetry.

In this paper, I will re-examine the use and semantics of the expletive particle in the skaldic poetry, and demonstrate that Schulte’s scenario does not comply with the evidence. The different developments leading up to the expletive particle on the one hand, and reduced forms such as greiða v. < *ga-raiddijan- and foru-nautr m. < *fara-ga-nauta- on the other, will be accounted for.
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Fine-tuning event structure: over-modification in Icelandic

Kristín Jóhannsdóttir  Michael Putnam  Volker Gast
University of Akureyri  Penn State University  University of Jena

Icelandic uses two main strategies to express that an event occurred ‘excessively’, a PP headed by yfir ‘over’ and complemented by the anaphor sig (cf. 1a), and a verbal prefix of- (cf. 1b).

While the two strategies are largely in complementary distribution, in some contexts both options are available, with systematic differences in meaning:

(1) a. Sara bakaði yfir sig.  b. Sara of-bakaði kökuna.
    ‘Sara baked too much.’  ‘Sara over-baked the cake.’

In our talk we will address the following questions: (i) What determines the distribution of the two strategies, and to what extent are they distributional (allomorphic) variants of one meaning? (ii) How can the variability of interpretation be captured under the hypothesis that the two strategies are equivalent? We argue that we are in fact dealing with a single meaning, ‘excessive actualization of an event’, for simplicity’s sake represented as ‘over’, which varies according to two parameters: (a) the level or part of a derivation that over attaches to, and (b) the standard of comparison. For instance, in (1a) the over-predicate relates to (repeated) actions of cake-baking by the external argument, and the standard is provided by the referent of that argument, too (syntactically represented by the anaphor sig): ‘The degree of Sara’s cake-baking was too much for/beyond sig/Sara’ cf. also Putnam & Gast 2012). In (1b), the over-predicate only applies to the VP bakaði kökuna, and the standard is provided by the internal argument (‘The degree of baking was too much for that cake’).

In our analysis we take a neo-Davidsonian perspective, with a rich internal structure of event predicates, directly reflected in the syntax. In examples like (1b), the over-predicate applies to the result of the baking process, represented as a predicate embedded within a result-projection (the external argument is introduced by an independent Agent/Voice-projection à la Kratzer 1996). Of- is interpreted as indicating that the degree δ to which a predicate P applies to an entity x is higher than the ‘standard degree’ δs. (Type-shifted variants of the predicate may apply to other levels of the derivation; cf. Putnam & Gast 2012 for a more elaborate semantic analysis).

(2) a. [baka-] = λxλe[bake(e)∧result(e,(baked(x)))]
   b. [of-baka-] = λxλe[bake(e)∧result(e,(baked(x))∧δ(baked,x) > δs(baked,x))]
   c. [of-] = λPλx[P(x)∧δ(P,x) > δs(P,x)]

Yfir sig has a similar semantics, but it applies at a different level of the derivation, and with a different standard of comparison. Unlike of-, yfir sig can take scope over the existential quantifier binding the event variable and, hence, refer to repeated actions (cf. 1a above). The standard of comparison is invariably the external argument.

In addition to providing an analysis of the basic semantics of over-elements we will address some more specific questions raised by the analysis sketched above, e.g.: What roles do argument structure/valency and/or aktionsart play for the choice of a strategy and its interpretation? How do syntax, semantics and pragmatics relate to each other? These questions will also be considered within the context of more general debates pertaining to the syntax-semantics interface (e.g. projectionist vs. neo-constructionist approaches).

Middle Low German Conservation and High German Infiltration in “Die Niederdeutschen Leberreime des Johannes Junior v. J. 1601”

Lane Sorensen
Indiana University-Bloomington

The Rhytmi Mensales of Johannes Junior, printed in 1601, were (re)introduced to the academic world as "Die Niederdeutschen Leberreime des Johannes Junior v. J. 1601" by Adolf Hofmeister in Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch 10 (1884). A collection of 131 stanzas of various lengths featuring regular end rhyme, this work is a testament to the now extinct tradition of reciting secular and spiritual, liver-based poetry during social gatherings, especially at weddings. Little attention has been paid to this text or genre for the last 130 years, an oversight that this paper sets out to remedy by illustrating its value as a point of transition between conservative Middle Low German ('MLG') orthographic practices and increasing Early New High German ('ENHG') orthographic and morphological conventions. The former is manifested in numerous examples of word-medial and -final <ff> and <ck>, final <dt>, and <th> in all contexts, whereas the latter is visible by 'Dehnungs-h', <sch> before <l m n w> (instead of <s>) — evidence that the ENHG sound change of word-initial /s/_C > /ʃ/_C was borrowed into this MLG dialect — and the introduction of the diminutive suffix -lîn. Furthermore, certain morphemes already present in MLG, such as the nominal, verbal, and adjectival prefix g(e)-, allowed for a relatively seamless influx of similarly-formed ENHG lexical items.

Classical MLG features, especially the widely-adopted conventions from Lübeck such as 3rd person plural indicative -(e)n (as opposed to the plural t-suffix, the so-called 'Einheitsplural' of Old Saxon and many modern Low German dialects), obfuscate the original dialect of the text. However, with the help of Robert Peters' (2012) Variablenkatalog, I argue that the presence of word-medial <dd> and <nn> (e.g. 'eddel', 'mennich') and rounded forms like 'drüdle' support an Eastphalian provenance.

The aforementioned features leave us with a text that is neither purely MLG nor ENHG, but rather a hybrid that reflects the waxing prestige of the latter at the expense of the former in commercial, clerical, and academic circles well after the height of the Hanseatic League. Although ENHG infiltration is not uncommon in the late MLG period, there has never been a thorough philological or linguistic analysis of the Rhytmi Mensales. Such an analysis will show that ENHG infiltration is discernable in this text, and in turn support Lasch's (1924) claim that the late MLG period has a "Doppelangesicht," one that foreshadows the reduction of Low German to spoken dialect and the advancement of High German as a literary standard.
Antecedent Preferences in Bilingual German Populations

Lara Schwarz
Pennsylvania State University

Overview. This study investigates the antecedent preferences of bilingual German populations. We test if the pattern of “convergence between L2 acquisition and L1 attrition” (Sorace, 2011, p. 3) that has emerged in prior research (see Sorace, 2011) extends to attrited heritage speakers. The Interface Hypothesis (Sorace and Filiaci, 2006) defines an interface as the interaction between different levels of a grammar (lexicon, syntax, semantics, discourse, etc.). Research has shown that L2 learners, balanced bilinguals, and L1 attriters deviate in similar fashion from monolingual behavior with regard to grammatical features located at interfaces. One well attested example is the interpretation of pronouns in pro-drop languages: bilinguals tend to over-use or misinterpret optional pronouns (Sorace, 2011). However, the attriters commonly studied in the literature acquired the L1 through young adulthood before relocating to the L2 environment. Attrited heritage speakers may not have had the same level of exposure to the L1, with much longer periods of attrition. The goal of this study is to determine if attrited heritage speakers conform to this pattern of convergence, and how.

Methodology. German licenses demonstrative pronouns to create discourse focus on the post-verbal object antecedent. German monolinguals show no preference for the subject or object antecedent when interpreting personal pronouns (er/sie/es – he/she/it), but prefer to interpret the demonstrative pronoun as referring to the post-verbal object (Wilson, Keller and Sorace, 2007; Wilson, 2009), as shown in (1):

personal: Der Mann trägt den Jungen, Er ist müde.
demons.: Der Mann trägt den Jungen, Der ist müde.

‘The man carries the boy, He is tired.’

We tested the preferences of five groups of German speakers with varying proficiency: (1) German monolinguals, (2) “classic” German attriters immersed in English, (3) advanced English speakers of German immersed in German, (4) high-intermediate English learners of German at an American university, and (5) severely attrited heritage speakers of German in the United States. Using an online survey tool, participants saw stimuli modeled after (1) using noun phrases with ambiguous gender or unambiguous gender. Participants were asked to clarify the subject (NP1 vs. NP2) of the second sentence.

Results. We counted NP1 choices for each condition. In the ambiguous trials, German monolinguals interpreted the personal pronoun as referring to NP1 or NP2 (50% NP1 choices), but dispreferred NP1 as the antecedent for the demonstrative pronoun (12%). The classic German attriters showed similar preferences (pers: 50%; dem: 22%). Advanced English speakers of German showed a tendency toward this pattern, but with a weaker NP1 dispreference in the demonstrative condition (pers: 47%; dem: 33%). English learners of German and attrited heritage speakers produced similar results for the ambiguous items, over-interpreting personal pronouns as the referent for NP1 (leaners: 58%, heritage attriters: 60%), and showing no preference for demonstratives (learners: 50% NP1, attriters: 50% NP1). On the surface these results support convergence of L1 attrition and L2 acquisition, yet accuracy on the unambiguous items (learners: 96%, heritage attriters: 73%) reveals that high-intermediate learners understand the syntax of pronoun resolution, yet lack the discourse-relevant interpretation. The heritage speakers, on the other hand, may instead be using lexical semantics, due to a combination of factors such as age, task effects, uncertain input, or incomplete acquisition (Montrul, 2002). Thus, the heritage attriters fall outside the scope of L1 attrition and L2 acquisition convergence.

The consequences of Age of Acquisition on second language narration strategy

Lara Schwarz  
The Pennsylvania State University

Nora Hellmold  
The Pennsylvania State University

Age of Acquisition (AoA) research has shown that earlier L1 or L2 acquisition correlates with higher levels of achieved proficiency. This study investigates how AoA affects narrative strategy in a speaker’s L2/L3. We hypothesize that AoA has a continued effect throughout the lifespan, and that with increasing AoA, speakers produce errors in different language domains. Using Error Analysis (EA), we quantify AoA effects in the English of three Low German-speaking Mennonites. Results indicate that with increasing AoA, speakers display not only more errors, but also a different distribution of error types, i.e. a gradual increase in grammar errors and a gradual decrease of building textual coherence. This has consequences on how speakers approach a guided narration task.

EA (Corder, 1981; James, 1998) gathers information from learners’ errors (i.e. discrepancies between learner production and the standard system of the target language) about the state of their acquisition process. We apply James’ levels of error to guided English narrations from three Plautdietsch speakers, from a recently immigrated community in Kansas. All speakers report Plautdietsch as their L1 and varying degrees of proficiency in English and Spanish as their L2 and L3. Their respective proficiencies reflect their ages of acquisition, but all have had extensive exposure to English. Using EA, we measure how proficiency manifests at the level of the lexicon, the syntax, and discourse. The results are conflated with a battery of fluency measures, including mean length of run (MLR) and speech rate (syllables per minute), in order to capture the overall consequences of proficiency on narrative strategy.

Table 1. Overall results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>AoA</th>
<th>MLR</th>
<th>Speech rate</th>
<th>Lexicon (%)</th>
<th>Grammar (%)</th>
<th>Discourse (%)</th>
<th># of Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>241.23</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>202.96</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>138.80</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fluency measures supported the speakers’ proficiency self-ratings. EA showed that with increasing AoA, the speakers produced more errors. Speakers 2 and 3 acquired English after puberty and produced three to four times as many errors as Speaker 1. A stronger distinction between Speaker 2 and Speaker 3 is visible in the fluency measures and the distribution of error types. Speaker 3’s errors were primarily grammatical; Speaker 2 displayed a more balanced distribution across error types. With specific regard to grammar errors, half of Speaker 2’s errors were at the clause level (50%), while Speaker 3’s errors were primarily local grammar errors, i.e., subject-verb agreement (60%). We interpret this as an indication of Speaker 2’s attempt to produce a cohesive narrative, while Speaker 3 avoided such an attempt.

These results reflect a critical phase for language acquisition (Lenneberg, 1967), now assumed to be a gradual age effect (Bialystok and Hakuta, 1999). The gradient nature of AoA effects is reflected in the gradient nature of our results. As hypothesized, with increasing AoA, speakers’ errors shifted from distant to local, which had measurable consequences for narrative strategy in the non-native language.
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The Role of Prosody in Shaping German Plurals: A Study

Laura Catharine Smith  Katharina Schuhmann  Charlotte Champenois  Nicola Schmerbeck
Brigham Young U.  U. of Bonn  Brigham Young U.  Ball State U.

With more than six potential means of forming plurals in German, second language learners find this aspect of German particularly difficult. German plurals have been shown to be prosodically-driven in that most plurals end in a trochee, namely the sequence of stressed-unstressed syllables (e.g., Wiese 2001, Booij 1998, and Smith 2009). For instance, nouns already fitting the trochaic pattern, e.g., Fläsche ‘bottle’ or Leh rer ‘teacher’, take non-syllabic endings, e.g., -n or a zero ending, to create the plural without upsetting the trochaic pattern of the stem, i.e., Fläsch en ‘bottles’ and Le hrer (zero ending) ‘teachers’, respectively. But for stems which are not already trochaic in the singular, e.g., Kind ‘child’ or Tisch ‘table’, the plural ending adds an unstressed syllable to create the trochaic plural, i.e., Kinder ‘children’ and Tische ‘tables’, respectively. Previous research has shown that in the various dialects of German (Smith and Anderson 2010) as well as in Standard Dutch (Smith 2007), prosody seems to be a driving factor behind plural formation, even when the plural endings themselves differ from the standard language. However, the question remains whether these patterns are merely the result of the language history or whether they are still productive in the language usage of native speakers.

To this end, our paper examines the role of prosody in German plural formation in two ways. We investigate 1) the production of new plural forms of nonsense words to examine not only the choice of endings, but most critically whether the output conforms to the expected trochaic output of Standard German; and 2) how sensitive native German speakers are when they hear erroneous or non-standard plural forms of existing German words. The question is whether prosodic errors are seen as more egregious than having a wrong plural ending alone.

In this study, we first examine native German speakers’ intuitions of plural formation by testing whether they produce plural forms of trochaic and non-trochaic nonsense words to fit the stressed-unstressed prosodic pattern found in most German plurals. These data are analyzed in terms of whether their plurals fit the trochaic pattern, as well as the specific endings chosen. We also study how native German speakers judge incorrect plural forms presented both auditorily and in written form in terms of how “well-formed” they seem on a 8-point Likert Scale. Tokens were recorded by a native speaker and presented in randomized order. The majority of the tokens have the wrong ending although the correct plurals for each word are included as a control. Incorrect forms are divided between trochaic and non-trochaic forms. Native speakers are asked how well formed the plural is. Scores from this part are analyzed to determine whether the endings themselves or the (lack of) trochaic pattern contribute to the error scores. Also taken into account is level of education of the native speaking participants, degree to which participants identify with a local accent, and what that local accent is.

The results of this study have two key implications: 1) the study will critically help identify whether the trochaic template shaping German plurals is productive in the grammars and intuitions of native speakers or whether the trochaic plurals found in the language are simply the result of German’s linguistic history without being productive in the grammars of today’s native speakers; and 2) this study will inform teachers of German as to the importance of teaching prosody when teaching German plurals. This last implication builds on a previous study (Smith and Christensen 2012) which demonstrated that teaching the prosodic structure of Dutch plural to learners of Dutch resulted in significant improvement in students’ plural formation.
Contrastivity and adjectival elements in a Norwegian dialect

Linda Evenstad Emilsen
Østfold University College

In this study I will present data on four DP-constructions that are considered rather marginal, namely adjectival incorporation (1), adjectives with definite suffixes (2) and complex demonstrative both with (4) and without (3) definite suffixes. The data is collected from a rural Norwegian dialect.

1. Å ungmærra ha tre
   And young+mare+DEF.FEM.SING. had three
   And the young mare who stands in contrast to the older mare, had three

2. Å Gamla ha fir
   And Old+DEF.FEM.SING. had four
   And the old one who stands in contrast to the younger one, had four

3. Va så stærk deinner karn
   Was so strong DEM+ADV man+DEF.MASK.SING.
   That man was so strong

4. Dein derra der
   DEF DEM+ADV+DEF.FEM.SING. there
   That one (over there)

These constructions have a complex syntax, require deictic or anaphoric reference, are definite and codes both specificity and inclusiveness, and may have a contrastive reading, whereas the adjectival incorporations and the adjectives with definite suffixes are inherent contrastive. These constructions also stands in a complementary relation to the construction with double definiteness in the studied dialect.

Similar phenomena are also attested and studied in Northern Swedish (Holmberg and Sandstrøm 2003, Vangsnes 2003 and Julien 2005), but neither of these analysis can fully explain the variation we find in the studied Norwegian dialect. I will suggest a common analysis of these phenomenon where the syntactic structure mirrors the common semantics. I will suggest that the adjectival elements in these constructions have been through a process of grammaticalisation which has led these elements to be reanalyzed as heads rather than phrases due to grammaticalisation processes including apocope and circumflex.
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Acquiring a Multiethnolect: 
Kiezdeutsch meets the Refugee Crisis
Lindsay Preseau
University of California, Berkeley

The aim of this paper is to characterize the role of multiethnic speech styles in the L2 acquisition of German by refugees in Berlin. The European refugee crisis has brought a new wave of migrants into pre-existing multilingual speech communities associated with the multiethnolect known as Kiezdeutsch (McWhorter 2015). Kiezdeutsch has been characterized predominately from a “multidimensional” perspective, emphasizing that Kiezdeutsch is a full-fledged sociolect spoken by native German speakers rather than a learners’ variety (Muysken 2010, Wiese 2011). Muysken, however, points out that that even from a multidimensional perspective, ethnolects are “fed” by L2 acquisition and language shift. I argue that Muysken’s perspective is particularly crucial to understanding the present and future of Kiezdeutsch in light of the 2015 refugee crisis. As new refugees live, learn, and work in urban areas where Kiezdeutsch is common, will they be absorbed into the Kiezdeutsch speech community? If so, what effect will their L2 variety have on Kiezdeutsch as a multiethnolect?

I answer these questions through an exploratory fieldwork project which gathers spontaneous and elicited speech and writing from both youth with migrant backgrounds and refugee youth in Berlin. Through Contrastive Analysis of Kiezdeutsch and the L2 German of recently-arrived refugees, I argue that contact between refugees and Kiezdeutsch-speaking populations does indeed appear to be influencing L2 acquisition. Particularly in the area of grammatical simplification, I find that refugees’ L2 German shows more similarities with Kiezdeutsch than would be expected for L2 learners in contact with only Standard German. Furthermore, the previously ignored influence of English ethnolects on Kiezdeutsch is coming to the fore as English becomes an increasingly common lingua franca in these speech communities.

While Kiezdeutsch has formerly been characterized as a fairly stable variety with little influence from L2 acquisition, I argue that this will likely no longer be the case in coming years. Understanding how Kiezdeutsch may change and how this will manifest itself in the L2 acquisition of German by refugees is important for both a theoretical understanding of Kiezdeutsch as a multidimensional ethnolect and for refugee language teaching. By understanding the relationship between non-native speaker L1 interference and multiethnolectic speech styles, refugee language teachers will be better prepared to address issues of Standard vs. non-Standard language in the classroom. Furthermore, the relevance of this study extends beyond Germany, as I suggest that similar questions should be investigated in other European cities where pre-existing urban speech communities (c.f., e.g., Straattaal in the Netherlands, Rinkebysvenska in Sweden) and new refugee populations are in contact.
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Attrition and case loss, especially of the dative case, have long garnered attention in heritage German research (Eikel 1949, Gilbert 1980, Freeouf 1989, Salmons 1994, Born 1994, Rosenberg 2005, Boas 2009, and others); yet, we lack a precise descriptive account of how these processes occur. The regression hypothesis (Jakobson 1941) was proposed as a way to describe the process of attrition; it suggests that one loses structures in the reverse order of acquisition. That is, those structures acquired last are lost first. Initially used to test language loss caused by aphasia, the regression hypothesis has been extended to other populations including L2 speakers, emigrants, and more recently, heritage speakers. Born (1994) supports it as an explanation for case loss in a community of Heritage German speakers in Michigan. Further, in the investigation of an individual heritage Norwegian speaker, Johannessen (2015) found results generally in support of it. This paper builds on previous work with heritage languages and the regression hypothesis by testing its application to case loss using a larger set of empirical data from a group of Wisconsin Heritage German (WHG) speakers.

The dataset for this study comprises 5,097 tokens from semi-structured interviews conducted with 19 WHG speakers from east-central Wisconsin. The average age at the time of interview was 81.6 years (SD=8.4). All learned German as their L1 at home and began learning English at school. The data in the following draws on just the masculine NPs from the dataset, as these show the most robust paradigm of distinct marked forms for the accusative and dative cases.

Under the regression hypothesis, case loss should demonstrate a reverse correlation to acquisition. Studies on child acquisition of German show that children first master the nominative case, then accusative, and then dative, and in this process they tend to overgeneralize the earlier-acquired case(s) to the latter one(s) (Szagun 2004). Under the regression hypothesis, one might expect to see higher frequencies of the earlier-acquired cases compared to the baseline of Standard German (SG). Comparing definite masculine NPs, dative marking appears in 51.6% (82/159) of the contexts and accusative in only 37.2% (54/151) of the contexts where it would be expected to occur in the baseline. In child acquisition, structural case tends to be mastered before lexical case. From the regression hypothesis, we could expect a higher frequency of structural case-marking compared to lexical. This is not the case; 42.7% (38/89) of structural oblique tokens and 43.1% (87/202) of lexical oblique tokens occur in expected contexts. During acquisition, children often omit the inflection from indefinite articles and other ‘ein-determiners’ such as possessive pronouns and the negation element ‘kein’ (Eisenbeiss et al. 2009). In the data, only 3.2% (1/31) of oblique indefinite masculine NPs show expected case-marking, compared to 43.9% (136/310) for definite masculine NPs. This could be suggestive of the regression hypothesis; however, the other findings do not lend their support to this model. The higher frequency of expected dative marking compared to accusative as well as the lack of a significant difference between structural and lexical case-marking attest to the complexities of this process. While previous studies have favored the regression hypothesis as a descriptive model of attrition, the findings here may suggest a different picture.
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Differences in the use of indirect-speech constructions
in manuscripts of Njáls saga

Ludger Zeevaert
The Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies

Icelandic uses a construction containing a subject, the finite mediopassive form of a verb of saying and one or more infinitives to reproduce utterances made by the grammatical subject of the sentence about itself.

Luke said that he would come [to the party] with a filled bread.' (Christine Nöstlinger: Vinur minn Lúki. Reykjavík: Mál og menning 1987, p. 91)

Gunnar said that he did not want to exchange words with her (and went away).’ (Njála ch. 41)

The construction is a special case of what in grammars of Icelandic usually is denominated as accusative and infinitive (ACI). Although ACI-constructions frequently appear in other Germanic languages they do not exhibit this special case of an ACI to render indirect speech but use instead a construction with a conjunctional clause (as in the English translations of the examples above).

The latter construction is also used in Icelandic, and different versions of Old Icelandic texts show variation in the use of the two constructions as can be seen from examples from different copies of Njáls saga, an Icelandic prose narrative from around 1280 which is transmitted in 61 manuscripts produced between the 14th and the 19th century. Linguistic context or semantic differences do not form a satisfying explanation, as variation between manuscripts appears at the same spots in the saga; and as the following examples from ch. 87 show, the variation cannot be explained simply as a chronological development. Both variants appear as well in 13th- as in 17th-century manuscripts (the examples are given in normalised Modern Icelandic spelling):

'Hrappur said that he was Icelandic/from Iceland'

Historical and contemporary language data from Icelandic and closely related languages indicate that the preference for a certain variant is connected to stylistic choices. In my presentation I would like to discuss the emergence of this (in the context of Germanic languages) exclusively Icelandic linguistic feature, give an overview of the amount and character of its variation in selected manuscripts of Njáls saga (at present the research corpus is still under construction) and present tentative explanations for the distribution of the variants in the corpus that mainly draw on the conscious and unconscious decisions of scribes during the process of copying a manuscript.
On the (In)extractability of Nominal PP Adjuncts

Luke Adamson  
University of Pennsylvania

Ava Irani  
University of Pennsylvania

Problem: The current study contributes to the understanding of a lesser-studied phenomenon, the non-uniformity of extractability from adnominal PPs. While extraction from verbal PP adjuncts has received much attention in the literature (Truswell 2007, 2013; Brown 2015), non-uniformity in the extractability of adjunct prepositions from nominals (Which girl did Sarah get into a fight over?/*Which rack did Monika buy a dress on?) has escaped notice in recent work (Bolinger 1972; Culicover and Rochemont 1992; a.o.). Previous work has advocated for semantic approaches: one line of research defines the relevant licensing condition for nominal subextraction as a part-whole relationship (Cattell 1979, Storoshenko & Frank 2014). Our argument is twofold: i) A semantic explanation of the pattern alone is inadequate, and ii) Certain PPs are like relative clauses and reduced relatives in that they are further embedded within the DP and obligatorily involve greater structural complexity, consequently disallowing extraction.

Against a semantic account: 1) Under a semantic account (Storoshenko & Frank 2014), identification of relational nouns is responsible for licensing extraction. However, semantic relations between a head noun and a nominal adjunct do not always license extraction: *It’s the FBI that he knows agents with. 2) Semantically equivalent adnominal expressions pattern separately: It’s pollution that we hear complaints about/*concerning nowadays. 3) Nominal extraction patterns of adjunct PPs hold cross-linguistically in pied-piping languages such as German (1). This similarity is unexpected under alternative syntactic accounts (along the lines of Svenonius 2004) if PP-internal structure or p-stranding is the cause of variation:

1. a. über welchen deutschen Philosophen hat Matt ein Buch geliehen.  
   ‘Which German philosopher did Matt borrow a book about?’  
   b. *auf welchem Regal hat Matt ein Buch geliehen  
   ‘*Which shelf did Matt borrow a book on?’ (ungrammatical with DP-internal reading)

Towards a structural account: 1) PPs that allow extraction appear to be higher in the tree. PPs that disallow extraction, similar to (reduced) relatives, are lower in the structure (2)–(3):

2. a. John bought a book about Lenin from the shelf.  
   b. *John bought a book from the shelf about Lenin.  
   c. Which person did John buy a book about?  
   d. *Which shelf did John buy a book on?

3. a. John read a book by Homer (that was) written in 1100 BC.  
   b. *John read a book (that was) written in 1100 BC by Homer.

2) Inextractable PPs pattern with (reduced) relatives in quantificational scope interpretation preferences, in contrast with extractable ones. Like (reduced) relatives, pairwise readings are preferred for PPs that disallow extraction; wide scope of the indefinite is preferred for PPs that allow extraction: John met every student (that was) from a European country. (∃>∀ preferred) / Valerie bought every movie about a powerful dictator (∃>∀ preferred). 3) The same inextractible PPs are ungrammatical in pied-piping languages such as German and Swedish, indicating that the inextractability is orthogonal to p-stranding.
Unlike English, where progressive aspect is marked productively by attaching -ing to the end of a verb stem (e.g., I am working), German employs a range of different constructions to express progressive, including the increasingly acceptable am-construction (e.g., Ich bin am Arbeit-en ‘I am working’) and a modification construction using the adverbs gerade or jetzt (e.g., Ich arbeite gerade ‘I am working now’). This paper discusses various progressive aspect constructions used in Kiezdeutsch, a newly emerging dialect spoken by youth in large cities in Germany (Wiese 2012).

While interest in the exploration of progressive aspect in German has become increasingly popular over the past 20 years and existing research has investigated the status of the progressive in German (e.g., Reimann 1997; Rödel 2004), no one has yet investigated how the progressive is distributed and used in Kiezdeutsch. One example of the progressive aspect in Kiezdeutsch is the following:

(1) Weil, du bist genervt, hast überhaupt keine Zeit für Freunde; nur, wenn sie [deine Freundin] arbeit- is. (Wiese 2012:11)
‘Because you are annoyed, you have no time at all for friends; only when she [your girlfriend] is working.’

The data for this study comes from the Kiezdeutsch Corpus (KiDKo) (www.kiezdeutschkorpus.de) which contains transcripts (~228,000 tokens) of conversations between 17 adolescents of various ethnic backgrounds from Berlin-Kreuzberg and their friends, ages 14 to 17. This data is compared to data from a complementary corpus containing transcripts (~105,000 tokens) of conversations between 6 adolescents of the same age who come from the reportedly less multiethic neighborhood of Berlin-Hellersdorf. Combined, this data is used to answer the questions: ‘How are certain constructions used to express the progressive aspect in Kiezdeutsch? Is there a difference between the uses of these constructions by Kiezdeutsch speakers and youths in less multiethic neighborhoods, and if yes, what are the differences? How does this contribute to our understanding of the progressive aspect in German on the one hand and Kiezdeutsch on the other?’

This study contributes to a greater understanding of how progressive marking functions in Kiezdeutsch and of how it fits into the larger patterns of progressive marking in other German dialects within Germany.
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- Welche sprachlichen Mittel in Anrede und Schlussformeln kommen vor, darunter auch Ausdrücke der Wertschätzung und Respektbezeugung?
- Wie variieren Länge und Differenziertheit der Anreden und Schlussformeln und wie korrespondieren sie mit möglichen Altersunterschieden oder Unterschieden im sozialen Rang?
- Welche Auslöser für Variation/Veränderung beim Formalitätsgrad der Anrede (Wahl der Anrede, Gebrauch von Titeln, Wechsel vom Sie zum Du usw.) lassen sich finden?
The English language as the current lingua franca and the policy multilingualism, espoused by the Council of Europe entail unfamiliar issues for foreign language teaching and learning, especially relevant to the acquisition of two related languages, such as German and English. The focus of this paper is on the influence of English as L2 on the acquisition of German as L3. It is based on observations of the language acquisition process, as well as on corpora of learners’ language production, comprised of written assignments, presentations and theses in German as a target language, in this case L3. The analysis aims to confirm or refute the view, popular among language teachers and learners, that it is much more difficult to learn German after English and vice versa. The numerous reported instances of morphological and syntactic negative transfer – errors in the use of prepositions, tenses, word order, etc., seem to confirm this view. At the same time, however, the much more intriguing and extremely common cases of positive L2 to L3 transfer, especially when the relatedness of German and English presupposes such transfer, remain unexplored. In addition to the transfer of communication strategies, we can point out to transfer in reading and interpreting of text, and strategies in L3 text construction, where the dominant models are those of L2 and not of L1. To a great extent this confirms the hypothesis of the author that L2 acts as FLAM (Foreign Language Teaching Model).
Descriptive Perception Verbs as ‘flavoured’ Copulas: Evidence from Dutch

Marjolein Poortvliet
University of Oxford/University of Amsterdam

Van Gelderen (2015) analyzes present-day English *remain* and *seem* as copulas with shades or flavours of modal (i.e. *seem*) and aspectual (i.e. *remain*) meanings, and shows how these verbs have undergone copularization, i.e. ‘the grammaticalization process which turns full verbs or other non-copular elements into copulas’ (Hengeveld 1992: 237-256).

In this talk, I introduce a new set of verbs to the group of flavoured copulas, namely the Dutch descriptive perception verbs: *eruitzien* ‘look’, *klinken* ‘sound’, *ruiken* ‘smell’, *voelen* ‘feel’, and *smaken* ‘taste’. An analysis of these verbs as copulas, even though hinted at (e.g. Rothstein 1983, Gisborne 2010), has thus far not been carried out.

In present-day Dutch, the descriptive perception verbs are syntactically very similar to the Dutch copula *zijn* ‘be’ in the arguments they take: predicative adjectives (1a); prepositional phrases headed by *als/zoals/alsof* ‘like’ either with an expletive subject (1b) or in a copy raising construction (1c); and at times explicit (but always implicit) experiencer arguments (1d) (all constructions were attested in the Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands).

(1) 

(a) *Jan klinkt/is boos*  
‘Jan sounds/is angry’

(b) *Het klinkt/is alsof ze uit een sprookje komen*  
‘It sounds/is like they’re from a fairytale’

(c) *Ze klinken/zijn alsof ze uit een sprookje komen*  
‘They sound/are like they’re from a fairytale’

(d) *Dat klinkt me goed in de oren/Dat is me toch lekker!*  
‘That sounds good to me/That is very tasty to me’

The Dutch descriptive perception verbs differ semantically from the copula *zijn* ‘be’ in that the former have shades of modal meaning, whereas the latter is semantically empty. To express these modal shades, I propose that the descriptive perception verbs carry the semantic features [+epistemic] and [+evidential]. Both are needed to distinguish the descriptive perception verbs from other flavoured copulas (e.g. *lijken* ‘seem’ which is [+epistemic] but [−evidential]).

I present findings from corpora that support this view of the Dutch descriptive perception verbs as copulas, as they demonstrate that the Dutch descriptive perception verbs have undergone copularization, just like the English flavoured copulas discussed by Van Gelderen. I trace the development of these verbs from full lexical verbs in Middle Dutch either with an adverb (2a) or without (2b) to serving as copulas in Modern Dutch requiring predicative adjectives (2c), most likely due to reanalysis of the verb-modifying adverb as a subject-modifying adjective.

(2) 

(a) *om dat coper elinket clare*  
‘so that the copper sounds clearly’ [1285]

(b) *so clare dat al die bosch elanc*  
‘so clearly that the whole forest resounded’ [14th century]

(c) *er volgde dan ook een antwoord […] dat raauw en hatelijk klonk*  
‘then an answer followed […] which sounded raw and hateful’ [1863]
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The Acquisition of Verb Complementation in Swedish as a Foreign Language
Martje Wijers
Ghent University

Verb complementation is known to be a major challenge for second language learners of English (Bourke 2007; Martinez-Garcia & Wulff 2012). The acquisition of verb complementation in other Germanic languages, such as Swedish, is less well-studied than in English, but equally challenging nonetheless. L2 learners must not only acquire which type of complement (finite or non-finite) can be combined with each Complement-taking Predicate (CTP) but also whether it takes a complementizer or not. When a CTP can take more than one type of complement, L2 learners must also understand the meaning differences between the complement types involved, which is highly dependent on the semantics of the matrix verb. The combinations that L2 learners produce can be influenced by various factors, such as input frequencies of the constructions in question and L1 transfer.

In the current study I analyzed the use of CTP’s with finite and non-finite complements from a usage-based constructionist approach. The investigated data consists of written input and output of 20 beginning native Dutch speaking learners of Swedish as a Foreign Language in Belgium. I compared the written input during the first 12 weeks of language development to the written assignments they produced during that same period as well as their output in a small-scale elicitation task based on picture stories. During data analysis, CTP's that take an infinitival complement, such as ‘han glömde att borsta tänderna’ (He forgot to brush his teeth), were compared to CTP’s that take a finite complement, such as ‘jag tror att han ljuger’ (I believe he is lying). As both the L1 and the L2 in question are Germanic languages, it is especially interesting to look at CTP's that differ between L1 and L2 with regard to the complement type they take.

It will be shown that most learners use a very limited variety of CTP’s (and auxiliaries) in each text and are inclined to rely on formulaic language or frequent CTP’s in the input. In the beginning stages of language development, item-specific constructional knowledge seems to play a very important role in developing more item-general constructional knowledge. Highly frequent or salient CTP’s in the input can more easily become path-breaking verbs, paving the way towards item-general constructional knowledge for the learners. In case a clear path-breaking predicate is missing, L2 learners tend to rely on L1 transfer of complement types more often.
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Pronominal cliticization, analogy and additive morphology: The case of Old High German -mês

Mary Allison  Matthew Boutilier  Robert Howell  Katerina Somers
University of Wisconsin, Madison  University of Wisconsin, Madison  University of Wisconsin, Madison  Queen Mary, University of London

Additive morphological innovation such as the Old High German (OHG) development of the second person singular indicative forms of the type feris > ferist are traditionally attributed to misparsing of clitic groups such as feristu 'you go' > ferist thu / thu ferist. While this explanation enjoys a certain common-sense appeal, it is remarkable that pronominal cliticization, already well-attested in the early Runic inscriptions, has yielded few if any parallel innovations in Old High German. Sihler (1986) argues instead that the added -t in the second person singular is instead most likely attributable to the influence of the second person singular ending -t in the preterit-present verbs and, indeed, to the influence of a subset of these verbs which show an -st ending (e.g., kanst, muost, tarst, weist). Somers (2011) makes the case that both cliticization as well as analogical pressure from the preterit-present verbs, contribute to -st’s introduction into the rest of the verbal paradigm.

Based on comprehensive data from major OHG texts (Isidor, Tatian, Otfrid, Benediktinerregel, Murbach Hymns), this paper seeks to apply the insights of Sihler and Somers to another notoriously intractable instance of additive verbal morphology, the OHG first-person plural present indicative endings in -mês (e.g., nemumês, suochemês '(we) take, seek', etc.). The research represents the first step in a larger research program that seeks to investigate the link between cliticization and morphological change and to explain exactly how the distinct processes of cliticization and analogy work together in order to effect change in the verbal paradigms of the oldest attested varieties of German. It builds on the work of Sihler and Somers and tests the hypothesis that cliticization alone is not typically an adequate trigger for the reanalysis and grammaticalization of new additive morphology. We test the plausibility of accounts of the origin of -mês based solely on analogy (Bech 1962) and those based solely on cliticization of a stressed first person pronoun of the type *-weis (Paul 1877; Hollifield 1980). These data call into question whether analogical innovation or pronominal cliticization alone can account for all of the relevant facts regarding the development of -mês forms in OHG. The study therefore represents a contribution to the question of the relationship between analogy and cliticization in the development of additive morphology in OHG.
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Separable Prefix Verbs in Binnendeutsch and Swiss Standard German

Matthias Fingerhuth
University of Texas at Austin

German is commonly considered a pluricentric language, i.e. a language with distinct regional or national differences in its standard varieties. While current research captures the breadth of this variation today (e.g. Dürscheid et al. 2011), virtually nothing is known about its historical development (Elspaß & Niehaus 2014). In the case of Binnendeutsch and Swiss Standard German, for instance, do the German and Swiss standard varieties represent recent distinct standardizations from the same pool of variation, or is there long standing continuity in the differences? The following paper aims to clarify these issues, drawing on a corpus-based study of one commonly described difference between Binnendeutsch and Swiss Standard German.

It is often argued that a number of verbs that are commonly described as separable prefix verbs in Binnendeutsch are inseparable prefix verbs in Swiss Standard German (Dürscheid and Sutter 2014, Meyer 2006, Zibrowa 1995). Separable prefix verbs like *widerspiegeln* exhibit very specific syntactic behavior. In main clauses, the prefix detaches from the verb and moves to the end of the clause, as seen in (1).

(1) Die Entscheidung spiegelt die Zahlen wider.
The decision reflects the numbers re.

(2) is therefore the Swiss equivalent of (1).

(2) Die Entscheidung widerspiegelt die Zahlen.
The decision reflects the numbers.

In my paper I trace the occurrence of 11 verbs that have been described as distinct throughout two corpora of 20th century German (Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache) and Swiss (Schweizer Textkorpus) German. The analysis allows several observations. (1) The described differences between the national varieties are not always found in the corpus. (2) In the Swiss corpus, there is a tendency of both separable and inseparable variants to occur parallel over the whole of the 20th century. (3) The German corpus shows more consistency in the use of the separable forms, nonetheless inseparable forms are occasionally found.

While the scope of the investigation is very narrow, it raises new questions. Further research will need to address whether the variation in the Swiss standard variety can be evidenced for other grammatical features. Overall, Swiss Standard German in the 20th century could be characterized by stronger variation than that found in Binnendeutsch, and the standardization processes in Germany and Switzerland could have distinct trajectories. Investigating the factors that support the maintenance of variation against the forces of standardization in Switzerland, in contrast to the apparent trend towards uniformity in Germany, could refine our understanding of pluricentricity. Swiss diglossia or the dominance of German media production in Switzerland could also offer explanations for the findings.
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Loanwords vs. native words in Old and Middle Icelandic
The coexistence and competition of (quasi-)synonymic couples in the texts and the lexicon

Matteo Tarsi
University of Iceland

My research focuses on the relationship between loanwords and native words in Old and Middle Icelandic (9th–15th century), namely when such words form a (quasi-)synonymic couple, i.e., a lexical doublet constituted by a loanword on one side and a semantically (semi-)equivalent native formation on the other: e.g., discipulus–læriseinn, dominus–dráttinn, evangelista–gúshpjáljamann or gúshpjállaskáld, messa–gúshpjírnusla (The Icelandic Homily Book); buðlafr–skjóldr, karfi–skip (Egils saga); bufftir–kinnheðar, láta–félðr (Gísla saga).

The main aim of the research is to investigate the dynamics of the aforementioned phenomenon in the period before the start of linguistic purism in Iceland (ca. 1600 [Ottósson 1990:20]), i.e., prior to the formal acknowledgement made by the humanist Arngímur Jónsson, that the Icelanders ought to use their native language, as found in the literary products of the past, as their chief source for the written, as well as the spoken, language and that they should therefore avoid loanwords from foreign languages such as Middle Low German and Danish (cf. Jónsson 1609:23).

The research follows a double path: Starting from a representative corpus of texts which covers the whole of the Old and Middle Icelandic written production, the (quasi-)synonymic couples will be analysed both from a narrower, textual, point of view and from a broader, lexical, one. With regard to the former two research questions are addressed, namely: a) Whether different textual typologies reflect a prevalent difference in the use of loanwords and/or native words (intertypological analysis); and b) whether there is a difference with regard to the phenomenon in the manuscript tradition of a single work (intrastemmatical analysis). As for the lexical point of view, the research questions which arise are of more quantitative nature, namely: c) Which is the frequency of the single couples in the lexicon as a whole; and d) how much does the use of loanwords vs. native words – or vice versa – relatively weigh in each of the two linguistic stages under research.

As previously sketched, the corpus has been designed in order to take into account all the textual typologies in the Old and Middle Icelandic period. These have been categorised as follows (cf. also Guðrún Nordal et al. 1992 and Boðvar Guðmundsson et al. 1993): religious texts, law and diplomatic texts, learned tracts, historiographical texts, bishops’ sagas and hagiographic texts, sagas of the Icelanders, kings’ sagas, chivalric sagas, legendary sagas, poetry (skaldic, Eddaic and rímur).

In the paper, the corpus will be presented in its entirety along with a more fine outline of the actual state of the research. In addition, some preliminary data from different textual typologies will be presented, namely: religious texts (The Icelandic Homily Book, The Old Norse Elucidarius), law and diplomatic texts (Grágás), sagas of the Icelanders (Egils saga, Gísla saga).
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Old Norse and Old English Hypermetric Connections
Megan E. Hartman
University of Nebraska at Kearney

In recent years, some long-overdue attention has been given to the two Eddic meters other than fornyðislag, ljóðaháttr and mállaháttr (see in particular Geoffrey Russom, “Why there are three Old Norse Meters,” Anglo-Saxons and the North, ed. Matti Kilpiö et al. [Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2009]; and Seiichi Suzuki, The Meters of Old Norse Eddic Poetry [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014]). These studies have raised questions about how exactly these meters are structured and why there might be three distinctive Eddic meters. One interesting feature of both meters is that they contain elements of hypermetric composition. In ljóðaháttr, that hypermetric element appears in the full line—the third and sixth verses of each stanza, which stand by themselves as a line. The principles that govern this line are far from determined, however; Sievers proposed two different methods of analysis, metrists often argue about whether lines have two or three stressed positions, and it is not at all clear to what degree analysis with the traditional five types is relevant. Russom and Suzuki have made some progress in this regard by building on the earlier analysis by Sievers, which says the full line consists of a normal (or possibly hypometric) verse followed by a cadence that is regularly formed by a single stressed syllable or a resolved stressed position. Though the two scholars have different methods of analysis that lead to different realizations of some verse patterns, the idea that the full line is formed by combining some form of shorter line with an additional foot makes sense in light of the one indisputably regular feature in the ljóðaháttr full line: the final stressed position.

If this is a type of regular hypermetrics, the form is quite different from Old English hypermetrics, which is formed by adding an additional onset that can be characterized by its exceptionally flexible unstressed position. Although the verse patterns differ, the two meters do have some similarities in terms of how the meter and syntax interact. While the cadence of the ljóðaháttr full line does not contain independent unstressed material, poets often compose the lines with long initial drops, using the cadence as a space for an additional stress word. The line therefore allows the poet to group the unstressed material in the beginning of the full line while still including a large number of stressed lexical words. These features closely parallel those of OE hypermetrics, which group the unstressed words in the drops of the onsets and have very concise and noun-heavy cadences. This paper will explore such structural similarities between Old English hypermetrics and the Old Norse full line in order to further refine the analysis of ljóðaháttr and to explore what the rhetorical purpose of this meter might be.
Naming the body in Germanic: etymology and evolution

Michael Dunn
Uppsala University

The systems for naming parts of the body in the modern Germanic languages are surprisingly diverse, both with respect to how the body is divided up into named parts, and with respect to the individual lexemes used to name those parts. On the basis of a rich empirical data set of cross-linguistic body part naming by native speakers of twelve Germanic languages, this paper will demonstrate that the body part names and the partonomic systems that these names enter into have disjunct histories: the history of categories and the history of the labels to those categories don't map directly onto each other. The cause of this disjunction is to be found in the different diffusional/evolutionary dynamics of lexical and semantic change.

This analysis unifies a philological and psycholinguistic account of body part naming systems with a statistical measures of diversity from evolutionary sciences and ecology. The basic logic of these analyses is that geographic and genealogical proximity can be used as a predictor for the similarity of lexemes and systems of categorization, and the departures from these predictions show where other, sociolinguistically more interesting, processes are in play.
Semantic Typology in Old Icelandic Poetics

Mikael Males
University of Oslo

Several scholars have discussed the rich lexicon of poetological terms found in Old Icelandic texts. The semantic typology of these terms, however, has more to add to the story than has as yet been realized. The native terminology is largely restricted to the semantic field of the home and the crafts. Based on this observation, even calques that are less than obvious can be identified, such as the term *nykrat*, drawing on the figure of a monster, the merman. This term seems to derive from Horace’s *Ars poetica*, and the semantic deviance of the term can here serve as corroboration of its foreign origin. In other cases, notably the Fifth Grammatical Treatise, the relation between native and Latin semantics was negotiated in an attempt to emulate the wealth of Latin terminology while retaining a native flavour. Semantic typology can thus further our understanding of the development of poetics and its progression from practical craft to intellectual discipline. This group of terms is, furthermore, particularly apt for a study of the various factors involved in the semantic realizations of calques, which involve not only usefulness and transparence, but also tradition, status and perceived propriety.
Towards a typology of Baltic lexical prefixes and Germanic particles

Milena Šereikaitė
University of Pennsylvania

Background&Proposal: Despite the similarities between Lithuanian lexical prefix-verb and German separable particle-verb configurations, the two patterns are of different nature: morphological objects vs. phrasal constructions. Lithuanian prefixes, like German particles and Slavic prefixes (Svenonius 2004a), transitivize intransitive verbs, and encode motion, perfectivity and idiomatic meanings. Slavic prefixes and Germanic particles are analyzed as phrasal complements XP to a VP, (1a) (Svenonius 2004a, Zeller 2001). Although the Lithuanian prefix is a VP-internal element, the prefix is not phrasal. Rather, it is a morpheme X which forms a complex predicate with a root via direct merge (1b).

Phrasal constructions vs. direct merge: I) German particle verbs behave like phrasal constructions, while Lithuanian verbs with a lexical prefix have more word-like properties. I) German particles can be separated from a verb (2), while Lithuanian prefixes are cannot, (3); 2) particles can be topicalized (2), while prefixes cannot (3); 3) particles can undergo focus scrambling (3), unlike prefixes (4); 4) only particles can be modified (5-6); 5) particles (7) and prefixes (8) participate in word formation which challenges the structure (1a) for German. II) The phrasal analysis is attractive for Lithuanian prefixes because lexical prefixes can introduce a new argument. However, not every prefix introduces a new argument, e.g., nu- does not change the argument structure of the verb: Jis mirė/nu

Implications: This study illustrates structural variations within the system of particle/prefix verbs: ones formed in the morphological component and others in syntax. (1b) makes better predictions for prefixed verbs: it explains their inseparability, word formation and idiosyncratic meaning assuming that the root is assigned an interpretation once merged with a verbalizer (Arad 2003). Lastly, we give additional evidence for the lexical and super-lexical prefix distinction from Baltic which as we show corresponds to Outer and Inner Aspect split (Travis 2010).

1) An der Haltestellen stiegen hübsche Frauen ein. Aus stiegen nur Männer.
   At the bus stop climbed pretty women in. Out climbed only men
   "At the bus stop, pretty women got on. Only men got off" (Zeller 2001:89 in Svenonius 2004b)

2) *Ich weiß, daß die Soone AUF im Osten and UNTER im Western geht.
   I know that the sun up in the east and down in the West goes
   "I know that the sun goes up in the East and down in the West. (Lüdeling 2001:50)

3) *I autobusą į-lipo grazio moterys. Įš tiktai vyrų lipo.
   In bus in-cimbed pretty women. Out only men climed.

4) Ich weiß, daß die Soone AUF im Osten and UNTER im Western geht.
   I know that the sun up in the east and down in the West goes
   "I know that the sun goes up in the East and down in the West. (Lüdeling 2001:50)

5) *Ipš į-vakaro u ir išs- rytuose teka.
   River in- west and out- east flows.

6) Peter had die Tür ganz weit auf-gemacht (Zeller 2001:100 in Svenonius 2004b)
   Peter has the door quite up-made “Peter has opened the door quite wide”

7) Jis (?tiesiai) i-nešė daiktus (tiesiai) į kambarį.
   He (straight) in-carried stack (straight) in room.

8) auf-gekochen – “to bring the boil” un-auf-gekocht- “unboiled” (Lüdeling 2001:4)
9) i-neštį – to bring in, i-neštąs- brought in.PRT.S.M, i-nešimas –bringing in (noun)
What Yiddish loans tell us about language

Neil G. Jacobs
Ohio State University, Emeritus

The recent use of a perceived "Yiddish" word in the U.S. presidential campaign caused a public stir and ensuing discussion. There were arguments and counter-arguments in the public sphere over the vulgarity or non-vulgarity of the word; whether or not this word was "Yiddish"--and if not, what it in fact was; as well as the "right" of outsiders (= non-Jews) to use a yiddishism. It spurred discussion in the media--both general and Jewish--as well as other candidates to react by using other "yiddishisms" of their own. While much in these discussions was linguistically imprecise, confused, and/or simply wrong—a closer meta-look at these public discussions can shed important light on a number of general linguistic and sociolinguistic issues.

The present paper attempts to provide a framework for the broader consideration of "yiddishisms" across a range of languages--German, Dutch, English, Polish, Modern Israeli Hebrew, as well as in specialized jargons--Rotwelsch, Jewish- and non-Jewish Viehhändlersprache 'cattle dealers' language,' Viennese thieves' cant, wandering musicians' jargon. There are several issues to be addressed. For example, Matras (1996) importantly shows that the ostensibly "same" Hebraisms in Jewish vs. non-Jewish cattle dealers' language in southwestern Germany have distinct and different sources. One can also ask why non-Jewish cattle dealers would (inaccurately) identify their specialized jargon as speaking "Jewish". Furthermore, we can ask why, in a given language, some Yiddish loans remain more marked while others become more fully integrated. One can also ask why such a large number of Yiddish loans became fully integrated into general Dutch, while the bulk of Yiddish loans in English were much more socially limited. We can also examine instances where a Yiddish loan is incorporated as a marked yiddishism in the non-Jewish general language, undergoes innovative change (e.g., semantic, morphological), and then is reincorporated into Jewish speech in the changed form, supplanting the original Jewish form and/or meaning. In what ways do monolingual Jewish speech communities in the United States (English) or Germany (German; see Jahns 2015) today use Yiddish loans to mark Jewish linguistic turf, and in what ways does this differ from earlier times when these communities were still largely bilingual (with Yiddish)?

Rather than treating Yiddish loans in static fashion as a simple borrowing phenomenon, the present paper places these in broader historical, dialect, and sociolinguistic contexts, employing the methodologies of scholarship on ethnolects, perceptual dialectology, crossing (Rampton), and acts of identity (LePage & Tabouret-Keller 1985). Thus, the present paper attempts to show that it is at the more general and macro-level of analysis that the patterning of the individual loans becomes clearer.
The intonation of polar questions in North American Icelandic
Nicole Dehé
University of Konstanz

The current paper focuses on the intonation of North American Icelandic (NAmIce), a heritage language still spoken to some extent in certain parts of the US and Canada (e.g. Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir 2006, 2015). Specifically, the focus is on the intonation of polar questions (PQ) in NAmIce, compared to polar questions in Icelandic as spoken in Iceland (IceIce) and in Manitoban English (MBEngl). The data are taken from a map task study carried out in Iceland and in Manitoba (Canada). Three sets of data were included:

(i) Icelandic PQs produced by 15 speakers (9 female, 6 male) of NAmIce, recorded in three locations in Manitoba in August 2014. The age range of these speakers was 64-89 at the time of the recordings (average age: 77). 

(ii) Icelandic PQs produced by 12 speakers (7 female, 5 male) of IceIce, recorded in three locations in Iceland in December 2013 and June 2014. The age range of these speakers was 64-89 at the time of the recordings (average age: 70).

(iii) English PQs produced by 4 monolingual speakers of MBEngl, who were not of Icelandic descent (age range 60-79; average 71), and 15 heritage speakers of NAmIce.

The results are as follows. First, the intonation of both the English and the NAmIce PQs are in line with previous analyses of their intonation (e.g. Kristján Árnason 2005, 2011 for IceIce, Hedberg, Sosa & Görgülü 2014 for English). Specifically, the default nuclear contour in English PQs is rising (typically low-rise $L^*H-H\%$; 89.5\% of the data; $N=47$), while the default nuclear contour in IceIce PQs is a fall or rise-fall (typically $L^*+H L-L\%$ or $L+H^* L-L\%$). Second, in the NAmIce PQ data ($N=120$), the distribution between rises and falls is more balanced, such that there were 60\% ($N=72$) rising contours (typically the low rise $L^*H-H\%$) and 40\% ($N=48$) falling contours (typically rise-fall $L^*+H L-L\%$ or $L+H^* L-L\%$, or high fall $(!)H^* L-L\%$). See the example contours below.

One way of interpreting these results is that there is some transfer from the dominant language (here: MBEngl) to the heritage language (here: NAmIce) in intonation. However, the fact that there is still a high percentage of falls in the NAmIce data leaves room for other ways of interpretation. 
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The investigation at hand argues that the unresolved partial overlap and divergence of the two focus particles *eben* and *gerade* can be explained by proposing a speaker’s underlying presupposition about the communicative context—in particular how the hearer’s opinion or knowledge about the matter that is being discussed relates to the speaker’s own: While *eben* is used to emphasize propositions in which the speaker presupposes that the hearer shares the speaker’s knowledge (i.e. interlocutor perspectives align), *gerade* is used in utterances in which the speaker presumes the hearer’s knowledge differs from the speaker’s (i.e. interlocutor perspectives do not align).

In German particle research, the focus particle *eben* has been extensively covered, while *gerade* serves for comparison only in brief side notes. Their exact relationship has not been fully resolved to date. Of the few works that have even addressed *eben* and *gerade* in conjunction, all claim that the two are synonymous. König, for example, argues that both particles emphatically assert the identity of two values in different propositional schemata (cf. 12-13). On occasion, however, scholars dare to admit that this view does not apply to all instances and should therefore be considered problematic (cf. Altmann 153). The question arises what the exact dynamic between the two focus particles is. In my paper I intend to answer this question.

A number of diverging syntactic and information structure-related characteristics of the two lexemes provide evidence for the proposed underlying meanings. As an extract of a larger body of research, I will present two representative syntactico-semantic observations: Firstly, the combination patterns of *eben* vs. *gerade* with a larger contrastive *nicht … sondern … ’not … rather …’ structure, and secondly, the significantly more frequent occurrence of *gerade* in the front field of sentences, frequently with scope over entire causal connectives. The strong affiliation of *eben* with the *nicht … sondern … construction is evidence of its co-occurrence with shared information. The more frequent occurrence of *gerade* in the front field of clauses, with scope over causal clauses, equivalently indicates that *gerade* is used when the speaker wants to emphasize information that is not shared with the hearer.

The findings are based on a corpus data analysis of 1,000 occurrences of each focus particle, extracted from IDS Mannheim’s *Plenarprotokolle* ‘plenary protocols’ sub-corpus from 2011. The quantitative analysis illustrates the distributional properties of *eben* and *gerade* in the syntactic environments above. A closer, qualitative examination of the context reveals the more expansive discursive strategies in which the two focus particles are embedded, supporting the observation that *eben* implicates high alignment and *gerade* implicates low alignment of interlocutors as presupposed by the speaker.
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The incredible weakness of the Germanic third weak verb class

Paul T. Roberge
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The Germanic third weak verb class poses a seemingly intractable etymological muddle. It is “one of the most extensively investigated yet least satisfactorily understood areas of Gmc. morphology,” wrote Dishington (1976:851) some forty years ago, and his words remain true today. The difficulty obtains from the considerable inflectional diversity of this class across the historical dialects. Old High German has a uniform formation with -ē- and athematic inflection (inf. habēn ‘have’, 1 sg. pres. ind. habēm, 3 sg. habēt, 1 sg. pret. ind. habēta, etc.). The OHG pattern is not found in any other Germanic dialect. Gothic shows a suffixal alternation between -ai in 2 sg. pres. ind. habais, 3 sg./2 pl. habaip, the preterite (1/3 sg. pret. ind. habaida, etc.), and past participle (habaip), and -a- in the rest of the paradigm (inf., haban, 1 sg. haba, etc.), which is indistinguishable from that of the strong verb. The Old Norse pattern corresponds for the most part to the Gothic: ON inf. vaka, ‘be wake’, 2/3 sg. pres. ind. vakir, 1 pl. vokum, 2 pl. vokid, 3 pl. vaka, etc. In Old Saxon and Old English Class III is only weakly attested.

Jasanoff (1973), among others, has concluded that the third weak class is archaic, given that a significant number of these verbs have congers outside Germanic built on a late IE deverbative suffix *-ē- (OHG dagēn ‘be silent’, Lat. tacēre). Despite the pedigree of the suffix itself, the remarkable degree of formal diversity across the dialects and the negligible presence of a third weak class in OE and OS suggest that it was not fixed in Proto-Germanic.

Roberge (2015) has claimed that the early Germanic habitus was the locus of intense language contact, out of which arose an exoteric base vernacular that was used for intergroup communication. This variety was characterized by simplification (particularly salient in what would become the Ingvaeonic dialects), restructuring, and innovation. It saw the instantiation of “Ingredient X,” the grammatical formative that underlies the Germanic weak preterital marker. Subsequent waves of in-migrating Indo-Europeans adopted the indigenized base vernacular and elaborated it regionally into esoteric varieties, with which increasingly well-defined groups (corresponding to the Germanic macrodialectal groupings) set themselves off from one another. Morphological complexity is a hallmark feature of esoterogeny. Inflectional patterns corresponding to the traditional weak verb classes were organized around “Ingredient X.” These expansions grammaticalized secondarily and independently during the development of Gothic and North Germanic, on the one hand, and Old High German, on the other. A third weak class failed to develop in Ingvaeonic to any significant degree. This hypothesis is consistent with Meillet’s view that the specific weak verb classes became established only during the development of the different Germanic dialects (1949:162).
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Stress is what gives you the allomorphs!
Allomorphy in Dutch derivational affixes

Paula Fenger
University of Connecticut

Introduction The interaction of agentive suffixes and female agentive suffixes in Dutch seems intricate at first sight. The allomorphs of these suffixes are chosen based on an interaction of morphological structure and stress of the preceding element. I show that this interaction is captured in a Distributed Morphology framework (Halle and Marantz 1993).

Data Agentive nouns in Dutch can be formed by adding a suffix to the base (Booij 1998, Plag 2000, van Oostendorp 2009). This paper focuses on two allomorphs, which I argue are phonological variants based on stress of the base (following Plag 2000). The suffix –er appears when the stress of the base is on the preceding syllable, (1); –ar is attached when followed by weak syllable, (2), but sometimes it is attached following a stressed syllable, (3).

(1) a. loop /'loʊp/ ‘walk’ b. loop-er /'loʊp.ər/ ‘walker’
   verkoop /'vər.koʊp/ ‘sell’
   verkoop-er /'vər.koʊp.ər/ ‘seller’
(2) a. luister /'luɪstər/ ‘listen’ b. luister-ar /'luɪstər.ər/ ‘listener’
   bedel /'be.ˈdal/ ‘beg’
   bedel-ar /'be.ˈdal.ər/ ‘beggar’
(3) a. min /'mɪn/ ‘love’ b. minn-ar /'mɪn.ər/ ‘lover’
   dien /'dɪn/ ‘serve’
   dien-ar /'dɪn.ər/ ‘servant’

Now, if we turn to female agentive nouns (by adding –ster), it turns out that the allomorph –er disappears and –ster is added to the root (4), but –ar does not disappear and –ster is attached to this affix (5). However, in those cases where –ar is attached as an exception in (3), we do not see –ster, but –es as the female agentive suffix, (6) (see for an overview Don 2015).

(4)   loop-ster ‘female walker’
   verkoop-ster ‘female seller’
(5)   luister-aar-ster ‘female listener’
   bedel-aar-ster ‘female beggar’
(6)   minnaar-es ‘female lover’
   dienar-es ‘female servant’

Proposal I provide an analysis in the framework of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993). To account for the alternation between –er and –ar I assume that there is a rule that makes –ar weak when it can attach to a stressed foot to form a bisyllabic foot, (7).

(7)  a.r $\Rightarrow$ σ₁

Thus, in the case of (1), –er can attach to loop since it will from a bisyllabic foot (which are preferred in Dutch (Booij 1997). Moreover, it does not alter the stress pattern, which stays on loop. On the other hand, –ar can be a foot on its own, since superheavy syllables have stress in Dutch (Kager 1989). In the case of (2), the stem is already bisyllabic and –ar can attach to it, and thus the word has two feet. In the case of (3) the differences between the underlying morphological structures become important. I assume the structures in (8) and argue that the structure of the nouns in (1-2/4-5) is as in (8a), whereas the structure of (3/6) is as in (8b). Both consist of a root and an agentive suffix (nag) and female suffix (nem). The difference is that (8b) lacks a nominizing first head and the nag attaches immediately to the root.

   b. [[[root] n] nag] nem

Following many (Marvin 2003, Marantz 2007, Embick 2010), I take the first head to be a boundary for rules that can only apply below or above this head. I assume that (7) does not apply below the first head, and therefore nag in (8b) cannot undergo this rule. Therefore –ar attaches to the syllable structure of the root itself, and the whole complex becomes bisyllabic.

The same structures in (8) can explain the suffixation of nem. Since in (2/5) –ar is a foot, but monosyllabic, –ster can attach to it to form a second bisyllabic foot. In the case of (1/4) this is not possible, since –er is part of another foot. –ster cannot form a foot on its own, since it contains a schwa. I assume, partly following Don (2015) that there is a rule that removes –er from the phonological string (but it does not remove the underlying syllable) and inserts –ster into the same syllable position. Again, the underlying phonological structure is not changed, but is realized by another suffix. Finally, (8) explains why (6) takes –es: since nag is closer to the root, the phonological suffix is part of the bisyllabic foot. Now, nem cannot be –ster since, it will be a weak syllable. Therefore it will be the form –es, with a full vowel.
The German Double Object Alternation and its Consequences for the Treatment of ‘Inherent’ Case

Peter Hallman
University of Vienna

In this talk, I claim that there is a transformational relationship between the dative DP *dem Sammler* ‘the collector’ in (1) and the prepositional phrase *an den Sammler* ‘to the collector’, where *Sammler* is accusative. The two constituents are in complementary distribution in (1), signified by the braces. The alternation between dative and accusative here in turn means that dative case does not inhere in a particular theta role, because *Sammler* ‘collector’ has the same theta role in both frames, as I demonstrate below.

(1) Hans verkauft{dem Sammler} das Gemälde {an den Sammler}.
    Hans sold {theDAT collector} the paintingACC {to theACC collector}.
    ‘Hans sold the collector the painting / the painting to the collector.’

The possibility of expressing the indirect object in an *an*-phrase is productive for some verbs but not others, meaning the alternation is sensitive to its lexical context. But whenever both formats are available, they display a decisive characteristic of transformational relatedness: they are subject to identical selectional restrictions, meaning they express the same argument of the verb. For example, while humans are possible in both formats (1), things that would not ordinarily possess paintings, like bodies of water, are not felicitous in either format (2). This correspondence is systematic.

(2) #Hans verkauft {der Nordsee} das Gemälde {an die Nordsee}
    Hans sold {theDAT North Sea} theACC painting {to theACC North Sea}
    #‘Hans sold the North Sea the painting.’

Like *verkaufen, schicken* ‘send’ has a dative frame that admits only a potential possessor (3a). Its corresponding *an*-frame also only admits a possessor (3a) but with locative *nach* it admits locations (3b). This means that dative and *an* mark the same argument (recipient), while *nach* marks a different argument, a location. The reason *Hans sent the painting to London* is grammatical in English is that *to* is ambiguous between *an* and *nach*, but these are underlyingly different constructions.

(3) a. Hans schickte {dem Sammler/#London} das Gemälde {an den Sammler/#London}.
    Hans sent {theDAT collector/#London} theACC painting {to theACC collector/London}.
    ‘Hans sent {the collector/#London} the painting {to the collector/London}.’

    Hans sent theACC painting to London.
    ‘Hans sent the painting to London.’

If dative and accusative *Sammler* bear the same relation to the verb in (1) and (3a), then dative is not inherent in that theta role. These observations support Frieden and Sprouse’s (1991) view that dative is contingent on a lexical case assigner but also Czepluch’s (1996) view that dative is contingent on an appropriate configuration, in which sense it is ‘structural’. Contemporary analyses of the double object construction suggest that that assigner is Appl and the configuration is *[spec,ApplP]*. ApplP is an intermediate projection between little-vP and big-VP that introduces the recipient. I claim that the *an*-phrase occurs as an adjunct of Appl’. Per Chomsky (2000), the theme receives accusative through an Agree relation with little-v.

Keeping it in the family:
Disentangling contact and inheritance in closely related languages

Rebecca Colleran
University of Edinburgh

The striking similarities between Old English (OE) and Old Frisian (OFr)—including aspects of phonology, lexis, and idiom—have long been cause for comment and controversy. Whether the resemblance is due to an immediate common ancestor (Anglo-Frisian) or to a dialect continuum/sprachkreis has been hotly disputed using phonological and toponymic evidence…but not in recent years. Stiles (1995), summing up the general feeling of the time, came down hard in favor of the dialect continuum, and there the issue has rested.

However, recent finds in archaeology (Nieuwhof 2009, 2013) and genetics (Weale et al 2002) argue that the case requires a second look. Developments in grammaticalization theory and contact linguistics give us new tools with which to investigate. Are the similarities due to an exclusive shared ancestor, or are OE and OFr merely part of a dialect continuum, with no closer relationship than that shared with the other early West Germanic dialects? And are there any reliable criteria to separate out similarities due to inheritance and those due to contact? Shared developments seem, \textit{primo facie}, to be evidence of shared inheritance, but there are other possible explanations. Parallel drift after separation, convergent development due to contact, or coincidence might be the cause of any shared feature.

In this paper, I discuss recently proposed methods of distinguishing inheritance from drift and contact (Heine and Nomachi 2013; Pat-El 2013; Robbeets 2013), focusing on how morphology and syntax can help explore the shared history of OE and OFr. Although grammaticalization processes often lead to crosslinguistic similarities (Bybee et al 1994; Heine and Kuteva 2002), the fact that OE and OFr display a cluster of grammaticalizations not found in other early West Germanic dialects may well be significant. The developments under investigation include \textit{aga(n)} ‘have’ > ‘have to’ and the so-called ‘long infinitive’. By comparing their distribution in the OFr corpus to that of their cognates in OE, I show that OE and OFr probably diverged from one another substantially later than they diverged from Old Saxon and Old Low Franconian, lending new credence to an Anglo-Frisian ancestor.
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Evidentiality, the linguistic realisation of a speaker’s (or writer’s) evidence for an asserted proposition, has received significant attention in the last three decades. However, most synchronic work has focused on establishing a typological classification of evidential systems (Aikhenvald 2004; Boye 2012); meanwhile, diachronic studies on evidentiality seem to focus more on the development of specific items into evidential markers with little or no regard to discourse context (Traugott 1997; Diewald & Smirnova 2010). Only a handful of recent studies have considered the role of genre or discourse context on the use and development of evidential markers (Taavitsainen 2001; Grund 2012).

This paper attempts to fill this gap by presenting the results of a corpus-based study in the use of evidential markers in Early Modern English and German Scientific Discourse. The Early Modern period was a period that witnessed the transition from scholastic-based models of science to more empirical models of scientific enquiry; consequently, it is predicted that there will be a decrease in the use of markers of mediated information (i.e. citing classical authorities such as Galen and Aristotle) and an increase in the use of markers of direct observation and inference. By focusing on more than one language, it is hoped that broader developments in the evidential systems of European languages can be examined alongside the particularities of English and German. Data will be analysed using a combination of “bottom-up” analysis (close reading of selected texts) and subsequent “top down” searches for frequently used evidential markers using the WordSmith concordancer program. Corpora to be consulted include: for English – the Corpus of Early Modern English Medical Texts and the ARCHER Corpus; for German – the Bonn Corpus of Early New High German, the Deutsches Textarchiv, and the GerManC Corpus.
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P positions in older Dutch

Robert A. Cloutier
University of Amsterdam

The historical development of so-called ‘postpositions’, a grammatical feature of Present-Day Dutch (PD), has received little attention in the literature on older stages of Dutch. Lin’s (2012) syntax-typological account of their development is thus far the only study specifically dedicated to their diachrony; however, Lin’s proposal suffers from two main issues. First, her proposal of typological alignment would suggest that this construction is the result of a purely syntactic motivation that is separate from semantics, which is clearly not the case—it is only when the context requires a directional reading that the postposed P element is possible. Even more problematic in this regard is the fact that this construction is not even possible with all P elements in PD that can encode direction, nor does it seem to be spreading to those P elements. Second, though her study focuses only on two of the eleven relevant P elements, her proposal relies heavily on the timing of the rise of this construction, which proves to be problematic when all the relevant P elements are taken into consideration. As a first step in understanding the development of this construction, this study uses insights from analyses of PD postposed simplex Ps (Helmantel 2002; Beliën 2008), where the status of such elements remains contentious, to examine the position of all the relevant Ps in three Old Dutch (OD) texts and one Early Middle Dutch (EMD) text. The results show that there are already instances of postposed simplex Ps in OD, much earlier than previously suggested; this poses problems for Lin’s account, which assumes that the first examples only occur eight centuries later, emphasizing the danger of hypothesizing on too few of the relevant Ps. Moreover, these first instances appear among the group of extended locative Ps (according to Helmantel’s classification), suggesting that at least the origin of this construction is strongly based in semantics, contra Lin.
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The High, the Low, and the Ugly
The peculiarities of Old Norwegian vowel harmony after short non-high vowels
Robert Kristof Paulsen
Universitetet i Bergen

Old Norwegian features a height-based vowel harmony: in the manuscripts, the Old Norse high suffix vowels /i/ and /u/ appear in the manuscripts as ʊ and ø following high root vowels and diphthongs, while they are written ø and ð after long non-high vowels:

‹guði›, ‹eigi›, ‹sinum›, ‹køyptuz›,  but  ‹dome›, ‹dvarer›, ‹brefom›, ‹moðor›

The situation following the non-high short vowels (/e~æ/, /o/, /ø/, /ǫ/, /a/) appears to be less clear-cut, and various attempts have been made to describe and explain the distribution of ʊ/ø and ø/ø following these vowels. In these cases, vowel harmony also seems to have functioned differently in the individual dialects of Old Norwegian.

I have examined the Norwegian part of the manuscript Holm perg 34 4vo, written in Western Norway around 1300 AD (adding up to over 56 000 tokens). The scribe does not distinguish between many of the vocalic qualities and quantities that are assumed for Old Norse (e.g., /o/, /ø/, and /ǫ/ are uniformly written ø), and we cannot be sure about the exact nature of the scribe’s phonology (e.g., were /e/ and /æ/ one or two phonemes?), so I decided to use an etymologically defined referential system as the basis of my analysis – rather than to rely entirely on manuscript orthography or normalized Old Icelandic (as it is usually done).

I will demonstrate that in my manuscript, the suffix vowels following non-high root vowels are quite regularly distributed according to seemingly unlikely rules:

• mid-low /æ/ and /ø/ are followed by high ʊ/ø (like the high vowels /i/, /u/, /y/):
  ‹hefir›, ‹dueri›, ‹ollum›  like ‹mikit›, ‹guði›, ‹systur›
• mid-high /e/ and /o/ are followed by low ø/ø (like low /a/):
  ‹beðer›, ‹skoten›, ‹konom›  like ‹aller›

Furthermore, certain suffix vowels appear not to have been affected by vowel harmony, namely the vowel of the article (þingi, but þinget) and the svarabhakti-vowel (siti, but sit-er).

In my presentation, I will explore what implications these observed distributions might have for our reconstruction of Old Norwegian phonology (giving new evidence for Gronvik’s short-diphthong hypothesis) and how these might help us to understand the history of present-day Norwegian (is there a connection between vowel harmony and the modern tonal system?).
Island Hopping:  
Dialects in the New World Plautdietsch Speech Archipelago  
Roslyn Burns  
University of California, Berkeley

This paper presents an analysis of factors underlying synchronic dialect variation in the Mennonite Plautdietsch speech archipelago in North America. Keiser (2001) demonstrated that the Amish Pennsylvania German archipelago developed a Midwestern dialect distinct from the Eastern dialect due to strong social links across islands in the Midwest. In this paper I show that in New World Plautdietsch communities, both traditional Old World dialect features and newer innovations in the vowel system cluster regionally, even in locations which have populations of both dialects present. I present evidence that within the New World, the speech patterns of the technologically restrictive Old Colony are spreading across long distances due to a variety of social factors (e.g. social status). The findings of this study indicate that in addition to maintenance of social links, some speech islands are situated in a socially prominent “hub” which spreads linguistic forms to new regions.

Plautdietsch speech communities first entered the New World in 1874 from Russia. They settled in Canada and the US bringing with them one of two dialects: Chortitza or Molotschna. Table 1 summarizes five features which define this division (Epp 1993, Rempel 1995, Tolksdorf 1985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Chortitza</th>
<th>Molotschna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Low German ü</td>
<td>Front Like Standard German &lt;ü&gt;</td>
<td>Not as far forward. Sometimes modified to English &lt;oo&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. West Germanic *auw Reflex</td>
<td>Front &lt;eiw&gt;</td>
<td>Back &lt;au&gt; Sometimes Front &lt;eiw&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &lt;oa&gt; Diphthong</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Palatal Oral Stops</td>
<td>&lt;kj&gt;, &lt;gj&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;tj&gt;, &lt;dj&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Plural and Infinitive Suffix</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Traditional Old World Dialect Features of Plautdietsch


This project surveyed 50 native speakers living in North America from 2012–2014 (places of origin = Canada, the US, Northern and Southern Mexico, Belize, and Bolivia). There is evidence that the traditional binary split is still relevant to speakers, but Feature 5 is the most salient indicator of dialect affiliation. Hierarchical clustering and bootstrapping verification indicate both traditional dialect features and vowel pronunciation are highly dependent on regional affiliation. The only regional pronunciations which spread to other regions are Old Colony Mexican features, even if the speaker does not live in or near this particular social group. These results indicate that despite technological restrictions, Mexican forms, especially Old Colony speech patterns, have been able to spread across long distances due to their migration pattern and other groups adopting their speech patterns.
Paradigm Internal vs External Motivations: 
The Case of Ablaut Classes in Plautdietsch

Roslyn Burns and Reem Alattas
University of California, Berkeley

This paper investigates the role of analogical processes in the development of the ablaut system of Canadian Plautdietsch. Traditional accounts treat analogical leveling as a process which reduces complexity of any given lexical paradigm, while proportional analogy is a process which matches patterns across paradigms (Anderson 2015:275-7, Trask 1996). Recently scholarship on morphological change has begun to view leveling as the result of proportional analogy with non-alternating paradigms, but not a separate process (Garrett 2008, Albright 2010). We present an analysis of both approaches using examples from Plautdietsch ablaut development. While the Plautdietsch ablaut system has simplified in some respects, it has become more complex in others. Analyzing innovations as forms of proportional analogy rather than leveling gives us two advantages. First, we can reference relevant preexisting patterns which form the basis of innovative “simple” patterns. Second, we can delineate restrictions on the types of patterns which can develop in the new ablaut classes.

Plautdietsch, like other West Germanic languages, has lost number alternations in the preterit ablaut paradigm. While inflectional reduction is simplification, the modern reflexes of simplification always follows a preexisting pattern of Middle Low German (MLG) classes which did not distinguish number in the preterit (Lasch 1914). Typology of analogy sometimes defines more “basic” forms, but in this case it is not clear whether the singular or plural preterit should be more the more “basic” form fed into leveling (Kuryłovicz 1947, Mańczak 1958). In some regions, Classes 4 and 5 exhibit reflexes of the plural <ee>, while others have reflexes of the singular <au> as in äte: jegjet: aut 'eat' (Neufeld 1999, Mitzka 1921). An analysis of number reduction as extension with the non-alternating Class 6 verbs, does not require an appeal to the simplest or most basic preexisting form.

In addition, Plautdietsch developed a new ablaut class shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Item (&lt;MLG Class)</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Past Participle</th>
<th>Preterit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fleaje(n) 'fly'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ie</td>
<td>uie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>süe(n) 'suck'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brääke(n) 'beak'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>e:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stääke(n) 'stick'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>o:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schlone(n) 'hit'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>o:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schwæare(n) 'swear'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foare(n) 'drive'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beaje(n) 'bend'</td>
<td>&lt; weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>froage(n) 'ask'</td>
<td>&lt; weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schrie(n) 'to scream'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>i:</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Innovative Strong Ablaut Classes

This new class contains members of several older classes which should exhibit more variation in the ablaut grades if they all developed via regular sound change (e.g. Classes 5 and 6 should have the same vowel in the Past Participle and Infinitive form). Instead, one now finds that most roots which have an opening diphthong in the past tense alternate like Class 6 verb stone(n) 'to stand' stone: jestone: stund. In summary, while one can analyze some of the developments of the Plautdietsch ablaut system as simplification, the developments found in Plautdietsch can always be matched to a preexisting pattern in earlier forms of the language.
Where’s the FON in that? The development of ‘final obstruent neutralization’ in Wisconsin German varieties

Samantha Litty
University of Wisconsin-Madison

In this paper I discuss the development of ‘final obstruent neutralization’ (henceforth FON) in Wisconsin German varieties starting in the mid 19th century and continuing through today’s speakers. While German neutralizes the distinction between lenis and fortis consonants in word final position so that words like Bad “bath, bathroom” and bat “to pray, request (past participle)” are pronounced the same, English maintains this distinction. Fourakis & Iverson (1984) and Iverson (1997) argue that German speakers can produce a distinction between lenis and fortis consonants, at least in experimental settings. I follow work from Purnell et al. (2005a, b) which shows that final obstruents in the English spoken in Southeastern Wisconsin are fundamentally different from those reported for General American English, as well as noting that this is different than what would be expected if this process were simply overtaken from German. They also show final neutralization as a sort of rebound process, where it occurs in the speech of German immigrants in initial generations, then doesn’t show up after the initial transition to English and finally returns with today’s younger speakers. Litty (2015) shows how FON, once imported by immigrant speakers of German, Dutch and Polish among others, has developed in English speakers in Wisconsin from the late 19th century to today. Although FON was once seen as being a typical marker of ‘Germanness’, it has lost that evaluation today and has been reallocated as a regional marker. Because of this, I examine how FON developed from 1860-2013 in the German spoken in Wisconsin. It is likely that the German affected the English in these regions, and it could well be that the English had an impact on the German spoken there. While previous work focused on the influence of German on English, I examine the influence of English on German. For German speakers, I expect that initial generations will exhibit no indication of influence from English, and only after contact for several generations, as speakers transition from mainly German speaking to mainly English speaking, do I expect to find any distinction.

Data for this project comes from Dodge County in south central Wisconsin. Here I focus on only a small subset of data from three personal letters written in 1860, 1887 and 1889 as well as acoustic recordings from three male speakers recorded in 1948, the late 1960s and 2013 that has been analyzed in order to concentrate on the progression of FON over time. Initial analysis of written sources does not indicate any English influence in this regard. Because the writers at this time were mostly educated in German or German-speaking schools in the U.S. it is not surprising that they write mostly with expected German orthography. Acoustic data is analyzed in Praat. Tokens were marked for vowel onset, vowel steady state, vowel offset, consonant gap and pulsing. Initial results for all speakers show longer average durations for fortis then lenis consonants, but there is no obvious trend for average vowel length. The ratio of vowel to consonant duration shows that the ratio of lenis obstruents is more than double the ratio of fortis obstruents in the later two recordings and warrants further analysis. More data is currently being collected for this purpose. Discussion will focus on this and contemporary Wisconsin German speakers, including production of final obstruents in a manner that is indicative of influence from English.
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**Moving forward and its German Counterpart: Euphemism, Modewort, Discourse Marker**

Sarah M. B. Fagan  
University of Iowa

In an opinion piece in the *Wall Street Journal* (June 30, 2015), “The Unstoppable Appeal of ‘Going Forward’,” Joseph Epstein argues that the buzz phrase *going forward* (*moving forward*) is favored by politicians because it is “evasive while inspiring hope. . . . Going forward is a useful phrase to cap an evasive political answer and close off further discussion of a tricky or touchy point. Implicit in the phrase is the notion of progress, futurity, help on its way. As such, it is perfect for the vocabulary of politicians, for electoral politics is built on promises.”

What expressions, if any, currently fill the role of *going forward* and *moving forward* in German? The online translation tool Linguee provides examples of a number of ways in which these phrases are rendered in German: *künftig, zukünftig, für die Zukunft, in Zukunft, darüber hinaus*, etc. To what extent are these expressions used euphemistically in the manner identified by Epstein? Can any of these be considered a buzz phrase (Modewort/Trendwort)? Schlüter (2015) identifies *Zukunft* as a word used euphemistically in the political sphere. Roland Gass’s blog “Trendwörter Modewörter” characterizes *zukunftsorientiert* ‘future-oriented’ as a Trendwort with an upwards trend, positive acceptance, and an aura of “Fortschrittsgläube” ‘belief in progress’.

This paper investigates the meaning and function of *moving forward* (*going forward*) in English and the possible equivalencies in German. *Moving forward* is well documented far beyond the sphere of politics. It is prevalent in the business world and academic administration and has found its way into the everyday language of personal interactions. It is argued that while the expression is still used with full semantic content and euphemistic force, it has also become grammaticalized and serves as a discourse marker with various functions.

The investigation of German focuses on the expression *in Zukunft*. It is argued that the euphemistic force of the word *Zukunft* and its current popularity are comparable to that of the word *forward* in the expression *moving forward*. The adverbial status of the phrase *in Zukunft* gives it the syntactic versatility of *moving forward* and thus the potential to develop into a discourse marker in the way that adverbs like *jedenfalls, nur, and bloß*, for example, have developed discourse-pragmatic uses (Auer and Günther 2005). This paper reports on the findings of a preliminary study of the use of *in Zukunft* in spoken German. A search of corpora in the database for spoken German (Datenbank für Gesprochenes Deutsch) of the Institut für Deutsche Sprache provides evidence that the expression *in Zukunft* may be developing characteristics typical of discourse markers in German.
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Two types of Impersonalization in Icelandic

Sigríður Sæunn Sigurðardóttir
Ghent University

Dórhallur Eyþórsson
University of Iceland

In this paper we focus on a morphosyntactic change in Icelandic termed Impersonalization, which involves the emergence of new oblique subjects with verbs previously taking the otherwise expected nominative subjects. We compare two recent cases of impersonalization which at first sight look similar but are upon closer examination in fact very different: Impersonalization Proper and Anticausativization. These changes are then contrasted with more widespread changes in case marking, i.e. Nominative Substitution and “Dative Sickness” (Svavarðsdóttir 1980, Eythórsson 2002, Barðdal 2011; for a summary, see Thráinsson 2007). It is concluded that while many verbs taking oblique subjects are Old Germanic heritage (þyrsta ‘thirst’, hungra ‘hunger’…) (Barðdal & Eythórsson 2012), others have been formed at various points in the history of Icelandic.

Impersonalization can be regarded as an instance of “sporadic mutation”, as it only affects a handful of experiencer verbs. The first type, Impersonalization Proper, includes hlakka til ‘look forward to’ and kvíða fyrir ‘be anxious about’. An example is given in (1), where the variants in (1b) have developed from (1a). The oldest attested examples of (1b) are from the early 20th century.

(1) a. Ég hlakka til jóla
    b. Mig/Mér hlakkar til jóla
    ‘I look forward to Christmas’

By examining the etymologies of these verbs, it can be shown that they have undergone a semantic shift and a reanalysis of an agentive verb (hlakka ‘cry (of birds)’) as an experiencer verb (hlakka til ‘look forward to’). The emergence of an oblique subject with these verbs is thus due to overgeneralization, although only sporadic, of the pattern of oblique subjects with experiencer verbs (cf. Jónsson 1997-98, 2003).

The other type of Impersonalization, Anticausativization, includes the idiomatic phrase in (2a) meaning ‘the shoe pinches; there are difficulties’, attested from the 18th century onwards. It is different from (1) in that the case marking of the subject NP does not change directly from nominative to accusative. Rather, there is an intermediate stage, emerging in the 20th century, involving formation of a transitive construction (2b) based on the original intransitive one (2a). This is then followed by a further change into an impersonal (anticausative) structure (2c). All of these “stages” are in fact attested with the phrase in question in contemporary Icelandic; the sequence of the changes is shown in (2a–c).

(2) a. Skóinn kreppir
    b. Eitthvað kreppir skóinn
    c. Skóinn kreppir
    the-shoe,NOM pinches
    something,NOM pinches the-shoe,ACC
    ‘The shoe pinches’
    ‘Something pinches the shoe’

To conclude: While many verbs taking oblique subjects are Old Germanic heritage, others have been formed at different points in the history of Icelandic, and in different ways. The findings presented in this paper reinforce the view that oblique subjects are productive in Icelandic, not just a fossilized remnant from an archaic stage.
Assertive outsiders: V1- and Wo-VE-clauses in German
Sonja Müller
Bergische Universität Wuppertal

Canonical assertions usually display verb-second order in German. However, there are (peripheral) types of assertive utterances which deviate from this pattern. Two of them are illustrated by (1) and (2).

(1) I’m clearly disappointed with the result of the FDP. The poor performance is very surprising.
   
   *Führten die Freisinnigen doch einen super Wahlkampf – ganz im Gegensatz zu den anderen Parteien.*
   
   ‘Though the Liberals ran a super election campaign – in contrast to the other parties.’
   
   (A08/SEP.09380 St. Galler Tagblatt, 29.09.2008)

(2) It’s funny though. For weeks they have been unable to overpower the bear with a tranquiliser gun.
   
   *Wo aber doch angeblich kaum scheu ist und der geneigte Wanderer von ihm als Appetithappen angesehen wird.*
   
   ‘Although it is said not to be shy at all, and the inclined hiker is regarded as a tasty morsel by him.’
   
   (BRZ06/JUL.00738 Braunschweiger Zeitung, 03.07.2006)

This talk is concerned with the grammatical properties and specific interpretations of such sentences. Particular characteristics and meanings/uses have been suggested by other authors (cf. Önnerfors 1997, Pasch 1999, Günthner 2002, Pittner 2011 e.g.) which – if true – have to be captured by an analysis: The sentences are claimed to receive a causal interpretation (on the epistemic level) and (where applicable) a concessive reading (on the propositional level). V1-clauses are said to be interpreted causally, Wo-VE-clauses concessively. Furthermore, the modal particle *doch* is obligatory or at least very typical for these sentence types. This fact has been related to the assumption that both sentences presuppose their contents and that the particle codes this meaning. However, at the same time, one component of the meaning usually ascribed to *doch* (contradiction, adversativity) cannot be made out. For that reason, the question is still unsolved why *doch* favours this environment so strongly.

By referring to corpus data ([Deutsches Referenzkorpus](https://www.deutsches-referenzkorpus.de) [(mostly) conceptually and medially written data and **DECOW**](http://www.decow.de) [conceptionally oral, medially written data], I will question such characteristics. In particular, I will argue against the presupposed status of the utterances’ contents and that this is why *doch* occurs so often in this context. Corpus data also show that the strict association of V1 & a causal interpretation and Wo-VE & a concessive reading is too strong an assumption. With Önnerfors (1997) and Pittner (2011), I will claim that *doch* is indirectly responsible for the causality by assuming that a causal default interpretation is decisive. In contrast to their analysis, my modelling of *doch* (which relies on the openness of the issue currently under discussion rather than the expressed proposition’s adversative nature) provides an explanation for *doch* facilitating (even if not coding) the causal reading. Based on the contribution I attribute to the particle, its meaning can be assumed to be transparently present. Above that, it also allows to derive certain stylistic effects (expressivity, emotional involvement) which other authors have vaguely referred to (cf. Oppenrieder 1989: 204), but which has not been spelled out so far.

My talk offers a study and analysis of two particular (peripheral) sentence types in German. However, it touches many aspects which are relevant for the study of particles, sentence types, information structure and speech act theory in general and cross-linguistically.
Dialect change and diffusion in South-East Norway  
Sverre Stausland Johnsen  
University of Oslo

Introduction. It is generally claimed that the upper class dialect of Oslo has a strong and direct influence on the local dialects in the South-East region of Norway, and that these dialects as a result are being leveled towards this variety. However intuitive this assumption may be, there is little or no data presented in the literature to support it. This paper surveys the existing literature on language change in the South-East region of Norway, and finds that the observed changes appear to have diffused from the lower class dialect of Oslo, not the upper class dialect. Following the basic assumptions of the communication accommodation theory, I suggest that the features of the upper class dialect of Oslo have not diffused to the local dialects because speakers of these dialects hold negative views about the speakers of the upper Oslo dialect.

Meta-analysis. There are 25 independent studies of language change conducted in south-eastern Norway. When this many studies exist, more can be gained from synthesizing and organizing the data and results from the available studies than from undertaking yet another separate investigation of the same topic. For this reason, I have collected all the data from these 25 studies that satisfy three criteria: (1) The change has been observed in at least two urban dialects, (2) At least two researchers have described the change, and (3) The change affects the grammar.

Results. There are nine changes that satisfy the three criteria above. Of these nine changes, seven appear to have diffused from the lower class dialect of Oslo, one appears to have spread from other urban dialects within the same region, and the final change is ambiguous with respect to its origin. No change appears to have spread directly from the upper Oslo dialect.

Analysis. The communication accommodation theory assumes that linguistic features diffuse through personal interaction, but that negative attitudes towards interlocutors prevent diffusion from occurring. A range of attitude studies have been conducted in the south-eastern region of Norway, and the overall finding is that the upper Oslo dialect and its speakers are viewed negatively. The dialect is often described by these speakers as ‘pretentious’, ‘snobbish’, ‘affected’, ‘hoity-toity’, ‘tiresome’, and ‘annoying’, and its speakers as ‘snobbish’, ‘suspicious’, ‘provoking’, and ‘effeminate’. I suggest here that these attitudes prevent linguistic features from diffusing from the upper Oslo dialect, in accordance with the communication accommodation theory.

Conclusion. It is important in sociolinguistic theory that overall theories of sociolinguistic change build on solid empirical data. Despite the fact that the available data demonstrate that local dialects in South-East Norway adopt new features from the lower class dialect of Oslo, the literature generally conclude that these dialects are strongly influenced by the upper class dialect of Oslo instead. There is, however, almost no linguistic data presented in this literature to support such a claim, suggesting that these theories are built primarily on sociological assumptions and not on linguistic data. I suggest that theories of sociolinguistic change should focus more on the linguistic data, as such theories will end up void if their conclusions end up disagreeing with the linguistic facts.
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Phonemic and derived glides in Middle High German

T. A. Hall
Indiana University

There is agreement in the literature that MHG <w> and <j> represented glides and not fricatives (e.g. [5]). The strongest argument for the glide pronunciation is that it is retained to the present day in the modern reflexes of those sounds in Bavarian and Alemannic ([6]). MHG also had offglides in diphthongs, e.g. the second sound in <uo>, e.g. <tuoch> ([tuɔx]).

In the literature on theoretical phonology it is assumed that all surface glides are derived from the corresponding vowels (e.g. [2]), but a number of languages have been shown to have phonemic (underlying) glides ([3]). In the present talk I argue that MHG <w> and <j> were phonemic glides, but that the offglides in the diphthongs were derived glides. By definition, phonemic glides behave phonologically as consonants but derived glides pattern with vowels. I follow the proposal that phonemic glides are [+cons(onantal)] and derived glides [‒cons] (e.g. [4]). Phonemic glides are represented below as [w, j] and derived glides as [u̯, i̯, o̯, e̯...].

MHG <w> and <j> were phonemic because of contrasts as in (1): (1a) shows a sequence of <w> or <j> plus short vowel, and (1b) illustrates words with MHG (falling) diphthongs consisting of a surface high vowel plus (mid) glide or a surface mid vowel plus (high) glide.

(1) a. <woche> [woxə]  b. <uover> [uʃər]  <ei> [eʃ]
    <jagen> [jɑ̃]          <miede> [m耶də]  <tou> [tou̯]
    <bieten> [bi listOf]  <hου> [hoi̯]

Falling diphthongs in (1b) consist of a peak (vowel) and a non-peak (glide) which both belong to the same nucleus. The glide portion of a diphthong is a derived glide; e.g. [uo] is underly ingly /uo/. By contrast, the glide in (1a) is phonemic, i.e. /w/ or /j/. The glides in (1a) cannot be analyzed as derived (i.e. from /u/ or /i/) because of the contrast with the diphthongs /uo/ and /ie/.

In the present talk I discuss how syllabification applies to the sequences in (1). I argue that a nucleus is assigned to all [‒cons] segments. If two [‒cons] sounds are adjacent (as in 1b), then they are parsed into the same nucleus (see [1]). Thus, only the /o/, but not the /w/, in a sequence like /wo/ is nuclear and therefore surfaces as the vowel [o]. By contrast, in sequences like /uo/, both segments are parsed under the nucleus. The second of two nuclear vowels is predictably the non-peak (i.e. derived glide); hence /uo/ surfaces as [uo].

The present talk poses a counterexample to the claim that all glides are derived from vowels (e.g. [2] and many others) and adds to the growing list of languages with both phonemic and derived glides ([3]).

Broken vs. unbroken forms of the 1st sg. pronoun in Middle Norwegian

Tam Blaxter
University of Cambridge

Kari Kinn
University of Oslo

In Old Norwegian, the nominative form of the 1st person sg. pronoun is *ek*. In Modern Norwegian, there is variation between unbroken forms (*eg* in the Nynorsk standard) and broken forms (*jeg* in the Bokmål standard). The broken forms arose in the Middle Norwegian period (ca. 1370–1550), at which time they were often spelt *jek/jak*, and have commonly been ascribed to influence from the prestigious East Nordic varieties Danish and Swedish (e.g. Hødnebo 1971 and Indrebo 2001:193). However, there are, as of yet, no large-scale empirical studies of the distribution of broken vs. unbroken forms in Middle Norwegian, and the origin of the broken forms is still not entirely clear (Seip [1954:220ff] takes the view that breaking was an independent development in Norwegian). Our paper aims to fill this gap and discuss geographical and sociolinguistic factors that underlie variation between *ek* on the one hand and *jek/jak* on the other.

Our study is based on a digital corpus of ca. 14,000 charters from the Diplomatarium Norvegicum (DN). We combine quantitative and qualitative methods and consider both inter-textual and intra-textual variation between broken and unbroken forms. The use of a corpus of this size, much of which is localised and all of which is tagged for social attributes, enables us to detect even very weak tendencies in the distribution of different forms, a necessity with the very noisy data that characterises Middle Norwegian. Counterintuitively, it also facilitates small-data, qualitative investigations by allowing us to identify all occurrences of a given individual or place name and thus draw as full as possible a picture of the lives of particular people and places.

We will present quantitative evidence based on regression analysis of inter-textual variation. This evidence shows that breaking of the 1st sg. pronoun was a change that happened from above, in the sense that it is associated with signatories of high social status (nobles, higher clergy) before those of lower status (magistrates, lower clergy) and in charters by female signatories earlier than charters by male signatories. The distribution of broken forms according to the localisations of charters shows a pattern of east-to-west spread, suggesting that broken forms in Norwegian are the result of East Norse influence and not a native phenomenon.

However, variation between the broken and unbroken form is not only found at the inter-textual level, in charters produced by different scribes, but also in charters produced by individual scribes and even within individual charters. By thoroughly researching the social and geographical contexts of particular documents and the individuals implicated in them, we can also gain an understanding of the variation at this smaller scale. This evidence shows that individual cases of intra-textual variation may often be in line with the quantitative evidence on inter-textual variation: a shift from unbroken to broken forms may be associated with the influence or reported speech of individuals of a higher social class or with more contact with an eastern social milieu. However, the full picture is far more complex than the evidence of inter-textual variation suggests, and we will argue that a large number of factors are relevant to account for this variation, including the use of exemplars, changes of point of view and document type. We will also present palaeographic evidence that in exceptional cases, variation may be due to co-authorship or scribes being interrupted during the production of a charter.
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Contrastive Hierarchy Analysis of Old English Vowels

Thomas Purnell  Eric Raimy  Joseph Salmons
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Dresher (2015) and Purnell & Raimy (2015) provide distinct analyses of the representation of the Old English vowel inventory based on proposals in Dresher (2009). The key aspect of both proposals is that distinctive features occur in a hierarchy based on language specific contrast. The ordering of features in the hierarchy makes specific predictions about the phonology of the language and how language may change over time (Oxford 2015). The two proposals also differ in whether binary (+/-) or privative (labial/O, etc.) features are adopted in the analysis. The equivalence between the two feature systems is that '[+low]' = 'Tongue Root', '[+high]' = 'Tongue Height', '[+back]' = 'Tongue Thrust', and '[+round]' = 'Labial'. We abstract away from length in the vowel system of Old English because none of the proposals here are affected by it.

We argue that neither of the hierarchies from Dresher (2015) or Purnell & Raimy (2015) provide the best analysis of Old English vowels based on phonological patterns and diachronic change. Many of the arguments presented are based on proposals in Oxford (2015) about language change and contrastive hierarchies. Additional evidence is provided in that the new hierarchy follows proposals by Jacobson & Halle (1956) on contrastive features much closer than the proposed alternative hierarchies.

Both Dresher (2015) and Purnell & Raimy (2015) violate different principles governing contrast in diachronic change proposed by Oxford (2015). The Contrast Shift Hypothesis favors minimal changes to constraint hierarchies. Both proposals violate this by the radical re-ranking of features from West Germanic. Both proposals demote 'low' without motivation and insert 'round' at a place other than the bottom of the hierarchy. Neither hierarchy follows the Sister Merger Hypothesis because they do not predict the future loss of round vowels from Old English to more contemporary versions (i.e. /œ/ > /e/ and later /y/ > /i/) by having these phonemes as sisters in the hierarchy.

The analysis presented here follows Lass (1993)'s description of diachronic change from West Germanic to Old English and addresses the above issues by adding 'round' to the bottom of the hierarchy. Adding round here is the minimal change to the hierarchy and creates sisterhood relationships between /œ/~/e/ and /y/~/i/ which predict the future mergers. We also maximize the satisfaction of the Contrastivist Hypothesis through the use of the privative distinctive feature model of Avery & Idsardi (2001). Further support for this analysis of Old English vowels is the reanalysis of phonological processes in Old English discussed in Dresher (1990, 1993). Mercian back mutation (Dresher 1990), /weras/ > [wearas], /featu/ > [featu], is reanalyzed as the insertion of a /ə/ to provide a transition from a 'front' vowel to a vowel unspecified for backness. Anglian Smoothing (Dresher 1993), /wæca/ > [wəca] >[wæca], is reanalyzed as the removal of the /ə/.

The conclusion is that the proposals on diachronic change in contrastive hierarchies from Oxford (2015) based on Algonquian languages hold for the changes from West Germanic to Old English and through to Contemporary English. Additionally, the conflicting proposals in Dresher (2015) and Purnell & Raimy (2015) are resolved in a productive manner.
English, Norwegian, and the Politics of Genealogy

Tim William Machan
University of Notre Dame

Studies of medieval English began of political necessity. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries witnessed the Reformation, the beginning of a united kingdom, and the expansion of British interests overseas, and it was in this context that scholars like Francis Junius, Matthew Parker, and George Hickes turned to the earliest English records. By recovering early English grammar and tracing its connections to other languages, they simultaneously established the history of the language and its people, the connections among them, and cultural history that could bracket French influence in the medieval period as an aberration in the history of English. When Hickes, in his 1689 Institutiones Grammaticae, printed parallel paradigms of Gothic, Old Norse, and Old English, all in a black letter font that emphasized their similarity and antiquity, he provided evidence of a lineage that made English and its speakers fundamentally Germanic and largely northern. Nineteenth-century travelers affirmed this perspective when for very different reasons they heard medieval English in the sounds of modern Scandinavian languages. In these examples, the dynamics between language genealogy and cultural practice identify empirical support for already determined views of how speakers relate to one another. The imagined historical relations of languages thereby further contemporary social beliefs. In this way, the significance of arguments about genealogy can lie less in their content than in the implications they have for the writing of sociolinguistic history.
The IELex project, originally hosted at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics at Nijmegen, used the Swadesh 100 and 200 lists to provide a database of cognate sets across the Indo-European language family. This database was used in two publications, Bouckaert et al. (2012) and Dunn et al. (2011), in which phylogenetic methods were applied to the cognate sets to generate a set of possible trees for Indo-European, as well as a possible date and location for Proto-Indo-European. These results were widely criticized as being (1) far too early, and (2) geographically improbable. A second attempt, using the same data but tweaking the computational model somewhat, is found in Chang et al. (2015). These results confirm the traditional hypothesis of a later date and a more eastern homeland for Proto-Indo-European.

Neither the analysis in Bouckaert et al. (2012) and Dunn et al. (2011) nor that in Chang et al. (2015) is completely satisfactory. A problem shared by both analyses lies in the data set itself, which was problematic. Thus CoBL (Cognacy in Basic Lexicon) seeks to remedy the weaknesses in the data (discussed below), both by changing some of the lexical items in the list and by expanding the set of languages surveyed. This paper will discuss the new methodology in data collection underlying CoBL, as well as a test of the data using the Germanic branch only, since this is a branch for which we have good historical evidence for relatedness and geographic location.

The primary problem with the data in IELex, which was particularly acute for the Germanic branch, was a result of the original data collection method, where all possible cognates were included, regardless of markedness or frequency of attestation. Thus, for example, the Old Norse list included five different lexemes for the meaning ‘man’, ignoring the fact that some of them were poetic, metaphorical, etc., revealing that finding a cognate set, even for closely related languages, can be nearly impossible, let alone finding one-to-one translational equivalents. CoBL is therefore built on a new 200 item list, the Jena 200 list (of which the Jena 100 list is a perfect subset), based on the Swadesh lists and the Leipzig-Jakarta lists, with the more problematic meanings excluded.

A second issue with the original data was that of the languages selected for the original database. The north Germanic branch was over-represented, and older stages of the west Germanic branch were ignored (e.g., Old Saxon and Old Frisian were not included). Additionally, intermediate stages (such as Middle English, Middle High German) were not included, making Old English the immediate mother node to Modern English, for example. This has been remedied in CoBL, with a much larger sampling of languages from across Indo-European, but particularly in Germanic.

This paper will provide an overview of the CoBL project, specifically the Germanic portion of it, as well as our preliminary results for the phylogenetic modelling of the Germanic branch. It is hoped that by refining the data, we will arrive at more plausible results.

References
Lexical borrowing is one of the staples of linguistics, yet even in this well-trodden area much remains to be investigated. One aspect of lexical borrowing that deserves renewed attention is the adoption of historically charged German loanwords like Anschluss, Blitzkrieg, Drang nach Osten, Endlösung, Kulturkampf, Lebensraum etc. into the public discourse of various European languages (see e.g. Oschlies 2000 on Eastern and South Eastern Europe). These ‘historical Germanisms’ have so far been approached mainly from the perspectives of lexicology/lexicography (Pfeffer/Cannon 1994) and cultural stereotyping (Stubbs 1998). By contrast, we propose a new discourse-analytical approach, treating historical Germanisms as part of wider discourses where they index (to a greater or lesser extent) the ‘Germanness’ or ‘German-relatedness’ of social, political or cultural phenomena in contexts other than German. Our methodological points of reference are corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS, Partington et al. 2013), the contrastive study of discourse keywords (Schröter/Veniard in press) and frame semantics (Ziem 2008), additionally informed by notions from transnational history (Ther 2009, Sierp 2014). To illustrate the benefits of our methodology, we will focus on the use of Kulturkampf ‘culture struggle’ in newspapers and general usage in (British) English, Polish and German. The data, accessed through LexisNexis, newspaper archives and the Internet, not only show differing token frequencies of Kulturkampf between languages, types of newspapers, and registers, but also great divergences in the extent to which the term is being ‘discursively appropriated’, i.e. recontextualised beyond its 19th-century historical reference, evoking versions of a present-day ‘clash of civilisations’. The trilingual methodology and its results (both quantitative and qualitative) will be discussed, as will its interdisciplinary implications and prospects for crosslinguistic comparison on a larger scale.
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Questions in Focus — Focus in Questions

Valeria Molnar
Lund university

Aim: This talk focuses on information-eliciting Wh-questions at the Syntax-Discourse Interface comparing two closely related Germanic languages, German and Swedish. These languages show considerable differences in the syntactic realization of Wh-questions and in their mapping to discourse strategies. Especially the discourse semantic properties of clefts in Wh-questions deserve attention; the restrictions on their use and other possible strategies for rendering equivalent contextual meanings (e.g. by the use of modal particles) are of great relevance for the contrastive and comparative analysis of Wh-questions.

However, the syntactic and discourse pragmatic properties of clefts in information-eliciting Wh-questions have been only discussed by a few researchers from the contrastive and/or comparative perspective (see Mathieu, Engdahl 2006, Myers 2007, Boucher 2010, Brandtler 2012). It was observed that the discourse-semantic effects of clefts in Wh-questions differ significantly from the effects of the non-clefted versions within the same language, and special attention was paid to the different question types in French (allowing non-clefted Wh-questions with or without fronting of the Wh-element). Interestingly, the distribution of clefts and non-clefts is completely different in other languages (e.g. English, German).

In a contrastive analysis concentrating on Wh-questions in German and Swedish it is also relevant to take into account the differences between the syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic properties of clefts in declarative sentences in these two languages (Huber 2002). The discourse-semantic potential of declarative clefts in German is more restricted than in Swedish—a fact which can provide a partial explanation for dispreferring clefts in German Wh-questions.

ANALYSIS: The different effects of the clefted and non-clefted Wh-questions in German and Swedish will be investigated in a discourse-oriented syntactic framework with the aim to clarify and compare the language specific patterns in this field.

We argue that the main difference between German and Swedish w.r.t. the use of clefts in Wh-questions can be traced back to the rules that these languages must observe for the specific additional marking of certain expectations on the answer. The requirements on the marking of an expected empty set in the answer and/or the need for a referential specification of the Wh-element seem to be language-specific. Swedish requires special syntactic marking for the expectation of referential specification by clefts, whereas additional marking of an expected expected empty set is essential in German and can achieved by the use of modal particles (e.g. schon). The use of other modal particles in German (e.g. denn, nun) is, however, also possible (but not obligatory) in Wh-questions. Modal particles in German questions can mark the expectation of a referential specification in the answer making possible close equivalents to the clefted Wh-questions in Swedish.

The theoretical analysis of the language-specific requirements and constraints is based on relevant morphological and syntactic properties of the interrogative clause discussed in detail in Brandtler’s (2012) analysis of Swedish Wh-questions. The distinction of different types of Wh-questions (argument questions, framing questions and propositional questions) seems to be decisive for the appropriateness and discourse-semantic potential of clefted Wh-questions. However, the choice of certain morphological forms ((in)definiteness, tense forms) and the use of certain lexical elements can also have influence on the distribution of clefted and non-clefted Wh-questions.

Our analysis is not only based on theoretical considerations but is also supported by empirical evidence provided by the comparison of Swedish Wh-questions in Sjövell-Wahlöö’s Martin Beck detective series and their translations into German by Eckehard Schulz. The quantitative and qualitative aspects of the empirical investigation demonstrate convincingly the cross-linguistic differences between German and Swedish w.r.t. the distribution and discourse-semantic effects of Wh-questions in these two languages.
Direct Object Scrambling and Double Object Scrambling: 
Information Structural Implications

Yana Chankova
South-West University

This study draws on theoretical assumptions borrowed from sources in the area of the movement approach to Scrambling (and Object Shift) phenomena (e.g. Haugan 2001; Thráinsson 2001; Richards 2004; Wallenberg 2009; Cheng & Corver 2013). Specifically, I hold that Scrambling applies optionally to raise internal Arguments and Adjuncts into left-phrasally-adjointed targets where the T-head serves as barrier to movement. While it is prohibited by Conservation of C-Command (Wallenberg 2009: 132) from moving constituents across c-commanding functional heads, Scrambling is conditioned by a variety of factors, semantic/ information-structural/ prosodic.

Data have been collected from two corpora: The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (2003) and the corpus of Íslendinga Sögur (1998). The proposed analysis has its focus on Vfin-DO(Acc)-Vnon-fin-IO(Dat) and Vfin-DO(Acc)-IO(Dat)-Vnon-fin orders in O(ld) English and O(ld) Old Norse and Icelandic and invokes semantic and information-structural factors in an attempt to determine to what extent the general linearization principles (e.g. weight, definiteness, pronominality) can be affected by such factors. The ultimate aim of the project is to describe and evaluate the ways the core properties of Scrambling interface with semantic, discourse/informational and prosodic properties (based on papers in Kemenade & Los 2006; Barðdal & Chelliah 2009; Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2009; Meurman-Solin, López-Couso & Los 2012; Nevalainen & Traugott 2012; Bech & Eide 2014; Bowern & Evans 2014).

The present account stands as an alternative to case-feature-driven analyses under which movement is triggered by the need for the internal Arguments to have their case-features checked. It also diverges from the weak version of semantic/ discourse/ informational analyses which assume that Topic and Focus are purely semantic features accessible at the interface, as well as from their strong version where Topic and Focus attract movement of constituents to dedicated functional projections.

Scrambled orders in OE and OIce canonical Vfin-DO(Acc)-Vnon-fin-IO(Dat) and Vfin-DO(Acc)-IO(Dat)-Vnon-fin constructions are straightforwardly accounted for. More intriguing and pertinent to the analysis prove to be non-canonical examples, cf.:

OE Nú hæfð God pé gesæld mé on geweald. (ÆlfrB 33,77) ‘Now God has given you into my power.’
Olce ... en þeir mættu gríðr gefa honum, (Heiðr 1387) ‘... so they might give him mercy’
OE Nu wille ic ... hit cow sum aseçgan. (VercB 50) ‘Now I will tell you some of it.’
Olce Vil eg það ræð þør gefa sem hverjum öðrum...(Fljöt 72) ‘I will give that advice to you as to anyone else...’

This study has resulted in drawing conclusions about the referential types of the ex-situ constituents, the type of the source and target positions, the barriers to movement, and most importantly about the set of factors that trigger direct object Scrambling and double object Scrambling. Remarkably, direct object Scrambling and double object Scrambling in OE and OIce seem to be able to apply in both directions, viz. they either affect the information structurally neutral constituent/s or they move some constituent/s into the Middle Field to mark them as information structurally prominent.
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Of the many different dimensions and varieties of German, sociolinguists have recently taken an interest in the *Umgangssprache*, or 'colloquial language'. This term is traditionally used to label any intermediate varieties that are neither basilectal nor standard. This has long since been pointed out as a problem, as it is based on what the varieties are *not* as opposed to what they are (Clyne, 1995).

While many studies, including Von Polenz (1954), Bausinger (1967), Mattheier (1980), Barbour and Stevenson (1990), and Lenz (2003), have discussed or investigated the phenomenon of colloquial language, there is still considerable disagreement as to exactly what constitutes it and how it should be subdivided. Furthermore, the linguistic distance between the standard and the local dialect is not the same in, say, Bavaria, as it is in Lower Saxony (König, 1978), which plays a role in shaping how many intermediate varieties there are, what shape they may take, or whether there is a fairly smooth continuum or a clean break at some point.

This study is a preliminary investigation of the colloquial language varieties used in and around Bitburg, a small town in the rural western section of Germany’s Rheinland-Pfalz province. Bitburg’s basilectal language, used predominantly in the farming communities surrounding the town, is not mutually intelligible with Standard German. Additionally, the dialect has been very well maintained when compared to most other German dialects (although there are definite signs of attrition in the percentage of younger speakers).

The present study is based on a data corpus recorded in the summer of 2010. Participants first took part in a conversational interview with me, in which I asked a range of questions about their attitudes toward the linguistic situation in Bitburg. Afterwards, participants were asked to take part in a recorded conversation with another community member, during which I was not present. The recordings were subsequently analyzed for quantifiable departures from Standard German, including, among others, the usage of post-vocalic [t] in words such as *das* ‘that’ and *was* ‘what’ (pronounced [dat] and [wat] in Bitburg).

The analysis yielded three major findings:

1. Participants who claimed to be fluent in the dialect almost unanimously declared that it was a separate entity from “German” (not a modified variant of it) and that they did not mix them or use intermediate varieties.
2. Participants who claimed *not* to be fluent in the dialect openly acknowledged that there was another variety (*Umgangssprache*) that they used in informal situations.
3. Most importantly, the quantitative data show that *all* participants (regardless of self-reporting) exhibited varieties of speech that were neither purely Standard nor basilectal.
Were distinctions made by accents in Old Norse?

Þorgeir Sigurðsson
University of Iceland

It has been assumed that morpheme boundaries (denoted by a hyphen) were obvious to speakers of Old Norse in rhyme in dróttkvætt poetry in words like hals ‘neck’ and val-s ‘hawk’ gen. These two words could rhyme with each other but only the latter could rhyme without including both consonants, e.g. with the words sal ‘hall’ or telja ‘tell’.

val-s ginu þar und halsa Þóroleikr fagri, flokk om Sven Ulfsson 1.6; Skj B I:365
Hval-s munk hvassa telja Haukr Valdisarson, Íslendingadrápa 2.1; Skj B I:539

They also differed in that hals could not stand in the fourth position of a dróttkvætt line, while val-s and sal could. This is according to the Law of Craigie [1] that forbids nominals with three morae in the fourth position. W.A. Craigie proposed that this was because too much emphasis was forbidden in that position. Consonantal inflectional endings were ignored.

vann hanga val-s hungri Tindr Hallkelsson, drape om Hakon jarl 7.3; Skj B I:137
alls dróttinn sal fjalla. Hallvarðr háreksblesi, Knútsdrápa 8.2; Skj B I:294

The syllable rhyme of dróttkvætt and the Law of Craigie seem to refer to word-stems and demand that a poem is understood and analysed before its meter can be verified. It would be easier to account for the dróttkvætt meter if words with three morae like hals and bœn ‘prayer’ differed audibly from words with two morae like val and bœ ‘farm’.

In the Third grammatical treatise it is stated that Old-Norse had accents and that the words bœ-num ‘farm’ dative def and bœn-um ‘prayer’ –dative plural were differentiated by an accent [2].

An accent, audible by pitch or emphasis (as proposed by Craigie), that would be distinctive in conjunction with morpheme boundaries would explain the above and also explain the problematic minimal pair sé-bu ‘see thou’ versus séð-u ‘(they) nailed’ presented in the First grammatical treatise [3].

On Bound Intensifiers in Icelandic

Þorsteinn Indriðason
University of Bergen

In this paper I will present results from my study on around 50 bound intensifiers in Icelandic. These intensifiers have been collected from dictionaries and corpuses and in (1) I show some examples of both inflected and non-inflected forms:

(1) Examples of bound intensifiers in Icelandic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With inflectional ending (gen.)</th>
<th>Without inflectional ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arfa 'weed'</td>
<td>pínu 'tiny'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egg 'edge'</td>
<td>grút 'train oil'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rok 'storm'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auga 'eye'</td>
<td>pöddu 'creep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bál 'fire'</td>
<td>eitur 'poison'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand 'hand'</td>
<td>sauð 'sheep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dauða 'death'</td>
<td>rísa 'giant'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bein 'bone'</td>
<td>fjall 'mountain'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrút 'ram'</td>
<td>skít 'shit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drullu 'mud'</td>
<td>sultu 'jam'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blá 'blue'</td>
<td>fok 'storm'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vra 'carrion'</td>
<td>snar 'fast'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bound intensifiers are border cases of independent words and prefixes and in all cases there exist corresponding independent words. In (2) I show examples of these forms as independent words in (2)a. and as bound intensifiers in (2)b.:

(2) a. eitur-efni  bál-köstur  blóð-rannsókn  stál-vinnsla
    'poison stuff'        'bonfire'      'bloodwork'        'steelproduction'

    b. eitur-ruglāður  bál-reiður  blóð-latúr  stál-heiðarlegur
    it. poison-confused  fire-angry  blood-lazy  steel-honest

    'totally crazy'      'furiously'    'bone-idle'     'completely honest'

In Icelandic, bound intensifiers are mostly found with adjectival bases as in (2)b. but they can also be found with bases which are nouns and verbs as in (3):

(3) Examples of bound intensifiers with various bases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns as bases</th>
<th>Adjectives as bases</th>
<th>Verbs as bases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aftöku-brim</td>
<td>arfa-slakur</td>
<td>dauð-langa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 'deadly waves'     | 'very slack'            | 'wanting something badly'
| arfa-léti          | dauð-hreinsaður         | svín-virka        |
| 'big star'         | 'totally disinfected'   | 'works very well'  |
| dúndur-fyllrí      | hrút-leiður             | hund-skamma       |
| 'crazy bender'     | 'so sick and tired'     | 'scold'           |

In the paper, I will discuss semantical and grammatical features of these intensifiers in addition to their productivity and they will be compared to prefixoids (see Skommer 1993, Ascoop and Leuschner 2006 and Meibauer 2013). The study shows that bound intensifiers in Icelandic have developed from independent words to grammatical units through grammaticalisation. At the same time, they change their selection of basewords, mainly from nouns to adjectives.
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Wh-extraction possibilities in Germanic: The role of the language production system

Dana McDaniel
University of Southern Maine

Jazmyn Sylvester-Cross
University of Southern Maine

We take the broad approach of Hawkins (e.g. 2014), which accounts for language variation in terms of processing efficiency. According to this account, language variation is the result of different responses to processing pressures. In other words, the production and comprehension systems have over time shaped the various instantiations of UG. The current study focuses on the potential role of the production system in long-distance (LD) wh-extraction.

Our ultimate goal is to explore this issue in a large typological study. We start by focusing on one language family in order to test the predictions in a situation where other factors are held constant due to cross-linguistic similarity. We chose the Germanic language family, since LD movement is discussed in the literature for many of these languages.

Several properties of the production system underlie our predictions (McDaniel et al 2015): 1. The clause is a major planning unit. This means that the internal structure of an embedded clause is planned as a separate step from the planning of the main clause up to that point (with the process being incremental); 2. Syntactically “heavy” material, including wh-trace, is difficult to plan for the beginning of a unit; 3. Reduced or tense-dependent embedded clausal structures (e.g., tensed clauses without an (overt) complementizer, infinitival clauses, subjunctive clauses) signal joint planning of the upper and lower clauses.

One prediction is that LD wh-movement will be constrained or ruled out in languages with morphologically case-marked wh-words or relativizers. Since the choice of case is dependent on the structure of the extraction site, extraction out of an embedded clause conflicts with Property 1. In the case of languages that do not have case-marked wh-words, we follow McDaniel et al (2015) in attributing the that-trace effect to Property 2. Finally, we predict that no(overt)-complementizer structures should occur more in LD wh-movement than in non-movement structures due to Property 3, since LD movement structures involve a conceptual connection between the material of the upper and lower clauses that leads to joint planning. German, with case-marked wh-words and relativizers, bears out this prediction. LD wh-movement is ruled out in relative clauses and, for northern dialects, in wh-questions as well. Two alternative wh-question structures alleviate the planning challenge: partial wh-movement, where the case-marked wh-word remains in the clause of the extraction site, and the no-complementizer structure, which we analyze as involving joint planning. Icelandic, with case-marked wh-words and LD movement, marks the embedded verb as subjunctive, which indicates joint planning as well. Faroese and Yiddish, with case-marked wh-words and LD extraction, pose a challenge. These languages do also have no-complementizer options for LD-extraction, as predicted.

The Germanic languages that have no case-marking on either wh-words or relativizers (mainland Scandinavian, Swiss German, Dutch) allow object LD movement unproblematically. Most also manifest the that-trace effect.

The Germanic languages also show the predicted pattern of the no-complementizer structure occurring more for LD movement than for non-movement structures.
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Remapping of Aspectual Features in Adult L2 Acquisition:  
*Am vs. Beim* in L2 German
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The acquisition and/or (re)mapping of (new) aspectual features often presents a challenge to second language learners (e.g. see Ayoun and Rothman, 2013; Comojian and Salaberry, 2013; Ellis, 2013). The present study examines how progressivity is encoded in the German present tense and related constructions among advanced second language (L2) learners of German whose first language (L1) is English.

Unlike English, German lacks an explicit gerundial form (e.g. Duden, 2005); however, all non-past aspectual readings are expressed through the simple present tense. Additionally, the so-called *am*+INFINITIVE (*am*) and *beim*+INFINITIVE (*beim*) constructions, formed from the prepositions *an* ‘at’ and *bei* ‘by’ (respectively) with the Dative article *dem* and a (nominalized) infinitive verb, express progressivity; however, each has a particular distribution based on idiosyncratic lexical features as shown in (1) and (2):

(1)  
Ich bin am Schwimmen  
Nom.1sg be.Present.1sg at the.Dat swim.Inf  
‘I am swimming.’

(2)  
Ich bin beim Schwimmen  
Nom.1sg be.Present.1sg by the.Dat swim.Inf  
‘I am at/by the swimming pool/I am swimming.’

Thus, *beim* conveys an extra meaning, true in the same contexts as *am*, but also true when the subject referent is not engaged in the event, rather near it. Although semantically *am* and *beim* map to the English copula + gerund construction, their syntax is different, leading to word order grammaticality differences. These facts allow us to test the extent to which L2 learners (a) remap aspectual meaning onto new L2 constructions; (b) differentiate *am* and *beim*; and (c) acquire the new syntax of *am* and *beim* given their differences from the English copula + gerund construction.

The predictions for our L2ers are threefold should they show sensitivity to German’s unique mapping of progressivity as compared to English: they should (1) allow for all aspectual readings of German present tense; (2) distinguish the contextual differences where *am* and *beim* are acceptable; (3) reject sentences in which there is an expressed post “verbal” DP, acceptable only in English. In this light, we present three tasks. A truth value judgment task (TVJT) consisting of 54 context-sensitive scenarios to which participants respond establishes whether they distinguish the unique aspectual readings of German present tense. Another TVJT consisting of 58 short video clips assesses learners’ knowledge of *am* and *beim* whereby *am* is acceptable only in a subset of contexts that *beim* is. Finally, a grammaticality judgment task (GJT) with 50 items examines the extent to which L2 learners know that *am* and *beim* differ syntactically as in (3) and (4):

(3)  
Ich bin am Sandwichessen  
Nom.1sg be.Present.1sg at the.Dat sandwicheat.Inf  
‘I am sandwich eating.’

(4)  
*Ich bin am Essen das Sandwich  
Nom.1sg be.Present.1sg eat.Inf the.Neu sandwich  
*I am eating the sandwich.’

Data from a monolingual control group (*n*=25) indicates that the *am* and *beim* distinction as described above holds with minor exceptions. Data from advanced L1 English learners of L2 German (*n*=20) show evidence of mapping progressivity to the simple present tense, expanding their L2 grammar, and acquiring the underlying syntactic and semantic differences of *am* and *beim* with no significant differences from the controls as a whole. All together, these results suggest that adult L2 acquisition is not limited to a superficial re-distribution of properties available from the L1, and that L2 feature reassembly is not an insurmountable task.
A New Collaborative Interface
for Online Language-Lesson Design

Hans C. Boas
UT Austin

Todd Krause
UT Austin

Marc Pierce
UT Austin

The detailed study of older Germanic dialects in their historical contexts and their relation to other Indo-European dialects demands both specialized knowledge and a familiarity with a broad range of languages. While a wealth of introductory materials, both in print and online, are available for some dialects, such as Old English, there is a relative dearth of materials for other dialects, even such important ones as Old Norse and Gothic. Moreover, such materials can be costly or difficult to obtain in print, and online materials can be of uneven quality. This discourages potential newcomers to the discipline.

Over the past decade the Linguistics Research Center (LRC) has sought to resolve this problem by creating freely available, online, introductory lesson series written by specialists in the field. This collection, the Early Indo-European OnLine (EIEOL) project, already contains introductions to Old English, Old Norse, and Gothic, exemplars of the major branches of the Germanic family, as well as to numerous Indo-European relatives. Though a series on Old Saxon is underway, numerous dialects, such as Old High German and Old Low Franconian, await presentation. This talk will unveil the LRC’s new computational infrastructure providing a streamlined, robust, and straightforward interface for scholars with little or no programming background to create new lesson series to complement the introductory series already present in the EIEOL collection. The in-progress series on Old Saxon will be used to demonstrate the new interface.

The individual lessons of series within EIEOL comprise three basic sections: an introduction, a glossed text, and a grammatical explanation. The glossed text forms the heart of the lesson: it consists of an original text with a grammatical analysis, dictionary definition, and contextual gloss for each word. The introduction serves to situate the text, the language, and the speakers in their historical context. The grammatical explanation provides an outline of the major grammatical structures of the language. The LRC requires consistency within each lesson, parallelism between lesson series, and robust linguistic tagging in the underlying HTML of the final webpage. Such requirements can prove intimidating for an author with little background in web design.

The LRC’s new computational infrastructure encourages lesson authors to focus on language, rather than programming, by accomplishing the above requirements automatically in the background while presenting an interface similar to that found in a word-processing program like Microsoft Word or blogging systems like WordPress. At the same time, the new interface is remotely accessible on the web, facilitating international collaboration. The talk will demonstrate basic features of the interface to the audience and will encourage proposals for the collaborative creation of new online language lesson series.
Welcome to Lindenstraße:
A German series for all levels and all skills

Judith K. Atzler
Guido F. Halder
Washington & Jefferson College
Washington & Jefferson College

Today film, TV series, and soap operas are an integral part in almost every foreign language classroom. It is not secret that films and video have made its way into the classroom. Those media tools are used in many programs from the very beginning and these tools not only foster listening skills through audio, but provide visuals to help understand the language, and thus have advantages over traditional textbooks. However, they are also mostly used as a separate entity, a lesson or unit that suddenly pops-up during the semester or as a tool to illustrate a given topic. Visual media, especially in the age of the Internet, where accessing materials becomes easier and easier, can be a valuable tool for the language classroom because it gives students the possibility to encounter a different culture and can “help them consider alternative ways of seeing, feeling and understanding things” as pointed out by the MLA Report (2007).

Peterson (2003) discussed the positive effects of using authentic sources stating that those provide students with authentic cultural experiences. He continues by pointing out the importance of cultural knowledge: “Understanding the cultural context of day-to-day conversational conventions such as greetings, farewells, forms of address, thanking, making requests, and giving or receiving compliments means more than just being able to produce grammatical sentences. It means knowing what is appropriate to say to whom, and in what situations, and it means understanding the beliefs and values represented by the various forms and usages of the language” (2). A study conducted by Weyers (1999) illustrates the benefits of soap operas (TV series) as teaching tools. The results of his study suggest that “telenovelas are a valuable source of authentic target language usage that has a positive effect on students’ communicative skills” (347).

Soap operas and TV series are “a good way into another culture and the interactive language of daily life” (Sherman, 43). While there is discussion about using TV series, shows and soap operas in the classroom those usually focus one language skills, on cultural understanding, or limit themselves to a specific language level. This paper addresses how a German TV series (namely Lindenstraße) can be utilized as the basis for the entire language course to incorporate students’ listening, speaking, writing and reading skills and to foster their cultural understanding. We will illustrate the benefits of using this TV series, discuss how it can be utilized at different language levels and show how it can be used as the common denominator to tie together all skills including culture.
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Icelandic Experiencer Verbs, subject case alternations, and obligatory reflexive pronoun

Margrét Jónsdóttir
University of Iceland

Subject case alternations in Icelandic are well attested (see, among others, Barðdal and Eythórsson, 2005). In this talk, the focus will be on the class of experiencer verbs in Icelandic that exhibit a particular type of subject case alternation. The verbs undra and furða ‘be surprised’, are good examples of this process. In (1a), there is the common form of undra with an accusative subject, whereas in (1b), we have a nominative subject and an obligatory reflexive pronoun. There appears to be no difference in meaning between the two examples.1

(1) a. Mig undrar á þessu. b. Ég undra mig á þessu.

me.A surprises on this.D I surprise myself.A on this.D

‘This surprises me.’

The same pattern of case alternations can be found with a few other verbs and to the best of my knowledge, this particular type of case alternation has not been discussed. This is not surprising as the examples are somewhat few and sporadic. All the verbs discussed here, perhaps with one exception, belong to the class of feeling.2 In this talk, an overview of the range of the phenomenon and the verbs in question will be discussed. They are found in written sources from different time periods, in the oldest sources of the language, as well as in very young sources of a different nature. The verb langa is an example as illustrated in (2):

(2) a. Mig langaði til að hlaupa heim. b. Ég langaði mig ... til að hlaupa heim.

me.A wanted to at run home I wanted myself.A to at run home

‘I wanted to run home.’

The verb kvíða is also noteworthy. In the standard language, the subject is in the nominative as originally. On the other hand, kvíða is very often used impersonally, taking either an accusative or dative subject (Dative Sickness) (see, among others, Jónsson and Eythórsson, 2005). In addition, the verb can be found with a reflexive pronoun and a nominative subject as shown in (3).

(3) a. Pú(/pig/þér) kvíðir fyrir þessu. b. Pú kvíðir þig fyrir þessu.4

you.N/A/D are anxious for this.D you are anxious yourself.A for this.D

‘You are anxious about this.’

Another pattern is found with the verb sjá eftir ‘regret’. The subject of this verb is nominative and it can occur with or without a reflexive pronoun.

(4) a. Ég sá efir þessu. b. Ég sá mig efir þessu.5

I.N saw after this.D I.N saw myself.A after this.D

‘I regretted this.’

The main topics to be discussed include the case alternation patterns seen here and the connection to the use of the reflexive pronoun in terms of their frequency and distribution. Further, I will discuss whether the use of the reflexive pronoun can be considered a prior stage or a prerequisite to the impersonal use of the verb.

1) This is based on examples from timarit.is which is an open digital library with texts from17th century to the early 21st century.

2) The semantic grouping is based on Jónsson, 1997—1998.

3) The b.-example is taken from timarit.is.

4) The b.-example is from the spoken language.

5) The b.-example is based on an example in the Written Language Archive of the University Dictionary, arnastofnun.is
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Voice Onset Time in Pomerano-Portuguese bilinguals
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Pomerano is a scarcely researched Low German variety taken to Brazil in the 1850s. To our knowledge, this is the only study that focuses on Voice Onset Time (VOT) in Pomerano speakers from the state of Santa Catarina. Our aim is to determine the VOT values for both Pomerano and Portuguese spoken by bilinguals in this part of Brazil, as well as to figure out whether two groups of bilinguals with different age ranges present phonetic transfer. Finally, a sociolinguistic interpretation of the results will be provided.

Occlusive consonants can be described in terms of VOT, i.e. the time between the release of the stop and the onset of voicing (Lisker/Abramson 1964, Cho/Ladefoged 1999). Most Germanic languages (like Pomerano) contrast in initial position between occlusives with long vs. short positive VOT values ([pθtθkθ] vs. [ptk]), whereas in the Romance languages (like Portuguese) stops present either short or negative VOTs ([ptk] vs. [bdg]).

14 Pomerano-Portuguese bilinguals and 4 monolingual Portuguese speakers were recruited and divided into three groups: (i) monolinguals, (ii) bilinguals >70 years, (iii) bilinguals ≤70. 18 items in Pomerano and 19 in Portuguese containing [ptkbdɡ] in word-initial and stressed position were recorded (e.g. bauk ‘book’, tung ‘tongue’ for Pomerano; beijo ‘kiss’, gota ‘drop’ for Portuguese); each consonant was followed by both front and back vowels.

The Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed that the three groups differ statistically significantly in Portuguese for VOT values of /pt/ and /bdɡ/, whereas no differences were found for their stop productions in Pomerano. Unlike the monolinguals, the younger bilinguals partially aspirate in Portuguese [pθtθ], but [bdɡ] are pre-voiced in both groups. By contrast, the older bilinguals clearly show aspiration in their productions of /pt/ (hence [pθtθ]), but instead of [bdɡ], we usually find (unaspirated) [ptk]. The Mann-Whitney tests proved these differences to be significant. Our Pomerano VOT values are similar to those obtained in previous studies carried out in regions other than Santa Catarina. However, the bilinguals in Schaeffer/Meireles (2011), aged 15-20, differ from our older group in that they present negative VOT values for [bdɡ] in Portuguese; Bandeira/Zimmer (2011) offer no data in this regard. As noted by Trudgill (2000), when a group is under attack, its speakers tend to stress what differentiates them. Interestingly, the speakers from our sample who transfer VOT values were brought up during the years of repression to German speakers in Getúlio Vargas’ dictatorship (1937–1945). Speaking Portuguese with no German accent seems to convey the mainstream social prestige, whereas the covert prestige, i.e. stressing the German features, seems to operate within the older generation.
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Singular indefinite pronouns in Old English and the insufficiency of case

Mary Blockley

University of Texas at Austin

In the preface to the 2nd edition of his 1897 textbook, A. S. Cook acknowledges he deliberately declines to provide gender in the Vocabulary: “The cardinal use of a knowledge of the gender of a noun is with reference to declension; given the declension, and the gender follows” (1894: xi) While Cook does not mention Brugmann here, he appears to invoke his view of gender against that of Grimm. If there is any place where the gender should not follow (that is, remain unspecified) it would be the interrogative pronouns, and the indefinites that they correspond to, as well as the indefinites such as man and ænig. Yet through coindexed personal pronouns, particularly in the nominative and genitive cases, these indefinites are gendered, even where the gender is pragmatically odd. In his typological survey of indefinites Haspelmath, relying on Einenkel (1903), claims English has no free-choice ænig “any” until the fifteenth century, but there are a handful of examples such as gif he ænige geaxode he æwfaste wæron (ÆLS (Maur)). There are also indefinites that remain indefinite, such as deme gehwa hæs wæðmynetes wyrhe: se he gæworht is: oðde se he ealle þing gesceop. (ÆCHom I, 29 Clemoes 422). These tend to be in hortatory first-person contexts, suggesting indefinites like North American Icelandic þú more than Icelandic hverr. Ælfric’s Letter to Brother Edward contains a strikingly odd passage in that his categorical indictment of the behavior of women is presented through a shift from the plural to the indefinite but gendered singular ænig man æfre swa unheawfast beon scrolo þæt he bone mid ufan mid metum aefyelle, and on ðeornende hit gere þet meox ut fram and drince þonne æger ge þet ealu ge þone siæng, þæt he huru swa aefyelle his fracodon gyfernysse. Use of relative clauses headed with indeterminate gender þæt (Ælfric’s usual relativizer) and the external possessor dative instead of the genitive his would have left gender indeterminate.

Hogg and Fulk (2011 §5.35) characterize the prefixed indefinite gehwa as having a “generalized meaning.” This prefixed indefinite tends to co-occur with feminine abstract nouns such as those with -ness, as if the prefixation gendered what is otherwise what they term the utter gender of masculine and feminine.
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Suburban and Rural Variation Between /y/ and /u/ in Achterhoek Melody Pattison University of York

The Achterhoek region is found in the eastern Netherlands, bordering Germany. A Low Saxon dialect, Achterhoeks, is spoken amongst many inhabitants of the region, and differs markedly from Standard Dutch in its phonology, grammar and lexicon. Lexical differences observed from town to town are common (cf. Schaars, 1987; Van Prooije, 2011), however there have been fewer studies on subtle pronunciation differences.

This research considers the pronunciation of the Standard Dutch vowel /œy/ in the Achterhoek region, where it is typically realised as a monophthong. Previous studies (eg. Kloeke, 1927; Van Reenen, 2005; 2006) have shown a variable use of /y/ and /u/ in this area of the Netherlands. However, this research follows on from previous studies by considering the links between rural and suburban pronunciation. During May-August 2015, 34 Achterhoeks speakers (aged from 26-73) from different towns in the region were recorded completing a picture task and reading sentences designed to elicit marked dialectal pronunciations. F1 and F2 formant frequencies were analysed in Praat and a formant editor developed by Márton Sóskuthy, and then compared in order to arrive at the final results.

Variations in the position of the vowel following rhotics were observed in the speakers. Grouped into age, gender, and location, it was found that the more retracted vowel /u/ was observed in rural speakers, whereas the fronted vowel /y/ was seen in speakers from suburban areas. Where the vowel appeared in any position other than following the rhotic consonant, it was realised as /y/, without any observable differences between speakers.

Indeed in the case of these vowels /y/ and /u/ it would appear there is variation based on the status of participants’ locations. The vowel /y/ in this area of the Netherlands resulted in a shift from the older /u/ of West Germanic dialects (Van Reenen, 2006), so here the /u/ pronunciation after /r/ could be considered a relic of the older dialect of the area. This therefore presents the conclusion that the rural speakers’ style is more representative of the traditional dialect, which sets up the basis for further exploration of this conclusion in other aspects of speech, and thus the implications for the future of the dialect in suburban areas.
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The Efficacy of Using Electropalatographic Biofeedback in Second Language German Instruction
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Advances in instrumentation and computer technology, such as electropalatography (EPG), have allowed second language (L2) instructors and learners the opportunity to use new and innovative methods to help individuals improve their communication. EPG or dynamic palatometry is a computer-based tracking system designed to provide real-time visual biofeedback of how the tongue is contacting the palate during speech (Fletcher, 1992; Fletcher, McCutcheon, & Wolf, 1975). EPG uses a pseudopalate or sensor similar to an orthodontic retainer, in that it is individually customized to fit the contours of an individual's teeth, extending from the alveolar ridge to the back molars (Fletcher, 1992; Fletcher et al., 1975). The device contains 124 gold-plated electrodes arranged in a grid pattern across the surface of the pseudopalate. The instructional use of this technology has increased recently, in part due to a device produced by SmartPalate International® that is relatively thin and available at a lower monetary cost than previous EPG technology. Anecdotal evidence and a limited number of small-scale studies (Gibbon, Hardcastle, & Suzuki, 1991; Bright, 1999; Schmidt, 1998) have reported positive results when EPG is used in L2 instruction; however the efficacy of using EPG to facilitate speech production for L2 learners has yet to be fully examined empirically and what few studies do exist have included only a handful of subjects.

To fill this gap in the research, the current study outlined in this poster investigates the use of EPG biofeedback to facilitate L2 pronunciation learning in German by native speakers of English enrolled in German language learning courses at a large private university. Although the larger project examines the linguopalatal contact patterns for a number of different consonants (e.g., /l/, /rl/, /ts/, /pf/), this poster presents data on the the ich- and ach-Laut sounds (in ich ‘I’ and Buch ‘book’ respectively). These native productions will serve as the target examples used during the four-week pronunciation training module for L2 German learners currently underway. The poster next highlights the training component examining the effectiveness of visual feedback via EPG across two types of pronunciation practice, distributed (4 x 20-minute each week) and mass (2 x 40-minute sessions) as opposed to using traditional auditory-based pronunciation training. Thus, the study includes three groups subjects each: a control group which practices pronunciation using auditory samples to mimic; a group using the EPG sensor for distributed practice, i.e., (4 x 20-minute sessions a week) and a group using the EPG sensor for fewer more intensive practice sessions (2 x 40-minute sessions a week). To verify efficacy of the training module, subjects complete pre-, post- and delayed post-test pronunciation tasks before and after the 4 week training module. They are then tested again several weeks later as part of a delayed post-test. Progress in acquiring L2 speech pronunciation patterns are examined in three ways: 1) in terms of acoustic measures of the target sounds from the pre, post- and delayed post production samples; 2) using ratings from 5 native speakers of German of the tokens from the pre-, post- and delayed post speech productions; and 3) EPG contact data during the training.

The poster thus presents the native speaker target contacts that form the basis of the training to show the audience the basis of comparison for the training as well as an overview of the study and preliminary findings. The study itself helps us better understand the tools available to help students improve their foreign language pronunciation and how these tools can most effectively be used, e.g., intensively (mass practice) or during shorter consistent practice sessions (distributed practice). This study includes the largest number of subjects to date to examine the efficacy of EPG contact feedback in L2 pronunciation training.
Weinrich’s Tense Categories of Narration and Comment in the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trials
Valentina Concu
Purdue University

The German preterite and present perfect are commonly described in DAF (German as a foreign language) material as used respectively in the written and the spoken language (Concu 2015). According to several grammars and textbooks used in second and foreign language classrooms, the difference between the two tenses is based in the written or oral register and therefore, every tense is assigned almost exclusively to one of them.

This paper explores the usage of preterite and present perfect in the recordings of the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials, held in Frankfurt am Main, from the December 20, 1963 to August 19, 1965 and available on the web page of the Fritz Bauer Institute. Textual analyses of the depositions of five former German prisoners of the Polish concentration camp show that German native speakers use both tenses in their spoken interactions. These results amply contradict their depiction in DAF materials, textbooks and grammars. In the testimony of Elisabeth Pickardt, recorded on December 11, 1964, more than 80 preterite and only 60 present perfect forms were found. The alternation of these two tenses observed here, also within the same sentences, provide support for Weinrich’s categories of comment and narration, as described in his most famous work from 1964, Tempus: besprochene und erzählte Welt, in which German tenses are divided according to the speaker’s communicative intentions: when speakers want to make claims or negotiate information, the present perfect will be used; when they want to narrate past events, they will opt for the preterite. Furthermore, according to Nicole Schumacher from the Free University of Berlin and Klaus Welke from Humboldt University, the difference between present perfect and preterite is determined by the subjective attitude of the speakers in relation to the information they want to convey (Schumacher 2006; Welke 2010). The mixed usage of preterite and present perfect highlights indeed that speakers are aware of the pragmatic and communicative differences between tenses.

In conclusion, this paper provides support for a pragmatic framework to tense related studies, as well as evidence for the existence of specific cognitive processes that are involved in the communicative exchanges among speakers in a specific language community.
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