

POZNAŃ, 17–18 SEPTEMBER 2026

Program and Book of Abstracts

Version of 14.09.2026

Program

Thursday, 17.09.2026, room C1

11:00 Opening

11:30-13:00 First session (Chair: Dominika Skrzypek)

- Axel Holvoet (Vilnius): Upward and downward percolation of genitive-triggering features in Lithuanian and Polish
- Sturla Berg-Olsen (Oslo): The Latvian non-prepositional genitive revisited
- Liina Lindström and Helen Plado (Tartu): Personal and impersonal *you* in Estonian dialects

13:00-14:00 Lunch break

14:00-15:30 Second session (Chair: Klaus Geyer)

- Anna Daugavet (Vilnius): *What (has) happened?* The perfect of current relevance in Latvian and English
- Tanja Anstatt (Bochum): Heritage Languages in Comparison: Does verbal aspect stay? Results of a sentence repetition task on Upper Sorbian and Polish in Germany
- Birutė Spraunienė (Vilnius): Pseudocoordination with 'take' in Danish

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

16:00-17:00 Third session (Chair: Björn Wiemer)

- Peter Arkadiev and Dmitri Sitchinava (Potsdam): Avertive-frustrative constructions in Lithuanian and Russian: a corpus study
- Piotr Wyroślak (Poznań): Antimirative and situation-backgrounding markers in Polish

18:00 - Conference dinner (for invited participants)

Friday, 18.09.2026, room C1

9:30-11:00 Fourth session (Chair: Jurgis Pakerys)

- Nicole Nau (Poznań): Verbs in verbal art: emergent constructions in Latgalian folktales
- Dominika Skrzypek & Natalia Kołaczek (Poznań): Sentence initial participles as narrative device
- Kirill Kozhanov (Potsdam): Another areal feature revealed: Resultatives in Lithuanian Romani

11:00-11:30 Coffee break

11:30-13:00 Fifth session (Chair: Axel Holvoet)

- Björn Wiemer (Mainz): What to do with clitics losing their ground in Baltic and Slavic?
- Jurgis Pakerys (Vilnius): On the development of verbal inflection classes in Baltic
- Everita Andronova (Stockholm): Tracing variants in the works of G. Mancelius (1593-1654)

13:00-13:30 Coffee break

13:30-15:30 Sixth session (chair: Tanja Anstatt)

- Klaus Geyer (Odense): Danes can't learn German – seriously?
- Heiko F. Marten (Mannheim): "Language X in Country Y": Reflections on German in Latvia and Beyond
- Sanita Martena (Riga): *Somehow, I've started to perceive all these Latvian dialects in a completely different way*: Changing language attitudes among the Latvian diaspora
- Joanna Chojnicka (Groningen): Critical Language Awareness as a future-oriented metacognitive competency

15:30-16:00 Summing up and saying goodbye

Abstracts

Anna Daugavet (Vilnius University, Lithuania) 5
Axel Holvoet (Vilnius University, Lithuania) 6
Birutė Spraunienė (Vilnius University, Lithuania) 7
Björn Wiemer (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Germany) 8
Dominika Skrzypek & Natalia Kołaczek (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland) 9
Everita Andronova (Stockholm University, Sweden) 9
Heiko F. Marten (Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Germany) 12
Joanna Chojnicka (University of Groningen, The Netherlands) 13
Jurgis Pakerys (Vilnius University, Lithuania) 13
Kirill Kozhanov (University of Potsdam, Germany) 15
Klaus Geyer (University of Southern Denmark in Odense, Denmark) 16
Liina Lindström & Helen Plado (Tartu University, Estonia) 16
Nicole Nau (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland) 18
Peter Arkadiev, Dmitri Sitchinava (University of Potsdam, Germany) 20
Piotr Wyroślak (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland) 21
Sanita Martena (Riga Technical University, Latvia) 23
Stephan Kessler (University of Greifswald, Germany) 24
Sturla Berg-Olsen (Språkrådet, Norway) 24
Tanja Anstatt (Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany) 25

Anna Daugavet (Vilnius University, Lithuania)

***What (has) happened?* The perfect of current relevance in Latvian and English**

The study aims to reveal quantitative and qualitative differences in the distribution of the Present Perfect vs Simple Past in two languages with a highly grammaticalized perfect, English and Latvian. In Latvian, perfect forms consist of a past active participle (PAP) accompanied by the auxiliary 'be', which can be dropped (1). It is contrasted with synthetic simple past forms (2).

(1) *Kas* ***(ir)*** ***noticis*** *pa* *šo* *gadu?*
what.NOM be.PRS.3 happen.PAP.M.SG through this.ACC.SG year. ACC.SG
'What **has happened** this year?'

(2) *Kas* ***notika*** *tālāk?*
what.NOM happen.PST.3 further
'What **happened** next?'

Different uses of perfect come with their own lexical input, as well as structural and pragmatic features, allowing their description in terms of constructions. E.g. the experiential perfect in another Baltic language, Lithuanian, is predominantly found with verbs 'be', 'see', 'hear' and 'acquire'; the auxiliary is dropped less frequently than in other uses of the Lithuanian perfect, and the subject is frequently the 1st person (Kapkan 2024, 84–88). An analysis of Latvian by Daugavet & Kapkan (2025) zooms in on pragmatically marked idiomatic expressions containing individual verbs in the perfect form with the meaning of current relevance.

In the talk, comparison between the use of Present Perfect vs Simple Past in Latvian and English is narrowed down to the question *What (has/'s) happened?* The question presumes an event and thus can be relied on to provide examples with the meaning of current relevance, corresponding to a high degree of grammaticalization (Dahl & Hedin, 2000, 391–392). Table 1 specifies the structures extracted together with dependent constituents, in the main clause of questions, from the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Balanced Corpus of Modern Latvian (*Līdzsvarotais mūsdienu latviešu valodas korpuss, LVK*) and gives their frequencies.

Table 1

structures	**English (BNC)**			**Latvian (LVK)**		
full present perfect	*has happened*	79	7%	*ir noticis*	45	10%
reduced / omitted auxiliary	*'s happened*	224	19%	*noticis*	214	46%
simple past	*happened*	857	74%	*notika*	206	44%
total		1160	100%		465	100%

The prevalence of the perfect (56%) in Latvian vs the Simple Past (74%) in English cannot be attributed to the difference in text types. Even though BNC contains more spoken data than LVK, over 70% of the Simple Past in the BNC data comes from written texts similar to

the main sources of LVK. The hypothesis is that the English Simple Past is found in uses where Latvian prefers the Present Perfect. The classification of uses is based on the semantic and pragmatic components of the question, potentially linked to different related constructions.

Those are the time and the place of the presumed event *(What (has) happened here/now?)*, allowing the addressee to identify it, or the adjacent events (*What (has) happened next?)*. Especially important is the experiencer, undergoing changes (Dahl 2022, 282), recognized through the results and consequences of the presumed event, that may clash with the speaker's expectations *(What (has) happened to you?)*.

References

Dahl, Östen (2022) Perfects across languages. *Annual Review of Linguistics,* 8(1), 279-297.

Dahl, Östen & Eva Hedin (2000) Current relevance and event reference. In: Ö. Dahl (Ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 385-401.

Daugavet, Anna & Danguolé Kapkan (2025) The Latvian perfect on Facebook: an analysis based on data from comments. 58th Annual Meeting of the Societas Lingüistica Europaea, Université Bordeaux Montaigne, 2025-08-27.

Kapkan, Danguolé (2024) *The Grammaticalization of BE Perfects and beyond: Case Studies in Lithuanian, Bulgarian and Barese.* Doctoral Dissertation. Vilnius University.

Axel Holvoet (Vilnius University, Lithuania)

Upward and downward percolation of genitive-triggering features in Lithuanian and Polish

Percolation is the spread of a feature from a dependent to a head or from a head to a dependent. It is illustrated in the following example from Old Lithuanian, where the genitive governed by the verb *bijotis* 'fear' is passed on to the object of the head verb of the embedded infinitival clause:

(1)	*bet*	*Samuel*	*bijojos*	*pasakit*	***ano***	***regieima***	*Eley*
	but	Samuel	fear.PST.3	say.INF	**that.GEN.SG.M**	**vision.GEN.SG**	Eli.DAT

'And Samuel feared to shew Eli the vision.' (Chyliński Bible, 1Samuel 3.15)

The best-known case of this downward percolation of a genitive-triggering feature is the genitive of negation, which is regularly passed on from a negated higher-clause verb to the infinitival head of an embedded clause in both Old and Modern Lithuanian:

(2)	*Egypczoniey*	*nes*	*negali*		***donos***	*walgit*	*su*	*Źydeys*
	Egyptian.NOM.PL	for	NEG.be_allowed.PRS.3		**bread.GEN.SG**	eat.INF	with	Jew.INS.PL

'because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews' (Chyliński Bible, Gen. 43.32)

This so-called long-distance genitive of negation is usually considered in isolation, separately from other instances of case percolation, but I will here attempt to gain a more comprehensive picture by discussing it in the context of other instances of upward and downward percolation. Both downward and upward percolation are observed in the following example from modern Lithuanian, where the polarity feature triggering genitive of negation is percolated upward from the adverb *nelabai* 'not too much' to the head verb and then downward to the infinitival head of the embedded clause:

(3) *Atvirai* *sakant,* *nelabai* *mėgstu* *skaityti*
openly say.CVB NEG.a_lot like.PRS.1SG read.INF

vertimų *iš* *tų* *kalbų,* *kuriomis*
translation.GEN.PL from that.GEN.PL language.GEN.PL which.INS.PL.F

galiu *skaityti* *originalą.*
be_able.PRS.1SG read.INF original.ACC.SG

'To tell the truth, I don't particularly like reading translations from those languages in which I can read the originals.' (llvs.lt, ltTenTen21)

In my talk I will give an overview of upward and downward percolation of genitive-triggering features in Lithuanian and Polish, two Balto-Slavonic languages with a highly regular use of genitive objects both under negation and with specific verb classes. I will compare lexically and syntactically determined cases of percolation, looking both at older and newer varieties of these languages involved. I will also reflect on the factors that could possibly influence the operation of the genitival feature in terms of syntactic configuration, linear distance and semantics in those cases where it is not obligatory.

Birutė Spraunienė (Vilnius University, Lithuania)

Pseudocoordination with 'take' in Danish

This paper presents a first study of the Danish TAKE AND V construction (e. g. *tag og hold kæft!* 'shut up!'[1]) based on large corpus data. Methodologically, it is inspired by Nau *et al.* (2019) and aims to give a thorough description of the TAKE AND V construction in Danish in terms of lexical input, morphosyntactic properties, semantics and usage patterns from a cross-linguistic perspective. Previous accounts on TAKE AND V in Scandinavian languages mainly deal with Swedish and Norwegian data and use constructed examples (cf. Ekberg, 1993; Lødrup, 2002; Wiklund, 2008; Vannebo, 2003, *inter alia*) except Blasenius (2009) who uses authentic examples from Google, but restricts his sample to preterite verbs. Although the mainland Scandinavian laguages in general are rather similar regarding the functions and types of pseudocoordination constructions (Ross 2021: 75), there might be some microvariation concerning the use of TAKE AND V in Danish in comparison to Swedish and Norwegian. The preliminary results of the present study reveal that the TAKE AND V construction in Danish mostly occurs in the infinitive preceded by a deontic modal verb or

[1] The example is from Hansen & Heltoft (2011: 1002).

in the imperative and thus refers to potential events. It's typical context seems to be a directive speech act.

References

Blasenius, K. (2009). *Blir nog att jag tar och går och tar en tupplur nu. Om pseudosamordningar med gå och ta som förstaled*. Masteruppsats, Göteborgs Universitet.

Ekberg, L. (1993). The Cognitive Basis of the Meaning and Function of Cross-Linguistic TAKE and V. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics 8*. 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.8.03ekb

Hansen, E. & Heltoft, L. (2011). *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog*. Bind I-III. Det Danske Sprog-og Litteraturselskab.

Lødrup, H. (2002). The syntactic structures of Norwegian pseudocoordinations. *Studia Linguistica* 56(2). 121–143. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9582.00090

Nau, N. C., Kozhanov, K., Lindström, L., Laugalienė, A., & Brudzyński, P. (2019). Pseudocoordination with 'take' in Baltic and its neighbours / Nicole Charlotte Nau, Kirill Kozhanov, Liina Lindström, Asta Laugalienė, Paweł Brudzyński. *Baltic Linguistics.* https://doi.org/10.32798/bl.365

Ross, D. (2021). *Pseudocoordination, serial verb constructions and multi-verb predicates: The relationship between form and structure*. PhD Dissertation: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Vannebo, K. I. (2003). Ta og ro deg ned noen hakk: on pseudocoordination with the verb ta 'take' in a grammaticalization perspective. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26(2). 165–193. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0332586503001070

Wiklund, A. L. 2008b. Creating Surprise in Complex Predication. *Tromsø Working Papers on Language & Linguistics: Nordlyd 35(1)*. 163–187. https://doi.org/10.7557/12.141

Björn Wiemer (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Germany)

What to Do with Clitics Losing Their Ground in Baltic and Slavic?

The paper surveys phenomena testifying to increasing boundedness on the gradient between clitics and affixes in Slavic and Baltic languages. The starting point are enclitics, most of them with 2P-characteristics ("Wackernagel clitics"). Particular attention is paid (i) to the rise of so-called postfixes and their significance for a templatic view on verb morphology, (ii) to the intermediate enclitic-suffix behavior of person-number markers and of irrealis markers, and (iii) to the loss or restructuring of clitic clusters and their areal distribution across Baltic and Slavic.

Dominika Skrzypek & Natalia Kołaczek
(Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland)

Sentence initial participles as narrative device

In this presentation, we aim to identify and explicate stylistic distinctiveness in the use of sentence initial present participles in the first five volumes of Robert Galbraith's series of detective novels and their translations to Polish and Swedish. We establish their stylistic function in the original books and present a typology of their semantics and the relationship between them, which is further reflected in the range of translation equivalents (cf. Nau 2011 on relative clauses in narrative fiction). A comparison with two typologically distinct languages, Polish and Swedish, reveals that while Polish uses the sentence initial present participle with a higher frequency than English, Swedish, with its limited scope of use of the present participle, prefers finite clauses or prepositional adverbials. We demonstrate how narrative effects are conditioned and enabled by the clause type's properties (finite vs non-finite), as outlined in cross-linguistic studies (Twose 2008). We finally address the issue of translatability of syntactic structures and compensatory techniques in translation.

References

Nau, N. (2011). Relative clauses in narrative fiction. Findings from a parallel text in Swedish, German, Latvian, Polish and English. *Folia Scandinavica Posnaniensia*, *12*, 181–195. Retrieved from https://pressto.amu.edu.pl/index.php/fsp/article/view/3649

Twose, G. (2008). What's in a clause? Milton's participial style revisited. *Language and Literature* *17*(1):77–96. DOI: 10.1177/0963947007085056

Everita Andronova (Stockholm University, Sweden)

Tracing variants in the works of G. Mancelius (1593–1654)

The Latvian written language in the 17th century is characterized by a high level of linguistic variation in morphology, as well as syntax and lexis. This presentation applies the framework of variationist sociolinguistics (Tagliamonte 2012) to the sub-corpus of G. Mancelius (1593–1654), the reformer of Latvian orthography and prominent author. Most previous philological studies on Mancelius are based only on fragmented data (stimulating exceptions are Frīdenberga 2016 on nominal derivation, and Vanags, Frīdenberga, Trumpa 2023 on the orthography in a complete corpus). Here, on the basis of data from a 500,000-token sub-corpus (extracted from *senie.korpuss.lv*), different types of linguistic variables are examined by quantitative methods. The analysis demonstrates that variation in Mancelius's texts is constrained by internal and external factors, e.g., source-language interference and Latvian dialect features, as well as common spelling conventions of the time.

My presentation focuses on morphological variation, namely, the coexistence of older and younger forms. This has already been well described as a fact of the development of the

Latvian language (Endzelīns 1951, Pokrotniece 2002, Pokrotniece 2007), but little has been done with respect to Mancelius' language as a system of one author.

Numerous evidence concerns the variaton of Dat.Pl. forms, with older forms *-ms* present for all nouns:

(1) (..) *muhſſas Sirrdes und Prahtus us* ***Debbeſkighams*** *und* ***Deewiſkahms leetahms*** *pa=zellt*
'to lift our hearts and mind to **heavenly** and **divine things**' (Manc1654_LP1_254$_{23-24}$)

(2) *Nhe titzaht juhß/ kad es jums no* ***Semmesſkigahm leetahm*** *ſacku/ ka buhtat juhß tad titzeyuſchi/ kad es jums no* ***Debbeßſkigahm leetahm*** *ſatzitu?*
'You do not believe when I tell you **earthly things**, how will you believe if I tell you about **heavenly things**?' (Manc1643_44_LVM_134$_{4-7.}$)

Equally strong evidence is present for Loc.Sg. and Loc.Sg. of Illative origin for *ā*-stem nomens:

(3) *apraxta taß Swähts Ewangeliſts Jahnis* ***ſawà Ghramatà tan Deßmittan Weetan***
'the holy evangelist John describes **in his book in the tenth place**'
(Manc1654_LP1_446$_{18-20}$)

It should be added that several forms have been adverbialized and appear in both shapes. However, the form in *-an* is much rarer in comparison to the modern one, e.g. the form *kohpan* 'together' appears twice in the Catechism text of 1631 and 1643, whereas the modern forms *kohpa* (71x), *kohpà* (19x), *kopa* (3x) are much more common:

(4) *Ko Deews gir* ***kohpan*** *ſalaulayis..*
'What God has joined **together**..' (Manc1643_44_Cat_477$_{10}$)

(5) *tee laulati Draughi* ***kohpà*** *dſiewoja*
'those married friends lived **together'** (Manc1654_LP1_360$_{26}$)

The prepositional use clearly illustrates the shift from the earlier (the 16th c. and the beginning of the 17th c.) preferred form with *-an* toward a shortened form (as described by Nītiņa 1978). Cf. ***starpan*** (*ſtarpan*, also *ſtarrpan*) (119x) – *starpā* (*ſtarpa, ſtarrpa*) (20x) and ***starp*** (*ſtarp, ſtarrp*) (51x) meaning 'between, among' in similar constructions:

(6) ***Starpan*** *wiſſeems Ļaudeems / ſtarpan wiſſeems Pagganeems.*
'**Among** all people, among all the pagans.' (Manc1631_Syr_559$_{33}$)

(7) ***Starrpa*** *teems zitteems auxteems Kungeems*
'**Among** those other noble men' (Manc1631_LVM_225$_{16-17}$)

(8) *Wings ſeh ſawu nicknu Sahl* ***ſtarrp*** *teem ſchkieſteem Queeſcheem/*
'he sows his tares **among** those pure wheat' (Manc1654_LP1_206$_{30-31}$)

Dat.Sg. of *ē*-stems exhibits both the older ending *-i* and modern *-ei*:

(9) *muhſſai Dwehſſel**i*** 'for our soul' (Manc1654_LP2_225$_{25}$)

(10) *mannai Dwehſſel**ei*** 'for my soul' (Manc1654_LP1_496$_{18}$)

Interestingly, although Mancelius typically uses a reduced Acc.Sg. form for *ē*-stem nouns, this particular lexeme *dvēsele* 'soul' also appears with full ending forms in very few

examples: *Meeſſu vnd **Dwehſſeli** arridſan labbe ſarrgaht* ‘well protect both body and **soul**’ (Manc1631_LGL_303_21). This contrasts with the predominant reduced form as in *ka tu tawu gharrighu Nammu / **Dwehſſel** und Meeſſu usturreht warri.* ‘that you your spiritual house, **soul** and body can support’ (Manc1654_LP1_504$_{22\text{-}23}$).

Another interesting feature is the use of plural possesive pronouns ‘our’ and ‘their’ like *mūsos, mūsās, jūsāms* etc. For example,

(11) *Tee Ackminis nhe by tahdi/ ka **muhſſohß** Laukohß attrohd/*
‘those stones were not the same as in **our** field are found’ (Manc1654_LP3_201$_{21}$)

(12) *Juhß Wieri dſiewoyeeta py **juhſſahms** Seewahms ar Prahtu*
‘You, husbands, live with **your** wifes with understanding’ (Manc1631_Cat_502$_{13\text{-}14}$)

Every single variation should be considered, following the ‘principle of accountability’ (introduced by Labov 1966, mentioned by Tagliamonte 2012:9–10). While this process is quite challenging, it also enables the observation of some differences within registers (e.g. borrowed lexeme *Ewangelium* is found only in narratives but not in a vocabulary ‘Lettus’). It also helps to detect some variation present only in a certain source. Thus, pronoun forms *manim, tevim, sevim* with prepositions occur in the texts edited by Mancelius but are absent from his original texts, cf. phrase *py mannim* ‘to me’ in the hymnals from 1615 and later sources from 1631 and 1643 edited by Mancelius. At the same time, in the original texts, a variant *py man(n)* is frequently used:

(13) *Ko ſacku? wackar wackarà by Saimneex **py man**/ vnd aitzenaja ſchurr.*
‘What do I say? Last night the landloard visited me and invited me here’
(Manc1638_Run_419B$_{1\text{-}4}$)

Both variants can be observed in the edited text:

(14) *Vnd nhe leeds mann nhe kahdu briedi / Ock Deews **no töwim** attkahpt: Bett **py töw** pallickt ſtippre / Kamehr ta Dwehſſele no ſawas Weetas / Eekſchan Däbbäſſu eebraux.*
‘And do not forbid me, o, God, to depart **from you**, but keep strong next **to you** when the soul from its place will enter heaven.’ (Manc1643_LGL_362$_{22\text{-}24}$)

Already preliminary observations in Mancelius’ texts confirm the argument that ‘[n]ot all variability and heterogeneity in language structure involves change; but all change involves variability and heterogeneity’ (Weinreich, Labov, Hercog 1968:188).

References

senie.korpuss.lv — The Corpus of early written Latvian (16th–18th cc.)

Endzelīns, J. (1951). *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: LVI.

Frīdenberga, A. (2016). Nominālā vārddarināšana Georga Manceļa darbos. Promocijas darbs. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte, 2016, 255 lpp.

Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Nītiņa, D. (1978). *Prievārdu sistēma latviešu rakstu valodā*. Rīga: Zinātne.

Pokrotniece, K., ed. (2002). *Latviešu literārās valodas morfoloģiskās sistēmas attīstība. Lokāmās vārdšķiras*. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.

Pokrotniece, K., ed. (2007). *Latviešu literārās valodas morfoloģiskās sistēmas attīstība: Nelokāmās vārdšķiras*. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.

Tagliamonte, S. A. (2012). *Variationist Sociolinguistics: Change, Observation, Interpretation*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Vanags P., Frīdenberga A., Trumpa A. (2023). Georga Manceļa rakstības principi: darbības pirmais posms (līdz 1631.gadam). *Baltistica*, Vol. 58, no 2, pp. 329–353.

Weinreich U., Labov W., Hercog M.I. (1968). Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In: *Directions for historical linguistics. A symposium.* Ed. by W.P.Lehmann, Y.Malkiel. University of Texas Press, Austin & London, pp. 97–195.

Heiko F. Marten (Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Germany)

"Language X in Country Y": Reflections on German in Latvia and Beyond

Among the common interests that Nicole Nau and I have shared in formal contexts as well as in informal debates, is multilingualism in the Baltic states. Most of all, her passion for Latgalian and other aspects of multilingualism in Latvia have repeatedly influenced my understanding of language and languages in Latvia in substantial ways. In this, it certainly plays a role that we are both Germans who have developed a specific interest in Latvia and its languages.

My talk will reflect upon languages in Latvia with a focus on the historical and contemporary role of German. Based on previous and current research, I will discuss how to characterise functions of German as part of Latvian multilingualism. This includes German as an "additional language of society" used, e.g., by an increasing number of recent migrants to Latvia or by other people who regularly visit the country who give German a certain presence in contemporary Latvian society. This presence goes hand in hand with developments in language policy, and takes place in a region where a German palimpsest structure frequently remains visible under a not too deep surface.

On a broader scale, these reflections relate to a current project conducted at the Leibniz Institute for the German Language in Mannheim: how to characterise the role of a "language X" in a "country Y". In this vein, the paper will first summarise some main aspects of interviews conducted with the German minority in Latvia since 2023. Then it will shed light on a broader conceptualisation of this approach in a pilot project currently conducted in Bosnia-Hercegovina. Not least, I will reflect upon whether this approach may meaningfully also be applied to the perspective of a German-born scholar who has spent larger parts of her life not only in Poznań and its surroundings, but also in Latvia.

Joanna Chojnicka (University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

Critical Language Awareness as a future-oriented metacognitive competency

In this presentation, I would like to introduce the approach to Critical Language Awareness (CLA) as a future-oriented metacognitive competency, currently being developed in the CLA Hub at the University of Groningen. We first outlined this approach in a manifesto paper titled "Critical language awareness as a future imperative: seeing the 'water'", where we defined CLA as "an essential foundation for recognising, questioning, and intervening in how language shapes inequalities and social and physical realities" (Darics et al. 2025). From this starting point, we have then theorized a "CLA skillset and mindset" as consisting of Basic Awareness (native language intuition), Perceptive Awareness (the ability to notice and name formal and functional properties of language and multimodal communication), Exploratory Awareness (the skill of examining the values, norms, assumptions, power relations and purpose encoded in language) and Transformative Awareness (the aptitude to reflect on one's own role in meaning-making processes, reframe to shift perspectives, and act to challenge harmful discourses and offer ethical alternatives).

Through two externally funded grants, CLADES (Critical Language Awareness, Democratic Engagement and Sustainability) and CLAMAC (Critical Language & Multimodal Awareness Competence), our team is now working on developing innovative CLA teaching tools, including a MOOC (Massive Open Online Course), a resource hub, and an improvisation-theatre based pedagogy, whereby we collaborate with several improv theatres across Europe (including Poland).

As the lead educator on the MOOC (titled "Critical Language Awareness in Action. Change the World One Story at a Time"), to be launched on Future Learn on 25 May, I would like to use several activities from this course to illustrate our approach to CLA and substantiate our call for (better) integration of CLA in European competency frameworks and educational agendas.

Reference

Darics E., Staschen O., Drury M., Chojnicka J., Mazzoli M., Olthof J., Serafis D. and Wildfeuer J. (2025). Critical language awareness as a future imperative: seeing the 'water'. *Frontiers in Communication*. 10:1623193. doi: 10.3389/fcomm.2025.1623193

Jurgis Pakerys (Vilnius University, Lithuania)

On the development of verbal inflection classes in Baltic

I take the system of Lithuanian verbal inflection classes as a starting point to discuss the evolution of conjugations in Old Prussian, Latvian, and Latgalian. I focus on the vocalic inflection class suffixes, namely *****-*a*-, *****-*i*-, *****-*ā*- of the present stem and *****-*ā*-, *****-*ē*- of the past stem, e.g., Lithuanian prs. 3sg/pl *suk-a* 'turn(s)', *min-i* 'mention(s)', *laik-o* 'hold(s)', pst. 3sg/pl *suk-o* 'turned', *ved-ė* 'led'. The general tendency found in the Baltic lects is to simplify the conjugation by reducing the number of inflection classes due to homophonous forms.

Of note are also the phonetic developments that obscured the segmentation of inflection class suffixes in 1sg and 2sg forms.

In the present subsystem, the *-*a*-class is stable and survives in all Baltic languages, e.g., 2pl Lithuanian *im-a-te*, Old Prussian *imm-a-ti* 'take', Lithuanian *neš-a-te*, Latvian *nes-a-t*, Latgalian *nas-a-t* 'carry' (Endzelīns 1951: 726ff.; Nau 2011: 45–46). Old Prussian is peculiar in, e.g., 1pl *imm-i-mai* 'take' reminding of dialectal and old Latvian 1pl *es-i-m*, 2pl *es-i-t* 'are' found alongside 1pl *es-a-m,* 2pl *es-a-t* 'are' (Endzelīns 1943: 109, 114–115; Endzelīns 1951: 718; Pokrotniece 2002: 410).

The *-*i*-class is attested in Old Prussian, Lithuanian, Latgalian, and dialectal and old Latvian, e.g., prs. 1pl Old Prussian *turr-i-mai*, Lithuanian *tur-i-me*, dialectal Latvian *tur-i-m* 'hold', Latgalian *tic-i-m* 'believe'. In some Latvian and Lithuanian dialects, the *-*i*-class is replaced by the *-*ja*-class which in turn can be transformed into the *-*a*-class, just as in standard Latvian; this process is also underway in Latgalian (Endzelīns 1951: 791–792; Zinkevičius 1966: 342; Nau 2011: 46–47; Nau 2024: 46–47).

The *-*ā*-class is found in all Baltic languages, e.g., prs. 1pl Lithuanian *laik-o-me*, Old Prussian *lāik-u-mai* 'hold' (<ku> reflects *-*kū* < *-*kā*), Lithuanian 1pl *dar-o-me*, Latvian *dar-ā-m* 'do'. In Latvian dialects, the *-*ā*-class can be partly replaced by the *-*a*-class for 1pl and 2pl forms; occasionally, 2sg and 3sg/pl cells may also adopt the *-*a*-class forms. Latgalian demonstrates variability of the suffix due to phonetic development and analogical remodeling: *-a-* in 3sg/pl vs. *-o-* in 1pl, 2 pl (Endzelīns 1951: 831–833; Nau 2011: 46–47). In some Lithuanian dialects, one finds the *-*ja-* class forms instead of *-*ā*-class presents used alongside infinitives in *-*ī-* (Endzelīns 1951: 826–827; Zinkevičius 1966: 344).

In the past subsystem, the *-*ā-* and *-*ē*-classes are found in all Baltic languages, but the *-*ē*-class is in retreat in Latvian. For the *-*ā*-class, consider Lithuanian pst. 3sg/pl *su-prat-o* 'understood', Latvian *prat-a*, Latgalian *prot-a* 'knew'; for Old Prussian, *-*ā-* is seen in pst. 3sg/pl *pro-wel-a* 'betrayed' (Endzelīns 1943: 116; Nau 2011: 47). For the *-*ē*-class, consider Lithuanian pst. 3 *ved-ė* 'led', Old Prussian *wedd-ē-din* 'brought (her)', Latgalian *ved-e* 'led', dialectal Latvian *nes-e*, Lithuanian *neš-ė* 'brought'; the *-*ē*-class is also attested in old Latvian, but in general, many Latvian dialects and standard Latvian generalized the *-*ā*-class (Endzelīns 1951: 860ff.; Nau 2011: 47).

In my talk, I will also discuss the principles of pairing of the present and the past classes and the role of the present stem affixes *-j-*, *-n-*, and *-st-*.

References

Endzelīns, Jānis. 1943. *Senprūšu valoda*. Rīga: Universitātes apgāds.

Endzelīns, Jānis. 1951. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība.

Nau, Nicole. 2011. *A short grammar of Latgalian*. München: LINCOM Europa.

Nau, Nicole. 2024. *Seven hundred Latgalian words: A dictionary based on Stefania Ulanowska's collection of fairy tales from 1895. With morphological and lexicological analyses*. Poznań: Rys (doi:10.48226/978-83-68006-27-8).

Pokrotniece, Kornēlija (ed.). 2002. *Latviešu literārās valodas morfoloģiskās sistēmas attīstība*. Vol. [1]: *Lokāmās vārdšķiras*. Rīga: Latviešu valodas institūts.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. 1966. *Lietuvių dialektologija: lyginamoji tarmių fonetika ir morfologija*. Vilnius: Mintis.

Kirill Kozhanov (University of Potsdam, Germany)

Another areal feature revealed: Resultatives in Lithuanian Romani

Romani is an Indo-Aryan language that has been spoken in Europe since the Middle Ages. It has also been an integral part of the Curcum-Baltic linguistic area at least since the 16th century (e.g., Wiemer & Kozhanov 2025). Despite this long-standing presence, Romani data are generally underrepresented in discussions of areal features, even though their inclusion often yields valuable insights and confirms the integration of Romani varieties into the linguistic landscape of the region. A recent example is the study of verbal modifiers, which are partly borrowed from and partly replicated on the model of contact languages; their overall distribution closely follows the patterns observed in other languages of the area (Kozhanov & Ross 2022).

In this talk, I will present another areal feature: resultative constructions, which are common in the natural speech of Lithuanian Roma but have not been described in the previous research (Tenser 2005, 2008). These constructions involve an auxiliary *sy* 'be' (often omitted in present-tense contexts) and an indeclinable non-finite form (historically a gerund). They are primarily used with intransitive verbs (1), but they also constitute a productive formation with transitive verbs (2):

(1) *Do* *róm* *kaná* *me-ji*
DEM Rom.NOM.SG now die-RES
'That Rom is dead now'

(2) *sys* *bab-ákir-e* *duj-é* *pšal-én* *za-ly-jí…*
be.PST.3 grandmother-GEN.SG-PL two-OBL brother-ACC.PL PVB-take-RES
'[my] grandmother's two brothers were taken [in the war]'

These resultative constructions are clearly an instance of pattern replication of the subject-oriented perfect/resultative construction that is well attested across the area, particularly the *-všy* construction in the Slavic languages (Wiemer & Kozhanov 2025: 233).

Drawing on a corpus of transcribed Lithuanian Romani narratives, I describe the main characteristics of this construction in Romani and place it within a broader areal context.

References

Kozhanov, Kirill & Ross, Anette. 2022. Verbal modifiers in areal perspective: The case of Latvian Romani. *Kalbotyra* 75. 82–106. (doi:10.15388/Kalbotyra.2022.75.4)

Tenser, Anton. 2005. *Lithuanian Romani* (Languages of the World/Materials). Vol. 452. München: Lincom.

Tenser, Anton. 2005. *Lithuanian Romani* (Languages of the World/Materials). Vol. 452. München: Lincom.

Wiemer, Björn & Kozhanov, Kirill. 2025. Language contact in Lithuania. In Darquennes, Jeroen & Salmons, Joseph C. & Vandenbussche, Wim (eds.), *Language contact: An international handbook*, vol. 2, 221–245. De Gruyter. (doi:10.1515/9783110443011-013)

Klaus Geyer (University of Southern Denmark in Odense, Denmark)

Danes can't learn German – seriously?

Within the Danish education system and in Danish society as a whole, German has a reputation for being a language that is difficult and almost impossible to learn – especially when compared to English. This perception is challenged in my presentation with the help of two tools from linguistic typology: (i) the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS, https://wals.info/) with its focus on (morpho-)syntactic structures, and (ii) the Automated Similarity Judgment Program (ASJP, https://asjp.clld.org/), which specifically compares basic vocabularies. Not entirely surprisingly, there appear to be far greater similarities between German and Danish than one might expect from the Danish folk-linguistic perceptions. A point for discussion could therefore be how this misconception of German as an extremely difficult language for Danes has arisen, even though the linguistic substance tells a completely different story.

Liina Lindström & Helen Plado (Tartu University, Estonia)

Personal and impersonal *you* in Estonian dialects

The option to use singular 2nd person forms (either pronouns or verb forms) for referring to other entities than the canonical addressee of the speech situation is widely attested in many languages, esp. Slavic, Romance, and Germanic languages (Siewierska 2004: 210-213). Such SG2 usages are typically called *generic*, *impersonal*, or *non-specific* (see e.g. DeCock & Kluge 2016), in Finnish tradition also *open reference* (Laitinen 2006, Helasvuo 2008). Moreover, it has been demonstrated that the SG2 forms can also be used for referring to the speaker (Auer & Stukenbrock 2018).

In Finnic languages, the generic or impersonal use of *you* is relatively well studied in Finnish (e.g. Helasvuo 2008, Seppänen 2000, Suomalainen 2020, Forsberg & Uusitupa 2020), and Karelian dialects spoken in Finland (Uusitupa 2017), but not much in Estonian. In spoken Finnish, for example, generic SG2 is typically used for expressing personal experience which is mutually accessible to both participants (Suomalainen & Varjo 2020), although it is less frequent than the open SG3 (the 'zero person') construction (Varjo & Suomalainen 2018). In addition, the use of open 'you' is more characteristic of southeastern Finnish dialects (Forsberg & Uusitupa 2020) and Karelian dialects in Finland (Uusitupa 2017), which gives reason to suggest that contacts with Russian have an augmenting effect on the phenomenon.

In this paper, we look at the use of SG2 in Estonian dialects, using the data obtained form the Corpus of Estonian Dialects. We compare the frequency of personal vs. impersonal/generic uses on SG2 in all North Estonian and South Estonian dialects, in order to see whether there are differences between dialects in the use of generic *you*. Additionally, we look how often and under which conditions are the 2SG verb forms accompanied by the (non-obligatory) subject pronoun, and analyse common contexts where generic 2SG is used.

References:

Auer, Peter & Anja Stukenbrock. 2018. When 'You' means 'I': The German 2Nd Ps.Sg. pronoun *Du* between genericity and subjectivity. *Open Linguistics* 4(1). 280–309. https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2018-0015.

De Cock, Barbara & Bettina Kluge. 2016. On the referential ambiguity of personal pronouns and its pragmatic consequences. *Pragmatics* 26(3). 351–360. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.26.3.01dec.

Forsberg, Hannele & Milla Uusitupa. 2020. Yksikön 2. persoonan avoimen käytön levikki ja yleisyys suomen murteissa. *Sananjalka* 62. 7–32.

Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa. 2008. Minä ja muut. Puhujaviitteisyys ja konteksti. *Virittäjä* 112. 186–206.

Jokela, Hanna & Helen Plado. 2015. Subjects under generic conditions. Implied subjects in Finnish and Estonian *if*-clauses. In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Tuomas Huumo (eds.), *Subjects in Constructions – Canonical and Non-Canonical*. John Benjamins. 73–97.

Laitinen, Lea. 2006. Zero person in Finnish: A grammatical resource for construing human reference. In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell (eds.), *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, vol. 277, 209–231. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.277.15lai.

Seppänen, Eeva-Leena. 2000. Sinä ja suomalaiset: yksikön toisen persoonan yleistävästä käytöstä. *Kielikello* 3/2000. 16–18.

Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Suomalainen, Karita. 2020. Kuka sinä on? Tutkimus yksikön 2. persoonan käytöstä ja käytön variaatiosta suomenkielisissä arkikeskusteluissa. Turku: Turun yliopisto.

Suomalainen, Karita & Mikael Varjo. 2020. When personal is interpersonal. Organizing interaction with deictically open personal constructions in Finnish everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 168. 98–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.003.

Uusitupa, Milla. 2017. *Rajakarjalaismurteiden avoimet persoonaviittaukset*. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.

Varjo, Mikael & Karita Suomalainen. 2018. From zero to 'you' and back: A mixed methods study comparing the use of two open personal constructions in Finnish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 41(3). 333–366. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586518000215.

Nicole Nau (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland)

Verbs in verbal art: emergent constructions in Latgalian oral folktales

Function follows fairytale. (Aylin Langreuter)

One of the striking linguistic features of oral folktales is their "verbiness". In many languages, the proportion of verbs in folktales is higher than in other registers, and it drops dramatically when tales are written down and literalized. The high density of verbs can partly be explained by the focus on action in narratives and the shortness of clauses in oral delivery. However, it also reflects the special roles verbs may play in oral storytelling. My ongoing research shows how functions of text management and narrative design give rise to grammatical structures centring on specific lexical classes or morphological forms of verbs. The material analysed is the collection of 53 Latgalian folktales documented by the Polish ethnographer Stefania Ulanowska in the 1890s, told by speakers who did not use this language, and rarely other languages, in writing. The study analyses in detail the following structures (for examples, see extracts at the end of the abstract):

- the use of verbs and preverbs of directed motion,
- constructions with a verb 'take',
- verb doubling,
- narrative tenses and tense switches,
- backstitching (bridging) constructions,
- verb chaining,
- verbs introducing represented speech, and
- non-finite verbs in represented dialogues and related functions.

These phenomena are known from oral narratives in typologically diverse and geographically distant languages. On the other hand, they are rare or non-existent in European standard languages, including written, but also spoken Latgalian in most of its contemporary forms. This motivates my argument that much in grammar is register-specific and connected to practices of language use, and that changes in verbal art have consequences for linguistic structures.

In my presentation, I want to give an insight into my research on the language of Ulanowska's collected fairytales that have fascinated me for about twenty years and discuss the idea of the book I have been writing since 2021 and hope to finish in my first year of retirement. I will highlight some of the constructions, explain their functions, and attempt to explain how grammar and narrative are intertwined.

Extract (1) illustrates the abundance of verbs of movements and their preverbs (*īt* 'go; come', *da-īt* 'go up to, reach', *ī-leist* 'creep into') and constructions with 'take' (lines 1.d and 1.g). Extract (2) shows a switch of narrative tense from past (lines a. and c.) to present (line e.), backstiching with a converb (line b.), and a future participle expressing intent or imminence (line d.). It also contains an example of the supine with the direct object in the genitive (line a.), a phenomenon outside of the scope of the current study.

(1) How Thumbling gets into the wolf's belly (B23)

a. ***Laižās*** *jis i* ***īt,***	'He **sets off** and **goes**'
set_off.PRS.3.RFL he ADD go.PRS.3	
b. ***īt*** *iz mežu,*	'**goes** into the wood'
go.PRS.3 to wood.ACC.SG	
c. ***da-īt*** *da tūs zornu,*	'**goes up** to the bowels'
PVB-go.PRS.3 to DEM.GEN.PL.M bowels.GEN.PL	
d. ***pa-jam,*** ***ī-līn*** *vydā, -*	'**takes** [and] **creeps** inside'
PVB-take.PRS.3 PVB-creep.PRS.3 inside	
e. *a vylks* ***īt,***	'along **comes** a wolf'
ADD wolf.NOM.SG go.PRS.3	
f. ***redz*** *ka zornys,*	'**sees** the bowels'
see.PRS.3 that bowels.NOM.PL	
g. ***ģiun*** *i* ***ap-ād!***	'**seizes** [them] and **eats** [them] **up**!'
seize.PRS.3 and PVB-eat.PRS.3	

(2) The hare is going to make hay (beginning of B20)

a. *Začs* ***guoja*** *sīna* ***pļau-tu,*** –	'The hare **went to mow** hay, –'
hare.NOM.SG go.PST.3 hay.GEN.SG mow-SUP	
b. ***ī-dam-s*** ***pļau-tu,***	'**going to mow**,'
go-CVB-SG.M mow-SUP	
c. ***pajēme*** *mads buceņu*	'he **took** a keg of honey'
PVB.take.PST.3 honey.GEN.SG keg.DIM.ACC.SG	
d. *i* ***pļau-šk-ys*** *jau sīnu, –*	'and **being ready to mow**, –'
ADD mow-FUT.PA-SG.M PTC hay.ACC.SG	
e. ***saprosa*** *jis lopsys,*	'he **invites** the fox and the wolf and other hares [to join].'
PVB.ask.PRS.3 he fox.GEN.SG	
i vylka, i cytu začu.	
ADD wolf.GEN.SG and other.GEN.PL hare.GEN.	

References (sources)

Ulanowska, Stefania. 1895. Łotysze Inflant Polskich, a w szczególności z gminy Wielońskiej powiatu Rzeżyckiego. Obraz etnograficzny przez Stefanię Ulanowską. Część III. *Zbiór Wiadomości do Antropologii Krajowej*, Kraków, Tom XVIII, Dz. II, 232-492.

Nau, Nicole (compiler). 2014. Stefania Ulanowska's folklore material in the database *Dziedzictwo językowe Rzeczypospolitej. Baza dokumentacji zagrożonych języków* (project leader Tomasz Wicherkiewcz). Available online at https://inne-jezyki.amu.edu.pl/language/latgalski/. (Accessed 21.06.2026)

Peter Arkadiev, Dmitri Sitchinava (University of Potsdam, Germany)

Avertive-frustrative constructions in Lithuanian and Russian: a corpus study

Both Lithuanian and Russian possess constructions expressing functions from the domain of "non-realisation" (Plungian 2001; Kuteva et al. 2019): the Lithuanian construction "be.PST + *be*-present active participle" (Sližienė 1961; Arkadiev 2011, 2019) and the Russian construction with the particle *bylo* (< be.PST.SG.N) modifying the lexical verb (usually in the past tense) (Barentsen 1986; Kagan 2011; Sitchinava 2013: 204–293), see ex. (1), where they serve as translational equivalents in the avertive meaning describing a past situation that was imminent but did not occur (Kuteva 1998).

(1) Lith. ***Buvo belipąs*** *iš automašinos, bet vėl liepė šoferiui važiuoti tiesiai*.
Rus. ***Сошёл было*** *с машины, но снова попросил водителя ехать прямо*.

'He **was about to get out** of the car, but again told the driver to go straight.' (RNC)

The two constructions, to our knowledge, have never been explicitly compared. We undertook such a comparative study based both on our previous corpus-based work on each of the constructions individually (see references above) and on parallel texts. The latter comprise the data from the Lithuanian-Russian parallel subcorpus of RNC (ca. 700k tokens in both languages) as well as the manually aligned Russian resp. Lithuanian translations of "In the Shadow of the Altars" by Vincas Mykolaitis-Putinas (ca. 400k tokens) and "The Master and Margarita" by Mikhail Bulgakov (ca. 220k tokens). These sources yielded a total of 53 examples of the *buvo be*-V-PAP construction and 81 examples of the *bylo* V construction.

The preliminary results of our comparative study are as follows:

1) While sharing the avertive function, the two constructions differ in their overall distribution. The Lithuanian construction is semantically broader (Arkadiev 2019, 2025), also occurring as past proximative and, with some lexical verbs, past progressive. The Russian construction has a significant share of "inconsequential" (Kuteva et al. 2019) uses, describing events that actually took place but either were (immediately) cancelled or failed to have the expected consequences; for the Lithuanian construction such uses are also possible, but less prominent and lexically restricted.

2) The two constructions differ significantly in their lexical input and in the event-types they combine with. The Russian construction is skewed in favour of intentional predicates such as 'want', 'intend', 'decide', 'try'; besides, it mostly occurs with predicates denoting agentive events with volitional human subjects (in the RNC data, non-human subjects account for only 8% of instances). The Lithuanian construction is more balanced in its lexical distribution and is compatible with spontaneous events, non-volitional and non-human subjects. Notably, however, both constructions are attracted to the domain of inception, 'begin'-verbs being among the most frequent in both.

3) In parallel texts, the *buvo be*-V-PAP construction corresponds to the *bylo* V construction in only 20% of occurrences of the latter; by contrast, almost 40% of examples of the *bylo* V construction correspond to the *buvo be*-V-PAP construction. Moreover, in another almost 40% of examples *bylo* can be felicitously inserted. The abovementioned lexical differences

clearly manifest themselves: of the 25 examples with Rus. *xotet'* 'want' + *bylo* only one corresponds to the Lith. *buvo be*-V-PAP construction (as expected given the low frequency of Lith. *norėti* 'want' in the construction); by contrast, of the 15 examples with Lith. *pradėti* 'begin' in the *buvo be*-V-PAP construction 7 correspond to the *bylo* V construction and another 5 could include *bylo*.

References

Arkadiev, Peter. 2011. On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2, 37–78.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2019. The Lithuanian "*buvo* + *be*-present active participle" construction revisited: A corpus-based study. *Baltic Linguistics* 10, 65–108.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2025. Tracing the avertive through semantic space: Evidence from Lithuanian. Invited keynote talk at the workshop "Avertives in the languages of Europe", University of Helsinki, 22–23 May 2025.

Barentsen, Adriaan. 1986. The use of the particle BYLO in modern Russian. *Dutch Studies in Russian Linguistics*, vol. 8, pp. 1–68.

Kagan, Olga. 2011. The actual world is abnormal: on the semantics of the *bylo* construction in Russian. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 34: 57–84.

Kuteva, Tania. 1998. On identifying an evasive gram: Action narrowly averted. *Studies in Language* 22/1, 113–160.

Kuteva, Tania, Bas Aarts, Gergana Popova & Anvita Abbi. 2019. The grammar of 'non-realization'. *Studies in Language* 43(4), 850–895.

RNC: Russian National Corpus, www.ruscorpora.ru

Sitchinava, Dmitri. 2013. *Tipologija pljuskvamperfekta. Slavjanskij pljuskvamperfekt*. [Pluperfect: a typology. Pluperfect in Slavic] Moskva: AST-PRESS

Sližienė, Nijolė. 1961. Apie sudurtines pradėtines veiksmažodžių formas [About the periphrastic inceptive verbal forms]. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 4, 67–72.

Piotr Wyroślak (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland)

Antimirative and situation-backgrounding markers in Polish

The presentation will concern Polish constructions used to mark the closely related functions of *anti-mirativity*, understood here in terms of the construal of a situation as ordinary, unsurprising or normative in its character, and *situation-backgrounding*, i.e. signalling that the given discourse segment is not supposed to be treated as prominent (cf. Shirtz 2023 on anti-mirativity; Wyroślak 2022 on situation-backgrounding; cf. also Panov 2020 on the *enimitive* function).

Examples (1-2) illustrate uses in which a normative course of the action, 'just happening', are profiled:

(1) SPOKES (7xKX, 'DS500248.Rozmowa.na.temat.ubrań', utt. 150)

tak sobie wychodziła po prostu?
so REFL.DAT walk_out.PST.F.SG simply
'And she would just walk out like this?'

(2) SPOKES (obav, 'Pogadanki koleżeńskie', utt. 222, MALE24_jwXP)

czy mógłby pan na minutkę otworzyć ***ja bym sobie tylko wyszedł sobie zapalił szybko***

'could you open it for a minute, sir? **I'd just (sobie) go have a quick smoke'**

ja bym sobie tylko wyszedł sobie zapalił szybko
1SG COND.1SG REFL.DAT only walk_out.PST.M.SG DAT.REFL set_fire.PST.M.SG quickly
'I'd just (sobie) go have a quick smoke'

Arguably, in such cases, the functions of anti-mirativity and backgrounding do not seem to be clearly reliant on a single marker, but rather shared between multiple forms – or fulfilled by their chunked use (*tak* 'so', *sobie* 'REFL.DAT', *po prostu* 'simply' in ex. 1; *sobie* 'REFL.DAT' *tylko* 'only' in ex. 2).

By looking at a set of relevant markers, the present study aims to analyse whether marker-stacking is a systematic strategy used in interactive registers of Polish to express anti-mirativity and situation-backgrounding. It will also attempt to identify particularly frequent combinations of markers, non-compositional effects in their interpretation, and specialised functions related to anti-mirativity and situation-backgrounding. The selected markers include *normalnie* 'normally, casually' (cf. Maryn-Stachurska 2019), *tylko* 'only', *na spokojnie/ ze spokojem* 'taking one's time, without haste', *bez problemu* 'no bother', *generalnie* 'generally', *po prostu* 'simply, just' (cf. Ożóg 1989), *na luzie* 'no bother, in a laid-back manner', and the uses of the reflexive dative marker *sobie/se* (cf. the overview in Wyroślak 2024:140-198, Wyroślak 2022).

The study will feature data from SPOKES corpora (Pęzik 2015). For each marker, concordances will be retrieved for both a qualitative overview and a quantitative analysis of skip-grams generated on their basis. For each marker, skip-gram profiles will be created so as to identify the most frequent combinations of forms with anti-mirative or situation backgrounding potential. Particular attention will be dedicated to co-occurrences within the analysed set of markers (e.g. *po prostu sobie*), as well as to the uses with *tak* 'so, yes'. Through the identification of such formal and functional patterns of association, the study aims to further the understanding of the underanalysed domains of anti-mirativity and situation-backgrounding, and discourse marker stacking.

References

Maryn-Stachurska, Dagmara Natalia. 2019. O znaczeniu przedmiotowym i metatekstowym jednostek normalny i normalnie. *Polonica* 39. 179–191. https://doi.org/10.17651/POLON.39.9.

Ożóg, Kazimierz. 1989. Funkcja leksemu po prostu w polszczyźnie mówionej. *Język Polski* 69(3–5). 152–161.

Panov, Vladimir. 2020. The marking of uncontroversial information in Europe: presenting the enimitive. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 52(1). 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/03740463.2020.1745618.

Pęzik, Piotr. 2015. Spokes-a search and exploration service for conversational corpus data. In Jan Odijk (ed.), *Selected papers from the CLARIN 2014 conference, October 24-25, 2014, Soesterberg, The Netherlands*, 99–109. Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press.

Shirtz, Shahar. 2023. Siuslaw final-consonant reduplication and the anti-mirative domain. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 76(4). 471–498. https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2023-2021.

Wyroślak, Piotr. 2022. No big deal: Situation-backgrounding uses of the Polish dative reflexive pronoun sobie/se. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association*. De Gruyter Mouton 10(1). 77–98. https://doi.org/10.1515/gcla-2022-0005.

Wyroślak, Piotr. 2024. *Benefaction in Polish: An analysis of the interplay with related functions*. Poznań, Poland: Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Université Paris 8 Vincennes – Saint-Denis.

Sanita Martena (Riga Technical University, Latvia)

***Somehow, I've started to perceive all these Latvian dialects in a completely different way*: Changing language attitudes among the Latvian diaspora**

Since 2023, I have conducted studies on language use in diaspora families, with a particular focus on family language policies and their impact on the use of the Latvian language and its transmission to future generations. The data is primarily based on in-depth interview questions. An example of the most important questions is: "Do you also use a dialect when communicating?" In response to this question, respondents mentioned regional languages used in their countries of residence—such as Catalan in Spain—, but also commented on their regional origins, e.g. the use of Latgalian while living in or visiting Latvia, or referred to the Kurzeme accent in their speech.

In my presentation, I will focus on an analysis of those parts of the interviews which are related to the regional varieties of the Latvian language. In particular, I will pay attention to the respondents' attitudes toward regional languages. These are based on beliefs in the value of certain languages or dialects, both symbolic and pragmatic. In addition, my presentation will also provide insight into changes in linguistic attitudes and their causes, particularly the impact of the sociolinguistic environment of the new country of residence.

The study is based on 30 interviews (each lasting for between 25 and 80 minutes) with Latvian-speaking informants living in one of several European countries (United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Germany, Spain, Greece), the United States, or New Zealand conducted between 2023 and 2025. Although both parents and children were invited to participate in the interviews, in all cases the informants were mothers; only in one interview, the respondent's two adult children (aged 18 and 28) also participated. The

age of the children referred to in the interviews, however, ranges from two months to 36 years.

Finally, I will also provide insight into the research process itself, including factors which gave me important inspiration. Not least, I will highlight the role of important colleagues and different types of cooperation as key elements in developing new research ideas.

In this vein, the main research questions are the following: 1) What are the language attitudes of the Latvian diaspora towards Latgalian and other regional varieties? 2) What has shaped or continues to shape those attitudes? 3) What role can a charismatic individual play in science when, and how can individual cooperation influence the formation of research groups and the professional development of young researchers?

Stephan Kessler (University of Greifswald, Germany)

Some ideas regarding the Latvian debitive **Talk cancelled**

As it is well known, Latvian has a particular grammatical form to express necessity, the debitive. In grammar books, however, the possibilities of the debitive are treated neglectfully. My presentation might not and cannot fill this gap, of course. Instead, I would remind the audience of what Prof. Nau's Latvian grammar says on the debitive, why the debitive is neither a mood nor a diathesis, though it is often seen so, what bizarre debitive constructions we can find in sources, and why we can draw perhaps a parallel to Estonian but surely to Latin when we try a historical or typological approach to the debitive.

Nau, Nicole (1998), *Latvian*, München–Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Sturla Berg-Olsen (Språkrådet, Norway)

The Latvian non-prepositional genitive revisited

In Berg-Olsen (1999, 2000) I examined the Latvian genitive in some detail, focusing on its non-prepositional uses and especially on those functions where this case is in a situation of competition with other forms. Drawing on data from contemporary written and spoken Latvian, historical data and comparative evidence from Lithuanian, I argued that the genitive was losing ground in functions where it expresses a complement of a verb (adverbal functions) or a part-whole relationship (partitive functions). Indeed, in some functions where the genitive was attested historically, it was practically absent from the modern language. At the same time, the evidence for ongoing change was not as clear-cut as one might have wished, and older sources indicated that the changes involving the genitive must have been underway in some varieties of Latvian for several hundred years. Below are some examples of the functions where case variation is observed today:

(1) genitive/nominative with quantifiers:

Te ir daudz velocelip̦u/velocelip̦i.
'There are a lot of cycle paths here.'

(2) genitive/accusative with quantifiers:

Es nopirku desmit ābolu/ābolus.
'I bought ten apples.'

(3) genitive/nominative in subject with negated *būt* 'to be':

Viņiem nav dārza/dārzs.
'They don't have a garden.'

(4) genitive/accusative with negated transitive verbs:

Es nekā/neko neredzu.
'I don't see anything.'

In this talk, I will revisit central parts of my earlier study, comparing the results from my original – rather limited – corpus of written texts with more recent data from the lvTenTen21 web corpus available on Sketch Engine. This will provide insight into how the genitive is faring against its competitors today. Furthermore, by comparing the results from the two studies I should be able to determine with a greater degree of certainty whether my hypothesis from 1999 – that the Latvian non-prepositional genitive is on the decline in adverbal and partitive functions – is borne out.

References

Berg-Olsen, Sturla (1999) *A syntactic change in progress: The decline in the use of the non-prepositional genitive in Latvian, with a comparative view on Lithuanian*. MA thesis, University of Oslo.

Berg-Olsen, Sturla (2000) The Latvian non-prepositional genitive – a case losing ground, in: *Res Balticae* 6, 95–146.

lvTenTen – Latvian corpus from the web. <https://www.sketchengine.eu/lvtenten-latvian-corpus/>. April 2026.

Tanja Anstatt (Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany)

Heritage Languages in Comparison: Does verbal aspect stay? Results of a sentence repetition task on Upper Sorbian and Polish in Germany

Verbal aspect is a grammatical category that exists in Slavic languages but not in German. What happens to this category when Slavic languages are in contact with German over shorter or longer periods of time? Is the category of verbal aspect reduced, as predicted by the Language Transfer Hypothesis? Or is it changed? What role do language-internal factors, such as the frequency of forms, play?

In my talk, I address these questions based on data from our ongoing research project "Heritage Languages in Comparison: Upper Sorbian and Polish in Germany." The aim of the project is to compare these two closely related Western Slavic languages. Both are under strong influence from German, but over quite different time spans: Polish as an immigrant

minority language for roughly two generations, and Upper Sorbian as an autochthonous minority language in Saxony for many generations.

In our project, we analyze the development of verbal aspect using different methods. In this talk, I present the first data from one of these methods, the Sentence Repetition Task (SRT, also called the *Elicited Imitation Task*; cf. Vinther 2002). In this task, participants listen to sentences and are asked to repeat them as accurately as possible. It is well known that such sentences are not simply parroted but are processed and newly reconstructed. Despite its potential, this method has so far rarely been used to analyze the mental representations of specific grammatical categories.

In our project, we use the SRT to investigate whether aspect is changed in the repeated sentences. We assume that participants tend to replace the less frequent and less typical aspectual partner (the beta verb, in the terminology of V. Lehmann 1999) with the more frequent and more typical partner (the alpha verb). I will present the first analyses of our data, which have been collected since the beginning of 2026, and discuss what our results reveal about the mental representations of grammatical aspect in Upper Sorbian and Polish as heritage languages.