

WILA6 Abstracts (*Version 23 September 2015*)

## **Sixth Annual Workshop on Immigrant Languages in the Americas**

September 24–26, 2015

*Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden*

Aalberse, Suzanne

Weerman, Fred

### **Vulnerability in Inflection in Dutch Heritage Languages: A Learner Perspective**

*Suzanne Aalberse & Fred Weerman*  
University of Amsterdam

#### Vulnerable Inflection

Smits & van Marle (2015) show the inflectional system is under pressure in heritage Dutch in the US: speakers tend not to recognize inflectional errors in perception tasks: The rejection rate of inflectional errors ranges between 0-28% depending on the inflectional domain. Although speakers do much better in production tasks than in receptive tasks - a well-known pattern in heritage speakers as shown by Bowles (2011), Montrul (2008, 2010, 2011) and Polinsky (2006) - the error patterns in the production task also evidence the vulnerability of the inflectional system. Error rates range from 5% to 62% depending on the inflectional domain. On the basis of the success rate in the production and perception tasks Smits & van Marle (2015) formulate a hierarchy of inflectional robustness for Dutch: Nominal plural inflection > verbal inflection > adjectival inflection. The domain on the left of the hierarchy, nominal plural inflection is the most robust, speakers make errors in the production of plural only 5% of the time. The errors in the verbal domain range from 35% in the irregular verbs to 45% in the regular verbs. The adjectival system is most vulnerable. No speaker in the sample is able to detect inflectional errors in the use of adjectives in the perception task. The error rates in the production task are very high, namely up to 62.5 percent in singular indefinite neutral nouns.

#### Learner Perspective

The central goal of this talk is to explain the inflectional robustness hierarchy in terms of acquisition strategies in different learner groups (cf. Weerman 2002). Heritage language acquisition usually begins during childhood, but is affected by limited input and limited use (cf. Montrul 2008) and a shift in language dominance. Blom, Poliřenská & Weerman (2008) show that both age of onset and the frequency of use affect the direction of overgeneralization patterns as well as the level of ultimate attainment in inflection. We will compare the outcomes of heritage speakers to three groups of learners of Dutch, namely monolingual children, early sequential bilinguals and adult second language learners.

The ordering of the Dutch robustness hierarchy can be directly related to the timing in the acquisition process: nominal plural morphology is acquired early and successfully in all learner groups and thus we can understand its robustness (Van Wijk 2006, Kjærbaek & Basbøll 2014).

Verbal morphology is acquired somewhat later and the acquisition process is very successful in all young learners. Verbal morphology proves to be more of a challenge for adult learners. Adjectival inflection is very challenging for all bilingual learners (young and old), thus the high error rates in the heritage speakers do not come as a surprise. We will discuss what factors cause the timing of the acquisition process such as transparency, frequency and formal features. Moreover, we will compare the direction of overgeneralization patterns in heritage speakers to those in other learner groups of Dutch.

### References

Blom, E., D. Polišenská, and F. Weerman. 2008. "Articles, Adjectives and Age of Onset: The Acquisition of Dutch Grammatical Gender." *Second Language Research* 24.3: 297–331.

Bowles, M. A. 2011. "Measuring Implicit and Explicit Linguistic Knowledge." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 33.2: 247–271.

Clahsen, H., M. Rothweiler, A. Woest, and G. F. Marcus. 1992. "Regular and Irregular Inflection in the Acquisition of German Noun Plurals." *Cognition* 45.3: 225–255.

Kjærbaek, L., and H. Basbøll. 2014. "Sound Structure and Input Frequency Impact on Noun Plural Acquisition: Hypotheses Tested on Danish Children across Different Data Types." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 37.1: 47–86.

Montrul, S. A. (2008). *Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism: Re-examining the Age Factor* (Vol. 39). John Benjamins Publishing.

Polinsky, M. 2008. "Gender under Incomplete Acquisition: Heritage Speakers' Knowledge of Noun Categorization." *Heritage Language Journal* 6.1: 40–71.

Smits, Caroline, and Jaap van Marle. 2015. "On the Decrease of Language Norms in a Disintegrating Language." In Janne Bondi Johannessen, and Joseph C. Salmons (eds.), *Germanic Heritage Languages in North America: Acquisition, Attrition and Change*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Philadelphia.

Weerman, F. P. 2002. *Dynamiek in taal en de explosie van de neerlandistiek*. Vossiuspers UvA.

Anderssen, Merete

Westergaard, Marit

**Complexity, Frequency and Crosslinguistic Influence in Heritage Language:  
Subject Shift and Object Shift in Norwegian\***

[\*Paper withdrawn from the program.]

*Merete Anderssen & Marit Westergaard*  
UiT The Arctic University of Norway

This study investigates two word order phenomena in the speech of Norwegian heritage speakers in the United States and compares this to the non-heritage variety of Norwegian spoken in Norway. Norwegian exhibits word order variation with respect to the position of subject and object pronouns relative to negation, usually referred to as subject shift (SS) and object shift (OS). SS is found in non-subject-initial clauses with V2: In main clauses, pronominal subjects typically occur in front of negation (1a) and DPs after (1b). In embedded clauses, both pronouns and DPs mainly appear in the shifted position. In the adult language, the percentage of shifted subjects is 85–90% in both clause types (Westergaard 2011). OS is found in contexts in which the verb moves out of the VP. DP objects always appear after negation (2a); pronominal objects with nominal antecedents precede negation (2b), while pronominal objects with non-nominal antecedents usually follow (2c) (Anderssen & Bentzen 2012). Pronominal objects with nominal and non-nominal antecedents shift at very different rates, 87% vs. 5% (Bentzen et al 2013).

Norwegian children have been found to exhibit a delay in the acquisition of both structures, SS until the age of 3, OS until age 7–8 (Anderssen et al. 2010, 2012). It has been claimed that this is due to the complexity of the constructions, as well as the low frequency of OS compared to SS. In heritage languages, on the other hand, complexity has been argued **not** to be a crucial factor (e.g. Westergaard & Anderssen 2015). Instead, frequency has been considered to be more important, protecting against attrition. Furthermore, while structural similarity has often been found to be a factor in bilingual acquisition, structural *difference* has been argued to play a role in heritage languages (Kupisch 2014, Westergaard & Anderssen 2015).

Based on this previous work, we make the following predictions: If complex structures are vulnerable to attrition (*pace* Westergaard & Anderssen 2015), we would expect both SS and OS to be affected, as both involve syntactic movement. If frequency plays a major role, OS and SS in embedded clauses should be more vulnerable than SS in main clauses. And since both SS and OS typically require verb movement, there is little overlap with English in these cases, and cross-linguistic influence should play no role (cf. Müller & Hulk 2001).

We have investigated the Corpus of Norwegian American Speech (CANS) (Johannessen 2015) and find that the heritage speakers behave like Norwegian adults with regard to SS in subordinate clauses, shifting pronominal subjects at 82.8% (Table 1). In main clauses, on the other hand, subjects are shifted only 61.7%, and non-target-consistent examples are attested in the corpus (3). An examination of OS reveals that the heritage speakers shift pronominal objects with nominal and non-nominal antecedents at 71% and 16% (Table 2), clearly distinguishing between the two.

Somewhat surprisingly, therefore, the most vulnerable structure seems to be SS in main clauses, particularly in *yes-/no*-questions often phrased as tags (4).

Our findings go against the predictions that complexity and/or frequency should be the main factors. We are therefore led to consider cross-linguistic similarity/difference. There are two exceptions to the lack of overlap between Norwegian and English, viz. SS in embedded clauses (where word order is identical in the two languages) and in questions with auxiliaries or *be*, where English has residual V2 in the form of subject-auxiliary inversion. This means that both English and Norwegian display word order variation in these questions – with preferences that go in opposite directions, with S-Neg being preferred in Norwegian and Neg-S in English (5).

We thus argue that, contrary to previous studies, this cross-linguistic influence is the likely factor responsible for our results, causing SS to be unproblematic in embedded clauses (positive transfer) and vulnerable in questions with *aux/be* (negative transfer).

(1)a. *I går spiste han ikke (?han) middag.* b. *I går spiste (Jon) ikke (Jon) middag.*  
 yesterday ate he not dinner yesterday ate John not John dinner

(2)a. *Peter så ikke bilen.* b. *Peter så den ikke.*

Peter saw not car.def Peter saw it not  
 ‘Peter didn’t see the car.’ ‘Peter didn’t see it.’

c. *Mari synes den er fin, men Peter synes ikke det.* (**det** = ‘that it is nice’)

Mari thinks it is nice but Peter thinks not it  
 ‘Marit thinks it is nice, but Peter doesn’t think so.’

(3)*nei jeg veit da vi begynte på skolen så # kunne ikke vi # snakke engelsk at all*  
 no I know when we started at school so could not we speak English at all  
 ‘No, I know that when we started school, we couldn’t speak English at all.’

(4)*ja ## er rart hvor fort disse åra har gått forbi er ikke det ?*  
 yes is strange how fast these years have gone by is not it

(5)a. *Isn’t he clever?/Is he not clever?*b. *What didn’t he like?/What did he not like?*

**Table 1. Pronominal subjects**

	S-Neg	Neg-S
Main clauses	74/120 (61.7%)	46/120 (38.3%)
Embedded clauses	24/29 (82.8%)	5/29 (17.2%)

**Table 2. Pronominal objects**

	O-Neg	Neg-O
Nominal antecedents	15/21 (71%)	6/21 (29%)
Non-nominal antecedents	14/90 (16%)	76/90 (84%)

## References

- Anderssen, M., and K. Bentzen. 2012. "Norwegian Object Shift as IP-internal Topicalization." *Nordlyd 39.1: The Grammar of Objects*, 1–23.
- Anderssen, M., K. Bentzen & Y. Rodina. 2012. "Topicality and Complexity in the Acquisition of Norwegian Object Shift." *Language Acquisition* 19.1: 39–72.
- Anderssen, M., K. Bentzen, Y. Rodina, and M. Westergaard. 2010. "The Acquisition of apparent Optionality: The Word Order of Subject and Object Shift Constructions in Norwegian." In M. Anderssen, K. Bentzen, and M. Westergaard, (eds.), *Variation in the Input: Studies in the Acquisition of Word Order*. Springer, 241–270
- Bentzen, K., M. Anderssen, and C. Waldmann. 2013. "Object Shift in Mainland Scandinavian: A corpus study of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 36.2: 115–151.
- Johannessen, J. B. 2015. "The Corpus of American Norwegian Speech (CANS)." In B. Megyesi (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th Nordic Conference of Computational Linguistics, NODALIDA 2015*.
- Kupisch, T. 2014. "Adjective Placement in Simultaneous bilinguals (German-Italian) and the Concept of Cross-linguistic Overcorrection." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 17.1: 222–233.
- Müller, N., and A. Hulk. 2001. "Crosslinguistic Influence in Bilingual Language Acquisition: Italian and French as Recipient Languages." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 4: 1–21.
- Westergaard, M. 2011. "Subject Positions and Information Structure: The Effect of Frequency on Acquisition and Change." *Studia Linguistica* 3: 299–332.
- Westergaard, M., and M. Anderssen. 2015. "Word Order Variation in Norwegian Possessive Constructions: Bilingual Acquisition and Attrition." In J. B. Johannessen and J. Salmons, (eds.) *Germanic Heritage Languages in North America: Acquisition, Attrition and Change*. John Benjamins.

Arnbjörnsdóttir, Birna

### **Naturalistic vs. Elicited Data on Long Distance Binding in NA Icelandic\***

[\*Paper withdrawn from the program.]

*Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir*  
University of Iceland

A recent paper by Putnam and Arnbjörnsdóttir (2015) describes the loss of long-distance anaphoric binding in NA Icelandic heritage grammar. That analysis was based on naturalistic data from interviews conducted in the Icelandic heritage communities in North Dakota and in Manitoba in 1986. The findings are consistent with developments of binding relations found in

other heritage languages (Cole et al. 1990; Sun et al. 1997; and Kim et al. 2009). This presentation will present findings of an analysis based on recently collected data that was specifically elicited to explore speakers' judgment on the grammaticality of clause bound and long distance anaphora. The results support previous findings that long distance anaphora is not a consistent feature in the speech of a majority of speakers almost 30 years after the first study. The presentation will conclude with a few remarks about how the relationship between factors such as time of acquisition, frequency, and lack of usage/activation throughout the lifespan of individual speakers may affect the development of the grammar of heritage languages (Putnam and Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015; Polinsky 1997, 2006; Johannessen & Larsson 2015; Montrul 2002, 2004, 2008, 2009, 2011; Putnam & Sánchez 2013; Rothman 2009).

Bousquette, Joshua

**Is das der Hammer, das du den Traktor gebrochen hast mit?  
Preposition Stranding in Wisconsin Heritage German**

*Joshua Bousquette*  
The University of Georgia

This presentation examines 'preposition stranding' in Wisconsin Heritage German (WHG). Typical of American English, but prohibited by Standard German in most instances, preposition stranding involves the extraction of an NP complement from a prepositional phrase (PP). During an English to German translation task with ten bilingual WHG/English consultants recorded in 2014, speaker frequently employed preposition stranding; these results were confirmed by a separate acceptability judgment task. During a similar acceptability judgment task, continental speakers of historically related varieties of German – East Franconian and Bavarian – rejected examples of preposition stranding, suggesting that preposition stranding was not present in pre-immigration grammars. These results instead suggest contact-based change, similar to Pennsylvania Dutch, which also licenses preposition stranding (Louden 1992). Building also on related work in WHG on parasitic gapping by Bousquette et al. (2013) and Sewell & Salmons (2014), this presentation provides evidence that the licensing of preposition stranding in WHG is indicative of an innovative, long-distance relationship between syntactic constituents, not otherwise present in the monolingual input variety. Broadly, such data similarly show that heritage speakers may license innovative syntactic structures due to cross-linguistic transfer from a socially dominant L2 (Grosjean 2008, Putnam & Sánchez 2013).

Preposition stranding in English, as noted above, involves the extraction of an NP complement from a PP. Typically topicalized in questions or relative clauses, the extracted NP then leaves the preposition 'stranded' at the end of the clause (1).

(1) Who<sub>i</sub> did he buy a present [<sub>pp</sub> for *t<sub>i</sub>*]?  
(König & Gast 2012: 217)

By comparison, a similar derivation in Standard German would be ungrammatical (2); rather, the NP complement follows its topicalized PP head (also known as 'pied-piping'), as in (3).

- (2) \*Wen<sub>i</sub> hat Karl [pp für *t<sub>i</sub>*] ein Geschenk gekauft?  
 (3) [Für wen]<sub>i</sub> hat Karl *t<sub>i</sub>* ein Geschenk gekauft?  
 ‘For whom did Karl buy a present?’  
 (König & Gast 2012: 217)

Data from WHG show English-like preposition stranding, as in the subordinate clause in (4), which also shows complementizer agreement (C-agr).

- (4) ... wos<sub>i</sub> du net solls gucken [<sub>pp</sub> danach *t<sub>i</sub>*].  
 who-2sg you not should-2sg look towards  
 ‘... who you shouldn’t look at.’  
 (Bousquette 2014: 566)

In contrast, continental speakers of East Franconian and Bavarian – non-standard varieties that also license C-agr – categorically rejected example sentences involving preposition stranding. On a 5 point, Likert-like scale where 1 was positively rated and 5 negatively, speakers all insisted that preposition stranding (5) was ungrammatical; speakers preferred standard-like pied-piping, either with (6) or without (7) C-agr (Table 1).

	Example Sentence	Average Rating	Number of speakers
(5)	Is des de Frau, wo <sub>i</sub> du gesprochen hast mit <i>t<sub>i</sub></i> ?	4.97	15
(6)	Is des de Frau, [mit derst] <sub>i</sub> (du) <i>t<sub>i</sub></i> gesprochen/gret hast?	1	3
(7)	Is des de Frau, [mit der(re)] <sub>i</sub> du <i>t<sub>i</sub></i> gesprochen/gret hast?	1	5

Preliminary analysis of WHG acceptability judgments suggests acceptance of both the standard-like pied-piping examples (6) and (7), but also preposition stranding as in (5), confirming similar structures in the production data, as in (4).

Data show that WHG permits extraction from PP that is not permitted in either Standard German, nor in related, non-standard varieties. Such an innovative structure in the heritage grammar is most likely resultant from cross-linguistic transfer of parallel structures from speakers’ English L2.

## References

Bousquette, Joshua, Benjamin Frey, Nick Henry, Daniel Nützel, Michael Putnam, Joseph C. Salmons, and Alyson Sewell. 2013. “How Deep is Your Syntax? Heritage Language Filler-Gap Dependencies.” *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 19.1: 19–30.

Bousquette, Joshua. 2014. “Complementizer Agreement in Eastern Wisconsin: (Central) Franconian Features in an American Heritage Language Community.” *Language Typology and Universals / Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)*, 67.4: 561–588.

Grosjean, François. 2008. *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Louden, Mark. 1992. “German as an Object-Verb Language: A Unification of Typological and Generative Approaches.” In Irmengard Rauch, Gerald F. Carr, and Robert L. Kyes, (eds.), *On Germanic Linguistics: Issues and Methods*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 217–232.

Putnam, Michael T., and Liliana Sanchez. 2013. "What's So Incomplete about Incomplete Acquisition? A Prolegomenon to Modeling Heritage Language Grammars." *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 3.4: 478–508.

Sewell, Alyson, and Joseph Salmons. 2014. "How Far-reaching are the Effects of Contact? Parasitic Gapping in Wisconsin German and English." In Robert Nicolai, (ed.), *Questioning Language Contact: Limits of Contact, Contact at its Limits*. Leiden: Brill, 217–251

Eide, Kristin Melum

Hjelde, Arnstein

### **Structural Reduction in Heritage Language: Simplification, Transfer, and/or Convergence?**

*Kristin Melum Eide & Arnstein Hjelde*

NTNU/Norwegian University of Science and Technology  
Østfold University College

Heritage speakers, second language learners and bilinguals are often described as displaying some sort of "structural reduction" in their production with patterns that are "simplified" as compared to those produced by monolingual speakers. Lynch (2003:1 ff) explicitly states that heritage speakers employ "L2 processes of simplification". Benmamoun et al. (2013: 171–172) also point out that heritage speakers have an intermediary status with respect to L1 and L2 speakers; "they do not develop uniform native-like competence in all grammatical domains". Amaral and Roeser (2014: 29) are at odds with this way of describing bilingual grammars ([1]) and argue instead that Roeser's (1999) *Multiple Grammars Theory* can be extended from dealing prevalingly with "monolingual speakers" to interlanguages of L2 acquisition and heritage language. Heritage languages and the interlanguage of L2 speakers thus constitute their own individual systems of coherent rules (cf. i.a. Selinker 1972), but the authors also argue that there are deep dependencies between the grammatical representations of the two languages in a bilingual mind, since "it is virtually impossible to switch off the language not in use and [...] the parallel activation of a bilingual's two languages can be observed in reading, listening and planning speech" (Amaral and Roeser 2014:30).

Benmamoun et al. (2013: 169) argue that the simplification observed in heritage languages might be reduced to transfer effects ([2]), in keeping with the authors' accurate observation that the dominant language in most cases investigated happens to be English (itself evidently simplified due to language contact between the English and invaders or immigrants into their realm; e. g. the Celts, the French, and the Scandinavians; cf. references in Eide & Hjelde (forthcoming)). Thus, simplification could amount to just transfer from the dominant language. The notion of transfer is intrinsically directional, but Matras (2011: 200), views transfer effects in a more non-directional way ([3]). Matras (2009, 2011) emphasizes the notion of convergence rather than transfer, an approach which fits well with the *Multiple Grammars Theory* of Roeser (1999) and Amaral and Roeser (2014). Our paper discusses these notions of simplification, transfer and convergence in the light of a data produced by heritage speakers of Norwegian in the American Midwest. We employ data sets from three different times, recordings collected in the 1940s, 1990s, and 2010s,

enabling to detect changes over time in these particular heritage languages, as all recordings are collected from the same two Norwegian communities in Wisconsin: Coon Valley/Westby, Vernon County and Blair, Trempealeau County.

We illustrate “simplified characteristics” from the domain phonology (vowel qualities), morphology (verbal inflectional paradigms), syntax (verb placement) and information structure (the frequency and use of topicalization or fronting). We discuss each of these phenomena in turn to see if they are best understood as simplification, transfer from the dominant language, or as convergence. We draw on insights from (first and) second language acquisition, bilingualism and contact linguistics, on recent developments in heritage language theories specifically, and linguistic theories more generally.

### Quotes

[1] In general, in the bilingual and L2 literatures we see a tendency to establish artificial gold standards based on idealized L1 models. The consequence is that heritage languages and L2 grammars are frequently described as ill-conceived versions of this idealized monolingual grammar. [...] However, an individual grammar is never deficient in any way.

[2] In examining linguistic characteristics of heritage grammars, the first question that comes to mind is whether many of the “simplified characteristics” observed in the heritage languages could be due to transfer from the dominant language [...]

[3] Rather than view borrowing as a transfer of structure from one system into another, I view it as the removal of an invisible demarcation line that separates subsets within the linguistic repertoire (or the speaker’s ‘languages’).

### References

Amaral, Luiz, and Tom Roeper. 2014. “Multiple Grammars and Second Language Representation.” *Second Language Research* 30.1:3–36.

Benmamoun, Elabbas, Silvina Montrul, and Maria Polinsky. 2013. “Heritage Languages and Their speakers: Opportunities and Challenges for Linguistics.” *Theoretical Linguistics* 39 3/4:129–181.

Eide, Kristin Melum, and Arnstein Hjelde. 2015. “Verb Second and Finiteness Morphology in Norwegian Heritage Language of the American Midwest.” In R. Page and M. Putnam (eds.), *Moribund Germanic Heritage Languages in North America: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Findings*. Leiden: Brill.

Lynch, Andrew. 2003. “The Relationship between Second and Heritage Language Acquisition: Notes on Research and Theory Building.” *Heritage Language Journal* 1 (1).

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Yaron. 2011. “Universals of Structural Borrowing.” In: Peter Siemund (ed.), *Linguistic Universals and Language Variation*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter: 204–236.

Roeper, Tom. 1999. “Universal Bilingualism.” *Bilingualism* 2/3: 169–186.

Selinker, Larry. 1972. "Interlanguage." *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10: 209–231.

Eryd, Henrietta Adamsson

**“see there I’m stuck now”  
Code-switching and Repair in Swedish in America**

*Henrietta Adamsson Eryd*  
University of Gothenburg

In an interview with a Texan heritage-speaker of Swedish the following sequence occurs:

01 Interviewer: du pratar aldrig svenska då?  
02 Informant: m dä ä hält (.) lite  
03 Interviewer: ja  
04 Informant: kanske nöra orl lite n- nu å då men (.)  
05 inte ti (.) hä ti öh tala (.) åh å (.)  
06 göra en **conversation** å ett se du **see there**  
07 **I’m stuck now** ((smiles))

01 Interviewer: you never speak swedish then?  
02 Informant: m that is very (.) little  
03 Interviewer: yes  
04 Informant: maybe some words every n- now and then but (.)  
05 not to (.) hä to öh speak (.) åh and (.)  
06 make a **conversation** of it you see **see there**  
07 **I’m stuck now** ((smiles))

The sequence is an example of how code-switching can be used both as a strategy of solving a repairable (“conversation” in line 06) and as a meta language for commenting on one’s production. In the example above the informant comments on the repair sequence by codeswitching (“see there I’m stuck now” in line 06–07). This presentation investigates codeswitching coincident with repair in interaction.

The studied interactions are excerpted from recordings made within the project Swedish in America (SVAM) (Andréasson et.al. 2013, Larsson et.al. 2012) and consist of interviews with one or more informant and dyads between informants.

Auer uses the term code-switching for “all instances of *locally functional use of two languages in an interaction episode*” (Auer 1984:491) and states that code-switching may be “restricted to a well defined unit or change to whole language of interaction” (1984:491). This “well defined unit” may consist of only one word (cf. Boyd 1997) and these code-switched words are neither incorporated morphologically nor phonologically. One may also add that in the SVAM-material there are some examples of switching between more than two languages in one interaction.

Repair is usually divided into self- and other-initiated repair (Schegloff 1977, Lindström 2008, Lehti-Eklund 2006). Self-initiated repair is preferred and is also the main focus of this

study.

A word search (Schegloff 1977, Lindström 2008) would be a logical setting for codeswitching but one might also replace or correct something by changing language. This presentation aims to discuss examples of how these different repair types coincide with codeswitching and the interactional effects seen in excerpts from the SVAM-material.

## References

Andréasson, Maia, Ida Larsson, Benjamin Lyngfelt, Jenny Nilsson, and Sofia Tingsell. 2013. "På jakt efter amerikanskan." In B. Bihl, A. Andersson, and L. Lötmarker (eds.), *Svenskans beskrivning 32*. Umeå: Institutionen för språkstudier, Umeå universitet, 82–91.

Auer, Peter. 2009 [1984]. "Bilingual Conversation." In Nikolas Coupland and Adam Jaworski, (eds.), *The New Sociolinguistic Reader*. Palgrave Macmillan, 490–511.

Boyd, Sally, Paula Anderson, and Christina Thornell. 1997. "Patterns of Incorporation of Lexemes in Language Contact: Language Typology or Sociolinguistics?" In Gregory R. Guy Crawford, Feagin, Deborah Schiffirin, and John Baugh (eds), *Towards a Social Science of Language 2*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. P. 259–284. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory. Vol. 128.

Larsson, Ida, Sofia Tingsell, Maia Andréasson, Benjamin Lyngfelt, and Jenny Nilsson 2012. "Amerikasvenskan förr och nu." *Norsk Lingvistisk tidskrift* 30.2: 263–286.

Lehti-Eklund, Hanna 2006. "Att planera och reparera – skillnader mellan talare av svenska som förstaspråk och andraspråk." In Sofia Ask, Gunilla Byrman, Solveig Hammarbäck, Maria Lindgren, and Per Stille (eds), *Lekt och lärt*. Växjö: Växjö University Press, 120–131.

Lindström, Jan 2008. *Tur och ordning. Introduktion till svensk samtalsgrammatik*. Norstedts Akademiska förlag.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sachs. 1977. "The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation." *Language* 53.2: 361–382.

Forlani, Stefania

## **Den amerikanska drömmen: Swedish Americans and Their Knowledge of Their Heritage Language**

*Stefania Forlani*

Emigration to the United States represents an important chapter in Swedish and American history. The fate of Swedish in the United States, however, has not been studied in much depth, except for the era of mass emigration and in the decades immediately afterwards, with descriptive studies of *amerikasvenska* (the varieties of Swedish spoken in America) such as Andreen 1900;

Zetterstrand 1904; Berger 1912. Hedblom and Ordéus in the 1960s focused primarily on Swedish dialects spoken in the US. The recordings they made were useful in subsequent studies, like Hasselmo 1974, which analyzed American Swedish phonology, morphology, lexicon and syntax, interviewing persons born at the end of the 19th century, and examining the language's contexts of use. The conclusion drawn from these studies was that Swedish was on its way to extinction. In 2003 Karstadt wrote a longitudinal study focused on Swedish-American English, examining linguistic material from more than seventy life-history interviews recorded in the Midwest over three decades: 1960s, 1980s and 1990s. Research concerning the descendants of immigrants continues to be ongoing, with one of the projects in Sweden being "Svenskan i Amerika," whose aim is to describe spoken Swedish in the United States today.

The purpose of my research is to observe the persistence of the Swedish language and culture in later generations in order to understand to what degree the descendants of immigrants still consider themselves to be part of the culture of origin, at a distance of many decades after the mass emigration ended. Given the impossibility of updating Hasselmo's on-site interviews, I chose to use a questionnaire submitted to the descendants of Swedish immigrants.

The participants (401 people, of whom 272 completed the survey) were recruited in the United States via the Internet. The questionnaire consisted of four sections, with a total of 70 questions, 34 of which concerned the Swedish language, where the participant self-evaluated their level of knowledge, and gave opinions about Swedish itself and its persistence in their community.

The analysis confirms Hasselmo's conclusion that Swedish has disappeared as a primary language in the United States, even in communities where it was traditionally spoken. Most of the participants (65%), in fact, had parents who did not have any knowledge of Swedish. However, while only one person can be considered early bilingual, 131 of them (48%) learned Swedish as a second language. Their vocabulary appears to be archaic which is confirmed by the fact that few of them know the neologisms of recent decades.

Participants also show a positive attitude towards the language, and are in favor of its being taught in schools. With the fact that they still consider themselves to be ethnically Swedish, and keep their traditions alive this shows a strong interest in Swedish language and culture even after language shift.

## **Reference**

"Svenskan i Amerika", a research project by Gothenburg University:

<<https://sites.google.com/site/svenskaniamerika/project-definition>> (last accessed 2015-07-15).

Hale, Christopher

## **People, Pets and Places: Icelandic Nomenclature in Manitoba**

*Christopher Hale*  
University of Alberta

When Icelanders immigrated to Canada, they brought their naming customs with them. Of all the Scandinavian peoples, however, to come to Canada, they were the most successful in preserving

these customs. In part this was likely due to their being able to arrange for a block settlement so that they could live together as a relatively homogeneous group in the first years, whereas other Scandinavians tended to settle in more dispersed groups.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the name material in the Manitoba Icelandic settlements and its usage. In particular three groups of names will be considered - bynames or nicknames, names of domestic animals and place names. While several articles on bynames and animal names in Iceland, and a number of works on its place names have appeared, until now the field of Manitoba-Icelandic onomastics has remained virtually unexplored.

The bynames I collected in Manitoba I found could be divided into seven categories: (1) physical characteristics, (2) habits, (3) temperament, (4) occupation, (5) biographical, or event in someone's life, (6) place of origin, and finally, (7) fitting no specific category. Most of the names of domestic animals I have gathered from Manitoba have been those of cows. These may refer to colour, markings, temperament or quality of milk. As in Iceland, both farms and natural geographical features were named in Manitoba. Virtually every place of habitation was given a name, and especially in the Interlake area a large number are still in use, even by those who speak no Icelandic. Farm names can be divided into two main groups, those which I will call transfer names, or the names of farms in Iceland which were the homes of the name-giver or with which he or she had some connection, and original names invented by the name-giver.

Naming traditions in Canada follow, on the whole, closely those of Iceland. There are, however, a few exceptions, especially in place names where an Icelander might think the name is based on a topographical feature, but in fact is not.

I should like to stress the fact that these Icelandic naming traditions, especially those of domestic animals and bynames, are disappearing in Canada. It is to be hoped that those which are left or still remembered will be collected before too long, so that this area of onomastics will be preserved.

Hartling, Anne Sofie

**‘Ja, der er ord, jeg kan ikke huske’ –  
Word Order in Subclauses in Spoken Danish in Argentina**

*Anne Sofie Hartling*  
University of Copenhagen

Next to the United States of America, Argentina has been the most important destination for emigrants from Denmark around the turn of the twentieth century. Between 1850 and 1930, approximately 13,000 Danes emigrated to Argentina. Among the descendants of these emigrants an unknown number - at least several hundred - still speak Danish as a heritage language today. Very little has yet been written about syntactic aspects of Danish as a heritage language (for an exception cf. Kühl (2014) on Danish in the United States). Within the theoretical framework of heritage language studies and contact linguistics, my Ph.D. project examines different aspects of the lexicon and the morphosyntax of spoken Danish in Argentina and clarifies in what ways the language differs from European Danish, and when this can then be said to be due to convergence

with Spanish. It is part of a larger research project: ‘Danish Voices in the Americas’ (2014–2018, University of Copenhagen).

One of the aspects I investigate is word order in subordinate clauses (henceforth ‘subclauses’). In European Danish, the placement of the sentence adverbial distinguishes so-called main clause word order (conj>S>Vfin>Adv) and subclause word order (conj>S>Adv>Vfin). This normative distinction does not hold when it comes to the colloquial language, though: 49 % of spoken subclauses, of all types, exhibit ‘main clause word order’ V>Adv (Christensen & Jensen 2014:3). However, V>Adv is rarely observed in relative clauses, adverbial clauses containing other subordinators than *fordi* ‘because’ and complement clauses initiated by *hv*-words (i.e. wh-question words) or *om* ‘if/whether’ (cf. Jensen (2011)). Christensen et al. (2015) and Jensen & Christensen (2013) find that V>Adv in spoken European Danish adds to the semantico-pragmatic foregrounding of the subclause, i.e., that the content of the subclause is the main point of the utterance. In recent studies of word order in subclauses in Heritage Swedish and Norwegian, Larsson & Johannessen (2015a & 2015b) argue “that Heritage Scandinavian has optional V-to-T movement” and that it “appears to be independent of clause type” (2015a: p.172–173).

I have studied the word order in subclauses in four semi-structured interviews with four Danish Argentinians in order to investigate a twofold hypothesis:

- (1) The distribution, and consequently the semantico-pragmatic meaning, of V>Adv word order in subclauses in spoken Danish in Argentina differs from the patterns found in the European variety.
- (2) The distribution also differs from the word order syntax found in Heritage Swedish and Norwegian, in the sense that the employment of V>Adv in subclauses is not as optional in Danish in Argentina as in Heritage Scandinavian in North America.

In my talk, I will present the results of this case study that indicates that the distribution of subclausal word order patterns in spoken Danish in Argentina does differ from what is found in the European variety, but that clause type still plays a role for this distribution in the former just as in European Danish.

Keywords: language contact, heritage languages, language change, word order, convergence, bilingualism, Danish, Spanish

## References

Christensen, Tanya Karoli, Torben Juel Jensen, and Marie Herget Christensen. 2015. “Adverbielle ledsætningers ledstilling i dansk talesprog.” In Inger Schoonderbeek Hansen; Tina Thode Hougaard, eds., *MUDS*, vol. 15. Aarhus: Institut for Æstetik og Kommunikation, Aarhus Universitet.

Christensen, Tanya Karoli, and Torben Juel Jensen. 2014. “Det er klart at ledsætninger har da ledsætningsordstilling – eller har de?” *Nyt fra Sprognævnet 2014/1*. København: Dansk Sprognævn.

Jensen, Torben Juel. 2011. “Ordstilling i ledsætninger i moderne dansk grammatik.” *Ny forskning i grammatik* 18: 123–150.

Jensen, Torben Juel, and Tanya Karoli Christensen. 2013. “Promoting the Demoted: The Distribution and Semantics of “Main Clause Word Order” in Spoken Danish Complement clauses.” *Lingua* 137: 38–58.

Kühl, Karoline. 2014. “‘Det er easy at tale engelsk også’. Amerikadansk i 1960’erne og 1970’erne.” In Tanya Karoli Christensen, et al., eds. *NyS 47 - Nydanske Sprogstudier*. København: Dansk Sprognævn.

Larsson, Ida, and Janne Bondi Johannessen. 2015a. “Incomplete Acquisition and Verb Placement in Heritage Scandinavian.” In: Richard S. Page and Michael T. Putnam (eds.), *Moribund Germanic Heritage Languages in North America: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Findings*. Brill Academic Publishers, 153–189.

Larsson, Ida, and Janne Bondi Johannessen. 2015b. “Embedded Word Order in Heritage Scandinavian.” In Martin Hilpert; Jan-Ola Östman; Christine Mertzlufft, and Michael Rießler (eds.), *New Trends in Nordic and General Linguistics*. Mouton de Gruyter, 239–267.

Hjelde, Arnstein

Emilsen, Linda

Kvifte, Bjørn

**Heritage Language Acquisition and Attrition –  
Intergenerational Change among Norwegian Speakers in the Midwest**

*Arnstein Hjelde, Linda Emilsen & Bjørn Kvifte*  
Østfold University College

During the last five years the Text Laboratory at the University of Oslo has organized fieldwork where the aim has been to do video recordings of the last speakers of Norwegian in America. In this material of approximately 200 hours of recordings we find four speakers of particular interest for us; they are interesting because we have access to recordings of their parents done by Hjelde during the 1980s and 90s.

These four individuals belong to the youngest generation of Norwegian speakers, being born around 1940 or later, and they are 4<sup>th</sup> generation Norwegian-Americans as their ancestors came from Norway to America in the second half of the 1800s. All four grew up in Norwegian dominated communities where Norwegian was spoken when they were children. Three of them are from Vernon County, Wisconsin, and one from Goodhue County, Minnesota.

In our view this material represents a unique opportunity to study actual transfer of a heritage language from one generation to the next. If we know the baseline – the language of the parents, we can determine which language structures and features are most prone to being transferred between generations, and which ones are less likely to be acquired by the subsequent generation. In this present study we will exam a selection of phonologic, morphologic and syntactic features

and structures, and by doing this for the four family groups, we hope to see if there is a pattern in the way such features are transferred and acquired. Among the features we will exam, are the phonemes /y/, /r/ and “thick l”; verb and noun morphology; topicalization, V2 and the structure of subordinated clauses.

Our approach presumes that the main arena for acquiring Norwegian has been the homes, and that the influence from peers and others outside the family has been very limited. Here we partly rely on what the speakers themselves report – that the use of Norwegian outside the family has been rather limited. But we also have some linguistic indicators we can employ to verify this. All the speakers involved in this study live or lived in a rather mono-dialectal Norwegian environment; most of the Norwegian speaking dwellers in these communities has or had a background from a particular region in Norway. Still, we find some rather subtle dialect variation within these communities, especially phonological and morphological variation that the speakers themselves are not aware of. In this particular study, such micro-variation will be important as we consider it a good indicator for identifying the input: if the offspring has acquired the same features as the parents, we find it fair to assume that the main input during the acquisition process has been the language spoken at home, and that the impact from outside the family has been limited.

## References

Benmamoun, Elabbas, Silvina Montrul, and Maria Polinsky. 2013. “Heritage Languages and Their Speakers: Opportunities and Challenges for Linguistics.” *Theoretical Linguistics* 39.3–4: 129–181.

Haugen, Einar. 1969 [1953]. *The Norwegian Language in America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hjelde, Arnstein. 2012. “‘Folkan mine, dæm bære snakka norsk’ - Norsk i Wisconsin frå 1940-talet og fram til i dag.” *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift* 183–203

Montrul, Silvina. 2008. *Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism: Re-examining the Age Factor*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Polinsky, Maria. 2011. “Reanalysis in Adult Heritage Language: A Case for Attrition. The Linguistic Competence of Heritage Speakers.” *Special Issue. Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 33.2: 305–328.

Hoffman, Angela

Kytö, Merja

### **According to the Recipe:**

## **Swedish-American Cookbooks and the Diachronic Patterning of Heritage Lexical Items**

*Angela Hoffman & Merja Kytö*  
Uppsala University

Cookbooks assembled and published in heritage language communities can be used for more than just planning menus, combining ingredients, and entertaining guests (cf. Solomon 2014). We access such community cookbooks in order to gain insights into the bilingual resources used in the kitchens of families, churches, and civic organizations (cf. Haugen 1953; Hasselmo 1974; Hedblom 1982). Further, as many community cookbooks are periodically updated and re-published, the multiple editions allow for longitudinal comparisons of the language patterns in the prefaces, tables of contents, chapter introductions, recipes, hints for cooks, and indexes. The conventionalized discourse of such texts is advantageous to our analysis as we survey the diachronic patterning of heritage language lexical items in recipe collections used in the community.

The present study tracks the linguistic patterns in cookbooks produced in McPherson County, Kansas, an area in which thousands of Swedish-born persons had settled by the beginning of the 1900s. The study reports on the bilingual patterns in the cookbooks transmitted across more than a fifty-year period, pinpointing where heritage Swedish has been used in relation to American English, the matrix language of each of the volumes (cf. Falk 2015). The early 1960s mark the beginning of a flourishing period of cookbook publication in the town of Lindsborg, where various spiral-bound compilations of hundreds of Swedish-American recipes have been published. The paper presents an inventory of heritage language phenomena in four editions of *Measure for Pleasure. Featuring Hyllningsfest Smörgåsbord, Lindsborg, KS* (1961, 1970, 1991, 2005). By analyzing the heritage language phenomena over the decades, primarily as found in the chapter introductions and in the names of the recipes, we identify signs of stability and change in the various editions. The basic picture emerging from our analysis is that the proportion of recipes identified as being “Swedish” recipes in the editions has stayed very stable over time (i.e., hovering around 20% of the total number of recipes in each book); meanwhile, some, but not all, of the Swedish orthography in the names of recipes has become more standard in the most recent editions.

In order to contextualize these and other findings in the Lindsborg data, we compare the results with cookbooks printed in Swedish-American communities elsewhere: books from neighboring small towns in central Kansas as well as from the urban centers of Kansas City and Chicago. Looking at the phenomena of heritage maintenance as expressed linguistically, and to some extent to be understood notionally in the cookbook data, we aim to identify which patterns of heritage Swedish have helped shape the discourse of hearth and home in Lindsborg.

## References

The Bethany College Auxiliary. 1961, 1970, 1991, 2005. *Measure for Pleasure. Featuring Hyllningsfest Smörgåsbord, Lindsborg, KS*. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> editions. Lindsborg, Kansas: The Bethany College Auxiliary.

Falk [now Hoffman], Angela. 2015. “Where Discourse Structure and a Heritage Language Meet. Oral History Interviews of Swedish Americans.” In *Moribund Germanic Heritage Languages in North America: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Findings* (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory), edited by B. Richard Page and Michael T. Putnam, 102–132. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Hasselmo, Nils. 1974. *Amerikasvenska. En bok om språkutvecklingen i Svensk-Amerika*. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska språknämnden 51). Stockholm: Esselte Studium.

Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian Language in America. A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Volumes I and II. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hedblom, Folke. 1982. *Svensk-amerika berättar*. Stockholm: Gidlunds.

Solomon, Eileen. 2014. “More than Recipes. Kosher Cookbooks as Historical Texts.” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 104.1: 24–37.

Johannessen, Janne Bondi

Larsson, Ida

## Sentence Processing in American Scandinavian Heritage Language

*Janne Bondi Johannessen & Ida Larsson*  
University of Oslo

Studying the language of heritage speakers and trying to understand the causes of their linguistic performance is a very interesting and challenging endeavour. When the language of heritage speakers is different from the language of origin, a number of reasons come to mind. Here are some: (1) The speakers never learnt the language of origin due to the context of language learning, i.e. incomplete acquisition (cf. Larsson and Johannessen 2015), (2) The speakers never learnt the language of origin since they were never exposed to it, i.e. the language of the community had already changed, (3) The speakers did learn the language as children, but lost parts of it later, due to lack of use, cf. Putnam and Sanchez (2013), (4) The speakers learnt the language as children, but lost parts of it due age-related changes in their linguistic or cognitive processing ability (attrition).

In this paper we will describe a syntax processing test has been devised by the authors, and the first results from testing heritage Scandinavian speakers – Norwegian and Swedish – in America.

The syntax processing test has been developed using existing tests for children and linguistically impaired speakers, for example patients with aphasia, as a starting point. Specifically, we have taken a subset of the sentences used to test Icelandic children (Magnúsdóttir and Þórðardóttir) and one to test aphasic patients. The latter (Bastiaanse et al. 2006) has been adopted into several languages from an original Dutch and later English test (Bastiaanse et al. 2000, 2003).

Given that both Norwegian and Swedish have syntactic sentence types that were not present in the test mentioned, we have added more sentence types, including morphological passives (though Norwegian has very limited use of this construction and hardly none in the past tense), and, for American Norwegian, pseudopassives (which are rare in Swedish).

Our test is based on picture and sentence matching. There are 36 sentences consisting of 1) proper passives, 2) subject clefts, 3) simple active, transitive sentences, 4) simple sentences with topicalised object, 5) pseudo-passives, and 6) object clefts.

The sentences were presented to the test subjects in random order (using a Unix randomizing command), and each sentence was accompanied by two pictures or videos. The subjects had to point to the one that was correct, i.e. that fitted the sentence. The pictures and videos were always the opposite of each other. Since the test subjects are older, we did not want to provide too much noise in the input, and therefore decided against using distractors.

In this paper we will present the results, which are surprisingly clear. There are subjects that make no mistakes, and there are subjects that make many. There is also a group in between, and the mistakes they make are nearly always of the object topicalization kind. There is also some correlation between results and age. In the paper we will discuss the results in more detail. The results tell us something about how attrition affects syntactic representation.

## References

- Bastiaanse R., E. Maas, and J. Rispens. 2000. *Werkwoorden-en Zinnetest (WEZT)*. Swets Test Publishers; Lisse, Netherlands.
- Bastiaanse, R., S. Edwards, E. Maas, and J. Rispens. 2003. “Assessing Comprehension and Production of Verbs and Sentences: The Verb and Sentence Test (VAST).” *Aphasiology* 17: 49–73.
- Bastiaanse, Roelien, Marianne Lind; Inger Moen, and Hanne Gram Simonsen. 2006. *Verb- og setningstesten: VOST*. Novus forlag.
- Larsson, Ida, and Janne Bondi Johannessen. 2015. “Embedded Word Order in Heritage Scandinavian.” In Hilpert, Martin, Jan-Ola Östman, Christine Mertzlufft, Michael Riessler, and Janet Duke (eds.), *New Trends in Nordic and General Linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 239–266.
- Magnúsdóttir, Sigríður, talmeinafræðingur and Sigríður Arndís Þórðardóttir. *Setningafræðipróf. Skilningur barna á ólíkum setningagerðum*.

Putnam, M., and L. Sánchez. 2013. “What’s So Incomplete about Incomplete Acquisition? A Prolegomenon to Modeling Heritage Language Grammars.” *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 3.4: 476–506.

Jóhannsdóttir, Kristín

### The Progressive in North American Icelandic

*Kristín M. Jóhannsdóttir*  
University of Akureyri

Heritage speakers of a language frequently regularize how they describe certain relations, like the relations between time and events. Such over-regularizations have been shown to be particularly common in verbal paradigms (see for instance Polinsky and Kagan 2007 and references therein). This paper will present evidence that show that this is indeed the case with the progressive aspect of NA Icelandic as it is spoken in Canada and the US today.

In Icelandic, a language with rich inflectional system and complex verbal conjugation, the progressive can be expressed in fairly simple terms with only the copular inflected, whereas the main verb stands in the infinitive. It is thus to be expected that heritage speakers that don’t speak the language daily, would choose the simpler progressive over the complex simple tense.

Preliminary results from elicitations carried out among speakers of North American Icelandic (Jóhannsdóttir, Björnsdóttir and Bragason 2014, Þráinsson et.al. 2013) and Icelandic (Jóhannsdóttir 2013) in 2013 and 2014, show that NA Icelanders use the progressive construction *vera að* + inf. considerably more than Icelanders do; in some situation the difference was more than 20%. Instead of the progressive the Icelanders would rather report on the status of the development at certain times or simply refer to the event as a whole. NA Icelandic is shown in (1) and Icelandic in (2):

(1) Hann *er að klæða* barnið.

‘He *is* dressing the child.’

(2) a. Og á næstu mynd þá er hann búinn að... að klæða barnið í peysuna.

‘And on the next picture he has dressed the child in the sweater.’

b. Og... hann klæddi barnið í peysu í gær.

‘And he dressed the child in the sweater yesterday.’

The difference is particularly high when it comes to the past tense where NA Icelanders use the progressive (as in (4)) but Icelanders the simple past (as in (5)).

(4) Hann *var að sauma*.

‘He was sowing.’

(5) Og hann saumaði þessa treyju í gær.

‘And he sewed this shirt yesterday.’

In addition to the higher frequency of the progressive in NA Icelandic, there are also cases where verbs that usually are not used in the progressive in Icelandic do so in NA Icelandic; for instance posture verbs, locational verbs and semi-stative verbs like *sofa* ‘sleep’.

(3) Og hann *er að sofa*. Og hundurinn *er að sofa* líka

‘And he’s sleeping. And the dog’s sleeping too.’

In earlier NA Icelandic data (Eiríksson and Franzdóttir 1972/1982, Sigurðsson 2012, Sigurðsson 1984) such verbs never occur in the progressive.

This is in line with what we would have expected. Firstly, studies have shown that L2 speakers of English use the progressive considerably more than native speakers of English (Ranta 2006) and one of the possible explanations given is the fact that the English progressive has been shown to be the easiest verbal morpheme to be acquired by L2 learners (Dulay and Burt 1973) and that it is acquired earlier than in other languages (Giacalone Ramat 1997). Even though there are no studies on the use of the progressive amongst L2 speakers of Icelandic, nor on the L1 acquisition of the Icelandic progressive, it is safe to say that as the progressive construction has no conjugation of the main verb, which appears in the infinitive with only the auxiliary verb conjugated, it is more easily produced than the simple present with its complicated conjugation rules. In fact, Ragnarsdóttir, Simonsen and Plunkett (1998) showed that the morphological complexity of Icelandic delays the acquisition of the past tense morphology as first language learners tend to overgeneralize the past tense ending of weak verbs for the first few years. Furthermore, Arnbjörnsdóttir (2006:97–98) showed that the verbal morphology in NA Icelandic has been regularized, and particularly in the past tense.

These results provide us with valuable insight into NA Icelandic, as well as heritage languages in general, with regards to simplification of verbal paradigms, over-regularization of the more easily produced patterns and loss of variety.

## References

Arnbjörnsdóttir, B. 2006. *North American Icelandic. The Life of a Language*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Dulay, H., and M. Burt. 1973. “Should We Teach Children Syntax?” *Language Learning* 23: 245–258.

Eiríksson, H. Ö., and O. Franzdóttir. 1972/1982. Ethnographic Interviews with Some 145 Speakers of North American Icelandic. Recordings and transcripts at the Árni Magnússon Institute of Icelandic.

Giacalone Ramat, A. 1997. “Progressive Periphrases, Markedness, and Second-language Data.” In S. Eliasson and E. H. Jahr (eds.), *Language and Its Ecology*. Berlin: Mouton, 261–285.

Jóhannsdóttir, K. M. 2013. Interviews with Icelanders in Reykjavík and Akureyri. Recordings at the University of Iceland.

Jóhannsdóttir, K. M., Björnsdóttir, S., and U. Bragason. 2014. Interviews with NA Icelanders in Alberta, British Columbia and Washington. Recordings at the University of Iceland.

Polinsky, M., and O. Kagan. 2007. “Heritage Languages: In the ‘Wild’ and in the Classroom.” *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1(5): 368–395.

Ragnarsdóttir, H., H. G. Simonsen, and K. Plunkett. 1998. “Acquisition of Past Tense Inflection in Icelandic and Norwegian Children.” *Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics. Learning to Talk about Time and Space. Proceedings from the 3<sup>rd</sup> NELAS Conference*, 47–60.

Ranta, E. 2006. “The ‘Attractive’ Progressive – Why Use the *-ing* Form in English as a Lingua Franca?” *The Nordic Journal of English Studies* 1 (2), 95–116.

Sigurðsson, G. 1984. Viðtöl við Vestur-Íslendinga. Tekin og skráð af Gísla Sigurðssyni. Orðasafn úr vesturíslensku. [‘Interviews with North American Icelanders ... Plus a NAmIcel lexicon.’] Ms., Stofnun Árna Magnússonar, Reykjavík.

Þráinsson, H., B. Arnbjörnsdóttir, K. M. Jóhannsdóttir, and M. Whelpton. 2013. Interviews with NA Icelanders in Manitoba. Recordings at the University of Iceland.

Kühl, Karoline

Peterson, Elizabeth

### **Post vernacular Danish in Sanpete County**

*Karoline Kühl & Elizabeth Peterson*

University of Copenhagen, University of Helsinki

The notion of post vernacular language was introduced by Shandler (2006) for Yiddish in the United States. It has since been applied to other languages, e.g. Low German in Northern Germany (Reershemius 2009) or Rama in Nicaragua (Pivot 2013). Shandler coined the term in order to describe a situation where a vernacular/language is no longer used for communicative purposes in daily communication. In such a situation, lexical elements of the language might gain symbolic value and can be used by the speakers to express affiliation with a certain culture represented by the use of the vernacular. This implies that in these contexts the secondary, i.e. symbolic, level of meaning is always privileged over its primary level, i.e. the communicative purpose (Shandler 2006: 22). Post vernacular language use adds an extra dimension to the linguistic repertoire of speakers of heritage languages and can even add to the perspectives of

endangered languages in terms of revitalization (as in the case of Low German, Rama and Yiddish).

In our talk, we want to focus on the use of lexical Danish elements in the speech of Danish Americans living in Sanpete County, Utah. Sanpete County is a geographically isolated area in the center of Utah where many Scandinavians, and especially Jutland Danes, settled in the years 1850 to 1920. At present, the language situation with regard to Danish is probably best classified as “dormant,” according to the language vitality scale presented by Lewis & Simons (2010), meaning that there is still an ethnic association with Danish and Denmark among Sanpete County residents of Danish descent, and some knowledge of Danish customs, traditions, and language relics.

In our data set, these linguistic elements include pragmatic routines such as greetings and farewells, culturally-bound notions such as *nisse* ‘elf,’ nursery rhymes, songs, and taboo terms such as curse words. In some instances, speakers may know the form, but not the semantic content. We investigate if these elements can be characterized as post vernacular language use by relating our analyses to Shandler (2006) and Reershemius (2009). In his description of Yiddish used as a post vernacular, Shandler notices very conscious acting of the speakers. Reershemius notices that the conscious post vernacular use of Low German correlates with speaker attitudes, sociolinguistic factors like gender and linguistic landscaping.

Our initial findings for Sanpete County indicate that the use of Danish lexical items is linked to conscious acting on the one hand (in the form of nursery rhymes, songs, and stories, for examples) but also unconscious, “hidden” Danish on the other (in the form of household items, cultural notions, and certain discourse functions). What is left of Danish lexical items in the speech of the Sanpete speakers, is the result of careful and even covert transmission, but also comes from natural, everyday means, as Danish was the substrate language for the majority of the population. In our talk, we will try to tease out the differences and to account for them by including factors such as gender, in-group marriage, and attitudinal factors.

The data for the study come from ethnographic fieldwork conducted over two two-week periods in Sanpete County, with the researchers entering the community as informed and connected outsiders. At present, interview data from 15 members of the Sanpete County community, comprising some 20 hours of audiorecorded material, have been collected. (Additional fieldwork material will be collected during the summer of 2015.) This information is supplemented with field notes, photographs, and other artifacts including scrapbooks, journals, and letters. Additional information has been obtained from archives in Sanpete County and Salt Lake City.

## References

- Lewis, M. Paul, and Gary F. Simons. 2010. “Assessing Endangerment: Expanding Fishman’s GIDS.” *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 55.2:103–120. Available at <http://www.lingv.ro/RRL%20%202010%20art01Lewis.pdf> (accessed 14 March 2015).
- Pivot, Bénédicte. 2013. “Revitalisation d'une langue post-vernaculaire en pays rama (Nicaragua).” *Langage et société* 145.3: 55. DOI: 10.3917/lis.145.0055.

Reershemius, Gertrud. 2009. "Post-vernacular Language Use in a Low German Linguistic Community." *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 21.2: 131–147.

Shandler, Jeffrey. 2006. *Adventures in Yiddishland. Postvernacular Language & Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Litty, Samantha

### **Variation in Word Final Obstruent Neutralization in Wisconsin English over 150 years**

*Samantha Litty*

University of Wisconsin – Madison

Integrating historical sociolinguistics and sociophonetics, I am using real- and apparent-time data to track changes in Wisconsin English speech patterns from the 1850s to the present. This paper focuses on how the neutralization of a 'voicing' contrast in final obstruents in German has led to new patterns of feature loss when imposed on English and how this neutralization develops in new varieties. Although often referred to as 'final devoicing', because both German and English are [spread glottis] and not [voice] languages, I use neutralization to describe all processes associated with the change from lenis to fortis final obstruents. German neutralizes the distinction between lenis and fortis consonants in word final position, meaning that words like *Rad* "wheel, bicycle" and *Rat* "advice" are pronounced the same, while general American English maintains a distinction. Because of this a German speaker might impose this same pattern on English so that words like *bad* and *bat* would be pronounced the same. Bagwell & Olson gives examples from 19th century letters in Dodge County showing this pattern, e.g. 4th generation speakers writing "twelf" and "thinks" instead of "twelve" and "things" (manuscript).

Purnell et al. 2005 show that English in Southeastern Wisconsin distinguishes final obstruents differently than reported for general American English, as well as differently than what would be expected if this were completely taken over from German. Annear et al. show that across Southern Wisconsin linguistic variation is not only regional, but also local, with significant differences by both age and geography (manuscript). In this paper I look at groups from two areas in Wisconsin, South Central and Southeastern, to explore local variation in the production of final obstruents.

In order to discover how this neutralization develops in German and impacts English in Wisconsin from the mid 19th century to today, and what role contact plays in this situation, I use an analysis of handwritten 19th century 'ego documents', mostly letters and journals, and audio recordings made since the 1940s, to show the long trajectory of changes in pronunciation in these communities. Initial results from Wisconsin English support the view that final fortition is a feature once imported by immigrant speakers of German, Dutch and Polish among others. This feature was presumed dead as second generation speakers adapted/conformed to the speech of other American English speakers, but 3rd+ generation speakers are now exhibiting signs of final fortition as shown by Annear et al. (manuscript) and Purnell et al. (2005). Preliminary results from contemporary English speakers support previous findings in this area, and expand upon that work (Bagwell & Olson, Annear et al., Purnell et al. 2005a, b, Salmons & Purnell 2010, among

others) by expanding the geographic region to include South Central Wisconsin, as well as the time period, by looking at English from the mid 19th century to contemporary speakers.

### References

Annear, Luke, Emily Claire, Alicia Groh, Mary Simonsen, Trini Stickle, Nick Williams, Tom Purnell, Eric Raimy and Joseph Salmons. “Motivating Emerging Final Laryngeal Neutralization: Evidence from Wisconsin English.” Manuscript.

Bagwell, Angela, and Mike Olson. “Language Change through Immigration: Sifting through Wisconsin’s Linguistic Past.” Manuscript.

Purnell, Thomas, Joseph Salmons, and Dilara Tepeli. 2005. “German Substrate Effects in Wisconsin English: Evidence for Final Fortition.” *American Speech* 80.2: 135–164.

Purnell, Thomas, Joseph Salmons, Dilara Tepeli, and Jennifer Mercer. 2005. “Structured Heterogeneity and Change in Laryngeal Phonetics Upper Midwestern Final Obstruents.” *Journal of English Linguistics* 33.4: 307–338.

Salmons, Joseph, and Thomas Purnell. 2010. “Contact and the Development of American English.” *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 454–477.

Natvig, David

### Heritage Norwegian Vowel Phonologies

*David Natvig*

University of Wisconsin – Madison

This paper investigates to what extent Heritage Norwegian speakers in the American Midwest have different vowel systems for Norwegian and English. Operating on the view that phonological structure consists entirely of contrastive features (Dresher 2009) that provide instructions for the articulation of segments (Avery and Idsardi 2001), I argue that differences in vowel targets reflect differences in the phonological grammars of speakers. I test the hypothesis that speakers who are more proficient in Norwegian, from either earlier learning or more consistent maintenance, will have Norwegian vowel targets that differ more from their targets in English, where the less proficient speakers will make use of more English-like targets for both languages. Targets are measured at vowel heads and tails, 33% and 66% of vowel duration, respectively, for both F1 and F2, to determine differences in height or backness. In a framework where the processing of linguistic input for comprehension and production correspond to the acquisition and preservation of grammatical structure (Putnam and Sánchez 2013), this study seeks to find a relationship between language proficiency and maintenance and the acquisition of separate phonological systems.

Data come from interviews with eight consultants, conducted in English and Norwegian where consultants were asked about Norwegian use as children, as well as throughout adulthood. The shapes of both English and Norwegian vowel spaces, as well as the positions of analogous English and Norwegian vowels, are compared. Norwegian and English vowels are compared (i.e. Jacewicz, Fox and Salmons, 2007) to assess qualitative differences in the shapes of the vowel systems, as well as the position of the corresponding Norwegian and English vowels within the vowel space. Similar vowel spaces and targets indicate similar phonological structure in Norwegian and English, and differences suggest the (partial) maintenance of two separate phonological systems. A comparison of the phonological systems of English and Norwegian vowels, as well as an evaluation of speakers' proficiency and maintenance will provide support for the source of the similarity of English and Norwegian targets.

## References

Avery, Peter, and William J. Idsardi. 2001. "Laryngeal Dimensions, Completion and Enhancement." In T. Allen Hall (ed.), *Distinctive Feature Theory*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 41–70.

Dresher, B. Elan. 2009. *The Contrastive Hierarchy in Phonology*. Cambridge University Press.

Jacewicz, Ewa, Robert Allen Fox, and Joseph Salmons. 2007. "Vowel Space Areas across Dialects and Gender." *16<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, Saarbrücken, Germany*.

Putnam, Michael, and Liliana Sánchez. 2013. "What's so Incomplete about Incomplete Acquisition? A Prolegomenon to Modeling Heritage Language Grammars." *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 3.4: 478–508.

Petersen, Jan Heegård

### **Phonological Conservatism and Variance in the Danish of South Dakota**

*Jan Heegård Petersen*  
University of Copenhagen

Between 1870 and 1920, ca. 200,000 Danes crossed the Atlantic Ocean to settle in the USA. In general, the Danish language was given up within two generations. Demographic and macro-sociolinguistic patterns are often mentioned as causes for the rapid language loss: A large proportion of the Danish immigrants were single men who to a large extent married with women of other ancestry than Danish, and there were few cohesive Danish settlements (Grøngaard Jeppesen 2005: 282ff; Kühl 2014: 40–41).

However, there are a few exceptions to the loose settlement pattern, among these a number of communities in eastern South Dakota around Arlington, Lake Norden and Lake Preston. This area was primarily settled by Danish immigrants from Northwest Jutland, who assumedly brought along a Northwest Jutish dialect of Danish. The Danish linguist M. Baumann Larsen who

was the first to investigate these communities, claims that the settlements were quite isolated and had only little interaction with other Danish speaking settlements (Baumann Larsen 1981: 5). Further, Baumann Larsen claims that the Danish dialect spoken there, i.e. Northwest Jutish, had been preserved until 3rd generation of speakers who at the time of the recordings (1966–1976) spoke “a language that is old-fashioned Northwest Jutish” (ibid.).

In this paper I will present an investigation of this assumed dialect conservatism. The data consist of the structured interviews recorded by a.o. M. Baumann Larsen. 18 speakers (1st, 2nd and 3rd generation) are analysed for their use of 10 phonological variables that are characteristic for traditional Northwest Jutish (Nielsen 1980: 7–9) (see table for examples).

	Northwest Jutish	Standard Danish	
Short vowel ‘glottalization’	[‘daʔdø]	[‘dadø] ‘datter’	‘daughter’
	[‘paʔg]	[‘paɡ(ə)] ‘pakke’	‘pack’
‘Parasite’ stop consonant	[migʔ]	[mi:ʔl] ‘mil’	‘mile’
Short vowel lengthening	[‘sø:sdø]	[‘søsdø] ‘søster’	‘sister’
Aspiration in <i>hj-/hv-</i> clusters	[hjemʔ]	[jɛmʔ] ‘hjem’	‘home’
	[hvað]	[vað] ‘hvad’	‘what’

Since these features are not equally stable and distributed across the speakers, preliminary studies point to a different conclusion than the one suggested by Baumann Larsen. For example, whereas all speakers have pronunciations with short vowel glottalization not all show it systematically and consistently. And whereas some speakers consistently have aspiration in *hv-/hj-*clusters, this feature is absent in the speech of other speakers.

The paper examines the distributional variation of these features. The analysis includes linguistic as well as speaker-specific factors, and a hierarchy of ‘conservative features’ is proposed. It will be discussed to what extent the observed variance is a consequence of language obsolescence or whether the distribution is of such a systematic nature that it may be said to constitute a particular South Dakota variety of Northwest Jutish.

## References

Baumann Larsen, Mogens. 1981. “Dansk i USA – et forskningsprojekt.” [Danish in USA – A Research Project]. Ålborg: Institut for sprog, kommunikation og kulturhistorie.

Grøngaard Jeppesen, Torben. 2005. *Danske i USA 1850–2000: En demografisk, social og kulturgeografisk undersøgelse af de danske immigranter og deres efterkommere*. [Danish in USA 1850–2000. A Demographic, Social and Culture-Geographic Investigation of the Danish Immigrants and Their Descendants]. Odense: Odense Bys Museer.

Kühl, Karoline. 2014. “‘Det er easy at tale engelsk også’. Amerikadansk i 1960’erne og 1970’erne.” [‘It’s easy to speak English also’. America-Danish in the 1960–1970s]. *NyS* 47: 39–60.

Nielsen, Niels Åge. 1980. *Dansk Dialektantologi. II Jydsk*. [Danish Dialect Anthology. II Jutish.] Århus: Hernovs Forlag.

Putnam, Michael

Page, Richard

### **Tense and Agreement in Late L2 English: Towards an Understanding of the Trilingual Sociolinguistic Dynamics in Southwestern Kansas**

*Michael Putnam & Richard Page*  
Penn State University

Beginning in the 1990s, immigration from Mexico to Southwestern (SW) Kansas has included a number of Mennonites who speak Low German in addition to non-Mennonite Spanish speakers.. Although the vast majority of German varieties in North America are moribund (see e.g. Page & Putnam 2015), the trilingual sociolinguistic situation in SW Kansas is unique given the high, stable number of highly proficient L1 speakers of Mennonite Low German (MLG; a.k.a. Plautdietsch) who also have some proficiency in English and Spanish. According to Putnam & Salmons (2015: 42), by 2007 an estimated 4,000-5,000 migrant farmworkers with this linguistic profile have migrated to this area. The purpose of this is twofold: 1.) To provide an overview of the sociolinguistic domains forming in this area pertaining to MLG, English, and Spanish, and 2.) To take a closer look at the tense and aspect properties of late L2 English spoken in these communities.

#### Sociolinguistic Domains

According to Grosjean's Complementarity Principle (2010: 226): "Bilinguals usually acquire and use their languages for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people. Different aspects of life normally require different languages." With regard to trilingual Mennonites in SW Kansas, MLG is the language used for worship and in-group communications. Spanish is used in interactions with non-Mennonite Mexican immigrants in the workplace and in other public places. English is the primary language used with other non-Mennonites when in public. In churches that have a greater focus on mission, there has been a recent shift to English for religious services. Members of these mission-focused churches have also reported an increase in the use of English at home when speaking with their children.

#### Tense and Agreement in Late L2 English

Examples in the literature on difficulties in successfully acquiring inflectional morphology in L2 acquisition abound (e.g. Montrul 2008, 2009). In many respects, "there are indeed commonalities between L2 acquisition and other types of language development, such as non-pathological attrition in the L1 of speakers who have had prolonged contact with a second language" (Sorace 2005: 57). Most of the MLG speakers we interviewed were first exposed to English as adults when they came to the United States in the 1990s. These late L2 learners of English exhibited similar patterns of tense and agreement to that of Israeli children who are heritage learners of English (Viswanath 2013). For example, the inconsistent inflectional marking of the third person

singular present tense is found in both the L2 English of MLG speakers and the Heritage English of Israeli children, as illustrated in (1) and (2).

- (1) He **sit** and **watch** while the dog looks in the jar. Female MLG speaker, adult learner of English
- (2) He lies down next to a picnic, then a fly comes, and **take** that out, then a bee comes, and he smokes on the bee and then the bee **run** after him ... Israeli child, heritage speaker of English (Viswanath 2013: 36).

In summary, we will provide a snapshot of a relatively new and dynamic area of language contact involving MLG, Spanish and English in SW Kansas where English is not currently the dominant language of most MLG speakers – as exemplified by our preliminary treatment of tense and agreement in late L2 English spoken in the region – and where segments of the MLG speech community vary with regard to the sociolinguistic domains in which MLG, Spanish and English are used.

### **Selected References**

Grosjean, F. 2010. *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Montrul, S. 2008. *Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism: Re-examining the Age Factor*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Montrul, S. 2009. “Knowledge of Tense-Aspect and Mood in Spanish Heritage Speakers.” *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13.2: 239–269.

Page, B. R. and M. Putnam, eds. 2015. *Moribund Germanic Heritage Languages in North America: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Findings*. Leiden: Brill.

Paradis, M. 2009. *Declarative and Procedural Determinants of Second Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Putnam, M. and J. Salmons. 2015. “Multilingualism in the Midwest: How German Has Shaped (and Still Shapes) the Midwest.” *Middle West Review* 1.2: 29–52.

Sorace, A. 2005. “Syntactic Optionality at the Interfaces.” In L. Cornips and K. Corrigan, eds., *Syntax and Variation: Reconciling the Biological and the Social*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 46–111.

Viswanath, A. 2013. “Heritage English in Israeli Children.” Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University.

Salmons, Joseph

## **Immigration, Learning English and Language Shift: Beyond Hustisford**

*Joseph Salmons*

University of Wisconsin – Madison

A centerpiece of U.S. anti-immigrant rhetoric runs along lines that Crawford (2000:6) captures this way: “Today’s immigrants refuse to learn English, unlike the good old immigrants of yesteryear.” In 2008, Miranda Wilkerson and I published a study showing that German immigrants in Wisconsin often did not learn English at all and that their children and sometimes grandchildren remained monolingual German speakers. In one community, Hustisford, a quarter of the population reported knowing only German in 1910, over a third of those people born in Wisconsin. A body of work since 2008 has developed issues of immigrants (not) learning English for language communities across Wisconsin and beyond. This paper shows how research following on our earlier article informs (1) our understanding of how other immigrant communities did and did not learn English, and (2) supports a general theory of language shift.

First, a frequent question about the 2008 paper was whether Hustisford was somehow unique or reflected broader patterns of English learning. We now know that many Wisconsin communities were more monolingual and had even more American-born monolinguals (e.g., Frey 2013). At the same time, in other communities, speakers of German and other languages acquired English very rapidly but maintained their immigrant languages for several generations, while yet others acquired English and quickly shifted to become English monolingual.

Second, in the vast research on language shift, attention has usually been directed toward the loss of the original language, ignoring when and how the new language was first acquired in the community. Follow-up work on Hustisford (Wilkerson & Salmons 2012) and other communities (Frey 2013) helps fill out this picture and provides striking new evidence for the ‘verticalization’ theory of language shift, that shift is driven fundamentally by changes in community structure.

Ultimately, this project’s bigger significance is for society at large. I close with examples of how public discussion on immigrants learning English is changing and how we can push those changes, through research, teaching and outreach, as I will illustrate with data from media, a new course on language and immigration and materials prepared for a broader reading public.

### **References**

Crawford, James. 2000. *At War with Diversity: U.S. Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Frey, Benjamin. 2013. *Towards a General Theory of Language Shift: A Case Study in Wisconsin German and North Carolina Cherokee*. University of Wisconsin – Madison dissertation.

Wilkerson, Miranda, and Joseph Salmons. 2008. “‘Good old immigrants of yesteryear’ Who Didn’t Learn English: Germans in Wisconsin.” *American Speech* 83. 259–283.

Wilkerson, Miranda, and Joseph Salmons. 2012. "Linguistic Marginalities: Becoming American without Learning English." *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4.2. acgcc\_jtas\_7115. <http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/5vn092kk>.

Wolski-Moskoff, Izolda

### Nominal Morphology in Polish Heritage Speakers – A (Not) Lost Case

*Izolda Wolski-Moskoff*  
The Ohio State University

The Polish language has a considerable history in the United States, but despite being one of the country's largest minority languages (Nowicka McLees & Dziwirek 2010), it has received scant attention from researchers. Such studies as have investigated nominal morphology in American Polish have described it as reduced (Kozminska 2013) or haphazard (Lyra 1962). The results of the present study indicate that knowledge of the morphology of the five major cases is retained in advanced Polish heritage speakers, whose use of these cases, however, diverges from that of native speakers.

In this study, three different groups of speakers – heritage speakers (n=9), L2 learners (n=4), and native speakers (n=6) – participated in a story elicitation task based on the picture book *Frog, Where Are You?* by M. Mayer. Comparing the results from these different groups, the study attempted to discern features that are characteristic to American Polish.

Polish heritage speakers as bilinguals acquire and use two quite opposite systems, where the same structures are expressed through diametrically different processes of synthesis (Polish) and analysis (English). As a result, the Polish morphosyntax undergoes restructuring, apparently affecting declension most of all. The results of the present study indicate that knowledge of the nominal morphology in Polish heritage speakers, though divergent from that of native speakers, is retained to a certain degree; i.e., the morphology of the five most frequently used cases in Polish (the nominative, genitive, accusative, instrumental, and locative) is known to this group of speakers. However, Polish heritage speakers do not use these cases in all contexts. The use of the genitive case is the most inconsistent in this group, although several common tendencies were observed. First of all, most participants use it just as native speakers do after negated existentials

–  
*Nie ma żabki\_GenSG*

“The frog is not there.”

– as well as in the adnominal function; but not after negated verbs, nor verbs that require the genitive. In the latter instance, unlike native speakers, heritage speakers prefer the most frequent case for the direct object (Swan 2002), namely, the accusative:

*Szukają żabkę\_AccSG*

“They are looking for the frog.”

Additionally, as has been observed with regard to other Slavic languages (Polinsky, 2008), despite various levels of proficiency, all heritage speakers employ cases in scene-setting expressions frequently used in the language, i.e., in so-called “chunks” such as *na dworze*\_LocSG (outside) or *w lesie*\_LocSG (in the forest).

Different trends were observed in L2 learners, who displayed more problems with morphological case forms than heritage speakers (producing more pauses, self-corrections, and inaccuracies), but seemed to use them in most required contexts. This might suggest that heritage speakers acquire most of the inflectional forms of nouns (of even so complex a case as the locative) prior to the knowledge of how to use the cases in various contexts. It may be, moreover, that heritage speakers assign new functions to Polish cases, rendering these cases less ambiguous, more clear-cut, than they are in the grammar of native speakers.