

LUCL PhD Symposium 2019 (15 November, 2019)

@Lipsius 148	
11:00-11:25	Walk in
11:25-11:30	Opening (Katja Lubina)
11:30-11:50	Jiang Wu History of Kelantan and Terengganu (northeast Malay Peninsula): A linguistic account
11:50-12:10	Rasmus Thorsø Nielsen Armenian prehistoric contacts
12:10-12:30	Ami Okabe Grammaticalization path of Dutch posture-verb progressive
<i>Lunch break</i>	
@Huizinga 026	
14:00-14:20	Anthony Jacob Were the Finns and Balts intimately intertwined? Or was it but a brief encounter?
14:20-14:40	Brenda Assendelft The Frenchification of Dutch: French influence on the Dutch language, 1500-1900
14:40-15:00	Meike de Boer “Um... what uh do you mean, uh..”: The results of one year of research on native and non-native filled pauses
<i>Coffee break</i>	
15:15-15:35	Andrew Wigman Triangulating Italic Prehistory
15:35-15:55	Elisabeth Kerr Diagnosing cleft structures in Tunen
15:55-16:15	Astrid van Alem Pronoun innovations and problems with possessors in dialects of Dutch
16:15-16:20	Closing
	(Drinks)

Abstracts

11:30-11:50

History of Kelantan and Terengganu (northeast Malay Peninsula): A linguistic account (Jian Wu)

The states of Kelantan and Terengganu in the northeast of Malay Peninsula are among the most conservative regions in the Malay world. The inhabitants are predominantly Malay (around 95%), who hold strong identity of 'Malayness' with the heavy influence of Islam. Yet linguistically, they are known to speak aberrant Malay varieties that are divergent from Standard Malay in many phonological and morpho-syntactic aspects. Questions arise concerning the history of the Malay varieties in this region: why are they so different? Can their linguistic history also shed light on the history of the speakers? My project aims at offering a better understanding of the three Malay(ic) varieties spoken in the region, i.e. Kelantan Malay, Inland Terengganu and Coastal Terengganu Malay, and exploring their linguistic history, as well as the history of the speakers.

11:50-12:10

Armenian prehistoric contacts (Rasmus Thorsø Nielsen)

I will present the main question of my PhD project about prehistoric migrations and contacts of Armenian speakers, with some particularly troublesome and/or interesting examples from my data set.

12:10-12:30

Grammaticalization path of Dutch posture-verb progressive (Ami Okabe)

Dutch posture verbs are polysemous: they can refer to human postures but also the location of an entity and spatial configuration. Next to the use as a main verb, it can function as an aspectual marker, namely as a progressive auxiliary (e.g. *Ik sta te wachten*, literally I stand to wait, meaning I am waiting (in a standing posture)). This construction is a relatively new structure, which arose from its antecedent: *Ik sta en wacht*. In the presentation, I will focus on this older form of progressive construction and present a possible grammaticalization path from a coordinating structure to a subordinate one, which is to be verified by my further research.

14:00-14:20

Were the Finns and Balts intimately intertwined? Or was it but a brief encounter? (Anthony Jacob)

The number of Baltic loanwords proposed in Finnic goes well into the hundreds, and it would seem that this was an exceptionally long and intimate case of linguistic contact. However, a new methodology reveals the traces of 'love triangles' in the Baltic region, suggesting that many of these

apparent loanwords have a much more complex history. In this light, the Baltic imprint in Finnic seems much fainter, if not less intimate.

14:20-14:40

The Frenchification of Dutch: French influence on the Dutch language, 1500-1900 (Brenda Assendelft)

French and Dutch have been in close contact for ages, and particularly in the period between 1500 and 1900. Due to the political and cultural hegemony of France in the Netherlands, this period is traditionally considered to be a period of so-called Frenchification. During this time, many French words and suffixes entered the Dutch language, and it is assumed that French influenced the use of Dutch syntactic patterns as well. However, so far the actual influence of French on the Dutch language has hardly been studied empirically. For example, it is not known whether the elements borrowed from French were used to the same extent by all language users and in all situations. My research focuses on the question what the actual influence of French on Dutch was by means of corpus-based case studies. In this presentation, I will introduce the corpus I am working on, which consists of Dutch texts, all originating from the Dutch city of Leiden, from seven different social domains and spanning the period from 1500 to 1900. I will also tell something about the case studies I want to carry out with this corpus.

14:40-15:00

“Um... what uh do you mean, uh..”: The results of one year of research on native and non-native filled pauses (Meike de Boer)

Last year, I presented differences in filled pause realizations of 20 Dutch females when speaking Dutch and English. As predicted by others, some features of the filled pauses remained stable, implying that filled pauses could be used in cross-linguistic forensic speaker comparisons. However, the results also showed that some core features changed: native and non-native filled pauses differed in their vowel realizations and in the um : uh ratio.

In this talk, I will present updated results for an expanded speaker set of 59 females. In addition, the new models include the position of the filled pauses in the utterance. I will show how position affects filled pauses' duration, fundamental frequency, and vowel formants. Taking these position effects into account, we still get comparable results for native versus non-native filled pauses.

15:15-15:35

Triangulating Italic Prehistory (Andrew Wigman)

The Italic sub-family of the Indo-European family of languages spread into Europe at some time in prehistory. Speakers of Italic languages likely arrived to an Italian peninsula already populated by farmers. My research focuses on uniting linguistic, archaeological, and genetic data to determine when and from where speakers of Italic languages entered Italy as well as who was already there when they arrived.

15:35-15:55

Diagnosing cleft structures in Tunen (Elisabeth Kerr)

Cleft structures like “It’s Emmanuel who shut the door” are common cross-linguistically, and typically have an exhaustive property (only Emmanuel shut the door; no-one else did it too). Such constructions are used to provide new information in the answer to a question. Here, we would have a question context like “Who shut the door?”, and the answer therefore has subject focus (we have already talked about shutting the door, but the new and focal information is the identity of the subject). In this talk I present findings from investigating such question-answer pairs in Tunen, a Bantu language of Cameroon, showing how cleft structures are used. I discuss how tonal evidence helps show that these sentences have the syntax of clefts and helps situate the status of one marker on a diachronic grammaticalisation scale from copula to focus marker.

15:55-16:15

Pronoun innovations and problems with possessors in dialects of Dutch (Astrid van Alem)

In the course of history, many varieties of Dutch have lost the original 2sg pronouns *du* (NOM) and *dich* (ACC) and replaced them with the respective 2pl pronouns. This process left a gap in the 2pl slot of the pronominal paradigm. In this talk, I will show, based on data from present-day dialects, how this gap has been filled. While the strategy for 2pl NOM is the same across dialects, the 2pl ACC gap has been filled by means of varying strategies. A subset of the newly created 2pl pronouns cannot occur as a possessor in cases where the possessed noun is elided, cf. Standard Dutch **de jullie-e* (lit. ‘the you-s’). I will discuss how the different strategies of creating a pronoun could account for this distribution, and talk about question for further analysis.