



LUND UNIVERSITY

More on pancakes

Klingvall, Eva; Beijer, Fabian; Heinat, Fredrik

2025

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Klingvall, E., Beijer, F., & Heinat, F. (2025). *More on pancakes*. Abstract from Grammar in Focus, Lund, Sweden.

Total number of authors:

3

Creative Commons License:

Unspecified

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

More on pancakes

Eva Klingvall, Fabian Beijer & Fredrik Heinat, Lund University

In this talk we will present the results from three studies on adjectival agreement in *pancake constructions* (PCs) in Swedish, exemplified in (1). PCs have been discussed widely in the literature from different theoretical perspectives (e.g. Enger, 2004; Faarlund, 1977; Haugen and Enger, 2014, 2019; Josefsson, 2006, 2009, 2014a,b; Källström, 1993; Malmgren, 1984; Telemann et al., 1999; Wellander, 1949, 1955; Widmark, 1966; Åkerblom, 2020). We will discuss our findings in light of the semantic approach in Haugen and Enger (2014, 2019) and the syntactic approach in Josefsson (2006, 2009, 2014a,b). In short, the semantic approach has it that the predicative adjective in PCs gets *t*-agreement rather than regular agreement because the subject is interpreted as unbounded, and the syntactic approach explains *t*-agreement as the result of the subject lacking a number feature. Following Josefsson (2009, In prep), we distinguish between **substance-denoting** and **situation-denoting** PCs. The former express inherent (usually physical) properties of the subject, and the latter express properties that are necessarily realised through some event (such as an event of eating in 1b).

- (1) a. Senap är gult. [substance-denoting]
mustard_c is yellow-T
'Mustard is yellow.'
- b. Senap är gott. [situation-denoting]
mustard_c is nice-T
'Mustard is nice.'

On both the semantic and the syntactic approach to PCs, the presence of a modifier in the subject noun-phrase has an effect on the agreement marking of the predicative adjective. On the semantic approach, modification of the subject makes it less unbounded and therefore regular agreement is more acceptable. On the syntactic approach, modification has different effects in the two PC-types: resulting in regular agreement in substance-denoting PCs but either type of agreement in situation-denoting PCs.

We conducted an acceptability study, a sentence-completing study, and a corpus study to investigate how speakers judge and use regular agreement and *t*-agreement in modified and unmodified PCs of both subtypes. Taken together, the results suggest that substance- and situation-denoting PCs behave in different ways when they are modified, indicating that an analysis along the lines in Josefsson (2009, In prep) can explain more of the data.

References

- Enger, H.-O. 2004. Scandinavian pancake sentences as semantic agreement. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 27:5–34.
- Faarlund, J. T. 1977. Embedded clause reduction and Scandinavian gender agreement. *Journal of Linguistics* 13:239–257.
- Haugen, T. A., & H.-O. Enger. 2014. Scandinavian pancake constructions as a family of constructions. *Cognitive Linguistic Studies* 1:171–196.
- Haugen, T. A., & H.-O. Enger. 2019. The semantics of Scandinavian pancake constructions. *Linguistics* 57:531–575.
- Josefsson, G. 2006. Semantic and grammatical gender in Swedish –independent but interacting dimensions. *Lingua* 116:1346–1368.
- Josefsson, G. 2009. Peas and pancakes: On apparent disagreement and (null) light verbs in Swedish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 32:35–72.
- Josefsson, G. 2014a. Pancake sentences and the semanticization of formal gender in Mainland Scandinavian. *Language sciences* 43:62–76.
- Josefsson, G. 2014b. Scandinavian gender and pancake sentences: A reply to Hans-Olav Enger. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 37:431–449.
- Josefsson, G. In prep. Pancake inflection is agreement in non-specificity. On the extended pancake construction URL <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/006700>.
- Källström, R. 1993. *Kongruens i svenska*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Malmgren, S.-G. 1984. *Adjektiviska funktioner i svenskan*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Telemann, U., S. Hellberg, & E. Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens Grammatik*. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.
- Wellander, E. 1949. *Riktig svenska*. Stockholm: Esselte Studium.
- Wellander, E. 1955. Årter är gott och liknande inkongrunta satstyper. *Nysvenska studier* 35:1–47.
- Widmark, G. 1966. Är färsk sill god eller gott? *Språkvård* 2:3–6.
- Åkerblom, S. 2020. På väg mot en förståelse av fenomenet inkongruent predikativ. Ph.d. thesis, Lund University, Lund.