Background. *swarm* constructions exist in many natural languages; they appear at least in two sub-types (A-construction: *Termites are swarming in my kitchen* with agent in the subject and L-construction: *My kitchen is swarming with termites* – location in the subject) and attracted some linguistic attention (Dowty 2000, Hoeksema 2009, 2018 a.o.). Formal linguistic approaches to swarms offer two basic lines of analysis: (i) Dowty’s (2000) dynamic texture analysis treats L-construction as in essence transfer from the domain of events to the domain of locations, the multiplicity of events resulting in the parcellation of the location into many subregions; (ii) Hoeksema’s (2009) high degree analysis identifies the L-construction as a causative one, where the object of *with* (in English) affects the subject to exhibit a high degree of some property. Both analyses agree on default/semantically unmarked status of A-construction. Hoeksema (2018) further classifies *swarms* as PPIs (analogically to the other high degree constructions).

Experiment. *swarms* haven’t been extensively empirically investigated so far (the main reason of our Experiment on Czech *swarms*; the other reason: to eventually decide between the two theories). Another goal of the experiment was to verify/falsify the PPI status of *swarms*, concretely whether L-construction exhibit: i) high degree properties and whether it behaves as PPI; ii) avoiding PPI contexts, iii) rescuing in iterated DE contexts. In the experiment we used all three tests, see an example item in (1) for L-construction. Next to the three conditions Deg, Neg and Resc, there was a baseline condition Ref; each condition was varied for L-construction (Lcon) and A-construction (Acon). In total there were 4x2 conditions, 32 stimuli were created with 32 fillers. 50 subjects filled the experiment, and all of them passed the fillers.

(1) REF: Ta louka bzučela včelami.
‘The meadow swarmed with bees.’

DEG: Ta louka trochu bzučela včelami.
‘The meadow swarmed slightly with bees.’

NEG: Ta louka nebzučela včelami.
‘The meadow didn’t swarm with bees.’

RECS: Jestli to dnes na louce nebzučí včelami, tak zítra bude.
‘If the meadow doesn’t swarm with bees today, it will swarm tomorrow.’

Results & discussion. We analyzed the data in a mixed-effects linear model with sub-ject and item random effects (R package ordinal). The independent variables were: Conditions (DEG, NEG, RESC and ref-level REF), Construction (Acon, Lcon) and their interaction. The dependent variable was sub-ject’s response. We found a negative main effects of DEG ($z = -6.333, p = 2.41e-10$) and the negative interaction of Lcon by DEG, NEG, RESC and even REF ($z = -13.916, p < 2e-16; z = -8.373, p < 2e-16; z = -9.424, p < 2e-16; z = -8.406, p < 2e-16$): graphical summary (means and standard errors are in Figure 1). The overall worse accep-tability of Lcon results from the relative morpho-syntactic markedness (against Acon) of (Czech) swarms probably; moreover, the main negative effect of DEG proves the high degree status of swarms. We found no negative interaction of NEG by Lcon ($z = -0.066; p = 0.9774$) and no positive interaction of Lcon by RESC ($z = -1.115, p = 0.26484$). The results taken together strongly support the high degree analysis of *swarms* and falsify the PPI status of them.