

Programme / Program

Vendredi, 5 décembre / Friday, December 5

(9h00-12h30, salle 4.15 / 14h30-19h00, salle 4.07)

9h00-9h45

Anton ANTONOV (INaLCO, CRLAO) & **Alexandru MARDALE** (INaLCO, SeDyL),
Introduction : MDO et contact linguistique

9h45-10h30

Hans-Jörg DOEHLA (Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen & SeDyL), *Contact-induced replication and grammaticalization: the case of DOM*

10h30-11h00 : pause-café / coffee break

Président de séance / Chair : Franck FLORICIC

11h-11h45

Daniela BOEDDU (University of Basque Country), *The DOM of the Arborese dialect of Sardinian in language contact setting*

11h45-12h30

Avelino CORRAL ESTEBAN (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid & Universidad Complutense de Madrid), *A study of DOM in Asturian ('dialectu vaqueiru')*

12h30-14h30 : déjeuner / lunch

Président de séance / Chair : Pollet SAMVELIAN

14h30-16h00

Georg BOSSONG (Université de Zürich), « *Main invisible* » et/ ou contact : l'évolution du MDO dans les langues sémitiques, **conférencier invité / invited speaker**

16h00-16h30 : pause-café / coffee break

Président de séance / Chair : Sophie VASSILAKI

16h30-17h15

Aleksandra GJURKOVA (University Ss. Cyril and Methodius & Institute of Macedonian Language 'Krste Misirkov', Skopje), *DOM in Macedonian and Greek from a diachronic perspective*

17h15-18h00

Petros KARATSAREAS (University of the West of England & Open University of Cyprus), *The short-lived trajectory of DOM in Cappadocian Greek : language contact, typological anomaly and morphological change*

Samedi, 6 décembre / Saturday, December 6

(Salle des Conseils, 4^{ème} étage)

Président de séance / Chair : Annie MONTAUT

9h30-10h15

Gilles AUTHIER (Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris), *Emprunt du MDO azéri en udi et alignement tripartite*

10h15-11h00

Ilja SERŽANT (University of Konstanz), *Independent Partitive (Genitive) as an isogloss of the Eastern Circum-Baltic area*

11h00-11h30 : pause-café / coffee break

Président de séance / Chair : Romain GARNIER

11h30-12h15

Tom DURAND (INaLCO, SeDyL), *Le marquage différentiel de l'unique actant dans les langues arawak : origines et distribution*

12h15-13h00

Thomas DOUGHERTY (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa), *Marked Nominative from DOM in Okinawan*

Résumés des communications

Conférence invitée : « Main invisible » et/ ou contact : l'évolution du Marquage Différentiel de l'Objet dans les langues sémitiques

Georg BOSSONG

Professeur émérite, Université de Zurich

One of the major topics in typology in recent years has been the relationship between language change driven by internal factors (the famous “invisible hand”) and by contact with other languages. I think that both these factors have to be taken into account and that in most cases it is not a single type of factors which is exclusively responsible for the language change in question.

The Semitic language family offers a wide range of DOM phenomena. This family is particularly important in typological research because of its very old and long documented history – indeed the Afro-Asiatic phylum is the oldest attested language group of humanity which is still alive until today. Its historical depth is even greater than that of Indo-European and Sino-Tibetan. Despite of its incomparable historical importance, the Semitic family has not yet been studied comprehensively as far as the marking of basic case relations is concerned. In this contribution I will give an overview over the development of DOM in the main branches of Semitic.

DOM is unknown in the oldest stages, such as Old and Classical Babylonian as well as in Ugaritic, but it makes its appearance in the younger layers of Babylonian and is fully developed in Assyrian. In Hebrew it surfaces as a fully-fledged grammatical category from the earliest documents on, whereas in Classical Arabic, which appears on the historical scene much later than Hebrew but which represents a much more archaic stage of internal development, it is still unknown; however, DOM has become important in Neo-Arabic, especially in Levantine dialects and Iraqi at the one hand and in Maltese at the other. The history of DOM in the diverse branches of Aramaic is particularly rich and variegated, from the oldest stages up to the modern varieties; Aramaic always has been a language at the crossroad and it has its influence as a contact language. Finally, DOM has followed its own way in Southern Semitic languages; in this contribution, Classical Ge'ez and Amharic will be studied in some detail.

Le marquage différentiel de l'objet à l'épreuve du contact linguistique : introduction

Anton ANTONOV, INaLCO - CRLAO

Alexandru MARDALE, INaLCO - SeDyL

Le marquage différentiel de l'objet (MDO) est un phénomène désormais bien connu et de mieux en mieux documenté (Comrie 1979, Bossong 1985, 1998, Croft 1998, Lazard 1994, 2011, Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011, Iemmolo 2011). Les nombreuses recherches menées sur ce sujet depuis une vingtaine d'années ont permis de dégager les principaux paramètres pouvant l'influencer (Hopper & Thompson 1980, Laca 2002, 2006, Aissen 2003, Leonetti 2003, 2007, Næss 2004, von Heusinger & Kaiser 2005, de Hoop & de Swart 2007). Ces recherches ont également contribué à affiner la présentation du phénomène dans de nombreuses langues en synchronie, et pour certaines d'entre elles en diachronie.

En revanche, le rôle du contact linguistique dans l'émergence, le développement ou encore l'attrition d'un système de MDO n'a pas été suffisamment étudié. Or, dans une

situation de contact de langues dont au moins une présente le phénomène, on peut envisager au moins deux cas de figure :

a) dans le premier, que l'on peut appeler *symétrique*, les deux langues en contact ont chacune un système de MDO dont le fonctionnement précis est conditionné par des paramètres différents. Il serait intéressant d'étudier l'évolution de chacun de ces deux systèmes et d'essayer de déterminer la part du contact dans cette dernière. On peut par exemple s'intéresser à la façon dont les systèmes de MDO du castillan et du catalan ou encore du moldave et du russe s'influencent (ou non) mutuellement.

b) dans le deuxième, que l'on peut appeler *asymétrique*, seule l'une des deux langues possède un système de MDO pré-existant, tandis que l'autre présente des exemples sporadiques de MDO qui indiquent une influence de la langue à MDO systématique. Il peut s'agir soit d'une copie (partielle) du système, soit d'une copie du marqueur (*pattern-replication* vs. *matter-replication* à la Matras & Saxe 2007) : en effet, la langue sans MDO peut se contenter de reproduire (de façon partielle) le système de la langue à MDO, ou alors elle peut aussi emprunter le marqueur du MDO de la langue à MDO systématique. C'est le cas de certaines variétés de français en contact avec d'autres langues romanes à MDO (occitan, provençal, corse), du basque parlé en Espagne ou encore du bulgare parlé dans le sud de la Roumanie. Enfin, la langue sans MDO peut aussi provoquer l'attrition de ce phénomène dans l'autre langue.

Il n'est évidemment pas toujours facile de déterminer si nous sommes devant un cas de contact symétrique ou asymétrique, et l'on peut même s'interroger sur la pertinence du contact en tant que facteur (en tout cas unique ou principal) à l'origine de l'émergence d'un système de MDO. Ainsi, dans le cas du macédonien d'Ohrid et de l'aroumain de Frăsiet, il n'est pas aisé de décider si nous sommes en présence d'une influence du macédonien sur l'aroumain, de l'aroumain sur le macédonien ou bien devant une évolution indépendante. On peut en effet envisager des cas de contact où un tel système a vu le jour de façon indépendante dans les deux langues. Il semble en revanche plausible de considérer le contact comme décisif dans l'évolution ultérieure du système des deux langues.

Contact-induced replication and grammaticalization: the case of differential object marking

Hans-Jörg DOEHLA

Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen - SeDyL

The data set of the presentation is taken from six language contact situations studied in detail over the past few years: Aimara-Spanish, Guaraní-Spanish, P'urhépecha-Spanish, Colloquial Arabic-Old Sicilian, Papia Kristang-Bazaar Malay/Hokkien, Chabacano-Tagalog/Ilocano/Cebuano. The languages on the left developed DOM in contact with the language(s) on the right or were formally influenced as in the last two cases. In the presentation we will compare the structural and typological properties of the recipient languages (word order, alignment type etc.) as well as the special conditions of the respective contact situation (duration, intensity, social stratification, bilingual speakers etc.). Moreover, the bridging context which helped developing DOM will be analyzed. This comparison aims at pinpointing the typological and situational similarities which also might figure as preconditions in other cases of development of DOM.

The DOM of the Arborese dialect of Sardinian in language contact setting

Daniela BOEDDU

University of the Basque Country

Aim of the paper

This presentation focuses on DOM in Arborese, a Sardinian dialect, spoken in the central-western area of Sardinia. The aim of this study on contemporaneous Arborese DOM in language contact setting is twofold: to offer a more complete view of the phenomenon involved thus allowing a better analysis of inter-dialectal and infra-dialectal variation.

Background

Sardinian language displays a DOM system (based on semantic and/or pragmatic status of the direct object NPs) also called prepositional accusative (PREP.ACC.) and similar to that showed by other Romance languages.

Sardinian has been in contact with a number of languages during its historical development: earlier (in the XIV-XVIII centuries) Catalan and Spanish and later (in the XIX and especially in the XX century) Italian. In the XX century a variety of Regional Italian emerged from the contact between Sardinian and Italian (Loi Corvetto 1983). While the Sardinian variety of Italian displays DOM due to the influence from Sardinian, Sardinian most probably developed DOM independently from other languages (XII century documents already show prepositional accusative (Putzu 2008)).

Authors dealing with different Sardinian dialects agree in identifying three domains of distribution of the preposition: a domain where preposition is mandatory (personal 1st, 2nd, 3rd person pronouns and proper names; see example 1); a domain where the preposition is excluded (inanimate common nouns, example 2); and a domain within which variability occurs (common names referring animated, as in example 3). The third domain is characterized by strong inter-dialectal and infra-dialectal variability, some dialects being more permissive than others in admitting the use of the preposition (Jones 1995; Blasco Ferrer 1998; Floricic 2003; Putzu 2005).

- | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|------------------|------------|--|
| 1) | <i>Zuane</i> | <i>biet</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>Maria</i> (personal knowledge) |
| | John | see:PRES.IND.3SG | | ACC. Mary |
| | "John sees Mary" | | | |
| 2) | <i>Zuane</i> | <i>biet</i> | Ø | <i>sa perda</i> (personal knowledge) |
| | John | see:PRES.IND.3SG | Ø | DET stone |
| | "John sees the stone" | | | |
| 3) | <i>Seo</i> | <i>cricande</i> | <i>a/Ø</i> | <i>unu dotore</i> (personal knowledge) |
| | be:PRES.IND.1SG | search:GERUND | ACC/ Ø | INDET doctor |
| | "I'm searching for a doctor" | | | |

Basic issues in the diachrony of Sardinian DOM

This investigation is part of a PhD dissertation on the diachrony of Sardinian DOM, which bases on two types of data: a historical corpus of literary texts which covers the complete diachrony of the Campidanese, Logudorese and Arborese dialects (diachronic studies, e.g. Putzu (2008), have hitherto investigated only medieval Sardinian); and an oral corpus of contemporary Arborese (for which there was up to this moment no study on PREP.ACC.). Data from both corpora have been analyzed according to semantic and pragmatic features of direct object NPs (animacy, specificity, individuation, topicality). The data from the Arborese oral corpus have been compared to literary Arborese materials and to data provided by other authors with respect to other diatopic varieties of Sardinian.

The study of the historical corpus shows that, in the texts of the XVI-XIX centuries, the use of the preposition is, in general terms, quite similar to the actual use (i.e. the common animated names domain shows a considerable variability).

Results

The analysis of the oral corpus of contemporaneous Arborese confirms the existence of the three domains of distribution of Sardinian DOM, as showed by previous research. However, the limits of the three domains in contemporaneous Arborese are different to the traditional descriptions. Indeed, the area of mandatory preposition is restricted and the optionality area results more extensive than expected: only personal pronouns show mandatory DOM; both animate (human and non-human) and inanimate are susceptible to receive DOM (even if with different levels of probability).

Since all the informants of the Arborese oral corpus are bilingual (Sardinian-Italian), the data reflect the situation of DOM in Sardinian-Italian (both Standard and Regional Italian) contact setting: in spite of Standard Italian influence (and in constant exchange with Regional Italian), the linguistic feature of DOM is maintained. It may be argued that Standard Italian (a language without DOM) plays a role in the variation of Sardinian DOM and that the increase of optionality area may be a result of Standard Italian influence (Putzu 2005). However, it should be taken into account that in the language contact scenario not only Standard Italian but also Regional Italian (DOM variety) plays a role. In addition, synchronic variation displayed by Arborese replicates the same variation which characterizes historical data (which show a “constant instability”). As a result, it makes it difficult to consider the variation as a simple effect of the Standard Italian influence.

References

- Blasco Ferrer, Eduardo, 1998, *Le parlate dell’Alta Ogliastra. Analisi dialettologica: saggio di storia linguistica e culturale*, Cagliari, Della Torre.
- Fiorentino, Giuliana, 2003, (ed.), *Romance Objects: transitivity in Romance Languages*, Berlin-New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Floricio, Franck, 2003, “Notes sur l’accusative prépositionnel en sarde”, En *Bulletin de la Société linguistique de Paris*, t. XCVIII (2003), fasc. 1, p.247-303.
- Jones, Michael Allan, 1995, “The prepositional Accusative in Sardinian: its Distribution and Syntactic Repercussions”. En Smith J. C., Maiden M. (eds) 1995, *Linguistic Theory and the Romance Languages*, 37-75. Amsterdam- Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Loi Corvetto 1983, *L’italiano Regionale di Sardegna*, Bologna, Zanichelli.
- Putzu, Ignazio, 2005, “L’accusativo preposizionale in sardo campidanese”. En Dettori, Antonietta, (ed), *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica e Stilistica dell’Università di Cagliari. Lingue e culture in contatto*, 225-260. Roma, Carocci.
- Putzu, Ignazio, 2008, “Per uno studio dell’accusativo preposizionale in sardo antico”. En Lazzeroni, Romano et al., *Diachronica et synchronica: studi in onore di Anna Giacalone Ramat*, 397-428. Pisa, ETS.

A study of Differential Object Marking in Asturian (“dialectu vaqueiru”)

Avelino CORRAL ESTEBAN

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid & Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Historically, Asturias was one of the few areas of the Iberian Peninsula that never came under Moorish control. This fact is crucial to understanding the nature of the Ibero-Romance dialects that developed and spread throughout this region. As a result, Asturias contains the unbroken linguistic descendants of early Latin dialects formed when this region was romanized in the first centuries of the modern period. Unfortunately, the decline of the Asturian language spread rapidly throughout the 20th century, owing to the rapid expansion of Castilian as a lingua franca into Asturias, and there are currently few areas of Asturias where these dialectal forms collectively called Asturian or bable continue to be spoken.

However, there does not exist a central Asturian linguistic standard and, instead, there is a plethora of isolated rural varieties throughout the region. In this presentation, I will focus on the variety spoken by the ancestral ethnic group called “Vaqueiros de Alzada”, a nomadic people inhabiting the mountainous areas in western Asturias whose main activity has always involved the breeding of cattle. In this ancestral form of speech, we can observe very characteristic traces, ranging from profound changes in pronunciation, vocabulary and morphology to slight but relevant effects on syntax. This study attempts to offer a comprehensive outline of the information structure in Asturian (“dialect vaqueiru”), putting a special emphasis on the differences existing between this dialect, Central Asturian, and standard Spanish. This comparison will allow us to shed some light on the problem of the origin of two grammatical phenomena, namely clitic doubling (CD) and differential object marking (DOM). Although it is clear that these two kinds of object marking are closely related and that their distribution in Central Asturian and standard Spanish appears to be governed by the same factors that have been invoked in the literature, which include intrinsic features of the object (animacy), discourse-related properties (referentiality, definiteness, specificity, anaphoricity), properties of the whole predicate (degrees of transitivity and affectedness) or a combination of more than one of these, the data obtained from this ancestral variety will give more prominence to the factor of topicality over the rest. More specifically, it will be argued that the non-obligatory nature of CD and the narrow use of DOM in this variety are related to the rigid information structure exhibited by this variety. The fact that both Central Asturian and standard Spanish often show a variance regarding CD and DOM that cannot be explained by the dependence on the mentioned categories may be accounted for by understanding that the conditions that determine the use of CD and DOM are in the process of evolution. Thus, as can be observed when comparing different versions of the language under investigation, only after the information structure of this variety becomes loses its rigidity, the clitics change from pronominal elements into agreement markers and the DOM system expands because of the stronger necessity to mark more topical elements distinctively. In summary, in this paper special attention will be paid to diachronic changes that can even be observed on a quasi-synchronic level, that is between the conservative and modern forms of the Vaqueiru dialect, which are certainly brought about by the influence of the contact with standard Spanish. This will allow us to observe the role of language contact in the evolution of the DOM system in this dialect. This situation will reflect a symmetrical scenario where two closely-related linguistic systems had originally the same DOM conditioned by roughly the same factors, but, as this system of object marking is governed by the pragmatic features of the language and each variety has its own pragmatic properties, it followed a different development.

Keywords: Asturian, Vaqueiru dialect, information structure, syntax, Differential Object Marking, topicality, clitic doubling

References:

- Academia de la Llingua Asturiana. 2001. Gramatica de la Llingua Asturiana, 3^a ed. Uviéu, Académica de la Llingua Asturiana.
- Aissen, Judith. 2003. “Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21, 435-448.
- Bosson, Georg. 1998. “Le marguage différentiel de l’objet dans les langues d’Europe”. In: Feuillet, J. (ed.): “Actance et Valence dans les Language de l’Europe”. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 193-258.
- De Hoop, Helen and Andrej Malchukov. 2007. “On fluid differential case marking: a bidirectional OT account”. *Lingua* 117, 1636-1656.

Fernández-Rubiera, Francisco José. 2009. Clitics at the edge : clitic placement in Western Iberian Romance languages, PhD Thesis, Georgetown University.

García Arias, X. Ll. 2003. Gramática histórica de la lengua asturiana. Fonética, fonología e introducción a la morfosintaxis histórica, 2.^a ed., Uviéu, Academia de la Llingua Asturiana.

González i Planas, Francesc. 2007. "Sintaxis de los clíticos pronominales en asturleonés", *Revista Philologica Románica*, 7: 15-35.

Iemmolo, Giorgio. 2010. "Topicality and differential object marking. Evidence from Romance and beyond". *Studies in Language* 34:2, 239–272.

Kittilä, Seppo T. 2006. "Object-, animacy- and role-based strategies: A typology of object marking". *Studies in Language* 32/1, 1-32.

Kittilä, Seppo, Jussi Ylikoski, Katja Västi (eds.). 2011. Case, animacy and semantic roles. *Typological Studies in Language* 99. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lazard, Gilbert. 2001. "Le marquage différentiel de l'objet". In Haspelmath, Martin, Ekkerhard König, Wulf Oesterreicher and Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language universals and language typology: an international handbook*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 833-855.

Lorenzo, Guillermo. 1994. "Optionality in the placement of Asturian clitics", *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics*, 4, 1: 93-120.

Van Valin, R. D. Jr. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Von Heusinger, Klaus and Georg A. Kaiser. 2007. "Differential Object Marking and the lexical semantics of verbs in Spanish. In: Kaiser, G.A. and M. Leonetti (eds.): *Proceedings of the Workshop "Definiteness, Specificity and Animacy in Ibero-Romance Languages"*. Universität Konstanz (Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft Arbeitspapier 122), 85-110.

Viejo Fernández, X. 2008. *Pensar asturiano: ensayos programáticos de sintaxis asturiana*. Uviéu: Ed. Trabe.

Differential Object Marking in Macedonian and Greek from a diachronic perspective

Aleksandra GJURKOVA

University Ss. Cyril and Methodius &

Institute of Macedonian Language 'Krste Misirkov', Skopje

The development of differential object marking represents one of the fundamental research subjects in balkanological studies. In the studies of this linguistic feature by several authors (Ilievski 1988, Demiraj 1992, Cyhun 1968) an emphasis is put on analysis regarding the origin and development of differential object marking (or object doubling) in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund. According to the conducted research from a synchronic perspective, the DOM is not in accord with the traditional word order in the Slavic sentence (cf. material from Macedonian and Bulgarian Medieval manuscripts) and in general, it is considered to have developed from the contact with non-Slavic Balkan languages. The hypothesis that DOM has stabilized as a language feature in Macedonian medieval manuscripts dated from the 12th and 13th century is verified by examples from the OCS manuscripts noted by Rusek (1965) and Ilievski (1988). From a contemporary aspect, the object doubling constructions in Macedonian represents a universal linguistic feature to signalize direct (patient) and indirect object (beneficiary/recipient), whereas in Greek and Albanian (Demiraj 1992) the object doubling is not a regular feature and its usage depends on the representation of the

construction as topic or focus or the specific intention of the speaker to emphasize the object (recipient or patient). The issue of positioning the pronominal clitics in the sentence is significant in this analysis because the pronominal forms are used to designate the case relations and the link between the verb and the object. This research of the DOM focuses on the level of convergence in the development of the pronominal systems of Macedonian and Greek and its importance for the development of object redoubling constructions.

In this study we focus our attention to examples of object doubling in the Macedonian manuscript *Krninski damaskin* from the 16th century in comparison to the Greek original *Thesaurus*. The definiteness and the anymacy of the object are considered as important elements in the analysis of the development of object doubling. The emphasis in the research is put also on the level of equivalence in the translation i.e. the level of paralelism in rendering the object doubling constructions.

The aim of this research is to define the language contact between Medieval Greek and Old Church Slavonic of the Macedonian Recension in regard to the differential object marking. The study is expected to define the language contact as symmetrical or asymmetrical and by comparing the status of object doubling construction in Standard Macedonian and Modern Greek we expect to draw some conclusions in regard to the symmetrical (or asymmetrical) development of the object doubling constructions, taking in view the Balkan context.

References:

Bubenik, V., 2001: *Morphological and Syntactic Change in Medieval Greek and South Slavic Languages*. LINCOM Europa, LINCOM Studies in Indo-European Linguistics 14. Muenchen.

Cyhun G., [Цыхун Г.] 1968: *Syntax of pronominal clitics in South Slavic Languages*. [Синтаксис местоименных клитик в южно-славянских языках]. Minsk: "Nauka i tehnika".

Demiraj S., [Демирај Ш.] 1992: *Balkan Linguistics*. [Балканска лингвистика]. Skopje: Logos-A.

Dočekal, M. and D. Kallulli, 2012: More on the semantics of clitic doubling: principal filters, minimal witnesses and other bits of truth. In *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 9, pp.113-128.

Kalluli, D. and L. Tasmowski (eds.), 2008: *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ilievski, P. Hr. [Илиевски, П.Хр.] 1988: *Balkan Linguistic Studies* [Балканолошки лингвистички студии]. Skopje: Institute of Macedonian Language "Krstе Misirkov".

Lopašov, J. A. [Лопашов Ю. А.] 1978: *Pronominal redoubling in Balkan Languages*. [Местоименные повторы дополнения в балканских языках]. Leningrad: Nauka.

Revithiadou, A. and V. Spyropoulos, 2008: Greek object clitic pronouns: A typological survey of their grammatical properties. In *STUF - Language Typology and Universals*, vol. 61, 1/2008, pp.39-53.

Rusek, J., 1965: *Przyczynki do historii języków bułgarskiego i macedońskiego*, Odbitka ze Sprawozdań z poidezeń komisji oddziału PAN, Krakow.

The short-lived trajectory of Differential Object Marking in Cappadocian Greek: language contact, typological anomaly and morphological change

Petros KARATSAREAS

University of the West of England & Open University of Cyprus

Research on the historical origin and subsequent diachronic evolution of Differential Object Marking (DOM) has focused mainly on language-internal mechanisms of change (see *inter alios* Bosson 1991; Guardiano 2010; von Heusinger 2008; Igartua 2005). My aim in this paper is to increase our understanding of the ways in which a language that does not originally display DOM may come to acquire it as a result of language contact and the implications of such a development. I address two main questions:

- I. Do DOM systems that arise as a result of language contact conform to the typological generalisations that define the phenomenon across the world's languages?
- II. How does the introduction of DOM in the grammar of a previously DOMless language interact with the properties of the morphological system that is used to formally realise it?

As a case-in-point, I examine the introduction of DOM into the grammar of Cappadocian Greek (henceforth Cappadocian), in which the effects of cross-linguistic influence from Turkish are clearly identifiable on all levels of grammar (Dawkins 1916; Janse 2009; Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Winford 2005).

In Turkish, the ACC ending *-(y)I* is used to mark direct object NPs only when they take a specific reading. *-(y)I* can therefore occur with the definite article *bir* that marks an NP as indefinite as well as with definite determiners such as demonstratives and universal quantifiers (Turkish lacks a definite article). Non-specific NPs are not case-marked similarly to subject NPs of simple sentences. For examples, see (1).

Cappadocian speakers employed the mechanism of pattern replication (in the sense of Sakel 2007) to introduce DOM into their grammar. Cappadocian DOM, however, differs from its Turkish model in two crucial respects. In replicating DOM on the model of Turkish, we find that Cappadocian matched (a) the grammatical feature of SPECIFICITY with that of DEFINITENESS, which was already morphosyntactically expressed in the grammatical system of the language (*contra* Spyropoulos & Tiliopoulou 2006 and in support of Janse 2004); and, (b) zero and ACC marking with NOM and ACC marking respectively, based on the correspondence in the means for the expression of subject and direct object between the two languages. This replication is schematically illustrated in Table 1 below.

Owing to the nature of the Cappadocian inflectional system, the differential distinction between definite and indefinite NPs could only be formally realised on nouns that preserved the morphological distinction between NOM and ACC in their paradigms, namely on historical masculines such as *milos* 'mill', which distinguish between the two cases by means of the morphological opposition *-s :: -∅*. This resulted in a DOM pattern that violates Aissen's typological generalisation that "*overwhelmingly*, DOM is implemented by overtly marking the marked class of objects, and leaving the unmarked ones with no morphological mark" (2003: 446, emphasis in the original). The generalisation is borne out by Turkish, which has always been differential in its history. As can be seen in (2), however, in Cappadocian, the overt, morphologically more complex element involved in the morphological distinction employed for the formal realisation of the phenomenon marks the unmarked class of objects and *vice versa*. The formal implementation of the Cappadocian DOM pattern evidently constitutes a counterexample to Aissen's (and others') robust generalisation.

What is more, with its introduction into the grammatical system of Cappadocian, DOM created a novel grammatical condition that led to the syncretism of NOM and ACC in indefinite

contexts. In all Greek dialects, this type of syncretism is prototypically associated with neuter nouns, which in turn overwhelmingly denote inanimate entities. As a result, the nouns that were able to display DOM in Cappadocian, namely historical masculines, became morphologically associated with the neuters. This ultimately facilitated their shift to the most productive neuter inflectional class. This, however, did not formally differentiate between NOM and ACC and was therefore unable to formally realise DOM. In the varieties in which this took place, DOM had a rather short life and was soon lost as can be seen in (3)

Examples and tables :

1. Turkish (adapted from Aydemir 2004)

- a *Ali-Ø anahtar-Ø kaybettti.*
 Ali-Ø key-Ø lose.PST.3SG
 ‘Ali lost keys.’
- b *Ali-Ø anahtar-ı kaybettti.*
 Ali-Ø key-ACC lose.PST.3SG
 ‘Ali lost the key.’
- c *Ali- bu anahtar kaybettti.*
 Ø -ı
 Ali DEM.PRO key-ACC lose.PST.3S
 -Ø X G
 ‘Ali lost this key.’
- d *Ali- bir anahtar kaybettti.*
 Ø -Ø
 Ali IND key-Ø lose.PST.3S
 -Ø F G
 ‘Ali lost a key.’
- e *Ali-Ø bir anahtar-ı kaybettti.*
 Ali-Ø INDF key-ACC lose.PST.3SG
 ‘Ali lost a certain key.’

Table 1. *The replication of DOM from Turkish to Cappadocian*

DOM-defining grammatical feature				DOM-realising means			
Turkish				Turkish		Cappadocian	
SPECIFICITY				DEFINITENESS			
specific	direct	object	::	definite NPs	zero	::	nominative
non-specific		direct	::	indefinite	(-Ø)		(-s)
object NPs				NPs	accusative	::	accusative
					(-(y)ı)		(-Ø)

2. Axó Cappadocian

ivren ena issuz milo-s semen eci sto milo-Ø
 find.PST.3 IND deserte mill- go.in.PST.3 DEM.DI in.ART.DEF.SG.A mill-ACC.SG
 SG F d NOM.SG SG ST CC
 ‘he found a deserted mill (...) he went into that mill’ (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 196)

3. Ghúrzono Cappadocian

os to=perpenifce qarfulat/e to kleft/is-Ø
 whilst 3SG.ACC=bring.PST.IPFV.3SG meet.PST.3SG ART.DEF.SG.ACC thief-
 NOM/ACC.SG
 ‘whilst he was bringing her, he met the thief’
 (Dawkins 1916: 344)

References :

Aydemir, Y. 2004. Are Turkish preverbal bare nouns syntactic arguments? *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:3, 465-474.

Bosson, G. 1998. Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues d'Europe. In J. Feuillet (Ed.), *Actance et Valence dans les Langues de l'Europe*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 193–258.

Dawkins, R. M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guardiano, C. 2010. L'oggetto diretto preposizionale in siciliano: una breve rassegna e qualche domanda. In J. Garzonio (Ed.), *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt 11 (2010). Studi sui Dialetti della Sicilia*. Padova: Unipress, 95–115.

von Heusinger, K. 2008. Verbal semantics and the diachronic development of DOM in Spanish. *Probus* 20, 1–31.

Igartua, I. 2005. *Origen y Evolución de la Flexión Nominal Eslava*. Bilbao: Servicio Editorial. Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea.

Janse, M. 2004. Animacy, definiteness, and case in Cappadocian and other Asia Minor Greek dialects. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 3–26.

Janse, M. 2009. Greek-Turkish language contact in Asia Minor. *Études Helléniques/Hellenic Studies* 17:1, 37–54

Mavrochalyvidis, G. & I. I. Kesisoglou. 1960. *Tò γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Ἀζοῦ (Le dialecte d'Axos)*. Athens: Institut Français d'Athènes.

Sakel, J. 2007. *Types of loan: matter and pattern*. In Y. Matras and J. Sakel (Eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 15–29.

Spyropoulos, V. & M.–A. Tiliopoulou. 2006. Definiteness and case in Cappadocian Greek. In M. Janse, B. Joseph and A. Ralli (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Patras: University of Patras, 365–378.

Thomason, S. G. & T. Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Winford, D. 2005. Contact-induced changes: classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22, 373–427.

Emprunt du MDO azéri en udi et alignement tripartite

Gilles AUTHIER

Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris

L'udi est une langue caucasique de l'est de la branche sud, dite lezgique. Comme toutes les langues lezgiques, l'udi marque l'actant agentif des verbes transitifs par un cas ergatif. Mais contrairement à toutes les autres langues caucasiques de l'est, où l'actant en fonction de patient est toujours non marqué, en udi celui-ci connaît un marquage différencié. Il peut être au nominatif (alias absolutif) non marqué, comme l'actant unique des verbes transitifs, quand il est indéfini ou que l'agent est focalisé, ou bien marqué à un cas employé par ailleurs en fonction de datif, en particulier quand il est question d'un référent défini. L'actance de l'udi peut donc être qualifiée de tripartite, et partiellement déterminée par la structure informationnelle de la phrase insérée dans un contexte discursif. Après avoir mis en parallèle les marquages différentiels de l'objet dans les langues non-apparentées avec lesquelles l'udi est ou a été en contact (azéri, tat et arménien), on étudiera ce marquage différentiel dans un conte udi.

Independent Partitive (Genitive) as an isogloss of the Eastern Circum-Baltic area

Ilja SERŽANT

University of Konstanz

Introduction

This paper aims at uncovering the semantic aspects of the partitive vs. accusative alternations – a phenomenon pertaining to Differential Object and Subject Marking – in the East of the Circum-Baltic area. The syntactically dependent partitive case in Finnic and the partitive genitive case in East Slavic and Baltic area have been extensively discussed in the literature. It constitutes a firmly established feature of the Eastern part of the Circum-Baltic language area (cf. Larsson 1983; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001; Koptjevskaja-Tamm/Wälchli 2001: 649-669). The partitive genitive in East Slavic and Baltic exhibits functional correlations with the partitive case in the Finnic languages that "...are typologically too infrequent to be explained by a coincident parallel development." (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001:540f). However, much less attention has been paid to the syntactically independent correlate. The latter is however remarkable with respect to both its typologically specific functions and a certain consistency across the languages of the eastern part of the Circum-Baltic area.

From the typological point of view, the typical semantics of Case is to encode "the type of the relationships the dependent nouns bear to their heads" (Blake 1994:1-2). Differently from the "regular" cases, the function of the IP(g) pertains to such domains as aspect and quantification, referentiality and discursive prominence in East Slavic, Baltic and Finnic.

In the present paper I will discuss some specific properties of the independent partitive genitive in Baltic, East Slavic and the partitive case in Finnic that pertain to the domain of quantification and aspect.

Quantificational properties

One of the common innovations of Baltic, East Slavic and Finnic is that the implicit quantifier invoked by the IP(g) extended its domain of application from originally an NP-internal quantifier (*D(eterminer)-quantifier*) into an *A(dverb)-quantifier* that applies on the clause level. It becomes sensitive to the quantificational adverbs, incorporated verbal quantifiers and verbal aspect. While acknowledging language-specific differences in the quantificational value of the implicit quantifier in every particular language, I claim that there is, nevertheless, a semantic core that is common to all three language branches, and certain differences may be explained as motivated by the differences in, e.g., the aspectual organization of every language of concern. The discrepancy between the syntactic position (NP-internally) of the implicit quantifier and its domain of application (clause-level) is typologically rare, cf. the overview in Corbett (1994:202; 2000:251) where such a quantifier is said to be unattested. This makes this correlation particularly telling with regard to language contact. To give an example, consider the *temporal-transfer-reading* induced by the implicit quantifier of the IP(g) (that overrides the accusative case-marking here):

- (1) *Duok man peiliuko* (Eastern Lithuanian)
give me knife:GEN.SG
'Give me a/the knife for a while!'
- (2) *Daj lošadi* (North Russian)
give horse:GEN.SG
'Give a/the horse for a while!'
- (3) *Anna-han tänne kirvestä-ni* (Finnish)
give:IMPV-PRT here ax:PART.SG-POSS.1SG
'Give here my ax (for a while)! (from Larsson 1983:87)

The regular, canonical accusative case-marking of the objects in (1)-(3) would not induce the implication ‘for a while’. The implicit indeterminate quantifier induced by the IP(g) quantifies here the phase after the transfer event has taken place, inducing the meaning ‘the result will last a specific period of time’. This is so, because the transfer verbs (achievements) do not presuppose a (preparational) phase that could be measured by the quantifier which has to resort to the after-phase.

Another example represents the delimitative aspect (= cessative¹). The delimitatives entail that the process had been running for a while and was stopped for whatsoever reason without reaching a natural end (if such an end (*telos*) is presupposed by the lexical semantics of the verb at all). The typical implication here is that the action could have lasted longer and was not fully exhausted (cf. Sasse 2002:206). The delimitatives require the IP(g) marking of the direct object (instead of the structural accusative). It is only Standard Russian that allows accusative here too.

Conclusions

One finds a number of typologically striking correspondences across the languages of concern. Even though the IPg is an inherited category in Baltic and Slavic, most of its synchronic properties are not attested in the ancient IE languages and are thus likely to be recent innovations of Baltic and Slavic. Even more, the IPg shows a greater functional correspondence with the IP in the Finnic languages than with its etymological counterparts in the ancient IE languages. Interestingly, most of the properties not inherited from Proto-IE in Baltic and Slavic – as far as I can judge from the data available – are not inherited in Finnic either. This means that these properties were created relatively recently, and that the major part of these properties is the result of common developments in Baltic, Finnic and East Slavic.

References:

- Blake, B. J. 1994: *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Second Edition.
- Corbett, G. 1994: Systems of grammatical number in Slavonic, Slavonic and East European Review 72, no. 2, 201-217. A revised version of Systems of grammatical number in Slavonic, In: David Gil (ed.) Studies in Number and Quantification. European Science Foundation Programme in Language Typology: Theme 7, Noun Phrase Structure: Working Paper no. VII/19, pp. 1-17.
- Corbett, G. 2000: *Numerals*. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge, UK, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Huumo, T. 2010: Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: The case of the Finnish object, *Journal of Linguistics* 46, 83–125.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 2001: A piece of the cake and a cup of tea: partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages. In: Ö. Dahl and M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and Contact*. Vol. 2. *Grammar and Typology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. 523-568.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. and Wälchli, B. 2001: *The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach*. In: Circum-Baltic Languages, Östen Dahl, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), Volume 2. 615-750.
- Larsson, L.-G. 1983. *Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia 15. Uppsala: Borgströms Tryckeri AB.
- Sasse, H.-J. 2002. Recent activity in the theory of aspect: Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-progressive state?, *Linguistic Typology* 6, 199–271.

¹ In the Finnish tradition, cf. Huumo 2010:90

Le marquage différentiel de l'unique actant dans les langues arawak : origines et distribution

Tom DURAND
INaLCO - SeDyL

L'étude du marquage différentiel de l'unique actant (MDU) dans le cadre des langues arawak est pertinente en raison de leur alignement. Ces langues-ci sont en effet caractérisées par différents types d'intransitivité scindée, ce qui nous amène à nous demander quelles sont les raisons motivant un marquage différentiel pour ces langues alors que le marquage patientif jouerait un rôle similaire.

De fait, Givon (2001) soutient que le marquage différentiel de l'unique actant² est surtout présent dans les langues nominatives-accusatives, et ce, afin de rendre compte des énoncés où l'entité concernée est peu agentive – peu ou pas d'intentionnalité ou de contrôle au niveau de l'action. Woolford (2008), pour sa part, soutient que le marquage au datif sert souvent à désigner ce que les anglophones qualifient de *goal* et d'*experiencer*, ce que l'on pourrait traduire par cible et expérient. L'auteur exemplifie cette situation par cet exemple de l'islandais :

- 1) *Bátnum hvolfdi*
bateau-DAT chaviré

« Le bateau a chaviré » (Woolford 2008 : 7, de Levin and Simpson 1981 (1b))

Les langues arawak, au contraire, se caractérisent par de l'intransitivité scindée, le plus souvent du type lexical – la scission s'effectue au niveau de deux classes lexicales ou plus –, parfois du type grammatical – la scission opère selon des critères grammaticaux comme le temps, l'aspect ou le mode. Dans les deux cas, le marquage patientif est présent pour les verbes intransitifs. Cette innovation typologique nous amène donc à nous interroger sur une éventuelle influence de l'espagnol. Pourtant, cette hypothèse est écartée pour plusieurs raisons. Si l'on prend l'exemple de l'énoncé *hape-ka no-sru* "j'ai froid", le fait de considérer en baniwa-kurripako –*sru* comme étant un auxiliaire et non pas comme un datif est intenable sur le plan morphosyntaxique – ordre des mots peu naturel, usage improbable du morphème – *ka* comme nominalisateur (Granadillo 2006 : 115-117).

De plus, le MDU a été attesté très tôt – il est possible d'identifier plusieurs exemples dans le dictionnaire du père Breton (1665) sur le caribe insulaire ou dans la grammaire de Neira & Rivero (1762) sur l'achagua – et pour des langues éloignées génétiquement et géographiquement au sein de la famille – groupe caribéen pour le caribe insulaire et le garifuna, groupe nord-amazonien pour le baniwa-kurripako, le piapoco, le tariana et le baniwa.

L'existence de ce phénomène pour ces langues se justifie pleinement lorsque l'on analyse sa distribution par rapport au marquage patientif. Il apparaît alors une situation claire de complémentarité. Plus exactement, un même prédicat admet plusieurs marquages, ce qui entraîne alors une subtile différence de sens, c'est pourquoi nous parlerons désormais de pluri-marquage. Si l'on prend pour exemple, en piapoco, le fait d'avoir chaud, un prédicat utilisant canoniquement le datif, il est parfaitement possible d'utiliser également le superessif ainsi que la marque du patient. Il en découle une différence sémantique claire :

- 1) *Úle-ka nu-lí*
être.chaud-REAL A1-DAT
« J'ai chaud »

² Marquage différentiel du sujet, selon sa terminologie. Nous préférons suivre la terminologie de Creissels (2006) et de ne pas utiliser le terme « sujet », plus polémique.

- 2) *Úle-ka* *nua*
avoir.chaud-REAL P1SG
« J'ai chaud (à cause de la fièvre) »
- 3) *Úle-ka* *nu-wàli*
avoir.chaud-REAL A1SG-SPRESS
« J'ai senti une vague de chaleur (par exemple en ouvrant la porte d'une pièce surchauffée) »

Nous sommes donc en présence d'un phénomène inhérent à la famille arawak pour lequel son émergence au sein de langues à intransitivité scindée permet de rendre compte de sa grande adaptabilité.

Bibliographie :

Givón T., 2001, *Syntax : A Functional-Typological Introduction*, vol. 2, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Granadillo Tania, 2006, *An ethnographic account of language documentation among the Kurripako of Venezuela*. Ph.D. diss. Tucson: University of Arizona.

Neira, Alonso de & Rivero Juan, 1762. *Arte y Vocabulario de la Lengua Achagua*. Doctrina Christiana de uno y otro sexo é instrucción de Cathecumenos. Sacado de lo que trabajaron los Padres Alonso de Neira y Juan Ribero de la Compañia de Jesus. Trasuntado en el Pueblo de S.n Juan Fran.co Regis Año 1762.

Troiani Duna (ed.), 1999, *Dictionnaire caraïbe-français de Raymond Breton (1665): xlvii-lxvii*, Paris: CELIA-GEREC, Karthala-IRD.

Woolford Ellen, 2008, « Differential Subject Marking at Argument Structure, Syntax, and PF », In Helen de Hoop and Peter de Swart (eds.), *Differential Subject Marking*, pp 17-40.

The Development of Marked Nominative from Differential Object Marking in Okinawan

Thomas DOUGHERTY
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Okinawan is a severely endangered Japonic language spoken on the southern half of the Japanese island of Okinawa. Okinawan is a so-called marked nominative language, meaning that while it has an overt nominative case marker, it has no accusative case marker. An example of a typical transitive sentence is given in (1):

- (1) *Hanako=ga* *Taroo naraacha-n*.
Hanako=NOM.ANI Taroo teach\PFV-FIN
'Hanako taught Taroo.' [constructed]

In this presentation, I will argue that the Okinawan marked nominative system developed from an earlier differential object marking system, common to nearly all other Japonic languages. Using evidence from historical Okinawan materials, I will also discuss the possibility that the sporadic use of the accusative case marker in some of these materials is due to the contact influence of Middle and Early Modern Japanese.

Differential object marking is present in almost all of the recorded varieties of the Japonic language family, and can likely be reconstructed for Proto-Japonic. Differential object marking in Japonic is indicated by the presence or absence of an accusative case marker. In modern Japanese, for instance, the presence of the accusative case marker indicates high discourse salience of the grammatical object or as an aid to sentence processing (Fujii and Ono 2000), while its absence indicates that an NP is low in animacy or definiteness

(Minashima 2001). (2) and (3) are both potentially equivalent to the Okinawan sentence given in (1):

(2) *Hanako=ga Taroo=o oshie-ta.*

Hanako=NOM Taroo=ACC teach-PFV

‘Hanako taught Taroo.’ [constructed]

(3) *Hanako=ga Taroo=∅ oshie-ta.*

Hanako=NOM Taroo=∅ teach-PFV

‘Hanako taught Taroo.’ [constructed]

The situation in Okinawan is typologically unusual, violating several proposed universals, notably Greenberg’s universal 38:

Universal 38: Where there is a case system, the only case which ever has only zero allomorphs is the one which includes among its meanings that of the subject of the intransitive verb. (Greenberg 1966: 95)

Okinawan has two nominative case markers, split on animacy lines. =*ga* marks human referents, while =*nu* marks non-human referents. These two case markers include in their meanings the subject of an intransitive verb. However, in Okinawan, only the direct object of a transitive verb never has overt marking. Okinawan therefore violates Greenberg’s universal 38.

There is, however, diachronic evidence that an accusative case marker was occasionally used in Okinawan. In the *Omoro Sooshi* (compiled ca. 16th or 17th century CE), the largest early Okinawan textual source, there is occasionally an overt accusative case marker, as in (4):

(4) *Fasikari=ga omoro tama=yo soro-i-wa-tiwe Mototuki asub-as-u.*

Fasikari=NOM omoro gem=ACC gather-INF-HON\INF-SUB Mototuki perform-HON-FIN

‘Fasikari gathers the gems of the *omoro* and Mototuki performs them.’ (OS II: 50)

However, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the accusative case marker is omitted:

(5) *Goweku mori gusuku o-miya tudi=∅ mi-tiyar-u.*

Goweku grove shrine BEAU-shrine peak=ACC see\INF-PFV-FIN

‘At Goweku Grove Shrine, [I] saw the top shrine.’ (OS II: 73)

Further, all other Old Okinawan texts consistently omit the accusative case marker entirely. The *Haydong Ceykwukki*, a Korean phrasebook of Okinawan compiled circa 1497 CE, for instance, has no attestations of the accusative case marker.

(6) *sakiy wakat-i k-u*

sake share-INF come-FIN

‘Come and share *sake* [with us]’ (HC: 3)

Additionally, there is an important sociolinguistic distinction between the *Omoro Sooshi* and other early Okinawan texts: the *Omoro Sooshi* was a product of the Ryūkyū court, while the other, foreign sources (especially the *Haydong Ceykwukki*) were presumably based on colloquial Okinawan. Due to the influence of Middle and Early Modern Japanese on the Ryūkyū Kingdom, it is possible that these usages in the *Omoro Sooshi* are due to the effects of language contact, rather than the last vestiges of a more typical Japonic case marking system.

Primary sources :

HC *Haydong Ceykwukki* 「海東諸国紀」 ‘A Chronicle of the Various Countries of the Eastern Sea’. Compiled 1497 CE.

OS *Omoro Sooshi* 「おもろさうし」 ‘A Book of Omoro’. Compiled 16th-17th centuries CE.

References :

- Fujii, Noriko and Tsuyoshi Ono. 2000. The occurrence and non-occurrence of the Japanese direct object marker *o* in conversation. *Studies in Language* 24(1). 1-39.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Joseph Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Language*, 2nd edn., 73-113. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Minashima, Hiroshi. 2001. On the deletion of accusative case markers in Japanese. *Studia Linguistica* 55(2). 175-190.

