

**Journée d'études sur
le Marquage différentiel de l'objet
le jeudi, 19 juin 2014**

organisée avec le soutien de la Fédération *Typologie et Universaux Linguistiques* du CNRS,
dans le cadre du programme *Unité et diversité dans le marquage différentiel de l'objet*

<http://www.typologie.cnrs.fr/spip.php?rubrique101>

**dans les locaux de l'INALCO (salle 5.28)
65, Rue des Grands Moulins 75013 Paris**

Programme

8h30-9h00 : Accueil des participants et ouverture

9h00 – 10h00 : Evangelia ADAMOU (LACITO, CNRS), *Differential object marking in Balkan Slavic spoken in Greece: A unified approach of adpositional and case marking of human objects*

10h00 – 12h00 : Giorgio IEMMOLO (Université de Zurich), conférencier invité, *On the typology of differential object marking and differential object indexation: synchrony and diachrony*

12h00 – 14h00 : Déjeuner

14h00 – 15h00 : Hans-Jörg DÖHLA (SEDYL, CNRS), *When a companion becomes a recipient: differential object marking in Indo-Portuguese creoles, Papia Kristang, Bazaar Malay and Southern Chinese dialects*

15h00 – 16h00 : Hilary CHAPPELL (EHES – CRLAO, CNRS), *Differential object marking in Sinitic languages: some unusual sources for reanalysis*

16h00 – 16h30 : Pause café

16h30 – 17h30 : Pegah FAGHIRI & Pollet SAMVELIAN (Université Paris Sorbonne Nouvelle), *Differential object marking and the position of the direct object in Persian*

17h30 – 18h00 : discussion sur la suite du Programme MDO de la Fédération TUL et clôture

Résumés des communications

Evangelia Adamou, *Differential object marking in Balkan Slavic spoken in Greece: A unified approach of adpositional and case marking of human objects*

In Adamou (2009) a unified analysis of the innovative adpositional marking of human direct objects and the inherited genitive-accusative marking (Meillet 1897) was suggested for Balkan Slavic spoken in Greece. The DOM approach offers an elegant account of the innovative adpositional marking of some direct objects and renders unnecessary the wide-spread analysis of these Slavic data as induced from contact with Balkan Romance (see Koneski, Vidoeski & Jašar-Nasteva 1968; Cyxun 1981; Topolinjska 1995; Markovik 2007; Sobolev 2008).

Giorgio Iemmolo, *On the typology of differential object marking and differential object indexation: synchrony and diachrony*

In this talk I present the results of a typological investigation on Differential Object Marking and Differential Object Indexation, based on a sample of 175 languages. I first discuss the typological differences underlying the two phenomena, in terms of functions and triggering parameters. In the second part, I discuss some possible diachronic pathways of development of DOM and DOI, with particular regard to the -crosslinguistically rather infrequent- co-occurrence between the two phenomena. Finally, I introduce a distinction between asymmetric and symmetric object marking, and argue that there is a systematic relationship between the morphological realisation of object marking and the functions and triggering parameters.

Hans-Jörg Döhla, *When a companion becomes a recipient: differential object marking in Indo-Portuguese creoles, Papia Kristang, Bazaar Malay and Southern Chinese dialects*

When studying differential object marking in the Portuguese creoles of Asia the most salient aspect is to be found in the fact that in Papia Kristang, the Portuguese creole of Malacca, Malaysia, the object marker is *kun(g)* which also shares the function of comitative, instrumental, NP coordinator and dative marker. The unusual grammaticalization path comitative > (recipient) > patient in Papia Kristang will be explained as a case of intensive language contact between the Portuguese creoles of Malacca and Batavia and Bazaar Malay, ultimately leading to its supposed origin in Southern Chinese dialects, such as Hokkien. Therefore historical language documentation, mostly of missionary origin, will be analyzed.

Hilary Chappell, *Differential object marking in Sinitic languages: some unusual sources for reanalysis*

In Sinitic languages (Sino-Tibetan), differential object marking constructions are non-canonical constructions where the direct object is explicitly morphologically marked:

S – [Object marker – O] – Verb

Known as the *chūzhìshì* 处置式 in Chinese linguistics, or the ‘disposal construction’ in English, these DMO constructions appear to ‘prepose’ the direct object of a SVO clause, marking its new position by a preposition. Despite these synchronic facts, historically they have evolved from serial verb constructions (SVC) where the first verb grammaticalizes into a preposition with the function of introducing a typically referential direct object.

In Chappell (2006, 2007, 2013) and in Li & Chappell (2013a, 2013b), the crosslinguistic variation is examined and described in a large sample of Sinitic languages for the sources of these prepositional markers. While this includes the well-known source of verbs of holding and taking such as *bǎ* 把 and *ná* 拿, other less well-attested sources that will be explored in this diachronic study include verbs of giving and helping, comitative and allative prepositions, as well as causative verbs.

Pegah Faghiri & Pollet Samvelian, *Differential object marking and the position of the direct object in Persian*

In Persian, direct objects are marked based on their definiteness and/or specificity and one of the most prominent hypothesis on the position of the direct object is the DOM criterion (Karimi 2003). It is claimed that specific (i.e. marked) DOs can be separated from the verb, and precede the IO, while nonspecific (i.e. unmarked) DOs are adjacent to the verb. We have conducted both corpus-based and experimental studies which question the empirical validity of this claim. Our data show that while the behavior of marked DOs is in accordance with the DOM criterion, unmarked DOs do not conform to this criterion. Namely, indefinite unmarked DOs, i.e. unmarked DOs that carry an indefinite determination (whether the indefinite enclitic or an indefinite determiner) group with marked DOs, but show more variation. We claim that the position of the DO does not categorically depend on its markedness and it is more accurately reflected by a continuum on the basis of its degree of determination and/or accessibility: The more a DO is determined the more it is likely to be separated from the verb, given that DOM is the highest degree of determination for a NP in the DO position in Persian and bareness the lowest degree.