

# Programme

8h30 - 9h00 : Accueil des participants, café (salle 4.23)

9h00 - 10h00

Pegah FAGHIRI & Pollet SAMUELIAN (Université Paris Sorbonne Nouvelle)

*Differential object marking and the position of the direct object in Persian*

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, Papiá Kristang, Bazaar Malay and Southern Chinese dialects*

15h00 - 16h00

Hilary CHAPPELL (EHESS - CRLAO, CNRS)

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

16h00 - 16h30 : Pause-café (salle 4.23)

16h30 - 17h30

Bruno HERIN (INaLCO de Paris)

*Le marquage différentiel de l'objet en domari*

17h30 - 18h00 : Discussion finale et clôture

## Résumés des communications

### *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.

### *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 *chǔzhìshì* 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.

### Bruno Herin, *Le marquage différentiel de l'objet en domari*

Le domari, langue indo-aryenne centrale parlée au Moyen-Orient par les Doms, fait partie d'un ensemble de langues diasporiques de nomades commerciaux originaires d'Inde : le romani, le lomavren, le parya et le domaaki. Le lomavren ne subsistant semble-t-il que sous forme d'un lexique secret, seuls le romani et le domari sont parlés en dehors de l'aire indienne. Alors que le romani est bien documenté et décrit, le domari n'était connu jusqu'à date récente que dans sa variété hiérosolymitaine. Dans cette variété méridionale du domari, l'objet est marqué comme oblique lorsque celui-ci est défini. Le marquage différentiel de l'objet est bien attesté dans plusieurs langues de la région (turc, persan et aussi arabe levantin du nord). Des données supplémentaires sur des variétés septentrionales du Domari parlées en Syrie et au Liban ont permis de confirmer que le facteur déclencheur du DOM en domari, en dépit d'importantes différences formelles, est le même dans les deux aires dialectales. Ce qui était en revanche inconnu, c'est l'existence d'un marquage différentiel du sujet dans certaines variétés du nord. Après avoir caractérisé rapidement le DOM dans les différents dialectes domari, nous explorerons d'abord le conditionnement du marquage différentiel du sujet dans les variétés du nord, pour ensuite s'intéresser à la diachronie du phénomène dans le contexte indo-aryen.