

It was found that heritage children were better at reading than writing, comprehension than production. They had both developmental and transfer (from CG) spelling errors in their dictations. There was found a correlation between speech rate, word-per-minute output in reading and spontaneous/elicited speech, and degree of grammatical knowledge, this is in line with Polinsky (2008, 2011).

The results of the DVIQ test showed for production bilingual children performed better for lexicon rather than for morpho-syntax; for comprehension bilingual children scored higher for morpho-syntax comprehension than for metalinguistic concepts.

The analysis of the RPTMC results revealed that for production the best performance was for verbal inflections, while the worst was for case; for perception bilingual children had a better production for nouns in comparison to verbs and grammatical constructions.

Overall, the results show that these bilingual children have better comprehension in both languages, Russian and Greek, than production. The gap between production and comprehension can be eliminated with more exposure to both languages and more output in both languages (Thordardottir, 2011; Hoff, 2006; Hoff et al., 2012; Pearson et al., 1997; Bedore et al., 2012).

Definiteness marking in Moksha⁴

Egor Kashkin

(V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of RAS)

This paper deals with the use of the definite declension in Moksha (< Mordvin < Finno-Ugric). Moksha has three declension types, traditionally labelled as definite (or “demonstrative”), indefinite (or “basic”), and possessive. The possessive type is outside our discussion (see its analysis in Pleshak 2015). According to the traditional view (Koljadenkov, Zavodova 1962: 83; Evsevjev 1963: 56; Tsygankin 1980: 210), the use of definite and indefinite declensions only depends on the definiteness of a NP. I will show that the choice of a declension type cannot be reduced to the factor of referential status and also depends on the syntactic function and on information structure, often involving the interaction of all these factors. My data comes from fieldwork in the villages of Lesnoje Tsibajvo and Lesnoje Ardashevo (Mordovia, Russia) in 2013-2016 and includes both elicited examples and those taken from spontaneous texts.

The factor of syntactic function is important for most referential statuses. In general, it makes definiteness marking less obligatory (or sometimes less grammatical), but the borderline on the hierarchy of syntactic relations (in terms of Keenan, Comrie 1977: 66; Kibrik 2003: 110) varies across referential types. Thus, a definite NP requires the definite declension if it is a subject, a direct object or an indirect object. In the oblique position, the indefinite declension is acceptable, but only for locative cases and not for dependents in a postpositional phrase (see (1)–(2), the definite inessive in (1) is analytical). Thus, Moksha develops here a further opposition within obliques, which can possibly be explained by the priority of morphological marking in the choice of a declension type (the morphological form of a noun is the same in postpositional phrases and in the subject or direct object which require marking of definite NPs).

(1) *vaz'-s'* *ašč-i-∅* *t'e* *karopka-t'* *esə* */karopka-sə*

⁴ This work has been supported by Russian Foundation for Basic Research, grant № 16-06-00536a.

- cap-def.sg be-npst.3-sg this box-def.sg.gen in box-in
 ‘The cap is in this box’.
- (2) *vaz’-s’* *ašč-i-∅ t’ε* *karopka-t’* /**karopka-n’* / **karopka* *lank-sə*
 cap-def.sg be-npst.3-sg this box-def.sg.gen box-gen box on-in
 ‘The cap is on this box’.

In generic NPs, the definite declension competes with the indefinite one in the higher ranks (being favoured in topical contexts), but is almost impossible in obliques (3). At the same time, for distributive universal NPs the borderline between marking strategies is higher on the syntactic hierarchy: subjects and direct objects require definiteness marking, while indirect objects (4) and obliques are compatible with both declensions. Interestingly, the syntactic factor is irrelevant for indefinite and non-specific NPs, probably because they are usually incompatible with the definite declension by themselves.

- (3) *vel’ə-n’* *lomat’-t’n’ə* *kel’k-sa-z’* *vir’-sə* /^{??} *vir’-t’* *esə*
 village-gen man-def.pl love-npst:3.o-3.s.pl.s/o forest-in forest-def.sg.gen in
gul’anda-ma-snə-n
 walk-nzr-3pl.poss-gen
 ‘Rural inhabitants like walking in forest [in general]’.
- (4) *mon’* *baba-z’ə* *er’* *loman’-t’i* / *loman’-ən’d’i* *pomaga-j-∅*
 I.gen grandmother-1sg.poss.sg any man-def.sg.dat man-dat help-npst.3-sg
 ‘My grandmother helps any person’.

The factor of information structure (in the framework of Lambrecht 1994) is especially prominent in predicate (kind-referring) NPs. If the head of a predicate NP is focal, it cannot take the definite declension, but definiteness marking becomes possible on a topical head:

- (5) – *ko-sə* *rabəta-j-∅* *maša?* – *son* *učit’el’n’ica* / **učit’el’n’ica-s’*
 where-in work-npst.3-sg Masha (s)he teacher teacher-def.sg
 ‘– Where does Masha work? – She is a teacher’.
- (6) –*kodamə* *maša* *azərava-s’* / ^{OK}*azərava?*
 what Masha housewife-def.sg housewife
 – *maša* *c’eber’* *azərava-s’* ^{OK}*azərava*
 Masha good housewife-def.sg housewife
 ‘What kind of housewife is Masha? –Masha is a good housewife’.

To sum up, the obligatoriness of the definite declension falls along the hierarchy of syntactic relations (the borderline for different referential statuses being on indirect object, on oblique, or within obliques). At the same time, definiteness marking is often favoured by the topical status. In my talk I will provide the overall scheme of how all these factors interact, as well as the comparison with my field data from some other Finno-Ugric languages (primarily Erzya and Komi) showing some similar patterns. In a broader typological research the interaction of definiteness with other grammatical phenomena (e. g. differential case marking, number marking, argument structure, information structure) was discussed with various degree of detail for various cases (Lyons 1999: 199–226; Danon 2001; Schroeder 2006; de Swart, Zwarts 2008, etc.). However, the interdependence of referential, syntactical, and topical properties in one particular language still has not been claimed as a trivial case.

Abbreviations

3 – 3rd person; DAT – dative; DEF – definiteness; GEN – genitive; IN – inessive; NPST – non-past tense; NZR – nominalization; O – object; PL – plural; POSS – possessiveness; S – subject; SG – singular;

References

- Danon, Gabi. 2001. Syntactic definiteness in the grammar of Modern Hebrew. *Linguistics* 6, 1071–1116.
- de Swart, Henriëtte, Zwarts, Joost. 2008. Article use across languages: an OT typology. A. Grønn (ed.) *Proceedings of SuB12*. Oslo: ILOS, 628–644.
- Evsevjev, Makar. 1963. *Osnovy mordovskoj grammatiki (Izbrannyje trudy. Tom IV)* [Essentials of Mordvin grammar (Selected papers. Vol. IV)]. Saransk: Mordovskoje Knizhnoje Izdatel'stvo.
- Keenan, Edward, Comrie, Bernard. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and Universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 63–99.
- Kibrik, Alexandr. 2003. *Konstanty i peremennyye jazyka* [Constants and variables of language]. Saint-Petersburg: Aletheia.
- Koljadencov, Mikhail, Zavodova, Raisa. 1962. *Grammatika mordovskix (mokshanskogo i erzjanskogo) jazykov. Ch. I. Fonetika i morfologija* [Grammar of the Mordvin languages (Moksha and Erzya). P. I. Phonetics and morphology]. Saransk: Mordovskoje Knizhnoje Izdatel'stvo.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pleshak, Polina. 2015. Semantics and morphosyntax of Moksha possessive constructions. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 111, 379–393.
- Schroeder, Christoph. 2006. Articles and article systems in some areas of Europe. G. Bernini, M. Schwartz (eds.). *Pragmatic organization of discourse in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tsygankin, Dmitrij. 1980. *Grammatika mordovskix jazykov. Fonetika, grafika, orfografija, morfologija* [Grammar of the Mordvin languages. P. I. Phonetics, graphics, orthography, morphology]. Saransk: Izdatel'stvo Mordovskogo Universiteta.

Relative clauses as a result of cooption: The case of Mano correlatives

Maria Khachatryan
(University of Helsinki, UC Berkeley)

In this talk, I will explore relative clauses of the correlative type in Mano, a South Mande language, and in a cross-linguistic perspective. The data used for the paper is natural speech data collected by the author.

Correlative strategy is a subtype of non-reduction relativization strategy where “the head noun appears as a full-fledged noun phrase in the relative clause and is taken up again at least by a pronoun