

GRAMMAIRE DE L'INFORMATION ET TYPOLOGIE INFORMATION GRAMMAR AND TYPOLOGY

Résumés – Abstracts

Jirasak ACHARIYAYOS : Les particules énonciatives dans la structuration informationnelle du thaï

Cette présentation porte sur l'étude des particules énonciatives en thaï ; leur distribution, leurs fonctions et leurs variantes. Nous montrerons qu'ils peuvent également marquer le détachement initial et final au point de la structuration informationnelle.

À partir de quelques exemples oraux et/ou écrits, nous examinons d'abord les particules énonciatives en fin de l'énoncé qui expriment l'attitude, le sentiment du locuteur. Ensuite, nous montrons que certaines particules en particulier *NA*, dont le ton peut varier, peut jouer un rôle de marqueur de la structure informationnelle. La variation de ton en effet peut modifier la signification des constituants détachés à l'initiale ou en finale.

Discourse particles in the Information Structuring of Thai

This presentation focuses on the study of discourse particles in Thai, their distribution, their functions and their variants. We show that they can also mark the initial and final detachments from the Information Structuring point of view.

By means of some examples from oral or written Thai, we first review the discourse particles at the end of an utterance, which express the speaker's attitude, mood and feeling. Next, we show that some particles, especially *NA* particle on which the tone can vary, may play a role as an information structure marker. The tone variation may namely change the meaning of the detached constituents in initial or final position.

Injoo CHOI-JONIN & Véronique LAGAE : Corrélatif et pseudo-clivée : le cas des constructions en *de Adjectif*

La présente étude a pour objectif de mettre en évidence les points communs et les différences entre deux constructions syntaxiques constituées d'une protase comportant un élément cataphorique suivi de *de Adj* et d'une apodose représentée par *que P*. Il s'agit d'une structure que nous appellerons corrélatif (ex. 1) et d'une pseudo-clivée (ex. 2) :

- (1) Mais les belles œuvres ont **ceci de particulier** qu'elles ont entre elles un air de famille.
- (2) **Ce qu'il a de particulier** cette fois, **c'est que** le père n'est pas en scène.

Les deux structures comportent dans la protase un élément cataphorique, le démonstratif *ceci* dans la corrélatif, et le pronom relatif périphrastique *ce que* dans la pseudo-clivée. Il s'agit donc de deux constructions syntaxiques qui consistent à scinder une proposition en deux parties, dont la seconde spécifie l'élément cataphorique de la première, propriété qui a été notée par Higgins (1973 : 17) comme caractéristique de la pseudo-clivée.

On pourrait alors plaider pour l'hypothèse que les deux constructions partagent la même structure relationnelle dans laquelle l'objet du verbe *avoir* des exemples ci-dessus est représenté d'abord par un pronom cataphorique, puis par une proposition. Cela dit, elles se

distinguent d'une part par l'élément cataphorique présent dans la protase, et d'autre part par la relation syntaxique qu'entretient l'adjectif avec celui-ci : dans la corrélatrice (1), le démonstratif a une valeur définie et entretient avec l'adjectif une relation prédicative, alors que dans la pseudo-clivée (2), le relatif a une valeur indéfinie et l'adjectif fonctionne comme épithète. Cette différence a pour conséquence différentes contraintes syntaxiques, sémantiques et discursives pour les deux structures en question.

Notre étude est basée sur un corpus de 216 exemples, datés à partir de 1900, extraits majoritairement de Frantext mais aussi relevés sur Internet, notamment sur Google livres.

Danh Thành DO-HURINVILLE : A pragmatic and syntactic study of the Vietnamese polyfunctional marker *thì*

The word *thì*, derived from a noun meaning « time », has been grammaticalized to become a conjunction linking, from a syntactic point of view, two constituents A and B following the pattern *A thì B*, or a topicalizer, which the speaker uses to act on the addressee from a pragmatic point of view. The constituents A and B can be clauses or phrases. The scope and the nature of the constituent A (clause or phrase) are correlated to a semantic decline of *thì* and to the emergence of new grammatical meanings.

At the clause level, *thì* combines with the subordinators *khi* (*when*), *nếu* (*if*) to form the structures *Khi A, thì B* (*When A, then B*), and *Nếu A, thì B* (*If A, then B*). In the first structure, *thì* participates in the expression of an anaphoric temporal value and an inchoative aspectual value. In the second structure, *thì* participates in the expression of a consequence value. From a pragmatic point of view, subordinate clauses (protases) are topics, and main clauses (apodoses) are comments.

At the phrase level, *thì* is used to topicalize the constituent A, which can be a noun phrase, a pronoun phrase, a verb phrase, or a prepositional phrase, and to take part into the reduplication of the constituent A to express, according to contexts, a contrastive effect or a concessive effect. In this operation of reduplication, the scope of B is bigger than A, because it is normal that the comment (B) be more informative than the topic (A).

Le vietnamien à travers le prisme de la structure thème – rhème

Le mot *thì*, d'origine nominale signifiant « temps », a été grammaticalisé pour devenir un relateur - qui, sur le plan syntaxique, met en relation deux constituants A et B selon le modèle *A thì B* - ou un topicaliseur, dont se sert le locuteur pour agir sur l'allocutaire du point de vue pragmatique. Les constituants A et B peuvent être des propositions ou des syntagmes. La taille et la nature du constituant A (proposition ou syntagme) sont corrélées avec un affaiblissement sémantique de *thì* et avec l'apparition de nouveaux sens grammaticaux.

Au niveau propositionnel, *thì* se combine avec les subordonnants *khi* (*quand*), *nếu* (*si*) pour former les structures *Khi A, thì B* (*Quand A, alors B*), et *Nếu A, thì B* (*Si A, alors B*). Dans la première structure, *thì* participe à l'expression d'une valeur temporelle anaphorique et d'une valeur aspectuelle inchoative. Dans la seconde structure, *thì* participe à l'expression d'une valeur de conséquence. Du point de vue pragmatique, les propositions subordonnées (protases) sont des topiques, les propositions principales (apodoses) sont des commentaires.

Au niveau du syntagme, *thì* sert à topicaliser le constituant A, qui peut être un syntagme nominal, un syntagme pronominal, un syntagme verbal, ou un syntagme prépositionnel, et à participer à la reduplication du constituant A pour exprimer, selon les contextes, un effet contrastif ou un effet concessif. Dans cette opération de redoublement, la taille de B est

supérieure à celle de A, car il est normal que le commentaire (B) soit plus informatif que le topique (A).

M.M.Jocelyne FERNANDEZ-VEST et Marie-Ange JULIA : *Detachments, language and discourse typologies : evidence from Finno-Ugric and Ancient Indo-European languages – Finnish, Latin, (Sami, Greek). Détachements, typologies linguistique et discursive : exemples de langues finno-ougriennes, et indo-européennes anciennes – finnois, latin, (same, grec)*

Within the frame of a theory of Information Structuring originally elaborated for an orally transmitted FU language, Northern Sami (Fernandez-Vest 1987, 2009), we shall here study two distinct operations, Initial Detachment (ID) and Final Detachment (FD) – formerly « left / right dislocations » (see Lambrecht 1994, 2001) – used in the binary strategy 1 (Theme-Rheme) and the binary strategy 2 (Rheme-Mneme) in another FU language, Finnish, from the point of view of internal (oral-written) contrastivity. For the sake of external contrastivity, the comparison will be extended to two Ancient IE languages, Latin and Greek.

Taking into account the morphosyntactic similarities between the two groups of languages – eg. their word order traditionally considered as « free » due to their rich case system – we shall show the impact of the textual type and strategy on the frequency of detachments, and we shall argue that this « secondary » typology should be included in the future analyses of detachment constructions.

Dans les langues anciennes flexionnelles, les occurrences de détachements initiaux prennent la forme de syntagmes nominaux, placés en début d'énoncé, qui ne sont pas sous la dépendance de la rection verbale (ou faiblement intégrés syntaxiquement), et peuvent ne pas être repris par un pronom anaphorique. Ex : *Flumen Axonam, quod est in extremis Remorum finibus, exercitum traducere maturavit* « le fleuve de l'Aisne, qui est aux frontières les plus lointaines des Rèmes, il se hâta de (le) faire passer à l'armée » (César, Guerre des Gaules, 2,5), où deux accusatifs (cas du COD) précèdent le verbe *traducere* (pour lequel le mouvement est d'ordinaire dénoté à l'aide de la préposition *trans*). De même, en grec, dans l'Economie de Xénophon, certains énoncés ont une intégration syntaxique faible, ex. Πάνυ γάρ μοι δοκεῖ, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκратες, ἀθυμία ἐγγίγνεσθαι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ὅταν ὁρώσι τὰ μὲν ἔργα δι' αὐτῶν καταπραπτόμενα « C'est bien, en effet, ce qu'il me semble, dit-il, ô Socrate, (qu') une forme de découragement gagne les bons esclaves quand ils voient que tout l'ouvrage est exécuté par leurs mains... », où le lien entre la proposition infinitive et la proposition principale n'est pas explicitement marqué. Nous nous attacherons à montrer que de tels énoncés témoignent, non d'écarts ponctuels vis-à-vis de la norme syntaxique, mais de phénomènes spécifiques de détachements initiaux, analysables en termes de structuration informationnelle.

Ref.: FERNANDEZ-VEST M.M.Jocelyne, 1987, *La Finlande trilingue, 1 - Le discours des Sames - Oralité, contrastes, énonciation*, Préface de Claude Hagège, Paris, Didier Erudition, 990 p. • 2009, "Typological evolution of Northern Sami : spatial cognition and Information Structuring", in *The Quasiquicentennial of the Finno-Ugric Society*, Jussi Ylikoski (ed.), Helsinki, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne – Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seuran Toimituksia, 258, 33-55. LAMBRECHT Knud, 1994, *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referent*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge studies in linguistics 71. • 2001, "Dislocation", in Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals. Sprachtypologie und Sprachliche Universalien. Typologie des langues et universaux linguistiques. An international handbook. Volume 2*, Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 20.2, 1050–1078.

Diana Forker : Reference tracking and information structure in Hinuq

Hinuq is the smallest of the five Tsezic languages (Nakh-Daghestanian language family, Caucasus, Russia). It has a gender system with five genders and is ergative case-marking.

In the first part of my talk I will highlight the main features of information structuring¹ in Hinuq: word order and clitics. The most frequent word order is SOV, but many other constituent orders are also attested. According to some scholars (c.f. Testelec 1998, Haspelmath 1993, Polinsky and Potsdam 2001), word order in Daghestanian languages encodes primarily information structure. These claims regarding the connection between word order and topic/focus will be looked at in more detail and I will that not all of them seem to be true for Hinuq. For instance, contrary to Testelec' (1998) claim, the preverbal position does not seem to be the preferred focus position in Hinuq. Focused subjects occupy sentence initial position, adjuncts vary in their position and adverbials/adjectives with contrastive focus tend to appear clause finally.

The second part of my talk will be devoted to the reference tracking system, i.e. how speaker and hearers keep track of which pronoun or zero refers to which full NP. What is special about the Hinuq reference tracking system are the gender prefixes which are used to mark agreement between nouns in the Absolutive case and verbs. Only verbs that begin with a vowel can have a gender prefix (e.g. compare *toλ-* 'give' in (1) with *-iλi-* 'go'). In the absence of overt arguments gender prefixes may help to identify the absolutive argument (S or P) of the verb. I will explore the possible influence of the gender prefixes on the referential system in comparison with the other coding devices. If there is such an influence one may expect that clauses with gender prefixed verbs contain fewer other reference-tracking devices (e.g. NPs or pronouns) than clauses where the verb does not have a gender prefix. In addition, the *referential distance* (Givón 1983) of gender prefixes will be compared with the referential distance of other reference-tracking devices. Gender prefixes encode almost as much information as third-person pronouns (gender, number, case) so they may be expected to have a referential distance value similar to that of pronouns.

Referential distance assesses the number of clauses boundaries between the previous occurrence in discourse of a referent and its current occurrence in a clause. For instance, the NP *xexbe* ('children') in clause (iv) has the referential index 3 in this clause because the last reference to the children is made in clause (i), whereas the NP *hago uži* ('that boy') in the clause gets the referential index 1 in this clause because it has been mentioned in the immediately preceding clause.

Example

(1) [Hagze xexza-y toλ-iš hayto-qo-r hag]_i.
those.OBL children-ERG give-WPST he.OBL-AT-LAT that

[Hago uži Ø-iλi-š]_i [k'onk'a-n b-iž-in]_{iii}.
that boy(I) I-go-WPST bike(III)-and III-take-CVB

[Hezzo xexbe b-aq'e-s hayto rek'u-de]_{iv}.
then children HPL-come-WPST that.OBL man.OBL-ALOC

'(i) The children gave it to him. (ii) That boy went, (iii) taking the bike. (iv) Then the children came to that man.'

¹ The notions of INFORMATION STRUCTURE, TOPIC and FOCUS underlying the talk are essentially those of Lambrecht (1994).

References : Givón, Talmy. (1983) *Topic continuity in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Haspelmath, Martin. (1993) *A Grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. • Lambrecht, Knud. (1994) *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Polinsky, Maria and Eric Potsdam. (2001) 'Long-distance agreement and topic in Tsez', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 583–646. • Polinsky, Maria and Bernard Comrie. (2002) 'Right periphery in Tsezic languages'. In: XI Kollokvium Evropejskogo Obshchestva Kavkazovedov, Moskva. • Testelec, Yakov G. (1998) 'Word order in Daghestanian languages'. In: Anna Siewierska (ed.) *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Karl Erland Gadelii : Topicalization and the V2 parameter in Nordic languages

In their research on comparative Scandinavian syntax, Holmberg & Platzack (2005) propose that Icelandic differs from Mainland Scandinavian (Danish, Norwegian, Swedish) when it comes to the finiteness feature, which they claim is hosted by the verb in the former but by the subject in the latter languages. Holmberg & Platzack suggest that once the verb occupies the C position (*typplats* in the terminology of Diderichsen, cf. the V2 position), the specifier of CP (Spec-CP, the *fundament* (« foundation ») in Diderichsen's model) can be filled by practically any type of constituent (including zero). In Mainland Scandinavian, it would seem that Spec-CP must obligatorily be filled by a phrase which must furthermore be of a nominal nature, and C can be empty (for example in certain types of embedded clauses).

Holmberg & Platzack's hypothesis could be interpreted as follows : the V2 feature is « stronger » in Icelandic than in Mainland Scandinavian because in the former language the C position HAS TO be filled, and once this requirement is met, the contents of Spec-CP do not matter. However, certain facts militate against such a conclusion, for example the following :

- certain inhabitants of Spec-CP in Mainland Scandinavian are NOT grammatical in Icelandic, for example topicalized VPs (cf. also Platzack 2004).
- Mainland Scandinavian seems to be more tolerant than Icelandic towards « unbounded wh-movement » (movement from the embedded clause into the upstairs one)

This talk tries to resolve these paradoxes by analyzing in more detail the relation between the two positions involved, Spec-CP and C (*fundament* vs. *typplats*) in the different Nordic languages.

Topicalisation et le paramètre V2 dans les langues nordiques

Dans leurs recherches sur la syntaxe scandinave comparative, Holmberg & Platzack (2005) proposent que l'islandais se distingue des langues scandinaves continentales (danois, norvégien, suédois) de par le trait de « finitude », qui, selon eux, réside dans le verbe dans cette première langue, mais dans le sujet dans les dernières. Holmberg & Platzack préconisent qu'une fois le verbe en islandais dans la position C (*typplats* chez Diderichsen (= la position V2)), le spécificateur de C (Spéc-CP ; le *fundament* chez Diderichsen) peut être rempli par presque n'importe quel type de constituant (y compris rien). Dans les langues scandinaves continentales, un constituant dans Spéc-CP serait par contre obligatoire, il devrait posséder un trait nominal, et C peut être vide (dans certains types de propositions subordonnées).

On pourrait interpréter l'hypothèse de Holmberg & Platzack de la manière suivante : le trait V2 est « plus fort » en islandais qu'en langues scandinaves continentales, car la position C

doit obligatoirement être remplie, et quand elle l'est, peu importe le contenu du Spéc-CP. Or certains faits contredisent une telle conclusion, par exemples les suivants :

- certains habitants que l'on trouve dans Spéc-CP en langues scandinaves continentales ne sont pas possibles en islandais, tels le groupe verbal topicalisé (cf. aussi Platzack 2004)
- les langues scandinaves continentales semblent être plus tolérantes que l'islandais vis-à-vis le déplacement des syntagmes « à distance », c'est-à-dire d'une proposition subordonnée vers la proposition principale.

L'exposé essaie de résoudre ces paradoxes en analysant plus en détail la relation entre les deux positions Spéc-CP et C (= fondement et *typplats*) dans les différentes langues nordiques.

Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Ritva Laury : Functional motivations for the use of relative clauses in Finnish conversation

This paper concerns the use of relative clauses in everyday Finnish conversation. Although there have been several recent studies of clause combining in Finnish linguistics (e.g. Karlsson 2007a, b, Laury 2006a, b, Seppänen & Laury 2007), none have focused specifically on relative clauses since Helasvuo (1993), which proposed that the restrictive/non-restrictive distinction is not relevant to Finnish relative clauses and questioned the status of relative clauses as subordinate clauses in Finnish. Studies of relative clauses in other languages have shown that the form of a relative clause is closely linked with its function (Fox & Thompson 1990a, Tao & McCarthy 2001) and with the information flow properties of the referents involved (Fox & Thompson 1990b, Ariel 1999), and that clause combinations involving relative clauses range from highly formulaic, prestored constructions to complex combinations constructed on the fly (Fox & Thompson 2007). Many recent studies of clause combining in a variety of languages question the applicability of the notion of subordination to the description of clause combining in spoken language, and have noted that many types of clause combinations involve highly formulaic 'main' clause patterns combined with more variable 'subordinate' clauses (e.g. Günthner 1999, 2007, Thompson 2002, Kärkkäinen 2004, Keevallik 2003, 2006, to appear, Pekarek Doehler 2007, Laury & Seppänen 2008, Hopper and Thompson 2008).

Spoken Finnish has three relativizers, *joka*, *mikä*, and *ku(n)/kuka*. All but *ku(n)* show case; *ku(n)* is invariant. Only *joka* is marked for number in all its forms, *mikä* is marked for number only for grammatical, but not oblique cases, and *ku(n)* never shows number marking. *Joka* only functions as a relativizer, while *mikä* and *kuka* are also used as interrogatives and *ku(n)* is an adverbial conjunction. In our paper, we will show that in ordinary conversation, the different relativizers have quite distinct discourse profiles. Specifically, we will show that *joka*-relative clauses tend to have human head nouns, while the heads of *mikä*-relatives hardly ever refer to humans. The head type has a profound influence on the grammar of the relative clauses and their main clauses in our data. As for *kun*, the majority of heads refer to concrete objects. However, in contrast to both *joka* and *mikä*, the referents of the heads of *kun* tend not to be specific; rather, they represented a class or a kind. *Kun* thus appears to serve in the negotiation of class membership rather than e.g. in specifying reference. Presentational clauses predominate among the main clauses, especially so for *joka*- and *kun*-clauses, while *mikä*-clauses are more likely to have ordinary transitive or intransitive main clauses.

In our paper, based on a database of relative clauses in over 8 hrs of conversation, we will discuss the functions of the different relativizers: we will consider the nature of main clauses of the relativizers and the information flow characteristics of the main clause and the relative

clause, the syntactic function of the head in the main clause, the semantic class of the head and the syntactic function of the relativizer in the relative clause.

Elena Kalinina : *Sentence focus in Russian: syntactic, intonational and referential properties* – Le focus de phrase en russe: propriétés syntaxique, intonationnelles et référentielles des jugements thétiques

Sentence focus structures (orthetic judgments) are quite fascinating from cross-linguistic viewpoint. In many languages, there is no separate strategy for marking sentence focus: it is marked as a subtype of VP focus or narrow focus (Caucasian languages). In others, on the contrary, there is a dedicated strategy for expressing sentence focus. It can be found in some languages of Europe as well as in Russian.

In my paper I will examine syntactic, prosodic and referential properties of sentence focus constructions in Russian demonstrating that in Russianthetic judgments are contrasted with VP focus and narrow focus. First, I will show that in the Russian sentence focus constructions there are more restrictions on the combinations of word order and prosody than in VP-focus and narrow focus sentences. Next, I will present some further research on the syntactic hierarchy of accent placement in sentence focus constructions suggested in (Yanko 2001) and (Testeleets 2001). Finally, I will discuss referential properties of NPs in sentence-focus: the data suggests that specific NPs can hardly surface as objects of sentence focus structures as sentences with specific objects do not allow to be pronounced with sentence focus accent.

Pablo Kirtchuk : *Topic-first utterances in Hebrew and beyond: dynamical considerations*

The dynamics of language involves not only diachrony, but also, among others, ontogeny phylogeny, creolistics and register variation; and not only grammar but also pragmatics. I will show that not only do topic-first utterances exist in Hebrew in all of its diachronic layers, ontogenetic stages and synchronic registers, but that they are all the more present inasmuch as the emotive, communicative, oral and context-dependent factors gain in importance at the expense of rational, conceptual, written and context-free parameters. Moreover I will show on both internal and external evidence, taking in account pragmatic, intonative, morphosyntactic, typological and psychological factors, that the topic-first utterances do not result from the dislocation of grammatical sentences previously constructed. Indeed I reject terms such as *dislocation*, *left* and *right* inasmuch as they imply the precedence of syntax over pragmatics and of the graphic representation of language over its real nature, which is multidimensional and cognitive. Rather than being fixed in graphic space it *happens* in time. Language is not dynamic only as a phenomenon, even its actual manifestations *work* dynamically and each one of them reflects the properties of language as a whole. In this sense, language may be considered as a fractal phenomenon. Even the terms ‘*grammar* or *structure* of information’ are misleading inasmuch as they imply a structure, a construction, while the *raison d’être* of the topic-first utterances is reflecting a natural iconic pragmatic order independent of the constraints imposed by the structure of the language in which those utterances are produced. Topic-first utterances are spontaneous and as such require a minimal encoding and decoding effort on the side of speaker and hearer, while grammatically well-formed sentences must conform to rules, especially of word-order and agreement. It will be shown that there is indeed an affinity among all the dynamic parameters which is too consistent to be imputed to

coincidence. Quite the opposite: as they are founded on pragmatic and communicative factors, topic-first utterances precede their syntactically well-formed, *i.e.* grammatical vis-à-vis. It is not with structure that we're dealing but with its absence; not with the order characteristic of grammar but with the entropy characteristic of pragmatics; in other words with pre-grammatical utterances, in which iconic, archaic and strongly biologically motivated mechanisms such as into-prosody and position - not symbolic, recent and relatively non-motivated mechanisms such as morphological marking and syntactic order - play a central part. *Mutatis mutandis*, all this applies to focalization as well. My views, which ultimately connect to the biological nature of language and its speakers, are opposed to those of the majority of authors who treated this topic both in general (Lambrecht *passim*, Blanche-Benveniste *passim*, etc.) and in Hebrew linguistics (Blau 1958, Ornan 1969, Tzadka 1980, Azar 1983, Bar 2003). In general linguistics, a view close to mine is found in Séchehaye (1926) and Givón (1979), more specifically Ochs (1979). In Hebrew and Semitic linguistics it is found in Bravmann (1944, 1953), according to whom the topic-first utterances parallel interrogative ones, so that the topic is equivalent to a question and the focus to the answer.

My contention is part and parcel of the puzzle of language hence of Man. I have called it *LUIT: Language – a Unified and Integrative Theory* (Kirtchuk 2007 and to appear), according to which in the dichotomies ***deixis*** - *conceptualization*, ***parole*** vs. *langue*, ***discourse*** vs. *grammar*, ***non-segmental phonemes*** vs. *segmental phonemes*, ***diachrony*** vs. *synchrony*, ***iconic*** vs. *symbolic mechanisms*, ***pragmatics*** vs. *morphosyntax*, ***communication*** vs. *categorisation*, it is the first element that primes, precedes and is more central than the second, at the opposite of the claims of classic linguistic from de Saussure to this day.

Franck NEVEU: La linguistique du détachement en français – *The linguistics of detachments in French*

On illustrera le vaste domaine de la linguistique du détachement en français par un examen des frontières fonctionnelles et des niveaux syntaxiques des segments dits *détachés* en position frontale. On mettra principalement l'accent sur les problèmes liés à la connexité entre le segment *détaché* et son ou ses supports syntaxiques et informationnels. Cela nous amènera à proposer une perspective typologique, qui rendra compte des hypothèses de description qui ont été formulées dans plusieurs de nos travaux. On examinera successivement, de manière synthétique : le segment détaché comme zone de l'énoncé disjointe de la structure argumentale, et le rôle du point d'ancrage dans le fonctionnement de ce segment ; les segments détachés procédant par redoublement actanciel (segments vocatifs et disloqués instanciés), par caractérisation actancielle (segments apposés), et par expansion de relation prédicative (segments vocatifs et extraposés non instanciés, autres constructions, associées au système appositif). Les observables seront principalement empruntés à la réalisation écrite de la langue. Cela permettra de souligner le fait que la localisation d'un segment détaché est réglée par deux ordres de paramètres, celui de la *place*, évaluée relativement au microcontexte, c'est-à-dire à l'environnement immédiat, et celui de la *position informationnelle*, évaluée relativement à l'environnement textuel, la connexité constituant un aspect du fonctionnement de cette position informationnelle. Nous verrons notamment que pour ce qui est des caractérisants détachés (de type appositif), le placement du segment dans la séquence constitue un indice iconique du domaine d'interprétation de son référenciateur.

Marie-Claude Paris : Word order and information structuring in Mandarin Chinese

Chinese has been characterized as displaying interesting isomorphic properties.

According to some functionalists, there exist isomorphic relations 1) between word order and word order and 2) between word order and the order in which information is displayed in a sentence (Tai (1989) and Tsao (1990)). According to some formalists, there exists an isomorphism between SS and LF structure as regards the surface order and the scope properties of quantifiers (Ernst (1994)).

In this talk, I would like to show that although the articulation between informational structure and syntactic structure is not isomorphic in Chinese, it is nonetheless regular.

Ordre des mots et structuration de l'information en chinois mandarin

La relation entre structure informationnelle et structure syntaxique en chinois a été décrite, tant par les fonctionnalistes que par les formalistes, comme une relation isomorphique. Pour les premiers, il y aurait une relation directe soit entre l'ordre des mots et l'ordre des événements du monde (Tai (1989)), soit entre l'ordre des mots et l'ordre de présentation de l'information (Tsao (1990)). Pour les seconds, il y aurait un isomorphisme entre la structure syntaxique de surface et la forme logique (Ernst (1994)).

On cherchera à montrer que, bien que l'articulation entre structure informationnelle et structure syntaxique est beaucoup plus complexe en chinois, elle reste cependant régulière.

References : ERNST, Thomas (1994). Conditions on Chinese A-not-A questions. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3.3. 241-264. • PARIS, Marie-Claude (1999) Ordre des mots, topique et focus en chinois contemporain. In C. Guimier (ed), *La thématization dans les langues*. Actes du Colloque de Caen, 9-11 Octobre 1997. *Sciences pour la communication* 53. 201-216. Berne : P. Lang. • TAI James H.-Y. 1989. Toward a Cognition-Based Functional Grammar of Chinese. In J. Tai & F. Hsueh (eds.), *Functionalism and Chinese Grammar*, 18 - 226. J.C.T.L.A. Monograph Series N°1. New Jersey : Seton Hall University. • TSAO, Feng-Fu. 1990. Sentence and clause structure in Chinese: a functional perspective. Taipei : Student Book Co.

Heete Sahkai: Sentence accent and the use of demonstratives in spoken Estonian

It has been hypothesized that in spoken Estonian, the demonstrative adjective *see* 'this/that' (identical to the demonstrative pronoun) and attributively used locative demonstratives *siin* 'here' and *seal* 'there' are developing into grammatical definiteness markers, i.e. definite determiners (Pajusalu 1997, 2001). This hypothesis is suggested by uses like those illustrated in (1) and (2) ¹ where these demonstratives are semantically weakened, stress-less, and often phonetically reduced:

- (1) *ei* *no* *ma* *ütlen* *et* (.) *et* *kui* ***see*** *vald*
 NEG PRTCL I say-1SGthat that if see-NOM commune-NOM
- ikka* *maksaks* *nüüd* *ikka* *sulle* ***selle*** *kooli* *lõpuni*
 PRTCL pay-COND now PRTCL you-ALLsee-GEN school-GEN end-TERM
- 'No really I say that if the commune would only pay you until the end of the school...'

- (2) *no ma helistan sinna mobiili peale*
 well I call-1SG to.there mobile.phone-GEN on
 'I'll call on the mobile phone then.'

However, not all of these uses seem to correlate with definiteness: they can occur with newly introduced referents that may even be explicitly marked as indefinite (as in ex. 3), as well as with predicative complements and subjects of existential sentences, which are not the most usual contexts for definiteness markers.

- (3) *meie koolist võeti siis nagu kaks tükki*
 our school-ELAT take-IMPERS-PST then like two piece-PART
onju see kaheteistkümnendast see üks Aivar onju ja siis nagu mina onju.
 right see twelfth-ELAT see one Aivar right and then like me right
 'From our school they took two people, from the twelfth class one (boy called) Aivar and then me.'

Thus the hypothesis that *see*, *siin*, *seal* are developing into definiteness markers does not account exhaustively for their “non-demonstrative” uses. From a study on the use of demonstratives in spoken Estonian (Sahkai 2002), another correlation seemed to emerge: *see*, *siin*, *seal* seemed to occur often in focal phrases and in stressed phrases in general. Moreover, a similar phenomenon can be observed in focal phrases of other categories than NP: adjectival phrases may be preceded by the demonstrative proadjectives *selline*, *niisugune* ‘such’ (4), and adverb phrases and adverbial noun phrases by the demonstrative proadverb *niimoodi* ‘like that’ (5) (more rarely, time expressions are preceded by *nüüd* ‘now’ and *siis* ‘then’):

- (4) *see on nüüd nisukene kindlam*
 this is now such stronger
 'Now this one is stronger.'
- (5) *emme üts et Elsa istus niimoodi omaette=ja.*
 mum said that Elsa sat like.that on.her.own and
 'Mum said that Elsa sat there on her own.'

In other words, it seems that focal phrases (or stressed phrases in general) of different categories can be preceded by the corresponding demonstrative proforms. It could thus be hypothesized that the use of demonstratives (possibly along with that of other particles) is related to focus marking strategies. Alternatively, it could be hypothesized that their occurrence is conditioned by the stress pattern of the sentence. Of course, these hypotheses do not exclude the possibility that *see*, *siis*, *seal* are developing into definiteness markers since demonstratives are clearly polyfunctional in spoken discourse: they can also participate in hesitation strategies, mark the case or category of the following phrase, and of course function as “true demonstratives”.

In my presentation I will give more evidence of the use of demonstratives in spoken Estonian and argue for the need to study its relationship to sentential stress patterns and focus structures. This study will be part of a larger research project of the Institute of the Estonian Language, “Modelling intermodular relations in Estonian”, which is aimed at studying, among other things, the interactions between pragmatics, syntax and prosody in Estonian.

References : Pajusalu, Renate (1997) “Is there an article in (Spoken) Estonian?” In Mati Ereht, ed. *Estonian typological studies II*. 146–177, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus. • Pajusalu, Renate (2001)

“Definite and indefinite determiners in Estonian.” In Enikö Nemeth (ed.) *Pragmatics in 2000. Selected Papers from the 7th International Pragmatics Conference*. 458–469, Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association. • Sahkai, Heete (2002) Demonstrative doubling in spoken Estonian. MA thesis, University of Tartu.

Peter Slomanson : *Morphological Effects of Temporal Sequence and Clause Focus Interaction* – Effets morphologiques de l’interaction entre séquence temporelle et focus de proposition

Extensive grammatical change, when this occurs in speech communities subject to profound contact with a model language(s) belonging to a different typological class, can be explained by examining plausible discourse-pragmatic motivations. These can play a triggering role in grammatical change in languages generally, however the number and consequences of discourse-pragmatic triggers may be greatest in contexts in which speakers of the affected language lose contact with conservative speakers of their L1. A variety of Malay spoken in Sri Lanka and the glottogenetic context that created it provide a useful window on these processes. The language has preserved a predominantly L1-derived lexical inventory, both open and closed class, while undergoing dramatic typological change due to contact with Dravidian (primarily Muslim Tamil). The resulting grammar however does not straightforwardly reproduce any grammatical system in the Muslim Tamil source language, although the parallels are clearly identifiable. Many of the changes that have taken place involve morphology and syntax, including the development of new inflectional morphology. A number of these accretions in Sri Lankan Malay are most plausibly motivated by discourse-pragmatic triggers. A strong case for this process can be made by examining tense and (in)finiteness phenomenon in the language, and their reflexes in its negation system. These morphosyntactic contrasts were not originally present in Malay, however two discourse processes in the Sri Lankan sprachbund can conspire to motivate their development in the language. The first of these is a clausal asymmetry in which the predicate representing the most recent event is always in focus in a sequence of predicates, and the second is the communicative need to reassign focus in certain contexts to a temporally non-primary predicate. I show how the new morphology supports these information-structuring functions, whereas the original grammar could not do so.

¹ The examples derive from a corpus assembled and transcribed by the Spoken Estonian Research Group at the Department of Estonian Language at the University of Tartu (<http://test.cl.ut.ee/suuline/Korpus.php?lang=en>). Transcription marks: (.) – micropause (0,2 seconds or less); word – stress; = – pronounced as one word. Abbreviations: ALL – allative; GEN – genitive; ELAT – elative; IMPERS – impersonal; PART – partitive; TERM – terminative.