

Verb and argument coding pattern borrowing has recently enjoyed much attention, both from diachronic and synchronic perspectives (inter alia, Say 2014, Michaelis 2019, Luraghi, Roma 2021). In this paper, I combine both perspectives to show that language contact causes deviations from the high-productive object marking strategies in Western Eurasia.

**Data and method.** The data is subsampled from BivalTyp (Say 2020), a typological database of bivalent verbs and their coding patterns based on a questionnaire contextualizing the particular verb meaning. The transitive pattern is defined cross-linguistically (Haspelmath 2015) whereas other bivalent patterns are language-specific patterns. I consider 103 verbs in 30 languages of Western Eurasia, focusing on objects (second arguments). I have tagged all object coding patterns according to the following rules (very much in the spirit of Haspelmath (2010)'s *comparative concepts*): 1) the objects in the transitive constructions fall under the same tag (DO); 2) the markers in the non-transitive constructions are tagged according to their least abstract meaning: spatial (FROM, ON/ONTO, etc.), comitative or possessive meaning. For example, the Russian marker *iz/s* + genitive and German *aus* + dative are tagged as FROM since both are mostly used to denote the starting point of movement. The distribution of marking strategies is analyzed for each verb, using the linguistic maps created with the *lingtypology* R package (Moroz 2021).

**Results and discussion.** The contact-induced deviations can be identified particularly well when two or more languages in contact employ a marking strategy that deviates from the macro-areal strategy for the same verb meaning. Also, I will argue that language contact is responsible for the retention of the old coding patterns. For instance, 'hate' is very high on the transitivity scale but employs a possessive marker in Lithuanian and Polish, see Figure 1. The same strategy was still in use in Russian in the 18th century (also in Old Church Slavonic) but now it is completely replaced by a transitive one (which is preferred in 27 languages out of 30). Deviations from the macro-areally non-transitive strategies can also be explained by language contact. For example, the object of German verb *zustimmen* 'agree' and Latvian verb *piekrist* 'agree' is marked as goal/recipient in contrast to the macro-areal preference of the comitative strategy (Figure 2). I will put forward a more fine-grained analysis of contact at the morpho-syntactic level, revealing some theoretical problems and the directions for future research.

## Maps



Figure 1. Object markers of 'to hate' in the languages of Western Eurasia



Figure 2. Object markers of 'to agree' in the languages of Western Eurasia

## References

- Haspelmath, M. (2010). Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language*, 86(3), 663-687.
- Haspelmath, M. (2015). Transitivity prominence. In Volume 1 Introducing the Framework, and Case Studies from Africa and Eurasia, 131-148.
- Luraghi, S. and Roma, E. (2021). Valency and transitivity over time: An introduction. In *Valency over Time: Diachronic Perspectives on Valency Patterns and Valency Orientation*, 1-12.
- Michaelis, S. M. (2019). World-Wide Comparative Evidence for Calquing of Valency Patterns in Creoles, *Journal of Language Contact*, 12(1), 191-231.
- Moroz, G. (2017). [lingtypology: easy mapping for Linguistic Typology](#).
- Say, S. (2014). Bivalent verb classes in the languages of Europe: A quantitative typological study. *Language dynamics and change*, 4(1), 116-166.
- Say, S. (ed.). 2020. [BivalTyp: Typological database of bivalent verbs and their encoding frames](#). St.Petersburg: Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS.