

variants has been extensively studied (e.g. Bresnan & Hay 2008 among others), little is known about the extent to which lexical considerations – besides the verb – might be cross-regionally malleable. To that end, the present study compares the lexical profiles of 13,171 interchangeable dative variants across five non-native – Hong Kong, Indian, Jamaican, Philippine and Singapore English – and four native varieties of English – Canadian, British, Irish, and New Zealand English – sampling spoken and written data from the International Corpus of English and the Corpus of Global web-based English. Following traditional variationist approaches (Tagliamonte 2006), the data was restricted to interchangeable dative variants only, excluding thus tokens where the other variant was not semantically equivalent or grammatically acceptable. Degrees of association between lexical items and the two variants (collocations) were measured using distinctive collexeme analysis (Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003; Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004). Lexical items were restricted to verb, theme heads and recipient heads.

Results reveal that speakers of non-native varieties tend to reuse lexical items in both argument slots in the ditransitive variant, more so than native speakers, suggesting that syntactic variation is lexically more specified in non-native compared to native varieties. These findings not only provide evidence for the cognitive reality of meso-constructions and their role in usage-based models of syntax (Diessel 2016), the lexical specificity of the ditransitive variant also points to asymmetry in the allostructional relationship between the two variants in non-native varieties. Finally, the study also illustrates how the development of entrenched lexical biases with particular syntactic variants among different language varieties can lead to the emergence of variation in the probabilistic factors governing the choice among more abstract constructional schemas.

## References

- Bresnan, Joan & Jennifer Hay. 2008. Gradient grammar: An effect of animacy on the syntax of *give* in New Zealand and American English. *Lingua* 118(2). 245–259.
- Cappelle, Bert. 2006. Particle placement and the case for “allostructions.” In Doris Schönefeld (ed.), *Constructions all over: Case studies and theoretical implications*, 1–28. [http://www.academia.edu/1432971/Particle\\_placement\\_and\\_the\\_case\\_for\\_allostructions\\_](http://www.academia.edu/1432971/Particle_placement_and_the_case_for_allostructions_) (25 August, 2017).
- Diessel, Holger. 2016. Frequency and lexical specificity in grammar: A critical review. In Heike Behrens & Stefan Pfänder (eds.), *Experience counts: Frequency effects in language*, 209–237. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gries, Stefan Th. & Anatol Stefanowitsch. 2004. Extending collocation analysis: A corpus-based perspective on alternations. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9(1). 97–129.
- Perek, Florent. 2015. *Argument structure in usage-based construction grammar: Experimental and corpus-based perspectives*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Stefan Th. Gries. 2003. Collocations: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8(2). 209–243.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. 2006. *Analysing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



## On the inventory and functions of final particles in Lithuanian

Anna Ruskan  
(University of Vilnius)

**Keywords:** final position, (inter)subjectivity, spoken discourse

**Schedule:** Thu 14.30 Room 10

The proliferation of studies into the complex category of discourse particles (Fischer 2006, Aijmer, Simon-Vandenberg 2006, Degand, Simon-Vandenberg 2011, and Fedriani, Sansó 2017) has brought to light the question of the categorial distinction of final particles, which occur in utterance final position and display a cluster of formal and functional features unattested in other positions (Hancil et al. 2015). The inventory, description and categorization of final particles have been thoroughly covered in East and Southeast Asian languages, whereas in European languages (English, German, Dutch, Russian, etc.) the formal and functional distinction of final particles and their affinities with other functional classes have been at initial stage of investigation (Hancil et al. 2015). In Lithuanian, the distinction of final particles has not been addressed yet. Discourse particles have been primarily considered in terms of their functional classes (Ambrasas 2006a), lexical sources and categorial status (Holvoet, Pajėdienė 2005) as well as diachronic development (Ambrasas 2006b, Nau, Ostrowski 2010). The present study deals with the focus particles *gi*, *net* and the demonstrative particle *va* in Lithuanian occurring in utterance final position:

- (1) *-Bet jis į medį nemoka lipti gi!*  
‘-But he cannot climb the tree, **even!**’
- (2) *-Čia tau klausimų jokių negali kilti net.*  
‘-You cannot have any questions here, **even.**’
- (3) *Aš turėjau mmm keletą draugų vyresnių gerokai, kurie man vis patardavo ir padėdavo, va.*  
‘I had mmm several much older friends, who used to give me advice and help, **so.**’

The aim of the study is to examine whether the particles *gi*, *net* and *va* found in utterance final position display functional differences when compared to their occurrence in other positions and show potential for being considered within the category of final particles. By applying a corpus-driven methodology, the study explores the correlation between the final position of the particles under analysis and the dimension of (inter)subjectivity (Traugott 2010). Since final particles most frequently occur in spoken language, the data have been drawn from the spoken and fiction sub-corpora of the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language.

The preliminary results show that the particles under analysis tend to display a range of attitudinal functions that highlight speaker-hearer interaction, i.e. the intersubjective dimension. The focus particles *gi* and *net* may convey the speaker’s surprise with the state of affairs. The particle *gi* may also be used as a corrective device in response to the hearer’s previous contribution, thus challenging the hearer’s knowledge and judgement of the situation. The intersubjective dimension of the particles and their high degree of emotivity are highlighted in directive speech acts. The particle *va* marks the speaker’s conclusive remarks and checks whether the hearer follows the speaker’s explanation. However, utterance final *va* may also be used as a demonstrative particle, found in initial or medial position. Although the current study does not provide conclusive evidence for the categorial status of the particles under analysis, it illustrates their functional distinction on the right periphery, also attested in Germanic and other languages (Hancil et al. 2015).

## References

Aijmer, Karin and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg (2006), *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.

- Ambrasas, Vytautas (2006a), *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Ambrasas, Vytautas (2006b), *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Degand, Liesbeth and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg (2011), Introduction: Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of discourse markers, *Linguistics* 49(2), 287-294.
- Fedriani, Chiara and Andrea Sansó (2017), *Pragmatic Markers, Discourse Markers and Modal Particles*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fischer, Kerstin (2006), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Hancil, Sylvie, Margje Post and Alexander Haselow (2015), Introduction: Final particles from a typological perspective, in S. Hancil, A. Haselow, and M. Post (eds), (2015), *Final Particles*, Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 3-36.
- Holvoet, Axel and Jūratė Pajėdienė (2005), Aplykybės ir jų tipai, in A. Holvoet, and R. Mikulskas (red), (2005), *Gramatinių funkcijų tyrimai*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 93-116.
- Nau, Nicole and Norbert Ostrowski (2010), Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages, in N. Nau, and N. Ostrowski (eds), (2010), *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*, Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas & Asociacija "Academia Salensis", 1-37.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (2010), (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment, in K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte, and H. Cuyckens (eds), (2010), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 29-74.



## Finite verb placement and accentuation in Estonian main clauses

Heete Sahkai & Anne Tamm

(Institute of the Estonian Language & Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary)

**Keywords:** [sentence prosody](#)

**Schedule:** [Thu 14.30 Room 10](#)

In Estonian main clauses, the verb is generally in the second position (e.g. Lindström 2017). As an exception, the verb may be in the third position; in this case, it is usually preceded by a weak pronominal subject, and a fronted adverbial (Vihman and Walkden 2017) or contrastive topic (Sahkai and Tamm, ms.). In addition to the V2/V3 orders, certain types of main clauses may be verb-initial or verb-final (Lindström 2017).

The aim of the present study is to examine a further finite verb position, which has not been previously described; it could be referred to as 'clause-medial' (1-3). This position can be observed in the respective placement of verbs and non-fronted sentence adverbials. In V2 sentences (and the V3 sentences of the kind described above), non-fronted sentence adverbials follow the finite verb, while in the examined case, they precede it. The examined sentences differ from the V3 sentences described above in two more respects: the verb may be preceded by more than two constituents, and all the constituents preceding it may be phonologically heavy. The examined position also differs from the clause-final position in that it is not completely final, the verb being followed by any internal arguments and VP adverbials.