THE DEVELOPMENT OF GRAMMAR SYSTEMS IN DIASPORA CHILDREN'S LANGUAGE[*]

L'ubomir Ďurovič

In SlaL 9 and some other papers (1984c) I described case systems in the S/C language of 25 children in school start age. Nov, after having gathered in the JUBA (called now Arkiv for diasporaspråk, ADS) materials about language development of several of those children, I would like to present some observations about the diachrony of the child S/C in the Swedish diaspora.

0.1 The language found in our recorded texts differs, naturally, from the S/C standard. These differences consist of approximately three kinds of phenomena.

0.11 a) Firstly, those deriving from general properties of spoken language, including allegro-forms, "slips of tongue" and other irrelevant (see below) deviations from an ideal S/C norm.

0.12 b) Secondly, dialectal features in the children's speech that have been inherited from the parents' language or from other sources; the bulk of such dialectal features (the "correct" or "original" properties of a given dialect) is irrelevant for our investigation. When, however, dialectal features are found in combinations non-existent in the given dialect, and when they can thus be considered a result of processes specific to the diaspora (on diaspora monitoring see SlaL 9, 70-71), then such features are no longer dialectisms, they become part of the diaspora language and are, thus, object of our investigation.

0.13 c) The object proper of our investigation are those features of the texts recorded that are a result of specific diaspora conditions. Those features, again, fall into two groups.

0.131 ca) A natural, predictable consequence of the life in the Swedish environment is the penetration of Swedish language features into the children's family speech. Such penetration occurs on all language levels and in all bilingual social conditions. It can range from single isolated features to systematic changes in the target language (in our case e.g. the use of S/C <u>ledan</u> in function of the Swedish indefinite article).

0.132 cb) Linguistically the most interesting kind of deviations from an ideal S/C (or any other) norm are those features which can be considered to be a result of endogenous autoregulating automatisms of a "langue", occuring In more than a single speaker, in other words features that are result of a functioning system. The outcome of our investigation here In Lund gives us right to consider the S/C of Yugoslav children in Sweden as such a part of the S/C that behaves at some points differently than the S/C as a whole. The pressure of the Swedish language and the lack of a compact and linguistically homogeneous monitoring by the children's own environment generate innovations or destructions which are either compulsory, or probable. These innovations do not destroy the possibility of communicating within the entire S/C area, since they affect mostly the "technical" or redundant parts of the language , such as congruence, case, gender, models for constructing NPs and clauses etc., not to mention abolishing such "historical compromises" as different morphophonemic phenomena, e.g. stem alternations called in the Yugoslav tradition "palatalization" (cf. <u>možem. na ruki</u>). choice of synonymous affixes or endings (<u>ocov. magarcom</u>) etc.

One of the important aims of this symposium is to determine to what extent these potentially systematic innovations are common for S/C in other than Swedish linguistic environments, to what extent they are subject to development and if so, the direction of such development.

0. 2 At this point, we must draw attention to an important reservation concerning all data within the former JUBA, now ADS.

Because we are restricted by Swedish rules for ethical conduct of research within humanities, our children do not constitute a representative sample of all Yugoslav diaspora children in Sweden. This means that all our informants fall into a category where the school directions, parents as well as the child itself was willing to grant test permission. Both the parents and the child can revoke their permission at any time and without any motivation -which happened not infrequently.

Our material does not reflect, therefore, an average sample; we probably did not obtain permission from families where the S/C family language level is too low and the family did not wish to reveal it - the guarantee of absolute anonymity notwithstanding.

All conclusions drawn on the basis of our material should thus be considered with this reservation.

<div align="center">***</div>

In this paper, I will touch on three phenomena: development of the case systems, changes of constructions with the impersonal verb <u>ima,</u> and the behaviour of the S/C gender when a Swedish text is renarrated in S/C.

A "leitmotiv" of this paper will be the <u>parallelism</u> of features in the diaspora language, i.e. the existence of two different surface phenomena for the same underlying value. This parallelism is made possible by a property of diaspora systems, unknown or avoided by "normal" languages - namely, that diaspora systems are open <u>for different surface implementations</u> of the same constituent (phonetic/phonematic, morphologic, syntactic). This is a consequence of the non-homogenous monitoring specific for the diaspora language.

<div align="center">***</div>

1.0   <u>Development of case systems.</u>

The behaviour of case systems in diaspora children is very significant for the diaspora language, since these - on one hand - are not identical with known case systems in Yugoslavia, but - on the other hand - they are not and can not be directly influenced by Swedish. Consequently, all case phenomena are regulated by autoregulating automatisms of diaspora S/C in conditions of diaspora monitoring.

What these "autoregulating automatisms", this 'Systemzwang", this "langue" are, where they come from, how they function and why they function the way they do - these are the most important questions of general linguistics. All of us make assumptions about them, without having an explicit, satisfactory answer.

1.1 I shoved in SlaL 9, that in 7 year olds case systems occur consisting of 2, 3, 4, 5, Б, 7 cases and that there is an implica-

tive order NAGLIDV, which means, that systems NA, NAG, NAGL, NAGLI, NAGLID and NAGLIDV occur. Since the locative can be fully or partially replaced by the Accusative, we can also obtain systems NAGI, NAGID and, theoretically NAGIDV. To partially replace the Locative by the Accusative entails that there appear, without motivation, promiscuously constructions such as stoli u vodi and stoli u vodu. Such parallelism is marked by y_, i. e. Ly.

In these case systems, both the L. and any other case expressing a relation can be replaced by the Accusative and only the Accusative, e.g. .le napravl/len od drvo (inetead of od drva). igra se sa lutku (instead of sa lutkom). on ih (instead of im.) reko. The only instance where this type of replacement has not been observed is Genitive in quantitative NPʙ : in its place we find most frequently the N. pi. (e.g. tri misevi). As in many variants of the S/C, the N. is also the only potential substitute for the Vocative.

The Dative has a special position: in our texts it is almost never governed by a preposition (my only occurence is prema ono.l dami with the speaker 07.14, at the age of 9).

In this case there is a fundamental difference between noun and pronoun, since - as in the Balkan linguistic type - the pronominal enclitic forms can have the function of possessive pronoun (as majka mu) and occur also in caseless language systems. For this reason, pronominal dative is marked differently in our figures and tables (d vs. D). The role of the Dative (and Vocative) in the implicative order is not as strong as it is in that of all the other cases.

The most important grammatical feature revealed in the language of the school start children is that - compared with the S/C as such - the genitive loses the character of a grammatical case. In other words, in the children's language the G. can neither be a postmodif1er in a NP (type boja kuće) nor a predicate noun (kuca je žute bole). The NPs with a postmodifier are - in our entire corpus between 7 and 11 mostly avoided, and when they do occur, they are organized in another way (SlaL 9,65 ff.; see also Ďurovič 1984b, 95).

1.2 Is there any development of this state between the school start age at seven, and the ll[tn] year? Eleven is a point when - as demonstrated on the development of children's lexicon (Friberg 1983) - the twofold process of intense   increase   of   the Swedish

word stock and the compensatory decrease of the S/C word stock stops, and both languages' vocabularies begin to increase parallel to each other.

Two tendencies can be observed:

a) almost all children's case systems are completed, so that six cases (NAGLID) is a rule at the age of 8 or 9 (1.2.1);

b) the occurence of the G., L., I. and D. does not mean, that these cases are <u>always</u> used where they should be: they can always parallel the accusative, which is typographically marked by an index y_, as in the case of the Locative, viz. Gy, Ly, ly, Dy (1.2.2). The increase of this parallelism is very characteristic, when compared with the systems at the school start age, where the parallelism was a common phenomenon only in the L. and sometimes occured also in the G., while the I. and the D. either did or did not exist, i.e. were in all instances substituted by the A.

1.2.1 The changes in the case inventory can be surveyed in Table 1 (p.56-57), where the case systems of six children are shown, aged 7 at the beginning of our investigation in 1981 and tested each subsequent year from 1981/82 to 1985.

In SlaL 9, 24-27 I formulated an implicative order NAGLIDV, with two restrictions: a) L., because of replaceability by the A., implies the N., A. and G., but is not necessarily implied by the I., D. and V.; b) the implicativity of the D. and V. is not as strong as the implicativity of other cases.

This description is fully valid also for the new corpus.

1.2.11 The Genitive appears as the first case after the N. and A. We can demonstrate it on the record of the speaker 07.03, an ekavian girl, with a rather destroyed S/C in her first year cuts (see also my description of 1981 and 1982 year cuts in SlaL 9, 32, 36 and passim: since these two records have now been computer stored in another way, the numbering of quotations has been changed).

In 1981, this speaker uses in direct object function promiscuously either N.-A. or G.-A. for masculine animate nouns: N.-A.: "i pose tata skineo <u>magarats</u> // +" (07.03,81:39); G.-A.: "i tata iśo + i ponaso <u>magara</u>" (33); correction: "i došo ko- ((=kod>) <u>jean</u> <u>drugi....</u> c- <u>drugoga</u> <u>ćove-ka/</u>" (35); both these forms are, consequently <u>accusative.</u> We have therefore right to   identify as

55

T A B L E 1

( ) = only once   d = only pronominal dative

"Diachrony"

Speaker	Year	Age	Case System
07.03	1981	7	NA(L)
"	1982	8	NA(L)
"	1983	9	NAG(L)d(V)
"	1984	10	NAG(L)(I)dV
"	1985	11	NAGLyD
07.05	1981	7	NAGLy(d)
"	1983	9	NAGLyd
"	1984	10	NAGL(y)ID
"	1985	11	NAGyLyDyV
07.09	1981	7	NAG(I)d
"	1982	8	NAGyLyIyd
"	1983	9	NAGLyIyD
"	1984	10	NAGLyIyD
"	1985	11	NAGyIyD
07.13	1981	7	NAG(I)d
"	1982	8	NAGyLyIyd
"	1983	9	NAGyLyIyd
"	1984	10	NAGyLyIydV
"	1985	11	NAGyLyIyD
07.14	1981	7	NAGy(L)Id
"	1982	8	NAGyLyID
"	1983	9	NAGLyIDdyV
"	1984	10	NAG(L)(I)d
"	1985	11	NAGyLyIyD
07.16	1982	7	NAGyLyIyd
"	1983	8	NAG(I)d
"	1984	9	NAGyLyIy
"	1985	10	NAGy(I)d
07.17	1982	8	NAGyLyIDy
"	1983	9	NAGyLyID

"Synchrony"

Speaker	Year	Age	Case System
07.01	1981	6	NAGLyID
07.07	1982	7	NAGLyId
07.08	1982	7	NAGyLyI
07.18	1982	7	NAGIydy
07.19	1982	8	NAGLy(I)
07.20	1982	8	NAGyLyDV
07.21	1982	8	NAGLyID
07.22	1982	8	NAGLyID
07.22	1982	8	NAGLyId
07.23	1982	7	NAGyLy(I)D
07.24	1982	8	NAGLyIdV
07.25	1982	7	NAGyLy(I)d
07.26	1982	7	NAGLyId
00.01	1979	7	NA(L)
"	1980	9	NA
00.04	1979	9	NAGyd
"	1980	10	NAGyD
"	1982	13	NAGyd
00.06	1979	11	NAd
"	1980	12	NA
00.07	1979	10	NAGIy
10.01	1981	10	NAGyLyI
10.02	1981	10	NAGyIyD
10.03	1981	10	NA(G)I?
"	1982	11	NA(G)(I)
"	1983	12	NAG(L)
10.05	1981	10	NAGyLydV
10.06	1981	10	NAGLyIDyV
10.08	1981	10	NAGyLyIy
10.11	1981	10	NA(G)
10.12	1981	10	NAGLyID
10.14	1981	10	NAGL(y)ID
10.15	1981	10	NAGLIyD
10.22	1981	10	NAGLyID
13.04	1981	13	NAGyLyID
13.06	1981	13	NAGyLyIy
13.09	1981	13	NAGLyI?D
13.13	1981	13	NAGyLyIyDy
13.15	1981	13	NAGL(y)ID

accusative the same forms, when combined with the preposition kod ("i došo je kod druogi ćovek // + " (15); "pos- doši ko- drugoga ćoveka//" (20); see also the last example by 07.03,81:33 above), although kod drugoga ćoveka. outside this text, could and would be interpreted as G.. This gave me in SlaL 9, 24, 32 and passim some right to consider the system of 07.03,81 as a weak NAG, although NA would be more motivated. Another genitive preposition od, as well as all other prepositions u, na and sa also govern here the A. (about one occurence of the L. u vodi see below). A quantifier occurs only once, and this dva is combined with N. pi. ("dva (...) used." 94). The conditions for development towards the G. consist, consequently, only in the G.-A. accusative.

One year later, in 07.03,82's record, no G.-A. is found and all masc. animate direct objects are in N.-A. (e.g. "i pose imo sin +" 139); the inventory of prepositions is reduced to a semantically diffuse u and one na, both governing the A. (here also appears one u vodi. see 1.2.12). All combinations involving quantifiers - always in answers to the teeter's questions - are in N.-A. (see SlaL 9,33); this includes also "(...puno) stene" (239) 'many stones'. In this record a real genitive form is found, however, as partitive in object function: "i pije vode + u ((=iz)) šolju +" (230-231).

In contrast to these two year cuts, where the G. occurs more as a potential than in a manifest form, some change took place in 1983: the G.-A. is here the only accusative form for animate masculines, a genitive preposition blizu governing a G. occurs ("sede tu blizu bare ...+" 373) and a genitive partitive form sira in object is used repeatedly. Noreover, both occurences of numerals ("dve kofe" (336), "tri male macice" (388)) can be interpreted also as G.eg. - as in the S/C standard.

Thus, in 1983 the G. is fully established as a part of 07.03's case system, consisting earlier only of N. and A.. This corresponds diachronically to the implicative order NAGLIDV. revealed former as a synchronic structuring principle.

1.2.12 The function of the locative is in principle fulfilled by the A., with one reservation: in both 1981 and 1982 year's records occurs the locative u vodi (96, 228) and in 1983 the locative u iugoelaviji (384).

In an overall record of a child, this isolated u vodi. when considered against all the other occurences of u governing the A., is not necessarily a proof that the L.   really does exist in

his/her system: it can, but does not need to be, an isolated, petrified loan form from "the others'" or "the adults'" language. (See also burović - Stankovski 1979,32). - Such occurrence of an isolated L. form as opposed to many accusatives in the same essive meaning is also found in 1984 (1:9) and 1985 (2:9). The combination u juaoslavi.li is repeated in 1983 and 1985, the other combinations being u qratu (=gradu) in 1984 and u konzervi in 1985. - We see that some L. is present on the perifery of 07.03's case system in all year cuts; since also other combinations than u vodi are found in 1983-85, these can in no way be considered petrifactions: rather, the L. became a part of 07.03's (actively used) grammar system.

If, however, the two u vodi in 1981 and 1982 really are L. case forms rather than petrifactions or "loans", they would be an argument against the implicativity principle NAGLIDV.

1.2.13   With 07.03 the Instrumental does not appear until one year later in the 1984 year cut; its only occurence demonstrates clearly its instability: "i vidim + da se igra da ((=sa)) jednoga … da((=sa)) jedno brodo- ... nekoga brodom... +" (497-8). In fact, 07.03's attempt to use an I. was hampered by the properties of the word brod itself, which in our corpus repeatedly behaves as a feminine or an animate noun (due to the Swedish hon 'she' referring all vessels, see SlaL 9, 42, e.g. "ona je naśla jednoga broda ... +" (07.05,81:87)). Since in all three attempts to form the attribute (probably an equivalent to an underlying Sw. indefinite article) the speaker tries to form the accusative, the assumed animateness of brod requires a G.-A. - thus jednoga and nekoga: cf. both other occurences of the preposition sa. (07.03 pronounces always sa as da) that also govern the A.: "a ... da da ((=sa)) ... kucu … sam se igrała" (07.03,84:524; kuca = 'doggy'); "... igrała sam da nikicu ... + jedan dećak ... +" (527; the apposition iedan dećak in N.-A.). The I. brodom is thus the first and only occurence of an instrumental in 07.03'в record, while in all other instances the instrumental preposition sa. governs the A. - In the following year cut, 1985, we find again: "(...) devojćica što se igra da brod +" (549).

Very unstable, the I. thus appears later than the L., in conformity with the implicativity principle.

1.2.14   The emergence of the dative and the vocative in the system of 07.03 is also in accord with the implicativity principle. These two emerge as last case forms, the dative appearing first (1983 and 1984) within the pronominal flexion.   The same

temporal succession - pronominal D. preceding nominal D. - is preserved in all investigated records containing more than one year cut (07.03, 07.05, 07.09, 07.13, 07.14 while 07.16 has the pronominal dative only). These pronominal dative forms are possessive pronouns ("da ti. ... otac ... ide ...pešкe +" 07.03,83:282), always enclitic, or indirect objects ("on sedi + i prića + a ona pecsa ((=peca)> ... n.lemu +" 07.03,83:376). Because of this peculiarity, I consider "the implicative character of the dative (...) rather probabilistic" (SlaL 9, 25, 61).

1.2.15   The vocative - properly speaking not a case stricto sensu - occurs in our texts only sporadically: its presence in one year cut does not imply that it will also appear with the same speaker in the next year (while this is more or less a rule with the other cases). Consequently, it has no special importance for the structuring of the diaspora case systems. As a matter of fact, only with the speaker 07.03 does the vocative occur in two immediately following year cuts: "(...) vuk + i kaze + šta to radio ... lisic-so tamo dole t" (07.03,83:348) and "eta to radia tamo dole lisico + " (07.03,84:468).

1.2.16   It can thus be said in general that during the five years of the investigation all of our 07. speakers acquired the genitive and that all of them came to develop the locative and the instrumental - case forms that can be in any year cut partially or fully substituted by the accusative. This substitution adheres to the principle that I in SlaL 9, 54 found valid and described for the locative only. The pronominal dative occurs earlier than the nominal dative. By the 9th - 10th year, these cases are found in all children's records. Only the vocative is a case form which can be missing at this age.

1.2.2 As I stated several times, the combination of the N. and the A. is the necessary core of each investigated case system in our corpus and it alone is sufficient to make up a functioning case system. It was also stated that the A. can substitute for any L., I. and D., as well as for the G. in combinations other than 0NP (i.e. in all functions where it is not governed by a quantifier, as dva stola, puno vode). This property is manifested most spectacularly in the possibility of the A. to be governed by any preposition.

1.2.21 When we first began investigating children in school start age, as described in SlaL 9, it seemed often that governing the A. excluded governing the "right" case. In the L., however.

the coexistence with the A. in the same essive meaning vas clear, and we introduced the sign y̲ in order to mark typographically this parallelism, viz. Ly: limit points of this parallelism are necces-sarily either L. alone with locative prepositions such as u or na, or a total absence of the L. This concept is reflected in my study in SlaL 9.

Later, analyses done by students at the Stockholm School of Education showed that in the language of 13 year old children, the parallelism of the A. and another case is also a normal phenomenon for the G., I. and D. (Jovanović s.a. /1984/).

1.2.22 The corpus of our diachrony shows that a development toward this parallelism of the A. and the "right" case is a very strong tendency for G., L. and I., i.e. for cases governed by prepositions, while a parallelism between the D. and the A. in dative function is less common: 07.05, 07.14 and 07.17 are the only children to display Dy/dy, but even in these three instances, this pattern occurs in a single year cut only, while with 07.03, 07.09, 07.13 and 07.16 the parallelism never takes place. This can be explained by the fact that although it is often avoided (cf. SlaL 9, 63 and Ďurovič 1984c, 93) the D. must in some instances be distinguished from the N. or A.: cf. e.g. "bio je jedan čovek + śto ima je- jedan magarac + pa ... onda je reko necrøv sin +" (07.18:1-6), i.e. 'he said to his son' or "i onda vak ((=vuk)> licica -ca *rete/* + uzmij onaj ... onaj tamo ... + " (07.17,82:67-68), i.e. 'the fox said to the wolf. In both instances the N.-A., i.e. the accusative thus replaces the dative in the indirect object function, abolishing the opposition between the subject and the indirect object. Some semantically less dangerous instances are:

"onda je tata kaza sin. +" (07.05,83:153);

"on mu kaže + ti mene dal sesto punde +" (07.14,83:619);

"i oni ... oni ga. kažžu + ne sme se -vatu ((=hvatati ='to hunt')) ovde u sumu" (07.14,83:518).

1.2.23 In all of our records, the occurence of the A. instead of, or parallel with the G., L. or I. is completely random and unpredictable (cf. SlaL 9, 29, 41, 54 and passim). Parallel forms can appear in various places in the text, and such instances can also occur within one

coordinative syntagm, where they are governed by the same preposition. Not infrequently different case forms occur in a NP with a "congruent" attribute:

```
"... prvo smo otišli do jugoslavije ((G.))" (07.16,85:696);

"...  e vozili smo brod do tasos ... to ostrvo ((N.-A.=A.))
... +" (07.16,85:701);

"onda sidu obadvoje s magare ((N.-A.)) + jedan s druge  strane
((G.)) + drugi s druge strane ((G.))" (07.13,82:137-139);

"a pored njega ((G., properly  G.-A.)) je išo njegov sin"
(07.14,83:299);

"stoji pored nju ((A.)) sa osmehom" (07.13,83:399);

"možda je pao iz bicikle ((G.))/ iz drvad ((N.-A.=A.))"
(07.09,82:277);

"(... šta rade?) lože vatru + (...) od drva ((G.)) ... od male
grančice ((N.-A.pl.)) +" (07.13,84:587-588);

"i jean šator ta- ((tamo)) ima kod ... nekih drveća sa  nekim
((I.)) kola ((N.-A.=A.))" (07.09,84:525): a similar case with
inverse roles is the passage, cited in 1.2.13.
```

We can thus detect a clear tendency In the children to complete their own case systems before the age of 10-11, even while allowing within those systems for a parallelism of "normative* and "diaspora" forms.

1.2.24 A noticeable difference between individual systems at 7 and at 10 years of age and beyond consists - in my opinion - in the extent of this parallelism. While at 7 the parallelism is primarily a characteristic feature of the locative, at 10 and beyond the parallelism is a rule for both the 6., and the L., I. as well as for D. in the diaspora idiolects.

This can be interpreted to mean that at 7 each idiolect is a result of impulses and monitoring within a close diaspora surrounding which is linguistically nonhomogeneous and oral. A majority of the diaspora children at this age never come in touch with either the S/C standard or with any homogeneous S/C environment. Thus, each idiolect is a result of the mysterious autoregulating automatisms mentioned above.

Then, between 7 and 10-11, alongside with the acquisition of Swedish, each diaspora child encounters - to different extent and with different intensity - the S/C standard in a written or an

oral form and, very probably, It then completes its own language from those sources (instruction in family language, books, newspapers from the "old country", radio and television programs in Swedish, contact with his/her teacher of family language or with other educated Yugoslavs).

It must, however, be emphasized, that such enrichment does not entail the substitution of one form for the other, normative one. As we said earlier, the parallelism of the G., L., I. and to some minor extent also D. with the A.   is the normal state of things.

1.2.25 Characteristic in this respect is the development of 07.05's system. 07.05 is a 10 years old ijekavian boy. In 1981, he has a NAGLy(d) system with a stable G. governed by several prepositions, a parallelism of L. and A. in essive function (2:9) and one pronominal dative object da mu dade (82). The 1982 record is lacking, but in 1983 his G. has disappeared almost completely, no genitive preposition is found, his only prepositions being na. and u. He has, however, fully acquired the dative, which is paralleled by the N.-A. ; the Ly is 2:2 (L. :A.).

In both these year cuts, 07.05 renarrates the Swedish story about the fox and the wolf according to the model C and C$_{cr}$ (see 3.1.3 below), i.e. he uses gender sensitive words (GSW, cf.3.), grammatically related to lisica f.. promiscuously as masculines or feminines (e.g. bi.1a ((m.)) je jedan dan jedn- ledan ((m.)) lisi-jedan Urn.)) lisica + šta je vidla ((f.)) ..." etc. (07.05,83:167-168)).

In 1984, the picture of 07.05's language changes completely: he speaks an almost correct Croatian, he has acquired the I. and has now a complete case inventory, except for the fact that the A. parallels the L.. Similarly, he is in this year one of few, to renarrate the story about the fox with correct feminine gender in all GSW. We assume that this improvement is a result of a longer summer visit (6 weeks) with his grandparents in Yugoslavia, as mentioned in his sociolinguistic questionnaire.

One additional, and somewhat peculiar proof of the stabilization of 07.05's mother tongue in 1984 is the behaviour of the word /magar#c-/ in this year cut: its gender, shifting in 1981-83, is here stabilized - in favour of the feminine, however:

"(...) sa svojim sinom ... išša + jaššao na magarci + " (07.05,84:200)

```
"bolje ... + da ti tata jaši na magarcu +" (ib.:211-212)

"i sin on ide kraj magarce +" (ib.:250)

"i sad mi moramo magarcu nosti +" (ib.: 231) etc..
```

In only one out of fifteen (1:15) instances, in QNP with 2, the /magar#c-/ remained a masculine:

```
"šta ste vi dva magarca natovli ((=natovarili)) na ovu jednu
životinju + " (ib.:219).
```

The boy has both times a typical diaspora deformation: under influence of Swedish åsna 'donkey', he conceives the word magarac (morphophonemically /magartc-/) sometimes as a masculine magarac. sometimes as a feminine magarca (morphophonemically the same /magar#c-/ with shifting gender). This is one more example of the parallelism of items, until now demonstrated only on the case systems (see also 3. below):

```
1981:masc.: "on je jašio ... //na magartsa// ...+" (07.05,81:9),

            "(... šta su radili?) zavezali magarca // ... +"
            (ib.:23),

     fem.:  "da on /n/e vuče magarcu+" (07.05,81:7),

            "onaj čojek je sjeo na magartsu/" (ib.:3),

1983:masc.: "da su baš lud- (('silly')) + da ...  na magarca  jaši
            +" (07.05,83:145-146),

     fem.:  "(...)  bolje + da ... da magarca jašše na nama  +  pa
            su zavezal- noge magarci  +  pa su  je  stavli  na  na
            seb- +" (ib.:154-157).
```

In the next record (1985), new changes appear; again they are oriented towards the diaspora phenomena and away from the standard. 07.05's genitive prepositions govern now both G. and A., while L. preserves its parallelism with the A., and once a nominal dative is paralleled by a prepositional construction. The word /magaric-/ is still a feminine, but in the story about the fox, the "lisica" was changed to a "lisac" 'the he-fox', in order to give a correct morphological motivation to the masculine, found in all GSW. It means that the names of the pivotal animals in both renarrated stories (where the model was narrated once in S/C -

'the donkey', once in Swedish - 'the fox') acquire that gender, which is motivated by the morphophonemic properties of the two <u>Swedish</u> words, which are interpreted by the S/C grammatical "filter".

This example demonstrates clearly that, in the diaspora, the development towards a correct S/C standard is never a finished process - at least in   child language.

1.3 In SlaL 9 I stated that in our corpus the children's genitive has almost lost its character of a grammatical (syntactical) case, which has important consequences for the structure of the NP. In the whole corpus between the ages 4 and 11 no NP with a genitive postmodifier (type <u>boja kuce</u>) is found (cf. the stop for a presumptive genitive in: "(...) on je bio pravi kralj <u>cele england</u> +". In general, NPs with postmodifiers are avoided here, but instances found in this corpus are linguistically extraordinarily important: they are often completely different from NP types in Slavonic languages (a survey of NP types in diaspora S/C is given in SlaL 9, 85-89).

a) The appositive type (ib. 2.3.3.4) is represented by following examples:

   "i na stapu su viseli dva konopca a <u>na kraj konopac</u> dve ... dve kante" (07.13,85:733);

   "(sto ima na sebi?) <u>kratkę pantalonlce to bela boja</u> +" (08.35:130);

b) A copy of Swedish compounds are NPs as <u>handikap stolica</u> or <u>teve</u> igra:

   "a onaj ((je)) ++ kak- zove ++ u jednu stolicu/neku <u>handikap stolicu</u> ... +" (07.14,85:925);

   "... igrali smo <u>teve igrę</u> ..." (07.13,85:877).

   The object, called here <u>handikap stolica</u> is called in S/C <u>invalidska</u> (adj.) <u>stolica</u> (f.) or invalideka (adj.) <u>kolica</u> (pi.), in Swedish <u>rullstol</u>: consequently <u>handikap stolica,</u> is no caique. It must be an ad hoc (cf. <u>neku</u>) construction there the S/C Onomasiologie type "adj. + substantive", with the Semasiologie "inner form" 'a seat/car for disabled', is first translated to Sw. (<u>invalid</u> =   handikappad) and then transposed to a compound of the

Swedish type (cf. handikapptoalett) - a pattern that is typologi-cally completely impossible in S/C. A teve igra is a direct loan-translation from the Swedish TV-spel; typologically, one could suppose a standard S/C NP with adjective, viz. televizilska reportaž, but in the spoken S/C also expressions as teve-ekipa can be found (words as auto-, radio-, elektro- became a kind of prefix In all Slavonic languages).

   c)   NPs formed by the preposition od + G./A. behave in our corpus in в very peculiar way.

An NP consisting of a head (T) and an attribute (T') od + G./A. can in our corpus be used instead of an incongruent postmodifier. as bo1a kuce, kuca za ptice (cf. *Ill* below) or instead of a congruent prenominal possessive adjective, as mamin kraj (cf. /1/ below).

In this way, we obtain two kinds of NPs:

/1/ "i došli onda od luhanesa 11udi ... +" (=Johanesovi, Jovanovi ljudi) (07.14,83:508);
      ae against:

/2/ "i na jednu drvetu ima kao jedna kućica od drveta mala ... +" (07.13, 83:405).

These two kinds of attribute retain, consequently, their linear place in respective NPs, in spite of the morphological form, completely impossible in prenominal position in standard S/C: the underlying immaterial syntactic model is stronger than a segmental surface construction.

The construction od + G./A. occurs in different prenominal combinations:

/3/ "i kad su došli od juhanesa vojnici +" (=Johanesovi, Jovanovi v.) (07.14,83:516);
/4/ "(kod koga?) kod od tate žena(1) ... +" (=kod tatine žene) (07.03,84:520);
/5/ "pozadi robin huda (...) i jos -ednoga od robin huda čovek(t) +" <=jednoga Robin Hudovog čoveka) (07.14,83:595); /6/
/6/ "ima od ptice kuća +" <=ptičija kuća) (07.09,85:719).
The last example proves that the od + G./A. construction is not necessarily a reflex of a Swedish 's-genitive.

In instances *141* and *151* the Ts are in N., although the prepositions <u>kod</u> and <u>oozadi</u> govern the 6. (viz. <u>kod žene. pozadl ćoveka</u> thus in normal S/C <u>kod tatine žene. pozadi Robin Hudovog coveka</u>): apparently, the combination od. + G./A. rules out the government of the preceding preposition, since two neighboring prepositions cannot exist in normal S/C. - In the example *111* is noticeably 07.14 embarrased, when he should implement the position of a congruent attribute by the construction od. + G.*Ik.* (cf. /4/ and /6/) *:*

/7/   "da se biju <u>sa ... juhanens</u> ++ kako ((se)) zove ++   <u>Hudi</u> + (07.14, 83:641).

The instrumental case form of <u>1.1 udi,</u> required by the preposition sa. is ruled out here as well and instead of an unsuitable prepositional phrase the boy 07.14 substitutes a Swedish deformed 's-genitive, since in diaspora language a S/C prepositionless genitive is impossible and he has no possessive adjective in his own paradigmatics - only an universal substitute od. + G.. - One more thing: the form <u>luhanens</u> is not a Swedish G. of <u>Johannes</u>: here, the correct G. would be identical with the N. I suspect that <u>.luhanens</u> is an ad hoc adapted form, (maybe "<u>1uhan</u>:<u>luhanens</u> as Swedish <u>man</u>:<u>mannens</u>) with no ambiguity in the formal marking of the genitive function - as this context requires (a "*da se biju sa <u>1uhanes</u> ljudi" would probably not give the desired meaning, that is in Swedish: "för att slåss med Joh<u>annes</u>' folk").

2.   <u>The impersonal ima</u>

2.0 The usage of the impersonal verb <u>ima</u> is a very instructive example of the autoregulating automatisms. In our corpus we found this verb in diametrically different syntactic constructions nonexistent in standard S/C, although some of them do occur in dialects and some are also registered in Jugoslaviska akademins Rječnik, bd. 3, 1891 (edited by P. Budmani), pp. 809-811 and in Miklosich's Vergleichende Grammatik IV, p. 356. A systematic description of dialectal syntax do not exist, however, making it difficult to distinguish between, on one hand, recorded forms due to dialectisms in the speech of the environment's and on the other, endogenous straightforward generalizations, due to the autoregulating automatisms.   The results can be exactly the same.

The diversity of our material can be represented by following examples:

```
I    /1/   (describing  a  picture:) "i ovde ima trava pored njih +
              tu ima jednu  jedna ((sic!)) šolju + ne znam  šta  je
              unutra + " (08.35,82:107-109);
     /2/   "(pošto se vidi da je star? (...)  nema  mu  kosu ...+"
              (07.16,85:652);
     /3/   "što ...  povredila  nogu + i  ima  joj  gips  ...+"
              (07.09:692);

II   /4/   "ja sam išao sa jednom grupom + i imala još jedna grupa
              +" (07.16,84:509-510);
     /4a/  "tu je imao jedan štap +" (07.13,84:503);
     /5/   "(a kad bi bilo zima, kako bi vigledalo?) (...)  onda ne
              bi ... pečurke imale +" (07.13,84:607,616);
     /6/   "u vodi imaju kamenje puno +" (07.21:155);

III  /7/   "i ima kola /1 jedna kuća/ i na  drvo  jedna  kučica  +"
              (07.09,81:62);
     /8/   "posle ima neke mravi +" ('ants') (07.09,85:766);
     /8a/  "na drvetu ima ...tri miševa + " (07,13,83:419);
     /9/   "I imalo ... posle neki čovek + (šta) ulovio  neku  vaku
              ribu +" (10,02:233);
     /10/  "ne bi imalo jagode +" (07.13,84:610);
     /11/  "onda je imalo jedan ... hink ... +" (07.19,82:44);
     /12/  "nema koga ovde na vrh ..." (07.14,83:470);
     /13/  "ak  se  nešto  desi  +  može  imati  tu  nešto  +"
              (08.32,82:100);

IV   /14/  "tu se more da se ima piknik i ta- +" (07,16,84:511);
     /15/  "ondak  ak- nije zima ... + mož- se svašta tu imat samo"
              (08.32,82:115).
```

2.1 The impersonal ima in the existential meaning developed from the personal transitive imati 'to have', a two-argument verb, by truncation (or "loss") of the x-argument: it is, thus, still transitive (i.e. has preserved its y-argument), although in the *SIC* standard the object is in partitive genitive.

Since normally the partitive genitive is a parallel form with the accusative object, such an A. occurs both in our corpus (see 1-3) and in old Serbian, see Miklosich 1926, 356: "i tuj ima vrulu", the same examples also in Rječnik 1891, 809. Significative is the A. in /2/; with nema. the S/C standard invariably requires the G., while 07.16 uses the accusative.

Ambiguous N.-A. forme in a coordinative syntagm can be consi-

dered disambiguated by a clear accusative form like <u>laknu</u> in: <u>ima</u> <u>puno</u> debeli demperi /öizme i <u>laknu</u>/ +" (07.01:210).

The unambiguous accusative government of <u>ima</u> is, in fact, rather exceptional: there are, however, many instances where, in this position, the A. and the N. cannot be distinguished, as in /3/ (such is also Budmani's only example "U seoskom mjestu od Kozara ima <u>ikone</u> Gospojine", Rjecnik 1891, 809). This applies for all nouns that have N.-A.: examples may be found in almost each one of our hundreds of records, e.g. "i posle ovde ima <u>śator</u> ... +" (10.05:116), "i bllzu zeka ima <u>пеке pećurke</u> +" (07.14,83:427) or "i ima <u>puno</u> drveta kao suma ... +" (07.13,83:425) etc.

2.2 In instances where the N. is not identical with the A., the absolute majority of nouns is in Nominative. The grammatical system can conceive this N. as either a subject or as a predicate noun. Both possibilities occur in our corpus and are documented also in Rječnik 1891 as well as in Miklosich's grammar, but do not appear in contemporary normative S/C lexicons (e.g. Rečnik 1967) and grammars (e.g. Stevanović 1974, Baric et al. 1979, Katičić 1985).

2.2.1 To conceive the N. as the subject (see 4 - 6) means, in terms of the system, that the verb <u>ima</u> "conceives" its y-argument as an x-argument and becomee in this way synonymous with the existential <u>jest</u>: "i imala joe jedna grupa" in /4/ means 'i bila jos jedna grupa', germ, 'es gab noch eine Gruppe'. The same process is found also in Russian, where the verb <u>imet'</u> is deprived of its y-argument by reflectivization ("i imelas' *este* odna gruppa") in order to acquire the existential meaning.

Such shift in sentence function changes the sentence construction and it becomee personal: this can only be proved when the former impersonal <u>ima</u> paradigmatically forms congruent personal forms. Rjecnik 1891 registers only plural forms, e.g. "Navrh toga brda <u>lmaju zidine</u> od crkve" (Vuk), "<u>Mnoge skupstine</u> na svitu <u>imadu</u>" (Filipović), always in present (the whole extensive material, about 100 examples, is in present tense, with one exception in imperfect : "u vojski <u>imaśe</u> gorostasan zatocnik" (Djordjić). In our materiel (4 - 6) several instances with subject also have the past (as /4/, /4a/ and /5/), a usage that has not been documented outside the diaspora.

When presented within a larger context, we can see how a diaspora child seeks the appropriate syntactical construction, and

then vacillates between a personal and an impersonal sentence, e.g. :

"(a kad bi bilo zima kako bi vigledalo?) (...) trava <u>ne bi</u>

<u>bila</u> viä- tako zelena ... +

(...) posle <u>ne bi imalo</u> jagode ... +

 ... ni sunce <u>ne bi bio</u> puno +

(..) morda <u>ne bi</u> ni śator <u>imali</u> +

(..) onda <u>ne bi</u> ... pećurke <u>imale</u> +

<u>ne bl</u> i ova detelina ... +"   (07.13,84:607-617)

or another child's reaction on the same cue:

"vozili bi skridsko ovde +

... tu <u>bi bilo</u> ... +

<u>ne bi imalo</u> lišće ... +

<u>ne bi imalo</u> jagode +

tu <u>bi imała</u> samo sne- +

ne <u>bi imala</u> vatra + "   (07.14,85:981-986).

2.2.2 The normal shape of existential sentences with <u>ima</u> in our corpus - and apparently also in spoken S/C – is

imaimpers. + N.

(cf. /7/ - /13/). The N. is, consequenly, a predicate noun, as in existential sentences with the verb <u>biti.</u>

   The impersonality of this sentence type is sufficiently proved by the lack of congruence with the noun *(111 -IBI)* and, especially, by the neuter of the L-form in past and conditional: *(19 -11/)* :

imalo ... čovek. ne bi imalo iagode. etc.

This impersonality of <u>ima</u> is in a normal way "mirrored" by modal verbs as <u>moći</u> nad <u>morati.</u> cf. "tu <u>ima</u> nešto" --> "tu može imati nesto" /13/, probably also tu <u>bi mogło imati.</u> tu može <u>da ima</u> etc. Synonymous S/C sentences with the existential verb <u>biti</u> are personal and they do have congruence, as <u>bio je neki ćovek. ne bi bile iagode. bio je ledan hink.</u>. Apparently according to the <u>ima</u>-type. impersonal <u>biti</u>-sentences also can be found: "<u>trava</u> tu ne bi <u>bila</u> + " (07.09,85:750) instead of <u>trava tu ne bi bila</u> or <u>trave tu ne bi bilo.</u>

The compulsory character of the N. in this diaspora sentence type Is confirmed by the negated Impersonal <u>nema</u> with the same N. /12/. In the following sequence the difference between a personal and an impersonal <u>nema</u> is very clear: the personal one ('he does not have') governs the A., while the impersonal one ('there are not') is combined with the N. :

"i ... zeko nema <u>ovaku boiu</u> ((A.)) u zimu ... +

... i <u>miši</u> ((N.)) nema +

oni bi umreli ... +" (07.14,85:991-993)

In standard S/C only the 6. is possible with the impersonal <u>nema</u> (nema kose); all examples in Rjećnik 1891, 809-910 also have the 6. (with one pronominal exception: "Znas kockarom kakva je avlija,da u njojzi <u>ništa ne imade</u>" (Reljković)).

I did not either find past forms and conditional of the <u>ima-</u>construction (as /9 - 11/) and impersonal constructions as <u>može lmati</u> /13/ outside the JUBA-corpue.

The high frequency of the <u>ima-</u>construction and its paradigmatic productivity, unparalleled in the S/C in Yugoslavia, is, in my opinion, due to the Swedish construction "det finns (inte) + noun" with the same existential meaning. The Swedish basic noun form has its natural equivalent in the S/C nominative and the formal subject <u>det</u> 'it' in neuter form favours the S/C neuter of gender sensitive forms, viz. <u>imalo (bi)</u> = <u>det fanns</u>: in turn, in S/C this neuter form is a symptom of lacking subject, i.e. of the impersonality of this sentence model.

As we saw in 2.1, the noun in <u>ima-</u>sentences can also, if infrequently, be conceived as <u>governed</u> by the - still impersonal - <u>ima</u> (see /1 - 2/), according to the personal verb <u>imati</u> 'to have'. Vacillations between the N. and the A. quoted in /1/ testify to this potential conflict in the diaspora language.

The ultimate consequence of the impersonality is provided by a Dative used to express a person involved (/2 - 3/). This is a general feature of Slavonic impersonal sentences: since, however, the impersonality of <u>ima-</u>sentences is an innovation, the dative has not been documented outside the diaspora language. In both our instances the noun is, or can be conceived as the accusative. I have no evidence of the D. in impereonal <u>ima-</u>sentences with an unambiguous N. (as are /7 - 12/): no *<u>imalo mu kuca</u> is documented (which, of course, would be superfluous with respect to <u>imao je</u>

<u>kucu,</u> but we do have the right to expect it with respect to /2/ "nema mu kosu", which also means 'on nema kose', 'he has no hairs').

3 <u>Gender in the story of the fox and the wolf.</u>

In the renarrated text about the fox and the wolf, strikingly many errors in gender were observed: when speaking about the fox, S/C <u>lisica</u> fem., in gender sensitive words (GSW) masculine forms were used surprisingly often not only in coreference (<u>lisica</u> -> <u>on.</u> <u>sam</u> instead of ona, sama), but also in congruence (<u>.ledan lisica,</u> <u>lisica je seo.</u> instead of jedna lisica, lisica je sela).

This text is a story that was first read to every informant in Swedish and then renarrated both in Swedish and in S/C. In the original, the fox is "Mickel räv", while the wolf has no name, and our first guess was that the male name Michael causes the gender errors. Investigation of a greater material (about 100 texts) showed, however, error models that testify to a deeper cause.

3.1 The four error models.

According to the distribution of gender errors in GSW (gender sensitive words) referring to or congruent with the feminine word "lisica", we can reveal in the about 100 texts of children aged 7 - 10 four error models, abbreviated schematically:

$$F, \quad F_x, \quad C, \quad M,$$

(In the following text "GSW" will mean "gender sensitive words referring to or congruent with the word <u>lisica</u>").

3.1.1 In error model F all GSW are feminine, i.e. no gender errors occur.

Schematically:

(incipit:)	Bil<u>a</u> je jedn<u>a</u> lisica ...
(referent "lisica":)	... išl<u>a</u> ...
	... mislil<u>a</u> ...
(changing the referent:)	bunar ... dve kofe
("lisica" is referent again:)	... on<u>a</u> je sel<u>a</u> ...
	... videl<u>a</u> ...

```
(changing the referent:)        vuk
("lisica" is referent again:) ... ne mogu sama pojesti ...

                              ... vuk išo dole, lisica gore ....

                              ... prevarila ga.
```

There are 14 euch texts e.g. 07.05,84; 07.08; 07.19; 08.39; 09.25, 09. 34.

3.1.2 Because of its frequency F_x can be conceived as a special error model; F_x means a model with masculine or neutre GSW in the incipit, but feminines elsewhere.

Schematically:

```
                        Bio  ⎤
(incipit :)                  ⎬─  je jedan lisica ...
                        Bilo ⎦

(continued as in F:)              ... išla ...
                                  ... mislila ...
                                  etc.


E.g.:     "bio jedan ... jedna lisica +
          što se zvala mikel ... +
          (...) i je- jedanput jednog dana ... onda lisica ona je
              ... išla u šumu +
          i ondak je došla ... do jednog bunara ... +" etc.
                                                      (10.22,82)


or:       "bilo jednom jedan ... +
          bilo jed-an lisica +
          i ona otiššla +
          da ... ide +
          da vidi tamo +
          -de e bilo ... (bunar) bunar +
          i ondak ona videla ... +" etc.            (07.16,82)
```

This model is found for instance in records 07.13,84; 09.35; 10.02; 10.14; 10.22.

3.1.3 The error model C (a conventional abbreviation of "conflict") is the crucial point in my presentation.

In this model the feminine GSWs occur in a more or less close connection   with the word lisica. When another referent (e.g. the

draw-well, the wolf) appears in the narration instead of the fox, the feminine influence of

lisica is broken; from this point on coreferring pronouns as well as GSW predicates become

masculine, until the next occurrence of lisica, with the same effect on neighbouring or

following GSWs as above. This gender change can be repeated several times.

Schematically:

```
(incipit:)                      Bio je jedna lisica ...
(word "lisica":)                ... išla ...
                                ... mislila ...
(changing the referent:)        bunar ... dve kofe
("lisica" is referent again:)   ... on je seo ...
                                ... video ...
(changing the referent:)        ... vuk
(referent "lisica":)            ... ne mogu sam pojesti ...
                                ... vuk išo dole, lisica gore ...
(word "lisica" is used again:)  ... prevarila ga ... .


E.g.:
    masc.:   "bio jedanput ...+
    fem.:    bio jedan dan jedna lisica +
             išla +
             i v- i videla jedan bunar +
             i gleda dol- +
             i vidi +
             da ima ... je-da- ... +
             da ima jedan ... (sir) sir +
    masc.:   i posle on je ... ((...)) uzo uso (=ušao)) u bunar +
             bie dve kofe + ((...)) +
             onak on dole a drug- gore ...+
             pose on je seo u je/dnu/ +
             i ba- i brzo je otišo dole + ((...))
             i došo jedan v- vuk +
             i kaze +
             šta to radiš lisicao tamo dole +
             i kaž +
             n- je ne vidi/š/ +
             šta sam našo ... sira ... sira +
    fem.:    ne mogu sama +
             d- ga pojedmo ako oćeš +"   etc.          (07.03,83)
```

3.1.4 In the corpus we also have some 14 records where lisica is consistently conceived as a

masculine noun and where all or almost

all GSW have masculine form. (We vill discuss this issue theoretically later, see below 3.2.) In the majority of those records the word <u>lisica</u> is simply treated as a masculine, in two of them the informant names the fox Mikael, i.e. a male (08.25,81; 10.08,81). In the last the fox is <u>llsac.</u> a marked form for 'male fox', while <u>lisica</u> is unmarked and can design any animal of this species.

Examples:

     "bilo je jedanput ... ++ sta se sad zove to ++
     (šta se sad zove to, mislis lisica?) varg +
     (vuk ... varg) <u>lisica</u> i vuk +
     pa s- ... pa je <u>lisica</u> i- ... išo_ +
     pa je tam našg jed- jedan ... veliki +
     ((...)) onda on misli +
     da da sam se ja preva<u>rio sam</u> +
     ((...)) onda došo vuk +
     pa pita <u>lisicu</u> ... +
     sta on ((i.e. lisica)) tam- dole radi +
     ((...)) al- ali vuk je bio tako težak +
     da <u>lisica</u> do- doso gore +
     pa onda kazo kaže ovako do vuk + " etc . (10.11,81)

or (with Mikael):

     "(o kome se radi?) od ... (li-) lisica i (vu-) vuk +
     <u>lisica</u> se zvala <u>mikael</u> ... +
     ... i ondak je ... je išo +
     i pośle je vido ovu ... +
     (bu-) bunar i ... mislio +
     da ima tu ... (ei-) sir +
     i ondak je s<u>eo</u> + ((...))
     i ondak o- doso <u>mikael</u> gore +
     i ... sišo je +
     i onda kaže"   etc. (08.25,82)

or (with <u>lisac</u>):.

     "jeanput je <u>lisač</u> iśa van u mjesečini +
     pa je doša ko- jednog bunara +
     gleda je dole u bunar +
     pa je vidjo jedan ... veli-ki ... veliki ... sir +
     i onda kaza +
     ako (('hov')) bi imao (('to get')) taj sir + ((...))
     ... a <u>lisac</u> je sjedneo u jednu kantu +
     pa je dole dośa. ... u bunar +
     ((...)) i onda doša vuk +
     i pita <u>lisca</u> +"   etc. (07.05.85)

3.1.5 In each of these modele, gender corrections occur. They testify somewhere to an unconscious, in other cases to a conscious search for the correct gender. Such vacillations are especially often in incipits.   Some examples:

```
"jedan dan jedan noć otišo otišla ... ++
ee ... onaj ... kako se zove ++ (li-) li- lisici +
i videla +" etc.               (07.14,83 ; a C model)
```

with following 12 feminine GSW. And later in the same text:

```
(the wolf:) "a kako ću da dođem dole +
            on ka- + (=the fox)
            ona kaže ... +
            sedi u kofu +
            pa ćeš da dođeš dole +
            i on ona kaže ... +"  etc.
```

The informant 10.14, with a pure F model has two corrections in the incipit (all three genders!) and on the critical point after the first referent shift:

```
"((...)) pre bio je +
bilo je +
bio joj je +
bila je jedna lisica ((...))" etc.
```

```
(referent shift:)
```

```
"to je samo bio mjesec +
što se gleduo u vodu +
onda on o- o- ona ona misli +
kako će doč gore +"            (10.14,81)
```

A conscious correction can be exemplified in the record of 10.12,81 (a C model): he has a "normal" vacillation in the incipit: "bio je jeden + o i bila. je jedna lisica + i isla, je +" etc; then, the narration continues with shifts between the feminine and the masculine GSW; then, in the conversation between the fox and the wolf, the fox says:

```
"pa da vidiš ka- kakav fin sir ovde dole ima ... +
i on i on kaže +
ćekaj +
i ona kaže +
pa dođi dole +"   etc.
```

These corrections are one more eloquent symptom of the conflict between the two genders which took place in the mind of a diaspora child during the renarration of this text.

Records with gender corrections are marked "cr", e.g F_{cr} C_{cr}, M_{cr}.

3.2 Is there any development of these error models in the language of the same child? The records of our six informants with 4-5 year cuts each reveal rather a tendency to preserve a given model:

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
07.03	C	C	C	C	M
07.05	C	–	C_{cr}	F	M
07.09	C_{cr}	C	C	C	C
07.13	F	F_{xcr}	C	F_x	F
07.14	F	C_{cr}	C_{cr}	F/M*	F_{xcr}
07.16	–	F_{xcr}	F_{xcr}	F_{xcr}	F_{cr}
07.17	–	M	M	–	–

*) In the last five sentences only masculine GSW, two occurences of <u>lisica</u> notwithstanding.

Only the informant 07.OS changée his error model in a significative, and, at the same time, explicable way: as we saw in connection with the development of case système, possibly as a consequence of a journey to Yugoslavia, he improved in 1984 the command of his grammar syetem and eliminated fully gender errors (model F). - Psycholinguistically, his development between 1984 and 1985 is extremely interesting. In order to motivate a pressure towards the masculine (see below), he changes the sexually unmarked word <u>lisica</u> for male marked <u>lisac</u> (a completely unique behaviour in our whole corpus). I would like to stress that the use of this masculine noun <u>lieac</u> is <u>a consequence,</u> not a cause of the gender shift in 07.05,85.

2.3 There are no sharp boundaries between various models, e.g. records F with corrections (F_{cr}) and/or those with masculine inci-pits (F_x, $F_{X}cr$> differ only quantitatively from records belonging to the model C/C_{cr}. Statistically achieved conclusions must, thus, be taken with a grain of salt. With this reservation, the quantative distribution of my 91 investigated texts is as follows:

	total	%
F	14	15.38
F_x	13	14.28
C, C_{cr}	45	49.45
M	13	14.28
destroyed	6	7.22
total	91	100

This means that only ln 15.44 of records the gender of GSW is correct. In 78% of records (F_x, C, M) more or less often the grammatically counterindicated masculine replaces the correct feminine. The syntax yields normal plots (prenominal attributes, congruent predicates, coreferring pronouns), but the morphology does not follow the rules, wich apply absolutely and without exception not only to the whole S/C territory, but to all Slavonic (properly all Indo-European) languages. Syntagms as Iedan lisica have no potential source in the S/C.

An explanation must be sought in the diaspora conditions.

3. 4 How to explain this disturbance of absolutely valid grammatical rules?

3.4.1 Our first assumption was that it was the male name Mickel = Michael that took over the gender dominance.

It is, however, easy to understand that the majority of children completely omit the name and speak about an unnamed lisica: in all models such records are in an absolute majority. Furthermore, the use of Mickel or Micke (the name is never transposed to the S/C, like Mihajlo, Misa: in S/C tales the fox is never named, like Renard)   does not necessarily mean the gender shift. For instance:

```
"bio jednom jean vuk ... +
bio jednom lija +
šo se zove mikel ... +
i ona -e išla jedan dan pokraj jednog ... +
(videla jedan bunar) bunar +
i ... i našla +
i videla u sira jedan veliki sir +"
etc,. only fem.
                        (07.14,85; model Fxcr);
```

or:

```
"bil- ((?)) jedna lisica +
što se zvala mikael +
i vuk ... +
mik- mike lisica išla pored jedn- veliki bunar +
kad je pogledala dole +
videl- ((?)) jedan veliki ost ... +
... sela +"  etc.
```

(after referent shift:)

```
"i on je mislio +
kako sad da se spustim dole +
nego sjedne u jednu kofu +
kofa ga spusti dole ..."  etc.
```
<div align="right">(07.13,83; model C)</div>

On the contrar, Mikael seems to have some influence for the choice of the masculine in 10.08,91

```
"(kako se zove råv?) ... vuk // ... ne / ... +
(to je ona druga životinja) ... (li-) lisisa //
   ... lisica i vuk // ... +
"bio jedanput jean lisica / +
ća se zvala ... mikael // +
... i ona ... on ... išal ... vanka malo ... do
   jedan ... (bunar) buna // +
i gledal dole / ... +" etc., masculine only.
```
<div align="right">(10.08,81; model M_{cr}).</div>

The same is the case in 08.25,82:

```
"(o kome se radi?) od ... (li-) lisica i ... (vu-) vuk +
lisica se zvala mikael ... +
i ondak je ... je išo +
i posle je vido ... ovu ... +" etc., masc. only.
```
<div align="right">(08.25,82; model M).</div>

The child 07.17, with two year cuts only <1982 and 1983), has a stable M model! she does not use the name Mikael in the first record (1982), but does so in the second one: "((...)) (išla je jednom) išla jedna lisica ... + što se zvao ... mikel + lisica ... išo + i našo jeden bunar ... +" etc. mase. only (07.17,83: 199-201); "a mikael lisica je bio lakši nego vuk +" (ib. 228) etc.

In the records belonging to the C or F_x model, no connection can be found between the gender or model choice and the use of the name Mickel, Micke.

It. is, consequently, clear that the masculine GSW are caused by something other than the name Mickel.

3. 4. 2 A cue for the solution can be found in diaspora incipits with the neuter, as <u>Bilo je jedanput jedna lisica,</u> which is a literal translation of the Swedish <u>Det var en gang en räv,</u> with a neutre <u>det,</u> since it is independent of the noun: the S/C word <u>bilo</u> follows morphologically the Swedish pattern, although it violates the S/C congruence rule. The choice of the appropriate form is determined by a principle which exists outside the text and outside the child's own language system.

Following the same principle, the gender of GSW can be determined by the Swedish word <u>räv.</u> This word ends with the consonant <u>-v</u> and this phoneme shape of a noun causes the speaker to <u>conceive</u> <u>it as a masculine</u> when transferred - or just thought - in S/C (cf. e.g. <u>spjev.</u> <u>usjev. zahtjev</u> etc.). It is, consequently, the morphophonemic factors that determine gender choice. I can quote an instance which reveals that behind the on, <u>sam</u> etc. the child does think <u>räv</u>: "onda je <u>r- on</u> skočia. ((u)) kantu / + i otéa je dole // ... +" (07.07,82:49; model C). By this "r- on ..." a sequence of feminine GSW (<u>lisca</u> ... isla.... <u>videla</u> ... <u>videla</u> ...) is broken and a sequence of 15 masculine forms opens (<u>akoćia</u> ... <u>otsa</u> .. <u>on vidila</u> ... <u>negov</u> ... <u>o- reka</u> ... <u>on niie moaa sam</u> ... etc.).

It can be noted that using on. to refer to the fox does not exclude the possibility of using on. to also refer, in the same sequence, to the wolf. Despite the chaos that this causes, such substitution is present in many texts.

We can thus propose an interpretation of our models C and F_x.
3.4.3 In F_x as "Bio jedan lisica ..." the primary sentence concept in the speaker's mind supposes a subject <u>räv</u> that is morphophonemically attributed the masculine gender. Both the predicate <u>bio</u> and the attribute <u>jedan</u> follow this assumption, until, in the linear manifestation of the concept, the feminine <u>lisica</u> ie found on the plot of the subject.

This feminine can at this point cause the gender shift (see 3.1.3) and in this way the text model F_x arises   if   the feminine

continues in the entire text. If, however, the feminine is preserved only in some following GSWs, while masculine GSWs appear after the next referent shift (as a rule after the motif of the well) until the next occurence of the lisica etc. - we obtain the model C.

Since the gender shift is not necessary (see "lisica iso". possible in the model C, necessary in H), we can see different "grammatical strenght" in the same word lisica with different speakers, in different idiolects.

Moreover, such "grammatical strenght" of a single word must to a certain extent also reflect the "grammatical strenght", or "grammatical integrity" of an Idiolect as a whole.

3.5.1 It may be objected that the masculine gender is caused by the pronoun han 'he', which refers to räv as far as it is meant as a sexually unmarked designator. Against such objection, I can adduce one more argument for the morphophonemic interpretation.

Our first text, narrated in S/C and renarrated by the children in both S/C and in Swedish, tells about a father, a son and a donkey in S/C magarac. in Swedish åsna.

In this case, maoarac m. is very often changed to maaarca f. (non existent in the S/C), or, less frequently, the word magarac has the feminine coreference and/or congruence, even though åsna is coreferred as han too.

Some examples:
  "da bolje + da ... da magarca jaâse na nama +"
   (07.05, 83:154-155);

  "ali sad je maga-raca + što će nas / da pomogne *II* ... + " (= 'which shall help us')
     (07.09,81:26-27)

  "((...)) jedan čovek i njegov sin ... po- + posli ... + (hm) i maaarca ... pošli su kući iz ...
     grad +" (10.01,81:2-5);

(Congruence:)
  "(zašto?) zato što obadvoje jašu na onoj na onu ... magarca... + " (07.16, 82:76).

81

It is sometimes difficult to identify morphologically certain forms, primarily the form <u>na maoarcu,</u> since it can be a <u>L. masc..</u> as well as <u>A. fern,</u> replacing the L. in the essive meaning (cf. also SlaL 9, 1.3.1.1). Thus, in the record 07.05,84, the word "magerte-" occurs 15 times: it is clearly masculine once ("dva magarca" 219), clearly feminine 10 times (e.g. "sad mi moramo magarçu. nosti +" 231; "ide <u>kral</u> magarge. +" 250) and four instances are ambiguous - the insoluble Instr. <u>magarcom</u> (199) and three times <u>jaši na maqarcu</u> (204, 212, 227). Given that <u>1asi na magarci</u> (200) is found also here, <u>na maqarcu</u> would be identified (in the standard S/C) as the masculine. But, since the diaspora language possesses the feature Ly (cf. 1.1), we are fully authorized to consider in this text "na magarcu" (A.) as well as "na magarci" (L.) - both having the same essive meaning - as forms of "magarca" <u>fern..</u> This "femininized" <u>magarca</u> is a diaspora feature which mirrors in the S/C morphophonemic shape the Swedish "åsna" with auslaut <u>-a.</u>

Such "femininization" of the word <u>magarac</u> is somewhat less frequent as the "masculinization" of <u>lisica.</u> But out of 7 children in our 07. diachrony (30 records), 5 (11 records) do have at least once either the feminine shape "magarc-", or the pattern of the feminine congruence.

3.5.1.1 The language behaviour of 07.05 can be noted as a psy-cholinguistically very significant case.In all his four records, the boy uses predominantly the feminine "magarca" in different case forms and coreferent pronouns are always feminine (e.g. ("a šta je magarac radio?) onaj ... onda -stalą <u>sama</u> // ... + (šta?) -stala je onde <u>sama</u> +", 07.05,81:30-31). In 1981 and 1983 (we have no 1982 record), he has the (essive!) accusative in both masculine and feminine shape ("da sin joâi na <u>maoarcu</u> +" 129), alongside with "da ... <u>magarca</u> jaši +" 146), in 1984 all case forms but the quantitative ("dva magarca") are feminine, and in 1985 the word is consistently feminine. This is to be compared with the development of "lisica" in 07.05's records (see 3.2 above): in the same 1985, he consistently masculinized his "lisica" and feminized his "magarac", viz. <u>lisac</u> and <u>magarca.</u> reflecting the Swedish words <u>rav</u> and <u>åsna.</u> - The improvement of 07.05's language, especially his grammar mentioned in 1.2.25, entailed at this point apparently the strengthening of its consistent system character rather than accepting standard S/C forms. The "grammatical integrity" (3.4.3) of 07.05's idiolect in 1985 is perfect, at least in this respect, even though it takes place at the expense of its "correctness".

3.5.2 Another comparable example of the disturbing influence of a Swedish model is the behaviour of the word <u>brod, brodić</u> 'boat' (see SlaL 9, 42>: it behaves often as an animate noun (<u>ima brodića</u> <u>maloaa</u>). apparently because boats, ships etc. are in Swedish core-ferred to by <u>hon</u> 'she', something that in the mind of a diaspora child can "personalize" these objects/words in the same way as <u>rav</u> can "masculinize" and <u>åsna</u> can "femininize" their S/C equivalents.

3.6 The quantitative difference between the "masculinization" of the "lisica" and the "femininization" of the "magarac" is probably caused by the fact that the story about the fox was narrated in Swedish and renarrated in the S/C, while the story about the donkey was narrated in S/C (according to the child's wish in Serbian or Croatian version). - A complementary factor may be the fact that the fox story was renarrated, as a rule, firet in Swedish and only afterwards in S/C: the potential masculine impuls was, maybe, continued in the S/C text. This may be why the model F_x with a masculine incipit occurs so frequently.

3.7 The behaviour of these key words in our two texts demonstrates with all desired clarity the conflict that goes on in the "language mind" of a diaspora child.

In contrast to the autonomy of a normal language system we encounter here a permeability, that yields way to the impact of Swedish (i.e. of any language of the environing society) on all levels and in the most unexpected ways (as are both the impact of the Swedish phoneme shape on the gender in S/C, and the violations of congruence and coreference). The autoregulating automatisms can then generalize any innovation (see 07.05,65), or the parallelism of the "correct" and "diaspora" features is possible.

Whatever the case may be, this permeability must be both the object of further linguistic investigation, and the starting point for all language pedagogy in diaspora conditions.

Literature

Bazić, E., Lončarić, M. et. al.: 1979, <u>Pirirućna gramatika</u> <u>hrvatskoga kniiževnog jezika.</u> Zagreb.

Ďurovič L'.: 1983, 'The case systems in the language of diaspora children', <u>Linaus in Diaspora</u> (= Slavica Lundensia 9), 21-94, Lund.

Ďurovič, L'. : 1984a, 'The diaspora children's Serbo-Croatian', in: <u>Language and Literary Theory.</u> In Honour of Ladislav Matejka (= Papers in Slavic Philology 5), 19-27, Ann Arbor.

Ďurovič, L'.: 1984b, 'The inner consistency of a linguistic continuum', in: <u>Signs of Friendship.</u> To Honour A. 6. F. van Hoik..., 89-95, Amsterdam.

Friberg, A.-Ch.: 1983, 'The vocabulary test', <u>Lingua in Diaspora</u> (= Slavica Lundensia 9), 95-105, Lund.

Jovanović, S.: s.a. (1984), <u>0 padežnim slstemima trinaestogodiśnle dece sraskohrvatske düaspore u S vedskoj,</u> s. 1., Stockholm School of Education (manuscript).

Katičić, R.: 1986, <u>Sintaksa hrvatskoaa književnog lezika.</u> Zagreb.

Miklosich, F.: 1926, <u>Vergleichende Grammatik der slaviBchen Sprachen.</u> IV. Band (Neudruck), Heidelberg.

<u>Rečink srpskohrvatskooa knliževnog jezika.</u> knj.2, Matica Srpska -Matica Hrvatska, Novi Sad - Zagreb 1967.

<u>Rječnik hrvatskoaa ili srpskoga iezika.</u> III/12, ed. P. Budmani, Jugoslavenska Akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb 1891.

SlaL 9: 1983, <u>Lingua in Diaspora.</u> Studies in the Language of the Second Generation of Yugoslav Immigrant Children in Sweden (= Slavica Lundensia 9), Lund.

Stevanović, M.: 1974[2], <u>Savremeni srpskohrvatski iezik.</u> II, Sintaksa, Beograd.

Table of Contents

Lunds Universitet

85