Ľubomír Ď u r o v i č

THE CASE SYSTEMS IN THE LANGUAGE OF DIASPORA CHILDREN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

0.1. In the following article I will present the results of a special investigation, made within the JUBA project. While reading the children's texts, we were surprised by the diversity of case forms in combinations which are rather stable in the whole Slavic territory, especially in combinations with prepositions.

S/C has, of course, a special position in this respect, it is situated in a territory where the 7 (6) case systems are replaced by 2 (3) case or caseless "Balkan" systems, but the language of "our" diaspora children did not seem to fit into any known model.

Besides, some other results of our investigation, particularly the investigation of the vocabulary and the experience of the teachers testified that the school starting age is a period when important changes take place in the diaspora language (cf e g the article on the vocabulary test, pp. 99ff.).

On these assumptions we posed a question whether there are common features, characterizing the case systems of school beginners.

We investigated the records stored in file D07. (i e children aged 7 years in 1981) and completed the material with older records from our "Pilot Study" (file D00.), extracting the informants of approximately the same age and some informants from file D06., who reached the age of 7 when tested.

In this way, altogether 25 childrens' records were investigated in order to find out how their case systems (nouns and pronouns) are constructed.

The results are accounted for in part 1 and 2 of this article, preceded by a summary in 0.2.

0.2.   SUMMARY

The final result of this investigation can be presented in the following table:

1.	NA	D00.01, D00.06, D07.03,82
2.	NAG	D00.04,79, D00.07, D06.16, D07.03,81, D07.18
3.	NAGL	D07.05y, D00.04,76
4.a)	NAGLI	D07.07y, D07.08y, D07.19y, D07.22, D07.25y, D07.26y, D06.17, D00.08,79
b)	NAGI	D07.09, D07.13, D07,14y, D06.15
5.a)	NAGLID	D07.01y, D07.21y, DC7.23y, D00.08,80
b)	NAGID	D07.17y
6.a)	NAGLIDV	D07.20y, D07.24y
b)	NAGIDV	not found

Note to the table.

The letters in the left hand column are abbreviations of the case names N = nominative, A = accusative, G = genitive, L = locative, I. = instrumental, D = dative, V = vocative.
The letter y added to a figure in the right hand column marks the instability of the case opposition locative vs accusative (it is always the locative that can be replaced by the accusative in individual cases: the opposite is a unique exception). The systems 4.b), 5.b) and (not attested) 6.b) completely lack the locative and, therefore, they are considered to be a variant of their a)-counterparts, e g NAGI in relation to NAGLI, NAGLyI being an intermediate stage.

0.2.1. The table, as the result of our investigation, shows that among the given school beginners' group six different case inventories have been revealed: systems consisting of only the nominative and accusative (NA), spoken by the children D00.01, D00.06 and D07.03 in 1982, systems of nominative, accusative and genitive (NAG), spoken by D00.04 in 1979 and 1982, by D00.07, D06.16, D07.18 and by D07.03 in 1981 and so on.

In all systems containing the locative, this case form can sporadically (=y) or systematically (b)-variants) be replaced by the accusative.

The ordering of the case symbols from left to right reflects the

implicative character of the cases in the systems investigated:
the presence of any case in a system implies the presence of all
the other cases "to the left", but says nothing about the cases
"to the right". Thus, e g the locative as a part of the system
implies that the other cases in the same system are the nomina-
tive, the accusative and the genitive. It says nothing, however,
about the presence of an instrumental, dative or vocative in the
respective system - see 3. NAGL vs 4. NAGL_I_, 5. NAGL_ID_ or 6.
NAGL_IDV_.

From this implicativity (= "to be implied") the locative is exemp-
ted. As was stated in the note to the table, the locative can be
in the single personal idioms partly or totally replaced by the
accusative: in the table such cases are marked by y_ with the
child number or by b) with the system number respectively. Conse-
quently, the L itself does imply the N, A, and G, but it is not
automatically implied by I., D and V (this implication is only
potential).
The implicativity is not equally strong in the case of the dative.
The dative enclitic pronominal forms are sporadically found in
records, in which neither nouns nor pronouns (accentuated) in the
dative occur (well known as one of the "balkanisms"). It is
perhaps in this connection that dative forms of the nouns some-
times appear without implying the instrumental, locative or geni-
tive. Thus the implicative character of the dative is rather pro-
babilistic (see 1.4.0. and 1.5.0).

0.2.2. Although this table describes the presence or absence of
cases in personal systems of 25 Yugoslav diaspora children, there
is a striking similarity with Roman Jakobson's description of the
Russian case system (TCLP 6, pp 240-288), based on the relations
between the invariant meaning (Gesamtbedeutung) of the cases.

The vocative, non-existent in Russian, is strictly speaking not a
case (it does not express any relation) and it comes last in our
implication hierarchy, preceeded by L, I. and D, Jakobson's three
"Randkasus". The vicinity of our G and L corresponds to Jakobson's
subsuming them into the "Umfangskasus". Jakobson's "Vollkasus" N,
A and G, linked together by an "Umfangskorrelation" (TCLP 6, 255),
are our first three cases - the N, A and G. Jakobson's "unmarked"
character of the genitive in its opposition to the N and A toge-
ther corresponds to "our" implication by a Genitive of the pre-
sence of N and A, but not the opposite.

0.2.3. The kind of case system has no impact on the inventory of
prepositions or numerals, used by single informants: on the

contrary, the individual preposition inventory fits into the given
case system. Generally speaking: when in a given system the case
governed "normally" (i e in the S/C in general) by a preposition
is lacking, that preposition governs the accusative: e g in a NAG
system instead of sa mamom has been found only sa mamu, never *sa
mame or *sa mami. This principle has an almost compulsory charac-
ter in our corpus: one single exception (DOO.04,76) with three
contradicting examples has been found (except for Swedish loans
which can remain unflected and unless corrupted, unidentifiable
forms). Instead of governing other cases the accusative govern-
ment can, however, prevail even in idiolects, in which those other
cases in principle do occur as a part of the system (see e g
1.2.4.1).

Consequently, the accusative must be considered a "praepoaition-
alis generalis". It is in perfect accord with Jakobson's charac-
teristic "Die Angabe des Vorhandenseins eines Bezugs" (my spacing
- Ď.) ist also das Merkmal des A im Gegensatz zum N" (TCLP 6,
249). When more differentiated means for expressing relations are
lacking, it is the accusative as the marked member of the
"Bezugskorrelation" which takes their place.

An inquiry into the preposition inventory will not be made in this
study. But an inner semantic hierarchy can clearly be seen there
(e g the preposition u can replace many others, but itself is not
missing in any record). On the other hand, their inventory seems
to have some similarities with the age conditioned growth of the
vocabulary. This problem deserves a special investigation.

No similar regularity has been found for the combinations with
numerals. Since the presence of the genitive in a system does not
imply its use in quantitative combinations, we find many different
arrangements for those combinations in both NA and in all other
systems.

0.2.4. On the other hand, the diaspora monitoring with many
different language influences can be an acceptable explanation for
isolated grammatical forms, which are theoretically counterindica-
ted by the implicational principle presented above, but nonethe-
less do appear in a text. In this way a prepositional combination
such as sa lutkom once can be met in an idiolect without instru-
mental, i e where all prepositions govern the accusative, the same
sa in all other instances as well. This can be compared with
lexical loans or with idioms in "normal" languages: in e g the
Russian idiom sredi bela dnja an adjective genitive short form
bela is found, which disappeared from the Russian standard a long

26

time ago as a part of the grammatical system, but has been conserved as a part of this petrified expression. It is impossible to decide in each single instance, whether such an "alien element" is an accidental ephemera, or a symptom of a new development process. Such questions can be answered only from the retrospective, "diachronically".

C.2.5. Concerning the methodology of the following inquiry I want to emphasize that a simple absence of a case in a child's record was not considered to be a sufficient argument for classification. An attempt was always made to find positive proofs of the impossibility of using a certain case. E g the absence of the instrumental is considered as proved only when examples as <u>sa dece</u>, <u>sa lutku</u> are found. Naturally, the restricted volume and the restricted subject matter of the records does not guarantee an exhaustive picture of the speakers' possibilities.

At this stage of investigation I did not have the possibility of examinating the children again with special regard to the hypotheses made in this study about their case systems.

1.0.   A N A L Y S I S

1.1. The NA Case Systems

1.1.0.1. The NA case systems are found with our informants DOO.01, DOO.06 and DO7.03 (1982-year-cut): - the record of DOO.06 contains 934 words in 191 predications, that of DO7.03 - 899 words/260 predications, that of DOO.01 - 1221 words/202 predications.

In those systems the nominative is used for the functions of subject, of predicate noun with copula (<u>biti</u> or impersonal <u>ima</u>) and of vocative. The accusative is used for the function of object (direct and indirect, thus fullfilling the dative function too) and for the combinations with all prepositions. In the combinations with numerals (2 - 5 are found in those three records) DOO.06 uses N pl (unless one G sg m), DO7.03 has no clear system and DOO.01 very consistently uses a combination of numeral + <u>-e,</u> which properly is his/her universal plural form (see 1.1.5.1).

The masculine animate gender in the accusative is not found with DOO.01, it is not distinguished from inanimate gender by DO7.03 in object function (thus marked by N-A), but a very significative vacillation between G-A and N-A is found in combination with the preposition <u>kod</u> with both DOO.06 and especially with DO7.03 (see

27

1.1.22.6).

All three texts are published in this volume (pp. 151, 158, 165).

1.1.0.2. The texts, including figures, have been printed by compu-
ter storing and listing programs. The numbers after the examples
refer to this storage, namely to the number of the predication (=
sentence, clause) quoted: it is the second cipher column to the
left of the text. E g D07.03,81:26 means: informant D07.03,
testing performed in 1981 (can be omitted), predication - i e
segment between two + - number 26: <u>i on mete magaracs dole u
zemlju</u>. All tester's interventions (in parentheses ( )), all dots
signifying pause etc are preserved in the quotations. Omissions
are marked ((...)). The examples in favour of the proposed hypo-
thesis are adduced in a selection: the examples against it are
given in complete lists.

1.1.1. <u>Nominative</u>

1.1.11. a) <u>Subject function</u>:
   "onda poslje ... je <u>lisica</u> je došla gori / i vuk doli / +"
      (D00.01,79:71),
   "kad se <u>gosti</u> najeli / ...+" (D00.06:36),
   "pala je <u>kišša</u> / ..." (D00.06:9),
   "i došo jedan <u>čovek</u> + i kaže +" (D07.03:5).

1.1.12.1 b)<u>Predicate noun function</u> with <u>biti</u>:
   "to je samo bio <u>mjesec</u> /" (D00.01:105),
   "samo <u>nesec</u> ((= mesec)) je to bilo / +" (D00.06:84).

1.1.12.2 with <u>ima</u>:
   "ima <u>tica</u> ((= ptica)) / ... ⊥ šta jede ..." (D00.01:14-15),
   "i pose ((= posle)) ima ovaj <u>tata</u> +" (D07.03:222),
      (not found with D00.06).

1.1.13 c) <u>Vocative function</u>:
   "i kazala hejdâ ... <u>vuk</u> + ti dobeš moj sir +" (D07.03:
      53-5), (not found in other texts).

1.1.2. <u>Accusative</u>
   All N-A are interpreted as accusative, if in the respective
   function the accusative is found in non-homonymous instances,
   e g if <u>sedi u vodu</u> vs <u>voda</u>, then also <u>sedi u bu-
   nar</u> is considered as accusative.

1.1.21.1. <u>Object</u>:

"kolica ima <u>točke</u>" (DOO.01:4),
"da spremi <u>rakiju</u>" (DOO.06:16),
"i pos ... došo jean negde / + i ... vido <u>jean ćovek</u>"
    (DO7.03:126-127),
"i pose ... tata... skineo <u>magarats</u>" (DO7.03:162),
"da sin ima ... <u>dobre noge</u>" (DO7.03:141).

1.1.21.2. <u>Indirect object</u>:
    "daj ti <u>nas-s</u> ... sve ... sve sta imas naj-bolje"
    (DOO.06:123-124).
As another completely corrupted case of the indirect object can be
considered the narrative about bears: ((jagode)) jena majka da
svoji (DO7.03:229), probably = 'daje svome ...'(?).
(In all three texts, one pronominal dative is found: tražio <u>im</u>
... račun (DOO.06:37)).

1.1.22. <u>With prepositions</u>:
1.1.22.1.
  <u>U</u> (direction):
    "on je skočio dom- doli / u ... <u>u kantu</u> // +" (DOO.01,80:101),
    "sedni tamo <u>u kofu</u> +" (DOO.06:103),
    "jena deoćica // ... ide <u>u vodu</u> / +" (DO7.03:211)

  <u>U</u> (place):
    "<u>u kolica</u> je ((...)) björn // +" (DOO.01:3),
    "ovaj držži nessto u <u>ruke</u> // +" (DOO.06:50),
    "i ((...)) videla nešto ... dole // ... <u>u vodu</u> // +"
      (DOO.06:82),
    "i tu dole <u>u bunar</u> ((...)) videla veliki sir // +"
      (DOO.06:114),
    "to je termos + (gde?) <u>u ruku</u> +" (DO7.03:77-78).
The stability of this accusative can be seen in DOO.01:107, when
the informant repeats the test-leader's locative by saying the
accusative:
    "(ogledao se mjesec <u>u vodi</u>) ogljedljao <u>u vodu</u>".
  <u>U</u> (time):
    "iš-la je jedna ... lisi-((ca)) ... <u>u noć</u> // +" (DOO.06:80).
  <u>U</u> with corrupted meaning (DO7.03 used <u>u</u> even instead of
      <u>iz, za, na</u>):
    "(gde on to sedi?) u ... <u>u jenu stolicsu</u>" (DO7.03:82),
    "to -e jean ćovek / ... + jašio <u>u ma- magarats</u> // ..."
      (DO7.03:124-125),
    "sa- će magarats <u>u</u> ... <u>mene</u> ... <u>u mene</u> da jaše // +"
      (DO7.03:152-153),
    "i pije vode + (iz čega?) <u>u šolju</u> +" (DO7.03:94-95).
    "(a gde je ovaj ...?) drži se <u>u rep</u>+" (DO7.03: 112).

1.1.22.2.
  Na (direction):
    "jedan did ko gleda na ... gleda / ((...)) na neki djec- / +"
      (DOO.01,80:184-185),
    "jedan vrabacs otišo ispod ... na krov / +" (DOO.06:1),
    "da zavežemo nešto na oći // +" (DOO.06:42).

  Na (place):
    "ljuljaju ((...)) na ljuljaške // na ... na neku dasku
      // +" (DOO.06:63),
    with a pronoun:
    "jedna surica ima ... haljinu // ... na sebe // +" (DOO.01,
      80:200).

1.1.22.3.
  Śa ('with'):
    "tamo ima ... curice i dečke sta igra sa ... aute / +
      i ... sa grus " (DOO.01:7-9),
    "tamo je ... mama sa svoju bebu / ... +" (DOO.01:11),
    "igra se 1- sa lopte / ... +" (DOO.01,80:175),
    "igraju se // ... sa auta // ... u pesak // +" (DOO.06:48),
    "ide za svoj brod" (D07.03:220),
    "dve devojćise se igraju / sa lutku / i kolica // +"
      (DOO.06:148),
    even with a pronoun:
    "(čime igraju?) sa ... sa nešto ov- ... sa bordtennisrakov //
      +" (DOO.06:72),
    "sta igra sa bro-dove ..." (DOO.01:30),
    "(a ovdje?) neki dječake / što igra sa svoje ...
      brodove // +" (DOO.01,80:162).

1.1.22.4.
  Po:
    "neka že-na i ... neki ... tšovek ... idu ... tamo po
      park // +" (DOO.06:64) (not used by DOO.01 and D07.03).

1.1.22.5.
  Za:
    "mali ko- kotao promenio za veliki // +" (DOO.06:23)
      (the only use).
  Od:
    "mi -mamo jedan han- rućni- od oke / +" (DOO.01:87),
    "(je napravljen ovaj brod) od drvo"(D07.03:256)
      (not used by DOO.06).
  Do:
    "oni došli do re- ... redan ((=jedan)) restorang // +"

(DOO.01:75),
"i ... onda je ona došla <u>do jedan brunar</u> // ... +"
(DOO.01,80:98)
(not used by DOO.06 and DO7.03).
<u>Pored</u>:
"to neko dete // sedi tam- <u>pored nju</u> // +" (DOO.06:55)
(not used by DOO.01 and DO7.03).

1.1.22.6.
<u>Kod</u>:
"((...)) ona on- sjedi <u>ko- mamu</u> // ... +" (DOO.01:13).
The use of <u>kod</u> in the idiom of DOO.06 and DO7.03 requires
a more detailed commentary.
The following examples are found in their texts:
DOO.06 (1976)
/1/ "žalosno otiššo <u>kod svoae ... vra-bača</u> (6),
/2/ i posle se vratio <u>kod vrapči</u> // +" (11),
        (1979)
/3/ "kad doššo je ... došše <u>kod njega</u> hopet ((=opet)) / ... +"
        (17),
/4/ "((...)) tri varanice / + sta su ... otiššli <u>kod neki krčmar</u>
        // ... +" (24-25).
/5/ "i došla je ... <u>kod neki brunn</u> ((= bunar, Sw)) // +" (81),
        (1980)
/6/ "((...)) tri varalic // + otiššli su <u>kod krtčmara</u> // +"
        (121),

DO7.03 (1981)
/7/ "on i došo <u>kod drugoga čošše ((=čoveka?))</u> / ... +" (134),
/8/ "i došo je <u>kod drugi čovek</u> // +" (138),
/9/ "pos- doši <u>ko- drugoga čoveka</u> //" (143),
/10/ "i posi dosi <u>ko-d ... + drugi je ((?)) čovek</u> //" (147-148),
/11/ "i došo <u>ko- jean drugi č- drugoga čove-ka</u> /" (158),
        (not found in records from 1982).

In 1976, which is a very short record of non-standard text collec-
ted before the start of the JUBA-project, we can see the conflict
between an accusative and a genitive (not G-A!) conceiving, with
an obvious uncertainty in the choice of the noun form <u>vrabača</u> (= G
pl <u>vrabaca</u>) after a plural accusative congruent form <u>svoae</u> (=
svoje). The form <u>vrapči</u> in /2/ can be a non-differentiated N-A
plural form (see DOO.01: <u>oće dat novci</u> in 1.1.5.).

In the other year-cuts DOO.06 has N-A with <u>kod</u> in 1979 (both mi
<u>brunn</u> Sw 'well', and ma <u>krčmar</u> 'pub-keeper') but G-A for <u>krčmar</u>
in 1980, which may reflect the development of G-A for animate

masculine nouns.

In the idiom of DO7.03, the synchronic vacillation between N-A and G-A can clearly be seen in the same NP drugi čovek. For our present discussion about the case system the important issue is, whether these instances are accusatives or genitives. In examples /8/ and /10/ N-A are accusatives, in complete accord with the N-A object for masculine animate nouns in this text. Against this background the "correct"/9/ (ko- drugoga čoveka) the correctly programmed /7/ (i e the adjective in G-A, the corrupted noun notwithstanding) and mostly the corrected /11/ (the change in the attribute, some uncertainty in the "grammatical" part of the noun) bear witness either to a distinction animate (G-A) vs inanimate (N-A), or to another case - the genitive with kod. There are no other arguments in favour of the first possibility (animateness) in the record, while one instance of genitive form in partitive meaning is found (93-94: i pije vod- + i pije vode) and in another instance an absent genitive is assumed by the congruent adjective: (a šta beru?) ... jagode // + (a koja boja? ((sic!)) crvene (kako?) crvene (227-228).

All this can be seen as a symptom of a weak NAG system in the 1981 year-cut against the NA in 1982 (see 1.1.5.2.). In the directed tests, DO7.03 has correct forms for both accusative and genitive (while dative and instrumental are completely wrong).

1.1.23. Combinations with numerals
For the combinations with numerals, two of our three bearers of the NA-system constructed their own rules within the NA formal possibilities, reducing the rich S/C spectrum of numerals to one unique form for all kinds of nouns.

DO0.06 combines the numerals 2 - 4 with the N pl, the form for 2 being in all instances dve: dve kofe (115), dve devojčise (148),dve dečaci (151, 2x), tri deča (158),tri varanice ((= varalice)) (2). We even have pet deca (186), deca always being conceived of as plural (kako se deca igraju (DO0.06:163, 180, 182)): pet deca can therefore be constructed according to the same model as tri dečaci.Only in one utterance, in an isolated answer, was an indecisive quantitative case (= genitive) used: (koliko ih ima?) četiri // (šta?) točk-a // (DO0.06:149).

The homonymous feminine N-A forms kofe, devojčice are identified as N.pl., since the masculines have non-homonymous N.pl. forms in the same syntagm, viz dve dečaci (vs. A dečake). It is the same reasoning which has been used about accusatives governed by prepo-

sitions, viz N-A <u>u bunar</u> according the accusative <u>u vodu.</u>

DOO.01 does not distinguish between N and A in the plural either and in 1979 any of the three endings <u>-e</u> (mostly), <u>-i</u> and <u>-a</u> is used for both subject and object (cf <u>oće dat novci</u> (82), <u>prave kolaće</u> (9); in the text from 1980 only <u>-e</u> is found in plural). This ending <u>-e</u> is the universal means of combining with the numerals for this informant: here, according to <u>tri</u> and <u>četiri,</u> a universal form <u>dvi</u> (1979) was created: <u>dvi curice</u> (1), <u>dvi dećke</u> (32), <u>dvi djece</u> (23), <u>dvi kante</u> (51), <u>dvi rakete</u> (35), <u>dvi točke</u> = 'wheels' (6); 1980: <u>dvi surice</u> (147), <u>tri ((...)) djećakove</u> (164), <u>ćetri ((...)) brodove</u> (166), <u>pet djece</u> (188). There are only three different examples in the whole text of DOO.01: <u>tri brati</u> (74), and in 1980 <u>dvije ((...)) rakete</u> (158) and <u>dvije kućice</u> (177) - both within the NA system, but different from the "-i + -e"(<u>dvi dećke</u>) model.

The use of numerals in the records of DOO.01 can be considered as a very typical diaspora restructuring: within the frames of a given (the child's own) inventory of grammatical means the speaker constructs a combination of rules of his own, based on a straight-forward generalizing. In this case, <u>-i</u> in <u>dvi</u> is generalized according to other numerals <u>tri</u> and <u>četiri</u> (and/or, maybe, an ikavian <u>dvi,</u> heard somewhere), <u>-e</u> is the plural ending most often used. This model, although almost totally prevalent, (6:1 in 1979 and 7:2 in 1980), is not totally resistant to influence from outside, viz the ijekavian <u>dvije.</u> And <u>tri brati,</u> another innovation must probably be seen as a break in the prevalent model in favour of another but rare plural form <u>-i</u> in DOO.01,79, viz <u>dat novci,</u> which, however, is not found in the records of 1980.

DO7.03 did not use numerals in his running texts: answering the questions intended to reveal his personal system, he always used forms fitting in with the NA case system, but we did not get a clear picture, whether he internalized a fast rule for those combinations or not. Cf: <u>tri ((...)) miševe</u> (108), (dva) <u>uši</u> (116), (dva) <u>kamen</u> (102). A picture of a defective numeral system is also given by his directed tests.

1.1.3. The pronouns do as a rule fit into the same case system (cf examples sub 1.1.22.1, 1.1.22.2, 1.1.22.5). An exception - as in all following case systems without the dative - is the enclitic dative personal pronouns such as <u>mi, ti, mu,</u> which can be met with sporadically in many texts lacking the dative as such. Such dative encliticon is found once, maybe twice, with DOO.06: "kad se gosti najeli / ... + tražio <u>im</u> ... račun //" .(DOO.06:36-37), see 0.2.1.

1.1.4. Besides N and A forms, there are three locative, no dative, no instrumental and no vocative noun forms in the texts of those three speakers. For dative pronominal forms, see 1.1.3., for the genitive, see 1.1.5.2. The locative forms are: na stolu (DOO.01:170), and twice u vodi (DO7.03,81:219, DO7.03,82:92). Since they are very frequent words in - maybe - their most frequent prepositional combinations (in 1982 "u" is almost the only preposition used by DO7.03 and it is even used instead of na, za, iz) these two examples can be considered as petrified loans from the "language of the other ones", used randomly with the speaker's own "system right" forms, viz "(gde je to?) u vod-u" (DO7.03:236).

1.1.5. In certain parts of our speakers' texts some latent tendencies to a development towards other case systems can be discovered ;- towards a caseless system (N) or towards a system with the genitive as well (NAG). Indeed in the record of DO7.03, the pure NA in 1982 can also be seen as a reduction of a weak NAG.

1.1.5.1. In the idiom of DOO.01, there are features which testify to a tendency to lose even the opposition N-A. Since the G-A is lacking, the subject and the object case are not distinguished in the sg of the masculine declension: perhaps the most extreme example: "(a ovdje šta vidiš?) jedan did / ko gleda /na on- ((N-A)) ... + gleda na neki dtec- ((N-A)) /+" (185). In the neuter the identity of N and A is given.

Relevant changes can be seen in the masc plural. The endings -i and -e no longer signalize the opposition N-A. The ending -i is seen only four times in 1979, but two of them mark an object: oni oće dat novci (82) and the normal ja ima ((sic)) oći (95). In 1980 -i does not occur at all, so that -e is the general and universal plural ending for masculines and feminines and -a for the few neuters. In the congruent adjectives -i and -e are found promiscuously:
"neki djeca sta igra ((...)) // neke sta ... ăka
((= 'voze', Sw)) ruschebana // ... +" (30-31),
"(šta su ovo?) kuće ... male // ... + (kako si rekla?)
mali- kuće // ... +" (42-43),
"neki djecake" (162).

In this way, the opposition N-A is dependent on the feminine declension. But the loans from Swedish in -a are not always inflected:
"dvi djece gunga na brăda" (23) = 'ljuljaju se na dasci'.
And between the S/C words as well can be found feminines which seem not to be inflected, as (182):

"jeda ((=jedna)) mama sa svoje djec- svoje beba', or
"(što radi on?) on spušta // jedna suris- ((= jedna curic-))+"
     (160).
Similar features - a latent possibility of abolishing the case
opposition N vs A - can be found even in the records of some
informants belonging to the NAG system (especially D00.07 and
DC7.18).

1.1.5.2. As a result of the discussion about the case vacillations
in the combinations with kod in the 1981 year-cut of D07.03, we
saw a reduction of a weak NAG system in 1981 to NA in 1982. Here,
no single kod is used and the inventory of prepositions is
reduced to only u in many meanings, always with the accusative
(and once na in a diffuse rather instrumental meaning, with accu-
sative too, D07.03,82:61). No instance of G-A for animate mascu-
lines is found. As symptomatic of the absence of the genitive, the
following dialogue with the tester can be cited
(D07.03,82:97-104):
     "(šta je ovo?) stena + ((...)) + (ili može se kazati) kamen + (a
dva?) stene + (a ne) kamenje + (dva?) kamen + (a kad je puno?)
stene + (ali ako kažeš kamen ? ... puno) ... ne znam +".

1.1.5.3. An opposite latent development possibility - towards
widening of the NA case system can be found in two records: in
both cases the latent "next case" is the genitive, especially in
its partitive function. With D00.01, the S/C sir appears six
times (five times as object, once as predicate noun), always as
sira: but this paradigmatic partitive is always conceived by the
system as N-A:
     "poslje vidila jedan velki sira / ... +" (50),
     "ne vidiš ... ovaj veliki sira / +" (112),
     "sada ti dobiš sv- cjeli sira // +" (123), Indeed, the gender of
this syntagm, reflected in the copula, is not masculine:
     "i tamo je bilo jedan ... veliki ... sira // +" (1000). Once,
in an answer, a bare partitive occurs:
     "(što jedu?) kruva ((= kruha))" (D00.01,80:194).
In this grammatical arrangement, I see an actually present parti-
tive (= genitive) paradigmatic form, fitted into the NA system, i
e a system without the genitive (a thorough discussion of the
partitive see 2.2.3.1.).
In the text of D00.06 from his third year-cut (1980) we find one
clear example of partitive and one indecisive quantitative
(=genitive) in an answer, without context:
     "one jedu ((...)) pssenicu // ((...)) hleba // +"
          (D00.06,80:189),
     "(koliko ih ima?) četiri // (šta?) točk-a //"(D00.06,80:119).

The genitive in conflict with the N or A pl in this function
is characteristic of the child DOO.07 as well. Against his/her
stronger model "Num + -e/-a" (very similar to the one described in
1.1.23 in the record of DOO.01), we find some examples with the
genitive as well:

   "(pa evo kolko točkova vidiš?) <u>dvi</u> // ... + (šta dvi?)
      <u>tоćkova</u> // ... +" (DOO.07:119-120),
   "(a kad bi video sve točkove koliko bi ih bilo?) <u>osan</u> // ...
      (šta osam) <u>točkovi</u> / ... (osam toč-?) ... <u>-kova</u> // +"
      (122),
   "... i ... <u>šest / dana</u> / poslje / pa je došo +" (40),
   "i ... <u>deset dana</u> poslje / pa je došo +" (46).
The potential genitive "dvi curice" (99) must be interpreted as a
non-differentiated nominative-accusative pl. because of
non-homonymous instances:
   ; "bili su <u>tri braće</u> / +" (DOO.07:3),
   "da je bilo <u>dvi ... lonce</u> / +" (60),
   "... imaju <u>dvi kolica</u> / ... +" (100),
   "on- ((ono?, one?)) <u>dvi</u> su ljuljali se // ... +" (92).

   Undoubtedly, the genitive model for the combination of the
cardinals in the idiolect of DOO.07 is weaker than the
nominative/accusative one, but the presence of the genitive in
his/her case system cannot be denied.
The speaker DO6.16 also has the non-homonymous G sg only once
(<u>dva kamena</u> 175), against a consistent model "Num + N pl" for all
cardinals:
   "<u>dvi, dve uši</u>" (144-149),
   "<u>tri miši, miši-vi, mišovi</u>" (132-134),
   "<u>tri ribe</u>" (188-189),
   "<u>četri pečurke</u>" (165-165),
   "<u>pet pečurke</u>" (154).
In the record of the subject DO7.18 we find the combination model
with undifferentiated genitive (G sg/G pl as DOO.04,79) for the
cardinal but indefinite numerals (twice) combine with N sg which
is a very unusual phenomenon (se 2.2.23.6.):
   "<u>malo sir</u>" (42),
   "<u>mnogo kamenje</u>" (127).
Apparently, this must be seen in connection with the N-A marking
the animateness of this child, described in 1.2.0.2.2. When the
accusative loses its role as the general signalizer of "Bezug"
(0.2.3.) in its opposition against the nominative, then, apparen-
tly, the way is open for the N into functions, elsewhere reserved
for the oblique cases in the Slavic languages.
In the records of DO7.03,81, where we found a very weak NAG case
system (1.1.22.6), no example of using numerals was found. As

his/her directed tests show, his ability to use S/C numerals is almost zero.

1.2.2. Another quantitative function of the genitive form is the partitive: it is found only once with both DOO.04,79, DO7.18 and DOO.07, but is growing in the later year-cuts of DOO.04:
 "da će se ići doli / i donest <u>vode</u> // +" (DOO.07:61),
 "pa je to mama + šta drži termus jed- jed- + i tamo ima <u>kave</u> +"
  (DO7.18:84-86),
 "dobiješš <u>cel- /celoga sira</u> // +" (DOO.04,79:68), but twice N-A
in the 1979 record:
 "da je <u>bilo jedan veliki sirr</u> / +" (DOO.04,79:47),
 "// i je- jednu <u>jednu sir</u> ne mogu da ga pujedem // +"
  (DOO.04,79:57). In 1980, in all three occurences of the
lexeme <u>sir,</u> the partitive with congruent attributes is used:
 "je vidla <u>jednoga velikog sira</u> // +" (DOO.04,80:75),
 "ona kaže + jedem <u>sira</u> // +" (DOO.04,80:87-88),
 "da ... ja ti dam <u>celog ... sira</u> // +" (DOO.04,80:105). In 1982
the congruence model of the partitive shifts (see even 1.1.5.3.
for DOO.01 and 2.2.3.1.2.):
 "i videla jedna jedan veliki <u>jedan veliki sira</u> ... +"
  (DOO.04,82:431),
 "e ne vidiš + <u>kakav lep sira</u> imam dole ... +" (DOO.04,82:448),
 "dajem ti <u>ceo sira</u> ... +" (DOO.04,82:460),
 "... i vidim da ptice su kod korpu + i jedu ... jelo ...
  <u>-leba</u> možda ... +" (DOO.04,82:467-468).
The last example shows the syntactical parallelism with an accusative <u>jelo</u>.

In fact, the use of a determinating attribute, such as eg <u>celoga</u> <u>sira</u> or <u>ceo sira</u> annuls the quantifying grammatical meaning of the partitive (=genitive) and equates it with the accusative: since - with all speakers tested - the partitive occurs only as a form of a few nouns with given meaning 'meals', the whole arrangement resembles in some respect the G-A for animate nouns.

1.2.3. On one occasion, DOO.04 replaces a dative, which does not exist in his system (see, however, 1.2.6.3), with a form, which can be interpreted as genitive. It is in the beginning of a story about a cauldron:
 "bilo jedan jedno pro- prodavacs / i jedan seljak // ... +
((...)) seljak on je došo + pola ((=posle)) je reko <u>onoga prodav-</u> <u>nice</u> + da oćše mi pozajmiš jednu ... ki- ((=Sw kittel)) (kotao) kotao / +" (DOO.04:106-109).
<u>Onoga prodavnice</u> can be a genitive of a deformed <u>prodavnica</u> from <u>prodavac,</u> since probably the zero-vowel interferes with the

37

normal declension. However the fact that all cases, non-existent in NAG, have been replaced in our corpus by the accusative, see 1.2.5., contradicts the genitive interpretation.

1.2.4. Combinations with the prepositions
As I said above, in our five records the prepositions govern the genitive but sporadically, always in concurrence with the accusative government.

1.2.4.1. The material of DO7.03,81 was analysed in 1.1.22.6: against the stable general use of N-A for animate masculines, we saw a vacillation between kod governing the genitive and the accusative, viz:
  "pos- doši ko- drugoga čoveka //" (DO7.03,81:143), vs
  "i došo je kod drugi čovek // +" (DO7.03,81:138).

We see the same picture in the ample record of DOO.04.79 (1.2.4.2.1.) and DO6.16 (1.2.4.3.2.).

1.2.4.2.1. DOO.04,79. From the four "genitive" prepositions, do and od are governing both G and A, kod - only A and posle is used twice with indeclinable numeral combinations (posle sedam dana (114), posle deset dana (119). DOO.04 consistently uses G-A for animate masculines in all his records.

Do with G: "pa su do suda od- odveli njega / +"
                  (DOO.04,79:28),
    with A: "(kojim putem putujete?) idemo ... do ...
                  jetebori ((=Göteborg)) / +" (252),
Od with G: "((telling about stalagmites in a cave)) ("da li su to
                  od leda figure ili?) ne / nego od stene ((=of stone))
                  // +" (DOO.04,79:216),
                  "(al ne prvo mu je doneo?) jedno ždrebe // (ždrebe od
                  kotla) od kotla // +" (DOO.04,79:118 - repeating
                  the tester).

Other examples of od and kod can be identified only against the whole system:
Od /1/: "a tamo unutra / sad su od moga tatu ro- ne /
                  ono ... kusin // ... +" (DOO.04,79:197),
    /2/: "(a porastao je) više od jednu godinu ... bio+"
                  (202),
    /3/: "i velik // veći o- moga ... brata / +" (207),
    /4/: "... i ona mi mnogo daje // ... ++ kako se zove / ++
                  ... ono sa tegle od ... od šljive/ +" (295),
Kod /5/: "i ... je i- došla ko- jedan brun ((=bunar)) / ...+

```
                      (D00.04.79:44),
    /6/:  "(kod koga tamo ideš?) kod ... mog starog atu // +"
                      (190),
    /7/:  "da će idemo tamo u nišš ((=Niš)) // kod (kod koga
              ideš u Niš?) kod ... moga kusina // +" (204).
```

The examples /2/ and consequently /5/ are clearly A. Very significative are /1/ and /6/ with the noun in the accusative, distinct from the assumed genitive such as onoga prodavnice (108) in 1.2.3. or od stene (216).

The congruent NPs od moga tatu and kod mog starog atu are thus properly not G-A, and the adjectives alone mark the animateness exactly in the same manner as they do in the really congruent /3/ "od moga brata and /7/ kod moga kusina with correct G. In all those examples (full list) the nouns are thus in the accusative.

1.2.4.2.2. Unclear is the form broda in D00.04:254:
   "i posle vozimo se sa broda do do ... nemačku // +". Against all other (7) examples with the preposition sa (sa jednu kofu (51), sa auta (135), s auto naš (251) etc), broda must be A. The "animate" G-A can be caused by conceiving in Swedish the ships as hon = 'she', which "personalises" them in the linguistic subconsciousness of a Slav (vi åkte med henne ((literally "with her")) instead of an expected non-personal utrum med den). Cf the same with a NAGL speaker D07.05:
   "ona je našla jednoga broda ... +" (D07.05,81:87),
or with D07.19 (NAGLI) and D07.20 (NAGLIDV):
   "... ima jedn- jednoga ... + ima brodića maloga +"
   (D07.19:71-72),
   "ona se igra sa sa jedna brod ... +" (D07.20:134).

1.2.4.2.3. All other prepositions govern solely the accusative: u (13 times) and na (11 times) in all meanings, o ("imamo jednu sliku // o to // +" (D00.04,79:218) and ispred ("ispred nas" D00.04,79:232).

1.2.4.2.4 In the following year-cuts of D00.04 the same relation between the G and A is preserved: the genitive with prepositions occurs but sporadically, while the accusative is the rule.

So in 1980 among all prepositions used do occurs once with G and once with A:
   i je išla do jednog bunara / +" (D00.04,80:73),
   "... došli su ... tri ... varalice do jednu gostilnu // +"
   (D00.04,80:302).

The prepositions u (6x), na (4x) and sa (6x) in this year-cut govern A, e g:
"je mesec bia na oblake // +" (DOO.04,80:72),
"ššto se gledao u vodu // ... +" (83),
"ššto se igraju sa lutke // i sa jednog medveda // i
     sa kolica // +" (376).

In the very extensive record from 1982 we find the following rela-
tions between G and A (no other cases are governed):

	with G	with A
do	1	8
iz	2	2
kod	0	8
od	0	2
preko	0	1
u	0	20*
na	0	7
sa	0	8
kroz	0	4
za	0	1

*) One occurrence of u with G or G-A is unclear:
   ((after a trip through Austria)) "...i posle smo
   došli u ... maribora ((sic)) i šen- šentilj u
   do granicu ... +" (521).

Examples:
Do with G (the only one registred):
          "i sa njih smo putovali čak do naše kuće u slo-
               veniju +" (DOO.04,82:526),
     with A, e g:
          "pa je došla do jedan bunar ... +" (428),
          "pa smo išli ... u brod do dansku +" (507),
Iz with G (all registered):
     "i oni sad izlazu iz kuće ... +" (483),
     "onda je moj burazer došo iz se- iz mora ...+"
          (569),
     with A (all registered):
      "ja sam naručio ((=a song)) moj brat iz tužinu
          ((...)) +" (592)
Kod only with A, e g:
      "i vidim da ptice su kod korpu +" (467)
      "bili smo na more u ... posudarje kod
      ... ++ ((...)) ja ne sećam se to ++
      (kod zadra) ja kod zadar ... +" (540) - an example which

spectacularly demonstrates how the speaker identifies the tester's
genitive as his own accusative,

> "i bili smo kod mnogo ((=mnogih)) + što poznajemo
> ... +" (578-579),
> "tamo u selo sam bio kod njih ..." (567),

Od only with A:

> "(a baba i deda čiji su to?) od ... od mamu +
> (od) od mamu tata tata +" (588),

Preko:

> "i preko plitvice smo prošli ... +" (553),

U only with A, e g:

> "i on je bio tad u jugoslaviju ... +" (565),
> "onda kad se ona sela u tu kantu ... +" (439),

Na only with A, e g :

> "što se ljuljaju na ljuljaške ... +" (486),
> "... jedan ... deda gleda na decu +" (488),

Sa only with A, e g:

> "što imaju kolica sa lutke unutra +" (462),
> "potovali smo sa jednoga isto jugo-
> slovena +" (524),
> "... i smo bili i sa onoga + što tu u
> eslev ((=Esloev)), živi ... +
> sa njega smo bili u jednu kafanu tamo
> ... +" (580-581),

Kroz only with A, e g:

> "pa smo vozili kroz dansku ... +" (510) etc.

1.2.4.3.1. The situation with DO6.16 and DO7.18 is almost exactly
the same as that of DOO.04,79 (properly DOO.04,80). Besides
u (10/2x) and na (7/8x), only the prepositions od (9/3x), sa
(4/3x), za (0/2x) and once o (with pronoun) are used, thus only
one "genitive" preposition od: but, very remarkably for combina-
tions with the comparative, as a synonym to od, the Swedish
conjuction/preposition än with the same comparative meaning 'than'
and with genitive government has been borrowed by DO6.16.

The prepositions u and na govern the accusative (except in one
example with L u vodi (DO6.16:168) and so does sa (except one
instance with Instr sa brodom DO7.18:58): the accusative is N-A
for inanimate and G-A for animate masculines in the record of
DO6.16, but only N-A in that of DO7.18.

1.2.4.3.2. DO6.16 - some examples:

1.2.4.3.2.1.

U:

"tu je jelo u košaru jednu +" (DO6.16:220),
"vozi se u jedan brod + (240),
"da sjedni se u tu drugu kantu +" (121),

Na:

"(na čemu je otac jašio) na ... na magarac +" (73)
    - the only occurence of N-A for animate masculine -
    and the only na with the superessive meaning,
"i onda se sin onaj popeo na magarca +" (6),
"on se pope na na magare +" (19) - N-A,

Sa:

"ona se igra sa taj brod +" (225,228) - N-A.
"(s kim je bio čovjek? sa) sa ... svoga sina +" (5) - G-A,
"(s kim su išli otac i sin?) sa sa magarca +" (74) - G-A.

1.2.4.3.2.2.   The preposition od is used once with G (inanimate od
početka 3), all the other 8 times with G-A for the animate noun od
magarca in two different meanings and for personal pronouns (od
njega 9,200):

"onda onaj sašo on od magarca +" (14) - similar context
    even 10 and 61,
"da onaj da on ima jače noge od magarca +" (31) - similar
    context even in 9 and 30,

The borrowed än = 'od':

"a kaže tata + da je on ima jače noge än magarca"(40)
    - G-A,
"ti imaš jače noge -n ((=än)) magarca"(60)
    - G-A,
but with a neuter the N-A was used:
"ima jače noge än magare +" (45).

An unequivocal solution to the question whether od governs the G
or the A is not possible. For the accusative solution speak the
parallelism with sa and the unequivocal än magare (än magarca :
än magare = od magarca : od magare? N-A = A). For the genitive
solution speaks the unequivocal od početka. From the record it
cannot be decided, whether the verb sáci, sadem governs the accu-
sative or the genitive in the idiolect of DO6.16, which could be
decisive in this discussion:
"i onda je sašo onog magarca +" (32),
cf the transitive jašiti konja in the S/C standard. Doubtless,
without the linguistic arguments, any native speaker would identi-
fy all those instances with od (except, maybe, od magare) as geni-
tives. Therefore I included DO6.16 in the NAG case system.

1.2.4.3.3. The subject DO7.18 used the preposition <u>u</u> but marginal-
ly (with Sw loans) and his/her local (essive) preposition is thus
only <u>na</u>.
<u>Na</u> (place, some examples):
    "pa onda je čovek ... nije sedio
        <u>na magarac</u> +" (DO7.18:8-9),
    "i onda magarac jaši na ... <u>na čovek</u>
        ... +" (DO7.18:25), see even 1.2.0.2.2.
   (other meanings, all instances):
    "pa onda su njega zavezali <u>na noge</u> +" (DO7.18.24),
<u>U</u> (all instances):
    "((...)) je reko + da se sjedi <u>u hinken</u> ((='kofu')) ... +"
    (DO7.18:46-47),
    "ona je videla jedan si- jedna sir
    <u>u brunena</u> ((='bunaru'))+"(DO7.18:34).
<u>Za</u> (all instances):
    "... eto vidite jedna kuća <u>sa</u> ((='za'))
       (ptice +" (DO7.18:81),
    "tamo se igrau miš ((=pl)) <u>za opaške</u>
       ... +" (DO7.18:121),
<u>Od</u> (substituting <u>sa</u> and <u>iz</u> (all instances):
    "... onda je čovek s- ... se sidio
       <u>od ((='sa'))</u> <u>magarac</u> +" (DO7.18:22),
    "pije <u>od brunu</u> ((='iz bunara')) ... sa
       ... + vodu pije <u>od jednu čašu</u>... +"
       (DO7.18:116,117),
<u>Sa</u> (all instances):
    with Instr: "... pa ona se igra <u>sa brodom +"</u> (58)
    with Acc: "šta šta se igra s <u>sa</u> njoj
            <u>devočicu</u> +" (DO7.18:60) (<u>njoj</u> see
            1.2.6.3.),
            "pa onda se igra baba sa <u>sa onu malu</u>
            <u>dečka</u> ... + (DO7.18:110) sic!

1.2.5. The strong position of the accusative, even in <u>NAG</u>, can be
seen in prepositionless constructions as well. In spite of the
presence of the genitive in the NAG systems, for all but the quan-
titative relations the accusative is used or, at least, preferred.

In all comparative constructions the conjunction <u>nego</u> or the pre-
position <u>od</u> with A is used:
    "on je bio težži <u>nego lisisa</u> / +" (DOO.04,80:101),
    "više <u>od jednu godinu</u> ... bio +" (DOC.04,79:202)
and all instances of <u>od</u> with comparative in DO6.16 (1.2.4.3.2.2.).

Even in the temporal meaning we find the accusative instead of G:

"bio jednom jedna lisica / + i ... je iššla je <u>jednu noč</u> /
+" (DOO.04,80:71), apparently instead of "<u>jedne noći</u>
almost the same even in DOO.04:427).
In 1979, in the same place, a prepositional construction was used:
"-ila ((?)) jeda jedna jednom jedna lisica / <u>u jedan noč</u> / +"
(DOO.04,79:43).
For the A instead of G in non-congruent NP, see 1.2.0.1.

In DOO.04 the same role of the A is found instead of the instru-
mental:
"pa smo se vratili <u>isti put</u> ((= 'istim putem')) (573),
"// i se hoda / ÷ i se može vozi / <u>takav voz</u> // +"
((='takim') (219-220).

1.2.6. A summarizing comment about the cases, ex definitione
absent in NAG.

1.2.6.1. L, both times <u>u vodi,</u> is found once with DO6.16 and once
with DO7.03 (cf even 1.1.4. for NA systems) and pronominal <u>o čemu</u>
once with DO6.16. Against the compact use of A in all locative
functions in all NAG idioms the loan interpretation from 1.1.4.
seems to be confirmed.

1.2.6.2. The same can be said about the instrumental, which is
found only once with DO7.18 ("pa ona se igra <u>sa brodom</u> +"
(DO7,18:58)) and once with DOO.07 ("šta igraju se <u>sa loptom</u> //
+"DOO.07:108). The same informant even has a form <u>sebon</u> ("ima
jean mali dječak sebon // +"89), which can be an I. <u>sa sobom,</u> but
an adverb <u>sebom/sobom</u> as well.
The absence of the vocative must be testified in general by a
complete lack of it: indeed, in all NAG texts direct address to an
interlocutor is avoided. In our only occurrence the nominative is
used:
"pa je ... köpmannen ((=trgovac)) reko / ... +<u>varalji</u>
<u>-sća</u> varalica / ... + kako može / jedan kittel ((=kotao))
u- umriti // +" (DOO.07:49-50).

1.2.6.3. The incompatibility with the dative is not equally
compact with all our speakers, as I noted above (0.2.1, 1.1.3.).
Really, the enclitic pronouns as <u>mi, ti, mu</u> are found with
DOO.04,79 and DO6.16. DOO.07 has one accentuated pronominal form:
"mores ti doći doli <u>meni</u> pomoći /"+ (DOO.07:75).

The absence of the dative can be proved very persuasively in the
idiolect of DO7.18. Twice, the indirect object is expressed by a
N-A (N-A is very consistent with this speaker, see 1.2.0.2.2.):

"pa onda je ... lisica išo + i na ti sir je reko ... <u>vuk</u>
    (('vuku')) + (D07.18:55),
"bio je jedan čovek + ((...)) + pa ... pa onda je reko
    <u>negov sin</u> ((='svome sinu')) + šta ((='da')) tvoje mlade
    ... noge ... + šta ti možeš + da ideš ... +"
(D07.18:1-6).
Once, a clear pronominal A is found in the same function:
    "pa onda baka pomogni <u>nje</u> ... +" (D07.18:103)
that deciphers the N-A above as an <u>accusative</u> (not nominative!).
The same accusative (paradigmatically pronominal G-A) in the pre-
dication
    "... pa onda su <u>njega</u> zavezali na noge +" (D07.18:24)
can also be explained by avoiding a construction with D (<u>zavezali</u>
<u>su mu noge</u>). With the other NAG children the "active
resistance"against the dative, or at least the impossibility of
morphologically realizing a dative "communicative task" can be
shown on following examples:
    "zavezaćemo oći <u>na</u> / ... (reci na švedskom) <u>på hovmästarn</u>
    // +" ((= 'konobaru', lit. 'na konobara')) (D00.07:18),
    "pola je reko onoga prodavnice", commented on in 1.2.3.

A general testimony of the weak position of the dative is the
complete lack of the preposition <u>k</u> in all our records to date. On
the contrary, the position of the dative is strengthened by the
possibility of replacing the possessive pronouns with it, which
occurs in D06.16 and D07.18:
    "a ode tu je možda baba <u>mu</u> +" (D06.16:182),
    "(ko je to?) tata <u>njoj</u> + (D06.16:208, similarly 232).

One example from D07.18 seems to testify that this possessive
dative form can become an uninflected possessive pronoun, <u>ceasing</u>
thus to be a dative:
    "šta se igra s sa <u>njoj</u> devoćicu + ((='sa svojom devojkom'))"
    (60),
cf the Russian <u>s jeje devočkoj</u>, Slovak <u>s jej dievčatkom</u> (R. <u>jeje</u>,
Slk. <u>jej</u> are originally genitives of <u>ona</u> 'she'). In this context
once even a noun in D is found:
    "(a ko je to tata jednoj?)<u>curci</u> +" (D06.16:209).

In two other instances of pronoun, the possessive function and
that of indirect object can hardly be distinguished:
    onda ... onda kaže o- otac <u>mu</u> + ne ... imaš ti jače noge +"
    (21-22),
    tata <u>mu</u> kaža + da da ima on jače noge ... od magarca +"
    (29-30).

45

Apparently, the pronominal dative has not the same implicative character, stated in 0.2.1., as the other cases. For a general discussion on D see 1.5. below.

1.2.7. Summarizing our presentation of the NAG case systems, we can state that the G can "take over" firstly the quantitative function, fulfilled in the NA systems by nominative (N pl) or nominative not distinguished from accusative (cf the type <u>dvi dečke,</u> 1.1.2.3., 2.2.3.2.). The two functions of the accusative in NA, namely to be the case of the object and the "casus praepositionalis generalis", are affected by the G only marginally, when differentiating the animate masculines by the G-A from the inanimate ones; both are being, however, <u>accusatives,</u> in all accusative functions. In this way situations can arise (cf e g 1.1.22.6, 1.2.4.2.1, 1.2.4.3.2) which cannot be identified segmentally (i e by the endings used), but only relationally. Due to those homonymities the genitive comes into the NAG systems "at the expense" of the accusative, without replacing it fully in any of its functions: merely as its parallel.

1.3. The NAGL Case Systems

1.3.0. Case systems consisting of four cases - N, A, G and L are found only in two records - DO7.05 (recorded in 1981) and in one year-cut of DOO.04, that one from 1976. Since the last text is very restricted (100 words /16 predications) but contains features not found elsewhere in our corpus, it will be discussed separately (1.3.3.). Therefore, my description of NAGL will be based only on the analysis of DO7.05 (420 words/122 predictions).

1.3.1.1. In DO7.05 all four cases are well documented. The most important difference against the NAG systems analysed above (1.2.) consists, beside the presence of the locative, in the role of the genitive: it is used primarily with the "genitive"-prepositions without being in this position parallelled by A. The G-A for animate masculines is stable: it is found once in plural of pronouns as well ("-edna mala kuća ... + (za koga je to?) <u>za ovih svih</u> ... +" (120-121). Once, <u>brod</u> is conceived as animate (87), see 1.2.4.2.2.

In the record there is no instance of genitive in quantitative function: the names of 'meals' such as <u>sir</u> (cf 1.2.2.) are never in partitive and the only combination with a numeral is <u>dva uši</u> (119). This does not mean that with another speaker using NAGL the

use of the G in other functions, parallelism with A or reluctance
to use the G with prepositions should be ex definitione excluded
(we have such cases in NAGLI, NAGLID and NAGLIDV). The word
<u>magarac</u> occurs with D07.05 (and similarly with several other
informants) in two morphological shapes - as the masculine <u>magarac</u>
or the feminine <u>magarca</u> according to the Sw åsna, (e g: "jedan sin
i jedan čovjek i <u>jedna</u> magar- <u>magarca</u> ... +" (1), "i sin da vuće
<u>magarcu</u> ... +" (12)): this must be kept in mind when interpreting
such utterances as:
"onaj čojek ... on je sjeo <u>na magartsu</u> +"which is an
which is an accusative (and not the locative!).

1.3.11. Arguments for the absence of the instrumental in the idio-
lect of D07.05 are only reluctance of the informant to use it, but
not "positive" proofs of its non-existence (see 0.2.5.):
′ "ona ... peca ribu ... + (čime peca?) <u>sa</u> ... + ne snan
((=znam)) ... +"(110-112),
what indeed can equally apply to his/her not knowing the S/C name
for the fishing-rod.

1.3.12. The same is valid for the dative and vocative: no
"positive" proofs of their non-existence are found and avoiding
them must be used as an argument. We can quote e g a passage
retelling a dialogue between the fox and the wolf, where the verbs
<u>kazati</u> and <u>pomoći</u> are repeatedly used without indirect object and
the direct speech without the vocative or anything else instead of
it: (the word <u>lisica,</u> its feminine gender notwithstanding, is
referred to by the pronoun <u>on,</u> because of the noun Mickel räv =
'Michael the fox' in the Sw stimulus):
"onda je doša ... vuk ... + i pita + šta ti onde onde radiš +
onda je on kaza + da ... da je naša ((=našao)) jedan sir +
i onda je ... on ... + onda je kaza + da ne može to sam
pojest + i pita + ako on bi pomogo +" etc (60-70).

In only one instance does an enclitic pronominal indirect object
occur (see 0.2.1.3.):
"da dade c- ta + da <u>mu</u> dade cijeli sir ... +" (81-82).
It can be seen how the first predication is an implicit nucleus,
more explicitly developed in the second one: the dative pronoun
comes in this developed version, while the passage 60-70 above can
be compared rather with the nuclear one.

1.3.2. The prepositions used by D07.05 govern the A, L and G. As
with many other children in this investigation, the prepositions
<u>u</u> and <u>na</u> in "essive"(superessive, inessive) meaning govern the
locative and the accusative <u>randomly,</u> without any discernible

47

difference. E g:
       "(ko je to tamo?) miš ... + (gde je on?) ... u jednoj burki
              ((Sw utrum burk(en) = 'a tin': fem burka by
       konzerva f)) ... + (šta radi on?) on je u svoj brod
              ... +" (90-92) (a tin is used by a mouse as a boat).

1.3.21. Prepositions with the accusative (i e masculine animate in
G-A):
U (direction), e g:
       "onda je on skočio u sić +" (77),
na (direction), e g :
       "(šta radi mali braca?) veriši na svijeće ((= miriše na
              cvijeće)) +" (101),
za (once, with pronoun):
       "-edna mala kuća ... + (za koga je to?) za ovih svih
              ...+" (120-121),
u (place), e g:
       "(u šta on to drži?) u ruku +" (102),
na (place), e g:
       "da sin jaši na kona +" (5),
       "on je jašio na magartsa ... +" (8),
       "(gde je taj gips?) na nogu ... +" (107).

1.3.22. Prepositions governing the locative are u and na, each of
them used only once:

U (see 1.3.2.),
na:
       "(kako znaš da je curica?) vidim na kosi ... +" (98).

The ratio between the accusative and locative in place (=essive)
meaning is thus 3:1 (u) and 4:1 (na).

1.3.23. The "genitive" prepositions used in this record are do,
iz, od.
do:
       "((vuk)) došao do jednoga ... + (bunar) je // bunar//
              ...+" (43),
iz:
       "(iz čega pije?) iz čaše ..."(115),
od:
       "(od čega je napravljen taj brod?) od ... lišta
              ((lišča? lista?)) i od- daske ... +" (89).

1.3.3. With the speaker DOO.04, who was described as a bearer of
the NAG system since 1979, a short record was made in 1976, when

he was 6 years old.
This record differs deeply from DOO.04,79: the difference consists
in using in 1976 the locative twice instead of the accusative but
parallel with another accusative in the same meaning and once with
the preposition <u>pored</u> instead of the genitive:
> "pao je <u>u vodi</u> // (tko) dešak // + pa je pas /
>   sko- "skoćio <u>u vodu</u> i / + pa ga ... odveo // ...
>   <u>na ... trafi</u> // ... +" (DOO.04,76:3-5),

with <u>pored</u> (because of the foregoing L?, because of not knowing
its meaning?):
> "pa se igrao na ... u <u>na livadi</u> // ... (pored)
>   <u>poret livadi</u> // +" (DOO.04,76:2).

Apart of those instances only once is the preposition <u>za</u> in the
meaning 'o' found in the whole record:
> "dečak je ćuo <u>la</u> ((=za)) <u>ledenu goru</u> / ... +"
>   (DOO.04,76:8).

Those three locatives are in conflict with two of our elsewhere
generally valid principles, applying in the investigated texts -
that the accusative is the "praepositionalis generalis"(O.2.3.)
and that the accusative can replace the locative, but not the
reverse (see note to the table in O.2.).

The text of DOO.04,76 is rather restricted and the case system in
the next year-cut (DOO.04,79) is substantially rearranged: proba-
bly in connection with the informant's journey to his grandparents
in Niš he totally lost the locative and introduced a consistent
NAG system. Therefore , we have no more material about his 1976
idiolect and simply register its peculiarities without inferring
conclusions for the general theory.

1.4.   The NAGLI/NAGI, NAGLID/NAGID and NAGLIDV Case Systems.

1.4.0.   As I said in O.2.1., the implicativity of the dative is
not as strong as we saw in the case of A., G. or L., and as will
be demonstrated for the Instrumental. The most probable reason is
the "Balkan" distance between the nominal and pronominal dative.
While in the corpus described there is a parallelism between
nominal and pronominal case forms in N., A., G., L. and I.
(including animateness), the nominal dative differs substantially
from the pronominal one. The latter one is found with almost all
of our speakers, even in the NA or NAG systems. A distinction must
be made between an object dative (<u>reče mu</u>) and a possesive dative
(<u>baba mu,</u> 'his grandmother'). Since the latter is not enclitic and

not paralleled by a nominal dative, it can be questioned whether
it still remains a paradigmatic D form of the corresponding
personal pronoun. - In the case of the object dative, where the
parallelism with the accented form (njemu) and with a noun (e g
vuku) exists in theory, the "Balkan" development preserves the
enclitics, but has abolished the noun. This Balkan development is
reflected in our corpus by a quantitative disproportion between
the pronominal and the nominal D forms (cf. table 2 in 1.5.0.).The
pronominal D does not imply and is itself not implied by any gram-
matical case. The nominal D is more regular in that it implies as
a rule N, A, G and I. (about L see 0.2.1.), but in the idiolect of
07.20 (NAGLIDV) and 07.23 (NAGLID) the expected Instr. is not
found: in 07.20's attempts the absence of an Instr. can be seen
very clearly:

"sa mom magarcu ... +" (07.20:50),

"sa njenu ... njegov ... od ... dvo- sa devojčicu
...+" (07.20:130),

"ona se igra sa sa jedna brod ... +" (07.20:134) (about brod
see 1.2.4.2.2.).

It is for this reason that I will describe the locative and the
instrumental in the NAG(L)I, NAG(L)ID and NAGLIDV systems jointly,
assuming that in the last two groups they are not implied by the
dative.

T a b l e   1

Type	Speaker	Dial. area	A(loc):Loc	Instr	Dative Pron	Dative Nouns	Voc	Number of words	pred
NaGL	07.05	j*	7:2	0	1	0	0	421	122
NaGLI	D07.07	i/j	2:13	4	4	0	0	641	158
	D07.08	e	13:3	6	0	0	0	878	199
	D07.19	i/j/e	2:3	1⁴	2	Y**	0	582	134
	D07.22	e	0:7	8	5	0	0	703	164
	D07.25	e	6:3⁴	1	1	0	0	589	139
	D07.26	e	7:6	2	5	0	0	727	197
	D06.17	e	0:5	7	1	0	0	434	118
	D00.08,79	j	1:6³	7	1?	Y	Y	443	107
NaGI	D07.09	e	4:0	1	2	Y	0	567	96
	D07.13	e	9:0	1	3	0	0	403	118
	D07.14	e	7:0	2	6	0	0	562	144
	D06.15	i/j	6:0	3	1	0	0	402	95
NaGLID	D07.01	e	7:6	2	0	1	0	915	231
	D07.21	e	5:13	3	1	1	0	721	184
	D07.23	e/j	4:3	0⁴	9	1	0	643	134
	D00.08,80	j	6:3	6	4	2/Y	0	578	160
NaGID?	D07.17	j/e	5:1	2⁵	4	1/Y	0	865	165
NaGLIDV	D07.20	j	5:3	0⁶	9	1(2?)	4(3)	738	173
	D07.24	j/i	7:7	2	6	0	1	1001	246

*) j = (i)jekavian, e = ekavian, i = ikavian
**) The sign Y denotes an "active" counterexample.
1) Disturbed congruence ("sa svome tatom", 66).
2) na 5:0, i e only with the Acc.
3) u only.
4) Only one adjective in Instr. ("sa.... bjelom tačka", 115).
5) Both very destroyed ("s- sa sa s- mojom magarco", 24;
   "ja -ću sa s- moj s- maga- magarom sve napraviti", 28).
6) All Gen. and Instr. prepositions govern Acc. in this idiolect.

1.4.1.   The use of the *locative* in the NAGL(L)I, NAG(L)ID and
NAGLIDV systems is the same as was stated about NAGL (1.3.2.):
with the prepositions u and na in the "essive" sense, the choice
between L and A is free and random: neither semantic,   nor   social

factors (e g dialectal background or character of stimulus) were found, by which a single speakers' model for this choice could be deciphered. As a significative case the child 00.08 can be adduced: in his/her record from 1979 L in the essive meaning is used almost exclusively, one year later, in 1980, both case forms alternate in the same contexts:

   1979: "tri djećake igraju se sa brodovma <u>u vodi</u> ... +"
       (D00.08:76) vs
   1980: "(... šta vidiš ovdje?) djeca što se igraju sa brodima
        <u>u vodu</u> "(252) but "kako mjesecs ugledalo
        <u>u vodi</u>... "(167),

   1979: "i igraju se u pjesku ... + (91) and the same in 1980:
   1980 "djeca što se igraju u pjesku +" (289),

   1979: "jedna sjedi <u>na kantu</u> a tu su <u>na</u> ... <u>på marken</u>
       (= on the ground, 100) and the same in 1980:
   1980: "jedna -tica sjedi <u>na kantu</u> + (a ove druge?) oni ...
       oni stoje <u>na zemlju</u> +" (294-5).

Other nouns:
   1979: "jeden djećak nosi jednu kantu ... <u>u rukama</u> +" (95),
      "(kako su obućeni ?) njeko njekake su <u>u suknjama</u>
      a a njekakve su <u>u -lačama</u> +" (106),
   1980: "(... šta vidiš tu ?) jedan čovjek što sjedi <u>na</u>
      <u>drugu klupu</u> +" (284), "imaju ... haljine
      <u>na sebe</u> ...+" (302).

Record D07.26:
     "(gdje se oni nalaze ?) u + (šta je ovo ?) <u>u travi</u> +
     (a šta je to okolo njih sve ?) ... (šta je to ?)
     ne znam + (šta je to ?) a na švedski se zove skog +
     (aha, a ne znaš srpskohrvatski ? u) <u>šupu</u> +
     (ne, šuma, oni su u) <u>šumu</u> + (di su oni ?)
     <u>u šumu</u> "(134-140).

The same random distribution is found in all the other records.

   With those relations in mind it is clear, that the "pure" types NAGLI (D07.22 and D06.17) and NAGI (D07.09, D07.13, D07.14 and D06.15) and the "transitive" ones NAGLyI (D07.07, D07.19, D07.25 etc) are in fact the same type NAG(L)I and of course also NAG(L)ID and NAG(L)IDV, although no pure NAGID and NAGIDV are found among the 25 children investigated here. Table 1 gives a general account of items (speakers, case forms, records) in this part of JUBA-corpus (LIDV-part).

1.4.1.2. The prepositions <u>u</u> and <u>na</u> are the only ones found with all speakers in the LIDV-part (table 1). In some cases, certain semantic rearrangements between them are made. The speaker

DO7.26, for instance, expresses the meaning of direction only by u, while in the essive meaning u and na retain their normal meaning:

"seo je na kantu +" (DO7.26:56),

"i onda vuk je seo na ... vedro ... +" (DO7.26:75, i.e. 'u vedro', cf later "lisica skočila ... iz vedra ...+" (ib. 82). In the texts about the monkey (107) and about the fox (101) the speaker DO7.23 used only na instead of u, but when telling about the picture (108), he/she used all but once u instead of na - the general meaning notwithstanding (f ex "... popeo se na jenu kantu + "i.e 'into' 47, similary 69 in 101 vs.

"nekolko miševa su se objesili u drva ... +", i.e.
        'on the trees' (97),
"(kako znaš da je dečak slomio nogu?) e pa vidim u nogu
        + zave- zavejanu u gips- ", i.e. 'na' or
        'po nozi' (124-5). O - Such semantic rearrangements are possible with any diaspora speaker in any part of speech: with prepositions, which are a closed class, any semantic expansion influences necessarily the semantic scope of some other parts of the same class: often one of the prepositions u and na takes over one more function at the expense of some other preposition. Some exemples:

"(kako znaš da je devojčica ?) ... vidim na kosi +"
        i.e. 'po' (DO7.08:138), similar as "vidim u nogu"
        cited above from DOO,08:124-5: po does not occur
        in DO7.08's record; see 1.3.22. and 1.4.1.2. as well;
"((...)) / + što pije vodu // ... + u koficu jednu /
        ... + ", i.e. 'iz' (DO7.24:180); iz does not
        occur in DO7.24's record.
As a rule, Swedish words in combinations with u and na remain uninflected: they can also be paralleled by S/C words:
"((...)) sjedi + i ljulja se + (na čemu se ljuljaju ?)
        na ... gungbraeda ((='swing plank')) gungor
        ((pl., ='swing')) ljuljajke... +" (DOO.08:89).

1.4.1.3. Other prepositions governing the L. are extremely rare in LIDV. The preposition o occurs once (and once in the shape od) and po once regarding the meaning 'po' see 1.4.1.2.):
    o:

"a ... šta je ono sad bilo ... o magarcu + i ...
        i šta je ono bilo jos ... čoveku i ... +"
        (DO7.07:1), the same
po:

"(kako znaš da je to ćerka ?) jel po ko-si +"

(DO7.14:136).

Use of <u>od</u> ='o' is found in 07.01 as well, but here <u>of</u> preserves the G. government:
> "((...)) da priča nešto št- <u>od magarca</u> / i jed-dva
> ... dva onih // ... +" (DO7.01:9)

1.4.2. The <u>instrumental</u> occurs in the LIDV-part either with the prepositions <u>sa</u> and <u>za</u> or as a prepositionless case.

1.4.2.1.1. The prepositionless I. are always used as non-sentential answers to the questions of the testers, and never in a sentence context. The following exemple is significative:

> "... (čime peca ova baka?) ... <u>pecaljkom</u> + ili
> dr- <u>sa drvetom</u> upravi +" (DO7.08:160-1).

Other instances:
> "... (čime lovi ova teta?) <u>udicom</u> // + (i ?)
> štap- // +" (DO7.07:125-6),
> "(a čime bi skijao ?) <u>skijama</u> // +" (DO7.07:158).

1.4.2.1.2. In continuous speech the same speakers use the preposition <u>sa</u>:

> "i vesla <u>sa ...štapom</u> // ... "(DO7.07:107),
> "zato što je vuk ... otišo dole <u>sa onom drugom kor-</u>
> <u>pom</u> +" (DO7.07:82),
> "((...)) vozio se na ledu + (čim ?) pa <u>sa klizaljkama</u>
> +" (DO7.07:196-7).

Another child uses the preposition in isolated answers as well:

> "(a čime peca ?) <u>sa jea- pecalkom</u> // +" (DO7.01:157),
> "mogo bi + da se skija // + (čime ?) <u>sa skijama</u>
> // +" (DO7.C1:224),
> "ondak bi mogo mal- onak- + da se vozi // + <u>sa</u>
> onako ... + (čime ?) <u>s</u> ne znam +" (DO7.01:212-15).

The same "tool" meaning of the I. is found also in other NAG(L)I and NAG(L)ID records:

> "igra se <u>sa brodom</u> +" (DO7.13:88),
> "i sveza ga <u>sa konopcsom</u> ... +" (DO7.14:43),
> "(čime su mu zavezali noge ?) sa ne-...<u>sa konopcem</u> +"
> (DO7.22:42).
> "šta vidiš ovdje na slici ?) dvje cure šta se igraju <u>sa be-</u>
> <u>bima</u> +" (DC0.08:231),
> "((...)) jedna csura igra se <u>sa loptama</u> na ... na ovoj pla-

```
         (...) plank +" (D00.08:270-71),
    "(čime sa igraju ta djeca ?) sa kolma + (i s čim još ?)
         ...sa ... kantom +" (D00.08:290-91) etc.
```

The most frequent function of the preposition sa is, however, the concomitative one. Some exemples:

```
    "mama peca sa njim...+" (D07.08:105),
    "((...)) to -e kuća ... + i jedan samo još   s jednom
        životinjom ((...)) "(D07.08:107-8),
    "jean jedan čšika sa detetom / ... +" (D07.09:79),
    "šta bere jagode sa svome tatom ... +  " (D07.19:82),
    "hošeš hoćeš ti + da podjeliš sa mnom +" (D00.08:171-2),
```

The preposition za 'after,behind' with I. is used only in two records:

```
    "... a tata je is- išao za njom ... +" (D07.21:110),
    "(... devojčica je) ugledala brot ... + i trčala za njim
        ... + a tata je pošo za devojčicom +" (D07.21:112-14),
    "(the fox shouts from the draw-well))"... jedem sir + dod-
        dol- sa -nom + "='dođi doli za mnom' (D00.08,79:53-54).
```

Since, however, the speaker 00.08 normally distinguishes the phonemes /s/ and /z/, it is not excluded that the instrumental preposition za 'after, behind' got identified with the polysemic sa and got in this way to be differentiated in opposition to the accusative preposition za, primarily with the final meaning (za does occur in the same text).

The same za 'after' is nonetheless found in D07.08 governing the A:

```
    "otaca se popeo na magarca + a a sin išo za magarca +"
        (D07.08:4),
    "zašto čovek ... jaše na magarca + a zašto dećko ide
        za magarca +" (ib.8-9).
```

Since 07.08 has a very stable instrumental governed by sa, this change can be seen as an idiolectic grammatical leveling within the polysemic preposition za, analogous with the leveling described above with regard to the polysemic sa. The choice of the A is in perfect accord with the general role of the A, as stated in 0.2.3. - Another case of replacing I. by A within LIDV-part is found in the record D07.20: all instances are quoted in 1.4.0.

None of the other spatial prepositions governing I., viz nad, pod, pred, među, is found in the entire corpus investigated in this study.

1.4.2.2. Disturbed congruence in a nominal phrase (NP) occurs often in the diaspora child language. In connection with the I. we have a series of such instances.

a) The noun in right form, the adjective wrong (as a rule N. sg. masc.):

"((...)) on ćuva -ednu malu bebu + šta se igra jedan
    brodon ... +" (D06.15:61),
"(a čime peca?) sa jes- pecalkom // + "
    (D07.01:157),
"ja -oću sa s- moj s- maga- magarom sve na-
    praviti +" (D07.17:28),
"šta bere jagode sa svome tatom ... +" (D07.19:66).

b) The right form anticipated by the adjective, but the noun uninflected (in N.):
"... vidim jednu malu seku + šta bere jagode svojim
    tata + "= 'sa svojim tatom' (D06.15:55),
"... a jena je crvena ... + i sa ... bjelom tačka
    +" about mushrooms (D07.23:115),
"ja ću ja ja ću napraviti s- sa sa s- mojom magarco
    +" (D07.17:24), maybe "magarcom?": conceiving
    "magarac" as a feminine "magarca", according
    to the Swedish "åsna" is a widespread phonome-
    non (see 1.3.1.1.).

The typology of violations of the congruence in the diaspora lan-guage deserves a special investigation.

1.5. The dative.

1.5.0.   The role of the dative in the diaspora children's texts is very complex. As I said earlier (1.4.0.), there is a clear dis-proportion between the nouns and pronouns in D: the pronouns are found in almost all texts, the NA and NAG not excepting (see Tab. 2), while the nouns in D occur only in 6 records. The typological characteristics NAG(L)ID and NAGLIDV are, consequently, based on nominal D forms only.

Another difference between the nominal and the pronominal D is the quantitative one. The nominal D is found - in a few records - one or exceptionally two times in each: the pronouns can be found many times (see Tab. 2).

T a b l e 2

Type	Speaker	Dial area	Dat. forms totally		Pronouns				Long forms	Phras expr.
			Pron	Nouns	Short poss. encl	non-encl	forms indir.obj encl	non encl		
NA	00.01	j/i	0	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-
	00.06	e	1/Y	0	-	-	1	-	-	-
	07.03,82	e	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
NAG	00.04,79		3	0	-	-	2	1	-	-
	80	e	2	2	-	-	1	-	-	-
	82		1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
	00.07	j/i	1	Y	-	-	-	-	1	-
	06.16	j/e	6(8)	1/Y	-	4	2	2	2	-
	07.03,81	e	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	07.18	e	1/Y	Y	-	-	-	-	-	1
NAGL	07.05	j	1	0	-	-	1	-	-	-
	00.04,76	e	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
NAGLI	07.07	i/j	4	0	2	-	1	1	-	-
	07.08	e	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	07.19	i/j	2/Y	0	1	-	-	-	-	1
	07.22	e	5	0	5	-	-	-	-	-
	07.25	e	1	0	1	-	-	-	-	-
	07.26	e	5	0	-	-	4	1	-	-
	06.17	e	1	0	1	-	-	-	-	-
	00.08,79	j	1	Y	-	-	-	1	-	-
NAGI	07.09	e	2/Y	0	-	-	-	2	-	-
	07.13	e	3	0	-	-	3	-	-	-
	07.14	e	6	0	-	-	6	-	-	-
	06.15	i	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	1
NAGLID	07.01	e	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	07.21	e	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
	07.23	e/j	9	1	3	1	2	-	3	-
	00.08,80	j	4	2/Y	-	-	1	-	2	-
NAGID	07.17	j/e	4	1/Y	2	-	-	-	2	-
NAGLIDV	07.20	e	9	2	1	1	7	-	-	-
	07.24	e	6	0	1	-	3	2	-	-

Y = forms contraindicating the dative are found in
the record.

57

Consequently, the pronominal D is neither implied by any other case, nor implies itself other cases (1.4.0.). The implicativity of the nominal dative is not very strong: besides what has been said in 1.4.0. it can be mentioned that nominal D forms are found also in two last year-cuts of 00.04 (1979 and 1980), who has a very sure NAG system, without any trace of the I. and L. and with "genitive" prepositions prefering A. government (see 1.2.4.2.1., 1.2.4.2.4.).

Since we have only 2 records with the vocative, it is not possible to generalize. But in one of those two records, the 07.24, the nominal dative is not found either and its characteristic as NAGLIDV can thus be questionned.

1.5.1.   In the whole corpus, investigated in this article, the dative never combine with a preposition: and no "dative" preposition, as "k, proti, usprkos" etc, has been met.

The D forms found (in the NA, NAG, and NAGL records as well) have mainly two syntactic functions: the function of indirect object (e g "reko mu") and the possesive one ("baba · mu = 'his grandmother'). In some idiolects they seem to be formally differentiated (see below 1.5.3.).   Besides, pronominal D is found in expressions such as "na ti" or "evo ti ": I will call it "phraseological" use of D

1.5.2.   As we see in our records, the non-existing or not fully established D can be either avoided or replaced by another form: it applies equally both to the nominal and the pronominal forms.

1.5.2.1.   My most restricted instance of contraindicating the D is the speaker 00.08, who does not tolerate D in the combination indirect object + direct object, although he/she does have the D, at least in the 1980 year-cut (both the times renarrating the S/C stimulus: "... napokon jedan predloži drugoj dvojici: ...   ... Zavežimo krčmaru oči, pa koga od nas trojice uhvati žmurke, toj neka plati ... ")

"... stav- ćemo krčmać u jednu maramicsu za oče + pa koga
    on uzme + taj će platiti ... +" (D00.08,79:131-34),
"hajde / stavimo konobar ... peškir ... il- maramu za o-
    za oći + pa da ... pa taj ko- on ufati + nek plati +"
    (D00.08,80:211-214): the dative follows immediately,but
    (since?) without any direct object: "... a kad su oni
    stavil- konobaru + traži + i traži +" (D00.08,80:218).
The forms krčmać, konobar are nominatives, since the speaker 00.08

has   G-A   for   animate   masculines   (another   case   is   "vuk"   in
1.5.2.2.).

1.5.2.2. The D in any syntactic function can be replaced by ano-
ther paradigmatic case form: such replacing is found also with
speakers which have NAG(L)ID systems.

   All our speakers use in such situation the A., with or without
preposition:
   a) The speakers 00.01 (NA) and 00.07 (NAG), renarrating the
      same motive as in 1.5.2.1., use the "Balkan" prepositi-
      on "na":

      "onda je jedan kaža // + da -oćemo ... (šta hočemo zave-
         zati oći <u>na</u> ... (krčmaru) krčmaru // ... + "
         (DOO.01,80:139),
      "... -ajmo radt -vako / ... + zavezaćemo oći <u>na</u> / ...
         (reci na švedskom) på hovmästarn // +" (DOO.07:17-18).
   b) According the general role of the A. as a general "Bezug"-
      case, a "normal" D can be replaced by an A. This A
      can be a G-A (necessarily with personal pronouns) or a
      N-A:

      "daj ... daj ti <u>nas-s</u> ... sve sve + sta imas naj-
            bolje // +" (DOO.06,80:123-124) N A,
      "...ali sad je maga-raca +što će <u>nas</u> / da
            pomogne // ... +" (DOO.07.09:27) NAG<u>I</u>,
      "ja ne ne mogu više ... + pomogni <u>me</u> i jesti +"
            (DO7.19:55) NAGLI,
in all three instances pronominal G-A.
      "kako će doč- doči dolje + i onda onda <u>vak</u>
            ((= vuk, i e 'to the wolf')) licica-ca reče + uzmij
            onaj ... onaj tamo ... (kanta) kan- kantu + "
            (DO7.17:67) NAGID! with N-A,
      "bio je jedan čovek + što ima + što ima je- jedan ma-
            garac + pa ... pa onda je reko <u>negov sin</u>
            ((= 'to his son')) + šta tvoje mlade ... noge ...
            (i e 'that your legs are young') ... + šta ti
            možeš + da i-deš ... +" (DO7.18:1-6) NAG with
            N-A,
      "a kaže onaj ... + kaže <u>sin</u> +" (i e 'to his son')
            (DO6.16:58-59) NAG, but with N-A.

I am not completely sure in identifying the following instance,
where a G (?) fulfills the role of indirect object:
      "i onda došo jedan vug ... + š- i o doč (?) onda-e

```
        reko lici-ca-ce-ce +" (D07.17:59-60) NAGID!.
```
c) The most common way of avoiding the D is to drop it.
   children can use dozens of verbs such as "reći, ka-
   zati, pomoći, smejati se" without specifing to
   whom somebody speaks or shall help.

As an example I can cite the re-narrated dialogue between the fox
and the wolf in the record D07.08:64-78:
```
  " (...) onda  došo jedan vuk kod ... (bu-) bunar kod bunara
    i onda v- ... i onda video lisicu + i onda lisica ka-
    zala + j- ja ne mogu + da pojedem ... ovo parče sira
    ... + -oćeš + ti  da pojedeš + i onda kaže vuk + -oću
    ... + al- a i onda kaže lisica + dođi dole + al- on ...
    al- ... al- vuk kaže + kako ... + ((...)) pa sedni u onu
     korpu ... + i on je seo + i otišo dole u vodu + i onda ...
    onda kaže lisica ... + ! etc (neither D, nor V).
```

This kind of re-narrating texts where the D is strongly indicated
by both model stories (both about the monkey and about the fox) is
very typical for the whole population investigated. As another
strategy of avoiding an indicated D (the passage cited in 1.5.2.)
we can adduce the child OO.06 (NA):

```
  "i pose jedan se setio // ... + da ... da ... z- zave-
     da za- zavežemo nešto na oći // + i on ... i oni su
     tako radili // +" (DOO.06,1979:41-43).
```
The inn-keeper is named only in the introductory sentence::

```
  "// ... jedamput bili su ... tri varanice / + sta su ...
      otiššli kod neki krčmar // ... +" (DOO.06,79:24-25),
```
   which is a very common, general S/C way of replacing the pre-
   position k governing the D.

1.5.3. The nominal D, used in the NAG(L)ID (D07.01, D07.21,
D07.23, DOO.08,80, DO7.17) and NAGLIDV (07.20) systems, is always
the indirect object, with verbs reći or kazati, in all instances
with no attribute, e g:
```
  "a  posle -e reko ovaj lisica vuku // +" (D07.01:88),
  "i... onda ... pa onda mu tata ... onda tata sinu kaze
    +" (D07.23:28),
  "sad sad je njemu sinu reko +" (D07.17:36), which, really,
    can also be interpreted as 'to his son': in such case it
    ought to be an attribute.
```
About the form curci in D07.18 see 1.5.4.

1.5.4.   The <u>pronominal</u> dative forms are normally divided into unaccentuated (enclitic) and accentuated. Since the unaccentuated forms are not always enclitic in our corpus, we shall distinguish
   a) short (e g <u>mu</u>) vs long (e g <u>njemu</u>) forms
   b) (among the short forms) enclitic (pa <u>mu</u> tata kaže)
    vs non-enclitic (pa kaže tata <u>mu</u>) forms.
All occurences of the D in all investigated texts are systematically accounted for in Tab. 2.

1.5.4.1.   The pronominal long forms always function as indirect object. They can be both accentuated, i e non-enclitic and non-accentuated; as D in general, they are never governed by a preposition. Some exemples:
   "((...)) oni sretnu jednoga coveka + i on <u>njima</u> kaze ... +"
    (D07.23:7),
   "p- pa onda dođe ... vuk + i <u>njemu</u> kaze (D07.23:55) -
    non-enclitic,
   "i viću na konobara + da dođe + da <u>njima</u> stavi + najbolje
    šta imaju .... + (D00.08,80:187) twice in similar
kontext: there is no <u>im</u> in this record, and <u>njima</u> is both times in an enclitic position - syntactically and semantically;
   "((...)) onda je reko vako <u>njemu</u> +" (D07.17:20) (see also
    1.5.3. about 07.17:36)

1.5.4.2.   The pronominal "short" forms occur, as we have seen, in two, or properly speaking, in three functions:
   a) in the possessive function,
   b) in the function of an indirect object,
   c) as a part of phraseological expressions such as <u>na ti
    sira</u>.
There is no difference between the behavior of the short pronominal forms in systems with and without the nominal dative.

1.5.4.2.1.   The D forms in phraseological expressions:
  "evo <u>ti</u> ... e sira" (D06.15:53) - NAGI,
  "evo <u>ti</u> sira" (D07.19:63) - NAGLI and
  "na <u>ti</u> sir " (D07.18:55) - NAG;
in the first and third instance it is the only occurences of D in those records.

1.5.4.2.2.   The short pronominal D functioning as indirect object is most often enclitic and does not differ in any way from the S/C standard. Non-enclitically placed forms occur as a rule together with enclitic ones and must then be considered rather as a normal phenomenon in spoken language. Some exemples:

D07.07:
  non-enclitic:
      "i o- (i e 'on' or 'ona') reka mu mu je +" (55),
  enclitic:
      "u- unda mu je .. lisca rekla // ... " (67)
D 07.26:
  non-enclitic:
      "((...)) sretrnu petog čoveka ... + pa on petog
         čove- im reče .. +" (33-34),
  enclitic:
      "... čovek mu reče ... +" (5),
      "... i li-si-ca mu reče ... +" (67),
      "... pa im reče ... +" (22)
D 07.24:
  non-enclitic:
      "i ondak ... i ondak gaže lisica mu +" (118),
      "ondak prednje noge mu me- ((i e 'metne')) on / čovek
         // +" (50),
  enclitic:
      "(šta mu radi sa prednjim nogama?)... metu mu na
         na leđa // +" (51),
      "a peti čovek mu gaže // +" (46),
      "... pa je ondak ... i- išli + i drugi čovek mu im
         je reko // +" (14-15).

The speaker 07.09 is the only case where the non-encliticity of short pronominal dative seems to be systematic (although we only have two instances in the record), while his/her verbal and reflexive enclitics do behave as normal enclitics:
      "i posle ... o- mu kaže // +" (D07.09:36),
      "i tako on mu kaže +" (40)
vs. verbal and reflexive enclitics:
      "i posle su obadve jašili / +" (9),
      "i mi- mišovi se penju na ... na rep // +" (61)
        and so on.

It must be underscored, however, that the occurence of short forms does not imply the existence of the "long" forms (mu vs. njemu and vice versa (cf below 1.5.5.) - as far as can be inferred from our records.

1.5.4.2.3. The pronominal D forms with possessive meaning (e g baba mu = 'his grandmother') are one aspect of an extremely complex linguistic problem, labelled often as the question of the "to be vs. to have languages" (cf "On 'have' and 'be' Languages. (A Typological Sketch)" by A.V. Issatschenko, published in Slavic Forum: Essays in Linguistics and Literature, M. Flier ed., The

Hague - Paris, 1974, 43-77; I myself have written about this prob-
lem in <u>Slavica Lundensia 8, Bohemica et Slovaca</u>, pp. 19-28 "Vzt'ah
slovies <u>esse: habere</u> v slovanských jazykoch...").

The same referential content as in
        "i noga <u>mu</u> je uvijena" (D07.22:92) can also be expressed by
two other arrangements:
        "<u>njegova</u> noga je uvijena" or
        "nogu <u>ima</u> uvijenu ".
Consequently, the presence of a possesive D can be in complemen-
tary distribution with possesive pronouns <u>moj, tvoj, njegov, nje-
zin</u> ... and can influence the semantic spectrum of the verb
<u>imati</u>.

    In our texts the pronominal D in the possessive function is
always in the short form (never in the long one; one instance of
nominal D in this function is dubious). This form is as a rule
enclitic, but in the records D06.16, D07.23 and D07.20 it seems to
be significantly non-enclitic:
    Enclitic short forms (some exemples):
        "a tata <u>mu</u> ide // +" (D07.07:17),
        "onda su <u>mu</u> noge zavelali / ... +" (D07.07:32),
        "pa nek <u>ti</u> sin sidne ... +" (D07.19:15),
        "pa <u>mu</u> zavoj tako okolo +" (D07.22:95),
        "ovaj / zavezali su <u>mu</u> noge u ... +" (D07.22:41),
        "tu <u>im</u> je njino skrovište +" = 'tu imaju svoje ...'
            (D07.22:103),
        "... tu je jedan stariji deda ... + on je boja ... bela ...
            + a gaće su <u>mu</u> još belije ... +" (D07.25:126-128),
        "(a kako se ta njegova žena zove?) pa patka + (mm, patak
            i patka znači, a jel imaju decu?) sada <u>joj</u> je velki
            stomak ... +" (D06.17:88),
        "... ah kako ... ti ... sin <u>ti</u> je mladi / +" (D07.24:8).

    Non-enclitic short forms:
        "... onda ... onda kaže o- otac <u>mu</u> +" (D06.16:21),
        "a ode tu je možda baba <u>mu</u> +" (D06.16:182),
        "(a ko je ovo onda?) tata <u>njoj</u> +" (D06.16:232, similary
            ib. 208) .
In D06.16 (NAG) all possesive D follow the nouns, while the object
D are enclitic, viz
        "a kaža <u>mu</u> ... tata +" (D06.16:7),
        "tata <u>mu</u> kaža +" (ib. 29),
the last instance, however, is equivocal. In the record D06.16
possessive pronouns of the type "njegov" do not appear and to
direct question

"...čiji je to to šator, znaš?" the girl answered:
"...o- njega = 'od njega' (DO6.16:200), instead of the expec-
ted standard "njegov".
In this record we have an instance of a nominal dative:
"(ko je to ?) tata njoj + (a ko je to tata jednoj ?)
      curci +" (DO6.16:208-209), but this D could have been
stimulated by a suggestive question.
O6.16 is our most consequent dative type of possessivity, although
the semantic scope of imati is not touched by this feature (cf the
potential nogu ima uvi-jenu above). The difference between the
possesive and the object short forms in the record of this speaker
is also expressed formally: the indirect object forms are invaria-
bly enclitic, the possesive ones are not, see above.

A less consequent dative possessivity is found in the record of
the speaker 07.23 (NAGLID), using potentially non-enclitic short
forms (as opposed to long forms in indirect object function), but
also the possesive pronouns of the type njegov:
  non-enclitic:
    "da nije dobro + da sin mu jaše ... +" (15),
  enclitic:
    "... a ... i ... da mu tata ide ... +" (16),
    "a sin mu je otišo pješke ... +" (5),
    "a d- a sin mu otiso na drugu stranu +" (26).
A possessive pronoun, synonymic with all other possessive datives,
has been used only once:
    "a njegova mama je sedela pored njega na jedan kamen +"
        (83).
The only enclitic form in indirect object function has been imme-
diately corrected and replaced by a noun:
    "i... onda ... pa onda mu tata ... onda tata sinu kaza
        +" (28).
In all three instances with pronominal D in object function long
forms were used:
    "... oni sretnu jednoga coveka + i on njima kaze ... +" (7),
    ".. pa on njima kaze +" (20),
    "... p- pa onda dođe .. vuk + i njemu kaze +" (55).

The potential non-encliticity of possessive D short forms,
combined with uncertainness in using the possesive pronouns, is to
some extent also found with the speaker 07.20 (NAGLIDV):
  non-enclitic:
    "jel li nije li bolje da ... + da t- sin ti jaše
        +" (DO7.20:8-9),
  enclitic:
    "ej sine ... zašto ... ti ded ide + a ti jašeš ... +"

(16-17),
possesive pronoun:
"(aha, šta ovaj čovjek radi?) on bere ... sa <u>njenu</u> ...
        <u>njegov</u> ... <u>od njega</u> ... dvo- sa devojčicu ... +
        on bere jagode ... +" (130-131).
The same 07.20 uses D short forms in object function frequently
without vaccilating.

1.5.5. This complex picture reflects the inner instability of the
dative in the vast S/C territory (the quantitative discrepancy
between the nominal and pronominal D forms), but also a clear ten-
dency to distinguish, in single idiolects, the object and the
possessive D forms through formal devices (D07.23 and D.07.17: for
the possessive function - short forms vs. for the object function
- long forms; D06.16: for the possessive function - non-enclitic
vs. for the object function - enclitic).

1.6.   <u>The vocative</u>
Vocative forms are used in two records only - D07.20 and D07.24:

        "i kaže mu ... + ej <u>sine</u> ... zašto ... ti deda ide +
                a ti jašeš ... +" (D07.20:15-17),
        "onda čovek kaže sinu .... + ej sine bolje da mi ... uznemo
                ... +" (D07.20:33-34),
        "i onda dođe vuk ... + ej ... z- ... <u>lisice</u> šta radiš tamo
                dole ... +" (D07.20: 63-64),
        "i video lisicu // + i pita ga // ... + <u>lisice</u> // <u>lisca</u>
                šta radiš / tu dole u bunaru // ... +"
(D07.24:100-102):

the second "lisca" can, in fact, be a correction of the V by a N;
no other address occurs in the record D07.24.
Generally it can be said that the absence of the V is caused by
"stylistic", rather than by morphological reasons. What is being
avoided is not the V as such, but rather the mode of a direct
address to an addressee: I have found only a single instance of
the V form replaced by a N, normal in a great part of the S/C
area:

        "i ondak došo ... vuk + i pita + šta radiš dol-
                ... <u>lisca</u> +" (D00.08,79:50-51).

This avoidance of an explicit addressing of an actant seems to be
the same phenomenon as has been mentioned in connection with the
dative (1.5.2.2.c). When building a text in this stage of child
diaspora language development, a majority of our informants prefer

not to express verbally those parts of content. In the "text-building subconsciousness" of the children, these parts are apparently provided sufficiently by the context.

The last places of the D and V in the NAGLIDV hierarchy reflect maybe this hierarchy of values.

2.0.   S Y N T H E S I S

2.1.   The linguistic facts we are speaking about in this study
have been revealed in the language of 25 children of school start
age (7 years), speaking different social varieties of S/C (their
parents call their language Serbo-Croatian, Croatian,
Croato-Serbian, most often Jugoslavian), born and living in Swe-
den. A majority of them attend the 2-3 hours/week of voluntary
"home language teaching" (hemspråksundervisning) that the Swedish
school system guarantees to each child with a non-Swedish mother
tongue. The choice of speakers has been completely random: they
are all those children aged 7, whose parents, in response to
formal letter from us, allowed their participation in our investi-
gation. They live in five South Swedish towns Lund, Malmö, Eslöv,
Helsingborg and Olofström. The probability of their or their
parents' mutual personal (i e linguistic) contact is very small
(only D00.01 and D00.07 are brother and sister). Some of them
visit Yugoslavia during summer vacations, some of them have no
contacts with the "old country" at all.

All of them are bilingual and speak Swedish at least as freely
as their mother tongue. As can be seen from the investigation of
the vocabulary development in this volume, the age of 7 is a cri-
tical one: here begins a rapid increase in the Swedish lexicon
(and competence in general as well!) and a slight recess of the
S/C.

It is such circumstances that we call "language in diaspora" or
"diaspora language". In diaspora the child acquires its mother
tongue in a linguistically non-homogeneous environment, i e it
gets impulses belonging to different social and/or geographical
dialects of the language of its own and it never experiences the
social unifying pressure that is a necessary attribute of each
homogeneous language environment. Consequently, each diaspora
child builds up an idiolect of its own, potentially in some points
differing from the language of the parents and/or from what is
conceived as "normal" in the mother tongue.

It is our opinion that an idiolect with such differing proper-
ties is a result of the endogeneous autoregulating capacity of the
"langue" given. (It can be discussed whether this autoregulating
capacity lies in the underlying system of an individual or in the
underlying "langue" common to the whole language community). This
autoregulating capacity can give different overt results in the
idiolect of any speaker.

The in somewhat differing 25 case systems that nevertheless
obey one single structuring principle (overtly perceived as im-
plicativity) are a proof of such an underlying autoregulating
capacity of the S/C system.

2.2.0.   The central feature of all the 25 case systems described
is the pivotal role of the opposition nominative vs. accusative.
Not only can N and A together bear all case functions (in NA
systems), but even in all other systems the N and especially the A
can take over many functions fulfilled in the S/C standard and
dialects by other means. This must be seen against the background
of the genitive completely losing all grammatical case functions
(cf. 2.2.3.0.). Since none of our speakers used either a NP of
the type boja kuće (G) or a predication as kuća je žute boje (G),
we have the right to say that in the corpus investigated the geni-
tive has only adverbial case functions (see 1.2.0.3., 2.2.3.). The
instrumental, as in S/C generally, with our speakers has only
adverbial functions (see 2.2.5.) too. And, since the dative of
nouns in our corpus almost disappeared (cf 1.5.1.), the nominative
and the accusative are the only cases apt to fulfill functions of
grammatical cases: apparently as a consequence of this, they can
fulfill many adverbial case functions as well.

2.2.1.   The accusative

2.2.1.0.   The accusative is used, besides its normal functions
(direct object, government of certain prepositions, directional
meaning of certain prepositions) in the following functions:

2.2.11.   It can be the exclusive government of all prepositions
(NA systems) or it can occur as government in random distribution
with another case - G, L or I. (cf 1.2.4.2.4. and 1.2.4.3.2.2. in
NAG, 1.3.2. in NAGL and 1.4.1.2.2.). Such random distribution of
the A and L is almost a rule for the essive meaning of the prepo-
sitions u and na (13 out of 19 speakers having the L in their case
inventory; cf table in 1.4.).

2.2.12.   Even prepositionless adverbial genitive and instrumental
can be replaced by the accusative: A for G is in "bio jednom jedna

lisica + i... je išsla je <u>jednu noč</u> / + " (DOO.04:70-71,
DOO.04:427, cf 1.2.5.), although DOO.04 has the NA<u>G</u> system; A for
I. is in "pa smo se vratili <u>isti put</u>" (DOO.04:573), "i se može
vozi <u>takav voz</u>" (DOO.04:220) - both times N-A, cf 1.2.5.

Real temporal genitive is not found in the corpus investigated;
for real prepositionless instrumental see 1.4.2.1.1. - it is found
only in isolated answers, never in sentence context.

2.2.13. We have many instances of replacing the dative by A, cf
1.5.2.2.b). In all three pronominal instances the substituting A
is G-A, in all three nominal instances it is N-A. It must be
mentioned that in the records DO7.09 and DO7.19 even pronominal
dative forms are used; and in NAGLID DO7.17 the substitution takes
place although the dative (in the same indirect object function)
is used in another place.
D replaced by N-A:
    "i onda onda <u>vak</u> ((='vuk')) licica-ca reče"
        (OO7.17:67) - the indirect object function is clear from
        the context; there are both N-A and G-A in this record
        with animate nouns;
D is not replaced in the same record:
    "sad sad je njemu sinu reko" (DO7.17:36);

An unclear instance:
    "onda -e reko <u>lici-cs-ce-ce</u> + na (='da'?) dođi dole"
        (DO7.17:60-61).
Some uncertainty in identifying those N-A as accusatives will be
discussed below in 2.2.2.

2.2.14. Centrally important for our discussion, although a unique
instance, is replacing the prepositionless G by A (in the NAG
system DOO.04) in a NP: "sad samo <u>moju mamu</u> oćka živi tamo"
(DOO.04:293), i e 'my mums daddy'. As a rule dependence within an
incongruent NP in our corpus is expressed by a preposition, but
never by a prepositionless G, cf below 2.3.0.

2.2.15. In the NA system of OO.01 the cardinal numerals govern in
all instances a case that we identified as a non-differentiated
nominative-accusative plural form (1.1.23.). The same non-
-differentiated N-A form (indeed, parallelled by a genitive) is
used by NAG-speaker DOO.07 (cf. 1.2.1.2.). Since, however, some
other NA- and NAG-speakers have combinations cardinal + Npl.
(DOO.06 cf. 1.1.23., DO6.16. cf. 1.2.1.3., partly DOO.04.; and
DO7.18 has indefinite cardinal numerals + N sg., cf. 1.2.1.4.),
but nobody has a combination cardinal + A, the only conclusion can

be that the accusative cannot be a substitution of the quantitative genitive: such substitution is the N pl.

2.2.2.   The nominative

2.2.2.0.   The scope of the nominative in our corpus is broadened too, although those changes are not so spectacular as the substitutions by the accusative.

2.2.21. The N is the exclusive bearer of both constitutive nominal functions in a sentence: both the subject and the predicate noun compulsorily have the form of a nominative. All predicate nouns where in the S/C standard a G is to be expected, are in our corpus in N:

"(kakve su boje te pečurke?) ova je boja crvena"
    (D07.22:131) - NAGLI;
" to je jedna kučic- ku-ća ... za... pti-ce + i to je
    boja ...braon" (D07.25:125) - NAGLI.
The same with improperly used impersonal copula ima = 'je':
"(a boja?) a boja /ima pla- ...crvena/ +"
    (D07.24:144) - NAGLIDV.
One, maybe opposite, instance will however be quoted here:
"(a šta beru?) ... jagode // + (a koja je boja?)
    crvene (kako?) crvene // +" (D07.03,81:
    227-228) - NAG.
When in the question the G is used, a G in the speaker's answer does not need be significative:
"(šta je ovo?) kuća // + ... (koje boje?) zelene
    // ... +" (D07.07:146, similary 142) - NAGLI.
But it must be significative, when in the same situation an A is used:
"((...)) pećurke // + (koje boje?) žutu / + (kako?)
    žutu / +" (D07.01:192-193) - NAGLID;
"((...)) to -e šator // + (koje boje?) plavu // +
    (a ovo?) auto / + (koja je ovo boja?) ko ((='kao'))
    u žutu // +" (D07.01:201-204) - NAGLID.
This type of predicate noun must be seen in connection with appositive NP, discussed below in 2.2.24. and 2.3.3.4.

2.2.22. Replacing the vocative by a nominative when addressing somebody is a very well-known feature in north-western parts of Yugoslavia. As we saw in 1.6., the same is the case in one instance in our corpus (vs. altogether 2 vocatives); in general directly addressing an addressee is rather avoided.

Structurally, this substitution is possible since both the

vocative and the nominative have non-relational grammatical meaning (not unmarked towards "Bezug" as the Russian N in Jakobson 1935, 249).

2.2.23.   A very significative broadening of the scope of the N is a possibility of using the N in connection with cardinal numerals (see 2.2.15. above), replacing in this way the G sg. or G pl.

2.2.23.1.   Npl. instead of G is found in case systems with as well as without the G. That is the case in DOO.06 (NA, cf. 1.1.23.) and DO6.16 (NAG, cf. 1.2.1.3.) - in both cases very consistently; Npl. combines here with 5, as well as with 2 - 4 (no indefinite numerals are found in these two records).

2.2.23.2.   The NA speaker DOO.01 combines numerals (5 as well) with a form ending in -e, that we identify (1.1.23.0) as the speaker's universal plural form; the child's only differing form is <u>tri brati</u>. This allows subsuming this system as well under the model <u>cardinal numeral + N pl</u> (cf 2.2.15).

2.2.23.3.   In the records of some speakers vacillation between the genitive and the N pl combination model is found. This is the case with NAG DOO.07 (exemplified in 1.2.1.2.), NAG DOO.04,82 (1.2.1.1.) and NAGLI DO7.25:

Genitive:
  "dva <u>para</u>" = 'pairs' (DO7.25:93).
  "(a ovo tu?) ... dva kamen + (šta dva?) <u>kamenja</u> +"
    (DO7.25:108-109),
  "i ondak kod vode su je bilo <u>puno kamanja</u> +" (DO7.25:105);
Nominative:
  "i mišovi su tu bili ... + (koliko ih je bilo?) ...
      <u>tri miši</u> ... +" (DO7.25:79),
  "(dva čega? šta je to dva?) ... <u>dva uve</u> dva ...
      <u>dva-a uši uva uveta</u> ..." (DO7.25:94) -
  desperate series of thinkable forms in answering the
  tester's apparently annoying questions bears wittness to
  conceiving the forms as nominatives;
  "bilo je ... je leto ... + ... bilo je <u>drveće puno</u>
    ... +" (DO7.25:57).

2.2.23.4.   In the idioms of DO6.15, DO7.01 and DO7.21 with a normal genitive combination model the single indefinite numeral <u>puno</u> is combined with the nominative:
  "ima <u>puno brviće</u>" = 'drveće' (DO6.15:56) - NAGI,
  "ima <u>puno debeli džemperi</u> / ćizme / i jaknu / "

(DO7.01:210) - NAGLID,
"oko šatora ima <u>puno puno drveće</u> ... " (DO7.21:133) -
    NAGLID,
"(šta ima tu u vodi?) u vodi imaju ((!)) <u>kamenje puno</u> + "
    (DO7.21:155) - NAGLID.
An extreme proof of such a nominative conceiving the whole syntagm
with <u>puno</u> is this sequence:
    "bilo jedno leto ... + ((...)) + kad su <u>neki puni ljudi</u>
    oš- otišli ... na more + " (DO7.20:82-84) - NAGLIDV.

2.2.23.5. An odd, very strange combination model with N sg/pl and
universal form <u>dva</u> can be revealed in the record of DO7.17 -
NAGLID:
    "((...)) vidio + onda ima <u>dva</u> ... (kanta) ka-
        <u>kanta</u> + " (48-49),
    "ima <u>dva zub</u> (mhm) <u>-be</u> + <u>dva oći</u> i +
        (a šta ima dva?) ... dva i ima <u>dva uši</u> ... i jedan
        ... rep + " (118-120),
    "onda tu ... <u>tri mišš</u> šta -oće dole + " (144).
This "model" is as more surprising, as in this record both geni-
tive partitive and negative genitive (but only seldom G with pre-
positions) are repeatedly used.

2.2.23.6 This posibility of substituting a genitive in combina-
tions with the cardinal numerals by the nominative sg, very uncom-
mon for S/C, is structurally conditioned, since the genitive in
this function is a historical petrifaction, without any relational
grammatical case meaning and, consequently, can be subsumed under
the non-relational invariant meaning of the nominative. There is
hardly any doubt that the impulse for the substitution is the
Swedish combining the cardinals 2 and upwards with N pl (cf. tre
kron<u>or</u>, fem pojk<u>ar</u>). Maybe the explanation for combination model
with N sg (2.2.23.5.) is the Swedish plural with zero desinence,
viz <u>tre hus, fem barn</u>.

2.2.24. Another significative broadening of the scope of the N is
its appositive use in NPs, instead of a G, general in all flec-
tional Slavonic languages:
    "to je <u>šator</u> ... <u>zelena boja</u> a <u>auto žuta boja</u>
        + " (DO7.25:122) - NAGLI.
    Maybe even:
    "on je u č- <u>svom čamcu/neka konzerva</u> / ... + " =
        'iz neke konzerve' (DO7.07:106) - NAGLI.
This appositive attribute is, I suppose, a starting-point for
predicates described in 2.2.21: "ova ((sc. l. pečurka)) je boja
crvena". (About transformational connections between VPs and NPs,

see e g Topolińska, "Mechanizmy nominalizacji v języku polskim", <u>Studia gramatyczne</u> 1, 1976, 175-212). All those phenomena are a direct consequence of the G not having the function of a grammatical case in our corpus. The apposition expresses the same syntagmatical relation within a NP as a subordination formally signalized by the genitive.

2.2.3. The genitive

2.2.3.0. The genitive is functionally the most complex case in S/C. In our corpus, this complexity increases considerably, since - as I said above - the G has here lost its character of a grammatical case, but this loss (which, ex definitione, is a diachronical phenomenon), can be seen on our synchrony as an extreme diversity of single systems and subsystems. The genitive occurs really in 6 different functions and I found no two speakers, where all those G functions are structured in the same way.
Those G functions of the genitive are:
a) partitive (2.2.3.1.);
b) government of numerals (2.2.3.2.);
c) government of prepositions (2.2.3.3.);
d) object genitive (2.2.3.4.1.);
e) negative genitive (2.2.3.4.2.);
f) genitive-accusative (for animate). As I said above, there is no prepositionless genitive in NP's (no "subject", "object" or "attributive" genitive).

2.2.3.1.0. Speaking about <u>the partitive</u> in our corpus is properly a "licentia poetica". We have on the one hand a quantity of real partitives, but on the other hand, the "partitive genitive" form <u>sira</u> ('cheese'), occurring with about 15 of our speakers, is structured in so many ways that it deserves a special description.

2.2.3.1.1. The genitive form in the partitive function is registered for the following nouns: meals - <u>sir, kruh, hleb, voda, kava, hrana</u> and a collective noun <u>narod</u>.
Some examples:
"da će se ići doli / i donest <u>vode</u> // +" (DOO.07:61)
        - NAG;
"jedan dečko p- pije + ((...)) stao u vodi + i uzme
        <u>vode</u> + i pije ... +" (DO7.17:109-112) - NAGID;
"...košaricu ((= 'u košarici')) ima <u>-rane</u> ((= 'hrane'))
        // ... pit ... isto // +" (DO7.07:115) - NAGLI;
"... i vidim da ptice su kod korpu + i jedu ... jelo ...
        <u>-leba</u> možda ... +" (DOO.04,82:467-468) -NAG.

2.2.3.1.2.0. The form _sira_ differs from all other partitives by a lot of strange substructures. Its behaviour can be well demonstrated on three year-cuts of our NAG speaker DOO.04.
1979 - the forms _sir_ and _sira_ are differentiated:
     "mislila + da je bilo ((!)) _jedan veliki sirr_ / +
        (DOO.04,79:46-47);
     "šta radiš tamo dole // + i je- ((= 'jedem'?)) _jednu_
        jednu sir +ne mogu da _ga_ pujedem // +" (56-57);
     "dobiješš _cel / celoga / sira_ // + (68).
1980 - in all functions the form _sira_ congruent with _G_:
     "je vidla _jednoga velikog sira_ // +" (DOO.04,80:75);
     "ona kaže + jedem _sira_ // + ja ne mogu sve da poje-
        dem // +" (88-89);
     "i posle ona skočila van / + je rekla // da ... ja
        ti dam _celog ... sira_ // +" (103-105).
1982 - _sira_ in all functions, congruent with N (N-A):
     "i videla _jedna jedan veliki jedan veliki sira_ ...
        +" (431);
     "e ne vidiš + _kakav lep sira_ imam dole ... +" (448);
     "i onda je rekla ... lisica vuku ... + dajem ti _ceo_
        sira ... +" (460); (in the same record DOO.04,82, there
is one more real partitive _-leba_ (468), parallelled by an A _jelo,_
see the last example quoted in 2.2.3.1.1.).

2.2.3.1.2.1. This last arrangement, i e _sira_ _always_ in the partitive (= genitive) form, its adjectival congruence in _nominative_ and verbal past form with _neuter_ congruence is found in both year-cuts of the NA-speaker DOO.01 (all examples quoted in 1.1.5.3.) and in the record DO7.08 (NAGLI) as well:
     "((...)) videla + da to nije _bilo sira_ nego ...
     nego sunce ... +" (DO7.08:61-62), approximately the
     same also in DO7.08:79,
     "(a šta mu je kazala ... ?) da da to nije bilo sunce
        + da da to nije _biollo_ ((sic!)) _ov_ ...
     sira nego ... nego sunce +" (DO7.08:89-90);
     "((...)) i videla ... _jedno parce ... sira_ +"
        (DO7.08:59);
     "a ne mogu + da pojedem ... _ovo parće sira_ ... +"
        (DO7.08:67).
    I described DOO.01's system in an earlier paper ('The Diaspora Children's Serbo-Croatian" in _Papers in Slavic Philology_ - Matejka Festschrift, Ann Arbor, forthcoming) and expressed a hypothesis that in this manner, an originally genitive form fits in a NA system. I will continue this discussion in 2.2.3.1.2.5. below.

2.2.3.1.2.2. The universal form _sira_ with a _genitive_ attribute -

74

as in 00.04,80 above - occurs in D07.23 as well and the same form without attribute in D07.20:

    "naso ((= našao)) sam <u>jednoga ... jednoga sira</u> +"
        (D07.23:57);
    "u- došo sam + da uvatim <u>sira</u> +" (D07.20:65-66);
    "i on je vido jedan ... <u>jedan ... s- parče sira</u>
        ... +" (D07.20:58).

2.2.3.1.2.3.   In many idioms both <u>sir</u> and <u>sira</u> occur (in the whole corpus investigated no other case form of this word has been registered). Their functional relation is, however, very different in many of them. Before analyzing, I will cite them all:

    /1a/ "i video jedan ... /<u>lepi sir</u> // +" (D07.01:73) -NAGLID;
    /1b/ " // -oćeš + da dobiješ <u>sir</u> +" (D07.01:90);
    /1c/ " // i posle idi ... tu + i dobićeš <u>pola</u> od mene ...
        <u>sira</u> // +" (D07.01:94);
    /1d/ "dobiš <u>cselo sira</u> od mene ... // +" (D07.01:101);
    /2a/ " / i tamo ona nađe <u>jedno-ga</u> ... e ... <u>sira</u> / +
    /2b/   onda našli su <u>sira</u> / + i onda ... o- on kaže +
    /2c/   kako ću sad da uzmem <u>sira</u> // +" (D07.09:30-33) -
        - NAGI;
    /2d/ " // to nije <u>bio</u> ... o ... + nije to <u>bilo</u> ...
        <u>sir</u>+" (D07.09:37-38);
    /3a/ " ((...)) u vodu videla mesec + (i šta je mislila da je?)
        <u>sir</u>" (D07.13:50-51) - NAGI;
    /3b/ " ... i ugledala + da -e <u>sir</u> +" (D07.13:54-55);
    /3c/ " (a ona) ona kaže ... + (da šta jede?) šta jedeš to
        <u>sira</u> ... +" (D07.13:65-66);
    /4a/ "i ona stavila rep duž nju ... <u>oko sir</u> + stavila
    /4b/   r- rep + da uzme <u>sira</u> +" (D07.14:63-65) - NAGI;
    /4c/ "i videla <u>sira</u> + (...šta je ona uradila?) da uzme
        <u>sira</u> +" (D07.14:67-68);
    /4d/ "(... šta je našla dole?) <u>sira</u> +" (D07.14:79);
    /4e/ "i da izvadi <u>malko sira</u> ... za nju +" (D07.14:77);
    /5a/ "... onda je vidila <u>jedan sir</u> +" (D07.19:40) -NAGLI;
    /5b/ "... i jedem <u>sir</u> ... +" (D07.19:52);
    /5c/ "i onda ka- onda je lisca kazala vako + eto ti <u>sira</u>
        +" (D07.19:62-63);
    /6a/ "un-a je vidija <u>jedan sir</u> + unda on kaže -vako +
    /6b/   kako će doći <u>do sira</u> +" (D06.15:29-31) - NAGI;
    /6c/ "ja ja jedem <u>sir</u> +" (D06.15:42);
    /6d/ "pa pa on kaže -vako + bog evo ti ...-e <u>sira</u> +"
        (D06.15:53).

2.2.3.1.2.4.   In 11 records only the form <u>sir</u> occurs. We quote only some examples that significatively differ from the S/C stan-

dard:
/7a/ "mislila da je ... to neki veliki sir bilo // +"
       (DOO.06:83) -NA;
/7b/ "... i on je video to samo / + s- sam ((= 'samo')) nije
       bio sir // to // +" (DOO.06:109);
/8/ "moš ((= 'možeš')) dobiti još malo od moj sir +"
       (DO7.17:75) - NAGLID;
/9/ "ja ja ću malo sir ... // +" (DO7.18:42) -NAG.

2.2.3.1.2.5. An interpretation of this quantity of facts is very
difficult, since the material from each speaker is restricted.
And now, a few years later, it is impossible to extract the same
underlying structures by testing the same speakers again, since
the changes can be very rapid.
      Among the idioms with both sir and sira (2.2.3.1.2.3.) the
following varieties can be distinguished:
      a) sir is a predicate noun, sira is an object:
          DO7.09 (/2/ above), DO7.13 (/3/);
      b) sir with a preposition, sira in other functions:
          DO7.14 (/4/ above);
      c) sir as equivalent of a Swedish indefinite article,
          sira as equivalent of the Swedish definite article:
          DO6.15 (/6/), DO7.19 (/5/), DOO.04,80 (see
          2.2.3.1.2.0.).
      d) sir and sira are used in my identification promis-
          cuously: DO7.01 (/1/).
      The most probable starting-point of a development towards all
varieties differing from the standard is using the partitive form
sira as equivalent of the Swedish definite article (variety c)
above): this happens always, when a speaker finishes the story
with the fox's words "Here you have the whole cheese" (/1d/, /5c/,
/6d/ (OO.01, OO.04.79:68): the word 'whole' as such precludes the
partitive meaning. In this way a genitive-partitive form becomes
the expression for an accusative function. From there a possibili-
ty arises of it being determined as a genitive, i e according to
the form ("dobiješ celog sira": all instances in DOO.04,80,
DOO.04,79, DO7.23 in 2.2.3.1.2.2.) or as an accusative, i e accor-
ding to the function: here the attribute can be either a masculine
form, as belonging to sir ("cjeli sira" DOO.01:123) or a neuter as
are attributes of each form without a gender of its own ("celo
sira" /1d/, cf. e g "njezino meko 'Molim?'"). This stage is,
maybe, represented in DO7.09 (/2/), and DO7.13 (/3/ above), where
sira fulfills the functions of an A, i e object functions, but sir
preserves its nominative functions, in our records the function of
a predicate noun (/2d/, /3a/, /3b/).
      Since, however, with inanimate nouns the A is N-A, the way for

sira is opened to the functions of the nominative.

The situation in D07.14 (/4/ above) can be interpreted as a symptom of this stage of the "chain reaction":sira stands for N-A (/4b-d/), sir for the form governed by a "genitive preposition" oko, differing from the inanimate N-A form, cf. N grad, A vidim grad but oko grada as videla sira but oko sir, see /4a/. It is, however, difficult to explain against this background malko sira (/4e/): if oko sir, why not malko sir too?, cf. malo sir in D07.18 (/9/) as malo od moj sir in D07.17 (/8/) (indeed, in D07.17 and D07.18 sir is the universal form).

In the idioms of D00.01 (in both year-cuts) and D00.04,82 this conceiving sira as N-A with attribute in masculine N-A form is consistent. Potentially the same is the case in D07.08, D07.20, but here only once sira has the congruent attribute "da to nije biollo ov ... sira (D07.08:90, see 2.2.3.1.2.1. above). All other instances of sira in predicate noun in D07.08 have the congruent past in the neuter ("to nije bilo sira") apparently because of the Swedish neuter Det var, but here, with the masculine attribute ov, the conflict between the masculine and the neuter conception crea-ted a "combined" biollo from bio/bilo.

The three year-cuts of D00.04 quoted above (2.2.3.1.2.0.) illu-strate very well three stages of this "chain reaction": its star-ting point (1979), reflecting the Swedish opposition between inde-finite (47) and definite (68) article, its consequent achievement in 1982 with nominative congruence and between them a transitional stage (1980), when the original genitiveness of sira still causes genitive congruence, the new accusative function notwithstanding.

2.2.3.2.1. The concurrence between G and N in combinations with the cardinal numerals was described in 2.2.23. Generally speaking, in NA systems cardinals are not used with G, in NAG systems the same cardinals can be used in combinations with both N and G, in NAGL, NAGLI and NAGLIDV only G is used in these combinations in our corpus (D07.25 excepted); in NAGI, NAGID and NAGLID systems, however, both combination possibilities are found. It means that NA excludes (ex definitione) the numerals governing the G, but the G as a part of a case system does not imply its exclusive use with the numerals, as is the case in the S/C standard and dialects. Quantitatively expressed: among the systems containing the G, in 13 year-cuts the numerals combine with both N and G, in 12 with G only; in 1 year-cut the numerals do not occur; in another one (D07.05) there is only one combination numeral + noun (dva uši), which does not allow drawing conclusions about D07.05's combinati-on system. From those facts, it can be inferred about the use of the G that in each case system containing the G, this G was really used as government of the cardinal numerals: in all of our records

the G governed by a cardinal numeral was used at least once
(D07.05 being an exception).

2.2.3.2.2. Those generalizations are valid for the cardinal nu-
merals as such without distinguishing the definite and indefinite
ones, since their government is in principle the same. We have,
however, 4 records with discrepancy in government between the
definite and indefinite numerals. In all these 4 records the in-
definite ones govern either the N (malo sir, mnogo kamenje D07.18,
puno brviće D06.15, puno drveće, puno kamenje D07.21), or the
prepositon od + N-A: malo od moj sir D07.17 (D07.17 is a girl from
Dalmatia!).

This must be seen in connection with the rules for forming NPs:
since in the corpus investigated the prepositionless G can not be
used in NPs (2.2.0., 2.2.21., 2.2.3.0., 2.3.1.3.5.), the combina-
tions "indefinite numeral + noun" can in single speakers' idio-
lects apparently also be conceived as NPs and, consequently,
constructed without the G. Really, there is intuitively no sharp
boundary between a pure attributive slika brodova, a quantitative
količina brodova and a pure numeral combination puno, malo brodo-
va. The prepositional "malo od moj sir" (D07.17.:75) is sufficien-
tly symptomatic for such a conception.

2.2.3.3.0. In this study we call prepositions, governing in stan-
dard S/C the G, "genitive prepositions". Genitive prepositions in
our corpus govern either G, or G and A randomly (sign Gy will be
used for those records) or only A.

In our records the following G prepositions were found: do, iz,
kod, od, pored, sa ('from') and sporadically also blizu, duž,
ispod, između, kraj, oko, pokraj, posle, pozadi, preko. It is
significative of all our speakers that bez has never been used
(only once with the infinitive).

There are two genitive prepositions that are diaspora child-
ren's innovations, both for comparative constructions - än and
nego (both 'than'):

"da je on ima jače noge än magarca +" (D06.16:40);
"ima jače noge än magare +" (D06.16:45) as
"da on ima jače noge od magarca +" (ib.:31), cf also
1.2.4.3.2.2.;
"zato vuk je bio ... malo... veći i teški ... nego
licice +" (D07.17:72).

Both the Swedish än and nego are originally conjunctions, but in
Swedish än is now commonly used as a preposition: han är större än
dig parallelly with the older and correct han är större än du
(är); nego is probably a translation loan on än - the child D07.17
has no own comparative constructions cf. "zašto ti ... na njega

jaši-š i ne tvoj dečko + ti ti si ti imaš <u>jake</u> noge + <u>ali</u> on je
mali +" ib. 9-11; cf also his problems with the comparative form
in the utterance quoted above.

2.2.3.3.1. There is a strong regularity in the distribution of
the prepositional G government in our corpus: in the NAG systems
only Gy occurs, i e all the genitive prepositions govern here both
A and G, but the G is clearly used more seldom than the A (cf
1.2.4.). Exclusive use of the G government occurs only in systems
having at least one of the other adverbial cases - L or I. (e g
D07.05 - NAGL, D07.09 - NAGI and others). We saw a very similar
distribution of the G and the N in combinations with the cardinal
numerals in 2.2.3.2.1. above.

It is, however, necessary to underscore that also in all those
-: i.e. NAGL, NAGI etc. - systems a possibility of accusative
government does exist: moreover, in the record of D07.20 (NAGLIDV)
all the genitive prepositions govern the accusative in all
instances, in the same way as his/her instrumental prepositions
do. Consequently, the same possibility of governing the A, as we
stated for locative prepositions (0.2.1., 1.3.2., 1.4.1.) exists
in diaspora S/C for genitive (and instrumental) prepositions as
well: from 20 year-cuts, having NAGL, NAG(L)I, NAG(L)ID and
NAGLIDV systems, 13 have a consistent G government, 6 are Gy and
in one, the mentioned D07.20, the genitive prepositions always
govern the A. I did not find any correlation between the G, Gy
and A government respectively and any other structural property in
the systems investigated: it means that their distribution is
synchronically completely random and not predictable. Since, howe-
ver, the G governed by genitive prepositions is only one out of
many possible functions of the genitive, the different values of
the distribution of the government have no impact on the implica-
tivity principle and on the place of the G in the implicativity
hierarchy.

2.2.3.4.0. Other functions of the G occur, but sporadically: in
the whole corpus we found only some 8-10 such instances.

2.2.3.4.1. The <u>object genitive</u> with reflective verbs is not
sufficiently sure: <u>"poplašili su se zeca +"</u> (D06.17:25 NAGLI) is
ambiguous - it can be G as well as A. Another instance is A: "ne
sećam se ja <u>ono</u> +" (D07.22:40).

We investigated this problem by following a multiple choice
test:

<pre>
                        (slonovi) (slona) (slon) (slonu)
     Marko se boji   (zmiju) (zmije) (zmijo) (zmijama)
                        (pile) (pilići) (piletu) (pileta)
</pre>

In the files 06. and 07. we gathered 32 answers (several spea-

kers with 2-3 year-cuts).
The results are:

    slon: G-A 24, Npl 3,   Dsg 3,   Nsg 1 (G - 75%)
    zmija: G 19,   A   10,   V   2,   Dpl 1 (G - 59%, A - 31%)
    pile: G 12,   Npl 11,   N-Asg 8, Dsg 1 (G - 37.5%)

The test shows that when G and A are identical (boji se slona),
the result is 75% right answers, but when they are different
(zmije - zmiju), the proportion of G vs. A is 2:1, i e one third
of the subjects also perceptively choose the A object with refle-
xive verbs. When they speak, this proportion is probably higher.
In our text corpus the number of registered occurences is negli-
gible, but the proportion G-A: A = 1:1 can be the right one.

2.2.3.4.2.   The negative genitive is found both with transitive
verbs and with the negated impersonal copula nema:
    transitive verbs:
        "(... po čemu još izgleda da je star?) zato što ((i.e.
            on)) nema kose ... +" (DO6.17:6);
        "(jel možemo jest pečurke?) m- + koje nisu otrovne +
            koje jesu + nji- ((= njih)) ne možemo +"
            (DO7.21:169-172);
        "nema smisla + da ti jašeš ... na magarca +"
            (DO7.21:17,25);

    impersonal nema:
        "(zar nema led?) ne nema sad leda +" (DO7.17:161);
        "(zašto misliš da je to ljeto?) ... nea ((= nema))
            snijega ... +" (DOO.08:300).
On the whole negative transitive verbs do not occur very frequent-
ly, cf also the complete absence of the preposition bez
(2.2.3.3.0.).

2.2.3.4.3.   Above (DOO.04,82:427: "lisica je išla jednom jednu
noć"), we saw replacing of a temporal G by the A; but besides, I
found one single temporal G. Its "genitiveness" is, however, espe-
cially important, as it is an improper G form:
        "jednog no- ... jednog noća lisica ... išla
            +" (DOO.08:146);
This form could never have been heard; it witnesses to a living
model as e g "jednog dana".

2.2.4.   The locative and instrumental.

2.2.4.0. A general survey of these two cases was given in 1.3.2.,
1.4.1. and 1.4.2. Here, I only wanted to stretch a general tenden-
cy of the I. to become exactly such a prepositional case, as is

80

the L.

We showed it in the inability of prepositionless instrumentals to
be parts of sentences: all instrumentals without preposition occur
in non-sentential answers (1.4.2.1.1.).   Other symptoms of the
same tendency:
    a) in the NAGLI system DO7.26, where instrumental forms are
       used with the prepositions, the I. was replaced by A,
       when governed by a verb (<u>napuniti</u>):
       "pa onda jedan dečak ... je imao ... + + pa kako se to zove
          + + ... kanticu + i malo ...ju dao dole ... + je napunio
          <u>vodu</u> ... + i pije +" (89-92), instead of <u>vodom</u>;
       indeed, this interpretation is not the only possible one;
    b) in the NAGLI system DO6.17 the child reinterprets the tempo-
       ral instrumentals used by the tester, as N-A:
       "(znači noću stignete ili danju?) nekad <u>dan</u>/nekad <u>noč</u>
        // +" (73) - the archaic, non-paradigmatic <u>danju</u> was
       conceived as the I. in the same way, as the paradigmatic
       <u>noću</u> and transferred into the child's own system as N-A
       (i e temporal A); by the same A temporal genitive was also
       replaced in DO0.04 - NAG: "i lisica je išla jednom <u>jednu</u>
       <u>noć</u> +" (DO0.04:427).

2.2.5.   Synthetic accounts of the <u>dative</u> and <u>vocative</u> were given
in 1.5. and 1.6.

2.3.   The noun-phrase

2.3.0.   In our corpus the properties of the case forms do not influence the structure of the sentence so much, as the structure of the noun-phrase (NP).

There are two problems that I want to mention here - the semantic classes of the congruent attributes and the syntactic structure of the NPs with incongruent attributes. I am not completely sure, but probably these two properties of diaspora S/C are structurally connected with each other.

2.3.1.   In the whole corpus we found no relational adjectives of the type _drven_ or _gradski_ that are very typical of Slavonic languages, but are completely absent in Swedish or English (cf e g my paper Otnositel'noe prilagatel'noe v slavjanskich jazykach, in: The Slavic Word, D. S. Worth ed., The Hague-Paris 1972, pp. 189ff.). In a few instances, where a relational adjective could be expected, our children prefer a construction with preposition _od,_ e g _grudve od snjega_ (D07.08:195) instead of a possible _snjež-ne grudve_ or _grudve snjega_ (cf. also Stevanović 1974, II, 228).

As we have underlined several times, the NPs formed with a prepositionless genitive are avoided in our children's idioms and prefering _grudve od snjega_ to _snježne grudve_ can be a consequence of the Swedish exclusive use of compounds of the type _snöboll_: the impossibility of a relational adjective in Swedish can entail not using the relational adjectives in the mother tongue too, without trying to positively follow the Swedish model.

2.3.2.   The noun-phrases (NP) partly behave differently depending on their meaning. I will distinguish the possessive and the generally attributive NPs.

2.3.2.0.   In the S/C standard and dialects the "possessivity" (properly "individual relation") is expressed by congruent possessive pronouns (_moj, njegov, njihov..._), so called "possessive adjectives" (_djedov, mamin_) if the depending noun is without an attribute (_dedova glava_) and the "possessor" belongs to certain semantic classes of nouns and by the genitive, if the name of the "possessor" is determined; in the dialects, both prepositionless G and G with preposition _od_ can occur. The congruent pronouns are not parallelled by a prepositional construction: thus _dedova glava_ vs. _glava našeg deda_ and dialectal _glava od našeg deda_; _negova glava_ but never *_glava nega_ or _od nega._

In our corpus the prepositionless G does not occur, the possessive adjective is extremely rare, and, thus, the normal expres-

sion of possessivity is constructions with completely grammatica-
lized preposition <u>od</u> (with G or A), but we have an instance with
simple A, replacing the G according to the general tendencies.
Parallel with this there occurs the use - most often tentative -
of prepositional constructions with pronouns, impossible in the
S/C standard.

2.3.2.1.   Nouns:

    a) accusative:
       "sad samo <u>moju mamu oćka živi // tamo //</u> +" (D00.04:293);
    b) possessive adjective:
       "(...kakvu boju ima mamin kostim?) <u>mamin kostim</u> ima boju
         braon +" (D07.21:141) - our only instance of possessive
       adjective, repeated from the question;
    c) expressions with <u>od</u>; the noun without attribute (cf
       Stevanović 1974, II, 226):
       "(a beba i deda čiji su to?) <u>od</u> ... <u>od mamu</u> +
         (od) <u>od mamu</u> tata tata +" (D00.04:585-586);
       "a kosa je + a <u>od dede</u> kosa i ... <u>od devo-čice</u> kosa
         je ... + ((...)) crvena" (D07.25:137-138);
    d) expressions with <u>od</u>; the noun with attribute:
       "...a tamo unutra / sad su <u>od moga tatu</u> ro- ne/ono ...
         kusin // ... +" (D00.04:197);
       "(... čija je to bicikla bila?) <u>od njegovog starijeg
         brata</u> +" (D06.17:45).
We have - in an older record - an utterance where the preposi-
tional construction with <u>od</u> directly translates the Swedish geni-
tive:
       "beba je u ... u jedn- od devojčice ruke"
  cf. "dockan är i en flickas händer" (002:103-105) "the doll is
       in a girl's hands".

2.3.2.2.   Pronouns:
       "(čiji je to šator, znaš?) ...<u>o- njega</u> +" (D06.16:200);
       "(šta ovaj čovek radi?) on bere ... sa <u>njenu</u> ... <u>nje-
         gov</u> ... <u>od njega</u> ... dvo- sa devojčicu ... + on be-
         re jagode ... +" (D07.20:130) = 'he gathers strowberries
         with <u>his</u> girl': when both attempts <u>njenu</u> and
         <u>njegov</u> seemed to be wrong (although <u>njenu</u> was
         rigth in her code since she has no <u>svoj</u>), the girl
         D07.20's last hope was the general <u>od</u>; but this
         was rejected too and she finished with <u>sa devoj-
         čicu</u> without any pronominal attribute; this girl
         consistently controls and corrects her production, the
         gap between her perceptive requirements and her active

ability is, however, rather big;
"drži se za nj- nje- od ovoga miša rep +" (a record
outside the corpus investigated) - the intended pronoun
is replaced by a prepositional construction with od.

2.3.3.0.   All NPs other than possessive ones in the following
text will be called attributive NPs.
    It is here the impossibility of using the genitive as a general
means of subordination causes the most interesting differences
from the "normal" S/C.

2.3.3.1.   We have no instance of replacing the prepositionless G
by A, as we saw - although only once - concerning the possessive
NPs: it means that this exclusion of the G is rather a deep struc-
ture phenomenon.

2.3.3.2.   In several instances the intended subordination is not
expressed by grammatical means, the two nouns are simply juxta-
posed and a pause witnesses to the speaker's inability to find an
appropriate formal expression for the denotational content:
        "tamo gde su ptice ... kuća... +"(DO7.19:81), i e
            'birdhouse',
        "pa onda su uzeli magars- ra- magarac ... noge +"
            (D10.11:51), i e 'magarca za noge, magarcu noge, noge
            magarca...' or similar,
        "(a ovaj miš, šta on radi?) .. on je u č- svom čamcu /
            neka konzera / ... i vesla sa ... štapom //" (DO7.07:
            106-107), i e approximately 'čamcu iz neke konzerve'.
2.3.3.3.   The most general way of forming NPs in our corpus is
prepositional constructions. As in the S/C in general, they can be
either prepositions in their own meaning, as transferred from a VP
in the process of nominalization (cf Topolin'ska 1976), or fully
grammaticalized prepositions od, maybe also na.

2.3.3.3.1.   There are in the texts some instances, where the pre-
positional expresssion is related both to the NP and to the VP and
these two relations can be of different strength:
        "tata i dete je napravilo brod od dr- od drve-
            ta tako ... +" (DO7.22:72): tako underlines
            rather the VP relation,
        "(od čega je taj brod?) od drva +" (DO7.14:106);
        "(dali znaš, od čega je napravljen taj brod?) od
            ... lišta i o- daske ... +" (DO7.05:89);
        "ondak ima za pticu jedan / + (šta?) za ptice jednu
            / ... jednu kućicu // +" (DO7.24:139-140);
        "ima i ... za ptice ... kuču ..." (DO7.26:140);

                        both times the word order focuses the relation
                        to the verb.
In other instances, the same prepositional combinations with the
same meaning form clear NPs:
            "to je jedna kučic- ku-ća ... za ... ptice ... +"
                (D07.25:124);
            "i ta- tamo ... eto vidite jedna kuća sa ((= za))
                ptice +" (D07.18:81);
            "(šta je ovo ovdje?) kuća / kuća za igranje // +"
                (D00.08:272).
We have no such clear NPs with od in this sense, but they are
common in S/C and examples can be found e g in Stevanović 1974,
II, 228.

2.3.3.3.2. Typical of our corpus is the change of those prepo-
sitions having a meaning of their own, into pure grammatical
indexes of subordination, replacing in many cases the G:
            "(šta je ovo ovde?) ... kuća od jedne male -tice
                +" (D07.14:138), in the same denotational situation,
                as za above;
            "mi je ((?)) igramo kurragömma ((= 'hide-and-seek')) / +
                onda mi ... mi -mamo jedan han- ručni- od oke
                / +" (D00.01:87);
            "... bacao grudve + (od?) od snega +" (D07.08:194-
                195);
            "to je samo od mesc slika +" (D14.04) - a pure examp-
                le from a record beyond the corpus investigated.
            "onda tu mala koja ((= 'kućica')) na mali +"
                (D07.17:139) - a "Balkan" feature in an ikavian/ijeka-
                vian text (with Dalmatian lexical elements as barba
                'a man').

2.3.3.4. The same principles of nominalization as were demon-
strated above also work in a type without parallel in the "normal"
S/C.
     We saw in 2.2.21. predicate nouns of the type "ova (sc.1. pe-
čurka) je boja crvena" (D07.22:131), as a consequence of the loss
of the grammatical case functions by the genitive: the G "ova
pečurka je crvene boje" was replaced by the N.
     When nominalized, this VP becomes a NP "pečurka crvena boja",
where the postponed N, i e the apposition, took over the function
of signalizing the subordination:
            "to je šator ... zelena boja a auto žuta boja +"
                (D07.25:122).
     In the same record the predicate noun of this type was used se-
veral times:

"to je jedna kućic-kuća ... za ... pti-ce + i to je
    boja ... braon + ((...)) tu je jedan stariji deda
    ... + ... + on je boja ... bela ... + a gaće su mu
    još belije ... + ((...)) devo-čica ((...)) + ... i ona
    je isto bela boja ko i deda njen +" (DO7.25:
    124-135). VPs are cited in 2.2.

2.3.3.5.   As we said above in 2.2.3.2.2., the last two types of
NP (grudve od snega and auto žuta boja) must be seen also as a
possible model for the combinations with indefinite numerals malo
od moj sir and malo sir.

3.   Afterword

    I am, of course, fully aware of the pitfalls involved in making
generalizations based on 25 potentially different items. One
methodological dilemma has proved to be of particular concern:
while we, on one hand, have 25 children speaking the same langua-
ge, we are also, on the other hand, facing 25 specific idiolects
generated by individual speaker's minds from varying impulses in
his or her environment, free from the levelling influence of a
unifying social pressure.
    There is without doubt an invariant which enables a relatively
normal communication among compatriots both in Sweden and in Yugo-
slavia.
    This invariant is not, however, an arithmetically computed grea-
test common denominator of all diaspora S/C features. It is proba-
bly that quantity of "langue" features which do not exclude mutual
communication. A concrete example can be the case systems: a
general case concept with the opposition N vs. A as its base is
common to all the children investigated. Together with lexical
items, such as prepositions and numerals, this general case
concept is apparently sufficient for expressing the main bulk of
meanings required, although for many of those meanings different
means of expression (i e different cases) can be used obligatorily
or potentially by each speaker (cf. e g such a feature as Ly in
0.2., 1.3.2., 1.4.1.).
    The generalizations are valid to the extent to which they bear
on parts of the language shared really by all its speakers. Each
statement conceiving other parts of the language investigated is,
instead, incomplete: it can only be considered complete when the
entire system of the specific idiolect has been described. This,
in turn, would amount to an exhaustive description of a dialect or
of a language - a task which can never be fulfilled once and for
all.

LITERATURE

Ďurovič, Ľ.: 1972, 'Otnositel'noe prilagatel'noe v slavjanskich jazykach', in: D.S. Worth (ed.), <u>The Slavic Word</u>, The Hague - Paris, 189-207.

Gvozdev, A. N.: 1949, <u>Formirovanie u rebenka grammatičes-kogo stroja russkogo jazyka I-II</u>, Moskva.

Isačenko, A. V.: 1974, 'On "have" and "be" Languages (A Typological Sketch)', in: M.S. Flier (ed.), <u>Slavic Forum</u>, . The Hague - Paris, 43-77.

Jakobson, R.: 1936, 'Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre', <u>Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague</u> 6, 240-288.

Kuryłowicz, J.: 1949, 'Le problème du classement des cas' <u>BPTJ</u> IX, 2-43.

Peco, A.: 1980, <u>Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata</u>, Beograd.

Stevanović, M.: 1974, <u>Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik</u>, Beograd.

Topolińska, Z.: 1972, 'Struktura słowiańskiej frazy nominalnej', in: <u>Z polskich studiów slawistycznych</u>, Ser. 4. Językoznawstwo, 47-54.

Topolińska, Z.: 1976, 'Mechanizmy nominalizacji w języku polskim', in: <u>Studia gramatyczne</u> 1, 175-212.

REGISTER

reflexive verb   2.2.3.4.1.,
restructuring   1.1.23.,
subject   1.1.0., 1.1.11., 1.1.23., 1.1.5.1., 1.5.1., 2.2.21.,
Swedish (loans words)   0.2.3., 1.1.5.1., 1.2.4.2.2., 1.2.4.3.1.,
          1.3.1.1., 1.4.1.2., 1.4.2.2., 2.2.23.6., 2.2.3.1.2.5.,
          2.2.3.3.0., 2.3.1., 2.3.2.1.,
temporal (functions, meanings)   1.2.5., 2.2.12., 2.2.3.4.3.,
          2.2.4.,
words:
 brod   1.2.4.2.2., 1.3.1.1.,
 magarac   1.3.1.1., 1.4.2.2.,
 sir   1.2.3.1.2.