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1. Martinican
Martinican

- Regional language of France - Martinique, Lesser Antilles
- 600,000 speakers (APiCS)
- SVO language

- The lexicon: French-based (Holm 2000, 146)

- Sociolinguistic background - bilingual speakers (Martinican; French)
- socially stigmatized language
  (Hazaël-Massieux 2002, 65; Valdman 1978, 32)
- language of instruction and administration: French
2. State of the Art

Bernabé 1983  
description of the Martinican basilect  
Bernabé and Pinalie 1999  
didactic handbook  
Colot and Ludwig 2013  
online description of Martinican and Guadeloupean  
Damoiseau 2012  
comparative syntax
Relativization of the subject

- RC-initial marker $ki$

- Expletive form $éti$ (Bernabé and Pinalie 1999)

- Before the imperfective marker $ka$: 3 phonetic realizations of $ki$

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
 Ni & moun & [(ki)] & ka & kwè & sa] \\
 have & people & REL & IPFV & believe & DEM \\
\end{array}
\]

(1) ‘There are people who believe that.’

(Damoiseau 2012, 39)
Relativization of the direct object

➢ No RC-initial marker

(2) Kabrit-la [ou maré a]
goat-DET.DEF 2SG tie.up DEF

‘the goat you tied up’

(Bernabé et Pinalie 1999, 34)
Relativization of the oblique (place)

- 5 RC-initial markers
  - oti
  - éti
  - ola
  - Definite NP + otila
  - Definite NP + étila

(3) Koté-a [oti man ka alé a]
place-DET.DEF REL 1SG IPFV go

‘the place where I am going’

(Bernabé 1983, 1424)
Domains with a definite determiner

The RC-final marker *la~a*

(4) *Kabrit-la* [ou *maré* a]

goat-DET.DEF 2SG tie.up

‘the goat you tied up’

(Bernabé et Pinalie 1999, 34)

1) A repetition of the **definite determiner** present in the definite domain

(Bernabé and Pinalie 1999, 190; Colot and Ludwig 2013)

2) A **discourse marker** with a deictic function

(Colot and Ludwig 2013)
3. Methodology
The corpus: 200 RC + 2 questionnaires (1/2)

**Written data**

- *Jik dèyè do Bondyé* (Confiant 1979): 45 first pages

**Oral data**

- *Ziétaj*: TV programme broadcast on La1ère Martinique
- Recordings of native speakers (narrations ; descriptions)
The corpus: 200 RC + 2 questionnaires (2/2)

- Online questionnaires

 ✓ Do speakers accept subject RC with no initial marker?
   
   => Questionnaire 1 (5 native speakers)

 ✓ What are the language attitudes to several strategies to relativize the direct object?
   
   => Questionnaire 2 (4 native speakers)
Criteria of the syntactic analysis (1/2)

1) **The relativized syntactic role** (Creissels 2006): S, DO, IO, DOC, OBL

2) **Presence of a syntactic gap** (Creissels 2006, 2:209-10)
   
   vs.

   **Presence of a resumptive pronoun**

3) **The type of domains** (Creissels 2006, 2:207)
   
   => **Domain**: nominal constituent of the matrix whose reference is specified by the RC
   
   => DEF NPs, INDF NPs, DEM NPs, DEM PR…
Criteria of the syntactic analysis (2/2)

4) Presence of relative markers
   - Relativizer: invariable morpheme which informs about the presence of a RC
   - Relative pronoun: pronominal morpheme which informs about the relativized syntactic role

5) Position of the RC
   Always postposed to the domain

6) Form of the verb within the RC
   Always finite
4. Results
a) Strategies
Subject relative clauses
1) Subject RC with the RC-initial marker *ki*

- **Overt domain**

(5) *i té ka pwopté sé sijé-a*  
  3PL PST IPFV clean  DEF.PL trinket-DET.DEF REL PST on altar  
  ‘she was cleaning the trinkets that were on the altar’

- **No overt domain** (oral data, 1 occurrence)

(6) *(sa)*  
  *ki _ vlé di*
  DEM REL want say  
  ‘which means’

- **RC-initial marker *ki***
- **Syntactic gap**

- **No overt domain**
- **Casual expression**
- **No loss of information**
  - pronominal head semantically empty,
  - anaphoric function
2) Subject RC without RC-initial marker

(7) a. nou té konfronté a dé pwofésionnel
   1PL PST deal.with to DET.INDF.PL professional
   [___ té ka vini déwò]
   PST IPFV come outside

   ‘we were dealing with profesional coming from outside’

b. nou té konfronté a dé pwofésionnel
   1PL PST deal.with to DET.INDF.PL professional
   [ki ___ té ka vini déwò]
   REL PST IPFV come outside

   ‘we were dealing with profesional who were coming from outside’

- No RC-initial marker
- The corresponding RC with *ki* is correct (b.)
- Syntactic gap
Direct object relative clauses
1) DO RC without RC-initial marker

(8) *li Mano té ka espéré*

3SG Mano PST IPFV wait

*pou *fanm-la [i té chwèzi ___]*

for woman-DET.DEF 3SG PST choose

‘He, Mano, was waiting for the woman he chose’

➢ No RC-initial marker
➢ Syntactic gap
2) **DO RC with the RC-initial marker** \([kø]\)

(9) \*aktivité-mwen \([kø]\) \*man \*mété \*an

\activity-1SG \*REL \*1SG \*put \*in

\plas \*an \[91]\]

place \*in \*91

‘my activity that I implemented in 1991’

- RC-initial marker \([kø]\)
- Syntactic gap
3) DO RC with the RC-initial marker *ki*

(10) Jean Bernabé [*ki nou kay fête ___*]
    Jean Bernabé REL 1PL FUT celebrate
    ‘Jean Bernabé who we will celebrate’

(11) Jean Bernabé [*ki ___ kay fête nou*]
    Jean Bernabé REL FUT celebrate 1PL
    ‘Jean Bernabé who will celebrate us’
RC-initial markers $[k\phi]$ and $ki$ (1/2)

- Rare strategies: 7% of direct object RCs have an RC-initial marker

- Which role could bilingualism play in these rare constructions?
  - In Martinican, for some syntactic roles like S, there is a RC-initial marker
  - French direct object RCs begin with the relativizer *que* (Riegel, Pellat, Rioul 2009, 799)
  - In Martinican like in French there are RC markers:
    - clause-initial
    - monosyllabic
    - with an initial [k]
RC-initial markers $[k\phi]$ and $ki$ (2/2)

- Direct object RC-initial markers in the literature

Because of the bilingual repertoires of Martinican speakers, direct object RC-initial markers are frequently described


- Damoiseau (2012, 139): $ké$, $ki$, $ke$

- My hypothesis: interlectal direct object RC-initial marker

‘Interlectal zone’: ‘obeys neither to the nuclear basilect nor to the acrolectal grammar’ (Prudent 1981, 26, 31)

- No prediction = impossible to know if $[k\phi]$ works - as a Martinican RC-initial marker

- as a rephonologization of French $que$
Oblique relative clauses
1) Peripheral oblique RC with the RC-initial marker *oti*

(12) *sé*  *pyéklokliko-a*  [*oti*  *sé*  *nèg-la*]  
DEF.PL  hibiscus-DET.DEF  REL  DEF.PL  man-DET.DEF  
*té*  *maré-'y*  _  *la*]  
PST  tie-3SG  DEF  

‘the hibiscus where the man had tied him’

- RC-initial marker *oti*  
- RC-final morpheme *la*  
- Syntactic gap
2) Peripheral oblique RC with the RC-initial marker éti

(13) Séchel [éti kréyol sé]

Seychelles REL Creole be

an lang ofisièl ___

DET.INDF.SG language official

‘Seychelles where Creole is an official language’

- RC-initial marker éti
- Syntactic gap
b) The RC-final morpheme *la*

13 RC out of 200 (1h27min of recordings)
3 homonyms:
*la* RC-final marker, *la* definite, *la* ‘here/there’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Allomorphs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>la</em> RC-final marker</td>
<td>RC-final</td>
<td><em>la, a, an</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-<em>la</em> definite suffix</td>
<td>NP-final</td>
<td>-<em>la</em>; -<em>a</em>; -<em>an</em>; -<em>lan</em>; -<em>ya</em>; -<em>yan</em>; -<em>wa</em>; <em>wan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>la</em> ‘here/there’</td>
<td>In NPs and in RCs</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phonetic realizations of *la* RC-final marker

(14) **tout**  
DEF.PL all  
**sé** year-DET.DEF  
**lanné-a** REL end  
* [ki] go.by  
* [fini] DEF

‘all the years which have just went by’

(15) **sé**  
DEF.PL  
**pyékloliko-a**  
hibiscus-DET.DEF  
**[oti sé nèg-la té maré-'y la]**  
REL DEF.PL man-DET.DEF PST tie-3SG  
* [ki] DEF

‘the hibiscus where the man had tied him’

(16) **fòs-la**  
strength-DET.DEF  
3SG  
* [i] have  
* [ni] DEF

‘the strength he has’
-la definite suffix

- **Position: NP-final**

17. *loto-a*  
   `car DET.DEF`  
   ‘the car’

18. *loto wouj-la*  
   `car red DET.DEF`  
   ‘the red car’

- **Systematic nazalisation**

19. *chien vwazen-an*  
   `door neighbour DET.DEF`  
   ‘the neighbour’s dog’
-la definite suffix vs. RC-final marker la (1/2)

Non systematic nasalization of the RC-final morpheme la

(20) fòs-la  [i  ni  _  an]
strength-DET.DEF  3SG  have  DEF
‘the strength he has’

(21) Chonjé  sa  [ou  ka  fè  mwen  _  a]!
remember  DEM  2SG  IPFV  do  1SG  DEF
‘Remember what you are doing to me!’
-la definite suffix vs. RC-final marker la (2/2)

The RC-final marker la does not repeat the definite determiner which is on the domain

(Bernabé and Pinalie 1999, 190)

⇒ la can be used when the domain is not determined by the definite suffix

Demonstrative pronoun

(22) sa [dé zyé-mwen ka wè __ a]
DEM two eye-1SG IPFV see DEF

‘what my two eyes see’

Proper noun

(23) Carbet [oti man ké alé __ a] sé an vil péchè.
Carbet REL 1SG FUT go DEF be DET.INDEF.SG city fisherman

‘Carbet, where I will go to, is a fishing town’
"la (here/there) vs. RC-final marker la (1/2)"

- la ‘here/there’: invariable form

- la ‘here/there’ vs. RC-final morpheme la: no free variation

(24) a. tout sé lanné-a [ki __ fini passé a]  
   all DEF.PL year-DET.DEF REL end go.by DEF  
   ‘all the years which have just went by’

b. tout sé lanné-a [ki __ fini passé la]  
   all DEF.PL year-DET.DEF REL end go.by here  
   ‘all the years which have just went by recently’
**la (here/there) vs. RC-final marker la (2/2)**

- *la* ‘here/there’ and *la* RC-final marker can co-occur

(25) \( \text{tout sé lanné-a [ki } \_ \text{ fini pasé la a]} \)

all DEF.PL year-DET.DEF REL end go.by here DEF

‘all the years which have just went by recently’
How to analyse the **RC-final marker* $la$* ? (1/2)

- The **RC-final marker* $la$* is not a relativizer: it can be used with a RC-initial relativizer.

(26) `tout sé lanné-a [ki _ fini passé a]`

*all DEF.PL year-DET.DEF REL end go.by DEF*

‘all the years which have just went by’

- Use of the **RC-final marker* $la$* in the corpus according to the domain

  | NPs with a definite determiner: | 8 RCs |
  | Demonstrative pronouns:        | 4 RCs |
  | NPs with a demonstrative:      | 1 RC  |
How to analyse the RC-final marker *la*? (2/2)

- **RC-final marker *la* indicates the end of the RC**

- **RC-final marker *la*: a morpheme of definiteness**
  
  - The RC-final marker *la* is used when the domain of the RC is semantically definite
  
  - Definite = referential + identifiable (Creissels 2006, 1:129)
c) Relativization in discourse
The syntactic roles relativized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oral data</th>
<th>Written data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear oblique</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral oblique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject relativization strategies (129 RC)

Subject RC in discourse

- No RC-initial marker
- RC-initial marker ki

Written Data | Oral data
---|---
27 | 93
9 | 0

0 20 40 60 80 100
Direct object relativization strategies (63 RC)

Direct object RC in discourse

- RC-initial marker ki: 1
- RC-initial marker [kø]: 6
- No RC-initial marker: 48

Written Data: 0
Oral data: 0
Peripheral oblique relativization strategies

Peripheral oblique RC in discourse

- RC-initial marker éti
  - Written data: 0
  - Oral data: 3

- RC-initial marker oti
  - Written data: 0
  - Oral data: 3
5. Take home message: a new look into...
What differs from the literature?

- A corpus-based study

- RC-initial markers not found in the corpus:
  - *Eti*: Expletive form
  - *Ola*: Oblique marker
  - *Otila*: Oblique marker with definite domains
  - *Etila*: Oblique marker with definite domains

- No fusion between the relativizer *ki* and the imperfective marker *ka* (Damoiseau 2012, 39)
  
  Alignement with the omission analysis (Colot and Ludwig 2013)
What is new? (1/2)

- No headless RCs in Martinican

  *ki vlé di* ‘which means’: lexicalized RC

- The **morpheme of definiteness** *la*
  - is a RC-final marker used when the domain is semantically definite
  - indicates the end of the syntactic domain of the RC
What is new ? (2/2)

- **Interlectal RC-initial markers** for the DO
  - [kø]: relative pronoun
  - *ki*: relativizer

- The distribution in discourse of the relativization strategies
  - Martinican follows the accessibility hierarchy (Keenan and Comrie 1977)
  - An RC-initial marker is specific to oral productions: [kø]
  - High frequency of *ki* in subject RCs vs. low frequency of RC-initial markers in object RCs
Mèsi anpil !
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Double-object RC:
no RC-initial marker, resumptive pronoun

(27) *boug-la* [man ba-’y lajan-an]

man-DET.DEF 1SG give-3SG money-DET.DEF

‘the man to whom I gave the money’

(Bernabé and Pinalie 1999, 34)