

School of English

Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics



Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

# 23<sup>rd</sup> International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics

## Book of Abstracts

March 31-  
April 2, 2017



Aristotle University Campus  
Research Dissemination Center  
3 Septemvriou St.

[www.enl.auth.gr/istal23](http://www.enl.auth.gr/istal23)

Δημήτρης Στάσιος 16



RESEARCH COMMITTEE  
ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI

Unterstützt von / Supported by



Alexander von Humboldt  
Stiftung/Foundation



ARISTOTLE  
faculty of  
UNIVERSITY  
education  
OF THESSALONIKI  
GREECE



GOETHE-INSTITUT  
THESSALONIKI

Μοβ  
xew  
μιά  
www.print-24.gr

ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΙΑ ΕΦΑΡΜΟΣΜΕΝΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ  
GREEK APPLIED LINGUISTICS ASSOCIATION  
ASSOCIATION GRECQUE DE LINGUISTIQUE APPLIQUEE

2017

Thessaloniki, Greece

## **Preface**

The Organizing Committee of the 23rd International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics (ISTAL 23) welcomes you to the city of Thessaloniki.

We were honored to receive many high quality submissions. We thank all scholars who submitted their work for choosing ISTAL 23 as the forum for their research and we owe a special debt to the abstract reviewers. We hope we have succeeded in putting together an interesting conference program.

We heartily thank our invited speakers, Artemis Alexiadou, Jóhanna Barðdal, Outi Bat-El, Dan Dediú, and Fanny Meunier. Our thanks also go to Nikolaos Lavidas and Alexander Bergs for organising the workshop on “Historical Language Contact in English and beyond”, Artemij Keidan, Leonid Kulikov and Nikolaos Lavidas for the “Morpho-syntactic isoglosses in Indo-European: Diachrony, typology and linguistic areas” workshop, Marina Mattheoudakis for The Centre for Foreign Language Teaching workshop and Eleni Peristeri for the workshop on Linguistic and Cognitive Deficits in Developmental and Acquired Language Disorders.

We also thank the members of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics for their assistance, and especially our technician, Tasos Paschalis, for his support in organizing the technical aspects of the Symposium and his efforts to improve its website. Special thanks go to our sponsors: The Research Committee of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, the Greek Applied Linguistics Association, and Monochromia. We are also grateful for the support of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, the Faculty of Education of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, and the Goethe Institut Thessaloniki. Last we warmly thank our student volunteers, whose help is most appreciated.

We hope you will find ISTAL 23 both scientifically stimulating and socially enjoyable.

March 2017

### **The Organizing Committee**

Nina Topintzi

Nikolaos Lavidas

Marina Mattheoudakis

Katerina Nicolaidis

Maria Moumtzi

## **ISTAL 23 Reviewers**

Eleni Agathopoulou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Thomaï Alexiou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Elena Anagnostopoulou (University of Crete)  
Angeliki Athanasiadou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Mary Baltazani (University of Oxford)  
Spyridoula Bella (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens)  
Lia Efstathiadi (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Marianthi Georgalidou (University of the Aegean)  
Ed Joyce (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Ioanna Kappa (University of Crete)  
Kyriaki Kourouni (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Eliza Kitis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Nikolaos Lavidas (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Marika Lekakou (University of Ioannina)  
Marina Mattheoudakis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Katerina Nicolaidis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Despina Papadopoulou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Angeliki Psaltou-Joyce (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Anna Rousou (University of Patras)  
Nicos Sifakis (Hellenic Open University)  
Athina Sioupi (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Areti-Maria Sougari (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Vasilis Spyropoulos (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens)  
Melita Stavrou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Nina Topintzi (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Anastasios Tsangalidis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)  
Spyridoula Varlokosta (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens)  
Giorgos Xydopoulos (University of Patras)

## **ISTAL 23 Sponsors & Supporters**

We are grateful for the support of the:

- Research Committee, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
- Greek Applied Linguistics Association
- Alexander von Humboldt Foundation
- Faculty of Education, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
- Goethe-Institut Thessaloniki
- Monochromia - Print and Copy Shop

## CONTENTS

<b>PLENARIES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>GENERAL SESSION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>POSTERS .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>WORKSHOPS</b>	
<b>Morpho-syntactic Isoglosses in Indo-European .....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Historical Language Contact in English and beyond .....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>The Centre for Foreign Language Teaching: Promoting plurilingualism in a monolingual university .....</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>Linguistic and cognitive deficits in developmental and acquired language disorders .....</b>	<b>118</b>

Abstracts are arranged alphabetically based on the Greek alphabet: A, B, Γ/C, Δ/D, E, ΖΖ, F, G, H, Θ, I, J, K, Λ/L, M, N, Ξ, O, Π/P, Q, Ρ/R, Σ/S, T, Y, Φ, U, V, W, X, Y, ΖΖ, Ψ, Ω.

# **WORKSHOP**

**Morpho-syntactic Isoglosses in Indo-European**

ancient IE languages, near identity of agreement rules for conjoined NPs across virtually all IE languages, and the use of a linking element between head nouns and certain modifiers in some Balkan languages.

The most striking of these is the first phenomenon, reproduced famously in the Greek axiom *ta zōa trekhei* ‘the animals-pl. run-sg.’, common also to Vedic, Hittite, and Avestan (cf. Fortson 2010: 158). This rule is synchronically unmotivated and apparently archaic—and thus usually classified as a shared retention, traditionally irrelevant for subgrouping but important for reconstruction. Similarly, the agreement rules for conjoined NPs, constrained by the same factors in Ancient Greek and Latin (cf. Johnson 2014), with some discrepancies in the outcomes in Germanic and Indo-Iranian, can be understood as typologically natural based on similar patterns in the unrelated Bantu languages. Finally, the linking element in Albanian and Romanian, similar to the repetition of the article in Ancient Greek, cf. Alexiadou 2008, superficially appears to be a potential areal feature of Balkan languages, yet the same phenomenon has been observed in Scandinavian as well (Alexiadou 2006).

Agreement appears to be a less fruitful area for isoglosses, as developments are usually typologically predictable/common, but this paper raises the issue of whether certain agreement data can still be informative. Shared retentions in certain extreme contact situations might warrant proposing special “retentive” isoglosses (Friedman & Joseph forthcoming: Ch. 3.2.2.8). Typologically common developments as isoglosses can potentially identify groups of languages that share the same conditions necessary for change. Such isoglosses are perhaps only marginally relevant for dialectal grouping but are nonetheless useful in understanding the relationship between shared retentions, typology, reconstruction, and dialectology.

## References

- Alexiadou, A. (2006). On the cross-linguistic distribution of (in)definiteness spreading. In *ÖLT Syntax Workshop*, Universität Klagenfurt, 1-13.
- Alexiadou, A. (2008). *Multiple Determiners and the Structure of DPs*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fortson, B.W. (2010). *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Friedman, V. & B.D. Joseph (Forthcoming). *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, C.A. (2014). *Deconstructing and Reconstructing Semantic Agreement: A Case Study of Multiple Antecedent Agreement in Indo-European*. Ph.D. Thesis, The Ohio State University.

---

## New NP dependency marking in the “second generation” IE languages

**Artemij Keidan**

*Sapienza University of Rome*

*artemij.keidan@uniroma1.it*

Proto-Indo-European lacked a separate morphological marker for the lexical class of nominal modifiers. In other words, it had no specific endings for the adjectives as opposed to nouns. In languages without a distinct adjective class the adjectival semantics is divided between verbs and nouns: verbs encode certain qualities and properties and nouns modify other nouns, with or without morphological agreement. Some ancient IE languages, such as Vedic Sanskrit,

preserve the original state of affairs. In particular, in Sanskrit many actual nouns were able to change their syntactic/semantic gender in agreement with a head noun; so they exhibited the typical behavior of the adjectival modifiers. In the younger Indo-European languages, which could be called “second generation IE languages” (including Middle Indic, or Prakrits; Middle Iranian, Old Slavonic, and Old Germanic), we observe a common drift towards the morphological reinforcement of the modifier-to-head nominal agreement. In several cases this process caused the birth of a new morphologically marked lexical class of adjectives. In some languages the adjectives as modifiers were differentiated from the predicative adjectives. A frequent source of morphological material for this new morphological class was the pronominal declension as a whole, and, in particular, the cliticization of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person relative or demonstrative pronouns. Generally, the new adjectival endings were phonologically longer than the endings used in the old non-differentiated (thematic) declension. The most interesting instances of this innovation include the following.

- Prakrits: incorporation of some pronominal endings into adjectival paradigm; such forms as Locative in *-e* vs. those in *-ammi* are said to alternate freely or to appear metri causa (see Pischel §366a), but a tendency for the use of longer endings to mark the attributive adjectives could be suggested (e.g. the Loc. NP *sarisammi guṇe* ‘similar quality’ in Hala’s *Sattasāi* 1.44).
- Khotanese: creation of a set of optional adjectival endings (Emmerick §§5, 27), of possible pronominal origin (Sims-Williams 278) and longer than those used in the nominal paradigm.
- Pahlavi: creation of the head-marking morpheme (traditionally called *ezāfe*) on the basis of the OP relative pronouns *haya* (in constructions of the type *adam Bardiya ahmiy haya Kurauš puça* ‘I am Bardiya, REL Cyrus’s son’ in DB 1.39, see Nyberg 105, cf. Ciancaglini 47), to be compared with such Av. relative constructions as *stāram yam tištrīm* ‘the star named Tištriya’ (see Meillet 388).
- Slavic: creation of the new adjectival paradigm through the gradual agglutination of pronominal forms of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative in *je-* that later were completely amalgamated, producing long adjectival endings (see Polivanova §§269–273, 868, Meillet §509).
- Germanic: creation of the “strong” (as opposed to “weak”) adjectives, having longer endings of pronominal origin and devoted to the modifier position.
- Greek: creation of the article from 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns that could be used in order to link a modifier to its head noun (cf. such constructions as *ἄνθρωπος ὁ σοφός* ‘the wise man’ or *τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ πατρὸς* ‘the book of the father’, quite similar to the already discussed Avestan construction).

Meillet observes the similarity of these developments only with regard to Slavic adjectives and the relative construction in Avestan. In my opinion, however, a wider network of parallel developments should be individuated here, be it an areal phenomenon or a Sapirean drift.

## References

- Ciancaglini, C.A. (2008). *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Emmerick, R.E. (1968). *Saka Grammatical Studies*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Meillet, A. (1924). *Le slave commun*. Paris: Champion.
- Nyberg, H.S. (1974). *A Manual of Pahlavi. II. Ideograms, Glossary, Abbreviations, Index, Grammatical Survey, Corrigenda to Part I*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pischel, R. (1900). *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strasburg: Trübner.
- Polivanova, A.K. (2013). *Staroslavjanskij jazyk. Grammatika. Slovāri*. Moskva: Institut Slavjanovedenija.



- Schmitt, R. (1989). Altpersisch. In *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 56-85.
- Sims-Williams, N. (1990). Chotano-Sogdica II: Aspects of the Development of Nominal Morphology in Khotanese and Sogdian. In *Proceedings of the first European conference of Iranian studies, Turin, September 7<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup>, 1987*, Vol. 1. Rome: IsMEO, 276-296.
- 

## Von den Sätzen zu den Wörtern: The neglected role of historical syntax for Germanic and Indo-European etymology

**Guus Kroonen, Peter Alexander Kerkhof & Jóhanna Barðdal**

Ghent University

*guus@hum.ku.dk, g.j.kroonen@hum.leidenuniv.nl,*

*Peter.Kerkhof@ugent.be, Johanna.Barðdal@ugent.be*

It is a well-established fact within historical and comparative Indo-European linguistics that several ancient Indo-European languages exhibit a construction where the subject-like argument occurs with an accusative, dative or genitive marking (Conti 2008, 2010, Luraghi 2010, Barðdal et al. 2012, 2013, 2016, Dahl & Fedriani 2012, Matasović 2013, Danesi 2014, Fedriani 2014, Viti 2016a, 2016b, inter alia).

The existence of such argument structures raises the question of how old such structures are in the respective language branches of the Indo-European languages, if they are archaic, and whether they can be reconstructed back to a proto-stage. Our goal here is to add to the growing body of evidence showing that oblique subjects can be reconstructed for Proto-Germanic, which in turn raises interesting questions regarding the Proto-Indo-European pre-stage of the relevant verbal roots.

In a recent study Barðdal & Eythórsson (2012) have shown that in cases where a lexico-syntactic match extending over several ancient daughter languages can be found, projecting the argument structure back into the proto-stage of the language family certainly is both cogent and compelling. We illustrate several such lexico-syntactic matches and show how taking the non-canonical argument structure of these verbs into account may shed light on their Proto-Indo-European etymology and development, as their meaning is always less agentive than that of corresponding nominative subject constructions (cf. Bauer 2000, Barðdal 2004, Barðdal & Eythórsson 2009, Danesi 2014).

We present several examples illustrating this development, from which there can be no doubt about the existence of non-canonical subjects in Proto-Germanic, as argued by Barðdal & Eythórsson (2012). High-quality lexico-syntactic matches between Germanic and other Indo-European branches are hard to find, but they certainly exist. Such matches are the key to understanding many otherwise obscure semantic shifts documented across the Indo-European phylum.

### References

- Barðdal, J. (2004). The Semantics of the Impersonal Construction in Icelandic, German and Faroese: Beyond Thematic Roles. In A. Werner (ed.), *Focus on Germanic Typology*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 105-137.