

The Category of Case in Idiolects of Polish Children in Sweden¹

1. The case patterns of Serbo-Croatian diaspora children in Sweden.

Ľ. Ďurovič, in his study *The Case Systems in the Language of Diaspora Children* (1983), has presented a set of claims concerning the development of the category of case in Serbo-Croatian idiolects of Yugoslavian children in Sweden. The basic claim is that there is a strong order of acquiring/losing particular cases by the Serbo-Croatian speaking children which depends on the internal structure of the category of case as defined by Roman Jakobson (1936). The observed order may be summarized by the following pattern: NAGLIDV² where "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 case 'to the right'" (Ďurovič 1983, 24-25). In other words: the acquisition of particular cases should, in accordance with this pattern, follow the right-to-left order while the process of losing particular cases follows the opposite left-to-right order so that the process starts with the "rightmost" case on the scheme (V) and proceeds leftwards ending, possibly, as the one-case (i.e. caseless) system.

The following case patterns have been observed by Ľ. Ďurovič in SCr. diaspora children: 1. NA (3)³, 2. NAG (5), 3. NAGL (2), 4. a) NAGLI (8), b) NAGI (4), 5. a) NAGLID (4), b) NAGID (1), 6. a) NAGLIDV (2).

2. Markedness relations and the structure of the category of case.

In Laskowski (1989), I have examined markedness relations within the case system of Standard Polish. The phenomena of case syncretisms in Standard Polish, case statistics in Polish⁴ (compared with the statistical data from other Slavic languages), as well as trends in case-system acquisition and case-system disintegration in idiolects of Polish diaspora children have been considered as arguments for establishing the network of markedness relations which define the case hierarchies within the system.

It has been argued in this paper that the case system should be reinterpreted as a complex structure of functionally defined subsystems characterized by subsystem-specific markedness relations. Hence, I have shown that two dimensions should be taken into consideration when discussing the structure of the category of case: 1) the syntactically defined distinction between the subsystem of prepositional (A, G, L and I in Polish) and non-prepositional cases (N, A, G, D and I); 2) the semantically defined distinction between the subsystem of personal (animate) vs. non-personal (non-animate) nouns. Within the subsystem of prepositional cases, locative and instrumental are the maximally marked members of the subsystem, while genitive seems to be the unmarked case within this subsystem (Laskowski 1989, 214-216). The markedness relations existing among the non-prepositional cases depend strongly on the semantic feature of personality (animateness). Within the sub-subsystem of personal (animate) nouns, nominative is the unmarked case while the maximally marked member of this case subsystem is instrumental. The markedness relations within the subsystem of non-personal (non-animate) cases are distinct: the unmarked case here is accusative while the maximally marked case is dative (Laskowski 1989, 221-223).

It has been observed that there is a strong interdependence between the degree of markedness of a member of a (sub-)system and the degree of its integration into this (sub-)system. Hence, the more marked is a particular member of a given (sub-)system, the weaker is its position within this (sub-)system. E.g., in the language acquisition processes, the marked member of a grammatical opposition tends to be integrated later into the system than its unmarked counterpart; on the other hand, it is the marked member which tends to disappear earlier in the language decay processes. The implicative case pattern presented above by Ľ Ďurovič (1983) is obviously defined by the markedness relations within the category of case.

On the basis of Laskowski 1989, we may now attempt to define case hierarchies specific for the three above mentioned case subsystems in Polish:

- a) the subsystem of prepositional cases: GAI&L⁵
- b) the subsystem of personal (animate) nouns: NAGDI
- c) the subsystem of non-personal (non-animate) nouns: ANGID.

In what follows, I shall dwell on two questions: a) how the Polish data match the implicative case pattern established by Ďurovič for SCr. diaspora

idiolects? b) to what extent the data from the Polish diaspora idiolects in Sweden support the above indicated subsystem - dependent case hierarchies based on the markedness relations within the case system?

3. The case hierarchy in Polish diaspora idiolects (PDIs).

The following discussion is based on the analysis of a sample of 15 texts of 7-15 year old Polish children in Sweden. The texts have been recorded in 1988-1989. With the exclusion of two shorter texts (78.00⁶ - about 850 words and 79.03 - ca. 750 words), the size of the analyzed texts is reasonably large (1700 - 2600 words per text).

The idiolects represented by these texts demonstrate different degrees of mastering the Standard Polish grammatical system. As to the category of case, the following case patterns appear in the analyzed texts:

case patterns	idiolects
N(AGL) ⁷	78.05
N(A)GI(L)	78.14, 80.04
NAG(IL)	78.02, 80.03
NAGI(L)	73.02, 74.02, 78.00, 78.01,
NAGI(LD)	77.08, 79.03
NAGIL	74.01, 79.05, 81.04, 81.08

The above case patterns demonstrate sharp distinctions between the three strong cases: N, A and G (the *grammatical cases* of J. Kuryłowicz 1949, the *non-peripheral cases* of Jakobson 1958) and the three weak cases: I, L and D (the *Kuryłowiczian concrete cases*, the *Jakobsonian peripheral cases*). The three "grammatical" ("non-peripheral") cases are well represented in the vast majority of idiolects, with the exclusion of 78.14 (in which both accusative and genitive are weakened) and two more idiolects: 78.05 and 80.04. with an optional accusative case (we shall discuss these three idiolects later). As to the "concrete" ("peripheral") cases, one may observe a rather transparent hierarchy among them with dative as the weakest member of the case system, locative as the next weakest case and instrumental being the strongest "concrete" case. The idiolects without or with optional instrumental (i. e. the idiolects representing the N(AGL) and NAG(IL) case patterns) demonstrate further that instrumental - the strongest concrete case - is, nevertheless, a weak case with respect to the three "grammatical" cases.

Hence, on the basis of the data from the PDIs we may now establish the ILD hierarchy (implicative order) of the concrete cases. The pattern differs slightly from the one observed by Ľ. Ďurovič (1983) in idiolects of SCr. diaspora children, viz. with respect to the position of locative in the system. We suspect, nevertheless, that there are grounds for revising the status of locative in Ďurovič's pattern. He observes: "In all systems containing the locative, this case form can sporadically or systematically be replaced by the accusative" (Ďurovič 1983, 24). On the next page, Ďurovič states: "the L(ocative) itself does imply the N(ominative), A(ccusative) and G(enitive), but it is not automatically implied by I(nstrumental), D(ative) and V(ocative)" (Ďurovič 1983, 25). Now, if we consider Ďurovič's schemes 1-6 (see above), we may observe that there are ten idiolects in which locative appears without dative and only one seemingly locativeless idiolect in which dative is represented (see above the pattern 5b: NAGID). Notice that there appear only six instances of the locative case⁸ in this idiolect, represented by five accusative forms and one locative form (Ďurovič 1983, 54, table 1). The appearance of the locative form in the text shows that locative maintains the status of an optional case in this idiolect. The presented data (Ďurovič, l. cit.) demonstrate that Dative, too, is an optional case in the idiolect in question.

As to the instrumental vs. locative relation, we may observe that, among the idiosystems discussed by Ďurovič, there are 5 idiolects with the instrumental case but without the locative case (the patterns 4b and 5b) vs. 2 idiolects with locative but no instrumental case (the pattern 3). Nevertheless, none of the last two idiolects proves the absence of the instrumental case in these idiolects; it seems that we are here dealing with accidental gaps in the texts (very short ones) rather than with the systemic absence of the instrumental case in the idiolects in question (cf. Ďurovič 1983, 50). It seems, then, that there is no difference in the status of locative in the SCr. and PDIs in Sweden. Consequently, we are claiming that, for both languages, the case hierarchy follows Ďurovič's revised implicative order NAGILD.

The above pattern describes the case-system inherent hierarchy which, in the PDIs, is subject to modifications due to case-system external factors, viz. the decay of the category of animateness/personality of nouns in some idiolects. The disintegration of this grammatical category strongly influences the position of accusative in the system, weakening it to the status

of an optional case or narrowing its function to that of a prepositional case (see below, par. 4.4.). As the result of the interplay of the case-system internal and the case-system external factors, the case hierarchy which is actually represented in some of the investigated PDIs is NGAILD.

Hence, two different case hierarchies are attested in the 15 investigated Polish idiolects:

1) The case-system inherent hierarchy

NAGILD

represented by these idiolects in which the grammatical category of animateness/personality is well preserved.

2) The secondary, derived case hierarchy

NGAILD

appearing in the minority of idiolects, viz. in idiolects with the disintegrated or weakened category of animateness/personality.

4. The Polish data.

4.1. Dative has been almost entirely lost in the investigated PDIs. There are 60 dative case-function⁸ appearances in the investigated idiolects, represented by 18 dative forms (almost exclusively enclitics) and 42 non-dative case forms.

The specific status of dative enclitics has to be stressed here⁹: even in those idiolects which represent case systems without dative, instances of the dative enclitics may still appear. The enclitics *mu* 'him' and *mi* 'me' appear, e. g., in the idiolect 78.05 with the most disintegrated case system reduced to the N(AGI) pattern. One-fold examples of the dative enclitics *mi* 'me', *ci* 'you', *mu*¹⁰ 'him', and *im* 'them' are attested from the idiolects 74.02, 79.03, 79.05, 81.04, 81.08¹¹. The stability of the dative enclitics even in languages in which the case system has been lost is a well known historico-linguistic phenomenon (cf. e. g., Bulgarian, Macedonian and

Spanish where dative enclitics have been maintained despite the fact that the category of case had been lost in these languages). This resistance of the dative enclitics towards the case system disintegration processes is motivated by the relatively strong position of dative within the subsystem of personal (animate) nouns (see Laskowski 1986, 131; Laskowski 1989, 207-226).

Nevertheless, the majority of dative pronominal forms and almost all dative nominal forms have been substituted by non-dative forms or non-dative PPs in the idiolects under consideration. Most frequent is the substitution of the dative by the A-G syncretic case-form (the $D > A-G$ substitutional pattern¹²; 16 instances), the next frequent one is the $D > p G$ substitution pattern ($D > do G$ and $D > dla G$) - 12 instances in common. The remaining substitutional patterns attested in the texts are: $D > p A$ - 6 instances, $D > N-A$ - 3, $D > A$ - 3; exceptional are the $D > G$ and $D > I$ patterns represented in our sample of texts by one-fold instances. This diversity of the dative substitutional patterns is even more striking if we consider the fact that, typically, two or more different dative substitutions co-occur in the same idiolect. So, e. g., four different patterns are represented in 74.02 ($D > N-A$, $D > G$, $D > do G$ and $D > na A$) and in 79.03 ($D > A-G$, $D > dla G$, $D > do G$, $D > A$); three distinct patterns are attested in 80.03 ($D > N-A$, $D > A-G$ and $D > I$).

On the basis of this data, we may establish the following hierarchy of case forms substituting the dative case in the idiolects under consideration:

A-G, p G, p A, N-A, A, (G, I)¹³

4.2. The status of *locative* in the case systems of the PDIs has also been considerably weakened: the vast majority of the texts under consideration show at least some instances of the substitution of locative PPs by other case forms. The only two idiolects in which locative is fully preserved are: 80.08 (no errors in the use of locative) and 79.05 (one instance of the $L > G$ substitution). In the remaining 13 texts, there appear 151 locative forms vs. 76 cases of substitution of L by non-locative case-forms. The most common substitution here is the $L > N-A$, represented by 37 instances (i. e. almost 49% of all incorrect uses of the locative case). This substitutional pattern is attested in all the investigated idiolects with the only exclusion of 81.08 - the idiolect with an almost perfectly maintained case

system. Quite common is the $L > G$ substitution represented by 17 cases appearing in 10 different idiolects. The $L > A$ pattern is almost equally frequent: 14 appearances in 9 idiolects. Two other substitutional patterns are clearly marginal in our sample of data: the $L > I$ substitution is attested by 5 instances (from 5 different idiolects) and the $L > N$ pattern is represented by 3 appearances in 3 idiolects. The co-occurrence of three or four distinct substitutional patterns is characteristic of almost all idiolects which show the weakened status of locative.

The hierarchical order of the above-indicated locative substitution patterns is as follows:

N-A, G, A, I, N

4.3. Instrumental, is preserved considerably well in the idiolects in question. There are 128 appearances of instrumental forms in the texts vs. 37 instances of non-instrumental forms substituting the instrumental case. Five texts (74.02, 78.14, 79.05, 80.04 and 81.08) show no instances of substitution of instrumental by some other case. In four more idiolects (73.02, 74.01, 78.00 and 81.04), cases of such a substitution are exceptional. The only idiolect which has totally lost the instrumental case is 78.05¹⁵. This idiolect represents the most disintegrated case system (reduced to the pattern NA<GL>) in our sample of the PDIs. The idiolects 78.02 and 80.03 have maintained instrumental as an optional case¹⁶ only.

Instrumental is most frequently substituted by the nominative form ($I > N$: 16 appearances in 9 idiolects) and by the N-A syncretic case-forms ($I > N-A$: 12 instances attested in 3 idiolects: 78.05 - 9 instances, 78.01 - 2 forms and 73.02 - 1 appearance). The next frequent $I > G$ substitution is attested in 5 cases (from 3 idiolects), while the remaining substitutional patterns are exceptional: $I > G$ - 2 instances from 2 idiolects, and one-fold examples of the $I > A$ and the $I > L$ substitution. The application of several substitutional patterns in the same idiolect is less frequent in instrumental, but still this phenomenon is attested in 6 idiolects where 2-4 different patterns may appear in a single idiolect (the following 4 patterns are attested in 78.05: $I > N-A$, $I > N$, $I > A-G$ and $I > A$). The hierarchy of the substitution capacity of different case forms is for instrumental the following one:

N, N-A, G, A-G, (A, L).

4.4. Genitive belongs to the most stable cases in the PDIs. Nevertheless, there appear 94 instances of the substitution of genitive by non-genitive case forms (vs. ca. 350 genitive forms). The examples of the genitive substitution are attested, in fact, from each of the investigated idiolects. The most conservative from the point of view of the genitive case are idiolects: 73.02, 78.00, 80.03, 80.04, where instances of the substitution of genitive by non-genitive case forms are exceptional. $G > N-A$ is obviously the basic substitutional pattern for the genitive case; it is represented by 62 examples (i. e. more than 65% of all cases of the genitive substitution) in our data, attested in 12 idiolects. Other case-forms are by far less frequent: the $G > A$ substitution is attested by 14 cases, the $G > N - 5$ appearances and the $G > L - 8$ examples. Exceptional is the only instance of the substitution of genitive by dative form (the idiolect 77.08). The weakening of genitive in the PDIs is basically due to changes of two Polish syntactic rules: a) the rule which demands the genitive direct object in negated sentences and b) the rule that numerals govern the genitive case. The changing of these two syntactic rules is responsible for almost half (46%) of the genitive substitutions. The next 28% of the incorrect genitive realizations appears in prepositional phrases due to the weakening of the morphological oppositions in the subsystem of prepositional cases.

The hierarchical order of the genitive substitutions, which appears from the above considerations, is as follows:

N-A, A, N, L, (D)

4.5. Accusative is quite often substituted by other cases: 117 examples of such a substitution appear in the analyzed texts. Instances of such substitutions are attested from all idiolects except two: 78.00 and 80.03; the errors in the use of the accusative case are exceptional in 78.01, 79.05 and 81.04.

On the other hand, three idiolects with the most disintegrated case system (78.05, 78.14 and 80.04¹⁷) demonstrate far-gone decay of accusative. This weakening of the accusative depends on the changes in the category of personality/animateness in these idiolects. The category, which concerns masculine nouns in Standard Polish, is indicated by the opposition of A-G

vs. A-N case syncretisms with the A-G syncretism being the exponent of animateness (singular) or personality (plural). In two of the three idiolects in question (78.05 and 78.14), the disintegration of the animateness/ personality category has resulted in the strong tendency towards generalization of the A-N syncretism not only on masculine animate (personal) nouns but also on feminine nouns. In 78.14, this process has been carried out consistently¹⁸, to the effect that the opposition of the direct-object case - accusative vs. the subject case - nominative has been entirely obliterated in the idiolect. The accusative case has been narrowed here to the function of a prepositional case. The generalization of the N-A syncretism is less consistent in 78.05 but even here, instances of accusative forms are quite scarce.

Among the three above-indicated idiolects, 80.04 is the least consistent. Two conflicting processes are taking place here: a tendency towards generalization of the N-A syncretism and the trend towards generalizing the A-G syncretism co-occur. There are instances of the simultaneous application of both processes even in a single NP (e. g., *ma różowego <G> sukienka <N>*, [widzę] *jednego <G> dziewczynka <N>*; *ma białego <G> czapkę <A>* ... *i czerwona <N> czapkę <A>*; *ma czerwonego <G> sweter <N-A>*).

Instances of the $A > N$ and the $A > G$ substitution due to the disturbances in the animateness/personality category are attested by all the remaining idiolects¹⁹. Those forms compose, in fact, the majority of the incorrect realizations of accusative in the Polish diaspora texts (69% of cases of the accusative substitutes). The next major source of substitution of accusative by non-accusative forms is case errors in prepositional phrases (26% of the data).

It follows from the above considerations, that the two basic accusative substitution patterns are: $A > N$ - 54 instances and $A > G$ - 43 cases. The remaining substitutional patterns are by far less frequently represented in our data: $A > L$ - 12, $A > I$ - 6, and the exceptional pattern $A > D$ represented by a single appearance of a dative form instead of accusative. This data may be summarized in the following hierarchical order of the case forms appearing as accusative substitutes in the analyzed texts:

N, G, L, I, (D)

5. The case hierarchy revisited.

In par. 3, the case hierarchies NAGILD and NGAILD have been established on the basis of the analysis of the degree of integration of particular cases into the case systems of the PDLs. Now, after presenting in par. 4 the substitutional patterns characteristic of particular cases, we are in a position to look at the question of the case hierarchies from a different angle, viz. from the point of view of the degree of participation of particular case forms in the case substitution processes. Let us first review the above established hierarchies of substitutional patterns of particular cases:

dative:	A-G ²⁰ , p G, p A, N-A, A, (G, I)
locative:	N-A, G, A, I, N
instrumental:	N, N-A, G, A-G, (A, L)
genitive:	N-A, A, N, L, (D)
accusative:	N, G, L, I, (D)

The above schemes point, once more, to dative as being the weakest (most marginal) member of the case system: it is the case whose forms almost never substitute other cases. Instrumental appears as the next weakest case in the case-substitution hierarchy - its forms are attested marginally as substitutes of other cases (A, L and exceptionally - D). Locative forms appear relatively frequently as substitutes of (the prepositional) accusative and genitive²¹. Accusative forms may substitute any other case except nominative but they are never represented in the basic substitutional patterns of these cases. The position of genitive in the hierarchy of substituting cases seems to be stronger than that of accusative: the substitution by genitive forms is the basic one for accusative (along with the $A > N$ substitution) and dative (the two basic substitutional patterns here are: $D > p G$ and $D > A-G$), it is quite frequent for the instrumental case too. Nominative is clearly the strongest case in this hierarchy: its forms are the most frequent substitutes of accusative and instrumental; they appear too, as genitive and locative substitutes in our sample of the diaspora texts. The strong status of nominative in the case-substitution hierarchy becomes even more apparent if we take into consideration the fact that the substitution by the N-A syncretic forms is the most prominent one for genitive and locative.

More detailed information about the substitutional patterns attested in PDLs is shown in the table 1:

Table 1
The case by case-form substitution²²

	N-A	N	G	A	L	A-G	I	D	p+G	p+A
A		54	43		11		6	1		
G	62	9		14	8			1	3	
I	13	16	5	1	1	2				
L	38	3	17	14			5			
D	3		1	3		16	1		12	6
total	116	82	66	32	20	18	12	2	15	6

The data discussed in this paragraph support the case hierarchy established in par. 3. The only distinction is that the position of instrumental on the scale of the case-substitution hierarchy seems to be lower than that of locative. This low position of instrumental on the case-substitution scale is corroborated, too, by the data demonstrated in the table 1 which shows the overall frequency of instances of case substitutions in the analyzed texts of PDIs. Hence, the case hierarchy which may be established on the basis of the "substitutional power" of particular cases could be summarized by the following pattern with nominative as the most frequent and dative as the least frequent substituting cases.

NGALID

Some comments should be made in connection with the above case-substitution hierarchy:

The scarcity of appearances of instrumental forms as substitutes of other cases is, obviously, the result of the overall low text-frequency of instrumental. Instrumental is the next least frequent (after dative) case in our texts. It is attested by 155 instances (including 37 cases of incorrect realizations by non-instrumental case-forms) in the analyzed Polish diaspora texts. Locative appears in these texts almost twice as frequent (281 instances, including 77 appearances of non-locative substitutes). This distinction in the instrumental case vs. the locative case text-frequency (155 : 281) is in direct ratio to the difference in the amount of instrumental forms vs. the locative forms appearing as substitutes of other cases (12 : 21). Hence, taking into consideration the two discussed indicators of the case-hierarchy (the implicative order and the substitution capacity), we are ranking the first factor above the last one, concluding that (in agree-

ment with the implicative order) locative has the lower status than instrumental on the case-hierarchy scale. This hierarchical order of the two cases follows from the markedness relations within the case system with the locative case marked as the (obligatorily) prepositional case. Its status in the case system depends, then, ultimately on the subsystem of prepositional cases: the decay of the case oppositions within this subsystem results in disintegration of the locative case (see below).

It has been already indicated (see par. 4.5) that the status of accusative in the case systems of the PDIs has been strongly influenced by the disintegration of the grammatical category of animateness/personality in some of those idiolects. If we disregard the instances of the accusative substitutions which depend on the animateness/personality category, it turns out that the non-prepositional accusative almost never is substituted by other case-forms (there appear only 9 instances of such substitutions in our data²³) being the next strongest case (after nominative) in the subsystem of non-prepositional cases²⁴. Hence, the main case-system internal source of incorrect realizations of the accusative case are errors concerning the accusative PPs.

Let us, then, consider a bit closer the subsystem of prepositional cases as it is represented in the PDIs. The relevant data are summarized in the table 2:

Table 2
Case substitutions in prepositional cases

	C ²⁵	N-A	G	L	A	N	I	A-G	D
A	79		12	12			4		
G	201	12		6	3	5			
I	73		2			4	1	2	
L	204	38	17		14	3	5		
total	557	50	31	18	17	12	9	2	0

The data in the table 2 show that the two case forms which most frequently appear as substitutes for different cases are the N-A syncretic case-forms and the genitive forms. This strongly supports the results of our analyses of the markedness relations within the subsystem of prepositional cases summarized in Laskowski 1989, p. 214-216. We have claimed there

that genitive is the unmarked member of the subsystem of non-prepositional cases²⁶ which entails that, under the processes of disintegration of the category of case, genitive would tend to be generalized as a common prepositional case. Another case form which is expected to appear as one of the basic substitutes of various prepositional cases is the N-A syncretic form (or the nominative form of animate/personal nouns) - the most unmarked case forms representing the noun in language systems which have totally lost the category of case. The situation in the PDIs, as the table 2 shows, fits almost perfectly the above sketched theoretical expectations. There are, of course, instances of case substitutions going in different, often opposite directions. But this is the picture one may expect in the situation of the weakening of the case oppositions among prepositional cases when prepositions tend to become the only exponents of the functional distinctions existing among different prepositional phrases. The general trend towards generalizing the unmarked prepositional case (i. e. genitive) as the common prepositional case seems, nevertheless, apparent in the investigated diaspora idiolects.

6. Conclusions.

The analyzes of a reasonably large sample of Polish diaspora texts in Sweden shows that Ľ. Ďurovič's strong order of acquiring / losing the case system by SCr. bilingual children in Sweden almost perfectly fits the situation in Polish. The only systemic distinction between the SCr. and Pol. diaspora idiolects concerns accusative, which in some Polish idiolects is weakened to the status of an optional case or degraded to the status of a prepositional case. It has been, nevertheless, shown that this specific feature of a part of the PDIs is a case-system external phenomenon, dependent on the decay of the nominal category of animateness/personality.

Relevant is also the fact that this case implicative order is corroborated by the hierarchy of the "substitutional power" of particular cases, i. e. by their capacity to appear as substitutes of other cases.

The fact, that the data from two different Slavic languages, i. e. SCr. and Polish, yield the same picture of the case-system acquiring/losing processes, shows that the pattern attested in the SCr. and Polish diaspora idiolects may be considered common to all Slavic languages. The pattern itself is clearly dependent on the internal structure of the case system in Slavic, viz. on the network of markedness relations among the members of

the case system. The degree of functional marking of particular cases defines their position on the implicative order scale and the "substitutional power" scale. The more marked is a case the lower is its position on the two scales. I. e. the more marked cases tend to be later acquired by a child than the less marked ones. In the process of the case-system decay, they would undergo disintegration already in the early phases of this process. At the same time, they would rather exceptionally substitute other, less marked cases in idiolects with the weakened category of case.

In the above considerations, no systemic attempt has been made to thoroughly analyze the language-system internal factors which trigger disintegration processes of the case system. Nevertheless, I have pointed above to some of the system-internal circumstances which influence the development of the category of case in the situation of bilingualism. We may now suggest a rough preliminary classification of the case-system destroying factors which have been observed in the investigated Polish diaspora idiolects. First, the distinction between the case-system internal and the case-system external factors should be made. The first ones consist in obliteration of some case oppositions to the effect that case forms representing distinct cases tend to be used more or less at random and/or the most marked case(s) become optional or totally effaced. In our data, these type of factors are responsible, e. g., for the case substitutions within the subsystem of prepositional cases, as well as for the obliteration of the dative case.

The case-system external factors attested by our data are of two different types: a) changes in other nominal categories, viz. weakening (obliteration) of the category of animateness/personality which results in the above discussed changes in the status of accusative within the case system; b) changes of syntactic rules (accusative instead of genitive in negated sentences and in the context of a numeral, the predicative nominative instead of the predicative instrumental). All these case-system external changes lead to modifications in the functional characteristics of particular cases. The general trend of these modifications is that the less marked cases broaden their functional scope on the expense of the more marked ones. The marked cases become even more marked which opens the door to further weakening of their status in the case system.

Co-occurrence of all these case-system internal and external factors is obviously triggered by the general weakening of the native-language system

in the situation of bilingualism with the dominating typologically different language of the social environment. The dominating language itself is one more source of case errors in the diaspora idiolects (Swedish calques in these idiolects) but the impact of this immediate foreign influence on the case system of the PDLs is rather modest.

Notes

- ¹ The present analysis is a part of a larger project (POLSVE) started at the Department of Slavic Languages of the University of Gothenburg in 1988. The aim of the project is to investigate trends in the development of the native (Polish) language of Polish diaspora children in Sweden under conditions of the Swedish-Polish bilingualism. The basic data comprise records of 120 Polish texts (1500-2700 words per text) representing individual idiolects of 5-15 year old children of Polish immigrants in Sweden as well as the results of the inquiry of the socio-linguistic situation of these children. The data have been collected in 1988-1989.
- ² N - nominative, A - accusative, G - genitive, L - locative, I - instrumental, D - dative, V - vocative. Vocative (which, strictly speaking, is not a case in the proper sense of the term) will be disregarded in our forthcoming analysis.
- ³ The number in brackets indicates the amount of idiolects representing a given case pattern.
- ⁴ Laskowski (1986) presents a more extensive discussion of case-statistic relations in standard Polish spoken texts.
- ⁵ The prepositional instrumental and the locative case should be interpreted as context-dependent surface representations of a single non-directional locative case within the subsystem of prepositional cases (Laskowski 1989, 214).
- ⁶ The first two figures indicate the year of the birth of a child, the last two - the individual number of a child within a sample of children born a given year.

- 7 Symbols in brackets indicate optional cases, i.e. cases whose status within the case-system of a given idiolect has been considerably weakened.
- 8 Further on I shall use the term "case" for case-functions as opposed to the term "case-form" denoting realizations of a given function in an idiolect.
- 9 The relative stability of the dative enclitics in idiolects of Yugoslavian children in Sweden has also been noted by Đurovič (1983, 53-54).
- 10 There are two instances of the orthothonic dative form *jemu* instead of the enclitic *mu* (78.01 and 77.08) in the texts.
- 11 In fact, the only two non-enclitic dative forms represented in our texts are: *państwu* 'to you, the honorific form' (80.05) and *mamie* 'to (my) mother' (79.03).
- 12 Further on, we shall use this type of notation of case substitution schemes. The symbol which appears before ">" indicates the case function, the symbol after ">" indicates the case form representing this function in a text. Hence, the formula $X > Y$ should be interpreted as follows: "the case function X is represented by the case form Y ". The letter p appearing in some formulas denotes a preposition.
- 13 The linear order indicates the decreasing (from right to left) frequency of a given substitutional pattern; the symbols in brackets indicate exceptional case substitutions.
- 14 I am here disregarding 5 instances of locative prepositionless NPs (the $p\ L > L$ substitution), entirely unacceptable in Standard Polish.
- 15 It is worth stressing here that the idiolect in question is a clear instance of the decay of an already acquired case system. The eleven years old boy speaking this idiolect is born in Poland. He came to Sweden as a 7 year old child, i. e. at the age when the morphological system of an individual is fully established.
- 16 Notice that locative, too, has been weakened to the status of an optional case in both these idiolects.

- 17 Notice that genitive is well preserved in these idiolects.
- 18 There are only 3 instances of accusative forms (disregarding the Standard Polish N-A syncretic forms) in the text representing this idiolect: *jego* (masc. pers.), *księdza* (masc. pers.), *gazetę* (fem.) as opposed to 23 instances of the A > N substitution (including 7 appearances of feminine NPs).
- 19 With the exclusion of 78.00 and 80.03.
- 20 Bold characters indicate the basic substitutional patterns; the symbols in brackets show the marginal substitutional patterns for particular case.
- 21 The I > L substitutional pattern is represented by one instance only in our data.
- 22 The symbols in the first column indicate the substituted cases, the symbols in the first row show the substituting case forms.
- 23 There are 5 cases of the substitution of the non-prepositional accusative by genitive, 2 - by instrumental and one-fold instances of the substitution by dative and (the non-prepositional!) locative.
- 24 See in this connection Laskowski 1989, 216-223, where the network of markedness relations within the subsystem of non-prepositional cases has been discussed.
- 25 The symbol C indicates correct realizations of particular cases. Instances of improper preposition uses and the substitution of prepositional phrase by the respective prepositionless case-form are included.
- 26 The reasoning presented in that paper runs as follows: "The fact that the accusative on the one hand and the instrumental-locative on the other are connected with the same set of [spatial] prepositions shows without any doubt that the semantic opposition of the directive vs. locative meaning is determined by the systemic function of the cases themselves. The prepositions governing these cases are neutral with respect to the directivity/ locativity opposition. The relation between the preposition and the case in genitive PPs is obviously distinct - it is

the preposition which is the exponent of the locative and the directive ablative or adlative meanings of a genitive prepositional phrase. The genitive itself is neutral with respect to the directivity/locativity and the ablativity/adlativity features. We may conclude, then, that genitive is the unmarked case within the marked subsystem of prepositional cases." (Laskowski 1989, 215).

References

- Đurovič, Ĺ.: 1983, 'The Case Systems in the Language of Diaspora Children', *Lingua in Diaspora* (= *Slavica Lundensia* 9), Lund, 21-94.
- Jakobson, R.: 1936, 'Beitrag zur allgemeine Kasuslehre', *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 6, 240-288.
- Jakobson, R., 1958: 'Морфологические наблюдения над славянским склонением', *American Contributions to the 4th International Congress of Slavists*, s'Gravenhage, 127-156.
- Kuryłowicz, J.: 1949, 'Le problème du classement des cas', *BPTJ* 9, 2-43.
- Laskowski, R.: 1986, 'Statystyczna struktura gramatycznej kategorii przypadka w polskim tekście mówionym', *Zeszyty Naukowe UJ DCCCXV, Prace Językoznawcze* 84, 119-140.
- Laskowski, R.: 1989, 'Markedness and the Category of Case in Polish', in: *Markedness in Synchrony and Diachrony (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 39)*, Mišeska Tomić, O. (ed.), Berlin & New York, 207-226.