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Objectives & Introduction

- **Generalization:** V is high, so stress is on the Complement
  - WA differs from TU&PA for sub-sentential stress
- **Commonalities and prosodic differences:**
  - All 3 are SOV, rich Def marking and DOM
  - WA differs from TU&PA for sub-sentential stress

**Background on languages & methodology**
- **Commonalities and prosodic differences:**
  - All 3 are SOV, rich Def marking and DOM
- **Word Compound Phrase:**
  - WA: (don-a-kan) ‘this book’
  - Armenian: (kirk-a-kan) ‘library’
- **Semantics:**
  - WA keeps stress on definite O, while TU does too, but PA doesn’t
  - Show that difference is not due to special semantics or pragmatics
  - Arbitrarily about being a morphologically definite direct object
  - PS: TU-PA have overt specific indefinites, but WA doesn’t

**Definite objects & variation**


**Indefinite objects**

- **What’s the word order?**
  - A lot of debate on the default word order of IO & DO in the 3 lects
- **Word Order:**
  - IO-DO vs DO-IO depends on definiteness and information structure [1, 4]
  - 2 indefinites: DO-IO preferred in PA, while IO-DO in WA-TU (but works)
- **Stress leftmost argument in PA, rightmost in WA-TU [7].

**What I showed:**
- Distribution of stress in WA is like TU, not like PA
- Def-DOs are stressed in WA (not PA) despite syntactic and semantic similarities
- Stress is rightmost (preverbal) in WA (like TU), while it’s leftmost in PA

**What I didn’t show:**
- Adverbs: WA low adverbs don’t have exactly same stress + ordering like PA or TU
- More fun with ditransitives.

**What I don’t know:**
- Intransitives
- Eastern Armenian (which is more PA-like)

**Syntax and irreducibility**

- Near-animality for 3 lects that Def-DOs is higher than Bare DO [8, 3, 5]
- Arbitrary parameter among stressing Def-DOs (cf. discourse transitivity) [2]
- Different ranking for WA (TU) vs. PA
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