The Gypsies are the largest minority in Hungary. It is estimated that today nearly one fifth of primary school children are of Gypsy origin. My presentation focuses on language socialization processes of the Gypsy communities in Hungary.

My research aims to explore the mechanisms used for language socialization in early childhood education, in pre-school, and in primary school. This grants us the opportunity to examine native language competence as well as communicative competence, which can determine the Roma children's school performance. The current picture shows that the Hungarian education system has been unable to adapt and relate to the inherent disadvantages of Roma children, while the 2015 Pisa Reports indicate that one fourth of fifteen-year-olds in Hungary are functionally illiterate. The results of my study may impact on improving this trend so that the rate of analphabetism in Hungary would not rise further. I study adult-children and children-children communication from the preverbal era till the end of primary school education. I avoid the traditional sociological research methodology, my approach is of a constructivist anthropological one which focuses on the socialization processes of the Gipsy linguistic communities.

I analyze the data according to the following (sociolinguistic) aspects:
(1) Speech modes in the school vs. community language practice,
(2) The role of language attitude(s) in individual and social identity,
(3) The relationship between identity, inter-language comprehension, and superdiversity.

The talk will address the language socialization of two different Hungarian Gypsy communities, both monolingual and multilingual, with the aim of demonstrating similarities and differences between the heterogeneous Gypsy communities. The results of this research will contribute to the understanding of the factors forming ethnicity and identity in the Gypsy communities in light of language socialization.
Following the approach of studies such as Rothstein (2004), I define a secondary predicate (SP) as a predicative expression that conveys information about the subject or the object, in addition to the information given by the main predicate. Accordingly, contrary to what is suggested by studies such as Rapoport (1993), I do not consider small clauses, causatives, and adverbials to be SPs.

Crosslinguistic Studies discuss mainly three kinds of SPs: subject oriented depictives, as in the English sentence (1) below, object-oriented depictives, as in (2), and resultatives (3):

(1) John drove the car drunk. (subject-oriented depictive)
(2) Mary ate the fish raw. (object-oriented depictive)
(3) Sharon painted the house red. (resultative)

The APs ‘drunk’, ‘raw’, and ‘red’ in these sentences are considered to be SPs of their respective sentences, as they convey some information about the subject or the object but are not the main predicates, which are ‘drove’, ‘ate’, and ‘painted’ in (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

As noted by Rothstein (2004), SPs are characteristically APs. However, it is well acknowledged that while Hebrew has AP depictives, it does not have AP resultatives, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (4) below:

(4) *Sharon cav’a et ha-bayit adom.

Hebrew must resort to other kinds of phrases for resultative SPs. E.g., the SP ‘red’ in the English sentence (3) can be depicted by a PP in Hebrew: be- adom ‘in red’.

In this paper, I will show that both Biblical and Modern Hebrew make use of converbs, i.e., verbs deprived of temporal features, for secondary predication. In particular, I will show that apart from APs, which can be used only for depictives, Biblical Hebrew (BH) makes use of the infinitive-absolute and Modern Hebrew (MH) of the Benoni for all three kinds of secondary predication, including resultatives.

Harbour (1999) considers the infinitive absolute (IA) in BH to be a converb form deprived of temporal and agreement features. As such, it is found in a number of constructions. In this paper, I will show that what is usually referred to as ‘the double infinitive absolute construction’ is used for secondary predication. Example (5) below illustrates:
In addition to its first occurrence in the finite form *wayyiqtol*, the verb ‘strike’ in this verse appears again in IA, conjoined with the verb ‘wound’, also in IA.

A number of analyses have been suggested for this construction. My contention is that it is used for SP. E.g., the SP in our verse, I believe, is a resultative: The man struck the prophet and as a result the prophet was wounded.

Modern Hebrew (MH) lost the IA as a productive form. For verbal SPs, MH makes use of the Benoni, which may be considered a converb, as it patterns more like nouns and adjectives rather than verbs in the past or future tense. The example in (6) illustrates:

(6) *Satiti et kol habakbuk *rek/ merokent oto.*

‘I drank the bottle *empty/ emptying it.’

The use of the adjective *rek* ‘empty’ is ungrammatical in this sentence as it functions as a resultative SP, but the Benoni *merokent* ‘emptying’ is fine.
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Some Questions in the Theory of Antonymy

There exist several competing approaches to antonymy (e.g., Bierwisch 1989, Heim 2007, Sassoon 2010). The main goal of this talk is to make further headway towards adjudicating between them. After presenting evidence against approaches that assume that so-called ‘negative’ antonyms like “slow” introduce a negative operator (cf., Heim 2007, Büring
2007), we turn to approaches that do not make this assumption (e.g., Rullmann 1995, Kennedy 2001, Sassoon 2010). We compare them partly by investigating a variety of phenomena that have been put forward as supporting the negative operator approach.