NICKLAS N. B. ORANEN (Helsinki)

DIFFERENTIAL OBJECT MARKING IN TVER KARELIAN

Abstract. This study provides a descriptive account of differential object marking (DOM) in the (endangered) Tver Karelian variety of the Karelian language. DOM in Tver Karelian is primarily based on the referential boundedness of a verb phrase, which in turn is determined according to the divisibility and cumulativity of the referents of the verbal and nominal predicates of the verb phrase in question. In addition to boundedness, DOM in Tver Karelian is also affected by the word class of a given object (noun or pronoun), as well as verbal morphology and semantics.

Keywords: Tver Karelian, Russian, DOM, differential object marking, argument marking.

1. Introduction

Tver Karelian is an endangered variety of the Karelian language spoken in the Tver Oblast in northwestern Russia. Like other Finnic languages, Tver Karelian displays a phenomenon known as differential object marking (DOM), whereby the morphosyntactic marking of direct objects is determined by certain pragmatic, semantic, and/or morphosyntactic parameters. The term was originally coined by Bossong (1985) in relation to Persian, for which he observed that object marking is based on parameters such as definiteness and specificity. In subsequent decades, the phenomenon has received much attention, both from a typological point of view and in the form of case studies. Animacy and definiteness have been shown to play important roles in DOM in a large number of languages, and these parameters often figure prominently in discussions of DOM, especially in the wake of a widely cited paper by Aissen (2003). However, although this is the case for many languages, the effects of these parameters should by no means be considered universal (see, e.g., Bickel, Witzlack-Makarevich 2008; Sinnemäki 2014). Indeed, a multitude of other parameters involved in DOM have been attested, but have hitherto received less attention, including topicality, information structure, word class, clause type, etc. (for an overview, see Witzlack-Makarevich, Seržant 2018). This case study supports these recent findings, as neither animacy nor definiteness plays a role in the DOM of Tver Karelian. On the contrary, DOM in Tver Karelian is governed

primarily by the nature of the course of an event and the quantitative determinacy of an object, parameters which will be discussed jointly in terms of boundedness. Other parameters such as word class, verbal morphology, and verbal semantics also affect direct object marking to varying degrees. Unlike many of its Karelian and other Finnic relatives, Tver Karelian is conspicuously underdescribed and linguistic studies of the language are scarce. This study is thus a rare contribution to the research of the language in question.

The concept of boundedness was originally formulated by Kiparsky (1998) for Finnish, and as will become evident in the subsequent sections, Tver Karelian and Finnish are largely similar in terms of their DOM. The ancestors of Tver Karelians originally inhabited the central parts of what is today known as the Republic of Karelia, but emigrated southeast towards the heartland of Russia following the Ingrian War between Sweden and Russia 1610—1617 and eventually settled in Tver Oblast (see, e.g., Lallukka 1996 for a historical overview). Prior to the emigration their language formed part of a Finnish-Karelian dialect continuum stretching from the Gulf of Bothnia in the west to the White Sea and Lake Onega in the east. Following the emigration all contact between Tver Karelian and other Finnish and Karelian varieties virtually ceased, yet its DOM has remained remarkably stable. True, Russian appears to have had some influence on DOM in the language, but this is hardly surprising considering the long history of contact between the languages, particularly in the last four centuries, during which the Tver Karelian-speaking area has constituted a linguistic enclave in an otherwise Russian-speaking area approximately 200 kilometres from Moscow. As a result, most — if not all — speakers of Tver Karelian are today also bilingual in Russian.

This study is based primarily on data recorded by the author in the Lichoslavľskij and Rameškovskij districts of Tver Oblast during May 2017 and May 2018, and secondarily on data obtained from Virtaranta's (1990) chrestomathy of Tver Karelian, which is representative of the same area. The latter type of data is explicitly marked by the shorthand notion "Virt." in parentheses. Other dialects of Tver Karelian, notably Vesjegonsk and Djorža, will not be discussed further due to unavailability of data.

2. DOM in the Finnic languages

DOM is a well-known phenomenon in Finnic linguistics, in which discussions have often targeted the major standard languages Finnish and Estonian. Despite the focus on Finnish and Estonian, a few studies have focused on DOM in a broader Finnic perspective (e.g. Kont 1963; Larsson 1981; 1983; Lees 2015), and a few case studies of minor Finnic languages have been published as well (e.g. Ritter 1989 on Veps; Tveite 2004 on Livonian). DOM is not exclusive to the Finnic branch of the Uralic languages, but has been attested in all branches of the language family, including the Saami languages (e.g. Kroik 2016 on South Saami), the Mordvinic languages (e.g. Grünthal 2008; 2016 on Erzya), the Permic languages (e.g. Klumpp 2012 on Komi), the Ugric languages (e.g. Virtanen 2013; 2014 on Eastern Mansi), and the Samoyedic languages (e.g. Wratil 2018). The main objective of this study is to provide an outline of DOM in Tver Karelian, and not to provide

a comparison to — nor a comprehensive discussion of — DOM in other Uralic languages. However, due to the close genealogical relationship between Tver Karelian and other Finnic languages, a brief overview of DOM in Finnish and Estonian is provided below.

Finnish and Estonian grammarians traditionally distinguish between total objects and partial objects (in Finnish *totaaliobjekti* and *partitiiviobjekti*, in Estonian *täissihitis* and *osasihitis*). Partial objects are marked by the partitive case, while total objects are marked by the nominative or accusative case in Finnish, or by the nominative or genitive case in Estonian. Total objects are traditionally associated with the perfective aspect and quantitative determinacy, while partial objects are associated with the imperfective aspect and quantitative indeterminacy, as well as negated clauses. The latter three parameters are also highlighted as underlying factors motivating partitive object marking by the normative Finnish grammar (VISK) and Estonian language handbook (EKK), as summarised in (1a—c) below.

Characteristics of the partitive object in Finnish (VISK §930)
and Estonian (EKK §M53)

1. (a) Object of a negative clause (syntactic or by interpretation),
   (b) object of a clause characterised by the imperfective aspect,
   (c) quantitative indefinite/non-specific object.

The parameters in (1) are also representative of parameters involved in the DOM of many other Finnic languages, including Karelian, but few attempts at unifying the parameters into a single framework have been widely adopted. Kiparsky (1998) provides one such framework for Finnish, in which he jointly explains the parameters in (1a—c) in relation to the b o u n d e d n e s s of the overall verb phrase (VP). This approach is adopted in this study in a slightly simplified version. In brief, the boundedness of a VP is determined by the referential boundedness of its predicates: its head (verb) and argument (direct object). If either of these predicates is referentially unbounded, the VP is unbounded, too. Finally, if the VP is unbounded, its direct object (DO) is marked by the partitive case. The boundedness of a VP's predicates (i.e. verb and DO) is determined according to their divisibility, and/or cumulativity. Unbounded verbs and DOs are referentially divisible and/or cumulative, while bounded verbs and DOs are non-divisible and non-cumulative.

On the one hand, a verb is regarded as unbounded if it denotes an action that can somehow be divided or accumulated, for instance general, abstract, or habitual actions: 'I often go to the shop', i.e. again and again. The same holds true for actions that have no clearly defined temporal boundaries, e.g. actions that do not reach an end point: 'I am drinking a glass of water', but the glass is not yet empty. If actions remain unfinished altogether, they can be considered unbounded, too. On the other hand, a verb is regarded as bounded if it denotes an action that cannot be divided or accumulated, but is completed in its entirety, for instance: 'I went to the shop', i.e. the destination was reached. Thus, unboundedness is often — but not always (Kiparsky 1998 : 16) — closely associated with atelicity (or irresultativity), while boundedness is often associated with telicity (or resultativity). The divisible or cumulative nature of a verb can in many cases be tested according to, e.g., gradability and degree: it is possible 'to love

somebody a lot/more' (unbounded), but not *'to kill somebody a lot/more' (bounded).

Likewise, a DO is divisible and/or cumulative if it can readily be divided or accumulated, without affecting the intended semantic meaning of its referent. Thus, if the meaning '(a quantitatively indeterminate amount of) trees' is suggested by a particular context, the DO 'trees' is divisible and cumulative in the sense that it can be divided into a smaller number of trees, or accumulated to include more trees, without affecting the aforementioned meaning. The DO is therefore regarded as unbounded. In contrast, if the meaning '(a quantitatively determinate amount of) trees' is intended, the DO 'trees' is regarded as bounded, as any division or accumulation would affect the intended semantic meaning. The same is true for mass nouns like 'soup': e.g., if it refers to a quantitatively indeterminate amount being eaten, it can be regarded as unbounded; but if it refers to a quantitatively determinate amount of soup being eaten, e.g. the amount contained by a bowl, it can be regarded as bounded. Evidently, the nature of verbs and DOs and their boundedness ultimately depends on pragmatics and wider context.

The above-described principles, originally formulated for Finnish, can by and large be mapped unto Tver Karelian, as also noted in the introduction (see Section 1) and in the conclusion (see Section 8). In fact, boundedness is likely relevant in relation to DOM throughout the Finnic languages. For the sake of clarity, the principles are summarised and defined in (2) below, loosely based on Kiparsky (1998).

Boundedness and DO marking in Tver Karelian

2. (a) A predicate (P) is unbounded if it is divisible and cumulative.
   (b) A verb phrase (VP) is unbounded if it has an unbounded P.
   (c) The DO of an unbounded VP is marked by the partitive case.

Note again that both the verb and the DO of a VP are predicates. In other words, both the verb and the DO of a VP might be either unbounded or bounded, as already described in detail above. If at least one of the predicates (i.e. the verb or the DO) is unbounded, the VP is unbounded. Note also that only the DO marking of unbounded VPs is explicitly mentioned in (2), and not the DO marking of bounded VPs. In both Finnish and Tver Karelian, the DO marking of bounded VPs is either accusative o r nominative, depending on, e.g., the finiteness and mood of the verb. This will be discussed in more detail in Sections 4 and 5.

3. DOM in Tver Karelian

Tver Karelian possesses thirteen grammatical cases, three of which are involved in DOM: the nominative, the accusative, and the partitive. The DO of most verbs can appear in any of these three cases depending on the boundedness of the overall verb phrase, as discussed in more detail in the following Section 4. The DO of so-called intrinsically unbounded verbs is always marked by the partitive case. This phenomenon is also found in, e.g., Finnish, and does not belong to DOM per se, due to the invariance in the marking of the DO of the verbs in question. The phenomenon — henceforth known as intrinsic partitive object marking (IPOM) — is never-

theless briefly discussed in Section 7 to provide a more exhaustive account of the overall DO marking in Tver Karelian.

Singular nouns and all personal pronouns are morphologically unmarked in the nominative case, whereas plural nouns are characterised by the plural marker *-t* in the nominative. The partitive case is generally marked by the morphological ending *-(d)a/-(d)ä*, although the first and second personal singular pronouns employ the special ending *-lma*. The accusative case is subject to more variation. For singular nouns and singular personal pronouns the same morphological ending, *-n,* is employed for both genitive and accusative case marking; while the accusative in plural nouns is identical to the nominative. For plural personal pronouns the morphological ending *-n* is reserved for the genitive alone, while the accusative is marked by the ending *-t*, virtually identical to the plural marker *-t* in nominative nouns. This so-called *t*-accusative is also found among the plural personal pronouns in the closely related Finnic varieties Valdaj Karelian (Palmeos 1962 : 46), Maaselkä Karelian (Ojajärvi 1950 : 111), and Ingrian (Laanest 1986 : 120); and among all pronouns in Finnish and Northern Karelian (Zaikov 2002 : 107). It is absent in Estonian and Livonian (Tveite 2004 : 12f.). In summary, the accusative case is characterised by the endings *-n* (singular nouns and singular personal pronouns) and *-t* (plural nouns and plural personal pronouns), and glossed as such (ACC) when marking the DO of a clause. When the same endings are used in genitive constructions and to mark subjects, respectively, they are glossed correspondingly (i.e. GEN and NOM).

The four above-mentioned cases — nominative, accusative, genitive, and partitive — and their respective endings are illustrated in (3) and (4) below. In Finnic linguistics the accusative is often merged with the genitive (in the singular) and with the nominative (in the plural) for nouns, due to their identical endings, as also indicated by the borders in (4). Nevertheless, the distinction between the nominative, accusative, and genitive cases is retained in this study, as the cases are clearly distinct among plural personal pronouns in Tver Karelian, as evident in (3).

3. **Case marking on pronouns in Tver Karelian**

	Singular			Plural		
	1	**2**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**3**
Nominative	*mie*	*šie*	*hiän*	*müö*	*tüö*	*hüö*
Accusative	*miun*	*šiun*	*hänen*	*miät*	*tiät*	*hiät*
Genitive				*miän*	*tiän*	*hein*
Partitive	*milma*	*šilma*	*händä*	*meidä*	*teidä*	*heidä*

4. **Case marking on nouns (e.g. *kala* 'fish') in Tver Karelian**

	Singular	Plural
Nominative	*kala*	*kalat*
Accusative	*kalan*	
Genitive		*kaloin*
Partitive	*kalua*	*kaloida*

When the partitive endings *-a* and *-ä* are added to nouns ending in a vowel, productive morphophonological processes of diphthongisation cause changes in either the partitive ending, the final vowel of a noun, or in both. The diphthongisation occurs if a noun ends in the vowel *o* (5a), *ö* (5b), *u* (5c), *ü* (5d), *a* (5e), *ä* (5f), or *i* (5g). These processes explain the large number of allomorphs of the partitive case ending found in the examples throughout the paper.

	Nom.	**Part.**	
5. a.	*rebo*	*rebuo*	'fox'
b.	*löttö*	*löttüö*	'frog'
c.	*čuaju*	*čuajuo*	'tea'
d.	*käbü*	*käbüö*	'coniferous cone'
e.	*kniiga*	*kniigua*	'book'
f.	*külä*	*küliä*	'village'
g.	*perti*	*pertie*	'room, house'

This study investigates DOM in indicative clauses (Section 4), as well as in imperative clauses and clauses with non-finite verbal forms (Section 5). Clauses with time expressions resembling DOs are not investigated in detail, as these tend to entail accusative case marking in indicative clauses (6a), and nominative case marking in most non-indicative clauses, e.g. in imperative clauses (6b). Variation in the semantic meaning of verbs according to DO marking is not investigated heredue to scarcity of data; e.g. *kuččuo* 'to call by name' (with partitive DO marking) or 'to call for' (with accusative DO marking). Such variation can be found in other Finnic languages as well, e.g. in Finnish. For the same reason of lack of data, the DO marking of phrasal verbs will not receive further attention, although it can be mentioned that these objects generally seem to involve partitive case marking (7), like in, e.g. Estonian (Lees 2015 : 42). Other factors potentially influencing DOM not investigated in this study are briefly discussed in the conclusion (Section 8).

6. a. *Vuota-mma k o d v a z e -n*   b. *Vuotta-kkua k o d v a n e*!
     wait.PRS-1PL w h i l e-ACC   wait-IMP.2PL w h i l e.NOM
     'We wait for a while'   'Wait for a while!'

7. *Anna   šuu-da   häne-llä*!
   give.IMP.2SG mouth-PART 3sg-ADE
   'Give him/her a kiss!' (lit. 'Give him/her a mouth!')

Finally, considering the large number of Russian loanwords found in the examples used in this study, it is worth mentioning that the lexical aspect of Russian verbs is generally not transferred into Tver Karelian when borrowed. In Russian the majority of verbs have distinct imperfective and perfective verbal forms, e.g. строить 'to build' (impf.) and построить 'to build' (pf.), respectively. The former is used to indicate atelic (irresultative) actions, and the latter telic (resultative) actions. According to the principles pointed out in Section 2, the verbal forms can roughly be considered unbounded and bounded, respectively. When Russian verbs are borrowed into Tver Karelian, however, generally only one of the forms is borrowed, and the particular borrowed verb form can be used for both unbounded and bounded actions. For instance, although the Tver Karelian verb *strojie*

'to build' (sometimes also pronounced *srojie*) reflects the Russian imperfective verb *строить*, the verb *strojie* can be used for both bounded and unbounded actions, as illustrated in Example (8) below.

4. Boundedness and DO marking

The following discussion of boundedness applies to most verbs in Tver Karelian with the notable exception of verbs with IPOM (Section 7). As the definitions in (2) in Section 2 suggest, it is not possible to discuss the role of a VP's verb independently of the role of its DO, and vice versa. If either of these is unbounded, the DO is marked by the partitive case. This interdependency is evident in Examples (8) and (9) below. In Example (8) the DO *külü* 'bath house, sauna' is quantitatively determinate, and the verb refers to a completed action. Consequently, both the DO and the verb are bounded, hence the accusative DO marking. In Example (9) the DO *talo* 'house' also refers to a quantitatively determinate entity, yet it is marked by the partitive case due to the unboundedness of verb 'to build' which here denotes an ongoing process (the angle brackets indicate Russian code-switching).

8. *A   šidä   k ü l ü - n   papa   stroj-i   i   ruv-i-ma*
   and then s a u n a-ACC father.NOM build-PST.3SG and begin-PST-1PL
   külü-h   kävö-mä-h,   <po-čornamu>
   sauna-ILL go-INF(MA)-ILL <in the black manner>
   'And then dad built a sauna and we began to use it, in the "black" manner'

9. *Hiän   stroji-u   t a l u - o   šielä*
   3SG.NOM build.PRS-3SG h o u s e-PART there
   'He is building a/the house over there'

On the one hand, if the verb in (9) had been in the past tense (i.e. *stroji*) and the DO remained unchanged, the verb would still be unbounded: 'he was building a house over there'. On the other hand, however, if the verb's DO were marked by the accusative case (i.e. *talon*), the verb would be regarded as bounded, in the sense that the process of building is seen as reaching an end point, e.g. 'he is finishing building a/the house.' Often this would imply a future prospect, for instance 'he will build (and finish) a/the house.' With regard to future prospect, consider the two elicited clauses in (10). The first of these clauses (10a) would be used in most contexts involving a purchase, due to the semantics of the verb 'to buy', which generally implies a bounded action. However, the speaker in question commented that the second clause (10b) could for example be used when describing a situation in which one haggles for a better price. In other words, the process of buying would be considered ongoing, and not to have been concluded yet.

10. a. *Hiän   ošta-u   t r a k t o r a - n*
       3SG.NOM buy.PRS-3SG t r a c t o r-ACC
       'He buys a tractor (i.e. in the near or far future)'

    b. *Hiän   ošta-u   t r a k t o r u - a*
       3SG.NOM buy.PRS-3SG t r a c t o r-PART
       'He buys a tractor (i.e. in the process of doing so)'

The same principles of boundedness apply to plural objects, as illustrated in Examples (11) and (12) below. In Example (11) the verb is clearly bounded, and so is the DO, as it refers to the quantitatively determinate number of exams that the speaker in question had passed. As a result, the DO 'exam' is marked by the accusative case, which is virtually identical to the plural nominative case (as discussed in Section 3). In Example (12) the verb is unbounded, denoting an action with no particular end point, and so is the DO, as it refers to a quantitatively indeterminate number of gloves.

11. *Mie   hüviin zdaič-i-n   i g z a m e n a-t i   miu-n*
    1SG.NOM well   pass-PST-1SG e x a m-ACC   and 1SG-ACC
    <na feľdšerku> pan-dih
    <as a nurse>   put-PP/3PL
    'I passed the exams well and I was put [to work] as a nurse'

12. *Meilä   ol-i   žemmuone   masterskoi,   missä nieglo-ttih*
    1PL-ADE be-PST.3SG kind.of.NOM workshop.NOM where knit-PP/3PL
    p e r č a t k o-i-d a, šielä ruado.
    g l o v e-PL-PART   there work.PST.3SG
    'We had this kind of workshop, where they knitted gloves, [and] there [she] worked'

Note the translation in Example (12) above, where the verbal form *nieglot-tih* is translated as 'they knitted'. Historically, the ending *-ttih* and the corresponding ending *-tah/-täh* in the present tense (both composed of the passive marker *-ta/-tä* and illative case marker *-h*, in addition to the past tense marker *-i* in the former ending) marked passives only (or impersonals with regard to intransitive verbs), but in the modern language it has even become the default third person plural marker. By contrast, the cognate endings *-ttiin* and *-taan/-tään* are used for the first person plural in colloquial Finnish, in addition to their passive and impersonal use. Consequently, the semantic reading 'gloves were (being) knitted' is also possible, as the context in the clause provides no further clues (and neither does the wider context). In spite of its diachronic development, however, this peculiar marking does not affect DOM neither in active clauses with third person plural verbal marking (13), nor in passive clauses, in which passive subjects are treated exactly like DOs in active clauses (14). Finnish behaves in a slightly different manner, as the case marking of noun subjects in passive clauses varies between the nominative and the partitive case, not the accusative and the partitive case. Ludic and North Karelian are similar to Finnish in this respect (Ojajärvi 1950 : 36, 108). The case marking of personal pronoun subjects in Finnish passive clauses, however, varies between the accusative and partitive case, like in Tver Karelian. Compare the Finnish translation in (15) to the original Tver Karelian clause in (14). The third person singular DO pronoun is in the accusative case in both clauses. The DO noun 'father', however, is marked by the accusative case in the Tver Karelian clause, but by the nominative case in the Finnish translation.

13. *Solhoza-šta   uji-ttih,   p r o i z v o d s t v e n n o i-n   r u a v o-n*
    agriculture-ABL leave-3PL i n d u s t r i a l-ACC   w o r k-ACC
    löüve-ttih
    find-PP/3PL
    '[They] stopped working in agriculture, [and] found industrial work'

14. *T u a t o - n   ote-ttih   voina-h, <v 42 godu> ote-ttih   h ä n e - n,*
    f a t h e r-ACC take-PP/3PL war-ILL <in '42>   take-PP/3PL 3SG-ACC
    a <v 43>   h ä n e - n tape-ttih   <pod Leningradom>
    and <in '43> 3SG-ACC   kill-PP/3PL <in [the siege of] Leningrad>
    'Father was taken to war, he was taken in '42, and in '43 he was killed
    in the siege of Leningrad'

15. *I s ä   ote-ttiin sota-an, vuon-na 42 h ä n e - t ote-ttiin, ja*
    f a t h e r.NOM take-PP war-ILL year-ESS 42 3SG-ACC   take-PP and
    vuon-na 43 h ä n e - t tape-ttiin Leningradi-n   piiritykse-ssä   [Finnish]
    year-ESS 43 3 S G-ACC kill-PP   Leningrad-ACC siege-INE
    'Father was taken to war, he was taken in '42, and in '43 he was killed
    in the siege of Leningrad'

The examples presented so far have contained countable nouns as DOs,
i.e. 'sauna', 'house', 'exam', 'glove', 'oven', and 'father'. Nevertheless, the same
principles also apply to mass nouns, e.g. *rokka* 'soup' and *vezi* 'water'. In
Example (16) below the DO 'water' is bounded, as it refers to a quantita-
tively determinate amount of water contained in a tub. The verb, too, is
bounded, referring to the whole process of pouring, from start to end. In
Example (17) the DO is unbounded, referring to a quantitatively indetermi-
nate amount of tea, and from the wider context it is evident that the verb
is unbounded, too, as it refers to the speaker's habit of going to the bakery
to have tea throughout her childhood.

16. *Kuin rubie-u   puize-šša vezi   jiädü-mä-h,* [---] *v e j e - n*
    when begin.PRS-3SG tub-INE   water.NOM cool-INF(MA)-ILL   w a t e r-ACC
    puizešta kua-mma   poiś (Virt. 268)
    tub-ELA   pour.PRS-1PL away
    'When the water in the tub begins to cool, we pour the water out of the
    tub'

17. *i   müö   šiel*[ä] *istu-ma,   jo-i-ma   č u a j u - o,*
    and 3PL.NOM there sit.PST-1PL drink-PST-1PL t e a-PART
    ol-i   nin hüväzen kävellä
    be-PST.3SG so nice   go.INF(A)
    'And we sat there and drank tea, it was so nice going [to the bakery]'

As we saw in Example (9), partitive marking of a singular countable
noun does not indicate that the noun in question is unbounded. Instead, to
indicate that a countable noun is unbounded, partitive marking of a plural
countable noun is generally expected; cf. *perčatkoida* 'gloves' in Example
(12). In some situations, however, singular countable nouns marked by the
partitive case can be considered unbounded, as illustrated in Example (18)
below. This is generally the case when the noun in question is considered
to form a group (i.e. it is divisible and cumulative), and not regarded as an
individual entity. A similar phenomenon can be found in Finnish (cf. *istut-
taa sipulia* 'to plant onions').

18. *Iss*[u]*ta-mma l u u k k u - a,   o g u r č u - a   iss*[u]*ta-mma,*
    plant.PRS-1PL o n i o n.SG-PART c u c u m b e r.SG-PART plant.PRS-1PL
    p o m i d o r u - a iss[u]*ta-mma, kaikki e n e h - t ä*
    t o m a t o.SG-PART plant.PRS-1PL all   v e g e t a b l e.SG-PART

'We plant onions, we plant cucumbers, we plant tomatoes, all (kinds of) vegetables'

As can be deduced from the definitions in (2), and from the examples and the discussion above, accusative DO marking is far more restricted in usage than partitive DO marking. Accusative DO marking is triggered only if both the DO *and* the verb are bounded, while only one of these criteria has to be fulfilled for partitive DO marking to be triggered.

5. Imperatives and non-finite verb forms

In imperative clauses DOM behaves in a slightly different manner from DOM in the indicative clauses investigated so far. The same principles of DOM also apply to imperative clauses, but instead of a distinction between partitive and accusative DO marking, partitive DO marking contrasts with nominative DO marking. This phenomenon is also found in other Finnic languages, with the notable exception of Livonian, in which partitive DO marking contrasts with genitive DO marking (Lees 2015 : 229). This nominative-partitive distinction in DO marking is illustrated in Examples (19) and (20) below. In Example (19) the DO is unbounded, referring to a quantitatively indeterminate amount of sour cream; while the DO in Example (20) is bounded, referring to a quantitatively determinate rifle. In both examples (19, 20) the verbs are bounded, as they indicate that the actions in question ought to be performed in their entirety.

19. *Pane   k u o r e - t t a   rokka-h*
    put.IMP.2SG s o u r.c r e a m-PART soup-ILL
    'Add (some) sour cream to the soup'

20. *Ota   r u ž j a   šeľgä-h da mäne   ečči-mä-h*   (Virt. 82)
    take.IMP.2SG r i f l e.NOM back-ILL and go.IMP.2SG look.for-INF(MA)-ILL
    'Take a rifle on [your] back and go look for [her]'

The above-mentioned distinction between nominative and partitive DO marking also applies to DOs in certain clauses with infinitive verbs, for instance those preceded by the modal auxiliary *pidiä* 'must, have to.' This auxiliary verb is illustrated in (21) below alongside the infinitive verbs *lämmittiä* 'to warm up' and *tuuva* 'to bring, fetch'. The DOs of the former verb, *kiugua* 'oven' and *ložanka* 'sleeping ledge', are bounded and marked by the nominative case; while the DO of the latter verb, *vezi* 'water', is unbounded and marked by the partitive case (i.e. *vettä*). The nominative-partitive DO distinction has also been observed with the auxiliary verb *voija* 'can, be able to' among some speakers, although most speakers seem to prefer an accusative-partitive DO distinction.

21. *Koi-ssa, mi-dä   müö   nüt rua-mma?   K i u g u a*
    home-INE what-PART 1PL.NOM now work.PRES-1PL o v e n.NOM
    pidä-ü   lämmittiä,   l o ž a n k a   pidä-ü
    must.PRES-3SG warm.up.INF(A) l e d g e.NOM must.PRES-3SG
    lämmittiä [–––] pidä-ü   tuuva   v e t - t ä   tuuva,
    warm.up.INF(A) must.PRES-3SG fetch.INF(A) w a t e r-PART fetch.INF(A)
    i   ka   i   päivä   proidi-u
    and well and day.NOM pass.PRES-3SG

'What do we do at home nowadays? One has to warm up the oven, one has to warm up the sleeping ledge, [––– and] one must fetch water, and well, [that's how] a day goes by'

The nominative-partitive distinction is also found in predicative clauses, in which an infinitive verb is linked to a predicative adjective. In Example (22) the DO is unbounded, referring to a quantitatively indeterminate amount of fish (cf. Example 18), and the verb, too, is unbounded, as it refers to a general abstract action. In Example (23) the verb is bounded, referring to the point in time when the action is completed (i.e. 'to have found'), and so is the DO. The optionality of the copula *olla* 'to be' in this kind of clause — absent in (22), present in (23) — is likely due to Russian influence. Ogren observes that the semantics of the predicative adjective in such constructions in Estonian may affect case marking, noting that "adjectives expressing value judgments [e.g. "good"], positive assessments of possibility [e.g. "possible"], and result-orientation [e.g. "useful"] favor the use of the total object, while the opposite characteristics (assessments of possibility, especially negative assessments [e.g. "impossible"], as well as process-orientation [e.g. "easy"]) favor the use of the partial object" (Ogren 2015 : 285). The generalisations regarding result-orientation and value judgment seem to apply to (22) and (23) below, respectively, yet the DO marking in these clauses can also be explained by boundedness as discussed above. It is therefore unclear whether or not DO marking in predicative clauses in Tver Karelian is also affected by adjective semantics, and the general lack of data on the language currently prevents the topic from being investigated further.

22. *Ülen kebie   püüdiä   k a l u - a*
    very easy.NOM catch.INF(A) f i s h.SG-PART
    'It is very easy to catch fish'

23. *Löüdiä   o m a   k v a r t i r a   on   važno*
    find.INF(A) o w n   a p a r t m e n t.NOM be.PRS.3SG important
    'It is important to find your own apartment'

In spite of what the examples (19—23) above suggest, DOs of non-finite verbs are not always marked by either the nominative or partitive case. For instance, DO pronouns of infinitive verbs, like in Example (24) below, are marked by the accusative case. Likewise, DO pronouns in imperative clauses are also marked by the accusative. In Examples (19-23) the non-finite verbs are all *A*-infinitives, i.e. infinitive verbs characterised by the underlying ending *-a/-ä*. However, DOs of *mA*-infinitives, i.e. infinitive verbs characterised by the ending *-ma/-mä*, are generally marked by either the partitive case, or the accusative case (and not the nominative case). On the one hand, the unbounded DO in example (25) below, *halgo* 'firewood', is marked by the partitive case (i.e. *halguo*) like the DOs in Examples (19) and (21—22) above. On the other hand, the bounded DO in Example (26), *hebone* 'horse,' is marked by the accusative case (i.e. *hebozen*), and not by the nominative case like the DOs in Examples (20—21) and (23).

Note that the word *tiänpiänä* in Example (26) is not used in its literal sense 'today', but serves as a stylistic device together with *huomen* 'morning, tomorrow' to indicate a particular day (e.g. 'one day') and the following day (e.g. 'the next day'), respectively. The speaker in question refers to an episode

in her childhood, when she was put to work in the field the day after she had finished the school year.

24. *Mama   käšk-i   š i u - n   kiugua-h panna,*
    mother.NOM order-PST.3SG 2SG-ACC oven-ILL put.INF(A)
    kodvaze-kši vain (Virt. 42)
    moment-TRS only
    'Mother ordered [me] to put you in the oven, just for a while'

25. *Mužikka läks-i   meččä-h   h a l g u - o   šua-ma-h* (Virt. 70)
    man.NOM leave-PST.3SG forest-ILL f i r e w o o d-PART get-INF(MA)-ILL
    'The man went to the forest to get firewood'

26. *Tiänpiänä škola-n   lopp-i-ma,   huomen   anne-ttih*
    today   school-ACC finish-PST-1PL tomorrow give-PP/3PL
    ohjakše-t   jo   käde-h   h e b o z e - n val'l'asti-ma-h
    rein-PL.ACC already hand-ILL h o r s e-ACC harness-INF(MA)-ILL
    'One day we finished school, [and] the next day we were already given reins to harness the horse'

Certain infinitive constructions seem to always require partitive DO marking, as they denote unbounded actions that have no specific temporal boundaries, e.g. ongoing or habitual actions. This is true for, e.g., *mA*-infinitives with inessive case marking (27) and *mA*-infinitives preceded by a finite verb like *zavodie* 'to begin, start' or *ruveta* 'id.' (28). All investigated attestations of an *A*-infinitive preceded by a verb like *staraija* 'to attempt, try' also feature partitive DO marking (29). Note that the verb *alottua* 'to begin, start' entails an *A*-infinitive, like *staraija*, and not a *mA*-infinitive, like the synonymous verbs *zavodie* and *ruveta*. Finnish has a similar distinction between *alkaa* and *ruveta*, respectively, both meaning 'to begin, start.'

27. *Hiän   on   ongitta-ma-šša   k a l u - a*
    3SG.NOM be.PRS.3SG angle-INF(MA)-INE f i s h-PART
    'He is fishing'

28. *A kun ruve-ttih   likvidirui-ma-h   r a j o n o - i - d a   da*
    but when begin-PP/3PL dissolve-INF(MA)-ILL d i s t r i c t-PL-PART and
    k ü l - i - ä   objedińai-ma-h,   nimissä   rahvaha-lla, i
    v i l l a g e-PL-PART combine-INF(MA)-ILL nowhere people-ADE   and
    ui-dih   linna-h kaikki
    leave-PP/3PL city-ILL all.NOM
    'But when they began to dissolve districts and combine villages, people had nowhere [to go], and they all left for the city'

29. *Kiugua-n o č č u - a   starai-dih luadie*
    oven-GEN f o r e h e a d-PART try-PP/3PL make.INF(A)
    šome-mma-kši (Virt. 338)
    beautiful-CMP-TRS
    'They tried to make the top of the oven more beautiful'

E-infinitives characterised by the underlying ending *-e* are less frequent in natural discourse than *A*- and *mA*-infinitives, and remain unattested in materials recorded during fieldwork. However, *E*-infinitives tend to denote actions that are semantically unbounded, like the constructions in Exam-

ples (27—29) above, and partitive DO marking is therefore expected. At least one example of an *E*-infinitive alongside a DO can be found in Punžina's Tver Karelian-Russian dictionary (Пунжина 1994), in which the DO is marked by the partitive case as expected: *kuunnellešša händä* 'when/while listening to him' (Пунжина 1994 : 291).

Other infinitive constructions always require accusative DO marking, as they intrinsically denote bounded actions with clear temporal boundaries. One of the most frequent constructions of this type consists of a *mA*-infinitive with illative case marking preceded by the finite verb *loppie* 'to stop, cease', as illustrated in Example (30) below.

30. *Kun loppie-ttih   š a v e - n   leikkua-ma-h, niin luaji-ttih*
    when finish-PP/3PL c l a y-ACC cut-INF(MA)-ILL then make-PP/3PL
    kävelükše-n, kohti   ikkuna-h (Virt. 336)
    entrance-ACC through window-ILL
    'When the clay had been cut, an entrance was made, through the window'

6. Negation

All negated clauses hitherto attested in Tver Karelian require partitive DO marking. Partitive DO marking is also commonly found in negated clauses in other Finnic languages, although accusative DO marking has been attested sporadically, most notably in Livonian (Tveite 2004 : 147—148). Veps constitutes an exception, as negation does not seem to affect DO marking in the language (Grünthal 2015 : 256). Negation itself, however, should not be considered an overarching parameter that overrules boundedness in Tver Karelian. On the contrary, negation is also encompassed by boundedness. Negated verbs denote actions that are essentially left unfulfilled, and they can therefore be considered unbounded. Consequently, DOs in negated clauses are always marked by the partitive case.

DOM in negated clauses is illustrated in Examples (31) and (32) below. Both clauses are essentially negated and modified variants of the clauses in Examples (10a) and (13), which both contain bounded DOs and bounded verbs.

31. *Hiän   ei   ošša   t r a k t o r u - a*
    3SG.NOM NEG.3 buy.CNG.PRS t r a c t o r-PART
    'He does/will not buy a tractor'

32. *Hiiö   ei   löüdiin   p r o i z v o d s t v e n n o i - d a   r u a d u - o*
    3PL.NOM NEG.3 find.CNG.PST i n d u s t r i a l-PART   w o r k-PART
    'They did not find industrial work'

7. Intrinsic partitive object marking (IPOM)

Certain verbs in Tver Karelian appear to invariably entail partitive DO marking, including, e.g., *šuata* 'to like', *varata* 'to fear', and *eččie* 'to look for'. This preference for partitive DO marking is the result of semantic unboundedness. Similar behaviour has been observed in other Finnic languages as well, notably in Finnish, for which several exemplificative lists of such verbs have been published (see, e.g., Denison 1957; Itkonen 1975;

Kiparsky 1998; 2001). The verb *varata* 'to fear' illustrates the phenomenon in the Tver Karelian examples (33-34) below, in the present and past tense, respectively.

33. *Hiän   varaja-u   k o i r u - a   /   *koira-n*
    3SG.NOM fear.PRS-3SG d o g-PART   dog-ACC
    'He fears the dog'

34. *Hiän   varaj-i   k o i r u - a   /   *koira-n*
    3SG.NOM fear-PST.3SG d o g-PART   dog-ACC
    'He feared the dog'

In both Examples (33-34) the DOs are bounded, referring to a quantitatively determinate dog, and the action in (33) is without clear temporal borders, and thereby unbounded. The action in (34) is semantically ambiguous, and can denote either a seemingly unbounded action ('he feared the dog, and still does so') or a seemingly bounded action ('he feared the dog, but no longer does so'). In both cases, however, the verb is considered unbounded, as the action 'to fear' is not perceived as having any clear temporal boundaries under any circumstances. Both DOs are therefore marked by the partitive case. The intrinsic unboundedness of this verb (and other similar verbs) is further supported by the fact that speakers tend to refute and object to artificially constructed clauses with intrinsically unbounded verbs alongside accusative DO marking; cf. the alternate ungrammatical DO marking indicated by asterisks in (33) and (34).

Sometimes the intrinsic unboundedness of a verb is semantically less obvious, as illustrated by the behaviour of the verb *koškuo* 'to touch, affect'. Although the verb can be used in clauses like (35) below, with a seemingly bounded DO and bounded verb, it requires partitive DO marking. In (35) the DO refers to a quantitatively determinate cat, and the verb denotes a sudden action with clear temporal boundaries. The verb *koškie* behaves in a similar manner, and so does the Finnish cognate *koskea*.

35. *kun   mukelduač-i   da lange-i   lattieh, da hännä-llä*
    when roll.over-PST.3SG and fall-PST.3SG floor-ILL and tail-ADE
    k a z i - e   košku (Virt. 384)
    c a t-PART   touch.PST.3SG
    'When [the pike] rolled over and fell to the floor, and touched the cat
     with [its] tail'

Due to the absence of a Tver Karelian corpus, it is currently difficult to estimate the number of intrinsically unbounded verbs in the language. However, it is assumed that intrinsically unbounded verbs are less widespread in Tver Karelian than in Finnish, because both accusative and partitive DO marking appears to be possible with all verbs borrowed from Russian, regardless of semantics. For instance, the Finnish verb *rangaista* 'to punish' is considered intrinsically unbounded (Kiparsky 1998 : 17), as illustrated in (36a—b), but the corresponding verb in Tver Karelian, *nakažie* 'to punish' (cf. Russian наказать) can take both accusative and partitive DO marking (37a—b).

36. a. *Opettaja   rankais-i   o p i s k e l i j a - a*   [Finnish]
       teacher.NOM punish-PST.3SG s t u d e n t-PART
       'The teacher punished the student'

b. *Opettaja   rankaise-e   o p i s k e l i j a - a*   [Finnish]
teacher.NOM punish.PRS-3SG s t u d e n t-PART
'The teacher punishes / is punishing the student'

37. a. *Učiteľa   nakaž-i   s t u d e n t a - n*
teacher.NOM punish-PST.3SG s t u d e n t-ACC
'The teacher punished the student'

b. *Učiteľa   nakaži-u   s t u d e n t u - a*
teacher.NOM punish.PRS-3SG s t u d e n t-PART
'The teacher punishes / is punishing the student'

As discussed in Section 3, most verbs in Russian have distinct imperfective and perfective verbal forms. As a result, most actions and events in Russian can be regarded as either unbounded or bounded, including actions that are considered intrinsically unbounded in Finnish. Although Tver Karelian appears to have some intrinsically unbounded verbs, like Finnish, most verbs appear to be capable of being both unbounded and bounded, like in Russian. Considering the long history of contact between Tver Karelian and Russian, as well as the widespread bilingualism in Russian among speakers of Tver Karelian, it is plausible that the perception of events in Russian has had some influence upon the perception of events in Tver Karelian. The formal means of expressing the contrast between unbounded and bounded actions, however, remains distinct in the two languages: Russian employs distinct verbal forms, while Tver Karelian employs case marking. The Tver Karelian verb *nakažie* 'to punish' is a loanword reflecting the Russian perfective verb *наказать*, yet it can be used in both imperfective (37a) and perfective contexts (37b). In Russian the perfective verb *наказать* would be used in the former context, while the imperfective verbal form *наказывать* would be used in the latter.

8. Conclusion

The preceding sections have demonstrated that DOM in Tver Karelian is determined primarily by the boundedness of a verb phrase's (VP) predicates (P), i.e. verb and direct object (see Section 4). The boundedness of the Ps is determined by their divisibility and cumulativity. If a verb is divisible and/or cumulative (e.g. referring to ongoing, irresultative, or general actions), it is considered unbounded. On the contrary, if a verb is non-divisible and non-cumulative (e.g. referring to resultative or temporally restricted actions), it is bounded. Likewise, a direct object (DO) is unbounded if it can be readily divided and accumulated, otherwise it is bounded. If either or both of the Ps (i.e. verb and/or DO) are unbounded, the overall VP is unbounded, and the DO is marked by the partitive case. Otherwise the VP is bounded, and the DO is marked by either the accusative case or the nominative case. Accusative DO marking can be found among bounded finite verbs, mostly with *A*-infinitives, as well as with *mA*-infinitives; while nominative DO marking can be found among bounded imperative verbs, and with *A*-infinitives alongside the modal verb *pidiä* 'must, have to' or in predicative clauses (see Section 5). Bounded pronouns functioning as DOs, however, are always marked by the accusative case, and not by the

nominative. Furthermore, DO marking in Tver Karelian is also affected to some degree by verbal semantics. Certain verbs are intrinsically unbounded semantically, and therefore they always require partitive DO marking (see Section 7). It is worth noting, however, that this phenomenon — intrinsic partitive object marking (IPOM) — is strictly speaking not involved in DOM, as there is no actual differentiation in the DO marking of the verbs in question.

The principles of boundedness and the effects of verbal morphology and semantics are summarised and visualised in (38) below. The subscript notes –B and +B denote unboundedness and boundedness, respectively; and the subscript notes P and N denote pronoun and noun, respectively. Vs and DOs are interdependent with regard to DOM, but in (38) V is placed higher in the hierarchy than DO to account for IPOM.

38. **Differential object marking in Tver Karelian**

Verb phrase (VP)					Marking
V_{-B}					Partitive DO marking
	DO_{-B}				
V_{+B}	DO_{+B}	DO_N	V_{IMP}		Nominative DO marking
			$V_{INF(A)}$	with the auxiliary 'must'	
				in predicative clauses	
				otherwise	Accusative DO marking
			$V_{INF(MA)}$		
			V_{FIN}		
	DO_P				

The concept of boundedness in relation to DOM was first formulated by Kiparsky (1998) for Finnish, and as evident from the preceding sections the concept can by and large be applied to DOM in Tver Karelian as well. As discussed in the introduction (see Section 1), the interlingual similarities between DOM in Tver Karelian and Finnish highlight and illustrate the stability of DOM in the languages despite centuries of little or no contact, neither direct nor indirect. One important difference between the languages is found in the marking of passive subjects, which in Tver Karelian are marked by either the accusative or partitive case just like DOs (and therefore discussed in relation to DOM in this paper). In Finnish, on the contrary, the accusative-partitive distinction only applies to passive subject pronouns, while passive subject nouns feature a nominative-partitive distinction. Furthermore, IPOM appears to be more restricted in Tver Karelian than in Finnish due to Russian influence. All verbs of Russian origin investigated for this study are subject to the general principles of DOM in Tver Karelian, irrespective of verbal semantics. In Finnish, on the contrary, verbal semantics still seems to play a rather important role with regard to IPOM. It is plausible that the perception of events as almost always being capable of being unbounded or bounded in Russian also extends to Tver Karelian verbs of native origin, but the lack of data and a proper corpus has prevented this topic from being investigated in more detail.

Textual analysis and statistics have sometimes been applied to the study of DOM in Finnic languages (see, e.g. Ogren 2015 on Estonian; Lees 2015 on Livonian), but such methods are difficult to apply to Tver Karelian due to the above-mentioned lack of a corpus for the language. The general lack and unavailability of data on Tver Karelian also impedes the investigation of other phenomena which may have an effect on DOM. Doubt and politeness, for instance, have been shown to affect DOM in some Finnic languages (e.g. Finnish and Livonian; Lees 2015 : 45ff.), and so have adverbial complements imposing a sense of completion. For the same reasons, phrasal verbs have not been discussed in this study, as already noted in Section 3. Effects of causation, subordination, relativisation, etc. have not been addressed either. These parameters potentially affecting DOM in Tver Karelian all remain points of interest for further research.

Address

Nicklas N. B. Oranen
University of Helsinki
e-mail: nicklas.oranen@helsinki.fi

Abbreviations

1 — first person, **2** — second person, **3** — third person, ACC — accusative case, ADE — adessive case, CMP — comparative adjectival form, CNG — connegative, DO — direct object, ELA — elative case, FIN — finite verb, ILL — illative case, INE — inessive case, INF(A) — infinitive (*-A*) verbal form, INF(MA) — infinitive (*-mA*) verbal form, IMP — imperative mood, NOM — nominative case, PL — plural number, PP — past passive voice, PRS — present tense, PART — partitive case, PST — past tense, SG — singular number, TRS — translative case.

EKK — M. E r e l t, T. E r e l t, K. R o s s, Eesti keele käsiraamat, Tallinn 2007. http://www.eki.ee/books/ekk09/; **Virt.** — P. V i r t a r a n t a, H. V i r t a r a n-t a, Karjalan kieltä ja kansankulttuuria I. Tverinkarjalaisia kielennäytteitä, Helsinki 1990 (MSFOu 205); **VISK** — A. H a k u l i n e n, M. V i l k u n a, R. K o r h o n e n, V. K o i v i s t o, T. H e i n o n e n, I. A l h o, Iso suomen kielioppi, Helsinki 2004. Verkkoversio. http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk.

R E F E R E N C E S

A i s s e n, J. 2003, Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. — Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 21 (3), 435—483.
B i c k e l, B., W i t z l a c k - M a k a r e v i c h, A. 2008, Referential Scales and Case Alignment: Reviewing the Typological Evidence. — Scales, Leipzig (Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 86), 1—37.
B o s s o n g, G. 1985, Empirische Universalienforschung. Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen, Tübingen (Ars Linguistica 14).
G r ü n t h a l, R. 2008, Transitivity in Erzya Mordvin. — Ünnepi írások Havas Ferenc tiszteletére, Budapest (Urálisztikai Tanulmányok 18), 235—246.

— — 2015, Vepsän kielioppi, Helsinki (Apuneuvoja suomalais-ugrilaisten kielten opintoja varten XVII).

— — 2016, Transitivity in Erzya: Second Language Speakers in a Grammatical Focus. — Mordvin Languages in the Field, Helsinki (Uralica Helsingiensia 10), 291— 318.

K i p a r s k y, P. 1998, Partitive Case and Aspect. — The Projection of Arguments. Lexical and Compositional Factors, Stanford (CSLI Lecture Notes 83), 265—307.

— — 2001, Structural Case in Finnish. — Lingua 111 (4—7), 315—376.

K l u m p p, G. 2012, Differential Object Marking and Information Structure: On the Function of Two Different Pronoun Accusatives in Komi and Khanty Dialects. — ESUKA 3 (1), 343—372.

K o n t, K. 1963, Käändsõnaline objekt läänemeresoome keeltes, Tallinn (KKIU IX).

K r o i k, D. 2016, Differential Object Marking in South Saami, Umeå.

L a l l u k k a, S. 1996, The Breakdown of Tver' Karelian Demographic Continuity. — Ethnic and Racial Studies 19 (2), 316—338.

L a r s s o n, L.-G. 1981, Studier i de östersjöfinska språkens partitivbruk, Uppsala.

— — 1983, Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen, Uppsala (Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia 15).

L e e s, A. 2015, Case Alternations in Five Finnic Languages, Leiden.

O j a j ä r v i, A. 1950, Sijojen merkitystehtävistä Itä-Karjalan Maaselän murteissa, Helsinki.

O g r e n, D. 2015, Differential Object Marking in Estonian: Prototypes, Variation, and Construction-Specificity. — SKY Journal of Linguistics 28, 277—312.

R i t t e r, R.-P. 1989, Untersuchungen zum Partitiv im Vepsischen, Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica. Band 26).

S i n n e m ä k i, K. 2014, A Typological Perspective on Differential Object Marking. — Linguistics 52 (2), 281—313.

T v e i t e, T. 2004, The Case of the Object in Livonian. A Corpus-Based Study, Helsinki (Castrenianumin toimitteita 62).

V i r t a n e n, S. 2013, Informaatiorakenteen vaikutus suoran objektin merkintään mansin itämurteissa. — JSFOu 94, 293—335.

— — 2014, Pragmatic DO Marking in Eastern Mansi. — Linguistics 52 (2), 391—413.

W i t z l a c k - M a k a r e v i c h, A., S e r ž a n t, I. 2018, Differential Argument Marking: Patterns of Variation. — Diachrony of Differential Argument Marking, Berlin, 1—40.

W r a t i l, M. 2018, Structural Case and Objective Conjugation in Northern Samoyedic. — Diachrony of Differential Argument Marking, Berlin, 348—380.

П у н ж и н а А. В. 1994, Словарь карельского языка (тверские говоры), Петрозаводск.

НИКЛАС Н. Б. ОРАНЕН (Хельсинки)

ДИФФЕРЕНЦИАЛЬНОЕ МАРКИРОВАНИЕ ОБЪЕКТА В ТВЕРСКОМ КАРЕЛЬСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

В статье описывается дифференцированное маркирование объекта (далее ДМО или DOM от англ. *differential object marking*) в тверском карельском языке. ДМО в этом языке основывается главным образом на референциальной ограниченности глагольной группы, которая определяется в соответствии со способностью референций своих глагольных и существительных сказуемых разделяться и аккумулироваться. Наряду с этой ограниченностью ДМО зависит также от части речи объекта (существительное или местоимение) и от глагольной морфологии и семантики.