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Encoding direct object in Enets

0. The data
Enets < Samoyedic < Uralic; North of Central Siberia
Two dialects: Forest Enets (FE) and Tundra Enets (TE); total number of speakers not more than 50.

A corpus of texts – transcribed FE 31 hours, transcribed TE 10 hours - prepared in terms of the project ‘Documentation of Enets: digitization and analysis of legacy materials and fieldwork with the last speakers’ supported by the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme in 2008-2011 at MPI-EVA and by MPI-EVA in 2011-2013:
- modern recordings done by the authors, Maria Ovsjannikova, Natalya Stoynova, and Sergey Trubetskoy in 2005-2010
- legacy recordings of the previous generation of Enets speakers, kindly provided by the Dudinka branch of GTRK ‘Noril’sk’, Tajmyr House of Folk Culture, Dar’ja S. Bolina, Oksana E. Dobzhanskaja, Irina P. Sorokina, and Anna Ju. Urmanchieva

We express our deepest gratitude to all people who have contributed to this collection and to the Enets speakers we have had the privilege to work with.

1. Preliminaries

1.1. 1st / 2nd vs. 3rd person direct objects

Encoding 1st / 2nd person direct object: pronoun in Accusative, no cross-reference on verb.

(1)  
\[ \text{teza-xaa} \ jizna? \ djurta-? \]  
\[ \text{now-TOP we.ACC forget(pfv)-3PL.S} \]  
‘But now they forgot us.’

Encoding a 3rd person direct object suggests a choice from the following options:
- object cross-reference affix on the verb,
- Nominative or Oblique case on the overt direct object NP.

The options are not incompatible: both can be used.

1.2. 3rd person direct objects in verbal morphology

Object cross-reference is possible for a transitive verb:
- only 3rd person direct object can be cross-referenced,
- only the number of the object can be cross-referenced,
- object cross-reference it is not obligatory.

(2) a.  
\[ \text{pon'ina-r} \]  
\[ \text{use(ipfv)-2SG.SOsg} \]  
‘you use it’

b.  
\[ \text{pon'ina-i-z} \]  
\[ \text{use(ipfv)-SOpl-2SG.SOpl} \]  
‘you use them (pl)’

c.  
\[ \text{pon'ina-xu-z} \]  
\[ \text{use(ipfv)-SOdu-2SG.SOpl} \]  
‘you use them (du)’

d.  
\[ \text{pon'ina-d} \]  
\[ \text{use(ipfv)-2SG.S} \]  
‘you use’

e.  
\[ \text{daza-d} \]  
\[ \text{go(ipfv)-2SG.S} \]  
‘you go’
Question: when is direct object cross-referenced on a verb and when is it not? – Section 2

1.3. 3rd person direct objects in nominal morphology
Enets core case system consists of three cases for pronouns: Nominative, Accusative, and Genitive. Enets core case system consists of two cases for nouns: Nominative and Oblique. Nominative is always used to express a subject. Oblique is always used in adnominal contexts and with postpositions, both Nominative and Oblique can be used to express a direct object.

1.3.1. 3rd person personal pronouns as direct objects
Only Accusative is attested in the object position.

(4) a. bu b. budu? c. budî? FE
   s/he.NOM they(pl).NOM they(du).NOM

3rd person Accusative pronouns are extremely rare (5); usually verbal cross-reference is used for zero anaphora (6).

(5) fita <…> peritʃu-ubi-z? FE
   s/he.ACC help sometimes(ipfv)-HAB-1SG.S
‘I help him.’

(6) kasta-u FE
dry_out(pfv)-1SG.SOsg
‘I have dried it out.’

1.3.2. Non-possessed nouns as direct objects
➢ FE has no case marker for Oblique case,
➢ TE has an optional -ʔ affix for Oblique case (rarely used).

Nouns of the non-alternating inflectional class
If a noun belongs to the non-alternating inflectional class, it does not distinguish between Nominative and Oblique, and so it is unmarked when used as a direct object (always so for FE, almost always so for TE with its optional -ʔ affix).

(7) a. bɔgul’a to-bi ɲobkutun FE
   bear come(pfv)-PRF.3SG.S once
   ‘A bear came once.’

b. entʃeʔ bɔgul’a piiʔe-za FE
   person bear be afraid(ipfv)-3SG.SOsg
   ‘A human is afraid of a bear.’

Nouns of the alternating inflectional classes
If a noun belongs to one of the alternating inflectional classes, it does distinguish between Nominative and Oblique due to two distinct stems.

(8) a. meʔ b. entʃeʔ c. siʔ FE
tent.NOM person.NOM salt.NOM
d. meʔ e. entʃeʔu f. sir FE
tent.OBL person.OBL salt.OBL
(9) d‘iri-da  entfeu  tidara-ʔ  n‘i-zuʔ  FE
  live(ipfv)-PTCP.SIM  person.OBL  sell(pfv)-CONN  NEG-3PL.SOsg
  ‘They sold a living person, after all.’

(10) ese  n‘iβ-ʔ  daxara-b  TE
  father  name-OBL  not_know(ipfv)-1SG.SOsg
  ‘I do not know (his) father’s name.’

‘They sold a living person, after all.’

‘I do not know (his) father’s name.’

Question: when NOM form is used and when OBL form is used for direct object? – Section 3

(11) tʃike  entjeʔ  mod  gorodo-d  kadta-a  FE
  this person  I  town-DAT.SG  take_away(pfv)-FUT-1SG.SOsg
  ‘I will take this man to the town.’

1.3.3. Possessed nouns as direct objects
When a noun has a possessive affix, Nominative vs. Oblique are distinguished via the form of the affix.

(12) a. mɛ-m  
    b. mɛ-nʔ  
    c. mɛ-l  
    d. mɛ-t  FE
  tent-NOM.SG.1SG  tent-OBL.SG.1SG  tent-NOM.SG.2SG  tent-OBL.SG.2SG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular head noun</th>
<th>dual or plural head noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-jʔ, -b / -m / -m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-r / -l / -l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-za / -da / -ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1DU</td>
<td>-jʔ, -bʔ / -mʔ / -mʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DU</td>
<td>-rʔ / -lʔ / -lʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DU</td>
<td>-zʔ / -dʔ / -tʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-aʔ (–èʔ, –ɔʔ), –baʔ / –maʔ / –maʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-raʔ / –laʔ / –laʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>-zuʔ / –duʔ / –tuʔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Forest Enets nominal possessive markers.

Question: when NOM form is used and when OBL form is used for direct object? – Section 4

2. Presence vs. absence of object cross-reference

Cross-referencing 3rd person direct object in the verb is almost obligatory when the object NP is absent from the clause, as in (13); omitting direct object is attested without cross-referencing, but such examples are rare (14).

(13) ese-jʔ  tʃi  peri  baziʔ-ubizaf  FE
  father-NOM.SG.1SG  here  always  tell(pfv)-HAB-3SG.SOsg.PST
  ‘My father always told about him.’

(14) nek  uza-xan-ed  ed  nobera-da-d  tʃe-z  FE
  other  arm-LOC.SG-OBL.SG.2SG  so  hold(ipfv)-FUT-2SG.S  lower_part-ABL.SG
  ‘[It will already move <…> in the sieve. <…>] You will hold (it) with one hand at the lower part.’

Cross-reference cannot be used when the direct object has a destinative marker, as in (15).

(15) ugal-e-za-d  teza-da-d  TE
  coal-DEST.SG-OBL.SG.2SG  bring(pfv)-FUT-2SG.S
  ‘You will bring coal.’
What does influence the choice of presence vs. absence of object cross-referencing with a full non-

destinative direct object NP?

(16) a. bese n/e-ʔ teza-dɔʔ \(\text{TE} \) money NEG-3PL.S bring(pfv)-FUT.CONN

‘They will not give money.’

b. kunoxɔa tʃike bese naʔa-da-zutf \(\text{TE} \) where-TOP this money send(pfv)-FUT-3PL.SOsg.PST

‘They’d better send this money somewhere.’

Previous research: attributing this choice to the information structure in terms of ‘logical stress’ (Tereščenko 1973: 188, Sorokina 2010: 310–311) or ‘information structure neutrality’ (Siegl 2013: 253–254).

- Referentiality and definiteness?
  The object in (16a) is non-specific, the object in (16b) is definite.
  The object in (16a) is a part of focus \(\text{[bese n/e? tezadɔʔ]}\), the object in (16b) is a topic \(\text{[tʃike bese]}\).
- Discourse-level topicality?
  The object in (16a) is not mentioned before in the discourse and is not the main topic of the further
  dialogue, the object in (16b) is indirectly related to the preceding dialogue and this clause
  summarizes it.

Definiteness does not explain all cases (17).

(17) anʃ tʃike nixuʔ menɛo-dəa seixɔja-zə? \(\text{TE} \) and this three old_woman-PEJ look_at(pfv)-1SG.S

‘I saw these three old women again.’

In search of correlates of topicality we use such parameters as:

1. being mentioned in the previous discourse: mentioned before (18), indirectly mentioned before (19),
   not mentioned before (20)

(18) no, kixu peri trapka-xan mu-ubi-za \(\text{FE} \) well idol always cloth-LOC.SG PLC-HAB-3SG.SOsg

‘[My mother had an idol. <…>] Well, she always put \text{the idol} into a cloth.’

(19) manʔ, nolju-uf sira-saj dii kunv dese-da-r \(\text{FE} \) say(pfv)-2SG.S.IMP one-RESTR-TRANSL snow-COM tent_cover how cover(pfv)-FUT-2SG.SOsg

‘[Dealing with this \text{tent} <…>] Say, how would you alone put a \text{tent cover} with snow?’

(20) peɛ ponjaʔa-zə?, maltʃa ponjaʔa-zə? \(\text{FE} \) shoe do(ipfv)-1SG.S overcoat do(ipfv)-1SG.S

‘[Once I went fishing. <…> I fell down into a whirlpool.] I wear \text{shoes}, I wear an \text{overcoat}.’

2. being mentioned in the subsequent discourse: mentioned after (21), indirectly mentioned after (22),
   not mentioned after (23).

NB: This parameter presumably speaks about whether the direct object is something that will be
   discussed afterwards and has to be remembered.

(21) texe bem-da ke-xoz kirba kada-za \(\text{FE} \) there chief-OBL.SG.3SG side-ABL.SG bread take_away(pfv)-3SG.SOsg

‘[And the dog was near us. <…>] It took \text{bread} near its boss. [<…> It went under the hill. <…> And
  my daughter looks for her bread]’

(22) kiuznoju modi mer ner-e-jʔ, tʃajnʔik laxu-zaʔ \(\text{FE} \) morning-ADV I quickly get_up(pfv)-M-1SG.M kettle boil_up(pfv)-CAUS-1SG.S

‘I woke up early in the morning, I boiled \text{the kettle}. [I sat down to drink tea.]’
(23) `bese mirza-d i pogur-? FE
iron pay(ipfv)-2SG.S and fish(ipfv)-2SG.S.IMP
 `[They took a paper. <…> People pay for it with money <…>] Once you have paid the money, then fish. [So, so we live.]’

Below are numbers for non-destinative NPs headed by nouns (excluding pronouns, placeholders, nominalized uses of ‘this’, ‘such’, etc.)

**NPs with possessive affixes as direct objects**

**Tundra Enets:**
- a strong correlation between the presence of verbal cross-reference and the fact of being mentioned in the previous discourse
- a strong correlation between the absence of verbal cross-reference and the fact of NOT being mentioned in the previous discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Cross-reference</th>
<th>Mentioned Before</th>
<th>Not Mentioned Before</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(All Examples)</td>
<td>114 (89%)</td>
<td>14 (11%)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Verbal Cross-reference</td>
<td>8 (9%)</td>
<td>81 (91%)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. TE NPs with possessive affixes

**Forest Enets:**
- a somewhat weaker correlation between the presence of verbal cross-reference and the fact being mentioned in the previous discourse,
- BUT no correlation between the absence of verbal cross-reference and the fact of NOT being mentioned in the previous discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Cross-reference</th>
<th>Mentioned Before</th>
<th>Not Mentioned Before</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A Sample of 120 Examples)</td>
<td>97 (80%)</td>
<td>23 (20%)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Verbal Cross-reference</td>
<td>59 (49%)</td>
<td>61 (51%)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. FE NPs with possessive affixes

What about the subsequent discourse?
- the same correlation between the presence of verbal cross-reference and the fact being mentioned in the subsequent discourse, as in the case of the previous discourse,
- AGAIN no correlation between the absence of verbal cross-reference and the fact of NOT being mentioned in the subsequent discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Cross-reference</th>
<th>Mentioned After</th>
<th>Not Mentioned After</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A Sample of 120 Examples)</td>
<td>73 (61%)</td>
<td>47 (39%)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Verbal Cross-reference</td>
<td>57 (47.5%)</td>
<td>63 (52.5%)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. FE NPs with possessive affixes in subsequent discourse
The combination of the two parameters works better:

- if an object has not been referred to both in the previous and in the subsequent discourse, it has lower chances of being encoded by verbal cross-reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mentioned before &amp; after (directly or indirectly)</th>
<th>not mentioned before &amp; after</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>verbal cross-reference (a sample of 120 examples)</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no verbal cross-reference (a sample of 120 examples)</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. FE NPs with possessive affixes in preceding and subsequent discourse

**NPs without possessive affixes as direct objects**

Tundra Enets & Forest Enets:

- a correlation between the presence of verbal cross-reference and the fact of being mentioned in the previous discourse;
- a correlation between the absence of verbal cross-reference and the fact of NOT being mentioned in the previous discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mentioned before (directly or indirectly)</th>
<th>not mentioned before</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>verbal cross-reference (all examples)</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no verbal cross-reference (a sample of 90 examples)</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. TE NPs without possessive affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mentioned before (directly or indirectly)</th>
<th>not mentioned before</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>verbal cross-reference (a sample of 120 examples)</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no verbal cross-reference (a sample of 120 examples)</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. FE NPs without possessive affixes

If possessed and non-possessed direct objects are compared,

- Tundra Enets shows a weaker correlation between the presence/absence in the previous discourse and the presence vs. absence of object verbal cross-reference in the case of non-possessed nouns,
- while Forest Enets shows a stronger correlation in the same case.

Such difference in the closely related dialects is noteworthy.

Preliminary result: discourse-level topicality is the best option for explaining the distribution of presence vs. absence of object cross-reference.

By the discourse-level topicality we understand mainly the presence in the previous discourse with the additional support of the presence in the subsequent discourse.

Perspectives: a search for more fine-grained tools for estimating the degree of the discourse-level topicality.
3. Nominative vs. Oblique of alternating nouns

Previous research: Tereščenko (1973: 179) claims that Nominative is used for a definite object, and Oblique is used for an indefinite direct object.

Our data show that two factors may influence the choice of the case for alternating nouns:

- referential status, i.e. genericity and specificity: generic and non-specific NPs tend to be marked with Oblique (24)-(25), though the correlation is weak; specific NPs may be marked both with Nominative (26) and Oblique (27).

(24) a biz an bi-kọ bi-pi-pi-za FE and water and water-TOP be_afraid(ipfv)-PRF-3SG.SOsg ‘But she’s afraid of the water.’

(25) biz təzara-b bi-ti-n təo-da-ubi FE water bring(pfv)-CAUS-CVB.COND water-DEST.PL-PL.1SG reach(pfv)-CAUS-HAB.3SG.S ‘When they bring the water, she carries my water.’

- prominence in discourse: key participants of discourse strongly tend to be marked with Nominative.

By key participants we understand participants crucial for the whole text – cf. the object the tale is about in (28) and objects crucial for the purification ritual that are introduced in (30), from a text devoted to the description of this ritual.

(29) ini-zi ko- ọdi FE certainly-3DU.SOsg find(pfv)-CONN verdure.NOM ‘Of course, they found the plant.’ (the aforementioned plant, important for the story)

(30) duu tọ muaa FE fat.NOM there do(pfv).3SG.S ‘She put some fat there (into the basin).’

<...> sen mii-ga tabu ... tabu so? soaa, how_much what-TOP hair.NOM hair.NOM take_out(pfv).3SG.S ‘She took out some wool, and then she lighted it all up.’

The prominence factor is stronger than the referential factor: cf. example from a story where the water is crucial (31).

(31) bi jee-xuru ẹe-xo-da ni mi mis FE water who-EVEN mother-DAT.SG-OBL.SG.3SG NEG.3SG.S give(pfv)-CONN ‘No one gave water to mom.’
Table 8. Distribution of Nominative and Oblique of alternating nouns.

Noteworthy, this distribution between Nominative and Oblique direct objects goes against the general cross-linguistic tendency of the differential object marking to use the nominative form for less prominent (Aissen 2003) or less affected (Næss 2004) objects. Cross-linguistically, if there is a choice between nominative and non-nominative direct objects, the non-nominative is more often used for a less typical direct object. Still, in Enets we have an opposite distribution, even if bare numbers of Nominative vs. Oblique instances are compared to each other: 109 instances of Oblique vs. 61 instances of Nominative.

4. Nominative vs. Oblique of possessed nouns

4.1. Number of the noun and person of the possessor

The choice of Nominative vs. Oblique form of possessive forms is mainly based on the number of the noun and on the person of the possessor. Traditionally, this distribution is analyzed via a case system including Nominative, Accusative and Genitive where Accusative is homonymous either with Nominative, or with Genitive. In (Khanina & Shluinsky 2013, 2014) we proposed the description with two cases only, that we adhere to in this paper.

Singular direct objects
- with the 1st person possessor take Nominative affixes, as in (32a),
- with the 2nd and the 3rd persons possessors take Oblique affixes, as in (32b-c).

(32) a. kunʲ poga-jʔ berta-da-u FE
   how  fishing_net-NOM.SG.1SG throw(pfv)-FUT-1SG.SOsg
   ‘How will I leave my net?’

b. poga-d tetti-r FE
   fishing_net-obl.SG.2SG measure(pfv)-2SG.SOsg
   ‘You have measured your net.’

c. bu poga-da ʧʃiʔ n/e-zauʔ FE
   s/he fishing_net-obl.SG.3SG install(pfv)-CONN NEG-3SG.SOsg.CONT
   ‘He installed the net, after all.’
Plural and dual direct objects

- with the 1st person possessor do not distinguish morphologically Nominative vs. Oblique,
- with the 3rd person possessor take Nominative affixes (33).

(33) koba-saj tʃukʃi pɛd-zi? tʃukʃi mu-dkod-e-zi?
skin-COM all kamus-NOM.PL.3PL all take(pfv)-HYPOT-SOpl-3PL.SOnsg
‘They will take away all the skins with the kamuses.’

Still, this distribution is a trend, and exceptions are found for direct objects with the 2nd and 3rd person possessors (but not for direct objects with the 1st person possessors):
- cf. a Nominative singular direct object with the 2nd person possessor, instead of Oblique in (34),
- cf. an Oblique plural direct object with the 3rd person possessor instead of Nominative in (35).

(34) tɔz nɛte-u anʃi ke banka-ku-ʁ modʃi
so open(pfv)-1SG.SOsg and this jar-DIM-NOM.SG.2SG I
‘So I opened this little jar.’

(35) uzu-tuʔ koin
footstep-OBL.PL.3PL find(pfv)-SOpl-1SG.SOnsg
‘We found their footprints.’

Such examples cannot be considered absolutely occasional, but still are rather few: e.g. for singular direct objects
- our TE corpus has 19 irregular examples vs. 116 regular examples,
- our FE corpus has 37 irregular examples vs. more than 450 regular examples.

4.2. 2SG Imperative

In 2nd person singular imperative clauses direct objects are usually encoded by Nominative, even when it is not expected from the number and person factor, as in (36)-(37).

(36) tu-ʁ sareʔ
fire-NOM.SG.2SG light_up(pfv)-2SG.S.IMP
‘Light the fire up!’

(37) eba-za mu-ʁ
head-NOM.SG.3SG take(pfv)-2SG.SOnsg.IMP
‘Take the head.’

In the TE corpus, there are no exceptions; in the FE corpus non-destinative Oblique object is also attested in 10 2SG imperative clauses of 47, cf. (38). Destinative 2nd person Oblique objects are significantly more widespread, cf. (39).

(38) lata-da pɔna mujza-ʁ
board-OBL.SG.3SG then wipe(pfv)-2SG.SOnsg.IMP
‘Wipe then the floor!’

(39) tʃaj-zo-ɖ tidis, kirba-zo-ɖ tidis
tea-DEST.SG-OBL.SG.2SG buy(pfv).2SG.S.IMP bread-DEST.SG-OBL.SG.2SG buy(pfv).2SG.S.IMP
‘Buy tea, buy bread.’

2nd person plural and dual Aorist forms used in imperative function (40), as well as 3rd person Imperative form (41) behave in the same way as all other non-Imperative forms, i.e. they have not been attested with the unexpected Nominative object, though only few occurrences of these forms have been attested.
4.3. Additional factors for destinative NPs

For possessive destinative forms two other factors come into play (see Khanina & Shluinsky 2014 for more details):
- in FE unexpected Oblique can optionally be used in other-benefactive contexts, as in (42)

(42) kɔru-zo-nʔ ta-?
knife-DEST.SG-obl.SG.1SG give(pfv)-2SG.S.IMP
‘Give me a knife!’

- in TE unexpected Oblique can optionally be used with specific direct objects, as in (43)

(43) taʔ tʃikɔ-xɔkɔ kasa-zi-niiʔ mua-ziʔ
so this-ABL.SG man-DEST.SG-obl.SG.1SG take(pfv)-1SG.S
‘Then I got married (lit. took a husband for myself).’

5. Conclusion

Enets has a complicated system of encoding the direct object combining nominal inflection and verbal cross-reference. Different parameters are involved in each subpart of this system.

The verbal cross-reference of 3rd person objects is possible when they are topical at the discourse level; a destinative object is not cross-referenced, since the destinative construction introduces a new referent (see Khanina & Shluinsky 2014).

The choice of Nominative vs. Oblique of alternating-stems nouns is related, on the one hand, to genericity and specificity of the object, and on the other hand, to its prominence in the discourse; in both cases we deal with marking that is unexpected in the cross-linguistic perspective.

The choice of Nominative vs. Oblique of possessed nouns is related, first, to the number of the noun and on the person of the possessor; second, to the 2sg imperative vs. other clause; third, to the additional factors for destinative NPs, such as the specificity or a self-beneficiary context.

Most of our statements reflect statistical trends, and not clear-cut distributions.

Thus, this research would have been impossible without extensive naturalistic data we had collected and annotated while working at MPI-EVA! Thank you.
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