

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU  
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY  
DEPARTMENT OF FINNO-UGRIC STUDIES

Tony Keller

CHANGES IN THE FUNCTIONS OF THE PARTITIVE IN KARELIAN UNDER  
THE INFLUENCE OF RUSSIAN

MA thesis

Supervisor: Prof. Gerson Klumpp

TARTU 2016

TARTU ÜLIKOOL  
FILOSOOFIATEADUSKOND  
SOOME-UGRI OSAKOND

Tony Keller

OSASTAVA KÄÄNDE FUNKTSIOONIDE MUUTUMINE KARJALA KEELES  
VENE KEELE MÕJUL

Magistritöö

Juhendaja: Prof. Gerson Klumpp

TARTU 2016

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction:	1
1.1	The Karelians and the Karelian language	1
1.2	Russian-Karelian language contact	2
1.3	Research History of Karelian	4
1.4	Research Topic and Methodology	5
2	Theory	7
2.1	Case and government	7
2.1.1	Case functions	7
2.1.2	Argument-structural primitives	8
2.1.3	Semantic roles	9
2.1.4	Animacy and definiteness	11
2.1.5	Differential object marking as an example of case assignment	12
2.2	The Case systems in Karelian, Finnish and Russian	14
2.2.1	The different functions of different cases in Finnish and Russian	17
2.2.2	Government in Finnish and Russian	19
2.3	The partitive	22
2.3.1	The partial object	25
3	The analysis	29
3.1	Example 1: <i>paista ~ paissa</i>	29
3.2	Example 2: <i>ellendiä / malttua</i>	36
3.3	Example 3: <i>soittua ~ šoittua</i>	41
3.4	Example 4: <i>himo(i)ttua</i>	45
3.5	Example 5: <i>miellyttyä</i>	48
3.6	Example 6: <i>a(vv)uttua</i>	50
3.7	Example 7: <i>opastua ~ opaštua ~ opaššua</i> and <i>opastuo ~ opaštuo ~ opaššuo</i>	55
3.8	The similarities between the functions of the Finnish and the Russian cases	64

3.8.1	Russian dative and Finnic allative .....	65
3.8.2	Russian language adverb and Finnic translative.....	67
3.8.3	The Russian locative and the Finnic adessive .....	70
3.8.4	The Russian dative and the Finnish illative.....	72
3.9	Example 11: animacy and the choice of object case.....	73
4	Conclusion .....	79
6	Abbreviations .....	81
7	References .....	82
	Kokkuvõte: Osastava käände funktsioonide muutumine vene keele mõjul .....	85
	<b>Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks .....</b>	<b>87</b>

# 1. Introduction:

## 1.1 The Karelians and the Karelian language

The Karelian language belongs to the Baltic Finnic or Finnic branch of the Uralic language family. It is closely related and to some extent mutually intelligible with languages such as Finnish and Estonian as well as with some minority languages spoken in the Baltic countries, Fennoscandia and Northwest Russia. Karelian itself is mainly spoken in and around the Republic of Karelia and the Tver Oblast (federal subjects of the Russian Federation) and has official minority status in Finland, where it must not be confused with the Karelian dialects of the Finnish language.

The Karelian language itself can be divided into several dialect groups and subdialects (Laanest: p. 26):

- Karelian language
  - Karelian Proper
    - Northern Karelian
    - Southern Karelian
  - Olonetz Karelian
  - Ludic

Proper Karelian is the dialect most closely related to standard Finnish. It can be divided into Northern and Southern Karelian, the main difference of which is the existence of voiced plosives in the Southern dialect, while in the Northern dialect voiceless plosives appear in the same position. It is easily recognizable by *š* and *ž* in positions where in related languages *s* and *z* appear. Olonetz and Ludic do not share these features. They can be recognized by a less developed gradation system and the change of the word final *a* and *ä* to resp. *u* and *ü* in Olonetz and *e* in Ludic. Ludic is also considered a bridge language between Karelian and Veps (Laanest: 26-27).

As a written language, Karelian initially used the Cyrillic alphabet (Laanest: 40), which was eventually abandoned. Nowadays, there are two orthography systems in use: one based on the more widely used Olonetz and one based on the smaller Northern subdialect of the Proper Karelian dialect.

According to the Russian census from 2010 (VPN 2010: Vol. 4, 14), there are 60.815 ethnic Karelians. The 45.570 Karelians located in the Republic of Karelia constitute roughly 7% of the population, while the 7.394 Karelian inhabitants of the Tver Oblast make up approximately 0.5% of the Oblast (VPN 2010: Vol. 4, 54 & 168). Of the 60.815 Karelians, 60.738 responded to speak Russian and only 25.605 responded to speak Karelian (VPN 2010: Vol. 4, 26 & 142), meaning that Russian has become the mainly used language among the Karelians.

## **1.2 Russian-Karelian language contact**

Being spoken on the territory of the Russian Federation, Karelian has undergone significant Russian influence. The first contacts with Eastern Slavic tribes happened between the 6th and 9th century AD, when both the separate Finnic languages as well as Russian began to emerge (Laanest 1982: 25; Sarhima 1999: 18-20). These contacts intensified when trade with the Slaves became more extended and the current living area of the Karelians started to be inhabited between the 11th and 14th century (Berecki 1996: 70; Laanest 1982: 32). In the beginning of the 2nd millennium Karelia also became part of Novgorod (Sarhima 1999: 29), which led to orthodox Christianisation and forced baptisings under the rule of count Yaroslav II Vsevolodovich (Berecki 1996: 70). Consequently, the social and linguistic contacts between Baltic Finns and Eastern Slavs were strengthened. In the 13th century, Sweden started to be interested in the Finnish-Karelian areas and resulted in century long lasting conflicts about the rule in these territories until Russia gained the last parts of Karelia under the treaty of Åbo (Berecki 1996: 70-71; Klement'ev 2008: 35-39; Laanest 1982: 32; Sarhima 1999: 31-32).

The second half of the 18th century was a period of new cultural bloom: On the Karelian Isthmus, which belonged to the Russian empire, Vyborg was an important cultural and economical centre (Berecki 1996: 72). Moreover, factories and settlements were established, one of which should grow to be the city of Petrozavodsk, the current capital of the Republic of Karelia (Klement'ev 2008: 38-39). Three years after the conquest of Finland in 1809 the Karelian Isthmus became part of the Grand Duchy of Finland. As a result, the local Karelians were strongly assimilated to the Finns, while only a minority managed to maintain their culture, religion and language to some extent (Berecki 1996: 72; Klement'ev 2008: 39-40). The other Karelians, which lived on the territory of the Russian Empire, underwent strong Russification from the second half of the 19th

century. The state tried to establish a school system with Russian as the language of instruction, the success of which is rather unclear (Sarhimaa 1999: 33-34).

After the October Revolution 1917 the political system aimed to grant equal rights to everyone regardless of nation or language. Therefore the grammars of the minority language started to be developed in order to improve their functionality (Sarhimaa 1999: 34).

After an unsuccessful try to establish an independent Karelia, the Karelian Worker's Commune was founded in 1920 as an autonomous Part of the RSFSR and later renamed to the Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic in 1923 (Klement'ev 2008: 41). Official languages were Russian and Finnish (Sarhimaa 1999: 35). Until the 1930ies the Russian population in Karelia was mainly concentrated in the region between the Lakes Ladoga and Onega, which lead to stronger contacts between Russians and Olonetz and Ludic Karelians (and the Karelians in central Russia) and greater influence of Russian on these dialects, while the dialects of the Northern and Southern Karelians in Karelia were spared heavy impact (Sarhimaa 1999: 23).

In 1931 a Latin based Karelian orthography was introduced, books and newspapers were published and Karelian was taught in schools in order to help successfully alphabetize the majority of the Karelians (Berecki 1996: 73; Klement'ev 2008: 42; Sarhimaa 1999: 37). Moreover, two orthographies for the Finnish language spoken in the USSR were developed, which were mainly used in Northern Karelia because of its close relations to the local Karelian variety, Proper Karelian. The speakers of the other dialects became Karelian-Russian bilinguals more quickly (Sarhimaa 1999: 35-37).

The later 1930ies marked a changing point in the attitude of the Soviet State towards its minorities. Russian was considered and propagated as 'the language of high culture, of Pushkin, of the great Russian people' and as 'the language of the Revolution and socialism' As a consequence, the Karelian Intelligentsia was liquidated and the minority language were more heavily influenced by Russian, e.g. by being forced to adapt the Cyrillic alphabet (Sarhimaa: 38). However, in 1937 Karelian became one of the official languages in the Karelian ASSR for the first time (as well as Russian and Finnish), despite the repressions against the language (Klement'ev 2008: 52). At the end of the 1930ies a Cyrillic based Karelian orthography was in use for a short time, in which

approximately 200 books, newspapers etc. were released, after which Russian almost entirely replaced Karelian in literature (Berecki 1996: 73).

Because of the severe losses and deportations of Karelian men during World War II and the economic success in the 1950ies, which caused a migration wave to Karelia of mainly ethnic Russians, the Karelians became more and more a minority in their homeland. Also, Karelian women started to get married with Russian men and not only with other Karelians (Klement'ev 2008: 53-55; Sarhimaa 1999: 42). The repressions against other languages than Russian became constantly stronger even after the death of Stalin in 1953. Finnish, for example, was replaced by Russian as a language of instruction in 1954 and abandoned as a school subject in 1956. In 1958 the last Karelian school and the Finno-Ugric department at the University of Petrozavodsk were closed. Children were forbidden to speak Karelian at school and their parents were encouraged to use Russian even at home. The prestige of Karelian was so low by the 1970ies that the younger generation voluntarily preferred to speak Russian (Sarhimaa 1999: 40-42).

The Perestroika of the 1980ies and the period after the collapse of the Soviet Union brought new hope to the Karelian language. Nowadays, Karelian language preschools, schools, cultural organisations, newspapers etc. exist again. In the 1990ies a language law was discussed about the status of the languages of Karelia. After a long time of debates and rewritings, the Law on the State Support of the Karelian, Veps and Finnish languages in the Republic of Karelia was adopted on March 17, 2004. It recognizes Russian as the sole official language in the Republic of Karelia but guaranteed Karelian, Veps and Finnish the statuses as minority languages, i.e. the possibility for e.g. the use in media or education (Rom-Sourlova 2004: 184-188; Antonova 2004; Zakon Respubliki o Karelija o gosudarstvennoj podderžke karel'skogo, vepsskogo i finskogo jazykax v Respublike Karelija).

### **1.3 Research History of Karelian**

Karelian has as of today mainly been researched (often in the context of other Finnic languages) in the fields of phonetics and morphology, recently more attention has been paid to syntax. Notable works are Arvo Laanest's *Sissejuhatus Läänemeresoome Keeltesse* (1975), which compares the Finnic languages and gives an overview of their morphology, phonetic system and some syntax issue. Vieno Fedotova provides a bigger insight of syntax in her *Očerki sintaksisa karel'skogo jazyka* [Survey on the syntax of the



Karelian language] (1990). Apart from several articles about Karelian, there have been two important monographs in the context of language contact: Anneli Sarhimaa's *Syntactic transfer, contact-induced change and the evolution of bilingual mixed codes: focus on Karelian-Russian language alternation* (1999) and Raija Pyöli's *Venäläistyvä Aunuksenkarjala: kielenulkoiset ja -sisäiset indikaattorit kielenvaihtolanteessa* (1996). The newest grammars are Raija Pyöli's *Livvinkarjalan kielioppi* (2011) for Olonetz and Pekka Zaikov's *Vienankarjalan kielioppi: Lisänä harjoitukse ja lukemisto* (2013) for Proper Karelian.

#### **1.4 Research Topic and Methodology**

The topic of this work is the partitive case and its functions, i.e. its assignment in certain semantic and syntactic environments involving verbs. Which functions were formerly taken by the partitive but are now represented by other case forms? What are the conditions for these case forms and how can they be explained? My focus will be on the partitive as a case of verbal government in the wider sense (i.e. government of verbs in the classical sense and the direct object as a special kind of government). Other functions such as partitive of negation, of comparison, of the subject (unless the partitive is caused by verbs) or after numerals will not be regarded in this study.

The varieties researched will be Olonetz and Karelian Proper in online newspapers. I chose online newspaper for the easy accessibility, the amount of text and the stylistic homogeneity of the material. I decided to exclude Ludic because of the size of the dialect and its questionable status as a dialect of Karelian or language on its own. I will use Finnish and Russian for comparison. Finnish is the closest related language to Karelian and considered to be the Finnic language with the least foreign influence, while Russian is the main language of communication in the core areas of the Karelians and has therefore had a major impact on the Karelian language during the last centuries.

For the research I compiled a corpus of Karelian, which I divided into two different subcorpora according to the dialects. The bigger subcorpus is the Olonetz corpus, the smaller subcorpus is the Karelian Proper corpus. I grouped my material into the dialects because I suspected differences in the degree of the Russian influence on the two varieties. Because of the size of the corpus, however, the eventual results should not be taken as representative for the whole Karelian language but as what they are: representative for the language of online newspapers on the one hand, but indicators for

possible tendencies in Karelian in general on the other hand. The Olonetz subcorpus contains issues from three big online newspapers. *Oma Mua*, *Karjala žurnualu* and the Karelian version of *YLE*. *Oma Mua* is a Karelian language online newspaper based in Karelia, Russia. The newspapers published online on its website [www.omamua.ru](http://www.omamua.ru) from 2009 to 2013 are part of the Olonetz my subcorpus. It contains the issues from number 941 to number 1190, i.e. 249 issues consisting of a couple of smaller articles each. The topics reach usually from mainly Karelian language and local culture, history as well as local events to Russian and Karelian politics, especially when connected to Karelia, to a smaller extent. The issues since 2014 are mixed Olonetz and Proper Karelian and therefore not included in the subcorpus. *YLE* is the national broadcasting company Finnish. Its local Finnish Karelian section based in Joensuu started to publish news in Olonetz Karelian in the beginning of 2015. I collected the news of 75 publishing dates since its beginning in January 2015 until April 2016 on <http://yle.fi/uutiset/joensuu/karjalakse/>. Per publishing date, there are usually up to three small articles about the Karelian language and (Finnish-Karelian) culture but also topics like local and Russian politics, culture and society. Another bigger resource for Olonetz text material was the online newspaper *Karjalan žurnualu* from <http://verkolehti.karjal.fi/>. The material of the newspaper is mostly from the recent years (End of 2013 to early 2016) and covers similar topics as *Oma Mua* or the news from *Yle*. Moreover the page offers a smaller range of articles about culture, history, language and media that are not listed in the news section of the newspaper.

The Karelian Proper subcorpus contains the issues of the newspaper *Vienan Karjala*, published in Russian Karelia, until its merge with *Oma Mua* in the beginning of 2014. This corpus consists of the articles published online at [www.omamua.ru](http://www.omamua.ru), of which the years 2009 till 2013 were available, i.e. the issues from number 269 to number 376 (107 issues). The topics are similar to those of *Oma Mua*.

I will first present the main functions of the partitive case in the Finnic languages. After this I will give an overview about the principles of government in the context of semantic roles and grammatical relations and give examples of partitive government in Finnish and Russian. After this I will discuss the results of my analysis of the Karelian corpus, explain the changes that affect the use of the partitive in context of language contact and conclude with a summary of the study.

## **2 Theory**

### **2.1 Case and government**

In order to understand how a language assigns case and how it is possible that a language can change its way of assigning case, we have to know what case and government is.

Polinsky and Preminger define case as “[t]he alternation in the form of a nominal or adjectival constituent based on its functions” (Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 150).

There exist two notions of “case”: morphological case and abstract case. Under morphological case we understand a “category that reflects the relationship between a head and its dependent noun(s), or between different nouns in a clause” (Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 150).

On abstract case needs they write: “The notion of abstract Case can be used to predict the distribution of both overt and non-overt nominal forms, and may thus be thought of as one of the fundamental abstract syntactic relations in the mental grammar” (Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 152-153). It is “a primitive feature that reflects a relationship between an argument and its syntactic context; in other words, the assignment of abstract Case is determined by syntactic structure” (Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 153). In this work I deal with the assignment of morphological cases (from now on „case“) and will therefore not focus on abstract case.

The definition of government that I will work with is a rather traditional one, i.e. the assignment of case by verbs, nouns and preposition, although I will focus on verbs.

#### **2.1.1 Case functions**

A case is the morphological expression of semantic, syntactic and/or pragmatic functions, often combined (cf. Comrie 1989: 124). However, there is no 1:1 correlation between function and case, and cases are usually not monofunctional. According to Comrie, one important function of the cases is to distinguish between participants (1989: 127). Also, one case can express several functions, and one function can be in theory expressed by different cases. Before I give some examples, I will explain some important syntactic and semantic features that can have influence on case marking.

### 2.1.2 Argument-structural primitives

In the languages of the world we can reduce the arguments to three so-called argument-structural primitives or protoroles: S - the sole argument of intransitive verbs, A - the agent or most agent-like argument of a transitive verb and P - the theme or patient or most patient-like argument of the transitive verb (Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 151). Most languages have a strategy to distinguish A and P. If A and S are marked in the same way but differently from P (e.g. Slavic languages), we speak of nominative-accusative languages.

(1) Russian

*Я сплю.*  
1SG sleep-1SG  
S-NOM  
'I sleep.'

(2) Russian

*Я тебя вижу.*  
1SG 2SG-ACC see-1SG  
A-NOM P-ACC  
'I see you.'

If P and S are marked the same way and differently from A (e.g. Basque, Chukchi), we speak of absolutive-ergative languages.

(3) Chukchi

*ətlʔəg-ən ret-gʔe*  
man-ABS arrive-AOR.3SG  
S-ABS  
'The man arrived.' (Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 151)

(4) Chukchi

*keyŋ-e ətlʔəg-ən təm-nen*  
bear-ERG man-ABS kill-AOR.3SG:3SG  
S-ERG P-ABS  
'The bear killed the man.' (Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 151)

Neutral languages like English (for proper nouns and adjectives) do not distinguish morphologically between the arguments. The word order helps to distinguish the arguments. In tripartite languages (like some native Australian languages), S, A and P are all marked in a different way (Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 151-152).

(5) Antekerrepenhe

*arengke-le aye-nhe ke-ke*

dog-A me-P bite-PST

‘The dog bit me.’ (Bittner and Hale 1996: 4 in Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 152)

(6) Antekerrepenhe

*athe arengke-nhe we-ke*

me:A dog-P strike-PST

‘I hit the dog.’ (Bittner and Hale 1996: 4 in Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 152)

(7) Antekerrepenhe

*arengke-Ø nterre-ke*

dog-S run-PST

‘The dog ran.’ (Bittner and Hale 1996: 4 in Polinsky & Preminger 2014: 152)

### 2.1.3 Semantic roles

The strategy of distinction between arguments is one of the basic reasons why morphological cases exist. These arguments can be differentiated according to their semantic roles in a clause. These roles describe the semantic properties of the verb’s arguments. They do not need to have an impact on the grammatical relations of the clause, but “[t]he use of a different role label implies a potential difference in grammatical properties” (Kroeger 2014: 54). The number of semantic roles may vary according to the researcher and used in different ways (Kroeger 2014: 54). Widely accepted semantic roles are:

AGENT: causer or initiator of events

EXPERIENCER: animate entity which perceives a stimulus or registers a particular mental or emotional process or state

RECIPIENT: animate entity which receives or acquires something

BENEFICIARY: entity (usually animate) for whose benefit an action is performed

INSTRUMENT: inanimate entity used by an agent to perform some action

THEME: entity which undergoes a change of location or possession, or whose location is being specified

PATIENT: entity which is acted upon, affected, or created; or of which a state or change of state is predicated

STIMULUS: object of perception, cognition, or emotion; entity which is seen, heard, known, remembered, loved, hated, etc.

LOCATION: spatial reference point of the event (the SOURCE, GOAL, and PATH roles are often considered to be sub-types of location)

- SOURCE: the origin or beginning point of a motion
- GOAL: the destination or end-point of a motion
- PATH: the trajectory or pathway of a motion

ACCOMPANIMENT (or COMITATIVE): entity which accompanies or is associated with the performance of an action (Kroeger 2014: 54-55).

An example of identifying the semantic roles in a clause:

(8) English

<i>John</i>	<i>gave</i>	<i>Mary</i>	<i>a bouquet of roses.</i>
AGENT		RECIPIENT	THEME

These roles can be split into more concrete roles.

(9) English

<i>John</i>	<i>gave</i>	<i>Mary</i>	<i>a bouquet of roses.</i>
GIVER		GIVEN	GIVÉE

These concrete categorizations might be useful in very isolated situations, yet often they are probably not abstract enough. But where does one need to draw the line? To restrict the number of semantic functions, Haspelmath (1997: 10-11) suggests: “A semantic function has been isolated when there is a significant number of languages which clearly distinguish this type from related ones in their means of expression. Thus, the main criterion is a typological one, not a semantic one. It would be very difficult to base such a

list on semantic criteria alone, because then there would be no way of constraining the possible proliferation of John gave Mary a bouquet of roses.”

Sometimes, more than just one semantic role can be identified on one argument:

(10) English

<i>John</i>	<i>gave</i>	<i>Mary</i>	<i>a bouquet of roses.</i>
AGENT		RECIPIENT	THEME
		GOAL	

In examples (10), Mary can be also be labelled as a goal, because she is also the direction of a physical movement.

#### 2.1.4 Animacy and definiteness

According to Comrie (1989: 128), “the most natural kind of transitive construction is one where the A is high in animacy and definiteness, and the P is lower in animacy and definiteness; and any deviation from this pattern leads to a more marked construction.” Therefore, an A with low animacy or definiteness as well as a P with high animacy and definiteness will probably marked specially to avoid confusion (Comrie 1989: 128). Comrie also gives a hierarchy in animacy:

“first/second person > other human noun phrases > animal noun phrases > inanimate noun phrases” (Comrie 1989: 128).

Such a hierarchy is in principal valid for all languages. At what point of the hierarchy a language starts to indicate animacy, if at all, is different from language to language. In Russian, only inanimate noun phrases are not marked specially, but take the nominative as an object case if belonging to the I declension. This differentiation is necessary because word order in Russian is free and might lead to confusion:

(11) Russian

<i>Охотник-Ø</i>	<i>убил</i>	<i>медвед-я.</i>
hunter-NOM	kill-3SG	bear-GEN

‘The hunter killed a bear.’

(12) Russian

*Охотник-а убил медведь-Ø.*

hunter-GEN kill-3SG bear-NOM

‘The bear killed the hunter/the hunter was killed by a bear.’

### 2.1.5 Differential object marking as an example of case assignment

To elaborate on the different syntactic and semantic conditions having influence on the choice of case, I present examples from differential object marking in Finnish, Russian and German. Differential object marking is the possible assignment of more than one case to a direct object under different conditions.

In Finnish, the partitive is a case for the direct object (syntactic function). The cases for the total object are the nominative, genitive or accusative. A total object case is used if the action is perfective and affirmative and the object is neither dividable nor part of a bigger entity (semantic functions). The distinctions between the nominative, genitive and accusative are syntactic and semantic: The morphological accusative is restricted to personal pronouns. Proper nouns and adjectives are assigned the genitive as the object case if the clause contains a subject in order to be distinguished from the subject. If the clause does not contain any overt subject in the nominative, the object will be in the nominative.

(13) Finnish

*Päivä-llä juo-n usein kahvi-a.*

day-ADE drink-1SG often coffee-PRT

‘During day time I often drink coffee.’ (dividable noun)’

(14) Finnish

*Hän luke-e kirja-a.*

3SG read-3SG book-PRT

‘(S)he is reading a book.’ (imperfective action)

(15) Finnish

*Me e-mme osta-nee-t auto-a.*

1PL NEG-1PL buy-PTCP-PL car-PRT

‘We did not buy the car.’ (negation)



(16) Finnish

*Ota-Ø häne-t mukaan kahvila-an.*

take-IMP 3SG-ACC with café-ILL

‘Take him with you to the café!’ (personal pronoun, total object)

(17) Finnish

*Mi-stä löys-i-t kassi-poiakase-n?*

what-ELA find-PST-2SG cat-cub-GEN

‘Where did you find the kitten?’ (proper noun, total object)

(18) Finnish

*Anna-Ø minu-lle kynä-Ø!*

give-IMP 1sg-ALL pencil-NOM

‘Give me the pencil.’ (proper noun, total object, no over subject)

At the same time, Russian has three possible cases, which are chosen according to the grammatical gender and animacy of the object (semantic/syntactic functions) in order to avoid confusion: Nouns of the second declination (usually feminine nouns ending on *-a*), as well as feminine pronouns and adjectives have a special accusative form. Masculine pronouns, adjectives and nouns of the first declination (mostly masculine and neuter nouns) are assigned the genitive if animate (humans, humanoid or animals) or the nominative if they are inanimate. Neuter nouns always take the nominative because they are per se inanimate.

(19) Russian

*Нина виде-л-а Наташ-у / Виктор-а / автобус-Ø / пиво-Ø.*

NAME see-PST-F NAME-ACC / NAME-GEN / bus-NOM / beer-NOM

‘Nina saw Natasha / Viktor / a bus / a beer.’

German does not mark objects differently. Animacy, perfectivity, partitivity etc. do not play a role in case assignment for the direct object.

(20) German

*Sie sieh-t die Frau / den Mann /*  
 3SG see-3SG ART.F.ACC woman / ART.M.ACC man /  
*den Bus / das Bier.*  
 ART.M.ACC bus / ART.N.ACC beer

‘She sees the woman / the man / the bus / the beer.’

## 2.2 The Case systems in Karelian, Finnish and Russian

The case systems of Karelian and Finnish are not only rich in forms, but also very similar to each other with minor phonetic differences. There exist also such differences between the two big Karelian dialects. In both Finnish and Karelian, the endings are essentially the same in the singular and the plural and might undergo slight phonological changes:

case	Karelian Proper		Olonetz	
	question words	case endings	question words	case endings
nominative	ken? mi?	-∅	ken? mi?	-∅
genitive	kenen? min?	-n	kenen? min?	-n
partitive	kedä? midä?	-A, -tA, -O, -e	kedä? midä?	-A, -U, -dU, -tU, -O, -e
essive	kenä? minä?	-nA	kenny? minny?	-nnU
translative	kekši? miksi?	-kši, -ksi	kenekse? mikse?	-kse
inessive	keššä? missä?	-ššA, -ssA	kenes? mis?	-s
relative	keštä? mistä?	-štA, -stA	kenespäi? mispäi?	-s(päi)
illative	keh? mih?	-h	keneh? mih?	-h
adessive	kellä? millä?	-(l)lA	kenel? mil?	-l
ablative	keltä? miltä?	-ltA	kenelpäi? milpäi?	-l(päi)
allative	kellä? millä?	-(l)lA	kenele? mille?	-le
abessive	kettä? mittä?	-ttA	kenettäh? mittäh?	-ttAh
comitative	kenenke? minke?	-nke, -neh	kenenke? minke?	-nke, -neh
prolative	kečči? mičči?	-čči	keneči? miči?	-či
instructive	-, min?	-n	milleh? min verroin?	-n

Table 1: The Karelian case system with question words and endings for the singular. (Pyöli

2011: 32; Svetlov 2004; Zaikov 1999: 36)

The differences between the Olonetz partitive endings and those of Karelian Proper result from the phonetic differences in the dialects: word final *-A* in Karelian Proper equals *-U* in Olonetz. Moreover, Karelian Proper does not have voiced plosives, which Olonetz has. Also, case endings that include an *-s-* in Olonetz have an *-š-* instead in Karelian Proper. While the essive in Olonetz has a long *-nm-*, the Karelian Proper has a short *-n-*. Vice versa, Olonetz has a short *-č-* and Karelian Proper a long *-čč-* in the prolativ ending. In Olonetz, the *-i* of the translative ending changed to *-e* and the abessive has an additional *-h* at the abessive ending *-tta*. Very interesting is the fact, that adessive and allative have the same form in Karelian, while the Olonetz separative and locative cases are similar (i.e. inessive = elative, adessive = allative). In Olonetz, one can add *-pää* to the *-l* or *-s* of the adessive-ablative resp. inessive-elative to emphasize the separative function.

Compare the Karelian system to Finnish:

case	Finnish	
	question words	case endings
nominative	kuka? mikä?	-Ø
genitive	kenen? minkä?	-n
partitive	ketä? mitä?	-A, -(t)A
essive	kenä? minä??	-nA
translative	keneksi? miksi?	-ksi
inessive	kenessä? missä?	-ssa
elative	kenestä? mistä?	-sta
illative	keneen? mihin?	-Vn, -hVn, -seen
adessive	kenellä? millä?	-lla
ablative	keneltä? miltä?	-lta
allative	kenelle? mille?	-lle
abessive	-	-tta
comitative	-	-ne+Px
prolative	-	-tse
instructive	-	-n

Table 2: Finnish case paradigm (Buchholz 2004: 46)

A big difference between Finnish and Karelian is the clear distinction between all the local cases. Moreover, instructive, comitative and to some extent the abessive are becoming old-fashioned and are usually replaced by adpositional constructions. The prolative is not considered a case but a derivation in the Finnish tradition (Buchholz 2004: 32).

The three Russian declension paradigms are essentially different from Finnish and Karelian:

		Russian	
case	question	singular	plural
nominative	кто? что?	-Ø or -о	-ы/и or -а
genitive	кого? чего?	-а/я	-ов/ев/ей/ий
dative	кому? чему?	-у/ю	-ам/ям
accusative	кого? что?	= N. or G.	= N. or G.
instrumental	кем? чем?	-ом/ем/ём	-ами/ями
locative	ком? чём?	-е/и/(у)	-ах/ях

Table 3: declension I in Russian (Bendixen & Voigt 2003: 33)

		Russian	
case	question	singular	plural
nominative	кто? что?	-а/я	-ы/и
genitive	кого? чего?	-ы/и	-Ø/ей/ий
dative	кому? чему?	-е/и	-ам/ям
accusative	кого? что?	-у/ю	-ы/и. or G.
instrumental	кем? чем?	-ой/ей/ёй	-ами/ями
locative	ком? чём?	-е/и	-ах/ях

Table 4: declension II in Russian (Bendixen & Voigt 2003: 33)

		Russian	
case	question	singular	plural
nominative	кто? что?	-я	-и or -а
genitive	кого? чего?	-и	-ей or -Ø
dative	кому? чему?	-и	-ам/ям
accusative	кого? что?	-я	-и. or а.
instrumental	кем? чем?	-ью/ем/ём	-ами/ями
locative	ком? чём?	-и	-ах/ях

Table 5: declension III in Russian (Bendixen & Voigt 2003: 33)

Russian has six grammatical cases, but only two resp. three of them exist also in Finnish and Karelian: the nominative, the genitive and the accusative. The accusative has its own morphological form only in the II. declension in Russian, and in Finnish and Karelian Proper only for personal pronouns. Otherwise, the genitive or nominative are used instead of a morphological accusative case in all three languages. The functions of the Russian dative, instrumental and locative case are expressed by other case forms in Finnish and Karelian, such as adessive, allative, inessive, translative etc.

While in Karelian and Finnish basically only one paradigm applies for every nominal form both in the singular and plural, Russian has three types of declension in the singular and one in the plural. The endings may differ on account of phonological and semantic reasons. Also, Finnish and Karelian are agglutinating language, i.e. the case endings are added to the word forms, while the stem does not change (the occurring gradation is a correlating phonotactic phenomenon and is not part of the case marking). In the inflectional language Russian on the other hand, the stem may change by movement of stress from one syllable to another or by the loss or addition of sounds.

### **2.2.1 The different functions of different cases in Finnish and Russian**

The functions that cases can express are universal. The ways they are expressed in different languages can vary hugely. A function that is expressed in one language by a certain case can be expressed in another language by a different case. In one language, one case can have several functions while the same functions can be expressed by several cases in another language. Here are examples for functions expressed differently in Russian, Finnish and German (which I added for the sake of elaboration):

function	morphological case		
	German	Russian	Finnish
subject	<b>Nom</b>	<b>Nom</b>	<b>Nom / Part</b>
predicative ( <i>be, become</i> )	<i>sein</i> + <b>Nom</b> <i>werden</i> + <b>Nom</b>	<i>быть</i> + <b>Instr</b> <i>стать</i> + <b>Instr</b>	<i>olla</i> + <b>Nom</b> <i>tulla</i> + <b>Trans</b>
direct object animate	<b>Acc</b>	<b>Acc (f), Gen (m), Nom (n)</b>	<b>Nom / Gen / Acc / Part</b>
direct object inanimate	<b>Acc</b>	<b>Acc (f), Nom (m, n)</b>	<b>Nom / Gen / Acc / Part</b>
direct total object	<b>Acc</b>	<b>Acc / Gen / Nom</b>	<b>Nom</b> (without subject) / <b>Gen</b> (Sg) / <b>Acc</b> (Pl)
direct partial object	<b>Acc</b>	<b>Acc / Gen / Nom</b>	<b>Part</b>
consider sth to be sth	<i>halten für</i> + <b>Acc</b>	<i>считать</i> + <b>Instr</b>	<i>luulla</i> + <b>Trans</b> <i>pitää</i> + <b>Ess</b>
indirect object	<b>Dat</b>	<b>Dat</b>	<b>All</b>
location at (ade)	<i>an</i> + <b>Dat</b>	<i>у</i> + <b>Gen</b>	<b>Adess</b>
location on (supe)	<i>auf</i> + <b>Dat</b>	<i>на</i> + <b>Loc</b>	<b>Gen + päällä</b>
location in (ine)	<i>in</i> + <b>Dat</b>	<i>в</i> + <b>Loc</b>	<b>Iness</b>
direction to (all)	<i>an</i> + <b>Acc</b>	<i>до</i> + <b>Gen</b>	<b>All</b>
direction onto (subl)	<i>auf</i> + <b>Acc</b>	<i>на</i> + <b>Acc</b>	<b>Gen + päälle</b>
direction into (ill)	<i>in</i> + <b>Acc</b>	<i>в</i> + <b>Acc</b>	<b>Ill</b>

Table 6: case functions and case forms.

We can see for example, that the German system has one case for the subject and the predicative (nominative), Russian has the nominative for the subject and the instrumental case for the predicate (if copula is overt in the clause). Finnish uses the nominative for non-partial subjects and the predicative after the copula *olla*, the partitive for partial subject and the translative for the predicative after *tulla*, which describes a change of state. Again, German has one case for the direct object (accusative), location (dative) and direction (accusative), Russian has two for the direct object (genitive, nominative), location (genitive, locative) and direction (genitive, accusative), while Finnish has four possible cases for the direct objects (nominative, genitive, accusative, partitive), two for location (inessive, bare adessive, adessive on *pää*-) and two for direction (illative, bare allative, allative on *pää*-).

## 2.2.2 Government in Finnish and Russian

In Finnish, there is a great amount of verbs governing the partitive. Many of them do not require a direct object in Russian but demand an oblique case with or without an adposition. Here is a list of some of these verbs.

*ajatella* ‘to think’ (Ru. *думать/подумать о* + PREP), *auttaa* ‘to help’ (Ru. *помогать/помочь* + DAT), *estää* ‘to bother, to disturb’ (Ru. *мешать/помешать* + DAT), *haluttaa* ‘to want, to feel like’ (Ru. *хотеться/захотеться* + DAT), *harrastaa* ‘to be busy with, to deal with’ (Ru. *заниматься/заняться* + INS), *hävetä* ‘to be ashamed of’ (Ru. *устыдиться* + GEN), *ihmetellä* ‘to be surprised’ (Ru. *удивляться/удивиться* + DAT), *ikäväidä* ‘to long for’ (Ru. *тосковать «стосковаться» по* + DAT), *inhota* ‘to be disgusted by’ (Ru. *брезгать* + INS), *kaivata* ‘to long for’ (Ru. *тосковать по* + DAT), *kysyä* ‘to ask’ (Ru. *спрашивать/спросить о* + PREP), *käskää* ‘to order, to command’ (Ru. *приказывать/приказать* + DAT), *käyttää* ‘to use, to make use of’ (Ru. *пользоваться/воспользоваться* + INS), *lähestyä* ‘to get closer’ (Ru. *приближаться/приблизиться к* + DAT), *miellyttää* ‘to like’ (Ru. *нравиться/понравиться* + DAT), *muistella* ‘to remember’ (Ru. *помнить/вспомнить о* + PREP), *muistuttaa* ‘to remind’ (Ru. *напоминать/напомнить* + DAT), *neuvoa* ‘to advise’ (Ru. *советовать/посоветовать* + DAT), *noudattaa* ‘to follow’ (Ru. *следовать/последовать* + DAT), *opettaa* ‘to teach’ and *oppia* ‘to learn, to study’ (Ru. *учить/научить* + DAT), *palvella* ‘to serve’ (Ru. *служить/послужить* + DAT), *pelätä* ‘to fear’ (Ru. *бояться* + GEN), *puhua* ‘to speak’ (Ru. *говорить/сказать* + ADV), *rikoilla* ‘to pray to’ (Ru. *молиться* + DAT), *seurata* ‘to follow’ (Ru. *следовать/последовать за* + INS), *soittaa* ‘to play an instrument’ (Ru. *играть/сыграть на* + PREP), *surra* ‘to mourn’ (Ru. *скорбеть, горевать о* + PREP), *toivoa* ‘to hope’ (Ru. *надеяться/понадеяться на* + ACC), *uhata* ‘to threaten’ (Ru. *грозить* + DAT), *uskoa* ‘to believe’ (Ru. *верить/поверить* + DAT), *vaatia* ‘to demand’ (Ru. *потребовать/требовать* + GEN), *varoa* ‘to beware, to take heed’ (Ru. *остерегаться* + GEN), *vastustaa* ‘to be reluctant towards’ (Ru. *противиться* + DAT), *ymmärtää* ‘to understand’ (Ru. *понимать/понять* + ADV).

Of those verbs, I will have a closer look on the Russian equivalents of the frequent verbs *auttaa* - *помогать/помочь* ‘to help’, *haluttaa* - *хотеться/захотеться* ‘to want’, *miellyttää* - *нравиться/понравиться* ‘to like’, *oppia* - *учить(ся)/научить(ся)* ‘to study, to learn’, *opettaa* - *учить/научить* ‘to teach’, *puhua* - *говорить/сказать* ‘to speak’, *soittaa* - *играть/поиграть* ‘to play an instrument’ and *ymmärtää* - *понимать/понять* ‘to understand’. The Karelian equivalents *a(vv)uttua* ‘to help’, *himo(i)ttua* ‘to want’, *miel(l)yttiä* ‘to like’, *opastuo/opaštuo* ‘to learn, to study’, *opastua/opaštua/opaššua* ‘to teach’, *paista/paišta/paišša* ‘to speak’, *soittua/šoittua* ‘to play an instrument’ and *ellendiä/malttua* ‘to understand’ will be the topic of the analysis part of this thesis.

### 2.2.2.1 Russian verbs with the dative

Most of the Russian verbs in question demand a complement in the dative case. The theme of the verb *учить/научить* in the meaning ‘to teach’ is assigned the dative, in the meaning ‘to learn, to study’ the accusative. The reflexive form *учиться/научиться* ‘to learn, to study’ demands its theme always in the dative case. The beneficiary of a construction with *помогать/помочь* ‘to help, to assist’ also needs to be in the dative.

(21) Russian

*Учитель учи-л-Ø их русск-ому.*

teacher teach-PST-M 3PL.ACC Russian-DAT

‘The teacher taught them Russian.’ (Franke 2005: No. 539)

(22) Russian

*Мы помога-ем мам-е по хозяйств-у.*

1PL help-1PL mother-DAT with chores-DAT

‘We help mother with the chores.’ (Franke 2005: No. 340)

The verbs *хотеться/захотеться* ‘to want, to feel like’ and *нравиться/понравиться* ‘to like’ require an experiencer in the dative, which usually precedes them.

(23) Russian

*Мне хоч-ет-ся в театр.*

1SG.DAT want-3SG-RFL into theatre

‘I want to go to the theatre.’ (Franke 2005: No. 544)

(24) Russian

*Нам нрав-ит-ся вид из окн-а на океан.*

1PL.DAT like-3SG-RFL view from window-GEN to ocean

‘We like the ocean view from our window.’ (Franke 2005: No. 236)

### 2.2.2.2 Russian verbs with adverbial/prepositional government

The verbs of this category are used with prepositions or certain type adverbs. When talking about languages, the verbs *понимать/понять* and *говорить/сказать* are used with an adverb with the prefix *по-* and the suffix *-ски*, which is derived from an adjective meaning the language in question, or with the preposition *на* and the locative case.



(25) Russian

*Мама понима-ет по-эстонь-ски.*  
mum understand-3SG ADV-Estonian-ADV  
'Mum understands Estonian.'

(26) Russian

*А папа говор-ит по-латыш-ски.*  
But dad speak-3SG adv-Latvian-ADV  
'And dad speaks Latvian.'

(27) Russian

*Если говор-ить на русск-ом не быстро,*  
If speak-INF in Russian-LOC not fast,  
  
*то он понима-ет многое.*  
so 3SG.M understand-3SG much

'If you don't speak fast Russian, he will understand a lot.'

(28) Russian

*Если говор-ить не быстро,*  
If speak-INF not fast,  
  
*то он понима-ет на русск-ом многое.*  
so 3SG.M understand-3SG in Russian-LOC much

'If you don't speak fast, he will understand a lot of Russian.'

The verb *играть/поиграть* 'to play [a musical instrument]' uses the preposition *на* and the locative.

(29) Russian

*Я игра-л-а на скрипк-е и на фортепьяно.*  
1SG play-PST-F on violin-LOC and on piano(.LOC)<sup>1</sup>  
'I used to play (on) the violin and (on) the piano.' (Franke 2005: No. 165)

---

<sup>1</sup> *фортепьяно* is not declinable.

### 2.3 The partitive

In this chapter, I will elaborate on the partitive case from a general point of view in the Finnic languages. In different grammars, especially those of Estonian and Finnish, the use of the partitive is explained as follows: The Estonian Grammar Pt. I by Ereht et al. (1995) describes the partitive case under § 26 as an abstract case the functions of which is to form (a) the partial object expressing unlimitedness, (b) a time or quantity adverbial expression similar to the partial object, (c) the partial subject, (d) partial predicative, (e) quantizer phrases, (f) joint attribute, (g) complement in the plural, (h) place adverbials in certain fixed phrases and (i) in exclamation phrases (all examples in Estonian from Ereht et al. 1995: 53):

a) *Jüri loe-b toa-s raamatu-t.*

NAME read-3SG room-INE book.PRT

‘Jüri is reading a book in the room.’

*Keegi on siit õun-u võt-nud.*

somebody be.3SG from here apples-PL.PRT take-PTCP

‘Somebody has take apples from here.’

b) *Jüri sõit-is juba kolmanda-t kord-a Prantsusmaa-le.*

NAME drive-PST.3SG already third-PRT time-PRT France-ALL

‘Jüri drove to France already for the third time.’

*Ei ol-nud möödu-nud veel vii-t minuti-t-ki.*

NEG.3SG be-PTCP pass-PTCP yet five-PRT minute-PRT-PARTICLE

‘Not even give minutes had passed.’

c) *Kõikjal vedele-s pabere-i-d.*

everywhere lie around-PST.3SG paper-PL-PRT

‘Pieces of paper was lying everywhere.’

- d) *Jüri on meie helge-ma-i-d pä-i-d.*  
 NAME be.3SG 1PL.GEN bright-COMP-PL-PRT head-PL-PRT  
 ‘Jüri is one of the brightest ones among us.’
- e) *Ulata-Ø mu-lle klaas vet-t.*  
 reach-IMP 1SG-ALL glass water-PRT  
 ‘Give me a glass of water.’
- f) *Too mees on päris suur-t kasv-u.*  
 DEM man be.3SG quite tall-PRT height-PRT  
 ‘This man is quite tall.’
- g) *See on-gi Jüri Mets, meie pari-ma-i-d töötaja-i-d.*  
 DEM 3SG-PARTICLE NAME, 1PL.GEN good-COMP-PL-PRT worker-PL-PRT  
 ‘This actually is Jüri Mets, one of our best workers.’
- h) *Vasaku-t kät-t on väike metsatukk.*  
 left-PRT hand-PRT be.3SG small grove  
 ‘On the left side, there is a small grove.’
- i) *Oh sind!*  
 oh you.PRT  
 ‘Oh you!’

According to the Karelian grammar of Bubrix (2005: 316), the partitive is used for marking the partiality of an item (i.e. if the item is not affected as a total), after words which denote a collective or quantity, certain nouns and numerals except for *yksi* ‘one’:

(30) Olonetz

*karja lehm-i-ä*

herd cow-PL-PRT

‘a herd of cattle’

(Bubrix 2005: 316)

(31) Olonetz  
*kobralline jauhu-o*  
 handful flour-PRT  
 ‘a handful of flour’ (Bubrix 2005: 316)

(32) Olonetz  
*kolme lehmi-ä*  
 three cow-PRT  
 ‘three cows’ (Bubrix 2005: 316)

Also, the partiality of the action is mentioned. The partitive is used instead of the accusative (nominative or genitive) if the action is only done partially, not totally, i.e. if the action is imperfective:

(33) Olonetz  
*Anna-Ø miu-lle leibi-ä / leiby-Ø*  
 give-IMP 1SG-ALL bread-PRT / bread-NOM  
 ‘Give me [some] bread’ / ‘Give me the [loaf of] bread’ (Bubrix 2005: 316)

(34) *Stroi-n kodi-e / koi-n*  
 build-1SG house-PRT house-GEN  
 ‘I am building a/the house’ / ‘I will build a/the house’ (Bubrix 2005: 316)

According to the same source, the partitive is also used for comparison:

(35) Olonetz  
*Puu-da korgie-mbi*  
 tree-PRT high-COMP  
 ‘Higher than the tree’ (Bubrix 2005: 316)

There are also two very recent grammar of Karelian. Raija Pyöli’s *Livvinkarjalan Kielioppi* (2012) and Pekka Zaikov’s *Vienankarjalan Kielioppi* (2013). Pyöli lists several uses for the partitive case: object case, subject case if the subject is of uncertain number, negation, after numbers bigger than *yksi*, after certain numerals, for comparison and after certain pre- and postpositions (Pyöli 2012: pp. 38). Zaikov names basically exactly the same criteria: subject case if the subject is of uncertain number, as an object case – especially with collective or mass nouns, number bigger than *yksi* after quantifying

words, for comparison, negation and after certain post- and prepositions (Zaikov 2013: pp. 85). Overall, the basic functions of the partitive are similar in all Finnic languages.

### 2.3.1 The partial object

As an object case, the partitive forms the so-called partial object. The Estonian Grammar Pt. II by Erelt et al. (1993) describes the object as follows:

„Objektivariandi valik oleneb kõigepealt verbi aspektist, s.o sellest, kas verbiga väljendatud tegevusel on mingi talle sisemiselt omane piir (tulemus, kestuspiir vms), nii et tegevus võib, ehkki ei pruugi lõppeda selle piirini jõudmisega, või tegevusel puudub selline piir. Esimest tüüpi tegevus on piirivõimalusega ehk piiritletav, teist tüüpi tegevus piirivõimaluseta ehk piiritlematu tegevus. Piirivõimaluseta tegevust väljendavas lauses esineb ainult osaobjekt. Nt

Ma alahindasin *Peetrit*/\**Peetri*.

Piirivõimalusega tegevust väljendavas jaatavas lauses võib esineda nii osa- kui ka täisobjekt. Nt

Ma ehitan *suvilat/suvila*.”

Jänes (1971: 137) names three conditions for the partial object in Estonian, at least one of which must be fulfilled. These are negation, an unfinished action or if there is an undefined quantity or a part of something. Eva Buchholz (2004: pp. 162) describes similar conditions for the Finnish partial object, namely negation, an unfinished action and an undefined quantity or a dividable object. A difference between Estonian and Finnish however is that besides uncountable things in the singular also countable things in the plural are marked with the partitive in Finnish. *Iso suomen kielioppi* (2005: § 930), describes three criteria for the partial object of which at least one has to be fulfilled. These criteria are 1) as negated interpreted sentence (*Tapasitko häntä?, Tuohon on mahdoton antaa vastausta.*), 2) an aspectually unlimited sentence (*Taloamme maalataan.*) and 3) quantitatively undefined object (*Söin aamulla puuroa ja omenan.*) (examples: (VISK 2005: § 930).

According to the Finnish Grammar by Paul Alvre (1992), the conditions for the partial object are a) the expression of an undefined/indeterminate part, b) the action being imperfective or durative and c) the sentence being negated or doubted (p. 189).

Arvo Laanest (1975: 198) explains:

“Totaalobjekti tarvitatakse järgmistel tingimustel: 1) lause on jaatav; 2) tegevus viiakse lõpule, on resultatiivne; 3) predikaadiga väljendatud tegevus haarab objekti tervikuna või tema kindlat osa. Kui kas või üks nendest tingimustest puudub, siis tarvitatakse partsiaalobjekti.”<sup>2</sup>

According to Lees (2015: 35), however, “The basic criteria for the choice of the partitive or the accusative object case are stated to be broadly the same for Estonian [...], Finnish [...], Karelian [...], Veps [...], Votic [...], and indeed for all Finnic languages [...] Ojajärvi (1950a: 40, 42, 137) mentions differences from Finnish in case alternation in Karelian, with partitive instead of accusative.”

One of the first researches about the functions of the partitive and the use of the partial object has been done by Aulis Ojajärvi. His results were presented in his book *Sijojen merkitystehtävistä itä-karjalan Maaselän murteissa* in 1950. He writes that the conditions for the choice of the partial object are basically the same as in Finnish, i.e. 1) the irresultative aspect of the main verb, 2) negation, 3) if the object is only partially affected by the action stated in the sentence (Ojajärvi 1950: 121).

Also according to Larjavaara (1990: 419) is the choice of the object in Karelian (Karelian Proper) case determined by the same conditions as in the other Finnic languages, the conditions for the partitive being a negation and the imperfective aspect, otherwise the accusative is used. Pyöli (1996: 273) also describes the appearance of a Total and a partial object for Olonez Karelian. The cases of the total object may be the nominative, the genitive and in case of personal pronouns also a special accusative form as in Finnish. The partitive is as in the other Finnic languages the case of the partial object.

Pyöli names also indirectly imperfectivity as one condition for the choice of the partitive as the object case (“Partiaallinen eli osaobjekti ilmaisee toimintaa, joka on aloitettu tai jatkuu mutta jota ei ole suoritettu loppuun. Sen sija on partitiivi.” 2012: 165). Moreover, the partial object comes to use when feelings, wishes and moods (not in the grammatical sense) are expressed (Pyöli 2012: 165).

---

<sup>2</sup> The Total object is used under the following conditions: 1) The sentence is affirmative; 2) the action is finished, resultative; 3) the action expressed by the predicate covers the object as a whole or a certain part of it.

The partitive gained another function in Karelian: It is the case for marking the direct object of pronouns and animate nouns. According to Pyöli (1996: 273) the partitive appears as the object case often even in situations when the accusative would be expected, even when the verb carries resultative meaning:

(36) Olonetz

*anna-Ø mei-dy huka-t syyv-väh*

let-IMP 1PL-PRT wolf-PL eat-3PL

‘May the wolf eat us’ (Pyöli 1996: 273)

(37) Olonetz

*minu-n mužikku-a tänne työ-ttih*

1SG-GEN husband-PRT there work-PST.3PL

‘My husband was sent there to work’ (Pyöli 1996: 274)

These situations are according to Pyöli (1996: 274) personal pronouns and animate nouns being the object of the sentence. She suspects the Russian genitive as the cause for the use of the partitive instead of a total object case because of its functional similarities with the Finnic partitive:

”Venäjän genetiivi vastaa usein ims. kielten funktioissa partitiivia, jolloin verbi yleensä tarkoittaa mm. ulkokohtaista toimintaa [...] ja objektina on useimmiten persoonapronomini tai elollista olentoa tarkoittava sana.” (Pyöli 1996: 274)

Pyöli also names cases, in which the partitive is replaced by the nominative, because in Russian a grammatically masculine or neuter noun will be assigned the nominative case:

(38) Olonetz

*ei oste-ta tavaru*

NEG.3SG buy-3PL.CNG product.NOM

‘They do not buy the product.’ (Pyöli 1996, p. 274)

(39) Olonetz

*minä suvaiče-n ruado*

1SG love-1SG work.NOM

‘I love the work.’ (Pyöli 1996, p. 274)

Leet (2015, p. 45) says about the partitive in Karelian in connection with animacy that “There is mention of the animacy factor in the Maaselkä dialect of Karelian, where Ojajärvi (1950a: 42) finds the partitive case where accusative would be more appropriate, and points out that such objects often refer to animate beings. Kont (1963: 101) also points out such usage in Karelian, as well as Veps and Votic and gives a number of examples. [...] The languages where animacy seems to be a factor are those which have been particularly influenced by Russian.” In her analysis of the Olonetz New Testament nearly all personal pronoun objects were assigned the partitive (99.5%) with the exception of one, whereas for example 65.8% of all personal pronouns in the Estonian New Testament and 46.5% of all personal pronouns in the Finnish New Testament were partitive (cf. Lees 2014, p. 57).

In fact, Ojajärvi discovered not only that the partitive is especially used with personal pronouns and animate nouns as the case of the object (Ojajärvi 1950: 137) but also that it is used often in positions when one would expect the nominative rather than the genitive as the case for the direct object (Ojajärvi 1950: 140). These are typically imperative and passive sentences. However, he draws attention to the fact that the partitive is not always used as the object case in this situation but also the nominative and genitive as expected (Ojajärvi 1950: 138.). It is also mentioned that sometimes the total object appears when actually a partial object would be expected. He does not elaborate on this topic, though, nor gives he more than just a few examples (Ojajärvi 1950: 141).

For personal pronouns, there seems to be a *-t* accusative for personal pronouns, whereas at least in the Olonetz new testament all pronouns are virtually partitive except for one example (Lees 2014: 149). Pyöli, however, mentions the use of special *-t* accusative forms for personal pronouns (1996: 273).

In his grammar from 1938, Ahtia describes the use of the partitive as the following: “Kun tekeminen kohdistuu henkilöön, niin objekti usein esiintyy partsiaalisena, imperatiivin ja passiivin jälkeen aina.” (2014: 10). Neither Pyöli (2012) nor Zaikov (2013) nor Markianova (2002), on which Pyöli’s newer grammar of Olonetz is base, however, name animacy as a factor for the choice of the partitive as an object case in the chapters about partitive or objects in their grammars of Olonetz resp. Karelian Proper, so that the partitive might presumably be assigned to animate objects in colloquial speech only but not in the written standards.



### 3 The analysis

#### 3.1 Example 1: *paista* ~ *paissa*

The verb *paista* (Olonetz) resp. *paissa* (Karelian Proper) means ‘to speak’. I researched its government pattern in the expressions in the meaning ‘to speak a language’, i.e. what case is assigned to the language spoken. I differentiated between direct expressions for languages (e.g. Karelian, Russian, Finnish, English etc.) and indirect expressions (e.g. mother tongue, own language, pronouns; also expressions with adjectives and the word ‘dialect’). For the direct expressions for language, I also paid attention to whether the words are assigned the case directly (*karjalua*, *venua*, *suomie*) or if the case is assigned to the word *kieli* ‘language’ (*karjalan*, *venan/venyän*, *suomen/š Suomen kiely/kiely*).

The equivalents in the reference languages are *puhua* in Finnish and *говорить* in Russian. *puhua* governs the partitive, in Russian a special adverb with *no-*, which is derived from the language (e.g. *no-русски*), or the expression *на* + ‘language’. ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC follow the verb. There are minor differences between the two types of government. While in Finnish the verb demands a direct object, a direct object is not possible in Russian. At the same time, an oblique case is not possible in Finnish.

(40) Finnish

*Hän puhu-u karjala-a / \*karjala-ksi / \*karjala-n kiele-llä.*

3SG speak-3SG Finnish-PRT / Finnish-TRS / Finnish-GEN language-ADE

‘(S)he speaks Finnish.’

(41) Russian

*Он(а) говор-ит по-карельски / на карельск-ом /*

3SG speak-3SG Karelian.ADV / on Karelian-LOC /

*\*карельск-ий язык-Ø.*

Karelian-ADJ.M.ACC language-ACC

‘(S)he speaks Karelian.’

In Karelian I found different cases for the languages spoken. The main cases are the translative, the partitive and the adessive. Moreover, the illative is sometimes assigned to language to. The overall distribution is as follows:

	bare PRT	PRT with „kieli“	bare TRS	TRS with „kieli“	bare ADE	ADE with „kieli“	ILL	total
direct	55 (4.9%)	39 (3.5%)	909 (80.5%)	1 (>0.1%)	-	117 (10.4%)	8 (0.7%)	1129 (100%)
indirect	118 (25.4%)		9 (1.9%)		321 (69.0%)		17 (3.7%)	465 (100%)
total	212(13.3%)		919 (57.6%)		438 (27.5%)		25 (1.6%)	1594 (100%)

Table 7: distribution of cases for paista

For the vast majority of all the 1594 examples, the main case of government is the translative (919, 57.6%), followed by the adessive (438, 27.5%), the partitive (212, 13.3%) and finally the illative (25, 1.6%). The partitive is the original case in Finnic. The adessive reflects the Russian expression with *на* + ‘language’.ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC. It probably took over the functions of the partitive because the adessive and the expression *на* + ‘language’.ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC share similarities in their basic function of expressing location at or on something. The Russian pattern was simply borrowed into Karelian. A similar borrowing happened to the translative. The expression ‘language’.TRS is native to Karelian meaning ‘in the language’ (compare Fi. *suomeksi* ‘In Finnish’). Its functions have been extended to those which had been (probably) exclusively carried by the partitive and it reflects the Russian expression with the adverb with *но*-. As there is a variation of the adverb with *но*- and the expression *на* + ‘language’.ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC in Russian, there is now a variation of the adessive vs. translative in Karelian.

(42) Finnish

*Mi-tä se tarkoitta-a suome-ksi?*  
 what-PRT DEM mean-3SG Finnish-TRS  
 ‘What does this mean in Finnish?’

(43) Russian

*Что это знач-ит но-фински?*  
 What DEM mean-3SG Finnish-ADV  
 ‘What does this mean in Finnish?’

(44) Olonetz

*Mi-dä-bo tama merkičč-öy suome-kse?*

What-PRT-Q DEM mean-3SG Finnish-TRS

‘What does this mean in Finnish?’

I assume that the Karelian translative reflects the adverb with *no-* and the Karelian adessive the expression *na* + ‘language’.ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC in Russian because of the structures in Karelian: In expression with a direct word for language, the construction is always ‘language’.GEN + *kieli*.ADE (117 examples) or ‘language’.TRS (909 examples), but according to my data never ‘language’.ADE (0 examples) and only marginally ‘language’.Gen + *kieli*.TRS (1 example), the same as the adverb with *no-* in Russian can never take the word *язык* and the construction *na* + ‘language’.ADJ.LOC is only possible in elliptical expressions. The partitive can be assigned directly to the word for language (55) or to the word *kieli* (39).

(45) Olonetz

[...] *paista-Ø meijä-n čoma-l karjala-n kiele-l.*

[...] speak-IMP 1SG-GEN beautiful-ADE Karelian-GEN language-ADE

‘[...] speak our beautiful Karelian language.’

(46) Karelian Proper

[*hyö*] *opašše-ttih mei-tä oikie-šti*

[3PI] teach-PST.3PL. 1PL-PRT correct-ADV

*pakaja-ma-h šuome-n kiele-llä.*

speak-SFX-ILL Finnish-GEN language-ADE

‘[They] taught us to speak correctly Finnish.’

(47) Olonetz

*Linna-s pais-tah enimiteven’a-kse.*

city-INE speak-PAS mostly Russian-TRS

‘In the city mostly Russian is spoken.’

(48) Karelian Proper

*Muamo-ni* [...] *aina* *paka-si* *lapš-i-en* *kerä*  
mother-1PX [...] always speak-3SG.PST child-PL-GEN with  
*vain* *venäjä-kši.*  
only Russian-TRS

‘My mother [...] always spoke only Russian with the children.’

(49) Olonetz

*Joga* *päivi-ä* *karjala-n* *kiel-dy*  
every day-PRT Karelian-GEN language-PRT  
*pagiz-ou* *Suome-s* *läs* *5 000.*  
speak-3SG Finland-INE approximately 5 000.

‘5.000 [people] speak Karelian in Finland every day.’

(50) Karelian Proper

*Tietyšti* *mie* *enemmän* *pakaja-n* *venäjä-n* *kiel-tä.*  
of course 1SG more speak-1SG Russian-GEN language-PRT  
‘Of course I speak more Russian.’

(51) Olonetz

*Škola-s* *laps-i-i* *kielle-ttih* *pagize-ma-s* *saami-e.*  
school-INE child-PL-PRT forbid-3PL.PST speak-SFX-INE Saami-PRT  
‘In school, the children were forbidden to speak Saami.’

(52) Karelian Proper

*En* *šuata-Ø* *pais-sa* *venäjä-ä.*  
NEG.1SG can-CNG speak-INF Russian-PRT  
‘I cannot speak Russian.’

In Olonetz, the illative also appears a little more than just marginally when the partitive would be expected. However, I cannot give a clear explanation for its appearance but the construction seems to be ‘language’.GEN + *kieli*.ILL and might just be another variation of the reflection of the Russian + ‘language’.ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC because the illative is like the adessive a local case. I am not sure how valid this theory is since the adessive is a so

called outer local case that expresses a position at a spot while the illative is an inner local case expressing movement.

(53) Olonetz

*Enimä-t pais-tah nemtsoi-n kiele-h libo ven'a-kse.*  
 most-PL speak-3PL German-GEN language-ILL or Russian-TRS  
 ‘Most [people] speak German or Russian.’

What concerns indirect expressions of language, the distribution is a bit different. The most common case of government is the adessive (321 examples, 69.0%), followed by the partitive (117 examples, 10.4%) and the illative (17 examples, 3.7%, again only in Olonetz). The translative (9 examples, 1.9%) appears only in the data collected from the Olonetz online newspaper *Karjal žurnualu*. The reason is probably again the fact that adessive (and illative?) and translative are reflections of the Russian *на* + ‘language’.ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC resp. the adverbial construction with *но-*, while the partitive is the original way of expression.

(54) Olonetz

*Lapse-nnu [...] pagiz-i-n vai muamankiele-l [...].*  
 child-ESS [...] speak-PST-1SG only mother tongue-ADE [...]  
 ‘As a child [...], I only spoke [my] mother tongue.’

(55) Karelian Proper

[...] *mie* [...] *voi-n pais-sa kyläläis-i-en*  
 [...] 1SG [...] can-1SG speak-INF villager-PL-GEN  
*kerä muamonkiele-llä.*  
 with mother tongue-ADE

‘I can speak my mother tongue with the people from the village.’

(56) Olonetz

*Vienankarjal on karjala-n kiele-n murreh,*  
Karelian Proper be.3SG Karelian-GEN language-GEN dialect,  
*kudamu-a pais-tah Karjala-n tazavalla-n pohjaze-s.*  
REL-PRT speak-PAS Karelia-GEN republic-GEN north-INE.

‘Karelian Proper is a dialect of the Karelian language, which is spoken in the north of the Republic of Karelia.’

(57) Karelian Proper

*Kakšikolme kertu-a kuukauve-šša Petroskoi-n*  
twelve time-PRT month-INE Petrozavodsk-GEN  
*karjalaise-t kerävyv-täh pakaja-ma-h muamonkiel-tä*  
Karelian-PL gather-3PL speak-SFX-ILL mother.tongue-PRT  
*Kanšallis-i-en kulttuur-i-en keškukše-h.*  
national-PL-GEN culture-PL-GEN centre-ILL

‘Twelve times a month the Karelians of Petrozavodsk gather in the Centre of National Cultures to speak Karelian.’

(58) Olonetz

[...] *pitkä-n aigu-a mei-le kielle-ttih*  
[...] long-GEN time-PRT 1PL-ALL forbid-PST.3SG  
*pais-ta tä-h kiele-h [...]*  
speak-INF DEM-ILL language.ILL [...]

‘[...] for a long time we were forbidden to speak this language [...].’

(59) Olonetz

[...] *sugulaz-i-en kel, kudama-t pais-tah sama-kse*  
[...] relative-PL-GEN with, REL-PL speak-3PL same-TRS  
*vähembistökiele-kse kui häi.*  
minority language-TRS as 3SG

‘[...] with relatives, who speak the same minority language as her.’

Moreover, there seems to be a slight difference in the case distribution between Olonetz and Karelian proper:

	partitive	translative	adessive	illative	Total
Olonetz	68 (7.2%)	784 (82.9%)	86 (9.1%)	8 (0.8%)	946 (100%)
Karelian Proper	26 (14.2%)	126 (68.9%)	31 (16.9%)	-	183 (100%)
Total	94 (8.3%)	910 (80.6%)	117 (10.4%)	8 (0.7%)	1129 (100%)

Table 8: Distribution of cases among the dialects for direct expression of language.

The use of the partitive is, according to my data, more widespread in Karelian Proper (14.2% of the examples) than in Olonetz (7.2%). An explanation might be the fact that Karelian Proper is more closely related to Finnish and less russified than its southern neighbour Olonetz. Opposed to this, the cases that I assume to mirror the Russian strategies of government (translative, adessive and illative) form a picture of 92.8% in Olonetz vs. 85.8% in Karelian Proper. Within this group it is noticeable that Karelian Proper seems to make less overall use of the translative case (68.9%) - which in general is the most frequently used case of government in both languages - than Olonetz (82.9%) but more of the adessive (16.9% vs. 9.1% in Olonetz). There is no evidence of a use of the illative in my data in Karelian proper, while in Olonetz it forms 0.8%.

	partitive	translative	adessive	illative	total
Olonetz	103 (25.4%)	9 (2.2%)	277 (68.2%)	17 (4.2%)	406 (100%)
Karelian Proper	15 (25.4%)	-	44 (74.6%)	-	59 (100%)
Total	118 (25.4%)	9 (1.9%)	321 (69.0%)	17 (3.7%)	465 (100%)

Table 9: Distribution of cases among the dialects for indirect expression of language.

The use of the partitive, i.e. the Finnic pattern, in my data is in both dialects approximately 25.4%, while the cases that mirror the Russian pattern (adessive, illative and translative) form in both dialects 74.6%, which indicates a rather strong general influence of the Russian language. Moreover, the adessive, which shares the functions of the Russian construction *на* + 'language'.ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC, is the most frequently used case for indirect expressions of language. In Olonetz it makes up to 68.2% in my data and 74.6% in Karelian proper. The translative on the other hand is non-existent in my data of Karelian Proper and makes up only 2.2% in Olonetz (which appear only in one and the same newspaper). If we bear in mind that the Karelian translative can be seen as an equivalent to the Russian adverb with *no-*, the Russian influence can be held

responsible, since in Russian the *no*-adverb is only possible with direct words for languages but the construction *на* + ‘language’.ADJ.LOC + *язык*.LOC does not necessarily need a direct word. Therefore, if we compare the data of the direct expressions for language and the indirect expressions, we also notice a much lesser use of the translative for indirect expressions (1.9% vs. 80.6% for direct expressions). The use of the partitive and the adessive is higher for indirect expressions, though: partitive 25.4% (indirect) vs. 8.3% (direct); adessive 69.0% (indirect) vs. 10.4% (direct).

### 3.2 Example 2: *ellendiä* / *malttua*

The verbs *ellendiä* (Olonetz) and *malttua* (Karelian Proper) mean both ‘to understand (a language)’. In these meanings, *ellendiä* is Olonetz and *malttua* is Karelian Proper. However, *malttua* has two meanings in Karelian Proper according to Zaikov’s dictionary (1999). The first meaning is ‘to understand’ (*понимать*), the second meaning is ‘can, to be able to, to have the possibility to’ (*уметь, мочь*). I researched the government of the verbs in the meaning ‘to understand a language’, i.e. not a person or a principle etc.

The Finnish equivalent is *ymmärtää*, which is used with the partitive. In Russian it is *понимать*. It governs the accusative case or a special adverbial form derived from the word of the language (*русский язык* ‘the Russian language.NOM/ACC’ → *но-русски* ‘in Russian.ADV’). I will not go deeper into possible grammatical, stylistic or free differences in the meaning of the two different types of government.

In Karelian, the verb *ellendiä* / *malttua* governs the partitive or the translative. The use of the partitive is also described by Raija Pyöli (1996: 261) gives examples of the Olonetz *ellendiä* and *ponimaija*<sup>3</sup>:

(60) Olonetz

<i>häi</i>	<i>el'l'endä-y</i>	<i>l'ivvi-gze-gi</i>
3SG	understand-3SG	Olonetz-TRS-PARTICLE
‘(S)he understands also Olonetz.’		

<sup>3</sup> The verb *ponimaija* is a loanword from the Russian *понимать* ‘to understand’ in Olonetz. Since there is no evidence of the verb in my corpus, I assume it is mainly used in spoken language



(61) Olonetz

*dai pon'imaičč-ou karjala-kse*  
and also understands-3SG Karelian-TRS  
'and also understands Karelian'

In my opinion, the translative is a reflection of the Russian adverb with *no-* (compare *paista* + translative). The partitive is typically the case used in the other Finnic languages because of the imperfective action. I believe in two reasons why the partitive did not disappear totally: Firstly, the process of shifting from once type of government to another is not complete yet. Secondly, there is also an opposition of two possible types of government in Russian (accusative and the adverb with *no-*). I.e. at the moment there seems to be a free choice between the two cases in Karelian.

Finnish, however, always uses the partitive. The translative in this position is ungrammatical.

(62) Finnish

*Me ymmärrä-mme karjala-a / karjala-n kiel-tä /*  
1PL understand-1PL Karelian-PRT / Karelian-GEN language-PRT /  
*\*karjala-ksi.*  
Karelian-TRS

'We understand Karelian'

(63) Russian

*Мы понима-ем карельск-ий язык-Ø. / по-карельски.*  
1PL understand-1PL Karelian-ADJ.M.ACC language / Karelian.ADV  
'We understand Karelian'

The distribution of the cases in the corpuses is the following:

	bare PRT	PRT with „kieli“	bare TRS	ADE	NOM	Total
Olonetz	3 (12.5%)	9 (37.5%)	10 (41.7%)	1 (4.2%)	1 (4.2%)	24 (100%)
Karelian Proper	2 (10.0%)	14 (70.0%)	4 (20.0%)	-	-	20 (100%)
Together	5 (11.4%)	23 (52.3%)	14 (31.8%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.3%)	44 (100%)

Table 10: distribution of cases for *ellendiä/malttua*

In both dialects, the verb governs the partitive and the translative. Keeping in mind the small number of examples, one can carefully say that both cases seem to be used more or less equally often. In Karelian Proper, the partitive seems to be used more frequently, maybe because this dialect is closer to Finnish, which only uses the partitive in this position, than the Olonetz dialect. The construction *language.Part (karjalua)* is used in lesser extent than the expression *language.Gen + “kieli”.Part, (karjalan kiieldy/kieltä)* probably because Russian expresses *language* as *language.Adj + “язык” (русский язык)*, which equals the Karelian *language.Gen + “kieli”* (cf. Estonian *eesti keel*). The lacking use of a construction like *language.Gen + “kieli”.Trans (\*karjalan kielekse/kieleksi etc.)* may be explained because the Russian *no-* construction does not include a word for *language*, hence the use of the bare translative.

(64) Olonetz

*Rahvaha-nke, kudama-t ellende-täh karjalua, [...]*  
 people-COM, REL-PL understand-3PL Karelian-PRT, [...]  
 ‘With the people, who understand Karelian, [...]’

(65) Karelian Proper

*Vet työ kaikin hyvin malta-tta venäjy-ä,*  
PARTICLE 2PL all well understand-2PL Russian-PRT,  
*voi-tta vet pais-sa venäjä-kši ta*  
be able-2PL PARTICLE speak-INF Russian-TRS and  
*toise-t-ki ihmise-t ymmärre-täh tei-tä!*  
other-PL-PARTICLE people-PL understand-3PL 2PL-PRT

‘You all do understand Russian well, you do can speak Russian and the other people will understand you!’

(66) Olonetz

*Duumai-čen suomelaine voi-bi karjala-n kiel-dy*  
think-1SG Finn can-3SG Karelian-GEN language-PRT  
*ellendi-ä kursi-loi-le käy-mä-ttäh.*  
understand-INF course-PL-ALL go-SFX-ABE

‘I think a Finn can understand Karelian without going to the courses.’

(67) Karelian Proper

*Livvi-n kiel-tä Julija ei malta-Ø.*  
Olonetz-GEN language-PRT Julija not.3SG understand-CNG  
‘Julija does not understand Olonetz.’

(68) Olonetz

*Tuoatto-häi paho-i vena-kse ellend-i*  
Father-PARTICLE bad-ADV Russian-TRS understand-PST.3SG  
*da vie paho-i kuul-i [...]*  
and even bad-ADV hear-3SG

‘Father understood Russian badly and even heard [it] badly [...]’

(69) Karelian Proper

*Malta-n*            *karjala-kši*    *melko*    *hyvin*,  
understand-1SG    Karelian-TRS    quite    well,  
  
*ka*    *paho-in*            *pakaja-n*.  
but    bad-ADV            speak-1SG

‘I understand Karelian quite well, but I speak [it] badly.’

In my Olonez data, I found two interesting exceptions: In one case, the verb governs the nominative, in another the adessive.

(70) Olonez

*Hieru-s*            *rahvas*    *si-h*            *aiga-h*    *jo*            *kaikin*  
Village-INE    folk    this-ILL    time-ILL    already    everyone  
  
*kudakui*            *ellende-ttih*            *saksa-n*            *kieli-Ø*.  
somehow    understand-PST.3PL    German-GEN    language-NOM

‘In the village, already all the people understood German at this time.’

An explanation for the nominative might be the impersonal voice of the predicate.

(71) Olonez

*Hilta*    *hyvin*            *ellend-i*            *dai*  
Hilta    well            understand-PST.3SG    and  
  
*pagiz-i*            *saksa-n*            *kiele-l*.  
speak-PST.3SG    German-GEN    language-ADE

‘Hilta understood and spoke German well.’

I suspect the reason for the use of the adessive in this certain example depends on the verb *paista* ‘to speak’, which is positioned closer and directly in front of the governed element.

### 3.3 Example 3: *soittua* ~ *šoittua*

The verb *soittua* (and its Karelian Proper variant *šoittua*) has the two meanings ‘to play an instrument’ and ‘to call (on the telephone)’. The same meaning has the Finnish equivalent *soittaa*. In this research I will focus on the first meaning of *soittua* and research the case of the instrument played. The verb’s translation in Russian is *играть*, which also bears the meaning ‘to play (in general)’.

In Finnish, the musical instrument is assigned the partitive if it is the object of the sentence. If the object is something else, e.g. a song etc., the object is assigned an object case (partitive/genitive/nominative/accusative) and the instrument the adessive. In Russian, the Instrument is always marked by the preposition *на* + LOC, while a possible object is assigned the accusative.

(72) Finnish

*Minä soita-n kitara-a.*  
1SG play-GEN guitar-PRT.  
‘I play the guitar.’

(73) Finnish

*Minä soit-i-n Nightwish-in laulu-n kitara-lla.*  
1SG play-PST-1SG Name-GEN song-GEN guitar-ADE  
‘A played a song by Nightwish on the guitar.’

(74) Russian

*Я поигра-л-Ø на гитар-е ради удовольстви-я.*  
1SG play-PST-M on guitar-LOC because of amusement-GEN  
‘I played the guitar for fun.’ (Franke: § 165)

(75) Russian

*Я поигра-л-Ø Катюш-у на гитар-е.*  
1SG play-PST-M Katyusha-ACC on guitar-LOC  
‘I played Katyusha on the guitar.’

The Finnish pattern is the same as in languages like English or German. The song, piece of music etc. being played on the instrument is the object of the sentence. If there is no other object, the musical instrument will be the object:

(76) English

*I play the guitar (OBJ) / a song (OBJ) on the guitar (OBLIQUE)*

(77) German

*Ich spiel-e Gitarre / ein Lied auf der Gitarre.*

1SG play-1SG guitar (OBJ) / a song (OBJ) on ART.DAT guitar.DAT

‘I play the guitar / a song on the guitar.’

Pyöli (1996: 261) brings an example of the use of the adessive in spoken Olonetz, which bears similar locative functions as the construction *na* + LOC in Russian, instead of the partitive:

(78) Olonetz

*joga perem'enu-a soite-ttih pian'iino-l*

every break-PRT play-PST.3SG piano-ADE

‘during every break they played the piano’

The distribution of cases for the musical instruments in Karelian is as follows:

	partitive	adessive	illative	Total
Olonetz	16 (12.8%)	106 (84.8%)	3 (2.4%)	125 (100%)
Karelian Proper	43 (86.0%)	7 (14.0%)	- (0%)	50 (100%)
Total	59 (33.7%)	113 (64.6%)	3 (1.7%)	175 (100%)

*Table 11: distribution of cases for soittua*

According to my data, there is a difference between the two dialects. Karelian proper mainly assigns cases according to the Finnish pattern (86% of the examples), i.e. the partitive for the musical instrument.

(79) Karelian Proper

*Ape Nieminen šoitt-i kitaru-a.*

NAME NAME play-PST.3SG guitar-PRT

‘Ape Nieminen played the guitar.’

(80) Karelian Proper

*Mei-lä ol-i kova halu*

1PL-ADE be-PST.3SG strong will

*šoitu-a musiikki-šoitim-i-e.*

play-INF music-instrument-PL-PRT

‘We had the strong urge to play musical instruments.’

The adessive case is also used in cases where there is no direct object:

(81) Karelian Proper

*Jeanskantele-n jäšene-t šoite-tah kanteleh-ella*

NAME-GEN member-PL play-3PL Kantele-ADE

*karjalais-ta musiikki-e.*

Karelian-PRT music-PRT

‘The members of Jeanskantele play Karelian music on the Kantele.’

(82) Karelian Proper

*Nykyjäh tämä-n yhtyveh-en ošallistuja-t oša-tah šoitu-a*

now this-GEN band-GEN participant-PL be able-3PL play-INF

*erilais-i-lla musiikki-šoitim-i-lla.*

different-PL-ADE music-instrument-PL-ADE

‘Now this band’s members are able to play different musical instruments.’

In Olonetz, the adessive is mainly assigned to the musical instrument (84.8% of the examples):

(83) Olonetz

*Sit vie malto-i-n bayan-al soittu-a.*

then still can-PST-1SG bayan-ADE play-INF

‘Then I was still able to play the bayan.’

(84) Olonetz

*Häi soitt-i akkordeon-al, mandolin-l,*  
3SG play-PST.3SG accordion-ADE, mandolin-ADE,  
*bandžo-l da viulu-l.*  
banjo-ADE and violin-ADE

‘He played the accordion, the mandolin, the banjo and the violin.’

The partitive, however, is still a possible case to be assigned for the musical instrument.

(85) Olonetz

*Häi soitt-i pianu-o dai skripku-a, toim-i*  
He play-PST.3SG piano-PRT and violin-PRT, function-PST.3SG  
*kuoro-n-vedäjä-nä da säveld-i.*  
choir-GEN-leader-ESS and compose-PST.3SG

‘He played both the piano and the violin, worked as a choir leader and composed.’

The different distribution of the cases assigned to the musical instruments can be explained by the nature of the dialects. Olonetz is in many ways much more influenced by the Russian language, which is why it probably follows the Russian pattern rather than the original Finnic one. Here, the partitive was mainly replaced by the adessive, the main function of which is to express the position at something, as in the Russian construction *на* + LOC. Karelian Proper is closer to Finnish, with which it is to some extent mutually intelligible. This is probably why the replacement of the partitive by the adessive has not spread widely.

Moreover, there is an interesting exception in Olonetz: In my data, I found three examples with the illative. Here is one example:



(86) Olonetz

[...] *Viena-n Karjala-s on vai nelli kyli-ä,*  
[...] Name-GEN Name-INE be.3SG only four village-PRT,  
  
*kus soite-ttih kandeleh-eh.*  
where play-PST-PAS kantele-ILL.

‘[...] in Northern Karelia, there are only four villages, where the kantele was played.’

At this point I cannot give a good explanation for this occurrence. The illative, however, is a locative case as is the adessive.

### 3.4 Example 4: *himo(i)ttua*

The verb *himoittua* (Olonetz) ~ *himottua* (Karelian Proper) means ‘to want, to need’. It equals semantically the Finnish *haluttaa* and the Russian *хочется/захочется* and bears structural similarities: All three verbs are impersonal verbs. That is, they all can appear only in the third person singular and the logical subject is assigned another case. In Finnish it is again the partitive, in Russian on the other hand it is the dative. The distribution for the Karelian *himo(i)ttua* is somewhat complicated. In Olonetz, there is the possibility to assign either the adessive, the allative or the partitive to the logical subject.

(87) Olonetz

*Iivan kazvo-i da häne-l, kui kaik-i-l nuor-i-l,*  
Iivan grow.up-PST.3SG and 3SG-ADE, as all-PL-ADE young-PL-ADE,  
  
*rube-i himoittua-ma-h linna-h.*  
start-PST.3SG want-INF-PL city-ILL.

‘Iivan grew up and he, as all young people, started to want to go to the city.’

(88) Olonetz

*Hei-le himoittua-s eli-ä linnalaz-i-en jytyi.*  
3SG-All want-CND live-INF townsman-PL-GEN according.to  
‘They would like to live like the people in the town.’

(89) Olonetz

*Himoitta-s myös nuor-i-i sua-ha oma-h ruado-h, anna-Ø*  
want-CND also young-PL-PRT get-INF own-ILL work-ILL, let-IMP

*hyö oma-s puole-s mi-dä-gi sanel-la-h.*

3PL own-ELA side-ELA what-PRT-PARTICLE say-INF-PARTICLE.

‘Also the young people would like to get to their work, let them just say something from their point of view.’

The adessive seems to be the most favoured by far. The allative is used in approximately one fifth of the examples, whereas the partitive is used only marginally:

adessive	100 (75.2%)
allative	30 (22.5%)
partitive	3 (2.3%)
total	133 (100%)

Table 12: distribution of cases for *himoittua* in Olonetz

The situation for Karelian Proper looks different. Because of phonetic reasons, the adessive and the allative have the same ending *-(l)lA*.

(90) Karelian Proper

*Olehka-lla e-i himotta-n ava-ta šilm-i-e.*

name-ADE not-3SG want-CNG.PST open-INF eye-PL-PRT

‘Olehka did not want to open his eyes.’

The partitive does not appear at all, instead we can notice a high distribution of the genitive.

(91) Karelian Proper

*Laura-n himott-i enemmän tiijuštu-a vepšäläis-i-stä.*

name-GEN want-PST.3SG more learn-INF Vepsian-PL-ELA

‘Laura wanted to learn more about the Vepsians.’

The genitive is used slightly more often than the adessive-allative case (however, the amount of examples is rather small):

genitive	17 (54.8%)
adessive-allative	14 (45.2%)
total	31 (100%)

*Table 13: the distribution of cases for himottua in Karelian Proper*

The adessive and the allative case are in the basic functions quite similar, the former describing a position at something, the latter a movement next to something. Again the similar functions of the Finnic outer local cases and the Russian dative must have inspired to transfer the functions of the partitive over to the local cases, so that they would be functionally even more similar to the Russian dative. At least in Olonetz, this type of government has nearly totally replaced the partitive. Also Pyöli writes that 30 examples of her data have the Russian type of government, while the partitive is used in only 6 examples (Pyöli 1996: p. 259).

The genitive in Karelian proper seems to be a little surprising: There is no evidence of the use of a genitive in my data nor in Raija Pyöli's. Also the Karelian Dictionary does not include examples in the genitive under *himoittoa* (p. 274). Instead, except for many examples with the adessive/allative, there are two examples of partitive government, one of which being in Karelian Proper:

(92) Karelian Proper

*Šii-tä hän-tä himotta-u näh-ä jotta mi-tä*

here-EL 3SG-PRT want-3SG see-INF that what-PRT

*šie-llä on šième-ššä.*

there-ADE be.3SG hear-INE

‘Here s(he) wanted to see what is inside the heart.’

This type of sentence is called *tunnekausatiivilause* according to Visk (§ 905): “Tunnekausatiivilauseessa ilmaistaan kausatiivisella verbillä elollisen objektitarkoitteen tunnetta tai tuntemusta [...]. Lausetyypin keskeiset osat ovat teemaksi sijoittuva kokijaobjekti ja verbi: *Minua harmittaa.*” The case of this experiencer object is the partitive in Finnish and should be the partitive, too, in Karelian resp. a case reflecting the Russian dative. But the genitive often used in these cases can hardly explained by

Russian influence. Since the logical subject / experiencer object is usually animate, it should be more likely to be in the partitive. One explanation could be the reinterpretation of the construction as a necessive construction like the Finnish *minun täytyy*, *minun pitää*, *minun on tehtävä*. The Finnish, Russian and Karelian verbs express not only a wish, but also a need which the experiencer does not have full control over. This may also explain the differences in the dialects: Karelian Proper may have developed similarly as Finnish or been influenced by it more and thus has an experiencer object in the genitive in this construction, while Olonetz has been more influenced by Russian and shares less similarities with Finnish, so that the experiencer object is assigned the adessive or allative as a reflection of the dative and may rarely be found with the partitive.

### 3.5 Example 5: *miellyttyä*

The verb *miel(l)yttyä* means ‘to like, to please, to gratify’ and can be - as its Finnish counterpart *miellyttää* - not only transitive but *tunnekausatiivinen*, i.e. the experiencer object (logical subject) is assigned the partitive. The translation into Russian is *нравиться/понравиться*, whose experiencer is in the dative.

Again, the adessive and/or allative would be expected to replace the original Finnic partitive government. There are quite a few examples in Karelian Proper that show the use of the adessive-allative with the experiencer.

(93) Karelian Proper

*Miellyttä-y-kö šiu-la ely-ä Kalevala-šša?*

like-3SG-Q 2SG-ADE live-INF Kalevala-INE

‘Do you like to live in Kalevala?’

(94) Karelian Proper

*Paikkallis-i-lla elä-j-i-llä oikein miellyte-ttih*

local-PL-ADE live-SFX-PL-ADE very like-3SG.PST

*hän-en tikutukše-t.*

3SG-GEN embroidery-PL.

‘The local inhabitants very liked her embroidery.’

Most of the examples are, however, in the partitive.

(95) Karelian Proper

*Vienan Karjala miellyttä-y suomalais-i-e.*

name name like-3SG Finn-PL-PRT

‘Finns like Vienan Karjala.’

(96) Karelian Proper

*Toivo-n, jotta še miellyttä-y kaččoj-i-e.*

hope-1SG, that this like-3SG spectator-PL-PRT

‘I hope that the audience will like it.’

(97) Karelian Proper

*Totta-š myö hei-tä miellytä-mmä!*

really-Particle 1PL 3PL-PRT like-1PL

‘They really liked us!’

The exact distribution is as follows:

partitive	69 (78.4%)
allative-adessive	19 (21.6%)
total	88 (100%)

Table 14: the distribution of cases for miellyttä in Karelian Proper

The situation in Olonetz on the other hand is very interesting. Because of the stronger influence of Russian, we should expect a broader use of the adessive or allative in this dialect. Also Pyöli (1996: p 256) finds exclusively allatives for the 25 examples of *miel'yttiä* in the spoken language. She describes however, that she found examples for the partitive in older language collections, the KKS and in Oma Mua. Of my 166 examples of *miel(l)yttyä*, almost all of which were found in Oma Mua, I found only one example of the adessive and one example of the allative.

(98) Olonetz

[...] *tuuli tämä minu-l e-i miellytä-Ø, sano-i Miikul* [...].

[...] wind this 1SG-ADE NEG-3SG like-CNG, say-PST.3SG name [...].

‘[...] I don’t like this wind, said Miikul [...].’

(99) Olonetz

*Griiša-le miellytt-i poija-n mor'aka-n-virgu [...].*

name-ALL like-PST-3SG boy-GEN seaman-GEN-position [...].

‘Griišu liked the boy’s position as a seaman [...].’

The local cases might be used here because the first example is reported spoken speech, while the second example is taken from a story and might be used as stylistic device.

The rest of the examples were all in the partitive.

(100) Olonetz

*Kilva-s minu-u ylen mielytt-i, konzu [...].*

competition-ELA 1SG-PRT very like-PST-3SG, when [...].

‘I especially liked about the competition, when [...].’

(101) Olonetz

*Minu-u miellyttä-y Vladimir Putin ristikanza-nnu.*

1SG-PRT like-3SG name name person-ESS

‘I like Vladimir Putin as a person.’

For some reason, the Russian-type government is not used in the Olonetz literary language, or at least not in the newspaper *Oma Mua*, while in Karelian Proper (*Vienan Karjala*), the adessive-allative is used to some extent.

### 3.6 Example 6: *a(vv)uttua*

The next example that I researched was the verb *auttua ~ avvuttua ~ avuttua* meaning ‘to help’. Finnish has the same verb, *auttaa*, and in Russian we find the aspectual pair *помогать/помочь*. Again *auttaa* requires the partitive while *помогать/помочь* - as in many other Indo-European languages with morphological case systems - require the dative. In Karelian the partitive would be the expected case of government. The allative can be used, too, obviously with the Russian dative as a model. However, I could not find any evidence for a functional difference between the cases as in Estonian, where the partitive is required if there is no infinitive-complement and the adessive, which is functionally similar to the allative if there is an infinitive-complement.

(102) Karelian Proper

*Pappa, auta-Ø mammu-a!*  
father, help-IMP mother-PRT

Estonian

*Isa, aita-Ø ema!*  
father, help-IMP mother.PRT

‘Father, help mother!’

(103) Olonetz

*Mene-Ø kodi-h, mene-Ø, avvuta-Ø mammi-lle-s [...]*  
go-IMP home-ILL, go-IMP, help-IMP mother-ALL-PX.2SG

Estonian

*Mine-Ø koju, mine-Ø, aita-Ø ema.*  
go-IMP home, go-IMP, help-IMP mother.PRT

‘Go home, go, help your mother [...].’

(104) Karelian Proper

*Mie auta-n šiu-la šua-ha luva-n.*  
1SG help-1SG 2SG-ALL get-INF permission-GEN.

Estonian

*Ma aita-n su-l luba saa-da*  
1SG help-1SG 2SG-ADE permission-PRT get-INF.

‘I will help you get a permission.’

(105) Olonetz

[...] *avvuta-t las-tu ellendä-mä-h, kui hyvä azii*  
[...]help-2SG child-PRT understand-INF-ILL, how good thing

*hän-en kaksi-kieliz-ys on [...]*  
3SG-GEN two-language-SFX be.3SG [...]

Estonian

*aita-d lapse-l aru saa-da, kui hea asi*  
help-2SG child-ADE understand-INF, how good thing

*tema kaks-keels-us on*  
3SG.GEN two-language-SFX be.3SG [...]

‘[...] you help the child understand, what a good thing his bilinguality is [...]’

Occasionally, the adessive is also marginally used in Olonetz. The functions of the adessive and the allative are very similar, i.e. they are both outer local cases, hence the use of the adessive as a case of government.

(106) Olonetz

*Toine toize-l auto-i-mmo pyzy-ö jallo-i-lle-h.*  
other other-ADE help-PST-1PL stay-INF foot-PL-ALL-PARTICLE.  
‘We helped eachother to stay on our feet.’

(107) Olonetz

*Avvuta-Ø häne-l Jumal.*  
help-IMP 3SG-ADE God  
‘Help him/her, God.’

The exact distribution of my data is as follows:

	partitive	allative	adessive	Total
Karelian Proper	168 (93%)	12 (7%)	0 (0%)	180 (100%)
Olonetz	298 (88%)	38 (11%)	4 (1%)	340 (100%)
total	466 (89%)	50 (10%)	4 (1%)	521 (100%)

Table 15: the distribution of cases for a(vv)uttua

As can be seen, the partitive, the differences in the use of the cases of government are not very big. The adessive does not appear in Karelian Proper. The partitive is used a little more in Karelian Proper than in Olonetz, the allative is used a little less. Overall, the partitive is preferred to the adessive.



However, I noticed one difference: In Karelian Proper, personal pronouns seem to be more likely to take the allative:

	Karelian Proper				Olonetz			
	pers. pron.	other pron.	proper nouns	total	personal pronouns	other pronouns	proper nouns	total
partitive	47 (82%)	13 (100%)	108 (98%)	168 (93%)	109 (87%)	27 (79%)	162 (90%)	298 (87%)
allative	10 (18%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	12 (7%)	13 (10%)	6 (18%)	19 (10%)	38 (11%)
adessive	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	5 (1%)

Table 16: the distribution of cases for a(vv)uttua according to parts of speech in the dialects

Also, the allative seems to be assigned almost exclusively to personal pronouns in Karelian Proper. In Olonetz, the distribution is more or less equal among the different parts of speech. The slightly higher amount of allatives used for other pronouns in this dialect can be explained because repetitions in the same source text in my corpus. More data has to be researched.

In the data of the Olonetz newspaper Oma Mua, I noticed a difference in the distribution of cases depending on the stem of the verb:

	auttua	avvuttua
partitive	280 (87%)	176 (61%)
allative	38 (12%)	105 (37%)
adessive	4 (1%)	6 (2%)
total	322 (100%)	287 (100%)

Table 17: the distribution of cases for auttua and avvuttua in Olonetz

*auttua* demands the partitive in 87% of the cases in my data, *avvuttua* only 61%, a difference of 27%. on the other hand, *avvuttua* demands the allative in 37%, while *auttua* demands it in 12% - a difference of 25%. Because of the big differences I do not consider this to be a coincidence. Where does the difference originate in?

According to KKS, there is no lexical difference between the two stems:

“**auttoa** v. auttaa, hyödyttää.” ‘to help, to be useful’ (p. 87)

“**avuttoa** v. = auttoa.” (p. 92)

“**avvu-** → avu-“ (p. 92)

I suppose that *avvuttua* is the original Karelian verb which had been influenced more by the Russian language, and *auttua* is a loan from Finnish language and therefore used more with the partitive. Although it can be found in the KKS, in my data of Karelian Proper, which is more closely related to Finnish, *avvuttua* is non-existent. Both verbs are synonyms and the topic in the discussion of the standardisation of the Karelian language, as are other words:

“Oli pagin normativnois kiele. Meijän mieles, pidäy andua väilly “kyläle dai hierule”, “stolale dai stolal”, “avvuttua dai auttua” lugijoil lugie “lehtie dai gaziettu”. Ei pie brakuija sinonimoi, midä enämbi niidy on, sidä bohatembi on pagin. [There were talks about a normative language. In our opinion, it should be free to use “kylä and hieru”, “stolale and stolal”, “avvuttua and auttua” and for the reader to read “a lehti or a gaziettu”. There is no need to condemn synonyms, the more there are of them, the richer is the speech.]” (Oma Mua 2010/07, No 994: 2).

Raija Pyöli makes a different observation. In the data from her informants, she found 33 examples of an allative government, but only 3 examples for the partitive (Pyöli 1996: 255). She also says that the allative is dominating nowadays: “[V]anhoista aineistosta tavatut partitiiviesimerkit viittaavat tähän samoin kuin se, että nykyaunuksessa lähes ainoana vaihtoehtona esiintyy allatiivirektio. [...] Tilanne näyttää olevan sama kuin variaabelin kava kohdalla: venäläismallista on tullut aunuksen uususta.” (Pyöli 1996: 256). This seems to be contradicting to my results, which show that the partitive is still preferred. But my data represent the language of the media of the recent years, whereas Pyöli’s data are examples of spoken language. I conclude that the Russian influence on the spoken language must be stronger than on the written language of the media, which might indicate an ongoing process of language shift in (Olonetz) Karelian.

3.7 **Example 7: *opastua* ~ *opaštua* ~ *opaššua* and *opastuo* ~ *opaštuo* ~ *opaššuo***

*Opastua* (Olonetz) resp. *opaštua* ~ *opaššua* (Karelian Proper) means ‘to teach’ and *opastuo* (Olonetz) resp. *opaštuo* ~ *opaššuo* (Karelian Proper) means ‘to learn, to study’. Its Finnish counterpart is *opettaa*, which demands the partitive no matter if somebody is taught something or if something is taught. If the learner and the learned appear in the same sentence, the learner takes the allative and the learned the partitive.

(108) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>opeta-n</i>	<i>suome-a.</i>
1SG	teach-1SG	Finnish-PRT
‘I teach Finnish.’		

(109) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>opeta-n</i>	<i>laps-i-a.</i>
1SG	teach-1SG	children-PL-PRT
‘I teach children.’		

(110) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>opeta-n</i>	<i>laps-i-lle</i>	<i>suome-a.</i>
1SG	teach-1SG	children-PL-ALL	Finnish-PRT
‘I teach Finnish to children.’			

*Opastuo* means ‘to learn, to study’ and is the counterpart to the Finnish *oppia*, which demands the partitive.

Also, Russian has to verbs that can express ‘to teach’ and/or ‘to study’, but there is no 1:1 translation from Russian to Finnic. The more common verb *учить/выучить* can mean both ‘to teach’ or ‘to study’ depending on the semantic or grammatical context. With only one object designating the learned object it can mean both:

(111) Russian

<i>Я</i>	<i>уч-у</i>	<i>русск-ий</i>	<i>язык-Ø.</i>
1SG	learn/teach-1SG	Russian-ADJ.M.ACC	language-ACC
‘I learn Russian.’ or ‘I teach Russian.’			

If the learner and the learned appear in the same sentence with the meaning ‘to teach’, unlike Finnish, the learner takes the case for the direct object (i.e. the genitive-form accusative), while the learned is assigned the dative.

(112) Russian

*Я уч-у школьник-ов русск-ому язык-у.*  
 1SG teach-1SG pupil-ACC Russian-ADJ.M.DAT language-DAT  
 ‘I teach Russian to children.’

Similarly, the word ‘to learn, to study’ demands the dative case instead of the accusative. In Finnish, however, the word *oppiä* takes the partitive (direct object).

(113) Russian

*Я уч-у-сь русск-ому язык-у.*  
 1SG learn-1SG-RFL Russian-ADJ.M.DAT language-DAT  
 ‘I study Russian.’

For this reason, I compared both *opastuo* and *opastua* in the same chapter. The distribution of cases for *opastuo* are the following:

	Olonetz		Karelian Proper	
partitive	182	60.87%	85	98.84%
illative	116	38.80%	-	-
accusative/genitive	1	0.33%	1	1.16%
total	299	100%	86	100%

Table 18: distribution of cases for *opastuo* according to dialects

In Olonetz, in 60.87% of the examples of my data, the original Finnic partitive is used.

(114) Olonetz

*Opastu-n suome-n kiel-dy jo viijet-ty vuot-tu [...]*  
 learn-1SG Finnish-GEN language-PRT already fifth-PRT year-PRT  
 ‘I study Finnish the fifth year [...].’

(115) Olonetz

*Tunisa-s opastu-n kriminalistiekku-a [...]*

Tunesia-INE learn-1SG criminalistics-PRT

‘In Tunesia, I study criminalistics [...].’

In 38.80%, the illative is used. The illative is a reflection of the Russian dative. The Russian dative has a lative function, i.e. it can be used as a local case designating a movement towards something. This function is usually carried by the allative in Karelian but since the *opastua* originally takes the adessive for the learner, the semantically related *opastuo* does not take the same case for the learned. Instead of the allative, the verb demands (if not the partitive) the functionally similar illative.

(116) Olonetz

*Opastu-n karjala-n kiele-h enzimäze-s kluasa-s.*

learn-1SG Karelian-GEN language-ILL first-INE class-INESS

‘I have been learning Karelian since the first grade.’

(117) Olonetz

*Jurii Bobin ei opastu-nnuh taidoilija-n ammatti-h [...]*

NAME NEG-3SG learn-PTCP artist-GEN profession-ILL

‘Jurii Bobin did not learn the profession of an artist.’

Also, I found one example in the accusative.

(118) Olonetz

*Opastu-o hos yksi kieli putilleh*

learn-INF at least one language properly

‘Learning at least one language properly’

Proper Karelian follows almost always the Finnish pattern and assigns the partitive to the learned.

(119) Karelian Proper

*Mie opaššu-n vierah-i-e kiel-i-e!*

1SG learn-1SG foreign-PL-PRT language-PL-PRT

‘I study foreign languages!’

(120) Karelian Proper

[...] *kun heijä-n lapše-t opaššu-tah karjala-n kiel-tä* [...]  
when 3SG-GEN child-PL learn-3PL Karelian-GEN language-PRT  
‘[...] when their children learn Karelian [...]

Only to one example the accusative was assigned.

(121) Karelian Proper

[...] *šiitä pit-i opaštu-o venäjä-n kiele-n-ki*.  
thereafter must-PST.3SG learn-INF Russian-GEN language-GEN-also  
‘[...] after this [I] had to learn Russian, too.’

Again the dialect influenced by Russian more - Olonetz - makes very often use of the Russian pattern, while Proper Karelian, which is closer to Finnish and less influenced by Russian, does usually not follow the Russian pattern.

There are several possible combinations of cases for *opastua*. This is their distribution in Olonetz:

		learned object						
		partitive	accu- sative	0	illative	verb	side clause	total
learner	partitive	-	-	116	106	164	2	388 (50.59%)
	allative/ adessive	77	1	-	-	8	1	87 (11.34%)
	accusative	-	-	4	1	1	-	6 (0.78%)
	0	243	-	-	43	-	-	286 (37.29%)
total		320 (41.72%)	1 (0.13%)	120 (15.65%)	150 (19.55%)	173 (22.56%)	3 (0.39%)	767 (100%)

Table 19: distribution of cases for *opastua* in Olonetz

The learned takes the partitive in 41.72% of the examples (in 67.94% of the nouns) of my data, the illative in 19.55% (31.85%/nouns) and in one case the accusative (0.13% resp. 0.21%).

(122) Olonetz

*Pagina-n tehniekku-a mei-le niken ei opasta-Ø.*  
speech-GEN technique-PRT 1PL-ALL nobody NEG.3SG teach-CNG  
'Nobody taught us the technique of a speech.'

(123) Olonetz

*Marija Pelešenko opast-i [...] laps-i-i*  
NAME teach-PST.3SG child-PL-PRT

*karjala-n kiele-h-gi.*  
Karelian-GEN language-ILL-PARTICLE

'Marija Pelešenko taught the [...] children Karelian.'

(124) Olonetz

[...] *kudama-s kai ainehe-t opaste-tah karjala-kse*  
REL-INE all subject-PL teach-PAS Karelian-TRS  
[...] where all the subjects are taught in Karelian.

Also Pyöli (1996: 260) gives an example for *opastua* and its use with the illative: "[...] olen havainnut sporadisia esiintymiä venäläismallisesta rektioista eräiden muidenkin verbien yhteydessä":

(125) Olonetz

*opaste-ttih karjala-n kiel'e-h* (MaKi) (Pyöli 1996: 260)  
teach-PST.3PL Karelian-GEN language-ILL  
'They taught Karelian.'

The learner on the other hand takes the partitive in 50.59% (80.66%/nouns), the adessive or allative in 11.34% (18.09%/nouns) and the accusative in 0.78% (1.25%/nouns) of the examples.

(126) Olonetz

[...] *kus opast-i laps-i-i dekupaž-tehniekkä-h* [...]  
where teach-PST.3SG child-PL-PRT decoupage-technique-ILL  
'[...] where [she] taught the children the decoupage technique [...]'

(127) Olonetz

*opaste-ttih joga toize-le muheloitta-ma-h*  
 teach-PST.3PL every other-ALL smile-INF-ILL  
 [...] they told every other person to smile [...]

(128) Olonetz

[...] *gu tuatto meijä-n lapse-t kai opast-i kirja-h* [...]  
 how father 1PL-GEN child-PL all teach-PST.3Sg writing-ILL  
 ‘[...] how father taught all us children how to write [...]

The distribution for Proper Karelian differs significantly:

		← learned object →					
		partitive	accusative	0	illative	verb	total
← learner ↑	partitive	-	-	53	1	82	136 (45.3%)
	allative/ adessive	69	1	-	-	-	70 (23.3%)
	accusative	-	-	2	1	3	6 (2.0%)
	0	87	-	-	1	-	88 (29.3%)
total		156 (52.3%)	1 (0.3%)	55 (18.3%)	3 (1.0%)	85 (28.3%)	300 (100%)

Table 20: distribution of cases for opastua in Karelian Proper

The learned takes the partitive in 52.0% (but 97.5% of the nouns) and the illative in 1.0% (1.88%/nouns) while the accusative is assigned to the learned in only 0.3% (0.62%/nouns) of the examples.

(129) Karelian Proper

*Lari opaš-ti šuome-n kiel-tä* [...] *yliopisto-i-ssa*  
 NAME teach-PST.3SG Finnish-GEN language-PRT [...] university-PL-INE  
 ‘Lari taught Finnish at the [...] university.’



(130) Karelian Proper

[...] *kumpas-i-ssa opašše-ttih perintehellis-i-h*  
REL-PL-INE teach-PST.3PL traditional-PL-ILL

*kiso-i-h ta tanšši-loi-h.*  
game-PL-ILL and dance-PL-ILL

‘[...] where traditional games and dances were taught.’

(131) Karelian Proper

*Rohke-imm-i-lla opašše-ttih niittämise-n*  
brave-SUP-PL-ALL teach-PST.3PL mowing-GEN

‘The bravest were taught mowing.’

The learner takes the partitive in 45.3% (64.15%/nouns), the allative in 23.3% (33.02%) and the accusative in 2.0% (2.83%/nouns) of the examples.

(132) Karelian Proper

*Hiän on opašta-n milma enšimmäise-ltä luoka-lta alkuan.*  
3SG be.SG teach-PRT 1SG.PRT first-ABL grade-ABL since

‘(S)he has been teaching me Karelian since the first grade.’

(133) Karelian Proper

*Rohke-imm-i-lla opašše-ttih niittämise-n*  
brave-SUP-PL-ALL teach-PST.3PL mowing-GEN

‘The bravest were taught mowing.’

(134) Karelian Proper

*Häne-t vähäsen opašše-ttih [...]*  
3SG-ACC few.ADV teach-PST.PAS

‘(S)he was taught a little a bit.’

If there is only the learned in the sentence, it will be assigned either the partitive (Proper: 100% of the examples, Olonetz: 85%) or the illative (Proper: 0%, Olonetz: 15%).

	Olonetz		Karelian Proper	
partitive	243	85%	88	100%
illative	43	15%	0	0%
total	286	100%	88	100%

Table 21: distribution of cases for *opastua* without a learner but with a learned

(135) Karelian Proper

*Etuštaja-t* [...] *tul-tih* *opaštu-ma-h* *matkailu-asie-ta*.  
 representative-PL come-PST.3PL learn-INF-ILL travel-thing-PRT  
 ‘The representatives [...] came to study travelling.’

(136) Olonetz

*Karjala-n* *kiel-dy* *da* *kul’tuuru-a*  
 Karelian-GEN language-PRT and culture-PRT  
*opaste-tah* *yliopisto-s* [...]  
 teach-PAS university-INE

‘Karelian language and culture are taught at the university [...].’

(137) Olonetz

*Mittuze-h* *ammatti-h* *opastu-i-t?*  
 What kind-ILL profession-ILL study-PST-2SG  
 ‘What kind of profession did you study?’

But if there are both the learner and the learned in one and the same sentence, two competing patterns can be found. The first pattern is the original Finnic one with the learner in the adessive/allative and the learned in the partitive, and the Russian type with the learner in partitive and the learned in the illative. In Russian, the learner is the direct object and the learned is assigned the dative case. Instead of the allative, which often equals the Russian dative, the illative is preferred because the competing structure also makes use of the allative. In order to avoid a confusing situation like learner<sub>ALL</sub>-learned<sub>PRT</sub>

VS. learner<sub>PRT</sub>-learned<sub>ALL</sub> the functionally very similar illative is used in the latter version instead of the allative.

(138) Olonetz

*Opast-i-n hei-le pajoz-i-i [...]*  
 teach-PST-1SG 3PL-ALL song-PL-PRT  
 ‘I taught them songs [...].’

(139) Karelian Proper

*Mie nytki rupie-si-n karjala-n kiel-tä*  
 1SG now start-PST-1SG Karelian-GEN language-PRT  
  
*lapš-i-lla opašta-ma-h*  
 child-PL-ALL teach-INF-ILL

‘I now started to teach Karelian to children.’

(140) Olonetz

*Tä-h nero-h opast-i [...]* *Andrei Anisimov*  
 DEM-ILL ability-ILL teach-PST.3SG NAME  
 ‘Andrei Anisimov taught this ability.’

(141) Karelian Proper

[...] *elämä opašt-i meijä-t šii-h.*  
 life teach-PST.3SG 1PL-ACC this-ILL  
 ‘[...] life taught us this.’

The whole pattern comes as follows:

		← learner →					
		Olonetz			Karelian Proper		
		partitive	allative/ adessive	total	partitive	allative/ adessive	total
← learned →	partitive	-	77	77 (42.1%)	-	69	69 (97.2%)
	illative	106	-	106 (57.9%)	1 <sup>4</sup>	-	1 (1.4%)
	accusative	-	-	- (0%)	-	1	1 (1.4%)
total		106 (57.9%)	77 (42.1%)	183 (100%)	1 (1.4%)	70 (100%)	71 (100%)

Table 22: distribution of cases for opastua with a learner and a learned

If we do not consider the one example in the Russian pattern and one example, in which the partitive is replaced by the accusative, which also is a direct object case, we can say that the Finnic pattern is the only one used in my set of data of Proper Karelian. In Olonetz, it constitutes 42.1% of the examples. The dominating pattern in Olonetz, however, is the Russian-like pattern, which is used in 57.9% of the examples.

(142) Karelian Proper

*Rohke-imm-i-lla opašše-ttih niittämise-n*  
 brave-SUP-PL-ALL teach-PST.3PL mowing-GEN  
 ‘The bravest were taught mowing.’

### 3.8 The similarities between the functions of the Finnish and the Russian cases

By now we have seen that the partitive is replaced by other cases in Karelian to a certain degree. These cases are the adessive, the allative, the translative and the illative. I will now show the connections between the functions of the Finnic (Finnish) cases and the functions of the Russian cases which lead to the replacement of the partitive by other cases to some extent (because the partitive’s original function are expressed by other cases now).

<sup>4</sup> The learner takes the accusative in this example

### 3.8.1 Russian dative and Finnic allative

The Russian dative is as in other Indo-European languages the case for the indirect object. It is often the case assigned to the recipient, beneficiary, which often coincides with the goal, and in some constructions the experiencer. The allative in Finnish is also the case for the indirect object, i.e. the beneficiary, and due to its nature as a lative case it is the case for a goal that indicates movement to, onto, next to something etc.

(143) Russian

<i>Я</i>	<i>да-ю</i>	<i>тебе</i>	<i>книг-у.</i>
1SG	give-1SG	2SG.DAT	book-ACC
		BENEFICIARY	
		GOAL	

‘I give you the book.’

(144) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>anna-n</i>	<i>sinu-lle</i>	<i>kirja-n.</i>
1SG	give-1SG	2SG-ALL	book-GEN
		BENEFICIARY	
		GOAL	

‘I give you the book.’

The P in a construction with a verb with the meaning ‘to call’ could be labelled an addressee as a certain type of recipient, experiencer or goal.

(145) Russian

<i>Я</i>	<i>звон-у</i>	<i>тебе.</i>
1SG	call-1SG	2SG.DAT
		ADDRESSEE
		GOAL

‘I call you.’

(146) Finnish

*Minä soita-n sinu-lle.*  
1SG call-1SG 2SG-ALL  
ADDRESSEE  
GOAL

‘I call you.’

The goal is in Russian not expressed by the bare dative but can be expressed by the preposition *к* and the dative.

(147) Russian

*Иди-Ø к врачу!*  
go-IMP to doctor-DAT  
GOAL

‘Go to the doctor!’

(148) Finnish

*Mene-Ø lääkäri-lle!*  
go-IMP doctor-ALL  
GOAL

‘Go to the doctor!’

The similarities of these cases probably caused the use of the allative in position where the partitive should have been used. In Finnish, the experiencer in *tunnekausatiivilauseet* precedes the predicative and is assigned the partitive. In similar constructions in Russian, the experiencer also usually precedes the verb, but is assigned the dative. Because of the general similarity of the Russian dative and the Finnic allative as well as the similarities between these certain constructions, Karelian started to use the allative.

(149) Russian

*Мне хоч-ет-ся ни-ть.*  
1SG.DAT want-3SG-RFL drink-INF  
EXPERIENCER

‘I want to drink.’

(150) Finnish

<i>Minu-a</i>	<i>halutta-a</i>	<i>juo-da.</i>
1SG.PRT	want-3SG	drink-INF
EXPERIENCER		
‘I want to drink.’		

(151) Russian

<i>Мне</i>	<i>нрав-ит-ся</i>	<i>его</i>	<i>имя.</i>
1SG.DAT	like-3SG-RFL	3SG.GEN	name
EXPERIENCER			
‘I like his name.’			

(152) Finnish

<i>Minu-a</i>	<i>miellyttä-ä</i>	<i>häne-n</i>	<i>nime-nsä.</i>
1SG.PRT	like-3SG	3SG-GEN	name-PX.3SG
EXPERIENCER			
‘I like his name.’			

### 3.8.2 Russian language adverb and Finnic translative

The Russian adverb with *no-* denoting a language is similar to the Finnic translative because of the context when it is used. This context is usually clauses with verbs of speaking, understand etc. The language is used with the translative if it is not the P protorole of the clause. In this case, the language is usually the medium. If there is no other P, then the partitive is assigned.

(153) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>opi-n</i>	<i>suome-a.</i>
1SG	learn-1SG	Finnish-PRT
P		
‘I study Finnish.’		

(154) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>ymmärrä-n</i>	<i>suome-a.</i>
1SG	understand-1SG	Finnish-PRT
P		
‘I understand Finnish.’		

(155) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>puhu-n</i>	<i>suome-a.</i>
1SG	speak-1SG	Finnish-PRT
		P

‘I speak Finnish.’

(156) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>puhu-n</i>	<i>häne-n</i>	<i>kanssa</i>	<i>suome-a.</i>
1SG	speak-1SG	3SG-GEN	with	Finnish-PRT
				P

‘I speak Finnish with her/him.’

(157) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>sano-n</i>	<i>si-tä</i>	<i>suome-ksi.</i>
1SG	say-1SG	this-PRT	Finnish-TRS
		P	MEDIUM

‘I say this in Finnish.’

(158) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>ymmärrä-n</i>	<i>si-tä</i>	<i>suome-ksi.</i>
1SG	understand-1SG	this-PRT	Finnish-TRS
		P	MEDIUM

‘I understand this in Finnish.’

In Russian, the adverb with *no-* can be used in all these contexts, if it denotes the medium.

(159) Russian

<i>Я</i>	<i>уч-у</i>	<i>финнск-ий</i>	<i>язык-Ø.</i>
1SG	learn-1SG	Finnish-ADJ.M.ACC	language-ACC
		THEME	

‘I study Finnish.’



(160) Russian

*Я* *понима-ю* *по-финнски.*

1SG understand-1SG Finnish-ADV

MEDIUM

STIMULUS

‘I understand Finnish.’

(161) Russian

*Я* *говор-ю* *по-финнски.*

1SG speak-1SG Finnish-ADV

MEDIUM

THEME

‘I speak Finnish.’

(162) Russian

*Я* *говор-ю* *с* *ней* *по-финнски.*

1SG speak-1SG with 3SG.F.INS Finnish-ADV

MEDIUM

‘I speak Finnish with her.’

(163) Russian

*Я* *это* *скаж-у* *по-финнски.*

1SG DEM.ACC say-1SG Finnish-ADV

MEDIUM

‘I say this in Finnish.’

(164) Russian

*Я* *это* *понима-ю* *по-финнски.*

1SG DEM.ACC understand-1SG Finnish-ADV

MEDIUM

‘I understand this in Finnish.’

The connection originates in the semantic field „language“. While in Finnish the object case or the translative case is used, the adverb is preferred in Russian. The fact that the oblique case can be used in Russian in most contexts, but usually not the object case, made Karelian start to use an oblique case, i.e. the translative more.

### 3.8.3 The Russian locative and the Finnic adessive

The connection between these two cases is rather obvious: both cases are locative cases and share the main function of assigning case to locations. Similarly to the language adverb, the construction *на* + language-LOC can be used in similar situations:

(165) Russian

*Мы с ней обща-ем-ся на финнск-ом.*  
1PL with 3SG.F.INS speak-1PL-RFL on Finnish-LOC  
'I speak Finnish with her.'

(166) Russian

*Они хорошо понима-ют на финнск-ом.*  
3PL well understand-3PL on Finnish-LOC  
'They speak Finnish well.'

While Finnish does not assign the adessive for languages in this context, the similarity between the Russian language adverb and the construction with preposition and locative inspired Karelian to use the adessive in situations when the latter construction is used in Russian.

Both the Russian instrumental and the Finnish adessive are often assigned to the instrument of a clause, when it is a kind of location at the same time. In these examples, the mean of transport and the musical instrument are the instrument of the clause because the action happens with the help of them, and they are also a location because the action takes place in or on them.

(167) Finnish

*Mene-t-kö sinne bussi-lla?*  
go-2SG-Q there bus-ADE  
INSTRUMENT  
LOCATION

'Do you go there by bus?'

(168) Russian

*Ты туда ед-ешь на автобус-е?*  
2SG there drive-2SG on bus-LOC  
INSTRUMENT  
LOCATION

‘Do you go there by bus?’

(169) Finnish

*Soita-n laulu-a harmonika-lla.*  
play-1SG song-PRT accordion-ADESS  
P INSTRUMENT  
LOCATION

‘I play a song on the accordion.’

(170) Russian

*Я игра-ю песн-ю на гармошк-е.*  
1SG play-1SG song-ACC on accordion-LOC  
P INSTRUMENT  
LOCATION

‘I play a song on the accordion.’

If the instrument is not a location, Russian uses the instrumental, while Finnish still uses the adessive:

(171) Finnish

*Avaa-n ove-n avaimе-lla.*  
open-1SG door-GEN key-ADE  
INSTRUMENT

‘I open the door with the key.’

(172) Russian

*Я открo-ю дверь-Ø ключ-ом.*  
1SG open-1SG door-ACC key-INS  
INSTRUMENT

‘I open the door with the key.’

In a clause with a musical instrument, the instrument is always used with *на* and the locative case in Russian. In Finnish it is used in the partitive and in the adessive only if the clause contains a theme, typically a song or another piece of music. In Finnish, the musical instrument is probably recognized as a patient, while in Russian it is more understood as a location, where the music is played. It might be also the case that the theme is implied in Russian.

(173) Finnish

<i>Soita-n</i>	<i>harmonikka-a.</i>
play-1SG	accordion-PRT
	INSTRUMENT
	PATIENT

‘I play the accordion.’

(174) Russian

<i>Я игра-ю</i>	<i>на гармошк-е.</i>
1SG play-1SG	on accordion-LOC
	INSTRUMENT
	LOCATION

‘I play the accordion.’

The similarities of the Finnic adessive and the Russian locative probably caused Karelian to go over to a more Russian-like pattern for case assignment for musical instruments, i.e. the adessive is used also in cases without any song (theme) played.

### 3.8.4 The Russian dative and the Finnish illative

The similarities between the Finnish illative and the Russian dative are the local case functions (compare the Russian dative and the Finnish allative). The Finnish adessive, however, is functionally closer to the Russian dative than the illative. In clauses with *opastua* and *opastuo*, Karelian assigns the illative to the theme in clauses with the Russian pattern, because the adessive is already assigned to the student (beneficiary) of the clause. Finnish assigns the object case (partitive) to the theme of the clause, while the allative is assigned to the beneficiary. In Russian, the situation is vice versa: The beneficiary is in the dative (which usually corresponds to the Finnic allative), while the theme takes the object case.

(175) Finnish

<i>Minä</i>	<i>opeta-n</i>	<i>hei-lle</i>	<i>suome-a.</i>
1SG	teach-1SG	3PL.ALL	Finnish-PRT
		BENEFICIARY	THEME

‘I teach them Finnish.’

(176) Russian

<i>Я</i>	<i>уч-у</i>	<i>их</i>	<i>русск-ому</i>	<i>язык-у.</i>
1SG	teach-1SG	3PL.ACC	Russian-ADJ.M.DAT	language-DAT
			BENEFICIARY	THEME

‘I teach them Finnish.’

If Karelian would make use of the allative in the clauses with Russian pattern, there would be no morphosyntactic difference between the original Finnic and the newer Russian construction, because the student could take either the partitive or the allative and the theme the other case respectively. Apart from the semantic context, it would not be possible to understand whether the student studies a theme or a theme studies the student. In order to avoid this confusion, Karelian uses the functionally similar illative instead of the allative for the theme in clauses with the Russian pattern, and the allative for the beneficiary in clauses with the original Finnic pattern. The main functional difference between the illative and the allative is the illative denoting the goal into which the movement is directed (inner local case), while the allative denotes the goal towards/onto/next to which the movement is directed.

### 3.9 Example 11: animacy and the choice of object case

Both Larjavaara (1990: pp. 419) and Pyöli (1996: 273-275) give examples of the tendency to use the partitive as the object case even in situations when a total object would be expected. The higher the object in the animacy hierarchy (cf. Comrie 1989: 128), the more likely it seems to be assigned the partitive. In my analysis of the corpus I could not find enough evidence of this on account of the sparse material (a strategy as in Larjavaara’s 1990 article would be much more successful). See the example of the verb *löydyä/löytyä* ‘to find’. Although the findings are not reliable, they might give an idea of the situation.

		total object	partial object
1. person	SG	-	1
	PL	-	-
2. person	SG	-	2
	PL	-	1
3. person	SG	-	3
	PL	-	2
inanimate noun phrase	SG	73	9
	PL	22	6
animate, non-human noun phrase	SG	6	-
	PL	-	1
human noun phrase	SG	8	1
	PL	5	13

*Table 23: distribution of objet cases for löytyä*

From these examples, no clear conclusion can be drawn. The majority of inanimate noun phrases take the total object, while human noun phrases often take the partitive at least in the plural, and personal pronouns always take the partitive in this example. These findings might, however, indicate a partitive tendency for animated (or rather human) nouns in the written language and definitely do not contradict Larjavaara's and Pyöli's observations, who wrote about this topic in spoken Karelian Proper resp. spoken Olonetz. I will have to rely on these two authors and discuss the origin of this development.

According to Larjavaara (1990: 437) "The animacy opposition in Russian noun declension may have been promoted by the partitive tendency and strengthened the animate vs. inanimate borderline which also plays a part in the animacy hierarchy, but it was not a primary cause of the development."

In his research he researched the use of the partitive as an object case with the focus on the role which animacy plays in choosing the object case. He had 15 informants aged 59 to 81 from the region Šuigärvi-Lehto (ru. Шуезеро-Лехта) and Tunguo (ru. Тунгуда), which is located in the area where the Southern dialects of Karelian Proper are spoken. All of them spoke Karelian and all of them at least understood Russian. In fact, apart from the two oldest speakers, everyone claimed to be bilingual. 60 simple Russian language sentences were presented to the informants. He admits that the results were more Russian-like than he usually encountered (Larjavaara 1990: pp. 419).

In the first group of ten sentences, the object was (a) inanimate. In the next ten, the object was (b) animate but non-human. In further 10 sentences, the object was (c) human. And in the last 30 sentences he used personal pronouns: (d) 6 sentences with *mie* ‘I’, (e) 4 sentences with *šie* ‘you, SG’, (f) 7 sentences with *heän* ‘he, she’, (f) 5 sentences with *müö* ‘we’, (g) 4 sentences with *hüö* ‘you, PL’ and (h) another 4 sentences with *hüö* ‘they’ (Larjavaara 1990: p. 420-423).

His results were – briefly concluded – the following:

group	sentences	partial objects	total objects	percentage of partial objects
(a)	150	50	<b>100</b>	33,3%
(b)	150	64	<b>86</b>	42,7%
(c)	150	<b>83</b>	67	55,3%
(d)	90	<b>77</b>	13	85,6%
(e)	60	<b>60</b>	0	100,0%
(f)	105	<b>87</b>	18	82,9%
(g)	75	<b>58</b>	17	77,3%
(h)	60	<b>42</b>	18	70,0%
(i)	60	<b>48</b>	12	80,0%

Table 24: Larjavaara’s (1990) results

In groups (a) and (b), i.e. the groups with inanimate and animate but non-human nouns as objects, the total object overweighs, whereas in the other groups it is the partial object. While the proportions in group (c) with human nouns as object the proportions are quite balanced with about 11:9 (partial object : total object), the overwhelming majority of the pronouns are in the partitive case.

Also Larjavaara (1990: pp. 423) sees this tendency and explains: “Nämä lauseet osoittavat, että persoonapronominit yhtäältä eroavat muista persoonaisista ilmauksista ja toisaalta että *mie*, *šie* ja *heän* käyttäytyvät objekteina hieman eri tavoin kuin monikollinen kolmikko *müö*, *tüö*, *hüö*; myös *heän*-pronominin ja *mie* + *šie* -parin välillä on jonkinlainen ero. [...] Persoonapronominit ovat [...] useammin partitiivissa kun – persoonaviitteisetkin – substantiivilausekkeet [...]. Tälläkin lohkolla partitiivitendenssi on yksikössä astetta vahvempi kuin monikossa [...].”

He concludes (p. 425): “[...] kun objekti on *elotonviiteinen*, karjalan sijanvalinta on suomenmukaista, ts. myönteisissä lauseissa puhtaasti aspektin säätelystä. Mutta kun objekti on tarkoittaa *elollista* vaan ei persoonaista oliota, karjalan normaalilauseissa jo

esiintyy aspektinvastaisia partitiiviobjekteja [...]. Ilmiö edellistä näkyvämpi, kun objektit ovat *henkilötarkoitteisia* substantiivilausekkeita. Monikolliset *persoonapronomit* ovat sitten nomaalilauseissa muuten (arviolta) kutakuinkin yhtä usein aspektinvastaisesti partitiivissa kuin edellinen ryhmä, mutta nyt lisänä ovat passiivi- ja 2. p:n imperatiivipredikaatteihin liittyvät niin ikään aspektinvastaiset objektit [...]. *Yksikössä*, etenkin 1. ja 2. persoonassa kummankinlaiset objektit ovat vielä tavallisempia.”

Furthermore he tries to explain the partitive tendency. For him, a generally more imperfective perception of the verbs in Karelian cannot be the reason for the more frequent appearance of the partitive because in this case all the lexical groups would be affected by this tendency. According to Larjavaara this tendency had been explained only by the Russian genitive (1990: 425).

The use of the Russian genitive for denoting for example quantity –it is used after cardinal numbers and quantity denoting numerals with the exception of ‘one’ – and it is often used in negated existential clauses (*У меня нет машины* ‘I don’t have a car’ as opposed to *У меня есть машина* ‘I have a car’) and habeo-constructions (*Я не умею права/счастья* ‘I don’t have the right/luck’ as opposed to *Я умею право/счастье* ‘I have the right/luck’). There is also a Genitivus Partitivus used in denoting uncertain quantities such as *стакан чаю* ‘a glass of tea’, *чашка сахара* ‘a cup of sugar’. The direct object case for an animate noun in the plural or of the first declension as well as the personal pronouns (with the exception for the third person singular feminine, which has a special form) is the genitive. The Finnic partitive bears similar functions as the Russian genitive like the use after numerals and words denoting quantity or for negation. Leisiö (2001: 116) mentions the origin of both Finnish partitive and Russian genitive from an ablative and adds the example of the functions as cases for comparison:

(177) Finnish

*Liisa on Pekka-a vanhe-mpi.*

NAME be.3SG NAME-PRT old-COMP

‘Liisa is older than Pekka.’ (Leisiö 2001: 116)

(178) Russian

*Луиза стар-ше Пет-у.*

NAME old-COMP NAME-GEN

‘Liza is older than Pet’a.’ (Leisiö 2001: 116)



These similarities and the opposition of the genitive and nominative as the case for the direct object in Russian, which resembles the opposition of the partitive and the nominative/accusative for the direct object in Finnic, have led to assume that the Russian genitive may be the origin of the use of the partitive for animate nouns and personal pronouns in Karelian.

Larjavaara (1990: 426) argues that Russian may have had some influence on this development but does not consider it the main factor for it. In his opinion the Karelian object system would have been influenced in such way that the genitive would be more prominent as the case for the direct object because of the wide spread genitive forms of the direct object for animate nouns and pronouns in Russian if Russian truly had had a strong influence of the object system of Karelian. He compares this situation with more deeply Russian-influenced Vepsian, where the partitive has been partly replaced by the genitive in such sentences as *Job vinan* ‘drinks vodka’ with the object being in the genitive instead of the expected partitive. His second argument is the lack of formal symmetry in the opposition of partitive-genitive (Finnic) and genitive-nominative (Russian). His third argument against the genitive-theory is that it does not explain why the partitive is less used for animate but non-human-denoting nouns but much more for personal pronouns.

Although I can follow Larjavaara’s argumentation I do not find it particularly convincing. It is not the superficial similarity of the Russian and Finnic genitive or the formal symmetry of the oppositions in the object marking systems of the languages that influenced Karelian here. As I already explained, it is the many similarities in the Functions of the Russian genitive and the Finnic partitive which led to the establishment of a morphologically realised animacy category in differential object marking. Terms like “partitive” or “genitive” are primarily labels to help describe morphological units which express certain syntactical functions. Thus although there exist morphological case called *genitive* both in Russian and Karelian, it does not mean that these genitives share the same Functions to 100%. I suppose unlike in Vepsian, the Russian genitive was perceived actually as being closer to the partitive in Karelian for the above mentioned reasons – as it also appears to me. Larjavaara, however, has a different opinion:

“Yhtä kaikki on vaikea ymmärtää, miksi karjalainen olisi kytkenyt partitiivinsa tällaisen mutkan kautta venäjän genetiivin, kun oma genetiivi on objektinakin tätä paljon lähempänä.” (1990: 426)

I agree that the universal hierarchy in animacy allows such development as we can see in Estonian, where all personal pronouns are used in the partitive per default, but negating the strong influence of Russian on this topic does not seem sensible to me. Pyöli (1996: 274) also sees a connection to the strategy of object marking according to animacy in Russian: “Venäjässä objekti on genetiivin kaltaisessa akkusatiivissa silloin, kun se tarkoittaa elollista olentoa ja nominatiivissa, kun kyseessä on esine tai asia. Venäjän genetiivi vastaa usein ims. kielte funktiossa partitiivia, jolloin verbi yleensä tarkoittaa mm. ulkokohaista toiminta [...] ja objektina on useimmiten persoonapronomini tai elollista olentoa tarkoittava sana. (Ojajärvi 1950: 137, 140-141.)”

## 4 Conclusion

Karelian has long been subject to cultural and linguistic Russification. Especially during the Soviet times the Russian impact was strong on the Karelian language. This did not only lead to a Russian-Karelian bilingualism but also to syntactic changes in the structure of Karelian. In my study about the changing functions of the partitive case, I found that impact of influence is stronger in different varieties: First of all, the Karelian Proper dialect, which is spoken in the North of the Karelian Republic and more closely related to its neighbouring language Finnish, has less evidence of Russian influence at least in the written data of my corpus. The bigger, Southern dialect Olonez shows more Russian-like structures. The second finding is that the written language maintained more of the original Finnic structure than the spoken language. This is at least what I found out about my data compared to the findings of Larjavaara (1990) and Pyöli (1996), who studied certain feature of the spoken language.

While the partitive used to be the case of government of several verbs, as it is still in Finnish, its functions started to be expressed by other cases like the adessive, allative, illative or translative. This development is a reflection of Russian case syntax where typically the dative, locative or adverbs express some of the functions of the partitive in Finnic. The similarities of other functions between the Finnic and the Russian cases lead to the transfer of functions from the partitive to other cases in Karelian. These functions depend typically on semantic roles, semantic meaning and syntactic structures. In all the examples of my corpus, the old type of government with the partitive is always to some extent prominent.

In Karelian, it is now possible to use verbs like *paissa* ‘to speak’ and *ellendiä/malttua* ‘to understand’ demand the translative or adessive, *soittua* ‘to play an instrument’ the adessive, *himoittua* ‘to want’, *miellyttyä* ‘to like’ and *a(vv)uttua* ‘to help’ with the allative and *opastua* ‘to teach’ and *opastuo* ‘to study’ the illative for the theme taught. All verbs can be used either in the original construction or with the new Russian pattern.

Another development is the use of the partitive with animated objects that in other Finnic languages like Finnish would usually be a total object in the nominative, accusative or genitive. Although my study on this was hard with the methods of corpus linguistics, the works of Pyöli (1996) and Larjavaara (1990) gave an impression on this issue in the

spoken language. A connection with the Russian system of object marking according to animacy seems logic to me. If this system developed independently in Karelian, the Russian language probably worked at least as a kind of linguistic catalyst.

To conclude my findings: the partitive is losing its functions as a case of government to other oblique cases which bear similarities with corresponding cases in Russian. On the other hand, the partitive seems to be more prominent in the choice of object case, where animated nouns tend to take the partitive more often in contexts where a total object would be expected. Especially Olonetz has been more influenced by Russian than its sister language Karelian Proper. Also, my overall impression is that these developments are more widespread in the spoken language than in the written language. This was at least what I could see when comparing my results with Pyöli's (1996) findings in spoken Olonetz. Possibly, the Russian influence will become stronger in the written language, too.

## 6 Abbreviations

1SG	first person singular	ILL	illative
2SG	second person singular	IMP	imperative
3SG	third person singular	INE	inessive
1PL	first person plural	INF	infinitive
2PL	second person plural	INS	instrumental
3PL	third person plural	COM	comitative
ABE	abessive	LOC	locative
ABL	ablative	M	masculine
ABS	absolutive	N	neuter
ACC	accusative	NEG	negative
ADE	adessive	NOM	nominative
ADJ	adjective	OBJ	object
ADV	adverb	PAS	passive
ALL	allative	PREP	preposition
AOR	aorist	PRT	partitive
ART	article	PST	past tense
CNG	connegative	PTCP	participle
COMP	comparative	PX	possessive suffix
DAT	dative	REL	relative pronoun
DEL	delative	Q	question
DEM	demonstrative	RFL	reflexive
ELA	elative	SFX	suffix
ERG	ergative	SUBL	sublative
ESS	essive	SUP	superlative
F	feminine	SUPE	superessive
GEN	genitive	TRS	translative

## 7 References

- Ahtia, Edvard Vilhelm** (2014): *Karjalan kielen kielioppi III. Lauseoppi*. Karjalan Kielen Seura.
- Antonova, Natalya** (2004): Karelian, Vepps, and Finnish languages have got the state support in the Republic of Karelia. *The Official Karelia. The Republic of Karelia State Government Bodies' Official Web Portal*.  
<[http://gov.karelia.ru/News/2004/03/0318\\_08\\_e.html](http://gov.karelia.ru/News/2004/03/0318_08_e.html) [20.07.16]>
- Alvre, Paul** (1992): *Sooime keele grammatika*. Tallinn: Valgus.
- Bendixen, Bernd; Voigt, Wolfgang** (2003): *Russisch aktuell. Erklärt – geübt – beherrscht. Der Leitfaden. Lehr- und Übungsgrammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Berecki, András** (1996): Istorija karelov. In: Nanovski, György (ed.): *Finno-ugorskij mir. Spravočnik po istorii, kul'ture i jazyku*. Budapest, Moskau: II vsemirnyj kongress finno-ugorskich narodov. Buchholz, Eva (2004): *Grammatik der finnischen Sprache*. Bremen: Hempen.
- Bubrich, D. B.** (2005): *Pribaltijsko-finskoe jazykoznanie. Izbrannye trudy*. Saint-Petersburg: Filologičeskij fakul'tet Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.
- Erelt, Mati; Kasik, Reet; Metslang, Helle; Rajandi, Henno; Ross, Kristiina; Saari, Henn; Tael, Kaja; Vare, Silvi** (1995): *Eesti keele grammatika I. Morfoloogia, sõnamoodustus*. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Eesti Keele Instituut.
- Erelt, Mati; Kasik, Reet; Metslang, Helle; Rajandi, Henno; Ross, Kristiina; Saari, Henn; Tael, Kaja; Vare, Silvi** (1993): *Eesti keele grammatika II. Süntaks, Lisa: Kiri*. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Eesti Keele Instituut.
- Jänes, Henno** (1971): *Grammatik der estnischen Sprache*. Stockholm: Utbildningförlaget.
- Klement'ev, E. I.** (2008): *Karely. Istoriko-istoričeskij očerk*. Petrozavodsk: Periodika.
- Laanest, Arvo** (1975): *Sissejuhatus läänemeresoome keeltesse*. Tallinn: Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.

- Laanest, Arvo** (1982): *Einführung in die Ostseefinnischen Sprachen. Autorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Estnischen von Hans-Hermann Bartens.* Hamburg: Buske.
- Larjavaara, Matti** (1990): Karjalan kielen partitiivi objekti. In: *Virittäjä 94*, p. 419-437
- Lees, Aet** (2015): *Case Alternations in Five Finnic Languages. Estonian, Finnish, Karelian, Livonian and Veps.* Lieden, Boston: Brill. (Brill's Studies in Language, Cognition and Culture Volume 13)
- Leisiö, Larisa** (2001): *Morphosyntactic convergence and integration in Finland Russian.* (Acta Universitatis Tamperensis, 795) Tampere: University of Tampere.
- Markianova, L'udmila** (2002): *Karjalan kielioppih.* Petroskoi: Periodika. (web versioon <http://opastajat.net/opastus/grammar/index.html>)
- Ojajärvi, Aulis** (1950): *Sijojen merkitystehtävistä itä-karjalan Maaselän murteissa. Nominatiivi, genetiivi, akkusatiivi ja partitiivi. Vertaileva funktio-opillinen tutkimus.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia XCVII)
- Pyöli, Raija** (1996): *Venäläistyvä aunuksenkarjala. Kielenulkoiset ja –sisäiset indikaattorit kielenvaihtotilanteessa.* Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto. (Joensuun yliopiston humanistisia julkaisuja N:o 18).
- Pyöli, Raija** (2012): *Livvinkarjalan kielioppi.* Helsinki: Karjalan Kielen Seura.
- Rom-Sourkova, Olga** (2004): *Die sprachliche Situation in der Russischen Föderation. Gesetzgebung und Wirklichkeit.* (Osteuropaforschung. Schriftenreihe der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde, Bd. 45). Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag.
- Sarhimaa, Anneli** (1999): *Syntactic transfer, contact-induced change, and the evolution of bilingual mixed codes: focus on Karelian-Russian language alternation.* (Studia Fennica Linguistica 9). Helsinki: SKS.
- Svetlov, Genadij Ivanovič** (2004): *Uroki karel'skogo jazyka.*  
<<http://depvladimir.narod.ru/urokkat/index.html>>

--- **VISK** (*verkkoversio Iso suomen kielioppi*). Helsinki: Suomalainen Kirjallisuuden Seura,  
Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen ja kotimaisen kirjallisuuden laitos.)  
<<http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>>

--- **Vserossijskaja Perepis' Naselenija** 2010.

<[http://www.gks.ru/free\\_doc/new\\_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis\\_itogi1612.htm](http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm)>  
[20.07.16]

**Zaikov, Pekka** (2013): *Vienankarjalan kielioppi. Lisänä harjoitukse ja lukemisto*.  
Helsinki: Karjalan sivistysseura.



## **Kokkuvõte: Osastava käände funktsioonide muutumine vene keele mõjul**

Karjala keel kuulub uurali keelte läänemeresoome keelte allrühma, mida räägitakse peamiselt Vene Federatsiooni Karjala Vabariigis, Tveri oblastis ja Soomes. Karjala keeles on kolm murderühma: Päriskarjala murre, mida räägitakse Karjala Vabariigi põhjaosas ja mis on soome keelele lähim variant, aunuse karjala, mis on karjala keele suurim murre, ning lüüdi murre, mida peetakse kas karjala ja vepsa keele vaheliseks variandiks või iseseisvaks keeleks.

Karjala keelt on tugevalt mõjutanud vene keel. Karjalastel ja nende eelkäijatel on peaaegu tuhat aastat olnud keelekontaktid slaavide ja venelastega, aga alles eelmisel sajandil algas Nõukogude Liidus range venestamine. Tänapäeval räägib 60 815 karjalasest vaid 25 605 karjala keelt Venemaal, kuna suurim osa karjalastest valdab vene keelt.

Oma töös uurisin kuidas vene keel on mõjutanud osastava käände funktsioone kirjakeeltes (päriskarjala ja aunuse murdes). Selleks rakendasin korpuse, mis koosneb kahest allkorpusest - nimelt päriskarjala ja aunuse allkorpustest. Materjaliks on olnud karjalakeelsed veebiajalehed Soomest ja Venemaalt (päriskarjala: *Vienan Karjala*, aunuse: *Oma Mua*, *Yle uudizet*, *Karjala žurnualu*). Võrdlesin karjala keele näited soome keelega, mis on karjala keele lähim sugulaskeel ja läänemeresoome keelte hulgast kõige vähem võõrkeelest mõjutatud keel. Uurimisaluseks oli tegusõnade rektsioon, sealhulgas ka sihitise kääned.

Uurimus näitas, et kuigi semantilised rollid on erinevates keeltes samad, kasutavad keeled erinevaid käänendeid, sest käänete funktsioonid on erinevalt jagatud. Kui soome keeles kasutatakse sageli osastavat käänat, siis vene keeles kasutatakse daativi, lokatiivi, määrsõna jne. Karjala keeles on funktsioonide muutumine tekkinud vene keele mõjul: osastava käände funktsioonid läksid osaliselt üle teistele käänetele ning nüüd kasutatakse karjala keeles sageli alaleütlevat või sisseütlevat käänat siis kui vene keeles on vaja daativi (*a(vv)uttua* 'aitama', *himoittua* 'tahtma', *miellyttyä* 'meeldima', *opastua* 'õpetama', *opastuo* 'õppima'), alalütlevat seal kus vene keeles kasutatakse lokatiivi (*paissa* 'rääkima', *soittua* 'pilli mängima') ning rajavat käänat kasutatakse seal kus vene keeles määrsõna (*paissa* 'rääkima', *ellendiä/malttua* 'aru saama'). Uuema venemoodi mustri kõrval on kasutuses ka vanim läänemeresoome rektsioonitüüp. Kuna aunuse

murdes, mida vene keel on tugevamalt mõjutanud, leidub rohkem vene struktuuriga näiteid, on neid vähem päriskarjala murdes, mis on väga sarnane soome keelele. See areng on kirjakeeltes nõrgem kui kõnekeeles. Sihitise käände valimisega toimub ka funktsiooni muutumine: Nii nagu vene keeles valitakse ka karjala keeles kahe käände vahel: akkusatiivi (kas nominatiivi- või genitiivikujulise) ja osastava käände vahel. Kuigi üldiselt valitakse totaal- ja partsiaalobjekti samade tingimuste järgi nagu teistes läänemeresoome keeltes, eeldatakse karjala keele osastavat käänat, kui sihitis on eluline (eriti isiklikute asesõnade ja inimest tähendavate nimisõnade puhul).

## **Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks**

Mina, Tony Keller (sünnikuupäev: 27.11.1990),

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose „Changes in the Functions of the Partitive under the Influence of Russian“, mille juhendaja on Gerson Klumpp.
  - 1.1. reprodutseerimiseks säilitamise ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemise eesmärgil, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-is lisamise eesmärgil kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni;
  - 1.2. üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna kaudu, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace'i kaudu kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni.
2. olen teadlik, et punktis 1 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.
3. kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei rikuta teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse seadusest tulenevaid õigusi.

Tartus, 10. august 2016

Tony Keller