

DAVID OGREN

Object case variation
in Estonian *da*-infinitive constructions



DAVID OGREN

Object case variation
in Estonian *da*-infinitive constructions



UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
Press

University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics

Dissertation accepted for the commencement of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on December 5th, 2017 by the Committee of the Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tartu

Supervisors: Professor Helle Metslang, University of Tartu

Dr. Helena Metslang, University of Tartu

Opponent: Dr. Anne Tamm

Károly Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary

Commencement: March 9th, 2018 at 14.15, Senat Hall in the University main building, Ülikooli 18, Tartu

Doktoritöö valmimist on toetanud Keeleteaduse, filosoofia ja semiootika doktori-kool; rahastanud Euroopa Liit Euroopa Sotsiaalfondi ja Euroopa Regionaalarengu Fondi (Tartu Ülikooli ASTRA projekt PER ASPERA) kaudu.



Euroopa Liit
Euroopa
Regionaalarengu Fond



Eesti
tuleviku heaks



Euroopa Liit
Euroopa Sotsiaalfond



Eesti
tuleviku heaks

ISSN 1406-1325

ISBN 978-9949-77-685-6 (print)

ISBN 978-9949-77-686-3 (pdf)

Copyright: David Ogren, 2018

University of Tartu Press

www.tyk.ee

PREFACE

This thesis grew out of my own experiences learning Estonian as a foreign language. I came to Tartu in 2011 as a master's student, having already spent several years independently learning Finnish and Estonian. Like many foreign learners of Finnic languages, I was particularly bewildered by the opposition between partial and total objects. While I was able to find clear rules guiding the choice of object case in most sentences, and I observed that actual language usage did indeed follow these rules, I discovered that object case usage with *da*-infinitives seemed inconsistent. Intrigued, I began polling my Estonian friends and neighbors as to which object case they would use in sentences including various common *da*-infinitive constructions, and when I saw their difficulty in providing definitive answers, I began to suspect I had stumbled upon something worth studying in more detail. Fortunately, I discovered that the topic had indeed thus far escaped rigorous scientific study, and thus my thesis was born. Initially I was afraid that the topic was too narrow for even a master's thesis, that I would find a simple, clear solution that would render further research unnecessary; thankfully, I could not have been more wrong, and the topic has proved richer and more nuanced than I had ever imagined.

Special thanks are due to my supervisors, Helle and Helena Metslang. Helle has been wonderfully supportive and encouraging, always willing to take time to answer my questions and assuage my concerns. Helena has provided invaluable feedback on the drafts of my articles, helping to push me in directions I wouldn't naturally go and address broader theoretical questions.

I would like to thank my preliminary reviewers Anne Tamm, Irina Niko-laeva, and Heete Sakhai for their constructive comments on the introductory section of this thesis.

I am also grateful to my colleagues and fellow students at the University of Tartu Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, especially the members of the project "Integrated model of morphosyntactic variation in written Estonian: a pilot study" (PUT475).

Finally, I would like to thank my family for supporting me throughout my journey of self-discovery, even as it has taken me halfway around the world for years on end.

Tartu, January 30, 2018

CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| LIST OF PUBLICATIONS..... | 9 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 10 |
| 1.1. Subject of thesis..... | 10 |
| 1.2. Structure of thesis | 11 |
| 1.3. Relationship with previous works on the same topic..... | 13 |
| 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH HISTORY | 14 |
| 2.1. Differential object marking across languages..... | 14 |
| 2.2. Object marking in Estonian | 19 |
| 2.3. Constructions and construction grammar | 25 |
| 2.4. <i>da</i> -infinitive constructions | 26 |
| 2.5. Word order and information structure | 29 |
| 2.6. Aspect | 30 |
| 2.7. Competing motivations..... | 31 |
| 3. DATA AND METHOD | 34 |
| 3.1. Data..... | 34 |
| 3.2. Method..... | 34 |
| 4. RESULTS | 37 |
| 4.1. Word order..... | 37 |
| 4.2. Repeating/non-repeating situations..... | 40 |
| 4.3. Other aspectual features..... | 42 |
| 4.4. Lexical factors | 45 |
| 4.5. Quantification | 48 |
| 4.6. The total vs. partial object opposition in different constructions..... | 50 |
| 4.7. Total object case variation | 50 |
| 5. CONCLUSIONS..... | 55 |
| 6. SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN..... | 57 |
| 6.1. Sissejuhatus..... | 57 |
| 6.2. Teoreetiline taust | 58 |
| 6.3. Materjal ja meetod | 60 |
| 6.4. Tulemused..... | 61 |
| 6.4.1. Sõnajärg | 61 |
| 6.4.2. Situatsiooni korduvus/ühekordsus | 63 |
| 6.4.3. Teised aspektilised omadused..... | 65 |
| 6.4.4. Leksikaalsed mõjud | 67 |
| 6.4.5. Kvantifikatsioon..... | 70 |
| 6.4.6. Ülevaade totaal- ja partsiaalobjekti vastandusest eri konstruktsioonides | 71 |
| 6.4.7. Totaalobjekti vormivaheldus | 72 |
| 6.5. Järeldused | 74 |

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ABBREVIATIONS..... | 76 |
| REFERENCES..... | 77 |
| PUBLICATIONS..... | 81 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE..... | 209 |
| ELULOOKIRJELDUS..... | 210 |

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

- [P1] **Ogren, David 2013.** Objekti kääne hinnangukonstruktsioonis: kas *on võimalik osta auto või autot?* *Emakeele Seltsi Aastaraamat* 59: 171–192.
- [P2] **Ogren, David 2015a.** Differential Object Marking in Estonian: prototypes, variation, and construction-specificity. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 28: 277–312.
- [P3] **Ogren, David 2015b.** Sõnajärg, infostruktuur ja objekti kääne eesti keeles. *ESUKA-JEFUL* 6–3: 197–213.
- [P4] **Ogren, David 2017a.** Aspect and irregular object case variation in Estonian *da*-infinitive constructions. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics* 6, 2: 80–105.
- [P5] **Ogren, David 2017b.** Finiitverbi mõju objekti käändeale *da*-infinitiiviga objektikonstruktsioonis. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 4: 258–271.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Subject of thesis

This thesis addresses a hitherto under-researched aspect of Estonian morpho-syntax: the choice of object case in constructions where the object is governed by a *da*-infinitive, one of the two primary infinitives. A simple example is shown below:

- 1) Kavatsen *osta* **pesumasina**.¹
 intend:PRS;1SG buy:INF washing.machine:GEN
 ‘I intend to buy a washing machine.’

These constructions exhibit substantial irregularities in object case usage, with a large amount of what appears to be free variation as well as considerable variation according to parameters whose influence on object case is substantially different in *da*-infinitive constructions than in finite clauses. These parameters include word order, individual lexemes, and some aspectual phenomena that do not comfortably fit within the standard understanding of the criterion of “boundedness” typically used to explain the total vs. partial object opposition in Estonian and other Finnic languages (bounded situations require the total object, marked in Estonian with the nominative or genitive; unbounded situations require the partial object, marked with the partitive). As the *da*-infinitive is a semantically neutral infinitive form that conveys no temporal meaning, the temporal component of the boundedness criterion is less clear in these constructions than in finite clauses, which leads to additional variation in object case usage.

The core research question of the thesis is: what factors/variables affect the choice of object case in *da*-infinitive constructions, and to what extent does this differ from object case usage as observed in finite clauses, which are the basis for the standard guidelines for object case usage in the language as a whole?

The primary finding is that there are numerous semantic and syntactic features that show a strong relationship with object case in *da*-infinitive constructions but not in finite clauses. Therefore, the principles used to explain object case in finite clauses are insufficient for explaining the highly inconsistent object case usage in *da*-infinitive constructions. Moreover, some of these features are unique to individual constructions, further complicating efforts to establish a satisfactory set of general rules for object case.

¹ In all example sentences herein, the object is shown in bold, while the *da*-infinitive form and other essential elements of the constructions in question are shown in italics.

1.2. Structure of thesis

The main body of the thesis is comprised of five articles. While all employing the same corpus-based research method, the articles differ in their focus, each highlighting a particular environment in which irregular object case variation occurs and/or a feature or group of related features that help to explain this variation.

Article [P1] examines one specific *da*-infinitive construction – the assessment construction – and explores the various syntactic and lexical/semantic features that influence object case within it. The article finds that the single most important factor is the semantics of the assessment adjective. Negative assessment adjectives such as *raske* ‘difficult’ are used more often with the partial object than are positive assessment adjectives such as *lihtne* ‘easy, simple’; process-oriented adjectives such as *lihtne* favor the partial object more than do result-oriented adjectives such as *võimalik* ‘possible’; and adjectives that express an assessment of probability or possibility, such as *võimalik*, favor the partial object far more than do value judgment adjectives such as *tähtis* ‘important’. In addition to the adjective semantics, the article finds a very strong relationship between object case and word order, with the partial object dominating in infinitive clauses with OV word order and the total object prevailing with VO word order. It is also established that the partial object is far more common in repeating (iterative, distributive, generic) situations than in non-repeating situations.

Article [P2] takes a broader perspective, assessing the general scheme of differential object marking (DOM) in Estonian in relation to some prominent cross-linguistic generalizations regarding the nature and workings of DOM as well as highlighting some differences between Finnish and Estonian with regard to object marking in infinitival clauses. This article also discusses variation in the form of the total object, whereas all the other articles focus on the partial vs. total object opposition. It is shown that Estonian (like Finnish) does not fit neatly into the conventional DOM typology, as it exhibits variation both between an unmarked and a marked object form (nominative vs. partitive) and between two different marked forms (genitive vs. partitive), but the semantic contribution of the DOM opposition is the same in both cases. In other words, the fundamental nature of the total vs. partial object opposition does not change depending on whether the construction in question requires a nominative or genitive total object. Moreover, there are some examples of object case variation in *da*-infinitive constructions – particularly those in which the total object may appear in either nominative or genitive – where the variation serves no discernible function.

Article [P3] explores the relationship between word order and object case in various *da*-infinitive constructions and attempts to explain the relevance of word order to object case by means of information-structural considerations. Perhaps surprisingly, it is found that the connection between word order and object case has little if anything to do with information structure, as the effect of

word order persists even when controlling for whether the object nominal represents new or old information. Rather, the most likely explanation is that the predominance of the partial object in infinitive clauses with OV word order is brought about by cognitive processes of association and analogy, as there is a significant (albeit non-causal) relationship between word order and object case in finite clauses as well.

Article [P4] takes the category of aspect, a primary factor driving the partial vs. total object opposition in Finnic in general, and highlights the way in which various aspectual markers affect object case in *da*-infinitive constructions as compared to finite clauses. It is shown that the different aspectual markers examined do indeed all have the expected influence on object case: durativity markers and repeating situations favor the partial object, while perfective particles and destination adverbials increase the likelihood that the total object will be used. However, in some cases, the effect of these parameters on object case varies dramatically from one *da*-infinitive construction to another, thus highlighting the highly construction-specific nature of object case variation. This article also briefly explores the question of whether the partitive can be regarded as the default object case in Estonian.

Finally, Article [P5] is devoted to the impact of lexical factors, i.e. the influence of individual lexemes on object case, specifically in finite verbs in the *da*-infinitive object construction. There are some finite verbs, such as *kavatsema* ‘to plan, intend’ and *soovitama* ‘to recommend’, that very rarely (less than 10% of usage instances) occasion the use of the partial object in this construction, while others, such as *kartma* ‘to fear’ and *üritama* ‘to try’, appear mostly with the partial object. The article shows that this impact cannot be adequately explained by appealing to the semantic or syntactic properties of the lexemes, as it is not possible to divide the lexemes into groups whose members are similar both semantically/syntactically and in terms of their behavior as regards object case usage. Rather, it appears to be a separate property of the lexemes themselves. This article therefore serves as another example of the difficulty of establishing general principles governing the choice of object case in *da*-infinitive constructions.

The articles are preceded by an introductory chapter consisting of five sections. The first section introduces the topic of the thesis and the relationship of the thesis to previous works on the same or closely related topics. The second section provides an overview of the theoretical background of the thesis, regarding the Finnic partial vs. total object opposition as well as the broader research field of differential object marking as a whole. The third section describes the research material and the methods employed in the articles. The fourth section summarizes the most important results of the studies described in the articles. Finally, the fifth section offers some concluding thoughts regarding the broader questions of why object case in *da*-infinitive constructions is so variable and what approaches could be of use in further study of the topic.

1.3. Relationship with previous works on the same topic

While there have been numerous investigations into the nature of the partial vs. total object opposition in Estonian, as well as Finnish and other Finnic languages (e.g. Kont 1963, Askonen 2001, Tveite 2004, Tamm 2004, Tamm 2007, Huumo 2009, Tamm 2014a), these have focused overwhelmingly on defining/describing the boundedness criterion in general, i.e. what counts as a quantitatively bounded object and what counts as a resultative action.

The present thesis takes the common understanding of the boundedness criterion and demonstrates its inadequacy for the purpose of explaining the variation in object case observed in *da*-infinitive constructions. There are no previous studies of this variation, merely brief acknowledgments of its existence, sometimes accompanied by a sentence or two of elaboration/potential explanation (and typically referring to only one particular construction, not to *da*-infinitive constructions in general). Furthermore, even these brief treatments date from before the age of corpus linguistics. As such, the present thesis represents the first large-scale corpus-based investigation of the topic.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH HISTORY

This section provides an overview of the theoretical underpinnings of the present thesis, outlining key concepts as well as summarizing previous writings on object case in *da*-infinitive constructions.

2.1. Differential object marking across languages

Alternations in direct object encoding are a well-attested phenomenon in the world's languages. There is, however, considerable cross-linguistic variation in both the semantic/pragmatic functions of these alternations and the morpho-syntactic instruments employed to express these functions. For instance, in some languages, such as Spanish, the differential object “marker” is an adposition, in this case the preposition *a* ‘to’:

2) Veo **un** **árbol.**
see:PRS;1SG ART tree
‘I see a tree.’

3) Veo **a** **Rubén.**
see:PRS;1SG to Rubén
‘I see Rubén.’

In other languages, the same function may be performed via a case alternation, most commonly by marking certain direct objects with the dative (Bossong 1991), as in the examples below from Eastern Armenian:

4) **Ծառ** եմ տեսնում:
Tsar em tesnum
tree:ACC PRS;1SG see
‘I see a tree.’

5) **Րուբենին** եմ տեսնում:
Rubenin em tesnum
Rubén:DAT PRS;1SG see
‘I see Rubén.’

Examples 2–5 illustrate “traditional” differential object marking (DOM), wherein the opposition is between an unmarked (examples (2) and (4)) and a morphologically marked (examples (3) and (5)) form. Following Iemmolo (2013), I will refer to such alternations as **asymmetric DOM**. Moreover, object marking in these examples is determined by the animacy of the object referent; indeed,

animacy and definiteness are commonly regarded as the primary criteria driving asymmetric DOM oppositions (see e.g. Aissen 2003: 436).

Some languages feature **symmetric DOM** alternations, wherein two or more forms of overt coding are in opposition. In Kazym Khanty, for example, pronouns have two distinct accusative case forms, and the alternation between these forms is related to information structure, with focal and non-focal object referents being marked differently.

- 6) Aj aple-λ jaj-ŋa-λ peɫa lupij-əλ:
 young younger.brother:3SG elder.brother:DU;3SG towards say:PRS
 Jaj-ŋan, **mantī** pa töt'λ'-ja-λən.
 brother:DU me:ACC2 also bring:IMP;2DU/PL
 'The younger brother says to his brothers: Brothers, [take me along]FOC!'
- 7) Aj apše-λ [sic!] vera vūrat-λ: Äntö,
 Young younger.brother:3SG strongly beg:PRS no
 jaj-ŋan ši λuvat jām ver-a, **mänöt**
 elder.brother:DU DEM big good do:IMP;2SG me:ACC1
 panən tūv-a-λən.
 with take:IMP;2DU
 'The younger brother entreats: No, brothers, do such a good thing and [do]FOC take me along!' (Klumpp 2012: 366–368)

It is also possible for a language to feature both symmetric and asymmetric DOM. In the Finnic languages, direct object marking alternations are determined not only by properties (whether semantic, referential, or pragmatic) of the object referent, but also by properties of the action denoted by the verb (or verb phrase). The primary object marking alternation is between the partial object (partitive case) and the total object (nominative or genitive), as in the Estonian examples below:

- 8) Jaan joonistab **tiigri**.
 Jaan:NOM draw:PRS;3SG tiger:GEN
 'Jaan will draw a tiger.'
- 9) Jaan joonistab **tiigrit**.
 Jaan:NOM draw:PRS;3SG tiger:PAR
 'Jaan is drawing a tiger.'
- 10) Jaan ei joonista **tiigrit**.
 Jaan:NOM NEG draw:PRS tiger:PAR
 'Jaan is not drawing/will not draw a tiger.'
- 11) Joonista **tiiger!**
 draw:IMP;2SG tiger:NOM
 'Draw a tiger!'

These examples illustrate several of the factors determining the choice of object case in Estonian: aspect (8–9), negation (10), and mood (compare (8), indicative mood with total object in genitive, to (11), imperative mood with total object in nominative). Crucially, the alternation in the form of the total object means that the total vs. partial object opposition in Estonian, as well as other Finnic languages, represents both symmetric and asymmetric DOM (as a nominative-partitive alternation is asymmetric while a genitive-partitive alternation is symmetric). However, the meaning difference expressed by the total vs. partial object opposition remains the same regardless of the case of the total object. In examples (5) and (8) above, while the total object form differs (and therefore the (a)symmetry of the DOM opposition differs as well), the reason for the use of the total rather than the partial object is the same, namely that the action is conceptualized as perfective/resultative.

Witzlack-Makarevich & Seržant (2017) divide differential argument marking (DAM) systems into two categories, argument-triggered and predicate-triggered DAM. Argument-triggered DAM is sensitive to the semantic and pragmatic properties of the relevant argument, while predicate-triggered DAM is sensitive to the properties of the event (including, among other things, tense and aspect). They also distinguish between restricted and unrestricted DAM systems, the latter applying across the board within a language and the former being restricted to particular constructions or particular verbs. (Witzlack-Makarevich & Seržant 2017: 39–40). Furthermore, following the distinction between split and fluid DAM systems made by de Hoop and Malchukov (2007), they draw attention to the fact that not all DAM systems are equally obligatory, and that some exhibit considerable internal variation. With regard to the optionality of argument marking, Witzlack-Makarevich & Seržant (2017: 33) distinguish between three types of DAM systems: split (obligatory complementary distribution), fluid (probabilistic usage, not obligatory), and split-fluid (featuring a combination of splitting and fluid contexts). As this thesis illustrates, Estonian DOM belongs to the split-fluid category.

In addition to the fundamental typological question of what kinds of DOM systems exist in the world's languages, another core research topic is the function(s) of DOM. One prominent functional classification is that of de Hoop and Malchukov (2008), who posit two different motivations behind systems of direct object encoding. The first, *DISTINGUISHABILITY*, requires that subjects and objects of transitive clauses be morphologically distinct from one another (typically accomplished by case marking), while the second, *IDENTIFY*, “makes use of case morphology to encode specific semantic/pragmatic information about the nominal in question”, including, for instance, thematic roles such as agent, goal, and experiencer (de Hoop & Malchukov 2008: 567–568). According to de Hoop and Malchukov, asymmetric alternations may be related to either *DISTINGUISHABILITY* or *IDENTIFY*, while symmetric alternations, since all possible forms within a symmetric alternation are morphologically distinct from the subject, are necessarily driven by *IDENTIFY*. (In practice, this is equivalent to

stating simply that all direct object encoding alternations are motivated by DISTINGUISHABILITY and/or IDENTIFY).

The meaning differences typically expressed by the total vs. partial object opposition in Finnic languages – aspect, polarity and quantification – clearly fall into the category of IDENTIFY, while the use of the two total object cases can largely be explained by appealing to DISTINGUISHABILITY. Nevertheless, as the function of the total vs. partial object distinction remains the same regardless of whether the alternation is symmetric or asymmetric, Finnic languages pose a challenge to theories that seek to associate particular functions with asymmetric vs. symmetric DOM (e.g. Iemmolo 2013, who concludes that symmetric alternations typically express differences in aspect, polarity or quantification, while asymmetric alternations are driven by differences in the referential properties of the direct object, such as animacy, topicality, and definiteness).

An alternative functional explanation of DOM is offered by Dalrymple & Nikolaeva (2011), who focus on the differences in the information-structural properties of those objects which tend to receive marking in DOM systems as compared to those which do not. Rather than suggesting that the role of DOM is to *distinguish* subjects from objects, however, they argue that DOM was originally motivated by the need to highlight *similarities* between subjects and topical objects, i.e. to overtly mark the property of topicality (Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011: 3–8). They also draw attention to the different syntactic profiles of marked vs. unmarked objects in some languages, concluding that in such cases marked and unmarked objects bear different grammatical functions. However, it is worth pointing out that their analysis only concerns asymmetric DOM alternations; phenomena such as the Finnic total vs. partial object opposition are explicitly excluded.

A further aspect of DOM research relevant to the present thesis is the difference between finite and non-finite clauses with respect to object marking. The observation that non-finite clauses in some languages may behave differently from finite clauses with respect to object marking is not a new one. Arkadiev (2013) has examined direct object case in non-finite clauses in Lithuanian, finding that, while the prototypical direct object case in Lithuanian is the accusative, various non-finite constructions feature direct objects in the nominative, genitive, or dative. The nominative direct object appears when the non-finite clause is itself the subject of the sentence:

- 12) Jam nepatiko **laukelis** arti.
3SG:DAT like:PST;3SG;NEG field:NOM;SG plough:INF
'He did not like to plough the field.' (Arkadiev 2013: 421)

Dative and genitive direct objects in Lithuanian appear in conjunction with purposive infinitives: the genitive object is used when the main verb is a verb of motion (13), while the dative object appears with non-motion verbs (14) (Arkadiev 2013: 421):

- 13) Išvažiavo **kelio** taisyti.
drive.out:PST;3PL road:GEN;SG repair:INF
‘(They) went to repair the road.’ (Arkadiev 2013: 421)
- 14) Iššovė **žmonėms** pagąsdinti.
shoot:PST;3SG person:DAT;PL frighten:INF
‘(He) fired to scare the people.’ (Arkadiev 2013: 422)

All three of these Lithuanian constructions thus represent examples in which objects of non-finite verb forms are marked in a way that is not possible for objects of finite verb forms.

Another example of object marking differing in non-finite clauses as compared to finite clauses comes from Old Hungarian, where objects in finite clauses were consistently marked with the accusative, while objects occurring in non-finite subordinate clauses sometimes received no marking (É. Kiss 2014). A similar pattern has been observed in Eastern Mari, where omission of the accusative case marker on direct objects is possible only in dependent non-finite clauses (15), not elsewhere (16).

- 15) māj č’odəra-š **ponggo** pog-aš kaj-em
I forest:LAT mushroom collect:INF go:PRS;1SG
‘I am going to the forest to collect mushrooms.’
- 16) č’odəra-šte kaj-že da **pong-əm** / ***ponggo** pog-əžo
forest:INE go:OPT and mushroom:ACC mushroom collect:OPT
‘Let him go to the forest and collect mushrooms.’ (Serdobolskaya 2015: 308–309)

The DOM systems mentioned above generally involve consistently realized oppositions, in which a clear set of rules can be formed, i.e. the (un)availability of a particular object form can be reliably predicted on the basis of various properties of the object, the verb, and/or the situation as a whole. This thesis, however, explores a rather different sort of DOM phenomenon. In Estonian, the central object marking alternation is the opposition between partial and total objects (as illustrated in examples 8 and 9 above), and this opposition occurs in all clause types, i.e. both partial and total objects appear in both finite and non-finite clauses. However, Estonian *da*-infinitive constructions represent a syntactic/semantic environment underspecified with respect to a key parameter driving the partial vs. total object opposition (namely the property of temporal (un)boundedness). In this environment, the DOM alternation itself remains, but its function is blurred, as are the principles guiding its realization in any given sentence. Thus, in these constructions, object marking is clearly *related* to various syntactic/semantic/lexical criteria, but remains highly variable, and therefore cannot be said to be *determined* by those criteria.

Accordingly, the focus of this thesis is on describing the resulting semi-free variation in object case, identifying the parameters associated with increased

usage of one or another case. The result is a probabilistic rather than rule-based account of object case usage. A conceptually similar study is the analysis of Nepali DOM in Schikowski (2013), who finds a rule-based approach inadequate for describing the variation in Nepali object marking, instead developing a probabilistic model reflecting the non-deterministic nature of the relationships between object case and various semantic/syntactic/referential properties of the object.

2.2. Object marking in Estonian

Object case usage, especially the partial vs. total object opposition, has been a popular topic in Finnic linguistics for decades. The three basic rules have been quite well established (e.g. Mihkla et al. 1974: 146, Karlsson 1999: 84–87, Hakulinen et al. 2004: 889, Metslang 2017: 264–265). Namely, the partial object is used if

- a) the action described by the verb is irresultative (either imperfective, i.e. continuous aspect, or perfective but irresultative, i.e. intrinsically atelic),
- b) the object referent is quantitatively indefinite/non-limited, or
- c) the object is governed by a negative verb form.

Thus the partial object is used in cases such as the following:

- 17) Praegu loen huvitavat raamatut. (imperfective)
 now read:PRS;1SG interesting:PAR book:PAR
 ‘Now I am reading an interesting book.’
- 18) Mari armastab Jürit. (irresultative)
 Mari:NOM love:PRS;3SG Jüri:PAR
 ‘Mari loves Jüri.’
- 19) Lapsed sõid putru. (quantitatively indefinite object)
 child:NOM;PL eat:PST;3PL porridge:PAR
 ‘The children ate porridge.’
- 20) Ma ei ostnud uut pesumasinat. (negative)
 1SG:NOM NEG buy:PST new:PAR washing.machine:PAR
 ‘I didn’t buy a new washing machine.’

Conversely, the total object is possible only if none of the above criteria are satisfied, i.e. if the action is perfective and resultative, the object referent is quantitatively definite, and the verb form is affirmative, as in (21) below.

- 21) Ma ostsin uue pesumasinaga.
 1SG:NOM buy:PST;1SG new:GEN washing.machine:GEN
 ‘I bought a new washing machine.’

However, as this thesis demonstrates, the fact that the total object is *possible* does not mean it is *mandatory*; in some *da*-infinitive constructions, the partitive is often used even when all three of the conditions for total object use (the opposites of criteria (a)–(c) above, i.e. a resultative action, a quantitatively definite/limited object, and an affirmative verb form) are satisfied.

The first two of the core criteria – resultativity of the action and defined/limited quantity of the object – have been referred to jointly under the umbrella notion of “boundedness”. In fact, the third criterion fits equally well under this umbrella, since a negated event has no beginning and end, and is therefore unbounded. Thus, the basic principle guiding the choice of object case in Finnic can be stated even more simply: the partial object is used if the situation is in some way unbounded (whether temporally or quantitatively) and the total object is used if the situation is bounded.

The three core criteria are, for the most part, quite straightforward. The concepts of imperfective/continuous aspect, indefinite quantity, and negation are fairly clear and unproblematic. The gray area is the notion of irresultativity, i.e. what counts as a resultative action and what does not. The problematic nature of the (ir)resultativity parameter is illustrated by the fact that it is the only one of the core object case criteria which is interpreted significantly differently in Estonian than in Finnish, as illustrated below:

- 22) Näen **tiikerin.** (Finnish)
 see:PRS;1SG tiger:GEN
 ‘I see a tiger.’
- 23) Haluan **uuden** **auton.** (Finnish)
 want:PRS;1SG new:GEN car:GEN
 ‘I want a new car.’
- 24) Näen **tiigrit.** (Estonian)
 see:PRS;1SG tiger:PAR
 ‘I see a tiger.’
- 25) Tahan **uut** **autot.** (Estonian)
 want:PRS;1SG new:PAR car:PAR
 ‘I want a new car.’

As can be seen from these examples, verbs of sensory perception require the partial object in Estonian, but not in Finnish. Furthermore, while all Estonian verbs of emotion require the partial object, there are some Finnish verbs of emotion that allow the total object, such as *haluta* ‘to want’.

While the boundedness criterion itself has been explored in considerable detail (see e.g. Kiparsky 1998 and 2001 for Finnish, Tamm 2004 and 2007 for Estonian), relatively little attention has been paid to the cases in which the boundedness criterion (at least as typically understood) does not seem to apply

consistently. Such inconsistency in usage is a hallmark of *da*-infinitive constructions, as evidenced by the following pair of examples:

- 26) Regulatsiooni mõte seisnebki selles, et kui
 regulation:GEN idea:NOM stand:PRS;3SG=too that:INE that if
 tööandja soovib ühepoolset töölepingut
 employer:NOM wish:PRS;3SG unilaterally work.contract:PAR
lõpetada, siis töötajale jääks aega,
 terminate:INF then employee:ALL remain:CND;3SG time:PAR
 et enda edasist tegevust planeerida. (ETT)
 to self:GEN future:PAR activity:PAR plan:INF
 ‘The idea of the regulation is that if an employer wishes to unilaterally terminate a work contract, the employee would have time to plan his/her future activity.’
- 27) Samas kui töötaja soovib töölepingu
 same:INE if employee:NOM wish:PRS;3SG work.contract:GEN
lõpetada seoses sellega, et asub
 terminate:INF connection:INE that:COM that start:PRS;3SG
 ülikooli õppima, peab ta sellest
 university:ILL study:SUP must:PRS;3SG 3SG:NOM that:ELA
 ette teatama vaid 5 päeva. (ETT)
 in.advance inform:SUP only 5 day:PAR
 ‘At the same time, if an employee wishes to terminate a work contract because he/she is going to start studying at university, he/she only needs to provide five days’ advance notice.’

These examples describe very similar situations, even using the same lexemes (*soovib töölepingu/töölepingut lõpetada* ‘wishes to terminate a work contract’). However, in example (26) the partial object is used, and in (27) the total object is used. There is no apparent semantic or syntactic difference between the two sentences that seems a likely or even plausible cause of the difference in object case usage. Such seemingly inexplicable variation is extremely rare in finite clauses; in *da*-infinitive constructions, however, it is quite common.

The irregular object case variation in *da*-infinitive constructions has been observed by numerous researchers, but their remarks are typically confined to the *da*-infinitive object construction (see section d) below), not addressing the other common constructions in which similar variation takes place, and amount to little more than a general recognition of the phenomenon, only hinting at possible explanations.

For instance, Erelt (2006: 42), commenting on the object construction, acknowledges the existence of the variation in object case, but offers no explanation of it, merely stating that the partial vs. total object opposition in this instance is not associated with any relevant semantic distinction: “soovimist, tahtmist või kavatsemist väljendavate verbide puhul võib esineda nii osa- kui ka täissihitis, kuid võimalik tõlgendus erinevus on ebaoluline” (“with verbs

expressing wishing, wanting or intending, both the total and the partial object are possible, but the possible difference in interpretation is insignificant”). Mihkla et al. (1974: 162–163) go into somewhat more depth, offering the following generalization:

da-tegevusnimega seostuvate verbidega, nagu *jõudma*, *kavatsema*, *laskma*, *lubama*, *soovima*, *suutma*, *tahtma*, *tohtima* jt, võib esineda nii osa- kui ka täissihitist: vrd *soovin osta seda raamatut* ~ *soovin osta selle raamatu* ... Seega kasutatakse täissihitist, kui kogu sõnaühendiga väljendatud jaatav tegevus on mõtestatud lõpetatuna või lõpetatavana (tulemuslikuna), millega kaasneb jaotatava tegevusobjekti korral viimase hõlmamine tegevusse tervikuna. ... Osasihitist aga esineb juhtudel, kui kogu sõnaühendiga märgitud tegevus on mõtestatud jätkuvana, korduvana või tulemusetuna, kui tegevus haarab objekti osaliselt või lause on eitav.”

(Verbs associated with the *da*-infinitive, such as *jõudma* ‘to manage’, *kavatsema* ‘to intend, plan’, *laskma* ‘to let, have (sb do sth)’, *lubama* ‘to allow, promise’, *soovima* ‘to wish, desire’, *suutma* ‘to be able to’, *tahtma* ‘to want’, *tohtima* ‘to be allowed to’ and others, may appear with either the partial or the total object: compare *soovin osta seda raamatut* ~ *soovin osta selle raamatu* ‘I’d like to buy this book’... Therefore the total object is used when the action expressed by the phrase as a whole is conceptualized as completed or to-be-completed (i.e. resultative), which, in the case of a divisible object referent, implies the complete inclusion of the object in the action... The partial object appears when the action expressed by the phrase as a whole is conceptualized as continuing, repeating or irresultative, if the activity includes only a part of the object or the sentence is negative.)

This is essentially equivalent to stating that the boundedness criterion applies in this *da*-infinitive construction in the same way as it does in finite clauses: if the situation is conceptualized as bounded, the total object is used. Even if true, this is uninformative, because it provides no indication of under what conditions a situation is likely to be conceptualized as bounded.

Mihkla et al. (1974: 163) also make reference to the “concreteness” of the action denoted by the finite verb as a determining factor in the choice of object case:

Kui peetakse eeskätt silmas *da*-infinitiivis avaldatud tegevust, mille teostamiseks on konkreetne soov või kavatsus, kasutatakse täissihitist. Näit. *Kolhoos kavatseb kevadel uue mootorpaadi osta. Tahan puhkuse ajal väikese matka ette võtta*. Kui aga tõstetakse esile esmajoones öeldisverbis avaldatud tegevust ja räägitakse millegi teostamisest üldse, siis kasutatakse osasihitist. Näit. *Kolhoos kavatseb kevadel uut mootorpaati osta. Tahan puhkuse ajal väikest matka ette võtta*.

If one has in mind primarily the action expressed by the *da*-infinitive, for the execution of which there is a concrete desire or intention, the total object is used. E.g. *Kolhoos kavatseb kevadel uue mootorpaadi osta* ‘The kolkhoz plans to buy a new motorboat’, *Tahan puhkuse ajal väikese matka ette võtta* ‘I want to do a little hike during my vacation’. If, however, one wishes to emphasize the action

expressed by the main verb and talk about the execution of some activity in general, the partial object is used, e.g. *Kolhoos kavatseb kevadel uut mootorpaati osta. Tahan puhkuse ajal väikest matka ette võtta.*

The above states that when the primary focus is on the (bounded, resultative) infinitive verb phrase, the total object is used, whereas the partial object is used when the primary focus is on the (unbounded, irresultative) finite verb. However, as this primary focus is typically only identifiable by way of the choice of object case (if that), there is an obvious circular logic issue here. As before, even if true, this is uninformative, because it fails to explain what conditions lead to either the finite or non-finite verb receiving primary focus.

One of the most detailed treatments of object case in Finnic is found in Kont (1963). Like Mihkla et al., Kont references the definiteness/concreteness of the action (*määratud/määramata, konkreetne/mittekonkreetne tegevus*) as a relevant factor for object case. Moreover, in discussing object case variation in the *da*-infinitive object construction, Kont cites Aavik (1936), whose interpretation largely agrees with that of Mihkla et al. discussed above, arguing that the choice of object case reflects which of the two verbs is considered more important, the finite verb or the non-finite verb: “toonitagu, et osaobjekt sobib ainult siis, kui tähtsam on tahtmine, oskamine, suutmine üldse; kui aga tähtsam on infinitiiviga osutatud tegevus, eriti üksikus, konkreetnes juhtumis, peab olema täisobjekt, kui infinitiiv seda nõuab” (“It should be stressed that the partial object is only appropriate when the focus is on wanting, knowing how to, or being able to in general; when, however, the action expressed by the infinitive is more important, especially in an individual, concrete instance, the total object must be used if the infinitive requires it”) (Aavik 1936: 133). Aavik also makes some claims about the extent to which various finite verbs in this construction favor the partial object; the veracity of his generalizations is explored in Article [P5] of this thesis.

Aavik’s comments, however, are not confined to the object construction. He also touches on several other constructions discussed in the present thesis:

Uuemal ajal aga on tugev kalduvus tarvitada siin partitiivi (osaobjekti): ‘tal on kavatsus uut äri avada’; ‘vaja seda meest (pro ‘see mees’) siia kutsuda’ jne. Mõnes juhtumis ongi partitiiv parem, nimelt kõigepealt niisuguste sõnade järel kui ‘katse, tahtmine, soov, püüe, tung’ jne., teiseks kui väljendatakse enam tegevuse üldist võimalikkust ja esinemist kui üksikut kindlat juhtumit, kolmandaks mõnikord eitavate omadussõnade järel... Partitiiv on mõnikord ka selguse või ladususe pärast: ‘siis näis mulle mõte seda neiu kellelegi teisele jätta päris pilkena’. Teissuguses sõnade järjestuses, nimelt kui verb asetseb enne objekti, on nominatiivne kuju kergemini võimalik... Kõigis neis juhtumites aga ei ole ka nominatiiv viga, vaid samuti võimalik ning õige, kuigi mõnikord vähem ladus.

Lately, there is a strong tendency to use the partitive (partial object): ‘tal on kavatsus uut äri avada’ ‘he has the intention of starting a new business’; ‘vaja seda meest (pro “see mees”) siia kutsuda’ ‘need to invite that man here’ etc. In

some cases, the partitive is indeed better, namely after words such as *katse* ‘attempt’, *tahtmine* ‘will, volition’, *soov* ‘wish, desire’, *püüe* ‘endeavor’, *tung* ‘urge’ etc, or when what is expressed is rather the general possibility and occurrence of some action, not a specific individual instance, or sometimes after negative adjectives... The partitive is also sometimes used for clarity or facility: ‘*siis näis mulle mõte seda neiu kellelegi teisele jätta päris pilkena*’ ‘then the idea of leaving that young woman for someone else seemed to me a mockery’. With the opposite word order, when the verb precedes the object, the nominative is more possible... However, in none of these cases is the nominative a mistake; it is possible and correct, but sometimes less facile (Aavik 1936: 135)

As will be seen, the results of this thesis emphatically confirm all of these generalizations.

It is worth noting that there is disagreement regarding the relevance of object case variation in *da*-infinitive constructions, i.e. whether or not there is actually a difference in meaning between the total and partial object. As mentioned above, Erelt (2006) states that the possible difference in meaning is insignificant. Aavik, however, states that the partial object is only appropriate under certain circumstances (i.e. when the action described by the finite verb is more important than that described by the non-finite verb), which clearly suggests that in his eyes there is a relevant semantic distinction. Tauli (1980: 60) also sees a difference in meaning between the partial and total object in the *da*-infinitive object construction, and is more concrete than Aavik regarding the nature of the distinction: “*partsiaalobjekt väljendab nõrgemat, totaalobjekt kindlamat soovi, soovitust, tahet, kavatsust; partsiaalobjekti puhul ei väljendata, totaalobjekti puhul väljendatakse võimalikku tulemust*” (“the partial object expresses a weaker desire, recommendation, will, or intention, while the total object expresses a stronger, surer one; in the case of the partial object, the possible result is not expressed, while in the case of the total object it is”). This thesis does not explore the question of whether there is a meaningful semantic difference between the partial and total object in the constructions examined; that is ultimately a subjective judgment, not a question that can be answered with the help of quantitative corpus data. Nevertheless, the fact that there is disagreement over the meaning of the partial/total object opposition in these constructions serves to further illustrate the difficulty that they present to the language user: the choice of object case in such environments, while far from random, is far more subjective and disputable than it is in finite clauses.

Total object case in Estonian is much less variable than the partial vs. total object opposition. There are two total object cases, genitive and nominative, but their distribution is almost entirely predictable on the basis of syntactic factors. Plural total objects appear exclusively in the nominative. Singular total objects appear in the nominative in the imperative and jussive moods, as well as in the impersonal voice and in *da*-infinitive constructions lacking an explicit subject argument. In the personal voice in all other moods (indicative, conditional, quotative), as well as *da*-infinitive constructions with explicit subjects, singular total objects appear in the genitive. It is difficult to formulate a rule defining the

features distinguishing constructions with nominative total objects from those with genitive total objects; however, while it varies cross-constructively, total object case is quite consistent construction-internally. Only in the case of two closely related *da*-infinitive constructions do both nominative and genitive singular total objects occur. A more detailed treatment of the general rules for total object case, as well as these exceptional *da*-infinitive constructions, is given in Article [P2] of this thesis.

2.3. Constructions and construction grammar

The notion of *constructions* – linguistic units with morphosyntactic restrictions that cannot be predicted from grammatical rules applying to the language as a whole (cf. Goldberg 1995, Sahkai 2006) – is central to the analysis presented in this thesis, as I appeal repeatedly to the notion that different constructions may (and in fact do) behave quite differently with respect to object case usage.

Construction grammar theory postulates that the construction is the smallest grammatical unit in language and therefore the lowest level of syntactic representation. This does not mean that constructions are independent of one another; rather, they exist in an inheritance hierarchy, with constructions lower in the hierarchy inheriting traits from those higher in the hierarchy. (Goldberg 2003: 219–222) Indeed, there are some aspects of object case usage, e.g. the use of the partitive in the case of atelic events (including negative verb forms), that apply to all constructions in Estonian, whether with finite or non-finite verb forms. Nevertheless, there are also vast differences in object case usage between finite and non-finite constructions, as well as between different non-finite constructions such as the *da*-infinitive constructions discussed in this thesis. It is only through a construction-centric approach that one can make any sense of the numerous differences in the way certain factors affect (or don't affect) object case in different constructions; in the construction grammar framework, different constructions are allowed to have different rules (and those rules do not have to be derivable from more general rules, i.e. there is no requirement that the behavior of a particular construction should be predictable from any property or properties of that construction).

The present thesis does not rely on any specific variety of construction grammar (or any other formal framework), nor does it attempt to formally describe any hierarchy of constructions or rules. In fact, the precise definition of “construction” is immaterial to the analysis presented herein, the general concept suffices. The units referred to in this thesis as “constructions” could just as easily be referred to as “syntactic patterns”, “sentence types”, or similar. The core principles of construction grammar are thus employed here merely as a general means of describing language structure and accounting for the possibility of cross-constructive variability, not of explaining why one or another form is used in a particular circumstance.

The variation in object case usage in *da*-infinitive constructions poses a great challenge to any formal structural approach; whatever the “rules” may be (i.e. whatever hierarchy of constructions one may postulate), in actual language use, the application of those rules (i.e. the realization of the predicted inheritance operations) is extremely inconsistent. Thus, for instance, the common framework of optimality theory (see e.g. Prince and Smolensky 2004) is unsatisfactory for the purposes of this thesis. Optimality theory (OT) seeks to explain linguistic systems by means of a hierarchy of constraints, wherein conflicts between constraints are resolved by appealing to the relative ranks of the constraints in question. In such a system, variation can theoretically be handled by allowing the rank order of the constraints to vary (Guy 1997); however, this is not a solution, but merely a re-statement of the problem, as the task then becomes to determine what factors influence the way in which the constraints are re-ordered in any given usage instance. This is, in a sense, precisely what the present thesis aims to do, but the explicit application of OT or any other formal approach would not add any clarity to the process. In general, theories that seek to describe a system are ill-suited to the task of explaining system-internal variation, which is the primary focus of this thesis.

While a proper formalization of the decision-making process thus remains elusive, the concepts of constructions and construction-specificity (features/patterns unique to a particular construction or group of constructions) represent the theoretical backbone without which the central findings of this thesis would be impossible to explain.

2.4. *da*-infinitive constructions

There are two primary infinitives in Estonian, the *da*-infinitive and the *ma*-infinitive. While the *ma*-infinitive is the standard dictionary form, it has a much narrower scope of usage. In its basic form, the *ma*-infinitive, also known as the supine, expresses relative future, i.e. that one action follows another (EKK: 218–220). The *da*-infinitive, by contrast, is a “neutral” form that merely expresses an action without conveying any particular temporal meaning. Due to its semantic and temporal neutrality, the *da*-infinitive may fill a wide variety of syntactic roles, as in the following examples:

- 28) On raske leida head söögikohta. (subject)
 be:PRS;3SG difficult:NOM find:INF good:PAR place.to.eat:PAR
 ‘It is difficult to find a good place to eat.’
- 29) Ma tahan osta uue auto. (direct object)
 1sg:NOM want:PRS:1SG buy:INF new:GEN car:GEN
 ‘I want to buy a new car.’

- 30) Nüüd on hilja *koostada* **plaan**. (adverbial)
 now be:PRS;3SG late make:INF plan:PAR;PL
 ‘Now it’s too late to make plans.’
- 31) Igaühel on õigus *saada* **haridust**. (attribute)
 each:ADE be:PRS;3SG right:NOM get:INF education:PAR
 ‘Everyone has the right to receive education.’
- 32) Kuidas *leida* **motivatsiooni**? (stand-alone predicate)
 how find:INF motivation:PAR
 ‘How to find motivation?’

A clarification is needed here regarding the relationship between the boundedness criterion and the semantics of the *da*-infinitive form. While the *da*-infinitive is tense and aspect-neutral, this does not mean that all *da*-infinitive phrases are neutral/equal with respect to the boundedness criterion, or that the category of boundedness does not apply to them; rather, events are bounded or unbounded even though the *da*-infinitive form itself is underspecified with regard to tense and aspect and therefore provides no relevant information for making the determination. This is because boundedness is communicated not merely by the verb’s grammatical form, but also by its semantics, as well as the semantics of the object nominal. A *da*-infinitive phrase with the verb *armastada* ‘to love’ is far more likely to be associated with a bounded event than is one with the verb *saavutada* ‘to achieve’. Similarly, a *da*-infinitive phrase with the object lexeme *auto* ‘car’ is far more typically associated with a bounded event than is one with the object lexeme *vesi* ‘water’. References in this thesis to the boundedness of particular *da*-infinitive phrases thus concern the boundedness implied by the semantics of the verb and object, independent of their grammatical forms. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that boundedness is more ambiguous in *da*-infinitive constructions than in finite clauses, and therefore, that a *da*-infinitive phrase described herein as bounded is still somewhat less clearly bounded than is a bounded finite clause.

The present thesis does not seek to examine object case usage in every single *da*-infinitive construction; there are far too many of them, and some of them are rare enough that they cannot be adequately studied with the available corpus data. Instead, the thesis focuses on five common constructions, which differ from one another both structurally/syntactically as well as in the patterns of object case usage they exhibit. These five constructions are the following (the definitions of the constructions, as well as their Estonian names, come from Penjam (2008); the English names used below are my translations/adaptations of Penjam’s terminology):

1. The purpose construction (*otstarbe- ja põhjuslausekonstruktsioon*), in which the *da*-infinitive phrase serves as the predicate of a subordinate clause beginning with *et*. The subordinate clause expresses the purpose of the action described in the main clause:

- 33) Jaan läks metsa, et tappa hirv.
 Jaan:NOM go:PST;3SG forest:ILL to kill:INF deer:NOM
 ‘Jaan went to the forest to kill a deer.’

2. The assessment construction (*hinnangukonstruktsioon*), consisting of OLEMA + adjective + *da*-infinitive phrase, where the *da*-infinitive phrase is the syntactic subject and the adjective expresses the speaker’s attitude toward/assessment of the activity described in the *da*-infinitive phrase:

- 34) On tähtis leida mugav
 be:PRS;3SG important:NOM find:INF comfortable:NOM
magamisasend.
 sleeping.position:NOM
 ‘It is important to find a comfortable sleeping position.’

3. The object construction (*objektikonstruktsioon*), in which the *da*-infinitive phrase is directly governed by the finite verb. There are three sub-types of the object construction:

a) The wishing-intending construction (*soovimis-kavatsemiskonstruktsioon*), which expresses the agent’s desire or intention to perform the action described in the *da*-infinitive phrase (Penjam 2008: 82):

- 35) Püüan kirjutada võimalikult head väitekirja.
 try:PRS;1SG write:INF as.possible good:PAR dissertation:PAR
 ‘I’m trying to write the best dissertation I can.’

b) The modal construction (*modaalkonstruktsioon*), in which the *da*-infinitive phrase is directly governed by a modal verb which expresses the possibility/permisibility of the action described in the *da*-infinitive phrase:

- 36) Igaüks saab tellida endale meelepärase õhtusöögi.
 each:NOM can:PRS;3SG order:INF self:ALL agreeable:GEN dinner:GEN
 ‘Everyone can order a dinner to his/her liking.’

c) The enabling-obligating construction (*võimaldamis-kohustamiskonstruktsioon*), a biclausal construction in which the subject (agent) of the main clause differs from that of the subordinate clause, and the former enables/forces/helps/etc. the latter to perform the action described in the *da*-infinitive phrase:

- 37) Soovitan sul osta uue mantli.
 recommend:PRS;1SG 2SG:ADE buy:INF new:GEN coat:GEN
 ‘I recommend that you buy a new coat.’

Penjam (2008) treats these three sub-types as separate constructions, and indeed, they do have structural differences motivating such a distinction. In this thesis, however, they are all referred to under the umbrella term of “object construction” (although they are analyzed separately, i.e. statistical data from the various sub-types is not combined). The three sub-types of the object construction share two features that are not found in any of the other constructions examined herein: first, the *da*-infinitive phrase is directly governed by the finite verb (essentially filling the syntactic role of direct object, hence the name “object construction”), and second, the case of the total object is the genitive rather than the nominative (although in one sub-type, the enabling-obligating construction, nominative total objects are also possible; this variation in total object case is explored in depth in Article [P2] and is summarized in section 4.6 of this Introduction).

4. The postposed attribute construction (*järeltäiendikonstruktsioon*), in which the *da*-infinitive phrase modifies the preceding NP:

- 38) *Otsus* **korter** *müüa* *ei* *tulnud* *kergelt*.
 decision:NOM apartment:NOM sell:INF NEG come:PST easily
 ‘The decision to sell the apartment did not come easily.’

5. The translative adverbial construction (*translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioon*), in which the *da*-infinitive phrase is the syntactic subject and the predicate consists of the copula OLEMA and a nominal phrase whose head is in the translative case:

- 39) *Tema* *eesmärgiks* *on* *leida* *viirusele* **ravim**.
 3SG:GEN goal:TRA be:PRS;3SG find:INF virus:ALL cure:NOM
 ‘Her goal is to find a cure for the virus.’

As stated above, this is far from an exhaustive list of all the *da*-infinitive constructions found in Estonian; however, it is an adequate representation of the range of syntactic environments in which *da*-infinitive constructions typically appear, and all five of these constructions are found quite frequently in the standard written language.

2.5. Word order and information structure

As the relevance of word order to object case is a recurring theme in this thesis, a brief overview of word order and information structure in Estonian is appropriate here. Both SVX and XVS word order are quite common in Estonian, and neither is substantially more common than the other; Tael (1988) reports the frequencies of SVX and XVS orders as 25% and 24%, respectively.

While Estonian does generally follow the V2 (verb in second position) principle observed in the Germanic languages, the word order of any given sentence is determined much more by information structure than by any grammatical restrictions or preferences (Lindström 2006: 875). Information structure has been described with varying terminology over the years, and debates over the proper terminology have gone on for decades (Amon 2015: 21–30); commonly used terms/oppositions include theme/rheme, topic/comment, topic/focus, old vs. new information, etc. Regardless of the terminology used, however, the fundamental distinction underlying these oppositions is the same, namely the distinction between the object of discourse (theme, topic, old information) and what is being said about it (rheme, comment, new information). The most typical focus is the part of the sentence containing the most essential new information, and new information tends to follow old information (Lindström 2006: 878); thus, the most common information structure is that in which the old, i.e. background information is placed at the beginning of the sentence, and the new, focused information is at the end of the sentence. An exception to this is contrastive focus, wherein the focused element often appears sentence-initially (Lindström 2006: 879). There is, therefore, a clear relationship between word order and information structure. Moreover, in many languages, there are clear relationships between information structure and object marking (Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011), which gives rise to the hypothesis that information-structural considerations could be behind some of the otherwise unexplained variation in object case in *da*-infinitive constructions.

Old (or “given”) and new information can be defined in different ways; one's definition of old information may or may not include items known to the interlocutors prior to the discourse in question (Lindström 2006: 877). For the purposes of this thesis, I classify as “new” any non-pronominal referent not previously mentioned in the source text; a finer-grained analysis, while desirable, would require a more detailed understanding of the interlocutors' knowledge level than can be inferred from written-language corpus data. In any case, though, given a large sample of sentences, the objects classified as representing “new” information clearly distinguish themselves from those classified as representing “old” information, and this classification is sufficient for a broad-brush exploration of the relationship between the givenness of the object referent and the choice of object case.

2.6. Aspect

Broadly speaking, the notion of *aspect* encompasses all temporal properties of a situation except for tense itself. According to Comrie (1976: 5) and Dahl (1985: 25), the difference between tense and aspect is that tense deals with the temporal location of a situation in relation to some other situation (often the present moment), while aspect deals with a situation's internal temporal structure. It should be noted that aspect is indeed a property of *situations*, not

merely of verbs, a distinction of great importance for the purposes of the Finnic partial vs. total object opposition (see Sulkala 1996, Kiparsky 1998).

Aspect is one of the core criteria determining object case in the Finnic languages: as previously stated, the total object can be used only if the situation is temporally bounded, i.e. if it is conceptualized as having an endpoint. The core aspectual property at the heart of the total vs. partial object opposition, then, is (im)perfectivity. However, there are many other temporal properties that fall under the umbrella of aspect, including the distinction between durative and punctual verbs (Vendler (1967) classifies durative and punctual transitive verbs as accomplishments and achievements, respectively) as well as characteristics such as iterativity (the repetition of the same event by the same participant(s)), distributivity (the repetition of the same event with different participants), ingressivity (associated with the beginning of an event), etc. Erelt (2017: 112–128) distinguishes three types of aspect: boundedness aspect (perfectivity), phasal aspect (ingressivity, continuativity, progressivity, egressivity, prospectivity, avertivity, retrospectivity) and quantitative aspect (iterativity, distributivity, frequentativity).

Of particular interest for the purposes of this thesis, as it proves to be a substantial factor influencing object case in various *da*-infinitive constructions, is the notion of *repeating vs. non-repeating situations*. The term *repeating situations* is used herein to refer to situations that are, for one reason or another, non-unique. This covers both iterative and distributive events, as well as generic/gnomic aspect. However, true examples of iterativity, where the participants (i.e. both the subject and the object) remain the same in each iteration, are quite rare in my data set. Moreover, generic/gnomic aspect is fundamentally a subset of distributive aspect, since the meaning of a generic/gnomic statement is that the statement is true regardless of the identity of the participants in any given instantiation of the event (e.g. *it's impossible to be in two places at once*). As such, the overwhelming majority of repeating situations in the data used in this thesis could simply be referred to as examples of distributive aspect; however, I have chosen to use the broader term *repeating situations*, because the notion of repetition conveyed by that term is linked to the criterion of temporal boundedness, which is at the heart of the partial vs. total object opposition in the language as a whole as well as the differences between finite and non-finite clauses with regard to object case usage.

2.7. Competing motivations

A recurring theme in the analysis of object case variation undertaken in this thesis is that of competing motivations. This refers to the simultaneous presence of different factors encouraging opposing linguistic choices, in this case factors encouraging the use of the total object and factors encouraging the use of the partial object. The concept of competing motivations is fundamental to conflict resolution and decision-making in general, and manifests itself in all areas of

linguistics (Moravcsik 2014). It is a prominent notion in explanations of the general phenomenon of differential object marking, e.g. Aissen (2003) sees the variation in DOM systems across languages as alternative resolutions of the conflict between the motivations of iconicity (favoring the explicit marking of certain objects) and economy (favoring minimal marking). Moreover, linguistic variation such as that examined in this thesis is naturally related to competing motivations; where there is variation, there must be some motivation underlying the use of each of the variant forms. The connection between DOM (especially optional/variable DOM) and competing motivations is also drawn by Witzlack-Makarevich & Seržant (2017: 34), who write that fluid argument marking “is highly complex and involves a number of often competing motivations”.

Attempting to analyze object case usage in Estonian *da*-infinitive constructions in terms of absolute rules, i.e. circumstance X *requires* object case Y, quickly proves fruitless, since variation is ubiquitous and true “rules” are few and far between. Instead, it is far more instructive to view the variation in object case as a result of competition between factors motivating the use of the partial object and factors motivating the use of the total object. Some of these factors are stronger than others, hence the existence of pronounced statistical tendencies in favor of one or another object case in certain syntactic/semantic/lexical environments. However, the competition is always present, and the result of the competition is a function not only of the environment, but of the cognitive processes taking place in the mind of the individual language user. This cognitive angle is important to keep in mind when analyzing variation-rich data such as that presented in this thesis; the reasons for using a particular object case in a particular circumstance may be purely associative, not motivated by any functional or semantic distinction relevant to the sentence in question. For example, the partial object may appear more frequently in infinitival phrases with OV word order than in those with VO word order, because in finite clauses, OV word order is associated with negation (and therefore with partial object usage, since negation requires it).

In all of the constructions examined herein, the primary motivation for the use of the total object is the same: the *da*-infinitive phrase (including the object) describes a bounded situation, with a quantitatively limited object and a verb lexeme associated with resultative, telic events. There is also a competing feature in all these constructions motivating the use of the partial object, namely that the event described by the *da*-infinitive phrase is not presented as having taken place or being sure to take place in the future, but is merely a possibility, goal, desire, intention or similar; accordingly, the implication of resultativity in such sentences is inherently weaker than in perfective finite clauses (e.g. *tahan osta auto/autot* ‘I want to buy a car’ is less clearly resultative than *ostan auto* ‘I will buy a car’).²

² The presumed analogy here is not to the irrealis moods (which behave no differently from the indicative as regards the partial vs. total object opposition), but to negation, which combines maximally clear irresultativity with obligatory use of the partial object.

In addition to the core competition described in the previous paragraph, there are other factors motivating the use of one or another object case, some of which (e.g. word order and distributivity) are found in multiple *da*-infinitive constructions and others of which are unique to (or are integral elements of, e.g. the assessment adjective in the assessment construction) individual constructions. The differences between various *da*-infinitive constructions with respect to object case usage can be examined by comparing the effect of these various motivating factors on object case in different constructions.

This thesis thus represents a contribution to the growing body of literature (see e.g. MacWhinney et al. 2014) exploring the role of competing motivations in different aspects of (morpho)syntax in various languages.

3. DATA AND METHOD

In this section, I provide an overview of the corpus material used in the study as well as the methods of analysis and the criteria according to which individual corpus sentences were included in/excluded from the study.

3.1. Data

The great majority of the data presented in this thesis comes from the etTenTen corpus of Estonian online texts (<https://www.sketchengine.co.uk/ettenten-corpus/>), created in 2013. With 330 million tokens, etTenTen is by far the largest Estonian corpus currently in existence. It covers a variety of domains including government websites, blogs, forums, newspapers, periodicals, as well as religion-themed and informative (including scientific) texts. While there are somewhat different registers represented within the corpus, with different levels of adherence to standard Estonian versus colloquial/dialect usage as well as different levels of tolerance for mistakes (some “texts” being merely short forum posts, others being self-edited texts, others professionally edited), overall the corpus provides a thematically diverse representation of modern written Estonian.

Article [P1], however, was written on the basis of data collected for my master’s thesis, which dates back to shortly before the etTenTen corpus became available. The data for Article [P1] come from a variety of subcorpora of the University of Tartu’s Estonian Reference Corpus (<http://www.cl.ut.ee/korpused/segakorpus/>), primarily the corpora of some prominent newspapers: *Eesti Päevaleht* (1995–2007), *Postimees* (1995–2000), *Õhtuleht* (1997–2007), and *Eesti Ekspress* (1996–2001). These four newspaper corpora account for over 90% of the data used in the article; however, some data from modern (beginning from 1990) fiction texts, as well as Parliament transcripts from 1995–2001, are included as well.

As such, the corpus material used in Article [P1] is stylistically somewhat more uniform, consisting almost entirely of edited texts representing the formal written language (minor exceptions being quotations in news stories or characters’ speech in fiction texts). However, the great majority of the etTenTen corpus material fits this description as well. More importantly, since the aim of the thesis is to explore the significant factors influencing object case rather than to develop a precise statistical model, these small differences between the corpora should have no effect on the overall results and conclusions.

3.2. Method

The present thesis is predominantly empirical rather than theoretical in its orientation. As discussed in section 2.2, there are disagreements between scholars as to the semantic relevance of the partial vs. total object distinction in

da-infinitive constructions. This highlights the danger of relying on intuition and artificial constructed examples in attempting to explain object case usage in these constructions: intuition may be weak, and may vary from person to person and/or sentence to sentence.

Using large volumes of corpus data allows one to avoid these classic pitfalls of “armchair linguistics”. Constructed examples are used occasionally in this thesis in order to prove/illustrate a theoretical point, but the general aim is to rely as heavily as possible on actual language usage data, to obtain results that are quantitative/empirical rather than anecdotal/subjective. Therefore, the overall methodological approach taken herein is to identify the relative frequencies of partial and total objects under a variety of different syntactic/semantic/lexical conditions, in order to determine the influence of those conditions on object case.

The primary difficulty in assessing the effect of different factors on object case is that every sentence involves the co-occurrence of various factors, making it impossible to determine which is the deciding factor (or if there is no one deciding factor, but rather different factors working together) motivating the choice of object case in any given sentence. Every sentence can be coded for the following features, among others:

- which *da*-infinitive construction it features
- word order (*da*-infinitive preceding or following its object)
- repeating (distributive/iterative/generic) vs. non-repeating situation
- presence or absence of a perfective marker
- presence or absence of a durativity marker
- individual lexemes of key elements (e.g. assessment adjectives in the assessment construction, finite verbs in the object construction)

The sheer number of variables involved make a standard formal statistical analysis (e.g. linear regression) impractical, as the data set would have to consist of tens of thousands of coded sentences in order for all relevant permutations of the features listed above to be represented in sufficient number. As such, the aim of this thesis is not to offer a comprehensive probabilistic model for the choice of object case in any given sentence, but rather to provide a more general overview of the key factors influencing object case, their relative importance, and the similarities and differences between individual *da*-infinitive constructions with respect to those factors as well as their overall preference for one or another object form.

Therefore, rather than examining the entire data set all at once and attempting to generalize from those results, the approach taken throughout all of the articles in this thesis is to present a series of micro-studies, controlling for certain key variables (which may differ depending on the construction and the variable being studied) in order to isolate the particular variable under investigation. For instance, in Article [P4], when exploring the influence of the perfective particle *ära* on object case in the assessment construction, only sentences featuring the adjective *lihtne* ‘easy’ are used, and the results are shown separately for OV and

VO word orders; this turns out to be important, as assessment construction sentences with *ära* show a strong preference for OV word order.

A further restriction is that only a small percentage of sentences featuring a *da*-infinitive with an object are actually suitable for the type of analysis described above. In order to properly isolate individual factors influencing object case, the overwhelming majority of corpus sentences featuring the *da*-infinitive constructions in question have been excluded from consideration. Specifically, sentences have been omitted if they meet any of the six criteria below, of which the first five are semantic and the last one is purely morphological:

1. the *da*-infinitive phrase describes an atelic event (in this case, the object always appears in the partitive and there is no variation to analyze);
2. the main verb is negated (since negation triggers the use of the partitive);
3. the object nominal is quantitatively unbounded (e.g. mass nouns);
4. the object nominal is in the plural (as the partitive plural in Estonian may indicate both quantitative unboundedness and imperfectivity, it is often difficult to determine its meaning in a given sentence. As such, sentences with partitive plural objects cannot be reliably analyzed for the purposes of this study, and therefore, in order to avoid biasing the sample, all sentences with plural objects, whether partial or total, must be excluded);
5. the object nominal is a pronoun (pronouns as objects appear uncommonly often in the partitive);
6. the case of the object nominal is impossible to determine due to homonymy of forms (i.e. the total and partial object forms of a word are identical).

These conditions may be more succinctly summarized as follows: sentences are admissible for inclusion in the study if and only if a) the object is a singular, quantitatively bounded common or proper noun, b) the main verb is in the affirmative form, c) the *da*-infinitive phrase describes a telic event and d) the forms of the total and partial object are morphologically distinct from one another.

As these rules illustrate, this thesis takes for granted various rules requiring the use of the partitive. As such, the empirical data provided do not show the overall frequency of the partial vs. the total object; rather, they show the extent to which one object form is preferred over the other *given that the choice is not determined by any of the well-established criteria governing object case in the language as a whole*. This restriction makes it possible to focus on the idiosyncrasies of *da*-infinitive constructions and the object case usage patterns unique to them, rather than re-treading ground that has been thoroughly covered by previous researchers who have formulated the general principles concerning the partial vs. total object opposition.

4. RESULTS

In this section, I look at the factors influencing object case in different *da*-infinitive constructions. Separate sub-sections are devoted to each of the primary factors (or groups thereof), as well as to a summary of which factors appear in which constructions, and finally to the special case of total object case variation.

4.1. Word order

In all of the *da*-infinitive constructions examined herein where the partial vs. total object opposition varies substantially based on factors outside of the standard boundedness criterion (i.e. all except the translative adverbial construction), there is a clear relationship between word order and object case, with OV word order favoring the partial object and VO word order favoring the total object. This is illustrated in Table 1 below, taken from Article [P3] of this thesis (Ogren 2015b: 208):

Table 1. Relationship between word order and object case in various *da*-infinitive constructions

| Construction | Partial object %, OV word order | Partial object %, VO word order | Difference |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| Assessment construction | 68 | 33 | 35 |
| Purpose construction | 55 | 26 | 29 |
| Postposed attribute construction | 58 | 17 | 41 |
| Wishing-intending construction | 65 | 57 | 8 |

A pair of examples from the postposed attribute construction, first with OV word order and a partial object and then with VO word order and a total object:

- 40) Kui avaldasin soovi e-arvet vormistada,
 when declare:PST;1SG wish.PART e-bill:PAR draw.up:INF
 kuulsin, et klienditeenindaja ei saa
 hear:PST;1SG that customer.serviceperson:NOM NEG can:PRS
 seda teha, sest programm ei tööta. (ETT)
 that:PAR do:INF because program:NOM NEG work:PRS
 ‘When I declared my desire to draw up an electronic bill, I heard that the
 customer service agent couldn’t do it, because the program wasn’t working.’

- 41) Skulptor Tauno Kangro *soov* *kinkida*
 sculptor.NOM Tauno Kangro:GEN wish:NOM gift:INF
 tallinlastele **üks** **kuju** ei näi
 Talliner:ALL;PL one:NOM statue:NOM NEG appear:PRS
 meeldivat tema kolleegidele, skulptorite
 please:QUO 3SG colleague:ALL;PL sculptor:GEN;PL
 ühendus nõuab avalikku konkurssi. (ETT)
 association:NOM demand:PRS;3SG public:PAR competition:PAR
 ‘Sculptor Tauno Kangro’s desire to gift the people of Tallinn a statue doesn’t
 appear to please his colleagues, the sculptors’ association is demanding a
 public competition.’

As the table indicates, the effect of word order, while still discernible, is much smaller in the wishing-intending construction than in the other constructions analyzed. This is most likely due to the fact that the wishing-intending construction is the most similar to a transitive finite clause (compare *Tahan autot* ‘I want a car’ to *Tahan osta auto/autot* ‘I want to buy a car’), in that there is a transitive finite verb (the verb expressing wishing, intending, etc.) to which the object nominal is syntactically linked, albeit indirectly. As word order has no effect on object case in finite clauses, it follows intuitively that the presence of a finite verb (with a substantial influence on object case) reduces the impact of word order on object case in the wishing-intending construction. A general principle can be formulated here: the stronger the syntactic connection between the transitive finite verb and the object, the weaker the effect of word order on object case. In simple finite clauses, where the object is directly governed by the finite verb, the impact of word order is zero; in the wishing-intending construction, where the object is inside a non-finite clause that itself is governed by the finite verb, the impact of word order is small, but non-zero; and in other *da*-infinitive constructions, where there need be no transitive finite verb at all, the effect of word order on object case is quite large.

Furthermore, the impact of word order on object case appears to be independent of information structure, as the relationship between word order and object case persists even when the sample is restricted to sentences in which the object nominal represents new information. This is shown in Table 2, excerpted from Article [P3] (Ogren 2015: 206), showing data for the postposed attribute construction with the head noun *soov* ‘wish, desire’:

Table 2. Object case in the postposed attribute construction with the head noun *soov* ‘wish, desire’, by word order, object nominal represents new information

| Word order and IS | Partial object | Total object | Total | Partial object % |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------------------|
| OV _{da} , new info | 25 | 18 | 43 | 58% |
| V _{da} O, new info | 19 | 91 | 110 | 17% |

Examples (40) and (41) above illustrate this point as well, as both feature object nominals representing new information.

There is no functional explanation for the relationship between word order and object case. It is tempting to suggest that the use of the partitive for objects preceding the verb could serve to disambiguate, to clearly mark these arguments as objects rather than subjects; however, as none of the *da*-infinitive constructions in which the total object appears in the nominative feature an explicit subject argument, there is in fact no need to disambiguate.³ Rather, the explanation may lie in the general pattern, observed in finite clauses as well, for negative sentences to employ OV word order more often than do affirmative sentences. This is shown in another table from Article [P3] (Ogren 2015b: 201), modified/expanded and presented as Table 3 below:

Table 3. Frequency of various verb + object collocations in the etTenTen corpus

| Verb, object | N | VO | OV |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|-----|
| <i>leidsid, lahenduse</i> ‘found, solution (GEN)’ | 80 | 88% | 12% |
| <i>ei leidnud, lahendust</i> ‘did not find, solution (PART)’ | 64 | 52% | 48% |
| <i>armastab</i> ‘loves’, <i>Npart-sg</i> | 842 | 80% | 20% |
| <i>ei armasta</i> ‘doesn’t love’, <i>Npart-sg</i> | 327 | 49% | 51% |
| <i>tahab</i> ‘wants’, <i>Npart-sg</i> | 3184 | 78% | 22% |
| <i>ei taha</i> ‘doesn’t want’, <i>Npart-sg</i> | 3240 | 60% | 40% |
| <i>ostis</i> ‘bought’, <i>Nsg</i> | 50 (chosen at random) | 82% | 18% |
| <i>ei ostnud</i> ‘did not buy’, <i>Nsg</i> | 50 (chosen at random) | 48% | 52% |

The relationship between word order and object case in finite clauses is merely associative, not causal. OV word order is more typical of negation than affirmation, and negation requires the partial object. Therefore, a disproportionate percentage of instances of OV word order occur in contexts where the partial object is obligatory. Nevertheless, object case is determined by the boundedness criterion.

In *da*-infinitive constructions, however, where the application of the boundedness criterion is not as straightforward (and therefore the choice of object case is less obvious), this association appears to exert a substantial influence on

³ It could perhaps be argued that there is a need to disambiguate arising simply from the sentence-initial position of the object, because a sentence-initial nominative object is not clearly identifiable as an object until the sentence continues and more syntactic clues are provided. However, there is no reason why the need to disambiguate should be greater in *da*-infinitive constructions than in the case of e.g. sentence-initial plural objects in finite clauses (which do not exhibit this sort of variation in object case, rather following the boundedness criterion, even though plural total objects appear in the nominative and are therefore not immediately identifiable as objects rather than subjects).

object case, with OV word order dramatically increasing the probability that the partial object will be used even when the semantics of the *da*-infinitive lexeme and the object nominal provide no reason to conceptualize the situation as unbounded. It is of course not clear that the relationship between word order and object case in *da*-infinitive constructions is in fact driven by this association; there could be another cause not yet identified. The associative link is thus presented here not as a definitive explanation, but merely as a plausible hypothesis.

4.2. Repeating/non-repeating situations

In finite clauses, repeating situations behave predictably with regard to object case. While the situation itself may repeat, object case is determined by the aspectual properties of an individual instance of the situation, meaning that the standard boundedness criteria apply, as in the following example:

- 42) Jaan ostab igal hommikul **ajalehe.**
 Jaan:NOM buy:PRS;3SG every:ADE morning:ADE newspaper:GEN
 ‘Jaan buys a newspaper every morning.’

However, whether the situation described is repeating or non-repeating has a substantial influence on object case in several *da*-infinitive constructions. A summary table is presented below:

Table 4. Object case in various *da*-infinitive constructions, by situation type

| Construction | Partial object %, repeating situations | Partial object %, non-repeating situations | Difference in % |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Assessment construction | 87 | 47 | 40 |
| Purpose construction | 36 | 39 | -1 |
| Postposed attribute construction | 45 | 20 | 25 |
| Wishing-intending construction | 77 | 54 | 23 |

Some examples of repeating (examples (43) and (44)) and non-repeating (examples (45) and (46)) situations:

- 43) Praegu on *lihtne* ja *odav* **mobiiltelefoni**
 now be:PRS;3SG easy:NOM and cheap:NOM mobile.phone:PAR
muretseda. (EPL)
 get:INF
 ‘Now it is easy and cheap to get a mobile phone.’

- 44) *Iga katse fikseerida valuutakurssi langeks*
 every:NOM attempt:NOM fix:INF exchange.rate:PAR fall:CND;3SG
 ilmselt kohe rahaturgude rünnaku alla. (ETT)
 clearly immediately financial.market:GEN;PL attack:GEN under
 ‘Any attempt to fix the exchange rate would clearly be attacked by the
 financial markets.’
- 45) *Püüie asetada see raamat ennekõike Euroopa*
 effort:NOM place:INF this:NOM book:NOM above.all Europe:GEN
 ja ka Eesti konteksti on üks selle
 and also Estonia:GEN context:ILL be:PRS;3SG one:NOM this:GEN
 artikli eesmärke. (ETT)
 article:GEN goal:PAR;PL
 ‘The effort to place this book in above all else the European and Estonian
 context is one of the goals of this article.’
- 46) *Siis hakkas silma, et sõiduki põrand*
 then begin:PST;3SG eye:ILL that vehicle:GEN floor:NOM
 on tavalisest kõrgem ning edasi oli
 be:PRS;3SG usual:ELA higher:NOM and ahead be:PST;3SG
 juba lihtne narkootikum avastada. (EPL)
 already easy:NOM narcotic:NOM discover:INF
 ‘Then it caught their eye that the floor of the vehicle was higher than usual,
 and from there it was easy to find the drugs.’

Conceptually, it is easy to see why repeating situations might favor the partial object: while each individual repetition may be bounded, the repeating nature itself (a property external to the infinitive phrase) causes the situation as a whole to be seen as unbounded. Moreover, as previously explained, the fact that the *da*-infinitive itself conveys no temporal meaning serves to reduce the salience of the boundedness of the individual repetition, thereby reducing the motivation for the use of the total object.

However, this does not explain the irregular behavior (relative to the other constructions shown here) of the purpose construction with respect to this parameter. The partial object is used much more frequently in repeating situations in the assessment construction, the postposed attribute construction, and the wishing-intending construction; in the purpose construction, however, the frequency of the partial object remains the same regardless of whether the situation is repeating or non-repeating. I have yet to find a satisfactory explanation for why this is the case.

Another point of interest here is the translative adverbial construction. As previously mentioned, this construction exhibits virtually no irregularities in object case: given a bounded object and a telic verb, the total object is used almost exclusively. However, the construction does have one interesting characteristic: it is associated very strongly (again, almost exclusively) with non-repeating situations. The reason for this is simple: the phrases *eesmärgiks*

on ‘the goal is’, *ülesandeks on* ‘the task is’, *sooviks on* ‘the desire is’ etc. necessarily imply that it is *someone*’s goal/task/desire or similar, and in the great majority of cases, the identity of that someone (typically made explicit as a genitive attribute, e.g. *Jaani eesmärgiks on* ‘Jaan’s goal is’) serves to concretize the situation, to render it unique and therefore non-repeating. In some cases, though, the owner of the goal/task/desire may be non-specific, and thus the situation becomes a repeating one. Indeed, one of the rare examples of the partial object in this construction comes in just such a sentence. For context, the preceding sentence from the source article is also provided:

- 47) Sageli tulevad inimesed tööhõiveametisse mitte tööd otsima, vaid hoopis tõendeid küsima, tõdeb Tallinna Tööhõiveameti psühholoog Sirje Kündre.
Eesmärgiks on saada korterisoodustust,
 goal:TRA be:PRS;3SG get:INF apartment.subsidy:PAR
haigekassakaarti või töötu abiraha. (EPL)
 health.insurance.card:PAR or unemployed:GEN assistance:PAR
 ‘Often, people come to the employment office not to look for work, but to ask for evidence, says Tallinn employment office psychologist Sirje Kündre. The goal is to get an apartment subsidy, a health insurance card, or unemployment assistance.’

It is of course possible that the repeating situation is not the reason for the use of the partial object in the above example. Perhaps it is merely an error, or perhaps the partial object form *haigekassakaarti* is motivated by the presence of two other partial objects in the coordinate structure (even though the other two are in the partitive due to their quantitative unboundedness, which does not apply to the bounded nominal *haigekassakaart*). Nevertheless, given the rarity of both partial objects and repeating situations in this construction, an example where the two so clearly coincide serves as a vivid illustration of the link between them.

4.3. Other aspectual features

In addition to the repeating/non-repeating situation parameter, there are a number of other aspectual features that play a significant role in the choice of object case in *da*-infinitive constructions. These include durativity markers, perfective particles, and destination adverbials.

Durativity markers, i.e. time adverbials or verbs expressing continuativity (e.g. *jätkama* ‘to continue’), occur semi-frequently in conjunction with the purpose construction, with the durativity marker appearing in the main clause and the purpose construction forming the subordinate clause. In the example below, the durativity marker is the adverb *pikalt* ‘for a long time’.

- 48) *Pikalt* käisime vaatamas, et leida sobivat
 long.time go:PST;1PL look:SUP;INE to find:INF suitable:PAR
pisikest kutsut ja lõpuks selle ka leidsime. (ETT)
 little:PAR puppy:PAR and finally it:GEN also find:PST;1PL
 ‘We looked for a long time to find the right little puppy, and finally we found it.’

As expected, the presence of a durativity marker encourages an imperfective reading of the situation and therefore favors the partial object. The following table, from Article [P4] (Ogren 2017a: 96) shows the effect of durativity markers on object case in purpose construction sentences with the infinitive *leida* ‘to find’.

Table 5. Durativity markers and object case in the purpose construction, infinitive *leida* ‘to find’

| Durative marker | Partial object | Total object | Total | Partial object % |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------------------|
| Yes | 11 | 8 | 19 | 58% |
| No | 18 | 113 | 131 | 14% |
| Total | 29 | 121 | 150 | 19% |

The perfective particle *ära*, not surprisingly, has the opposite effect, increasing the likelihood that the total object will be used. However, its effect is not observed across all constructions; while a substantial difference is observed in the object construction (among object construction sentences with the finite verb *tahtma* and OV word order, sentences with and without *ära* show a partial object frequency of 36% and 58% respectively), the assessment construction data shows that *ära* has no impact at all. Examples (49) and (50) below illustrate the variation in object case in assessment construction sentences with *ära*:

- 49) Vallo sõnade kohaselt on seda ühte
 Vallo:GEN word:GEN;PL according.to be:PRS;3SG that:PAR one:PAR
rida sealt lihtne *ära* kustutada. (ETT)
 row:PAR there:ABL easy:NOM PP delete:INF
 ‘According to Vallo, it is easy to delete that one row from there.’

- 50) Vene riigi kapitaliga on ülimalt lihtne
 Russian state:GEN capital:COM be:PRS;3SG extremely easy:NOM
kogu eesti riigikese majandus *ära*
 whole:GEN Estonian state:DIM;GEN economy:NOM PP
nullida. (ETT)
 nullify:INF
 ‘With Russia’s capital, it is extremely easy to render null the entire Estonian economy’.

It should be reiterated, however, that these results consider only sentences in which the infinitive phrase allows a bounded interpretation. As such, the general perfectivizing function of the particle *ära*, i.e. its ability to turn an unbounded situation into a bounded one, is not reflected in the results shown here, because the unbounded situations without *ära* are excluded from the data set. In the sentences examined herein, *ära* does not render otherwise unbounded situations bounded, but rather merely serves to emphasize that a situation is indeed bounded. Therefore, the modest impact of the particle *ära* on object case in such environments should not come as a great surprise.

Another common aspectual feature with a significant impact on object case is the presence/absence of a destination adverbial (marking end location, recipient/beneficiary, or end state). Object construction sentences with destination adverbials are much more likely to use the total object (partial object frequency 32% with destination adverbial, 58% without). Likewise, in the postposed attribute construction with the head noun *soov* ‘wish, desire’, the frequency of the partial object is 6% with a destination adverbial and 36% without. Examples of each type of destination adverbial are presented below: end location in (51), end state in (52), and recipient in (53).

- 51) Alati *püüan* *oma* *ajakavasse* *mahutada* ka
 always try:PRS;1SG own schedule:ILL fit:INF also
mingi **muu** **trenni.** (ETT)
 some:GEN other:GEN training:GEN
 ‘I always try to fit some other training into my schedule as well.’
- 52) Meie *ruumid* *ei* *ole* *küll* *väga*
 1PL:GEN room:NOM;PL NEG be:PRS indeed very
avarad, *kuid* *sellest* *hoolimata* *püüame*
 spacious:NOM;PL but this:ELA regardless try:PRS;1PL
oma *patsientide* **füüsilise** **keskkonna** *muuta*
 own patient:GEN;PL physical:GEN environment:GEN change:INF
võimalikult *koduseks.* (ETT)
 as.possible cozy:TRA
 ‘Our rooms aren’t very spacious, it’s true, but despite that, we are trying to make our patients’ physical environment as cozy as possible.’
- 53) “*Tahame* *sellega* *anda* *tudengitele* **selge**
 want:PRS;1PL this:COM give:INF student:ALL;PL clear:GEN
sõnumi – *õppige* *edasi,*” *ütles* *Klaas.* (ETT)
 message:GEN study:IMP;2PL forward say:PST;3SG Klaas:NOM
 “‘By doing this, we want to give the students a clear message: keep studying,’”
 Klaas said.’

In all of these examples, the destination adverbial contributes to the interpretation of the situation as resultative, and the total object is used. As with the perfective particle *ära*, however, destination adverbials do not typically render an

unbounded situation bounded, but merely emphasize its boundedness, which helps explain why the partial object is still fairly common in such sentences.

4.4. Lexical factors

Of the five constructions examined herein, four contain variable lexical constituents outside of the *da*-infinitive phrase itself. These elements are:

- The assessment adjective in the assessment construction
- The head noun in the postposed attribute construction
- The finite verb in the object construction
- The translative adverbial in the translative adverbial construction

The last of those has no effect on object case because the construction itself does not show irregular object case variation. The other three, however, all prove highly significant, with different lexemes yielding dramatically different results in terms of object case usage. An overview of these differences is presented below.

In the assessment construction, the choice of object case is closely related to the nature of the assessment, i.e. to the assessment adjective itself (or at least to its properties). Table 6 summarizes object case usage in the assessment construction with various frequently occurring assessment adjectives:

Table 6. Object case in the assessment construction, by assessment adjective

| Adjective | Partial Object | Total Object | Total | Partial Object % |
|------------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------------------|
| <i>võimatu</i> ‘impossible’ | 47 | 3 | 50 | 94% |
| <i>raske</i> ‘difficult’ | 31 | 2 | 33 | 94% |
| <i>kerge</i> ‘easy’ | 32 | 9 | 41 | 78% |
| <i>lihtne</i> ‘easy, simple’ | 293 | 156 | 449 | 65% |
| <i>mugav</i> ‘comfortable’ | 12 | 18 | 30 | 40% |
| <i>võimalik</i> ‘possible’ | 54 | 114 | 168 | 32% |
| <i>parem</i> ‘better’ | 1 | 38 | 39 | 3% |
| <i>tähtis</i> ‘important’ | 1 | 96 | 97 | 1% |

Here, the differences between lexemes are largely reducible to general principles. Namely, assessment adjectives can be categorized according to three parameters: 1) polarity (whether the assessment is positive or negative), 2) the type of assessment being made (value judgment vs. judgment of probability/possibility), and 3) whether the adjective places the focus on the process or the result. All three of these parameters prove important as regards object case.

The positive assessment adjective *võimalik* ‘possible’ shows a much lower partial object frequency than does its antonym *võimatu* ‘impossible’. With the value judgment adjectives *parem* ‘better’ and *tähtis* ‘important’, the total object

is used almost exclusively; positive judgments of possibility/probability such as *lihtne* ‘easy, simple’ and *kerge* ‘easy’ show much higher partial object usage. Finally, the differences between the process-oriented possibility assessment *lihtne* and the result-oriented possibility assessment *võimalik* on the one hand, and between the process-oriented value judgment *mugav* and the result-oriented value judgments *parem* and *tähtis* on the other hand, demonstrate that process-oriented assessment adjectives favor the partial object while result-oriented ones favor the total object.

These differences make intuitive sense in light of the basic criteria driving the partial vs. total object opposition: the result-oriented vs. process-oriented opposition is essentially a manifestation of the perfectivity component of the boundedness criterion, while the relevance of the polarity and type of assessment can be explained via the link between the partial object and negation.

In the object construction, however, the picture is far less clear. A summary table of object case usage with different finite verbs in the object construction is presented below:

Table 7. Object case in the *da*-infinitive object construction, by finite verb

| Verb | Part | Tot | Part% |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| <i>kartma</i> ‘to fear’ | 166 | 34 | 83% |
| <i>üritama</i> ‘to try’ | 122 | 78 | 61% |
| <i>püüdma</i> ‘to try’ | 106 | 94 | 53% |
| <i>tahtma</i> ‘to want’ | 101 | 99 | 51% |
| <i>proovima</i> ‘to try’ | 97 | 103 | 49% |
| <i>soovima</i> ‘to wish’ | 91 | 109 | 46% |
| <i>tohtima</i> ‘to be allowed to’ | 89 | 111 | 45% |
| <i>oskama</i> ‘to be able to, know how to’ | 54 | 146 | 27% |
| <i>võimaldama</i> ‘to make possible, enable’ | 45 | 155 | 23% |
| <i>julgema</i> ‘to dare’ | 31 | 169 | 16% |
| <i>saama</i> ‘to be able to’ | 28 | 172 | 14% |
| <i>lootma</i> ‘to hope’ | 23 | 177 | 12% |
| <i>ähvardama</i> ‘to threaten’ | 20 | 180 | 10% |
| <i>suutma</i> ‘to be able to (physically)’ | 16 | 184 | 8% |
| <i>soovitama</i> ‘to recommend’ | 11 | 189 | 6% |
| <i>võima</i> ‘to be able to’ | 11 | 189 | 6% |
| <i>kavatsema</i> ‘to intend, plan’ | 3 | 197 | 2% |
| Average | 60 | 140 | 30% |

Here it is far more difficult to identify general principles guiding the differences in object case usage across various finite verb lexemes, although those differences are considerable. Rather, it appears that the degree of preference for one or another object form is a property of each individual finite verb lexeme.

A similar situation is observed in the postposed attribute construction, where some head nouns virtually rule out the partial object, others allow it quite regularly, and there is no obvious semantic difference between the two groups.

Table 8. Object case in the *da*-infinitive postposed attribute construction, by head noun

| Noun | Part | Tot | Part% |
|-----------------------------|------|-----|-------|
| <i>püüe</i> ‘endeavor’ | 78 | 122 | 39% |
| <i>katse</i> ‘attempt’ | 75 | 125 | 38% |
| <i>soov</i> ‘wish, desire’ | 57 | 143 | 29% |
| <i>kavatsus</i> ‘intention’ | 3 | 47 | 6% |
| <i>otsus</i> ‘decision’ | 0 | 50 | 0% |

As these data indicate, the construction as a whole favors the total object. Even in cases where numerous factors are present that ought to favor the use of the partial object (repetition, the failure of the event to take place i.e. implied negation, OV word order), and the head noun allows the use of the partial object, the total object may still appear:

- 54) USA kaitseministeerium teatas reedel,
 USA:GEN defense.ministry:NOM announce:PST:3SG Friday:ADE
 et nende andmetel on sunniitliku
 that 3PL:GEN info:ADE;PL be:PRS;3SG Sunni:GEN
 äärmusrühmituse Islamiriik (IS) liider
 extremist.group:GEN Islamic.State:NOM (IS) leader:NOM
 Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi tõepoolest endiselt elus
 Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi:NOM really still life:INE
 hoolimata liitlaste *korduvatest* *katsetest*
 despite ally:GEN;PL repeated:ELA;PL attempt:ELA;PL
islamist *hävitada*.
 Islamist:NOM destroy:INF
 ‘The USA Department of Defense announced on Friday that, according to their information, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the leader of the Sunni extremist group known as the Islamic State (IS), is still alive, despite the allies’ repeated attempts to destroy him.’ (<http://maailm.postimees.ee/3963887/usa-andmetel-on-islamiriigi-liider-endiselt-elus>)

It is worth noting that the differences between head nouns in the table above line up quite well with the figures for the corresponding finite verb in the object construction. Just as the verbs *kavatsema* and *otsustama* in the object construction are associated with a very strong (almost exclusive) preference for the total

object, so too are the nouns *kavatsus* and *otsus* in the postposed attribute construction. Similarly, the partial object is slightly more common with *püüdma* than with *soovima* in the object construction, and with *püüie* than *soov* in the postposed attribute construction. This suggests that the observed effect of individual lexemes on object case may in fact be extended to individual roots (covering different parts of speech) rather than mere lexemes, thus making it a cross-categorial property. The relevance of cross-categorial properties in Estonian DOM has been previously demonstrated in Tamm (2014b), which examines unexpected total object usage with deadjectival nouns such as *pimedus* ‘darkness’.

4.5. Quantification

In some *da*-infinitive constructions, there is a clear preference for the total object when the object nominal includes a quantifier. In this section, I examine the effect of the quantifier *üks* ‘one’ on object case.⁴

In the object construction, the frequency of partial object usage with the verb *tahtma* ‘to want’ is 51% (see section 4.4 above). However, a separate sample of 100 sentences in which the verb *tahtma* appears in the object construction with an object nominal containing *üks* shows a partial object frequency of only 23%. A pair of examples, both with total objects, are presented below:

- 55) Ütlesin, et *tahan* talle **ühe** **sõnumi**
 say:PST;1SG that want:PRS;1SG 3SG;ALL one:GEN message:GEN
saata. (ETT)
 send:INF
 ‘I said that I want to send him/her a message.’
- 56) *Tahan* *kirjutada* **ühe** **loo** mis
 want:PRS;1SG write:INF one:GEN story:GEN what:NOM
sind lohutaks. (ETT)
 2SG;PAR console:CND;3SG
 ‘I want to write a story that will console you.’

Likewise, in the postposed attribute construction, while the frequency of partial objects in conjunction with the noun *soov* ‘wish, desire’ is 29%, this drops to only 8% (4/50) when the object nominal contains the word *üks*, as in example (57):

⁴ While Estonian is traditionally considered to lack articles as such, *üks* is often used as an indefinite determiner, not merely a numeral (see Hint et al. 2017), and is therefore translated in the examples here by the English indefinite article when appropriate.

- 57) Tulin olümpiale sooviga saada vähemalt
 come:PST;1SG Olympics:ALL desire:COM get:INF at.least
üks kuldmedal. (ETT)
 one:NOM gold.medal:NOM
 ‘I came to the Olympics with a desire to win at least one gold medal.’

In the assessment construction, suitable sentences for analysis are more difficult to come by: the eTenTen corpus reveals only 23 such sentences featuring the assessment construction with the adjective *lihtne* ‘easy’ and an object nominal containing *üks*. However, of these 23 sentences, only 9 (39%) feature the partial object, compared to an overall figure of 65% partial objects in the assessment construction with *lihtne* (see Table 6). An illustrative example is presented below, in which the total object appears despite the OV word order in the *da*-infinitive phrase and the fact that the sentence describes a repeating situation:

- 58) Üks hea burger on aga lihtne
 one:NOM good:NOM burger:NOM be:PRS;3SG but easy:NOM
valmistada ka koduköögis või -aias. (ETT)
 prepare:INF also home.kitchen:INE or garden:INE
 ‘But it is also easy to make a good burger in one’s home kitchen or garden.’

It thus seems clear that the presence of the numeral *üks* in the object NP has a significant impact on object case, increasing the chance that the total object will be used. Why, however, should this be the case? The presence of *üks* does emphasize that the object is singular rather than plural, but that in itself has no obvious relation to object case, as the boundedness criterion applies in the same way to both singular and plural objects. It also marks the object as indefinite, but that if anything ought to be associated with increased, not decreased use of the partial object, since indefinite objects are more likely than definite objects to appear in repeating situations.⁵ The remaining semantics-based explanation is simply that the presence of the quantifier *üks* serves to emphasize the quantitatively bounded nature of the object nominal, and therefore favors the use of the total object. This is similar to the effect of the perfective particle *ära*, discussed in section 4.3; just as the presence of *ära* does not itself render the situation bounded, the presence of *üks* does not render the object bounded (as it would be bounded even if *üks* were omitted), it merely highlights the fact that the object is indeed bounded.

⁵ Definiteness per se is not discussed in this thesis as a potential factor influencing object case. The overlap between definiteness and the repeating/non-repeating situation parameter is one reason for this. Moreover, I have previously explored the impact of the semantics of the object nominal on object case in *da*-infinitive constructions (specifically the oppositions of abstract/concrete, definite/indefinite, and specific/non-specific) in Ogren (2013) and have found no significant relationships.

4.6. The total vs. partial object opposition in different constructions

The following table summarizes the primary factors that influence the choice between total and partial object in each of the five constructions examined in this thesis. “Aspect” refers to any aspectual features other than the parameter repeating/non-repeating (“R/non-R” in the table).

Table 9. Summary table of factors influencing object case in various *da*-infinitive constructions

| | Purpose | Assess. | Object | PostAtt | TraAdv |
|----------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Word order | + | + | + | + | – |
| R/non-R | – | + | + | + | – |
| Aspect | + | + | + | + | – |
| Lexical | N/A | + | + | + | – |
| Quantification | N/A | + | + | + | – |

Based on the above, the five constructions can be divided into three groups:

1. Constructions in which the total vs. partial object opposition is influenced by factors belonging to each of the five categories: **assessment construction, object construction, postposed attribute construction**
2. Constructions in which the total vs. partial object opposition is influenced by factors belonging to some, but not all, of the five categories: **purpose construction**
3. Constructions in which the total vs. partial object opposition is influenced by none of these factors and is simply determined in the same way as it is in finite clauses: **translative adverbial construction**

There is no clear reason why the purpose construction and the translative adverbial construction behave so differently from the others; in any case, however, the differences are unmistakable, and point to the need for a construction-specific approach to the problem.

4.7. Total object case variation

da-infinitive constructions are of interest not only due to the irregularities observed in the total vs. partial object opposition, but due to variation in total object case. This is a phenomenon found only in two closely related *da*-infinitive constructions, namely the reported command construction (59) and the enabling-obligating construction (60), where the total object may appear in either the nominative or the genitive.

- 59) *Palusin* *näidata* *talle* **istekoht/istekoha** *kätte*.
 ask:PST;1SG show:INF 3SG:ALL seat:NOM/seat:GEN hand:ILL
 ‘I asked him to show her to her seat.’
- 60) *Soovitan* *sul* *osta* **mantel/mantli**.
 recommend:PRS;1SG 2SG:ADE buy:INF coat:NOM/coat:GEN
 ‘I recommend that you buy a coat.’

These two constructions essentially represent a hybrid of the wishing-intending construction and the imperative. The formal similarity to the wishing-intending construction is evident, with the *da*-infinitive phrase directly governed by a transitive finite verb; however, these constructions resemble imperatives in terms of their participant structure, in that both feature an addressee who is requested and/or given the opportunity to perform the action expressed by the verb phrase. If made explicit, the addressee is marked in the adessive, as in (56) above. Since the object construction takes a total object in the genitive, and the imperative takes a total object in the nominative, the variation in total object case in these hybrid constructions is not entirely unexpected.

Different verbs in the enabling-obligating construction show very different preferences as regards total object case:

Table 10. Total object case in the *da*-infinitive enabling-obligating construction, by finite verb

| Verb | Nominative | Genitive | Total |
|---------------------------------------|------------|----------|-------|
| <i>soovitama</i> ‘to recommend’ | 63 | 37 | 100 |
| <i>käskima</i> ‘to command’ | 41 | 59 | 100 |
| <i>võimaldama</i> ‘to enable’ | 23 | 77 | 100 |
| <i>lubama</i> ‘to allow’ ⁶ | 15 | 85 | 100 |

As with the differences between finite verbs in the wishing-intending construction, it is difficult to explain these results. Intuitively, we might guess that verbs with a more imperative-like meaning would show a stronger preference for the total object, and it is true that the two most semantically imperative-like of the four verbs above are *käskima* and *soovitama*, which are also the two that show the highest frequency of nominative total objects. However, this does not explain why *käskima*, the most imperative-like verb imaginable, shows a slight preference for the genitive total object, while *soovitama* prefers the total object.

Another conceptually attractive possible explanation is that verbs that occur together with imperatives in everyday discourse may show a stronger preference for the nominative total object in this construction. Examples (61) and (62)

⁶ The verb *lubama* also carries the meaning ‘to promise’; however, as this meaning belongs to a different construction, only the ‘allow, permit’ uses of *lubama* have been considered in the analysis presented here.

below are felicitous Estonian sentences, while (63) and (64) are at best bizarre, if not outright unacceptable:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------|-------------|--------------|
| 61) | <i>Soovitan</i> | sulle: | <i>Osta</i> | auto! |
| | recommend:PRS;1SG | 2SG:ALL | buy:IMP;2SG | car:NOM |
| | 'I recommend to you: buy a car!' | | | |
| | | | | |
| 62) | <i>Käsin</i> | sul: | <i>Osta</i> | auto! |
| | command:PRS;1SG | 2SG:ADE | buy:IMP;2SG | car:NOM |
| | 'I command you: buy a car!' | | | |
| | | | | |
| 63) | <i>Võimaldan</i> | sul: | <i>Osta</i> | auto! |
| | enable:PRS;1SG | 2SG:ADE | buy:IMP;2SG | car:NOM |
| | 'I enable you: buy a car!' | | | |
| | | | | |
| 64) | <i>Luban</i> | sul: | <i>Osta</i> | auto! |
| | allow:PRS;1SG | 2SG:ADE | buy:IMP;2SG | car:NOM |
| | 'I allow you: buy a car!' | | | |

However, it is difficult to find empirical support for this idea. Such constructions are quite rare in the etTenTen corpus (they would perhaps show up more frequently in a corpus of spoken language). Of the four verbs shown above, only *soovitama* occurs more than once in the etTenTen corpus in such constructions (i.e. followed by a verb in the imperative). Overall, 27 such occurrences are found with *soovitama*, one with *käskima*, and none with *võimaldama* or *lubama*. These data thus paint a substantially different picture from that shown in Table 10 above, where nominative total objects occur with all four of the verbs. As such, the frequency (or felicitousness) of a verb's co-occurrence with imperatives does not prove to be a significant factor in the extent to which it favors nominative total objects in the enabling-obligating construction.

The general assumption that nominative total objects are used in the enabling-obligating construction due to an association with the imperative also suggests that the nominative ought to be more common in the present tense (in which a speech act, such as a command, is being performed) than in the past tense (in which a past speech act is merely being referred/described, not performed)⁷. Indeed, this appears to be the case, although the effect is relatively minor.

⁷ Another example of verb tense affecting the choice of object case in Estonian is given in Tamm (2008), regarding constructions with the *-vat* evidential.

Table 11. Total object case in the *da*-infinitive enabling-obligating construction, by finite verb and tense

| Verb | Present tense | | Past tense | |
|-------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| | # of sentences | % nominative | # of sentences | % nominative |
| <i>soovitama</i> | 82 | 66% | 18 | 50% |
| <i>käskima</i> | 16 | 63% | 84 | 37% |
| <i>võimaldama</i> | 82 | 20% | 18 | 33% |
| <i>lubama</i> | 73 | 16% | 27 | 11% |

As Table 11 shows, there are substantial differences between verbs in the extent to which they tend to appear in the present tense vs. the past tense; *soovitama*, *võimaldama* and *lubama* appear (in this 100-sentence sample, in any case) far more often in the present tense, while *käskima* typically appears in the present tense. Indeed, this difference helps explain why nominative total objects are more common with *soovitama* than with *käskima*. However, it does not explain the entire difference between them, nor does it help in understanding why those two verbs allow nominative total objects so much more readily than do *võimaldama* and *lubama*.

The distinction between performing a speech act and merely referring/describing one also suggests that nominative total objects should be more common with first-person subjects than with third-person subjects. The data do provide some mild support for this notion: with the verb *soovitama*, the total object appears in 69% (44/64) of sentences with first-person subjects and 55% (18/33) of sentences with third-person subjects. (With *käskima*, *võimaldama* and *lubama*, first-person subjects are too rare in this data set – no more than 9 out of the 100 sentences for any of the three verbs – to allow for any meaningful quantitative analysis).

A more significant factor influencing the choice of total object case in the enabling-obligating construction is the presence or absence of the optional adessive argument, the logical subject of the non-finite clause: compare *Soovitan osta mantel/mantli* ‘I recommend buying a new coat’ with *Soovitan sul osta mantel/mantli* ‘I recommend that you buy a new coat’. For all four verbs shown in the table above, the nominative total object is more common when an adessive argument is present; in the aggregate, the frequency of the nominative is 49% with an adessive argument and 28% without. The natural explanation for this is that the adessive argument is semantically and syntactically incompatible with the wishing-intending construction (where the subject of the finite verb is co-referential with the subject of the infinitive phrase) and indicates an imperative-like participant structure (i.e. the presence of an addressee). Therefore, the presence of an adessive argument renders an enabling-obligating construction sentence more similar to the imperative than to the wishing-intending construction, which in turn increases the likelihood that object case usage in the sentence will mirror that of the imperative.

A final factor influencing total object case usage in this construction is coordination. When a *da*-infinitive phrase with a total object occurs in the enabling-obligating construction as the second or later element in a coordinate structure, the total object appears overwhelmingly in the nominative. Sentences meeting this description account for 10% of the total sample shown in Table 11: 41 sentences, of which 32 (78%) feature nominative objects. Of the remaining 359 sentences (those in which the *da*-infinitive phrase either is not part of a coordinate structure or is the first element of one), nominative objects appear in only 110 of them (32%). An illustrative example is shown below, in which the first element of the coordinate structure takes a genitive total object and the second element a nominative one:

- 65) Näiteks arutame läbi ja
 example:TRA discuss:PRS;1PL through and
soovitame teistelegi taasavada igas
 recommend:PRS;1PL other:ALL;PL=too re-open:INF every:INE
 Eestimaa vallas vähemasti ühe avaliku
 Estonia:GEN municipality:INE at.least one:GEN public:GEN
külasauna ning sinna asutada
 village.sauna:GEN and there:ILL establish:INF
 mittetulundusühinguna kohalik saunaklubi. (ETT)
 nonprofit.association:ESS local:NOM sauna.club:NOM
 ‘For example, we are discussing and we recommend to others as well to re-open at least one public sauna in each Estonian municipality and establish a non-profit local sauna club there.’

Here, again, there is no functional explanation for the variation in object case. The most plausible explanation is simply that the finite verb *soovitame*, which is responsible for the choice of the genitive as the total object case in *taasavada... ühe avaliku külasauna*, is no longer as salient in the mind of the language user by the time he/she arrives at the second *da*-infinitive phrase *asutada... kohalik saunaklubi*. With the finite verb less prominent, the motivation for the genitive as the case of the total object is reduced.

Finally, the presence of a quantifier, which was found to substantially influence the realization of the partial vs. total object opposition, appears to have no effect on the alternation between nominative and genitive total objects. Of an additional 100 sentences featuring *soovitama* in the enabling-obligating construction with a total object nominal containing the numeral *üks* ‘one’, the object appears in the nominative 61% of the time, virtually identical to the overall figure for the same verb as shown in Table 10.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Estonian *da*-infinitive constructions differ from finite clauses in that the *da*-infinitive is tense- and aspect-neutral, and is therefore ambiguous with respect to the criterion of temporal boundedness which guides the partial vs. total object opposition. As a result, the motivations for choosing one object case over the other are far less clear when the object is governed by a *da*-infinitive than when it is governed by a finite verb form; there is even disagreement as to whether there is a relevant difference in meaning between the partial and total object in these constructions. Accordingly, object case usage is far less consistent in *da*-infinitive constructions than it is in finite clauses. Corpus analysis reveals numerous examples of sentences with *da*-infinitive constructions which are identical with respect to all identifiable parameters that might be thought to affect object case, but nevertheless vary with respect to object case itself.

Not only is object case in *da*-infinitive constructions remarkably inconsistent, but it is influenced by a number of factors that are not relevant to object case in finite clauses. Some of these factors are specific to individual constructions, while others prove important in all four of the analyzed constructions in which “irregular” object case variation (i.e. variation not reducible to the standard boundedness criterion) is observed. In many cases, it is difficult if not impossible to explain why a particular parameter shows a strong relationship to object case in one construction but appears irrelevant in another construction; this suggests that individual constructions operate according to their own rules, and their behavior is not reducible to more general (cross-constructionally valid) principles. Some constructions are far more “regular” than others; an example of this is the translative adverbial construction, which exhibits virtually no variation in object case that cannot be comfortably attributed to the standard boundedness criterion. Parameters such as word order which play a large role in other *da*-infinitive constructions thus prove entirely irrelevant in the translative adverbial construction.

On a broader level, this thesis demonstrates the limitations of functional explanations of object case variation, showing that much of the variation that takes place serves no functional or semantic purpose and therefore requires an associative/cognitive explanation. It is particularly in this context that the notion of competing motivations proves useful in accounting for variation in object case usage: even if the use of a given object case in a particular sentence lacks an identifiable purpose (= function), it must still have a cause (= motivation). All of the sentences examined in this thesis feature a mixture of elements favoring the total object and elements favoring the partial object, and the choice of object case in a particular sentence reflects the outcome of the competition between these elements. Motivations for the partial object include OV word order as well as markers/lexical factors supporting an imperfective/irresultative interpretation of the event described in the *da*-infinitive phrase, while those favoring the total object include VO word order and factors supporting a perfective/resultative interpretation. In addition, in all of the sentences examined

herein, the use of the total object is motivated by the fact that the *da*-infinitive phrase contains a quantitatively limited object and a verb lexeme associated with resultative, telic events. The partial object, in its turn, is motivated by the *da*-infinitive form's lack of tense/aspectual meaning, which weakens the implication of resultativity. In addition to the partial/total object opposition, there are also competing motivations for the use of nominative vs. genitive as the total object case, illustrated herein with regard to the enabling-obligating construction, where both total object cases occur.

A number of factors whose influence on object case in Estonian has previously not been described in detail are explained and quantified herein. The thesis also shows the importance of a construction-specific approach to object case, something generally lacking from previous works on object marking in Finnic languages. Moreover, the findings herein will be of use to learners and teachers of Estonian, as object case is one of the most difficult aspects of the language for L2 learners.

While this thesis does provide substantial answers to the core questions surrounding the issue of object case variation in *da*-infinitive constructions, there are still numerous issues awaiting further study. It is possible that some amount of the remaining unexplained variation can be tied to semantic, syntactic, or pragmatic factors yet to be identified. Moreover, it is concluded herein that much of the variation must be due to cognitive processes, i.e. factors existing at the level of the mind of the individual language user rather than at the level of the "language system" (because the language system is itself of little or no help in these cases); however, on the basis of corpus data, one can only speculate as to the precise nature of these cognitive processes. The existence of an associative (non-causal) relationship between word order and negation in finite clauses is a fact, but the suggested link between this associative relationship and the relationship between word order and object case in *da*-infinitive constructions is merely a hypothesis. An experimental psycholinguistic approach could perhaps yield stronger evidence for (or against) this hypothesis than can be obtained from corpus data alone.

Finally, while this thesis, as previously stated, does not seek to offer a comprehensive statistical model predicting the choice of object case in any given sentence, this does not mean that such a goal is unachievable. Realistically, however, this would require a larger, fully annotated corpus that marks not only morphological information, but also syntactic roles (i.e. direct objects). Such a corpus does not yet exist for Estonian, but it is certainly possible that resources will emerge in the future allowing for a more precise assessment of the relative importance of all of the various factors influencing object case.

6. SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN

Objekti käände varieerumine eesti keele *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides

6.1. Sissejuhatus

Käesolev väitekirj käsitleb objekti käändevaheldust *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides. Väitekirja uurimisküsimus on järgmine: millised tegurid mõjutavad partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti vastandust *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides, ja kui-võrd erinevad *da*-infinitiivi laiendava objekti käändevaliku põhimõtted finiitlausetes kehtivast objekti käände üldreeglistikust? See üldine teemapüstitus hõlmab mitmesuguseid allteemasid, millest kasvavad välja konkreetsemad küsimused. Kui-võrd sarnaselt käituvad erinevad *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonid objekti käände suhtes? Millised tegurid mõjutavad objekti käänat ainult ühes *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonis, ja millised osutuvad oluliseks mitmes konstruktsioonis (või isegi kõigis)? Kas eri parameetrite järgi toimiv objekti käände varieerumine *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides teenib mingisugust funktsionaalset/semantilist eesmärki, või peegeldab see lihtsalt keelekasutaja peas valitsevat ebakindlust, mis tuleneb partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti vahelise olulise tähenduserinevuse puudumisest kõnealustes konstruktsioonides? Kõiki eelloetletud küsimusi väitekirjas puudutataksegi.

Töö koosneb viiest artiklist, millele eelneb sissejuhatav peatükk. Artiklid käsitlevad eesti keele *da*-infinitiivi laiendava objekti käändevahelduse eri tahke, keskendudes eri konstruktsioonidele või objekti käänat mõjutavatele teguritele. Sissejuhatav peatükk koosneb omakorda viiest osast. Esimene osa annab ülevaate väitekirja temaatikast ning artiklite sisust. Teine osa on pühendatud uurimuse teoreetilisele taustale ning teema uurimisloole. Kolmas osa kirjeldab uurimismaterjali ja -meetodit. Neljas osa keskendub uurimistulemustele ja nende analüüsile. Sissejuhatava peatüki lõpetab järelduste ja arutelu osa.

Artikkel [P1] käsitleb objekti käände vaheldust *da*-infinitiiviga hinnangukonstruktsioonis, tuues välja objekti käänat mõjutavaid tegureid nagu sõnajärg, situatsiooni korduvus/ühekordsus ning hinnangut andva adjektiivivi semantilised omadused. Artikkel [P2] asetab eesti keele objekti käände vahelduse süsteemi keeltevahelisse konteksti, võrreldes seda eri keelte DOM-süsteemidega (DOM = *differential object marking* ehk eristav objekti markeerimine) ning hinnates selle vastavust varasemates DOM-uuringutes pakutud üldistustele DOM'i funktsioonide kohta. Osa artiklist [P2] on pühendatud ka paaris *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonis esinevale totaalobjekti käände varieerumisele, millesarnast teistes konstruktsioonides ei leidu. Artikkel [P3] käsitleb sõnajärje mõju objekti käändele *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides ning näitab, et seos sõnajärje ja objekti käände vahel ei ole seletatav infostruktuuri kaudu. Artiklis [P4] vaadeldakse erinevaid aspektiga seotud tegureid – duratiivsuse markerid, perfektiivsuspartiklid, sihtkoha- või sihtseisundimäärused, situatsiooni korduvus/

ühekordsus – ja nende mõju objekti käändele, et näidata, kuidas hinnatakse piiritle(ma)tust siis, kui verbivorm (nimelt *da*-infinitiiv) jätab situatsiooni ajalise struktuuri ebaselgeks. Artikkel [P5] käsitleb finiiitverbi mõju objekti käändele *da*-infinitiiviga objektikonstruktsioonis, nt *ma kavatsen osta auto/ autot* vs. *ma tahan osta auto/autot*. Võrreldakse andmeid 17 finiiitverbi kohta ja üritatakse leida semantilisi või süntaktilisi ühisjooni objekti käände suhtes sarnaselt käituvate verbide vahel.

6.2. Teoreetiline taust

Eesti (ja soome) keele objekti vormivaheldust kirjeldatakse tavaliselt kolme põhireegli abil (vt Mihkla jt 1974: 146, Metslang 2017: 264–265, Karlsson 1999: 84–87, Hakulinen jt 2004: 889). Nimelt esineb totaalobjekt ainult siis, kui on täidetud kõik järgmised kriteeriumid:

- 1) objekt laiendab jaatavat verbivormi,
- 2) tegevus on piiritletud, st perfektiiivne (lõpetatud/lõpuleviidav) ning tulemuslik,
- 3) objekt on kvantitatiivselt piiritletud.

Vastasel juhul kasutatakse partsiaalobjekti. Ümberpööratuna võib need reeglid sõnastada nii, et partsiaalobjekti kasutatakse eitava verbivormi, piiritlemata tegevuse ja/või piiritlemata objekti puhul. Seega, kui on täidetud esimene ja kolmas kriteerium ning tegevus on tulemuslik (st tegemist ei ole partitiiv-verbiga, mille semantika välistab totaalobjekti kasutamise), oleneb objekti käänne tegevuse (im)perfektiivsusest: perfektiiivse tegevuse korral kasutatakse totaalobjekti, imperfektiivsus aga nõuab partsiaalobjekti.

Objekti käände traditsioonilised käsitlused põhinevad aga finiiitse verbivormiga lausetel. Infiniitsetes konstruktsioonides, konkreetsemalt *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides, võib tegevuse piiritletuse kriteeriumi olla raske rakendada, kuna infiniitviiga väljendatud sündmusel puudub selge ajalise-aspektiline struktuur. Seepärast ei allu objekti käände valik *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides samale selgele reeglistikule, mis kehtib finiiitlausetes. Tulemuseks on objekti käännete ebajärjekindel kasutus *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides, millesarnast ei leidu finiiitlausetes.

Objekti käände varieerumist *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides on küll varem tähele pandud, kuid seda pole siiani põhjalikult uuritud. Eri uurijad, nende hulgas Johannes Aavik (1936), Karl Kont (1963), Valter Tauli (1980) ja Mati Erelt (2006), on tõdenud selle varieerumise olemasolu ja pakkunud mõningaid üldistusi selle seletamiseks, kuid nende analüüs on enamasti pealiskaudne ja põhineb keelekasutaja intuitsioonil, mitte suuremahulisel usaldusväärsel andmestikul. Keelekasutaja intuitsiooni kui usaldusväärse analüüsi aluse puudulikkust näitab aga kasvõi see, et eelmainitud teadlased on eri meelt selle suhtes, kas partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti vahel on *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides üldse mingi tähelepanuväärne tähendus erinevus. Aaviku ja Tauli järgi on selline

tähenduserinevus olemas, kuigi nad kirjeldavad seda eri viisidel; Erelt aga ütleb, et „võimalik tõlgenduserinevus on ebaoluline“ (Erelt 2006: 42). Seega täidab käesolev korpuspõhine uuring olulise lünga eesti keeleteaduses, pakkudes kvantitatiivseid andmeid küsimuste kohta, mida on siiani uuritud ainult põgusalt, üksikutele näidetele ning üksikute uurijate keelevaistule toetudes.

Teooria osas toetub väitekiri eelkõige *konstruktsiooni* mõistele ning konstruktsioonigrammatikale. Konstruktsioon on süntaktilis-semantiline mall, mille ulatus võib varieeruda lühikesest fraasist terve lauseni. Konstruktsioonigrammatika teooria järgi on konstruktsioon eraldi keeleline üksus, mille morfosüntaktilised piirangud ei ole taandatavad üldistele (kogu keele kohta kehtivatele) grammatilistele reeglitele (Sahkai 2005: 806). Selle taandamatuse tõttu on konstruktsioonid ühtlasi keele põhilised grammatilised üksused ning konstruktsioonigrammatika ei postuleeri konstruktsioonidest madalamate süntaktiliste tasandite olemasolu (Goldberg 2003: 219). Selles töös ongi lähtutud eeldusest, et erinevates *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides võivad objekti käändevalikut mõjutada erinevad tegurid. Samuti on oluline, et konstruktsioonid ei ole eraldi seisvad üksused, vaid on omavahel hierarhilistes suhetes, kusjuures hierarhias madalamal asuvad konstruktsioonid pärivad omadusi kõrgemal asuvatest (üldisematest, skemaatilisematest) konstruktsioonidest. Seega võib oletada, et käändevaliku tegemisel arvestatavad kriteeriumid eri konstruktsioonides väiksemal või suuremal määral kattuvad. Kuigi käesolevas töös ei rakendata ühtegi konkreetset konstruktsioonigrammatika mudelit ega kaardistata konstruktsioonide hierarhilisi suhteid, on konstruktsioonigrammatika keskne põhimõte – see, et erinevad konstruktsioonid võivad käituda erinevalt ega allu läbi keele ühtsetele reeglitele – siinse väitekirja teoreetiliseks selgrooks, ilma milleta oleks uurimise käigus välja tulnud konstruktsioonidevahelisi erinevusi (nii eri *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonide vahel kui ka *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonide ja finiitlausete vahel) võimatu seletada.

Teine oluline teoreetiline mõiste on *võistlevad ajendid* (ingl *competing motivations*), mille all mõeldakse vastandlikke keelelisi valikuid soodustavate tegurite omavahelist konkurentsi. Võistlevaid ajendeid leidub kõikidel keeletasanditel (Moravcsik 2014). Seda mõistet on kasutatud ka eri keelte DOM-süsteemide seletamiseks, nt Aisseni (2003) järgi on DOM seotud ikoonilisuse ja ökonoomsuse vahelise võistlusega, mis laheneb eri keeltes erinevalt. Seos keelelise varieerumise ja võistlevate ajendite vahel on üsna loomulik: varieerumise teke pole juhuslik, vaid seotud sellega, et erinevad tegurid soodustavad erinevate keelendite / grammatiliste vormide kasutamist.

da-infinitiiv esineb lausetes mitmes süntaktilises rollis – subjekt, objekt, adverbiaal, atribuut, iseseisev predikaat –, ning on võimalik eristada kümneid süntaktiliselt ja semantiliselt erinevaid *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioone. Kuna aga paljud neist konstruktsioonidest esinevad korpusmaterjalis suhteliselt harva,

on käesolevas töös piiratud viie sageli esineva *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsiooni analüüsiga. Nendeks konstruktsioonideks on⁸:

1. Otstarbelausekonstruktsioon – *et* + VP (*läheb metsa, et tappa hirv*)
2. Hinnangukonstruktsioon – OLEMA + Adj + VP (*tema kontorit on lihtne leida*)
3. Objektikonstruktsioon – infiniitne VP ise objekti rollis
 - a. Soovimis-kavatsemiskonstruktsioon (*ta soovib leida elukaaslase*)
 - b. Modaalstruktsioon (*ma võin leida teise raamatu*)⁹
 - c. Võimaldamis-kohustamiskonstruktsioon (*ta soovitas mul leida uue korteri*)
4. Järeltäiendikonstruktsioon – VP laiendab NP-d (*ta tegi ettepaneku uus parkla ehitada*)
5. Translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioon – NP-ks + OLEMA + VP (*tema ülesandeks on kirjutada ülevaade infiniitsetest konstruktsioonidest*)

Vaadeldavad konstruktsioonid on valitud nii kõrge esinemissageduse kui ka omavaheliste struktuuriliste erinevuste tõttu. Eesmärgiks on pakkuda võimalikult laiahaardeline ülevaade *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonidest, uurimaks objekti käände varieerumist erinevates süntaktilistes ja semantilistes ümbrustes.

6.3. Materjal ja meetod

Väitekirjas kasutatud korpusematerjal pärineb eelkõige aastal 2013 loodud eestikeelsete veebilehtede korpusest etTenTen, mis on kõige suurem eesti keele korpus üldse (330 miljonit sõnet). Korpuses etTenTen on esindatud palju valdkondi ning tekstiüüpe, nende hulgas blogid, foorumid, ajakirjandustekstid, religioossed tekstid, teatmekirjandus ning halduslikud (valitsuse või riigikoguga seotud) tekstid. Artiklis [P1], mis kirjutati enne korpuse etTenTen valmimist, on kasutatud materjali Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele koondkorpusest, eriti ajalehtede Eesti Päevaleht, Postimees, Eesti Ekspress ja Õhtuleht allkorpustest. Kõik käesolevas kokkuvõttes esitatud näitelauseid on võetud kas korpusest etTenTen või Eesti Päevalehe korpusest; viimased on märgitud lühendiga EPL.

Kuna eesmärgiks on uurida ebareeglipärast, infiniitvkonstruktsioonide omast objekti käände varieerumist, on analüüsist välja jäetud kõik laused, milles objekti kääne on kas ebaselge või teiste, infiniitsete konstruktsioonidega mitteseotud

⁸ Konstruktsioonide nimetused ja määratlused on pärit Pille Penjamilt (2008).

⁹ Penjam (2008) ei liigita modaalstruktsioonis esinevat *da*-infinitiiviga fraasi objektiks, vaid liitpredikaadi osaks. Sellest hoolimata käsitletakse siinses töös modaalstruktsiooni koos „päris“ objektikonstruktsioonidega, kuna a) sarnaselt teiste objektikonstruktsioonidega esineb totaalobjekt modaalstruktsioonis omastavas käändes, mitte nimetavas käändes nagu ülejäänud *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides ning b) modaalstruktsiooniga lause ülesehitus, välja arvatud finiiitverbi semantika ise, on identne soovimis-kavatsemiskonstruktsiooni omaga.

kriteeriumite abil (sh finiiitlausetes kehtiv objekti käände reeglistik) seletatav. Konkreetsemalt tähendab see, et analüüsist välja jäetud on laused, kus on täidetud vähemalt üks partsiaalobjekti põhilistest kasutustingimustest, kuna need tingimused kehtivad *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides samamoodi kui finiiitlausetes: 1) lause väljendab piiritlemata tegevust ehk ateelist sündmust; 2) lause põhivverb on eitavas vormis; 3) objekt on kvantitatiivselt piiritlemata. Lisaks on välja jäetud ka 4) mitmusliku objektiga laused (kuna mitmuse osastava puhul on ebaselge, kas objekt on kvantitatiivselt piiritletud või mitte); 5) asesõnalise objektiga laused (kuna asesõnalised objektid võivad esineda partitiivis isegi piiritletud sündmuse puhul); 6) laused, milles objekti kääne on vormihomomüümia tõttu ebaselge.

Uurimismeetod on võrdlev-kvantitatiivne: võrreldakse objekti käänete kasutust (st partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti osakaalu, või totaalobjekti varieerumise puhul nimetava- ja omastavakujulise objekti osakaalu) eri tunnuste eri väärtuste puhul, et võimalikult hästi isoleerida üksikute tunnuste mõju objekti käände. Näiteks sõnajärje mõju hindamiseks hinnangukonstruktsioonis võetakse hulk lauseid, mis on teiste oluliste tunnuste suhtes (hinnangut andva omadussõna semantika, situatsiooni korduvus/ühekordsus) sarnased, jagatakse need sõnajärje järgi kahte rühma (OV- ja VO-sõnajärjega laused) ning võrreldakse partsiaalobjekti osakaalu nendes kahes rühmas.

6.4. Tulemused

Järgnevalt on esitatud uurimistulemused erinevate objekti käänete mõjutavate tegurite kohta.

6.4.1. Sõnajärg

Üheks põhiliseks objekti käände mõjuriks *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides on infiniitse fraasi sõnajärg. Lausetes, kus *da*-infinitiivis verb eelneb objektile (VO sõnajärg), on partsiaalobjekt oluliselt haruldasem kui vastupidise (OV) sõnajärjega lausetes. Paar näidet:

- 1) Skulptor Tauno Kangro soov *kinkida* tallinlastele **üks kuju** ei näi meeldivat tema kolleegidele, skulptorite ühendus nõuab avalikku konkurssi.¹⁰
- 2) Kui avaldasin soovi **e-arvet vormistada**, kuulsin, et klienditeenindaja ei saa seda teha, sest programm ei tööta.

¹⁰ Näitelausestes on *da*-infinitiivi laiendav objekt paksus kirjas, *da*-infinitiiv ja konstruktsiooni teised olulised koostisosad on kaldkirjas.

Sõnajärje mõju ei ole aga kõikides vaadeldud konstruktsioonides samasugune. Translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioonis puudub sõnajärje mõju täielikult, kuna selles konstruktsioonis ei leidu ebareeglipärasest (st finiiitlausetes kehtivale reeglistikule mittealluvat) objekti käände varieerumist peaaegu üldse. Hinnangukonstruktsioonis, otstarbelausekonstruktsioonis ja järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis on sõnajärje mõju üsna tugev: partsiaalobjekti osakaalu vahe VO ja OV sõnajärjega lausete vahel nendes konstruktsioonides ulatub 30–40 protsendipunkti. Objektikonstruktsioonis (täpsemalt soovimis-kavatsemiskonstruktsioonis) on sõnajärje mõju aga palju tagasihoidlikum. Võimalikku varieerumist illustreerivad näited (3) ja (4), kus VO sõnajärjega esineb partsiaalobjekt (3) ja OV sõnajärjega esineb totaalobjekt (4).

- 3) 1000 € ratas tahab kohe *leida uut omanikku* ning ei ole vahet mis luku sa sinna paned.
- 4) Lõpuks ajas üksiolek üle ja tahtsin *mõne tüdruku leida* kellega oleks hea rääkida maailma asjadest.

Tabel 1 võtab kokku sõnajärje mõju objekti käändele erinevates *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides.

Tabel 1. Partsiaalobjekti osakaal erinevates konstruktsioonides sõnajärje järgi

| Konstruktsioon | Partsiaalobjekti %, OV sõnajärg | Partsiaalobjekti %, VO sõnajärg | Vahe |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|
| Hinnangukonstruktsioon | 68 | 33 | 35 |
| Otstarbelausekonstruktsioon | 55 | 26 | 29 |
| Järeltäiendikonstruktsioon | 58 | 17 | 41 |
| Soovimis-kavatsemiskonstruktsioon | 65 | 57 | 8 |

See konstruktsioonidevaheline erinevus aitab ka seletada, miks sõnajärjel on oluline mõju objekti käändele ainult infiniitsetes konstruktsioonides, mitte finiiitlausetes. Nimelt paistab sõnajärje mõju olenevat sellest, kui tugev on süntaktiline seos objekti ning transitiiivse finiiitverbi vahel. Finiiitlausetes on see seos võimalikult tugev, kuna objekt laiendab otseselt transitiiivset finiiitverbi, ning seost sõnajärje ja objekti käände vahel ei ole. Objektikonstruktsioonis kuulub objekt transitiiivset finiiitverbi laiendavasse fraasi, nii et süntaktiline seos objekti ja transitiiivse finiiitverbi vahel ei ole nii tugev kui finiiitlauses, kuid on siiski olemas; vastavalt on sõnajärje mõju objekti käändele ka olemas, kuid palju tagasihoidlikum kui teistes *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides. Ülejäänud *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides pole arvestatavat süntaktilist seost infiniitvi laiendava objekti ja transitiiivse finiiitverbi vahel (nendes konstruktsioonides ei pruugi transitiiivset finiiitverbi ollagi, nt *on lihtne teha X; tal on soov teha X; läks koju, et teha X*) ja sõnajärje mõju objekti käändele on palju tugevam.

Mõnevõrra üllatavalt tuleb välja, et seos sõnajärje ja objekti käände vahel ei ole seletatav infostruktuuri kaudu. Seoseid infostruktuuri ja objekti markeerimise vahel on täheldatud paljudes keeltes (vt Dalrymple ja Nikolaeva 2011) ning eesti keeles on sõnajärg tugevalt seotud infostruktuuriga (vt Lindström 2006), nii et tundub loogiline oletada, et näiline „sõnajärje mõju“ võiks tegelikult olla infostruktuuri mõju. Ometi selgub, et seos sõnajärje ja objekti käände vahel *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides püsib ka siis, kui vaadata ainult sarnaste infostruktuuriliste omadustega objekte (nt ainult selliseid, mis väljendavad uut infot), nagu näitab tabel 2. Seega ongi objekti käände mõjuriks sõnajärg, mitte infostruktuur. Seda on näha ka näitelauses (1) ja (2), milles objekti kääne varieerub (koos sõnajärgiga), kuigi mõlemas lauses väljendab objekt uut infot.

Tabel 2. Objekti kääne järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis sõnajärje järgi (põhisõnaga *soov*, objekt väljendab uut infot)

| Sõnajärg + infostruktuur | Partsiaalobjekt | Totaalobjekt | Kokku | Partsiaalobjekti osakaal |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------|--------------------------|
| OV _{da} , uus | 25 | 18 | 43 | 58% |
| V _{da} O, uus | 19 | 91 | 110 | 17% |

Kuna seos sõnajärje ja objekti käände vahel ei paista johtuvat semantilistest või funktsionaalsetest kaalutlustest, tuleb sellele otsida kognitiivset seletust. Väitekirjas esitatakse hüpotees, et mainitud seos põhineb finiiitlauses olemasoleval assotsiatiivsel seosel partsiaalobjekti ja OV sõnajärje vahel, mis tuleneb omakorda sellest, et eitavates lauses (kus on võimalik ainult partsiaalobjekt) on OV sõnajärg sagedam kui jaatavates lauses. Kuna *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonide näol on tegemist perifeersete konstruktsioonidega, kus üldisi objekti käänete kasutusreegleid on raskem rakendada kui finiiitlauses, on arusaadav, et keelekasutajad võiksid nendes konstruktsioonides esineva objekti käänat valides toetuda üldisematele tendentsidele ja/või võrdlustele sagedasemate konstruktsioonidega. Olukorras, kus verbi ebaselgete/alamääratud aspektiliste omaduste tõttu puudub veenev põhjus ühe või teise objektikäände kasutamiseks, eelistatakse seda käänat, mida seostub tugevamalt parasjagu moodustatava lause struktuuriga.

6.4.2. Situatsiooni korduvus/ühekordsus

Üks tegur, mis on mitmes *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonis tugevalt seotud objekti käänete kasutusega, on situatsiooni korduvus/ühekordsus. Korduvad situatsioonid võivad olla kas iteratiivsed (sündmuse kordumine samade osalistega) või distributiivsed (sündmuse kordumine erinevate osalistega) (Erelt 2017: 126–127). Distributiivseteks ja seega korduvateks sündmusteks liigituvad ka üldised väited (geneeriline/gnoomiline aspekt), mille puhul mingeid konkreetseid osalisi ei mainita, nt *On tähtis valida õige elukutse*. Seevastu on ühekordsetes situatsiooni-

des tegemist konkreetsete juhtumite ja spetsiifiliste osalistega, nt *Isa kavatseb osta uue suvila*.

Korduvaid situatsioone tähistavates finiiitlausetes esinevad objektid alluvad reeglipäraselt piiritletuse kriteeriumile: situatsioon võib korduda, kuid objekti kääne oleneb üksiku korduse aspektilistest omadustest (*Jaan ostab igal hommikul ajalehe/*ajalehte*). Seevastu esineb *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides tendents, et korduvate situatsioonidega kasutatakse partsiaalobjekti rohkem kui ühekordsete situatsioonidega. *da*-infinitiivi ajalise-aspektilise tähenduse puudumise tõttu on ka üksiku korduse aspektilised omadused mõnevõrra ebaselged, mis teeb piiritletuse kriteeriumi raskesti rakendatavaks. Selles olukorras osutub oluliseks situatsiooni enda korduv või ühekordne iseloom, mis seostub vastavalt imperfektiivse või perfektiivse tõlgendusega.

Mõned näited korduvatest (5, 6) ja ühekordsetest (7, 8) situatsioonidest:

- 5) Praegu on *lihtne ja odav mobiiltelefoni muretseda*. (EPL)
- 6) *Iga katse fikseerida valuutakurssi* langeks ilmselt kohe rahaturgude rünnaku alla.
- 7) *Püüie asetada see raamat* ennekõike Euroopa ja ka Eesti konteksti on üks selle artikli eesmärke.
- 8) Siis hakkas silma, et sõiduki põrand on tavalisest kõrgem ning edasi oli juba *lihtne narkootikum avastada*. (EPL)

Nagu täheldati ka sõnajärje puhul, on aga olemas märkimisväärsed konstruktsioonidevahelised erinevused korduvuse parameetri mõjus objekti käände. Need erinevused on välja toodud tabelis 3.

Tabel 3. Objekti kääne *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides situatsiooni korduvuse/ühekordsuse järgi

| Konstruktsioon | Partsiaalobjekti %, korduvad situatsioonid | Partsiaalobjekti %, ühekordsed situatsioonid | Vahe protsendipunktides |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Hinnangukonstruktsioon | 87 | 47 | 40 |
| Otstarbelausekonstruktsioon | 19 | 20 | -1 |
| Järeltäiendikonstruktsioon | 45 | 20 | 25 |
| Soovimis-kavatsemiskonstruktsioon | 77 | 54 | 23 |

Kui hinnangukonstruktsioonis, objektikonstruktsioonis ning järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis on partsiaalobjekti osakaal tunduvalt suurem korduvat situatsiooni väljendavates lausetes, siis ülejäänud kahes konstruktsioonis puudub selge seos korduvuse ja objekti käände vahel. Näites (9) on otstarbelausekonstruktsioonis kasutatud totaalobjekti, situatsiooni üldisusest/korduvusest hoolimata:

- 9) Kui tagasimaksmisega on raskusi, tuleb pangaga ühendust võtta, *et lahendus leida*.

Otstarbelausekonstruktsiooni puhul on raske leida põhjust, miks situatsiooni korduvus ei peaks mõjutama objekti käänat. Struktuuri poolest on peamine erinevus otstarbelausekonstruktsiooni ja teiste vaadeldud konstruktsioonide vahel see, et otstarbelausekonstruktsioonis paikneb *da*-infinitiiviga fraas kõrvallauses. Kuna aga otstarbelausekonstruktsioonis mõjutab objekti käänat pealauses väljendatud duratiivsus (sellest lähemalt allpool), siis on selge, et ka kõrvallauses esinev objekt on pealause omaduste mõjualas, nii et ei ole usutav, et see struktuuriline erinevus võiks seletada korduvuse parameetri ebaolulisust mainitud konstruktsioonis.

Translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioonis ei ole märgatavat statistilist seost situatsiooni korduvuse ja objekti käände vahel, sest selles konstruktsioonis allub objekti kääne peaaegu alati piiritletuse kriteeriumile viimase traditsioonilises mõttes (st partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti vastanduse osas käitub see konstruktsioon finiiitlause moodi). See konstruktsioon erineb teistest vaadeldud *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonidest ka selle poolest, et see väljendab peaaegu eranditult ühekordseid situatsioone. Põhjuseks on see, et situatsiooni konkretiseerib translatiivadverbiaali laiendav genitiivatribuut: alati on *kellegi* ülesandeks/eesmärgiks/sooviks midagi teha. Seega saab translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioon väljendada korduvat situatsiooni ainult siis, kui genitiivtribuudi referent on mitte-spetsiifiline.

Selliseid näiteid on korpuses üsna vähe, kuid üks vähestest partsiaalobjekti kasutusjuhtudest ongi just seda tüüpi. Kuna situatsiooni korduvus selgub antud juhul laiemast kontekstist, on esitatud allpool mitte ainult translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsiooniga lause, vaid ka sellele eelnev lause.

- 10) Sageli tulevad inimesed tööhõiveametisse mitte tööd otsima, vaid hoopis tõendeid küsima, tõdeb Tallinna Tööhõiveameti psühholoog Sirje Kündre. *Eesmärgiks on saada korterisoodustust, haigekassakaarti või töötü abiraha.* (EPL)

On võimalik, et partsiaalobjekti kasutus selles lauses ei olegi seotud situatsiooni korduvusega; võib-olla on see tingitud sellest, et teised objektid *korterisoodustust* ja *töötü abiraha* on ka osastavas käändes (olguigi, et teisel põhjusel). Siiski, arvestades nii partsiaalobjekti kui ka korduvate situatsioonide haruldust selles konstruktsioonis, on nende koosinemine selles näites tähelepanuväärne.

6.4.3. Teised aspektilised omadused

Lisaks situatsiooni korduvusele vaadeldakse väitekirjas teisingi aspektilisi omadusi, mis mõjutavad objekti käänat vähemalt ühes *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonis.

Otstarbelausekonstruktsioonis, kus *da*-infinitiiviga fraas on *et*-kõrvallauses, on selge seos pealauses väljendatud duratiivsuse ning *da*-infinitiiviga fraasis partsiaalobjekti esinemise vahel. Duratiivsuse markerid võivad olla kas ajamäärused (*pikalt, pidevalt, juba kaks aastat*) või kontinuatiivsust väljendavad verbid (*jätkama*). Duratiivsuse markeri olemasolu lauses soodustab situatsiooni imperfektiivset tõlgendust ja seega partsiaalobjekti kasutamist. Kui otstarbelausekonstruktsioonis üldiselt on partsiaalobjekt suhteliselt haruldane (partsiaalobjekti osakaal ühendiga *et leida* on 19%), siis duratiivsuse markeri olemasolul kasutati partsiaalobjekti 19 lausest 11-s (58%).

- 11) Pikalt käisime vaatamas, *et leida sobivat pisikest kutsut* ja lõpuks selle ka leidsime.

Teine oluline aspektimarker on infinitiivifraasis esinev perfektiivsuspriiktel *ära*. Oleks loogiline oletada, et selle priikli olemasolu tõstaks perfektiivse, resultatiivse tõlgenduse tõenäosust. Objektikonstruktsioonis just selline seos ilmnebki: OV sõnajärgiga objektikonstruktsiooni lausetes finiiitverbiga *tahtma* on partsiaalobjekti osakaal 36% priikli *ära* olemasolul (12) ja 58% selle puudumisel (13). Hinnangukonstruktsioonis ei paista priiktel *ära* aga üldse mõjuvat objekti käännet, nagu illustreerivad näited (14) ja (15):

- 12) Nii, et kahjuks pole mul võimalust osta kallimat kraami kui *tahan pere ära toita ja maksud ära maksta*.
- 13) Kui *tahate* oma seltskonnaga *teha ühte tõeliselt sisukat reisi* Saaremaal, siis soovitame järgida Kaali Külustuskeskuse perenaise nõuannet ning käia Kaali kraatri juures, vaadata Angla tuulikuid ja imetleda Panga panka.
- 14) Vallo sõnade kohaselt on *seda ühte rida* sealt *lihtne ära kustutada*.
- 15) Vene riigi kapitaliga on ülimalt *lihtne kogu eesti riigikese majandus ära nullida*.

Väärrib rõhutamist, et analüüsi on kaasatud ainult need laused, milles *da*-infinitiivis olev verb (või ühendverb) lubab totaalobjekti. Seega jääb tulemustes kajastamata priikli *ära* otsene perfektiivistav mõju (vrd *ootasin taksot* ja *ootasin takso ära*), kuna perfektiivpriiklitla partitiivverbiga laused ei luba totaalobjekti ja jäävad seetõttu analüüsist välja. Vaadeldud materjal on priikli *ära* funktsiooniks lihtsalt infiniitse fraasi piiritlemise rõhutamine, mitte piiritlemata situatsiooni piiritletuks muutmine. Seda arvestades ei ole üllatav, et priikli *ära* mõju objekti kääntele on siin nii tagasihoidlik.

Lisaks perfektiivsuspriiklile soodustavad totaalobjekti kasutamist ka *da*-infinitiiviga fraasi laiendavad sihimäärused, mis tähistavad sihtkohta (16), (kasu)saajat (17) või lõppseisundit (18). Objektikonstruktsioonis finiiitverbidega *tahtma, soovima* ja *püüdma* on partsiaalobjekti osakaal 32% sihimääruse olemasolul ja 58% selle puudumisel. Samaselt perfektiivsuspriiklile *ära* ei muuda

sihimäärus enamikel vaadeldud juhtudel piiritlemata situatsiooni piiritletuks, mis aitab seletada, miks selle mõju objekti käände on pelgalt totaalobjekti soodustav, mitte kaugeltki määrav.

- 16) *Alati püüan oma ajakavasse mahutada ka mingi muu trenni.*
- 17) “*Tahame sellega anda tudengitele selge sõnumi – õppige edasi,*” ütles Klaas.
- 18) *Meie ruumid ei ole küll väga avarad, kuid sellest hoolimata püüame oma patsientide füüsilise keskkonna muuta võimalikult koduseks.*

6.4.4. Leksikaalsed mõjud

Viiest vaadeldud konstruktsioonidest neljas sisaldub oluline muutuv leksikaalne komponent, mis paikneb väljaspool *da*-infinitiiviga fraasi. Need komponendid on:

- Hinnangut väljendav omadussõna hinnangukonstruktsioonis
- Põhinimisõna järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis
- Finiitverb objektikonstruktsioonis
- Translatiivadverbiaal translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioonis.

Neist viimasel ei ole mingit mõju objekti käände, sest translatiivadverbiaali konstruktsioonis ebareeglipärast objekti käände varieerumist peaaegu ei olegi. Ülejäänud kolm on aga objekti käände seisukohalt üsna olulised muutujad.

Hinnangukonstruktsioonis oleneb objekti kääne suurel määral sellest, milline hinnang *da*-infinitiiviga väljendatud tegevusele antakse. Omadussõnade semantikas on võimalik eristada kolm(e) parameetrit, mis määravad, milline on teatud omadussõna mõju objekti käände selles konstruktsioonis. Nendeks parameetriteks on 1) hinnangu polaarsus, 2) hinnangu tüüp (võimalikkus- või väärtushinnang) ja 3) hinnangu protsessi- või tulemuskesksus. Partsiaalobjekti kasutatakse rohkem, kui hinnang on negatiivne, käib tegevuse võimalikkuse/teostatavuse kohta ja keskendub protsessile. Totaalobjekti soodustab vastavalt positiivne, tulemusele keskendub väärtushinnang. Seega on partsiaalobjekt sagedasem negatiivset hinnangut väljendava omadussõnaga *võimatu* (19) kui selle positiivse vastandiga *võimalik* (20); võimalikkushinnangut andva omadussõnaga *lihtne* (21) on partsiaalobjekt üsna sage, kuid väärtushinnangut andva omadussõnaga *tähtis* kasutatakse peaaegu alati totaalobjekti (22); protsessikeskne *mugav* (23) soodustab partsiaalobjekti palju rohkem, kui seda teeb tulemuskeskne *parem* (näide 24).

- 19) Analüütikute enamuse arvamuse kohaselt on sisevastuoludes lõhenenud ODS-il *võimatu moodustada uut stabiilset valitsust* ja seega tuleb korraldada ennetähtaegsed valimised. (EPL)
- 20) Samas kõrval Virbi tänav 12 on hoonestustingimuste kohaselt *võimalik ehitada 9–12 korruselise elamu* koos postkontori ja pangaruumidega. (EPL)

- 21) *Lihtne on algatada **kriminaalasja**, mis võimaldab uudisena kajastada väikeriiki korrumppeerunud ja tasakaalustamatu riigina.* (EPL)
- 22) Haameri sõnul on *tähtis leida **sobiv inimene** välisriiki tütarfirmat juhtima.* (EPL)
- 23) Lisaks madalamale hinnale on **kaskolepingut mugav sõlmida**, sest sõiduki andmeid pole tarvis sisestada, need tulevad automaatselt ARK-ist. (EPL)
- 24) Täiesti nappus roos ei pruugi aga alati avaneda, seepärast on *parem osta **veidi avanenud õis**.* (EPL)

Tabel 4 annab ülevaate objekti käände-eelistustest hinnangukonstruksioonis erinevate omadussõnade puhul.

Tabel 4. Objekti kääne hinnangukonstruksioonis omadussõna järgi

| Omadussõna | Partsiaalobjekt | Totaalobjekt | Kokku | Partsiaalobjekti % |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|
| <i>võimatu</i> | 47 | 3 | 50 | 94% |
| <i>raske</i> | 31 | 2 | 33 | 94% |
| <i>kerge</i> | 32 | 9 | 41 | 78% |
| <i>lihtne</i> | 293 | 156 | 449 | 65% |
| <i>mugav</i> | 12 | 18 | 30 | 40% |
| <i>võimalik</i> | 54 | 114 | 168 | 32% |
| <i>parem</i> | 1 | 38 | 39 | 3% |
| <i>tähtis</i> | 1 | 96 | 97 | 1% |

Kõik need erinevused on aga selgelt seotud objekti käändevahelduse kesksete põhimõtetega. Vastandus protsessi- ja tulemuskesksete omadussõnade vahel on lähedane imperfektiivsuse-perfektiivsuse vastandusele; hinnangu polaarsuse tähtsus ning vastandus võimalikkus- ja väärtushinnangute vahel on seotud eitussega ehk sellega, et toimumata jäänud/jääva sündmuse puhul kasutatakse partsiaalobjekti.

Objektikonstruksioonis on pilt palju hägusam. Finiitverbi mõju objekti käändele on üsna suur – mõne verbi puhul on partsiaalobjekti osakaal üle poole, teiste verbidega on see alla viie protsendi – kuid neid erinevusi ei ole võimalik taandada üldisematele kriteeriumitele. Allpool on toodud näiteid erinevate verbidega. Näitepaarid 30–31 ja 32–33 illustreerivad, kui ebajärjekindel on objekti käänete kasutus selles konstruksioonis, kuna ühe ja sama verbiga (ja üsna sarnastes lausetes) võib esineda kord partsiaalobjekt, kord totaalobjekt.

- 25) Anatoomikum, politseinik ja uurija *püüavad* uurida mõrva ning *panna kildudest kokku **surnud mehe viimast elupäeva**.*
- 26) Kui indekseerimine on lõppenud, *proovime teha **otsingu** failidest, mis asuvad* filefolder kataloogis.

- 27) Ütlen välja nagu asi on – aitab naljast, *soovin* 2012 jooksul **abieluettepanekut saada** ja abielluda.
- 28) Kui keegi *julgeb raiuda* kasvõi **ühe puu**, võtavad vaimud talt mõistuse või suretavad.
- 29) Televisioonis oleks alkoholireklaam lubatud alles pärast kella 21 ja kinodes *kavatsetakse keelata* **alkoholireklaam** alaealistele lubatud seanssidel.
- 30) *Soovitan valida* **autot** auto enda järgi kui rahakott ei kannata esindusse minna.
- 31) Seetõttu *soovitamegi* harrastajatel ja ka võistlevatel rulluisutajatel *valida* **uisk** enda taseme, mitte hinna järgi.
- 32) Imelik, kuidas muutuvad ajakirjanikud lojaalseks valitsusele, kui *kardavad kaotada* **töökohta**.
- 33) Euroopas keskmiselt *kardab kaotada* **töökohta** 6 protsenti elanikest, Eestis aga 17 protsenti.

Tabelis 5 on esitatud andmed *da*-infinitiivi laiendava objekti käänete kasutuse kohta eri finiiitverbide korral.

Tabel 5. Objekti kääne objektikonstruktsioonis finiiitverbi järgi

| Verb | Partsiaalobjekt | Totaalobjekt | Partsiaalobjekti % |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>kartma</i> | 166 | 34 | 83% |
| <i>üritama</i> | 122 | 78 | 61% |
| <i>püüdma</i> | 106 | 94 | 53% |
| <i>tahtma</i> | 101 | 99 | 51% |
| <i>proovima</i> | 97 | 103 | 49% |
| <i>soovima</i> | 91 | 109 | 46% |
| <i>tohtima</i> | 81 | 119 | 41% |
| <i>oskama</i> | 54 | 146 | 27% |
| <i>võimaldama</i> | 45 | 155 | 23% |
| <i>julgema</i> | 31 | 169 | 16% |
| <i>saama</i> | 28 | 172 | 14% |
| <i>lootma</i> | 23 | 177 | 12% |
| <i>ähvardama</i> | 20 | 180 | 10% |
| <i>suutma</i> | 16 | 184 | 8% |
| <i>soovitama</i> | 11 | 189 | 6% |
| <i>Võima</i> | 11 | 189 | 6% |
| <i>kavatsema</i> | 3 | 197 | 2% |
| Keskmine | 60 | 140 | 30% |

Tabel 5 näitab, et semantiliselt sarnased verbid võivad käituda objekti käände suhtes väga erinevalt. Verbisemantika põhjal on võimatu seletada, miks näiteks *soovima* soodustab partsiaalobjekti palju tugevamalt kui *lootma*, miks totaalobjekt on nii palju sagedasem verbidega *võima* ja *saama* kui verbiga *tohtima* või miks on partsiaalobjekti osakaal suurem verbiga *võimaldama* (mis seostub semantiliselt modaalverbidega, mis üldiselt eelistavad totaalobjekti selles konstruktsioonis) kui verbiga *soovitama* (mis seostub semantiliselt pigem verbidega nagu *soovima* või *tahtma*, mis ei näita selles konstruktsioonis selget eelistust objekti käände suhtes). Kuna puuduvad üldised semantilised või süntaktilised tunnused, mis näitaksid järjekindlat seost eri verbide objekti käände-eelistustega, tuleb järeldada, et need eelistused on üksikute verbileksemide omadused.

Järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis on olukord sarnane: eri põhiniimisõnad on väga erinevad mõjud objekti käändele, kuid on raske leida semantilist kriteeriumi, mis eristaks partsiaalobjekti peaaegu välistavad nimisõnad neist nimisõnadest, millega partsiaalobjekti kasutus on palju suurem. Ülevaade partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti vastandusest järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis erinevate põhiniimisõnadega on esitatud tabelis 6.

Tabel 6. Objekti kääne järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis põhiniisõna järgi

| Põhisiõna | Partsiaalobjekt | Totaalobjekt | Partsiaalobjekti % |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| <i>püüe</i> | 78 | 122 | 39% |
| <i>katse</i> | 75 | 125 | 38% |
| <i>soov</i> | 57 | 143 | 29% |
| <i>kavatsus</i> | 3 | 47 | 6% |
| <i>otsus</i> | 0 | 50 | 0% |

Huvitaval kombel langevad järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis põhiniisõnana esinevate nimisõnade objekti käände-eelistused suuresti kokku nende samatüveliste verbide eelistustega objektikonstruktsioonis. Nii verbid *kavatsema* ja *otsustama* kui ka nimisõnad *kavatsus* ja *otsus* soodustavad väga tugevalt totaalobjekti; partsiaalobjekt on veidi sagedasem verbiga *püüdma* kui verbiga *soovima*, ning samuti veidi sagedasem nimisõnaga *püüe* kui nimisõnaga *soov*. Sellest järeldub, et eri leksemide mõju objekti käändele võib olla tegelikult eri tüvede mõju, mis ilmneb mitmes sõnaliigis. Kategooriavaheliste omaduste mõjusid objekti käändele on varem tähele pannud ka Anne Tamm (2014b).

6.4.5. Kvantifikatsioon

Mõnes *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonis eelistatakse tugevamalt totaalobjekti siis, kui objekti tähistav fraas sisaldab kvantorit. Järgnevalt käsitlem kvantori *üks* mõju objekti käändele.

Objektikonstruktsioonis verbiga *tahtma* on partsiaalobjekti osakaal 51% (vt tabel 5). Kvantoriga *üks* on partsiaalobjekti osakaal aga ainult 23% (korpusest etTenTen eraldi kogutud 100-st lausest koosneva valimi põhjal). Paar näidet:

34) Ütlesin, et *tahan* talle **ühe sõnumi saata**.

35) *Tahan kirjutada* **ühe loo** mis sind lohutaks.

Järeltäiendikonstruktsioonis on olukord sarnane. Kui partsiaalobjekti osakaal selles konstruktsioonis põhisonaga *soov* on 29%, siis kvantori *üks* olemasolu puhul on see ainult 8% (4/50).

36) Tulin olümpiale *sooviga saada* vähemalt **üks kuldmedal**.

Hinnangukonstruktsiooni puhul on kvantorit *üks* sisaldavaid ja muidu analüüsiks kõlbavaid lauseid raskem leida: omadussõnaga *lihtne* on selliseid lauseid korpuses etTenTen ainult 23. Ometi näitab ka see väike valim sama tendentsi, mis esineb teisteski konstruktsioonides. Neis 23-s lauses on partsiaalobjekti osakaal ainult 39%, palju vähem kui ilma kvantorita (Tabeli 4 järgi on partsiaalobjekti osakaal omadussõnaga *lihtne* 65%). Näites (37) kasutatakse totaalobjekti, partsiaalobjekti soodustavatest tingimustest hoolimata (OV sõnajärg, korduv situatsioon):

37) **Üks hea burger** on aga *lihtne valmistada* ka koduköögis või -aias.

Paistab, et kvantori *üks* olemasolul *da*-infinitivi laiendavas objektifraasis on oluline mõju objekti käände, suurendades totaalobjekti kasutust. Sellele leidub lihtne semantiline seletus: kvantor *üks* tõstab esile objekti kvantitatiivse piiritletuse. Seda mõju võib võrrelda nt perfektiivuspartikli *ära* omaga (vt osa 6.4.3): nii *üks* kui ka *ära* rõhutavad infiniitse fraasi ühe põhikomponendi (vastavalt objektinomeni ja verbiga väljendatud tegevuse) piiritletust, soodustades seeläbi totaalobjekti.

6.4.6. Ülevaade totaal- ja partsiaalobjekti vastandusest eri konstruktsioonides

Tabel 7 võtab kokku objekti käändevalikut mõjutavad tegurid kõikides vaadeldud konstruktsioonides. Rida 'Aspekt' hõlmab igasuguseid siinses töös vaadeldud aspektinähtusi (duratiivsuse markerid, perfektiivuspartiklid, sihimäärused) peale situatsiooni korduvuse/ühekordsuse. Reas 'Leksika' kajastub varieerumine, mis on seotud väljaspool *da*-infiniitivi fraasi paikneva leksikaalse komponendiga. Konstruktsioonide täispikkade nimetuste asemel on tabelis kasutatud lühendeid (OTLK = otstarbelausedkonstruktsioon, HK = hinnangukonstruktsioon, OK = objektikonstruktsioon, JTK = järeltäiendikonstruktsioon, TAK = translatiivad-verbialaiga konstruktsioon).

Tabel 7. Partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti vastandust mõjutavad tegurid *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides

| | OTLK | HK | OK | JTK | TAK |
|-----------------------|------|----|----|-----|-----|
| Sõnajärg | + | + | + | + | – |
| Situatsiooni korduvus | – | + | + | + | – |
| Aspekt | + | + | + | + | – |
| Leksika | 0 | + | + | + | – |
| Kvantifikatsioon | 0 | + | + | + | – |

Tabeli 7 järgi võib need konstruktsioonid jagada kolme rühma:

1. Konstruktsioonid, milles objekti käänat mõjutavad tegurid kõikidest kategooriatest: **hinnangukonstruktsioon, objektikonstruktsioon, järeltäiendi-konstruktsioon**
2. Konstruktsioonid, milles objekti käänat mõjutavad tegurid mõnest, kuid mitte kõikidest kategooriatest: **otstarbelausedkonstruktsioon**
3. Konstruktsioonid, milles objekti käänat ei ole üldse vaadeldud teguritest ning valitakse finitlausetes kehtivate reeglite järgi: **translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioon**

Ei ole selge, miks translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioon ning otstarbelausedkonstruktsioon käituvad teistest erinevalt. Need erinevused osutavad konstruktsioonispetsiifilise lähenemise vajalikkusele, kuna puudub konstruktsioonidevaheline kriteerium, mis võiks seletada nende konstruktsioonide omapärast käitumist.

6.4.7. Totaalobjekti vormivaheldus

Lisaks partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti vastanduse konstruktsioonispetsiifilistele eripärasustele leidub mõnes *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonis ka ebajärjekindlat totaalobjekti käändevormide kasutust. „Eesti keele käsiraamatus“ on mainitud, et refereeritud käsu puhul võib objekt esineda nii genitiivis kui ka nominatiivis:

38) *Palusin näidata talle istekoht/istekoha* kätte. (EKK: 408)

Ka ühes käesolevas väitekirjas vaadeldud konstruktsioonis, nimelt võimaldamiskohustamiskonstruktsioonis, võib täheldada samasugust varieerumist:

39) *Soovitan sul osta mantel/mantli.*

Neid kahte konstruktsiooni võib käsitleda kui soovimis-kavatsemiskonstruktsiooni ja käskiva kõneviisi segu. Ühelt poolt on neis olemas transitiivne finitverb, mida laiendab *da*-infinitiiviga fraas, nagu soovimis-kavatsemiskonstruktsiooniski; teiselt poolt on situatsioonis olemas kaks osalejat, nimelt palve/

soovituse vms esitaja ning adressaat, nagu käsu puhul (ja erinevalt soovimiskavatssemiskonstruktsioonist, kus on ainult üks osaleja). Seega on olemas motiivatsioon nii imperatiivipärase nominatiivi kui ka tavalise finiiitlausepärase genitiivi kasutamiseks, mistõttu ei ole üllatav, et kasutus varieerub.

Erinevusi võib täheldada ka võimaldamis-kohustamiskonstruktsioonis esinevate verbide vahel, nagu näitab tabel 8.

Tabel 8. Totaalobjekti vormivaheldus eri verbidega võimaldamis-kohustamiskonstruktsioonis

| Verb | Nominatiiv | Genitiiv | Kokku |
|-------------------|------------|----------|-------|
| <i>soovitama</i> | 63 | 37 | 100 |
| <i>käskima</i> | 41 | 59 | 100 |
| <i>võimaldama</i> | 23 | 77 | 100 |
| <i>lubama</i> | 15 | 85 | 100 |

Mõned näited:

- 40) Nimelt kui me sinna jõudsime *käskis* Gunnar mul ta pusa taskust *välja võtta* **ühe sõrmuse karbi**.
- 41) Kindlasti *soovitan paigaldada* arvutisse **mõni rootkitide tõkestusprogramm**.
- 42) Meie 20 aastane koostöö ja omavaheline usaldus *võimaldab* täna *astuda* veel **ühe sammu** edasi.
- 43) Head lumeolud on tänaseks *lubanud ette valmistada* **korralliku suusaraja**.

Nagu teiste leksikaalsete mõjude puhul, on ka siin raske leida seletust, miks teatud verb eelistab üht või teist käänat. Intuitiivselt võiks oletada, et mida imperatiivsem on verbi semantika, seda tugevamalt eelistab see nominatiivikujulist totaalobjekti. Mõnel määral võib see hüpotees ka paika pidada: verbid *võimaldama* ja *lubama*, mis selgelt eelistavad genitiivi, sisaldavad vähem käskivat jõudu kui *soovitama* ja *käskima*. Kui aga võrrelda viimaseid kahte verbi, siis on *käskima*-verbil ilmselt rohkem käskivat jõudu kui *soovitama*-verbil, kuid just *soovitama* eelistab kõige tugevamalt nominatiivi (vrd näiteid 40 ja 41, kus verbiga *käskima* esineb genitiiv, verbiga *soovitama* aga nominatiiv).

Erinevust verbide *soovitama* ja *käskima* vahel võib mõnel määral seletada asjaolu, et mõlema verbi puhul on nominatiiv sagedasem olevikulise verbivormiga, kuid *soovitama* esineb palju sagedamini olevikus kui *käskima*. Vaadeldud 100-st lausest esineb *käskima*-verb 84 korda minevikus, 16 olevikus; *soovitama*-verbiga on olukord vastupidine, 18 esinemist minevikus ja 82 olevikus. Kui vaadelda ainult olevikulise verbivormiga lauseid, on nominatiivikujulise totaalobjekti osakaal 66% verbiga *soovitama*, 63% verbiga *käskima*. Mineviku puhul on nominatiivikujulise totaalobjekti osakaal 50% verbiga *soovitama*, 37%

verbiga *käskima*. Leid, et nominatiivikujuline totaalobjekt on sagedasem olevikus kui minevikus, on seletatav imperatiivsusega; olevikulises lauses verbiga *soovitama* või *käskima* sooritatakse kõneakt, minevikulises lauses ainult kirjeldatakse juba toimunud kõneakti.

Üks tegur, mis paistab mõjutavat totaalobjekti käändevalikut selles konstruktsioonis, on aga adessiivis esineva adressaadi olemasolu või puudumine lauses. Kui kõigi nelja verbi tulemused kokku panna, on nominatiivikujulise totaalobjekti osakaal 49% adressaadi olemasolu puhul (*soovitan sul osta mantel/mantli*). Vastupidisel juhul, kus adressaati ei mainita (*soovitan osta mantel/mantli*), on nominatiivi osakaal ainult 28%. Seda võib seletada asjaolu, et adessiivis esineva adressaadi olemasolu lauses teeb eksplitsiitseks lause osalejastruktuuri, mis sarnaneb imperatiiviga, kuid ei sobi kokku soovimiskavatssemiskonstruktsiooniga.

Lisaks sellele väärrib mainimist seos totaalobjekti käände ja rinnastuse vahel. Kui võimaldamis-kohustamiskonstruktsiooni kuuluv *da*-infinitiiviga fraas esineb teise või hilisema rinnastatud liikmena, on totaalobjekti käändeks valdavalt nominatiiv (78%), samal ajal kui ülejäänud võimaldamis-kohustamiskonstruktsiooni lausetes on nominatiivi osakaal ainult 32%. Näites (44) on kaks rinnastatud *da*-infinitiiviga fraasi, kusjuures esimeses on totaalobjekt genitiivis ja teises nominatiivis.

- 44) Näiteks arutame läbi ja *soovitame* teistelegi *taasavada* igas Eestimaa vallas vähemasti **ühe avaliku külasauna** ning sinna *asutada* mittetulundusühinguna **kohalik saunaklubi**.

Sellisele varieerumisele ei leidu funktsionaalset seletust. Kõige usutavam seletus on see, et ajaks, kui jõutakse teise rinnastatud liikmeni, on genitiivi tingiv finiidne verbivorm *soovitame* keelekasutaja peas juba tagaplaanile tõugatud, nii et on vähem motivatsiooni genitiivi kasutamiseks.

Kvantori olemasolu, mis osutus oluliseks teguriks partsiaal- ja totaalobjekti vastanduse puhul, ei paista mõjutavat totaalobjekti käänat. 100-s lauses verbiga *soovitama* võimaldamis-kohustamiskonstruktsioonis, milles *da*-infinitiivi laiendav totaalobjekt sisaldab kvantorit *üks*, on nominatiivikujulise objekti osakaal 61%, ehk umbes sama palju, mis mainitud verbiga üldiselt (63% Tabeli 8 järgi).

6.5. Järeldused

Eesti keele *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonid näitavad ebajärjekindlat objekti-käänete kasutust, millesarnast ei leidu finiidlausetes. Selle põhjuseks on *da*-infinitiivi aspektiomaduste puudumine, mis raskendab piiritletuse kriteeriumi rakendamist. Seega on motivatsioonid ühe või teise käände kasutamiseks *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides nõrgemad kui finiidlausetes. Lisaks sellele on kõikides siinses töös vaadeldud lausetes olemas ajendid nii partsiaal- kui ka

totaalobjekti kasutamiseks; objekti käände valik on nende nõrkade vastandlike ajendite omavahelise võistluse tulemus, mida on raske ennustada.

Lisaks sellele, et *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides on objekti vormivaheldus vähem reeglipärane kui finiiitlausetes, on olemas mitu tegurit, mis mõjutavad objekti käänat üsna tugevalt ühes või enam *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonis, kuid mitte finiiitlausetes. Mõne teguri mõju on konstruktsiooniti väga erinev, näiteks situatsiooni korduvus/ühekordsus, mis on kolmes konstruktsioonis väga oluline, kuid otstarbelausekonstruktsioonis ei paista objekti käänat üldse mõjutavat. Sellised juhtumid näitavad, et eri konstruktsioonidel on erinevad „reeglid“ (pigem eelistused, kuna kindlastest reeglitest saab nende konstruktsioonide puhul rääkida väga harva), mis ei ole taandatavad üldisematele (konstruktsioonidevahelistele) omadustele või põhimõtetele. Mõned *da*-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonid on reeglipärasemad kui teised; kõige selgem näide on translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioon, mis allub peaaegu täielikult piiritletuse kriteeriumile nagu seda mõistetakse finiiitlauseteski. Konstruktsioonidevahelised erinevused objektikäänete kasutuse osas osutavad konstruktsioonispetsiifilise lähenemise vajalikkusele.

Korpusematerjali analüüs näitab ka objekti vormivahelduse funktsionaalsete seletuse ebapiisavust – korpusematerjalist võib leida lõpmatult lausepaare, milles paarilised on teineteisega sarnased kõigi objekti käänat mõjutavate tunnuste suhtes, kuid mitte objekti käände enda poolest. Varieerumise funktsiooni puudumine tuleb veel selgemini esile totaalobjekti vormi varieerumise puhul võimaldamis-kohustamiskonstruktsioonis, eriti selles osas, mis puudutab seost rinnastuse ja objekti käände vahel. Funktsionaalse seletuse puudumine osutab vajadusele otsida kognitiivsetel protsessidel põhinevaid seletusi; just kognitiivne suund on see, mille abil võiks käesolevas töös esitatud järeldusi edasi arendada. Väitekirjas on küll arutletud mõne võimaliku kognitiivse seletuse üle, kuid neid on võimatu tõestada ainult korpusematerjalile toetudes.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations used in the glosses

| | | | |
|-----|---------------|-----|---------------------|
| ABL | ablative | IMP | imperative |
| ACC | accusative | INE | inessive |
| ADE | adessive | INF | infinitive |
| ALL | allative | LAT | lative |
| ART | article | NEG | negation |
| CND | conditional | NOM | nominative |
| COM | comitative | PAR | partitive |
| DEM | demonstrative | PP | perfective particle |
| DIM | diminutive | PRS | present |
| DU | dual | PST | past |
| ELA | elative | PTC | participle |
| ESS | essive | QUO | quotative |
| GEN | genitive | SUP | supine |
| ILL | illative | TRA | translative |

Abbreviations used in the text

| | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| DAM | differential argument marking |
| DOM | differential object marking |
| HK | assessment construction (Est. <i>hinnangukonstruktsioon</i>) |
| JTK | postposed attribute construction (Est. <i>järeltäiendikonstruktsioon</i>) |
| OK | object construction (Est. <i>objektikonstruktsioon</i>) |
| OT | optimality theory |
| OTLK | purpose construction (Est. <i>otstarbelausekonstruktsioon</i>) |
| OV | object-verb (word order) |
| TAK | translative adverbial construction (Est. <i>translatiivadverbiaaliga konstruktsioon</i>) |
| VO | verb-object (word order) |
| VP | verb phrase |

Corpus abbreviations

| | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EPL | Eesti Päevaleht 1995–2007 (http://www.cl.ut.ee/korpused/segakorpus/epl/index.php) |
| ETT | etTenTen (https://www.sketchengine.co.uk/ettenten-corpus/) |

REFERENCES

- Aarts, Bas 2006.** Conceptions of categorization in the history of linguistics. *Language Sciences* 28: 361–385.
- Aavik, Johannes 1936.** *Eesti õigekeelsuse õpik ja grammatika* [Textbook and Grammar of Correct Estonian]. Tartu: Noor-Eesti kirjastus.
- Aissen, Judith 2003.** Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21: 435–448.
- Amon, Marri 2015.** *Initial and final detachments in spoken Estonian: a study in the framework of information structuring*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Arkadiev, Peter M. 2013.** Marking of subjects and objects in Lithuanian non-finite clauses: a typological and diachronic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 17 (1): 397–437.
- Askonen, Ebba 2001.** *Objektin aspektuaalinen sijanvalinta* [Aspectual choice of object case]. Oulu: Oulun yliopiston suomen ja saamen kielen ja logopedian laitoksen julkaisuja.
- Bosson, Georg 1991.** Differential Object Marking in Romance and Beyond. In D. Wanner and D. Kibbee (eds.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Urbana-Champaign, April 7–9, 1988*, 143–170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Company, Concepción C. 2002.** Grammaticalization and category weakness. In Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 201–216. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Comrie, Bernard 1975.** The anti-ergative: Finland's answer to Basque. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 11: 112–121.
- Croft, William 2001.** *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dalrymple, Mary, Irina Nikolaeva 2011.** *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Hoop, Helen, Andrej Malchukov 2007.** On fluid differential case marking: a bidirectional OT approach. *Lingua* 117 (9): 1636–1656.
- de Hoop, Helen, Andrej Malchukov 2008.** Case-marking strategies. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 565–587.
- Ehala, Martin 2001.** Eesti keele baassõnajärjest [On the core word order of Estonian]. In R. Kasik (ed.), *Keele kannul: pühendusteos Mati Ereli 60. sünnipäevaks 12. märtsil 2001*, 24–41. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 2014.** The evolution of functional left peripheries in the Hungarian sentence. In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *The Evolution of Functional Left Peripheries in Hungarian Syntax*, 9–55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- EKK = Mati Ereli, Tiit Ereli, Kristiina Ross 2007.** *Eesti keele käsiraamat* [Handbook of Estonian]. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- EKSS = Eesti keele seletav sõnaraamat [Explanatory Dictionary of Estonian]. 1–6, 2009. „Eesti kirjakeele seletussõnaraamatu” 2., täiendatud ja parandatud trükk. Ed. Margit Langemets, Mai Tiits, Tiia Valdre, Leidi Veski, Ülle Viks, Piret Voll. Eesti Keele Instituut. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus. <http://www.eki.ee/dict/ekss/>.**
- Ereli, Mati 2006.** *Lause õigekeelsus. Juhatused ja harjutused* [Sentence grammar. Directions and exercises]. Tartu: Bookmill.
- Ereli, Mati 2012.** Keeldkõne vormidest [On negative imperative forms]. *Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat* 58 (1): 30–38.

- Erelt, Mati 2017.** Õeldis [Predicate]. In Mati Erelt, Helle Metslang (eds.), *Eesti keele süntaks [Syntax of Estonian]*, 93–239. (Eesti keele varamu III.) Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995.** *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2003.** Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7 (5): 219–224.
- Grünthal, W. 1941.** *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten yksikön nominatiivi objektin edustajana aktiivin yhteydessä: lauseopillinen tutkimuskoe [The nominative singular as an object form in the active voice in Finnic languages; a syntactic study]*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 218. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Guy, G.R. 1997.** Violable is variable: Optimality theory and linguistic variation. *Language Variation and Change* 9 (3): 333–347.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Fred Karlsson 1975.** Suomen akkusatiivi – funktionaalinen näkökulma [The Finnish accusative – a functional perspective]. *Virittäjä* 79 (4): 339–373.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, Irja Alho 2004.** *Iso suomen kielioppi [A Large Grammar of Finnish]*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hint, Helen, Tiina Nahkola, Renate Pajusalu 2017.** With or without articles? A comparison of article-like determiners in Estonian and Finnish. *Lähivõrdlusi. Lähivertailuja* 27: 65–106.
- Huomo, Tuomas 2009.** Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: The case of the Finnish object. *Journal of Linguistics* 46 (1): 83–125.
- Iemmolo, Giorgio 2013.** Symmetric and asymmetric alternations in direct object encoding. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 66 (4): 378–403.
- Jahnsson, A.W. 1871.** *Finska Språkets Satzlära. För Skolornas Behov [Finnish Syntax. For Schools]*. Helsinki.
- Kaalep, Heiki-Jaan, Kadri Muischnek 2002.** *Eesti kirjakeele sagedussõnastik [Frequency Dictionary of Standard Estonian]*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Karlsson, Fred 1999.** *Finnish: An Essential Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Kiparsky, Paul 1998.** Partitive case and aspect. In Miriam Butt and Willem Geuder (eds.) *The Projection of Arguments*, 265–307. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Kiparsky, Paul 2001.** Structural case in Finnish. *Lingua* 111: 315–376.
- Klumpp, Gerson 2012.** Differential Object Marking and Information Structure: On the Function of Two Different Pronominal Accusatives in Komi and Khanty Dialects. *ESUKA–JEFUL* 3 (1): 343–372.
- Kont, Karl 1963.** *Käändsõnaline objekt läänemeresoome keeltes [Declinable objects in Finnic languages]*. Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituudi uurimused IX. Tallinn: Eesti Riiklik Kirjastus.
- Künnap, Ago 2008.** On the Finnic and Samoyedic genitive and accusative plural. *Linguistica Uralica* 1: 34–40.
- Lees, Aet 2015.** *Case Alternations in Five Finnic Languages: Estonian, Finnish, Karelian, Livonian and Veps*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lindström, Liina 2004.** Sõnajärg lause tuumargumentide eristajana eesti keeles [Word order as a distinguisher of core arguments in Estonian]. In Liina Lindström (ed.), *Lauseliikmeid eesti keeles [On parts of speech in Estonian]*, 40–49. Tartu: University of Tartu.

- Lindström, Liina 2006.** Infostruktuuri osast eesti keele sõnajärje muutumisel [On the role of information structure in Estonian word order]. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 11: 875–888.
- MacWhinney, Brian, Andrej Malchukov & Edith Moravcsik (eds) 2014.** *Competing Motivations in Grammar and Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Metslang, Helle 2001.** On the developments of the Estonian aspect: the verbal particle *ära*. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: typology and contact. Volume 2, Grammar and typology*, 443–479. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Metslang, Helle 2017.** Sihitis [Object]. In Mati Ereht and Helle Metslang (eds.), *Eesti keele süntaks [Syntax of Estonian]*, 258–277. (Eesti keele varamu III.) Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Mihkla, Karl, Lehte Rannut, Elli Riikoja, Aino Admann 1974.** *Eesti keele lause-õpetuse põhijooned I. Lihtlause [Basics of Estonian syntax I. The simple sentence]*. Ed. Ernst Nurm. Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut. Tallinn: Valgus.
- Muischnek, Kadri 2006.** *Verbi ja noomeni püsühendid eesti keeles [Fixed verb-nominal combinations in Estonian]*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Ogren, David 2013.** *Objekti käändevalik da-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonides [The choice of object case in da-infinitive constructions]*. Tartu. Master's thesis. Manuscript in the Estonian language department of the University of Tartu. http://dspace.utlib.ee/dspace/bitstream/handle/10062/30857/Ogren_MAG2013.pdf (28.01.2018).
- ÕS 2013** = Ereht, Tiiu, Tiina Leemets, Sirje Mäearu, Maire Raadik 2013. *Eesti õigekeelsussõnaraamat ÕS 2013 [The Dictionary of Standard Estonian ÕS 2013]*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Penjam, Pille 2008.** *Eesti kirjakeele da- ja ma-infinitiiviga konstruktsioonid [da- and ma-infinitive constructions in Standard Estonian]*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Pihlak, Ants 1985a.** Eesti ühendverbid ja perifrastilised verbid aspektitähenduse väljendajana [Estonian phrasal and periphrastic verbs as expressers of aspectual meaning]. In Mati Ereht and Henno Rajandi (eds.), *Ars Grammatica 1985*, 62–93. Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia, Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut. Tallinn: Valgus.
- Pihlak, Ants 1985b.** Tähelepanekuid kursiivsusest ja terminatiivsusest eesti keeles [Observations on cursivity and terminativity in Estonian]. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 3: 149–158.
- Prince, Alan, Paul Smolensky 2004.** *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*. Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rajandi, Henno, Helle Metslang 1979.** *Määramata ja määratud objekt [Indefinite and definite object]*. Tallinn: Valgus.
- Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, Miguel 2007.** *The Syntax of Objects: Agree and Differential Object Marking*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Rätsep, Huno 1978.** *Eesti keele lihtlause tüübid [Estonian simple sentence types]*. Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Emakeele Seltsi toimetised 12. Tallinn: Valgus.
- Sahkai, Heete 2005.** Teonimi perifrastilises verbivormis [The verbal noun in periphrastic verb forms]. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 10: 790–807.
- Sahkai, Heete 2006.** Konstruktsioonipõhise keelekirjelduse võimalustest adessiivse viisi- ja põhjusemääruse näitel [On the possibilities of construction-based language description, on the example of the adessive manner and cause adverbial]. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 10: 816–831.

- Sahkai, Heete 2011.** Eesti keele genitiivse agendifraasi süntaks [The syntax of the Estonian genitive agent phrase]. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 1: 12–30.
- Schikowski, Robert 2013.** *Object-conditioned differential marking in Chintang and Nepali*. Ph.D thesis, University of Zurich, Faculty of Arts.
- Serdobolskaya, Natalia 2015.** Pseudoincorporation Analysis of Unmarked Direct Objects in Mari. In Olga Borik and Berit Gehrke (eds.), *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*, 296–328. Leiden, Brill.
- Sulkala, Helena 1996.** Expression of aspectual meanings in Finnish and Estonian. In Mati Ereht (ed.), *Typological Studies 1*, 165–225. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Tael, Kaja 1988.** *Sõnajärjemallid eesti keeles (võrrelduna soome keelega) [Word order patterns in Estonian (compared to Finnish)]*. Tallinn: TA Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.
- Tamm, Anne 2004.** *Relations between Estonian verbs, aspect, and case*. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.
- Tamm, Anne 2007.** Perfectivity, telicity and Estonian verbs. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 30 (2): 229–255.
- Tamm, Anne 2008.** Partitive Morphosemantics across Estonian Grammatical Categories, and Case Variation with Equi and Raising. In Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of LFG08*, 473–493. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Tamm, Anne 2012.** *Scalar Verb Classes. Scalarity, Thematic Roles, and Arguments in the Estonian Aspectual Lexicon*. Florence: Firenze University Press.
- Tamm, Anne 2014a.** *Case out of Place: Social cognitive aspects of language structure*. Habilitation thesis. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.
- Tamm, Anne 2014b.** Cross-categorical scalar properties explaining Differential Object Marking. *Linguistics* 52 (2): 469–511.
- Tauli, Valter 1968.** Totaalobjekt eesti kirjakeeles [The total object in Standard Estonian]. In *Juhlakirja Lauri Postin kuusikymmenvuotispäiväksi*, 216–224. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura.
- Tauli, Valter 1980.** *Eesti grammatika. II: lauseõpetus [Estonian grammar. II: syntax]*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Taylor, John R. 2008.** Prototypes in cognitive linguistics. In Peter Robinson and Nick C. Ellis (eds.), *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*, 39–65. New York: Routledge.
- Tveite, Tor 2004.** *The case of the object in Livonian. A corpus based study*. Castreianumin toimitteita 62. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Vainikka, Anne, Joan Maling 1996.** Is partitive case inherent or structural? In Jack Hoeksema (ed.), *Partitives: Studies in the syntax and semantics of partitive and related constructions*, 179–208. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vendler, Zeno 1967.** *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena, Ilja A. Seržant 2017.** Differential argument marking: Patterns of variation. In I. A. Seržant & A. Witzlack-Makarevich (eds.), *Diachrony of differential argument marking*, 1–49. [Studies in Diversity Linguistics]. Berlin: Language Science Press.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: David Ogren
Date of birth: 31.01.1985
Citizenship: United States of America
Address: Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics,
University of Tartu
Jakobi 2, 51014 Tartu
E-mail: david.ogren@ut.ee

Education:
2013–2018 University of Tartu, PhD student (Estonian and Finno-Ugric linguistics)
2011–2013 University of Tartu, MA (Estonian and Finno-Ugric linguistics), *cum laude*
2003–2007 Arizona State University, BA (English language and linguistics), *cum laude*
1999–2003 Fairview High School, Boulder, CO, USA
1996–1999 Southern Hills Middle School, Boulder, CO, USA
1991–1996 Mesa Elementary School, Boulder, CO, USA

Professional experience:

2017– University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, junior researcher
2013– University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, junior researcher
2007–2011 IAB Centre, Yerevan, Armenia, English language coordinator and teacher

ELULOOKIRJELDUS

Nimi: David Ogren
Sünniaeg: 31.01.1985
Kodakondsus: Ameerika Ühendriigid
Aadress: Tartu Ülikooli eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut
Jakobi 2, 51014 Tartu
E-post: david.ogren@ut.ee

Haridustee:

2013–2018 Tartu Ülikool, doktorantuur (eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteadus)
2011–2013 Tartu Ülikool, MA (eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteadus), *cum laude*
2003–2007 Arizona State University, BA (inglise keel ja keeleteadus), *cum laude*
1999–2003 Fairview High School, Boulder, CO, USA
1996–1999 Southern Hills Middle School, Boulder, CO, USA
1991–1996 Mesa Elementary School, Boulder, CO, USA

Teenistuskäik:

2017– Tartu Ülikool, eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut, nooremteadur
2013 Tartu Ülikool, eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut, nooremteadur
2007–2011 IAB Centre, Jerevan, Armeenia, inglise keele osakonna koordinaator ja õpetaja

DISSERTATIONES PHILOLOGIAE ESTONICAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

1. **Ülle Viks.** Eesti keele klassifikatoorne morfoloogia. Tartu, 1994.
2. **Helmi Neetar.** Deverbaalne nominaaltuletus eesti murretes. Tartu, 1994.
3. **Ülo Valk.** Eesti rahvausu kuradi-kujutelm. Tartu, 1994.
4. **Arvo Eek.** Studies on quantity and stress in Estonian. Tartu, 1994.
5. **Reet Kasik.** Verbid ja verbaalsubstantiivid tänapäeva eesti keeles. Tartu, 1994.
6. **Silvi Vare.** Nimi- ja omadussõnatuletus tänapäeva eesti kirjakeeles. Tartu, 1994.
7. **Heiki-Jaan Kaalep.** Eesti keele ressursside loomine ja kasutamine keele- tehnoloogilises arendustöös. Tartu, 1998.
8. **Renate Pajusalu.** Deiktikud eesti keeles. Tartu, 1999.
9. **Vilja Oja.** Linguistic studies of Estonian colour terminology. Tartu, 2001.
10. **Külli Habicht.** Eesti vanema kirjakeele leksikaalsest ja morfosüntaktilisest arengust ning Heinrich Stahli keele eripärast selle taustal. Tartu, 2001.
11. **Pire Teras.** Lõunaeesti vokaalisüsteem: Võru pikkade vokaalide kvaliteedi muutumine. Tartu, 2003.
12. **Merike Parve.** Välted lõunaeesti murretes. Tartu, 2003.
13. **Toomas Help.** Sõnakeskne keelemudel: Eesti regulaarne ja irregulaarne verb. Tartu, 2004.
14. **Heli Laanekask.** Eesti kirjakeele kujunemine ja kujundamine 16.–19. sajandil. Tartu, 2004.
15. **Peeter Päll.** Võõrnimed eestikeelses tekstis. Tartu, 2005.
16. **Liina Lindström.** Finiitverbi asend lauses. Sõnajärg ja seda mõjutavad tegurid suulises eesti keeles. Tartu, 2005.
17. **Kadri Muischnek.** Verbi ja noomeni püsiühendid eesti keeles. Tartu, 2006.
18. **Kanni Labi.** Eesti regilaulude verbisemantika. Tartu, 2006.
19. **Raili Pool.** Eesti keele teise keelena omandamise seaduspärasusi täis- ja osasihitise näitel. Tartu, 2007.
20. **Sulev Iva.** Võru kirjakeele sõnamuutmissüsteem. Tartu, 2007.
21. **Arvi Tavast.** The translator is human too: a case for instrumentalism in multilingual specialised communication. Tartu, 2008.
22. **Evar Saar.** Võrumaa kohanimede analüüs enamlevinud nimeosade põhjal ja traditsioonilise kogukonna nimesüsteem. Tartu, 2008.
23. **Pille Penjam.** Eesti kirjakeele *da-* ja *ma-*infinitiiviga konstruktsioonid. Tartu, 2008.
24. **Kristiina Praakli.** Esimese põlvkonna Soome eestlaste kakskeelne keelekasutus ja koodikopeerimine. Tartu, 2009.
25. **Mari Mets.** Suhtlusvõrgustikud reaalajas: võru kõnekeele varieerumine kahes Võrumaa külas. Tartu, 2010.

26. **Karen Kuldnook.** Militaarne retoorika. Argumentatsioon ja keeleline mõjutamine Eesti kaitsepoliitilises diskursuses. Tartu, 2011.
27. **Kai Tafenau.** Uue Testamendi tõlkimisest Rootsi ajal: käsikirjad, tõlkijad ja eesti kirjakeel. Tartu, 2011.
28. **Küllil Prillop.** Optimaalsusteoreetiline käsitlus eesti keele fonoloogilisest kujunemisest. Tartu, 2011, 261 lk.
29. **Pärtel Lippus.** The acoustic features and perception of the Estonian quantity system, Tartu, 2011, 146 p.
30. **Lya Meister.** Eesti vokaali- ja kestuskategooriad vene emakeelega keelejuhtide tajus ja häälduses. Eksperimentaalfoneetiline uurimus. Tartu, 2011, 145 lk.
31. **Kersti Lepajõe.** Kirjand kui tekstiliik. Riigieksamikirjandite tekstuaalsed, retoorilised ja diskursiivsed omadused. Tartu, 2011, 141 lk.
32. **Tiit Hennoste.** Grammatiliste vormide seoseid suhtlustegevustega eesti-keelses suulises vestluses. Tartu, 2013, 236 lk.
33. **Helena Metslang.** Grammatical relations in Estonian: subject, object and beyond. Tartu, 2013, 443 p.
34. **Kristel Uiboed.** Verbiühendid eesti murretes. Tartu, 2013, 227 lk.
35. **Helen Plado.** Kausaalsuhete adverbiallaused eesti keeles. Tartu, 2013, 244 lk.
36. **Annika Küngas.** Pragmatiliste markerite kujunemine ja funktsioonid eesti keeles *lt*-sõnade näitel. Tartu, 2014, 200 lk.
37. **Maarika Teral.** Arvutipõhine eesti keele õpe: vahendid ja hinnangud nende efektiivsusele Tartu ülikooli keelekursuste näitel. Tartu, 2015, 175 lk.
38. **Anni Jürine.** The development of complex postpositions in Estonian: a case of grammaticalization via lexicalization. Tartu, 2016, 315 p.
39. **Kairi Tamuri.** Basic emotions in read Estonian speech: acoustic analysis and modelling. Tartu, 2017, 238 p.
40. **Sven-Erik Soosaar.** Eesti keele kultuursõnavara arenguhooni – eesti keel kui piirikeel. Tartu, 2017, 157 p.