

Abstract:

Komi-Permyak (Permic < Uralic) lacks differential object agreement but shows differential object marking. While personal pronouns take the accusative form (e.g. *menö* 'me'), nominal direct objects can either be unmarked or have the accusative (-ös) or the possessive-accusative (-sö for 3Sg) case suffix. Batalova (1975, 2002) assumes that the distinction is based on animacy properties, since inanimate direct objects are unmarked as opposed to marked animate ones.

In this talk, I will argue against this claim using novel elicited and corpus data and will show that definiteness of the object has a more important role in this variation. Following Klumpp's (2014) analysis based on the Kosa-Kama dialect, I will focus on identifiability properties of direct objects as well. In addition to typical transitive clauses, I will also provide data about ditransitives and causative constructions and have a brief overview on the non-possessive functions of possessive suffixes in the language.