

## **Differential object marking in contact-influenced Russian Speech: evidence from the Corpus of Contact-influenced Russian Speech of Russian Far East and Northern Siberia<sup>12</sup>**

Natalia Stoynova, [stoynova@yandex.ru](mailto:stoynova@yandex.ru)

Vinogradov Russian Language Institute, RAS; Moscow, Russia

**Abstract:** The paper deals with differential object marking in the Russian Speech of Nanai-Russian bilingual speakers, namely the variation such as *принес рыбу* ~ *принес рыба* ('{he} brought fish-acc ~ fish-nom'). The puzzle is that this peculiarity can result from a number of different processes: morphosyntactic borrowing from Nanai, penetration of dialectal features into the speech of bilinguals, under-acquisition or reinterpretation of the Standard Russian system. The data of a small corpus of contact-influenced Russian Speech is used to test all these hypotheses. The results are following. Nominative forms are used in DO-position in quite a systematic way and such uses cannot be estimated as occasional "errors". The main factors that influence the NOM~ACC distribution are a) information structure and b) the accentual type of noun stem. The latter fact supports the hypothesis of a systematic reinterpretation of the Standard Russian system in the situation of incomplete acquisition. No significant correlations with animacy, definiteness, verb form and word order were attested. DOM pattern of Nanai Russian differs from those of Russian dialects and reveals some similarity to those of Nanai. However it cannot be considered as a full morphosyntactic calque.

**Key words:** Russian, differential object marking, corpus linguistics, language contact

### **Дифференцированное маркирование объекта в контактно-обусловленной русской речи: данные Корпуса контактно-обусловленной русской речи Севера Сибири и Дальнего Востока**

Наталья Марковна Стойнова, [stoynova@yandex.ru](mailto:stoynova@yandex.ru)

Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова, РАН; Москва, Россия

**Аннотация:** В докладе рассматриваются случаи дифференцированного маркирования объекта, характерные для русской речи русско-нанайских билингвов, ср. конкурирующие структуры вроде *принес рыбу* ~ *принес рыба*. Эти случаи интересны тем, что не до конца понятно, чем они мотивированы:

---

<sup>1</sup> The research was conducted with support of RSF grant No. 17-18-01649 (Dynamics of language contact in the circumpolar region).

<sup>2</sup> Many thanks to my colleagues S. Oskolskaya, I. Khomchenkova, P. Pleshak and A. Shluinsky, to my Nanai-speaking consultants, especially to VSG and to the anonymous reviewers of "Dialogue-2018".

непосредственным влиянием первого языка (нанайского), неполным усвоением русского или явлениями неконтактной природы — диалектными особенностями локальной разновидности русского языка. Для исследования этого вопроса привлекаются данные создаваемого нами небольшого корпуса контактно-обусловленной русской речи. Эти данные обнаруживают следующую картину. Система DOM в нанайском русском кажется достаточно последовательной. Основными факторами, регулирующими выбор между номинативом и аккузативом в прямообъектной позиции оказываются информационная структура и акцентный тип основы. Последнее можно считать аргументом в пользу гипотезы о системной реинтерпретации русской системы в условиях неполного усвоения языка. Не обнаружено значимых корреляций с одушевленностью, определенностью, порядком слов, формой вершинного предиката. Система DOM в нанайском русском заметно отличается от представленной в русских диалектах (что не позволяет принять гипотезу о диалектном субстрате) и обнаруживает сходство с системой, представленной в нанайском языке (однако оно не достаточно для того, чтобы считать этот случай чистым случаем прямого морфосинтаксического калькирования).

Ключевые слова: русский язык, корпусная лингвистика, языковые контакты, грамматическая интерференция, дифференцированное маркирование объекта

## ***0. Introduction***

The paper has two main goals. The first goal is to present an ongoing project of creating a corpus of Contact-influenced Russian Speech of Russian Far East and Northern Siberia. The second goal is to show how the data of the corpus can be used in order to draw the borderline between a true grammatical interference and peculiarities of other origin attested in the Russian Speech of bilinguals.

The corpus of contact-influenced Russian Speech contains by the moment ca. 20 hours of oral speech (mostly narratives) of bilingual speakers of Samoyedic and Tungusic languages. The texts are transcribed in standard Russian orthography and supplied with a morphological annotation and a manual annotation of grammatical peculiarities.

The case study presented in the paper deals with differential object marking (DOM) attested in texts of the corpus. Some of bilingual speakers (both speakers of Samoyedic and Tungusic) widely use nominative in Direct Object position, as in (1), as well as the expected accusative, as in (2):<sup>3</sup>

(1) *Рыба* сдаем/ (NOM)

(2) То плохую *рыбу* принесла — чо\ там, собакам\ буду варить (ACC)

---

<sup>3</sup> Similar patterns of DOM are attested also in other contact-influenced varieties of Russian, cf. Daniel et al. 2010: 81 on Daghestanian Russian. However it is not evident that all such cases are in fact of the same nature. E.g. in this paper the pattern is analyzed as “quasi-ergativity” (the result of the interference with the ergative alignment of Nakh-Daghestanian L1’s).

At first glance, 1) Nominative and Accusative are used as free variants with no strict distribution, 2) the predisposition to Nominative forms in DO-position varies greatly across languages in contact and across individual speakers, so the general picture seems to be chaotic.

This is why an investigation of this feature should be a) held based on a text corpus (as large as possible by the moment), b) started by an analysis of particular idiolectal sub-systems.

In this paper I present an analysis of detailed data recorded from only one speaker. This speaker (VSG, 1931, the village of Kharpichan, Khabarovsk Krai) is fluent both in Nanai (Southern Tungusic) and in Russian; she learnt Russian at school (3 years) and now uses mostly Russian in her everyday life. Her Russian Speech reveals lots of deviations from Standard Russian which are presumably contact-induced. I analyze the full sample of DOs attested in her speech (see 2.3 below). The term “Nanai Russian Speech” is used in this paper for the Russian Speech of VSG.

This approach encompasses some general problems of extremely small fieldwork text collections (cf. Ostler 2008; Cox 2011; Mosel 2014; Vinogradov 2016 among others). Such collections are not as well-balanced and representative as standard large text corpora. However this is often the only type of text data available. There are two main risks in the case under discussion. First, the results of a study on one-speaker-corpus cannot be extrapolated with confidence to all patterns of speech of Nanai-Russian bilinguals. Second, in such a small text sample the quantitative analysis may be biased by particular genres, particular texts and particular lexical items, used in these texts. In this study I will not test the reliability of my data. However, having taken into account these risks. I will try to estimate if such data can give any plausible results.

The nature of DOM in Nanai Russian Speech is not self-evident. The following hypotheses can be proposed.

- 1) It may be a direct morphosyntactic calque (pattern-borrowing) from Nanai.
- 2) It may be a result of under-acquisition of the Russian case system by bilingual speakers with no clear prototype in their L1.
- 3) It may be not of a contact nature at all: similar syntactic patterns are attested in non-contact Russian dialectal varieties.

Finally, all these potential sources of DOM may play a role and interact with one another.

## ***1. Preliminary remarks on DOM***

### **1.1. Cross-linguistic expectations for DOM**

Differential object marking (DOM) is a situation in which a direct object (DO) can be marked with two or more competing forms. It is very widespread across languages of the world and well-studied in a cross-linguistic perspective (cf. Bossong 1985; Aissen

2003; Malchukov, de Swart 2009; Witzlack-Makarevich, Seržant 2017 among many others).

The choice between competing forms can be strict or not (split DOM vs. fluid DOM, Malchukov, de Swart 2009). Competing forms can be both equally marked (symmetric DOM), however the case where one of them is unmarked (asymmetric DOM) is quite typical. The choice can be regulated by inherent or contextual properties of the direct object itself vs. by features of the predicate (argument-triggered DOM vs. predicate-triggered DOM, Witzlack-Makarevich, Seržant 2017). In particular, the following factors can be relevant.

a) Inherent semantic features of the direct object, such as human vs. non-human, animacy, uniqueness, discreteness; splits are expected to follow the Silverstein's hierarchy or similar hierarchies:

(3) personal pronouns > proper names > humans > animals > inanimate objects (Silverstein 1976)

b) Definiteness and specificity (referential properties) of direct the object; splits are expected to follow the hierarchy of definiteness:

(4) definite objects > specific indefinite objects > non-specific indefinite objects

c) Information structure (cf. Dalrymple, Nikolaeva 2011; Iemmolo 2010 for the discussion).

d) Such features of the head predicate as finiteness, TAM, polarity and others.

The theoretical discussion on DOM focuses mainly on its possible functional motivations. DOM is considered either as a way to signal the semantic features of direct object themselves (indexing function of DOM) or as a way to disambiguate between the direct object and the subject within the clause (differentiating function of DOM), cf. e.g. Malchukov 2008.

An attempt to involve the data of bilingual speech can bring a new dimension to the discussion. In this case additional motivations to follow the pattern of L1 or to reanalyze the system of L2 is added.

## 1.2. DOM in Nanai

DOM is attested in Nanai (the first language of the speaker under discussion, VSG). Dedicated accusative forms with the marker *-wA~-bA* compete with nominative (unmarked) forms in DO-position. The choice is not strict (fluid DOM). The following factors are relevant for the choice between nominative vs. accusative marking of DO.

1) Definiteness and specificity: NOM is more frequent for indefinite specific objects and especially for indefinite non-specific ones.

2) Information structure: NOM is less frequent with the topic marker *=tAni*.

3) Number: NOM is less frequent for objects with the plural marker (presumably due to formal rather than semantic reasons).

4) Phonetic context: NOM is more frequent in the context of words on *wA-* (which are phonetically similar to the accusative affix).

For more detail see Avrorin 1948: 223–233 and Oskolskaya, Stoynova 2017.

### 1.3. DOM in Russian dialects

One more potential source of non-standard marking of direct object in Nanai Russian is dialectal substrate. So called “nominative object constructions”, as in (5), are attested in some Russian dialects, cf. Markova 1989; Ron’ko 2017 among others.

(5) Вам только гроб сделать да яма выкопать. [Свадьба (Архангельская область, 1994), RNC<sup>4</sup>]

As Ron’ko (2017) points out,

1) This feature is attested in different dialectal groups; it is especially characteristic for Northern dialects, however not only for them.

2) The main context for nominative objects are infinitive constructions (such as in (5)), to a lesser extent they are also used in finite clauses.

3) The choice between NOM and ACC is free, however NOM is more frequent (at least in Northern dialects):

a) for indefinite objects and especially for non-specific ones;

b) for foci, rather than for topics;

c) for objects of clauses with OV word order.

A reason to suspect a non-contact nature of DOM in the Russian Speech of VSG (and in Nanai Russian in general) is the presence of other dialectal or regional features in her Russian Speech. Currently I have not enough data to attribute these features with confidence to a specific dialect group, they can be of a mixed nature. See examples of: a) lexical dialectal features: *мамка*, *папка*, *маленько*; b) phonetic ones: [o] in unstressed syllables<sup>5</sup>; c) morphosyntactic ones: the genitive forms of pronouns *мене*, *тебе* (instead of *меня*, *тебя*), the preposition *с* instead of *из* (*с Москвы*).

VSG was born and spent her childhood in the village of Kondon (the settlement of Sorgolj), Solnechnyj District. There she acquired Russian at school-age. I have no clear data on the Russian input of VSG (1931) and her age-mates from the area. In the 1930s, the village was inhabited almost only by Nanai people. Contacts with Russians were not intensive in the first half of 20<sup>th</sup> century. The closest large Russian village was Nizhnjaja Tambovka, inhabited since the middle of 19<sup>th</sup> century by colonists from Tambov province. The first Russian teachers of Kondon’s school (opened in 1902) were from this village. In the 1930s a group of Russian Communist party activists (so called

---

<sup>4</sup> www.ruscorpora.ru.

<sup>5</sup> It can be however not dialectal “okanje”, but phonetic interference with Nanai which has no such type of vowel reduction, as Standard Russian.

“Krasnaja Jurta”) worked in Kondon. The active invasion of Russians from all over the country into the area near Kondon began in the end of the 1930s. In 1938, the construction of Baikal-Amur Mainline started not far from Kondon. At the same time, in 5-10 kilometers from Kondon a subdivision of the Gulag camp (“NizhAmurLag”) was settled (nowadays, the village of Kharpichan where VSG lives now).

Given this background, an intensive influence of Northern Russian dialects is hardly probable. Still, traces of other dialects (or of a mixture of dialects) are possible.

Below I address the data on Russian dialects as comparative well-studied data on a similar DOM strategy rather than as a possible source of the pattern under discussion.

## 2. The system of DOM in Nanai Russian

### 2.1. Nominative in DO-position among other non-standard uses of Nominative

The use in DO-position is not the only (though the most frequent) non-standard use of Nominative attested in Nanai Russian Speech. Nominative is also used in the text sample:

- a) in a numeral phrase;
- b) in a possessive construction for the possessor;
- c) for noun attributes;
- d) in a preposition phrase (mostly with prepositions that take Genitive in Standard Russian);
- e) in the negative existential construction;
- f) rarely, in a verbal argument position where cases other than Accusative or PPs are used in Standard Russian. Presumably these uses are driven by a non-standard information structure.

In the majority of the listed non-standard uses Nominative corresponds to Genitive in Standard Russian and to Nominative (or rather to the unmarked form) in Nanai.

Table 1 shows the frequencies of different types of uses, the list of correspondences in Standard Russian and in Nanai and examples.

**Table 1. Different non-standard uses of Nominative in Nanai Russian Speech**

	% (N)	in Standard Russian	in Nanai	example
<b>DO</b>	48% (39)	acc	acc~nom	<i>рыба сдаем</i>
<b>num phrase</b>	16% (13)	gen	nom	<i>три доска</i>
<b>PP</b>	10% (8)	<i>без, от, мимо, после</i> + gen, no +	nom	<i>мимо бабушка \ иду</i>

		dat		
<b>possessor</b>	7% (6)	gen	nom	<i>кета шкурой</i>
<b>exneg</b>	7% (6)	gen	nom	<i>краснота нету</i>
<b>attribute</b>	2% (2)	different	nom	<i>апрель месяце</i>
<b>other uses, presumably motivated by information structure</b>	9% (7)	different	different	<i>Крапива мы огород\ удобряем  Этот март рак\ она умерла</i>
<b>total</b>	100% (81)			

## 2.2. DOM in Nanai Russian compared to the Standard Russian system

Animacy distinction expressed within the case system of Standard Russian can be also interpreted as a case of DOM, but it differs significantly from what is observed in Nanai Russian Speech. Unlike Nanai Russian, in Modern Standard Russian:

- 1) there is no free variation, but there is a strict split, conditioned by animacy only (ACC=NOM for inanimate nouns, ACC=GEN for animate nouns).
- 2) The split is relevant only for a part of noun paradigm, namely for plural stems and for masculine singular zero-stems.
- 3) This is a morphological split in case marking rather than a syntactic one: the accusative form is equal to NOM~GEN not only in DO-position, but also in other contexts typical of the accusative case in Russian, including prepositional phrases.

**Table 2. DO-marking: Nanai Russian vs. Standard Russian**

	<b>Standard Russian</b>	<b>Nanai Russian</b>
<b>inanimate pl</b>	=NOM ( <i>вижу столы</i> )	NOM
<b>animate pl</b>	=GEN ( <i>вижу слонов</i> )	GEN~NOM
<b>inanimate 0-stems sg</b>	=NOM ( <i>вижу стол</i> )	NOM

<b>animate 0-stems sg</b>	=GEN ( <i>вижу слона</i> )	GEN~NOM
<b>o-stems sg</b>	=NOM ( <i>вижу окно / чудовище</i> )	NOM
<b>0-stems feminine sg</b>	=NOM ( <i>вижу мать / печь</i> )	NOM
<b>a-stems sg</b>	ACC ( <i>вижу маму / печку</i> )	ACC~NOM

As shown in Table 2, a) the Nanai Russian data of our sample form quite a consistent system, b) this system retains the distinction attested in Standard Russian. It can be described as the Standard Russian system complicated with an additional option of the nominative marking for all morphological types of stems:

- (6) Standard Russian: NOM => Nanai Russian: NOM  
 Standard Russian: GEN/ACC => Nanai Russian: GEN/ACC~NOM as free variants

So we cannot consider the data of Nanai Russian as an evidence for chaotic erosion of Standard Russian animacy-driven split in bilinguals' speech. In particular, we do not attest genitive-like forms or dedicated accusative ones in the contexts in which nominative-like forms are expected in Standard Russian. Only one such example is attested (7).

- (7) А у них *матери* / <=мать> давно хоронили/

The genitive-like form *матери* instead of the expected nominative-like *мать* can be interpreted here as the case of overgeneralization of semantic animacy-split to the non-appropriate morphological stem types. However this example is unique<sup>6</sup>. In outline, the Nanai System copies consistently not only the semantic distinction attested in Standard Russian, but also the formal split between different stem types.

### 2.3. The sample of DO-contexts

Taking into account the general picture presented in Table 2, in the remaining part of the paper I analyze only stems for which free variation between nominative forms and dedicated accusative or genitive ones is potentially expected in the Nanai Russian system (i.e. for which the accusative form in Standard Russian is not nominative-like), namely:

---

<sup>6</sup> In fact there are also some less clear examples with 0-stems masculine, such as the following one: *Мы один раз нашли/ сундука*. Here it is not evident if we deal with Genitive (with untypical stress position, *сундука́* is expected) or with a phonetic variant of Nominative (conditioned by a more general tendency to open final syllables in Nanai). The second option seems to be more probable, because the same forms are also attested as subjects (*стоит сундука*).



- a-stems singular (both animate and inanimate);
- 0-stems singular, animate;
- plural stems, animate.

My corpus of the speech of VSG (15 texts, 1601 clauses, 1 h. 15 min.) gives a sample of 94 examples. All of them are examples of the stems used in DO-position (in Nominative or in Accusative<sup>7</sup>). All other stems in DO-position (for which the Nominative-like form is the only option in DO-position both in Nanai Russian and in Standard Russian) were excluded from the sample<sup>8</sup>.

### 3. *NOM~ACC variation in DO-position: relevant factors*

#### 3.1. Animacy and definiteness: irrelevant

Semantic features of object which are expected to trigger the choice between different DO markers in languages of the world do not reveal any statistically significant correlations with NOM~ACC marking in our Nanai Russian data. In particular, the parameters that are relevant for DOM in Nanai and in Northern Russian dialects do not play any role in the Nanai Russian system.

##### 3.1.1. Animacy, human vs. non-human distinction

Nanai Russian follows the same animacy distinction as Standard Russian (see 2.2). However there are no statistical correlations with animacy scale (cf. 1.1 above) within the pool of NOM~ACC free variation.

Table 3 presents the distribution of different types of objects on animacy scale for a-stems (for all other types the variation is possible only for animate objects, see above). The slight differences between NOMs and ACCs are not statistically significant.

**Table 3. NOM~ACC variation and animacy: a-stems**

	<b>nom</b>	<b>acc</b>
<b>inanimates</b>	78% (21)	73% (24)
<b>animal/product (fish)<sup>9</sup></b>	11% (3)	9% (3)

<sup>7</sup> Further I refer both to dedicated accusative forms (for a-stems) and genitive-like forms (for 0-stems and plural stems) as “Accusative” (ACC).

<sup>8</sup> The following contexts were also excluded: a) numeral phrases in DO-position; b) negative contexts (because of the possible contamination with the Genitive-of-Negation construction).

<sup>9</sup> The uses of the word *рыба* ‘fish’ which is used in two senses (“animal” and “inanimate”, fish-meal) and which is very frequent in our texts were counted separately.

<b>animals</b>	0% (0)	9% (3)
<b>collectives</b>	4% (1)	0% (0)
<b>humans</b>	7% (2)	0% (0)
<b>proper names (human)</b>	0% (0)	9% (3)
<b>total</b>	100% (27)	100% (33)

Table 4 contains the data on distribution between animals and humans for all inflection types. There is no significant correlation either.

**Table 4. NOM~ACC variation and human/non-human distinction: all stems**

	<b>nom</b>	<b>acc</b>
<b>animals</b>	31% (4)	27% (4)
<b>humans</b>	69% (9)	73% (11)
<b>total</b>	100% (13)	100% (15)

### 3.1.2. Definiteness, specificity

Definiteness and specificity of the object do not play a role either. Table 5 shows that the proportions of non-specific indefinites and of specific indefinites are slightly larger for NOMs than for ACCs, however this difference is not statistically significant. Cf. example (8) with the definite object marked by NOM:

(8) Она же снимает/ эта берёста

**Table 5. NOM~ACC variation and definiteness**

	<b>nom</b>	<b>acc</b>	<b>2-tailed exact Fisher test</b>
<b>definite</b>	34% (14)	48% (24)	ns, p=0,2057
<b>specific indefinite</b>	17% (7)	12% (6)	
<b>non-specific</b>	49% (20)	40% (20)	ns, p=0,5246

<b>indefinite</b>			
<b>total</b>	100% (41)	100%( 50)	

### 3.2. Predicate form: irrelevant

Unlike nominative objects in Russian dialects those of Nanai Russian have no predisposition towards infinitive clauses. There are only two such examples in our sample, cf. (9).

(9) Вот *такая* сделать/ на доски — три ряд\.

### 3.3. Word order and information structure

Table 6 shows the word order distribution in clauses with Nominative vs. Accusative objects. Cf. examples (10) and (11) with NOM:

(10) *Полный нарта* нагрузили/ тащили (OV)

(11) Берет опять *газета*/ (VO)

The percentage of OV-uses is a bit higher for NOMs than for ACCs (like in Russian Northern dialects), but the difference is not significant.

**Table 6. NOM~ACC variation and word order**

	<b>nom</b>	<b>acc</b>	<b>2-tailed exact Fisher test</b>
<b>OV</b>	68% (26)	50% (23)	p=0,1201, ns
<b>VO</b>	32% (12)	50% (23)	

The data on general distribution of topics / foci is not significant either, see Table 7.

**Table 7. NOM~ACC variation and information structure: % of focused objects**

	<b>nom</b>	<b>acc</b>	<b>2-tailed exact Fisher test</b>
<b>topic</b>	33% (13)	50% (23)	p=0,1270, ns

<b>focus</b>	67% (27)	50% (23)	
--------------	----------	----------	--

Still, a significant trend to Nominative marking is attested with the more subtle class of left-dislocated objects in focus position, as in (12). See Table 8.

(12) Этой кричит\ так: Оооо\! Это значит медведь<sub>foc</sub>\ дед везет<sub>foc</sub>

**Table 8. NOM~ACC variation and information structure: % of objects in left-dislocated focus position**

	<b>nom</b>	<b>acc</b>	<b>2-tailed exact Fisher test</b>
<b>left-dislocated foci</b>	39% (16)	18% (9)	p=0,0340
<b>others</b>	61% (25)	82% (41)	

Notably, indirect objects can be also marked by NOM in clauses with a non-standard information structure (though to a lesser extent), as mentioned above (2.1). This is an argument for possible interpretation of this DOM pattern as a part of more general syntactic strategy of information structure marking.

#### 3.4. Formal features: inflection type

Factors which are the most relevant for the choice between NOM vs. ACC in DO-position are morphological and not semantic. This is a possible argument for the hypothesis of under-acquisition of the Standard Russian system.

There is not enough data to postulate a correlation of DOM with a declension type (a-stems singular vs. 0-stems singular vs. plural stems), as shown in Table 9.

**Table 9. NOM~ACC variation and declension type**

	<b>nom</b>	<b>acc</b>
<b>a-stems sg</b>	27	33
<b>plural stems</b>	5	7
<b>0-stems masc. sg</b>	7	0-2?

Still, a significant correlation with accentual types is attested within the most numerous a-stem class. The stems that have stress on the case affixes in ACC and in NOM (*eθ-a*, *eθ-y*) or at least in one of these forms (*zɔlov-a*, *zɔlov-y*) tend to take ACC in DO position. The stems with unstressed case affixes in ACC and NOM (*pɣ̄b-a*, *pɣ̄b-y*) tend to take NOM. See Table 10.

**Table 10. NOM-ACC variation and accentual type: a-stems**

	<b>nom</b>	<b>acc</b>	2-tailed Fisher test	exact
<b>case-affix unstressed</b>	89% (24)	61% (20)	p=0,0189	
<b>case-affix stressed</b>	11% (3)	39% (13)		

This rule can be reformulated in a following way. The stems with a higher degree of perceptive distinctiveness between NOM and ACC save the same opposition as in Standard Russian. The stems with a lower degree of perceptive distinctiveness between NOM and ACC lose the opposition between these forms in the under-acquired system of bilingual speakers, so the expansion of Nominative in DO-position is attested for the second type stems, rather than for the first type.

#### **4. Discussion**

Differential object marking attested in the Russian Speech of Nanai-Russian bilingual speakers presumably can have the following potential sources:

- a) DOM pattern in Nanai;
- b) DOM pattern in dialectal substrate of the local Russian variety;
- c) incomplete acquisition of Standard Russian system among bilingual speakers.

Table 11 shows the results of detailed comparison of factors relevant for DOM in Nanai Russian with those relevant for DOM in Nanai and in Russian dialects.

**Table 11. DOM in Nanai Russian, in Nanai and in Russian dialects**

	<b>Nanai Russian</b>	<b>Nanai (Oskolskaya, Stoynova 2017)</b>	<b>Russian Northern Dialects (Ron'ko 2017)</b>
<b>% of NOM's in DO-position</b>	44% (in competing	52%	?

	contexts)		
<b>animacy</b>	-	-	+ (inanimate)
<b>definiteness</b>	-	+ (indefiniteness)	+
<b>word order</b>	+/- (left- dislocated focus)	-	+ (OV)
<b>information structure</b>	+ (left- dislocated focus)	+ (-topic)	+ (focus)
<b>predicate form</b>	-	-	+ (infinitives)
<b>inflection type</b>	+ (accentual type)	0	?

The following conclusions can be made.

1) DOM pattern in Nanai Russian is not similar to the pattern attested in Russian dialects. The most sufficient structural difference is that in Nanai Russian DOM has no connection to infinitival constructions. At the same time there are no evident historical preconditions for such influence. So we estimate this potential source as very dubious.

2) DOM pattern in Nanai Russian reveals more similarity with the one attested in Nanai. However a) this similarity concerns the parameters which are not specific for Nanai, but rather typical of DOM in the languages of the world; b) DOM pattern in Nanai Russian has features which have no parallels in Nanai (cf. the correlation with morphological type of stem). So the morphosyntactic borrowing from Nanai can be estimated as one of sources of DOM in Nanai Russian, but not as the only one.

3) The hypothesis of incomplete acquisition seems to be probable. This is not the case of a chaotic set of occasional “errors” in L2 in the process of learning. The data we deal with present a rather clear consistent stable system. Moreover, this non-standard variety of Russian is near-native for VSG and nowadays it is her dominant language. So it is more accurate to describe the case as non-standard acquisition, rather than incomplete one. One can assume that the DOM pattern in Nanai Russian emerges as a systematic reinterpretation of the Standard Russian system in the specific situation of language contact and a lack of L2 input.

- a) Optional Nominative marking is added to the Standard Russian split Accusative marking system without breaking the initial system. This option itself can be interpreted as a result of a direct Nanai influence.
- b) Nominative penetrates more intensively into the parts of the noun paradigm that are more difficult to acquire. It covers most of all the stems with unstressed case markers for which the perceptive difference between Accusative and Nominative is minimal.
- c) Nominative marking of direct object can be brought into correlation with a more general trend to Nominative coding of non-standard information structure attested in Nanai Russian. This has no clear prototype in Nanai.
- 4) Some other non-standard uses of Nominative are attested in Nanai Russian beyond DO-position. These are mostly the contexts in which the nominative (=unmarked) form is used in Nanai. It is interesting if these uses in Nanai Russian are regulated by the stem accent type, in the same way as DO uses of Nominative (cf. 3) above). If yes, it would mean that the factor of interference (2) and the factor of non-standard acquisition or reinterpretation of the Russian system (3) work separately at different levels: 1) the Nanai system provides possible non-standard contexts for Nominative (interference) and then 2) the Russian system provides appropriate stems for Nominative (non-standard acquisition of Russian). Unfortunately, by the moment I have not enough data to test it.

## References

- Aissen J. (2003), Differential object marking: iconicity vs. economy, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 21(3), P. 435–483.
- Avrorin V.A. (1948), *Outline of Nanai Syntax. Direct Object* [Očerki po sintaksisu nanajskogo jazyka. Prjamoe dopolnenie], Leningrad, Učpedgiz.
- Bossong G. (1985), *Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Cox C. (2011), *Corpus Linguistics and Language Documentation: Challenges for Collaboration*, Newman J., Baayen R.H. and Rice S (Eds.), *Corpus Linguistics: An International Handbook. Volume 1*. Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, P. 239–264.
- Dalrymple M., Nikolaeva I. (2011), *Objects and information structure*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Iemmolo G (2010), Topicality and differential object marking: Evidence from Romance and beyond, *Studies in Language*, 34(2), P. 239–272.
- Malchukov A. (2008), Animacy and Asymmetries in Differential Case Marking, *Lingua*, 118(2), P. 203–221.
- Malchukov A., de Swart P (2009), Differential case marking and actancy variation, Malchukov A., Spencer A. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, Oxford, OUP, P. 290–303.

Markova N.V. (1989), Non-standard ways of expressing subject and object in Onega dialects and their history [Dialektnye sposoby vyraženiya sub'jekta i ob'jekta v Onežskix govorax i ix istorija]. PhD Thesis, M.

Mosel U. (2014), Corpus Linguistic and Documentary Approaches in Writing a Grammar of a Previously Undescribed Language, *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 8, P. 135–157.

Oskolskaya S.A., Stoynova N.M. (2017), Differential object marking in Nanai [Differencirovannoje markirovanije ob'jekta v nanajskom jazyke], *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*, XIII(3), P. 336–370.

Ostler N. (2008), Corpora of less studied languages, Lüdeling A. and Kytö M. (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics: An International Handbook. Volume 1*. Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter, P. 457–483.

Ron'ko R.V. (2017), Nado korova doit'! Nominative object in Northern Russian dialects [Nominativnyj ob'jekt v severnorusskix dialektax], *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*, XIII(3). P. 244–264.

Silverstein M. (1976), Hierarchy of features and ergativity, Dixon R.M.W. (Ed.), *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies Publications, P. 112–171.

Vinogradov I. (2016) Linguistic corpora of understudied languages: do they make sense?, *Káñina*, 40(1).

Witzlack-Makarevich A., Seržant I. (2017), Differential argument marking: Patterns of variation, Seržant I., Witzlack-Makarevich A. (Eds.), *The Diachronic Typology of Differential Argument Marking*, Berlin, Language Science Press, P. 1–45.