

# Object Marking with Discrete Objects in Finnish and Lithuanian

Asta Laugalienė

**Abstract:** The case of the direct object of transitive verbs in Finnish alternates between the accusative and the partitive. In Lithuanian, there is an alternation between the accusative and the partitive genitive. It was shown in previous research that some functions of the Finnish partitive and the Lithuanian partitive genitive in object marking are identical (i.e. partial affectedness of mass nouns) but there are some features that haven't received enough attention in the literature, e.g., the Lithuanian partitive genitive with discrete nouns. This paper offers an overview of possible conditions for the use of partitive genitive in resultative constructions in modern and older Lithuanian in comparison with their counterparts in Finnish and Slavic.

**Keywords:** *irresultativity, partitivity, object marking, partitive, Finnish, Lithuanian*

## 1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The topic of this paper is irresultative meaning in object marking in Finnish and Lithuanian and their neighbours. The resultative situation is interpreted in this article as a transition in which the event brings about a change, after which there is no return to the original state but entry into another one. Its opposite, the irresultative situation, implies that no such transition takes place and after completion of the event the situation returns to the original state or to a state that is conceptualized as similar to the original state. Both Finnish and Lithuanian make the resultative *versus* irresultative distinction in object marking.

The resultative and irresultative readings of some Finnish achievement verbs, such as *ampua* 'shoot' have been discussed at length by many authors (for example, Heinämäki 1984: 153, Kiparsky 1998: 2–3). It is stated that the resultative (1a) *versus* irresultative opposition (1b) indicates the achievement or absence of a result:

- (1) a. *Ammuin karhun.*  
shoot.PST.1SG<sup>2</sup> bear.ACC.SG  
'I shot the (a) bear.'  
b. *Ammuin karhua.*  
shoot.PST.1SG bear.PAR.SG  
'I shot at the (a) bear (without killing it).'
- (Finnish, Kiparsky 1998: 2–3)

In Lithuanian, the irresultative use of the partitive genitive seems to be very rare. Many scholars (for example, Larsson 1983: 135, Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 654, Seržant 2014: 286, Seržant 2015: 389) mention the fact that in Eastern Lithuanian dialects the partitive genitive may be used instead of the accusative in order to encode the temporariness of the result of a transfer (2a–b). The accusative object in (2c) has no implications of temporariness and is used in standard Lithuanian:

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank two anonymous reviewers as well as Axel Holvoet for their critical reading and valuable comments, which helped to improve the article.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations: 1 – first person, 2 – second person, 3 – third person, ACC – accusative, ABL – ablative, AOR – aorist, ART – article, COM – comitative, COMP – comparative, CVB – converb, DAT – dative, ELA – elative, F – feminine, GEN – genitive, ILL – illative, IMP – imperative, INE – inessive, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, LOC – locative, M – masculine, MED – middle voice, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PAR – partitive, PL – plural, POSS – possessive, PP – passive participle, PPA – past participle active, PRS – present, PST – past, PVB – preverb, Q – question particle, RFL – reflexive, SG – singular, TR – translative.

- (2) a. *Duok man peilio!* (neilgam, tuoj sugražinsiu)  
 give.IMP me knife.GEN.SG  
 ‘Give (me) a/the knife! (for a while, I will shortly give it back to you)’  
 (Lithuanian, Jablonskis 1957: 578)
- b. *Paskolink peilio!*  
 PVB.lend.IMP knife.GEN.SG  
 ‘Lend (me) a/the knife!’  
 (Lithuanian, Ambrazas et al. 1976: 25)
- c. *Duok peili!*  
 give.IMP knife.ACC.SG  
 ‘Give (me) a/the knife!’  
 (Lithuanian, personal knowledge)

Interestingly, both examples with the partitive genitive (2a–b) come from the same two sources (Jablonskis 1957: 578 (2a) and Ambrazas et al. 1976: 25 (2b)) and are cited again and again by scholars. Moreover, in Ambrazas et al. (1976) there is a reference to the example given by Jablonskis (1957: 578), which is basically the same as the one cited by Ambrazas et al. (1976). In the case of the author of this article, neither her intuition as a native speaker of modern Lithuanian nor her own dialect (Northern Lithuanian) suggest that the use of the partitive genitive in such sentences would be possible. This observation was one of the starting points for this research, which aims to answer the question in which situations partitive or partitive genitive is interpreted as encoding an irresultative event in Lithuanian compared to other neighbouring languages. The main focus will be on Lithuanian and Finnish, the latter – as will be shown – having much wider criteria to encode irresultative events than Lithuanian.

The idea behind the present article was to bring a new perspective to the widely investigated research domain of Fennic and Baltic object marking by concentrating on object marking with discrete objects as a separate topic, but also by using Lithuanian diachronic and dialectal data in order to show that irresultative partitive marking must once have been more widespread in both Fennic and Baltic, though standard Lithuanian has almost completely lost it.

The goal of this paper is to describe the semantic factors that give rise to the variation in the case-marking of discrete objects in Finnish, Lithuanian and the neighbouring languages (Polish, Russian, Estonian etc.), with a comparison between Lithuanian and Finnish in the foreground. Another research question, which the present article aims to answer, is to confirm the hypothesis, that Lithuanian and Finnish might have different strategies for encoding irresultativity in discrete objects (aspectual prefixes vs. partitive marking). If so, no consistent marking of irresultativity via case-marking would be expected in Lithuanian.

Examples for this research are taken from various sources, each of them marked separately next to the example. Old Lithuanian was checked against the old Lithuanian Corpus.<sup>3</sup> In the absence of electronic corpora of dialectal Lithuanian of all regions, the dialectal data was checked against the sources, which were available at hand, also some informants were consulted.

The following Section 2 provides the background of the study on object case marking in Baltic, Fennic and Slavic. Section 3 discusses the semantic classification of irresultative constructions and gives further observations. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to discussion and concluding remarks.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Old Lithuanian corpus contains texts from the 16<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, each century is represented by about 1 mln words. A list of verbs, which could be expected to have partitive genitive with discrete objects was drawn up based on the occurrences of partitive objects in neighbouring languages. Both prefixed and non-prefixed verbs were checked against the corpus in question. For more explanations about the data see Section 3.

## 2 Object case marking in Baltic, Fennic and Slavic

In Finnish, the case of the direct object of transitive verbs alternates between the ‘total object’ (marked with the accusative) and the ‘partial object’ (morphologically marked with the partitive). In this article, the term ‘accusative’ will be used as a blanket term for the non-partitive case forms.<sup>4</sup> The three interrelated and often overlapping functions of the partitive case in Finnish are: quantitative unboundedness of the object referent, which often correlates with an indefinite reading (3); aspectual unboundedness or lack of culmination in the designated event (4); and negation of the propositional content (5). They have been widely discussed in literature (e.g. Vainikka & Maling 1996: 193, Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 650–652, Laugalienė 2020):

(3) *Löysin marjoja.*  
find.PST.1SG berry.PAR.PL  
‘I found [some] berries.’

(4) *Kuuntelin radiota.*  
listen. PST.1SG radio.PAR.SG  
‘I was listening to the radio.’

(5) *En rakentanut taloa.*  
NEG build.PST.PA house.PAR.SG  
i. ‘I did not build a/the house.’  
ii. ‘I was not building a/the house.’

(Finnish, personal knowledge)

In a nutshell, the multifunctional nature of the alternation between Finnish total and partial objects could be described as follows (Larjavaara 2019: 199): the object of the sentence is **total** whenever and only when a positive sentence expresses a complete change of the event that has reached (or is reaching) its endpoint (6).<sup>5</sup> In all other cases (including transitive sentences denoting some extent of change, e.g. *lämmitin saunaa-PAR* ‘I heated the sauna (a bit)’ or no change at all, e.g. *katsoin televisiota-PAR* ‘I was watching TV’), the **partial** object is used as in (7):

(6) *Rakensimme talon.*  
build.PST.1PL house.ACC.SG  
‘We built a house.’

(7) *Rakennamme taloa.*  
build.PRS.1PL house.PAR.SG  
‘We are building a/the house.’

(Finnish, personal knowledge)

In Baltic and Slavic, it is the genitive that most closely resembles the Finnish partitive (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 652). However, the use of the Lithuanian partitive genitive differs from that of the Finnish partitive in many respects. The most common use of the Lithuanian

<sup>4</sup> This case has very little dedicated morphology and is thus largely a non-autonomous case which borrows forms from other cases (on the notion of non-autonomous case, see Blake 2004: 22–24). For singular NPs, the object marker *-n* is homophonous with genitive case; plural direct objects are marked with the nominative plural. A dedicated form (the *-t* accusative) is used for personal pronouns, for example *he* ‘they.PL.NOM’: *heidät* ‘they.PL.ACC’. The accusative case is thus defined mainly on the basis of syntactic context.

<sup>5</sup> Negation logically falls under this condition as the propositional content of the sentence is negated, which means that there was no culmination of the event (for more details on negation see e.g. Miestamo 2014: 67–70 or ISK 2004: § 932). Same applies to the sentences, where the actuality of the propositional content is doubtful, e.g. *Tuskin Jukka on lukenut kirjaa-PAR* ‘It is unlikely that Jukka has read a/the book’.

genitive is with indefinite non-incremental quantification (where the genitive is used to refer to an indefinite number or quantity):

- (8) *Jis rado knygu.*  
 3SG find.PST.3SG book.GEN.PL  
 ‘He found some books.’ (Lithuanian, personal knowledge)

In Lithuanian accusative is used in the case of incremental quantification, when the object participates in the event in an incremental, gradual way, and its components are affected sequentially (9), but also for definite mass nouns (10), and in generic sentences (11) (Laugaliene 2020):

- (9) *Aš geriu kavą.*  
 I drink.PRS.1SG coffee.ACC.SG  
 ‘I am drinking coffee.’

- (10) *Išgėriau kavą.*  
 PVB.drink.PST.1SG coffee.ACC.SG  
 ‘I drank up the coffee.’

- (11) *Geriu tik kavą.*  
 drink.PRS.1SG only coffee.ACC.SG  
 ‘I drink only coffee.’ (Lithuanian, personal knowledge)

In Lithuanian, in line with Finnish (5), the direct objects of transitive verbs (even those normally marked with the accusative) will take the genitive case in negated clauses; this is the so-called genitive of negation, which historically evolved from the partitive genitive (Ambrazas 1997: 500–506, 667–668, see also Kuryłowicz 1971 for the Slavic genitive of negation):

- (12) *Brolis nenusipirko naują namą.*  
 brother NEG.PVB.RFL.buy.PST.3SG new.GEN.SG house.GEN.SG  
 ‘[My] brother did not buy a new house.’ (Lithuanian, personal knowledge)

Aspectual distinctions in Lithuanian are often expressed by the choice of verbal prefixes (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 652). The difference in aspect is marked in imperfective/perfective verbs as in examples (13) and (14), but the case marking is not in itself a device used to differentiate aspect. The partitive genitive is mostly possible only with perfective verbs:

- (13) *Pa-rašiau laišką.*  
 PVB-write.PST.1SG letter.ACC.SG  
 ‘I wrote a/the letter.’

- (14) *Rašiau laišką.*  
 write.PST.1SG letter.ACC.SG  
 ‘I was writing a/the letter.’ (Lithuanian, personal knowledge)

In Polish, as in Lithuanian, direct objects are encoded by genitive in negated clauses. Genitive objects refer to quantitatively unbounded entities almost exclusively in the context of perfective verbs, therefore aspect in Polish is relevant for the occurrence of partial objects (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 653). In Finnish – as shown in examples (3) and (4) – both indefinite

quantity and imperfectivity can, independently of each other, trigger partitive marking on objects. Thus both the genitive in Polish and partitive in Finnish are sensitive to aspect, but Finnish and Polish systems take completely opposite directions with respect to object marking for imperfective and perfective clauses: Finnish partitive is favoured by imperfective contexts and Polish genitive is favoured by perfective contexts (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 653–654). In Finnish, an imperfective context automatically leads to the partitive marking of the object whereas in Polish aspectual characteristics provide an additional restriction on the occurrence of the genitive object (*ibid.*).

Even though the alternation between total and partial objects is well-known from some of the older Indo-European languages (Brugmann & Delbrück 1897–1990: 575ff, cited by Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 663), aspectual considerations are not mentioned as influencing the choice between the two cases at this stage. They appear as a factor in both Fennic and Balto-Slavic, but the developments were separate and led to different results.

At a first glance, there are considerable differences in the types of entities that could be treated as partial objects in Finnish, Lithuanian and Polish (Slavic). For Finnish mass nouns, the basic function of the partitive object is either non-culminating aspect or bounded non-specific quantity (or both):

- (15) *Join kahvia.*  
 drink.PST.1SG coffee.PAR.SG  
 (i) ‘I was drinking (the) coffee.’  
 (ii) ‘I drank some (of the) coffee.’ (Finnish, personal knowledge)

In (16a) *kirje* ‘letter’ designates a quantitatively bounded discrete entity, and the action has not culminated in a result (either only a part of the letter was written or the process of the writing of the letter is still ongoing). The discrete object remains undivided but the activity covers only its parts. In (16a), the partitive appears only when part of the letter was affected by the event of the writing. The difference with respect to total affectedness follows from the fact that the whole entity was not targeted and the rest remains unaffected (Luraghi & Kittilä 2014: 41):

- (16) a. *Kirjoitin kirjettä.*  
 write.PST.1SG letter.PAR.SG  
 (i) ‘I wrote some of the letter.’  
 (ii) ‘I was writing a/the letter.’  
 b. *Kirjoitin kirjeen.*  
 write.PST.1SG letter.ACC.SG  
 ‘I wrote a/the letter.’ (Finnish, personal knowledge)

With respect to the marking of partially affected discrete objects, Lithuanian is different from Finnish, which marks partial affectedness via case. Partial affectedness of the discrete object in Lithuanian is encoded not in the object marking (both partially and fully affected objects are marked with the accusative), but in different prefixes of the verb, see (17a) vs. (17b):

- (17) a. *Pa-skaičiau knygą.*  
 PVB-read.PST.1SG book.ACC.SG  
 ‘I read some of the book.’  
 b. *Per-skaičiau knygą.*  
 PVB-read.PST.1SG book.ACC.SG  
 ‘I read a/the book.’ (Lithuanian, personal knowledge)

To conclude, Finnish positive clauses allow partitive object marking for discrete entities. Neither Lithuanian nor Polish (or Russian) normally allow discrete entities in affirmative positive clauses to be marked with genitive. Some exceptions to this rule will be discussed in Section 3.

### 3 Semantic classification

The collection of the data for this research was firstly obtained from various sources from Slavic and Fennic in order to investigate the possibilities for discrete objects to be marked with partitive genitive or partitive. Based on this research, lists of verbs expected to license partitive object marking with discrete objects were drawn up. These lists were checked against the Old Lithuanian corpus and also against available Lithuanian dialectical data in order to check whether and how partitive genitive marking with discrete objects is (or was) possible. Even though the examples from Lithuanian sources are not very numerous, the results show clear traces of such partitive genitive uses with discrete objects both in old Lithuanian and dialects.

Further below I suggest a classification of the semantic factors that give rise to the variation of the case marking of discrete objects in the languages examined. The classification is based on verbs which normally assign accusative to discrete objects and with which the use of partitive or partitive genitive is rather exceptional. The focus stays on the Lithuanian data, but other neighbouring languages are also taken into account. Based on the areal data (Baltic, Slavic and Fennic languages), four semantic groups could be established: temporally restricted usage, surface-contact verbs, scalar verbs and conative verbs. The Lithuanian data shows that temporally restricted usage is attested both in old Lithuanian and dialectical examples. Surface-impact and scalar verbs are not very well attested in old Lithuanian (there are no traces in the dialects), whereas the conative type is not attested at all (see table 1).

Semantic group	Verb	Translation	Number of occurrences	Source
<b>Temporal restricted usage</b> <sup>6</sup>	<i>skolinti</i>	lend	1	Ambrazas et al. 1976
	<i>duoti</i>	give	1	Jablonskis 1957
	<i>užimti</i>	take	1	URB 2013
	<i>regėti</i>	see	2	LT_16
	<i>pamatyti</i>	see	1	LT_20
<b>Surface-contact verbs</b> <sup>7</sup>	<i>prigriebti</i>	catch	1	LT_18
<b>Scalar verbs</b> <sup>8</sup>	<i>sudaužyti</i>	break	1	LT_19
<b>Conative verbs</b> <sup>9</sup>	–	–	–	–

Table 1: Occurrences of verbs with partitive genitive for discrete objects in Lithuanian corpora

### 3.1 Temporally restricted usage

In Lithuanian discrete entities can be marked with partitive genitive with certain verbs when there is a need to emphasize that the corresponding referents are given in someone's possession “for a little while” (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 654). A series of verbs like ‘give’ can take genitive, if the object is to be given for a limited time, i.e. some verbs allow two readings differing in the temporal stability of the resultant state.

Such a type of partitive genitive object seems to survive in Eastern Lithuanian dialects, where it has the implication of temporariness of the results of the transfer. Next to the example (2b), already cited in the introduction, the informants confirm more examples:

- (18) *Duok kirvio!*  
 give.IMP axe.GEN.SG  
 ‘Give (me) an/the axe!’ (Eastern Lithuanian, p.c. V. Kardelis)

Example (19) is taken from a book written in a local dialect of the Ukmergė region. Two informants confirmed that such use of the genitive object is normal in situations where the discrete object is given in someone's possession for a certain limit of time. In (19) *užimti kieno nors posto* means ‘stand in for somebody’ and the situation describes a temporary situation in which one person stands in for another:

<sup>6</sup> Keywords *turėti* ‘have’, *daryti* ‘open’, *gauti* ‘get’, *padėti* ‘put’, *paguldyti* ‘lay down’, *nunešti* ‘take’, *pastatyti* ‘put’, *palikti* ‘leave’, *pririšti* ‘tighten up’, *išleisti* ‘let out’ yielded 0 results in Old Lithuanian corpus.

<sup>7</sup> Keywords *plauti* ‘wash’, *tepti* ‘spread’, *valyti* ‘clean’, *remti* ‘back up’, *traukti* ‘pull’ gave 0 results in Old Lithuanian corpus.

<sup>8</sup> Keywords *gadinti* ‘spoil’, *kelti* ‘lift’, *stabdyti* ‘stop’ gave 0 results in Old Lithuanian corpus.

<sup>9</sup> Keywords *įrodinėti* ‘argue, try to prove’ *įkalbinėti* ‘try to persuade’ gave 0 results in Old Lithuanian corpus.

- (19) *Po viena bijodavom užimti jo posto,*  
 by one.ACC.SG be-afraid.PST.1PL occupy.INF he.GEN.SG post.GEN.SG  
 <kad nepraganytume karvių- dviese vis drąsiau.>  
 <so the cows wouldn't go astray - we were braver when there were two of us>  
 'Each on our own we were afraid to take his post, <so the cows wouldn't go astray - we  
 were braver when there were two of us.>' (Lithuanian, URB 2013: 12)

In addition, it is attested both for older Russian (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 655) and Polish (Kempf 1970: 90), that there are certain verbs of perception or cognition that regularly combine with genitive. One of such verbs would be *regėti* 'see', which also takes the genitive object in Old Lithuanian as in (20) and (21):<sup>10</sup>

- (20) <Herodas Iesu ischmidens didei prassidžuga nesa> *iau senei isigeide*  
 <Herod was very happy to see Jesus, because> already long time want.PST.3SG  
*io regeti.*  
 he.GEN.SG see.INF  
 ' <Herod was very happy to see Jesus, because> he had been wanting to see him for a  
 long time.' (Lithuanian, corpus LT\_16)
- (21) *Ir ieškoio regēt' Iésaus*  
 and look-for.PST.3SG see.INF Jesus.GEN.SG  
 <kas būt ir ne galėjo vž miniós nes' būvo mąžo auglés>.  
 <and he was not able to see him amid the crowd as he was short of stature>  
 'And he sought to see Jesus <and he was not able to see him amid the crowd as he was  
 short of stature>.'

These two examples are taken from the 16th century Biblical texts. This partitive genitive would be absolutely unusual for modern Lithuanian, which would have the accusative as in (23). In both (20) and (21) the genitive object could have been used to refer to a restricted time span, so that the meaning could have been 'cast a glance'. It seems that this temporally restricted usage of the genitive object has survived until the 20th century, as in (22) (in contrast with (23), which has the more frequent accusative):

- (22) <Priangyje laukia moteris su mažyčiais verksniais kūdikėliais, mergaitės, atėjusios savo mylimųjų  
 aplankyti, ir> *vyrų, nori pamatyti draugų,*  
 to see their beloved ones and> man.NOM.PL want.PAP see.INF friend.GEN.PL  
*brolių ir savo žmonų.*  
 brother.GEN.PL and own wife.GEN.PL  
 ' <At the entrance hall, there is a woman waiting with small crying babies, girls who  
 came to see their beloved ones and> men wishing to see [their] friends, brothers and  
 wives.' (Lithuanian, corpus LT\_20)
- (23) *Portugalas Lietuvoje labiausiai norėjo pamatyti draugus.*  
 Portuguese.NOM Lithuania.LOC.SG most want.PST.3SG see.INF friend.ACC.PL  
 'A Portuguese man wanted most of all to see friends in Lithuania.' (Lithuanian<sup>11</sup>)

<sup>10</sup> Animate objects regularly assume genitive marking in Russian and other Slavic languages. It is impossible to say whether animacy plays a role in Lithuanian as the old Lithuanian corpus did not give any results with inanimate objects.

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.delfi.lt/verslas/verslas/cepelinai-ir-saltibarsciai-uzsieniecius-i-lietuva-vilioja-labiau-nei-merginos-ar-krepsinis.d?id=50816602>



In Finnish, a series of verbs like *lainata* ‘borrow, lend’ can take partitive, if the object is given for a limited amount of time. Depending on the speaker’s implications, both partitive and accusative are possible. In (24a) the girl is expecting to get her watch back in a while, whereas (24b) does not have such an implication:

- (24) a. *Tyttö lainasi kelloa.*  
 girl.NOM lend.PST.3SG watch.PAR.SG  
 ‘The girl lent [her] watch [to somebody for a while].’  
 b. *Tyttö lainasi kellon.*  
 girl.NOM lend.PST.3SG watch.ACC.SG  
 ‘The girl lent [her] watch [to somebody].’ (Finnish, personal knowledge)

Irresultative marking in Finnish applies to situations where the original state is almost the same as the target state. In (25a) the man raises his hat for a moment and puts it back: the target state does not significantly differ from the original state and also expresses the temporally restricted effect of the event. The sentence (25b), on the contrary, would indicate a transition from one state to another:

- (25) a. *Mies nosti hattua.*  
 man.NOM raise.PST.3SG hat.PAR.SG  
 ‘The man raised (his) hat.’ (Finnish, Leino 1991: 171–172)  
 b. *Mies nosti hatun päästään.*  
 man.NOM raise.PST.3SG hat.ACC.SG head.ELA.POSS.3SG  
 ‘The man took off his hat.’ (Finnish, personal knowledge)

In Old Polish, the concept of the temporal partiality was very strong and the partial genitive instead of the accusative appear very consistently here. A series of verbs was oriented towards action limited in time, especially such as *dobyć* ‘draw forth’, *poprosić* ‘ask’, *(za)wolać* ‘call’, *udzielać* ‘grant’, *pożyczyć* ‘borrow’, e.g. *pożyczyć książkę*.GEN ‘give someone a book for a while, let him use it’ (Kempf 1970: 192). However, genitive has remained productive in modern Polish with the verbs *dać* ‘give’ and *pożyczyć* ‘lend’.

- (26) *Daj mi ołówek.*  
 give.IMP me pencil.GEN.SG  
 ‘Hand me a pencil (for a while).’ (Polish, Holvoet 1991: 110)

Verbs like ‘give’ can also take the genitive object in clauses with the meaning of temporal restricted use in Russian and Ukrainian (for Russian Buslaev 1959: 461, Kempf 1970: 190, for Ukrainian Shevelov 1963: 167, cited by Holvoet 1991: 110). In Northern Russian typical verbs are ‘take’, ‘get’, ‘send’, ‘ask for’ etc.

- (27) *Voźmu topora u vas.*  
 take.FUT.1SG axe.GEN.SG from you  
 ‘I will take the axe from you.’ Russian (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 655)

The usage of genitive when the action is explicitly temporary ((28a) vs (28b)) is also noted for some North-Western Belarusian dialects, spoken in the area adjacent to the Lithuanian border:

- (28) a. *pry-njas-i nož*  
 PVB-bring-IMP knife.ACC.SG  
 ‘Bring me the knife (implicitly: for a longer time).’  
 b. *pa-da-j naž-a*  
 PVB-give-IMP knife-GEN.SG  
 ‘Hand me the knife (just for a moment)’ (Belarussian, BEL\_1 and BEL\_2)

Temporally restricted usage could also be illustrated by another type of clauses, where the genitive object refers to a specific purpose that is restricted in time. The meaning of temporal restriction is seen in *uchylić kapelusza.GEN* ‘lift off ones hat’, *dać buzi.GEN* ‘give a kiss’, *zapomnieć języka.GEN* ‘forget one’s tongue’, *zapomnieć lekcje.GEN* ‘forget a lesson’ (Kempf 1970: 193). But the connection of genitive with a specific purpose can be seen in *dobyć miecza.GEN* ‘draw a sword’, where the sword is drawn with the aim of engaging in a fight. Holvoet cites the term *genetivus partitivus intentionalis*, originally coined by Marian Jurkowski, for a type of use referring to situations where the object is taken for the purpose of performing a well-defined, concrete action and illustrates this with an example for Polish dialect provided by Kempf (Holvoet 1991: 110):

- (29) *Złapie warzęchy, wybiję ci zęby.*  
 catch.FUT.1SG ladle.GEN.SG knock-out.FUT.1SG you tooth.ACC.PL  
 ‘I’ll catch a ladle and knock out your teeth.’ Polish (Kempf 1970: 1991)

Holvoet mentions that the meanings of different degrees of affectedness (which could be realized in slightly different ways as ‘slight affectedness’, ‘temporal affectedness’ or ‘partial affectedness’ expressed by partitive genitive) has the roots in Indo-European (Holvoet 1991: 111, Kempf 1970: 191). Different rules were applied for discrete objects and mass nouns; for discrete objects, it was probably a genuine partitive genitive, similar to that of Fennic. Later on, with the rise of the opposition between variable and constant quantification, the partitive was transformed into a genitive of quantity and the two meanings (genuine partitive genitive and genitive of quantity) became dissociated from each other. For discrete objects, the genitive could now denote a slight or superficial affectedness (for more details on the hypothesis of the historical development see Holvoet 1991: 111–112).

### 3.2 Surface-contact verbs

In a number of cases the use of the partitive or partitive genitive can be associated with a specific lexical class. An important difference is that between change-of-state and surface-impact verbs. Change-of-state verbs (such as English *break*) are verbs denoting a change from one state to another. Surface-contact verbs (like English *hit*) refer to physical contact between two objects, but from the use of these verbs it is not always obvious that the objects have undergone some essential change (Fillmore 1970: 130–131). In an abstract sense, surface-contact verbs identify *some* change as the person who was hit by someone is different from the person they were before the hitting occurred.

A syntactic difference between change-of-state verbs and surface-contact verbs can be seen in English when the object is a body-part noun. The sentences with surface-contact verbs have paraphrases in which the possessor of the body part appears as the direct object and the body-part noun appears in a “locative prepositional phase” (Fillmore 1970: 131–132). Compare (30a) with the surface-contact verb to (30b) with the change-of-state verb:

- (30) a. *I hit his leg.*  
*I hit him on the leg.*

- b. *I broke his leg.*  
 \**I broke him on the leg.* (English, Fillmore 1970: 132)

Surface-contact verbs with partitive marking appear also in Baltic, Slavic and Fennic languages. Archaic Indo-European languages also have genitives:

- (31) *Elábeto tēs cheiròs antoú.*  
 take.AOR.MED.3SG ART.GEN.SG.F hand.GEN.SG 3.GEN.SG.M  
 ‘He took hold of his hand.’ (Classical Greek, Goodwin 1898: 234)

In older modern Polish, some surface-contact verbs could also take genitive object:

- (32) *zarzuciwszy nylotów i pogłaskawszy wąsa,*  
 throw\_back.CVB mock\_sleeve.GEN.PL and stroke.CVB moustache.GEN.SG  
*żaintonował [...] litanią*  
 intone.PST.3.SG.M litany.ACC.SG  
 ‘Having thrown back his mock sleeves and stroked his moustache, he intoned a litany.’  
 (Polish, Juliusz Słowacki, 19<sup>th</sup> c.)

The lexical meaning of the verb, rather than aspect, implies the slight degree of affectedness (Holvoet 1991: 109). An indirect trace of genitive with verbs of surface contact might also be seen in Russian:

- (33) *kasnut-sa neba*  
 touch.INF-RFL sky.GEN.SG  
 ‘to touch the sky’ (Russian, personal knowledge)

In modern Lithuanian, partitive genitive seems to be possible only with reflexive verbs as in (34a). Non-reflexive verbs would take accusative as in (34b). Normally the preference would be given for accusative (34b), but in some specific situations, when the person gets some impact, experience, knowledge about the nature of the object, partitive genitive would be used instead as in (34a):

- (34) a. *pri-si-liesti dangaus*  
 PVB-RFL-touch.INF sky.GEN.SG  
 b. *pa-liesti dangų*  
 PVB-touch.INF sky.ACC.SG  
 ‘to touch the sky’ (Lithuanian, personal knowledge)

Empirical data from older Lithuanian texts, e.g., from the 18th century, show clear traces of slight/partial affectedness expressed by a genitive object, as in (35):

- (35) *<Bet priėjom vieną Sallą, Klaudą wadinnamą>,* *czonay wós ne*  
 <But we have reached one island, which is called Klaud>, here scarcely not  
*wós Waltiės gallejome prigriebti.*  
 scarcely boat.GEN.SG can.PST.1PL catch.INF  
 ‘<But we reached an island called Clauda>, here we could scarcely get hold of our boat.’  
 (Lithuanian, LT\_18 corpus)

The sentence describes a situation in which a person could barely get hold of a boat, which was about to be carried away by water. The effort with which the object is seized is rendered by the use of the genitive marker for partial or superficial affectedness.

Finnish demonstrates much wider use of surface-contact verbs with partitive object, see (36a–c):

- (36) a. *Jeesus kosketti hänen kättään.*  
 Jesus touch.PST.3SG he.GEN.SG hand.PAR.POSS.3SG  
 ‘Jesus touched his hand.’ (Finnish, Raamattu, Matt 8, 15)
- b. *Enkeli kosketti häntä <ja sanoi hänelle: "Nouse ja syö!">*  
 angel touch.PST.3SG he.PAR.SG <and said, “Get up and eat.”>  
 ‘An angel touched him <and said, “Get up and eat.”>  
 (Finnish, Raamattu, 1. Kun 5, 19)
- c. *Hän taputti vanhan naisen selkää pienellä kädellään ja sanoi pehmeästi <...>*  
 he pat.PST.3SG old.GEN.SG woman.GEN.SG back.PAR.SG small.ADESS.SG  
 hand.ADESS.POSS.3SG and say.PST.3SG kindly  
 ‘He patted the old woman’s back with his small hand and said kindly <...>’  
 (Finnish<sup>12</sup>)

Examples (36a–c) contain the surface-contact verbs *koskettaa* ‘to touch’ and *taputtaa* ‘to pat’. There is some physical contact between two objects, marked with the partitive object. It is difficult to describe the nature of the change which the person undergoes when someone (e.g. an angel in (36b)) touches their hand.

Even though the use of the partitive object with Finnish surface impact verbs is a default, there are some exceptions; compare the difference between hitting something in (37a) (marked with the partitive) and hitting someone in such a way that the hitting causes death as in (37b), marked with the accusative:

- (37) a. *Mooses kohotti sauvansa ja löi Niilin vettä <...>*  
 Mooses raise.PST.3SG staff.ACC.3POSS and strike.PST.3SG Nile.GEN.SG  
 water.PAR.SG  
 ‘Moses raised his staff and struck the water of the Nile.’  
 (Finnish, Raamattu, 2. Moos 7: 20)
- b. *Baasa löi hänet kuoliaaksi <...>*  
 Baasha beat.PST.3SG he.ACC.SG dead.TR.SG  
 ‘Baasha beat him to death.’ (Finnish, Raamattu, 1. Kun 15, 27)

In the well-known example from Finnish involving shooting at someone and shooting someone dead (example (1) repeated here for the sake of convenience) different types of telic interpretation of the situation apply. The impact of the initial shooting intention is not clear. The verb *ampua* ‘shoot’ is a surface-impact verb whose meaning does not in itself imply a change. The opposition between two possible interpretations of the situation is marked with different object cases:

<sup>12</sup> <https://tales.xperimentalhamid.com/fi/novel/the-proxy-bride-of-the-billionaire-chapter-531/>

- (1) a. *Ammuin karhun.*  
 shoot.PST.1SG bear.ACC.SG  
 ‘I shot the (a) bear.’  
 b. *Ammuin karhua.*  
 shoot.PST.1SG bear.PAR.SG  
 ‘I shot at the (a) bear (without killing it).’ (Finnish, Kiparsky 1998: 2–3)

### 3.3 Scalar verbs

The culmination of the event, where the event reaches an endpoint, is the most important criterion for the choice between accusative and partitive for the Finnish direct object. This culmination is normally associated with telicity, but not every form of telicity entails culmination. In Finnish many verbs can show a distinction between *culminating* and *non-culminating telic behavior*. In most languages the non-culminating type would be represented by *telic scalar verbs*. This type is also known as a group of so called *degree achievement verbs*.<sup>13</sup> In English this type is represented by verbs like *widen*, *lengthen*. It was observed that these verbs have both telic and atelic properties: whilst atelic predicates are entailed by their progressive forms (Dowty 1979), some verbs in this group behave differently, e.g. the verb *lengthen* behaves like the atelic verbs (*Kim was lengthening the rope* entails *Kim has lengthened the rope*), whereas *straighten* behaves as telic in this respect (*Kim was straightening the rope* does not entail *Kim has straightened the rope*) (for more details see Hay et al. 1999: 127). The affected argument of telic scalar verbs undergoes a change in some property. In deadjectival verbs the change is in the property associated with the meaning of the adjectival base (Hay et al. 1999: 129).<sup>14</sup> The terminal point of the event can be identified with the following calculation: “the endpoint is that point at which the affected argument possesses a degree of the measured property that equals the initial degree to which it possessed this property plus the degree denoted by the difference value” (Hay et al. 1999: 133). When the difference value is not provided by overt linguistic material, it should be somehow inferred and boundedness is determined in other ways. Degrees are formalized as positive or negative intervals on a scale, where a scale is a set of points totally ordered along some dimension (Hay et al. 1999: 130–131), e.g. temperature, length, bad quality, strength etc.

Finnish verbs like *lämmittää* ‘to warm up’ are classified under telic scalar verbs (Larjavaara 2019: 229–231). The special feature of these verbs lie in their ability to have both partitive and accusative objects in sentences with discrete objects.<sup>15</sup> The verb *lämmittää* has two telic readings, one with the partitive (the non-culminational reading) and one with the accusative (the culminational reading). The use of the partitive in (38a) as opposed to the accusative in (38b) can be associated not only with an imperfective reading, but also with a non-culminational perfective reading:

<sup>13</sup> The term “degree achievement verbs” is taken from Dowty (1979) and has been criticized for inaccuracy as “degree achievements” show little evidence of being achievements at all (Hay et al. 1999: 143). Dowty claims that these verbs could be classified as achievements on certain semantic and syntactic grounds; Hay et al. argue that these verbs show the characteristics of accomplishments and activities (ibid).

<sup>14</sup> English adjectives fall into two classes: closed-range adjectives, which are associated with a scale with a maximal value, where maximality is relative to the adjective’s polarity (e.g. straight, empty, dry) and open-range adjectives (e.g. long, bad, strong), for which it is not possible to identify maximal values on the scale (see Hay et al. 1999: 135–136 for a discussion about English adjectives). The telicity of degree achievements depends on the open-/closed range distinction. Degree achievements derived from open-range adjectives normally demonstrate atelic behavior.

<sup>15</sup> The use of Finnish telic scalar verbs is often dependent on the context or even on the dialectal background of the speaker. Sometimes direct object alternations between ACC vs. PAR with some certain telic scalar verbs could be seen as strange or even impossible. This serves as evidence that the group of telic scalar verbs is flexible and subjective interpretations of the events apply (Larjavaara 2019: 281).

- (38) a. *Lämmitin saunaa.*  
 warm.PST.1SG sauna.PAR.SG  
 i. ‘I warmed the sauna a bit.’  
 ii. ‘I was warming up the sauna.’  
 b. *Lämmitin saunan.*  
 warm.PST.1SG sauna.ACC.SG  
 ‘I warmed up the sauna.’ (Finnish, personal knowledge)

In (38a), there was a change from the initial state, but the change was not significant enough to reach the resultative end phase (Huumo 2013: 101). Telic scalar verbs usually allow a maximum possible effect, which is normally the optimal outcome of the event (Larjavaara 2019: 280–281). The progressive partitive as in (16a) and the irresultative partitive as in (38a) are similar in that the progressive partitive refers to an event that, if continued, finally reaches the endpoint (e.g. the book is read until the last page) and the same expectation could be linked with the irresultative partitive (the sauna can be warmed up to a point when it is warm enough). The irresultative partitive also indicates that the expected endpoint was never projected or never reached, because e.g. the action was interrupted by some outside event (for more details see Huumo 2013: 102).

The Finnish examples in (39), (40), (41) and (42) have the scalar structure of the adjectival base (*pitkittää* ‘to lengthen’, *pahentaa* ‘to worsen’, *vahvistaa* ‘to strengthen’, *lyhentää* ‘shorten’). For a more detailed discussion of this type of verbs see Larjavaara (2019: 305–324):

- (39) <Ja mikä tulee olemaan loppuni, että vielä> *pitkittäisin tämän*  
 < And what will be my end > prolong.COND.1SG this.GEN.SG  
*kaltaisen sieluni elämää?*  
 alike.GEN.SG soul.POSS.1SG life.PAR.SG  
 ‘<And what will be my end> to further prolong the life of my soul like this?’ (Finnish<sup>16</sup>)
- (40) *Jos yrität apuun, vain pahennat asiaa.*  
 if try.PRS.2SG help.ILL.SG only worsen.PRS.2SG case.PAR.SG  
 ‘If you try to help, you will just make the case worse.’ (Finnish, Raamattu, Sananl. 19, 19)
- (41) *Nyt voit puhua, herrani, sinä olet vahvistanut minua.*  
 now can.PRS.2SG talk.INF lord.POSS.1SG you have.PRS.2SG strengthen.PPA  
 me.PAR.SG  
 ‘Speak, my Lord, for you have strengthened me.’ (Finnish, Raamattu, Dan. 10, 19)
- (42) *Lyhensin hiuksiani.*  
 shorten.PST.1SG hair.PAR.PL.1POSS  
 ‘I shortened my hair.’ (Finnish, personal knowledge)

In some cases, e.g., *pahentaa* ‘worsen’ the use of the accusative does not seem to be possible, probably because there is no absolute or normative degree of badness, which precludes the culminative use. The reason for the absence of an accusative construction is obviously pragmatic in this case. For other verbs of this group alternations with accusative (representing the culminational reading) are possible, as in (43) and (44):

<sup>16</sup> <https://unski.blogaaja.fi/tuhlattu-aika/>

- (43) *Puheenjohtaja venytti puheensa kahden tunnin mittaiseksi.*  
 speaker.NOM stretch.PST.3SG speech.ACC.POSS.3SG two.GEN.SG hour.GEN.SG  
 long.TR.SG  
 ‘The chairman stretched his speech out over two hours.’ (Finnish, p.c. K. Podshivalow)
- (44) *Vahvistin aidan niin pitäväksi, etteivät villisiat pääse siitä läpi.*  
 strengthen.NOM fence.ACC.SG so firm.TR.SG that.NEG.3PL wild boar.NOM.PL  
 pass.PRS.3SG this.ELAT.SG through  
 ‘I made the fence stronger so that the wild boars wouldn’t get through it.’  
 (Finnish, p.c. K. Podshivalow)

The scalarity of verb meaning (and subjective expectations about the complete event) plays an important role for the morphosyntactic aspectual encoding (Tamm 2012: 19). In some cases, the exact endpoint cannot be verified by perception (for more examples and interpretations concerning endpoints see Larjavaara 2019: 217–230). Note, however, that the endpoints are categorized differently in subjective terms (which shows a clear link with pragmatics). Examples (45) and (46) are given to illustrate, that the exact endpoint is difficult to determine. In (45), the difference value of healthy and unhealthy lifestyle could be inferred (if generally accepted, that there is always a chance to make one’s life healthier and healthier). In (46), with the verb *tabrata* ‘to make something dirty’ the exact endpoint of ‘being dirty a bit’ or ‘being very dirty’ is difficult to determine. Therefore in (46) only an abstract change is observed: when a person’s hand becomes dirty because of iniquity, the person is not the same as before:

- (45) *<...> he voivat muuttaa elämäntapojaan terveellisemmiksi.*  
 they can.PRS.3PL change.INF lifestyle.PAR.PL.POSS.3PL healthy.COMP.TR.SG  
 ‘<...> they can change their lifestyles to healthier ones.’ (Finnish<sup>17</sup>)
- (46) *Jos käsiäsi tabraa synti, heitä se pois, <älä anna pahan asua majassasi.>*  
 if hand.PAR.POSS.2SG get-dirty.PRS.3SG iniquity.NOM throw.IMP it.ACC.SG  
 away, <...>  
 ‘If iniquity be in thine hand, put it far away, <and let not wickedness dwell in thy tabernacles>.’ (Finnish, Raamattu, Job 11, 14)

In some situations the difference value is based on the context. For example, the length of the hair which I am shortening as in (42) might depend on some knowledge about hair during different periods of fashion (for more discussion on context-dependent telicity see Hay et al. 1999: 136–138).

Culminational telic and non-culminational telic uses in Finnish are further extended to other verbs that are not normally assigned to the class of telic scalar verbs, such as *avata* ‘open’. An opposition between a culminational and a non-culminational reading is also observed here:

- (47) a. *Hän avasi oven.*  
 3SG open.PST.3SG door.ACC.SG  
 ‘He opened the door.’  
 b. *Hän avasi ovea.*  
 3SG open.PST.3SG door.PAR.SG

<sup>17</sup> <https://sansa.fi/kambodzalainen-nem-lin-haluaa-rakentaa-kirko/>

‘He opened the door for a while; he opened the door partly, set the door ajar); he was opening the door.’ (Finnish, adapted from Kiparsky 1998: 8)

Example (47b), which is widely cited in literature (inter alia Larsson 1983: 87, Holvoet 1991: 109), can have progressive meaning (where the object is an incremental theme: ‘he was opening the door’), but also several other meanings: ‘he opened the door for a while’, and also ‘he partly opened the door’ referred to as telic and perfective (as suggested by Kiparsky 1998: 8 in a similar example with opening the window; also Larjavaara 2019: 229). Example (47a) with the accusative object, is also characterized as telic, bounded and perfective and the semantic difference between these two sentences lies in identifying different endpoints. The telicity of these verbs in Finnish cannot be completely specified in terms of semantic or syntactic features and often derives from conventional implicatures:

(48) *Auto vaihtoi kaistaa.*  
 car.NOM change.PST.3SG lane.PAR.SG  
 ‘The car changed lanes.’ (Finnish, Leino 1991: 171)

(49) *Kiristin ruuvia.*  
 tighten.PST.1SG screw.PAR.SG  
 i. ‘I tightened the screw (a bit)  
 ii. ‘I was tightening the screw.’ (Finnish, Larjavaara 2019: 229)

In example (48) with verb *vaihtaa* ‘change’ the endpoint is based on other measurements (contrary to the example like with the verb *kirjoittaa* ‘to write’ (16a), where the writing event is linked with the last written sign of the letter being written) — changing the driving lane (but still staying on the road), tightening the screw to some extent, but not too much as in (49).

Estonian scholars also single out degree achievement verbs. Estonian transitive degree achievement verbs occur with the partitive object naturally, as it is the case with activity or accomplishment verbs (e.g. *build, paint, read* etc.); thus these verbs occur context-neutrally with partitive objects in durative sentences like (51) and primarily denote activities. Sentences (50)–(51) would qualify for an accomplishment and activity, sentence (52) illustrates an achievement-like reading (for more details on Estonian see Tamm 2012: 174–175):

(50) *Firma laiendas tee ühe tunniga.*  
 firm.NOM widen.PST.3SG road.ACC.SG one.GEN.SG hour.COM  
 ‘The firm widened the road in an hour.’

(51) *Firma laiendas teed kaks tundi.*  
 firm.NOM widen. PST.3SG road.PAR.SG two.NOM.SG hour.PAR.SG  
 ‘The firm was widening/widened the road for two hours.’

(52) *Firma laiendas teed ühe tunniga.*  
 firm.NOM widen. PST.3SG road.PAR.SG one.GEN.SG hour.COM  
 ‘The firm widened the road (a bit) in an hour.’ (Estonian, Tamm 2012: 175–176)

In Russian dialects and Polish a few verbs can occasionally behave like the Finnish scalar telic verbs as well and take partitive genitive as object case. The examples are given for North Russian (53) and Polish (54):<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> In modern Polish most of such partitive genitives are now obsolescent or obsolete (Holvoet 1991: 107, Kempf 1970: 193). Kempf gives some examples from older Polish: *przytępić kosy.GEN* ‘blunt a scythe’, *przystrzyć*



- (53) *Ja otvorju dverej.*  
 I open.FUT.1SG door.GEN.PL  
 ‘I will somewhat/partly open the door(s).’ (Russian, Seržant 2020: 49)
- (54) *Uchylił okna.*  
 open.PST.3SG window.GEN.SG  
 ‘He half-opened the window.’ (Polish, Holvoet 1991: 107)

In the case of Polish *uchylić* the non-culminational telic meaning is lexicalized and case is also assigned lexically: genitive in older Polish and accusative in contemporary Polish. However, genitive case assignment is probably a trace of a former productive case alternation.

In Lithuanian, verbs showing non-culminational telic behavior with genitive partitive marking are hardly represented. There are no examples from modern Lithuanian, but it seems that such use was possible in older Lithuanian, as in (55):

- (55) <Nešes velnias akmeni, didumo kaip gryčios, ir> *sudaužyt*  
 <The devil was carrying a big stone, which was as big as the house, and> break.INF  
*norėjęs Anykščiu bažnyčios.*  
 want.PPA Anykščiai.GEN.PL church.GEN.SG  
 ‘<The devil was carrying a big stone, which was as big as the house, and> wanted to ravage the church.’ (Lithuanian, corpus LT\_19)

This old Lithuanian example, which is from the 19th century, could be interpreted in such a way that the church was subjected to partial destruction (the devil was carrying a big stone, but it affected only a part of the church, which was much bigger/stronger than a stone). However, this could also be a genitive of surface impact.

### 3.4 Conative verbs

The conative<sup>19</sup> alternation is a type of verb alternation between a verb construction indicating the completion of the action and a conative variant representing “an attempted action without specifying whether the action was actually carried out” (Levin 1993: 42, see also Goldberg 1995: 63). The notion of conative alternation is applied, in English, to certain semantic fields, e.g. verbs of contact by impact (*hit, kick*), see Levin (1993: 41):

- (56) a. *John kicked the ball.*  
 b. *John kicked at the ball.* English (adapted from Levin 1993: 41)

Construction (56a) entails that the ball was hit while the corresponding conative construction (56b) does not imply that this aim was achieved. The conative construction marked with the preposition *at* signals that the event of kicking took place irrespective of the final result or success of the action (*James may have missed while trying to kick the ball*). In other words, the conative construction (56b) can be paraphrased as something like *James tried to kick the ball* (Levin 1993: 6). Conative alternations also convey different meanings in terms of intentionality (Anscombe 2000) and affectedness (Beavers 2006).

---

*czupryny*. GEN ‘trim somebody’s hair’, where the action does not cover the whole object, but only parts of the object.

<sup>19</sup> The term *conative* comes from Latin *conor/conari* ‘try, attempt’.

In Lithuanian, one could also find a few cases of lexical distinctions along the conativity dimension, like Lith. *įrodinėti* ‘argue, try to prove’ vs *įrodyti* ‘prove’, *įkalbinėti* ‘try to persuade’ vs *įkalbėti* ‘persuade’. In Russian, conative meanings are coded, in some cases, with the alternation between imperfective/perfective verbs. In (57a) with the imperfective verb, the event of giving the money was not successful (the other person did not take the money), in (57b) with the perfective verb the final result is a success (the other person took the money):

- (57) a. *Ja davai emu den'gi,* <no on ne bral ih>.  
 1SG give.PST.1SG he.DAT.SG money.ACC.PL, <...>  
 ‘I gave him money, <but he did not take it.>’  
 b. *Ja dal emu den'gi.*  
 1SG give.PST.1SG he.DAT.SG money.ACC.PL  
 ‘I gave him money.’ (Russian, p.c. S. Podshivalow)

In Finnish conativity can be reflected in the form of the object. The conative alternation could be illustrated by examples (58a) and (58b). The alternation between partitive (58a) and accusative (58b) has nothing to do with partial affectedness: the person involved does not go ‘a little bit’ to a sauna, but either obeys the order given or not:

- (58) a. *Käskin häntä saunaan.*  
 order.PST.1SG he.PAR.SG sauna.ILL.SG  
 ‘I ordered him to go to sauna (and he most probably went).’  
 b. *Käskin hänet saunaan.*  
 order.PST.1SG he.ACC.SG sauna.ILL.SG  
 ‘I ordered him to go to sauna (and he went).’ (Finnish, Larjavaara 2019: 231)

Therefore, the difference between (58a) and (58b) is in the outcome of the event. In (58a) the emphasis is put on the action of giving the order to someone to go to a sauna (and the person most probably went to a sauna) while in (58b) the emphasis is both on the action and the outcome of the event (the person went to a sauna). For more explanations and examples see Larjavaara (2019: 231–232), where such verbs are classified under the group of telic fruition verbs (*teelis-suksesiiviset* in Finnish).

An analogous example involves the verb *suostutella* ‘persuade’, where the difference between the outcome of the action is also rendered by case marking:

- (59) a. *Hän suostutteli ystävää elokuviin.*  
 3SG persuade.PST.3SG friend.PAR.SG movie.ILL.PL  
 ‘He tried to persuade a friend to go to the movies (but he did not go).’  
 b. *Hän suostutteli ystävän elokuviin.*  
 3SG persuade.PST.3SG friend.ACC.SG movie.ILL.PL  
 ‘He tried to persuade a friend to go to the movies (and he went).’  
 (Finnish, personal knowledge)

All the constructions discussed above describe a complex event involving at least two participants, where one is giving and another is (not necessarily) taking as in (57a–b), one is giving the order and another either obeying or not (as in (58a–b)), one is trying to persuade another person to do smth. and the result is either successful or not (as in (59a–b)). As a result, the irresultativity cannot be quantified, as in the case of degree achievements: in a long causal chain of successive sub-events, any of the necessary events can remain unrealized, leading to the irresultative character of the whole complex event.

#### 4 Discussion

In the previous section a classification of the semantic factors that give rise to the variation of the case marking of discrete objects in Lithuanian and Finnish (and also other neighboring languages) were examined. The classification was based on verbs which normally assign accusative to discrete objects and the use of partitive or partitive genitive with such verbs is rather exceptional.

As Finnish does not have an overt aspect marking on the verb, partitive on the discrete object triggers the interpretation of an unbounded event (imperfective aspect or irresultativity). Lithuanian has overt marking of aspect on the verb (aspectual distinctions in Lithuanian are often expressed by the choice of verbal prefixes). Only plural and mass nouns can occur as objects, denoting indeterminate quantity, therefore the marking of discrete objects by partitive genitive in Lithuanian becomes problematic.

The question arises then whether the Finnish partitive case is used in situations/constructions where Lithuanian has an overt aspect marker on the verb? The resultative and irresultative readings of Finnish achievement verbs are marked with the accusative (= achievement) or partitive (= absence of the result) (see example (1a–b) repeated here for the sake of convenience):

- (1) a. *Ammuin karhun.*  
 shoot.PST.1SG bear.ACC.SG  
 ‘I shot the (a) bear.’  
 b. *Ammuin karhua.*  
 shoot.PST.1SG bear.PAR.SG  
 ‘I shot at the (a) bear (without killing it).’ (Finnish, Kiparsky 1998: 2–3)

In Lithuanian, the achievement or the absence of the result would be marked not on the object, but with different verbal prefixes as in (60a–b), which marks a difference in actionality:

- (60) a. *Nu-šoviau lokį.*  
 PVB-shoot.PST.1SG bear.ACC.SG  
 ‘I shot the (a) bear.’  
 b. *Pa-šoviau lokį.*  
 PVB-shoot.PST.1SG bear.ACC.SG  
 ‘I shot at the (a) bear (without killing it).’ (Lithuanian, personal knowledge)

Lithuanian verbal prefixes may offer a full range of possibilities to describe the event in a very detailed manner regarding the outcome of the result. To illustrate this, I give a non-prefixed Lithuanian verb *nešti* ‘carry’ with possible prefixes which modify the meaning of the verb and also the description of the result: *i-nešti* ‘carry in’, *iš-nešti* ‘carry out’, *per-nešti* ‘carry along’, *pri-nešti* ‘carry at’, *su-nešti* ‘carry to’, *už-nešti* ‘carry up’, *ap-nešti* ‘carry around’, *nu-nešti* ‘carry to’. The opposition between *nešti* ‘carry’: *i-nešti* ‘carry in’ is also the one of quantification. Apart from the description of the result of the event, prefixes may also reflect actional differences (i. e. differences in lexical aspect or Aktionsart), e.g., the prefix *pa-* in *pa-nešti* ‘carry for some time’ renders the verb perfective but atelic, and the boundedness associated with perfectivity is achieved through indication of an arbitrary boundary in time rather than through a change of state.

Historically, the partitive in Finno-Ugric was a spatial case with separative (‘from’) meaning (Kiparsky 1998: 32, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 534–535). Larjavaara (1991) shows that the object case variation in Finnish has developed in a logical manner, although there was some Baltic influence in the early stages. He argues that quantification is an older criterion than aspect and most probably the starting point from which the aspectual uses have developed. Whatever the factors involved in the historical development, the object marking of contemporary Finnish is based on

the culmination (or non-culmination) of the event: “the object of the sentence is total (= ACC) whenever and only when a positive sentence expresses a complete change of the event that has reached (or is reaching) its end-point. In all other cases (including transitive sentences denoting some extent of change, e.g. *lämmitin sauna*.PAR ‘I heated the sauna (a bit)’ or no change at all, e.g. *katsoin televisiota*.PAR ‘I was watching TV’), the partial (= PAR) object is used” (Larjavaara 2019: 207). Therefore for Finnish the culmination of the event (which historically might have its roots in quantification) is the most important criterion for the assignment of the object case.

Could the Finnish partitive have taken over the same functions as the verbal aspectual marker in Lithuanian? The non-availability of irresultative meaning of the partitive genitive in Lithuanian and other Slavic languages might have something to do with the overt marking of aspect and Aktionsart on the verb. The irresultative reading of the object can often be marked in Baltic by a prefix reflecting an atelic Aktionsart.

This preliminary exploration of partitive genitive marking with discrete objects in Lithuanian shows inconsistent marking of irresultativity via case-marking. More diachronic research as well as research on the Lithuanian dialects would be needed to get a better picture of partitive marking of discrete objects in Lithuanian. However, the present research shows, that there is a clear difference between Finnish and Lithuanian for encoding irresultativity in discrete objects: Lithuanian strategy is to use aspectual prefixes, Finnish uses partitive marking.

## 5 Concluding remarks

In this article, the treatment of discrete objects in relation to object marking in Lithuanian and Finnish was investigated. As partitive genitive (or partitive) in object marking with discrete objects is also present in neighbouring languages (e.g. Polish *dać buzi*.GEN ‘give a kiss’, Karelian *antaa suuta*.PAR ‘give a kiss’, Russian *otvorit’ dverej*.GEN ‘partly open the door(s)’), one of the aims of this research was to investigate in which situations partitive or partitive genitive is interpreted as encoding an irresultative event in Lithuanian compared to other neighbouring languages, with a special focus on Lithuanian partitive genitive and Finnish partitive.

As was already shown in previous research, Lithuanian and Finnish have completely different criteria for assigning object cases (Laugaliene 2020). In Finnish the most important factor is the culmination of the event (or the absence of the endpoint), in Lithuanian quantification plays the most important role. In this article it was also shown that the endpoints in Finnish are of different types and could be categorized in subjective terms (i.e. the exact endpoint cannot be traced by perception, the result of the change in the mental state of the experiencer cannot be exactly verified, the event has temporal boundaries or it is not completed according to the judgment of the speaker etc.), which opens up an array of possibilities to use partitive marking for discrete objects very widely. As quantification plays the most important role for the object marking in Lithuanian, the possibilities to quantify discrete objects (*versus* mass nouns) are much more limited. In Lithuanian, partitive genitive can denote a slight affectedness (which could also be realized as affectedness limited in time). In modern Lithuanian, partitive genitive with discrete objects is obsolescent or obsolete, found only in some dialects. However, data from older Lithuanian show that it might have been more frequent than at present. In Finnish, variable quantification is associated with progressive and imperfective readings. Quantification undoubtedly plays an important role in the Finnish aspect both from the diachronic and synchronic point of views (Larjavaara 2019: 209).

Finnish does not have overt aspect marking on the verb, whereas Lithuanian has markers on verbs (mainly prefixes). Hence, Finnish partitive on the discrete object triggers the interpretation of an unbounded event (imperfective aspect or irresultativity). As Lithuanian has overt marking of aspect and actionality (lexical aspect, Aktionsart) on the verb, marking of irresultativity in the case form of the object often becomes redundant. Therefore the non-availability of irresultative

meaning of the partitive genitive in Lithuanian (and other Slavic languages) might partly be due to overt marking of aspect and actionality on the verb.

To conclude, Finnish and Lithuanian both have a way of morphologically marking partially affected discrete objects but do so in different ways. Lithuanian encodes aspect on the verb and so marks partial affectedness that way, but Finnish uses partitive instead. The hypothesis at the beginning of this research was, that Finnish and Lithuanian might use different strategies for encoding irresultativity in discrete objects (Lithuanian has possibilities to express irresultativity with aspectual prefixes, Finnish expresses irresultativity with partitive marking). The results of the research confirm this hypothesis: no consistent marking of irresultativity via case-marking would be expected in Lithuanian, because that would be redundant. The fact that there are only 8 examples in Table 1 (occurrences of verbs with partitive genitive for discrete objects in Lithuanian corpora, which contains both examples from old Lithuanian and Lithuanian dialects) demonstrates that the partitive genitive strategy for discrete objects never completely developed in Lithuanian.

## Sources

- BEL\_1 = Avanesaŭ, R. I., K. K. Krapiva & Ju. F. Matskevich (eds.). 1963. *Dyjalektalahichny atlas belaruskaj movy* [A dialect atlas of Belarusian language]. Vol. 3. Minsk: Vydavetstva Akademii Navuk BSSR, map 211.
- BEL\_2 = Avanesaŭ, R. I., K. K. Krapiva & Ju. F. Matskevich (eds.). 1963. *Dyjalektalahichny atlas belaruskaj movy. Ustupnyja artykuly, davedchyja materyjaly i kamentaryi da kart* [A dialect atlas of Belarusian language. Introductory chapters, reference materials, and commentary on maps]. Minsk: Vydavetstva Akademii Navuk BSSR, 756-757.
- LT\_16 = 1547, Mazvydas Martinas, Catechismus; 1573, Wolfenbüttelio postilė, B; 1575, Vilentas Baltramiejus, Enchiridion z; 1585, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Patarlių knyga (Pat); 1586, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Mokytojo knyga (Mok); 1589, Jonas Bretkūnas, Giesmės Duchaunos; 1589, Jonas Bretkūnas, Kancionalas; 1589, Jonas Bretkūnas, Kolektos; 1590, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Antra metraščių (kronikų) knyga (2 Met); 1590, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Danieliaus knyga (Dan); 1590, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Giesmių giesmės knyga (Gg); 1590, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Izaijo knyga (Iz); 1590, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Jeremijo knyga (Jer); 1590, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Jobo knyga (Job); 1590, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Pirma metraščių (kronikų) knyga (1 Met); 1590, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Raudų knyga (Rd); 1585, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Josua; 1585, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Judges; 1585, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Kings 1; 1585, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Kings 2; 1585, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Ruth; 1585, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Samuel 1; 1585, Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Samuel 2; 1591, Jonas Bretrkunas Altes Testament; 1591, Jonas Bretrkunas, Postilla 1; 1591, Jonas Bretrkunas, Postilla 2; 1595, Mikalojus Daukša, Katekizmas; 1599, Mikalojus Daukša, Postilė.
- LT\_18 = 1700, Martinas Lutheris, Mažasis katekizmas; 1701, Samuelis Bitneris, Naujasis Testamentas; 1704, Danielius Kleinas, Frydrichas Šusteris, Naujos giesmių knygos, Naujos maldų knygelės; 1704, Danielius Kleinas, Frydrichas Šusteris, Naujos giesmių knygos; 1704, Danielius Kleinas, Frydrichas Šusteris, Naujos maldų knygelės; 1705, Jonas Jaknavičius, Ewangelie Polskie y Litewskie; 1706, Jokūbas Perkūnas, Wohlgegründetes Bedenken über die ins Litauische übersetzten zehn Fabeln Aesopi und derselben passionierte Zuschrift; 1706, Jonas Šulcas, Ezopo pasakėčios; 1706, Michaelis Mörlinas, Principium primum in lingua Lithuanica; 1709, Martinas Lutheris, Mažasis katekizmas; 1716–1744, Jokūbas Brodovskis, Litauische Sprichwörter und Rätsel; 1727, Ruigis, Naujasis Testamentas; 1728, Psalteras Dovydo; 1729, Johannas Anastasijus Freylinghausenas, Davadnas mokslas apie dūšios išganymą; 1750, Jonas Jaknavičius, Ewangelie Polskie y Litewskie; 1775, Gotfridas Ostermejeris, Agenda.

- LT\_19 = 1869, Motiejus Valančius; 1897, Pranas Vaičaitis; 1823, Silvestras Valiūnas; 1807, Johannas Arndtas, Šešios knygos apie tikrą krikščionumą (pirma knyga); 1815, Dionizas Poška, Mužikas Žemaičių ir Lietuvos; 1816, Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis, Naujas įstatymas; 1823, Simonas Stanevičius, Historija šventa; 1841, Keturios gražios giesmės; 1841, Keturi naujo giesmė; 1841, Penkis naujo giesmė; 1845, Eikš prie Jėzaus; 1859, Baranauskas, Anykščių šilelis; 1896, Antanas Baranauskas, Kalbomokslis lietuviškos kalbos
- LT\_20 = 1896-1933, Vaižgantas; 1919, Basanavičius; 1913, Ignas Šeinius\_Raštai\_9; 1903, Lazdynų pelėda; 1933, Ignas Šeinius\_Raštai\_10; 1937, Ignas Šeinius, Raštai\_5; 1942, Ignas Šeinius\_Raštai\_6
- Raamattu Dan. = Danielin kirja (Raamattu 1992, WSOY, Porvoo, Helsinki, Juva)
- Raamattu Jer = Jeremian kirja (Raamattu 1992, WSOY, Porvoo, Helsinki, Juva)
- Raamattu Job = Jobin kirja (Raamattu 1992, WSOY, Porvoo, Helsinki, Juva)
- Raamattu Matt. = Evankeliumi Matteuksen mukaan (Raamattu 1992, WSOY, Porvoo, Helsinki, Juva)
- Raamattu, 2. Moos 7: 20 = Toinen Mooseksen kirja (Raamattu 1992, WSOY, Porvoo, Helsinki, Juva)
- Raamattu Sananl. = Sananlaskujen kirja (Raamattu 1992, WSOY, Porvoo, Helsinki, Juva)
- Raamattu 1. Kun = Ensimmäinen kuninkaiden kirja (Raamattu 1992, WSOY, Porvoo, Helsinki, Juva)
- URB 2013 = Buteikytė-Urbanavičienė, Vanda. 2013. *Pro Usiuginę vieškeliu, tolin...* Ukmergė: Valdo leidykla.

## References

- Ambrazas, Vytautas, Dumašiūtė, Zelma, Juodelytė D., Kniūkšta, Pranas, Labutis, Vitas. 1976. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika. III tomas. Sintaksė* [Lithuanian grammar. 3rd Volume. Syntax]. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.). 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
- Anscombe, Gerthrud E. M. 2000. *Intention*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Beavers, John. 2006. *Argument/Oblique Alternations and the Structure of Lexical Meaning*. Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Blake, Barry J. 2004. *Case*. 2nd edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buslaev, Fedor I. 1959. *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka* [Historical grammar of Russian language]. Moskva, Učpedgiz.
- Dowty, David. 1979. *Word meaning in Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1970. The grammar of hitting and breaking. In R. Jacobs & P. A. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar*. 120–133. Waltham, MA: Ginn.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: a construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago [Ill.] – London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goodwin, William W. 1898. *Greek Grammar*. Boston: Ginn&Company.
- Hay, J., Kennedy, C., & Levin, B. 1999. Scalar Structure Underlies Telicity in “Degree Achievements”. In T. Mathews and D. Strolovitch (eds.), *SALT IX, CLC Publications*, 127–144. Ithaca.
- Heinämäki, Orvokki. 1984. Aspect in Finnish. In Casper de Groot and Hannu Tommola (eds.), *Aspect bound: A voyage into the realm of Germanic, Slavonic and Finno-Ugrian aspectology*, 153–177. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Holvoet, Axel. 1991. *Transitivity and clause structure in Polish: a study in case marking*. Warszawa: SOW.
- Huumo, Tuomas. 2013. On the many faces of incompleteness: Hide-and-seek with the Finnish partitive object. *Folia Linguistica* 47(1). 89–111.

- ISK 2004 = Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, and Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen keilioppi* [Descriptive Grammar of Finnish]. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 950. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Jablonskis, Jonas & Baublys, Rostislavas. 1957. *Rinktiniai raštai* [Selected articles]. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla [State Publishing House of Political and Scientific Literature].
- Kempf, Zdzisław. 1970. Rozwój i zanik polskiego partitiwu [The development and the disappearance of the Polish partitive]. In Jan Safarewicz (ed.), *Język Polski: organ Towarzystwa Miłośników Języka Polskiego* 3 [Polish Language: the Society of Polish Language Enthusiasts], 181–194. Towarzystwo Miłośników Języka Polskiego [The Society of Polish Language Enthusiasts].
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1998. Partitive Case and Aspect. In Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder (eds.), *The projection of arguments: lexical and compositional factors*, 265–307. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2001. “A piece of the cake” and “A cup of tea”: partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact*, Vol 2, 523–568. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria & Bernhard Wälchli. 2001. The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach. In Östen Dahl and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact*, Vol. 2, 615–750. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1971. Słowiański genetivus po negacji [Slavic genitive in negation]. In *Sesja Naukowa Międzynarodowej Komisji Budowy Gramatycznej Języków Słowiańskich* [Scientific Session of the International Commission for the Structure of the Grammar of Slavi Languages] (= Polska Akademia Nauk. Oddz. w Krakowie, Prace Komisji Słowianoznawstwa 23), 11–15., Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Larjavaara, Matti. 1991. Aspektuaalisen objektin synty [The Origin of the Aspectual Object]. *Virittäjä* 95. 372–408.
- Larjavaara, Matti. 2019. *Partitiivin valinta* [The Choice of the Partitive]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar. 1983. Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen [Studies of the use of the partitive in Balto-Finnic languages]. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. *Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia* 15. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Laugalienė, Asta. 2020. Partitivity and object marking in Finnish and Lithuanian. *Philologia Estonica* 5. 236–267. <https://doi.org/10.22601/PET.2020.05.08>
- Leino, Pentti. 1991. *Lauseet ja tilanteet. Suomen objektin ongelmia* [Sentences and situation. The problems of the Finnish object]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Class and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P.
- Luraghi, Silvia & Kittilä, Seppo. 2014. Typology and diachrony of partitive case markers. In Silvia Luraghi & Tuomas Huomo (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 54), 17–62. Berlin & Boston: DeGruyter.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2014. Partitives and negation: a cross-linguistic survey. In Silvia Luraghi & Tuomas Huomo (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 54), 63–86. Berlin & Boston: DeGruyter.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2014. The Independent Partitive Genitive in Lithuanian. In Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic (Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic 1)*, 257–299. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2015. The Independent Partitive as an Eastern Circum-Baltic isogloss. *Journal of Language Contact* 8. 341–418.

- Seržant, Ilja. 2020. Typology of partitives. *Journal of Linguistics* 59, 4, 5–67.
- Tamm, Anne. 2012. Scalar verb classes. Scalarity, Thematic Roles and Arguments in the Estonian Aspectual Lexicon. *Biblioteca di studi di filologia moderna* 14, Firenze University Press.
- Vainikka, Anne & Maling, Joan. 1996. Is partitive case inherent or structural? In Jacob Hoeksema (ed.), *Partitives: Studies on the Syntax and Semantics of Partitive and Related Constructions*, 179–208. Berlin: MoutonDe Gruyter.

Asta Laugalienė  
Vilnius University, Vilnius  
asta.laugaliene@flf.vu.lt