



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

This is the published version of a paper published in *Baltu filologija*.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Bjarnadóttir, V., de Smit, M. (2013)

Primary Argument Case-marking in Baltic and Finnic.

*Baltu filologija*, XXII(1): 31-65

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:su:diva-108408>

## PRIMARY ARGUMENT CASE-MARKING IN BALTIC AND FINNIC\*

Valgerður BJARNADÓTTIR, Merlijn DE SMIT  
Stockholms universitet

### 1. Introduction

Proto-Germanic and Proto-Baltic are known to have exerted a comparable impact on Proto-Finnic with loanwords: from Proto-Baltic, some very basic vocabulary such as Finnish *hammas* ‘tooth’ (cf. Latv. *zobs*) and the kinship terms *sisar* ‘sister’ (cf. Lith. *sesuo*) and *tytär* ‘daughter’ (cf. Lith. *duktė*) are known to have been borrowed. The Proto-Germanic loanword layer has been coupled with a sweeping hypothesis on Proto-Germanic influence on the Proto-Finnic phonological system (Posti 1953), which, if not entirely accepted today, has proven to be a fruitful basis for further research (e.g. Koivulehto and Vennemann 1996, Kallio 2000) – which is the best compliment one can pay to a scientific hypothesis.

Research into early Baltic influence on Finnic structure has been pioneered by Lars-Gunnar Larsson, focusing on the origin of partiality-based case-marking in Finnic (Larsson 1983) and the usage of genitive agents with participial constructions (Larsson 1996, 2001). Influence in the other direction has also been proposed, namely by Timberlake (1974) on the origin of nominative-marked objects in Baltic and Slavic in certain constructions. In the following, we will pursue Larsson in concentrating on partial object case-marking and genitive agents, and leave aside the question of nominative objects, as the date of the latter contact-induced change arguably postdates the break-up of Proto-Baltic and Proto-Finnic (Ambrazas 2001: 405–406). We will argue below that Larssons’ arguments can be extended by taking into account paradigmatically related constructions, such as the Finnic accusative object (\*-*m*), which vindicates the case for Baltic influence on the core syntactic structure of the Finnic languages.

### 2. Grammatical case-markers in Finnic and Baltic

#### 2.1. Grammatical case-markers in Finnic

Cases used for subject and object marking in Finnic are the nominative (-*o*, plur. -*t*), the genitive/accusative -*n* and the partitive -*tA*. Additionally, in various non-finite constructions, genitive (-*n*) and locative cases (adessive

\* We are indebted to Ilja Seržant and two external referees for valuable comments.

*-lla*, ablative *-lta* and allative *-lle*) may be used to mark agents: these usually have a more or less transparent adverbial background.

The term accusative is not unproblematic in Finnic: first of all, no distinct accusative marker is used with plural NPs. Plural direct objects are marked either with the *-t* nominative plural or the partitive plural (*-itA*). In similar fashion, numbers larger than one lack a distinct object marker. With singular NPs, the object marker *-n* is homophonous with the genitive case in all Finnic languages and indeed sometimes identified with the genitive, although the two cases have different historical roots (the object marker *-n* having developed from a Uralic accusative or, more properly, definiteness marker *\*-m*, the genitive *-n* having developed from a Uralic *\*-n*). In traditional Finnish grammar (for example, Setälä 1966: 18), the object marker *-n* is called the ‘marked accusative’ (*päätteellinen akkusatiivi*), whereas the nominative objects are called ‘unmarked accusatives’ (*päätteetön akkusatiivi*). The most recent reference grammar of Finnish (ISK) opts for using the terms ‘genitive’ and ‘nominative’ for *-n* objects and unmarked objects, reserving the term ‘accusative’ for pronominal objects only. In this paper, we will compromise by using ‘accusative’ for the marker *-n* on objects as well as the markers *-n* and *-t* on pronominal objects, and the term ‘nominative’ for unmarked singular objects as well as plural objects with *-t*.

The grammatical markers mentioned above are by and large common to Finnic. The object marking of personal pronouns shows variation in the Finnic language area. Standard Finnish (as well as East Finnish dialects) sport an object marker *-t* on personal pronouns (as well as the interrogative pronoun *kuka*, *kene-* ‘who’), e.g. *minu-t* (‘me’, *minä* ‘I’), *meidä-t* (‘us’, *me* ‘we’). West Finnish dialects (as well as the Old Finnish literary language with its strong West Finnish dialectal base) use *-n* throughout the pronominal paradigm. In Karelian, however, *-t* is used with plural personal pronouns only, singular ones sporting an object marker on *-n*. Lude, Vepse and partially Estonian use forms based on a partitive ending (Ojajärvi 1950: 111–113), though in Estonian singular pronouns may show an accusative ending as well. Livonian uses genitive forms for both singular and plural personal pronouns – homophonous with the original accusative in the singular, but distinct from the nominative plural (Tveite 2004: 12–13). The Finnish usage of the pronominal *-t* is thus confined to Finnish, and the marker may well be based on a plural marker (used pleonastically with plural personal pronouns, which show traces of a plural *\*-k* in their nominative forms, in North Finnish dialects *-t*: *met* ‘we’, *tet* ‘you’), analogically extended to the singular in Finnish (Laanest 1982: 190). With personal pronouns, it must be in any case kept in mind that the southern Finnic languages (Votic, Estonian and Livonian) show secondary 3rd person pronouns based on demonstrative *tämä* ‘this’, *nämä* ‘those’.



subject-like features (such as typical preverbal position and, occasionally at least, equi-deletion) may be observed.

## 2.2. Grammatical case-markers in Baltic

The main cases used for subject and object marking in Baltic are the nominative and the accusative. Masculine nouns show a specific nominative singular ending on *-s* in all three Baltic languages. The accusative is based on Proto-IE\**-m* > Proto-Baltic\**-n*, retained as *-n* in Prussian, as a long vowel written with a subscript nasalization on the stem vowel in Lithuanian, and *-u* from an older \**-uo* in Latvian where the loss of *-n* caused a subsequent lengthening of the vowel which then shortened in word final position: \**om* > \**am* > \**an* > *uo* > *-u/\_#*. The neuter gender has disappeared in Lithuanian and Latvian, and in these languages, nominative and accusative are always kept distinct in the singular. Prussian retains a neuter, with *-n* marking the nominative/accusative. With plural feminine nouns, nominative and accusative have merged in Latvian.

Additionally in various specific constructions subjects and objects can be non-canonically marked. These include e.g. the agentive genitive in passive constructions and non-referential evidential constructions in Lithuanian, the partitive genitive and genitive of negation both as a subject and an object in Lithuanian and High Latvian, and the ablative genitive<sup>2</sup> as an object marker in both languages. Additionally, the dative is used in subject-like fashion to mark the experiencer with *verba sentiendi* as well as some modal verbs, but its subject status is controversial<sup>3</sup>. The genitive singular has the ending *-s* in all languages, except in *o*-stems, where Lithuanian and Latvian replaced the genitive with the ablative, having the ending: \**-ā* (Lith. *vilk-o*, Latv. *vilk-a*, OCS. *vlk-a*)<sup>4</sup>. The East Baltic languages share this peculiarity with Slavic, and in these languages (Prussian included) the genitive and ablative have merged completely. In Prussian, on the other hand, the genitive of *o*-stems

<sup>2</sup> cf. Abliatyvinis kilmininkas (Ambrasas 2006: 240).

<sup>3</sup> It has been claimed (Seržant, forthcoming 1) that dative experiencer predicates in the Eastern Circum-Baltic area (Western Finnic, Russian and Baltic) share the same semantic and syntactic properties e.g. pass and fail the same subjecthood tests.

<sup>4</sup> These forms are interpreted differently, Endzelīns (1971: 134) and Stang (1966: 44, 181) claim that the Proto-Baltic gen. sg. ending \**-ā* derives from the IE ablative ending \**-ā-d* or \**-o-at* (cf. Lat. GNAIV-OD, old Vedic *asv-āt* (Stang 1966: 70, 181), as IE \**-ō* cannot render Proto-Baltic \**-ā*. Kazlauskas (1968) and Mažiulis (1970: 99–106) claim that the Lith. gen. sg. *-o* and Latv. *-a*, OCS *-a* is to be derived neither from PIE \**-ōd* nor \**-ād* but \**-ō* (o/e the *-d* being a postpositional dental element with the meaning 'from', cf. Latin *dē*. The unstressed variant of the IE ending \**-ō* developed into Proto-Baltic \**-ō*, from which Lith. *-o* and Latv. *-a*.

has the ending *-as* from PIE *\*-os(i)o* like Skt. *-asya* and Homeric Greek *-oio*<sup>5</sup>. The nominative singular and the genitive singular in Prussian thus have the same form. The genitive plural is based on *\*-ōm* and represented as a former nasalized *-y* in Lithuanian, *-u* in Latvian and *-an* in Prussian<sup>6</sup>.

### 3. Partial subject and object in Finnic and Baltic

#### 3.1. Partial object in Baltic and Finnic

Finnic and Baltic share a distinction between total (accusative) and partial (partitive in Finnic, genitive in Baltic) objects. In both language groups, this distinction is extended to a subset of subjects, namely those of s.c. existential clauses.

In Finnic, the distinction between accusative and partitive depends on a host of criteria: put simply, partially affected or unaffected objects will be marked with the partitive, totally affected objects with the accusative. Typical conditions for the partitive are thus negated clauses (where the object remains unaffected), atelic verbs, and verbs denoting psychological and emotional states such as ‘fear’ or ‘love’, e.g. *rakastaa* ‘love’, *pelätä* ‘fear’, *kaivata* ‘to long for’, *sääliä* ‘to pity’:

- (4) *Hän tappoi suden* (Finnish)  
 He killed wolf-ACC  
 ‘He killed the wolf’ (telic verb, totally affected object)
- (5) *Hän luki sanomalehden*  
 He read the paper-ACC  
 ‘He read the paper’ (totally affected object)
- (6) *Hän luki sanomalehteä*  
 He read paper-PART  
 ‘He was reading the paper’ (partially affected object)
- (7) *Hän ei tappanut sutta*  
 He NEG killed the wolf-PART  
 ‘He didn’t kill the wolf’ (negated clause)

These principles hold across the Finnic languages, though there is variation: in Livonian, objects may be marked with the accusative as well if the scope of negation does not extend to the object, i.e. its existence is implicitly affirmed – nonetheless the partitive is the most common case with

<sup>5</sup> See different views in Schmalstieg 1976: 144–146.

<sup>6</sup> Due to lack of reliable material and scanty documentation in Old Prussian we will mainly rely on findings from the still spoken East Baltic languages Lithuanian and Latvian.

negated clauses in Livonian (Tveite 2004: 16–17, 33, 51). And in the eastern Finnic languages (Karelian, Lude, Vepse), there appears to be a tendency for the nominative plural to be used in contexts that would call for the partitive in Standard Finnish (Ojajärvi 1950: 40–42).

The use of the genitive object in Baltic can be divided in two categories: partitive (and in that group, the closely related genitive of negation) and ablative. Some IE languages (Indo-Iranian and partly ancient Romance languages) exhibit the ablative as a particular case ending; others employ the genitive (Baltic, Greek) or dative (Celtic, Germanic) to express the ablative function. The East-Baltic languages and Slavic (*i*)o-stem genitive singular ending has a remnant from the ablative \*-ā (lith. *vilko*, la *vilka*, ocs *vlъka*). The original fundamental meaning of the ablative case was removal, separation and its basic function was to express the semantic role of Source (Luraghi 2003: 50). As with the partitive in Finnic, the ablative genitive is used with psychological verbs such as ‘be afraid of’, for example Lithuanian *bijoti* ‘to be afraid of’: *bijoti vilkų* ‘be afraid of wolves’, *nusigąsti* ‘get scared’ : *nusigąsti griaustinio* ‘get scared of thunder’, *gėdytis* ‘be ashamed of’ : *gėdytis mergų* ‘be ashamed of the girls’, *bodėtis* ‘dislike/get bored by’ : *bodėtis svečio* ‘be bored by guest’ (Fraenkel 1928: 82–83), Latvian *bīties*, *bijāties* ‘fear/be afraid of’ and *kaunēties* ‘to be ashamed of’. Many verbs with similar semantics take a genitive argument in Slavic as well, e.g. *bojati se* ‘fear/be afraid of’ and *styděti se* ‘to be ashamed of’, similarly in Greek, while in the old Indo-Iranian languages these verbs take an ablative argument (Ambrazas 2006: 243). The diachronic relation between the ablative and the partitive genitive is very close, as observed by Harris and Campbell (1996: 339–341)<sup>7</sup> and may be conceptualized as a unidirectional grammaticalization: Ablative > Partitive, in other words: source>separation>partiality (see also Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 538–539). This development has occurred in a straightforward manner in Finnic, where the partitive is used invariably with verbs denoting emotional states such as ‘fear’ and ‘love’, as mentioned above.

Alternating with the accusative, the genitive in Baltic is used for partially affected objects (or unaffected with genitive of negation) and the accusative for totally affected objects. Many ancient and some modern Indo-European languages share this usage of the genitive case (Gothic, Vedic, Greek, Old Slavic, Early Latin). The partitive usage of the genitive is considered to be of Proto-Indo-European origin and even one of its main functions: ‘le principal emploi du génitif indo-européen était sans doute d’indiquer le tout

<sup>7</sup> This is frequently attested but ablative is however not the only source for partitives. In Baltic and Slavic only one slot (the o-stem) that stems from the old ablative. All the other stems (consonant stems, ā-, ē, ū, i- and the plural) have genuine genitive endings.

dont on prend une partie' ('the main use of the Indo-European genitive was undoubtedly to denote the whole from which one takes a part') (Meillet 1964: 345)<sup>8</sup>. The partitive genitive has the functional property of denoting an indefinite and non-specified quantity of the object:

Lithuanian: *ėmė mėsq/mėsos* 'took all of the meat-ACC/a part of it-GEN', *gėrė piėnq/piėno* 'drank all of the milk-ACC/part of it-GEN', *matė paukščius/paukščių* 'saw the birds-ACC/some birds-GEN' (Ambrasas 2006);

Latvian: (*no*)*pirkt piėna*-GEN/*piėnu*-ACC 'buy milk/(all) the milk', *ēst siėra*-GEN/*siėru*-ACC 'eat cheese/(all) the cheese', *gribēties augļu*-GEN/*augļu*-ACC 'want fruit, (all) the fruit'.

This corresponds closely to the distinction between accusative and partitive in Finnic (examples (5) and (6) above). We can clearly distinguish some semantic groups of verbs that may exhibit the alternation of accusative and genitive objects. These are consumption verbs such as *eat*, *drink* etc.; verbs denoting give/take, as well as verbs of which the object is countable: *carry*, *buy*, etc. The objects of these verbs are usually concrete nouns and the the partitive meaning is quite transparent; one can give, take, eat, buy something of undefined quantity and of a clearly defined quantity.

Also, verbs of perception and cognition will take a genitive object in Baltic. The first argument of perception verbs is often an experiencer, and they score lower in transitivity:

- (8) *Prisakimu*                      *szinai*                                      (Old Lithuanian)  
 Commandments-GEN              you know  
 'You know the commandments' (BrB, Luke 18: 20)

In Old Prussian the partitive genitive is only encountered once<sup>9</sup>:

- (9) *Labbas*              *esse*    *stesmu waitiāt*                                      (Old Prussian)  
 Good-GEN    about this    talk  
 '(we should) talk well about this' (III 35:3)

<sup>8</sup> It might be worth noting that although etymologically related the partitive genitive of the ancient IE languages and in Baltic and Slavic differ in some ways as to regards semantics see further in Seržant (2012) about the discursive-driven function of the bare partitive-genitive in Old Greek and about the unbounded reading of the partitive genitive in Old Greek (Napoli 2010).

<sup>9</sup> Old Prussian was on the way towards a radical simplification of its case system, using mainly nominative and accusative for subject and object case-marking, with dative and genitive used only when no other means were available (Petit 2007). Old Prussian also clearly marked definiteness and indefiniteness by developing definite articles, formed from demonstrative pronouns in a manner similar to the Greek definite article.



The genitive object, although stable and widely used in Modern Lithuanian, was used more intensively in the oldest attested texts from the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. There we find both accusative, that is the common case used in Modern Standard Lithuanian, and genitive as the object of *verba memoriae* (cognition verbs) i.e. *atminti*, *minėti*, *užmiršti*, etc. ('to remember', 'to forget').

- (10) *Tada atmine Petras szodzių Iesus* (Lithuanian)  
 Then remembered Peter words-GEN Jesus  
 'Then Peter remembered the words of Jesus' (BrB, Matt. 26: 75)
- (11) *Atminās... muskuļa* (Latvian)  
 Remember... muscle-GEN  
 'remember the muscle' (LP III:15)

In this, Finnic differs from Baltic: verbs such as *tietää* 'know' and *muistaa* 'remember' generally take accusative objects unless the object fulfils specific conditions determining partitive case-marking, such as quantitative indefiniteness.

In Modern Lithuanian the accusative has been generalised as an object of *verba memoriae* although genitive can still be found in dialects. For other verbs the opposite has happened; the genitive has been generalized. The partitive meaning is lost and they no longer alternate with the accusative:

- a) Durative verbs denoting a striving towards something, such as psychological verbs denoting desire and longing: *norėti* 'want', *geisti* 'lust', *trokšti* 'desire', *linkėti* 'wish', as well as verbs denoting searching: *ieškoti* 'look for', *siekti* 'seek', and waiting: *laukti* 'wait for', all govern genitive in the Standard Lithuanian language;
- b) Verbs denoting a lack or having enough of something: *stigti* 'be short of', *(pri)trūkti* 'lack', *(už)tekti* 'have enough', *pakakti* 'suffice'<sup>10</sup>;
- c) Transitive verbs with the prefixes *pri-*, *at-*, *už-*, *pa-* which increase the sphere of action of the verb, usually take direct objects in the genitive case: *pririnkti uogų* 'pick too many berries'/*persivalgyti obuolių* 'eat too many apples'. This is especially true of the prefix *pri-* where it is obligatory to use the genitive.

From other languages we know that accusative/genitive alternation patterns have an impact on the aspectual interpretation of the resultant verb phrase. There, it is not only the object but the verb itself which is affected

<sup>10</sup> Ambrazas (2006) regards the genitive here as a subject and the dative as the object. In earlier work (1997) Ambrazas regards the genitive argument as an object. Without having run any syntactic subject tests here we prefer to regard the dative experiencer argument as the main argument in the sentence.

by the choice of case-marker, which gives rise to an opposition between incomplete and complete events. In Finnish as well, a verb denoting an unbounded situation takes the partitive case whereas when denoting a bounded event it takes the accusative case:

(12) *luin kirjaa* (Finnish)  
I read-PAST a book-PART  
'I was reading a book'

(13) *luin kirjan*  
I read-PAST a book-ACC  
'I read the book'

In Russian, however, a similar opposition would be expressed with imperfective/perfective aspectual pairs, where the imperfective form may imply an indefinite reading of the object as opposed to the perfective form which implies that the object is definite and specifically quantified (Kiparsky 1998: 22). This opposition is thus morphologically marked in both languages; by a verbal category in Russian and a nominal category in Finnish. A grammaticalization of this kind, with the partitive genitive marker becoming aspectual, has not developed to the same extent in Baltic. In eastern Lithuanian dialects certain transitive verbs can take a direct object in the genitive case as to denote that the action of the verb is terminally limited:

(14) *Duok man peilio* (Lithuanian)  
Give to me knife-GEN  
'Give me a knife' (for a short time, I will return it immediately)  
(LKŽ, sub nomine)

The use of the genitive here relates to the short time the knife is needed. From an aspectual point of view this event seems like a very accomplished and completed action i.e. a bounded reading, so we should rather expect an accusative. In a recent article Seržant (forthcoming 2) takes up this matter and convincingly argues that in this respect Lithuanian crucially differs from Finnish. He claims that boundedness is relevant for Lithuanian and plays a more prominent role than totality in assigning IPG (independent partitive genitive) as he calls it. 'Lithuanian has generalized only the *bounded reading* of the IPG for the interaction with the actional properties of the predicate, while the *unbounded reading* thereof is excluded from this function in Lithuanian; the latter remains at disposal only for the NP-internal quantification' (Seržant – forthcoming 2: 18).

Closely related to the partitive genitive is the genitive of negation. Both subjects in negated existential clauses and objects in negated transitive clauses are marked with the genitive case and, like partitives, alternate with

the nominative and accusative used in affirmative clauses. The connection between the partitive genitive and the genitive of negation is obvious but scholars are split in the way how they explain this relation: there are those who think that genitive of negation is a subgroup of partitive genitive (Fraenkel 1928: 47–55; Schwyzer, Debrunner 1975: 102 in Ambrazas 2006: 238) and others who believe it do be derived from the partitive (Meillet 1934: 465; Endzelins 1951: 403 in Ambrazas 2006: 238). As mentioned in the previous section, the partitive genitive can be found in most of the ancient IE languages. The genitive of negation, however, has not as wide a distribution. It is limited to the area surrounding the Baltic languages, and generally considered to be a common Balto-Slavic-Germanic feature, as it is observed in the Slavic languages, in Gothic and it is also found in the Finnic languages. In Slavic it is clear from OCS texts that the genitive of negation was widely used from early times<sup>11</sup>. It existed in Gothic but was lost in the other Germanic languages.

In both Baltic and Finnic, direct objects of transitive verbs – even those marked generally with the accusative – will take a genitive or partitive case-marker in negated clauses. This is restricted to accusative objects and does not apply to oblique objects:

Lithuanian:

- (15) *Aš nusipirkau naują dviratį / Aš nenusipirkau naujo dviračio/  
\*naują dviratį*  
I bought a new bike-ACC / I did not buy a new bike-GEN

But:

- (16) *Ji ruošiasi egzaminui / ji nesiruošia  
egzaminui/\*egzamino*  
She prepares for the exam-DAT / she does not prepare  
for the exam-DAT

And in Finnish:

- (17) *Ostin uuden polkupyörän / En ostanut uutta polkupyörää*  
I bought a new bike-ACC I did not buy a new bike-PART

Lithuanian has preserved the genitive of negation and it is obligatory in the modern standard language (Ambrazas 2006: 235). In Finnish, partitive object-marking occurs as regularly in Old Finnish as it does in modern

<sup>11</sup> The distribution in the modern Slavic languages is interesting: genitive of negation was obligatory in OCS and for subject it still is in Russian but optional for objects and the opposite for Polish and Slovene where it is mandatory for objects and very restricted for subject. In Ukrainian, Belorussian it is optional and in Czech and Serbo-Croatian it is considered an archaism (Kagan 2007).

Finnish: exceptions do occur, but these are quite sporadic. In older Lithuanian texts there are examples with accusative (for example, with preverbal objects – Fraenkel 1928: 48) but they are much less frequent than the genitive:

- (18) *Newed mus ingí pagundima* (Old Lithuanian)  
 Do not lead us-ACC in temptation  
 ‘Do not lead us into temptation’ (Mž 23:15)
- (19) *Ghis man ne pasake wardą sawa* (Old Lithuanian)  
 He me not tell name-ACC his  
 ‘He did not tell me his name’ (BrB, Judges 13:6)

In the older texts the use of accusative with a negated verb is notably more common among writers from Prussia (Lithuania Minor) than writers from Lithuania, yet the genitive dominates even there. In translated texts an accusative in a negated clause of the original text is usually translated with a genitive. In *The Gospel according to Luke* translated from Latin, Bretkūnas translated 66 accusatives with negated verbs as genitives and later when correcting the manuscript he changed 20 accusatives with negated verbs to genitives and only 23 remained as accusatives (Gelumbeckaitė 2002: 10). The use of accusative is more common in translations from German than from Latin (Palionis 1967:162). As was said, the genitive of negation had disappeared in all Germanic languages except Gothic, so this could be German influence. This becomes more common in this area later on, as can be seen in Donelaitis’ work from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, where the accusative dominates as an object after a negated verb. This is even clearer in tales published by Basanavičius in South East Aukštaitian dialects and Žemaitian from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, where only in 10% of the cases we have genitive of negation (Švambarytė 1998: 58). Thus, the closer to the old German (earlier Prussian) borders, the more general the use of accusative; and the further northeast, the more the genitive is used. Today the genitive of negation has been generalised and standardized in the modern Lithuanian language, and in all the dialects except for south western Aukštaitian and parts of Žemaitian the genitive of negation prevails. In Old Prussian writings, the genitive of negation only occurs twice:

- (20) *Nidraudiete steison / quai niturrilai... steison deicktas*  
 Not forbid this-GEN some not have ... this thing-GEN  
 ‘Do not forbid this’ ‘some do not have... anything’  
 (III 113: 3–4) (III 65: 5–6)

Otherwise we find an accusative.

This could be explained as a German influence, both in terms of structure i.e. reflecting the simplification of the case system where the accusative case was generalised as the object case and textually, as a direct translation from German.

### 3.2. Partial subject in Baltic and Finnic

Existential clause subjects in Finnic are post-verbal and do not agree in number with the main verb (which is, typically, a 3rd pers. singular form such as *on* ‘is’, *tulee* ‘comes’, *käy* ‘goes’). They are marked with the partitive case on similar grounds as objects, namely, if they are quantitatively indefinite, or when the clause is negated:

(22) *Kadulla on auto* (Finnish)  
 On the street is a car-NOM  
 ‘There is a car in the street’

(23) *Kadulla on autoja*  
 On the street is cars-PART PL  
 ‘There are cars in the street’

(24) *Kadulla ei ole autoa*  
 On the street NEG is car-PART SG  
 ‘There is no car in the street’

Both in terms of partitive marking in negated clauses, in post-verbal position and in lack of agreement with the main verb, the existential clause subject is reminiscent of an object. As existential clause subjects are typically indefinite, personal pronouns may not occur in normal existential clauses. Possessive clauses, however, form a structurally similar subset of existential clauses in Finnish, and here indeed possessive pronouns may (albeit marginally) occur. If they do, they are marked with the pronominal accusative *-t*:

(25) *Onneksi minulla on sinut* (Finnish)  
 Fortunately at me is you-ACC  
 ‘Fortunately I have you’

The existential subject has been analyzed in various ways in Fennistic literature. Itkonen (1979) holds to an analysis of Finnish subject and object marking as at least to some extent ergative, and he is followed here by Nelson (1998: 98–105). Authors such as Moravcsik (1978: 252–253) and Plank (1985: 183) argue one could speak of ergative patterning in an otherwise nominative-accusative language. On this analysis, the usage of object-like case-marking (and other object-like features) with some intransitive subjects is unexceptional. In contrast, Vilkuna (1996: 156–157) has argued for analyzing the existential subject as an object, at least with possessive clauses. And Helasvuo (2001: 101), departing from a construction grammar point of view, has argued against analyzing the existential clause subject as a subject, holding it to be very tightly

integrated into its specific construction (which does indeed show some lexical specificity in the limited number of verbs that occur).

Partitive marking on existential subjects appears across the Finnic language area (Ojajärvi 1950: 128–129, Laanest 1982: 295), though in most Finnic languages, the partitive seems to occur in a more restricted fashion than in Finnish (Ojajärvi 1950: 25). Thus the following clause from central Karelian would have a partitive subject in Finnish:

- (26) *liga on dorogalla* (Karelian)  
 dirt-NOM is on the road  
 ‘There’s dirt on the road’ (Ojajärvi 1950: 22)

This more restricted occurrence of partitive case-marking is found as well with nominal predicates (Ojajärvi 1950: 25–26) and may, according to Ojajärvi (1950: 24), represent an older state of affairs, though possibly conserved through contact influence with Russian. In Vepse, in contrast, partitive subjects may occur outside of existential constructions on purely semantic grounds: quantitatively indefinite subjects may be marked with the partitive even in transitive clauses (Kettunen 1943: 50–51).

The object-like marking of existential clauses is, as mentioned, reminiscent of ergative languages: Itkonen (1979) introduces the term ‘inverted ergativity’ to signify that the distribution of case-markers is ergative-like (nominative for transitive and most intransitive subjects, partitive, accusative or nominative for objects and a subset of intransitive subjects) but the case-marking itself is not. Explicit marking on transitive subjects (with unmarked objects and intransitive subjects) has indeed been held universal for ergative languages (Havas 2006: 105). Though counterexamples have been mentioned in the literature, these appear to be very rare (Creissels 2009: 453–454).

Though partitive subject-marking is largely restricted to indefinite, non-pronominal subjects, in Finnish pronominal subjects may occasionally occur with the partitive in existential clauses. In these constructions, nominative subject-marking would be ungrammatical (ISK par. 918):

- (27) *jos häntä ei enää olisi* (Finnish)  
 if he-PART no longer be-COND  
 ‘If he wouldn’t be there any more’

The Baltic equivalent of the Finnic partitive, the genitive case can function as a subject as well. The genitive as a subject marker occurs almost exclusively in existential clauses with certain intransitive verbs (unaccusative verbs). Just like in Finnic the existential clause subject is reminiscent of an object: in these clauses, the finite verb is always in the third person and not

in agreement with the genitive subject, which is most commonly found in post-verbal position.

- (28) *ira rumo namuosu Tiewa tawa* (Old Lithuanian)  
 is room-GEN in the house of Father your  
 ‘There is room in the house of your Father’ (BrB , Gen 24: 24)
- (29) *Ira ir kitu beskačias smulku dayktu*  
 Are also other uncountable little things-GENPL  
 ‘There are also other uncountable little things’ (SP I 313: 28)

The verbs with partitive genitive as a subject marker primarily express existence but can also express coming to be, ceasing to be, motion or change into another state of being:

- (30) *Šuliny yra vandens* (Lithuanian)  
 In the well-LOC is water-GEN  
 ‘There is water in the well’ (Ambrazas 2006: 225)

Verbs denoting movement may have genitive subject when the subject expresses indefinite number or quantity:

- (32) *Užvažiavo svetelių* (Lithuanian)  
 Arrived guests-GEN  
 ‘(Some) guests arrived’ (Ambrazas 2006: 225)
- (33) *Sanāca bez gala ļaužu* (Latvian)  
 arrive-PAST3 without end people-GEN.PL  
 ‘Endlessly many people came’ (Endzelīns 1922: 411)

The genitive has been generalised as a subject of the verbs *daugēti* ‘increase’ and *mažēti* ‘decrease’ in Lithuanian. With these verbs, the genitive is used for indefinite as well as definite subjects but it is difficult to say whether the distinction partitive/total is lost because the semantics of these verbs can hardly express the whole or the totality.

- (34) *Vandenio padaugės, lietus lyja* (Lithuanian)  
 Water-GEN will increase rain-NOM rains  
 ‘The water will increase, while it is raining’ (Schmalstieg 1988: 169)

The genitive subject is also obligatory with verbs with the prefix *pri-*, *per-* denoting too much of something, e.g. *priėjo svečių* ‘too many guests came’, as in Latvian (*pienāca/sanāca ļaužu*). Here we see a different function of the partitive genitive: while the semantic accusative is used to express totality, the partitive genitive expresses partiality or indefiniteness of the subject.

According to the norm of both standard Latvian and Lithuanian languages the genitive is the only possible subject marker in negated existence clauses. The difference however is that in Lithuanian it is widely used whereas in Latvian it has significantly diminished. It was used very regularly in the Latvian *dainas* or folksongs, both in dialects (especially in the Livonian dialect area) as in colloquial language; but in both spoken and written language, the use of nominative is widespread (Berg-Olsen 2005: 124). As with partitive genitive subjects, the subject of negated existential clauses and the predicate are not in agreement and the semantic restrictions are the same:

(35) *neliko žemės* (Lithuanian)  
not left land-GEN  
'No land remained' (Ambrasas 1976: 23)

(36) *karstās zemēs ziemas nav* (Latvian)  
warm countries-LOC winter-GEN is not  
'There is no winter in warm countries' (Endzelīns 1922: 419)

However, the genitive subject may occur in negated non-existential clauses with the verb *būti* 'to be' as in Lithuanian:

(37) *Tėvo nebuvo namie* (Lithuanian)  
Father-GEN was not at home  
'Father was not at home'

Clauses such as (37) differ from existential clauses in that they do not express existence, but rather location and they are referential, with a definite, preverbal subject. Genitive subjects are allowed in negated but not in corresponding affirmative clauses. In Finnic, most of the corresponding cases would not exhibit partitive subjects, though, as mentioned above, in some cases definite, pronominal subjects may occur with partitive case-marking in negated existential clauses. It is in this kind of clauses that subjects other than 3rd person may occur, e.g. Lithuanian:

(38) *Manęs nebuvo čia* (Lithuanian)  
I-GEN not was here  
'I was not here'

Genitive replaces the nominative in the so-called nominative with infinitive constructions, if these are existential:

(39) *Šiandien negirdėt vėjo* (Lithuanian)  
Today not hear wind-GEN  
'Today no wind is to be heard'



In older texts the genitive subject in negated existential clauses is much more common than nominative:

- (40) *ir nera weisdeghima and personu yemimp* (Old Lithuanian)  
 and there is not respect-GEN for persons with him  
 ‘And there is no respect for persons within him’ (VE 43: 20)

In locative sentences as below:

- (41) *Nera io cionai* (Old Lithuanian)  
 Is not he-GEN here  
 ‘He is not here’ (VEE 56: 16)

In a few examples nominative subjects may be found with a negated verb of existence:

- (42) *nesa nera schwiesibe iamije* (Old Lithuanian)  
 because there is not light-NOM in him  
 ‘Because there is no light in him’ (BrB, John 11: 10)

This is in line with the dialectal distribution of genitive objects of negation as we saw in the previous section.

### 3.3. The development of the Finnic partitive and Baltic influence

The distinction in Finnic between wholly affected objects (with accusative or nominative case) and partially affected objects (with partitive case) is absent in the most closely related Uralic branches. In Saami, the object case in the singular is based on the Uralic accusative *\*-m*, which has merged with the genitive in most varieties (and has been subject to deletion in some, leaving, as in Estonian, only stem alternations to distinguish it from the nominative). The *\*-m* suffix has, however, been dialectally retained, among others in South Saami (Itkonen 1972: 178). The plural object case, Proto-Saami *\*-dē*, is cognate with the Finnic partitive suffix *\*-tA* and likewise based on a Uralic ablative case ending *\*-tA* (Wickman 1955: 27, Korhonen 1981: 214–215). This would suggest that a partiality-based division of labour between the accusative and the partitive did exist in a common Finnic-Saami protolanguage, with both endings later being generalized to different number categories in Saami. Nominative objects occur in Saami to a much lesser extent than in Finnic. In North Saami, even the imperative uses an accusative object:

- (43) *borâ guole!* (North Saami)  
 eat-IMP fish-ACC  
 ‘Eat the fish!’ (Itkonen 1972: 178–179)



distinction in case-marking between total and partial objects disappeared, the partitive ending being generalized to the plural. In Finnic, the partitive case for partial objects grammaticized to the point of being obligatory in certain syntactic environments, such as that of negation. The more inconsistent usage of the partitive in negated clauses in Livonian, however, may be a trace of an earlier, semantically-based system. The same might be said for the usage of the partitive subject in the East Finnic languages, which occurs both in a more restricted fashion in existential clauses, and to some extent outside of existential clauses as well in Vepse. Indefinite subjects may appear with the partitive in transitive clauses in Finnish as well, to some extent (Sands and Campbell 2001: 265).

For the earliest stages of Proto-Finnic-Saami, we may suppose a system such as the one surviving in Mordvin and Permic, with unmarked indefinite objects and marked definite objects (Wickman 1955: 58–59). The Proto-Uralic accusative *\*-m* is thought to have originally been a definiteness marker of some kind (Korhonen 1991: 165–166), its further origins have been sought in a derivational marker *\*-mA* (Ravila 1945: 158), which seems possible but hard to prove due to the semantic diversity of the reflexes of that derivational marker in the Uralic languages; an alternative origin in a 1st pers. possessive suffix has been proposed (Katz 1980: 397), which seems counterintuitive – one would expect a possessive suffix grammaticizing as an object case marker to be a 3rd pers. suffix, as has indeed happened with the Permic accusative (Udmurt *-ez*, Komi *-ës*). A *\*-m* accusative suffix is reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European as well, though without strong supporting evidence for morphological borrowing or genetic relatedness, the similarity between the two suffixes remains just that.

Larsson (1983) is surely right in arguing Baltic influence played a decisive role in the grammaticalization process of the Finnic partitive. In the Indo-European languages ablative objects appear to occur widely. Some, like Latin, have retained the ablative case and other languages have replaced it with genitive or dative: in Baltic as well as in Slavic and Greek, the function of the ablative was taken over by the genitive case. In both the Indo-European languages and Finnic, an originally local case has thus grammaticized into an object case-marker. This development in Indo-European is not unusual: as a recent parallelism, one may mention the French partitive construction as in *j'ai bu de vin* 'I drank some wine', with the partitive marker *de* being originally a preposition meaning 'from'. In the Uralic language family, the grammaticization of the partial/total object distinction as in Finnic stands apart: Mordvin and Permic, as well as Mansi (Wickman 1955: 63–65) and apparently Kamass (Wickman 1955: 137) differentially mark definite and indefinite objects, which in Mordvin and

Mansi is coupled with object marking on the verb as well. Mari and Saami (with the exception of South Saami) employ accusative case-marking on both definite and indefinite objects. Hungarian and Nenets (Wickman 1955: 100) combine verbal object suffixes with generalized accusative case-marking. If differential marking of indefinite (nominative) and definite (accusative) objects such as found in Mordvin and Permic represents the original states of affairs, as it is generally taken to be (Raun 1988: 558), Finnic is the only language group which, through the grammaticization of the ablative *\*-tA* as an object marker, replaced it with a partial/total object distinction (Saami arguably went through this stage but then lost the distinction). With this distinction having more certain historical roots in the Indo-European languages, there is a strong case for supposing Baltic influence to have guided the development in Finnic (rather than Finnic to have guided developments in Baltic and Slavic, or all three languages basing their similarities on a common substratum language). As has been shown, the Baltic partitive genitive and Finnic partitive not only share the feature of signalling partially affected objects but in addition subjects of existential clauses. This feature is shared with many IE languages, however, the similarities between Baltic and Finnic are noteworthy, showing similar restrictions and generalizations. Object-like marking for negated existential subjects is a feature shared with Slavic and Gothic, but grammaticalized and generalized to the same, much larger degree in Baltic and Finnic.

Larsson's hypothesis may be reinforced by supposing a parallel contact-induced development of the Uralic definiteness marker *\*-m* as an object marker in Finnic. Whereas indefinite objects may be unmarked in Mordvin (Itkonen 1972: 159; Bartens 1999: 175), which may well represent the original state of affairs in this regards, the partitive case has been generalized to quantitatively indefinite objects in Finnic: other indefinite objects are generally marked with the genitive-accusative. The extension of the marker *\*-m* to a subset of indefinite objects in Finnic may well have occurred in parallel with the grammaticalization of the partitive case, and through the influence of the same donor language. This possibility is suggested also by the identical case endings involved: the accusative marker of Proto-Baltic is *\*-m*, which developed via *\*-n* (which is retained in Old Prussian) to a nasalization of the stem vowel in Lithuanian and Latvian (Endzelins 1971: 134, 143; Larsson 1983: 40). Thus Baltic models may have exerted an influence on the whole pattern of early Finnic object marking, not just on the usage of a single case marker.

The main problem for this hypothesis is the timing of contact: both the grammaticalization of the partitive and the extension of the definiteness marker *\*-m* to a subset of indefinite objects must be supposed to have

taken place before the split of Proto-Finnic and Proto-Saami, as the plural genitive-accusative case, Proto-Saami *\*-dē*, is cognate with the Finnic partitive suffix *\*-tA* and likewise based on a Uralic ablative case ending *\*-tA* (Wickman 1955: 27, Korhonen 1981: 214–215). This would suggest that a partiality-based division of labour between the accusative and the partitive did exist in a common Finnic-Saami protolanguage, with both endings later being generalized to different number categories in Saami. The Saami singular accusative is based on a historical *\*-m*, having later merged with the genitive as in Finnic, suggesting that aforementioned extension of the marker *\*-m* to indefinite objects took place in a common Finnic-Saami protolanguage as well. Though Baltic loanwords are represented in Saami as well, including such loanwords as South Saami *daktere* ‘daughter’, North Saami *jávri* ‘lake’ and *suolu* ‘island’ (Sammallahti 1998: 127) which testify of intense contact, the lion’s share of loanwords occur in Finnic only. The development of Finnic object marking according to Baltic models must thus be supposed to have occurred at a very early stage, before the brunt of lexical borrowing.

In Saami, the opposition between total and partial objects such as that found in Finnic has not been generally preserved, even if the origin of the genitive-accusative plural in an ablative or partitive ending *\*-tA* suggests it existed in a Proto-Finnic-Saami stage. The closer contact between Proto-Baltic and Proto-Finnic may have led to the preservation and extension of the opposition in Finnic, whereas the opposition may have been levelled at an early stage in Proto-Saami. This picture is complicated by the fact that an opposition between total and partial objects partially survives in South Saami, where the plural nominative may be used for (originally) collective or indefinite plural objects (Wickman 1955: 30–36, Itkonen 1972: 179, Sammallahti 1998: 98).

#### **4. ‘Ergative’ constructions in Finnic and Baltic: marked agents**

Marked agents in Finnic occur with converbs (47)–(49), some other participial constructions (52), (57)–(60) as well as neccessive constructions (63)–(64). The agent, which is of adnominal or adverbial origin, is marked with the genitive (most often in Finnish) or with various locative cases such as the adessive or the allative (most often in the eastern or southern Finnic languages, such as Vepse and Estonian). Converbial constructions involve non-finite verb forms such as the inessive of the *-tA* infinitive (*tullessa*), the partitive of the past passive participle (*tultua*) and the abessive form of the *-mA* infinitive (*tietämättä*).

- (47) *pojan tullessa sisään* (Finnish)  
 boy-GEN come-INF INESS inside  
 ‘While the boy came in...’
- (48) *pojan tultua sisään*  
 boy-GEN come-PARTIC PASS inside  
 ‘When the boy had come in...’
- (49) *pojan tietämättä*  
 boy-GEN know-INF ABESS  
 ‘Without the boy’s knowing’

Similar absolute constructions are found in Indo-European languages such as Slavic, Germanic, Indo-Iranian, Greek, Latin, as well as Baltic. The *dativus cum participio*-construction was very widely used in Lithuanian in the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries and then with a fully declined participle:

- (50) *Bet numirusiam szmogui /* (Old Lithuanian)  
 But died-PARTIC DAT man-DAT /  
*skaudei pradest werkti bet raudoti ia prietelei*  
 painfully begin to cry and weep his enemies (BrP II 516)  
 ‘As soon as the man has died his friends begin to cry and weep’

Later on the declined participle was replaced by a gerund:

- (51) *Lietui lyjant jis bėgo per mišką* (Lithuanian)  
 rain-DAT raining-GERUND he ran through forest  
 ‘While it was raining he ran through the forest’

In addition, a genitive agent occurs with a participial construction used as the object or subject of verbs of sensation in Finnish:

- (52) *näen pojan tulevan sisään* (Finnish)  
 I see boy-GEN come-PARTIC GEN inside  
 ‘I see the boy coming in’

These constructions are fairly widespread in the Finnic language area (Laanest 1982: 247–248), though genitive agents with constructions such as (47) appear to be absent in Olonets Karelian and Lude, and rare in Vepse (Ojajärvi 1950: 79); with constructions such as (48), genitive agents are not represented in the southern Finnic languages (with the exception of coastal Estonian dialects) and tend to be replaced by locatives in Karelian and Lude:

- (53) *ukol kuolduhutt on ükštošt kümme vuot* (Lude)  
 man-ADESS die-PARTIC PASS is eleven years  
 ‘It’s been eleven years since the man died’ (Ojajärvi 1950: 80)

Similar constructions (*accusativus cum participio*) exist in Baltic, employing psychological or physical perception verbs and an object in the accusative case along with a participle in the accusative:

- (54) *Matau tėvą ateinantį* (Lithuanian)  
 I see father-ACC coming-PARTIC ACC  
 ‘I see father coming’

In Old Lithuanian these constructions were used intensively and are characteristic for authors writing in the West Aukštaitian and Žemaitian dialects, such as Vilentas and Vaišnoras, and especially for writers from Lithuania minor like Bretkūnas, who used these constructions much more in original and compilation work than translation: the acc. cum partic. is three times more common in Bretkūnas’ Postila than in Bretkūnas’ Bible (Ambrasas 1979: 141).

These constructions are well known in other IE languages: In Latin *accusativus cum participio* often replaces acc. cum inf. with verbs of perception and Slavic has also counterparts (though only with verbs of physical and not with psychological perception). Few traces of this construction can also be found in Hittite:

- (55) *Arnuandan ŠEŠ-IA irman ištamaššir* (Hittite)  
 Arnuandas-ACC sick brother-ACC heard  
 ‘They heard (that) my brother Arnuandas (is) sick’ (Friedrich 1960: 164)

The *genitive cum participio* construction existed in Baltic as well but had a much narrower distribution used with verbs that take a genitive argument, and after negation:

- (56) *Laukiu bernelio parjojančio* (Lithuanian)  
 I wait boy-GEN riding home-PART GEN  
 ‘I wait for the boy riding home’ (LKŽ, sub verbo)

The usage of a genitive agent with construction (49) is attested in all Finnic languages (Ojajärvi 1950: 80–81). The genitive agent in construction (52), however, is based on a relatively recent reanalysis from an earlier accusative object governed by the main verb: this development can be traced in the Old Finnish literary language (Setälä 1966: 125, Timberlake 1977). The original construction was thus an *accusativus cum participio* similar to the ones occurring in Indo-European languages.

Two participial constructions with identical meaning may be used in Finnic either predicatively or attributively, and express a passive meaning:

- (57) *hüren syöty leipä* (Finnish)  
 mouse-GEN eat-PARTIC PASS bread  
 ‘Bread eaten by a mouse’

- (58) *tämä leipä on hiiren syöty*  
 this bread is mouse-GEN eat-PARTIC PASS
- (59) *hiiren syömä leipä*  
 mouse-GEN eat-PARTIC bread  
 ‘Bread eaten by a mouse’
- (60) *tämä leipä on hiiren syömä*  
 this bread is mouse-GEN eat-PARTIC

Of these two constructions, the one employing a *ttU*-participle has by far the largest spread, occurring in Finnish, Vepse (Kettunen 1943: 147–148), Votic (Ariste 1968: 19), as well as throughout Karelian, Lude, Estonian and Livonian (Ojajärvi 1950: 81). The one employing a *mA*-participle is much rarer, occurring only in Finnish and rarely in Karelian (Ojajärvi 1950: 81). A variant of the first construction with an active participle has been attested in the Ostrobothnian dialect of Finnish:

- (61) *joka hiire(n) syönyttä syöp* (Finnish)  
 who mouse-GEN eat-PARTIC PART eats  
 ‘Who eats what has been gnawed on by a mouse’ (Ojajärvi 1950: 82)

The agent is in the genitive in all Finnic languages except Vepse, which used a locative agent here as well:

- (62) *leib hirō šöd, leiktam palažen irdale*  
 breadmouse-ABL/ADESS eat-PARTIC PASS I cut a bit off  
 ‘The bread has been eaten by a mouse, I’ll cut away a bit’ (Kettunen 1943: 147–148)

Impersonal necessive constructions employing a genitive or oblique agent are also widespread in Finnic, though languages differ on which constructions are grammaticized as necessives – thus Estonian uses a *on vaja* ‘is necessary’ construction unknown in Finnish, and where *pitää* ‘must’ is used as an impersonal necessive in Finnish, Karelian, Lude, Vepse, Ingrian and Votic, it agrees with the subject in person and number in Estonian, as well as in Finnish dialects bordering Swedish-speaking areas (including Meänkieli and Kven) (Laitinen 1992: 40, 50).

As to the form of the agent, the genitive is used in Finnish, Karelian and Votic – though in both of the latter languages it competes with a locative agent.

- (63) *ainago šiuu šüüä pidäis?* (Karelian)  
 always-Q you-GEN eat must  
 ‘Do you always have to be eating?’



- (64) *ainago*      *šiula*      *šüüä*      *pidäis?*  
 always-Q    you-ADESS eat      must  
 ‘Do you always have to be eating?’ (Ojajärvi 1950: 97)

Locative agents are used exclusively in Lude, Vepse and Estonian (Ojajärvi 1950: 98). In Livonian, the dative case is used in a construction employing a copular *um* and a partitive infinitive suffix *-mōst* (Kettunen 1938: 58, Halling 1997: 108):

- (65) *mi'nnōn*      *um*      *läämōst*      *mōizō*      (Livonian)  
 I-DAT      is      go-INF PART      to the manor  
 ‘I have to go to the manor’ (Halling 1997: 108)

Though the construction itself has a cognate in Finnish (the s.c. 4th infinitive with the suffix *-minen*), the dative in Livonian is morphologically distinct from the genitive, and its origins are unclear (Halling 1997: 103). Kettunen (1938: 41) believes it to have developed from the locative *\*-nA* (surviving as the *essive* in Finnish), Laanest (1982: 170) regards this explanation as problematic, and believes the alternative explanation (that it is based ultimately on the genitive *\*-n*, which has generally disappeared in Livonian but retained in its functionally specialized dative function) is supported by similar functionally-based splits in Finnic. Any diachronic connection with the dative-genitive in Old Finnish, not to speak of the genitive agent in Finnic, remains thus unclear.

The genitive agent in general seems to be most firmly rooted in Finnish (where locative agents do not occur), the locative agent in Vepse. The originally adnominal genitive agent occurring with converbial participial constructions is more widespread in Finnic than the originally adverbial, dative-genitive agent in the *necessive* construction, which competes with locative agents in all languages other than Finnish, Meänkieli and Kven.

The passive *-ttU* and *-mA* participles with genitive agents in Finnic have cognates in the Baltic languages, where the passive is formed analytically, with the auxiliary *būti* (Lith) and *būt* or *tikt* (Latv) and a passive participle agreeing with the theme in gender and number: Lithuanian *-m-* / *-t-* (pres./past) and Latvian *-t-*. In Latvian the present passive participle derived by the means of the suffix *-m-* is not used to express a passive meaning but is used with a purely participial function in adnominal constructions, and has acquired the value of a verbal adjective expressing possibility, necessity and purpose (Holvoet 2001: 159). Lithuanian has an agentive passive where the agent is expressed in the genitive as seen in the examples below. In Latvian an agentive complement is expressed by the mere genitive and can be added only to an adnominal passive participle:

- (66) *Mātes*            *adīti*            *cimdi*            (Latvian)  
 mother-GEN    knitted-PARTIC    gloves  
 ‘The gloves knitted by mother’, ‘mother’s knitted gloves’ (Holvoet 1995: 174)

The similar construction in Lithuanian would be:

- (67) *Tėvo*            *pastatyta*            *troba*            (Lithuanian)  
 father-GEN    build-PARTIC    farmhouse  
 ‘The farmhouse (was) built by father’, ‘father’s built farmhouse’  
 (Holvoet 1995: 174)

Or the agentive passive (which does not occur in Latvian):

- (68) *Tėvo*            *buvo*            *pastatyta*            *troba*            (Lithuanian)  
 father-GEN    was            built            farmhouse  
 ‘The farmhouse was built by father’

Many dialects in south and east Lithuania lack agreeing participles, using instead a neuter passive participle. This passive probably reflects an archaic Common Baltic type (Ambrazas 2006) and has been extended to constructions not semantically passive but expressing, at least sometimes, an evidential meaning, as in Lithuanian:

- (69) *Darbininkų*            *vežama*            *plytos*            (Lithuanian)  
 The workers-GEN    being-carted-*ma*    bricks-NOM PL  
 ‘Workers are evidently carting bricks’

- (70) *Jonuko*            *tie grybai*            *atnešta*  
 Jonukas-GEN    these mushrooms-NOM PL    brought-*ta*  
 ‘Apparently Jonukas brought these mushrooms’

This construction is not restricted to transitive verbs, but is also used, even more frequently, with intransitive unaccusative verbs – a usage which has no counterparts in Finnic. The construction functions as an oblique mood and expresses inferred evidentiality:

- (71) *Mano*            *užmigta*            (Lithuanian)  
 I-GEN            fall-asleep-PARTIC PRET PASS NEUT  
 ‘I must have dozed off’ (Holvoet 2007: 102)

- (72) *Vaiko*            *sergama*  
 child-GEN    be sick-PARTIC PRS PASS NEUT  
 ‘Evidently the child is sick’ (Timberlake 1982)

The genitive agent is found in many Indo-European languages such as Avestan, Vedic and Tocharian, and occasionally in Greek, Latin and Germanic.

Sanskrit and Slavic, on the other hand, mainly use an instrumental agent, and in Homeric Greek, the dative is used. In later stages of Greek and in Germanic various prepositional phrases are used to express agents (Ambrazas 2006: 178–179, Luraghi 1995). Even within the Baltic languages there is variation: in Old Lithuanian texts one often finds the preposition *nuog* governing a genitive; the instrumental case is sometimes used with inanimate agents. In both Latvian and Lithuanian, the dative may also be used to express an agent in passive constructions. Despite these variations, this distribution, with most of the older Indo-European languages employing a genitive agent, indicates that genitive agents may have been archaic. At the same time, the great variety of agent constructions suggests the genitive agent was never that firmly established in the older layers, and in no other language has the genitive agent become so deeply entrenched as in Lithuanian. As noticed first by Fraenkel (1928: 95–96), the genitive agent has its roots in an adnominal possessive genitive.

As for the genitive agent in Finnic, a distinction needs to be drawn between the usage of genitive agents with participial constructions such as the Finnic *-mA* participle and the *-mAttA* 3rd infinitive abessive, which have an adnominal origin, and the usage of the genitive or locative agent in the necessive construction with verbs such as Fi. *pitää* and Est. *on vaja*, in which the genitive agent may have had an adverbial origin. With these constructions, the genitive agent may have originally been an adverbial with more or less dative meaning, or a genitive modifier of the infinitive (Saukkonen 1965: 114). In dialectal Finnish, the genitive agent may be replaced by a possessive suffix on the infinitive (Saukkonen 1965: 125), suggesting the latter analysis; on the other hand, the reanalysis of the genitive agent as a nominative subject agreeing with person and number with the necessive auxiliary *pitää* as testified in some Finnish dialects bordering Swedish (Saukkonen 1965: 123) suggest a closer link between the agent and the necessive auxiliary. The dative genitive which may lie behind the necessive construction of Finnish is known from Old Finnish, and a dative case which may be historically connected to the Finnic genitive is found in Livonian (Laanest 1982: 170, Halling 1997: 103). If the widely accepted theory according to which the Finnic genitive has its roots in a Uralic lative local case ending holds, the dative usage of the genitive may well be historically prior to its adnominal possessive one (Inaba 2007: 583–584) though outside of Finnish, the dative genitive is hardly to be found outside of necessive constructions (Inaba 2007: 584–585). In any event, the usage of a genitive agent with necessive constructions does seem to be explainable without reference to language contact.

The necessive constructions with locative arguments in southern and eastern Finnic languages such as Lude, Vepse, Estonian and partially Votic, may be a different story. The usage of adessive or allative arguments in Lude and Vepse has been held to be based on Russian influence, as the dative case is used in Russian in such necessive constructions as *мне надо* ‘I must’ (Ojajärv 1950: 98). For Estonian, however, Baltic influence seems more likely. Latvian employs a necessive construction with the auxiliary *vajag*:

- (73) *viņam vajag strādāt* (Latvian)  
 he-DAT needs to work  
 ‘He needs to work’

The auxiliary *vajag* itself is a borrowing from Livonian *vajag*, *vajāg* ‘necessary’ which has cognates in Finnic such as Estonian *vaja* ‘need, lack’ used in the Estonian necessive construction (Karulis 1992):

- (74) *mul on vaja minna* (Estonian)  
 I-ADESS is need to go  
 ‘I have to go’

Many examples from the 16th to 18th centuries employ, in accordance with the Livonian model, the verb ‘to be’: *mums vajaga jir sacit* ‘it is necessary for us to say’; beginning in the 17th centuries, constructions without the copula and with a verbal function of *vajag* begin to appear: *man vajaga* ‘I must’ (Karulis 1992). This suggests the Estonian usage of a local agent with the necessitive *on vaja*-construction is based on Latvian models, which it itself built around a borrowing from Livonian.

Larsson (1996; 2001: 247–249) has drawn attention to the similarities between the *-mA* participle in Finnic with its genitive agent and the similar constructions in Lithuanian employing a *-ma* participle as in the mentioned example:

- (69) *Darbininkų vežama plytos* (Lithuanian)  
 The workers-GEN being-carted-*ma* bricks-NOM PL  
 ‘Workers are evidently carting bricks’ (Lavine 1999)

The origins of the Baltic participial suffix are not entirely clear, however. As a participial ending, it is represented in Baltic and Slavic, with possible cognates in Greek but also other Indo-European languages such as Luvian (Schmalstieg 1989: 21, Larsson 1996: 149). The Finnic construction with *-mA* appears to be represented only in Finnish and to some extent Karelian. It has, however, clear cognates in other Uralic languages such as Saami and Mari (Häkkinen 1993: 133–135). This would exclude a Baltic origin for the Finnic construction. Larsson, however, argues that Baltic may have

exerted an influence on the survival of the construction in Finnic in a very restricted form: in Finnic, the *-mA* participial ending occurs only with the genitive agent construction, and an older Uralic *-mA* participle may have been pushed to its currently marginal position with the advent of the past active *-nUt* and past passive *-ttU* participles in the Proto-Finnic period (Häkkinen 1993: 144–145, Larsson 1996: 148, 150). In support of this, it should be mentioned the Baltic constructions have a wider usage, notably with intransitive verbs (71 and 72 above), whereas the Finnic constructions are restricted to transitive verbs, and the Finnic *\*-mA* participle cannot occur without a genitive agent.

The Finnic past passive *-ttU* participle, however, occurs in a genitive agent construction itself in all Finnic languages, as well as in the Old Finnish written language (Ojajärvi 1950: 83, Häkkinen 1993: 145). It, too, has close parallels to constructions in Baltic, e.g. (66)–(68) and Lithuanian:

- (78) *Jonuko*                    *tie grybai*                    *atnešta*    (Lithuanian)  
 Jonukas-GEN these mushrooms-NOM PL) brought-*ta*  
 ‘Apparently Jonukas brought these mushrooms’ (Lavine 1999)

The Finnic construction with *-ttU* has a much greater spread than the construction with *-mA* but no direct cognates in other Uralic languages: the passive *-ttU* participle is exclusively Finnic. Though Ojajärvi (1950: 83) regards the construction with *-ttU* as Proto-Finnic and the one with *-mA* as the result of a later development, the presence of cognates of the construction with *-mA* in other Uralic languages suggests a more ancient origin. If the close resemblance to Baltic model contributed to the preservation of the genitive agent construction with *-mA* in Finnish and Karelian, the genitive agent construction with *-ttU* may have been constructed on the basis of a straightforward Baltic model. As with the *-mA* participle, the phonological similarity between the participial endings may have contributed to contact, but a straightforward borrowing of morphological endings is unlikely. The Uralic *\*-mA* and the Baltic/Slavic participial *\*-mo* appear both well rooted in their respective language families. The Finnic past participial endings *\*-nUt* (active) and *\*-ttU* (passive) are innovative to Finnic, and their respective origin not entirely clear (though the consonant of the passive ending is doubtlessly related to the *\*-ttA* marker of the Finnic passive). They bear some similarity to the Indo-European verbal adjectives with *\*-no* and *\*-to*, the latter of which lies at the basis of the Baltic participial ending mentioned above. However, even aside from the problematic internal etymology of the Finnic endings (the *-t* of the active participle may be secondary, or it may not), in none of the Indo-European languages in close contact with Finnic do the action noun endings show the kind of active-passive diathesis that the Finnic endings exhibit.

A foreign origin for genitive agent constructions with the past passive – *ttU* participle is suggested as well by the fact that in all languages with the exception of Vepse, the agent is in the genitive case (Ojajärvi 1950: 82), whereas Finnish genitive agents generally often correspond to locative agents in the eastern and southern Finnic languages. Locative agents such as in Vepse have generally been held to be borrowed from Russian (Kettunen 1943: 195, Ojajärvi 1950: 98), but their absence in this particular construction may be due to the Baltic genitive as a model.

## 5. Conclusions

In employing morphological similarities to establish genetic relationships, it is paradigmatic relationships between morphological markers that really matter; the occurrence of 1st person pronouns with *m-* across the Uralic languages in itself does not prove so much, but the co-occurrence of *m-* with 2nd person *t-* and often 3rd person *s-* in the Uralic languages is highly significant. The same goes for establishing contact-induced change in the area of morphosyntax. The similar partiality-based object and subject-marking systems occurring in Finnic and Baltic can hardly have arisen independently and due to chance, and the deeper historical roots of partiality-based case-marking on the Indo-European side suggests Baltic as the donor language; this hypothesis can be strengthened by taking into account the extension of the Uralic *\*-m* accusative to indefinite objects, which must be assumed to have taken place at roughly the same time as the grammaticization of the Uralic ablative into an object marker. This extension may have taken place according to Baltic models as well.

Paradigmatic relationships are likewise important when considering the genitive agent with participial constructions in Finnic and Baltic; in both language groups, *t-* and *m-*-based participial endings co-occur in very similar constructions, though their relative distribution differs a lot. The Finnic *\*-mA* participle is doubtlessly of ancient pedigree, but marginal in Finnic and outcompeted by the younger *\*-ttU* participle; in Baltic, the *\*-to* participle is on much firmer Indo-European ground than the *\*-mo* participle. Yet the paradigmatic relationships of the two constructions, reflected in both language groups, forcefully suggest some historical connection – though a more complex one than that of object case-marking. We agree with Larsson's (1996: 148, 150) suggestion that the Baltic models may have exerted a conservative influence on the *\*-mA* participle of Finnic and Karelian, while suggesting that the usage of the *\*-ttU* participle with a genitive agent may rest on Baltic models in a straightforward manner.

A problem with pinpointing the origin of Finnic partiality-based object marking is that of timing; the development of the Saami plural accusative *\*-dē* from an Uralic ablative suggests that at some point during the prehistory of Saami, plural object marking was likewise partiality-based. Yet the bulk of Baltic loanwords is restricted to Finnic. This problem touches upon the precise relationship of Finnic and Saami, which may have had a distinct common proto-language or, alternatively, developed from a late Proto-Uralic variety more or less independently; in the latter case, Saami may have had independent contact with Baltic and (perhaps more probably) Finnic which could have influenced the development of the Saami accusative plural. With the participial constructions which employ genitive agents, the very likely hypothesis of Baltic influence needs to take into account the development of the Finnic participial system as a whole: a Finnic participial system with thoroughgoing voice diathesis (act. pres. *\*-pA*, pass pres. *\*-ttApA*; act. past *-nUt*, pass. past *-ttU*) supplanted an older Uralic system which opposed a present participial ending *\*-pA* to a past ending *\*-mA* which could have active or passive reading depending on the context. The development of genitive agent constructions with the new past passive participle on *\*-ttU* as well as the local retention of *\*-mA* participles with genitive agents needs to be seen against the background of this development.

## Sources

- III = The third Prussian catechism or *Enchiridion*, 1561.  
 BrB = Jonas Bretkūnas' translation of the Bible, 1590.  
 BrP = Jonas Bretkūnas' Lithuanian *Postilla Catholica*, Köningsberg, 1591.  
 LP = Lerhis-Puškaitis, *Latviešu tautas teikas un pasakas*, 1891.  
 LKŽ = online version of *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (Lithuanian dictionary — [www.lkz.lt](http://www.lkz.lt)) .  
 Mž = *Mažvydas Catechism*, 1547.  
 SP I = Konstantinas Sirvydas' *Punktai sakymų*, Part 1, 1629.  
 VE = Baltramiejus Vilentas' *Lithuanian catechism*, 1579.  
 VEE = Baltramiejus Vilentas' *Evangelias bei Epistolas*, 1579.

## References

- Ambrasas, Vytautas et al. 1976. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika. III tomas. Sintaksė*. Vilnius: Mokslas.  
 Ambrasas, Vytautas. 1979. *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė*. Vilnius: Mokslas.  
 Ambrasas, Vytautas (ed.). 1997. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika. 3 leidimas*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

- Ambrazas, Vytautas. 2001. On the development of the nominative object in East Baltic. Dahl, Östen and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). *Circum-Baltic languages 2. Grammar and Typology*. Amsterdam John Benjamins, 391–412.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas. 2006. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Ariste, Paul. 1968. *A grammar of the Votic language*. Indiana: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bartens, Raija. 1999. *Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys*. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen seura: Tiedekirja.
- Bereczki, Gabor. 1988. Geschichte der Wolgafinnischen Sprachen. Sinor, Denis (ed.). *The Uralic languages: description, history and foreign influences*. Leiden: Brill, 314–350.
- Berg-Olsen, Sturla. 2005. *The Latvian dative and genitive: A Cognitive Grammar account*. Dr. art-thesis (Acta Humaniora 242). Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo.
- Creissels, Denis. 2009. Uncommon patterns of core term marking and case terminology. *Lingua* 119:3, 445–459.
- De Smit, Merlijn. 2010. On some problems of Old Finnish syntax. Saarinen, Sirkka and Tanja Vaittinen (eds.). *Sanoista kirjakieliin. Juhlakirja Kaisa Häkkiselle 17 marraskuuta 2010*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 113–128.
- Endzelīns, Jānis. 1922. *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: A. Gulbis.
- Endzelīns, Jānis. 1951. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Riga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība.
- Endzelīns, Jānis. 1971. *Jānis Endzelīns' Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Baltic Languages* (Translated by William R. Schmalstieg and Benjamiņš Jēgers). The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Fraenkel, Ernst. 1928. *Syntax der litauischen Kasus*. Kaunas: Lietuvos universitetas.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Gelumbeckaitė, Jolanta. 2002. *Linksnų ir prielinksnių konstrukcijų vartoseną Jono Bretkūno Evangelijos pagal Luką vertime*. Vilnius.
- Halling, Tiina. 1997. Der Dativ im Livischen im Vergleich zum Lettischen. Hahmo, Sirkka-Liisa et al. (eds.). *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachen in Kontakt. Vorträge des Symposiums aus Anlass des 30-jährigen Bestehens der Finnougristik an der Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 21.–23. November 1996*. Maastricht, 103–110.
- Havas, Ferenc. 2006. Die Ergativität und die Uralischen Sprachen. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 59, 81–131.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa. 2001. *Syntax in the making. The emergence of syntactic units in Finnish conversation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Holvoet, Axel. 1995. On the evolution of the passive in Lithuanian and Latvian. Smoczyński, Wojciech (ed.). *Analecta Indoeuropaea Cracoviensia J. Safarewicz memoriae dicata*. Cracow: Universitas, 173–182.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and Modality in Baltic*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.



- Häkkinen, Kaisa. 1993. Ongelmoita oppimia. Suomen agenttipartisiipin historiaa ja nykyisyyttä. *Festschrift für Raija Bartens zum 25.10.1993*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 129–148.
- Inaba, Nobufumi. 2007. Vanhan kirjasuomen asema diakronisessa kielentutkimuksessa: tapaus datiiigenetiivi. *Viritäjä*, 582–590.
- ISK = Hakulinen, Auli et al. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Itkonen, Esa. 1972. Über das Objekt in den finnisch-wolgaischen Sprachen. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 39, 153–213.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1979. Subject and object marking in Finnish: An inverted ergative system and an "ideal" ergative sub-system. Plank, Frans (ed.). *Ergativity. Towards a theory of grammatical relations*. New York, London: Academic Press, 79–102.
- Kagan, Olga. 2007. A modal analysis of genitive case in Russian. Kosta, Peter & Lilia Schürcks (Eds.). *Linguistic investigations into formal description of Slavic languages. Contributions of the sixth European conference held at Potsdam University, November 30–December 02, 2005* (Potsdam Linguistic Investigations, 1). Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 217–226.
- Kallio, Petri. 2000. Posti's Superstrate Theory at the Threshold of a New Millennium. Laakso, Johanna (ed.). *Facing Finnic. Some challenges to historical and contact linguistics*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 80–99.
- Karulis, Konstantīns. 1992. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. 2 sēj. Rīga: Avots.
- Katz, Hartmut. 1980. Das Uralische – Eine Ergativsprache (Vorläufige Mitteilung aus der Werkstatt). *Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum Turku 20.–27. VIII. 1980*. Pars VI. Turku, 393–400.
- Kazlauskas, Jonas. 1968. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Kettunen, Lauri. 1938. *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Kettunen, Lauri. 1943. Vepsän murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Koivulehto, Jorma, Theo Vennemann. 1996. Der Finnische Stufenwechsel und das Vernersche Gesetz. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 118, 163–182.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1981. *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1991. Remarks on the structure and history of the Uralic case system. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 83, 163–180.
- Laanest, Arvo. 1982. *Einführung in die Ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Laitinen, Lea. 1992. *Välttämättömyys ja persoona. Suomen murteiden nesessiivisten rakenteiden semantiikkaa ja kielioppia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar. 1983. *Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.

- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar. 1996. Bemerkungen zur Geschichte der *mA*-Partizipien im Finnischen. *Congressus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 8 Pars III*. Jyväskylä, 145–152.
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar. 2001. Baltic influence on Finnic languages. Dahl, Östen and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). *Circum-Baltic languages 1. Past and Present*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 237–253.
- Lavine, James. 1999. Subject properties and ergativity in North Russian and Lithuanian. Katarzyna Dziwirek, Herbert Coats, and Cynthia Vakareliyska (eds.). *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 7*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 307–328.
- Lavine, James. 2010. Mood and a Transitivity Restriction in Lithuanian: The Case of the Inferential Evidential. *Baltic Linguistics* 1, 115–142.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1995. Prototypicality and agenthood in Indo-European. Andersen, Hening (ed.). *Historical linguistics 1993 (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 124)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 259–268.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2003. *On the meaning of prepositions and cases: the expression of semantic roles in ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas. 1970. *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1934. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris: Hachette.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1964. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed., University: University of Alabama Press.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. On the distribution of ergative and accusative patterns. *Lingua* 45, 233–279.
- Nelson, Diane Carlita. 1998. *Grammatical case assignment in Finnish*. New York: Garland.
- Ojajärvi, Aulis. 1950. *Sijojen merkitystehtävistä Itä-Karjalan Maaselän murteissa. Nominatiivi, genetiivi, akkusatiivi ja partitiivi. Vertaileva funktio-opillinen tutkimus*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Palionis, Jonas. 1967. *Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a.* Vilnius: Mintis.
- Petit, Daniel. 2007. Case system and translation strategy in the Old Prussian Enchiridion. *Baltistica* XLII, 347–381.
- Plank, Frans. 1985. The extended accusative/restricted nominative in perspective. Plank, Frans (ed.). *Relational typology (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and monographs, 28)*. Berlin etc.: Mouton, 269–310.
- Posti, Lauri. 1953. From Pre-Finnic to Late Proto-Finnic. Studies on the development of the consonant system. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 31, 1–91.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1945. Nomen verbale suomalais-ugrilaisissa kielissä. *Virittäjä* 49, 148–158.
- Raun, Alo. 1988. The Mordvin language. Sinor, Denis (ed.). *The Uralic languages: description, history and foreign influences*. Leiden: Brill, 96–110.
- Sammallahti, Pekka. 1998. *The Saami languages: an introduction*. Käräsjoška: Davvi Girji.

- Sands, Kristina, Lyle Campbell. 2001. Non-canonical subjects and objects in Finnish. Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., Robert M. W. Dixon, Masayuki Onishi (eds.). *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects* (Typological Studies in Language, 46). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 251–305.
- Saukkonen, Pauli. 1965. *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten tulosjainfinitiivirakenteiden historiaa 1*. Johdanto. Adverbiaali infinitiivi. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Schmalstieg, William. 1976. *Studies in Old Prussian*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schmalstieg, William. 1988. *A Lithuanian historical syntax*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Schwyzler, Eduard, Albert Debrunner. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik 2. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. München: C.H Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Seržant, Ilja. 2012. Morphosyntactic properties of the partitive genitive in the subject position in Ancient Greek, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 117, 187–204.
- Seržant, Ilja. (forthcoming 1). Dative experiencer constructions as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. Arkadiev, Petr, Axel Holvoet, Björn Wiemer (eds.). *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics*. De Gruyter.
- Seržant, Ilja. (forthcoming 2). Denotational Properties of the Independent Partitive Genitive in Lithuanian. Holvoet, Axel and Nicole Nau (eds.), *Grammatical Functions and their Non-canonical Coding in Baltic*.
- Setälä, Eemil Nestor. 1966. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Stang, Christian. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Švambarytė, Janina. 1998. Objektas galininko ir kilmininko linksnių kaita prie neiginio J. Basanavičiaus publikuotose pasakojamosios tautosakos rinkiniuose. *Lituanistica* 3 (35), 59–82.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1974. *The nominative object in Slavic, Baltic and West Finnic* (Slavistische Beiträge 82). München: Otto Sagner.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1977. Reanalysis and actualization in syntactic change. Li, Charles (ed.). *Mechanisms of syntactic change*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 141–177.
- Tveite, Tor. 2004. *The case of the object in Livonian. A corpus based study*. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Department of Helsinki University.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1996. *Suomen lauseopin perusteet*. Helsinki: Edita.
- Wickman, Bo. 1955. *The form of the object in the Uralic languages*. Uppsala.

Valgerður Bjarnadóttir  
 Merlijn de Smit  
 Department of Baltic languages, Finnish and German  
 Stockholm University  
 SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden  
 valgerdur.bjarnadottir@balt.su.se  
 merlijn.de.smit@finska.su.se

## KOPSAVILKUMS

### Primāro argumentu locījuma marķēšana baltu un Baltijas somu valodās

Valgerður BJARNADÓTTIR, Merlijn DE SMIT

Baltijas somu un baltu valodās ir ļoti līdzīgas parciālītātē balstīta objekta un subjekta marķēšanas sistēmas, kas var būt radušās neatkarīgi viena no otras. Šai rakstā autori seko L. G. Larsona teorijai par agrīnu baltu valodu iespaidu uz parciālītātē balstītu locījumu lietojumu (Larsson 1983), kā arī agensa apzīmēšanu ar ģenitīvu participālās konstrukcijās Baltijas somu valodās (Larsson 1996, 2001).

Baltu valodas piedāvātas kā donors parciālītātē balstītai locījumu marķēšanai, jo parādībai ir dziļākas saknes indoeiropiešu valodās. Šo hipotēzi var pastiprināt, ņemot vērā, ka urāliešu valodās akuzatīva ar \*-m lietojums ir paplašināts arī uz nenoteikto objektu, kas noticis aptuveni tai pašā laikā, kad urāliešu valodu ablatīvs ir gramatizējies par objekta marķieri. Šīs hipotēzes galvenā problēma ir kontakta laika noteikšana: gan partitīva gramatizācijai, gan noteiktības marķiera \*-m lietojuma paplašinājumam uz nenoteiktajiem objektiem bija jānotiek pirms protosomu un protosāmu valodu atdalīšanās, jo daudzskaitļa ģenitīva-akuzatīva protosāmu \*-dē ir radniecīgs ar Baltijas somu partitīva sufiksu \*-tA un abi cēlušies no urāliešu ablatīva galotnes \*-tA. Tas liek domāt, ka parciālītātē balstīta funkciju atšķirība starp akuzatīvu un partitīvu bijusi jau somu-sāmu pirmvalodā, bet vēlāk sāmu valodās galotnes tika vispārinātas citai skaitļa kategorijai.

Autori pievienojas arī Larsona teorijai par baltu valodu ietekmi Baltijas somu participālajām konstrukcijām ar agensu ģenitīvā. Somu divdabim ar \*-mA ir sena izcelsme, taču margināls stāvoklis valodās, kur to izkonkurējis jaunākas cilmes divdabim ar \*-ttU. Savukārt baltu valodās divdabim ar \*-to ir daudz stabilāks indoeiropieisks pamats nekā divdabim ar \*-mo. Autori piekrīt Larsona (1996: 148, 150) izteikumam, ka baltu valodu modelim ir bijusi konservatīva ietekme uz divdabi ar \*-mA somu un karēļu valodā, papildinot, ka divdabja ar \*-ttU lietojums ar agensu ģenitīvā var tiešā veidā balstīties uz baltu valodu modeļa.