

The Independent Partitive Genitive in North Russian

Ilija A. Seržant

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to describe the distribution, semantics and syntactic properties of the independent or bare partitive genitive (IPG) in North Russian in comparison with Standard Russian. The focus of this study is thus on phenomena that distinguish the use of the IPG in North Russian from its use in Standard Russian. The IPG is a multi-faceted category that bears on the domains of quantification, referentiality and discourse prominence. On its quantificational reading, the IPG encodes a covert quantifier, indefinite in its value. This quantifier's domain of application has expanded from the domain of the host NP to the clause quantifier in a number of cases. The IPG encodes an indefinite but specific quantification, which explains its high incompatibility with the imperfective aspect in Russian. Generally, the IPG represents a typologically rare case of a clause quantifier (beside the partitive case in the Finnic languages), whose locus of morphological realization is not VP-internal but rather NP- or even N-internal. North Russian, in a similar manner to Standard Russian though with a wider range, attests instances where the covert quantifier induced by the IPG marking changes the quantificational properties of the whole VP, altering, as a consequence, its actionality. I claim that the IPG object marking—if the IPG is used as a clause quantifier—always yields delimitative VPs, irrespective of the original actional properties of the verb: it encodes a non-culminating event being temporally and arbitrarily bounded. Different actional classes allocate different phases to yield delimitatives: it is the preparatory phase with accomplishments but the after-phase with (some) achievements. Regarding its determiner facet, the IPG typically marks participants that need not have a directly corresponding referent in the real world. Finally, the IPG also discursively demotes the participant that always represents background information, never central to the main message. The three denotational facets are interrelated in their origin and in terms of the prototype effects being organized around the function of the decreasing of the referentiality of the referent. Besides the different functional properties of the IPG, that are not typical of a morphological case, several striking formal properties of the IPG have been found in North Russian, such as verbal agreement with the IPG-subject, the ability of the IPG-marked NP to coordinate with structurally case-marked NPs, the wider use of the dedicated partitive ending *-u* or the more frequent use of the IPG under negation than in spoken standard Russian.

1. Introduction¹

The main focus of this paper is on the North Russian dialect. The present study is semasiologically organized and seeks to describe particular aspects of the syntactically *independent partitive genitive* (henceforth: IPG), i.e. a genitive that is not directly governed by some head (a few exceptions will be marked as such). The independent partitive genitive is related to the dependent partitive genitive, which is headed by a quantifier or a numeral; it is nevertheless a category on its own, as it has a number of functions that are not found with the headed partitive genitive. The IPG overrides the structural case-marking in the subject and object position in order to encode weak quantification and/or indefiniteness.

Although the IPG is labelled *partitive* here, its functions are quite distant from partitivity *sensu stricto*, and referring to this category as the *genitive-of-indefinite-quantity* might in many contexts be more appropriate (B. Wiemer, p.c.). Indeed, an intuitive understanding of partitivity implies that something constitutes a part (the *subset*) of a particular, definite group (the *superset*), often referred to as the *part-of-relation*, whereas the remainder of the group (the *complement*) is not equal to the group because it lacks the subset (cf., *inter alia*, Enç 1991; Heusinger 2002: 261–62; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2006). In many instances, the Russian IPG does not encode such a *part-of-relation*. Instead, the selectional restrictions on the embedded NP/DP have been loosened and extended here to assume kind- and subkind-referring NPs. With the latter, the IPG does not encode a particular *part of a group* but rather a particular instantiation of the kind/subkind to which the embedded NP refers (like English *a cup of tea*)—this function of a formally partitive expression has been referred to as *pseudo-partitivity* in the literature (term introduced in Silkirk 1977, for the typological overview see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001). The independent partitive genitive is inherently somewhat different from pseudo-partitives in that it lacks an overt measure phrase or a quantifier for the

1 This paper has been written for and during my affiliation with the Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Vilnius. I am extremely thankful to Margje Post (Bergen), who provided me with several unpublished transcribed texts, as well as to Ruprecht von Waldenfels, who made the Ustja Corpus (2013) available and also provided technical support. I cordially thank Anna Malyševa (Moscow) and Nina Markova (Petrozavodsk) for various consultations. Furthermore, this paper has benefited greatly from the help provided by Cori Andersen (Princeton), Michael Daniel (Moscow) and Björn Wiemer (Mainz). All disclaimers apply.

subset. The notion *generator* (Russ. ‘generativ’) used in Zolotova (1988: 55, 59–61) after Barwise & Cooper (1981) might be appropriate here. With *generator* she refers to the function of the IPG to encode the source set (*superset*) or class of the unexpressed referent whose quantificational properties and reference are irrelevant to the discourse (Zolotova 1988; see also section 4 below).

In addition to the NP-internal functions, the IPG also attests functions that pertain to the clause level, as will be argued below in this paper. Nevertheless, I refer to various uses of this independent genitive as to the *partitive genitive*. Here I follow the Finnic tradition for the sake of simplicity of description. In this tradition, the case that has a number of various, synchronically not necessarily related functions, including the partitivity function, is referred to as the *partitive case*.

The IPG is a feature of the Eastern part of the Circum-Baltic language area (cf. Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001; Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 649–69) representing an areal phenomenon with regard to a set of properties found only in this area (Seržant, *forthcoming-a*). The IPG is, at the same time, an inherited category, and its correlates *mutatis mutandis* are found in all old and many modern Slavic languages (such as Old Church Slavonic, Russian, Ukrainian, Czech, Polish) (Miklosich 1926: 427), as well as in the ancient Indo-European languages (cf., *inter alia*, Bauer 2007; Dahl 2009; Luraghi 2003: 60ff; Nachmanson 1942; Napoli 2010; Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950; Seržant 2012a, 2012b). Despite its origins, the functional load and morphosyntactic behaviour of the IPG have undergone considerable changes (Seržant, *forthcoming-b*). For example, not all verbs that attest the alternation between the structural accusative and the IPG in the Old Russian period attest this alternation in Modern or North Russian. And, vice versa, certain verbs in Old Russian that consistently took a genitive in an earlier period have gradually acquired the new, canonical and more productive object case-marking, namely, the accusative case, while retaining the genitive in some contexts. This concerns the curative verbs, such as *bereči* ‘guard, save’, *bljusti* ‘obey’, *stereči* ‘guard’, which have changed from taking almost no accusative objects to taking more accusatives and fewer (original) genitives, as well as synonymous verbs, such as *xraniti* ‘store’, *pasti* ‘pasture’, which have displayed the reverse shift from accusative objects only in an earlier period to allowing the optional IPG object marking more recently (Malyševa 2004; 2008a).

Obviously, at least the first group cannot be considered to continue the inherited accusative *vs.* IPG alternation. Historically, the alternation between the genitive and accusative in these cases has nothing to do with the partitive genitive, but is a transitional alternation between the old option (genitive) and the new option (accusative). However, it seems that this alternation has secondarily adopted the functional distribution between the accusative and the IPG.

Furthermore, in Modern Standard Russian and even as early as in Middle Russian (Krys'ko 2006: 225–26), the lexical input of the IPG has been seriously restricted along the continuum suggested in Ickovič (1982), who states the following preponderances for accusative *vs.* IPG:

IPG ←————→ ACC
 abstract nouns—mass nouns—inanimate nouns—‘role’—animate nouns

Thus, Standard Russian employs IPG primarily with mass and abstract nouns, as well as with plurals of inanimate nouns. The situation in modern East Slavic dialects is more archaic, e.g., in some Belarusian dialects (Karskij 1956: 319, 403) or North Russian, Northwestern Russian (the soc. Pskov Group) and in some Central Russian subdialects (Filin 1972: 514–15).

What about the token frequency of the IPG? Although the IPG's productivity subsided from the nineteenth to the twentieth century in subdialects from North-West to South-East and from West to East (Kuz'mina 1993: 36–37), the IPG remains productive in the West-North and North Russian subdialects. At the same time, the standard language has a strong impact on the modern Russian subdialects. The IPG is a category that is gradually reducing its frequency in Russian dialects, adjusting to the patterning of the IPG in the standard language.² In all cases to be discussed below, the respective structural case can be used in the dialects, and there is no grammatically obligatory context for the IPG in the Russian dialects whatsoever. Interestingly enough, while there is a considerably low token frequency of the IPG, it is, remarkably, not low in type frequency. In other words, it is quite rare to find occurrences of the IPG outside the patterns that are typical for standard language, but the versatility of these

2 There are several indications for that in the data I have examined. One is the low token frequency of the IPG in general.

deviating dialectal patterns is considerable, as can be seen below. North Russian thus imposes far fewer restrictions on the occurrence of the IPG; moreover, it attests many more functions thereof, despite the low token frequency.

The paper is structured according to the different meaning facets of the IPG. Section 2 is devoted to the quantifier facet of the IPG, subsection 2.3 and section 3 discuss instances of the interaction of the quantifier facet with aspectuality. Section 4 is devoted to the determiner facet of the IPG in North Russian. In turn, section 5 deals with some striking syntactic and morphological properties of the IPG such as the ability of the IPG subject to trigger verbal agreement (subsection 5.2.1), the emergence of the dedicated partitive ending (subsection 5.3) and the extension of the animacy domain in North Russian (subsection 5.4). Finally, section 6 presents the conclusions.

2. Indefinite Quantification

In this section I describe the properties and the semantics of the IPG that apply to its quantificational facet. The following examples illustrate the NP-internal quantification encoded by the IPG of the respective nominal:

- (1) *Da kakaja rabota jest', vsju rabotali.*

'Any work that was there we did'.

Nu za to, za eto nam zimoj predsedatel'

PRT for that for thiswe.DAT winter.INS chairman

daval

goroxu

give.IPFV.PST.M.SG pea.GEN.SG

'And for this, in winter the chairman supplied us with peas'.

(Ustjanskij r.;³ from Ustja Corpus 2013, 18239)

- (2) *U menja Veronika, von, begala uže, prinosila*

at me Veronika PRT run.PST.F.SG already bring.IPFV.PST.F.SG

jagod

berry.GEN.PL

'My Veronika was already running and bringing berries'.

(Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013, 20697)

3 With examples from the North Russian dialect, I will only indicate the region of provenience of the respective example.

I adopt the view expressed in Franks (1995: 182), and first suggested in Neidle (1988), that the IPG induces an implicit quantifier, semantically close to English *some* for descriptive purposes without subscribing to the syntactic implications inherent to this view. The value of this quantifier is arbitrary by default but may acquire a more specific value through the context. Although arbitrary, this value (even though indefinite) is inherently bounded or delimited in Russian (Padučeva 1998: 80), “unspecified but delimited” in Timberlake (2004: 319), crucially differentiating itself in this respect from Finnish, for example. It is, furthermore, semantically close to the English existential (non-generic) bare plurals, such as *apples* in the following example:

(3) *Peter ate apples*

2.1. *Partial affectedness*

Generally, *partial affectedness* means that the argument’s referent has been only partially affected by the action denoted by the predicate. This implies that the argument is referential and definite in that particular discourse, cf. reading (ii). Thus, reading (i) in example does not encode partial affectedness, as there is no referent whose part is affected as long as *water* implies just the sort of a liquid and not a particular instantiation thereof:

(4) Standard Russian

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| <i>Ja vypil</i> | <i>vody</i> |
| I drank.PFV.PST.M.SG | water.GEN.SG |
| (i) ‘I drank (some) water’. | |
| (ii) ‘I drank (some) of the water (that was in the bottle)’. | |

Since East Slavic does not have a dedicated grammaticalized means to encode definiteness, a bare NP may either be interpreted as definite or indefinite. On reading (ii), *water* refers to a particular amount of water accessible from the present discourse model. Here the IPG does encode the partial affectedness of that specific amount of water.

In both cases, the IPG encodes an implicit quantifier that is largely backgrounded in the discourse. Expectedly, as this quantifier is implicit, it cannot provide foreground information: it can neither be the focus nor

the topic of the utterance. In many cases, the IPG-marked NP joins the VP in yielding one information-structure unit, the focus. Thus, cannot be uttered as an answer to the question ‘How much water did you drink?’. Regarding quantity, this quantifier does not specify the exact amount of the water consumed, but the speaker commits himself to the fact that the amount consumed is restricted and not fully arbitrary or infinite, it is non-cumulative.

Partial affectedness, likely the most archaic reading, is scarcely attested even as early as in Old Russian; many examples that are often cited in the literature (cf. Kryš’ko 2006: 179–85; Lopatina 1998: 243; Malyševa 2008b: 240) do not unequivocally reflect partial-affectedness reading, since the respective contexts equally allow a holistic interpretation of the participant in question. In terms of the semantics of the IPG, the partial or insufficient accomplishment of the action is immediately related to the partial affectedness. Yet, this property is linked to the situation in general (VP level) and will be discussed below in section 3 in relation to aspectuality.

2.2. *Adverbial quantifiers*

The IPG is often not semantically independent, strictly speaking. In many instances, there is a quantifier somewhere in the clause that semantically triggers the partitive genitive by quantifying the VP. This quantifier can be expressed by an independent constituent (e.g., an adverbial) or, on the verb, by an explicit morphological item. An important disclaimer, however, is that the genitive is not immediately governed by this quantifier in terms of morphosyntactic relations, and an alternative case-marking with a structural case is also always available as the unmarked option.

Malyševa (2008b: 237) quotes the following example from the sixteenth century (Nikon’s Chronicle, XII 155), noting that both readings, *partial affectedness* (a part of the gravestone is destroyed) and *partial accomplishment* (the gravestone is somewhat destroyed), are equally possible:

(5) Middle Russian

a Iony mitropolita grobъ izščepľjalo, no ne razbi ego,

and Ion’s metropolitan grave-stone split but not broken it

- a u Filippa mitropolita malo nadgrobnici prorazi*
 but at Filipp metropolitan little grave-stone.GEN.SG destroy.AOR.3SG
 (a) ‘Ion metropolitan’s gravestone was split but not broken, but the gravestone of metropolitan Filipp was little destroyed’, or alternatively, (b) ‘...a small part of metropolitan Filipp’s gravestone was destroyed’.

Note that the ‘gravestone’, generally being a discrete entity, is coerced here into a mass noun (consisting of small parts). The adverbial quantifier *malo*, ‘little’, scopes the range of quantification. This example demonstrates that there is no formal criterion to distinguish between the two scope interpretations: (a) *malo* modifying the whole VP, and (b) *malo* being NP-internal, heading the *gravestone*-NP. Both meanings are not exactly the same in their ranges of interpretations. Presumably, similarly ambiguous contexts have given rise to the reinterpretation and emancipation of an (originally) constituent- or NP-internal, covert quantifier (henceforth: D(eterminer)-quantifier) of the partitive genitive (as in above) into a clause-internal quantifier (henceforth: A(dverb)-quantifier) as in (5a). Developments from a D-quantifier into an A-quantifier take place quite frequently cross-linguistically. In fact, many A-quantifiers are originally D-quantifiers. To give an example, consider the English quantifier *a lot* in *I have seen a lot of flowers* vs. *I have seen flowers a lot*. As soon as this indefinite covert quantifier, induced by the IPG, starts being sensitive to the quantification over the whole event, there is also no logical requirement anymore for the NP to be exclusively indefinite, and definite objects are well accepted here (cf. the same argument for Finnish in de Hoop 2003: 201). Thus, the D-quantifier *some* blocks the definite interpretation, while its A-counterpart *sometimes* does not impose such restrictions, allowing both definite and indefinite interpretation of the NP *flowers*:

- (6) a. *I have seen some (*the) flowers*
 b. *I have seen the/- flowers some(times)*

In contrast to Standard Russian, North Russian subdialects attest sensitivity of the IPG to overt weak A-quantifiers. The following A-quantifiers exhibit this function, e.g., Russian *malo* ‘a little bit’, *nemnožko/nemnogo* ‘a lit-

tle bit', as well as *ploxo* 'badly', *edva* 'scarcely', etc. (Malyševa 2008b: 237):

- (7) *Golovy popodnjaj malen'ko i upal*
 head.GEN.SG rise.PFV.PST.SG somewhat and fall-down.PFV.PST.SG
 '(He) raised a little bit (his) head and fell down'.
 (Siniki, Ustjanskij r.; from Malyševa 2008b: 237)

Not only are these overt weak quantifiers unlikely to be NP-internal syntactically,⁴ they are also not NP-internal semantically: the object nominal *golovy* in cannot be interpreted as being dependent on *malen'ko* semantically, which would mean 'he raised a bit of his head'. This is ruled out here for pragmatic reasons, and only the holistic interpretation of the nominal makes sense. The IPG is thus sensitive to the quantification/partitivity of the VP signalled by the overt A-quantifier, even if there is no partitivity in the nominal's referent. Consequently, the IPG marking is triggered here by the whole verbal phrase being quantified. Notably, this is not the original state of affairs and, in the ancient Indo-European languages, the IPG was exclusively sensitive to the quantification within the respective NP. Furthermore, North Russian subdialects exhibit instances in which the implicit IPG quantifier is the only quantifier in the clause (cf. examples like (71), and temporal transfer in subsection 3.3). In these cases, the IPG represents a typologically quite rare instance of a quantifier that is formally realized as internal to the respective NP constituent (or even to the respective N) but applies to the quantification of the whole event; it is thus formally a D- but functionally an A-quantifier.

Other intensifying A-quantifiers are also found to attract the IPG, often with no quantification of the respective NP as above. The following quantifiers are found with the IPG in North Russian: *kak* 'as to what extent' (lit. 'how'), *tak* 'to such an extent', *dotogo* 'to such an extent', *dočego* 'idem', verbal prefixes *do-*⁵, *na-* (Markova 2008; Malyševa 2008b: 235):

- (8) *Dotogo na-pixali nitok*
 to-such-an-extent QUANT.PFV-stuff.PST.SG thread.GEN.PL
 'They have stuffed threads (into the sewing machine) to such an extent'. (Pinežskij r.; Malyševa 2008b: 236)

4 Except, perhaps, for *nemnogo*, 'a bit', which may function as either.

5 In the dialects of the Arkhangelsk area, the prefix *do-* has an iterative or a durative meaning.

The following example is parallel to (9) except for the difference in the meaning of the quantifier. Again, here it is not the object nominal that is being quantified or measured. Thus, in (10) it is not intended to mean ‘so much of her face’ but rather ‘so [much] weather-beaten’:

- (9) *Oj, kak ona vetrila licja-to*
 EXCL how she weather-beat.IPFV.PST.SG face.GEN-PRT
 ‘Oh, how weather-beaten was her face’. (Onežskij r.; AOS apud Malyševa 2008b: 235)
- (10) *Tag by prižal svoej Iriny,*
 SO COND hug.PFV.PST.M.SG REFL.GEN.SG.F Irina.GEN.SG
ona by i ne gunula
 she COND and not sound.PST.F.SG
 ‘I would have hugged my Irina so [strong] that she would not have made a sound’. (Vel’skij r.; AOS apud Malyševa 2008b: 235)
- (11) *Ja dotogo glazu-to⁶ dokopala,*
 I to-such-an-extent eye.PART.SG-PRT rub.PFV.PST.F.SG
dag glaz-ot zakrasel
 that eye-PRT blushed
 ‘I rubbed (my) eye so long that it turned red’ (Peršlaxta, Pleseckij r.; AOS apud Malyševa 2008b: 236)

The reading of intensification or “special effort due to hindrance” mentioned in Malyševa (2008b: 237) is evoked with adverbs of small degree with evaluative connotation. The adverb *edva* in (12) below quantifies the action as evaluative ‘just, scarcely’:

- (12) *Ja po zemli-to materi edva voloču*
 I along ground-PRT mother.GEN.SG scarcely drag.IPFV.PRS.1SG
 ‘I am almost dragging (my) mother along the ground’.
 (Lešukonskij r.; AOS apud Malyševa 2008b: 237)

6 There is a morphologically and lexically restricted dedicated partitive singular ending, distinct from the respective genitive ending in Russian, which I will gloss in this paper as part where appropriate. I discuss the properties of this defective case in subsection 5.3 below.

Regarding parallels beyond the Russian area, I discuss correlations in the behaviour of the partitive case and A-quantifiers in Finnish and Lithuanian in Seržant (*forthcoming-a*).

While Standard Russian does not allow the interaction of overt A-quantifiers with the IPG, North Russian patterns with Standard Russian in allowing such an interaction with prefixal quantifiers. These quantifiers include perfectivization of the verbal action with the aid of prefixes, cf. *na-* in the following example:

- (13) *Nu èto kakix-nibud' eščemorkovki da repy*
 PRT PRT SOME.GEN.PL else carrot.GEN.PL and turnip.GEN.SG
da vot ètogo vsego na-sadim,
 and PRT this.GEN.SG all.GEN.SG QUANT.PFV-plant.1PL
u nas vse bylo
 at us everything be.PST.SG.N
 'So, else, we planted some carrots, and turnip, and these all things;
 we had everything'. (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013, 28869)

- (14) *A Novyj god v škole, kak vojna byla... dak tože vstrečali, stavili èlku.*
 'The New Year was also celebrated in the school during the war.
 We had a Christmas Tree'.
 [...] *Tam igrušek iz bumag na-rezali*
 PRT toy.GEN.PL from paper QUANT.PFV-cut.PST.PL
 'And we cut [quite many] paper toys'. (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja
 Corpus 2013, 18239)

In – , the prefix *na-* adds the connotation of 'quite many', implying that the needs of the speaker will be fully covered by what has been planted in or cut in . Note that the verbal action is understood here as a set of iterated micro-sub-events of planting (or cutting) allowing for an isomorphic relationship between the quantity of the action (acts of planting in) and the quantity of the object nominals (number of carrots, turnips and all other things in): the more acts of planting that have been carried out, the more pieces of the object nominal have been affected. This constellation is reminiscent of an incremental-theme action that is the primary source for the A-quantifier function of the IPG.

To conclude so far, the IPG encodes an undetermined, parcelled set, which can be additionally specified by some overt quantifier of the clause, including A-quantifiers. The quantity it encodes is indefinite, but always delimited.

3. *The IPG quantifier and aspectuality*

While intentional verbs (section 4) do not impose any aspectual restrictions on the co-occurrence with the IPG (which with these verbs is not used to encode quantity), other verbs allow the (quantificational) IPG only together with perfective verbs and sometimes with imperfective in a non-progressive (e.g. iterative) reading in Standard Russian (cf. Jakobson 1936; Padučeva 1998; Mehlig 2006). Presumably, this is because the unbounded meaning of imperfective aspect in its progressive reading would be in conflict with the restricted and, hence, bounded quantity of the object argument encoded by the IPG in Standard Russian. Unlike in Finnic languages, the quantity of the referent encoded by the IPG is indefinite but (arbitrarily) delimited in Russian, thus entailing a closed set or a bounded quantity (cf. Padučeva 1998: 80; *unspecified but delimited* in Timberlake 2004: 319). In turn, the accusative case is the default option (cf. Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 656; Seržant, *forthcoming-a*) and can occur equally well in both perfective and imperfective context.

In what follows I adopt the bi-dimensional approach to aspectuality (following, *inter alia*, Bertinetto 1997; Smith 1997; Sasse 2002). This approach assumes two cross-cutting universal grammatical dimensions within the domain of aspectuality that should be kept apart in any aspectual analysis but that are underspecified formally (e.g. morphologically) in many languages. On the one hand, there is *viewpoint aspect* or ASPECT₁ in Sasse (2002) and, on the other hand, *actionality* (also termed *Aktionsart* or ASPECT₂ in Sasse 2002). Crucially, both dimensions operate with the boundaries of an event: while actionality is about inherent (cf. Depraetere 1995) or intrinsic (cf. Sasse 2002) boundaries, viewpoint aspect is about “temporal or established” boundaries (Sasse 2002: 205–206). While actionality refers to the inherent organization of an event such as, e.g., the one referred to by Vendler’s classes (*activity*, *achievement*, *accomplishment* or *state*, Vendler 1957[1967]) and their different subsequent modifications, as well as by such properties as *telicity* (telic vs. atelic) or *dynamicity*, viewpoint aspect (ASPECT₁ in Sasse 2002), in

turn, refers to the properties that the speaker establishes in a particular utterance and that pertain to such domains as discourse organization or pragmatics, and not to the inherent semantics of an event. This established boundary may but need not coincide with the inherent boundary, as the process may stop before the inherent boundary will be achieved, cf. English *I wrote the letter for two minutes and then I had to leave*.

With regard to viewpoint aspect, a distinction is typically made between the *perfective* and *imperfective*. The following metaphor is used: perfective viewpoint aspect is found when a particular event is represented as included into the reference point of the narration, while imperfective viewpoint aspect entails that it is the reference point that is included into the duration of the event, or, more precisely, the imperfective is often simply non-committal as to its temporal delimitation. In other words, the event is either construed as having boundaries dictated by the discourse organization and not by the internal organization of that event, or no commitments are made as to whether or not this event is delimited in that particular situation. Particular utterances may have imperfective viewpoint aspect with telic events, cf. below:

(15) *He is writing a letter.*

The very event *to write a letter* presupposes a natural or inherent endpoint, namely, that moment when the letter is written and the event cannot continue the same way. The actionality of this event can thus be defined as *telic* or *culminating* (as in Tatevosov & Ivanov 2009). However, the viewpoint aspect is obviously imperfective here.

It is a well-known fact that object nominals may alter or disambiguate the actionality class (ASPECT₂) of the whole VP depending on the quantifier they carry. To give an example, while (17) is an accomplishment and telic, because the object nominal is clearly delimited by the definite article (i.e. *all apples* of the present discourse model), , conversely, is rather an activity and atelic, because its object nominal does not specify the quantity:

(16) *He ate apples*

(17) *He ate the apples*

This phenomenon is well-known with *incremental-theme* verbs (cf. Krifka 1989, term coined in Dowty 1991). I assume that the A-quantifier function of the IPG's implicit quantifier probably originally started out with incremental-theme verbs, where there is natural interaction between the quantity of the object and that of the verb. The parallelism between the quantification of the event structure and of the nominal's referent has been covered in several works (cf., *inter alia*, Verkuyl 1972; Krifka 1989, 1992; Filip 1989; Kiparsky 1998; Borer 2005 and most recently Champollion 2010). A striking property of North Russian is that it has extended this function to other accomplishment verbs that do not take incremental-theme objects (e.g. to a verb as *to open*), cf. subsection 3.2 below.

Tatevosov & Ivanov (2009: 93ff) discuss various subtypes of accomplishments with failed culmination. In their paper, they claim that there are two operators at play: an actionality operator yielding non-culminating events and a viewpoint operator yielding perfective vs. imperfective viewpoints. The former is the input for the latter. I argue, adopting this approach, that the IPG primarily alters the actionality or aktionsart of its VP on its A-quantifier function, yielding in the first place a non-culminating or activity-type event (cf. also Seržant 2014, *forthcoming-a*). Additionally, in Russian in general (also in Lithuanian)—but not, e.g., in Finnish—due to the exclusive boundedness or delimitedness of the implicit quantifier of the IPG (see section 2 above), the IPG restricts these non-culminating, activity-type actions exclusively to the interpretation of denoting a specific portion of such an action. The IPG marked object thereby makes its VP a *delimitative*. I adopt here the notion *delimitative* as, e.g. defined in Sasse (2002: 206), first introduced in Maslov (1959). Delimitatives entail that the action has taken place for a while and then has stopped for whatever reason without explicitly reaching its natural boundary (culmination/telos/inherent endpoint), if such a boundary is implied by the actionality type of the respective verb at all. Notably, delimitatives allow only a perfective viewpoint due to their inherent semantics. At this point, delimitatives, compositionally, are in a sense both: an aktionsart in that they always denote an atelic event (with no lexically determined, inherent endpoint), and a viewpoint aspect, in that they can only be used in the perfective viewpoint. To give an example, consider containing a delimitative marked by the prefix *po-*, cf.:

(18) Standard Russian

On po-stojal i sel

He.NOM DELIM-stand.PST.M.SG and sit.PST.M.SG

‘He stood [for a while] and then sat down’.

Delimitatives quantify over a set of equal eventualities with an indefinite but specific value. From this perspective, the IPG and delimitatives are quite parallel in their denotation, the difference being in the domain of application: the former is verbal, while the latter is primarily nominal but may also have verbal functions on its A-quantifier reading, as we will see below. I claim that, in parallel with *po-* delimitatives, the IPG marking of the object is just another strategy to derive and to mark delimitative VPs (see subsections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 below). Notably, *po-* delimitatives are among the most frequent verbs that co-occur with the objects marked by the IPG in Russian (and also in Lithuanian, cf. Seržant 2014).

Maslov refers to delimitatives as *aktionsart* (Russ. ‘sposob dejstvija’), i.e. as pertaining to the domain of actionality and not to the viewpoint aspect. Delimitatives are typically derived from homogenous non-culminating predicates such as *to walk* or *to sleep* (cf. Mehlig 2006 for this argument on Russian). As Mehlig (2006, 253ff) notes, however, there are also a number of accomplishment verbs like *pisat’* ‘to write’, *pit’* ‘to drink’ or even *otkryt’* ‘to open’, which can be conceptualized as homogenous, if the focus is on the activity taking place before the inherent culmination/endpoint. This is exactly the function of the implicit A-quantifier of the IPG—to signal that the focus is on the activity preceding the culmination. This new, derived event may theoretically have both perfective and imperfective viewpoint interpretations, as, for example, is the case in Finnish. In contrast, the Russian IPG is more specific than the Finnish independent partitive case in that the imperfective aspect (at least on its progressive reading) is not possible here. In other words, while the delimitative reading (or cessative reading in the Finnish tradition, cf. Huumo 2010: 90) is just one of the possible readings in Finnish, it is the only reading available in Russian (and in Lithuanian). I summarize this in the table below:

	CULMINATION	No (commitments to) CULMINATION	
		PERFECTIVE	Progressive IMPERFECTIVE
Russian and North Russian	accusative	partitive genitive	accusative
Lithuanian	accusative	partitive genitive	accusative
Finnish	accusative	partitive	partitive

Table 1: Denotation of the aspectually relevant independent partitive genitive and partitive case

To give an example of how a delimitative is derived from a telic event, consider the following example from Middle Russian:

(19) Middle Russian

On samъ podpravilъ vlasov svoix pod šapku
 he himself adjust.PFV.PST.M hair.GEN.PL REFL.GEN.PL under hat
 ‘He himself adjusted his hair under the hat’.

(Vesti-Kuranty, 17th c., from Kryš’ko 2004: 224)

In this example, we find a telic verb *pod-pravit’* ‘to adjust below’ that implies an inherent endpoint, namely, the point when all hairs are set appropriately under the hat. However, its object is marked by the IPG, which does not imply an inherent and clearly defined endpoint or quantity, as accusative would have done. The IPG refers here to the superset of the object’s referent, which is all the hairs of that person. Furthermore, it specifies that the quantity (and specific referents) of the subset of this superset is fully arbitrary but delimited (no matter which subset of that person’s hair). This quantificational property of the IPG marks the whole VP as non-culminating or as not committing to a culmination. The delimitatedness of the subset requires the whole action of adjusting the subset of the hairs to also be delimited given the distributive interpretation of the object. This is because one cannot adjust a delimited subset of one’s own hairs infinitely, but only for a certain period of time, until all members of that subset have been adjusted. The quantity of the sub-acts of adjusting corresponds to the quantity of that subset. Thus, we get a delimitative interpretation of (19).

sense. Thus, the reason for using the IPG marking here is this delimitative interpretation of the whole VP, rendered in the English translation by *somewhat*.

3.2. Unmarked delimitatives (incomplete accomplishments)

I assume that perfective verbs marked by a telic prefix such as *vy-pil*, ‘to drink up’, also yield exactly the same delimitative meaning with the IPG objects as delimitatives marked as such by the prefix *po-*. In other words, I claim that there is no substantial difference in meaning between a VP with both the IPG and the verb marked as delimitative, as in (22), and a VP with just the object being marked by the IPG and with no dedicated delimitative marking on the verb (cf. the perfective telic *vy-pil*), except for different emphases:

(22) Standard Russian

Ja vy-pil vody
 I PFV-drink.PST.M.SG water.GEN.PL
 ‘I drank up [some] water [for a while].’

(23) *Esli bol’no tugo, to drovnej-to po-dvinut*

if very hard then sledge.GEN.PL-PRT DELIM.PFV-move.FUT.3PL
i opat’ krutjat
 and again turn.PFV.FUT.3PL
 ‘If it gets too hard, then they [somewhat] move the sledge and then turn again’. (Sudroma, Vel’skij r.; from Malyševa 2008b: 237)

Malyševa (2008b: 237) provides a number of examples in which the IPG marking of the object nominal is the only marking that signals the delimitative reading of the whole proposition, while the object nominal itself is affected holistically:

(24) *Ja otvorju dverej*

I open.PFV.FUT.1SG door.GEN.PL
 ‘I will somewhat open the door’. (Kuškopola, Pinežskij r.; from Malyševa 2008b: 237)

- (25) *Ja tvoix oc'kof omocil*
 I.NOM 2SG.POSS.ADJ.GEN.PL glasses.GEN.PL soak.PFV.PST.M.SG
 'I [somewhat] soaked your glasses'. (Ozerko, Kargopol'skij r.; from
 Malyševa 2008b: 237)

Presumably, this A-quantifier function initially naturally arose with *incremental-theme verbs*, as has been mentioned above. This relationship entails that every subpart of the event the verb denotes is unique and is coupled with a particular unique subpart of the object nominal (Krifka 1992: 39). Thus, in a sentence like *John ate the roll*, every specific subpart of the roll corresponds to a specific subpart of the event of eating, and if only half of the roll has been consumed then the very action of *eating the roll* has also been carried out only halfway. The object is said to “measure out” the event with this type of verb (Tenny 1994). Consequently, if the object of an incremental-theme verb (such as, e.g., *to eat*) is case-marked with the IPG, which sets up only an arbitrary boundary but not an inherent or holistic one, then the whole VP will also be interpreted as not achieving an inherent endpoint due to the homomorphic relationship. Incremental-theme verbs seem to represent a natural source for the expansion of the IPG-marked nominal’s quantificational properties on the whole VP, secondarily and analogously also on VPs that do not contain a homomorphic relationship between the object and the verb.

Moreover, the IPG represents here a typologically rare case of a quantifier that is formally realized as internal to the respective NP constituent, in fact, to the respective N, but applies to the quantification of the whole event. It is, thus, formally a D- but functionally an A-quantifier. Such a quantifier seems to be typologically extremely rare, cf. the overview in Corbett (1994: 202; 2000: 251) where such a quantifier is said to be unattested (similarly Tatevosov 2002: 56).

3.3. *Temporal transfer events*

The IPG is also used with some transfer verbs like *dat'* ‘to give’, *vzjat'* ‘to take’, *brat'* ‘to take’, and synonyms, and implies that the object of concern is transferred for a short period of time (bounded). The resultant situation after the transfer has taken place is represented as temporally delimited (cf., *inter alia*, Markova 1989: 76a and Lopatina 1998: 236 for North

Russian; Kryš'ko 2006: 225 for the first attestations in Middle Russian at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century):

- (26) *Daj* *nožnicej!*
 give.PFV.IPV.2SG clippers.GEN.PL
 'Give [me] the/any clippers (for a moment)!' (Lešukonskij r.;
 from Malyševa 2008b: 234)
- (27) *Defki, ja* *u vas voz'mu* *malen'kovo*
 girls PRON.ISG at you take.PFV.FUT.ISG small.GEN.SG
kipetil'nic'ku, čaj *skipeču*
 boiler.GEN.SG tea.ACC boil.PFV.FUT.ISG
 'Girls, I will take your water kettle [for a while], I am going to
 boil water for tea'. (Javzora, Pinežskij r.; Malyševa 2008b: 235)

Unlike the other predicate types, such as *accomplishments*, these *achievement* verbs allow for the (temporal) measuring of the after-effects after the culmination took place. This is presumably motivated by the fact that achievements generally do not entail a somewhat lasting phase (as do, for example, the *accomplishments* with their preparatory phase), that could be measured; rather, they are inherently punctual. In this case, the particular semantic class of verbs of transfer allows for the metonymic extension of their semantics, which results in the resultant phase being included in their denotational profile. The covert A-quantifier evoked by the IPG can now apply to this lasting resultant state and measure it.

Notably, this type is also compatible with the delimitative interpretation that is claimed here for the aspectually relevant IPG. The after-effects-situation of a transfer event is a homogenous process, or, more precisely, a state that can be quantified temporally and, hence, be delimited. It is, thus, fully parallel to example (18), repeated here as for convenience:

- (28) *On* *po-stojal* *i* *sel*
 He.NOM DELIM-stand.PST.M.SG and sit.PST.M.SG
 'He stood [for a while] and then sat down'. (Standard Russian)

In this example, there is also a state predicate *to stand* that is temporally delimited—here by means of the prefix *po-*.

This type is attested quite widely in East Slavic: Early Modern Russian,⁷ North Russian (*inter alia*, Markova 1988: 98), Ukrainian, Belarusian (DABM Kamentary, 756; Lopatina 1998: 234, 236). It is, furthermore, attested in some other Slavic languages (Buslaev 1875: 247–48; Šaxmatov 1963[1925–1927]: 322; Lopatina 1998: 234; Miklosich 1926: 488). The earliest attestation in East Slavic is from the 12th c. (Krys’ko 1997: 200; Malyševa 2008b: 233).

3.4. Iterated events

As has already been shown in Wierzbicka (1967) for Polish—with the same conclusions being true for Russian as well—any kind of quantificationally bounded complement is prohibited with imperfective aspect in its progressive reading, due to the conflict between the bounded quantity of the argument and the unbounded situation invoked by the (progressive function of the) imperfective aspect of the verb (cf. Padučeva 1998, Mehlig 2008). Imperfectives with a quantificational phrase (henceforth QP) are, thus, only available if either the QP encodes a non-incremental, cumulative argument (all set members are affected simultaneously, e.g., *nesti* ‘to carry’) or the imperfective aspect encodes some kind of non-progressive meaning (stative, habitual, etc.). Here, the referent of the QP is said to have already been measured beforehand (Mehlig 2008).

Note that habituais or iteratives are complex events consisting of a set of iterated micro-sub-events and an iterating operator. I assume that whether the iterated micro-sub-event is delimited or not is crucial here for the assignment of the IPG, while the overall (un)boundedness is less important. If the former is delimited, then the IPG-marking may also be used, and the quantity implied by the implicit quantifier of the IPG is often under the scope of the iterating operator:

- (29) *Po večeram on vy-pi-va-l vody i ložilsja spat’*
 on eveningshe TELIC-drink-ITER-PST.3SG water.GEN andlied sleep
 ‘In the evenings he drank water and went to sleep’. (Standard Russian)

⁷ This meaning has been lost in Standard Russian recently (in the second half of the twentieth century, Švedova 1980: 200; Malyševa 2008b: 234).

Thus, in (30), the quantity implied by the object nominal *vody.GEN* ‘of water’ is meant to be the quantity of every iterated micro-sub-event and not the overall quantity consumed by these iterated micro-sub-events. Note that, derivationally, the iterated sub-event is delimitative ‘to drink water [for a while]/to drink [some] water’. However, and crucially, this sub-event is not telic or culminating with respect to its aktionsart, as there is no inherent endpoint implied. The IPG marks an activity event that is delimited.

The morphologically underlying forms of the iterative verbs in (30) and (31) are marked as telic by means of their prefixes: *za-rašč-iva-t’* is morphologically derived from *za-rasti-t’* and *vy-xvat-yva-t’* from *vy-xvati-t’* but they do not yield telic events because of the IPG marking of the object nominal:

- (30) ‘And she released him from the fetters and’
Stala ego ranoček krovavyx za-rašč-iva-t’
 started his wound.GEN.PL bleeding.GEN.PL TELIC-heal-ITER-INF
 ‘she started tending his bleeding wounds’.
 (Karelia r.; from Markova 1988: 100)

- (31) ‘A horse that was stuck in the ground’:
Iz zemljuški stal nožek on vy-xvat-yva-t’
 from ground started feet.GEN.PL he TELIC-take.out-ITER-INF
 ‘It (the horse) started taking his feet out from the ground’.
 (Karelia r.; from Markova 1988: 100)

The examples adduced imply a series of discrete bounded acts. The iteration is marked by the suffix *-(i/y)va-* in its iterative function (glossed as ITER). All these acts are delimitative-type events, each being temporally but not inherently bounded. That is to say, in (31) the horse repeatedly undertook the act of ‘taking the feet out from the ground’ but not entirely successfully every time. Each such act of the horse is bounded temporally but not achieving its goal, that is, the inherent boundary. The iterated sub-events are thus atelic.

Examples (29) and (30) are a little different from (31) in how the delimitativeness of the sub-events is generated. In (29) and (30) the delimitative nature of every sub-event is due to the NP-internal function of the IPG: every sub-event of the series affects an arbitrarily selected quantity of the ob-

ject's kind in (i.e. *water*) or of the object's superset in (i.e. *that person's wounds*), thereby inducing the arbitrary or established type boundaries for these acts and not inherent boundaries.

To conclude, the grammaticality of the imperfective aspect with the IPG-marked object in – can alternatively be explained by assuming that the iterated sub-events are delimitative in their nature and the quantity induced by the IPG is under the scope of the iterating operator. This is in line with the claim made in this paper that the IPG-marked object yields a delimitative interpretation of its VP. This allows the IPG to couple with the secondary, iterative imperfective, which is not possible with the corresponding simple imperfectives *pit* 'to drink', *rastit* 'to foster, heal' and *xvatat* 'to take'.

4. Determiner facet of the IPG

4.1. Indefiniteness

Close to the quantifier facet of the IPG is its determiner facet. Recall that quantifiers typically have a determiner facet as well, cf. English *some* (always indefinite) or English *all* (always definite). The same is true for the IPG. Here, the IPG encodes the indefiniteness of what is referred to by the respective NP. Naturally, items that cannot be quantified precisely also cannot be definite. Weak quantifiers like English *some* or *many* mostly correlate with the indefiniteness of their NPs. In fact, *some*, often spelled as *sm*, has been claimed also to be an indefinite plural article in English (see the discussion in Lyons 1999). Symptomatic of indefiniteness is the use of the IPG with abstract nouns that do not have a potential referent in the world due to their lexical semantics:

- (32) *Da, oj vot radi Boga, dajte milostyn'ki*
 yeah, PRT PRT for.sake God give.PFV.IPV.2PL alms.GEN.SG
Xrista radi
 Christ for.sake
 'Yeah, oh, for God's sake, give me alms, for Christ's sake!
 (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013, 27151)

Unlike its English counterpart, the Russian *milostyn'ki* is a singular abstract noun. While one cannot exclude a quantified meaning here, the

interpretation of *milostyn'ki* as an indefinite abstract noun seems to be more natural, especially because this noun is not really compatible with quantifiers such as *nemnogo* 'a little bit' or *mnogo* 'much'.

It has been suggested, *inter alia*, in Kuznecova (1964: 7–10) and Markova (2008: 155), that the IPG is inherently indefinite or even non-specific indefinite (non-referential) in Padučeva (1998), similarly in Timberlake (2004: 324), and is, thus, incompatible with definite reference, which can be expressed only by the default accusative (when talking about the object):

(33) Standard Russian

- a. *Ja svarila boršča*
 I cook.PFV.PST.F.SG red-beet-soup.GEN.SG
 'I cooked a beetroot soup'.
- b. *Ja svarila boršč*
 I cook.PFV.PST.SG.F red-beet-soup.ACC.SG
 'I (have) cooked a beetroot soup'.

Thus, as Padučeva (1998: 81) states, the *b* variant in (33) is more felicitous when uttered by a person holding a saucepan in her/his hands. Consider the following example from Trubinskij (Meščerskij, ed., 1972: 212):

(34) North Russian

- A otca-to u tebja est'?*
 but father.GEN.SG-PRT at you be.PRS
 'But do you have a father?'

Also diagnostic of the indefiniteness of the IPG is its use in locative or possessive existentials that typically require their sole argument to be indefinite:

- (35) *Raz've u nej moloka es'?*
 really at her milk.GEN.SG be.IPFV.PRS.3SG
 'Does she really have milk, doesn't she?'
 (Koskolovo, Kingiseppskij r.; from Kuz'mina 1993: 117–8)

- (36) *Spiček est'?*
 match.GEN.PL be.IPFV.PRS.3SG
 'Do [you] have matches?' (Koskolovo, Kingiseppskij r.; from
 Kuz'mina 1993: 117–8)
- (37) *Lošadej-to u vas es'?*
 horse.GEN.PL-PRT at you be.IPFV.PRS.3SG
 'Do you have horses?' (Novgorod r.; from Kuz'mina 1993: 117–8)

In these examples, the questions are neither about particular individuals nor about the quantity thereof. Rather, the existence/presence of any representatives of the respective kind of things whatsoever is questioned, somewhat similar to English *any*. The following sentence—while not being a question within itself—nevertheless represents a similar use of the IPG: any individual from the respective kind (*cows*) will make the condition in (38) true and, thus, the existence of some individuals from the set *cans* will also be true. Crucially, neither do the particular individuals matter nor is there any distributive correlation between the individuals in the protasis and the individuals in the apodosis. The IPG referents all have narrow scope here (e.g. with respect to the condition):

- (38) *U kogo korov es', dak i
 at whom COW.GEN.PL be.IPFV.PRS.3SG then and
 krinok esja
 can.GEN.PL be.IPFV.PRS.3SG
 'Those who have cows will also have cans.'
 (Arkhangelsk r.; from Kuz'mina 1993: 118)*
- (39) *Est' ešče ploxix ludej
 be.IPFV.PRS.3SG else bad.GEN.PL people.GEN.PL
 'There still exist bad people'. (Onežskij r.; from Markova 2008: 153)*
- (40) *Est' sovestnyx ludej
 be.IPFV.PRS.3SG honest.GEN.PL people.GEN.PL
 'There are honest people'.
 (Kažma Medvež'jegorskij r.; from Markova 1991: 136)*

- (41) *Est' i teper' takix rebjat*
 be.IPFV.PRS.3SG and now such.GEN.PL guy.GEN.PL
 'Now, there are also some guys of that kind'.
 (Onežskij r.; from Markova 2008: 153)

Moreover, the referent, whose existence is asserted by the (demoted) partitive subject, represents background information. It is not a participant that is somehow crucial to the narration and typically will not become a topic and/or picked up by an anaphoric pronoun in the following discourse:

- (42) *Dak toda ešče byli, kak teper' nazývajut, è-è, kak skazat'-to vot, èti... nu tuda pereselency, pere... byli prosto ot vojny.*
 'At that time, there were still, how are they called?, hm, how does one say it?, those ones, immigrants, they used to drink a lot'. (Varzuga, Terskij r.; from Varzuga Text)

Sjuda posylali v gluxoman'-to ètix
 here send.PFV.PST.PL into middle-of-nowhere-PRT these.GEN.PL
vsex narodov ottuda s jugov-to
 all.GEN.PL ethnicity.GEN.PL from-there from south
 'They sent **all these** [different] **ethnicities** here, into the middle-of-nowhere, from the South'. (from Varzuga Text)

- (43) *U nas vsju žizn' vot sem'ja bendjaki.*
 'Our family was always from the poor people'.
A v derevne bylo kulakov.
 but in village be.IPFV.PST.N.SG kulak.GEN.PL
Ona rasskazyvala tut mne. Neskol'ko (ob)obkulačivali
 she told here me several dispossessed
 'Our family was always from the poor people. But there were **kulaks** in our village. Several were dispossessed, she told me'.
 (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

Non-specificity (arbitrariness) can additionally be lexically marked by means of adjectives such as *vsjakij* 'any kind of', *raznyj* 'different kinds of' (cf. Kuz'mina 1993: 117; Markova 2008: 152):

‘Do you have salt bags for sale?’ (Middle Northwest Russian; Tönnies Fenne’s Low German Manual of Spoken Russian, Pskov 1607, from Zalizn’ak 2004: 159)

4.2. *Opaque contexts and negation*

There is a consensus that intensional contexts and negation, i.e., the two main subgroups here, are, as Partee (2008: 307) states, “conducive to decreased referentiality”, even though the latter is just one commonality aside from other factors that set intensional contexts and the negation apart.⁸ Intensional contexts are invoked by such verbs as *desire*, *request* or *achievement*, which are typically found with the IPG in Standard Russian (Neidle 1988: 31; Partee 2008).

It has been stressed in the literature that intensional verbs may typically have two readings: a specific or transparent reading (the speaker has a particular referent in mind as the object of intention) and an opaque, non-referential reading, i.e. with no existential presupposition (Quine 1960: §32; Zimmermann 1993). The latter has been argued to be, more precisely, a non-referential, existentially non-committal *property-denoting reading* (Borschev et al. 2007). The property reading may be differently encoded cross-linguistically (e.g. with the indefinite article in English or German, cf. von Heusinger & Wespel 2007 on the interpretation of personal names in German). The IPG is yet another option widely attested, in the ancient and archaic Indo-European languages, to encode an appeal to some set of properties of a particular kind (referred to by the embedded NP) while not establishing a particular reference.

The intensional context can be invoked either by the lexical semantics of the respective matrix verb (subsection 4.2.1 on *intentional verbs*), by the grammatical context it occurs in (subsection 4.2.2 on *imperative and future*), or by a modal predicate (subsection 4.2.3).

4.2.1. *Verbs of intention*

While there is a rather small group of *intentional verbs* (like to *wish*, *strive*, *request*, etc.) that allow for the IPG in Standard Russian (Neidle

8 Intensional contexts are contexts that evoke concepts, not referents, and are not to be confused with *intentional* contexts that typically form a part of *intensional contexts*. They are opposed to the *extensional approach to meaning*, which attempts to correlate expressions in language with aspects of the world (Cruse 2000: 21).

1988: 31), Russian dialects attest a much broader distribution (cf. Lopatina 1998: 236; Borschev et al. 2007; Malyševa 2008b: 232 on Russian dialects). Verbs such as *iskat* ‘search’ also belong here, since they do not necessarily require the existence of the object’s referent on the opaque reading. This verb is different, however, insofar as it shows lexicalization of the (originally independent) partitive genitive as the only possible case-marking of its object in Old Russian (Sreznevskij 1893: I.1114). The optional IPG marking is found in Standard and Northwest and North Russian (Markova 1989: 87):

- (49) *Daže naši vot derevenskie uezžali v Sibir’,*
 even our PRT village-people emigrated to Siberia,
iskat’ xorošej žizni tože
 look-for.IPFV.INF good.GEN.SG life.GEN.SG also
 ‘Even people from our village emigrated to Siberia... in order
 to look for a better life’. (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013).

Furthermore, verbs of a very specific intention, such as *svatat* ‘seek in marriage’, may also take the IPG in North Russian and belong here as well (Markova 1988: 100; 1989: 95).

4.2.2. *Genitive of purpose*

A number of (North) Russian subdialects (Markova 1988: 99; 1989) have a construction with the *genitive of purpose* that is semantically closely related to the *genitive of intention* or the intentional use of the IPG discussed in the previous subsection. In the *genitive-of-purpose construction*, the verb is typically expressed by an infinitive (historically replacing the supine, another infinitive type), often controlled by a verb of movement. Crucially, there must be a connotation of intention, provided either by the imperative mood, independent-infinitive modal construction or simply by future tense:

- (50) *Pošla golovy poloskat’*
 she-went head.GEN.SG wash.IPFV.INF
 ‘She went to wash (her) head’.
 (Onežskij r.; from Mansikka 1914: 163–64)

- (51) *Dajte mne bani vytopit'*
 let.IPV me sauna.GEN.SG heat.PFV.INF
 'Let me heat up the sauna.' (Onežskij r.; from Mansikka 1914: 163–64)

In addition, the construction based on the independent infinitive of purpose may trigger the genitive of purpose to override the lexical verb's structural accusative:

- (52) *Vy začem sjuda priexali?*
 you why here came
Znat' životišečkov sirotskix opisyvat'
 assumedly life.GEN.PL fatherless.GEN.PL describe.IPFV.INF
 'Why did you come here? Presumably, in order to describe the lives of orphans' (Onežskij r.; from Markova 1989: 80)

Finally, the genitive of purpose is found with imperatives formed from different kinds of verbs, cf. (53)–(55), as well as with verbs that have future reference as in (57):

- (53) *Sinej-to priprite*
 porch.GEN-PRT close.PFV.IPV.2PL
 'Close the porch!' (Onežskij r.; from Mansikka 1914: 163–64)

The following example supports the analysis of the IPG here as triggered by some modal operator of purpose. The purpose, i.e. an intentional context, is created by the imperative mood of the verb *prinesite* 'bring!' (2PL), while the past indicative form of the same verb *prinesla* '[I] brought [FEM.SG]' yields a transparent context in the response. The second speaker does not refer to a modal purpose event but rather to a referential event *prinesla* '[I] brought [FEM.SG]' that took place and that can be pinpointed. Here, the accusative case is used with the same verb:

- (54) *Prinesite okutki, što ne prinesli?*
 bring.PFV.IMPV.2PL blanket.GEN.SG what not brought
 — *Oj, ja zabyła, pribežala, prinesla okutku*
 PRT I forgot, ran-back brought blanket.ACC.SG

‘Bring a/the blanket, why didn’t you bring (it)? Sorry, I forgot (to do so), I ran back and brought a/the blanket’. (Arkhangelsk NR; from Malyševa 2008b: 242)

The next example provides further evidence for the claim that the genitive in these examples is triggered by the semantic component of intention that scopes over the whole clause.

- (55) *Posobi-ka* *mne ubit’* *Jagoj* *baby*
 help.PFV.IMPV.2SG-PRT me kill.PFV.INF Jaga.GEN.SG baba.GEN.SG
 ‘Help me kill the Jaga-Baba (*scil.* a witch)’. (Onežskij r.; from Mansikka 1914: 163–64)

As the object *Jagoj baby* of the embedded infinitive shows, also proper names undergo the change into the genitive if the event described does not have a correlate in the real world and implies some modality. Given that proper names are inherently referential and definite, the function of the IPG in the purpose construction cannot be analysed as NP-internal. It seems that the indefiniteness function of the IPG extends here to the whole clause, making the very event encoded by this clause non-referential. This is in some ways parallel to what happened with the quantifier function of the IPG, which also extended its domain of application from purely NP-internal function to the domain of the whole clause (from D-quantifier into A-quantifier). In other words, it seems that the function of the IPG in the purpose construction is similar to the function of the subjunctive particle *by* in Standard Russian:

- (56) *Ja poedu* *v gorod, čto-by*
 I drive.PFV.FUT.ISG into city in.order
kupit’ *elku*
 buy.PFV.INF Christmas.tree.ACC
 ‘I will drive into the city in order to buy a Christmas tree’.
 (Standard Russian)

The intentional context may also be created by the future reference:

- (57) *tol'ko stulu prinesu*
 only chair.PART.SG bring.PFV.FUT.ISG
 'I will just bring the chair'.
 (Arkhangelsk r.; from Malyševa 2008b: 239)

4.2.3. *Intentional context created by a modal verb*

The IPG also occurs with modal verbs that encode intention, such as Russ. *nado* 'is necessary, have to', *treba* 'idem' (Lopatina 1998: 244; Malyševa 2008b: 239–40):

- (58) *U eë nado vyrezat sarafana*
 at her needs cut-out.PFV.INF sarafan.GEN.SG
 'She has to cut a sarafan'.
 (Arkhangelsk r.; from Malyševa 2008b: 239)

At the same time, as the data from the Ustja Corpus (2013) show, most of the occurrences of *nado* 'need, have to' in its modal sense do not attest the change of the embedded lexical verb's object marking from the regular accusative into the IPG, as we observe in the following example:

- (59) *Ak on ključi zabral, ključi poterjal [...]*
 'He took the keys, he lost the keys [...]'
Nado tri zamka pokupat' novyx
 must three.NOM/ACC.PL locks buy.PFV.INF new.ACC.PL
 'He too the keys and then lost it. [...] We have to buy three new locks'. (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

4.2.4. *The context of negation*

The whole East Slavic area (and some languages beyond it) exhibits the so-called *genitive-under-negation* rule. Under this rule, the structural accusatives of transitive verbs are replaced by the genitive if the clause is negated. Furthermore, this rule affects subjects of several non-accusative predicates (most prominently the existential ones), thereby yielding a reference-related condition for the non-canonical subject marking (as per Haspelmath 2001: 56). The phenomenon has been intensively discussed

in the literature (*inter alia*, Babby 2001; Borschev et al. 2007; Krasovitsky et al. 2011; Padučeva 1997, 2005; Partee & Borschev 2002; Partee 2008, Rakhilina, ed., 2008). The genitive under negation historically derives from the IPG, see Kuryłowicz (1971), though not all the details are clear yet.

Crucially, in all East Slavic branches, the genitive-under-negation rule is optional in most of the cases triggered by a variety of factors. Babby (2001) was first to give a well-articulated functional explanation, claiming that, if the subject NP's referent is in the scope of negation, then the genitive is selected. Unfortunately, this explanation does not account for all cases. Counterexamples are found primarily with genitive case-marked subjects that are inherently definite and wide-scope (e.g. with personal pronouns or proper names). A breakthrough was achieved by Padučeva (1997 and 2005), when she claimed that, under negation, the choice between nominative and genitive is governed by whether or not the absence (negated presence) of the subject NP has been experienced by an implicit inferrer. The following examples demonstrate this:

(60) *Otca ne bylo na more*
 father.GEN NEG be.IPFV.PST.N.SG on see
 'Father was not on the seashore' [while I was there and I haven't seen him]. (Standard Russian)

(61) *Otec ne byl na more*
 father.NOM NEG be.IPFV.PST.M.SG on see
 'Father was not on the seashore' [he stayed at home].
 (Standard Russian)

While (61) asserts that the *father* has not been at a certain place/location, the utterance in (60) implies that the *father* has not been at a certain place/location in the perceptual world of *the inferrer* (Padučeva 2005: 103). Here, the inferrer becomes part of the event structure in terms of an implicit additional participant having certain control properties over the overall event by virtue of being the observer. The utterance in (60) not only implies the absence of the subject referent at the location ('seashore'), but also the presence of the inferrer and his mental activity. If the inferrer had not been at the location, (s)he would not have been able

to make the inference, part of which is the subject referent ('the father'). Padučeva (2005) argues that the existence at the location is denied in the inferrer's mind when the subject is marked with the genitive.

Interestingly, while the subject referent of the existential predicate *byt'* 'to be' in Russian can be either agentive, in the sense of 'to attend something on purpose', or non-agentive, 'to be somewhere', the subject marked with the genitive of this predicate excludes the former, agentive reading, offering only the latter, non-agentive reading. Thus, the agentive adverbials are mostly unlikely to co-occur with the genitive-marked subject under negation with *to be* in Russian, and generally prohibited in Polish (cf. Dziwirek 1994: 173–74, Błaszczak 2008: 125–34). In contrast to Polish, Russian marginally allows negated, genitive-subject sentences with agentive adverbials such as *naročno* 'on purpose'. Nevertheless, crucially, these agentive adverbials cannot ascribe agentivity to the genitive subject as mentioned above. They ascribe control properties to a third participant:

- (62) *Na šedevrax naročno ne bylo*
 on masterworks on.purpose.ADV NEG be.IPFV.PST.SG.N
imen ix sozdatelej,
 name.GEN.PL their authors
no vse znali, čto sredi eksponatov —
 but all knew, that among showpieces —
Džakometti, Xerst i Kuns
 Giacometti, Hirst and Koons
 '[It was] deliberate [that] there were no names of the authors on the masterpieces; but everyone knew that the exhibits included Giacometti, Hirst and Koons'. (Standard Russian; from www.izvestia.ru/chronicle/article3120761/)

The agentivity properties of the adverbial are not attributed to the genitive subject referent, since the latter inherently lacks them in this construction. It is this implicit participant—someone who has arranged the exhibition in such a way that the names of the painters have not been displayed by the exhibits. This implicit agent is endowed with the following proto-agent entailments (Dowty 1991: 572): (a) volitional involvement in the event or state, (b) sentience, (c) causing a situation not to take place,

and (d) it existing independently of the event named by the verb. Thus, the utterance in (60), in contrast to (61), if uttered with an agentivity adverb such as *special'no*, or *naročno*, 'on purpose', would be understood in such a way that someone has deliberately arranged the situation so that the father would not be on the seashore. In turn, with the agentivity adverb having the subject referent in the scope, (61) would imply, in such a case, that it was the father's own decision not to be at the seashore. Thus, these and possibly other factors constrain the choice between the structural case marking and the genitive in Russian.

When it comes to North Russian, it has to be stated that, in this dialect group, the frequency of the genitive under negation has decreased over time. Thus, in the Old North Russian of the Birch Bark Manuscripts, one finds structural accusatives replaced by the IPG under negation almost throughout (Zaliznjak 2004: 159). Moreover, the dynamics of the accusative objects under negation also increased from 1800 until 2000 in Standard Russian (Rusakova 2013: 331–32).⁹ The situation in modern subdialects of North Russian differs, although not principally. The genitive is still quite frequent in North Russian if compared to Standard Russian, which obviously imposes influence on North Russian here. Below, I present the frequency counts of the genitive occurrence, on the basis of the Ustja Corpus (2013) for North Russian and on the basis of RNC for modern Spoken (Standard) Russian:¹⁰

9 To be precise, Rusakova's (2013: 331–32) corpus data suggest a strong increase and then fall in the accusative at the end of the eighteenth century. However, her data may be statistically less representative for this period, because she has a total of only 38 hits with the negated context (both genitive and accusative) for the period 1757–1786 (due to the number of texts in the RNC for this period), as Rusakova (2013: 333) herself points out.

10 I have considered all occurrences of *ne* 'not' in the corpus while not taking into account other negative polarity items. Furthermore, I have taken into account only those instances which theoretically allow both genitive and accusative/nominative (not paying attention to pragmatics): thus, for example, I excluded the negated copula *net(u)* 'not is', which obligatorily requires genitive and all personal pronouns as well as animate nouns of the *o*-declension, which do not distinguish between genitive and accusative. With the RNC, I have selected the Spoken Russian subcorpus: the counts for literary texts, especially from the nineteenth century, would have been different and more archaic, as just a preliminary count suggests. Furthermore, in the RNC, I have narrowed down my search to include only occurrences of the negated verb *byt'* 'to be' (exclusively in its lexical function) for the subject position. There was no such restriction in the Ustja Corpus (2013).

	Genitive	Accusative/Nominative	Total
Object	92 (77,97%)	26 (22,03%)	118
Subject	94 (77,69%)	27 (22,31%)	121

Table 2: Frequency of the genitive vs. structural case under verb negation in Ustja subdialect of North Russian

As Table 2 demonstrates, the use of the genitive under negation is still predominant in North Russian. The situation is very different in Spoken (Standard) Russian, where the use of the structural case with objects prevails:

	Genitive	Accusative/Nominative	Total
Object	54 (45,76%)	64 (54,24%)	118
Subject	111 (88,09%)	15 (11,91%)	126

Table 3: Frequency of the genitive vs. structural case under verb negation in Spoken (Standard) Russian

Furthermore, not only token, but also type frequency is somewhat higher in North Russian than in Standard Russian. Thus, one finds a genitive under negation that is not triggered by a negation of its head verb, but rather by the negation of the matrix verb in contexts where the genitive would be less felicitous in Standard Russian, even in its spoken variety:

- (63) *A nyne nažrutsja da, von, ljagut na bereg da okolevajut. Ne nra-vitsja mne*, ‘And now, they swill, then lie on the bank and fall asleep. I don’t like it’,
ne umejut vstrečat’ prazdnikov. Nynče molodež’ [...] NEG can.3PL meet.PFV.INF celebration.GEN.PL now youth
 ‘they don’t know how to celebrate [lit. ‘meet celebrations’]. Young people nowadays [...]’ (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

The following examples are parallel. Here, the proper names *Van’ka*, *Verjuga* are marked with the genitive because of the negation of the

(modal) matrix verb—a use of the genitive that would not be favoured in Spoken (Standard) Russian in these contexts:

- (64) About someone who thought that Van’ka had fallen into the well and tried to pull him out:

Nikak ne mozet Van’ki-to pojmat’ dak
 by-no-way NEG can.3SG Van’ka.GEN-PRT catch.PFV.INF PRT
 ‘He just can’t get hold of Van’ka’.

(Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

- (65) *I bobrov mnogo, no bobry eë*
 and beavers many but beaver.NOM.PL PRON.F.ACC.SG
ne mozut ešče Verjugi zaprudit’ polnost’ju
 NEG can.3PL still Virjuga.F.GEN dam.PFV.INF completely
Ne mogut. Ona bol’saja ešče reka.
 not can.3PL PRON.F.NOM.SG large.NOM.F.SG still river.F.NOM.SG
 ‘And there are many beavers. But the beavers still cannot dam it completely. They can’t. It is a large river’.

(Ustjanskij r.; Ustja Corpus 2013)

There is also one example in the Ustja Corpus (2013) where the subject of an agentive verb *letat*, ‘to fly’, embedded under a phasal verb *stat*, ‘to begin’, is attested in the genitive, which, again, is less acceptable in Spoken (Standard) Russian:

- (66) *A sejčas ved’ vorony i toj ne*
 and now PRT crow.GEN.SG and this.F.GEN.SG NEG
stalo letat’, vorony, soroki!
 begin.PFV.PST.SG fly.IPFV.INF crow.GEN.SG pie.GEN.SG
 ‘And now even the crow does not fly [here], the crow and the pie!’
 (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

4.3. Decreased referentiality

There is an agreement that the IPG encodes—as Barbara Partee (2008) puts it—“decreased referentiality” found in intensional contexts or contexts of negation. It seems that situations under the scope of an inten-

tion operator, as well as situations under the scope of negation, are themselves less referential or, rather, not referential at all. They all constitute imaginary worlds and, consequently, their elements need not exist or have respective referents in the real world. Devoid of existential commitment or of a particular reference, the participants of these imaginary worlds are thus understood as concepts or ideas that may but need not find a real world referent (extension) or, at least, a referent that would ideally fit the concept. Thus, Zimmermann (1993) argues that, generally, the opaque objects of the intensional verbs are interpreted as *properties*. Partee (2008), in trying to relate the IPG of the intensional verbs to the genitive of negation, suggests that the genitive encodes the *property* value in both cases, a value that is otherwise associated with predicates rather than with argument positions (Partee 2008: 299). In the same vein, Timberlake (2004: 317), following on from Borrás & Christian (1971) and Neidle (1988: 31), states that "... the genitive is used for nouns that are essentialist rather than individuated in reference ('this is a token of the kind of thing defined as ...')." This is exemplified in (67):

- (67) *A kto rabotal pokrepče, tak ix byli*
 But who worked stronger, so they.GEN.PL be.IPFV.PST.PL
 'As for those who worked harder, there were (some) of them'.
 (Onežskij r.)

The anaphoric third-person plural pronoun in the second clause does not refer to particular individuals but rather to the kind (as is expected by Timberlake 2004: 317) or, perhaps more precisely, to the property of the referents *having worked hard* introduced in the first clause (as in Partee 2008).¹¹ In turn, the IPG extracts instantiations of the kind referred to by the personal pronoun, and thereby blocks the (original) kind reference, making the utterance less committal. The next example is similar. Here the adjective *takix* 'such.GEN.PL' also introduces a kind, while the IPG extracts instantiations of that kind:

11 Carlson (1977: 433) has already stated that third-person pronouns such as *they* may potentially have two types of antecedents: either the discursively accessible, active referent or the kind of that referent, cf. *Mark knows ten linguists, and Freddie knows six of them*. In this example, *they* is ambiguous between both antecedents.

- (68) *Est' i teper' takix rebjat*
 be.IPFV.PRES and now such.GEN.PL guy.GEN.PL
 'Also now, there are some guys of that kind'.
 (Onežskij r.; from Markova 2008: 153)

Furthermore, the IPG also has the effect of discursively demoting its NP;¹² unifying it with the verb into one information unit (focus). The clauses with the IPG usually provide background information.

- (69) *Vyšla замуž dočeri*
 go.PFV.PST.F.SG marriage daughter.F.GEN.SG
 A person speaking about her daughter: '(My) daughter is married'. (Onežskij r.; from Markova 2008: 146)

Here, an old woman enumerates different events in her life, one of which is the marriage of her daughter (Markova, p.c.). The daughter—even though she is the subject of the clause—is not the topic of the narration, and is herself of no relevance to this discourse. The point is rather that the old woman is now alone. The IPG demotes the discursive prominence of *dočeri* here, which it would otherwise have had as the subject by default.

The next example also demonstrates this. Here, the people that are asserted to be in the field constitute background or circumstantial information, while the message is about the trip on foot. Notably, the person speaks about people from the same kolkhoz being in the field, which must therefore be familiar to her. Nevertheless, they are marked by the IPG that otherwise marks indefinite NPs, because particular individuals are irrelevant to the discourse:

- (70) About a woman who has been sent to walk for two days to deliver a message, although there were also other people in the field:
Tak, vsě vspominaju, budu do smerti èto mesto vspominat'.
Potomu što mne očen' obidno bylo, što vtorogo čeloveka ne dali,
no menja vot, nu bedna taka vot...

12 I define *discourse prominence* as the relative degree of *relevance* or *importance* that any information provided by an utterance has in a discursive interaction (cf. Langacker 1987).

‘I still think about it, I will remember that place until I die. Because it hurt me a lot that no-one was sent to accompany me. Instead I [was sent alone], just me...’

Bylo ludej, na poljax robotali, a vot
 be.PST.N.SG people.GEN.PL on fields WORK.PST.PL but PRT
menja otozval

I.ACC call.PST.M.SG

‘There were other people in the fields working, but he asked me’.
 (Čavan’ga, Terskoj r.; from Čavan’ga Text)

Summarizing, I assume, following on from Partee (2008), that the IPG encodes an extreme reduction of referential information; in most of the cases, the IPG encodes non-referentiality. Furthermore, I hypothesize that the *non-referentiality function* has emancipated itself from the NP-internal domain to the domain of the whole VP, in exactly the same way as the *quantification-function* of the IPG did. Recall from subsections 2.2, 2.3, 3.2 above that the quantification-function of the IPG has expanded onto the entire predication, as in (repeated here as (71) for convenience):

- (71) *Ja otvorju dverej*
 I open.PFV.FUT.ISG door.GEN.PL
 ‘I will somewhat open the door’.
 (Kuškopola, Pinežskij r.; from Malyševa 2008b: 237)

In (71), the IPG does not apply to its NP (not **some door*), but rather to the whole predication ‘somewhat’. In the same way, one may assume that the *non-referentiality-function* of the IPG has emancipated itself, extending its domain from an NP-internal non-referentiality into a VP-internal non-referentiality. Thus, the genitive of negation can also encode definite participants that are outside of the scope of negation:

- (72) Standard Russian
Peti ne bylo doma
 Peter.GEN.SG NEG be.IPFV.PST.N.SG home
 ‘Peter wasn’t at home’.

I hypothesize that the genitive of the proper name Peter signals the non-referentiality of the event that is negated.

5. Formal properties

In what follows, I will discuss some of the morphological and syntactic properties of the IPG that are typologically less expected.

5.1. Object position: Coordination

The IPG overrides the case frame of a verb. Notably, only structural cases may be overridden. One finds some exceptions to this rule, however. Thus, the Old Russian verb *vľadyčestvovati* ‘rule, govern’ subcategorizes for an instrumental object whose case marking may be overridden by the IPG:

- (73) Old Russian
vl(d)č(s)tvovaľ Asourieju i Persidoju
 govern.PST.M.SG Assyria.INS.SG and Persia.INS.SG
i pročixň stranň soušřixň na vřstocě
 and other.GEN.PL country.GEN.PL being.GEN.PL on East
 ‘He governed Assyria and Persia and [some] other countries
 in the East’ (Chronicle of George Hamartolos, quoted from
 Krys’ko 2004: 188)

Interestingly, the IPG-marked object *pročixň stranň* ‘other countries’ in (73) is coordinated with the instrumental-marked object *Asourieju i Persidoju* ‘Assyria and Persia’. The IPG in the object position can also be coordinated with an accusative object of the same verb not only in Middle Russian (as in (74) below), but also in Modern Russian, where (74) would also be grammatical:

- (74) Middle Russian
Prinesi ovoščej da syrň
 bring.IPV vegetables.GEN.PL and cheese.NOM.SG
 ‘Bring vegetables and cheese!’
 (RG, 36–37 from Krys’ko 2004: 223)

I do not have similar examples from North Russian at my disposal, but there is no reason to assume that North Russian would behave differently

here from Standard Russian. The ability of the IPG to coordinate with other cases is striking, given that the coordination with the conjunction *i* ‘and’ elsewhere requires full case agreement.

5.2. Subject position

5.2.1. Subject-verb agreement in some North Russian subdialects

Unlike the ancient Indo-European languages, with their semantic agreement with the IPG subjects (Seržant 2012b), the North Russian IPG in the subject position typically triggers the default agreement form or the lack of agreement on the verb, namely, the third-person singular neuter in Russian.

To my knowledge, V.I. Trubinskij (in Meščerskij, ed., 1972: 211) was the first to draw attention to genitives that behave like subject objects («в роли субъектного дополнения»). Here, in the course of further development, a formal agreement does occur in some subdialects of North Russian, cf. the following example from Trubinskij (in Meščerskij, ed., 1972: 211):

- (75) North Russian
K jim vsegda ljudej nabegut, dak jabloku
 to them always people.GEN.PL run.3PL so that apple
nekudy upast'
 nowhere to fall
 ‘So many people run to them that there is no place for an apple to fall’.

The next examples, from the area around Lake Onega, are provided by Markova (2008: 153):

- (76) *Tut-to medvedej byvajut, tol'ko malo*
 here-PRT bear.GEN.PL occur.3PL only few
 ‘There are bears, but only a few’. (Sujsar', Onežskij r.)
- (77) *A kto rabotal pokrepče, tak ix byli*
 But who worked stronger, so they.GEN.PL were.PL
 ‘As for those who worked harder, there were (some) of them’.
 (Sujsar', Onežskij r.)

- (78) *Zdes' vsjakix rastut*
 here any-kind.GEN.PL grow.3PL
 'Here any kind (of plants) grows'. (Derevjannoe, Onežskij r.)
- (79) *Počti vsex poraz'exalis'*
 almost all.GEN.PL emigrated.3PL
 'Almost everyone has emigrated'. (Šun'ga, Onežskij)
- (80) *Snov budut*
 dream.GEN.PL be.FUT.3PL
 'There will be (night) dreams'. (Šun'ga, Onežskij)

The following example contains a genitive under negation that is related to the IPG, as has been mentioned above (subsection 4.2.4). Here, the speaker first says the same content without there being agreement between the genitive subject and the verb and, then, while reiterating and emphasizing the lack of 'heated garages', induces the agreement. One could, of course, claim that this is a case of mispronunciation (pace S.K. Pozharickaja, p.c.). However, given that these examples are not *hapax*, I am inclined to assume that they do exist in North Russian subdialects, although they are, I concede, quite infrequent:

- (81) *Zimoj nado v četyre časa vstat'. Pridti, mašinu nado kočegarit'.*
 'In the wintertime, one should wake up at four, [then] go [and] warm up the car'.

Garažov-to ne bylo tēplyx.
 garage.GEN.PL-PRT NEG be.PST.N.SG warm.GEN.PL
 'There were no heated garages'.

V žizni ne byli u nas garažej tēplyx.
 in life NEG be.PST.PL at us garage.GEN.PL-PRT warm.GEN.PL
 'Never did we have heated garages'.
 (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

Furthermore, Malyševa (p.c.) reports one example from her field work in the area around Arkhangelsk:

- (82) *A kotora krasivaja—za toj budut ženixof*
 PRT which.F.SG pretty.F.SG for this.F.SG be.PFV.FUT3PL fiancé.GEN.PL
 ‘The one which is pretty—there will be fiancés for her’.
 (Pavlovsk, Vilegodskij r.)

In a number of cases, constructions are found that seem to come close to the agreement between the IPG subject and the verb. The following example (70), repeated here in a shortened version as (83), illustrates the omission of the nominative subject in the conjoined clause on identity with the IPG subject, which can be taken as further evidence of the nominative-like behaviour of IPG subjects in North Russian:

- (83) *Bylo ljudej, [pro_i] na poljax robotali,*
 be.PST.N.SG people.GEN.PL 3PL.NOM on fields work.PST.PL
a vot menja otozval
 but PRT I.ACC call.PST.M.SG
 ‘There were other people in the fields working, but he asked me’.
 (Čavan’ga, Terskoj r.; from Čavan’ga Text)

The formal agreement in number (and perhaps in person) is thus an indication of a semantic and, subsequently, formal conflation of the nominative and (originally partitive) genitive subjects, whereby the latter acquires the agreement property in analogy with the former. In fact, in the process of subjecthood acquisition, the agreement property often comes before the acquisition of the prototypical subject case-marking, i.e. nominative (Seržant 2013: 346–48).

5.3. *The rise of a dedicated partitive ending*

Finnic languages formally distinguish between the possessive and (pseudo-)partitive relations by means of two different sets of case markers: the genitive case encodes possessiveness while the partitive case encodes (pseudo-)partitivity. In Russian, where both functions have been originally expressed by the genitive case, there has been a tendency to set these two meanings apart. In Standard Russian, and even more in North Russian dialects, there is a second genitive ending that can be used instead of the canonical genitive ending, though only in the contexts typical of a partitive case (as compared, e.g., with Finnish). Notably, the rise

of this new quasi-case has to be dated to Old Novgorodian (Old North Russian) where the ending *-oy*, phonetically [-u] is attested in the relevant meaning from the earliest period, cf. *vosk-u* ‘wax’, *gorox-u* ‘pea’, etc. (Zaliznjak 2004: 107).

Thus, a new, dedicated partitive ending for the singular of the *o*-stems, namely, *-u* arises, as opposed to the default genitive *-a*. This tendency has never been fully paradigmaticized, so that, in a (pseudo-)partitive context, both endings are equally possible and interchangeable, cf. (85), see also Daniel (*forthcoming*). In a possessive-like context, however, only the genitive ending *-a* is allowed, cf. (84) while the partitive ending leads to ungrammaticality:

(84) Standard Russian

*List'ja čaj-a / *čaj-u*
 leaves.NOM tea-GEN / *tea-PART
 ‘Tea leaves’. [lit. ‘leaves of tea’] (possessive context)

(85) Standard Russian

Ja popil čaj-a / čaj-u
 I DELIM-drunk tea-GEN/ tea-PART
 ‘I drank some tea’. (pseudo-partitive context)

I take this incompatibility between the *-u* case and the possessive relation as an indication of it being a different case from the genitive and not synonymous with the latter (following, *inter alia*, Breu 1994). This new case is highly restricted lexically in Spoken Standard Russian (see the extensive discussion in Daniel, *forthcoming*) and, as I will show below, a little less restricted in North Russian.

This new partitive case has not developed into an entirely independent case either semantically (due to the aforementioned overlap with the genitive) or morphologically (due to the lack of dedicated plural forms and separate endings for the other noun types). It has been claimed in the literature that this new case is not a full-fledged partitive, since it may also occur governed by a preposition within a context that is atypical for a (pseudo-)partitive (Daniel, *forthcoming*), cf.:

(86) Standard Russian

Ja uexal iz dom-a / dom-u
 I drive.PST.M.SG from home-GEN / home-PART
 'I left home'.

While this is essentially correct, this does not change the fact that this new case patterns with the partitive case in Finnic. In these languages, there are several pre- and postpositions that govern the partitive case (see, *inter alia*, Karlsson 1987: 85 on Finnish). This circumstance only reinforces the correlation between this new case-marker and the Finnic partitive case.

Crucially, the dedicated partitive ending *-u*, even though not as frequent, is nevertheless somewhat more productive in North Russian than it is in the Standard language; it is less constrained in terms of its compatibility with different contexts. Standard Russian restricts the use of this ending to mass nouns only in non-prepositional contexts, cf. the context of negation:

(87) Standard Russian

Ja ne našel čaj-a / čaj-u
 I NEG find.PST.M tea-GEN / tea-PART
 'I didn't find any tea'.

(88) Standard Russian

*Ja ne našel dom-a / *dom-u*
 I NEG find.PST.M house-GEN / *house-PART
 'I didn't find the/a house'.

The mass noun *čaj* 'tea' freely allows the partitive ending in the negated context while the count noun *dom* 'house' does not, even though this noun does occur with this ending after a preposition, cf. (86) above. In contrast, in North Russian dialects, count nouns are also attested in the partitive use:

(89) *Domu-to dva ras prišlos' perestroit'*
 house.PART.SG-PRT two times must.PST rebuild.INF
 'The house had to be rebuilt twice'.
 (Pleseeckij r.; Malyševa 2008b: 236)

The IPG *domu* is triggered here by the A-type measure phrase *dva ras* ‘twice’, which measures the verbal action and is fully parallel to the instances discussed in subsection 2.3 above. Other count nouns are attested with the dedicated partitive ending, e.g. *vyjezd* ‘leave’:

- (90) *Vyezdu ne bylo u nas iz kolchoza.*
 leave.PART.SG NEG be.PST.N.SG at us from kolkhoz
Rabotajte tut. A na učěbu tol’ko vyezd.
 work here PRT on studying only leave
 ‘There was no leave for us from the kolkhoz. “You should work here!” [they said]. One could leave only in order to study’.
 (Ustjanskij r.; Ustja Corpus 2013)
- (91) *I Šura uxodit na mesjac. Skol’ko godov-to robit-to, už četyre goda, oj pjat’ li.*
 ‘And Šura goes on a leave for a month. She has worked for so long already, four years, oh, maybe five’.
Otpusku-to ne pol’zovala, dak sej god
 leave.PART.SG-PRT NEG use.PST.F.SG so this year
 ‘She hasn’t used up her leave, so [she goes on vacation] this year’.
 (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)
- (92) *Prišla, govorit, ego, govorit, ševelju, a*
 come.PST.F.SG say.PRS.1SG him say.PRS.1SG turn.PRS.1SG but
on, govorit, mne otvetu ne dačt.
 3SG.M.NOM .PRS.1SG 1SG.DAT answer.PART.SG NEG give.PRS.3SG
 ‘She says, I came, she says, I tried to move him, and he, she says, didn’t respond to me, she says’. (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

Other count nouns are attested with the partitive ending in North Russian: *most-u* ‘bridge’, *sčet-u* ‘number, quantity’, mass nouns: *korm-u* ‘fodder’, *tabak-u* ‘tobacco’, *splav-u* ‘wood float’, abstract nouns: *appetit-u* ‘appetite’ (Ustja Corpus 2013). Distinguishing themselves from the latter, the former are ungrammatical in Spoken Russian.

5.4. Extension of the animacy domain in North Russian

Another function that is historically related to the IPG is the distinction between animates (humans and non-humans) as opposed to inanimates with certain NP types (cf. Krysko 1997, 2004; Seržant, *forthcoming-c*), following the Extended Animacy Hierarchy (Croft 2003: 130):

- (93) 1st/2nd person pronouns < 3rd pers. pronoun < proper names
 < human common noun < non-human animate common noun
 < inanimate common noun.

Personal pronouns, as well as animate nouns of the *o*-declension, are affected. This distinction is expressed by means of (originally) two different case-markers: animates are marked with the genitive while inanimates are marked with the accusative—a phenomenon known as Differential Object Marking (DOM) (cf., *inter alia*, Aissen 2003, Comrie 1979, Lazard 2001).

However, not all nouns referring to animates are grammatically treated as animate in Standard Russian. The case in point here is *skot*, ‘cattle’, which, presumably due to its collective semantics, does not receive the marked genitive form in the object position. This is different in the North Russian subdialects, which evidently treat this noun as animate. I have the following evidence for this: there are a number of examples where the genitive form of *skot* (*skot-a*) in object position is not motivated functionally, because it occurs in contexts which are incompatible with the IPG.

The contexts of the following examples imply the inclusiveness of all potential referents and, hence, holistic affectedness, which is a typical feature of definiteness and, thus, incompatible with the IPG:

- (94) In a story about one poor family:

A *skota* *kormili*.
 PRT cattle.GEN>ACC.SG feed.PST.PL
 ‘And they fed the cattle (not *‘some cattle’).
 (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

- (95) About the collectivization, expropriation of peasants:

Otbirali *tol’ko vot èto, postrojki*
 expropriate.PST.PL only PRT this building.NOM/ACC.PL

otbirali, skota otbirali
 expropriate.PST.PL cattle.GEN>ACC.SG expropriate.PST.PL
 ‘They expropriated only this: buildings they expropriated, cattle
 they expropriated’. (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

The following example unequivocally exhibits an animacy-driven marking:

- (96) *Nado platit’ za skota, kak umrët*
 must pay.INF for cattle.GEN>ACC.SG when die.3SG
skotina-to
 cattle.F.NOM.SG-PRT
 ‘One has to pay for the cattle, once an animal dies’. (Ustjanskij
 r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

An interpretation of the genitive ending as the IPG here is excluded since the NP *skota* is governed by a preposition *za* ‘for’ which—in the relevant meaning—exclusively governs the accusative and never the genitive or the IPG. There is even more evidence pointing to this. Consider the following example, in which the next clause is accusative:

- (97) — *Skota deržali. Korovu deržali,*
 cattle.GEN>ACC.SG hold.PST.PL COW.ACC.SG hold.PST.PL
olenej deržali. A syna nikakogo ne bylo
 reindeer.ACC/GEN.PL hold.PST.PL PRT son any not was
 ‘They had cattle, had a cow, had reindeers. But they didn’t have a
 son’. (Terskij r.; Tetrino Text)

The reflexive pronoun in the following example unequivocally provides a definite reading of the genitive NP *skota*:

- (98) *A bylo ved’ ran’še-to ved’ vozili.*
 ‘Before we have been supplied’.
Korov-to kormili, skota-to svoego.
 COW.GEN/ACC.PL-PRT feed.PST.PL cattle.GEN>ACC.SG-PRT REFL.GEN.SG
 ‘We fed the cows, fed our cattle’.
 (Ustjanskij r.; from Ustja Corpus 2013)

I conclude that the former genitive ending is used just as the accusative here and is not the IPG. This is in accordance with the general pattern of object marking in Russian and some other Slavic languages. These languages feature animate object NPs by means of a dedicated accusative ending (—former genitive).

6. *Conclusions*

I have examined different contexts compatible with the IPG in North Russian that were distinct from Standard Russian. The IPG is a multifaceted category that bears on such domains as (i) quantification, (ii) (in) definiteness/referentiality and (iii) discourse prominence.

Subgroup (i) is found in the context of a quantifier independently of the place of its phonological and syntactic realization in the clause: be it a quantifier head of the same constituent (in this case, however, it would be the syntactically dependent partitive genitive), another constituent (e.g. an adverb), or morphologically encoded in the verb as a prefix. In absence of any overt quantifier, the IPG invokes its own, covert quantifier, that is, however, undetermined by default but restricted by not allowing unbounded or generic quantification. This covert quantifier can have either NP-internal functions (D-quantifier) or apply to the whole clause (A-quantifier). In the latter case, if there are overt A-quantifiers present in the clause (e.g. the prefix quantifiers in subsection 2.3), then these quantifiers determine the value of the covert A-quantifier of the IPG. Alternatively, as is the case with the temporal transfer or in examples like or in subsection 2.3, it is only the covert A-quantifier of the IPG that determines the quantification of the event; as a consequence, it determines the aktionsart and aspect of the whole VP.

I partly adhere to the view expressed in Franks (1995: 182), that the IPG is governed by a quantifier (first suggested in Neidle 1988), which lacks a concrete value and, therefore, has to look elsewhere for its interpretation, and that this interpretation is provided by the verb. As the examples demonstrate, however, this quantifier has its own default value and need not be determined by some other quantifier in every case. I acknowledge the interrelationship between the IPG argument and its verb (Franks 1995: 184) in a number of instances, but not in terms of a straightforward syntactic dependency.

Regarding the interaction with aspectuality, I have argued that a VP with the IPG-marked object always has the delimitative interpretation, unless the covert quantifier of the IPG is used as a D-quantifier. I adopt the account of partitive events suggested by Tatevosov & Ivanov (2009: 93ff). These authors claim that there are two operators at play: an actionality operator yielding non-culminating events and a viewpoint operator yielding perfective *vs.* imperfective viewpoints taking the non-culminating events as its input. I claim that the IPG derives a non-culminating, activity-like process not only in Russian or North Russian, but also in Finnic languages or Lithuanian. Crucially, North Russian and Russian are different from Finnic in that these languages can only derive the perfective viewpoint from non-culminating events. This amounts to saying that the IPG derives delimitatives in Russian. Different actional verb classes undergo different semantic derivations: accomplishments typically employ the preparatory phase immediately before the culmination as the homogenous process that can be bounded by the (obligatory) perfective viewpoint, while achievements (only transfer verbs) metonymically extend their denotational base to include the after-effects situation, which then serves as the non-culminating input for the perfective viewpoint operator. The latter yields the meaning of temporal transfer. Furthermore, the delimitative marker *po-* frequently co-occurs with the IPG in Russian, thus providing further evidence for the delimitative function of the IPG-object-marking.

On the determiner facet of the IPG (ii), it is “conducive to decreased referentiality” (cf. Partee 2008). This function is found in opaque contexts or the context of negation. The IPG-coded referent therefore has a frequently but arguably not inherently narrow scope with regard to such operators as negation or modal operators (differently Babby 2001). I have argued that the use of the genitive under clause negation is somewhat more frequent in North Russian than in Spoken (Standard) Russian. Furthermore, I have also argued that the IPG marked arguments always represent background information as regards discourse organization (iii). They never become topics, and usually cannot constitute a focus on their own; instead they form one information-structure unit with the verb. The participant encoded by the IPG is demoted both morphosyntactically and discursively.

Finally, a number of striking morphosyntactic properties of the IPG in North Russian have been discussed. In the object position, it can be coordinated with objects that are otherwise case-marked: with accusative objects in Old and Modern Russian as well as with instrumental objects in Old Russian. This is a striking property of exclusively the IPG, since coordination is allowed in Slavic only provided case concord between the respective NPs.

Moreover, some North Russian subdialects not only allow the IPG to occur in the subject position, but also attest the *ad-formam* subject-verb agreement as to the number value. Note that otherwise only nominatives can control verbal agreement in Slavic. Furthermore, North Russian subdialects exhibit a wider range of use of the new, dedicated partitive ending *-u* with nouns of the *o*-declension than Spoken (Standard) Russian does.

Sources

- AOS: *Arkhangel'skij oblastnoj slovar'*, pod red. O.G. Gecova, vyp. 1–12, Moskva, Nauka, 1980–2004.
- Čavan'ga Text: Village Čavan'ga, Terskij region, district of Murmansk.
Speaker: Ol'ga Ivanovna Kožina (b. 1924). Recorded by Christian и Ursula Sappok (University of Bochum), transcribed by Karin Rösstad and Margje Post (University of Bergen, margje.post@if.uib.no).
- RNC Russian National Corpus. <http://www.ruscorpora.ru/en/index.html>.
- Tetrino Text: Village Tetrino, Terskij region, district of Murmansk.
Speaker Anfisa Andreevna Kuznecova (b. 1925). Recorded by Christian и Ursula Sappok (University of Bochum), transcribed by Margje Post.
- Ustja Corpus 2013: Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina, Ruprecht von Waldenfels. The language of the Ustja river basin. A corpus of North Russian dialectal speech. 2013. Bern, Moscow. Electronic resource, available at: <http://parasol.unibe.ch/Pushkin>.
- Varzuga Text: Village Varzuga, Terskij region, district of Murmansk.
Speaker: Čunina Klavdija Fedorovna (b. 1929). Records made by O.E. Karmakova, T. Lönnngren, D. Pineda and Margje Post on 20.08.2001. Transcription by E.B. Kuz'mina.

References

- Aissen, Judith, 2003, "Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21, pp. 435–48.
- Avanesov, R.I. & V.G. Orlova, 1964, *Russkaja dialektologija*, Moscow.
- Babby, Leonard H., 2001, "The Genitive of Negation: A Unified Analysis," *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Bloomington Meeting 2000* (FASL 9), eds. S. Franks, T. Holloway King & M. Yadoff, Ann Arbor, pp. 39–55.
- Barwise, J. & R. Cooper, 1981, "Generalized Quantifiers and Natural Language," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4, pp. 159–219.
- Bauer, Brigitte L.M., 2007, "The Definite Article in Indo-European: Emergence of a New Grammatical Category?," *Nominal Determination: Typology, Context, Constraints, and Historical Emergence*, eds. E. Stark, E. Leiss, & A. Werner, Amsterdam, pp. 103–39.
- Błaszczak, Joanna, 2008, "Differential Subject Marking in Polish," *Differential Subject Marking* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 72), eds. H. de Hoop & P. Swart, Dordrecht, pp. 113–50.
- Borras, Frank Marshall & Reginald Frank Christian, 1971, *Russian Syntax: Aspects of Modern Russian Syntax and Vocabulary*, Oxford.
- Borschev, Vladimir, E.V. Paducheva, Barbara H. Partee, Yakov G. Testel's & Igor Yanovich, 2007, "Russian Genitives, Non-Referentiality, and the Property-Type Hypothesis," *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Stony Brook Meeting 2007* (FASL 16), eds. A. Antonenko, J.F. Bailyn & C. Bethin, Ann Arbor, pp. 48–67, URL: <https://udrive.oit.umass.edu/partee/FASL16FinalForPrinting.pdf>.
- Breu, Walter, 1994, "Der Faktor Sprachkontakt in einer dynamischen Typologie des Slavischen," *Slavistische Linguistik* 1993, ed. H.-R. Mehlig, Munich, pp. 41–64.
- Buslaev, F.I., 1875, *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis*, Moscow.
- Carlson, Gregory N., 1977, "A Unified Analysis of English Bare Plural," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1, pp. 413–57.
- Comrie, Bernard, 1979, "Definite and Animate Direct Objects: A Natural Class," *Linguistical Silestana* 3, pp. 13–21.
- Corbett, Greville, 1994, "Systems of Grammatical Number in Slavonic," *Slavonic and East European Review* 72 (2), pp. 201–17.
- Corbett, Greville, 2000, *Number*, Cambridge & New York.

- Croft, William, 2003, *Typology and Universals*, Cambridge.
- Cruse, Alan, 2000, *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*, Oxford.
- Čujkova, O. Ju., 2011, *Variativnost' oformlenija vnutrennego argumenta pri russkix perexodnyx glagolax s polnoj vidovoj paradigmoj*, BA thesis, University of St Peterburg.
- Dahl, Eystein, 2009, "Some Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects of Object Alternation in Early Vedic," *The Rise of Semantic, Pragmatic, and Discourse Factors in the Development of Case*, eds. J. Barðdal & S. Chelliah, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- DAMB: *Dyjalektalahičny atlas belaruskaj movy*, 1963, Minsk.
- Daniel, Michael, forthcoming, "The Second Genitive in Russian," *Partitivity*, eds. S. Luraghi & T. Huumo, Berlin & New York.
- Dickey, Stephen M., 2006, "Aspectual Pairs, Goal Orientation and PO-Delimitatives in Russian," *Glossos* 7, pp. 1–32, URL: <http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/7/dickey.pdf>.
- Dowty, David, 1991, "Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection," *Language* 67, pp. 547–619.
- Dowty, David, 2001, "The Semantic Asymmetry of 'Argument Alternations' (and Why it Matters)," *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 44, URL: <http://ling.ohio-state.edu/~dowty/papers/groningen-00.pdf>.
- Dziwirek, Katarzyna, 1994, *Polish Subjects*, New York & London.
- Franks, Steven, 1995, *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax), New York & Oxford.
- Filin, F.P., 1972, *Proisxoždenie russkogo, ukrainskogo i belorusskogo jazykov: istoriko-dialektologičeskij očerk*, Leningrad.
- van Geenhoven, Veerle & Louise McNally, 2005, "On the Property Analysis of Opaque Complements," *Lingua* 115, pp. 885–914.
- von Heusinger, Klaus, 2002, "Specificity and Definiteness in Sentence and Discourse Structure," *Journal of Semantics* 19, pp. 245–74.
- von Heusinger, Klaus & Jaklin Kornfilt, 2005, "The Case of the Direct Object in Turkish: Semantics, Syntax and Morphology," *Turkic Languages* 9, pp. 3–44.
- von Heusinger, Klaus & Johannes Wespel, 2007, "Indefinite Proper Names and Quantification over Manifestations," *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 11, ed. E. Puig-Waldmüller, Barcelona, pp. 332–45.

- Holvoet, Axel, 2001, "Impersonals and Passives in Baltic and Finnic," *Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact*, vol. 2: *Grammar and Typology* (Studies in Language Companion Series), eds. Ö. Dahl & M. Koptevskaja-Tamm, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 363–90.
- de Hoop, Helen, 2003, "Partitivity," *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book*, eds. L. Cheng & R. Sybesma, Berlin & New York, pp. 179–212.
- Ickovič, V.A., 1974, "Očerki sintaksičeskoj normy," *Sintaksis i norma*, ed. G.A. Zolotova, Moscow, pp. 43–106.
- Jablonskis, Jonas, 1957, *Rinktiniai raštai*, vol. 1, Vilnius.
- Jakobson, Roman, 1971 [1936], "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus," *Selected Writings II: Word and Language*, The Hague, pp. 23–71.
- Karlsson, Fred, 1987, *Finnish Grammar*, transl. A. Chesterman, Porvoo, Helsinki & Juva.
- Karskij, E.F., 1956, *Belorussy: jazyk belorusskogo naroda*, vol. 2–3, Moscow.
- Kiparsky, Paul, 1998, "Partitive Case and Aspect," *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, eds. M. Butt & W. Geuder, Stanford, pp. 265–307.
- Koptevskaja-Tamm, Maria, 2001, "A Piece of the Cake and a Cup of Tea: Partitive and Pseudo-Partitive Nominal Constructions in the Circum-Baltic Languages," *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact*, vol. 2: *Grammar and Typology* (Studies in Language Companion Series), eds. Ö. Dahl & M. Koptevskaja-Tamm, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 523–68.
- Koptevskaja-Tamm, Maria & Bernhard Wälchli, 2001, "The Circum-Baltic Languages: An Areal-Typological Approach," *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact*, vol. 2: *Grammar and Typology* (Studies in Language Companion Series), eds. Ö. Dahl & M. Koptevskaja-Tamm, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 615–750.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin & Klaus von Heusinger, 2009, "Specificity and Partitivity in Some Altaic Languages," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* (MWPL) 58: *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Formal Altaic Linguistics* (WAFL 5), eds. R. Shibagaki & R. Vermeulen, Cambridge, pp. 19–40.

- Krasovitsky, Alexander, Matthew Baerman, Dunstan Brown & Greville G. Corbett, 2011, "Changing Semantic Factors in Case Selection: Russian Evidence from the Last Two Centuries," *Morphology* 21, pp. 573–92.
- Krifka, Manfred, Francis J. Pelletier, Gregory Carlson, Allice ter Meulen, Gennaro Chierchia & Godehard Link, 1995, "Genericity: and Introduction," *The Generic Book*, eds. G. Carlson & F.J. Pelletier, Chicago & London, pp. 1–124.
- Krys'ko, V.B., 1997, *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka: ob"ekt i perexodnost'*, Moscow.
- Krys'ko, V.B., 2004, *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka: ob"ekt i perexodnost'*, Moscow.
- Krys'ko, V.B., 2006, *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka: ob"ekt i perexodnost'*, Moscow.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy 1971, "Słowiański genitivus po negacii," *Sesja naukowa międzynarodowej komisji budowy gramatycznej języków słowiańskich*, Wrocław, pp. 11–14.
- Kuznecova, A.M., 1964, "Nekotorye voprosy upravlenija pristavočnyx glagolov v russkix, ukrainkix i belorusskix govorax," *Voprosy dialektologii vostočnoslavjanskix jazykov*, ed. R.I. Avanesov, Moscow.
- Kuz'mina, I.B., 1993, *Sintaksis russkix govorov v lingvogeografičeskom aspekte*, Moscow.
- Langacker, Ronald W, 1987, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 1: *Theoretical Prerequisites*, Stanford.
- Lazard, Gilbert, 2001, "Le marquage différentiel de l'objet," *Language Universals and Language Typology: An Onternational Handbook*, eds. M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher & W. Raible, Berlin & New York, pp. 873–85.
- Lopatina, L.E., 1998, "Roditel'nyj padež v funkcii prjamogo ob"ekta," *Vostočnoslavjanskije izoglossy* 2, ed. T.V. Popova, Moscow, pp. 234–44.
- Luraghi, Silvia, 2003, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases: The Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek (SLCS)*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- Lyons, Christopher, 1999, *Definiteness* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics), Cambridge.
- Malyševa, A.V., 2004, "Roditel'nyj padež prjamogo dopolnenija ob"ekta pri glagolax nesoveršenno govida v russkix letopisjax i sovremennyx

- arxangel'skix govorax," *Materialy i issledovanija po russkoj dialektologii* 2 (8), ed. L.L. Kasatkin, Moscow, pp. 170–84.
- Malyševa, A.V., 2008a, "Variativnost' genetiva i akkuzativa pri glagolax s obščim značenijem "bereč', zaščičat'" v russkix letopisjax," *Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščanii* 15 (1), pp. 57–78.
- Malyševa, A.V., 2008b, "Tipy upotreblenija količestvennogo genetiva isčisljaemyx suščestvitel'nyx (na materiale sovremennyx arxangel'skix govorov i russkix letopisej)," *Materialy i issledovanija po russkoj dialektologii* 3 (9), 5: *Grammatika*, ed. L.L. Kasatkin, Moscow, pp. 232–47.
- Malyševa, A.V., 2010, *Iz istorii russkogo glagol'nogo upravljenija: ob"ektnyj genitiv*, doctoral thesis (ms), Institut Russkogo Jazyka im V.V. Vinogradova RAN.
- Mansikka, Viljo, 1914, *O govorě sěvero-vostočnoj časti Pudožskago uězda*, vol. 19 (4), pp. 143–73.
- Markova, Nina, 1988, "Roditel'nyj padež prjamogo ob"ekta v russkom fol'klore Karelii," *Jazyk russkogo fol'klora*, ed. E.B. Artemenko, Petrozavodsk, pp. 96–104.
- Markova, Nina, 1991, "Roditel'nyj padež sub"ekta v onežskix govorax," *Sovremennye russkie govory*, ed. Ju.S. Azarx, Moscow, pp. 134–41.
- Markova, Nina, 1999, "Glagol'nye konstrukcii s padežom polnogo ob"ektivirovanija v onežskix govorax," *Severno-russkie govory* 7, pp. 102–109.
- Markova, Nina, 2008, "Glagol'nye konstrukcii s roditel'nyim padežom ob"ekta i sub"ekta v onežskix govorax," *Severno-russkie govory* 9, pp. 146–55.
- Mehlig, Hans Robert, 2006, "Glagol'nyj vid i vtoričnaja gomogenizacija oboznačemoj situacii: K upotrebleniju delimitativnogo sposoba dejstvia v russkom jazyke," *Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida* 4, ed. V. Lehmann, Munich, pp. 235–76.
- Meščerskij, N.A. (ed.), 1972, *Russkaja Dialektologija*, Moscow.
- Miklosich, Franz, 1926, *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen*, Heidelberg.
- Nachmanson, Ernst, 1942, *Partitives Subjekt im Griechischen*, Gothenburg.
- Napoli, Maria, 2010, "The Case for the Partitive Case: the Contribution of Ancient Greek," *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108 (1), pp. 15–40.

- Neidle, Carol, 1988, *The Role of Case in Russian Syntax* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 10), Dordrecht.
- Padučeva, E.V., 1997, "Roditel'nyj sub"ekta v otricateľ'nom predloženíi: sintaksis ili semantika?", *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2, pp. 101–16.
- Padučeva, E.V., 1998, "On the Non-compatibility of Partitive and Imperfective in Russian," *Theoretical Linguistics* 24 (1), pp. 73–82.
- Padučeva, E.V., 2005, "Ešče raz o genitive sub"ekta pri otricanii," *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2005 (5), pp. 84–99.
- Partee, Barbara H., 2008, "Negation, Intensionality, and Aspect: Interaction with NP Semantics," *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect* 110, ed. S. Rothstein, Amsterdam, pp. 291–317, ms (final): <https://udrive.oit.umass.edu/partee/ParteeInPress-NegIntensAsp.pdf>.
- Partee, Barbara H. & Vladimir Borschev, 2002, "Genitive of Negation and Scope of Negation in Russian Existential Sentences," *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Second Ann Arbor Meeting 2001* (FASL 10), ed. J. Toman, Ann Arbor, pp. 181–200.
- Partee, Barbara H. & Vladimir Borschev, 2004, "The Semantics of Russian Genitive of Negation: The Nature and Role of Perspectival Structure," *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 14, eds. K. Watanabe & R.B. Young, Ithaca, N.Y., pp. 212–34.
- Quine, Willard van O., 1960, *Word and Object*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rakhilina, E.V., ed. 2008, *Ob"ektnyj genitiv pri otricanii v russkom jazyke*, Moscow.
- RG: Sørensen, H.Chr. 1961, *Ein russisches handschriftliches Gesprächsbuch aus dem 17. Jahrhundert*, Copenhagen.
- Rusakova, M.V., 2009, *Èlementy antropocentričeskoj grammatiki russkogo jazyka*, eds. M.D. Voejkova, N.N. Kazanskij, A.Ju. Rusakov & S.S. Saj, Moscow.
- Ruwet, Nicolas, 1972, *Théorie syntaxique et syntaxe du français*, Paris.
- Šaxmatov, A.A., 1963 [1925–1927], *Sintaksis russkogo jazyka* (Slavistic printings and reprintings 41), The Hague.
- Schwyzler, Eduard & Albert Debrunner, 1950, *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik*, vol. 2: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, ed. A. Debrunner, Munich.

- Seržant, Ilja A., 2012a, "The Semantics and Pragmatics of the Partitive Genitive in Classical Greek," *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung STUF* 65 (2), pp. 113–36.
- Seržant, Ilja A., 2012b, "Morphosyntactic Properties of the Partitive Genitive in the Subject Position in Ancient Greek," *Indogermanische Forschungen* 117, pp. 187–204.
- Seržant, Ilja A., 2013, "The Diachronic Typology of Non-canonical Subjects," *The Diachrony of Non-canonical Subjects* (SLCS 140), eds. I. A. Seržant & L. Kulikov, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 339–85.
- Seržant, Ilja A., 2014, "Denotational Properties of the Independent Partitive Genitive in Lithuanian," *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic* (Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic 1), eds. A. Holvoet & N. Nau, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 257–99.
- Seržant, Ilja A., *forthcoming-a*, "Independent Partitive as a Circum-Baltic isogloss," *Journal of Language Contact*.
- Seržant, Ilja A., *forthcoming-b*, "An Approach to Syntactic Reconstruction," *Perspectives on Historical Syntax*, ed. C. Vitti, Amsterdam & Philadelphia (accepted).
- Seržant, Ilja A., *forthcoming-c*, "The Animacy-driven DOM in Russian," *The Diachronic Typology of Differential Argument Marking* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics), eds. I. A. Seržant, A. Witzlack-Makarevich & K. Mann, Berlin.
- Selkirk, E.O., 1977, "Some Remarks on Noun Phrase Structure," *Formal Syntax: Papers from the MSSB-UC Irvine Conference on the Formal Syntax of Natural Language, Newport Beach, California, June 9–11, 1976*, ed. P.W. Culicover, T. Wasow & A. Akmajian, New York, pp. 285–316.
- Silverstein, Michael, 1976, "Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity," *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, ed. R.M.W. Dixon, Canberra, N.J., pp. 112–71.
- Sreznevskij, I.I., 1893, *Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkago jazyka po pis'mennym pamjatnikam*, vols. 1–3, St Petersburg.
- Švedova, N.Ju., ed. 1980, *Russkaja grammatika*, vol 2, Moscow.
- Tatevosov, Sergej, 2002, *Semantika sostavljajuščix imennoj grupy: kvanturnye slova*, Moscow.

- Tatevosov, Sergei & Mikhail Ivanov, 2009, "Event Structure of Non-culminating Accomplishments," *Cross-linguistic Semantics of Tense, Aspect, and Modality*, eds. L. Hogeweg, H. de Hoop & A. Malchukov, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 83–129.
- Tenny, Carol, 1994, *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, Dordrecht.
- Timberlake, Alan, 2004, *A Reference Grammar of Russian*, Cambridge.
- Wierzbicka, Anna, 1967, "On the Semantics of the Verbal Aspect in Polish," *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, The Hague & Paris, pp. 223–49.
- Zaliznjak, A.A., 2004, *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt, 2-e izdanie, pererabotannoe s učetom materiala naxodok 1994–2003 gg*, Moscow.
- Zimmermann, Thomas Ede, 1993, "On the Proper Treatment of Opacity in Certain Verbs," *Natural Language Semantics* 1, pp. 149–79.
- Zolotova, G.A., 1988, *Sintaksičeskij slovar': repertuar elementarnyx edinic russkogo sintaksisa*, Moscow.