

OBJECT PARTITIVE OF NEGATION: AN AREAL TYPOLOGY

Peter Arkadiev

(Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Russian State University for the Humanities; Vilnius University; alpgurev@gmail.com)

1. The phenomenon

The alternation of case marking of the direct object induced by negation is a non-trivial areal phenomenon attested in several groups of languages of Eastern Europe, both Indo-European (Slavic and Baltic) and Uralic (Baltic Finnic).

POLISH (IE > Slavic; Przepiórkowski 2000: 120): accusative vs. genitive

- (1) a. *Lubi-ę* ***Mari-ę.***
like-PRS.1SG Mary-ACC.SG
'I like Mary.'
- b. ***Nie*** *lubi-ę* ***Mari-i*** / ****Mari-ę.***
NEG like-PRS.1SG Mary-GEN.SG / *Mary-ACC.SG
'I don't like Mary.' (ibid.)

LITHUANIAN (IE > Baltic): accusative vs. genitive

- (2) a. *Jon-as* *per-skait-ė* ***laišk-q.***
Jonas-NOM.SG PVB-read-PST(3) letter-ACC.SG
'Jonas read the letter.'
- b. *Jon-as* ***ne-per-skait-ė*** ***laišk-o*** / ****laišk-q.***
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-PVB-read-PST(3) letter-GEN.SG / *letter-ACC.SG
'Jonas did not read the letter.'

FINNISH (Uralic > Baltic Finnic; Brattico 2012a: 39): genitive vs. partitive

- (3) a. *Pekka* *söi* ***leivä-n.***
Pekka(NOM.SG) eat:PST.3 bread-GEN.SG
'Pekka ate the bread.'
- b. *Pekka* ***e-i*** *syö-nyt* ***leipä-ä*** / ****leivä-n.***
Pekka(NOM.SG) NEG-3SG eat-PST.PA bread-PTV.SG / bread-GEN.SG
'Pekka did not eat (the) bread.'

In the following, the phenomenon in question will be labeled “**PartNeg**”, regardless of the concrete case labels used for individual languages (see Seržant 2015 on “independent partitive genitive” in Baltic and Slavic).

In Polish, Lithuanian and Finnish PartNeg has the following shared characteristics:

- PartNeg affects only direct objects marked by the appropriate structural case (accusative or genitive), not indirect objects or obliques marked by other cases;
- PartNeg is obligatory and does not depend on semantics of either the transitive verb or the object;
- PartNeg can apply not only to the direct object of the negated verb (**local** PartNeg, as in (1)–(3)), but also to the direct object of a non-finite verb embedded under the negated matrix verb, i.e. **long-distance** PartNeg, as in (4)–(6):

POLISH (Przepiórkowski 2000: 123)

- (4) ***Nie*** *chcia-ł-em* *pisa-ć* ***list-ów.***
NEG want-PST(SG.M)-1SG write-INF letter-GEN.PL
'I did not want to write (the) letters.'

LITHUANIAN

- (5) *Jon-as ne-nor-i rašy-ti laišk-o / *laišk-q.*
 Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-want-PRS(3) write-INF letter-GEN.SG / *letter-ACC.SG
 ‘Jonas does not want to write a/the letter.’

FINNISH (Brattico 2012b: 253)

- (6) *Minä en halun-nut näh-dä häntä / *hänet.*
 I:NOM NEG.1SG want-PST.PA see-INF 3:PTV.SG / *3:ACC.SG
 ‘I did not want to see her.’

Slavic, Baltic and Finnic languages show considerable variation in the availability and productivity of local and long-distance PartNeg. This talk aims at an areal survey of the relations between local and long-distance PartNeg.

I disregard the following fascinating issues which would lead us too far afield:

- subject PartNeg;
- PartNeg affecting temporal adverbials;
- factors affecting the application of PartNeg when it is not categorical (specifically for the variation in long-distance PartNeg in Lithuanian see Arkadiev 2016);
- types of non-finite constructions allowing long-distance PartNeg (in particular, in Slavic and Baltic only infinitival clauses will be surveyed).

For a more general overview of the case marking of objects (and subjects) in the languages of the Circum-Baltic area see Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli (2001: 646–660; Bjar-nadóttir & De Smit 2013; Seržant 2015); a more general typological overview of the interaction between partitive/genitive cases and negation can be found in Miestamo (2014). Those reading Russian may also consult Arkadiev (2017).

Data for this work comes mainly from reference grammars and linguistic studies, less from corpora and elicitation.

2. Baltic languages

2.1. Lithuanian (see Arkadiev 2016 for more details)

Local PartNeg is obligatory.

Long-distance PartNeg is widely attested with infinitival clauses; it is close to obligatoriness with same-subject matrix predicates (5) and seems to be the default option with most different-subject matrix predicates (7):

LITHUANIAN

- (7) *Jon-as ne-liep-ė Aldon-ai rašy-ti laišk-o / *laišk-q.*
 Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-order -PST(3) Aldona-DAT.SG write-INF letter-GEN.SG / letter-ACC.SG
 ‘Jonas did not order Aldona to write a/the letter.’ (elicited)

Multiple PartNeg with matrix verbs assigning accusative case to their objects (8):

LITHUANIAN

- (8) *...gatvi-ų demonstracij-os ne-pri-vert-ė j-o*
 street-GEN.PL demonstration-NOM.PL NEG-PVB-make-PST(3) 3-GEN.SG.M
pakeis-ti pozicij-os.
 change-INF position-GEN.SG
 ‘... the street rallies did not make him change his position.’ (DLKT)

PartNeg is virtually unbounded being able to apply across successively embedded infinitival clauses (9), however, in such cases the accusative is also acceptable:

LITHUANIAN

- (9) *Pirminink-ė* *ne-nor-i* *leis-ti* *sekretori-ui* *pradė-ti*
 chairwoman-NOM.SG NEG-want-PRS(3) let-INF secretary-DAT.SG begin-INF
skaity-ti pasveikinim-o / pasveikinim-a.
 read-INF greeting-GEN.SG / greeting-ACC.SG
 ‘The chairwoman does not want to let the secretary begin to read out the greeting.’
 (elicited)

In Old Lithuanian the situation was largely similar, cf. the examples of local (10) and long-distance (11) PartNeg from Mikalojus Daukša’s “Postilla Catholica” (Vilnius, 1599):

OLD LITHUANIAN

- (10) *Ne darí-tí niék-o ger-o / tatái wién-a yra pikt-ái darí-tí.*
 NEG do-INF nothing-GEN good-GEN.SG.M that one-DF be.PRS.3 evil-ADV do-INF
 ‘To do nothing good is alone to do evil.’ (DP 391,46–47)
- (11) *ne-gal’ regé-t’ karálift-es Diéw-o.*
 NEG-can.PRS.3 see-INF kingdom-GEN.SG God-GEN.SG
 ‘... he cannot see the kingdom of God.’ (DP 452,31)

However, in the variety of Lithuanian spoken in East Prussia, the use of PartNeg was not entirely consistent, as evidenced by the variation attested in the oldest Lithuanian original text, the poetic introduction to Martynas Mažvydas’s translation of Luther’s “Enchiridion” (Königsberg, 1547), cf. genitive in (12) and accusative in (13).

OLD LITHUANIAN

- (12) *Ir nekada man-es nog ius-u ne-at-mes-kie-t.*
 and never 1SG-GEN from 2PL-GEN NEG-PVB-throw-IMP-2PL
 ‘And you should never throw me away from you.’ (MK, 27–28)
- (13) *Jeí bral-ei seser-is t-us řadzi-us ne-papeik-si-t...*
 if brother-NOM.PL sister-NOM.PL DEM-ACC.PL.M word-ACC.PL NEG-reject-FUT-2PL
 ‘If you, brothers and sisters, do not reject those words...’ (MK, 17–18)

2.2. Latvian

Modern Latvian does not have either local or long-distance PartNeg apart from emphatic contexts (Berg-Olsen 2004: 125; Menantaud 2007; Holvoet & Nau 2014: 7–9), in which it is attested both with local (14) and non-local negation (15).

LATVIAN: local PartNeg with emphatic negation

- (14) *viņ-ř ne-sak-a ne vārd-a*
 3-NOM.SG.M NEG-say.PRS-3 not.even word-GEN.SG
 ‘He does not say a single word.’ (Menantaud 2007: 95)

LATVIAN: long-distance PartNeg with emphatic negation

- (15) *nek-ā vairs ne-spēj pa-darí-t*
 nothing-GEN more NEG-be.able.PRS(3) PVB-do-INF
 ‘S/he can do nothing more.’ (ibid.: 93)

In non-emphatic contexts the accusative is the predominant option in contemporary language (see e.g. Nītiņa & Grigorjevs (eds.) 2013: 348–349), cf. (16)–(17), and is attested even in emphatic contexts (Holvoet & Nau 2014: 8), cf. (18).

LATVIAN: Accusative under local negation

- (16) *viņ-ř ne-sak-a vārd-u*
 3-NOM.SG.M NEG-say.PRS-3 word-ACC.SG
 ‘He does not say a/the word.’ (Menantaud 2007: 96)

LATVIAN: Accusative under non-local negation

- (17) *Es ne-gribēj-u traucē-t mājiniek-us...*
 I:NOM NEG-want.PST-1SG disturb-INF household-ACC.PL
 ‘I didn’t want to disturb the household.’ (LRPC, fiction 1977)

LATVIAN: Accusative with emphatic negation

- (18) *Un nekur ne-redzēj-a un ne-dzirdēj-a ne dzīv-u dvēsel-i.*
 and nowhere NEG-see-PST.3 and NEG-hear-PST.3 not.even living-ACC.SG soul-ACC.SG
 ‘And nowhere one could see or hear a single living person.’ (LRPC, fiction 1977)

The demise of the PartNeg is an innovation in standard Latvian; both classical grammars by Bielenstein (1863: 284–285) and by Endzelin (1922: 419–420) describe PartNeg as a pervasive phenomenon, although mention both dialectal variation and a tendency to supplant the genitive by the accusative. However, Berg-Olsen (2000), a detailed historical investigation of the use of the genitive in Latvian, shows that the accusative was the prevailing option already in the oldest Latvian texts (though this could well result from an interference with German).

2.3. Latgalian

In contrast to its close relative Latvian, Latgalian has preserved PartNeg (Nau 2011: 78, 91), though the actual situation as described in Nau (2014: 218–225) is much more complex than a simple rule reflected in prescriptive grammars (e.g. Bukšs & Placinskis 1973: 296) might suggest.

LATGALIAN: local PartNeg

- (19) *J-is taid-u slykt-u drēb-u nikod na-bej-a nusuoj-is.*
 3-NOM.SG.M such-GEN.PL bad-GEN.PL cloth-GEN.PL never NEG-AUX.PST-3 wear-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
 ‘He had never worn such bad clothes.’ (Nau 2014: 218)

LATGALIAN: long-distance PartNeg

- (20) *Es na-muok-u durov-u attaisē-t!*
 I:NOM NEG-can.PRS-1SG door-GEN.PL open-INF
 ‘I can’t open the door.’ (ibid.: 221)

However, accusative is also an option, especially with pronominal objects (21), (23) but also with nouns (22), (24):

LATGALIAN: accusative under local negation

- (21) *es tev-i na-sys-š-u*
 1SG.NOM 2SG-ACC NEG-kill-FUT-1SG
 ‘I won’t kill you.’ (Nau 2014: 220)

- (22) *a tēteit-i na-redz i na-dzierd*
 but daddy-ACC.SG NEG-see.PRS(3) and NEG-hear.PRS(3)
 ‘but she doesn’t see nor hear her daddy’ (ibid.: 219)

LATGALIAN: accusative under non-local negation

- (23) *A j-ī na-grib ni par kaid-u naud-u j-ū puordū-t.*
 PTCL 3-NOM.PL.M NEG-want.PRS(3) NEG for some-ACC.SG money-ACC.SG 3-ACC.SG sell-INF
 ‘But they don’t want to sell him for any price.’ (ibid.: 222)

- (24) *na-dreikstēj-a miš-u puormaisē-t*
 NEG-dare.pst-3 mass-ACC.SG disturb-INF
 ‘(they) didn’t dare to disturb the mass’ (ibid.)

2.4. Summary on Baltic

➤ The differences in PartNeg between Latvian, on the one hand, and Lithuanian and Latgalian, on the other, are part of the more general trend regarding the adverbial use of the Genitive in general, see Berg-Olsen (2000) and Nau (2014).

➤ Both internal evidence and comparison with Slavic (see next section) suggest that Lithuanian and Latgalian are closer to the original Baltic situation than Latvian. This divergence can be partly due to the fact that Lithuanian and Latgalian have been in prolonged contact with Polish, which could have contributed to the stability of the PartNeg pattern in these languages, while the western parts of the Latvian area have been under comparable German influence, which may have led to the demise of the non-prepositional Genitive in general and PartNeg in particular.

3. Slavic languages

PartNeg in Slavic has been extensively studied, though the coverage of individual languages differs widely. For general surveys, see Willis (2013) and Pirnat (2015). In the following, I will proceed from languages where PartNeg is actively used to those where it is limited or has disappeared.

3.1. Polish

PartNeg in Polish appears largely similar to that in Lithuanian, see Menantaud (1993, 1999), Przepiórkowski (2000), Błaszczak (2003).

➤ Multiple long-distance PartNeg in different-subject infinitival clause:

POLISH (Przepiórkowski 2000: 128)

(25) *Janek nie uczy-ł Mari-i lepi-ć garnk-ów.*
 John(NOM.SG) NEG teach-PST(SG.M) Mary-GEN.SG mold-INF pot-GEN.PL
 ‘John didn’t teach Mary how to make pottery.’

➤ Long-distance PartNeg across deeply-embedded infinitives:

POLISH (Przepiórkowski 2000: 123)

(26) *Nie mus-isz zamierza-ć przesta-ć studiowa-ć algebr-y.*
 NEG must-PRS.2SG intend-INF stop-INF study-INF algebra-GEN.SG
 ‘You don’t have to intend to stop studying algebra.’

➤ Long-distance PartNeg is optional (ibid.: 124–128):

POLISH (Przepiórkowski 2000: 123)

(27) *Nie mógł-ł-by-ś przesta-ć studiowa-ć algebr-ę?*
 NEG can-PST-IRR-2SG stop-INF study-INF algebra-GEN.SG
 ‘Couldn’t you stop studying algebra?’

A historical study by Harrer-Pisarkowa (1959) reports that the genitive has always prevailed under both local and non-local negation. However, accusative was also attested as an option in the texts coming from regions with strong German or East Slavic influence (on the latter, see Fellerer 2019).

3.2. Slovene

The distribution of PartNeg in Slovene resembles that in Lithuanian and Polish (Ilc 2011, Pavlič & Živanović 2012, Pirnat 2015), cf. local PartNeg (28a) and long-distance PartNeg (28b,c), including multiple PartNeg (28c):

SLOVENE: local and long-distance PartNeg

(28) a. *Janez ni bra-l časopis-a.*
 Janez(NOM.SG) NEG.AUX.3SG read-PST(SG.M) newspaper-GEN.SG
 ‘Janez didn’t read the newspaper.’ (Ilc 2011: 196)

b. *Nataš-a ni hote-l-a čita-ti knjig-e.*
 Natasha-NOM.SG NEG.AUX.3SG want-PST-SG.F read-INF book-GEN.SG
 ‘Natasha didn’t want to read a book.’ (ibid.: 197)

- c. *Učitelj* *ne* *sil-i* *študent-ov* *reševa-ti*
 teacher(NOM.SG) NEG force-PRS.3SG student-GEN.PL solve-INF
takšn-ih *problem-ov*.
 such-GEN.PL problem-GEN.PL

‘The teacher does not force the students to solve such problems.’ (ibid.)

According to Ilc (2011) and especially Pirnat (2015), both local and long-distance PartNeg in Slovene are optional, and different factors play a role in the choice of case of the direct object. In those regions where Slovene is spoken as a second language by German or Hungarian speakers, the Accusative supplants the Genitive under negation (Reindl 2008: 75).

➤ Polish and Slovene appear to be the only modern Slavic languages where both local and long-distance PartNeg are productive to the extent comparable to Lithuanian.

3.3. East Slavic languages

In modern Russian PartNeg in local contexts is optional and determined by a complex interplay of semantic, pragmatic and stylistic factors (Timberlake 1986; Brown & Franks 1995; Padučeva 2006; Raxilina (red.) 2008; Kagan 2012; Harves 2013; see also a useful historical overview by van Helden 2008), cf. (29), where the choice of case under local negation affects semantics.

RUSSIAN: Genitive vs. Accusative under local negation

- (29) a. *Ja* *by-l* *v* *London-e*, *no* *ne* *vide-l* *Maš-u*.
 I:NOM be-PST(SG.M) in London-LOC.SG but NEG see-PST(SG.M) Mary-ACC.SG
 ‘I’ve been to London but didn’t meet (lit. see) Mary.’ (Padučeva 2006: 27)
- b. *Ja* *by-l* *v* *London-e*, *no* *ne* *vide-l* *Maš-i*.
 I:NOM be-PST(SG.M) in London-LOC.SG but NEG see-PST(SG.M) Mary-GEN.SG
 ‘I’ve been to London but didn’t see Mary there (she might have not been there at that time).’ (ibid.)

Non-local PartNeg in Russian is largely obsolete. According to Krasovitsky et al. (2011: 588), the frequency of the Accusative objects of non-locally negated infinitives has been steadily going up during the last two centuries and in contemporary Russian is close to 90%, cf. (30). However, rare instances of long-distance PartNeg are nevertheless still attested (31); see also Brown & Franks (1995: 254–258).

RUSSIAN: Accusative vs. Genitive under non-local negation

- (30) *Potomu čto* *ja* *ne* *xoč-u* *poterja-t’* *svoj-u* *doč’*.
 since I:NOM NEG want-PRS.1SG lose-INF RFL.POSS-ACC.SG.F daughter(ACC.SG)
 ‘Since I don’t want to lose my daughter.’ (RNC, fiction, 2001)
- (31) *Ljud-i* *ne* *xot-jat* *vide-t’* *neprigljadn-oj* *real’nost-i...*
 people-NOM.PL NEG want-PRS(3)PL see-INF unattractive-GEN.SG.F reality-GEN.SG
 ‘People do not want to see the unattractive reality...’ (RNC, non-fiction, 2002)

The much less investigated situation in Ukrainian and Belarusian appears to be largely similar to that in Russian. Local PartNeg is recorded in grammars of both languages as a default, though non-obligatory, rule (on Ukrainian see Timčenko 1913: 144–166; Kulik 1961: 69–70; Pugh & Press 1999: 98–99, Kryshevich 2010, and Fellerer 2019: 172–174; on Belarusian see Atraxovič et al. (eds.) 1966: 330; Biryła & Šuba (eds.) 1986: 141–142 and Mazzitelli 2010). For both languages the distinction between indefinite/partitive (genitive) vs. definite/holistic (accusative) objects under negation is reported (32), although Timčenko (1913: 156) notes that case variation under negation in Ukrainian is not semantically-motivated.

UKRAINIAN: Accusative vs. Genitive under local negation (Kulik 1961: 70)

- (32) a. **ne** *vzja-v* **sal-o**
 NEG take-PST(SG.M) lard-ACC.SG
 ‘He did not take the lard.’
- b. **ne** *vzja-v* **sal-a**
 NEG take-PST(SG.M) lard-GEN.SG
 ‘He did not take (any) lard.’

Long-distance PartNeg in Belarusian is recorded in Atraxovič et al. (eds. 1966: 330), but is claimed not to exist already in Biryla & Šuba (eds. 1986: 141), which is confirmed by 14 native speakers I have consulted. However, corpora attest some examples (33).

BELARUSIAN: Genitive under non-local negation

- (33) *Ja ne veda-ju i ne xač-u veda-c’ inš-aj mac-i!*
 I:NOM NEG know-PRS.1SG and NEG want-PRS.1SG know-INF other-GEN.SG.F mother-GEN.SG
 ‘I don’t know and don’t want to know another mother!’ (BRPC, fiction, 1987)

Ukrainian grammars do not mention long-distance PartNeg, but examples with the genitive are attested in the corpora (34):

UKRAINIAN: Genitive under non-local negation

- (34) **ne** *mož-u nes-ti vidpovidal’nost-i za skazan-e vami...*
 NEG can-PRS.1SG bear-INF responsibility-GEN.SG for said-ACC.SG.N 2PL.INS
 ‘I can’t bear responsibility for what you have said.’ (URPC, non-fiction, 1993)

The data from Carpatho-Ruthenian are lacking, but the only modern grammar available to me (Pugh 2009) does not mention PartNeg at all. Notably, Timčenko (1913: 155) notes that the use of the accusative instead of the genitive under negation was especially widespread in the Ukrainian-speaking areas of the then Austrian Empire.

3.4. Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

In BCS, PartNeg is clearly on decline, see Pirnat (2015: 14–16) for an overview. Alexander (2006: 313) states that

“Sometimes the object of a negated verb appears in the genitive; in these cases, partitive meaning is usually present as well.”

BOSNIAN/SERBIAN/CROATIAN: semantic differences between Gen and Acc

- (35) a. **Ni-sam** *vidi-o nered.*
 NEG-AUX.1SG see-PST.SG.M mess(ACC.SG)
 ‘I did not see the mess.’ (Pirnat 2015: 15)
- b. **Ni-sam** *vidi-o nered-a.*
 NEG-AUX.1SG see-PST.SG.M mess-GEN.SG
 ‘I did not see any mess.’ (ibid.)

Browne & Alt (2004: 70) say that

“In present-day BCS such genitive objects are archaic and elevated in style except in fixed phrases and in two further circumstances: as object of *nemati* ‘not to have’ [36] and when negation is strengthened by *ni, nijedan, nikakav* ‘not even, not a single, no’ [37]”

BOSNIAN/SERBIAN/CROATIAN (Browne & Alt 2004: 70)

- (36) *Tada se sjeti-o da ne-ma revolver-a.*
 then RFL remember-PST.SG.M that NEG-have.PRS.3SG pistol-GEN.SG
 ‘Then he remembered that he didn’t have a pistol.’
- (37) a. **ne** *igra-ti ulog-u*
 NEG play-INF role-ACC.SG
 ‘not to play a role’

- b. *ne igra-ti nikakv-e ulog-e*
 NEG play-INF no.whatever-GEN.SG.F role-GEN.SG
 ‘to play no role whatever’ (40 hits in Google vs. 151 with the accusative, 15.08.2019)
- c. *ne mož-e igra-ti nikakv-e ulog-e*
 NEG can-PRS.3SG play-INF no.whatever-GEN.SG.F role-GEN.SG
 ‘can’t play any role whatever’ (1 hit in Google vs. 42 with the accusative, 15.08.2019)

Other South Slavic languages (Bulgarian and Macedonian) have lost PartNeg together with the case system.

3.5. West Slavic beyond Polish

In standard Upper Sorbian PartNeg is optional (Faßke & Michalk 1980: 457–458; Scholze 2007: 66; Pirnat 2015: 17) (38)–(39), and in the colloquial varieties heavily influenced by German it has become obsolete (40).

STANDARD UPPER SORBIAN: genitive under local and non-local negation

- (38) *Nje-běch dotal žan-eho wjets-eho wohnj-a widža-ł.*
 NEG-AUX.PST.1SG up.to.now no-GEN.SG.M big-GEN.SG.M fire-GEN.SG see-PST(SG.M)
 ‘I haven’t yet seen any big fire.’ (Faßke & Michalk 1980: 457–458)

- (39) *Wy ani nje-budź-eće smě-ć waš-eje wustajeńc-y wotewri-ć.*
 2PL even NEG-AUX.FUT-2PL be.able-INF 2PL.POSS-GEN.SG.F exhibition-GEN.SG open-INF
 ‘You won’t even be able to open your exhibition.’ (Faßke & Michalk 1980: 458)

COLLOQUIAL UPPER SORBIAN: accusative under local negation

- (40) *ha ne-jsu ... žan-e słow-o serbsce móh-l-i*
 and NEG-AUX.3PL no.whatever-ACC.SG.N word-ACC.SG in.Sorbian can-PST-PL
 ‘...and they didn’t know a word in Sorbian.’ (Scholze 2007: 66)

In Standard Lower Sorbian PartNeg is also preserved; the grammar by Šwela (1952: 93–94) describes it as obligatory (41)–(42), whereas the later grammar Janaš (1984: 281–282) reports it to be limited to verbs of possession and perception.

STANDARD LOWER SORBIAN: genitive under local and non-local negation

- (41) *won ŋe-jo słowick-a słyša-ł*
 he NEG-AUX.PRS.3 word-GEN.SG hear-PST(SG.M)
 ‘He did not hear a word.’ (Šwela 1952: 93)

- (42) *winik-i ŋa-mog-u nam łosk-a kśiwi-ś*
 enemy-NOM.PL NEG-can-PRS.3PL 1PL.DAT hair-GEN.SG bend-IMP
 ‘The enemies can’t even bend a single hair on us.’ (Šwela 1952: 93)

In Colloquial Lower Sorbian, according to Faßke & Michalk (1980: 459), the genitive under negation occurs with much greater frequency than in Upper Sorbian (28,5% vs. 4,9%), but anyway yields to the accusative.

In Kashubian, according to Breza & Treder (1981: 153), optional PartNeg is attested in both local and non-local contexts (43)–(44).

KASZUBIAN: genitive under local and non-local negation

- (43) *On ni miô-ł niźódn-ěch pieniędz-y.*
 he NEG have-PST(M.SG) none-GEN.PL money-GEN.PL
 ‘He didn’t have any money.’ (Breza & Treder 1981: 153)

- (44) *T-e koni-e ni mog-ł-ě cygnq-c t-ego woz-a.*
 DEM-NOM.PL.M horse-NOM.PL NEG can-PST-PL.M pull-INF DEM-GEN.SG.M cart-GEN.SG
 ‘Those horses could not pull that cart.’ (Breza & Treder 1981: 153)

In Czech, PartNeg, both local and long-distant, is completely obsolete (Mazon 1952: 119–120; Guiraud-Weber 2003; Guiraud-Weber & Zaremba 2007; Petkevič 2016: 214), (45).

CZECH: Accusative under negation

- (45) ...*ne-chc-i* *jís-t* *zabit-á* *zvířat-a*.
 NEG-want-PRS.1SG eat-INF killed-ACC.PL.N animal-ACC.PL
 ‘I don’t want to eat killed animals.’¹

According to Timberlake (2009: 1688),

“The genitive of negation in Czech remains vital through the seventeenth century, in both the vernacular (recorded in legal testimony) and the written language. <...> By the nineteenth century, the genitive of negation is in retreat and is almost completely absent from early twentieth-century progressive writers <...>”

Notably, in a recent grammar Votr (2001) and in a special study of Czech negation by Rechzieglová (1995) PartNeg is not even mentioned.

In Slovak, according to Pirnat (2015: 16), PartNeg is still possible in emphatic contexts and was more widespread until 1950ies. Indeed, Ružička (1966: 173–175) claims that the genitive is “more expressive” and more characteristic or “vernacular or literary” styles; however, the grammar Bartoš & Gagnaire (1972) does not mention PartNeg.

3.6. Historical perspective

PartNeg, both local and long-distance, is a Common Slavic phenomenon, see Willis (2013: 349–368), as is evidenced by the striking Polish-Slovene parallel hardly explainable but as a shared retention, by Old Church Slavonic (46)–(47), as well as by earlier stages of those languages where PartNeg has become obsolete, such as Czech, cf. (48)–(49) vs. (45).

OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC: local PartNeg

- (46) *blȑd-ite* *ne* *věd-qšt-e* *kŭnig-ŭ* *ni* *sil-y* *b<o>žij-ę*
 err-PRS.2PL NEG know-PRS.PA-NOM.PL.M book-GEN.PL nor power-GEN.SG divine-GEN.SG.F
 ‘You are mistaken, not knowing the scriptures, not the power of God.’ (*Codex Marianus*, 11th cent., Matt. 22:29, quoted after Willis 2013: 350)

OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC: long-distance PartNeg

- (47) *Ne ubo-i* *se* *priję-ti* *žen-y* *tvo-eje* *Marij-ę*.
 NEG fear-IMP.2SG RFL.ACC take-INF wife-GEN.SG your-GEN.SG.F Mary-GEN.SG
 ‘Do not be afraid to take your wife Mary.’ (*Evangeliarium Assemani*, 11th cent., Matt. 1:20, quoted after Willis 2013: 353)

OLD CZECH: local PartNeg

- (48) *Proto kněz-ě* *Ott-y* *ne-rodí-chu*
 thus prince Ota-GEN.SG NEG-heed-AOR.3PL
 ‘Thus they did not heed prince Ota.’ (*Dalimilova kronika*, beg. 14th cent., ch. 57 l. 45, quoted after Willis 2013: 361)

OLD CZECH: long-distance PartNeg

- (49) *ne-kazu-j* *nám* *přejí-ti* *Jordan-a*
 NEG-order-IMP.2SG we:DAT cross-INF Jordan-GEN.SG
 ‘Do not make us cross the Jordan.’ (*Bible Olomoucká*, Nos. 32:5, 1417, quoted after Willis 2013: 361)

In the history of Russian, accusative is said to have started replacing the genitive under negation only in the 15th century (van Helden 2008: 147), and in Czech in the 16th century (Guiraud-Weber 2003: 364).

¹ <http://www.vegetarian.cz/diskuse/dproc/dproc118.html>, accessed 12 January 2015.

3.7. Summary on Slavic and Baltic

- The combined Baltic and Slavic evidence suggests that obligatory PartNeg is a common Balto-Slavic phenomenon, while the decay of PartNeg in Latvian and most modern Slavic languages are innovations due to both language-internal and contact influences.
- It is hardly a coincidence that in those Slavic languages which have experienced particularly strong influence from German PartNeg has become either obsolete (Czech, Colloquial Sorbian, cf. Večerka 1960; Berger 2008: 59) or largely optional (Kaszubian, Standard Sorbian).
- On the other hand, contact with German can hardly be the main factor for the loss resp. retention of PartNeg, as shown by the East Slavic languages, which have largely restructured PartNeg without any influence from German, and Slovene, which has experienced contact influence from German hardly weaker than Czech (see e.g. Reindl 2008), but has kept its PartNeg largely intact.

4. Baltic Finnic languages

Partitive is obligatory under negation in most Baltic Finnic languages, see Larsson (1983), Lees (2015: 34, 75). Both local and long-distance partitive of negation are obligatory in Estonian (Erelt (ed.) 2003: 96, 111), cf. (50)–(51), and Finnish (Brattico 2012a, 2012b), see above. As is well known, the partitive case is widely used on objects of affirmative clauses (Kiparsky 2001; Huumo 2010, 2013; Metslang 2014; Lees 2015), sometimes implying aspectual differences (50a). All distinctions conveyed by the genitive vs. partitive alternation are neutralized under negation (50b).

ESTONIAN: local partitive of negation

- (50) a. *Kass söi hiir-t / hiir-e.*
 cat(NOM.SG) eat.PST.3SG mouse-PTV.SG / mouse-GEN.SG
 ‘The cat was eating a mouse / ate the mouse.’ (Miljan 2008: 13–14)
- b. *Kass ei söö-nud hiir-t / *hiir-e.*
 cat(NOM.SG) NEG eat-PST.PA mouse-PTV.SG / *mouse-GEN.SG
 ‘The cat did not eat a/the mouse.’ (ibid.)

ESTONIAN: long-distance partitive of negation

- (51) a. *President andis ta-lle medalit/*medalit.*
 president(NOM.SG) give:PST.3SG 3SG-ALL medal:GEN.SG/*medal:PTV.SG
 ‘The president gave him a medal.’ (Merilin Miljan, p.c.)
- b. *President ei käski-nud ta-lle medalit/*medali anda.*
 president(NOM.SG) NEG order-PST.PA 3SG-ALL medal:PTV.SG/*medal:GEN.SG give:INF
 ‘The president did not order to give him a medal.’ (Merilin Miljan, p.c.)

The same is true of Votic (Ariste 1968: 21; Rozhanskiy & Markus 2015: 507–508), cf. (52)–(53).

VOTIC: local partitive of negation

- (52) a. *tämä jej kaze vē.*
 3(NOM.SG) drink.PST.3SG DEM.GEN.SG water.GEN.SG
 ‘He drank (all of) this water.’ (Rozhanskiy & Markus 2015: 507)
- b. *tämä e-B jū-nu kas-tə vet-tə.*
 3(NOM.SG) NEG-3SG drink-PST.PA DEM-PTV.SG water-PTV.SG
 ‘He didn’t drink (any of/all of) this water.’ (ibid.)

VOTIC: non-local partitive of negation

- (53) *miä e-n taho teh-ä tū-t.*
 1SG(NOM) NEG-1SG want.CNG do-INF work-PTV.SG
 ‘I don’t want to do work.’ (Rozhanskiy & Markus 2015: 492)

PartNeg is also obligatory in Karelian (Larsson 1983: 91), Ingrian (Larsson 1983: 94), and Veps (Grünthal 2015: 256–257).

The situation is more complicated in Livonian (Tveite 2004); as is reported by Sjögren (1861: 65; 241–242), the use of the Partitive with negated verbs was not obligatory and depended largely on the same semantic parameters (degree of affectedness and aspect) as its use in non-negated sentences. However, Moseley (2002: 29) claims that the partitive is obligatory under negation, while Larsson (1983: 113) writes that the partitive is more frequent than the genitive. In the recent paper by Metslang et al. (2015) the optionality of PartNeg in Livonian is not mentioned (54)–(55).

LIVONIAN: local and non-local partitive of negation

(54) *Ma iz vōstā siedā rōntōzt.*
 1SG(NOM) NEG.PST.1SG buy.CNG DEM.PTV.SG book.PTV.SG
 ‘I didn’t buy this book.’ (Metslang et al. 2015: 451)

(55) *Ta äb ūo mittō mōtlō-n ka*
 3(NOM.SG) NEG.PRS.3SG AUX.CNG NEG think-PST.PA PTCL
ajjō siedā niēmō kuodāj.
 drive.INF DEM.PTV.SG cow.PTV.SG home
 ‘He has no intention of driving this cow home.’ (Metslang et al. 2015: 450)

According to the corpus-based study by Lees (2015), in the Modern Livonian translation of the Gospel of Matthew about 11% of negated transitive clauses have genitive rather than partitive objects, cf. (56), whose correspondences in other Baltic Finnic languages studied in Lees (2015) show the partitive.

LIVONIAN: genitive under local negation

(56) *Ma Izrael-s äb ūo lieudō-n selliz usk.*
 1SG(NOM) Israel-INE NEG.PRS.1SG AUX.CNG find-PST.PA such.GEN.SG faith.GEN.SG
 ‘I did not find such faith in Israel.’ (Matt. 8:10, Lees 2015: 76)

The variation in case marking of objects under negation attested in Livonian may reflect the contact influence from Latvian, where PartNeg has virtually disappeared. However, Bjarnadóttir & De Smit (2013: 48) suggest that this variation could be a relic of an earlier semantically-oriented system.

The partitive marking of the direct object under negation is most probably a common Baltic Finnic feature (Larsson 1983: 113). The diachronic investigation by Lees (2004, 2015: Ch. 5) has revealed some variation in early Northern Estonian texts, which might be attributed to the Low German influence. Early texts in Finnish, however, show consistent use of the partitive (Lees 2015: 148).

5. Typological parallels

The partitive of negation rule found in Baltic Finnic, Slavic and Baltic obviously is a cross-linguistic rarity and thus a prominent areal trait (Miestamo 2013, 2014). However, some typological parallels to this phenomenon can be found in the languages of the world.

5.1. Basque

In Basque, indefinite direct objects under negation are marked with the partitive case in *-(r)ik* instead of the regular absolutive (Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina (eds.) 2003: 124–125; de Rijk 2008: 292–293; Ariztimuño López 2014: 326–330; Etxeberria 2014: 308–318). This happens with both local (57) and non-local (58) negation.

BASQUE: partitive under local negation (de Rijk 2008: 292, glosses mine)

(57) a. *Gaur txokolate-a erosi d-u-t.*
 today chocolate-DEF(ABS) buy 3SG.ABS-AUX-1SG.ERG
 ‘Today I have bought some/the chocolate.’

- b. *Gaur ez d-u-t txokolate-a erosi.*
 today NEG 3SG.ABS-AUX-1SG.ERG chocolate-DEF(ABS) buy
 ‘Today I have not bought the chocolate.’
- c. *Gaur ez d-u-t txokolate-rik erosi.*
 today NEG 3SG.ABS-AUX-1SG.ERG chocolate-PTV buy
 ‘Today I have not bought any chocolate.’

BASQUE: partitive under non-local negation

- (58) *Ez d-u-t azalpen-ik entzun nahi.*
 NEG 3SG.ABS-AUX-1SG.ERG explanation-PTV hear wish

‘I don’t want to hear any explanations.’ (corpus example courtesy of Natalia Zaika)

According to Exteberria (2014: 308–309) and Ariztimuño López (2014), the Basque partitive is not used in affirmative declarative clauses, being limited to various contexts of suspended assertion.

5.2. Romance

In French, indefinite direct objects take the partitive article *de* under both local (59) and non-local (60) negation (cf. e.g. Muller 1997; Heyd 2003: 114–202). Non-local contexts licensing the partitive article in French are quite varied and include finite clauses (60b).

FRENCH: partitive with local negation (Muller 1997: 252)

- (59) a. *Pierre a acheté un cheval.*
 ‘Pierre bought a horse.’
- b. *Pierre n’a pas acheté de cheval.*
 ‘Pierre did not buy a horse.’

FRENCH: partitive with non-local negation (Muller 1997: 254)

- (60) a. *Je n’ai pas songé [à vous offrir de cigarettes].*
 ‘I did not even consider offering you cigarettes.’
- b. *Nous n’avons aucune information [qui nous permette d’avoir de certitude à cet égard].*
 ‘We have no information that would permit us to have any certainty in this regard.’

In Italian, the partitive article optionally occurs under both local (61a) and non-local (61b) negation with indefinite plural objects or mass nouns (Renzi et al. 1991: 262; Carlier & Lamiroy 2014: 488, 506–514); the use of the partitive article with singular count nouns is impossible (Chierchia 1997: 74), in contrast to French (59b).

ITALIAN: partitive under local and non-local negation

- (61) a. *Non ho bevuto del vino.*
 ‘I did not drink wine.’ (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2016: 60)
- b. *Non sono Socrate e non voglio bere del veleno.*
 ‘I am not Socrates and don’t want to drink poison.’²

Partitive article also existed in mediaeval Spanish, but did not grammaticalize and became obsolete (Carlier & Lamiroy 2014: 501–506). According to Foulet (1928: 73–76, 270–271), the use of the partitive article under negation in French is a late development.

² <http://www.efpfanfic.net/viewstory.php?sid=1234461>, accessed 30 December 2016 r.

5.3. Further parallels

According to Miestamo (2013, 2014), negation affects the use of (in)definiteness and partitive markers in various unrelated languages, such as Nambikwara (Brazil), Araki (Vanuatu), and the use of nominal class markers in Nunggubuyu (Northern Australia). Besides that, negation-induced shift in case marking of arguments is attested in another Australian language, Yukulta (Tangkic, Evans 1995: 427–430). In Yukulta, in negative and some other irrealis contexts, the transitive (ergative) construction of the clause (62a) changes into an intransitive with an oblique-marked object (62b).

YUKULTA: negation and transitivity

- (62) a. *dangka-ya = karri ngawu bala-tha.*
 man-ERG = 3 > 3.PRS dog(ABS) hit-IND
 ‘The man is hitting the dog.’ (Evans 1995: 427)
- b. *walirra = ngka dangka-ra kunawuna-ntha bala-tha.*
 NEG = 3SG.PRS man-ABS child-DAT hit-IND
 ‘The man isn’t hitting your child.’ (Evans 1995: 429)

In another Tangkic language, Lardil, negation affects case-marking of locatives:

LARDIL (Evans 1995: 431): negation and locatives

- (63) a. *niya yuud-ja-tha dawun-nge.*
 3SG.NOM PFV-enter-IND house-LOC
 ‘He went into the house.’
- b. *bidngen ja-jarri dawun-i.*
 woman(NOM) enter-NEG house-OBJ
 ‘The woman did not go into the house.’

By contrast, Kayardild, the best studied Tangkic language, does not show negation-related alternations of case marking (Evans 1995: 372).

6. Summary and discussion

The distribution of local and long-distance PartNeg in the languages surveyed above is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Areal distribution of local and long-distance PartNeg

language	local PartNeg	non-local PartNeg
Estonian, Finnish, Votic	obligatory	obligatory
Lithianian, Polish	obligatory	regular
Slovene	close to obligatoriness	regular
Latgalian, French, Basque	regular	regular
Livonian, Standard Sorbian, Kaszubian, Italian	optional	optional
Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian	optional	rare
Latvian	only emphatic, rare	only emphatic, rare
Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian	only emphatic, rare	very rare
Czech, Slovak, Colloquial Upper Sorbian	no	no

Two implicational generalizations emerge from Table 1; the first one given in (64) is quite expected while the second one in (65) is less trivial.

- (64) If a language allows at least rare instances of case alternation on the object determined by non-local negation, it allows the same alternation determined by the local negation to the same or greater extent.
- (65) If a language has obligatory rules of case alternation on the object determined by the local negation, it allows the same alternation in at least some embedded contexts, probably as a less rigid rule.

Indeed, in (64) the implication goes from a larger syntactic domain to a smaller one, but in (65) the direction of the implication is the opposite. Possible explanations for the unexpected generalization in (65) should probably be sought in the diachrony of such constructions.

PartNeg is a common Balto-Slavic innovation (see Pirnat 2015: 21–28 for argumentation and a diachronic scenario), which has declined in some of the modern languages due to both internal and external factors. The Finnic partitive of negation is hardly a fully independent parallel development, though the exact direction of contact-induced change is not fully evident (Wälchli & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 664; Larsson 2001: 245–247). Larsson (1983: 143) suggests that the use of the partitive in Baltic Finnic has spread under Baltic and Slavic influence; this hypothesis has been recently endorsed by Bjarnadóttir & De Smit (2013: 46–50) and De Smit & Luraghi (2016: 48). Like in Slavic and Baltic, the partial demise of the PartNeg in Livonian and some Finnish dialects is most probably due to more recent contact influences. The Basque-Romance parallel is an independent case whose historical interpretation is yet a desideratum; the claim by De Smit & Luraghi (2016: 48) that “[t]he Basque ablative acquired a partitive function and developed into a partitive determiner under the influence of Romance varieties” remains to be proven.

Acknowledgments

The investigation has been supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, grant # 17-04-00444. I thank Anna Alexandrova, Wayles Browne, Anzhalika Dubasava, Fedor Rozhanskiy, Maria Kholodilova, Merilin Miljan, Natalia Perkova, Mikhail Sayenko, Sergei Skorwid, Mladen Uhlík, Bernhard Wälchli, David Willis and Natalia Zaika for all kinds of help and useful feedback to the previous versions of this work.

Abbreviations

ABS — absolutive; ACC — accusative; ADV — adverb; ALL — allative; AOR — aorist; AUX — auxiliary verb; CNG — connegative; DAT — dative; DEF — definite; DEM — demonstrative; DF — default agreement; ERG — ergative; F — feminine; FUT — future; GEN — genitive; IMP — imperative; IND — indicative; INE — inessive; INF — infinitive; INS — instrumental; IRR — irrealis; LOC — locative; M — masculine; N — neuter; NEG — negation; NOM — nominative; OBJ — object; PA — active participle; PFV — perfective; PL — plural; POSS — possessive; PRS — present; PST — past; PTCL — particle; PTV — partitive; PVB — preverb; RFL — reflexive; SG — singular.

Sources

- BPRC — Belarusian-Russian Parallel Corpus, <http://ruscorpora.ru/new/search-para-be.html>
- DP — Mikalojus Daukša. *Postilė (Postilla Catholica tai est Išguldimas Ewangeliu ...)*. Vilnius, 1599. <http://www.lki.lt/seniejirastai/db.php?source=2>
- DLKT — Corpus of Lithuanian language, <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/>
- LRPC — Latvian-Russian Parallel Corpus, <http://ruscorpora.ru/new/search-para-lv.html>
- MK — Martynas Mažvydas. *Knigieles Paczias byla Letuuinikump jr Szemaicziump // Catechismvsa prasty Szadei, Makslas skaitima raschta ... Königsberg, 1547*. In: Ford, Gordon B., Jr. *Old Lithuanian Texts of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries with a Glossary*. The Hague: Mouton, 1969, pp. 12–16.
- RNC — Russian National Corpus, www.ruscorpora.ru
- UPRC — Ukrainian-Russian Parallel Corpus, <http://ruscorpora.ru/new/search-para-uk.html>

References

- Alexander R. (2006). *Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian. A Grammar with Sociolinguistic Commentary*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ariste P. (1968). *A Grammar of the Votic Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University; The Hague: Mouton.
- Ariztimuño López B. (2014). The origin of the Basque partitive. In: S. Luraghi & T. Huumo (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 323–344.
- Arkadiev P. (2016). Long-distance genitive of negation in Lithuanian. In A. Holvoet & N. Nau (eds.), *Argument Realization in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 37–81.
- Arkadiev P. (2017). Ob'ektnyj partitiv otricanija: areal'no-tipologičeskaja perspektiva [Object partitive of negation: An areal-typological perspective]. In: V. A. Plungian, R. V. Ron'ko, A. Ju. Urmančieva & A. V. Zimmerling (eds.). *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki. Vyp. 8: Differencirovannoe markirovanie argumentov: materialy k tipologii* [Studies in the theory of grammar. 8. Differential argument marking: Typological studies] (=Acta Linguistica Petropolitana 13.3). Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, 194–243.
- Atraxovič K. K., M. H. Bulaxau & P. P. Šuba (eds.) (1966). *Hramatyka belaruskaj movy. T. II. Sintaksis* [A Grammar of Belarusian. Vol. II. Syntax]. Minsk: Navuka i tèxnika.
- Bartoš J. & J. Gagnaire (1972). *Grammaire de la langue slovaque*. Bratislava: Matica slovenská; Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
- Berg-Olsen S. (2000). The Latvian non-prepositional genitive – a case losing ground. *Res Balticae* 6, 95–146.
- Berg-Olsen S. (2004). *The Latvian Dative and Genitive: A Cognitive Grammar Account*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oslo.
- Bielenstein A. J. G. (1863). *Lettische Grammatik*. Mitau: Fr. Lucas' Buchhandlung.
- Biryla, Mikalaj V. & Pavel P. Šuba (eds.) (1986). *Belaruskaja hramatyka. Č. II. Sintaksis* [Belarusian Grammar. Part II. Syntax]. Minsk: Navuka i tèxnika.
- Bjarnadóttir, Valgerður & M. De Smit (2013). Primary argument case-marking in Baltic and Finnic. *Baltu filologija* 23.1, 31–65.
- Błaszczak J. (2003). Genitive of negation constructions in Polish: A challenge to Chomsky's *Minimalist Inquiries?* Ms., University of Potsdam.
- Brattico P. (2012a). Structural case assignment and Phi-agreement in Finnish. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 25, 29–59.
- Brattico P. (2012b). Long-distance case assignment in Finnish. *Studia Linguistica* 66.3, 245–285.
- Breza E. & J. Treder (1981). *Gramatyka kaszubska. Zarys popularny*. Gdańsk: Zrzeszenie Kaszubsko-Pomorskie.
- Brown S. & S. Franks (1995). Asymmetries in the scope of Russian negation. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 3.2, 239–287.
- Browne W. & Th. Alt (2004). *A Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian*. (SEELRC Reference Grammars, <http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/mainframe.jsp?nLanguageID=1>).
- Bukšs M. & J. Placinskis (1973). *Latgaļu volūdas gramatika un pareizraksteibas vōrdneica* [Latgalian grammar and orthographic dictionary]. München: Latgaļu izdevnīceiba.
- Cardinaletti A. & G. Giusti (2016). The syntax of the Italian indefinite determiner *dei*. *Lingua* 181, 58–80.
- Carlier A. & B. Lamiroy (2014). The grammaticalization of the prepositional partitive in Romance. In: S. Luraghi & T. Huumo (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 477–519.
- Chierchia G. (1997). Partitives, reference to kinds and semantic variation. In: A. Lawson (ed.), *Proceedings of SALT VII*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 73–98.
- de Rijk R. P. G. (2008). *Standard Basque. A Progressive Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- De Smit M. & S. Luraghi (2016). Contact-induced change in the languages of Europe: The rise and the development of partitive cases and determiners. Presentation at the 49th Annual Meeting of *Societas Linguistica Europaea*, Naples, 31 August – 3 September 2016.
- Endzelin J. (1922). *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: A. Gulbis.
- Erelt M. ed. (2003). *Estonian Language*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Sciences.

- Etxeberria U. (2014). The definite article and the partitive particle in Basque: dialectal variation. In: S. Luraghi & T. Huuimo (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 291–322.
- Evans N. (1995). *A Grammar of Kayardild. With Historical-Comparative Notes on Tangkic*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Faßke H. & S. Michalk (1980). *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart. Morphologie*. Bautzen: VEB Domowina Verlag.
- Fellerer J. 2019. Accusative of negation in ‘Borderland’ Polish. *Russian Linguistics* 43, 159–180.
- Foulet L. (1928). *Petite syntaxe de l’ancien français*. 3ème éd. rev. Paris: Champion.
- Grünthal R. (2015). *Vepsän kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Guiraud-Weber M. & Ch. Zaremba (2007). Incidence de la négation sur les deux premiers actants de la phrase en polonais, russe et tchèque. In: Chr. Touratier & Ch. Zaremba (éds.), *La négation* (Travaux du Cercle linguistique d’Aix-en-Provence). Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence, 49–67.
- Guiraud-Weber M. (2003). Eščě raz o russkom genitive otricanija: vzgljad so storony [Yet again on the Russian Genitive of Negation: Another perspective]. *Russian Linguistics* 27, 363–384.
- Harrer-Pisarkowa K. (1959). Przypadek dopełnienia w polskim zdaniu zaprzeczonym. In: *Język polski* 39.1, 9–32.
- Harves S. (2013). The genitive of negation in Russian. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1–16.
- Heyd S. (2003). *L’interprétation des syntagmes nominaux en des et de en position sujet et objet. Générativité, habitué et incorporation sémantique*. Thèse de doctorat, Université Strasbourg-II.
- Holvoet A. & N. Nau (2014). Argument marking and grammatical relations in Baltic. An overview. In: A. Holvoet & N. Nicole (eds.), *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–41.
- Hualde J. I. & J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.) (2003). *A Grammar of Basque*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huuimo T. (2010). Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: The case of the Finnish object. *Journal of Linguistics* 46, 83–125.
- Huuimo T. (2013). On the many faces of incompleteness: Hide-and-seek with the Finnish partitive object. *Folia Linguistica* 47.1, 89–111.
- Ilc G. (2011). Optionality of the Genitive (of Negation) in Slovene. In: P. Kosta & L. Schurcks (eds.), *Formalization of Grammar in Slavic Languages. Contributions of the Eighth International Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages - FDSL VIII 2009 University of Potsdam, December 2-5, 2009*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 193–206.
- Janaš P. (1984). *Niedersorbische Grammatik für den Schulgebrauch*. 2. Aufl. Bautzen: VEB Domowina-Verlag.
- Kagan O. (2012). *Semantics of Genitive Objects in Russian. A Study of Genitive of Negation and Intensional Genitive Case*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kiparsky P. (2001). Structural case in Finnish. *Lingua* 111, 315–376.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm M. & B. Wälchli (2001). The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach. In: Ö. Dahl & M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol. 2, 615–750.
- Krasovitsky A., M. Baerman, D. Brown & G. G. Corbett (2011). Changing semantic factors in case selection: Russian evidence from the last two centuries. *Morphology* 21.2, 573–592.
- Kryshevich O. (2010). *The Genitive of Negation in Ukrainian*. MA Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Kulik B. M. (1961). *Kurs sučasnoï ukraïns’koï literaturnoï movy. Častyna II. Syntaksys* [A Course in Contemporary Ukrainian. Part II. Syntax]. Kyiv: Radjanska škola.
- Larsson L.-G. (1983). *Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Larsson L.-G. (2001). Baltic influence of Finnic languages. In: Ö. Dahl & M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol. 1, 237–253.
- Lees A. (2015). *Case Alternations in Five Finnic Languages. Estonian, Finnish, Karelian, Livonian and Veps*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

- Markus E. & F. Rožanskij (2011). *Sovremennyy vodskij jazyk. Teksty i grammatičeskij očerk. T. 2* [Modern Votic. Texts and Grammatical Sketch. Vol. 2] St Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija.
- Mazon A. (1952). *Grammaire de la langue tchèque*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
- Mazzitelli L. F. (2010). Il fenomeno dell'alternanza genitivo-accusativo per l'espressione dell'oggetto diretto in presenza di negazione in bielorusso. In: R. Benacchio & L. Ruvoletto (eds.), *Lingue slave in evoluzione: studi di grammatica e semantica*. Padova: Unipress, 139–148.
- Menantaud H. (1993). Contribution à la description morphosyntaxique de la phrase négative polonaise. Forme du complément nominal. *Revue des études slaves* 65.4, 821–826.
- Menantaud H. (1999). La négation comme catégorie grammaticale en polonais et en lituanien. *Cahiers de Linguistique de l'INALCO* 1-2, 43–57.
- Menantaud H. (2007). Note sur une alternance morphologique induite par la négation dans les langues baltes modernes (letton et lituanien). In: Chr. Touratier & Ch. Zaremba (éds.), *La négation*. (Travaux du Cercle linguistique d'Aix-en-Provence) Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence, 91–99.
- Metslang H. (2014). Partitive noun phrases in the Estonian core argument system. In: S. Luraghi & T. Huumo (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 177–255.
- Metslang H., K. Pajusalu & T.-R. Viitso (2015). Negation in Livonian. In: M. Miestamo, A. Tamm & B. Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic Languages*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 433–457.
- Miestamo M. (2014). Partitives and negation: A cross-linguistic survey. In: S. Luraghi & T. Huumo (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 63–86.
- Miljan M. (2008). *Grammatical Case in Estonian*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Moseley Chr. (2002). *Livonian*. München, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Muller Cl. (1997). De partitif et la négation. In: D. Forget, P. Hirschbühler, Fr. Martineau & M. L. Rivero (eds.), *Negation and Polarity. Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 251–270.
- Nau N. (1998). *Latvian*. München & Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Nau N. (2011). *A Short Grammar of Latgalian*. München, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Nau N. (2014). Differential object marking in Latgalian. In: A. Holvoet & N. Nau (eds.), *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 207–255.
- Nītiņa D. & J. Grigorjevs red. (2013). *Latviešu valodas gramatika* [A Latvian Grammar]. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.
- Padučeva E. V. (2006). Genitiv dopolnenija v otricatel'nom predložanii [The genitive of the object in negative sentences]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 6, 21–43.
- Pavlič M. & S. Živanović (2012). The genitive of negation in Slovenian. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Austrian Students' Conference of Linguistics, Innsbruck, November 2012*, 12–31.
- Petkevič V. (2016). Genitivní valence českých sloves. In: K. Skwarska & E. Kaczmarska (eds.), *Výzkum slovesné valence ve slovanských zemích*. Praha: Slovanský ústav AV ČR, 207–226.
- Pirnat Ž. (2015). Genesis of the Genitive of Negation in Balto-Slavic and its evidence in contemporary Slovenian. *Slovene Linguistic Studies* 10, 3–52.
- Przepiórkowski A. (2000). Long-distance genitive of negation in Polish. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8, 119–158.
- Pugh S. M. (2009). *The Rusyn Language. A Grammar of the Literary Standard of Slovakia with reference to Lemko and Subcarpathian Rusyn*. München: Newcastle.
- Pugh S. M. & I. Press (1999). *Ukrainian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Raxilina E. V., red. (2008). *Ob'ektnyj genitiv pri otricanii v russkom jazyke* [The Object Genitive of Negation in Russian]. Moscow: Probel-2000.
- Rechzieglová A. (1995). *On Negation in Czech*. Praha: Euroslavka.
- Reindl D. F. (2008). *Language Contact: German and Slovenian*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Renzi L., G. Salvi & A. Cardinaletti (1991). *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. Vol. 2. Bologna: Il Mulino.

- Rozhanskiy F. & E. Markus (2015). Negation in contemporary Votic. In: M. Miestamo, A. Tamm & B. Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic Languages*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 487–515.
- Ružička J. (red.) (1966). *Morfológia slovenského jazyka*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.
- Scholze L. (2007). *Das grammatische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Sprachkontakts*. Doctoral Dissertation, Universität Konstanz.
- Seržant I. (2015). The independent partitive genitive as an Eastern Circum-Baltic isogloss. *Journal of Language Contact* 8, 341–418.
- Sjögren J. A. (1861). *Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben* (Gesammelte Schriften. Bd. II. Th. I). St Petersburg: Commissionäre der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Šwela B. (1952). *Grammatik der niedersorbischen Sprache*. 2. Aufl. Bearb. und hrsg. von Dr. Frido Mětšk. Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag.
- Timberlake A. (1986). Hierarchies in the genitive of negation. In: R. Brecht & J. Levine (eds.), *Case in Slavic*. Columbus (OH): Slavica, 338–360.
- Timberlake A. (2009). The simple sentence. In: S. Kempgen, P. Kosta, T. Berger, K. Gutschmidt (eds.), *The Slavic Languages. An International Handbook of their Structure, their History and their Investigation*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1675–1699.
- Timčenko E. K. (1913). *Funkcii genitiva v južnorusskoj jazykovoj oblasti* [Functions of the genitive in the South Russian linguistic area]. Warsaw: Tipografija Varšavskago Učebnago Okruga. (<http://zbruc.eu/node/57974>)
- Tveite T. (2004). *The Case of the Object in Livonian: A Corpus Based Study*. (Castrenianumin toimitteita 62) Helsinki: Helsinki University.
- van Helden W. A. (2008). Vicissitudes of the genitive rule. In: P. Houtzagers, J. Kalsbeek & J. Schaeken (eds.), *Dutch Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid, September 10–16 2008. Linguistics*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 145–216.
- Vintr J. (2001). *Das Tschechische: Hauptzüge seiner Sprachstruktur in Gegenwart und Geschichte*. München: Sagner.
- Willis D. (2013). Negation in the history of the Slavonic languages. In: D. Willis, Chr. Lucas & A. Breitbarth (eds.), *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 341–398.