

OBJECT GENITIVE/PARTITIVE OF NEGATION: AN AREAL PERSPECTIVE

Peter Arkadiev

(Institute of Slavic Studies; Russian State University for the Humanities;
Moscow State Pedagogical 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 PRV-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-PRV-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 simply labeled “**GenNeg**”, even when the case occurring under negation is partitive, as in Finnic.

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

- GenNeg affects only direct objects marked by the appropriate structural case (accusative or genitive), not indirect objects or obliques marked by other cases;
- GenNeg is obligatory and does not depend on semantics of either the transitive verb or of the object itself;
- GenNeg can apply not only to the direct object of the negated verb (**local** GenNeg, 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** GenNeg, 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 GenNeg. This presentation, which stems from an empirical study of long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian (Arkadiev 2016), aims at an areal survey of the relations between local and long-distance GenNeg.

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

- subject GenNeg;
- GenNeg affecting temporal adverbials;
- factors affecting the application of GenNeg when it is not categorical (specifically for the variation in long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian see Arkadiev 2016);
- types of non-finite constructions allowing long-distance GenNeg (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); a more general typological overview of the interaction between partitive/genitive cases and negation can be found in Miestamo (2014).

2. Baltic languages

2.1. Lithuanian (see Arkadiev 2016 for more details)

As already said, local GenNeg is obligatory.

Long-distance GenNeg 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 GenNeg 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-PRV-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.’ (LKT)

GenNeg 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-q.
 read-INF greeting-GEN.SG / greeting-ACC.SG
 ‘The chairwoman does not want to let the secretary begin to read out the greeting.’
 (elicited)

2.2. Latvian

In sharp contrast to Lithuanian, modern Latvian does not have either local or long-distance GenNeg apart from emphatic contexts (Berg-Olsen 2004: 125; Menantaud 2007; Holvoet & Nau 2014: 7–9), in which it is attested both with local (10), and with non-local negation (11).

LATVIAN: local GenNeg with emphatic negation

- (10) *viņ-š* *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 GenNeg with emphatic negation

- (11) *nek-ā* *vairs* *ne-spēj* *pa-darī-t*
 nothing-GEN more NEG-be.able.PRS(3) PRV-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. Nitiņa & Grigorjevs (eds.) 2013: 348–349), cf. (12)–(13), and is attested even in emphatic contexts (cf. Holvoet & Nau 2014: 8), cf. (14).

LATVIAN: Accusative under local negation

- (12) *viņ-š* *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

- (13) *es* *ne-var-u* *ēs-t* *nemazgāt-us* *augļ-us...*
 I:NOM NEG-can.PRS-1SG eat-INF unwashed-ACC.PL.M fruit-ACC.PL
 ‘I can’t eat unwashed fruits.’¹

LATVIAN: Accusative with emphatic negation

- (14) *Jūs* *ne-es-at* *nek-o* *slikt-u* *izdarīj-uš-i*.
 2PL.NOM NEG-AUX-PRS.1PL nothing-ACC bad-ACC.SG perform-PST.PA-NOM.SG.M
 ‘You haven’t done anything bad.’ (Nau 1998: 59)

The demise of the GenNeg is an innovation in standard Latvian; both Bielenstein (1863: 284–285) and Endzelin (1922: 419–420) describe GenNeg as a pervasive phenomenon, though 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.

2.3. Latgalian

In contrast to Latvian, Latgalian has preserved GenNeg (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 GenNeg

- (15) *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 GenNeg

- (16) *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)

¹ http://sintetika.blogspot.ru/2011_10_01_archive.html, accessed 12 January 2015.

However, accusative is also an option, especially with pronominal objects (17), (19) but also with nouns (18), (20):

LATGALIAN: accusative under local negation

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

(18) *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

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

(20) *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.)

➤ The differences in GenNeg 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 GenNeg 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 GenNeg in particular.

3. Slavic languages

3.1. Polish

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

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

POLISH (Przepiórkowski 2000: 128)

(21) *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 GenNeg across deeply-embedded infinitives:

POLISH (Przepiórkowski 2000: 123)

(22) *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 GenNeg is optional (ibid.: 124–128):

POLISH (Przepiórkowski 2000: 123)

(23) *Nie mógł-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?’

3.2. Slovene

Another Slavic language closely resembling Lithuanian in the distribution of GenNeg is Slovene (Ilc 2011, Pirnat 2015), cf. local GenNeg (24a) and long-distance GenNeg (24b,c), including multiple GenNeg (24c):

SLOVENE: local and long-distance GenNeg

- (24) 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 takšn-ih problem-ov.*
 teacher(NOM.SG) NEG force-PRS.3SG student-GEN.PL solve-INF
 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 GenNeg in Slovene is optional, and different factors play a role in the choice of case on the direct object. Notably, in distinction to Lithuanian, where the negative pronoun appears in the genitive in all contexts (25), in Slovene it preferably occurs in the accusative (26):

LITHUANIAN

- (25) *Tėv-ai ne-leidži-a vaik-ui niek-o / *niek-q dary-ti.*
 father-NOM.PL NEG-allow-PRS(3) child-DAT.SG nothing-GEN / nothing-ACC do-INF
 ‘The parents don’t allow the child to do anything.’ (elicited)

SLOVENE

- (26) *Ni j-i prinese-l nič / ?ničesar.*
 NEG.AUX.3SG 3-DAT.SG.F bring-PST(SG.M) nothing(ACC) / nothing.GEN
 ‘He did not bring her anything.’ (Pirnat 2015: 33)

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

3.3. Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

In BCS, GenNeg 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

- (27) 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’ [28] and when negation is strengthened by *ni*, *nijedan*, *nikakav* ‘not even, not a single, no’ [29]”

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

- (28) *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.’
- (29) 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’

No data on long-distance contexts is provided by the sources at my disposal.

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

3.4. East Slavic languages

In modern Russian GenNeg 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; see also a useful historical overview by van Helden 2008), cf. example (30), where the choice of case under local negation affects semantics.

RUSSIAN: Genitive vs. Accusative under local negation

- (30) 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 GenNeg 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. example (31). However, rare instances of long-distance GenNeg are nevertheless still attested, cf. example (32); see also Brown & Franks (1995: 254–258).

RUSSIAN: Accusative vs. Genitive under non-local negation

- (31) *Potomu što 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)
- (32) *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 GenNeg is recorded in grammars of both languages as a default, though non-obligatory, rule (on Ukrainian see Kulik 1961: 69–70; Pugh & Press 1999: 98–99 and Kryshevich 2010; 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.

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

- (33) 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 GenNeg 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, there are some examples attested in the parallel Belarusian-Russian corpus, cf. (34) vs. (35).

BELARUSIAN: Genitive vs. Accusative under non-local negation

- (34) *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!’ (RNC, fiction, 1987)
- (35) *Adnak jon ne ŭspe-ŭ skaza-c’ hêt-yja slov-y...*
 however 3SG.M.NOM NEG have.time-PST(SG.M) say-INF this-ACC.PL word-ACC.PL
 ‘However, before he managed to utter these words, the foreigner spoke...’ (RNC, 1994 translation of Bulgakov’s “Master i Margarita”; Gen in the original)

Ukrainian grammars do not mention long-distance GenNeg, but the corpus data are similar to Belarusian, cf. (36) vs. (37):

UKRAINIAN: Genitive vs. Accusative under non-local negation

- (36) *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.’ (RNC, non-fiction, 1993)
- (37) *bud’-jak-i vybor-y ne mož-ut’ zmini-ti dolj-u krajn-y...*
 any-which-NOM.PL election-NOM.PL NEG can-PRS.3PL change-INF fate-ACC.SG country-GEN.SG
 ‘Any elections cannot change the fate of the country.’ (RNC, non-fiction, 2010)

3.5. West Slavic beyond Polish

In Czech, GenNeg, both local and long-distant, is completely obsolete (Guiraud-Weber 2003; Guiraud-Weber & Zaremba 2007), cf. (38), while in Slovak, according to Pirnat (2015: 16) it is still possible in emphatic contexts and was more widespread until 1950ies.

CZECH: Accusative under negation

- (38) *...ne-čhc-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.’²

In standard Upper Sorbian GenNeg is optional (Scholze 2007: 66; Pirnat 2015: 17), and in the colloquial varieties heavily influenced by German it has become obsolete, cf. (39).

COLLOQUIAL UPPER SORBIA: accusative under local negation

- (39) *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)

3.6. Historical perspective

GenNeg, both local and long-distance, is a Common Slavic phenomenon, see Willis (2013: 349–368), as is evidenced not only by the striking Polish-Slovene parallel hardly explain-

² <http://www.vegetarian.cz/diskuse/dproc/dproc118.html>, accessed 12 January 2015.

able but as a shared retention, and by Old Church Slavonic, cf. (40)–(41), and earlier stages of those languages where GenNeg has become obsolete, such as Czech, cf. (42)–(43) vs. (38).

OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC: local GenNeg

- (40) *blȋd-ite ne věd-qšt-e kŭnig-ŭ ni sil-y b < o > žij-e*
 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 GenNeg

- (41) *Ne ubo-i sę priję-ti žen-y tvo-eję Marij-e.*
 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 GenNeg

- (42) *Proto kněz-ě Ott-y ne-rodī-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 GenNeg

- (43) *ne-kazu-j nám přejī-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).

➤ The combined Baltic and Slavic evidence suggests that obligatory GenNeg is a common Balto-Slavic phenomenon, while the decay of GenNeg 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 (e.g. Czech and Sorbian) GenNeg has become obsolete as in Latvian.

➤ On the other hand, contact with German can hardly be the main factor for the loss resp. retention of GenNeg, as shown by the East Slavic languages, which have largely restructured GenNeg 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 GenNeg largely intact, see, however, Pirnat (2008: 8–9) on variation in early Slovene texts and the decline of GenNeg in modern colloquial language.

4. Baltic Finnic languages

Both local and long-distance partitive of negation are obligatory in Estonian (Erelt (ed.) 2003: 96, 111), cf. (44)–(45), and Finnish (Brattico 2012a, 2012b), see above.

ESTONIAN: local partitive of negation

- (44) a. *Kass sõi hiir-t / hiir-e.*
 cat(NOM.SG) eat.PST.3SG mouse-PTV.SG / mouse-GEN.SG
 ‘The cat ate / was eating 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

- (45) a. *President andis ta-lle medali/*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.)

In the now extinct Livonian the situation was different; 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. In another minor Baltic Finnic language, Votic, GenNeg is reported to be obligatory (Markus & Rožanskij 2011: 229). No data on the influence of non-local negation on the case marking of the object are available for these languages.

5. Summary and discussion

The distribution of local and long-distance GenNeg in the Baltic, Slavic and Finnic languages is shown in Table 1.

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

Language	Local GenNeg	Long-distance GenNeg
Estonian	obligatory	obligatory
Finnish	obligatory	obligatory
Lithuanian	obligatory	regular
Polish	obligatory	regular
Slovene	regular	regular
Latgalian	regular and meaningful	regular
Russian	optional and meaningful	rare
Belarusian	optional and meaningful	rare
Ukrainian	optional and meaningful	rare
Latvian	only emphatic	only emphatic
BCS	only emphatic	?
Czech	no	no
Upper Sorbian	no	?

Two implicational generalizations emerge from Table 1; the first one given in (46) is quite expected while the second one in (47) is less trivial.

- (46) 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.
- (47) 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 (46) the implication goes from a larger syntactic domain to a smaller one, but in (47) the direction of the implication is the opposite. Currently, I have no explanations for the unexpected implication in (47).

GenNeg 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).

Acknowledgments

The investigation has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation, grant # 14-18-03270. I thank David Willis, Maria Kholodilova and Mladen Uhlik for sharing with me relevant literature and Anžalika Dubasava and Merilin Miljan for providing me with the Belarusian and Estonian material, respectively.

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative; ALL – allative; AOR – aorist; AUX – auxiliary; DAT – dative; F – feminine; FUT – future; GEN – genitive; IMP – imperative; INF – infinitive; INS – instrumental; IRR – irrealis; LOC – locative; M – masculine; N – neuter; NEG – negation; NOM – nominative; PA – active participle; PL – plural; POSS – possessive; PRS – present; PRV – preverb; PST – past; PTCL – particle; PTV – partitive; RFL – reflexive; SG – singular.

References

- LKT – Corpus of Lithuanian language, <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/>
 RNC – Russian National Corpus, www.ruscorpora.ru
 Alexander, Ronelle (2006). *Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian. A Grammar with Sociolinguistic Commentary*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
 Arkadiev, Peter (2016). Long-distance genitive of negation in Lithuanian. To appear in Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Argument Realization in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 37–81.
 Atraxovič, Kandrát K., Mixail H. Bulaxaŭ & Pavel P. Šuba (eds.) (1966). *Hramatyka belaruskaj movy. T. II. Sintaksis* [A Grammar of Belarusian. Vol. II. Syntax]. Minsk: Navuka i tэхnika.
 Berg-Olsen, Sturla (2000). The Latvian non-prepositional genitive – a case losing ground. *Res Balticae* 6, 95–146.
 Berg-Olsen, Sturla (2004). *The Latvian Dative and Genitive: A Cognitive Grammar Account*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oslo.
 Bielenstein, August Johann Gottfried (1863). *Lettische Grammatik*. Mitau: Fr. Lucas' Buchhandlung.
 Biryła, Mikalaj V. & Pavel P. Šuba (eds.) (1986). *Belaruskaja hramatyka. Č. II. Sintaksis* [Belarusian Grammar. Part II. Syntax]. Minsk: Navuka i tэхnika.
 Błaszczak, Joanna (2003). Genitive of negation constructions in Polish: A challenge to Chomsky's *Minimalist Inquiries?* Ms., University of Potsdam.
 Brattico, Pauli (2012a). Structural case assignment and Phi-agreement in Finnish. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 25, 29–59.
 Brattico, Pauli (2012b). Long-distance case assignment in Finnish. *Studia Linguistica* 66 (3), 245–285.
 Brown, Sue & Stephen Franks (1995). Asymmetries in the scope of Russian negation. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 3 (2), 239–287.
 Browne, Wayles & Theresa Alt (2004). *A Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian*. (SEELRC Reference Grammars, <http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/mainframe.jsp?nLanguageID=1>).
 Bukšs, Miķelis & Jurs Placinskis (1973). *Latgaļu volūdas gramatika un pareizraksteibas vōrdneica* [Latgalian grammar and orthographic dictionary]. München: Latgaļu izdevnīceiba.
 Endzelin, Jānis (1922). *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: A. Gulbis.
 Erelt, Mati ed. (2003). *Estonian Language*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Sciences.
 Guiraud-Weber, Marguerite & Charles Zarella (2007). Incidence de la négation sur les deux premiers actants de la phrase en polonais, russe et tchègue. In: Christian Touratier & Charles Zarella (éds.), *La négation* (Travaux du Cercle linguistique d'Aix-en-Provence). Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence, 49–67.
 Guiraud-Weber, Marguerite (2003). Eščē raz o russkom genitive otricanija: vzgljad so storony [Yet again on the Russian Genitive of Negation: Another perspective]. *Russian Linguistics* 27, 363–384.
 Holvoet, Axel & Nau, Nicole (2014). Argument marking and grammatical relations in Baltic. An overview. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–41.
 Ilc, Gašper (2011). Optionality of the Genitive (of Negation) in Slovene. In: Peter Kosta & Lilia 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.
 Kagan, Olga (2012). *Semantics of Genitive Objects in Russian. A Study of Genitive of Negation and Intensional Genitive Case*. Dordrecht: Springer.
 Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria & Bernhard Wälchli (2001). The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach. In: Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol. 2, 615–750.
 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 (2), 573–592.
 Kryshevich, Olesya (2010). *The Genitive of Negation in Ukrainian*. MA Thesis, University of Cambridge.

- Kulik, Boris M. (1961). *Kurs sučasnoi ukrains'koi literaturnoi movy. Častyna II. Syntaksys* [A Course in Contemporary Ukrainian. Part II. Syntax]. Kyiv: Radjanska škola.
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar (2001). Baltic influence of Finnic languages. In: Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol. 1, 237–253.
- Markus, Elena & Rožanskij, Fedor (2011). *Sovremennyj vodskij jazyk. Teksty i grammatičeskij očerk. T. 2* [Modern Votic. Texts and Grammatical Sketch. Vol. 2] St Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija.
- Mazzitelli, Lidia Federica (2010). Il fenomeno dell'alternanza genitivo-accusativo per l'espressione dell'oggetto diretto in presenza di negazione in bielorusso. In: Rosanna Benacchio & Luisa Ruvoletto (eds.), *Lingue slave in evoluzione: studi di grammatica e semantica*. Padova: Unipress, 139–148.
- Menantaud, Henri (1993). Contribution à la description morphosyntaxique de la phrase négative polonaise. Forme du complément nominal. *Revue des études slaves* 65 (4), 821–826.
- Menantaud, Henri (1999). La négation comme catégorie grammaticale en polonais et en lituanien. *Cahiers de Linguistique de l'INALCO* 1-2, 43–57.
- Menantaud, Henri (2007). Note sur une alternance morphologique induite par la négation dans les langues baltes modernes (letton et lituanien). In: Christian Touratier & Charles Zaremba (éds.), *La négation*. (Travaux du Cercle linguistique d'Aix-en-Provence) Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence, 91–99.
- Miestamo, Matti (2014). Partitives and negation: A cross-linguistic survey. In: Silvia Luraghi & Toomas Huumo (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 63–86.
- Miljan, Merilin (2008). *Grammatical Case in Estonian*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Nau, Nicole (1998). *Latvian*. München & Newcastle: LINCUM Europa.
- Nau, Nicole (2011). *A Short Grammar of Latgalian*. München, Newcastle: LINCUM Europa.
- Nau, Nicole (2014). Differential object marking in Latgalian. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 207–255.
- Nitiņa, Daina & Grigorjevs, Juris, red. (2013). *Latviešu valodas gramatika* [A Latvian Grammar]. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.
- Padučeva, Elena V. (2006). Genitiv dopolnenija v otricatel'nom predložanii [The genitive of the object in negative sentences]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 6: 21–43.
- Pirnat, Žiga (2015). Genesis of the Genitive of Negation in Balto-Slavic and its evidence in contemporary Slovenian. *Slovene Linguistic Studies* 10, 3–52.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam (2000). Long-distance genitive of negation in Polish. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8, 119–158.
- Pugh, Stephan M. & Ian Press (1999). *Ukrainian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Raxilina, Ekaterina V., red. (2008). *Ob'ektnyj genitiv pri otricanii v russkom jazyke* [The Object Genitive of Negation in Russian]. Moscow: Probel-2000.
- Reindl, Donald F. (2008). *Language Contact: German and Slovenian*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Scholze, Lenka (2007). *Das grammatische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Sprachkontakts*. Doctoral Dissertation, Universität Konstanz.
- Sjögren, J. Andreas (1861). *Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben* (Gesammelte Schriften. Bd. II. Th. I). St Petersburg: Commissionäre der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Timberlake, Alan (1986). Hierarchies in the genitive of negation. In: Richard Brecht & James Levine (eds.), *Case in Slavic*. Columbus (OH): Slavica, 338–360.
- van Helden, W. Andries (2008). Vicissitudes of the genitive rule. In: Peter Houtzagers, Janneke Kalsbeek & Jos Schaecken (eds.), *Dutch Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid, September 10–16 2008. Linguistics*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 145–216.
- Willis, David (2013). Negation in the history of the Slavonic languages. In: David Willis, Christopher Lucas & Anne Breitbarth (eds.), *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 341–398.