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Intro: disclaimers

- Contrastive to Standard Russian.
- No fieldwork.
- **Partitive** genitive is just a convenient label (in analogy to the partitive case in Finnic) (henceforth IPG).
Intro: disclaimers

Dialectological remark:

• while North Russian represents a much more developed system than Standard Russian,
• both equally undergo the demise of the IPG
• mainly in terms of token frequency not in terms of type frequency
• while ACC is becoming more and more the default.
Intro: semantics

• Functionally, the IPG represents a cluster or multi-faceted category with bearings in at least three domains:
  ✓ (weak) **quantification**,  
  ✓ **negation** (negative polarity)  
  ✓ **(in)definiteness** (with intensional predicates) and  
  ✓ (discourse prominence)
• “decreased referentiality” (cf. Partee 2008).
• Immediately related to *pseudo-partitivity* (Silkirk 1977); true partitivitity infrequent.
• Etymologically related but synchronically represent rather independent categories in terms of homonymy.
• All these domains allow ACC as well (default),
• yielding different types of DOM, each of which has its own system.
Intro: syntax

• The IPG is not assigned by some head.
• Historically, it emerged from a true partitive expression with a covert head,
• gradually converging from two constituents into one constituent (as the result of the semantics: *partitivity* > *pseudo-partitivity*).
• IPG overrides structural case assignment *only* (not in Old Russian or Ancient Greek, cf. Seržant 2012, 2015a).
• Coordinatable with structurally marked NPs (scil. ACC+NOM).
=> rather a determiner/quantifier than a case.
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Quantification of the NP

NP-internal quantification:

(1) nam zimoj presedatel’ daval gorox-u
    1PL.DAT winter.INS director.NOM give.ITER.PST.SG pea-GEN.SG
‘The director distributed [some] peas in the winter to us’.
(Ustjanskij r.; Ustja Corpus 2013)

Quantification of the NP and the predicate

**Standard Russian:**

(2) *My na-sobirali grib-ov*

1PL.NOM QUANT-collect.PST.PL mushroom-GEN.PL

‘We collected [quite a lot] mushrooms.’

- Predicate quantification is found in Standard Russian only under *Isomorphismus* (lots of events of collecting = lots of mushrooms),
- i.e. with overtly quantified verbs and incremental-theme verbs.
Quantification of the NP and the predicate

• In North Russian, isomorphism is not a condition.
• The IPG may additionally be triggered by:
  (i) an overt adverb quantifier;
  (ii) the implicit quantifier of the IPG may itself quantify the predicate.
An overt verb quantifier triggering the IPG

(3) Ognja na-klali, nok po-greli
fire.GEN.SG QUANT-put.PST.PL foot.GEN.PL DELIM-warm.PST.PL
‘We made fire and warmed our feet’.

(4) Golov-y po-poanjai maien’ko l upal
head.GEN.SG QUANT-put.PST.SG somewhat and fell.
‘He slightly raised head and fell down.’

Some(what) warmed but not *some feet

’Somewhat, for a while’
The implicit quantifier of the IPG quantifies the predicate

NB: the implicit quantifier of the IPG is – differently from the one of the partitive case in Finnic – is delimited (Padučeva 1998: 80), “unspecified but delimited” (Timberlake 2004: 319) like ‘some’.
The implicit quantifier of the IPG quantifies the predicate /1

(5)   Ja otvorju dverej
       1SG.NOM open.FUT.1SG door.GEN.PL
   ‘I will **slightly/somewhat** open the door(s).’
   (Kuškopola, Pinežskij r.; from Malyševa 2008: 237)

(6)   Ja tvoix oc’kof omocil
       1SG.NOM your.GEN.PL glasses.GEN.PL water.PST.SG
   ‘I **slightly/somewhat** watered your glasses.
   (Ozerko, Kargopol’skij r.; Malyševa 2008: 237)
The implicit quantifier of the IPG quantifies the predicate /2

• Temporal transfer found with verbs of transfer *dat* ‘give’, *vzat* ‘take’, *brat* ‘take’ (examples from Markova 1989: 76a; Lopatina 1998: 236).

• The IPG induces the meaning of a temporally delimited result of transfer:
The implicit quantifier of the IPG quantifies the predicate /2

(7)  *Daj nožnicej!*

  give.impv.sg scissors.gen.pl
  ‘Give me the scissors [*for a while/short time]*!’

  (Lešukonskij r.; from Malyševa 2008: 234)

(8)  *Defki, ja u vas voz’mu malen’kovo kipetil’nic’ku, cjaj skipecju*

  ‘Girls, I’ll take your *small water cooker-IPG (for a short time)*, I’ll brew tea.’

  (Javzora, Pinežskij r.; Malyševa 2008: 235)
The implicit quantifier of the IPG quantifies the predicate /1+2

• To sum up:
  • A quantifier needs a divisible event which it can measure while momentary events such as achievements cannot be measured by their definition.
  • Accomplishments (...*otkryvaju dverej ‘open door.GEN’) are complex events that contain two parts: (i) the preparational part and (ii) the culmination.
  • While culmination cannot be measured by the implicit quantifier the preparational phase is an activity that can be quantified.
  • Achievements (...*daj nožnicej ‘give scissors.GEN’) are momentary and cannot be measured.
  • However, the resultant after-state (i.e. the possession) can be measured.
  • Temporal transfer is derived by the metonymic extension of the transfer to include the after-state/possession which is measured by the implicit quantifier: lit. ‘to possess for a while/somewhat/a little bit’.
Diachronic and typological background

• We thus observe the following development in North Russian: $D(eterminer)$-Quantifier (QP-intern) $=>$ $A(dverb)$-Quantifier (terms coined by Löbner 1985; Partee 1995):

  ‘I ate a little bit of the cake.’

  ‘I ate the cake a little bit.’

• Typologically such a change is trivial (Gil 1993, Keenan and Paperno 2012: 941), cf. Englisch some, a little bit vs. somewhat, a little bit,

• However, it is extremely unusual w.r.t. the locus of realization of the quantifier.
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(9) K jim vsegda ljud-ej nabeg-ut, to 3PL.DAT always people-GEN.PL come-3PL
dak jabloku nekudy upast’
so that there is no space for an apple to fall down
‘Always lots of people come to them so that there is no space for an apple
to fall down.’ (Mescerskij, ed., 1972: 211)

(10) Tut-to medved-ej byvaj-ut, tol’ko malo
here-PRT bear-GEN.PL be-3PL only few
‘There are bears but not that many.’ (Sujsar’, Onežskij r.)

(11) A kto rabotal pokrepče, tak ix byl-i
but who worked harder so 3PL.GEN be.PST-3PL
‘As regards those who worked harder – there were some.’ (Sujsar’, Onežskij r.)
(12) **Zdes’ vsjak-ix rast-ut**
‘Various [things] (GEN.PL) grow (PL) here’.
(Derevjannoe, Onežskij r.; Markova 2008: 153)

(13) **Počti vs-ex poraz’exas**
‘Almost all (GEN.PL) moved (PL)’
(Šun’ga, Onežskij) (Markova 2008: 153)

- ad formam
- ad sensum
- domain: subject-predicate
- Condition: nominative marking

(14) **Sn-ov bud-ut**
‘There will (PL) be dreams (GEN.PL)’.
(Šun’ga, Onežskij) (Markova 2008: 153)
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## Conclusions / Quantifier Domains

<table>
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**Notes:**
- Quantifier domains vary across linguistic groups.
- The diagram illustrates the distribution of quantified and non-quantified predicate and object slots.
- Baltic, Russian, Nordic, and Finnic languages each exhibit different patterns in quantification.
Conclusions / Quantifier Functions

• Standard Russian (and Baltic) allow the predicate to be quantified by the IPG only under isomorphism (= more archaic);
• North Russian (and Finnic), in turn, allow the predicate to be quantified regardless of isomorphism.
• In contrast to Finnic, the IPG in (North) Russian has only arbitrarily delimited (non-cumulative) existential meaning (≈ ‘some(what)’) (cf. Padučeva 1998; Neidle 1988; Franks 1995; Seržant 2014a, 2014b)
• while Finnic may also have less specified, non-referential property-denoting meaning (Seržant 2015b).
• Consequently, the IPG in Russian (and Baltic) is compatible only with the perfective viewpoint as it entails an upper-bound limit (= ‘to do something for a while and then stop’).
Conclusions / Quantifier Functions

• The IPG quantifier needs a process (= state or activity) as its input to quantify over.

• With accomplishments this process is lexically available, i.e. the preparatory phase.

• With achievements (only transfer verbs) such a process is metonymically created by referring to the after-phase (i.e. the possession resulting from the transfer). It is the after-phase that is quantified over by the IPG here (Seržant 2014b).
Conclusions / Agreement

• Agreement is found only sporadically.
• The agreement is “almost canonical” in that it is both *ad formam* and *ad sensum* (cf. Corbett 2006).
• However, it violates the conditioning: only NOM subjects trigger agreement.
• This formal agreement is found also in Veps (Finnic) (Lytkin *et al.*, 1975: 108; Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 658).
• but also on the Internet from Finnish which is not grammatical for many speakers (Tuomas Huumo, p.c. in Toscana).
Conclusions / Agreement

• The appearance of the formal agreement is the end result of the process (cf. Seržant 2015a):

| Head constituent + Dependent constituent | One constituent |

• Cf. English:

  a group of students IS ....
  a number of students ARE ....
Thank you!


