The independent partitive genitive in Lithuanian

Ilja A. Seržant
University of Konstanz / Vilnius University

The aim of the paper is to give a semantic description of the independent or bare partitive genitive (IPG) in Lithuanian in rather neutral, functional terms. The IPG is a multi-faceted category that bears on the domains of quantification and (in)definiteness. On its quantificational reading, the IPG encodes an implicit quantifier, arbitrary in its value. I have used the notion of (un)boundedness (re-)introduced in Paul Kiparsky's (1998) seminal paper on the partitive case in Finnish. NP-internally, the IPG has two main readings: *unbounded* and *bounded* reading. The first reading provides the concept of the participant rather than 'zooming in' on particular instantiations. It is extremely weak referentially, probably the weakest option available in Lithuanian. This reading is restricted to those verbs in Lithuanian that allow their arguments to be kind-referring NPs (e.g., the subject of the existential *to be*, or object of *to know*). On the bounded reading, in turn, the IPG encodes an undetermined but delimited set, the reading is existential and resembles indefinite plurals. The individuals introduced by this reading are stored in the discourse model and may be picked up by anaphoric pronouns in the following discourse. They never constitute primary or foregrounded information of the message, though. Furthermore, I have claimed that the incremental-theme verbs and verbs of transfer in East Lithuanian interact with the IPG-marked object with respect to their aspectual properties. Here only the bounded reading of the IPG is available. This explains the ban on the occurrence of IPG in imperfective contexts in Lithuanian (such as progressive, which has no grammatical marking in Lithuanian, generic and iterated atelics) with incremental-theme verbs, because the imperfective interpretation induces an inherently unbounded event which is not compatible with the bounded reading of the IPG. Both bounded and unbounded values are assumed to be originally two different readings of the same implicit quantifier that have, however, acquired different distributions in the course of time.

1. Introduction[1]

The present paper is devoted to the independent partitive genitive in Lithuanian, cf. the genitive argument in (1) below:

(1) *Nusipirkau* ***pien-o***
buy.PST.1SG milk-GEN.SG
'I bought (some) milk.'

The occurrence of this kind of genitive is not directly licensed by some overt head, hence it will be referred to as *independent* partitive genitive here (abbreviated: IPG). Instead, different kinds of semantic considerations are decisive for an NP to be marked with the IPG, when the latter overrides the NP's structural case marking; these range from referential and quantificational properties of the respective NP's referent to the referential and quantificational properties of the predicate.

Generally, Lithuanian does not have morphological or other grammaticalized means to mark (in)definiteness of an NP. Bare NPs freely allow definite interpretation in this language. This is, however, different with the bare NPs that are case-marked by the IPG – these NPs can only have indefinite interpretation with no presupposition.[2] The fact that proper names are excluded from occurring in the IPG in Lithuanian is telling in this respect. Equally telling is the observation that abstract nouns are especially likely to have the IPG marking if occurring in the object position. In many instances such abstract-noun objects remind one of objects of light verbs in other languages, cf. such frequent expressions as, e.g., *turėti kantrybės* [have patience.GEN] 'to be patient'. The verb *turėti* is a sort of light verb here lacking its original lexical meaning of possession, while the abstract noun *kantrybės* 'of patience' is not individualized, providing only the concept. The inherent indefiniteness of the bare IPG case-marked NPs in contrast to other

1. My thanks go, first of all, to Kristina Lenartaitė-Gotaučienė, whose contribution was essential. Without her this paper would never have been possible. The paper profited much from the comments of my colleagues in the project *Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic*, Vilnius University: (alphabetically) Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet, Rolandas Mikulskas, Nicole Nau and Björn Wiemer. Special thanks go to the external reviewer. All disclaimers apply.

2. Seeming exceptions are anaphoric pronouns marked with the IPG. I will discuss examples with anaphoric pronouns marked with the IPG, cf. examples (16), (17) below, in more detail. At this point, it suffices to say that these IPG-marked pronouns semantically embed presupposed kinds or supersets introduced in the preceding discourse as input but in their overall meaning (in the output) refer to the actual participant extracted from this superset/kind just as an instantiation of such a kind or as a member of such a superset. This participant is indefinite and not previously mentioned.

case-marked NPs is thus striking in Lithuanian. The IPG must be regarded as a particular sort of morphologically-marked indefinite description in this language. In general, one would expect a case to express some thematic relationship that the respective NP bears to its predicate (cf. Blake 1994: 1–2) and not to alter the referentiality of the respective NP. Here, however, the IPG is triggered by the quantificational and/or determination properties of its host NP and, in some instances, of its VP. Differently from the 'regular' cases, it cannot encode any of the semantic roles.

The IPG *vs.* NOM/ACC alternation represents a subtype of the widely-discussed phenomena of Differential Object- and Differential Subject Marking (*inter alios*, Bossong 1998; Aissen 2003; Kittilä et al. 2011). Cross-linguistically, this phenomenon may be governed not only by the NP-internal properties but also by the tense or aspectual properties of the verb phrase (cf. Lestrade & de Hoop 2011). This is exactly what is found with the IPG of Lithuanian: the alternation with the structural case is governed not only by indefiniteness of reference and quantity but may also depend on the aspectual interpretation of the verb. Thus, one may distinguish between NP-internal and VP-internal functions of the IPG. The latter – differently from other similar instances such as the partitive case in Finnic languages – are mostly restricted to incremental-theme accomplishments and are only possible with mass nouns and plurals in Lithuanian (exceptions are found with *temporary transfer,* cf. example (51) below).

As to its syntactic properties, the IPG takes part in a meaningful alternation with structural cases only: it overrides the nominative case of unaccusative intransitive subjects and accusative direct objects of a particular group of verbs. Although verbs do not subcategorize for the IPG, there are lexical restrictions. Only a restricted number of verb classes allow the IPG alternation in Lithuanian. Somewhat strikingly, the IPG of Lithuanian can (restrictedly) be coordinated with accusatives and nominatives:

(2) *Nusipirkau* ***pien-o*** *ir* ***bandel-ę***
buy.PST.1SG milk-GEN.SG and roll-ACC.SG
'I bought milk and a roll.'

(3) *Atvažiavo man-o brol-is, tėv-ai, kel-i*
arrive.PST.3 1SG-GEN brother-NOM.SG parents-NOM.PL some-NOM.PL
vaikyst-ės draugai ir visoki-ų kit-ų
childhood-GEN.SG friend:**NOM.PL** **and** various-**GEN.PL** other-**GEN.PL**
sveči-ų
guest-**GEN.PL**
'My brother, parents, some friends from childhood, and various other guests have arrived.'

Otherwise, only those constituents may be coordinated that "have an identical dependence relation to their head" (Ambrazas et al. 2006: 460), cf. ungrammatical (4) with an attempt to coordinate the beneficiary and the theme:

(4) *Nusipirkau* ***bandel-ę*** **ir* ***tėv-ui***
buy.PST.1SG roll-ACC.SG *and father-DAT
[Intended meaning] 'I bought a roll for my father.'

This example would have been fully grammatical if the two NPs were not coordinated. Moreover, it makes a certain type of participants indistinguishable with regard to their encoding. Thus, a subset of S and O – to use Comrie (1978)'s well-known labels –morphosyntactically pattern alike (S-split), which is by no means typical for an accusative language such as Lithuanian.

The paper is structured as follows. First, I will discuss the quantificational and determination properties of the IPG (Section 2). Section 3 deals with its interaction with the aspectual and actional properties of the verb. Finally, Section 4 discusses the reasons for the generalization and lexicalization of the IPG in the constructions with an intensional predicate. Finally, Section 5 draws some conclusions.

2. Implicit quantifier

2.1 Evidence for an implicit quantifier

In what follows I will assume that the IPG evokes a quantifier/determiner (henceforth: *Q*) following the analogous analysis of the Russian IPG in Pesetsky (1982), Neidle (1988), to mention but a few. Consider example in (2) (repeated here for convenience as (5)):

(5) *Nusipirkau pien-o ir bandel-ę*
Buy.PST.1SG milk-GEN.SG and roll-ACC.SG
'I bought milk and a roll.'

What is the reason for choosing the IPG marking of the first object NP and accusative marking with the second object NP? As regards the second NP the answer is simple: singular discrete entities cannot be marked by the IPG in Lithuanian by definition; if they are, alternatively and exceptionally, they will be coerced into a mass noun reading.[3] Thus, there is no meaningful alternation available with

3. Cf. *O pyragėlio pageidausit?* [But pie.GEN.SG wish.FUT.2SG] 'Would you like some pie?' (http://www.lastfm.de/user/SkyBlueEyed4eve). Here, the NP *pyragėlis* 'pie' is treated as a mass noun and not as a discrete count noun.

singular discrete referents (with some very few exceptions, see *temporary transfer* in examples (51)–(52) below).[4]

The situation is, however, different with the first object NP, which allows both IPG and the functionally (but not morphologically) unmarked accusative. One of the functions of the IPG is to cause its NP to be marked as quantificational, with an inherent indefinite quantity and, consequently, indefinite reference. That is to say, there is an implicit quantifier/determiner that implies an indefinite quantity of individuals, the references of which are also indefinite (cf. English *some*). For the sake of clarity, I will assume that the IPG evokes an implicit quantifier *Q* which has an indeterminate value by default, that is to say, in the lack of some other overt quantifier present in the clause. Otherwise, it assumes the value of that overt quantifier and (in many instances) becomes also syntactically dependent on that quantifier.

The assumption of an implicit quantifier evoked by the IPG finds support from those verbs that require their arguments to be quantified. Here, the IPG patterns with NPs having an overt quantifier or measure phrase. Thus, the IPG is triggered by such quantifiers incorporated by the verb as: *pri-*, *at-*, *per-* meaning 'a lot' as well as *už-* 'a little bit' (in the relevant meaning of these prefixes) – often only in combination with the reflexive suffix/prefix *-si-*, cf. *už-si-kąsti duonos* 'to eat bread (IPG) a little bit', *per-si-valgyti obuolių* 'overeat apples (IPG)' (Ambrazas et al. 2006: 503). In addition, there is a number of verbs that typically take a measure phrase such as *stokoti* 'to lack', *trūkti* 'to lack', *užtekti* 'to have enough of', *mažėti* 'to decrease', *daugėti* 'to increase', etc. The semantics of these verbs leads to a straightforward syntactic dependency such that verbs like *pri-važiuoti* 'to arrive massively' can occur with partitive-genitive-marked subjects only (cf. Wiemer & Bjarnadóttir, this volume):

(6) *Pri-važiavo* *žmoni-ų* / **žmon-ės*
QUANT-drive.PST.3 people-GEN.PL / *people-NOM.PL
'There have arrived a lot of people.'

Contrast (6) with the same verb *važiuoti* but without the quantifier:

(7) *Važiavo* **žmoni-ų* / *žmon-ės*
drive.PST.3 *people-GEN.PL / people-NOM.PL
'People drove/rode.'

4. This is different in Russian, where there is a meaningful alternation available in the context of negation and a number of intensional verbs. Lithuanian, by contrast, has generalized the IPG here (see Kuryłowicz 1971).

Such verbs as *pri-važiavo* do not allow non-quantified arguments: the nominative *žmonės* makes the sentence in (6) ungrammatical. At the same time, an NP with an overt quantifier such as *daug* 'many' or a measure phrase (in the nominative case) such as *(pilnas) kiemas* 'full yard' are fully regular:

(8) *Piln-as kiem-as žmoni-ų pri-važiavo*
full-NOM yard-NOM people-GEN.PL QUANT-drive.PST.3
'There have arrived a full yard of people.'

(9) *Daug žmoni-ų pri-važiavo*
many people-GEN.PL QUANT-drive.PST.3
'There have arrived a lot of people.'

The restriction is not conditioned morphologically, since the measure phrase *Pilnas kiemas* in (8) is nominative subject of the verb.

There is, however, one restriction on the use of partitive genitive with overt quantifiers: the reference of the NP – whether with or without an overt quantifier or measure phrase – must be indefinite as in (6), (8) and (9). Formally speaking, the IPG introduces here a variable that is bound by an existential quantifier by default, if there are no explicit quantifiers or measure phrases in the clause. If there is an overt quantifier, this variable is bound by the latter, e.g., by the one incorporated in the verb as in (6), by an overt quantifier as in (9), or by a measure phrase as in (8).

This being said, I will not dwell any longer on overt quantifiers triggering the partitive genitive, since these instances do not represent an independent partitive genitive taking part in a meaningful alternation with one of the structural cases.

2.2 Values of the implicit quantifier/determiner

Recall that the value of the implicit quantifier is vague – which is expected given that it does not have an overt realization:

(10) *Aš nusipirkau bandeli-ų*
1SG.NOM bought roll-GEN.PL
'I bought some rolls.'

The participant encoded by the IPG has inherently narrower scope with other operators, cf. the universal quantifier *visur* 'everywhere' in the following example. Here, the reading under which there would be everywhere one and the same group of *mistakes* (i.e. *specific mistakes*) is excluded:

(11) *Paklaustas, kokios klaidos lėmė jo pralaimėjimą, Mindaugas sakė:*
asked which mistakes decided his losing Mindaugas said
"*Visur buvo klaid-ų. Atsiprašau, vėliau pakalbėsim.*"
everywhere be.PST.3 mistake-GEN.PL excuse_me later talk.FUT.1PL
'As he was asked about which mistakes decided his failure, Mindaugas said: "Mistakes were everywhere. Excuse me, let us discuss (this) later."'[5]

Even though the value of Q remains vague, it has certain restrictions:

a. it is not compatible with contexts where it would have the value of 'one' item from a set, even though logically and historically (cf. Seržant 2012a) this might have been possible, cf. (12) below;
b. in some instances, it has become incompatible with contexts where it would have an unbounded quantity value (to be explained below).

As to (a), contrast the following example from Ancient Greek, where the IPG allows the value *one* (Seržant 2012a):

(12) *Adrḗst-oio égēme thygatr-õn* (Ancient Greek[6])
Adrastos-GEN.SG marry.AOR.3SG daughter-GEN.PL
'He married **a** daughter of Adrastos.' (Hom. *Il.* 14.121)

Now I turn to (b), which is a more complicated issue. I assume that the implicit quantifier evoked by the IPG generally may have two readings:

i. *bounded indeterminate reading*
ii. *unbounded indeterminate reading*

The unbounded indeterminate reading is found when, literally, no boundaries for the quantity implied are set, neither on the upper nor on the bottom edge. Here, the IPG denotes only the concept or *sort* of things (a non-technical term used in McNally 1998) that are involved in the situation referred to by the verb. On this reading, the characteristic properties of the respective kind are crucial for the discourse, rather than a particular set of instantiations thereof. Naturally, denoting just a concept and providing just for the properties of the participant, it cannot have a specific quantity value. The unbounded value is a non-specific indefinite reading with no existential commitments.

The bounded reading, in turn, implies certain boundaries on the quantity of the individuals, even though these boundaries are not stated explicitly and

5. http://www.mamosdienorastis.lt/?p=6&sub=4137&pr=80.

6. The source language is indicated only for the non-Lithuanian examples.

remain vague. On this reading, there is a particular, finite set of individuals/entities that cannot be extended (non-cumulative[7]). This reading is an existential, indefinite plural reading. In contrast to the unbounded reading, the participant introduced by the IPG on this reading can be anaphorically picked up in the following discourse.

Essentially, these readings are not just two different interpretations that can be disambiguated only pragmatically or contextually. There are certain grammatical contexts – as will be shown below – that display only one of these two readings.

In what follows I will elaborate on this distinction between two different readings with examples and further details.

2.2.1 *Bounded indeterminate reading*

Consider example (13) (about the airplane crash with the former Polish president) featuring the bounded indefinite reading:

(13) *Nustatyt-a, kad kabinoje buvo* ***asmenų,*** *kurie*
ascertained-PPP-N that in_cabin be.PST.3 person.GEN.PL who
ne-buvo įgul-os nari-ai. ***Vien-o*** *bals-as*
NEG-be.PST.3 crew-GEN.SG member-NOM.SG one-GEN.SG voice-NOM.SG
identifikuo-t-as, ***kit-ą*** *ar* ***kit-us*** *turi*
identify-PPP-NOM.SG.M other-ACC.SG or others-ACC.PL must.PRS.3
nustatyti Lenkij-o specialist-ai.
identify.INF Poland-GEN.SG expert-NOM.SG
'It has been ascertained that there were persons in the cabin who weren't crew members. One (person)'s voice has been identified, the other or the others will be identified by the Polish experts.'[8]

The quantity of the persons that must have been in the cabin before the crash is delimited (bounded) and individuated as the following clauses imply. The IPG invokes here a bounded or delimited set from which individuals can be discursively accessed. This is evinced by the anaphoric reference *vieno (balsas)* '(the voice) of one [person]' as well as by *kitą* 'other' and *kitus* 'others' that directly refer to voices but indirectly to the respective persons with these voices, that is, to particular members of the set. Notably, the semantics of the IPG is ambiguous in the first sentence of this example between the bounded and unbounded readings.

---

7. *x* is cumulative if: *x* plus *x* is also *x* (e.g., *apples* plus *apples* are also *apples*) (Quine 1960: 19; Krifka 1989: 39; Kiparsky 1998).

8. http://www.15min.lt/naujiena/aktualu/pasaulis/kaczynskio-lektuvo-kabinoje-pries-pat-katastrofa-buvo-zmoniu-kurie-nebuvo-igulos-nariai-nustate-tyrejai-57-99670

The bounded reading can only be assumed on the basis of the context provided by the second sentence.

The situation is somewhat different in examples (14) and (15). Here, it is the telic predicate in the past tense that requires or triggers the bounded reading of the object *seeds*, because the action of *buying* has been accomplished and another action is being carried out (*scatter* and *cook,* respectively), which can only be interpreted in such a way that only a particular set/number of seeds has been affected. Here, the IPG creates a set of individuals that are picked up in the next clause by the anaphoric pronoun although the very referents remain indefinite throughout the discourse:

(14) *Nu-pirkau gėli-ų* ***sėkl-ų*** *ir* ***jas*** *palei*
TEL-buy.1SG flower-GEN.PL **seed-GEN.PL** and **3.ACC.PL.F** along
keli-ą išbėriau
road-ACC.SG scatter.PST.1SG
'I bought [some] flower **seeds** and scattered **them** at the edge of the road.'[9]

(15) *Mam-a davė pači-os* ***užaugint-ų***
Mum-NOM.SG give.PST.3 self-GEN.SG.F cultivate.PPP-**GEN.PL**
pomidor-ų, *iš-spaudžiau* ***juos*** *ir netyčia*
tomato-**GEN.PL** TEL-press.PST.1SG **3.ACC.PL.M** and accidentally
išviriau skani-ą sriub-ą.
cook.PST.1SG tasty-ACC.SG.F soup-ACC.SG
'My mother gave me [some] **tomatoes** which she herself had grown, I pressed **them** and accidentally cooked a tasty soup.'[10]

The quantity of the individuals implied is consequently particular/delimited, non-cumulative: in (14), the speaker has bought a particular amount of flower seeds and no more than this, while the very amount – being irrelevant for the discourse – remains backgrounded, implicit and indeterminate. Example (15) is fully analogous. Differently from (14) and (15), the predicate in (13) does not have such an entailment on its subject and may readily take an unbounded subject as well. Indeed, it does so in the examples immediately below in (18).

Before I turn to the discussion of the unbounded reading in the next subsection, I briefly touch upon the examples in which the anaphora itself is embedded under the IPG:

9. http://www.inspiration.lt/2010/03/netobulas-asotis/

10. http://m.lrytas.lt/-11746027321172481245-p2-laim%C4%97s-akimirkos-%C5%A1uolyje-%C4%AF-bedugn%C4%99.htm

(16) … *burokėli-ų* *sriub-a,* *apie* *kuri-ą* *rašei*
beet-GEN.PL soup-NOM.SG$_i$ about which-ACC.SG.F write.PST.2SG
po *Naujamečio* *iš-viriau* ***jos*** *ir* *aš* *dabar*
after New-Year TEL-cook.PST.1SG **3SG.GEN.F$_i$**, also I now
'… the beet soup, about which you wrote after New Year. I have also cooked **it** now.'[11]

It is obvious that the person did not cook exactly the instance that is referred to in the preceding clause. The pronoun *jos* 'of it' anaphorically refers back not to the instance but to the kind of soup introduced by the first clause; it can be rendered literally by 'I cooked some of that sort of soup'. The predicate *iš-viriau* 'I have cooked' due to its telicity requires boundedness on its object – as in (14) and (15). The IPG extracts a delimited set of the kind introduced by the NP *burokėlių sriuba* 'beet soup' in the preceding clause. Crucially, the IPG *jos* is not a presupposition here, since the specific portion of the soup that has been cooked is not introduced previously in the discourse and cannot be accessed by general world knowledge. The following example is analogous:

(17) *Tauragės tinklinio komanda … į Kroatiją vyko už savo asmenines lėšas.*
"Iš *kur* *jie* *gavo* ***tų*** ***pinig-ų,***
From where 3.NOM.SG.M get.PST.3 **this.GEN.PL** **money-GEN.PL**
mes visai nesidomėjome."
'The basketball team of Tauragė went to Croatia on its private funds. From where did they get **that money**, we didn't ask at all.'[12]

Here again, the IPG embeds the definite DP *tie pinigai* 'these (NOM) money (NOM)' that in itself *is* presuppositional and referring back to the kind *asmenines lėšas* 'private funds' introduced in the preceding clause. In the output, in turn, *tų pinigų* 'of that money' evokes a delimited set out of this presupposed kind being itself not presupposed or definite. Again, it can be rendered by lit. 'where did they get some of that sort of money'.

Crucially, the IPG-marked object never constitutes primary information in the discourse, even in these instances, where its referent is stored in the model and picked up anaphorically in the following clauses. Thus, the exact money that has been used to cover the travel expenses to Croatia in (17), the very portion of the soup that has been cooked in (16) as well as those seeds that have been

11. http://gyvenimas.delfi.lt/receptai/article.php?id=8417053&com=1&s=2&no=120#ixzz2Iey3ZcHJ

12. http://www.aspauda.lt/repository/silokarcema/pagegiu%20archyvas%20PDF/2009-06-30%207-8.pdf

scattered along the road in (14) themselves do not constitute central information of the respective discourses. In (17), for example, the stress is on the information that it was private and not public money, and, in (16), the sort of the soup is relevant and not its particular instantiation that has been cooked.[13]

To conclude, the IPG itself cannot anaphorically pick up a discursively presupposed participant in its output, but it can take presupposed referents (typically kinds) as its input.

2.2.2 *Unbounded indeterminate reading*

Now I turn to the unbounded indeterminate reading. Consider examples (18) and (19), where the IPG introduces a particular kind of people described by the relative clause:

(18) ***Yra*** ***toki-ų*** ***žmoni-ų,*** *kur-iems* *gali*
be.PRS.3 such-GEN.PL people-GEN.PL whom-DAT.PL.M can.PRS.2SG
ne-rašyti ne-skambinti, ne-sikalbėti
NEG-write.INF NEG-phone.INF NEG-speak.INF
ir jie vis tiek bus patys artimiausi. Taip, ne?
'There are **such people** that you don't have to write to, to call, to speak with, and they will nevertheless be the closest to you. Isn't it so?'[14]

(19) *Kiekvien-as* *mūsų* *pažįsta* ***žmoni-ų,*** *kurie*
each-NOM.SG.M 1PL.GEN know.PRS.3 **people-GEN.PL** who-NOM.PL.M
yra *liekn-i,* *nors* *nuolat* *kemša.*
be.PRS.3 slim-NOM.PL.M though constantly gobble.PRS.3
šokolad-ą
chocolate-ACC.SG
Dažnai slapta net pykstame ant jų ar likimo, kad ne visi gali valgyti tai, ką nori, ir nestorėti.[15]
'Each of us knows **people** who are slim, although they constantly consume chocolate. We are often even secretly annoyed by them or by the fate that not everyone can eat whatever (s)he would want to and not get fat.'

These examples do not imply any restriction as to quantity and cumulativity holds. There might be just one individual or two hundred of them who would all satisfy

---

13. This has also been claimed in Seržant (2012b) for the IPG in Ancient Greek, where it seems to have primarily backgrounding function.

14. http://www.formspring.me/r/yra-toki-moni-kuriems-gali-nera-yti-neskambinti-nesikalb-ti-ir-jie-vis-tiek-bus-patys-artimiausi-taip-ne/350581344012617113?switch=hidden

15. http://www.lrytas.lt/gyvenimo-budas/tarp-musu/?p=3

the description given in (18) or (19). Existential sentences as in (18) or (19) assert existence of particular kinds/subkinds, i.e. *good people* or *slim people*. This can be tested by modifying the sentence as 'There is such a **kind/sort** of people whom …' for (18) and 'Each of us knows the **kind/sort** of people that are …'. This insertion does not change the meaning of the sentences or, at most, slightly. The IPG-marked NPs here evoke characteristic properties related to those kinds while they do not zoom in on particular instantiations. This reading of the IPG somewhat resembles NPs used predicatively, which also do not introduce a set of individuals but rather refer to the characteristics that a particular referent is equated with. The NP just provides the concept (cf. the property <e, t> type in Partee 1986, suggested for the genitive of negation in Russian in Partee & Borschev 2004; Kagan 2005; Borschev et al. 2008).

Observe the scopal interpretation of the IPG in example (19) with regard to the universal quantifier *kiekvienas* 'every/each': if taken as a quantity/set – since there are most probably different sets of *slim people* that each of the persons addressed might know (even if somewhat intersecting) – it has narrow scope. However, if taken as a kind, it has wide scope, since everyone knows one and the same kind of *slim people* (cf. McNally 1998: 359). The latter interpretation is even more likely in (19) and, hence, the kind analysis of the IPG. The reason is that it is the kind interpretation that is anaphorically picked up in the following discourse by the third person pronoun *jie* 'they' in (18) and *jų* 'them' in (19). If their antecedent, the IPG would have introduced sets of instantiations of the kind that *each of us* knows, one would expect these instantiations to be picked up by the personal pronouns, as in the case of the bounded reading in (13) or (14) above. However, in this is not the case in (19) where the pronouns obviously refer to the kind *slim people*.

Typical for the unbounded reading is the use of the abstract nouns with lexically empty verbs, quite parallel to light-verb constructions in other languages. Here it is only the noun that provides lexical information about the action. I mentioned above the following predicate:

(20) *Svarbiausia* ***turėti*** ***kantryb-ės*** *ir* *treniruotis.*
Important.SUPER.N have.INF patience-GEN.SG and train.INF
'The most important thing is to be patient and to train.'[16]

Thus, Ambrazas et al. (2006: 511) state that the construction *turėti* (lit.) 'to have' plus abstract noun in genitive constitute the general pattern, cf. *turėti reikšmės* (lit.

16. http://www.valstietis.lt/Pradzia/Laisvalaikis/Pramogos/Ugnies-sou-su-balandziais-ir-Isjunk-sviesa

'to have significance.GEN') 'to be of significance. If these nouns get modified by an adjective, however, then the accusative case-marking is preferred:

(21) *Tai turi reikšm-ės*
this have.PRS.3 significance-GEN.SG
'This is of importance.'

(22) *Tai turi didel-ę reikšm-ę*
this have.PRS.3 big-ACC.SG significance-ACC.SG
'This is of great importance.'

This is probably because the modification endows the referent of the NP with more individuation and, hence, the accusative is more preferable here. Note that semantically examples with the IPG can be interpreted as patterning somewhat with object incorporation. The object is disindividualized, it cannot be focused on its own (only the whole VP may be in focus), it constitutes one lexical meaning and one predicate with the lexically empty verb *turėti*. The insertion of a modifying adjective as in example (22) splits up the incorporation and, hence, non-incorporating accusative marking is preferable.

The kind or concept interpretation of the IPG NP on the unbounded reading is supported by its compatibility with adjectives taking kinds as their complements such as *visoks* 'any/different kinds of' or *įvairius* 'various':

(23) *Visoki-ų laik-ų užėjo*
any-GEN.PL time-GEN.PL come_up.PST.3
'There were all sorts of times.' (LKŽ, vide sub *užeiti*)

Note that these adjectives predominantly modify kinds due to their lexical semantics. The speaker of (23) does not speak about an indefinite number of periods in a purely temporal sense as non-diverse entities of the same sort but rather about different *kinds* of periods. In a sense, these adjectives modify the concept of the NP 'time' and not its particular instantiations.

2.2.3 *Bounded vs. unbounded indeterminate readings, summing up*

To summarize, the bounded indeterminate reading (henceforth: *the bounded reading*) is an indefinite plural or existential reading that denotes a set of individuals (analogously for mass nouns: a limited quantity of parts of a mass), while the unbounded indeterminate reading (henceforth: *the unbounded reading*) does not evoke any particular set. Instead, I assume that it just provides the concept or a description of a particular kind of the participant. On this kind-reading, it can be treated as a kind-individual, as can be observed from examples like (19), in which it is anaphorically picked up in the following discourse, or examples like

(11), in which as a kind-individual it has wide scope with regard to a quantifier. While this reading allows referring to the kind of the respective NP, it cannot have generic interpretation (as kinds typically have), because the situations described in the examples above are not about *all* or nearly *all* individuals fitting the description of that kind. In the latter conditions, nominative/accusative case has to be used. Seržant (2012b) argues that the IPG of Ancient Greek functions quite like a restrictive relative clause – it restricts the kind of the respective participant. Generics, in turn, provide kind reference by virtue of the totality of the members of the kind. Thus, a typical test for kinds of this type is its compatibility with such predicates as 'to die out'. Here, the judgement about the kind is logically derived from the judgements about all its members (a kind dies out only if *all* its members die out).

However, similar to generics, this reading is also unbounded, since there is no requirement for a particular limit of potential individuals. To use a metaphor for the unbounded reading, the description of the participant remains on a high zoom-out level "not seeing" the particular individuals but only their concept.

I have noted above that, for many occurrences, distinctions between the two readings are typically provided only by context. The optionality crucially hinges upon whether or not the predicate allows both readings. Thus, telic predicates denoting accomplished actions are compatible with the bounded reading only, while atelic predicates such as *pažinti* 'to know' or *būti* 'to be, to exist' allow both readings and further context is needed to disambiguate them. This situation is somewhat reminiscent of the Carlsonian unified analysis of English bare plurals (Carlson 1977) that also may have two different readings very much dependent on whether the predicate may have the *individual-level* (generic) interpretation or not, contrast the generic reading in (24) *vs*. the indefinite plural reading in (25):

(24) *Horses are smart.*

(25) *Horses ran into the lake.*

On Carlson's (1977) unified account English bare plurals encode only kinds, while there is a realization relation that derives the existential indefinite plural reading such as (25) from the unified kind reading, taking into account the individual *vs*. stage level value of the predicate (I skip the formalism). The existential quantifier is provided by the verb in instances like (25) and does not stem from the NP itself, which is thus the same in both (25) and (24) as to its referential properties. This is furthermore an elegant explanation for why the bare NPs always take narrow scope with regard to other quantifiers in the sentence: since the existential quantifier comes from the predicate, it is naturally within the same scope as the verb with respect to other quantifiers such as, e.g., negation.

Thus, a question would be legitimate about whether there might be a unified analysis for both the unbounded, kind/concept reading and the indefinite plural, bounded reading of the Lithuanian IPG in the same vein. Note, however, that not only the bounded reading but also the unbounded reading – contrary to the English bare plurals – cannot have the property of inclusiveness (totality) and, hence, does not have the generic reading, unlike the English bare plurals (the respective structural case is mandatory here in Lithuanian). Furthermore, as I will show below (Section 3.2) in more detail, the two readings of the IPG are not in complementary distribution across the Lithuanian predicates, unlike the two readings of the English bare plurals. Crucially, while the bounded reading is found to interact with the boundedness value of the incremental-theme verbs, this is not true for the unbounded reading, which is found only with NP-internal functions. The VP-related functions of the IPG are mainly found with incremental-theme verbs. Here, one might expect to find the unbounded reading of the IPG in the progressive reading of the verb, because progressive itself does not impose any boundary on the event, nor – with incremental-theme verbs – on the object NP (cf. English *I am eating sandwiches*). However, the unbounded reading is blocked, the accusative case-marking being the only option here in Lithuanian (differently from Finnish).

3. Implicit quantifier and aspect

In the examples above, the implicit quantifier *Q* is a typical D(eterminer)-quantifier (term introduced in Löbner 1985, Partee 1995) with regard to its domain of application, i.e., a quantifier that applies internally to its host XP. However, with some incremental-theme verbs and, dialectally, with some verbs of transfer (see example (51) below), this quantifier interacts with the actional properties of the verb in a uniform way, thus patterning rather as an A(dverb)-quantifier here (term introduced in Löbner 1985; Partee 1995). The implicit quantifier Q here undergoes a development otherwise well-established with overt quantifiers that start out as D-quantifiers but develop into A-quantifiers and not vice versa (cf. Keenan & Paperno 2012), cf. D in *I ate* ***a little bit*** *of the cake vs.* A in *I ate the cake* ***a little bit****.*

Before I turn to the discussion of the data (Section 3.2), I introduce the notional inventory on aspect and actionality – just as much as will be necessary for the present paper – in Section 3.1.

3.1 Extending (un)boundedness onto the verbal domain

3.1.1 *Actionality vs. aspect in narrow sense*

I adhere to the bidimensional approach to aspectuality (Bertinetto 1997; Smith 1997; Sasse 2002; just to mention a few). That is, I distinguish between the viewpoint aspect or ASPECT$_1$ (as per Sasse 2002) and actionality (also termed, e.g., Aktionsart or ASPECT$_2$ in Sasse 2002). Crucially, both dimensions operate with boundaries of an event: while actionality is about inherent (cf., inter alia, Depraetere 1995) or intrinsic (Sasse 2002) boundaries, viewpoint aspect is about temporal or *established boundaries* (Sasse 2002: 205–206). Actionality refers to the inherent organization of an event such as referred to by Vendler's classes (*activity, achievement, accomplishment* or *state,* Vendler 1957[1967]) and their various subsequent modifications as well as by such compositional properties as *telicity* (telic vs. atelic) or *dynamicity*.

The viewpoint aspect (ASPECT$_1$ in Sasse 2002), in turn, refers to the properties that the speaker establishes in a particular utterance and that pertain to such domains as discourse organization or pragmatics and not to the semantics of the event itself. Traditionally, one distinguishes the *perfective* and *imperfective* aspect here. The former implies that a particular event is represented as included into the reference point of the narration, while the latter entails that it is the reference point that is included into the duration of the event, or, more precisely, the imperfective is often simply non-committal as to its temporal delimitation. In other words, the event is either represented as not delimited or, minimally, as non-committal with regard to its boundaries.

Lithuanian does not have morphological means to encode viewpoint aspect, which therefore can only be disambiguated contextually (cf. Arkadiev 2011 and the literature therein). In what follows I will refer to viewpoint aspect in the sense of a contextually inferred interpretation.

The imperfective viewpoint can invoke different interpretations of the simple, non-derived verb in Lithuanian. Thus, such a form as *valg-o* (eat-PRES.3) 'eats/is eating' can have an episodic (actual) *progressive* interpretation 'is eating' if so required by the context, e.g., by the subjunction *kol* 'while'. It can, furthermore, have non-episodic interpretations such as *generic* ('John eats sandwiches') or *habitual* ('John eats sandwiches every morning'). To this extent, the Lithuanian verb is ambiguous. Notably, there are morphological means to derive dedicated habitual or iterative verbal stem formations, for instance, *valg-y-dav-o* (eat-#-ITER-PST.3) 'ate regularly'. These belong primarily to the domain of actionality (ASPECT$_2$) and are not dependent on the choice of the viewpoint, although there is some systematic affinity between such actional classes as, e.g., *habituals* or *states* and the imperfective viewpoint, as is well known (cf. Sasse 2002: 210). I will discuss these derivations in more detail in a separate Section 3.3 below.

In what follows I will briefly describe the framework that allows establishing a link between the nominal quantificational properties and such properties of the verb (Section 3.1.2). Then, I will turn to the discussion of the data (Section 3.2). Even though Lithuanian does not have dedicated markers for the viewpoint aspect (cf. Arkadiev 2011), as it will turn out from the discussion of the data, the viewpoint interpretation of the verb is relevant for the assignment rules of the IPG with incremental-theme verbs in Lithuanian as well as with transfer verbs in East Lithuanian.

3.1.2 *Aspect, actionality and the interaction with the object*

In general, it is a well-known fact that certain verbs allow their objects to determine their actional class (ASPECT$_2$ property), being themselves ambiguous between *accomplishments* or *activities* (Verkuyl's generalization in 1972), cf. English:

(26) *He ate apples*

(27) *He ate the apples*

The lack of a boundary in the object NP *apples* in (26) makes the whole VP *to eat apples* pattern with activities such as *to work*, e.g., with respect to the commonly used tests like *in an hour/for an hour*. The opposite is true of (27). Here, the delimited NP *the apples* supplies an inherent endpoint and the whole VP *to eat the apples* becomes an accomplishment. In other words, the delimitation of the object NP is projected on the verb, or, alternatively, the delimitation of the object NP disambiguates the accomplishment reading of the verb *to eat*, while lack of such a delimitation features the activity reading of this verb (Tenny 1992: 5). In any event, we observe that the quantificational value of the object NP is mirrored by the verb and, hence, becoming the value of the whole VP.

Now, the case with the IPG in Lithuanian is not fundamentally different from what we observe in the English examples above: the quantificational value of the IPG is rendered by the verb and, consequently, by the whole VP here. However, before I come to the presentation of the data illustrating this point, I first introduce a framework that will allow interaction between the quantificational properties of the object NP and the aspectual and actional interpretation of its verb and, consequently, VP.

Since the majority of the verbs to be discussed in Section 3.2 are incremental-theme verbs (cf. Krifka 1989, term coined in Dowty 1991), some remarks on this type of event encoding are in order. Incremental-theme verbs are typically accomplishment verbs that establish a so-called homomorphic relationship with their object NPs; this entails that every subpart of the event the verb denotes is unique, and is coupled with a particular unique subpart of the object NP (Krifka

1992: 39). Thus, in a sentence like *John ate the roll* every specific subpart of the roll corresponds to a specific subpart of the event of eating. The object is said to 'measure out' the event (Tenny 1994). From this it naturally follows that, if the incremental theme is bounded, then the event in itself is also bounded. The typical incremental-theme verbs that I will be dealing with below are consumption verbs *valgyti* 'to eat', *gerti* 'to drink' or verbs of creation like *virti* 'to cook'.

I believe that this relation holding between the object and the predicate with the incremental-theme verbs has been transferred to other predicates and their subjects or objects that are not typical incremental-theme verbs to begin with. To give an example, consider example (6) repeated here as (28) for convenience:

(28) *Pri-važiavo* *žmoni-ų* / **žmon-ės*
QUANT-drive.PST.3 people-GEN.PL / *people-NOM.PL
'There have arrived a lot of people / too many people.'

In this example the relationship between the verb and the object is read into a homomorphic one – the subparts/subsets of the subject *žmonių* 'people' can be mapped onto the subevents of the arrivals. The verb requires its IPG subject NP to have distributive reading while the collective reading is blocked. That is to say, different sets of people correspond to particular arrivals: e.g., first came John and Mary, then came a neighbor and some other people, etc., finally, too many people arrived and the inherent endpoint *massive arrival* has been achieved. The very event of arrival is not typically homomorphic not only with singular subjects and collective plurals but also with distributive plurals, since the regular verb *to arrive* is accomplished with every subpart of such a subject, and there is no inherent endpoint of a higher level comprising different arrivals like in the Lithuanian example above, cf. *Several well-known linguists have arrived.*

I suggest, following Kiparsky (1998)'s argumentation on Finnish, that these are the incremental-theme verbs that gave rise to instances with an interaction between the object quantifier and the actionality of the VP found with *temporal transfer* in Eastern Lithuanian (to be discussed below, cf. example (51)) or in Finnish examples like (34) (below). There is no homomorphic relationship between the verb and its object in these instances, but the object quantifier nevertheless quantifies over the predicate in the way the quantifier of an incremental theme object measures the event.

In order to be able to account for the Lithuanian data presented in the next subsection, I have to adopt an approach that would be able to model the interaction found between some verbs and their objects. I am not going to discuss possible options of the syntactic implementation of such an interaction. In formal approaches, such an interaction will assume a node where the quantificational

properties of the verb and those of the object will interact, generating the aspectual and actional interpretation of the whole clause. This, in turn, presupposes that the aspectual and actional values of the predicate, on the one hand, and the quantificational properties of the object NP (or, where necessary, also of the subject NP), on the other, must be compatible with each other in order to yield a common interpretation of the whole sentence. Such a parallelism between the quantification of the event structure and of the nominal has been argued for in the literature (cf., inter alia, Verkuyl 1972; Krifka 1989, 1992; Filip 1989; Kiparsky 1998; Borer 2005 and most recently Champollion 2010).

One of the most influential approaches which integrates event structure quantification and NP quantification is Kiparsky (1998). Kiparsky's concern is primarily to account for the assignment of the partitive case – as opposed to the accusative case (traditionally, genitive) – in Finnish. His main claim is that the *unboundedness* of the VP is the discriminating factor that requires the assignment of the partitive case to the object NP, whereas boundedness motivates accusative. According to Kiparsky, a VP is unbounded if the predicate and/or the object is unbounded. There are verbs that are inherently unbounded (such as psych verbs) and, hence, inherently take the partitive case, while there are accomplishment verbs that alternate between partitive and accusative giving rise to unbounded and bounded interpretations, respectively. Kiparsky (1998) defines *unboundedness* as follows: a predicate or NP is unbounded "iff it is *cumulative*, *divisive* and not *diverse*" (I skip the formulaic definitions):

(29) *Unboundedness: cumulative*, *divisive* and not *diverse*
x is cumulative if: *x* plus *x* is also *x* (e.g., *apples* plus *apples* are also *apples*);
x is divisive if: any subpart of *x* is also *x* (e.g., a subpart of *apples* is also *apples*);
x is diverse if: *x* is not atomic and its members are not related by a subpart relation (e.g., *one apple* is not diverse).

Indeed, this approach has a number of advantages: it coherently accounts for most of the instances of the partitive case assignments in Finnish and, crucially, it provides a unified model for the verbal and nominal quantification as well as for the interaction between both. Furthermore, it makes an important distinction between *(un)boundedness* and *(a)telicity* that are notoriously used synonymously in the literature (e.g., in Doetjes 1997).

There are, however, some problems with this account which are even more relevant for Lithuanian or Russian than for Finnish. The main problem lies in how it deals with what one might call "restrictedly unbounded" or "weakly bounded" quantities. These are indefinite portions of something: either (i) NPs headed by

such weak quantifiers/determiners as *some,* or (ii) verbs that denote only some portion of an action (by means of their morphology, lexically or contextually), e.g., Lithuanian *pa-valgyti* 'to eat a little bit/somewhat'. Lack of clear-cut, definite boundaries might point to the unboundedness of these portions but, on the other hand, the presence of some – even if vague – cut-off point unequivocally suggests bounded interpretation. I illustrate this in more detail.

Borer (2005) has pointed out that a problem for Kiparsky's approach emerges with such NPs as *apples* and *some apples* which are not explicitly discriminated here, even though both yield contradictory results with regard to the boundedness and telicity value of their VPs, contrast (30) vs. (31):[17]

(30) *He ate apples (for an hour/*in an hour)*

(31) *He ate some apples (in an hour/*for an hour)*

On Kiparsky's approach both NPs are cumulative and not diverse, while their divisiveness value is dependent upon whether or not the singular atoms are included in the set. To give an example, if one assumes a value of *two apples* for *apples* and *some apples,* then both would emerge as non-divisive (since *one apple* fits neither the description *apples* nor the description *some apples*), alternatively, if singular atoms are excluded with both then both become divisive (Borer 2005: 42ff.). Furthermore, a boundary at the upper edge is explicitly claimed with *some apples*, because one cannot infinitely add *some apples* to *some apples* and get a set that would still fit the description of *some apples*. Even though, I concede, this boundary is vague and is subject to an individual interpretation, it nevertheless exists and is explicitly signaled by the quantifier *some*. Thus, if one has *two apples* for *some apples* and add another *some apples,* e.g., also *two apples* then *four apples* might still fit the description of *some apples*. Once, however, one has reached, say, *1000 apples* the description of *some apples* will no longer do, at least, not for most speakers.[18] Note that this is not the case with the description *apples*. There is, thus, a difference between *apples* and *some apples* in terms of boundedness.

Having no distinction between *apples* and *some apples* would predict that both VPs in (30) and (31) must pattern alike. Crucially, only *some apples* yield a telic interpretation of the event, as pointed out in Borer (2005). Any account

17. As Eleanor Coghill pointed out to me (p. c.), the telic reading is somewhat odd, because one usually would not time how long it takes to finish a vague amount of food. Nevertheless, (31) is better with "in an hour" than with "for an hour".

18. Thus, one of the reviewers has pointed out that boundedness of *some* is a matter or pragmatics. I disagree, I believe the exact amount that no longer fits the description of *some* is indeed a matter of personal interpretation. However, the very existence of a boundary with *some* is not a matter of pragmatics or context, but is an inherent semantic property of *some*.

must therefore discriminate between *apples* and *some apples*. Thus, Borer (2005) suggests that bare plural NPs (i.e. the plural marker itself) induce plurality, which excludes atomic members and encompasses only various combinations of several members, while the quantifier *some* includes also the atomic singulars in its set. This makes *some apples* a non-divisive entity (because at least *one apple* cannot have a subpart that would fit the description *some apples*) and *apples* a divisive one. This allows Borer to get the value *bounded* with *some apples* (because it is non-divisive and, hence, violating (29)) and the value *unbounded* with *apples* (because it conforms to (29)). Borer's approach is, however, less compatible with mass nouns quantified by *some* (*some water*), which also yield a telic event interpretation but is unbounded. Additionally, as noted above, I assume that *some apples* is also not cumulative *sensu stricto*.

Be that as it may, on the descriptive level I state that the reading in (30) is to some extent parallel to (but not identical with) the *unbounded reading* of the Lithuanian IPG discussed above. By contrast, (31) is an existential reading evoking a non-empty set of entities (or a set of portions for mass nouns) that have naturally a quantificational value which is expressed by *some*. I suggest that (31) is parallel to the *bounded reading* found with the Lithuanian IPG. Note, however, that the functional overlap between the *unbounded reading* of the Lithuanian IPG and the English bare plurals, on the one hand, and the *bounded reading* with English *some,* on the other hand, is only partial. Thus, English *some,* being an overt expression, can be focused (at least, on its quantifier reading), while the implicit quantifier of the Lithuanian IPG cannot. The implicit quantifier is inherently backgrounded in the discourse – it is referentially so 'weak' that it cannot be a focus on its own. Thus, the question 'How much water did you drink?' cannot be answered by (32) but only by (33):

(32) *Vanden-s išgėriau*
Water-GEN drink.PST.1SG
'I drank [some] water.'

(33) *Šiek tiek truputį vanden-s išgėriau*
some / some water-GEN drank.PST.1SG
'I drank [some] water.'

The utterance in (32) can only be used when the whole VP is in focus, e.g., answering the question 'What did you do?'.

In the same way, the analogy between the bare plurals in English and the unbounded reading of the IPG in Lithuanian is not absolute. Recall that a typical function of English bare NPs is to have a generic reading (cf., *inter alios*, Carlsson 1977). This reading is not available with the IPG; instead the default, structural cases (i.e. the nominative in the subject and accusative in the object position)

have to be used in Lithuanian to denote genericity. The value of a sort of universal quantifier such as *all* is not available with the IPG on any of its readings. The unbounded reading of the IPG is even a weaker reference than that of bare plurals in English. It denotes only the concept and is, in a sense, non-extensional.

I turn back to the notion of (un)boundedness. I have noted above that – as far as Kiparsky's approach is concerned – it is problematic with indefinite plurals/existentials like *some X,* because the latter are bounded portions/sets not only semantically but also with respect to their behavior with other categories such as their contribution to the actionality type. Now, it seems that the same problem also exists with those predicates that morphologically or lexically denote a particular portion/part of an action. In the case of accomplishment verbs, Kiparsky's model predicts correct results only when this portion exhausts the action completely, including the culmination (P-property in Dahl 1981). However, if just a particular portion/part of an accomplishment event or of an activity event is referred to by the predicate, then this portion must intuitively be bounded, but Kiparsky's model treats it as unbounded. Consider the following example from Kiparsky (1998):

(34) *Hän* *avasi* *ikkunaa* (Finnish)
3SG open.PST.3SG window.PART.SG
(i) 'He was opening the window.'
(ii) 'He opened the window (partly).'[19]

Both readings encode an indeterminately quantified action. Crucially, while (i) does not make any commitments as to the boundaries of the event featuring the progressive reading, (ii) does imply such a boundary. Reading (ii) highlights here the delimitative reading (= cessative reading in the Finnish tradition, cf. Huumo 2010: 90). This reading entails that the action has taken place for a while and then has stopped for whatsoever reason without reaching its natural boundary (culmination/telos/inherent endpoint), if such a boundary is implied by the actionality type of the respective verb at all.[20] Now, while reading (i) is perfectly

19. Kiparsky (1998), who cites this example, adduces two other readings available: (iii) 'He opened the window for a while' (cf. *temporary transfer* below) and (iv) 'He opened the window again and again'. Those are, however, not relevant at this point.

20. I will use here the notion *delimitative* adopted in, inter alia, Sasse (2002: 206), first introduced in Maslov (1959). Maslov refers to delimitatives as to *aktionsart* (Russ. 'sposob dejstvija'), i.e. as pertaining to the domain of actionality and not to aspect *sensu stricto*. Delimitatives are typically derived from homogenous non-culminating predicates such as *to walk* or *to sleep* (cf. Mehlig 2006 for this argument on Russian). However, as Mehlig (2006: 253ff.) notes, there is a number of accomplishment verbs like *pisat'* 'to write', *pit'* 'to drink' or even *otkryt'* 'to open'

consistent with Kiparsky's model, reading (ii) suffers from problems similar to the ones mentioned above in relation to the boundedness value of *some apples* in the nominal domain. This reading cannot be regarded as unbounded in any non-theory-dependent sense – it obviously implies certain boundaries, although again, I concede, these boundaries are not definite.[21] It is, therefore, not cumulative, since not every *partly opening the window* plus *partly opening the window* will also yield *partly opening the window.* Consider the situation when the two processes *partly opening the window* have the value of *half-opening the window*. Here the result will no longer fit the description *partly opening the window* but rather the description *completely opening the window*. This is not the place to further discuss the Finnish data but I remark that the discriminating semantic factor in Finnish thus does not seem to be *boundedness* in Kiparsky's terms but rather *totality* as has been claimed in the literature, see Huumo (2010) for the most comprehensive recent account: those VPs that have a positive value of the feature *totality* (*culminating* VPs) mark their objects with accusative, while those that have a negative value thereof use partitive. The feature *totality* (conditionally) implies, of course, the positive value of the feature *boundedness* but not necessarily vice versa as in the case of the delimitatives (no biconditionality).

Similarly, the *partitivity* account adhered to in Filip (1989) or Krifka (1998) is generally coherent, though it faces similar problems. It crucially relies on the notion of *partitivity* that is assumed to be the common feature both of verbal aspects such as progressive and of mass nouns/bare plurals, given that the incremental-theme relation between the object and the verb holds. In Krifka (1998), the imperfective aspect is obtained by extracting some parts from the whole denotational base of a telic verb. Hence the parallelism with nominal partitivity: the imperfective aspect is interpreted here as referring to a part of a telic event in the same way as nominal partitives refer to a part of the NP they embed (cf. Krifka 1998). Again, Finnish data seem to match this account, because it is the partitive case here that yields the progressive interpretation of the event. However, this approach does not take into account the perfective non-accomplished, delimitative readings of the Finnish partitive, as in reading (ii) 'to open the window partly/somewhat' in example (34) above. That is, a part of an event may be either

as well that can be conceptualized as homogenous, if the focus is on the activity taking place before the inherent culmination/endpoint.

21. The lack of definite boundaries might have been the reason for treating it as unbounded. Indeed, to some extent this reading behaves as unbounded: *somewhat opening the window* plus *somewhat opening the window* may also yield *somewhat opening the window*, tests on divisiveness will give analogical results. However, this reading is only restrictedly unbounded and above/below some level it stops being cumulative or divisive, respectively.

bounded (i.e., be temporally delimited) or not. This distinction is less relevant for Finnish but is essential for Lithuanian (and Russian). Thus – as I will show below (Section 3.2) – only if the part of the event encoded by an incremental-theme verb is bounded, may the IPG be used, while if it is unbounded then only accusative can be used in Lithuanian. While essentially correct, the partitivity account in Filip (1989), Krifka (1989) or Kiparsky (1998) is thus not fine-grained enough with respect to aspectuality.

Tatevosov and Ivanov (2009) fix this problem by distinguishing two functions (*operators* in their terms): (a) *non-culmination* (actionality/ASPECT$_2$) and (b) *perfectivity/imperfectivity* (viewpoint aspect/ASPECT$_1$). This decompositional approach is coherent with the data discussed here. At this juncture, there is a way to capture the similarities and differences between the partitive case in Finnish and the IPG in Lithuanian (and Russian). The (a) function always creates *non-culminating accomplishments* in both Lithuanian and Finnish (and also in Russian), but not necessarily imperfective aspect as assumed in Krifka (1998) or progressive as claimed in Filip (1989). This function belongs rather to the domain of actionality and not to the viewpoint aspect, as Tatevosov and Ivanov (2009: 93–95) correctly maintain. This is also intuitively more likely, since the lack of culmination is inherent here to such VPs exactly as the presence of the latter is inherent for the accomplishment VPs. The authors argue that the output of the *non-culmination* function is the input to the *viewpoint aspect* (Tatevosov & Ivanov 2009: 94). Thus, the perfective interpretation is indeed found morphologically marked in Russian as well as contextually disambiguated in Bagwalal (Nakh-Daghestanian, Andic) (Tatevosov & Ivanov 2009: 93–94) and in Finnish with the delimitative readings such as (ii) in (34) above. Furthermore, this account is compatible with the imperfective reading (i) in (34) that for some reason has become more prominent in the literature.[22] The imperfective reading must be analysed as follows: the partitive case is responsible for the actional class of *non-culmination* of the VP, yielding a non-culminating activity VP *to open a window.* Now, this activity VP may occur in an imperfective (e.g. progressive 'I am opening the window') or perfective context (e.g., 'I somewhat opened the window').

For Lithuanian, I argue that not only *unboundedness*$_2$ (cf. Sasse 2002) on the level of actionality, i.e. the *non-culmination* of the VP, is an essential condition but that *boundedness*$_1$ (cf. Sasse 2002: 205–206) induced by the viewpoint perfectivity is equally important, in contrast to Finnish. That is to say, viewpoint *perfectivity* is

22. Cf. also Metslang (2001) on Estonian, who also adheres to a straightforward relationship between the partitive case and imperfectivity. However, what she means here is *non-culmination,* which belongs rather to the domain of actionality (inherent to a VP) and not to the viewpoint aspect.

an equally important parameter for assigning the IPG to the objects of the incremental-theme verbs and temporal transfer besides *non-culmination* (cf. Holvoet 1991 for a similar argument on Polish). Notably, these factors do not play any role for those verbs that do not allow such an interaction between the nominal and verbal partitivity, e.g. the verb *pirkti* 'to buy'. With these verbs the IPG operates NP-internally only, e.g., with *būti* 'to be', *pažinti* 'to know'. Notably, the Finnish synonyms of latter verbs equally do not show any interaction on the VP level.

3.2 Interaction of the predicate and nominal (un)boundedness in Lithuanian

Dahl (1984: 10) argues that the perfective aspect of Russian is incompatible with unbounded objects:

(35) *On* *na-pisal* *pis'm-a* (Russian)
3.NOM.SG.M TEL/PERF-write.PST.SG.M letter-ACC.PL
'He wrote some letters.'
*'He wrote letters.'

In (35), only the bounded reading of the object – 'some letters' – will make a grammatical sentence, while the unbounded reading 'letters' is not possible here. This is because the event of "*writing* is an unbounded activity as long as the object is not delimited in some way" (Dahl 1984: 10). In other words, the incremental-theme verbs require their objects to be bounded in perfective contexts. As I argue below, the situation with the IPG of Lithuanian is fully parallel.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli (2001: 652) argue that aspectual considerations – unlike some other languages of the linguistic area such as Russian or Finnish – are not relevant for the IPG in Lithuanian. Indeed, at first glance, unlike Russian, Lithuanian allows the IPG to occur with both telic (36) and atelic predicates (37) and seems to be independent of the choice of the actionality type, cf. the verb *ger-ti* 'to drink' with telicity overtly marked in (36) by means of the prefix *iš-* as opposed to the morphologically unmarked *gėrė* with no such marking in (37):

(36) *Jis* *iš-gėrė* *vanden-s/vanden-į*
3.NOM.SG.M TEL-drink.PST.3 water-GEN.SG/water-ACC.SG
'He drank up (some) water / water.'

(37) *Jis* *gėrė* *vanden-s/vanden-į*
3.NOM.SG.M drink.PST.3 water-GEN.SG/water-ACC.SG
'He drank (some) water / water.'

However, this is not the whole story. The incremental-theme verbs show that combinations of the IPG with different aspectual readings of the incremental-theme verbs reveal the interaction of the IPG with different viewpoint contexts in Lithuanian. In what follows I will argue that Lithuanian has generalized only the *bounded reading* of the IPG for the interaction with the aspectual properties of the predicate, while the *unbounded reading* is excluded from this interaction function in Lithuanian; the latter remains available only for NP-internal function.

The first evidence comes from delimitatives. Delimitatives are formed by means of the prefix *pa-* in Lithuanian. Delimitatives from incremental-theme verbs typically take IPG-marked objects. Contrast ***pa**-gėrė* in (38) marked explicitly as a delimitative allowing perfective viewpoint contexts only, with its etymological counterpart in (41) that is ambiguous as to its aspectual interpretation:

(38) *Jis* *pa-gėrė* *vanden-s/??vanden-į* *ir*
3.NOM.SG.M DELIM-drink.PST.3 water-GEN.SG/??water-ACC.SG and
išėjo *iš* *virtuvės*
walk_out.PST.3 from kitchen
'He drank water (for a while) and then left the kitchen.'
*'He was drinking (some) water.'

In the context of delimitatives, accusative is restricted to a very specific use, namely, if the ontological class of the NP has to be emphasized (cf. Paykin, forthcoming, on a similar phenomenon in Russian):

(39) *Jon-as* *tris* *dien-as* *pa-gėrė* *vien tik*
John-NOM three.ACC days-ACC.PL DELIM-drink-PST.3 only
vanden-s/vanden-į *ir* *pasveiko*
water-GEN.SG/water-ACC.SG and recovered
'John drank only water for three days and recovered.'

(40) *Kol* *ne-atvežė* *ger-o* *vyn-o,* *jis*
until NEG-deliver.PST.3 good-GEN.SG.M wine-GEN.SG 3.NOM.SG.M
kurį laiką *pa-gėrė* *Kagor-ą*
some_time DELIM-drink.PST.3 Cahors-ACC
'Until a good wine was delivered, he drank Cahors wine for some time.'

Elsewhere, the IPG is the default case-marking with incremental-theme delimitatives, to the extent that no examples with accusative can be obtained from Google search. This is different from the unmarked stem *ger-ti* 'to drink', where accusative is not only used for emphasizing class but also and mainly in imperfective contexts.

(41) *Jis* *gėrė* *vanden-į*
3.NOM.SG.M drink.PST.3 water-ACC.SG
'He drank/drank up/was drinking water / the water / water (and not beer).'

As has been mentioned, delimitatives entail that the process had run for a while and stopped for whatsoever reasons without reaching its natural end (if such an end is presupposed at all). The utterance in (38) is thus bounded, but the boundary is arbitrary and does not coincide with the intrinsic boundary (culmination). It is a non-culminating bounded or perfective event. There is thus a sort of 'agreement' between the indefinite *bounded reading* of the object 'some water' and the bounded reading of the predicate that equally does not provide a definite temporal boundary. Additionally, both the predicate and the object agree in their non-commitment to the full exhaustiveness (*culmination* for the verb and *inclusiveness* for the object). To further test the hypothesis about the necessity of a semantic concord between the value of the implicit quantifier of the IPG and that of the verb, let us embed the same verb into the context of the imperfective viewpoint (42)–(45) where, e.g., English would require a progressive verb:

(42) *Kol* *jis* *valgė* *bandel-es/?bandeli-ų,.*
while 3.NOM.SG.M eat.PST.3 roll-ACC.PL/?roll-GEN.PL
kitijau pradėjo dirbti
'While he was eating rolls, others already started working.'

(43) *Jon-as* *valgė* *ramiai* *??bandeli-ų/bandel-es,*
John-NOM eat.PST.3 quietly ??roll-GEN.PL/roll-ACC.PL
bet staiga pašoko ir išbėgo į kiemą
'John was quietly eating rolls, but suddenly jumped up and ran into the yard.'

(44) *Kol* *viriau* *makaron-ų* *sriub-ą/*sriub-os,*
while cook.PST.1SG noodles-GEN.PL soup-ACC/*soup-GEN,
man *sudegė* *bulvės*
1SG.DAT burn.PST.3 potato-NOM.PL
'While I was cooking noodle soup, my potatoes got burned.'

(45) *Kai Jonas paklausė Eglę dėl ryto planų, ji negalėjo iškart atsakyti,*
nes *virė* **sriub-os/sriub-ą.*
Because cook.PST.3 *soup-GEN/soup-ACC
'When John asked Eglė about tomorrow's plans, she could not answer right away, because she was cooking soup.'

(46) *Kol Jon-as virėsi kiaušini-us/ʔkiaušini-ų mišrainei,*
while John-NOM cook.PST.3.REFL egg-ACC.PL/ʔegg-GEN.PL salad-DAT
kaip tik rodė žinias.
just as show:PST.3 news
'While John was cooking himself eggs for a salad, the news was on (on TV).'

The results achieved with mass noun objects are clear-cut: the IPG case marking of the object is blocked here and only the accusative case marking is allowed. The results with plural count nouns are similar.[23] Indeed, the progressive context in (42)–(44) activates the unbounded (progressive) reading of the verb, which would have been in conflict with the *bounded reading* of the IPG.[24] One would expect the *unbounded reading* of the IPG here, but it is unavailable for the interaction with the actional properties of the incremental-theme verbs in Lithuanian (unlike Finnish) and only accusative is an option here.

I conclude that an incremental-theme predicate must not be unbounded (be in an imperfective context) in order to be able to combine with the IPG-marked objects in Lithuanian. The IPG is most natural with delimitative verbs marked with the prefix *pa-,* but it can also co-occur with culminating predicates such as in (47):

(47) *Jis iš-gėrė al-aus*
3.NOM.SG.M TEL-drink.PST.3 beer-GEN.SG
'He drank (some) beer.'

Note that the interpretation of the whole VP in (47) is similar to (42)–(44) – in both instances, at a minimum, there is no commitment as to whether the culmination has been achieved, and the conversational implicature of (47) would be that the event has not been fully exhausted. Needless to say, an implicature can be defeated. That is to say, (47) may in fact be uttered in the situation where the action has been exhausted *de facto,* but the speaker just did not want to commit her-/himself to the totality (something like English *there has been beer drinking* would neither entail nor exclude the fact that the whole amount of the beer

23. Both native speakers whom I have consulted unequivocally prefer accusative. However, in example (46), both speakers reported that they could imagine someone using the IPG, while not preferring it themselves. Speaker 2 rejected the IPG with (42) and (43), while speaker 1 reported that she accepts them with plural count nouns but not with mass nouns.

24. I haven't found any example on Google of the verbs *virti* 'to cook', *valgyti* 'to eat' or *gerti* 'to drink' in different forms occurring in the context with a progressive interpretation (evoked by *kol* 'while') and the IPG . Furthermore, such constellations seem to be unattested in the Lithuanian Corpus at http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/ (it is not tagged, which is why only around 300 hits of these verbs could be checked).

appropriate for the situation has been consumed). In order to commit oneself to exhaustiveness, accusative has to be used:

(48) *Jis* *iš-gėrė* *al-ų*
3.NOM.SG.M TEL-drink.PRT.3 beer-ACC.SG
'He drank up his beer.'

Another type of unbounded event (imperfective viewpoint) is the habitual reading of the verb. As expected, we find it ungrammatical with the IPG, even though the verb *valgyti* 'to eat' combines with the IPG elsewhere:

(49) *Jis* *visada* *valgė* *tik* *??bandeli-ų/bandel-es*
3.NOM.SG.M always eat.PST.3 only ??roll-GEN.PL/roll-ACC.PL
'He always ate only rolls.'

I summarize: The IPG has the *bounded reading* only when interacting with the aspectual and actional properties of incremental-theme predicates. It is, therefore, compatible with the bounded (readings of) predicates only and occurs only in the context of the perfective viewpoint. If the verb is marked as unbounded or contextually disambiguated as such, the IPG case marking of the object is typically blocked, and the structural case marking has to be used.

The data presented so far may give the impression that it is the predicate (or, more precisely, some predicate quantifier) that binds the quantificational value of the IPG, which *per se* should be just regarded as vague in such a case. This explanation, however, would not be able to account for the fact that the same predicates in an imperfective context (progressive, habitual, generic) do not have this ability. One would have expected that the imperfective context would display the *unbounded reading* of the IPG. Recall that the latter is attested NP-internally (see Section 2.2.2 above).

The following examples demonstrate that the *bounded reading* of the IPG can provide viewpoint disambiguation of an incremental-theme predicate. While accusative can in principle occur in both perfective and imperfective contexts, the IPG highlights only the perfective reading of an incremental-theme verb. Consider the following example, where *valgė* 'ate/was eating' is in itself ambiguous as to its viewpoint interpretation:

(50) *Jis* *valgė* *bandeli-ų*
3.NOM.SG.M eat.PST.3 roll-GEN.PL
'He ate rolls (a while and stopped).' (perfective/bounded)
*'He was eating rolls.' (*imperfective/unbounded)

While the verb *valgė* 'ate/was eating' is ambiguous between the bounded and the unbounded reading as long as the object is marked accusative, the IPG in (50) disambiguates the bounded reading, while blocking the unbounded one, cf. progressive in (42) and habitual in (49) above which are both incompatible with the IPG.

Thus, we have observed that the IPG disambiguates the morphologically ambiguous verb *valgė* 'ate/was eating', which cannot be interpreted as unbounded in the presence of the IPG object marking. This can additionally be illustrated with the IPG objects yielding temporary transfer interpretation – a phenomenon attested also elsewhere in the Eastern Circum-Baltic Area (cf. Seržant, forthcoming-a). In eastern Lithuanian dialects, the IPG may override the accusative object of the verbs of transfer in order to encode that the result of transfer is to be temporally delimited (Ambrazas et al. 1976: 25), i.e., bounded in our terms. Contrast the IPG marked object in (51) with the implication of temporariness of the results of the transfer and the canonical accusative object in (52) with no such implication:

(51) *Duok* *man* *peiliuk-o* (Eastern Lithuanian)
give.IMP 1SG.DAT knife-GEN.SG
'Give me a/the knife for a moment!' (from Jablonskis 1957: 578)

(52) *Duok* *man* *peiliuk-ą*
give.IMP 1SG.DAT knife-ACC.SG
'Give me a/the knife!'

The transfer verbs are typically achievements that do not presuppose a process phase (like activities or like accomplishments with their pre-phase) that the implicit quantifier of the IPG could quantify over. The resultant state, i.e. the after-effects, is the only phase with these verbs that is lasting and hence has potential to be measured. This is why the implicit quantifier applies exactly at this stage of the action. Crucially, here as in the examples above, we find only the *bounded reading* of the IPG projected on the whole event.

Notably, the temporary transfer construction displays a typologically quite rare constellation whereby a quantifier that is formally a *D(eterminer)*-quantifier being hosted in the NP or even more precisely in N acts functionally as an *A(dverb)-quantifier* quantifying over the whole event while in itself being affected holistically. Such a quantifier seems to be unattested, cf. the overview in Corbett (1994: 202; 2000: 251).[25]

Table 1 summarizes the results for instances of interaction between the IPG and the aspectual and actional properties of the verb. A somewhat simplified

25. As Wayles Browne (p.c.) pointed out the English adjective *occasional* may be somewhat parallel. Thus a pregnant woman may ask *Is it OK to have an occasional drink during pregnancy?*

Table 1. The Lithuanian IPG and its interaction with aspect and actionality of the verb with a comparison to the Finnish partitive

	Non-culminating		Culminating
	Imperfective	**Perfective**	
Lithuanian	Acc	Part	Acc
Finnish	Part	Part	Acc

Table 2. The denotation of the Lithuanian IPG and the Finnish partitive in aspectually relevant contexts

	Totality/culmination	**Bounded/perfective**
Lithuanian IPG	no	yes
Finnish partitive	no	yes & no

picture of the Finnish partitive case (both the Finnish partitive case and the Lithuanian IPG are labeled as *Part* in Table 1) is added for comparison (see Seržant, forthcoming-b, for an areal comparison).

As can be observed from the Table 1 above, in Lithuanian the aspectually relevant IPG is sensitive to viewpoint aspect boundedness. The Finnish partitive is more sensitive to totality/P-property (see Huumo 2010), or *boundedness*$_2$ in Sasse (2002), while both the IPG and the partitive case entail no commitments as to totality and are most naturally and frequently interpreted as non-total (recall that in Lithuanian this is valid only for incremental-theme verbs and (dialectally) for temporary transfer) (see Table 2).

3.3 Iterated events and the IPG

Finally, remarks on the object marking of iterated events are in order. I mentioned above that a habitual event, being in itself unbounded, is compatible with accusative only and blocks the IPG, because the latter consistently has the *bounded reading* when interacting with aspect/actionality of the verb. This is, however, not the whole story. There are iterative and habitual predicates that tend to be used with the IPG rather than with the accusative. While more research on this point is needed, the alternation between the IPG and accusative is anchored in the semantic composition of the iterative and habitual events. These events can naturally be decomposed into two components: the underlying simple event and an operator that multiplies the simple event into a habitual or iterative event. While the overall iterative or habitual event is unbounded, the simple events in the scope of the

operator need not be so. Thus, the habitual event in (54) contains a multiplication of the simple event in (53) which is itself culminating or telic:

(53) *Jon-as* *iš-gėrė* *kav-os*
John-NOM TEL-drink.PST.3 coffee-GEN
'John drank some coffee.'

(54) *Ryt-ais* *Jon-as* *visada*
morning-INS.PL John-NOM always
(iš-gėrė)/iš-ger.davo *kav-os*
(TEL-drink.pst.3)/TEL-drink-PST.HAB.3 coffee-GEN
'John used to drink coffee in the morning.'

Different from (54), the habitual event in (55) is a weaker statement than in (54): while (54) entails (55), the reverse is not true. The event in (55) states only the habit of drinking, not of drinking completely:

(55) *Ryt-ais* *Jon-as* *visada* *gėrė/gerdavo* *kav-os*
morning-INS.PL John-NOM always drank/drink.PST.HAB.3 coffee-GEN
'John used to drink coffee in the morning.'

Recall that telic predicates – if the temporal boundary coincides with the telos – may use accusative to encode *inclusiveness*, the totality of the object affected. Thus, a sentence as in (56) multiplies the event in (57) which is, in turn, total (+ P-property in Dahl's 1981 terms), and not the one in (53):

(56) *Ryt-ais* *Jon-as* *visada* *iš-ger-davo* *kav-ą*
morning-INS.PL John-NOM always TEL-drink-PST.HAB.3 coffee-ACC
'John used to drink up (a certain amount of) coffee in the morning.'

(57) *Jon-as* *iš-gėrė* *kav-ą*
John-NOM TEL-drink.PST.3 coffee-ACC
'John drank up the coffee.'

In other words, when the simple event that is in the scope of the multiplier is bounded, then the speaker uses the IPG when implying no commitments on exhaustiveness and the accusative case in order to communicate exhaustiveness.

However, if the reiterated simple event is not marked as telic or bounded, then the accusative is more natural (according to the native speakers) and also the most common option:[26]

26. I have checked 50 occurrences of the iterative/habitual *gerdavo* (drink.PST.HAB.3) with an overtly expressed object on Google: 49 were accusative objects against 1 with the IPG marked object.

(58) *Ryt-ais* *Jon-as* *visada* *gėrė/ger-davo*
morning-INS.PL John-NOM always drink.PST.3/drink-PST.HAB.3
kav-ą.
coffee-ACC
'John used to drink coffee in the morning.'

(59) *Jon-as* *gėrė* *kav-ą*
John-NOM drink.PST.3 coffee-ACC
'John drank coffee.'

4. Intensional contexts and negation

In this section I briefly touch upon the determiner facet of the partitive genitive. The discussion here is unavoidably suggestive rather than conclusive. This is so because the partitive genitive has been generalized in the contexts of intensionality and negation, thus turning into a syntactically rather than a semantically driven phenomenon. The partitive genitive entered the syntactic valence of the intensional verbs and became mandatory in the context of negation and in some other constructions. In spite of this, the original motivation for the partitive genitive here is primarily semantic as is also true, e.g., with some Russian intensional predicates, cf. *ždat'* 'to wait', *xotet'* 'to want' with Acc/IPG alternation as opposed to the Lithuanian *laukti* 'to wait', *norėti* 'to want' both governing genitive only as well as with the Russian genitive-under-negation.

It seems that what semantically links the contexts discussed in Section 2 with the intensional contexts and the context of negation is the *unbounded reading* of the IPG. There is a consensus that intensional contexts and negation, i.e., the two main subgroups here, are, as Partee (2008: 307) states, "conducive to decreased referentiality". This has to do with the fact that both the negated and intensional predicates allow their arguments to have no existential presupposition. In other words, the referents of the arguments of these verbs need not exist in the particular discourse model to yield a pragmatically and grammatically coherent expression.

Intensional contexts are contexts that evoke concepts, not referents, and are not to be confused with *intenTional* contexts that represent a specific subset of *intenSional contexts*. They are opposed to the *extensional contexts* which refer to aspects of the real world (cf. Cruse 2000: 21). Typically, a verb requires its arguments to be extensional or referring expressions. The situation is different with the so-called intensional verbs. Intensional verbs typically have two readings: (i) the specific (in terms of *scopal specificity*, cf. von Heusinger 2002) or transparent reading, and (ii) the opaque, non-specific reading, i.e., with no existential

presupposition (Quine 1960: §32; Zimmermann 1993). The latter has been argued to be, more precisely, a non-referential, existentially non-committal *property*-denoting *reading* (Borschev et al. 2007). By way of example consider the following two English sentences with the intensional verb *to plan* (from Lyons 1999: 170):

(60) *Tom plans to bring up* ***three children*** *on his own*
  a. they're horrible brats and I wish him luck.
  b. but first he needs to find a woman to bear them for him.

The verb *to plan* induces (scope) ambiguity in sentences such as (60), which can be highlighted by the additional contexts in *a.* or *b.* The context in (60a) displays the specific (transparent) reading of the cardinal NP in (60), because it makes the existence of the object's referent (i.e., *three children*) mandatory. The context of (60b), by contrast, implies a non-existential opaque/narrow-scope reading: the existence of the object NP is assumed only for the imagined world evoked by the verb *to plan*. Or, to be more precise, on the non-existential reading, the properties of the participant of the imagined (planned) situation are given, but not a real referent.

It has been claimed in the literature that the intensional verbs allow their object NPs to have property-denoting reading <e, t> (Zimmerman 1993; van Geenhoven & McNally 2005; Kagan 2012). The narrow scope found with intensional verbs follows naturally: only quantified expressions (i.e., instantiations) have the potential to have wider scope. The partitive genitive on its unbounded reading is yet another option to encode reference to the concept of a particular kind of the respective NP while not committing oneself to a particular reference.

The intensional context can be invoked either by the lexical semantics of the respective verb (e.g., intentional verbs or verbs of request) or by the intentional component of verbs of movement.[27] The following verbs require their objects to be marked with genitive in Lithuanian: *ieškoti* 'to look for', *norėti* 'to want', *siekti* 'to strive for', *trokšti, geisti* 'to desire, wish', *ilgėtis* 'to long for', etc., cf. the full list in Ambrazas et al. (2006: 486), cf. also Endzelīns (1951: 558) on Latvian.

(61) *Noriu* *stal-o/stal-ą* *su* *keturi-omis* *kėd-ėmis*
want.PRS.1SG table-GEN.SG/table-ACC.SG with four-INS.PL.F chair-INS.PL
'I want (to have) a table with four chairs.'

27. I will not discuss the experiencer verbs (such as *bijoti(s)* 'be afraid of', *išsigąsti* 'be frightened of') that encode their stimulus with the genitive. I believe (on the basis of comparative evidence from the ancient Indo-European languages) that this use of the genitive stems from the originally ablative function. The latter is not directly related to the partitive (family of) readings. In a similar vein, Genitive objects of such verbs as *šalintis* 'to avoid', *saugotis* 'to beware of' are rather related to the originally ablative use of the genitive.

The verbs of request (such as *prašyti* 'to ask for', *klausti* 'idem') may also be intensional, i.e., they do not necessarily require their object to exist:

(62) *Aukcione bus parduodamas Hitlerio laišk-as,*
kuri-ame jis prašė nuolaid-os automobile-ui
which-LOC 3.NOM.SG.M ask.PST.3 discount-GEN.SG car-DAT
'A letter by Hitler will be auctioned off in which he asked for a discount on a car.'[28]

The utterer of (62) does not make any commitments about whether or not there existed a referent for the IPG NP.

Lithuanian, as well as Latvian folklore and dialectal texts (Endzelīns 1951: 559, 562–563), have a construction with the *genitive of purpose*, also widely attested in a number of Russian and Belarusian dialects (Markova 1988: 99, 1989; Seržant, forthcoming-a). This construction consists of a motion verb and a complement clause comprising an infinitive and its object in genitive. The matrix verb must be a verb of motion, while the infinitive is optional and may be omitted yielding one clause (Franks & Lavine 2006; Arkadiev, this volume), contrast (63) and (64) vs. (65):

(63) *Važiavom į mišk-ą* ***egl-ės***
go.PST.1PL to forest-ACC.SG Christmas_tree-GEN.SG
'We went to the forest to get a Christmas tree.'[29]

(64) *Es iešu* ***sein-a*** *telīt-ēm* (Latvian folklore)
1SG.NOM go.FUT.1SG hay-GEN calf-DAT.PL
'I will go to get hay for the calves.' (Endzelīns 1951: 559)

(65) *Einu ruoštis, važiuosiu* ***egl-ės*** *pirkti*
go.PRS.1SG prepare.INF drive.FUT.1SG Christmas_tree-GEN.SG buy.INF
'I will go and prepare myself. I will go to buy a Christmas tree.'[30]

The *genitive-of-purpose* is semantically closely related to the *genitive of intention* discussed above. In the *genitive-of-purpose construction*, it is the verb of motion

28. http://www.15min.lt/naujiena/laisvalaikis/ivairenybes/aukcione-bus-parduodamas-hitlerio-laiskas-kuriame-jis-prase-nuolaidos-automobiliuiberlynas-61-104790#ixzz2Im2nVxa8

29. http://eia.libis.lt:8080/archyvas/viesas/20110131122940/http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid_id=729&kas=straipsnis&st_id=3127

30. http://www.supermamama.lt/forumas/lofiversion/index.php/t890132-300.html

that adds the intentional component.[31] The latter projects the embedded event and the object's referent into the domain of modality. Given the modal nature of the purpose clauses, we expect to find grammatical markers signalling non-referentiality of the purpose subclauses. Thus, e.g., in Russian, the non-referentiality of the event encoded by the purpose clause is marked by the subjunctive particle *-by*:

(66) *Ja* *poedu* *v* *gorod,* *čto**by*** (Russian)
1SG.NOM drive.FUT.1SG to town in_order_to
kupit' *elk-u*
buy.INF Christmas_tree-ACC
'I will drive to town in order to buy a Christmas tree.'

It is likely that the function of the partitive genitive in the genitive-of-purpose construction is parallel to the function of the subjunctive particle *-by* in Russian *čto-by* 'in order to'. Recall that one of the functions of the partitive genitive within the domain of determination is to allow the speaker to make no existential commitments with regard to the referent. Analogically to the original function of the partitive genitive in this Lithuanian construction, the subjunctive particle *-by* in the Russian purpose construction is semantically triggered by the non-reality/non-referentiality of the whole event encoded by the purpose clause.[32]

Notably, the canonical, accusative object marking can replace the *genitive-of-purpose* assumedly due to the analogy with other matrix predicates that are not motions and therefore regularly have accusative here. Thus, secondarily, both options with verbs of motion are available in Lithuanian: accusative and genitive. As a result, there is no difference in terms of referentiality of the respective NPs, as the following examples illustrate:

(67) *Vien-oje* *pasak-oje* *mergait-ė* *Žaliakepuraitė* *ėjo*
one-LOC.SG.F story-LOC.SG girl-NOM *Žaliakepuraitė* go.PST.3
aplankyti ***senel-ę*** ***Mild-ą***
visit.INF grandmother-**ACC** Milda-**ACC**
'In one story, *Žaliakepuraitė* went to visit **her grandmother Milda**.'[33]

31. Cf. the periphrastic future formations based historically on the verb of movement 'to go' in English or French.

32. For a formal syntactic account of the genitive-of-purpose clause in Lithuanian see Franks and Lavine (2006) and Arkadiev (this volume).

33. http://www.jurbarkas.rvb.lt/lt/vaikams/128-literaturinis-rytmetis-qskaityti-balsu-smaguq

(68) *Marij-a ėjo aplankyti **sav-o giminait-ės Elzbiet-os***
Mary-NOM go.PST.3 visit.INF REFL-GEN relative-GEN Elisabeth-GEN
'Mary went to visit **her relative Elisabeth**.'[34]

Evidently, both examples contain definite NPs in the relevant position, showing that there is no semantic contrast between the accusative and genitive marking anymore.

As to the genitive-of-negation, Lithuanian – differently from Russian and similar to Polish – has grammaticalized the former IPG marking with any predicate that is negated. By grammaticalization I mean here the development of a grammatical rule that requires genitive case-marking of the object in the context of negation. Originally, the genitive marking of the object had probably been driven semantically (depending on the referential properties of the object NP, etc.) and emphasis, but it turned into a semantically 'empty' rule in Lithuanian. We observe thus *increase in internal dependency* (Haspelmath 2004; cf. also Givón 1979: 208) and *semantic bleaching* (Traugott 2003).

5. Conclusions

In this paper I have discussed only instances of a syntactically (but not necessarily semantically) independent partitive genitive in Lithuanian.

I have claimed that the IPG when applied NP-internally attests two readings: (i) the indeterminate but bounded reading, and (ii) the indeterminate unbounded reading. The first reading is synonymous to existential indefinite plurals in that it evokes a delimited set of individuals. These individuals typically have wide scope and can be anaphorically back-referred. In contrast, the second reading denotes just a concept, a kind of the respective participant without referring to any of its instantiations. This reading is found only with atelic verbs, e.g., as subject of *būti* 'to be' or object of *pažinti* 'to know'. The kind or concept introduced by this reading may also be anaphorically picked up and have wide scope over a quantifier. In both cases, the participant encoded by the IPG is always discursively backgrounded and never constitutes the primary information in the discourse.

One could assume that the two readings may be derived from the kind reading, very much in parallel to the Carlsonian generalized account of bare plurals in English (Carlson 1977). The type of the predicate would provide for disambiguation, since telic predicates never allow for the unbounded reading. On this account, telic predicates would display the bounded reading due to their entailments

34. http://dievogarba.wordpress.com/2011/07/02/

on the object, while the atelic, stative predicates would allow both. Such an account seems, however, inappropriate synchronically. The reason is that the two readings are not complementarily distributed. There is a class of verbs, namely the incremental-theme verbs and the transfer verbs (the latter only in Eastern Lithuanian), which on their non-culminating reading induced by the IPG could theoretically be unbounded, e.g., in an imperfective context. Crucially different from, e.g., Finnish, though, these contexts are not grammatical with the IPG in Lithuanian. The bounded reading of the IPG is the only reading available for the interaction with the aspectual properties of the verb. The analysis of the IPG and the comparison to the Finnish partitive highlights the double nature of the intermediate stage between the telos/culmination and the beginning of an action. This stage crucially may be either bounded, as displayed, e.g., by delimitatives, or unbounded, as displayed by, e.g., the progressive context. While in Finnish this difference is not relevant for case assignment rules, in both cases the object being marked with the partitive case, it is important for Lithuanian, since Lithuanian can only mark those non-culminating stages that are perfective.

As regards the intensional contexts, I have only briefly illustrated the main groups that assign the partitive genitive. Note that the partitive genitive is not syntactically independent here. These are mainly the verbs of intention, the genitive-of-purpose construction, and the clausal negation: they require the direct object and unaccusative subject to be case-marked with genitive in terms of a syntactic dependency with no synchronic traces of the original distribution of the IPG here.

I have not discussed the genitive-under-negation rule on this occasion. In fact, the genitive is only mandatory for the object position, while in the subject position (applies to unaccusative subjects only) an alternation with the nominative case marking is still possible. This is an intriguing topic and needs a separate investigation. For the time being, however, the interested reader is referred to the analogous alternation in Russian, widely discussed in the literature (*inter alios*, Babby 2001; Borschev et al. 2007; Krasovitsky et al. 2011; Padučeva 1997, 2005; Partee & Borschev 2002; Partee 2008; Rakhilina, ed., 2008).

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	M	masculine
AOR	aorist	N	neuter
DAT	dative	NOM	nominative
DELIM	delimitative prefix	PPP	past passive participle
F	feminine	PERF	perfectivizing prefix
FUT	future	PL	plural
GEN	genitive	PST	past
HAB	habitual	QUANT	quantifying prefix
IMP	imperative	REFL	reflexive
INF	infinitive	SG	singular
INS	instrumental	SUPER	superlative
LOC	locative	TEL	telicizing prefix

References

Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential Object marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 435–448. DOI: 10.1023/A:1024109008573

Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed). 2006. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika. A Grammar of Modern Lithuanian*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2011. Aspect and Actionality in Lithuanian on a typological background. In *Langues baltiques, langues slaves*, Daniel Petit, Claire Le Feuvre, & Henri Menantaud (eds), 61–92. Paris: CNRS Editions.

Babby, Leonard H. 2001. The genitive of negation: a unified analysis. In *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Bloomington Meeting 2000* [Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 9], Steven Franks, Tracy Holloway King, & Michael Yadroff (eds), 39–55. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco. 1997. *Il dominio tempo-aspettuale: Demarcazioni, intersezioni, contrasti*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Blake, Barry J. 1994. *Case*. Second Edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borer, Hagit. 2005. Some notes on the syntax of quantity. In *Aspectual Inquiries* [Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 62], Paula Kempchinsky & Roumyana Slabakova (eds), 41–68. Dordrecht: Springer.

Borschev, Vladimir, Elena V. Paducheva, Barbara H. Partee, Yakov G. Testelets, & Igor Yanovich. 2008. Russian genitives, non-referentiality, and the property-type hypothesis. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Stony Brook meeting* [Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 16), Andrei Antonenko, John F. Bailyn, & Christina Y. Bethin (eds), 48–67. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publishers.

Bossong, Georg. 1998. Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues d'Europe. In *Actance et Valence dans les Language de l'Europe*, Jack Feuillet (ed), 193–258. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gryuter.

Carlson, Greg N. 1977. A unified analysis of the English bare plural. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1: 413–457. DOI: 10.1007/BF00353456

Champollion, Lucas. 2010. *Parts of a whole: Distributivity as a bridge between aspect and measurement*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. In *Syntactic Typology: Studies in the Phenomenology of Language*, Winfred Lehmann (ed), 329–394. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Corbett, Greville. 1994. Systems of grammatical number in Slavonic. *Slavonic and East European Review* 72(2): 201–217. A revised version of: Systems of grammatical number in Slavonic. In *Studies in Number and Quantification*, David Gil (ed), European Science Foundation Programme in Language Typology: Theme 7, Noun Phrase Structure: Working Paper no. VII/19.

Corbett, Greville. 2000. *Number* [Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics]. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139164344

Cruse, Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dahl, Östen. 1981. On the definition of the telic-atelic (bounded-unbounded) distinction. In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 14: *Tense and Aspect*, Philip J. Tedeschi & Annie Zaenen (eds), 79–90. New York: Academic Press.

Dahl, Östen. 1984. Perfectivity in Slavonic and other languages. In *Aspect Bound. A Voyage Into the Realm of Germanic, Slavonic and Finno-Ugrian Aspectology*, Casper de Groot & Hannu Tommola (eds), 3–22. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris Publications.

Declerck, Renaat. 1989. Boundedness and the Structure of Situations. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 78: 275–308.

Declerck, Renaat. 1991. *A Comprehensive Descriptive Grammar of English*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Depraetere, Ilse. 1995. On the necessity of distinguishing between (un)boundedness and (a)telicity. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18(1): 1–19. DOI: 10.1007/BF00984959

Doetjes, Jenny S. 1997. Quantifiers and Selection. On the distribution of quantifying expressions in French, Dutch and English. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics. (https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/19731)

Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection, *Language* 67: 547–619.

Endzelīns, Jānis. 1951. *Latviešu valodas gramatika* [Grammar of the Latvian Language]. Riga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība.

Filip, Hana. 1989. Aspectual Properties of the AN-Construction in German. In *Tempus – Aspekt – Modus. Die lexikalischen und grammatischen Formen in den germanischen Sprachen* [Tense – Aspect – Mood. Lexical and Grammatical Forms in the Germanic Languages] [Linguistische Arbeiten 237], Werner Abraham & Theo Janssen (eds), 259–292. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Franks, Steven & James E. Lavine. 2006. Case and word order in Lithuanian. *Journal of Linguistics* 42(1): 239–288. DOI: 10.1017/S0022226706003896

Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In *Up and down the cline: The nature of grammaticalization* [Typological Studies in Language 59], Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, & Harry Perridon (eds), 17–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Holvoet, Axel. 1991. *Transitivity and Clause Structure in Polish*. Warsaw: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.

de Hoop, Helen. 2003. Partitivity. In *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book*, Lisa Cheng & Rint Sybesma (eds). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Huumo, Tuomas. 2010. Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: The case of the Finnish object. *Journal of Linguistics* 46: 83–125. DOI: 10.1017/S0022226709990223

Jablonskis, Jonas. 1957. *Rinktiniai raštai*. I tomas. Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla.

Kagan, Olga. 2005. Genitive case: A modal account. In *Proceedings of Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics* 2, Yehuda Falk (ed).

Kagan, Olga. 2012. *Semantics of Genitive Objects in Russian. A Study of Genitive of Negation and Intensional Genitive Case*. Dordrecht/Heidelberg/New York/London: Springer.

Keenan, Edward L. & Denis Paperno. 2012. Overview. In *Handbook of Quantifiers in Natural Language*, Edward L. Keenan & Denis Paperno (eds), 941–950. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-007-2681-9_18

Kiparsky, Paul. 1998. Partitive case and aspect. In *The projection of arguments. Lexical and compositional factors,* Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder (eds), 265–307. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Kittilä, Seppo, Jussi Ylikoski, & Katja Västi (eds). 2011. *Case Animacy and Semantic Roles* [Typological Studies in Language 99]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.99

Krifka, Manfred. 1989. *Nominalreferenz und Zeitkonstitution. Zur Semantik von Massentermen, Pluraltermen und Aspektklassen*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

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: 573–592. DOI: 10.1007/s11525-010-9178-x

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria & Bernhard Wälchli. 2001. The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach. In *Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact* vol. 2, Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds), 615–750. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1971. Słowiański genetivus po negacij. In *Sesja naukowa międzynarodowej komisji budowy gramatycznej języków słowiańskich*, Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed), 11–14. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Lestrade, Sander & Helena de Hoop. 2011. On case and tense: the role of grounding in differential case marking. Unpublished manuscript, Radboud University Nijmegen.

Löbner, Sebastian. 1985. Natürlichsprachliche Quantoren – Zur Verallgemeinerung des Begriffs der Quantifikation. *Studium Linguistik* 17/18: 79–113.

Lyons, Christopher. 1999. Definiteness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511605789

Markova, Nina. 1988. Roditel'nyj padež prjamogo objekta v russkom fol'klore Karelii [Direct object genitive in the Russian folklore of Karelia]. *Jazyk russkogo fol'klora* [The Language of Russian Folklore], E. B. Artemenko (ed), 96–104. Petrozavodsk: Petrozavodskij gosudarstvennyj universitet.

McNally, Louise. 1998. Existential sentences without existential quantification. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21: 353–392. DOI: 10.1023/A:1005389330615

Mehlig, Hans Robert. 2006. Glagol'nyj vid i vtoričnaja gomogenizacija oboznačajemoj situacii: K upotrebleniju delimitativnogo sposoba dejstvija v russkom jazyke [Verbal aspect and secondary homogenization of the situation: On the use of the delimitative aktionsart in Russian]. In *Semantika i Struktura slavjanskogo vida* 4 [Semantics and Structure of Slavic Aspect 4], Volkmar Lehmann (ed), 235–276. München: Sagner.

Metslang, Helle. 2001. On the developments of the Estonian aspect. In *Circum-Baltic Languages* vol. 2: *Grammar and Typology*, Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds), 443–479. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Neidle, Carol. 1988. *The Role of Case in Russian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-009-2703-2

Padučeva, Elena V. 1997. Roditel'nyj sub"ekta v otricatel'nom predloženii: sintaksis ili semantika? [Subject Genitive of Subject in a negated sentence: syntax or semantics?]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2: 101–116.

Paducheva, Elena V. 1998. On non-compatibility of Partitive and Imperfective in Russian. *Theoretical Linguistics* 24(1): 73–82. DOI: 10.1515/thli.1998.24.1.73

Padučeva, Elena V. 2005. Ešče raz o genitive sub"ekta pri otricanii [Once again about the subject genitive with negation]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 5: 84–99.

Partee, Barbara H. 1986. Noun phrase interpretation and type shifting principles. In *Studies in discourse representation theory and the theory of generalised quantifiers*, Jeroen Groenendijk, Dick de Jongh, & Martin Stokhof (eds), 115–143. Dordrecht: Foris.

Partee, Barbara H. 1995. Quantificational Structures and Compositionality. In *Quantification in Natural Languages*, Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, & Barbara H. Partee (eds), 541–601. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Pulishers.

Partee, Barbara H. 2008. Negation, intensionality, and aspect: Interaction with NP semantics. In: *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect* [Linguistik Aktuell 110], Susan Rothstein (ed), 291–317. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Partee, Barbara H. & Vladimir Borschev. 2002. Genitive of negation and scope of negation in Russian existential sentences. In *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Second Ann Arbor Meeting 2001* [*Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 10*], Jindrich Toman (ed), 181–200. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Partee, Barbara H. & Vladimir Borschev. 2004. The semantics of Russian genitive of negation: The nature and role of perspectival structure. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 14, Robert B. Young (ed), 212–234. Ithaca NY: CLC Publications.

Paykin, Katia. Forthcoming. Russian Partitives and Verbal Aspect. In *Partitivity*, Silvia Luraghi & Tuomas Huumo (eds). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Pesetsky, David M. 1982. Paths and categories. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge.

Quine, Willard van Orman. 1960. *Word and Object*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Rachilina, Ekaterina V. (ed). 2008. *Ob"ektnyj genitiv pri otricanii v russkom jazyke*. Moscow: Probel.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 2002. Recent activity in the theory of aspect: Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-progressive state? *Linguistic Typology* 6: 199–271. DOI: 10.1515/lity.2002.007

Seržant, Ilja A. 2012a. Morphosyntactic properties of the partitive genitive in the subject position in Ancient Greek. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 117: 187–204. DOI: 10.1515/indo.2012.117.2012.187

Seržant, Ilja A. 2012b. Pragmatics and Semantics of the bare Partitive Genitive in Ancient Greek. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 65(2): 113–136.

Seržant, Ilja A. Forthcoming-a. Independent partitive genitive in Russian and North Russian. To appear in *Contemporary approaches to dialectology: The area of North, Northwest Russian and Belarusian vernaculars* [Slavica Bergensia 13], Ilja A. Seržant & Björn Wiemer (eds). Bergen: University of Bergen.

Seržant, Ilja A. Forthcoming-b. *Independent partitive as a Circum-Baltic isogloss*. Forthcoming paper.

Smith, Carlotta. 1997. *The Parameter of Aspect*. 2nd edition. Dordrecht: Kluwer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-011-5606-6

Tatevosov, Sergei & Mikhail Ivanov. 2009. Event structure of non-culminating accomplishments. In *Cross-linguistic Semantics of Tense, Aspect and Modality*, Lotte Hogeweg, Helen de Hoop & Andrej Malchukov (eds), 83–130. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tenny, Carol. 1994. *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-011-1150-8

Timberlake, Alan. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (http://www.dilbilim.info/doktora/Belgeler/Actionality.pdf)

Traugott, Elisabeth 2003. Constructions in Grammaticalization. In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Brian Joseph & Richard Janda (eds), 624–646. Malden, MA: Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9780470756393.ch20

Vendler, Zeno. 1957[1967]. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Verkuyl, Henk J. 1972. *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*. Dordrecht: Reidel. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-017-2478-4

van Geenhoven, Veerle & Louise McNally. 2005. On the property analysis of opaque complements, *Lingua* 115(6): 885–914. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2004.01.012

Zimmermann, Thomas Ede. 1993. On the proper treatment of opacity in certain verbs. *Natural Language Semantics* 1(2): 149–179. DOI: 10.1007/BF00372561