

The Case of the Object in Early Estonian and Finnish Texts

AET LEES
University of Sydney
aet.lees@iinet.net.au

1. Introduction

This paper traces the development of the modern Estonian and Finnish object case alternations, beginning with Bible texts from 1642 for Finnish and 1739 for northern Estonian, the precursor of the modern standard language. A southern Estonian Bible translation (1686) was studied for comparison. The case of all direct objects of transitive verbs in affirmative clauses was noted in the first letter to the Corinthians and the usage in the old texts compared with recent Bible editions as well as other texts. In the old texts Finnish object case selection is similar to present day usage, while in Estonian there are major differences.

1.1. Background

In Estonian and Finnish, as well as in other Balto-Finnic languages, the case of the direct object of transitive verbs alternates between accusative and partitive. In both languages in affirmative clauses, if the whole object is involved in the action, and the action has been completed, that is if we are dealing with a bounded event, the accusative is used. In all other situations (including negative clauses, where the action has not been completed, because it never took place) the object is partitive. This alternation has been discussed in more detail in numerous publications, e.g. Karlsson (1999) and Kiparsky (1998). Although the rules for choice of case are essentially the same for both languages, there are differences in actual usage. Some of these differences have been explored in Lees (2004), where I showed that in Finnish the accusative case is used more often than in Estonian (53.3% vs 28.4%). The accusative case does not have a distinctive form, except for modern Finnish personal pronouns. For plural nouns the accusative is homonymous with the nominative case. In the imperative mood and in some non-finite clauses it is homonymous with the nominative for singular as well as plural nouns. Singular noun objects otherwise have the accusative case homonymous with the genitive. This also applies to pronouns other than personal pronouns, as well as 3rd person inanimate. Modern Finnish personal pronouns, i.e. 1st, 2nd and 3rd animate, and interrogative 'who', have a distinct accusative form, and these forms are used in all direct object situations, where nouns are either in the genitive or the nominative. In Estonian personal pronouns do not have a special accusative form. The nominative is not used for the 1st and 2nd person plural in any situation, nor for the 1st and 2nd person singular in those situations where a noun object would be in the nominative case, the partitive being used instead. Otherwise they behave like nouns, that is, 1st and 2nd person singular pronoun objects can be genitive, and 3rd person objects occur in the nominative or genitive case like nouns. Throughout this paper the personal pronoun section includes those which have a special accusative form in Finnish. The inanimate third person pronouns are grouped with other pronouns. I have given some examples of pronoun usage in Estonian and Finnish:

- (1) (E¹) *Ta võttis toidu kaasa.*
 He took food-GEN/ACC along
 He took the food with him.
- (2) (E) *Ta võttis minu (1SG-GEN/ACC)/ mind (1SG-PART) kaasa.*
 He took me with him.
- (3) (E) *Ta võttis meid (1PL-PART) kaasa.*
 He took us with him.
- (4) (F) *Hän otti meidät kanssaan.*
 He took 1PL-ACC with-3Px
 He took us with him.

In example (2) with the 1st (and also with 2nd) person singular object either the genitive/accusative or the partitive can be used.

There have been many discussions about whether the genitive and nominative case, when used for direct objects, should be called accusative. Some claim that there is no accusative except for the Finnish personal pronouns (e.g. Kiparsky 2001; Asudeh 2004). Kiparsky (2001) has used the terms R- (resultative) and I- (irresultative) objects. In the present study I have used the blanket term ‘accusative’ for nominative, genitive and accusative objects.

1.2. Historical Developments

Historically in Uralic there was an accusative case for animate or specific nouns in singular, ending in **-m*, which changed to *-n* over time, and thus became homonymous with the genitive. In Estonian the *-n* was lost, in Finnish it persists. There does not appear to have been a separate accusative case for plural nouns, and the nominative was used for direct objects. The beginnings of the partitive case are traced back to the ablative in Proto-Finno-Ugric, where it was used mainly in a separative function, i.e. away from something. The original suffix **-ta* has undergone a number of changes. In Finnish the present day partitive suffixes *-ta/tä* and *-a/ä* are distinctive, but in Estonian the partitive suffix has lost its final vowel and in many cases the consonant as well, with often a compensatory lengthening occurring of the preceding consonant, which becomes extra long. This extra length is not indicated in the orthography, which in some instances results in the written forms being the same in the genitive and partitive case. A more detailed discussion of historical aspects can be found in Harris and Campbell (1995).

2. Old Finnish Bible Text

The first Finnish Bible translation appeared in 1642, although there was an earlier New Testament translation, which was not available for the present study. The first letter to the Corinthians was studied in all Bible texts. The case of all direct objects of transitive verbs in affirmative clauses was noted. Negative clauses were omitted from the analysis, as the object there is always partitive, and that was so also in the 17th century. Passive clauses were not considered in this study.

In Finnish, shown in the first column of Table 1, overall accusative objects predominate at 59.1%. However, of the personal pronoun objects, shown in the second section of the first column, only 21.6% are in the accusative and these have all surfaced as the genitive case, and all are singular. In the modern Bible text 47.6% of personal pronouns are in the

¹ (E) and (F) in examples refer to Estonian and Finnish respectively.

accusative (special modern form), so this is one area which has changed significantly. Other pronouns and nouns (including proper names) show, compared to the modern Bible, a slightly greater incidence of accusative case at 66.0% (modern 59.5%) and 63.6% (modern 51.3%) respectively. Combining the non-personal pronouns and nouns, there is a statistically significant difference between the old and the modern Finnish Bible by chi-squared analysis ($p < 0.025$).

Table 1. Object case in old Bible translations (1 Corinthians, ch. 1-16)

	Finnish	S.Estonian	N.Estonian
Objects – total	291	285	331
Partitive	119 (40.9%)	255 (89.5%)	229 (69.2%)
Genitive	119 (40.9%)	2 (0.7%)	22 (6.6%)
Nominative	53 (18.2%)	28 (9.8%)	80 (24.2%)
Accusative (Gen + Nom)	172 (59.1%)	30 (10.5%)	102 (30.8%)
Pers. pro. – total	37	30	28
Partitive	29 (78.4%)	30 (100%)	28 (100%)
Genitive	8 (21.6%)	0	0
Nominative	0	0	0
Accusative (Gen + Nom)	8 (21.6%)	0	0
Other pro. – total	103	113	128
Partitive	35 (34.0%)	88 (77.9%)	80 (62.5%)
Genitive	41 (39.8%)	0	2 (1.6%)
Nominative	27 (26.2%)	25 (22.1%)	46 (35.9%)
Accusative (Gen + Nom)	68 (66.0%)	25 (22.1%)	48 (37.5%)
Nouns – total	151	142	175
Partitive	55 (36.4%)	137 (96.5%)	121 (69.1%)
Genitive	70 (46.4%)	2 (1.4%)	20 (11.4%)
Nominative	26 (17.2%)	3 (2.1%)	34 (19.4%)
Accusative (Gen + Nom)	96 (63.6%)	5 (3.5%)	54 (30.9%)

Ikola (1965) summarized the development of the Finnish personal pronouns through the centuries, and stated that Mikael Agricola, who in the 16th century laid the foundation for written Finnish, used only partitive case for personal pronoun objects, yet in the examples he gave there is the occasional genitive and even one form of the modern accusative. Indeed, in one sentence, there are three different cases for three separate objects of completed action: accusative, genitive and partitive:

(5)(OF) *nin hen heitti heidhet (ACC) alimaisen Tornijn, ia pani*
 So he cast them lower-ILL tower-ILL and put
heite (PART) Jalcapuun, carkasi heiden pälens,
 them stocks-ILL jumped 3PL-GEN onto-3Px²
ia ylitzewoitti heite (PART), ia paiskasi heiden (GEN/ACC) alansa.
 and overcame them and threw them down-3Px
 (Ikola 1966: 30)

‘So he cast them into the lower tower, and put them into stocks, jumped on top of them and overcame them, and threw them down’. (my gloss)

² Px = possessive suffix

The example of the plural genitive personal pronoun object shows that such were used at the time, although none appeared in the Bible text.

3. Old Estonian Bible Texts

A translation of the New Testament into the southern dialect of Estonian was published in 1686. The two Estonian dialects show considerable differences. In both dialects a number of nouns have the same written form in the genitive and partitive case, and while in the modern language it is mostly possible to decide which case is meant, it would not be reasonable to make the same assumptions for the old language. In the southern dialect the 1st and 2nd singular pronouns also have the same form for the genitive and the partitive. All such ambiguous forms have been omitted from the general analysis. Otherwise the analysis was carried out in the same way as for Finnish, as indicated in Section 2.

3.1. Southern Estonian

In Southern Estonian of 329 direct objects 44 were ambiguous for case. The second column in Table 1 shows that the rest of the objects were overwhelmingly partitive. There were only two unequivocal objects in the genitive case (although some of the ambiguous forms could have been genitive). While there are a number listed as nominative, most of these are the pronouns *mes* (interrogative) ‘what’ and (relative) ‘which’ and *kik* ‘all, everything’, which do not appear to have had a partitive form at that time.

3.2. Northern Estonian

The northern Estonian dialect Bible was published in 1739, the New Testament appearing in 1715. This dialect has developed into modern standard Estonian. The total number of objects was 364, of which 33 were ambiguous for case. The results are shown in the third column of Table 1. The partitive case is the predominant object case here also, but less so than in southern Estonian. The total percentage of partitive objects at 69.2% is fairly similar compared to the modern Bible at 71.6%, but the distribution is quite different. Genitive forms are fairly few, while nominative forms are more frequent. Personal pronouns were exclusively partitive. Among non-personal pronouns there were 28 instances of *mis* ‘what’ and 15 instances of *keik* ‘all, everything’. The form *mis* was seen even in a negative clause. Apart from these there were only three other pronouns which were in the nominative case and two were genitive. Thus, with the exception of *mis* and *keik*, pronouns were largely in the partitive case. Of the 34 nominative noun objects 30 were plural. Thus, singular noun objects tended to be in the partitive, while plural ones were mostly in the nominative case, as illustrated below:

- (6)(OE)...*kes woörast keelt rägib* (1739: 14-4)³
 who foreign-SG-PART tongue-SG-PART speaks
 ‘who speaks (in) a foreign tongue’
- (7)(OE)...*kes woörad keled rägib* (1739: 14-5)
 who foreign-PL-NOM tongue-PL-NOM speaks
 ‘who speaks (in) foreign tongues’

The modern equivalent of clause (7) is shown in (8) from the 1945 Bible .

³ The numbers refer to Bible edition, chapter and verse of 1 Corinthians.

- (8) (E)...*kes wõõraid keeli räägib* (1945:14-5)
 who foreign-PL-PART tongue-PL-PART speaks
 ‘who speaks (in) foreign tongues’

The partitive case did exist for plural nouns, e.g. in negative clauses:

- (9)(OE)...*ja ärge keelge mitte woõraid kelesid*
 and NEG-IMP forbid NEG foreign-PL-PART tongue-PL-PART
räkimast (1739: 14-39)
 speak-1ST-INF-ELA
 ‘and do not forbid (them) to speak (in) foreign tongues’

There were also examples where accusative/nominative and partitive objects were conjoined. While this can sometimes occur where the objects differ in quantity, one being total and the other partial, here it was a further example of number affecting case, with the plural object being nominative and the singular object partitive:

- (10)(OE)...*ja teaksin keik sallajad asjad*
 And know-COND-1SG all secret-PL-NOM thing-PL-NOM
ja keik tundmist (1739: 13-2)
 and all knowledge-SG-PART
 ‘and if I knew all secret things and (had) all knowledge’

In the old texts aspect was not playing a consistent role in the determination of case. For singular nouns the partitive was used in resultative clauses and with a definite object, as shown in (11). For comparison the modern version is shown in (12).

- (11) (OE)...*et ta Kristust on üllesärratanud* (1739: 15-15)
 that he Christ-PART has resurrected
 ‘that he has resurrected Christ’

- (12) (E)...*et ta Kristuse on üles ärratanud* (1945: 15-15)
 Christ-ACC/GEN

Valmet (1956) stated that in the oldest Estonian writings from the 16th century even in negative sentences plural noun objects occurred in the nominative rather than partitive case, so there appears to have been a change by the 17th century. According to Valmet, the Estonian handbook by Joachim Rossihnius in the first half of the 17th century contained plural partitive forms. Perhaps it is significant that Rossihnius was from the southern part of Estonia, although the Estonian encyclopedia (1938) states that he based his writings on the publications in the northern dialect. On the other hand, his contemporary, Henricus Stahl, of German origin and living in northern Estonia, had just nominative case for all plural objects, presumably on the basis of German, where the accusative plural is homonymous with the nominative. His handbook of Estonian grammar may well have influenced the translators. Valmet (1963) suggested that the language of the texts did not reflect the spoken language of the people at the time. The situation was made more complex by the presence of numerous dialects. The question is whether the difference in object case usage between southern and northern Estonian was merely due to different translators or a real difference among the people themselves. In the 17th century Estonia was under Swedish rule and in 1721 Russia took over after defeating Sweden, but

throughout this time the feudal barons and the clergy were mostly of German background as a result of previous German occupation. Education was mainly in German and it was often obtained abroad. The translators were mainly clergy and the language spoken in their homes was German, but they were born in Estonia and would have been exposed to the Estonian language also from an early age. This whole area needs further research, including study of other Balto-Finnic languages.

4. Comparison of Old Finnish and Old Estonian

Finnish in the 17th century differed little from the modern language as far as the use of object case for nouns was concerned, while in both Estonian dialects there were major differences from the modern language. In Estonian aspect did not appear a factor in the choice of case, while in Finnish it did. Genitive forms of personal pronouns occurred in Finnish, although partitive ones were more common. In both Estonian dialects personal pronouns were exclusively partitive. A particular difference noted between Estonian and Finnish non-personal pronouns is that in Estonian the pronoun *see* ‘it, this, that’ was almost always in the partitive case *seda*, while the Finnish *se* was very often in the accusative/genitive case *sen*. As this is one of the commonest pronouns in the texts, the results are strongly influenced by this pronoun. In Estonian the modern genitive *selle* was not often seen in the old texts, the nominative *see* being used instead in other syntactic positions requiring the genitive, such as indicating possession or as complements of adpositions. In Finnish there were examples of the partitive form *mitä* of *mikä* ‘what’ (Estonian *mes/mis*), while the Estonian *mida* did not occur in the old texts.

5. Later Estonian Bible Texts

Subsequent reprints and revised editions of the Estonian Bible appeared at intervals. Table 2 shows the distribution of the various categories of objects among the three object cases in the editions, where the main changes appeared. In 1862 there were very minor modifications. By 1914 a number of changes were made, mainly in the spelling, but also in the choice of object case, where it was apparent that aspect was now playing a role, at least as far as nouns were concerned. Out of 114 singular noun objects 23 had been changed from partitive to genitive, and ten out of 30 plural ones from nominative to partitive. Personal pronouns remained partitive. Other pronouns, including *mis* and *keik* (now *kõik*), remained the same, except for the partitive *seda* ‘it’, which was changed to the nominative *see* in five resultative clauses, and one plural pronoun, which was changed from nominative to partitive.

In 1944 a large number of Estonians went into exile and in 1945 an edition of the Bible was published outside Estonia. This was virtually identical with the 1914 edition, retaining a number of archaic forms, although other literature at that time had already changed considerably.

Table 2. Distribution of case in various categories of objects from 1739 to 1989

	1739	1914	1968	1938/89	1989
Total	P 229	P 204	P 215	P 226	P 229
	G 22	G 43	G 66	G 72	G 59

	N 80	N 72	N 43	N 39	N 32
Pers. Pro.	P 28	P 27	P 31	P 27	P 30
	G 0	G 0	G 1	G 0	G 3
	N 0	N 0	N 2	N 1	N 1
Se/see 'it'	P 56	P 49	P 23	P 32	P 19
	G 0	G 0	G 10	G 9	G 6
	N 0	N 5	N 0	N 0	N 0
Mis 'what'	P 0	P 0	P 17	P 16	P 15
	G 0	G 0	G 1	G 2	G 2
	N 28	N 27	N 10	N 9	N 2
Keik/kõik 'all'	P 0	P 0	P 7	P 11	P 12
	G -	G -	G -	G -	G -
	N 15	N 16	N 9	N 5	N 5
Other pro.	P 24	P 20	P 12	P 18	P 28
	G 2	G 2	G 5	G 6	G 3
	N 3	N 2	N 5	N 3	N 7
Sg Nouns	P 114	P 91	P 107	P 98	P 90
	G 20	G 41	G 49	G 55	G 45
	N 4	N 4	N 4	N 4	N 4
Pl Nouns	P 7	P 17	P 18	P 24	P 35
	G -	G -	G -	G -	G -
	N 30	N 18	N 13	N 17	N 13

P = partitive G = genitive N = nominative

G - indicates that the genitive form is not used for objects in this category

In 1968 a further edition appeared in exile, which had largely been brought into line with modern grammar, incorporating a number of changes in addition to those in 1914 and 1945. A number of clauses no longer corresponded directly, with changes in voice and polarity and with adpositional phrases or inherent case substituted for structural case. Three personal pronouns now appeared in accusative (genitive or nominative form) case, and a number of instances of *mis* and *kõik* were changed to partitive in contexts where a noun would be partitive, but a few inappropriate instances of *mis* remained. Such a use of *mis* is still common today, especially in spoken Estonian. The five instances of nominative *see*, which still appeared as objects in 1945, were now in the modern genitive form *selle*. The nominative form of *kõik* is used also in modern Estonian for the accusative object.

The 1739 translation of the Bible was revised in 1938 in order to issue it for the 200th anniversary of Bible translation. Printing was commenced in Estonia in 1938, but due to the subsequent Soviet occupation it was not completed until 51 years later in 1989. It follows the sentence structure of the 1739 translation more closely than the 1968 edition in exile, but is modern in its lexicon and syntax. It is quite different from the new translation of the New Testament, also published in 1989, which was analysed in Lees (2004). Of the 30 plural nouns which were nominative in 1739, 12 were now partitive. Four singular accusative nouns were also changed to partitive. However, more commonly, singular partitive nouns were changed to accusative/genitive case, 27 in all. Thus, there was a

change in both directions, from accusative to partitive and partitive to accusative, but the common change was from the accusative/nominative plural to partitive and from the partitive singular to accusative/genitive.

6. Other Estonian Texts

In order to get a wider textual base a series of sermons ("*Jutlusse ramat*" 1791, pp. 1-17) were studied. These were very similar to the 1739 Bible in the usage of object case. All pronouns with the exception of the nominative *mis* and *keik* were in the partitive case as objects. Again there were ambiguous forms. Nouns were mostly partitive (74.3%), but there were 25.7% accusative forms (8.8% genitive and 16.9% nominative). Of the 21 plural nouns in the nominative case, seven would now be partitive. All five partitive plural nouns were used correctly according to modern standards. Of 101 partitive noun objects six would be accusative today. The main impression gained from this text was that, compared to the 1739 Bible, partitive plural nouns were appearing slightly more frequently, and there were fewer instances where by modern standards the wrong case was used.

Next, some secular literature ("*Pühhapäwa wahhe-luggemised*" 1818, pp. 1-51) was studied. These were geographical descriptions by Otto Wilhelm Masing, who was considered the best Estonian linguist of his time. Again, the partitive was predominant (80.4% overall). Personal pronouns, which were all 3rd person, were partitive. Of the other pronouns, the nominative forms were all *mis* and *keik*. All others were partitive. There were some genitive objects (2.6%), the use of which corresponded with modern norms. Of the 161 partitive noun objects, the vast majority were singular, but there were 27 instances of plural ones. Of the nominative noun objects 25/28 were plural and 20 of those would now still be used in the nominative, and so would the singular ones. Hence there was certainly a trend towards modern usage. The general impression is that genitive objects were still fairly uncommon. Masing came from southern Estonia and his writings do show an influence of the southern dialect, although they are basically written in the standard Estonian of the time, which was based on the northern dialect. It is possible that the relative paucity of use of the genitive object in his writings is related to his southern heritage.

In 1896 Hermann published a grammar of Estonian, which for the first time drew attention to the need to consider aspect in the choice of object case, so it must have been in the spoken language at that time. His work had a great influence on Estonian writing of his time.

Many writers in the latter part of the 19th and the early part of the 20th century used the partitive and genitive object in the same way as modern writers, but there were notable exceptions, for example Johann Mattias Eisen (born in 1857), whose book on Estonian mythology ("*Eesti mütoloogia*" 1919) was revised in 1995, with a number of corrections of object case. The Estonian translation of the Finnish novel "*Seitsemän veljestä*" in 1924 (Table 3) is modern in its use of object case. It is worth noting that a number of genitive personal pronouns are seen, which is not so evident even in the latest Bible translations. The fact that we are dealing with a translation from Finnish, where genitive personal pronouns are relatively frequent in the original, may well be a factor. As personal pronouns are still commonly used in the partitive where nouns would be accusative, there

would not be much reason for the old partitive personal pronouns in the Bible to be altered during revision.

7. Other Finnish Material

The earliest mention in grammar books of the modern personal pronoun accusative forms ending in *-t* is found in Jahnsson (1871:15), who stated that they were used in the spoken language of the Eastern dialects, and that the plural forms were beginning to come into the written language. However, in the main grammatical description he gave the genitive forms for both singular and plural personal pronoun objects of bounded events, as well as the partitive for unbounded ones. By 1880 the Finnish grammar by Setälä contained all the modern accusative forms of the personal pronouns. The first Bible translation to use the accusative form *meidät* appeared in 1913 (Ikola 1966: 28).

Table 2. “*Seitsemän veljestä*” ch. 1-2

	Finnish 1870	Estonian 1924
Objects – total	522	467
Partitive	258 (49.4%)	302 (64.7%)
Genitive	181 (34.7%)	123 (26.3%)
Nominative	81 (15.5%)	42 (9.0%)
Accusative (pers. pro.)	2 (0.4%)	–
Accusative (gen + nom + acc)	264 (50.6%)	165 (35.3%)
Pers. pro – total	80	70
Partitive	59 (73.8%)	61 (87.1%)
Genitive	19 (23.8%)	9 (12.9%)
Nominative	0	0
Accusative	2 (2.5%)	–
Accusative (gen + nom + acc)	21 (26.3%)	9 (12.9%)
Other pro – total	82	66
Partitive	35 (42.7%)	47 (71.2%)
Genitive	33 (40.2%)	8 (12.1%)
Nominative	14 (17.1%)	11 (16.7%)
Accusative (gen + nom)	47 (57.3%)	19 (28.8%)
Nouns – total	360	331
Partitive	164 (45.6%)	194 (58.6%)
Genitive	129 (35.8%)	106 (32.0%)
Nominative	67 (18.6%)	31 (9.4%)
Accusative (gen + nom)	196 (54.4%)	137 (41.4%)

The grammar books do not give any indication of the frequency of usage of the different forms, so further data was examined from the novel “*Seitsemän veljestä*” by Aleksis Kivi, first published in 1870. A new edition, published in 2002 was used, but this does not appear to have been modernized. The book consists mainly of dialogue, so all personal

pronouns are represented. The first two chapters of this book have been analyzed in the same way as the Bible passages, and the results are shown in Table 3. There was available an Estonian translation of this book from 1924, which was also analyzed, and those results are shown for comparison. In Finnish altogether 50.6% of objects are in the accusative case, a figure slightly less than the 53.3% in the modern Finnish Bible text. Again, the personal pronouns are of greatest interest. The results here are similar to those of the old Bible translation, with 26.3% accusative forms. The majority of these again surface as genitive, and it is noteworthy that the plural pronouns also have the genitive surface form for the accusative, differing from nouns which in the plural have an accusative form identical with the nominative. There were two examples of personal pronoun objects in the modern accusative case form: *hänet* and *sinut*. Jahnsson (1871:15) mentioned plural personal pronouns appearing in the accusative case, and here we also have singular ones. As far as other pronouns and nouns are concerned, there is no significant difference between this text and the modern Bible.

8. Summary

There are considerable differences between Old Finnish and Old Estonian. usage of object case in the 16-17th century. Finnish is much closer to the present day usage, with the main difference being in the personal pronouns, for which a particular accusative form was introduced in the second half of the 19th century. In earlier texts the partitive was more common than nowadays, but the genitive was frequently used in resultative clauses, even in the plural.

In southern Estonian in the 17th century almost all objects were in the partitive case, whether the event was bounded or not. In northern Estonian half a century later, the partitive also predominated for singular nouns, but more genitive forms were also found. Partitive plural objects, on the other hand, were very few, even when the event was clearly not bounded, although they did appear in negative clauses. Subsequently, the language of further Bible editions retained some of the older usage, even well into the 20th century, while other texts showed an earlier tendency towards modernization, with some late 19th century texts hardly appearing different from those of more modern writers with respect to object case. Personal pronouns have tended to remain partitive, obligatorily so for 1st and 2nd pronouns in situations where a noun object would be in the nominative case.

The gradual development of a more consistent relationship between object case and aspect in later texts is probably due to increasing education of the general population, more writers of Estonian origin, and the publication of prescriptive grammars.

References

- Asudeh A 2004 'A licensing theory for Finnish' in D Nelson & S Manninen (eds) *Generative Approaches to Finnic and Saami Linguistics* CSLI Publications Stanford: 165-199.
- Harris AC and Campbell L 1995 *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective* Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Hermann KA 1896 *Eesti Keele Lause-õpetus* Self-published Tartu.
- Ikola O 1966 "Päästä meitä pahasta" *Sananjalka* 8: 28-38.

- Jahnsson W 1871 *Finska Språkets Satslära* Finska Litteratur-sällskapet Tryckeri Helsingfors.
- Karlsson F 1999 *Finnish. An Essential Grammar* Routledge London.
- Kiparsky P 1998 'Partitive case and aspect' in M Butt & W Geuder (eds) *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors* CSLI Publications Stanford: 265-307.
- Kiparsky P 2001 'Structural case in Finnish' *Lingua* 11: 315-376.
- Lees A 2004 'Partitive-Accusative Alternation in Balto-Finnic Languages' in C Muskovsky(ed.) *Proceedings of the 2003 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*.
<http://www.newcastle.edu.au/school/lang-media/news/als2003/proceedings.html>
- Setälä EN 1880 *Suomen kielen lause-oppi* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura Helsinki.
- Valmet A 1956 *Pluurali partitiiv eesti vanemas kirjakeeles (1524-1857)* Tartu.
- Valmet A 1963 'Pluurali partitiiv XVII sajandi lõpu eesti kirjakeeles' *Emakeele Seltsi Aastaraamat* IX:63-84.