

***Kur tev sāp? – Where does it hurt?***  
**Location and impersonal predicates referring**  
**to body parts in Finnish and Latvian**  
***Kur tev sāp? – Ķermeņa daļas, vieta un bezpersonas***  
***predikāti somu un latviešu valodā***

**Marja Leinonen**

University of Helsinki

E-mail: *marja.leinonen@kolumbus.fi*

This article describes the non-canonical syntactic constructions of NPs and third person singular verb forms that express physical sensations, typically pain, in a certain body part. The starting point is Finnish, where impersonal constructions with NPs in the partitive or local cases form the centre of this semantic field. The test sentences, stemming from typological research material, are compared to their equivalents in Latvian. The results show that in Latvian, the nominative predominates, although locatives are used as well. Of the immediate linguistic neighbours of Latvian, Estonian follows the same strategy, while Lithuanian verbs of pain, which have received much attention, resort mostly to accusatives and locatives. In the broader Finnic field, the cognate languages express this using partitive NPs, while Russian employs a great deal of body parts in the locative and accusative, but also in the nominative. If an outside influence on Latvian and Estonian is considered, German seems to be the likeliest candidate, though there as well, locatives are a natural means for expressing sensations deep within the body.

**Keywords:** body-part location; impersonal constructions; areal typology; Finnish; Latvian; Baltic language area.

## 1. Introduction

Typological research on verbs expressing pain evolved during the 2000s and now covers a considerable number of languages. One of them is Finnish, for which Russian linguists collected data in the form of extensive questionnaires that were filled by two Finnish linguists, Ahti Nikunlassi and myself. One result of this work is an article by the former (Nikunlassi 2013). For Latvian, no comparable study has been conducted thus far. The aim of this paper is to fill the gap for the part of constructions resorting to impersonal predicate verbs. In both Finnish and Latvian, impersonal (third person singular) verb forms are used to signify physical and mental sensations or states that are located in specific organs of the human body. Most of the sensations concerned are indeed so-called pain verbs, but less unpleasant sensations can be coded this way as well. The Finnish corpus contained over forty verbs of the former type, while the latter, e.g. ‘ears tickling’, ‘eyes being dazzled’, ‘skin being chafed’, were not included at the time (Leinonen, MS). In this paper, the semantics and syntax of the relevant structures in these languages will be compared. The theoretical basis is the framework of the above-mentioned research, prior research in Finnish linguistics, and subsequent research

on Lithuanian, with one exception: defining the semantic role of the body part as stimulus (Reznikova et al. 2012; Holvoet 2016, 104) does not feel intuitively convincing, at least when it is non-nominative. The empirical basis is our data (AN & ML) along with additional data from Finnish websites, a Latvian electronic corpus (*The Balanced Corpus of Modern Latvian (Līdzsvarots mūsdienu latviešu valodas korpuss*, available at [www.korpuss.lv](http://www.korpuss.lv))), and a questionnaire presented to native Latvian speakers residing in Finland. In addition, the constructions are compared with the languages of the Baltic region: Latvian, other Finnic languages, Lithuanian, Russian, and German.

## 2. The constructions for expressing verbs of pain

In the typology of semantic case frames (Reznikova et al. 2012, 444–446), the constructions of verbs of pain consist of:

1. a body part, which can be expressed as:
  - a) a locative phrase: (German) *Es saust mir in den Ohren* ‘my ears buzz’, *Es beisst mir in den Augen* ‘My eyes smart’, (Russian) *Kol'nulo v boku* ‘There was a twinge in my side’;
  - b) the theme, or subject of an intransitive verb: (German) *Mir schmerzt der Kopf* ‘My head aches’, (Russian) *U menja bolit golova* ‘My head aches’, *Vchera u menja ochen' bok kolol* ‘Yesterday my side smarted a lot’, (Estonian) *Mul pea valutab* ‘ibid.’;
  - c) a stimulus, or initiator of the pain situation, the subject of a transitive verb: (Serbian) *Boli me ruka* (hurt.PRS.3SG I.ACC arm.NOM) ‘My hand hurts me’.
2. an experiencer, which can be expressed:
  - a) in the dative: (German) *Mir schmerzt der Kopf* ‘I have a headache’;
  - b) by a possessor – an oblique object or a possessive pronoun, or a possessive construction (Russian, Estonian, above);
  - c) as a patient – direct object: (Serbian, above).
3. a reason, conceptualized as a causer or source:
  - a) causer of the sensation, expressed as a subject: (French) *La lumière me fait mal aux yeux* ‘The light gives me pain in the eyes’;
  - b) source, as an oblique object, or a prepositional group: (Russian) *Golova bolit ot stressa* ‘My head aches from stress’.

## 3. Finnish impersonals with body parts

In Finnish grammar, the class of so-called impersonal verbs include, among other types, *tuntekusverbit* – verbs of sensation – which are separated from *tunnekausatiivit*, causatives of feeling, although some verbs can be used in both functions. The verbs of sensation cover both those verbs of pain that have been objects of recent research, and less serious states and processes of the organism, – though they are mostly more unpleasant than not. In the following, I shall discuss both verbs of pain and verbs of other physical sensations.

The Finnish verbs of sensation to be discussed collocate with animate nouns, which co-occur with body parts of inalienable possession. The animate noun has

the form of the possessor of the body part (adessive, partitive or genitive), and when omitted, it refers to the speaker or the implied author of the discourse. The body part is either in the partitive, which is one of the object cases in Finnish, or in a locative case (inessive, illative, elative); thus, the verb is always in the incongruent third person singular (Iso suomen kielioppi 2004, 458). The unmarked word order in Finnish clauses is theme-initial. If only the body part is expressed, it is the theme:

- (1) *Pää-tä*                      *huima-a / särke-e.*  
 head-PART                      feel-PRS.3SG / hurt-PRS.3SG  
 'I feel dizzy / My head hurts.'
- (2) *Jalka-a*                      *kuti-tta-a.*  
 leg-PART                      tickle-CAUS-PRS.3SG  
 'My leg tickles/itches.'

If the experiencer-possessor is expressed, it is the natural topic and occurs clause-initially. It commonly occurs in the adessive:

- (3) *Minu-lla*                      *särke-e*                      *pää-tä.*  
 I-ADE                      hurt-PRS.3SG                      head-PART  
 'My head hurts.'

Genitive experiencers, however, are quite rare:

- (4) *Voi olla, että minu-n koske-e pää-hän, koska en syö lihaa.*  
 can be that I-GEN hurt-PRS.3SG head-ILL because I.NEG eat meat.  
 'It may be that my head hurts, because I do not eat meat.'  
 (keskustelu.suomi24.fi>Ruoka ja juoma>Vegaaniruoka, 9.7.2016)

The genitive is in such cases called „dative-genitive”, since it appears in other impersonal constructions of non-controlled states as well, cf. *minun/minulla on kylmä* (I.GEN/ADE is cold.NOM) 'I am cold'.

Partitive experiencers are fairly common:

- (5) *Minu-a*                      *pistä-ä*                      *vasempa-an*                      *kylke-en.* ' '  
 I-PART                      stab-PRS.3SG                      left-ILL                      side-ILL  
 'I have a stitch in my left side.' (Nikunlassi 2013, 265)

The verbs with partitive body parts cannot be used with experiencer partitives, as intuitions do not allow two partitive arguments in the same predication: \**Minua* (PART) *särkee päätä* (PART).

Use of the local cases is dictated by the valency of the verb:

Illative:

- (6) *Minu-n*                      *koske-e*                      *silmi-in.*  
 I-GEN                      hurt-PRS.3SG                      eyes-ILL  
 'My eyes hurt.'

(quizlet.com; a study set for translating from Finnish into Russian = *u menja boljat glaza* 'at me hurt eyes'; 9.7.2016)

- (7) *Koske-e-ko*                      *sinu-lla*                      *jalkoi-hin?*  
 hurt-PRS.3SG-Q                      you-ADE                      feet-ILL

‘Do your legs hurt?’

(quizlet.com; same as above, = *u tebja boljat nogi?* ‘at you hurt legs?’)

- (8) *Pää-hän/vatsa-an*                      *koske-e/sattu-u.*

head-ILL /stomach-ILL                      hurt-PRS.3SG

‘My head / stomach hurts.’

*Kylke-en*                      *pistä-ä.*

side-ILL                      sting-PRS.3SG

‘I have a stitch in the side.’

Inessive:

- (9) *Jos*                      *korv-i-ssa*                      *soi,*                      *joku*                      *ajattelee*                      *sinua.*

if ear-PL-INE                      ring.PRS.3SG                      someone                      thinks                      of                      you

‘If your ears ring, someone is thinking about you.’

(mtv.fi/lifestyle/tunteet/artikkeli/...meilta-ja.../3195408, 9.7.2016)

- (10) *Silm-i-ssä*                      *mustene-e.*

eye-PL-INE                      blacken-PRS.3SG

‘It becomes black in my eyes.’

Elicative:

- (11) *Sydäme-stä*                      *otta-a.*

heart-ELA                      take-PRS.3SG

‘There is a pain in my chest.’

The case of the body part is determined by the original valence of the verb or of the specific verb construction. Some are homonyms of concrete meanings of „touching” (*koskea, sattua, pistää* + illatives), while those with partitives are mostly homonyms or metaphorical extensions of transitives (*särkeä* ‘to break’) or causatives (*kuti-tta-a* ‘to tickle’ < *kutiaa* ‘itches’ (PRS.3SG), no infinitive). In most cases, a nominative of stimulus/causer may be added, in which case the construction is close to an active sentence with a subject:

- (12) (*Metsä on täynnä elämää, välistä oikein*)

wood is full life-PART, sometimes really

*korv-i-a*                      *särke-e*                      *kaikki*                      *se*                      *meteli*                      *ja*                      *riekkuminen.*

ear-PL-PART                      hurt-PRS.3SG                      all                      that                      noise.NOM                      and                      hullabaloo.NOM.

‘The wood is full of life, sometimes my ears ache from all that noise and hullabaloo.’

(tiinanpatikointi.blogspot.com/... tossua-toisen-eteen-rengon-pääjärv... 9.7.2016)

Less often, the stimulus is in the elative:

- (13) *Jalko-j-a alko-i särke-ä paljo-sta seisomise-sta.*  
 leg-PL-PART begin-PRS.3SG hurt-INF much-ELA standing-ELA  
 ‘My legs began to ache from much standing.’  
 (www.suomisanakirja.fi, s.v. *särkeä*)

A three-fold valence is possible for some of these verbs; with an impersonal usage (14), a „normal” transitive construction with a partitive object (15), and an intransitive usage with a nominative subject (16):

- (14) *Jalko-j-a-ni arista-a.*  
 leg-PL-PART-POSS.1SG be-sore-PRS.3SG  
 ‘My legs feel sore.’
- (15) *Hän arist-i olkapää-tä-än.*  
 s/he feel-sore-PRS.3SG shoulder-PART-POSS.3  
 ‘He was very careful with his shoulder’. (because it was sore)  
 (www.sanakirja.org, s.v. *aristaa*)
- (16) *Haava arista-a.*  
 wound-NOM feel-sore-PRS.3SG  
 ‘The wound feels sore.’

Stating that most of the verbs of pain in Finnish are impersonal Nikunlassi (2013, 257) classified them into basic and derived verbs. The basic verbs are not associated in native speakers’ intuitions with a metaphorical transfer from other verbs – although for some, such a connection is evident. Such basic verbs include: *särkeä* (‘hurt’, < ‘break’), *pakottaa* (‘ache’, < ‘force’), *kolottaa*, *jomottaa*, *kivistää* (‘ache’), *vihloa* (‘stinging ache’) + partitive; and *sattua*, *koskea* (‘hurt’, < ‘touch’), *ottaa* (‘hurt’, < ‘take’) + illative, the latter occurring also with elative. These meanings also allow a nominative subject-causer (see above example (12)). The derived verbs are metaphorical extensions of verbs signifying destruction or deformation, including burning, pressure, and loud noise (ibid. 265).

Certain verbs collocate with only certain body parts, e.g., *kolottaa* (about the bones, back), *kivistää* (about the head, heart), *jomottaa* (about the head), *vihloa* (about a tooth), whereas the most general verbs *koskea*, *särkeä*, *sattua* signify a pain anywhere in the body (Nikunlassi 2013).

There is a great variety of metaphorically based derived pain verbs. For example, for the heart: *sydäntä* (PART) *ahdistaa*, *jäytää*, *kalvaa*, *pusertaa*, *raastaa*, *riipoo* (all signify various degrees and kinds of continuing pain), *kouristaa*, *riipaisee*, *viiltää* (signify a stronger sudden pain), *kylmää*, *jäätää*, *hyytää* (signify degrees of a freezing sensation). Unpleasant sensations in the stomach are a multitude as well: *vatsaa/vatsassa* (PART or INE) *kiertää*, *korventaa*, *kouraisee*, *kouristaa*, *korventaa*, *kääntää*, *myllertää*, *pistelee*, *polttaa*, *vääntää*... (twist, grab, wring, scorch, turn, churn, prick, burn, wrench...) (Leinonen MS).

### 3.1. Nominative vs. non-nominative body parts

In Finnish, the nominative can be used for the body part with some of these verbs in the meaning of bodily sensation: *korvat soivat* ‘ears-NOM ring-PRS.3PL’; *luut kolottavat* ‘bones-NOM ache-PRS.3PL’; *hammas vihloo* ‘tooth-NOM cut-PRS.3SG’. Nikunlassi (2013, 270) states that only the verbs *särkeä*, *pakottaa*, *jomottaa* and *kivistää* (various ways of aching) are always impersonal. However, the situation is not stable. For example, an online dictionary gives the following example:

- (17) *Jala-t*                      *alka-vat*                      *särke-ä*  
 leg-PL.NOM                      begin-PRS.3PL                      hurt-INF  
 ‘(My) legs begin to ache’ (www.suomisanakirja.fi, s.v. *särkeä*)

According to my intuitions, there should be a partitive: *jalkoja alkaa särkeä*. However, the example clearly shows that the original transitive meaning of the verb is entirely lost, since the predicate verb here agrees with ‘the legs’, a subject that hardly can be thought of as an agent. Nikunlassi (2013, 271) finds such a use colloquial, and mentions only an occasional use of nominative body-part for the verb *vihloa*:

- (18) *Viisaudenhammas*                      *vihloo*                      *taas.*  
 wisdom\_tooth.NOM                      ache.PRS.3SG                      again  
 ‘The wisdom tooth is aching again.’

The question remains as to what this nominative should be called semantically. In the article cited at the beginning, it was called stimulus, source of the pain. To me, it seems that such a usage would simply confuse the issue, as there is also a reason/cause, usually well separate from the body part. Why not call it theme, as it would then be comparable to other non-volitional nominatives?

If the verb allows a nominative alongside the oblique case, as with *soida* ‘to ring’, the subject nominative seems to be preferred in atemporal sentences, e.g., in the definition of tinnitus:

- (19) *Jokaise-n*                      *korva-t soi-vat*                      *joskus.*  
 everyone-GEN                      ears-NOM                      ring-PRS.3PL sometimes  
 ‘Everyone’s ears ring sometimes.’ (www.tinnitusyhdistys.fi/3)

The non-nominative rather refers to a concrete sensation in a certain situation – this is apparently the case with all impersonal predicates in a minimal context.

## 4. Latvian

In Latvian, comparable studies have not been conducted. The grammatical form of the body part co-occurring with third person singular has been treated in one study (Freimane 2008). Physical and mental processes and sensations or states are expressed using the possessive dative construction, the third person form (Latvian does not differentiate between third person singular and plural), and the

body part either in the nominative (as in 20) or, in a few instances, in the locative case (as in (20) and (21)):

(20) *Man tumst ac-is.*  
 I.DAT darken.PRS.3 eyes-NOM.PL  
 ‘My eyes go black.’

(20’) *Man tumst ac-īs.*  
 I.DAT darken.PRS.3 eyes-LOC.PL  
 ‘My eyes go black.’

(21) *Zēn-am sāp sird-ī.*  
 Boy-DAT hurt.PRS.3 heart-LOC  
 ‘The boy has a pain in his heart.’

According to Freimane (2008,127, 134), the nominative defines the location of the sensation exactly, whereas with the locative, the place of the sensation is less extensive or concretely defined: *sāp kakls, mugura – kaklā, mugurā* ‘hurts throat. NOM, back.NOM’ – ‘hurts throat.LOC, back.LOC’. Apparently, the author finds that the stimulus/cause is present in the context implicitly, or it is an indefinite ‘something’.

In order to investigate the usage, a questionnaire with Finnish impersonal constructions was presented for translation to three native Latvian speakers. In their answers, the nominative predominates. Support for the choices was sought in the Latvian electronic corpus in the *The Balanced Corpus of Modern Latvian*. Below, the results of the corpus are exemplified, if they differ from the answers of the informants:

Nominatives:

(22) *Silmi-ā kirvelee, hāikāisee. = Ac-is grauž, žilbst.*  
 eyes-PART smart are-dazzled eyes-NOM.PL smart.PRS.3 be\_dazzled.PRS.3  
 ‘Eyes smart, are dazzled.’

(23) *Kāsi-ā paleltaa. = Rok-as salst.*  
 hands-PART is-cold hands-NOM.PL cold.PRS.3  
 ‘Hands are cold.’

(24) *Hammas-ta sārkee. = Zob-s sāp.*  
 tooth-PART aches tooth-NOM ache.PRS.3  
 ‘Tooth aches.’

(25) *Kurkku-a kuristaa. = Kakl-s žņaudz-as.*  
 throat-PART chokes throat-NOM choke-PRS.3.REFL  
 ‘Throat is tight (chokes).’

(26) *Poski-a polttaa. = Vaig-i deg/svilst.*  
 cheeks-PART burn cheeks-NOM.PL burn/flare.PRS.3  
 ‘Cheeks are burning/flaming.’

The constructions with nominatives were used for ‘eyes going dark’, ‘mouth getting dry’, ‘feet tickling’, ‘face feeling hot’, ‘head aching’.

Locatives:

Apparently, locatives in Latvian are used for sensations that are felt within the body, as opposed to on the surface:

(27) *Korva-an, kylke-en pistāā.* = *Aus-ī dur, sān-ā/sān-os dur-as/dur.*  
 ear-ILL side-ILL stings ear-LOC sting, side-LOC/LOC.PL sting-(REFL-)PRS.3  
 ‘X stings in my ear, I have a stitch in the side.’

(28) *Rinta-a pakottaa.* = *Krūt-īs spiež/žņaudz.*  
 chest-PART aches chest-LOC.PL press.PRS.3  
 ‘My chest aches (feels pressed).’  
 (dictionary La-Ru s.v. *spiest*: *Man pakrūtē spiež.*)

(29) *Nenä-ān pistelee.* = *Degun-ā durst-ās/kņudina/kņud.*  
 nose-ILL prickles nose-LOC prick-(REFL-) PRS.3  
 ‘My nose prickles /itches.’

Several Latvian constructions were given for the following inner body sensations; the locative refers specifically to a sensation inside the body part:

(30) *Sydāmeštā ottaa.* = *Sird-ī dur.*  
 heart-ELA takes heart-LOC stab.PRS.3  
 ‘I have a pain in my chest.’

(31) *Korvi-ssa soi.* = *Aus-is/aus-īs džinkst/zvana.*  
 ears-INE ring ears-NOM/LOC.PL tingle/ring.PRS.3  
 ‘My ears tingle/ring.’

(32) *Vatsa-a turvottaa, vāntāā, kouristaa* =  
 stomach-PART swells, turns, gripes  
*Vēder-s piepūties, griež.*  
 ‘stomach-NOM is swollen, x turns my stomach’  
 ‘My stomach is swollen / x turns my stomach.’

(33) *Vatsaa korventaa, kiertāā.* = *Vēder-ā dedzina/griež-as.*  
 stomach-PART burns/turns stomach-LOC burn/turn-PRS.3.REFL  
 ‘I have stomach cramps.’

(34) *Kurkku-a kutittaa.* = *Kakl-s/kakl-ā niez.*  
 throat-PART tickles throat-NOM/throat-LOC tickle.PRS.3  
 ‘My throat tickles.’

A further impersonal use was found in the bonito corpus for the verb *smelgt* ‘to smart, to ache’, with a locative:

(35) *Viņam varbūt nedaudz smeldza pakrūt-ē par*  
 he.DAT maybe a\_bit smart.PST.3 belly-LOC PREP  
*pamestaj-iem bērniem.*  
 abandoned-DAT.PL child-DAT.PL  
 ‘He had a bit of a bellyache because of the abandoned children.’  
 (Jānis Kalve. *Skrīviņu sakraments* 2005; www.korpus.lv)



An example with *pulsēt* ‘throb’:

- (36) (... *drēbes un āda ir vienādi pelēkas,*) *deniņ-os* *pulsē.*  
 clothes and skin are equally pale, temple-LOC.PL throb.PRS.3  
 ‘The clothes and the skin are equally pale, the temples throb.’  
 (Inga Ābele. *Sniega laika piezīmes* 2004; www.korpuss.lv)

And for the verb *kutēt* ‘to tickle’ (cf. example (2)) above):

- (37) [*ceļš...*] *jau sašūpoja mašīnu, viegli pameta gaisā tā,*  
 road already rocked the car, lifted lightly into the air so  
*ka Kic-ei nokutēj.a vēder-ā, tad...*  
 that Kice-DAT tickle.PST.3 stomach-LOC then  
 ‘The road already rocked the car, lifted it lightly into the air, so that it tickled  
 in Kice’s stomach, then...’  
 (Inga Ābele. *Akas māja* 1999; www.korpuss.lv)

Accusatives:

There were a few metaphorical impersonals with transitive valency (ACC) retained:

- (38) *Henke-ā salpaa.* = *Elp-u aizsit.*  
 breath-PART closes breath-ACC close.PRS.3  
 ‘My breath is stopping, choking.’
- (39) *Luita kolottaa.* = *Kaul-us lauž.*  
 bones-PL.PART aches bone-ACC.PL break.PRS.3  
 ‘My bones ache.’
- (40) *Kurkkua ärsyttää.* = *Kairina kakt-u.*  
 Throat-PART irritates irritate.PRS.3 throat-ACC  
 ‘My throat is irritated.’

In *The Balanced Corpus of Modern Latvian*, there are no accusative body parts with these verbs, except *kaulus laužt*, which seems to be common:

- (41) *Man bez tām viņas drēbēm uzreiz bezmiegs*  
 I.DAT except those.DAT her.GEN clothes.DAT.PL suddenly insomnia.NOM  
*un kaul-us lauž.*  
 and bone-ACC.PL break.PRS.3  
 ‘Without those clothes of hers I get suddenly insomnia and my bones ache.’  
 (Pēteris Pūrītis. *Jansona istaba* 2006; www.korpuss.lv)

However, an example cited in an article by Holvoet (2016, 99), does show an accusative:

- (42) *Izmeklējumi taču jāveic, jo*  
 Examinations however must-make for  
*nabadziņam galv-u plēš pušu.*  
 poor-man.DAT head-ACC tears apart  
 ‘An examination is needed, for the poor devil’s head is torn apart.’

Holvoet (ibid. 98–99) calls the phenomenon „demoted agent”.

Impersonal sentences without the body part are used with these transitive verbs, often with a qualifying adverb:

- (43) *Citas sievietes atkal pēc operācijas saka – vai, kā sāp! Es pat*  
 other women again after operation say oh how hurt.PRS.3 I.NOM even  
*rok-as nevaru pacel-t, kā man spiež un sāp.*  
 hands-ACC.PL not\_can.PRS.1SG lift-INF how I.DAT press.PRS.3 and hurt.PRS.3  
 ‘Some women again after operation say: Oh, how it hurts, I cannot even lift  
 my hand, how it presses me and hurts.’  
 (Zane Nikodemusa. *Vai esam silikona paaudze*; www.korpuss.lv)

## 5. Verbs of sensation, without body part

Somewhere between body-part sensations and feelings are the constructions of experiencer + sensation. In Finnish, causative verbs in 3SG and partitive experiencers (animate, topic) replicate the productive construction of causatives of feeling, which have been the subject of research: Siirainen (2001) has studied the derivational processes of verbs of emotions, e.g. *suuttua – suuttuttaa* ‘to get angry’ – ‘to anger someone’. The causative with the suffix *-tta-* is used in the construction NP-PART + V-TTA-3SG, e.g. *minua suuttuttaa* ‘I feel angry’, which determines its meaning as a non-controlled feeling, attributed to the speaker (or the subject of discourse, from whose point of view the narrative develops) (Siirainen 2001, 168). This extremely productive means of impersonalization can base its correlation on verbs, nouns and adjectives as well. Similarly in our case, the verbs of physiological sensations are correlated with (if not directly derived from) verbs or nouns of the same root:

- (44) *Minu-a nuku-tta-a.*  
 I-PART sleep-CAUS-PRS.3  
 ‘I feel sleepy.’ (< *nukkua* ‘to sleep’, *nuku-tta-a* ‘put to sleep’)

The model also applies to such physiological sensations as ‘yawning’ (*haukotella – haukotuttaa/haukottaa*), ‘hiccupping’ (*nikotella – nikottaa*), ‘laughing’ (*nauraa – naurattaa*), ‘crying’ (*itkeä – itkettää*), ‘being thirsty’ (< *jano* ‘thirst’) *janottaa*, ‘being hungry’ (< *nälkä* ‘hunger’) *nälättää*, ‘being nauseous’ *oksentaa – oksettaa*, etc.

There are other verbs for sensations for which a derivational relationship is harder to find, such as *hiukoa/hiukaista* ‘to feel hungry’, *huimata* ‘to feel dizzy’, *yököttää, ällöttää, kuvottaa* ‘to feel nauseous’, etc.

In Latvian, the choices for constructions with the corresponding verbs of sensations are a dative-possessor either with the third person and a deverbal noun, or with an impersonal reflexive verb and the infinitive:

- (45) *Man nāk miegs. Man grib-as gulē-t.*  
 I.DAT come.PRS.3 sleep.NOM I.DAT want-PRS.3.REFL sleep-INF  
 ‘I am sleepy.’

Further answers of my informants to the above constructions resorted to deverbal nouns, often *plurale tantum*, cf. above:

- (46) *Man nāk smiekl-i, vēmien-s, žāv-as,*  
 I.DAT come.PRS.3 laughter-NOM.PL vomiting-NOM yawning-NOM.PL  
*drebuļ-i, žag-as.*  
 shudders-NOM.PL hiccups-NOM.PL  
 ‘I feel like laughing, vomiting, yawning, shuddering, hickuping.’

For a few basic sensations, there are specific impersonal verbs:

- (47) *Man salst, slāp-st.*  
 I.DAT freeze.PRS.3 thirst-PRS.3  
 ‘I am cold, thirsty.’

Both physical and psychological conditions are expressed using impersonal verbs with experiencer datives, but the causer/stimulus is in the nominative: *riebties* ‘to loathe’, *dergties* ‘to be disgusted with sth’, *sāpēt* ‘to ache’, *smelgt* ‘to smart’, *šķīst* ‘to seem’, *veikties* ‘to succeed, to have luck’, *patikt* ‘to please’, *rūpēt* ‘to be worried about sth’, *gribēties* ‘to feel like doing sth.’, etc.

The experiencer dative is also used with the copular verbs *būt* ‘to be’, *tikt* ‘to become’, *tapt* ‘to become’, *kļūt* ‘to become’ and adverbs: *bērnām ir bail* ‘the child is afraid’, *slimniekam kļūst labāk* ‘the patient is getting better’, *klausītājiem bija interesanti* ‘it was interesting for the listeners’.

## 6. Neighbouring languages

### 6.1. Baltic: Lithuanian

Unlike the corresponding constructions in Latvian, constructions with verbs of pain in Lithuanian have drawn the attention of several linguists. The obvious reason is the present heightened interest in oblique participants.

The Finnish PART + V construction appears to be similar to the Lithuanian construction. The possessor-dative is used in Lithuanian to encode the animate experiencer of the sensation. The verb is monopersonal third person, and the body part is usually in the accusative, or in some dialects in the nominative (Bjarnadóttir 2014, 9–10).

Standard Lithuanian:

- (48) *Man skauda galv-q.*  
 I.DAT ache-PRS.3 head-ACC  
 ‘I have a headache.’

Modern Lithuanian dialect:

- (49) *Sopa gi vis-i gal-ai.*  
 hurt.PRS.3 PARTICLE all-NOM.PL end-NOM.PL  
 ‘It hurts everywhere.’

In Old Lithuanian texts, the nominative is the main case used:

- (50) *Sopa*                    *galwa[...]*      *skaūst*                    *ingstai*.  
 hurt.PRS.3            head-NOM      hurt.PRS.3                    kidney-NOM.PL  
 ‘Head is hurting [...] kidneys are hurting.’

A locative or prepositional phrase is also possible (Seržant 2013, 190):

- (51) *Man*                    *skauda*                    *šon-e*.  
 I.DAT                    ache.PRS.3                    side-LOC  
 ‘It hurts in my side.’

The case frame dative – accusative is unique in Lithuanian for this semantic group of verbs, comprising two types of verbs. First, there are pain-specific verbs, which can be used without naming the body part. The dative denoting the affected person is licensed by the verb itself.

- (52) *Ligoniui*                    *skauda*.  
 patient.DAT                    hurt.PRS.3  
 ‘The patient is in pain.’

The second group is called derived pain constructions. The number of such verbs denoting pain is high. For ‘aching’, Bjarnadóttir lists 45 verbs (with derived senses, covering the various complaints given above for Finnish – no doubt closer scrutiny would produce just as much in Finnish dialects), and 4 verbs for ‘itching’. Some are rare, dialectal or archaic. Obviously, this semantic field is important, and the pattern is productive. The common factor is „physiological inconvenience”.

The sources of the derived pain verbs denote pricking, butting, poking, sticking, planting, digging down, biting, cutting, cleaving, splitting, slicing, peeling, tearing, gnawing, eating, prodding, hulling, shelling, burning, squeezing, pinching, screwing, breaking, hitting, and dragging. The characterizations for the Finnish verbs, „destruction, deformation, pressure”, would no doubt cover most of them. Metaphorization, and conceptualization of the construction as a state or a condition are probably applied universally. For this purpose, the pain-specific verbs are suitable, whereas the derived pain verbs may be better suited to denoting a pain that occurs once and then passes (Bjarnadóttir 2014, 13).

Lately, three other linguists have turned their attention to the pain verb constructions of Lithuanian, with varying theoretical descriptions and opinions on which construction is the original one. As Bjarnadóttir (2014) explained, Holvoet (2013) refers to the Obliqueness Hierarchy: accusative marking on the body part is due to an obliqueness adjustment, as an intransitive subject next to a dative argument (with certain subject properties) creates a mismatch, which is resolved by introducing the accusative. Seržant (2013) explains the accusative in terms of a more general drift from a non-canonical nominative object towards a canonical accusative-marked object. The drift is supported by the impact of the originally causal pain verb type (e.g., *durti* ‘sting’). Piccini (2008) argues that the accusative marking of body parts is the original case, and that the nominative is an innovation – the dative is not an experiencer but an external possessor, and the body part is the

experiencer and subject in the construction. She compares the construction with accusative experiencers in other constructions.

Bjarnadóttir (2014, 7–8) argues that the correct approach is Construction Grammar, where we find a lexicon-syntax continuum in which every part is treated as a construction. It is a symbolic unit, an association of structure and meaning. Since there is variation between nominative and accusative body parts in dialects and Old Lithuanian, Bjarnadóttir finds that the derived, originally transitive verbs serve with their accusative objects as a source construction for extension, thus retaining the accusative in the new meaning as well. The accusative, which Bjarnadóttir calls subject, may even be extended to the sphere of pain-specific verbs, which originally collocated with nominative subjects. Thus, the solution is similar to that of Seržant's, though sidestepping the idea of canonical forms. Extension, metaphorization, and productivity of language are the key concepts here. Besides, more general suggestions fail to explain why this extension concerns only verbs of pain and not other semantic fields.

## 6.2. Finnic and Finno-Ugric languages

The **Finnish** constructions have a possessor-adessive (less frequently genitive) to whom the inalienable body part belongs, while the body part is marked either with the partitive – the prototypical object case of durative processes, – or locative case with the case frame having been inherited from the original concrete verb. The causer-reason, if present, occurs in the nominative or the elative. In closely related Finnic languages, the situation varies somewhat.

**Estonian** does not fully resort to the impersonal frame, although partitive experiencers and causatives of feeling belong to the basic experiencer sentence models. Thus, the body part occurs in the nominative: *Mul pea valutab* I.ADE head.NOM hurt.PRS.3SG ‘My head aches.’ The causer is a normal source (elative) or subject (nominative): *pea valutab suurest lärmist* (head.NOM hurts big.ELA noise.ELA) ‘My head aches from the big noise’, or *suur lärm paneb pea valutama* (big.NOM noise.NOM makes head.ACC hurt.INF) ‘The big noise gives me a headache’ (Helle Metslang, p.c.). However, locative cases are also used, just as in Finnish and in Latvian. Rätsep (1978, 78, 107) lists the sentence models of Estonian, and in the group LOC + V, in addition to meteorological verbs, there is the only case of ‘physiological inconvenience’ *süda iiveldab* or *iiveldab* (heart.NOM sickens / sickens) ‘I feel sick, like vomiting’. In the group (N-NOM) + V there are the examples *südame all pööratab* (heart.GEN below dizzies) ‘I feel dizzy’; *rinnus pistab* (chest.INE stabs) ‘There is a stabbing in my heart’; *kõrvus kumiseb* (ear.INE hums) ‘My ears are humming’. The dictionary shows such examples as *ihus pistis* (skin.INE prickled) ‘My skin prickled’, *kõris pitsitab* (throat.INE constricts) ‘My throat is constricted’, *südame alt pigistab* (heart.GEN below tightens) ‘It tightens below my heart’ (SVSSK 2003 s.v. *pistää, pistellä, kuristaa, ahdistaa*).

In **North-East Estonian dialects**, which have had contacts with the more eastern Finnic languages, e.g., Votic and Finnish, the body part appears in the partitive: *pääd kivistä* (head.PART aches) ‘I have a headache’ (cf. Finnish *päätä kivistää*, *ibid.*), *sütand valutta* (heart.PART hurts) *ibid.* (Must 1987, 288; Lindström 2012, 33).

**Votic** employs the partitive body part with adessive experiencer: *Mill vajvęttaB vattsa* (I.ADE hurts stomach.PART) ‘My stomach hurts’ (Markus, Rožanskij 2011, 222).

**Vepsian** has taken the transitive model to the utmost, with the body part in the genitive, the case of the total object: *hibjan sibatav* (skin.GEN itches) ‘My skin itches’, *minei kohtun kibištav* (I.ADE stomach.GEN hurts) ‘My stomach hurts’ (Grünthal 2015, 67, 255, 262: ‘cognitive-somatological verbs of feeling’; a usage first noted in Kettunen 1943, 240–241).

**Karelian** shows both partitive and genitive for body parts: *suonda vedelöv* (vein.PART draws) ‘I have a cramp’, *peän huimoav* (head.GEN feels-dizzy) ‘My head feels dizzy’, *hengen ahistav* (breath.GEN presses) ‘I am short of breath’ (Ahtia 1938, 3, 11 /kaino.kotus.fi.digitointi/pdf/Ahtian\_lauseoppi.pdf).

The impersonal use of verbs of pain extends even to the eastern relatives of these languages, e.g., Komi (Luchina 2011).

**Livonian**: The two examples in the extinct Salaca Livonian written down by J. A. Sjögren in 1846 show a nominative body part with an agreeing verb: *min pää kienslu-b* (ich-Genetiv-Akkusativ Kopf lärmern-PRS) ‘I feel dizzy’, *ame-d podu-b* (Zahn-PL schmerzen-PRS) ‘(My) teeth ache’ (Salis-Livisch 2016, 223, 348). Thus, Livonian has followed the model presented by Latvian and Estonian.

### 6.3. Superstrate languages

Lindström (2012, 32) assumes that the modern Estonian nominative body-part construction may be due to an influence from the surrounding languages – i.e. Russian, German, and Latvian, – and that the partitive construction represents an older stage. As for the causatives of feeling, which in Finnish employ the impersonal construction with partitive experiencers, e.g. *Minua pelottaa* (I.PART frightens) ‘I am afraid’, the use of the corresponding constructions in Estonian without a stimulus, e.g. *Mind hirmutab* (I.PART frightens) ‘ibid.’, feels incomplete; the stimulus here is an obligatory argument, which may have its model in Russian or German as well.

In **Russian**, the constructions with both the nominative and accusative or locative + V.3SG are used to express pain in a body part: *spina/spinu lomit* (back.NOM/ACC hurts) ‘My back hurts’, *kol’nulo v boku* (stabbed PREP side.LOC) ‘There was a twinge in my side’, *u menja bolit golova* (PREP I.GEN aches head.NOM) ‘I have a headache’, *Vchera u menja ochen’ bok kolol* (yesterday PREP I.GEN very side.NOM hurt) ‘Yesterday my side hurt a lot’. However, locatives for certain phenomena are fairly common, e.g. *v grudi davit* (PREP chest.LOC presses) ‘There is a pressure in my heart’, *v gorle sadnit, peresohlo* (PREP throat.LOC smarts, got dry) ‘My throat smarts, has got dry’, *v glazah temneet* (PREP eyes darkens) ‘My eyes become dark’, *v viskah stuchit* (PREP temples pounds) ‘My temples pound’, *v noge sverbit* (PREP leg.LOC itches) ‘My leg itches’. There are different degrees of acceptability for different verbs (Reznikova et al. 2012, 456). In the conceptualization of their project, Bonč-Osmolovskaja, Rahilina and Reznikova (2007) state that typically, the Russian verbs of pain are used in constructions with unexpressed or non-nominative subjects. Apparently, much the same situation is found in other Slavic

languages (Bricyn et al. 2009; cf. the articles on Ukrainian, Polish, Serbian, Croatian).

For sensations of the experiencer without the body part, the constructions of accusative + V and dative + predicative adverb, and dative + reflexive V are commonly used: *ego korchit* (he.ACC convulse) ‘He feels convulsions’, *menja toshnit* (I.GEN feels-sick) and *mne toshno* (I.DAT sickening) both mean ‘I feel like vomiting’, *mne chihaetsja, zhevaetsja* ‘I feel like sneezing, yawning’.

As another candidate for the source of influence, **German** has also been proposed. In this language, both nominative and locative (PREP + N) body parts are found: (with the formal subject *es*) *es kratzt im Hals* (it scratches PREP throat) ‘My throat itches’, *mir schmerzt der Kopf* (I.DAT hurts head.NOM) ‘I have a headache’, *meine Augen beissen* (my eyes.NOM bite) ‘My eyes smart’ (Reznikova et al. 2012, 430, 445, 450; Reznikova 2009). If a model for the nominative body part use is required, it is rather German than Russian.

## 7. Conclusion

Finnish and Latvian apply possessive constructions of *esse* for the experiencer-possessor which is often left implicit. The body part represents inalienable possession, and the verb is of low semantic transitivity. A third argument, cause can be present. In Finnish, the body part in partitive, an object case, is very common and productive for metaphorical expressions of pain or lesser sensations. In Latvian, nominative for the body part predominates, and the locative is used for sensations within the body – as in Finnish as well. The accusative seems to be used in very few cases for body parts. It may be assumed that in all the languages discussed, locatives can be used in subjectless constructions.

In Latvian, there is no specific productive morphological means of creating verbs of sensation, or constructions of physical sensations. Reflexive verbs with dative experiencers often correspond to Finnish causatives. Physical sensations, without body parts but with dative experiencers, are expressed using a specific construction with *nākt* ‘to come’ and a deverbal noun.

Finnish and Lithuanian show similar strategies that deviate from the prototypical SAE Subject-Verb-Object type. In Finnish, no general verb of pain, comparable to Latvian *sāpēt*, Russian *bolet*, English *ache*, or German *schmerzen* has developed a personal usage, if we do not count the few examples with nominative subjects which can be found on the net for the verbs *särkeä*, *kolottaa*, *vihloa* and *aristaa*, possibly others as well.

In Lithuanian, the accusative plays the same role as the partitive in Finnish, when it refers to the body part with verbs of pain, and the usage appears to be just as productive.

Latvian deviates conspicuously from its Baltic neighbour by preferring the nominative, though the material is insufficient to justify any further conclusions. Is there a tendency towards canonical forms with a nominative subject in Latvian; a tendency towards one form – one meaning that is also apparent in the extension of accusative objects and nominative subjects into the sphere of former genitives with negation? Whether there was an original construction of pain verbs with accusative

at some earlier stage is not clear, though derived transitive verbs should naturally serve as a basis for metaphorization.

Locatives for body parts without subject nominatives are used in Finnish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Russian, German, and probably in all the rest of the Finnic and Slavic languages.

In areal typology, Latvian has been grouped together with Estonian, as they seem to have experienced certain changes that are not found in their neighbours. Stolz (2001, 604), who studied the instrumentals and comitatives in Circum-Baltic languages, states that the similarity of Estonian and Latvian constructions must be due to Germanicization, as Latvian and Estonian have shared the same Germanic superstrate for several centuries. That is, these neighbouring languages have *not* influenced each other.

## Abbreviations

ACC	accusative
ADE	adessive
CAUS	causative
DAT	dative
ELA	elative
GEN	genitive
ILL	illative
INE	inessive
INF	infinitive
N	noun
NEG	negative
NOM	nominative
PART	partitive
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PREP	preposition
PRS	present
PST	past
Q	question particle
REFL	reflexive
SG	singular
V	verb

## Sources of examples

1. Ahtia, Edvard G. 1938. *Karjalan kielioppi III (Lauseoppi)*. kaino.kotus.fi.digitointi/pdf/Ahtian\_lauseoppi.pdf.
2. *Angļu–latviešu vārdnīca / English–Latvian Dictionary*. 2002. Rīga: Avots.
3. Bricyn, Viktor M. et al. (eds). 2009. *Koncept bol' v tipologicheskom osveshchenii*. Kiev: Vidavničij Dim Dmitra Burago.



4. Grünthal, Riho. 2015. Vepsän kielioppi. *Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen*. XVII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
5. Hurme, Raija, Malin, Riita-Leena, Syväoja, Olli. 1984. *Uusi suomi-englanti-suursanakirja*. Porvoo-Helsinki-Juva: WSOY. Available: [www.ilmainensanakirja.fi/sanakirja\\_suomi-englanti](http://www.ilmainensanakirja.fi/sanakirja_suomi-englanti).
6. Kettunen, Lauri. 1943. Vepsän murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia*. LXXXVII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
7. *Latviešu-krievu vārdnīca. Latyšsko-russkij slovar'*. 2002. Rīga: Avots.
8. *Līdzsvarots mūsdienu latviešu valodas korpuss (The Balanced Corpus of Modern Latvian)*. Available: [www.korpuss.lv](http://www.korpuss.lv).
9. Leinonen, Marja (MS). *Metaphorical pain verbs and their use for emotional reactions*.
10. Markus, Elena B., Rožanskij, Filip I. 2011. *Sovremennyj vodskij jazyk*. II. Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istorija.
11. Must, Mari. 1987. *Kirderannikumurre. Häälikuline ja grammatiline ülevaade*. Tallinn: Valgus.
12. Reznikova, Tatiana I. 2009. Predikativy boli v nemeckom jazyke. *Koncept bol' v tipologičeskom osveshčenii*. Bricyn, Viktor M. et al. (eds). Kiev: Vidavničij Dim Dmitra Burago, 154–198.
13. Rätsep, Huno. 1978. Eesti keele lihtlauseete tüübid. *Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia, Emakeele seltsi toimetised*. 12. Tallinn: Valgus.
14. *Salisch-Livisch*. 1. J. A. Sjögrens Manuskript. *Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*, Winkler, Eberhard, Pajusalu, Karl (eds). 2016. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica. 87. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
15. *Suomen kielen perussanakirja*. I–III. 2001. *Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja*. 55. Helsinki: Edita, Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus. Available: [www.suomisanakirja.fi](http://www.suomisanakirja.fi)
16. *SVSSK = Suomi-viro-suursanakirja – Soome-eesti suursõnaraamat*. I–II. 2003. Tallinn–Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus, Eesti Keele Instituut.
17. Vahros, Igor', Ščerbakov, Antti. 1975. *Finsko-russkij slovar*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
18. Veisbergs, Andrejs (red.). 2003. *Jaunā latviešu-angļu vārdnīca / The New Latvian–English Dictionary*. Rīga: EKLV.

## References

1. Bjarnadóttir, Valgerður 2014. Emergence and spread of accusative marking of body parts in Lithuanian construction grammar account. *Baltu filologija*. XXIII (1), 5–28.
2. Bonč-Osmolovskaja, Anastasija A., Rahilina, Ekaterina V., Reznikova, Tatiana I. 2007. *Konceptualizacija boli v russkom jazyke: tipologičeskaja perspektiva*. Available: [www.dialog-21.ru/digests/dialog2007/materials/html/12.htm](http://www.dialog-21.ru/digests/dialog2007/materials/html/12.htm).
3. Freimane, Inta. 2008. *Trešā persona latviešu verbu sistēmā*. LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.
4. Holvoet, Axel. 2013. Obliqueness, quasi-subjects and transitivity in Baltic and Slavonic. *The Diachronic Typology of Non-Canonical Subjects*, Seržant, Ilja A.,

- Kulikov, Leonid (eds). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 257–282.
5. Holvoet, Axel. 2016. Argument marking in Baltic and Slavonic pain-verb constructions. *Argument Realization in Baltic*. Holvoet, Axel, Nau, Nicole (eds). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 83–106.
  6. Lindström, Liina. 2012. Tundekausatiivikonstruktsioon eesti moodi. *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 1, 30–47.
  7. Luchina, Elena. S. 2011. Konceptualizacija boli v muzhevskom govore komi-zyrjanskogo jazyka. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy Instituta lingvističeskij issledovanij RAN*. VII, 3. Kazansky, Nikolai N. (ed.). Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 122–128.
  8. Nikunlassi, Ahti. 2013. Bolevye predikaty v finskom jazyke. *Lingvisticheskij bespredel – 2. Sbornik nauchnyh trudov k jubileju A. I. Kuznecovoj*. Agranat, Tatiana et al. (eds). Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 255–273.
  9. Piccini, Silvia. 2015. Transimpersonal construction in Lithuanian. Towards the emergence of split intransitivity. *Baltistica*. 2(1), 19–55.
  10. Reznikova, Tatiana et al. 2012. Towards a typology of pain predicates. *Linguistics*. 50, 3, 421–465.
  11. Seržant, Ilja A. 2013. Rise of canonical objecthood by the Lithuanian verbs of pain. *Baltic Linguistics*. 4, 187–211.
  12. Siirainen, Mari. 2001. Kuka pelkää, ketä pelottaa. Nykysuomen tunneverbien kielioppia ja semantiikkaa. *Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia*. 844. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
  13. Stolz, Thomas. 2001. On Circum-Baltic instrumentals and comitatives: To and fro coherence. *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact. 2. Grammar and Typology*. Studies in Language Companion Series. Dahl, Östen, Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 591–612.

## Kopsavilkums

Somugru valodās vērojama teikuma galvenā aktanta nekanoniska realizācija (ne-nominatīvs) ar trešās personas verbiem, kas lietojami personas fizioloģisko procesu un stāvokļa nozīmē. Personiskas piederības adesīvs nosauc cilvēku, savukārt partitīvs vai vietas locījumi nosauc vietu, ķermeņa daļu, orgānu, kur cilvēks jūt sāpes vai ko citu fizioloģisku. Šī pētījuma mērķis ir locījumu izvēle nolieguma teikumos somu un latviešu valodā, kā arī salīdzinājums ar citām Baltijas areāla valodām. Rakstā galvenā uzmanība veltīta latviešu valodas ķermeņa daļu nosaukumu locījumiem. Tiek izmantoti autentiski piemēri no latviešu valodas korpusa (daīlliteratūras) un tulkojumiem no somu valodas, ko veikusi neliela grupa Somijā dzīvojošu latviešu. Rezultāti parāda, ka latviešu valodā fizioloģisko procesu, sāpju vietas izteikšanā dominē nominatīvs, taču trešās personas verbs var būt lietots arī ar lokatīvu un akuzatīvu. Lietuviešu valodā konstrukcija (*man skauda galvą*, DAT + verbs + ACC) līdzīga somu valodai. Starp Baltijas jūras somugru valodām partitīvu (vai citu objekta locījumu, ģenitīvu) lieto valodas, kas atrodas uz austrumiem no igauņu valodas, kur situācija līdzinās latviešu konstrukcijām. Šajā nozīmē latviešu un igauņu valoda pieder pie vienas valodu grupas.