



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Introduction: Partitive elements in the languages of Europe

An advancement in the understanding of a multifaceted phenomenon

Giusti, G.; Sleeman, P.

DOI

[10.1515/9783110732221-001](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110732221-001)

Publication date

2021

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Partitive Determiners, Partitive Pronouns and Partitive Case

License

CC BY

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Giusti, G., & Sleeman, P. (2021). Introduction: Partitive elements in the languages of Europe: An advancement in the understanding of a multifaceted phenomenon. In P. Sleeman, & G. Giusti (Eds.), *Partitive Determiners, Partitive Pronouns and Partitive Case* (pp. 1-30). (Linguistische Arbeiten; Vol. 580). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110732221-001>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Giuliana Giusti & Petra Sleeman

Introduction: Partitive elements in the languages of Europe

An advancement in the understanding of a multifaceted
phenomenon

1 Introduction

Partitivity is a linguistic notion that is used to denote diverse phenomena, including but not limited to those presented in (1)-(7) below.¹

In the **proper partitive** construction (1), a subset of three indefinite books is picked out of a larger definite set of books. In the **pseudo-partitive** construction (2) the quantity of a substance (wine) is measured by the quantity noun *glass* and no larger set of the quantity is introduced in the discourse (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001; Tănase-Dogaru 2017):

(1) *three of her books*

(2) *a glass of wine*

¹ As will be clear from this overview chapter, the adjective ‘partitive’ and the noun ‘partitivity’ can denote complex constructions referring to an indefinite part of a definite set, as in (1) and (6); but also to the indefinite quantified part of an understood superset (5); or even just to an existentially quantified nominal (with no relation to a superset), as in (2), (3) or (7). It may also denote an indefinite referent, as in (4) (in this case the notions of partition and quantification are not involved, despite the ‘partitive’ morphology, which is realized as a case-marker or a preposition). In this latter case, partitivity or quantification may have been present at previous stages of the language but is absent in synchrony. This wealth of similar forms with different although contiguous interpretations gives rise to wide variation across related languages and interesting parallels across unrelated languages, that are treated in competing analyses. This inevitably results in terminological inconsistencies that cannot be solved, as they are often related to different traditional grammars as well as different theoretical points of view (see Section 3). A caveat is therefore at stake before attempting to understand this complex phenomenon. Despite the ongoing discussion and collaborations across the authors of this volume, which is the result of the PARTE network, terminological consistency is not always possible and is not an aim of the project.

Note: This introductory chapter has benefited from the remarks and suggestions of several of the authors of this volume.

Partitivity in a broader sense may refer to **quantified expressions** (which may imply that the indefinite set is picked out of a larger set previously introduced into the discourse), as in (3). It may also refer to nominal expressions introduced by overt **indefinite determiners** found with mass and plural count nouns in French (and Italian), such as *du/des* in (4), that are apparently formed by the partitive preposition *de/di* inflected for the definite article and are traditionally named ‘partitive articles’ (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin and Beyssade 2004; Carlier 2007; Ihsane 2008). The interpretation of these determiners is partially similar to null (or absent) indefinite determiners in many other languages, as shown by the English glosses.

(3) *I have read three books.*

- (4) a. *Marie a bu du vin.* (French)
 Mary has drunk PART.DET.M.SG wine
 ‘Mary drank (some) wine.’
- b. *Marie a bu des apéritifs.* (French)
 Mary has drunk PART.DET.PL aperitifs
 ‘Mary drank (some) aperitifs.’

There are **partitive pronouns** that resume the nominal expression denoting the superset in ‘partitive’ constructions, such as the Dutch weak pronoun *er* in (5a), which requires the presence of the quantifier in Netherlandic Standard Dutch, or the clitic *ne* in Italian (5b) (and *en* in French). Note that *ne/en* can appear without the quantifier, resuming a determinerless indefinite expression, often called ‘bare noun’:

- (5) a. *Ik heb er drie.* (Dutch)
 I have PART.WK three
- b. *Ne ho (tre).* (Italian)
 PART.CL have.PRS.1SG (three)
 ‘I have three (of them).’

Note that *er* in (5a) does not imply reference to a definite superset. The basic structure of (5a) should therefore be totally similar to the quantified expression *drie boeken* (‘three books’) equivalent to (3), not to (1), whose equivalent is *drie van haar boeken* (‘three of her books’). In (5b) *ne* can resume a determinerless indefinite nominal. Thus, the basic structure can be *tre libri* (‘three books’), but it could also be just a bare noun *libri* (‘books’), with an indefinite interpretation. It is controversial whether these clitic pronouns can resume the definite superset. This would be suggested by the fact that these pronouns have oblique

case morphology and can resume genitive and locative prepositional phrases, a property that is shared by the prepositional phrase denoting the superset in partitive constructions (henceforth called the partitive PP).

In richly inflected languages, ablative and genitive **case** related to partitivity is expectedly found on nominal expressions, as in Turkish and Lithuanian:

- (6) a. *Meyve-ler-den üç elma(-yı) ye-di-m.* (Turkish)
 fruit-PL-ABL three apple(-ACC) eat-PST-1SG
 ‘I ate three apples of the fruits.’ (von Heusinger & Kornfilt 2021, this volume)
- b. *Mačiau (keletą) jo kolegų.* (Lithuanian)
 see.PST.1SG (some.ACC) his colleagues.GEN
 ‘I saw (some of) his colleagues.’ (Seržant 2021, this volume)

Finally, there are richly inflected languages, notably Finno-Ugric languages and Basque, which mark partitivity in the broad-sense with a dedicated case:

- (7) a. *Kissa jo-i (paljon/vähän) maito-a.* (Finnish)
 cat.NOM drink-PST.3SG much / little milk-PART
 ‘The cat drank a lot of / a little milk.’ (Thomas 2003)
- b. *Anek ez du garagardo-rik edan.* (Basque)
 Ane.ERG NO AUX beer-PART drink
 ‘Ane has not drunk beer.’ (Etxeberria, this volume)

As shown by the glosses, the nominals marked with partitive case in (7) have the interpretation of weak indefinites.

The phenomena above present many similarities, among which the notion of indefinite quantity, which is an ingredient of partitive and pseudo-partitive constructions and which is the main property of partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case. The study of partitivity therefore intersects with the study of (in)definiteness, which is an elusive notion itself (cf. Brasoveanu & Farkas 2016), expressed by very different markers (including zero marking even in languages with articles, as noted for English above), taking many different semantic and pragmatic interpretations (specificity, presupposition of existence, free choice), and notoriously interacting with clausal features such as polarity, modality, aspect, and quantification.

Although the interest in the concept of partitivity has continuously increased in the last decades and has given rise to considerable advances in research, partially represented in the considerations made so far (cf. Luraghi & Huuono (eds.) 2014; Falco & Zamparelli (eds.) 2019; Ihsane & Stark (eds.) 2020; Ihsane (ed.) 2021; Westveer 2021), the fine-grained morpho-syntactic and semantic

variation displayed by partitive elements across European languages is far from being well-described, let alone well-understood. There are two main obstacles to this: on the one hand, theoretical linguistics and typological linguistics are fragmented in different methodological approaches that hinder the full sharing of cross-theoretic advances; on the other hand, partitive elements have been analyzed in restricted linguistic environments, which would benefit from a broader perspective. The aim of the PARTE project, from which this volume stems, is precisely to bring together linguists of different theoretical approaches using different methodologies to address this notion in its many facets.

The volume wants to address the three core notions of partitivity, namely partitive structures, partitive determiners and partitive pronouns (including partitive case) in different languages, language families and language types, from different perspectives. The volume also aims to reflect on the many different terms used in different frameworks and hypotheses to name the same phenomenon and, vice versa on the ambiguously used term ‘partitivity’ to name very different phenomena.

The rest of this section provides an introduction to the major empirical phenomena observed by previous literature and the questions raised therein. Section 2 provides an overview of how the chapters of this volume contribute to answering some of these questions. Section 3 provides a terminological guide.

1.1 Cross-linguistic variation

While proper partitive (1) and pseudo-partitive (2) constructions are present in very many (possibly all) languages, partitive determiners, pronouns, and case are only present in restricted groups of languages, belonging to different language families. This is not to deny that the functions of these three types of elements cannot be identified in most (possibly all) languages, but to observe that in many languages these functions are associated to zero morphemes, that is zero determiners, unmarked case, or nominal ellipsis (occurring in the presence of a quantifier). The investigation of partitivity is therefore interesting and promising in both the intra-genealogical micro-parametric perspective (across languages belonging to the same language family) and the extra-genealogical macro-parametric perspective across languages that belong to different language families and language types. The former allows us to detect the microvariation that characterizes given markers. The latter allows us to test general properties across apparently very different markers.

This section sets the properties of the partitivity markers treated in the volume into a wider picture of the phenomena involved. In a micro-comparative perspective, we present the properties of partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and

partitive case in Romance and Germanic. In the macro-comparative perspective, we review recurrent properties of partitive case(s) in Balto-Slavic, Finnish or Basque that are also found on partitive determiners and partitive pronouns in the other language types.

In the Romance family, the partitive determiner (4) is limited to Gallo-Romance varieties (French, northern Italian dialects and Standard Italian, Gascon, Provençal). Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan and Romanian have another type of overt indefinite determiner competing with bare nominals, related to the plural form of the indefinite article (Port. *uns*, Cat. *uns*, Sp. *unos*, Rom. *niște* (nominative-accusative) and *unor* (dative-genitive)). There are some interesting differences in interpretation between Italian *dei* and French *des*: both can have ambiguous scope in intensional and negative contexts, but while the former can be the object of telic predicates (and for some Italian speakers only of telic predicates, cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2016; Giusti 2021), the latter can only appear with atelic predicates (cf. de Swart 2006; Carlier 2021, this volume, and the references in Section 1.4 below):

- (8) a. *Maria ha raccolto delle fragole* (Italian)
 Mary has picked PART.DET.PL strawberries
in un'ora / %per un'ora.
 in an hour / for an hour
 'Mary picked some strawberries in an hour.'
 %'Mary has been picking strawberries for an hour.'
- b. *Marie a cueilli des fraises* (French)
 Mary has picked PART.DET.PL strawberries
*pendant des heures *en une heure.*
 for PART.DET.PL hours / in an hour
 'Mary has been picking strawberries for an hour.'
 '*Mary picked strawberries in an hour.'

The most urgent step in this regard is to pin down the contexts that detect “core” indefiniteness and the other types of indefinites (cf. Gianollo 2018) to test the partitive article in different Romance varieties.

The partitive clitic *en/ne* (5b) is more extended across Romance languages than the partitive determiner, being also found in Catalan, Romansh, Occitan, Sardinian, and central and southern Italian dialects (Bossong 2016: 63). If a relation is to be hypothesized between the two markers, it is therefore an implicational one where the presence of the partitive pronoun is the condition for the presence of the partitive determiner. At the background of this issue is the notion of (partitive) case in languages in which case morphology is absent on nouns but present on pronouns. Not much literature has addressed this issue.

All Romance languages express partitivity and pseudo-partitivity with the genitive preposition *de/di*, as represented by Catalan (9), except Romanian, where *de* is limited to pseudo-partitives, and the locative preposition *dintre* appears with partitives, as shown in (10) (cf. Tănase-Dogaru 2008, 2017):

- (9) a. *molts dels meus amics* (Catalan)
 many.M.PL of-the.M.PL my.M.PL friend.M.PL
 ‘many of my friends’
 b. *una tassa de cafè*
 a cup of coffee
- (10) a. *mulți dintre / *de copiii mei* (Romanian)
 many.M.PL of-among / of friend.M.PL-the.M.PL my.M.PL
 ‘many of my friends’
o ceașcă de cafea
 a cup of coffee

Note that *de* in all Romance languages has preserved (to varying degrees) the original locative/relative/ablative function of Latin *de* (‘from’) and the same holds for the clitic pronoun *en/ne*, which can have a locative function (12), besides a partitive function (5b) and a genitive function (13):

- (11) a. *Elle est de Venise.* (French)
 ‘She is from Venice.’
 b. *Sono di Amsterdam.* (Italian)
 ‘I am from Amsterdam.’
- (12) a. *Ils en sortent.* (French)
 they OBL.CL come-out.
 ‘They come out of it.’
 b. *Ne usciremo presto.* (Italian)
 OBL.CL come-out. FUT.1P.PL soon
 ‘We’ll soon be out of it.’
- (13) a. *J’en demanderai le prix.* (French)
 I GEN.CL ask.FUT.1P.SG the price
 ‘I will ask its price.’
 b. *Ne conosco le virtù.* (Italian)
 GEN.CL know.PRS.1P.SG the virtues
 ‘I know his/her/its/their virtues.’

A locative preposition with partitive interpretation alternating with *de/di* is also found in Romance languages other than Romanian, such as Italian *tra/fra* ('out of'), which has a wider use than the genitive *di* (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2006, 2017, Giusti 2021, this volume) and is clearly related to the ablative case found in other languages, as in Turkish (6a) above.

In the microparametric perspective, many questions arise as to the synchronic relation between partitive forms on determiners and pronouns. Can the partitive determiner be unified with the preposition merged with the definite article introducing the superset in a partitive construction occurring with quantifiers (as attempted by Milner 1978; Chierchia 1998; Zamparelli 2008)? If not, what is the category of the partitive determiner? Is it the same category as the partitive pronoun? What are the properties responsible for the variation found in the distribution of partitive determiners and partitive pronouns across the Romance languages that display such elements? What are the properties that have triggered the new formation of such elements from the common Latin ingredients? Has the development of the partitive determiner in Italian an independent line or is it due to contact with French and Northern-Italian Gallo-Romance? A comparative perspective with continental Germanic may help us set such questions in a broader scenario.

Continental Germanic languages display a different pattern than English, cf. (1)-(2) and the glosses of (4)-(5) above. Let us take German, a language that has preserved genitive case. In Standard German, the part-whole relation can be expressed by genitive case or by the genitive / locative preposition *von*, assigning dative to its complement, as in (14):

- (14) a. *Ich habe drei ihrer Bücher gelesen.*
 I have three her.GEN books read
 b. *Ich habe drei von ihren Büchern gelesen.*
 I have three of/from her.DAT books.DAT read
 'I read three of her books.'
 c. *Ich habe drei davon gelesen.*
 I have three there-of read
 'I read three of those.'

Neither marker appears in the pseudo-partitive relation, which is instead realized with the juxtaposition of a bare noun to the quantity noun (15a). As in English, indefiniteness is realized by bare nouns (15b). Overt partitive determiners are not present. The pronominalization of a PP denoting the definite superset appearing with a null quantifier is possible with the weak pronoun *da* procliticized onto the preposition *von* in (15c):

- (15) a. *Marie hat ein Glass Wein getrunken.*
 ‘Mary drank a glass [of] wine.’
 b. *Marie hat Wein getrunken.*
 ‘Mary drank wine.’
 c. *Marie hat von dem Wein / *des Weins / davon getrunken.*
 Marie has of-the wine / the.GEN wine.GEN / there-of drunk
 intended reading: ‘Marie has drunk some (of the wine).’

Partitive determiners are however found in non-standard Germanic varieties and appear to be strictly related to the genitive case that is found in previous stages with a partitive function (cf. Glaser 1992, 1993; Strobel & Glaser 2021 and Section 1.2 below). Döhmer’s (2017: 120–121, 2018) data on Luxembourgish show that genitive determiners with a partitive interpretation appear with quantifiers (16a) as well as on indefinite nominals (16b), in which use they are in complementary distribution with the null determiner (16c), which is used with an indefinite interpretation. Strobel & Glaser (2021) confirm similar cases in Walliser and Valser German dialects (16d), with the interesting possibility of few “out of the blue” indefinites with a partitive determiner, equivalent to “*Do we still have apples?*” in the context of a grocery list, but not to “*These are no roses, they are tulips*” in the context of a flower shop.

- (16) a. *An ech kéint nach 100 där Beispiller nennen.*
 and I could more 100 the.GEN.PL examples mention
 ‘And I could mention 100 more of these examples.’
 b. *Mir hunn all Dag där Beispiller.*
 we have all day the.GEN.PL examples
 ‘Every day we have (some) of these examples.’
 c. *Gitt Beispiller!*
 ‘Give examples!’
 d. *Welleder nu deru/deschi Steina/Boone/Epfla?*
 want.you still the.GEN.PL stones/beans/apples
 ‘Would you like (some) more of these /such stones / beans / apples?’

Apart from these cases, they note that the genitive forms usually have an additional “sort-of” interpretation, as in all cases of (16). In this interpretation, they covary with the newly formed *von+art* construction, which is also present in Southern Rhine Franconian and Dutch.

As a matter of fact, not only does Dutch display the partitive (quantitative) pronoun *er* in (5a) above, it also has a construction that resembles the use of the partitive determiner in Romance: the *van die*-construction (de Hoop, van den

Wyngaerd & Zwart 1990). This construction, which contains a demonstrative, is however limited to the “sort-of” interpretation, which is possible but is not the core interpretation of the partitive determiner in Romance. Generally, the construction is used with a modifier and can figure as an object of a transitive verb (17a), or with an existential verb (17b) and in presentational constructions (17c):

- (17) a. *Hij heeft altijd van dat vieze haar.*
 he has always of that dirty hair
 ‘He always has (that) dirty hair.’
- b. *Er zijn van die mensen die altijd tevreden zijn.*
 there are of those people that always satisfied are
 ‘There are people that are always satisfied.’
- c. *Er liepen van die vreemde mensen op straat.*
 There walked of those strange people on street
 ‘There were such strange people walking on the street.’

The loss of genitive case and the new formation with the semi-lexical preposition *von/van* appear to be the two extremes of a system in which zero morphology represents an intermediate stage and a strong competitor. Note that these *van/von* determiners have the “quality” interpretation which is also present in French and Italian when the partitive determiner is formed by a demonstrative, which Le Bruyn (2007) calls bare partitives (translations are ours):

- (18) a. *Je n’ ai pas vu de ces bonhommes.* (French)
 I NEG.CL have NEG seen of these little-men
 ‘I never saw this type of guys.’
- b. *Non abbiamo di questi libri.* (Italian)
 NEG have.PRS.1PL of these books
 ‘We don’t have this type of books.’

As regards pronominal forms, Strobel (2012) shows that genitive weak pronouns are resilient in West Central German and East Franconian, as a pronominal partitive anaphor binding the quantitative complement of a quantifier, as in (19a), or a bare indefinite, as in (19b) (competing with different new formations, including the more general Germanic null pronoun, but also the use of the indefinite determiner *ein* ‘one’ and the interrogative determiner *welch-*, ‘which’):

- (19) a. *(Geschwister)? Ich habe (ere) fünf.* (Central Hessian)
 Siblings? I have PART.WK five.’ (SyHD Pt_E3_B_Aug_11: Q20)

- b. *Mer hu ach Melch. Willst du ere?* (Central Hessian)
 we have also milk want you PART.WK (SyHD E2_Jun_11: Q22)
 ‘We have milk, too. Would you like some?’

As for partitive case, in Balto-Slavic, partitive genitive is related to negation, as in (20a-b) and to quantifiers, as in (20c):

- (20) a. *W parku nie ma fontanny.* (Polish)
 in park.LOC NEG have fountain.GEN
 ‘There is no fountain in the park.’ (Miestamo 2014)
- b. *Jonas ne-per-skaitė laišk-o.* (Lithuanian)
 Jonas NEG-PRV-read.PST.3SG letter-GEN
 ‘Jonas did not read the letter.’ (Arkadiev 2016)
- c. *pjatj star-yx gorod-ov* (Russian)
 five.NOM/ACC old-GEN.PL town-M.GEN.PL
 ‘five old towns’ (Stepanov & Stateva 2018)

In Finnish, partitive case appears with unbounded predicates (21a), with quantifiers (21b) and in the scope of negation (21c).

- (21) a. *Poika sö-i omen-i-a.* (Finnish)
 boy.NOM eat-PST.3SG apple-PL-PART
 ‘The boy was eating apples.’ (Thomas 2003: 24)
- b. *Kissa jo-i paljon / vähän maito-a.*
 cat.NOM drink-PST.3SG much / little milk-PAR
 ‘The cat drank a lot of / a little milk.’ (Thomas 2003: 41)
- c. *He ei-vät syö liha-a.*
 they.NOM NEG-3PL eat meat-PART
 ‘They don’t eat meat.’ (Thomas 2003: 45)

The quantifier condition is notably independent of unboundedness, as shown by the contrast in (22). In (22a), the quantifier is marked for partitive because it is in the complement of an unbounded predicate and assigns partitive to the nominal expression it quantifies over. In (22b), there is no partitive case on the quantifier in the complement of a bounded predicate, but partitive case is still assigned by the quantifier to the noun (cf. Thomas 2003):²

² Parallel to the partitive genitive in Russian, the number of the quantified noun depends on the selectional properties of the quantifier. Note that two Finnish quantifiers with roughly the same

- (22) a. *Koira sö-i kahta luu-ta.* (Finnish)
 dog.NOM eat-PAST.3SG two.PART bone-PART
 ‘The dog was eating two bones.’
 b. *Koira sö-i kaksi luu-ta.*
 dog.NOM eat-PST.3SG two bone-PART
 ‘The dog ate two bones.’

Besides Balto-Slavic (and Finno-Ugric/Uralic languages (Tamm 2014)), a designated partitive case is also found in Basque. In the Basque examples (23) it interacts with modality (23a) and clause type (23b):

- (23) a. *Beharbada entzungo dut albiste on-ik.* (Basque)
 perhaps hear.FUT AUX news good-PART
 ‘Perhaps I will hear good news.’
 b. *Goxoki-rik nahi al duzu?* (Basque)
 candy-PART want QUEST AUX
 ‘Do you want any candy?’ (Etxeberria 2021, this volume)

Since partitivity in the broad sense can be expressed in different ways, the question arises as to whether cognate forms in cognate languages have the same interpretation and/or the same formal properties. Given the great variability in interpretation and distribution of these forms even in neighboring dialects (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2018, 2020 for Italian dialects and regional informal Italian), the expected answer is no. But then a more articulate question must be asked as to whether we can find constants in the attested variation. In order to start answering this question we must first establish the repertory of syntactic and semantic variation for each possible form, and the properties that it shares with homonymous non-partitive markers (such as ablative/genitive case or prepositions), as is attempted in Giusti’s, Carlier’s and Etxeberria’s contributions (2021, this volume).

In the macro-comparative perspective, there are at least two properties worth noting. First of all, partitive markers are generally restricted to internal argument

meaning such as *paljon* and *monta* display a different form of the noun (Thomas 2003; Csirmaz 2012):

- (i) *Kissa sö-i paljon hiir-i-ä.*
 cat.NOM ate many mouse-PL-PART
 (ii) *Kissa sö-i monta hiir-tä.*
 cat.NOM ate many mouse-SG-PART
 ‘The cat ate many mice.’

positions, such as direct object or subject of unaccusative predicates, and alternate with the structural case attributed to them (e.g., nominative/accusative in Finnish or Italian, absolutive in Basque). In many respects, partitive case is a type of DOM (differential object marking), which marks affected/specific/definite/salient referents as opposed to unaffected/non-specific/indefinite/unknown referents marked by partitivity or not marked at all (cf. Witzlack-Makarevich & Seržant 2018). This holds for richly inflected languages such as Turkic, Finno-Ugric, Balto-Slavic and Basque, but also for poorly inflected languages such as Romance and partially Germanic, irrespective of whether they have an article. These properties are recurrently noted in most contributions to this volume.

Many contributions also account for another recurrent property; namely, the fact that partitivity presents coexisting patterns that build a complex system of partitive markers. Some of these markers specialize for different interpretations (e.g., the part-whole relation, the measure interpretation of pseudo-partitivity, the indefinite quantity interpretation of existential quantifiers, and indefinite reference), some overlap with one another, providing an intricate pattern of variability and optionality. This gives rise to diatopic and diachronic variation. In this respect, again, the question arises as to whether it is possible to find recurrent paths of grammaticalization (Luraghi & Kittilä 2014), or partitivity cycles, i.e., recurrent diachronic developments by which a former proper partitive (a true-partitive construction in Seržant's terms) turns into a generalized partitive and then into a partitive determiner (Seržant 2021, this volume).

1.2 The diachrony of partitive determiners, pronouns and case

French and Italian provide a privileged field of study of the development of partitive determiners. Such a construction was already present in Latin (cf. Luraghi 2012). Carlier (2007) claims that in Old French the partitive determiner is formed by two concurring changes: the loss of case morphology that is at the base of a higher use of prepositions (in this case *de* becomes the marker of genitive case and grammaticalizes as an indefinite determiner) and the loss of plural morphology, which makes it necessary for the definite article to grammaticalize, losing its definite interpretation in the partitive determiner. This diachronic development was accompanied by an extension of the contexts in which partitives could be used. From direct objects, the use was extended first to subjects of existential verbs, then to subjects of unaccusative verbs, unergative verbs and transitive verbs, and to complements of prepositions (Carlier & Lamiroy 2014).

Partitive determiners are attested in Old Spanish and Portuguese but disappeared in later stages of these languages. With the Old Spanish example (24)

from the second half of the 13th century, Luraghi (2012) shows that the partitive construction was allowed with unaccusatives by that time, and had therefore set some steps already on the diachronic cline presented in the previous paragraph for French and Italian:

- (24) *Et salieron a él de los omnes buenos.* (Old Spanish)
 and come.PST.3PL to him of the men good
 ‘And some good men came to him.’
 (Alfonso X el Sabio, Primera Crónica general, 1260–1284)

According to Luraghi, a similar path of development also took place in the case of Finnish, partitive case being allowed on subjects with existential verbs, and, more recently, also on subjects of unaccusative verbs. Although partitive case in Finnish has different interpretive properties than French and Italian partitive determiners, it also clearly expresses indefiniteness, as in (25), (cf. also Section 1.4 below):

- (25) *Löysin voita.* (Finnish)
 find.PST.1SG butter.PART
 ‘I found some butter.’ (Huumo 2010)

The partitive pronoun follows a similar path. In both Romance and Germanic, its original meaning is that of a referential superset: ‘from there’, ‘thereof’, ‘of them’, ‘their’ (Badía i Margarit 1947; Bech 1952). The Romance partitive clitic derives from the oblique weak form INDE (‘from there’), as is often the case with genuine partitives. It was lost in Spanish and Portuguese, just like the partitive determiner (Gerards 2020). With the omission of the quantifier, an indefinite reading similar to the partitive determiner reading was created, as in the French example (26b):

- (26) a. *Tu connais ces livres? Oui, j'en ai lu trois.* (French)
 you know these books? Yes, I PART.CL have read three.
 ‘Do you know these books? Yes, I read three of them.’
 b. *Vous voulez du café? Non, j'en ai encore.*
 You want PART.DET.M.SG coffee? No, I PART.CL have still.
 ‘Do you want coffee? No, I still have some.’

In Germanic, it is a residual genitive pronoun (5a), (19), parallel to the genitive determiners in (16). Strobel (2017), Strobel & Glaser (2021) show that these genitive forms expressing partitivity and indefiniteness are abundantly present in Old and Middle High German (27)–(28) and residual in Early New High German (29):

- (27) a. *joh brast in thar **thes** win-es*
 also was-lacking them there the.GEN.M wine-GEN.M
 ‘and they also lacked wine’ (OHG, O. 2.8.11)
- b. *nam er tho selbo thaz brot [...] gibot thaz sie-s azin*
 took he then himself the bread[...] demanded that they-it.GEN ate.SBJV
 ‘then he took the bread and demanded that they should eat it/some’
 (OHG, O. 4.10.9)
- (28) a. *Wand ich noch **ein-er salb-en-** hân die dâ*
 because I still a-GEN.F ointment-GEN.F have that there
Feimorgân machte.
 Feimorgân made
 ‘Because I still have some ointment made by Feimorgân.’ (MHG, Iw. 3423)
- b. *und **dez** gap im nieman*
 and this.GEN gave him nobody
 ‘and nobody gave him any [pigfeet]’
 (MHG, Sermons, 13th c., Grieshaber 1848, 78)
- (29) a. *iss **des** brot-s*
 eat the.GEN bread-GEN
 ‘Eat (some) bread’ (ENHG Luther, OT, Ruth 2.14)
- b. *darmit das holtz, ob im **des** zufluß,*
 with-this the wood if him this.GEN towards-flowed
aus dem wasser gezogen werd
 out-of the water pulled was
 ‘so that he could pull the wood flowing towards him out of the water’
 (ENHG, ms. 1475, Lexer 1862, 250)

The diachronic dimension is crucial to capture the relation between the expression of partitivity and the expression of indefiniteness, thereby providing the ground to hypothesize the notion of partitive cycle. Seržant’s contribution (2021, this volume) discusses in a typological perspective recurrent patterns of change from adverbial (ablative) partitives to selected quantificational partitives (and pseudo-partitives) to generalized partitives (without the quantifier), which are the base of the formation of partitive determiners and dedicated partitive pronouns and partitive case. Luraghi and Albonico’s contribution (2021, this volume) gives an overview of the rare attestations of this development from Old Italian to modern Italian and argues that the “bare” partitive construction is independent of the formation of the partitive determiner in modern Italian.

1.3 The acquisition of partitivity in bilingualism and L2/L3

If the broad notion of partitivity is a linguistic universal that is realized by corresponding forms in human language, we would expect a rather direct transfer from one language to another. If we are in fact dealing with different types of phenomena, we expect greater variation of bilingual or L2–L3 acquisition from speakers who do not have partitive elements in their L1.

Research on the second language acquisition of partitive elements has shown that their acquisition is most problematic for learners who do not have the partitive element in their first language (L1), although it may also present some problems for learners who do have the partitive element in their L1. Studies for article-less languages as L1 are, a.o., Runić (2012), who studied the use of the Italian articles by Serbo-Croatian students. Runić showed, among other things, that the Serbo-Croatian learners overgeneralized the use of the definite article in contexts where a partitive determiner or a null determiner should be used in Italian. Example (30) was produced by an L2 student of Italian at the B2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference. For all definite determiners used by the student a null determiner (or a partitive determiner in other cases) would appear in the target language:

- (30) *Le numerose opere sono nate a causa dei sentimenti del*
 the numerous works are born because of-the feelings of-the
genere. (L2 Italian)
 sort

Sono piene delle emozioni che suscitano le riflessioni sui rapporti
 are.3PL full of-the emotions that arouse the thoughts on-the relations

esistenti nella nostra vita. [. . .] Abbiamo spesso i giudizi molto
 existing in-the our life. [. . .] have.1PL often the judgements very

soggettivi quando si tratta dell'atteggiamento di un amico.
 subjective when REF [it]-handles of-the attitude of a friend

‘Many works were born because of this kind of feelings. They are full of emotions that arise from thoughts about existing relations in our life. We often have very subjective judgements when the attitude of a friend is concerned.’

Studies on the acquisition of partitive pronouns by learners with L1s without a partitive pronoun are Wust (2009) in a dictogloss task, for the use of the French partitive clitic *en* by L1 English learners of French as an L2, and Perpiñan (2017), who studied the use of the Catalan partitive clitic *en* by Catalan-Spanish bilinguals by means of an Acceptability Judgement Task and an Oral Production Task. Wust

shows that low and intermediate L1 English learners of L2 French did not yet use partitive *en*. Perpiñan shows that the omission of the partitive clitic in the Acceptability Judgement Task was significantly more accepted by the Spanish-dominant bilinguals than by the balanced bilinguals, who in turn accepted the omission significantly more than the Catalan-dominant bilinguals. In the Oral Production Task, the Catalan-dominant speakers produced the partitive clitic significantly more than the two other groups. An example of the omission of the partitive clitic is given in (31):

- (31) *La Maria menja carn? No menja mai.* (L2 Catalan)
 the Maria eats meat? not eats.3SG never
 ‘Does Mary eat meat? No, she never eats it.’
 Expected Response: *No en menja mai.*

Sleeman & Ihsane (2017) show that L1 (Netherlandic Standard) Dutch learners of L2 French had most problems with the contexts in which the use of the partitive pronoun in French and Dutch differs. These were especially contexts in which in French a noun phrase introduced by a partitive determiner or negative *de* is replaced by the partitive clitic *en*. In a Grammaticality Judgement Task, most (advanced) Dutch learners of L2 French accepted the ungrammatical definite pronoun *le* in (32a), which they transferred from their L1, *het* in (32b):

- (32) a. *Tu ne bois jamais de vin?*
 you NEG.CL drink never DE wine?
*Non, je n’ en /*le bois jamais.*
 No, I NEG.CL PART.CL./ACC.CL drink never
 b. *Drink je nooit wijn? Nee, ik drink *er/het nooit.*
 drink you never wine? no, I drink PART.WK/ACC.WK never
 ‘Do you never drink wine? No, I never drink it.’

Recall that Dutch *er* is a weak pronoun, not a clitic, and cannot resume a bare indefinite in Netherlandic Standard Dutch, as noted in (5a) above.

Ehala (2012) conducted a quantitative study of Estonian object marking, including the use of partitive case, by L2 learners with Russian as their L1. In Russian, the direct object is usually in the accusative case, but in negative clauses, it may be in the genitive case. In Estonian, the direct object can be marked with the partitive, genitive, or nominative case, but the partitive case is the most used. The data show that informants negatively transferred Russian features to Estonian L2, but that there was also positive transfer. The author does not explain all errors in this way. It is argued that some non-target forms may also be due to

patterns that are productive in the L2, such as universal cognitive preferences and analogical extension of error patterns.

Some studies compare groups of learners with different L1s or different types of bilingualism. A study that was already mentioned is Perpiñan (2017) on the acceptance and production of the Catalan partitive pronoun *en* by adult Spanish-dominant, Catalan-dominant and balanced bilinguals. Soto-Corominas (2019) shows that different types of bilingual children (Spanish-dominant, Catalan-dominant, or balanced) display different behavior not only in the production of *en* in Catalan, but also in the non-target production of it in Spanish. According to Soto-Corominas, the Spanish-dominant bilingual children lag behind in the acquisition of the partitive clitic with respect to the Catalan-dominant bilinguals in contexts that require partitive *en* in Catalan, while Catalan-dominant bilingual children often recycle the Catalan clitic in Spanish. Tarrés & Bel (2017) studied the production of the Catalan partitive pronoun *en* by L1 French and L1 Portuguese learners of Catalan. Their results suggest a facilitative effect of French, which possesses a partitive pronoun, but not of Portuguese, which does not have one. Spoelman (2011) investigated the use of partitive case in L2 Finnish by L1 Estonian, German, and Dutch learners on the basis of the *International Corpus of Learner Finnish*. She showed that, since the use of partitive case is largely similar in Finnish and Estonian, the Estonian learners made significantly fewer partitivity errors than the German and Dutch learners. Some specific error patterns were attributable to subtle L1–L2 differences between Estonian and Finnish.

Most of these studies focus on the absence in the L1 and the presence in the L2 of a feature. Some of these studies investigate the acquisition of subtle differences if both the L1 and the L2 possess the partitivity marker. An interesting question is whether positive transfer is possible not only when the partitivity marker is used in the same way in the L1 and the L2 in all, most or some of the contexts, but also when the L1 does not have the same type of partitivity marker and can express partitivity in the relevant contexts in another way. This question will be answered in Sleeman & Ihsane's and Berends, Sleeman, Hulk & Schaeffer's contributions (2021, this volume).

1.4 The semantic implications of partitive constructions

For partitive constructions introduced by a quantifier, as in the example *three of her books* illustrated in (1) – see, among others, Hoeksema (1996), Zamparelli (1998) and Cardinaletti & Giusti (2006, 2017) – Jackendoff (1977) formulated the Partitive Constraint, which states that the presence of a definite determiner in the complement has to be respected:

- (33) a. **many of all books*
 b. **two of a lot of books*
 c. *many of the books*
 d. *two of these books*

Ladusaw (1982) argued that in partitive constructions such as in (33d) the superset ‘these books’ cannot contain less than two elements. The number of elements in the subset can be equal or smaller to the number of elements in the superset. On the opposite side, Barker (1998) argued that partitive constructions can only express proper partitivity, which means that the number of elements in the superset must be higher than in the subset. Marty (2019) defends Ladusaw’s view arguing that proper partitivity is the result of a presuppositional implicature, due to the competition with non-partitive alternatives, as in (34):

- (34) a. *Three of John’s lawyers.*
 b. *John’s three lawyers.*

However, while the interpretation of (34a) is that of three indefinite individuals out of a definite group of individuals, the interpretation of (34b) is that of three definite individuals and no superset is involved. The two constructions therefore do not truly compete for the same interpretation.

Partitivity in a broader sense may refer to nominal expressions introduced by overt indefinite determiners, as in the case of mass and plural nouns in French (and Italian) exemplified in (4) above. As also mentioned in Section 1.2, Carlier (2007) claims that the ‘partitive article’ in modern French is fully grammaticalized into an indefinite determiner: the form *de* is not a preposition and the definite article has no definite meaning (e.g. it interacts with scope, negation, and aspect). Cardinaletti & Giusti (2016) support the same claim, against Chierchia (1998) and Zamparelli (2008), showing that the definite article cannot be attributed a kind-referring interpretation.³

As for the fact that the plural indefinite determiner in French can only appear with atelic predicates, as illustrated in (8), Ihsane (2005) proposes that *de* is itself an aspectual functional head, thereby accounting for the unbounded aspect in sentences such as (8b).

When combined with sentential negation, *de* in French is used without the definite article. In that case, it can only get a narrow scope interpretation.

³ Cf. Giusti (2021, this volume) for a detailed argumentation of this.

- (35) a. *Nous n' avons pas de sucre.*
 we NEG.CL have NEG DE sugar
 'We do not have sugar.'
- b. *Jean n' a pas acheté de pommes.*
 Jean NEG.CL has NEG bought DE apples
 'John has not bought apples.'

In this respect *de* in (35) contrasts with noun phrases introduced by a definite determiner as in (36a), which can take wide scope over negation, as observed above with reference to Cardinaletti & Giusti (2016). It also contrasts with the use of the partitive determiner *des* in contrastive contexts, such as (36b), in which the intension rather than the quantity is negated:

- (36) a. *Nous n' avons pas mangé le pain.*
 we NEG.CL have NEG eaten the bread
 intended reading: 'There is bread and we have not eaten it.'
- b. *Jean n' a pas acheté des pommes, mais des bananes.*
 Jean NEG.CL has NEG bought PART.DET apples, but PART.DET bananas.
 'Jean has not bought apples, but bananas.'

In a macroparametric perspective the question arises if semantic or morphological distinctions such as those presented in this section can also be made by means of case distinctions. For Turkish, Enç (1991) claims that the sentence in (37a) can have either of the two continuations, which only differ in the accusative case morpheme appearing on the object DP in (37b), which is missing in (37c). The difference in interpretation is that only (37b) can refer to two girls that are part of the children mentioned in the context sentence (37a):⁴

- (37) a. *Oda-m-a birkaç çocuk gir-di.*
 room-1.SG-DAT several child enter-PST
 'Several children entered my room.'
- b. *İki kız-ı tanı-yor-du-m.*
 two girl-ACC know-PROG-PST-1.SG
 'I knew two girls.'

⁴ The translations of the examples in (37) and (38) are Enç's. The glosses have been taken from Kornfilt and von Heusinger (2021, this volume).

- c. *İki kız tanıyor-du-m.*
 two girl know-PROG-PST-1.SG
 'I knew two girls.'

Enç proposes that accusative objects are specific and semantically interpreted as partitives. Enç further observes that Turkish has two ways to express the superset, with genitive case or ablative case, as in (38):

- (38) a. *Ali kadın-lar-ın iki-sin-i tanıyor-du.*
 Ali woman-PL-GEN two-3.SG-ACC know-PROG-PST.3.SG
 b. *Ali kadın-lar-dan iki-sin-i tanıyor-du.*
 Ali woman-PL-ABL two-3.SG-ACC know-PROG-PST.3.SG
 'Ali knew two of the women.'

In both sentences (38), the accusative marker *-i* is obligatory. This leads Enç to attribute to the accusative marker an interpretation of specificity (capacity to refer to a previously introduced referent) and partitivity (the 'part' interpretation in a 'part-whole' construction). Many authors (cf. Kornfilt 1997; von Heusinger & Kornfilt 2005 a.o.) claim that Differential Object Marking in Turkish, parallel to what happens in other languages, conveys a specificity interpretation. Öztürk (2005) even claims that the accusative marker conveys definiteness and exhaustivity. But these notions are in turn cover terms for different types of reference, as argued by von Heusinger (2019) and von Heusinger & Kornfilt (2021, this volume). According to von Heusinger & Kornfilt, Enç's claim about the Turkish accusative marker expressing specificity is (probably) correct, but not for the reasons that Enç refers to (i.e., the partitivity of overt accusative in (38)); instead, they appeal to a formal morpho-syntactic constraint, which predicts the obligatoriness of overt accusative in such examples, and which is independent from partitivity. This is further discussed by the authors (von Heusinger & Kornfilt 2021, this volume).

Finnish is a language in which the use of partitive case shows many resemblances with the use of the partitive determiner in French. As already observed in (21)-(22) above, it is used both on indefinite mass nouns and indefinite plural nouns signaling an unbounded quantity; it may depend on the unbounded aspect of the verb (Kiparsky 1998); it is also used on indefinite nouns combined with clausal negation (Huumo 2021, this volume).

As regards Basque partitive case, historically, it could be licensed by negative polarity items (de Rijk 1972; Etxeberria 2021, this volume), just like *de* in French (32a) can be licensed by negation:

- (39) *Beretzat ez zegoen beste gizon-ik inor.* (Agirre, Kresala, 190)
 for her/him NEG AUX other man-PART anybody
 ‘For her/him, there was no other man.’

The clear parallel between partitive case on nouns, pronouns and determiners, with partitive determiners that have the form of a prepositional case marker, calls for a unified analysis. More research is needed to determine in which contexts case is exactly used and what its exact semantic contribution is in these languages. Does accusative case in Turkish distinguish a proper partitive reading from partitive tout court (Marty 2019) or vice versa? What is the relation between unbounded quantity and unbounded aspect in Finnish? How did the relation between partitive case and negation develop in modern Basque? The contributions by Kornfilt & Von Heusinger, Huumo, and Etxeberria help to answer these questions.

2 Overview of the volume

This volume collects several of the papers presented at the first workshop of the PARTE Network, held at Ca’ Foscari University of Venice on November 13–14, 2017. It focuses on Partitive Determiners, Partitive Pronouns and Partitive Case in European languages, their emergence and spread in diachrony, their acquisition by L2 speakers, and their syntax and interpretation in a cross-theoretical typological perspective. It is structured in nine chapters grouped in four parts: each part presents a different perspective to approach partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case.

Part I aims at setting general diagnostics to distinguish partitive determiners, pronouns and case from proper partitive constructions and pseudo-partitive constructions on the one hand and the zero marker for indefinites on the other hand. In Chapter 1, Giuliana Giusti presents a number of diagnostics that apply to Italian to distinguish partitive determiners from partitive pronouns and to distinguish both categories from the partitive PPs that refer to the definite superset in a partitive construction. The proposal is set in what Giusti calls a “protocol approach”, which organizes language properties into a taxonomic system that allows the comparison of different languages/varieties or different constructions in the same language. In Chapter 2, Anne Carlier observes differences and similarities between the French partitive determiner and the zero marker with plural count nouns and singular mass nouns in Spanish and English. She also brings into the discussion the indefinite article that appears with singular count nouns

in the three languages. The result is a protocol-like presentation of the environments that detect semantic and pragmatic functions of the partitive determiner.

Part II presents two complementary perspectives in the study of language change: the typological macro-comparative and the language-internal micro-comparative perspective. In Chapter 3, Ilja Seržant addresses the issue of diachronic change from the typological perspective, resting on a convenience sample of partitive expressions in 138 languages, from 46 families, covering the six macro-areas in the World, with a bias for Eurasia (48%), in line with the focus of the PARTE project on European languages. Seržant claims that partitive expressions encoded by adpositional strategies are unstable cross-linguistically and tend to first develop into pseudo-partitives and then in “generalized” partitives. In Chapter 4, Luraghi & Albonico provide a language-internal perspective of the still scarcely documented development of the partitive determiner in (Old) Italian. On the basis of a corpus search, Luraghi & Albonico claim that not only did Old Italian display the “faded partitive” (like (18) above), in which *di* occurs with all sorts of determiners and has the interpretation of “things of this type”, it also displayed the partitive determiner, in which *di* only combines with the definite article and at this stage was ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific interpretation. According to the authors, this shows that it is not correct to derive the partitive determiner from the faded partitive.

Part III deals with the second language acquisition of partitive pronouns in Romance and Germanic, which represent the only surfacing of partitive case in these languages. The two chapters complement each other in the different populations studied and resemble each other in the method used: a Grammaticality Judgement Task. In both chapters the question is raised what the role is of transfer from the L1 to the L2, but in a property-by-property approach and not in a whole-sale approach. In Chapter 5, Sleeman & Ihsane provide a case in the acquisition of the partitive pronoun *en* in L2 French by German L1 speakers. After a fine-grained comparison of French and German noun ellipsis constructions, Sleeman & Ihsane investigate if there can be positive transfer in cases in which in French the noun ellipsis construction requires the use of *en* and in cases in which the anaphoric pronoun *welch-* is used in German (see Section 1.1). In Chapter 6, Berends, Sleeman, Hulk & Schaeffer study the acquisition of the partitive pronoun *er* in L2 Dutch by L1 speakers of French and English and take a similar approach as the one taken in Chapter 5: a property-by-property approach, focusing on [±presupposition] contexts. The authors show that both L1 French and L1 English learners significantly discriminate between grammatical [-presupposition] and ungrammatical [+presupposition] constructions in Dutch, which they attribute to transfer of a distinction that is made in other constructions in the L1 languages.

Part IV is dedicated to the syntax-semantics correlations between case and aspect and information structure on the one hand, and case and negation on the other hand, in three non-Indo-European languages. Chapter 7, by Tuomas Huomo, addresses the relation between case, (un)boundedness and time – consecutive events or a simultaneous event – in Finnish. It is shown how longitudinal and transverse quantities are expressed by Finnish S and O arguments in the partitive vs. nominative/accusative, and how they contribute to the aspectual meaning of the clause. Chapter 8, by Klaus van Heusinger and Jaklin Kornfilt, investigates the contribution of accusative case on the subset in a partitive construction as in (1) in Turkish to the interpretation of the construction. Based on an experimental study, the authors argue against the view that accusative case marks exhaustivity, i.e., expresses non-proper partitivity (see Section 1.4). They claim instead that accusative case marks specificity. In Chapter 9, Urtzi Etxeberria studies the development of partitive case into a partitive determiner in Basque. The author argues that the partitive determiner is the negative form of the existential interpretation of the Basque definite article [-a(k)] and the partitive determiner is analyzed as a super weak Polarity Item and licensed in non-veridical contexts.

3 A terminological note

This section provides a handy guide in the intricate and often inconsistent terminology used to refer to the many different types of partitive items.

Proper partitive constructions or **true partitives** are synonymous terms to refer to the complex structures in (1) or in (40), which refer to the part-whole relation between an indefinite subset and a definite superset. Note that in (40a) the structure is headed by a quantifier, while in (40b) it is headed by a measure noun:

- (40) a. *many of the girls I know*
 b. *a cup of the tea you prepared, a bunch of the flowers you picked*

Pseudo-partitive constructions are instantiated by measure nouns (not quantifiers) which quantify over an indefinite mass or plurality:

- (41) a. *a cup of tea*
 b. *a bunch of flowers*

The partitive PP is the prepositional phrase denoting the superset in a partitive construction. Richly inflected languages do not have the preposition but case

marking. According to Cardinaletti & Giusti (2006, 2017) the partitive PP that occurs in a true partitive construction is selected by the quantifier and displays structural case. The quantifier sets a requirement of lexical identity between the (often elided) indefinite nominal and the nominal in the definite superset:

- (42) a. *many (girls) of the girls who were at the party*
 b. **these (girls) of the girls/children who were at the party*
 c. **many girls of the children who were at the party*

This does not hold for circumstantial partitive PPs, such as the one introduced by *out of* in (43), which may cooccur with any type of nominal and do not show any logical restriction (Sleeman & Ihsane 2016):

- (43) a. *these girls out of the children who were at the party*
 b. *many girls out of the children who were at the party*

Implicit partitives, quantitative constructions, or simple quantifier phrases are quantified nominal expressions that do not display an overt partitive superset. Since the superset may be recovered from the discourse, as in (44b), they are assigned by some authors an optional partitive interpretation:

- (44) a. *some / many / three girls*
 b. *There were nice boys at the party. I had already met three.*

By some authors, they are assimilated to pseudo-partitives.

Generalized partitives, according to Seržant (2021, this volume), are “headless partitives” derived from the generalized drop of the quantifier in a true-partitive constructions. They are different from quantitative constructions (implicit expressions in Seržant’s term) in that they still refer to the full part-whole relation, as in Lithuanian:

- (45) *Mačiau (kaletą) jo kolegų.*
 see.PST.1SG (some.ACC) 3SG.GEN colleague.GEN(=PART).PL
 ‘I saw some of his colleagues’.

Faded partitives (de Hoop 2003) or **bare partitives** (Le Bruyn 2007) have the form of a partitive PP in direct object position, parallel to the generalized partitives, but unlike these they do not convey the part-whole relation. Instead, they convey the ‘sort-of’ or ‘you-know’ meaning, as illustrated by example (46), taken from De Hoop (2003). They have a demonstrative and not a definite article:

- (46) *Els at van die smerige bonbons.*
 Els ate of those filthy bonbons
 ‘Els ate of those filthy bonbons (you know).’

The **partitive determiner** or **partitive article** introduces an indefinite nominal expression. It is a property of Gallo-Romance languages and it is formally made of the preposition *di*, which is claimed by many (a.o. Carlier 2007; Ihsane 2008; Cardinaletti & Giusti 2016 and references therein) to have grammaticalized into a determiner, and the definite article, which does not contribute definite interpretation:

- (47) a. *J’ai vu des filles.* (French)
 b. *Ho visto delle ragazze.* (Italian)
 ‘I saw (some) girls.’

Bare nominals or **bare nouns** are weak indefinites with no determiner in languages which have an article (e.g., Romance and Germanic languages). In Germanic they can also refer to a kind, while in Romance kind-reference is realized by the definite article, notably in subject and object position. Thus, while the object of *love* can refer to a kind, the object of *eat* cannot and is expressed with a bare noun in Spanish (Laca 1990) and with the partitive determiner in French (Anscombe 1996), which does not have bare nouns in any position. In Italian bare nouns in the indefinite object of generic sentences alternate with the definite article, which does not refer to a kind but is simply indefinite, as proven by the comparison with the other three languages (cf. Giusti 2021):

- (48) a. *Monkeys love bananas.*
 b. *Los monos aman las bananas.* (Spanish)
 c. *Les singes aiment les bananes.* (French)
 d. *Le scimmie amano le banane.* (Italian)
- (49) a. *Monkeys don’t eat bananas.*
 b. *Los monos non comen bananas.* (Spanish)
 c. *Les singes ne mangent pas des bananes.* (French)
 d. *Le scimmie non mangiano (le) banane.* (Italian)

Partitive pronouns, also named **quantitative pronouns**, resume indefinite nominal expressions. They resume a bare noun (as in Italian) or the nominal constituent of a quantitative construction (as in Italian and Dutch), as already exemplified in (5) above. In French, in which weak indefinites are introduced by a partitive determiner, the quantitative clitic resumes such weak indefinites:

- (50) a. *J'ai mangé des cerises.* (French)
 I have eaten PART.DET.PL cherries.
 'I ate cherries'
- b. *J'en ai mangé.*
 I PART.CL have eaten
 'I ate some'

References

- Agirre, Txomin. 1906. *Kresala*. Durango: Florentino Elosu-ren echean.
- Anscombre, Jean-Claude. 1996. Partitif et localisation temporelle. *Langue française* 109. 80–103.
- Arkadiev, Peter. 2016. Long-distance genitive of negation in Lithuanian. In Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau. (eds.), *Argument Realization in Baltic*, 37–81. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Badia Margarit, Antonio M. 1947. Los complementos pronominalo-adverbiales derivados de IBI e INDE en la península ibérica. (= *Anejos de la Revista de Filología Española* 38). Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Barker, Chris. 1998. Partitives, double genitives, and anti-uniqueness. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16(4). 679–717.
- Bech, Gunnar. 1952. Über das niederländische Adverbialpronomen *er*. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague* 8. 5–32. Copenhagen: Nordisk Sprog- of Kulturforlag.
- Berends, Sanne, Petra Sleeman, Aafke Hulk & Jeannette Schaeffer. 2021, this volume. The L2 acquisition of the referential semantics of Dutch partitive pronoun ER constructions. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.) *Partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bossong, Georg. 2016. Classification. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*, 63–72. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brasoveanu, Adrian & Donka D. Farkas. 2016. Indefinites. In Maria Aloni & Paul Dekker (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of formal semantics*, 238–266. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti. 2006. The syntax of quantified phrases and quantitative clitics. In: Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, vol. V, 23–93. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti. 2016. The syntax of the Italian indefinite determiner *dei*. *Lingua* 181. 58–80.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti. 2017. Quantified expressions and quantitative clitics. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax*, 2nd edn., 1–61. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti. 2018. Indefinite determiners: Variation and optionality in Italo-Romance. In Diego Pescarini & Roberta D'Alessandro (eds.), *Advances in Italian dialectology: Sketches of Italo-Romance grammars*, 135–161. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti. 2020. Indefinite determiners in informal Italian: A preliminary analysis. In Tabea Ihsane & Elisabeth Stark (eds.), *Shades of partitivity: Formal and areal properties*. Special issue of *Linguistics* 58(3). 679–712.

- Carlier, Anne 2007. From preposition to article: The grammaticalization of the French partitive. *Studies in Language* 31. 1–49.
- Carlier, Anne. 2021, this volume. *Du/Des* NPs in French: a comparison with bare nouns in English and Spanish. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.), *Partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Carlier, Anne & Béatrice Lamiroy. 2014. The grammaticalization of the prepositional partitive in Romance. In Silvia Luraghi & Tuomas Huomo (eds.), *Partitive cases and related categories*, 477–523. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Partitives, reference to kinds and semantic variation. In Aaron Lawson (ed.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)*, vol. VII, 73–98. Ithaca NY: CLC Publications.
- Csirmaz, Aniko. 2012. The case of divisible phase: Licensing partitive case in Finnish. *Syntax* 15(3). 215–252.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen & Claire Beyssade. 2004. *Définir les indéfinis*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- Döhmer, Caroline E. 2017. *Aspekte der luxemburgischen Syntax*. University of Luxembourg dissertation.
- Döhmer, Caroline E. 2018. A new perspective on the Luxembourgish genitive. In Tanja Ackermann, Horst J. Simon & Christian Zimmer (eds.), *Germanic genitives* (Studies in Language Companion 193), 15–36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ehala, Martin. 2012. Transfer, hybridization and analogy in L2 usage: The case of Estonian object marking. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16(1). 159–174.
- Enç, Murvet. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(1). 1–25.
- Etxeberria, Urtzi. 2021, this volume. The partitive marker in Basque and its relation to bare nouns and the definite article. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.) *Partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Falco, Michelangelo & Roberto Zamparelli (eds.) 2019. Special collection: Partitives. *Glossa*. <https://www.glossa-journal.org/collections/special/partitives/>
- Gerards, David P. 2020. *Bare partitives in Old Spanish and Old Portuguese*. University of Zurich dissertation.
- Gianollo, Chiara. 2018. *Indefinites between Latin and Romance* (Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics 33). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2021. A protocol for indefinite determiners in Italian and Italo-Romance. In Tabea Ihsane (ed.), *Disentangling bare nouns and nominals introduced by a partitive article* (Syntax & Semantics 43), 262–300. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2021, this volume. Partitivity in Italian: A protocol approach to a multifaceted phenomenon. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.), *Partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Glaser, Elvira. 1992. Umbau partitiver Strukturen in der Geschichte des Deutschen. *Sprachwissenschaft* 17(2). 113–132.
- Glaser, Elvira. 1993. Syntaktische Strategien zum Ausdruck von Indefinitheit und Partitivität im Deutschen (Standardsprache und Dialekt). In Werner Abraham & Josef Bayer (eds.), *Dialektsyntax*, 99–116. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Heusinger, Klaus von. 2019. Indefinites and specificity. In Barbara Abbott & Janet Gundel (eds.), *Oxford handbook of reference*, 146–167. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heusinger, Klaus von & Jaklin Kornfilt. 2005. The case of the direct object in Turkish: Semantics, syntax and morphology. *Turkic Languages* 9. 3–44.

- Heusinger, Klaus von & Jaklin Kornfilt. 2021, this volume. Turkish partitive constructions and (non-)exhaustivity. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.), *Partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hoeksema, Jacob. 1996. Introduction. In Jacob Hoeksema (ed.), *Partitives: Studies on the syntax and semantics of Partitivity and related constructions*, 1–24. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hoop, Helen de. 2003. Partitivity. In Lisa Cheng & Rint Sybesma (eds.), *The second Glot International state-of-the-article book*, 179–212. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hoop, Helen de, Guido van den Wyngaerd & Jan-Wouter Zwart. 1990. Syntaxis en semantiek van de *van die*-constructie. *Gramma, Tijdschrift voor Taalkunde* 14. 81–106.
- Huomo, Tuomas. 2010. Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: The case of the Finnish object. *Journal of Linguistics* 46(1). 83–125.
- Huomo, Tuomas. 2021, this volume. Longitudinal or transverse? How the unbounded quantity expressed by the Finnish partitive case relates to time. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.), *Partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Ihsane, Tabea. 2005. On the structure of French DU/DES ‘of the’ constituents. *GG@G (Generative Grammar in Geneva)* 4. 195–225.
- Ihsane, Tabea. 2008. *The layered DP. Form and meaning of French indefinites*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ihsane, Tabea (ed.). 2021. *Disentangling bare nouns and nominals introduced by a partitive article* (Syntax & Semantics 43). Amsterdam: Brill.
- Ihsane, Tabea & Elisabeth Stark (eds.). 2020. *Shades of partitivity: Formal and areal properties*. Special issue of *Linguistics* 58(3).
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. *X'-Syntax: A study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1998. Partitive case and aspect. In Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder (eds.), *The projection of arguments: Lexical and compositional factors*, 265–307. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2001. “A piece of the cake” and “a cup of tea”: partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages. Volume 2: Grammar and Typology*, 523–568. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish*. London: Routledge.
- Laca, Brenda. 1990. Generic object: Some more pieces of the puzzle. *Lingua* 81(1). 25–46.
- Ladusaw, William A. 1982. Semantic constraints on the English partitive construction. *Proceedings of West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 1, 231–242. Stanford: Cascadilla Press.
- Le Bruyn, Bert. 2007. The partitive article *dei* in Italian. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 2007, 138–149.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2012. Partitives and differential marking of core arguments: A crosslinguistic survey. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pavia.
- Luraghi, Silvia & Giovanna Albonico. 2021, this volume. The partitive article in Old Italian. Early stages in the grammaticalization of the Italian partitive article. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.), *Partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Luraghi, Silvia & Tuomas Huomo (eds.). 2014. *Partitive cases and related categories*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Luraghi, Silvia & Seppo Kittilä. 2014. Typology and diachrony of partitive case markers. In Silvia Luraghi & Tuomas Huomo (eds.), *Partitive cases and related categories*, 17–62. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Marty, Paul. 2019. On the source of proper partitivity. In M. Teresa Espinal, Elena Castroviejo, Manuel Leonetti, Louise McNally & Cristina Real-Puigdollers (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 23(2)*, 143–160.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2014. Partitives and negation: A cross-linguistic survey. In Silvia Luraghi & Tuomas Huomo (eds.), *Partitive cases and related categories*, 63–86. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Milner, Jean-Claude. 1978. *De la syntaxe à l'interprétation : Quantités, insultes, exclamations*. Paris: Seuil.
- Öztürk, Balkız. 2005. *Case, referentiality and phrase structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Perpiñan, Silvia. 2017. Catalan-Spanish bilingualism continuum. *Linguistic approaches to bilingualism* 7(5). 477–513.
- Rijk, Rudolf P.G. de. 1972. *Studies in Basque syntax: Relative clauses*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation. <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/12980>
- Runić, Marija. 2012. L'uso dell'articolo italiano in apprendenti di madrelingua serbo-croata. In Silvana Ferreri (ed.), *Linguistica educativa: Atti del XLIV Congresso internazionale di studi della Società di linguistica italiana (SLI). Viterbo, 27–29 settembre 2010* (Pubblicazioni della Società linguistica italiana 55), 395–407. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Seržant, Ilja. 2015. Independent partitive as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. *Journal of Language Contact* 8. 341–418.
- Seržant, Ilja. 2021, this volume. Diachronic typology of partitives. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.), *Partitive determiners, Partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Sleeman, Petra & Tabea Ihsane. 2016. Gender mismatches in partitive constructions with superlatives in French. *Glossa* 1(1): 35. 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.137>
- Sleeman, Petra & Tabea Ihsane. 2017. The L2 acquisition of the French quantitative pronoun *en* by L1 learners of Dutch. Vulnerable domains and cross-linguistic influence. In Elma Blom, Jeannette Schaeffer & Leonie Cornips (eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in bilingualism. In Honor of Aafke Hulk*, 303–330. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sleeman, Petra & Tabea Ihsane. 2021, this volume. The L2 acquisition of the partitive pronoun *en* in French by L1 speakers of German and the role of the L1. In Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.), *Partitive determiners, Partitive pronouns and partitive case* (Linguistische Arbeiten 580). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Soto-Corominas, Adriana. 2019. Acquisition of quantified partitivity in Catalan-Spanish bilingualism. Influence from child-level and language-level factors. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*. (online-first articles) <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.19016.sot>
- Spoelman, Marianne. 2011. The use of partitive predicatives by Estonian learners of Finnish at different levels of L2 proficiency. *Lähivõrdlusi. Lähivertailuja* 21. 280–304.
- Stepanov, Arthur & Penka Stateva. 2018. Countability, agreement and the loss of the dual in Russian. *Linguistics* 54. 779–821.
- Strobel, Thomas. 2012. On the areal and syntactic distribution of indefinite-partitive pronouns in German: Methodological advances and empirical results within the project Syntax of Hessian Dialects (SyHD). In Xosé Afonso, Álvarez Pérez, Ernestina Carrilho, & Catarina Magro (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Limits and Areas in Dialectology*, 405–430.

- Strobel, Thomas. 2017. *Pronominale Partitivität: Arealität und Mikrovariation einer morphosyntaktischen Variable in den Varietäten des Deutschen*. University of Frankfurt dissertation.
- Strobel, Thomas & Elvira Glaser. 2021. The rise and fall of partitive markers in some Germanic varieties. In Tabea Ihsane (ed.), *Disentangling bare nouns and nominals introduced by a partitive article* (Syntax & Semantics 43), 17–53. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Swart, Henriette de. 2006. Aspectual implications of the semantics of plural indefinites. In Svetlana Vogeleer & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Non-definiteness and plurality*, 161–189. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Tamm, Anne. 2014. The partitive concept versus linguistic partitives: from abstract concepts to evidentiality in the Uralic languages. In Silvia Luraghi & Tuomas Huomo (eds.), *Partitive cases and related categories*, 89–152. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tănase-Dogaru, Mihaela. 2008. Pseudo-partitives and (silent) classifiers in Romanian. In Sylvia Blaho, Camelia Constantinescu & Erik Schoorlemmer (eds.), *Proceedings of ConSOLE XV*, 295–320.
- Tănase-Dogaru, Mihaela. 2017. Partitive constructions. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax*, 2nd edn. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.
- Tarrés, Mònica & Aurora Bel. 2017. Optionality in sequential bilingualism. Production of Catalan adverbial clitics by children of different L1s. Paper presented at 2017 IASCL Conference.
- Thomas, Rose. 2003. *The Partitive in Finnish and its relation to the weak quantifiers*. University of Westminster dissertation.
- Westveer, Thom. 2021. *Gender mismatches in partitive constructions in French and German: How society shapes language*. Amsterdam: LOT.
- Witzlach-Makarevich, Alena & Ilja Seržant. 2018. Differential argument marking: Patterns of variation. In Alena Witzlach-Makarevich & Ilja Seržant (eds.), *Diachrony of differential argument marking* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 19), 1–40. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Wust, Valerie. 2009. A la recherche des clitiques perdus: The dictogloss as a measure of the comprehension of *y* and *en* by L2 learners of French. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 65(3). 471–499.
- Zamparelli, Roberto. 1998. A theory of kinds, partitives, and *of/z* possessives. In Artemis Alexiadou & Chris Wilder (eds.), *Possessors, predicates and movement in the Determiner Phrase*, 259–301. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zamparelli, Roberto. 2008. *Dei ex machina*: a note on plural/mass indefinite determiners. *Studia Linguistica* 63(3). 301–327.