

## **Book proposal – Partitives**

*edited by*

Silvia Luraghi, Università di Pavia [silvia.luraghi@unipv.it](mailto:silvia.luraghi@unipv.it)

Tuomas Huumo, University of Tartu [tuomas.huumo@utu.fi](mailto:tuomas.huumo@utu.fi)

## Editors' CVs

Silvia Luraghi

Professor of Historical and General Linguistics, University of Pavia.

I received my M.A. in Classics from the University of Turin (1982), and my Ph.D. in linguistics from the University of Pavia (1987). I also studied in the US (Yale University, Fulbright fellow) and in Germany (Ruhr-Universität Bochum), where I returned for several research periods as Humboldt fellow. My first appointment was at the University of Bergamo, where I taught courses of historical and Indo-European linguistics, and at the Istituto di lingue moderne in Milan, where I taught general linguistics (1987-1990). From 1990 to 1992 I collaborated with the Chicago Hittite Dictionary at the University of Chicago, and from 1992 to 1998 I taught general and historical linguistics at the University of Rome 3. I hold my current position since the fall of 1998. My main research interests concern language change, especially in the field of syntax and semantics, language typology, and cognitive linguistics. Language specialities include Greek, Latin, Hittite, and the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European; in addition, I have worked on Italian and other Romance languages. I have authored, co-authored or edited 15 books and have written about a hundred scholarly articles. My recent publications include:

*Key Terms in Syntax and Syntactic Theory*. London/New York, Continuum 2008, pp. xi + 256 (with C. Parodi).

“Possessive constructions in Anatolian, Hurrian, Urartean, and Armenian as evidence for language contact”. In B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova, I. C. Rutherford, eds., *Anatolian Interfaces*, Oxbow Press, 2008, 147-155.

“Case in Cognitive Linguistics”. In A. Malchukov & A. Spencer, eds., *The Handbook of Case*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2008, 136-150.

“The evolution of local cases and their grammatical equivalent in Greek and Latin”. In J. Barðdal & S. Celliax, eds., *The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in the Development of Case*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 2009, 283-305.

“The origin of the feminine gender in Indo-European. An old problem in a new perspective”. In V. Bubenik, J. Hewson & S. Rose, eds., *Grammatical Change in Indo-European Languages*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 2009, 3-13.

“The internal structure of adpositional phrases”. In J. Helmbrecht, Y. Nishina, Y.M. Shin, S. Skopeteas, E. Verhoeven, eds., *Form and Function in Language Research: Papers in honour of Christian Lehmann*. Berlin/ New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2009, 231-254.

“A model for representing polysemy: The Italian preposition *da*”. In Jacques François, Eric Gilbert, Claude Guimier, Maxi Krause, eds. *Actes du Colloque “Autour de la préposition”*, Caen, Presses Universitaires de Caen, 2009, 167-178.

“Indo-European nominal classification: From abstract to feminine”. In S. W. Jamison, H. C.

Melchert, B. Vine, eds., *Proceedings of the 20th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Bremen, Hempen, 2009, 115-131.

“Transitivity, intransitivity and diathesis in Hittite”. In *ИНДОЕВРОПЕЙСКОЕ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ И КЛАССИЧЕСКАЯ ФИЛОЛОГИЯ – XIV*, vol. 2. St. Petersburg, Nauka, 2010, 133-154.

“Adverbial Phrases”. In Ph. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin, eds., *A New Historical Syntax of Latin*. Berlin/ New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2010, 19-107.

*Linguistique historique et indoeuropéenne*. Louvain-la-Neuve, Peeters, 2010, pp. xv + 281.

*Continuum Companion to Historical Linguistics*. London/New York, Continuum, 2010 (edited, with V. Bubenik).

“History and sources of historical linguistics”. In Luraghi & Bubenik 2010, pp. 1-35 (with V. Bubenik).

“The rise (and possible downfall) of configurationality”. In Luraghi & Bubenik 2010, 212-.

“Causes of language change”. In Luraghi & Bubenik 2010, 354-366.

“Experiencer predicates in Hittite”. In R. I. Kim, E. Riecken, N. Oettinger, M. J. Weiss, eds., *Ex Anatolia Lux*. Beech Stave Press, Ann Arbor 2010.

“The extension of the passive construction in Ancient Greek.” In *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 42/1, 2010, 60-74.

Tuomas Huumo

Visiting Professor of Finnish language and culture, University of Tartu, Estonia

Professor of Finnish language, University of Turku, Finland

I am currently (2006–2011) the Visiting Professor of Finnish at the University of Tartu, Estonia. Since 1999 I have been professor of Finnish at the University of Turku, Finland, where I also received my grades: MA (1992), Lic. Phil. (1994) and PhD (1997). My central research topics include locatives, setting adverbials, word order, case marking, aspect, viewpoint, fictive motion and other topics related to grammar and cognitive semantics. Most of my works deal with the Finnish language, in a cognitive linguistic perspective, and many of them have been published in high-ranking international journals such as *Linguistics*, *Cognitive Linguistics*, *Folia Linguistica* and *Journal of Linguistics*. In spring term 1998 I visited UC San Diego (Visiting scholar), and in 1999, I called the foundational meeting of the Finnish Cognitive Linguistic Association (FiCLA) and got elected its first chairperson (1999–2003). I am currently board member in a number of Finnish, Estonian and international linguistic publications, including *Cognitive Linguistics*, *Virittäjä* and *Linguistica Uralica*, and have recently held positions of trust e.g., in the board of the Research institute for the languages of Finland and the Council for Finnish Studies at Universities Abroad (the Finnish Center for International Mobility / Ministry of Education).

Selection of recent publications (in English):

- Huumo, Tuomas. 2010. On directionality and its motivation in Finnish expressions of sensory perception. *Linguistics* 48(1): 49–97.
- Huumo, Tuomas. 2010. Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: The case of the Finnish object. *Journal of Linguistics* 46(1): 83–125.
- Huumo, Tuomas and Jari Sivonen 2010: Conceptualizing change as deictic abstract motion: metaphorical and grammatical uses of 'come' and 'go' in Finnish.– Mark Turner, Fey Parrell, and Vera Tobin (eds.), *Meaning, form, and body*. Stanford: CSLI Publications: 111–128.
- Huumo, Tuomas. 2009. Fictive dynamicity, nominal aspect, and the Finnish copulative construction. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20–1: 43–70.
- Huumo, Tuomas. 2007. Force dynamics, fictive dynamicity and the Finnish verbs of 'remaining'. *Folia Linguistica* 41(1–2): 73–98.
- Huumo, Tuomas. 2006. "I woke up from the sofa": Subjective directionality in Finnish expressions of spatio-cognitive transfers". In *Grammar from the human perspective: Case, space and person in Finnish* pp. 41–65. Eds. Lyle Campbell and Marja-Liisa Helasvuo.
- Huumo, Tuomas and Krista Ojutkangas. 2006. "The Finnish system for expressing spatial relations: local cases and adpositions". In *Grammar from the human perspective: Case, space and person* pp. 11–20. Eds. Lyle Campbell and Marja-Liisa Helasvuo.
- Huumo, Tuomas. 2005. "How fictive dynamicity motivates aspect marking: The Riddle of the Finnish Quasi-resultative construction". *Cognitive Linguistics* 16(1): 113–144.

## **Table of contents**

### *Introduction*

Silvia Luraghi and Tuomas Huumo

### *The typology and the diachrony of partitives*

Seppo Kittilä and Silvia Luraghi

### *Partitives and negation, a cross-linguistic survey*

Matti Miestamo

### *The origin of the Basque partitive*

Borja Ariztimuño López

### *The Basque partitive marker is interpreted existentially*

Urtzi Etxeberria

### *Partitives stretching borders: How well do Finnish and Estonian partitive subjects serve as a criterion for the existential clause?*

Tuomas Huumo and Liina Lindström

### *Semantic and morphological partitives in the Uralic languages*

Anne Tamm

### *How close are the Estonian partitive subjects to partitive objects?*

Metslang Helena

### *Partitive Subjects and Objects in Indo-Iranian*

Eystein Dahl

### *The Ancient Greek partitive genitive in typological perspective*

Luz Conti and Silvia Luraghi

### *The partitive genitive in Baltic and Slavic as compared to Ancient IE languages*

Ilja A. Seržant

### *The Russian Partitive and Verbal Aspect*

Katia Paykin

*Russian second genitive: partitive or not? A corpus study*

Michael Daniel

*The Finnish Partitive revisited: a discourse-cognitive approach, in comparison with some other Finno-Ugric and Indo-European languages*

M. M. Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest

*Double government in Polish: semantic and pragmatic motivation for the use of genetivus partitivus*

Elżbieta Tabakowska

*Partitives and diminutives in Russian and beyond*

Evgenia Chernigovskaya

*Partitives in Oceanic languages*

Peter Budd

*The grammaticalization of the prepositional partitive in Romance*

Béatrice Lamiroy and Anne Carlier

## Introduction

Silvia Luraghi and Tuomas Huumo

### Definition of ‘partitive’

The terms **partitive**, **pseudo-partitive** and **partitive construction** are often used in the literature in reference to expressions such as *A cup of (this) coffee* or *A bunch of flowers*, which have received quite a lot of attention in linguistics (Hoeksema 1996, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001 and 2006 among others). However, a few languages, as for example Baltic Finnic and Basque, have developed a specialized partitive case that is used in argument marking, while in other (most Ancient and some modern Indo-European languages, other Uralic languages) a morphological case such as the genitive or the ablative may also function as a partitive. Similarly, some languages which do not have morphological case may use other markers of case relations (adpositions, verb affixes) in the same way. These argument-marking, morphological partitives have been the topic of language specific studies, while to our knowledge no cross-linguistic or typological analyses have been conducted. Since individual partitives of different languages have been studied, a few of them quite thoroughly, there exists a basis for a more cross-linguistic approach. The purpose of our book project is to fill this gap and to bring together research on partitives in different languages.

Morphological partitives as those on which we want to focalize often have some of the same meaning usually associated with partitive and pseudo-partitive constructions headed by some type of quantifier, as in *A cup of (this) coffee* (see for example Heine and Kuteva 2002). Indeed, they are often translated as involving a quantifier (typically *some*) in languages such as English; however, they have an array of cross-linguistically recurrent functions which are quite distinctive, including aspect marking, existentiality, incremental theme marking and marking of indefiniteness. This last function may be the reason why partitives may become determiners.

In languages with a partitive case that marks arguments, the partitive is often in a complementary distribution with other grammatical cases that mark NPs with the same syntactic function. Partitives typically mark objects and patient-like subjects, and in some languages their use correlates with the polarity of the sentence (implicated or overt affirmation /negation). Even though the typical function of the partitive is to mark a patient-like participant, it is also worth pointing out that the partitive is most often used in low-transitivity expressions where the patient is not completely affected: it thus indicates partial affectedness of the patient (cf. Blake 2001: 151). In addition, the partitive is often used for subjects, especially with unaccusative verbs or in other contexts where agentivity is not especially high. A reminiscent function is also attributed to other cases in languages that do not have a separate partitive, as in the case of the Hungarian partitive/ablative, and the partitive/genitive of various Indo-European languages (a separate partitive, lexically restricted, also exists in Russian). Depending on the language, the use of

partitives may be more or less restricted. In Basque, for example, the partitive occurs in negative sentences and it can indicate either the object of transitive verbs or the subject on intransitive verbs. In other words, the partitive can substitute the absolutive case in negative sentences; it only occurs as subject with unaccusative verbs. This shows that the function of the partitive in ergative and accusative languages is similar. A connection between negation and partitive (genitive) also occurs in the Slavic and the Baltic Finnic languages. The alternation between the partitive and other cases sometimes also has connections with aspect: this has been argued for Baltic Finnic, Slavic (see e.g. Fischer 2004), and possibly Sanskrit (Dahl 2009).

In some Indo-European and Finno-Ugric languages, besides partitive objects and partitive subjects (mostly with unaccusative verbs, cf. Conti 2009 on Ancient Greek), partitive adverbials also exist, for example in time expressions, such as *Nachts* ‘during the night’ in German and in Finnish, in occurrences such as (1):

- (1) *Hän on täällä tois-ta vuot-ta*  
 s/he is here second-PART year-PART  
 ‘S/he is here for his/her second year’

In Ancient Greek, some locative occurrences of the partitive genitive are attested (see Luraghi 2003, 2009), as in (2):

- (2) *ē halòs ē epì gês*  
 or sea:GEN or on land:GEN  
 ‘Either at sea or on land’ (Homer, *Od.* 12.26-27).

In addition, in some languages such as Finnish and Homeric Greek the partitive can also occur with adpositions.

In one of the few existing cross-linguistic description of partitives, Moravcsik (1978: 272) summarizes typical semantic correlates of partitives as follows:

- a. the definiteness-indefiniteness of the noun phrase;
- b. the extent to which the object is involved in the event;
- c. the completedness versus non-completedness of the event;
- d. whether the sentence is affirmative or negative.

Moravcsik further remarks that marking difference brought about by the partitive “does not correlate with any difference in semantic case function”. Thus, the use of the partitive seems to be at odds with the basic function of cases, that is “marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads” (Blake 2001: 1): rather than to indicate a specific grammatical or semantic relation that a NP bears to the verb or to another head, the partitive seems to indicate



indeterminacy (in various manners). In fact, this has been noted by several authors. For example, Laka (1993: 158) suggests that “what is referred to as ‘partitive case’ in Basque is a polar determiner, much like English *any*”. In Finnish, the functions of the partitive are also related to indeterminacy, unboundedness and polarity, and it is noteworthy that the partitive is not the sole marker of any grammatical function but participates in a complementary distribution with other cases in all its main functions, i.e. as marker of the object (PART~ACC), the existential subject (PART~NOM) and the predicate nominal (PART~NOM), or as complement of adpositions (PART~GEN).

In this connection, one must mention the so-called partitive article of some Romance varieties, which derives from the preposition which has substituted the Latin genitive (Latin *de*). In French, the partitive article is clearly a determiner and not a marker of a case relation, as shown by its distribution:

- (3) *L’enfant joue dans le jardin / un enfant joue dans le jardin*  
‘The child plays in the garden.’ / ‘A child plays in the garden.’
- (4) *Les enfants jouent dans le jardin / des enfants jouent dans le jardin*  
‘The children play in the garden.’ / ‘Some(=part. art.) children play in the garden.’

The brief survey above shows that there are striking similarities among partitives across languages, which are not limited to the indication of partial affectedness. However, research on partitives is mostly limited to individual languages. In this book we would like to bring together and compare data from different languages in which a case (or some other marker of a case relation) are classified as partitive.

## Research questions

Central research questions that are addressed in our book include the following:

- (a) The distribution of partitives in different syntactic positions (objects, subjects, other roles) and across constructions;
- (b) Partitives as determiners;
- (c) Types of verbs with which partitive subjects (or objects) can occur;
- (d) The diachrony of partitives: what are the sources of partitive markers? What is the diachronic relation between ablative, genitive, and partitive? (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002: 32-33, 241);
- (e) Partitives as non-canonical grammatical markers: Finnish partitive subjects and objects have been treated under the heading of ‘non-canonical marking’ (Sands and Campbell 2001). How do partitive subjects/objects relate to other types of non-canonical arguments?
- (f) Discourse functions of partitives: Since partitives indicate indeterminacy, it might be expected that they are not topical

elements in discourse. For instance, Helasvuo (2001) has shown that the referents of Finnish partitive subjects (unlike those of nominative subjects) are typically not tracked in discourse. What is the discourse function of partitives crosslinguistically?

(g) Partitives, aspect and quantification: The Baltic Finnic partitive object is well-known for its function of indicating aspectual unboundedness. Other BF partitives (existential, copulative) do not share the aspectual function proper but often indicate an incremental theme (in the sense of Dowty 1991), which gives rise to unbounded “nominal aspect” (Huomo 2003, 2009). What are the aspectual and quantificational functions of partitives crosslinguistically?

The book addresses linguists of all theoretical persuasions, especially if interested in linguistic typology. For this reason, and because all papers are data oriented, we see it as especially suitable for the EALT series. We plan a total length of 400 pages.

## References

- Blake, Barry 2001. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Conti, Luz 2008. Zum Genitiv bei impersonalen Konstruktionen im Altgriechischen. Paper read at the *XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg 22.9.-27.9.2008*.
- Dahl, Eystein 2009 Some semantic and pragmatic aspects of object alternation in Early Vedic. In J. Barðdal and S. Chelliah (eds) *The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in the Development of Case*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Dowty, David 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67, 547–619.
- Fischer, Susann 2004. Partitive vs. Genitive in Russian and Polish: an empirical study on case alternation in the object domain. In S. Fischer, R. van de Vijver and R. Vogel (eds.), *Experimental Studies in Linguistics*. I, LiP 21. 123-137.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa 2001. *Syntax in the Making: The emergence of syntactic units in Finnish conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hoeksema, J., ed., 1996, *Studies on the syntax and semantics of partitive and related constructions*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huomo, Tuomas 2003. Incremental Existence: The World According to the Finnish Existential Sentence. *Linguistics* 41/3: 461–493
- Huomo, Tuomas 2009. Fictive dynamicity, nominal aspect, and the Finnish copulative construction. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20/1: 43–70.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., 2001, "A Slice of the Cake" and "a Cup of Tea": Partitive and Pseudo-Partitive Constructions in the Circum-Baltic Languages, in Ö. Dahl & M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds., *Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2, 527–568.

- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., 2006, Partitives, in K. Brown, ed., *Encyclopedia of Languages and Linguistics*, Second Edition, Oxford: Elsevier, 218–221.
- Laka, Itziar 1993. Unergatives that Assign Ergative, Unaccusatives that Assign Accusative. *MITWPL* 18: 149-172.
- Luraghi, Silvia 2003. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases. A Study of the Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Luraghi, Silvia 2009. The internal structure of adpositional phrases. In J. Helmbrecht Y. Nishina, Y.M. Shin, S. Skopeteas, E. Verhoeven, eds., *Form and Function in Language Research: Papers in honour of Christian Lehmann*. Berlin/ New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 231-254.
- Moravcsik, Edith 1978. On the case marking of objects. In Joseph Greenberg *et al.* (eds.) *Universals of Human Language*, vol IV. *Syntax*. Stanford University Press, 249-290.
- Sands, Kristina and Lyle Campbell 2001. Non-canonical subjects and objects in Finnish. In A. Aikenvald, R. M. W. Dixon, and M. Onishi (eds.) *Non-canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 251-305.

## **The typology and the diachrony of partitives**

by *Seppo Kittilä* and *Silvia Luraghi*

This chapter presents a cross-linguistic discussion of the issues highlighted as research questions in the introduction. It is organized as follows:

- a) A synchronic typology of partitives
- b) The origin of partitives and their possible evolution

In part (a), we describe possible types of morphemes that function as dedicated partitives in typologically different languages. Based on the data provided by the other chapters of the book, relevant parameters appear to be the tendency toward head or dependent marking and the extent to which bound morphemes are used to code grammatical relations and semantic roles. In addition, we explore possible patterns of polysemy of partitive morphemes in languages that do not have dedicated partitive cases (e.g. partitive/ablative, partitive/genitive). We then describe typical functions of partitives, such as indicating incremental theme, non-referentiality, indefiniteness, imperfective aspect, etc. and its cross-linguistic tendencies toward occurring in special environments, such as with negation (as in Basque and other languages, see Ariztimuño, Budd, Miestamo), diminution (as in Russian, Berber and Nahuatl, see Jurafsky 1996, Chernigovskaya), existential (as in Finnish and Basque, see Huomo and Lindström, Etxeberria), definite articles (as in Ancient Greek and in the Romance languages, see Conti and Luraghi, Napoli 2010, Lamiroy and Carlier), and so on. We then construct a scale of increasing prototypicality for partitives. We aim at describing the meaning of partitive morphemes as a radial category (see Lakoff 1987, Nikiforidou 1991), and map more and less central meanings onto semantic space, in order to come up with a semantic map that shows the relations among the different functions of partitives and their position relative to each other (on semantic maps see the discussion in the 2010 issue of *Linguistic Discovery*). The likelihood of such semantic map will be tested with the diachronic data discussed in part (b). A central area in the semantics of partitives is shared by partitive constructions in the sense of Koptjevskja-Tamm 2006 (see also Tamm); the semantic map and the radial category provided for the description of the functions of partitives will be shown to account for this polysemy.

In part (b) we present available data on the origin of partitive markers and on their evolution. Although restricted, such data consistently point toward a close relation among the partitive, the ablative and the genitive (see Moravcsik 1978, Heine and Kuteva 2002). An issue in this respect is the relation between the genitive and the ablative, whereby genitives are usually thought to originate from ablatives (see among others Heine and Kuteva 2002), however, if both a genitive and a partitive are available in a language, a pattern of polysemy involving partitive and genitive seems more frequent than a pattern involving partitive and ablative. This is not only shown by the data of the ancient Indo-European languages, but also by developments in the Romance languages

(specifically in Italian). Other possible sources for partitives are grammaticalized verb form, as contended for Basque by Ariztimuño. A possible evolution of partitives is toward becoming determiners, as shown by the Romance languages, and also by Basque and a number of Oceanic languages (see Etxeberria, Lamiroy and Carlier, Budd). Such an evolution can lead partitives to eventually lose their partitive meaning, and only retain the function of marking indefiniteness, as in the Romance languages (Lamiroy and Carlier, Luraghi *forthc.*). In addition, diachronic consideration of the origin of partitives highlights the relation between dedicated partitives and partitive constructions (see Introduction), which will accordingly also be addressed. The core meaning of morphemes that can generate partitives and the chronology of developments, where reconstructable, will then be matched against the radial category elaborated in part (a). We will address the question whether a radial category does indeed represent an ‘archaeology of meaning’ in the sense of Jurafsky 1996, and whether the prototypical meaning can be described in terms of its origins. We then proceed to revising the semantic map sketched in part (a) based on the insight regarding diachronic development as described in part (b).

## References

(references to papers in this collection are not listed here)

- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Jurafsky, Daniel 1996. Universal Tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive. *Language* 72/3: 533-578 .
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., 2006, Partitives, in K. Brown, ed., *Encyclopedia of Languages and Linguistics*, Second Edition, Oxford: Elsevier, 218–221.
- Lakoff, Johan 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Luraghi, Silvia *forthc.* Partitives, transitivity, and non-canonical marking of core arguments. In L. Kulikov and I. Serzants, eds., *Subject and Transitivity in Diachronic Perspective*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Moravcsik, Edith 1978. On the case marking of objects. In Joseph Greenberg *et al.* (eds.) *Universals of Human Language*, vol IV. *Syntax*. Stanford University Press, 249-290.
- Napoli, Maria 2010. The case for the partitive case: The contribution of Ancient Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108/1, 15-40.
- Nikiforidou, Kiki. 1991. The meanings of the genitive: A case study in semantic structure and semantic change. *Cognitive Linguistics* 2: 149-206.

## Partitives and negation, a cross-linguistic survey

### Matti Miestamo

Negation affects case marking in some European languages (Finnic, Baltic, Slavic and Basque): NPs in the scope of negation are marked with a case that has a partitive-marking function (partitive or genitive), either obligatorily or as a matter of preference. The following examples illustrate the case alternations in Finnish:

(1) Finnish (constructed examples)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| a. <i>söin banaani-n</i><br>eat.PST.1SG banana-GEN<br>'I ate {a/the} banana.'  | b. <i>söin banaani-t</i><br>eat.PST.1SG banana-PL.NOM<br>'I ate the bananas.'   |
| c. <i>söin banaani-a</i><br>eat.PST.1SG banana-PART<br>'I {ate some / was eating {a/the}}<br>banana.'                    | d. <i>söin banaane-j-a</i><br>eat.PST.1SG banana-PL-PART<br>'I {ate (some) / was eating {(some)/the}}<br>bananas.'        |
| e. <i>en syönyt banaani-a</i><br>NEG.1SG eat.PST.PTCP banana-PART<br>'I {didn't eat / wasn't eating} {a/the}<br>banana.' | f. <i>en syönyt banaane-j-a</i><br>NEG.1SG eat.PST.PTCP banana-PL-PART<br>'I {didn't eat / wasn't eating} (the) bananas.' |

In these examples, the object of the affirmative may be, on the one hand, in the genitive or nominative depending on the morphosyntactic environment (1a-b), or, on the other, in the partitive (1c-d). In the negative, only the partitive is possible (1e-f). Related case asymmetries between affirmatives and negatives are also found in some existential sentences where subjects can be either nominative or partitive in affirmatives but negatives have to use the partitive.

The tendency for NPs to receive partitive marking in the scope of negation is not limited to morphologically bound case marking. French negatives show a similar pattern with free determiners. The partitive marker *de* occurs instead of indefinite articles in most contexts: *Je mange une pomme* 'I eat / am eating an apple' vs. *Je ne mange pas de pomme* 'I do not eat / am not eating an apple'.

Although the link between partitives and negation is relatively well-studied in European languages, it has not been systematically addressed in typological research. Similar phenomena have been reported in some language groups outside Europe, e.g., in some Oceanic languages, but their cross-linguistic distribution is not known. The present papers aims to fill this gap. It will report the results of a large-scale typological survey of the link between partitives and negation.

To situate the phenomenon in a larger context, attention will be paid to other effects that negation has on the marking of grammatical categories within NPs, e.g. on the marking of referentiality and focus. In a yet larger context, the effects on NPs are one of the many ways in which negation can affect the structure of clauses, or in Miestamo's (2005) terms, one of the many ways in which negatives can show asymmetry vis-à-vis affirmatives.

These larger contexts become relevant when we start looking for explanations for the link between partitives and negation. In the literature, it has been attributed to different semantic and pragmatic factors, including aspect and referentiality. The typological evidence suggests that aspect does not play a role, but referentiality is an important factor in explaining the link.

Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

## THE ORIGIN OF THE BASQUE PARTITIVE

Borja Ariztimuño López

University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU)

This paper deals with the Basque partitive *-(r)ik* (*-rik* after consonant, *-ik* after vowel) from a diachronic perspective. One of the aims focuses on the evolution of its different uses (determiner-like function, adverbial function, etc.) and the relationship between this affix and the ablatival case-inflection (*-(r)ik/-tik*; Mitxelena 1977). The other purpose is to elucidate the partitive's proto-Basque source and its formal and semantical development (de Rijk 1996, Lakarra 2008).

Its main uses are (see Trask 1997: 93-94): a) to mark indefinite direct objects of negative/interrogative transitive sentences (*ez dauka-t diru-rik* 'I have no money'; *ba-dauka-zu diru-rik?* 'have you got any money?' (*diru* 'money')) and predicates of negative/interrogative existential sentences (*hemen ez da ur-ik* 'there is no water here'; *ba al da ur-ik hemen?* 'is there any water here?' (*ur* 'water')); b) to mark the category in superlative constructions (*gizon-ik garai-en-a* 'the tallest man' (*gizon* 'man')); and c) to imply ablative sense in some fixed (archaic) expressions (*herri-rik herri* 'from town to town'). It is important to bear in mind that the first of these uses involves only indefinite elements. Direct objects of negative/interrogative transitive sentences (predicates of negative/interrogative existential sentences are by their own nature indefinite) do not take partitive, but absolutive, when they are definite (*ez dauka-t diru-a* 'I haven't got the money' (the one that we have spoken about), *ba al dauka-zu diru-a?* 'have you got the money?' (e.g., the one that we both know that you should have)). Another important point is that, unlike the rest of the cases (where three forms of a number/definiteness axis are distinguished) the partitive is transnumeral in the sense that it is not specified for number (the verb agreement being always singular).

In order to cast light upon its origin and diachronic development, it is worth marking that in 16<sup>th</sup> century texts the cases in which *-(r)ik* appears with ablative meaning are more frequent. Both in Western and Eastern texts, for instance, the usual abl. suffix for proper names was *-(r)ik* (*Maule-rik* 'from Maule'). Moreover, nowadays, while the abl. sg. suffix is *-tik* everywhere and the abl. pl. *-eta-tik* in Western dialects (agglutination of pl. *-eta* + abl. *-tik*), Eastern dialects have abl. pl. *-eta-rik*. This points to a situation in which *-(r)ik* covered some ablative functions, perhaps in competition with old Western *-(r)ean*, another abl. suffix existing in Old Biscayan. Since then, a new suffix *-ti-k* (which derives from the agglutination of the old prosecutive *-ti* (*kale-ti* 'by way of/through the street') plus a controversial *-k(a)*) has encroached on the scope of *-(r)ik* as ablative and has become the main form on this function, limiting *-(r)ik* to the partitive function and to a few archaic fixed expressions with ablative meaning. From a formal point of view, both partit./abl. *-(r)ik* and abl. *-tik* appear respectively as *-(r)ika* and *-tika* in some old attestations (and as *-(r)ikan* and *-tikan* in some (also modern) dialects, by the addition of the so-called expletive *-(a)n*, from the inessive case).

With regard to the grammatical classification, almost in all the history (the documented time) of the Basque language, grammarians have attempted, with varying success, to explain the nature of the partitive mark. Until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they usually have been concerned to show the different uses and, in general, they have agreed on them (they differ only in the amount of applications that explain/discriminate in their grammars).

In contrast, there were more problems when grammatically classified, that is, to decide whether this was a case (functionally linked in some way with what is now called absolutive *-ø*) or, actually, a determiner (a indefinite one, as opposed to the definite *-a*), even to separate sharply the case

morpheme from the determiner, and assuming a purely accidental formal resemblance (de Rijk 1972, 1996). Indeed, the Basque partitive is quite marginal in the paradigm (as we have seen it has neither definite nor plural forms), but it seems to belong to the case system, both grammatical and local, acting as absolutive or as ablative, respectively.

Furthermore, the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards, there were also some concerns about the diachronic origin of this affix as well as its relationships, both formal and functional, with other cases. In fact, both the partitive and the old ablative marks are formed, seemingly, by a *-(r)i* suffix (identical to the current and the only historically known dative mark) plus a controversial *-k(a)*. The latter is probably the same adverbial suffix of expressions like *harri-ka* 'throwing stones' (*harri* 'stone') or *korri-ka* 'running' (*korri* 'run'); and what is more, we found it also added to other spatial/directional cases as the modern ablative *-ti-k(a)* (*-ti* = old prosecutive) and, in some dialects, with the allative: *-ra-ka* 'towards'. On the other hand, in recent works of Joseba Lakarra (2008), he derives this case-mark from the dative one, which in turn he explains by means of the grammaticalization of a 'give' proto-verb root (reconstructed as *\*nin*), a process that has parallels in some Austronesian languages.

In this paper I have wanted to show all these questions and to do my own proposal for the evolution of the different uses of the partit./abl. suffix, as well as a more suitable explanation of its etymological origin. Indeed, given the semantics divergences between the dative and the ablative meanings, we can approach to it by means of the grammaticalization of the ablative case, that would have nothing to do with the dative. This leads us to think in another Basque proto-verb root as the source of the partit./abl. suffix: *\*din* 'come'. Thus, this proposal would be more consistent with the typological data (Heine & Kuteva 2002) than the previous ones.



## The Basque partitive marker is interpreted existentially

Urtzi Etxeberria

The Basque partitive marker [-*(r)ik*] can only be attached to transitive objects (1) and to intransitive subjects (2) (de Rijk 1972, Ortiz de Urbina 1989) and requires licensing by some polarity element.<sup>1</sup>

- (1) Martxelek ez du baloi-rik ekarri (2) Bilerara ez da irakasle-rik etorri  
Martxel.erg not aux ball-part bring meeting-to not aux teacher-part come  
'Martxel didn't bring any ball' 'No teacher came to the meeting'

- (3) Baduzu haurrik? (4) Haur-rik baduzu, eser zaitez hemen  
yes.have child-part child-part yes.have sit down aux here  
'Do you have children?' 'If you have any children, sit down here'

Its meaning denotes an unspecified quantity of whatever the NP denotes. In the examples in (1) to (4) the speaker doesn't care about whether the set denoted by the NP consists of one, five, ten, or a thousand elements. In other words, the speaker does not have a singularity or a plurality in mind (singular agreement with the verb is just agreement by default, cf. Etxeberria & Etxepare 2007); note in fact that it is possible to answer positively to the question in (3) in a context where we only have a single child. So we can conclude that the partitive denotes the whole lattice and is thus number neutral (Link 1983).

The partitive marker can be argued to be the negative form of the existential interpretation (in absolutive case) of the Basque definite article (D) [-*a(k)*] (cf. Irigoien 1985, de Rijk 1972, Etxeberria 2009). Note that the Basque D is of a much broader use than the D of languages like English or Spanish. As expected, in non-generic contexts it forces the usual specific/definite interpretation. Now, when combined with kind-level predicates the specific interpretation disappears and the definite DP gets a kind reading, just like in Romance languages. Interestingly, Basque definite DPs (plurals/masses; we exemplify only with plurals) can also be interpreted existentially (with narrow scope), but only when in object position (6).

- (5) Dinosauru-ak aspaldi desagertu ziren.  
dinosaur-D.pl long time ago become extinct aux.  
'Dinosaurs became extinct a long time ago.'

- (6) Amaiak **goxoki-ak** jan ditu. [ $\sqrt{\text{definite}}$  /  $\sqrt{\text{existential}}$ ]  
Amaia.erg candy-D.pl eat aux  
'Amaia has eaten (the) candies'

If the plural D gets a definite interpretation in (6), the negative form of the sentence will contain a definite DP (7a); however, if the plural DP in (6) gets an existential interpretation the only way the sentence can be negated is by using the partitive (7b).

- (7a) Amaiak ez ditu **goxoki-ak** jan [ $\sqrt{\text{definite}}$  / \* $\text{existential}$ ]  
Amaia.erg not aux candy-D.pl eat  
'Amaia has not eaten the candies'

- (7b) Amaiak ez du **goxoki-rik** jan [\* $\text{definite}$  /  $\sqrt{\text{existential}}$ ]  
Amaia.erg not aux candy-part eat  
'Amaia has not eaten any candy'

Observing the behaviour of the Basque D in its existential interpretation Etxeberria (2005, 2007, in prep) argues in favour of the so-called Neocarlsonian (NC) approach, where the existential interpretation is argued to be dependent on the kind-level interpretation via *Derived Kind Predication* (DKP).

---

<sup>1</sup> Other syntactic environments that accept the partitive marker are: (i) existential sentences, (ii) partial interrogatives, (iii) *before* clauses, (iv) *without* clauses, (v) superlatives, (vi) with some quantifiers. Cf. de Rijk (1972); Etxepare (2003).

(8) *Derived Kind Predication* (Chierchia 1998: 364):

If  $P$  applies to objects and  $k$  denotes a kind, then:  $P(k) \Leftrightarrow \exists x [\cup k(x) \wedge P(x)]$

where  $\cup$  is a type shifter operator from kinds to the corresponding properties (Pred).

Assuming that the NC approach is correct, in order to obtain the existential reading the definite DP must also be able to have a kind-level meaning (cf. ex. (5)), i.e., a necessary step in the way to the existential interpretation will be the kind denotation. Thus, in contexts where the predicate cannot apply to kinds, the DKP will be needed to repair the type mismatch.

This proposal allows us to derive some intriguing patterns of cross-linguistic variation with regard to the morphosyntactic make up of nominals when existentially interpreted –with narrow scope– (English BNs, French *des/du*+NP, Basque DP): In English the whole derivation is covert. First, *nom* creates an individual denoting kind; then the type-shifter *pred* gives the predicative type back providing a free variable; and finally, the existential quantifiers introduced by the *DKP* quantifies over instantiations of the kind, in (9). In French, considering that *des/du* are composed of the partitive preposition *de* plus the D (Zamparelli 2002, Zribi-Hertz 2006, a.o.), *nom* as well as *pred* will be overt, while the existential quantifier will be covert, (10). Finally in Basque, the D creates an individual kind of type  $e$ . Although only the D is seen in the overt syntax, a covert partitive preposition that will play the role of *pred* gives us the predicative type back. Finally, the local existential quantifier will be provided by the *DKP* (11).

(9) John has read books.

read ( $j, \cup \text{books}$ )  $\Leftrightarrow \exists x [\cup \text{book}(x) \wedge \text{read}(x)]$  (via DKP)

(10) Jean a lu des livres.

Jean has read of-the books

lire ( $j, \text{les livres}_k$ )  $\Leftrightarrow \exists x [\text{de les livres}_k(x) \wedge \text{lire}(x)]$  (via DKP)

(11) Amaia-k liburu-ak irakurri ditu.

Amaia.erg book-D.pl read aux

irakurri ( $a, \text{liburuak}_k$ )  $\Leftrightarrow \exists x [\cup \text{liburu-ak}_k(x) \wedge \text{irakurri}(x)]$  (via DKP)

If the partitive marker is the negative form of the existential interpretation of the Basque D, then it follows that the partitive will also be interpreted existentially by means of a covert existential quantifier.

#### References:

- Chierchia, G. 1998. 'Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of 'semantic parameter'', in S. Rothstein (ed), *Events and Grammar*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 53–103.
- Etxeberria, U. 2005. *Quantification and domain restriction in Basque*, PhD diss., UPV-EHU & HiTT.
- Etxeberria, U. 2007. 'Existentially interpreted definites', in Puig-Waldmuüller, E. (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra. 229-243.
- Etxeberria, U. Prestatzen. *Nominal expressions in Basque*, Ms. IKER-CNRS.
- Link, G. 1983. The Logical Analysis of Plurals and Mass Terms: A Lattice Theoretical Approach, in R. Bäuerle et al. (eds), *Meaning, Use, and Interpretation of Language*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 302–323.
- de Rijk, R. P. G. 1972. 'Partitive assignment in Basque', in *ASJU* 6: 130-173. [Reprinted in de Rijk 1998].
- de Rijk, R. P. G. 1996. 'On the origin of the partitive determiner', in *ASJU* 30 [Reprinted in de Rijk 1998].

## Partitives stretching borders: How well do Finnish and Estonian partitive subjects serve as a criterion for the existential clause?

Tuomas Huumo and Liina Lindström  
University of Tartu

The received view in Finnish and Estonian linguistics holds that the use of the partitive subject is one of the main criteria that distinguishes existential (e-) from non-existential clauses. Partitive subjects only occur in e-clauses (and possessive constructions, which fulfil the criteria of e-clauses), whereas non-existential subjects are in the nominative. Some existential subjects, however, take the nominative, and the choice of the case depends on the quantity expressed by the subject NP: in affirmative e-clauses the nominative indicates a bounded and the partitive an unbounded quantity. Under negation, all e-subjects take the partitive, and the opposition based on quantity is neutralized. Other main criteria that characterize e-clauses are the lack of subject–verb agreement in person and number, and a typical inverse (X)VS word order. (ISK: 850–852, EKG II: 42–43).

The conditions for the partitive subject are thus presumably identical in Finnish and Estonian. Nevertheless, its distribution seems to differ in the two languages. For instance, a discourse-new postverbal subject often takes the nominative and triggers verb agreement in Estonian, while in Finnish the partitive must be used to convey the existential meaning, e.g. *Siin ela+vad vanuri+d* (Estonian) [here live+pres.3sg elderly.people+pl.nom] ~ *Täällä asu+u vanhuks+i+a*. (Finnish) [here live+pres.3sg elderly.people+pl.par] 'There are elderly people living here'.

From another point of view, the use of the partitive of negation does not seem to follow the boundaries of e-clauses in the way assumed by the standard grammars. Huumo (1999) demonstrates that the Finnish partitive of negation is natural only with most canonical existential verbs (e.g. 'be', 'appear', 'come', 'arrive'), while more contentful verbs do not allow it. This yields a class of apparently existential affirmative clauses, which under negation do not turn their subjects into the partitive i.e. do not follow the morphosyntactic criteria for existentials. On the other hand, such canonical e-verbs allow the partitive of negation also in negated counterparts of non-existential clauses. Such a tendency is even stronger in Estonian, where even pronominal subjects (which trigger verb agreement and are obviously not discourse-new) can take the partitive marking under negation. This yields negated clauses whose affirmative counterparts display non-existential syntax, for instance *Mina ole+n kodu+s* 1sg.nom be+pres.1sg home+ine 'I am at home' can be negated as *Min+d ei ole kodu+s* [1sg+par neg be home+ine] 'I am not at home' (lit. 'There is no me at home').

Our discussion shows, first, that even though identical grammatical criteria for the use of partitive subjects are given in the standard grammars of the two languages, there are crucial differences between them. Furthermore, we show that the partitive of negation does not follow the criteria for existentials as straightforwardly as has been supposed. From this it follows that either the borders of the clause types or the use of the partitive subject as a criterion for existentials needs to be reconsidered.

### References:

- EKG II = Erelt, Mati, Reet Kasik, Helle Metslang, Henno Rajandi, Kristiina Ross, Henn Saari, Kaja Tael, Silvi Vare. 1993. *Eesti keele grammatika. II Süntaks*. [A grammar of Estonian II: Syntax]. Tallinn: Eesti TA Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.
- Huumo, Tuomas. 1999. "Kiellonalaisen partitiivisubjektin semantiikkaa" [On the semantics of the partitive subject of negation]. *Sananjalka* 41: 21–42.
- ISK = Hakulinen, Auli, Vilkuna, Maria, Korhonen, Riitta, Koivisto, Vesa, Heinonen, Tarja Riitta and Alho, Irja 2004: *Iso suomen kielioppi* [A descriptive grammar of Finnish] Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

## *Semantic and morphological partitives in the Uralic languages*

Anne Tamm

Several Uralic languages have cases that are referred to as "partitive", but I claim that the semantics of these cases diverges from the generally assumed notion of "partitive". I propose a distinction between "partitive semantics" and "semantic partitives". While the partitive semantics has fixed semantic "part-of-N" properties, the semantic partitive cases have developed their specific semantics and pragmatics in each Uralic language where the case appears. I propose a motivated link between "partitive semantics" and the "semantic partitives" in the Uralic languages. The aim of this contribution is to propose a semantic map for the partitives in the Uralic languages and compare the results to the different ideas of "partitive" found in earlier literature.

Several Uralic languages have cases that are referred to as "partitive", but the semantics of these cases diverges from the generally assumed notion of NP-related "partitive", as in Basque (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003), or Turkish (Enç 1991). While the semantics of some Uralic cases is strikingly stable, as in the case of abessive/caritive expressing negation, the meaning of partitive is rather volatile. I propose a distinction between "partitive semantics" and "semantic partitives". The semantic partitive is the meaning that corresponds to "part-of-N", referring to a part or quantity out of a group or amount. Several European languages express semantic partitive with an adposition (*one of my friends*, *uno dei miei amici*, *the youngest of my children*, *dei miei figli la piu piccola*, *a glass of wine*, *un bicchiere di vino*). The semantic partitive (or rather, pseudo-partitive, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001) can be expressed by a case in some European languages, and the case is referred to as partitive-genitive as in *čajju* 'tea' in *čaška čajju* 'a cup of tea' (pseudo-partitive construction, Russian).

In the Uralic languages, the semantic partitive is generally expressed by the elative case and my contribution will concentrate on the Hungarian data on the semantic partitive. Hungarian lacks a morphological partitive, but its inventory of three separative cases allows interpreting these cases, especially elative, as semantic partitives. Elative, illustrated in (1), denotes movement from a container, ablative - movement away from something, delative – movement from a surface.

- (1) *gyerekeimből a legfiatalabb*  
child-PL.1PX-ELA the youngest  
'the youngest of my children' (Hungarian)

Also, several other Uralic languages have separative cases that are not referred to as partitive, but their semantics is that of a prototypical partitive. As in Hungarian, the typical semantic partitives are realized by the elative or ablative case in most of the Uralic languages. Example (2) illustrates the Estonian semantic partitive realized by elative; only the pseudo-partitive is realized with the partitive case-marking.

- (2) *noorim mu lastest / klaas veini*  
youngest my child-PL-ELA glass[NOM] wine.PART  
'the youngest of my children; a glass of wine' (Estonian)

On the one hand, in this analysis I put aside constructions where partitive has no or little semantic content. Generally, semantic content is missing in combinations with adpositions, where the partitive could be viewed as a general complement case with certain prepositions, postpositions, numeral phrases, and verbs in the Baltic Finnic languages (Vainikka and Maling 1995, cf Kratzer 2004).

- (3) *mööda jõge / jõge mööda / kaks jõge / vaatan jõge*  
along river. PART river. PART along two[NOM] river. PART look-1s river. PART  
'along the river (prep. phrase, postp. phrase); two rivers ; I am looking at the river' (Estonian)

In other Uralic languages with less frequently used partitives, such as the Inari and Skolt Sami, the partitive case cannot be regarded as a general complement case, since its use is restricted to specific constructions only (e.g. restricted postpositional, number phrases, etc).

In most Uralic languages that have partitive, it is semantically motivated, especially in Baltic Finnic. Instead of the "part-of-N" semantics, the semantics of the Finnic partitives is related to other semantic notions, typically, event structural properties, as in (4) (Ackerman and Moore 2001, Kont 1963). Sentences with the partitive object are referred to as non-bounded, irresultative, imperfective, and atelic. Sentences with an accusative (total) object are referred to as bounded, resultative, perfective, and telic. Presently, the Estonian partitive object case appears in sentences that have the semantics of incomplete event realization,

unboundedness, atelicity, or imperfective aspect (Kiparsky 1998, Erelt et al. 1993, Metslang 1994, Larsson 1984, Lees 2005), irrespective of part-whole relationships or partial affectedness (Tamm 2007).

(4) *Mari sõi (ühte) õunapirukat/ (ühe) õunapiruka (ära).*

M[NOM] eat.3S.PST one.PART apple tart.PART one.ACC-TOT apple tart.ACC-TOT up/PRT

‘Mari was eating an/the (/one) apple tart/Mari ate an/the(/one) apple tart (up).’ (Estonian)

Another peculiarity of the Uralic languages--case on non-finite verb forms (cf. Aikhenvald 2008)--has led to the situation where the partitive semantics has spread to the domain of epistemic modality and evidentiality (the *vat*-form, as in Erelt et al 2006, Kehayov 2008). As the result of the diachronic development of the partitive case the Estonian evidential, epistemic modal, aspectual and NP categories share similarities. The overlap between the epistemic modal and evidential categories (Van der Auwera & Plungian 1998) is due to these developments. Aspects of the diachronic development have been dealt with in Larjavaara (1991), Campbell (1991), or Aikhenvald (2004), but a coherent motivated link between the semantics of the various Uralic partitives will be given only in this presentation.. Partitive has 1) an NP-stage (Krifka 1998), 2) an aspectual stage (Larjavaara 1991, Laanest 1975), 3) epistemic modal and evidential phase (Campbell 1991). The aspectual partitive marks objects in sentences describing incomplete events, and the partitive evidential appears in sentences that encode incomplete evidence compared to the expectation of complete evidence (Tamm 2009). The spread of the partitive case to domains outside the ‘part-of-N’ domain can be found also in Karelian grammars, which contain instances of ‘partitive 3rd infinitives’, illustrated in (5).<sup>2</sup>

(5) *Suurdu keittämiä pada musteni.*

big.part cook-M\_NOM\_PART pot[NOM] blacken-3s.pst

‘Intensive cooking made the pot turn black.’ (Karelian)

Since the partitive marked adjective *suurdu* ‘big, intensive’ as in (5) can modify the partitive form in question, the latter cannot be an infinitive, but another type of nominalization with more nominal properties than infinitives would have. The meaning of a cause event emerges with the Karelian event predicates and partitive marking. This instance of partitive gives evidence of causation and event structural properties of the predicates involved.

In sum, while the partitive semantics has fixed semantic properties, and semantic partitive cases have developed their specific semantics and pragmatics in each Uralic language where it appears, the link between ‘partitive semantics’ and ‘semantic partitives’ can be established diachronically and on the basis of cross-linguistic variation despite the clear conceptual distinction between the two notions.

## References

- Ackerman, F. & Moore, J. 2001. *Proto-Properties and Grammatical Encoding: A Correspondence Theory of Argument Selection*. Stanford CA: CSLI.
- Aikhenvald, A.Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: OUP.
- Aikhenvald, A. 2008. Versatile cases. *Journal of Linguistics* 44 (2008), 565–603.
- Blake, B. 2001. *Case*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Campbell, L. 1991. Some grammaticalization changes in Estonian and their implications. In *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Vol. 1., E.C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds), 285–299. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Enç, M. (1991) The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.
- Erelt, M., Kasik, R., Metslang, H., Rajandi, H., Ross, K., Saari, H., Tael, H. & Vare, S. 1993. *Eesti Keele Grammatika II. Süntaks. Lisa: Kiri* (The grammar of the Estonian language II. Syntax). Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.
- Erelt, M., Metslang, H. & Pajusalu, K. 2006. Tense and evidentiality in Estonian. In *Topics in Subjectification and Modalization. Belgian Journal of Linguistics* Vol. 20, B. Cornillie & N. Delbecq (eds), 125–136. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hualde, J. I., Ortiz de Urbina, J. 2003. *A grammar of Basque*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kehayov, P.D. 2008. *An Areal-Typological Perspective to Evidentiality: the Cases of the Balkan and Baltic Linguistic Areas* [Dissertationes Linguisticae Universitas Tartuensis 10]. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Kiparsky, P. 1998. Partitive case and aspect. In *The Projection of Arguments*, M. Butt & W. Geuder (eds), 265–307. Stanford CA: CSLI Publications.

<sup>2</sup> <http://opastajat.net/opastus/grammar/lessons/urokku113.html>. The glosses reflect my analysis.

- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M.** (2001). “‘A piece of the cake’ and ‘a cup of tea’: Partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages”. In *Circum-Baltic Languages*. Volume 2: *Grammar and Typology* (Studies in Language Companion Series: 55), Östen Dahl and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds). Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 523-568.
- Kont, K.** 1963. Käändsõnaline objekt läänemeresoome keeltes (The declined object in Baltic Finnic languages). *ENSV Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituudi uurimused* IX.
- Kratzer, A.** 2004. Telicity and the meaning of objective case. In *The Syntax of Time*, J. Gueron & J. Lecarme (eds), 389–424. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Krifka, M.** 1992. Thematic relations as links between nominal reference and temporal constitution. In *Lexical Matters*, I. Sag & A. Szabolcsi (eds), 29–53. Stanford CA: CSLI.
- Laanest, A.** 1975. *Sissejuhatus läänemeresoome keeltesse*. Tallinn: Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.
- Larjavaara, M.** 1991. Aspektuaalisen objektin synty. *Virittäjä*, 372–408.
- Larsson, L.-G.** 1983. Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen. *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia* 15.
- Lees, A.** 2005. The case of the object in early Estonian and Finnish texts. In *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, C. Muskovsky (ed.).
- Metslang, H.** 1994. Temporal Relations in the predicate and the grammatical system of Estonian and Finnish. *Oulun Yliopiston Suomen ja saamen kielen laitoksen tutkimusraportteja* 39.
- Tamm, A.** 2007. Perfectivity, telicity and Estonian verbs. In *N JL* 30(2), R. Folli, H. Harley & B. Jensen (ed.), 229–255. Cambridge: CUP.
- Vainikka, A. & Maling, J.** 1996. Is partitive case inherent or structural? In *Partitives. Studies on the Distribution and Meaning of Partitive Expressions*, J. Hoeksema (ed.), 179–208. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- van der Auwera, J. & Plungian, V.** 1998. Modality’s semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2: 79–124.

## How close are the Estonian partitive subjects to partitive objects?

Helena Metslang

In the Baltic language area differential subject and object marking are wide-spread phenomena but they are conditioned by different factors. Differential subject marking (especially in existential clauses) is often more characteristic of subjects with fewer properties of a prototypical subject, to subjects closer to the objects. The subjects of existential clauses alternate between nominative and partitive/genitive. The latter is automatically accompanied by the unagreement of the predicate. (Wälchli and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 656, 665.) E.g. in Estonian:

Peenral kasva-b lilli.  
On the flowerbed grow+3sg flowers.prtv.pl  
'There are *some* flowers growing on the flowerbed.'

Wälchli and Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001) have described these non-canonical grammatical relations as a grey area between typical objects and subjects that permit different sub-divisions. Hiietam (2003: 239-240, 249) illustrates that Hopper and Thompson's Transitivity Hypothesis is in broad terms able to account for the case variation of Estonian subjects and objects, but also that the hypothesis needs to make a more subtle distinction of possible noun phrases constituting the subject relation in terms of Individuation (properties like concrete – abstract, singular – plural, etc. that have been assigned to object arguments only in Hopper and Thompson's theory).

This talk takes a typological approach to differential subject and object marking in Estonian. It compares the phenomena and rules triggering partitive subject marking with the ones triggering partitive object marking (clause type, verb type, meaning of the situation, semantics of the referent of the NP, pragmatic factors) in different clause types. The talk discusses whether the nature of Estonian subject marking can be accounted for in terms of split-S system (cf. Dixon 1994, Nichols 2008) and will place the Estonian data in the typological context (gradient of various split-S languages at Nichols 2008). To test Wälchli's and Koptjevskaja-Tamm's view the results of the case study measuring the distances of partitive and nominative subjects from partitive and total case objects will be presented. In my talk I also present a case study which tests how well Hiietam's suggestions work on broader data of various existential sentences.

## References

- Dixon, R., M., W. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hiietam, K. (2003). *Definiteness and Grammatical Relations in Estonian*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Manchester.
- Hopper, P. J. and S. A. Thompson. (1980). Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56.2: 251-299.
- Itkonen, T. (1974). Ergatiiviisuutta suomessa, I. (Abstract: Ergativity in Finnish.) *Virittäjä* 78. pp. 379-398.
- Itkonen, T. (1975). Ergatiiviisuutta suomessa, II. (Abstract: Ergativity in Finnish.) *Virittäjä* 79, pp. 31-65.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., Wälchli, B. (2001). The Circum-Baltic languages. An areal-typological approach. – Östen Dahl, Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (toim.), *Circum-Baltic Languages*, vol. 2: Grammar and typology, lk. 615-750. Studies in Language Companion Series 55. Amsterdam: Benjamins

[Nemvalts, Peep \(2000\). Aluse sisu ja vorm: alusfraasi käändevaheldus tänapäeva eesti kirjakeeles. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.](#)

Nemvalts, Peep (1996). Case marking of subject phrases in modern standard Estonian. (= Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 25.) Uppsala.

Nichols, Johanna (2008). Typological perspective on split subject marking.



# Partitive Subjects and Objects in Indo-Iranian

Eystein Dahl, University of Bergen

The genitive is the main marker of the partitive relation in Indo-Iranian and is quite frequently used as an object marker and somewhat less commonly used as a subject marker with finite verbs in the Indo-Iranian languages. This paper explores the semantic domain of these constructions with particular regard to the lexical semantic properties of the predicates selecting genitive-marked core arguments, claiming that, in general, partitive subjects and objects are restricted to predicates where the argument is represented as being only partially involved in the situation, either having a low degree of control over the outcome of the situation or only being partially affected by the situation.

A couple of relatively clear-cut examples of the genitive subject construction from Vedic and Avestan are cited in (1).

- (1) a.      *yád vái púruṣasya ~ āmáaty*  
if        PTC    man-GEN    be.ill-PRS  
‘If a man is ill’ (MS I 8.9)
- b.      *uruuaraṇqm zairi.gaonanaqm    zaramaēm paiti zemāḍa uzuxshiiēti*  
plants-GEN    yellow.coloured-GEN spring-ACC    again earth-ABL grow.forth-PRS  
‘Yellow-coloured plants grow forth again from the earth in the spring’  
(Yašt 7.4)

The data cited in (1) indicate that the Indo-Iranian genitive subject construction presupposed that the subject argument did not control the outcome of the situation named by the verb. This observation is corroborated by the fact that the genitive subject construction tended to occur with non-active voice morphology in Vedic as well as Avestan, as illustrated by the examples in (2).

- (2) a.      *yadā́ vái striyái            ca    puṃsáśca    saṃtapyáte*  
when    indeed    woman-GEN    and    man-GEN    heat.together-PRS.MID

‘When a man and a woman get into (sexual) fervor’  
(Śatapathabrāhmaṇa III 5.3.16, after Hock 1991: 129)

- b. *x<sup>v</sup>areṭṇam* he *barətaṃ* *zaremayehe* *raokhnahe*  
food-GEN he-DAT carry-AOR.IMP.MID springtime-GEN butter-GEN  
‘Springtime butter shall be carried to him as food’ (Haḍox̌t Nask 2.18)

The Indo-Iranian middle voice may be regarded as a valency-reducing or intransitivizing category and in many cases implies that the subject argument does not control the outcome of the situation.

The genitive is far more frequently attested in object position than in subject position in the Indo-Iranian languages. For example, a number of verbs are attested with an object argument alternately case-marked by the genitive or accusative, as illustrated by the following examples:

- (3) a. *śyāvāśuvasya* *sunvatás* *táthā* *śṛṇu*  
Śyāvāśuva-GEN extracting-GEN thus hear-PRS.IMP  
*yáthā śṛṇor* *átreḥ kármāṇi* *kṛṇvatáh*  
like listen-IPF Atri-GEN sacred.deeds-ACC performing-GEN  
‘Listen thus to Śyāvāśuva, who is extracting (soma), as you listened to Atri, who was performing sacred deeds’ (RV VIII 36.7)
- b. *vísve devāḥ* *śṛṇutá* *imám* *hávam* *me*  
all.gods-VOC hear-PRS.IMP this-ACC invocation-ACC I-GEN  
‘O all-gods, hear this invocation of mine’ (RV VI 52.13)
- c. *surunaoiti* *zaota* *upa.sraotaranam*  
listen-PRS high.priest-NOM assistant.priests-GEN  
*nōiṭ* *upa.sraotarō* *zaotarō*  
not assistant.priests-NOM high.priest-GEN  
‘The high priest listens to the assistant priests, not the assistant priests to the high priest’ (Nīrangastān 10.32)

- d.      *surunuiiā*      *nō*                      *yasnəm*                      *ahurāne*                      *ahurahe*  
listen-PRS.OPT   we-GEN                      prayer-ACC                      Ahurānī-VOC                      Ahura-GEN  
‘May you listen to our prayer, o Ahurānī (daughter) of Ahura’ (Yasna 68.9)

These examples illustrate that Indo-Iranian perception verbs like \**ŚRAV-* ‘hear, listen’ alternately select an object argument in the genitive or accusative. Note that verbs of this type do not imply that the object argument is directly involved in the situation.

Ingestion verbs constitute another important group of verbs that take a genitive or accusative object in Vedic, as illustrated by the examples in (4)

- (4) a.      *pācanti*                      *te*                      *vṛṣabhāṃ*                      *ātsi*                      *tēṣām*  
cook.PRS                      you.DAT                      bulls.ACC                      eat.PRS                      them.GEN  
‘They cook bulls for you, you eat a part of them’ (Vedic, Rigveda X 28.3)
- b.      *svadhām*                      *pīpāya*                      *subhú*                      *ánnam*                      *atti /*  
wantonly                      swell-PRF                      strong-ACC                      food-ACC                      eat-PRS  
‘He has swollen wantonly. He eats excellent food’ (Rigveda II 35.7)

Somewhat surprisingly, there are no attested parallel examples in Avestan or Old Persian of either of these constructions. This fact might lead one to suspect that this alternation pattern is peculiar to Vedic. However, the fact that we find exactly the same alternation pattern with ingestion verbs in Homeric Greek, as illustrated by the examples in (5), strongly suggests that this is an accidental gap in the Old Iranian corpus.

- (5) a.      *haimatos ofra piō*                      *kai toi*                      *nēmerteia eipō.*’ (...)  
blood-GEN so.that drink-AOR.SBJ and you-DAT   truth-ACC say-AOR.SBJ  
‘So that I may drink blood and speak the truth to you’ (λ 95-96)
- b.      *tōn*                      *efagon t’*                      *epion*                      *te*                      *kai aidoloisin*                      *edōka.*  
those-GEN eat-AOR and drink-AOR and and guests-DAT give-AOR  
‘Of those I have eaten and drunk and given to guests’ (o 373)

The use of the genitive as an object marker with ingestion verbs has traditionally been interpreted as directly reflecting its partitive meaning, implying that the object argument is only partially affected by the situation denoted by the verb. The accusative, on the other hand, has typically been interpreted as implying that the object argument is totally affected by the verb. Ingestion verbs do not entail that the object argument undergoes a total change of state and this is probably the motivation for the use of the genitive in object position with verbs of this type.

I have argued elsewhere (Dahl 2009a) that an important function of the Vedic genitive in such environments is to mark the verb phrase as atelic, whereas the accusative tends to give rise to a telic reading. To some extent at least, the data reviewed in the previous section suggest that this distinction was associated with this alternation pattern in Proto-Indo-Iranian and Proto-Indo-European. Consider first the examples in (3) where the genitive forms *śyāvāśuvasya* ‘Śyāvāśuva’, *átreḥ* ‘Atri’ and *upa.sraotaranam* ‘assistant priests’ and *zaotarō* ‘high priest’ denote persons, whereas the accusative forms *imám hávam* ‘this invocation’ and *yasnəm* ‘prayer’ denote inanimate, abstract entities. The act of listening to a person is typically conceived of as a temporally unbounded process in the sense that is not associated with any clearly defined endpoint. The act of listening to a prayer or invocation, on the other hand, is typically conceptualized as a temporally bounded process with a clearly defined endpoint which is reached when the prayer or invocation is finished. These considerations corroborate the assumption that the morphosyntactic distinction between the genitive and accusative was employed to distinguish atelic and telic verb phrases in Indo-Iranian. The fact that we find essentially the same distribution of these two case categories in Homeric Greek, as illustrated by the examples in (6), suggests that this alternation pattern was inherited from Proto-Indo-European.

- (6) a.    *hōs efath’, hoi d’ ara tou mala men kluon ēde pithonto:*  
           thus speak-AOR they-NOM and    he-GEN very indeed hear-AOR and obey-AOR  
           ‘Thus he spoke and, indeed, they listened to him and obeyed him’ (Il. O 300)

- b.    *ēe tin’ aggelien stratou ekluen erkhomenoio*

or some-ACC    message-ACC    army-GEN    hear-AOR coming-GEN

‘Or has he heard a message that an army is coming’ (Od. B 30)

A similar explanation could be invoked to account for the data cited in (4) and (5). Specifically, the act of fully consuming something implies an inherent temporal endpoint, whereas the act of partially consuming something is typically conceived of as temporally unbounded.

### Select references:

- Beavers, John T. 2006. *Argument/Oblique Alternations and the Structure of Lexical Meaning*. PhD diss., Stanford University.
- Conti, Luz 2008. Zum Genitiv bei impersonalen Konstruktionen im Altgriechischen. Paper read at the *XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg 22.9.-27.9.2008*.
- Dahl, Eystein 2009a. Some semantic and pragmatic aspects of object alternation in Early Vedic. In J. Barðdal and S. Chelliah (eds.) *The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in the Development of Case*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dahl, Eystein 2009b. Non-Canonical Subject Marking in Indo-Iranian. Paper read at the Workshop ‘*The Origin of Non-Canonical Subject Marking in Indo-European*’, *ICHL XIX*, Nijmegen, the Netherlands, Monday August 10<sup>th</sup> 2009.
- Dahl, Eystein and Maria Napoli 2008. Case as an Aspect Marker? The Partitive Case in Indo-European. Paper read at the *XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg 22.9.-27.9.2008*.
- Grimm, Scott. 2005. *The Lattice of Case and Agentivity*. MSc Diss., University of Amsterdam.
- Insler, Stanley. 1968. The Origin of the Sanskrit Passive Aorist. In *Indogermanische Forschungen* 73, 312-346.
- Seržants, Ilja 2009. Partitive Genitive in Indo-European. Paper read at the Workshop *Reconstructing Alignment Systems*, University of Bergen, Friday May 15<sup>th</sup> 2009

## The Ancient Greek partitive genitive in typological perspective

Luz Conti – Silvia Luraghi

As in other Indo-European, the genitive is used as a partitive in Ancient Greek. Possible usages include direct object, second argument of intransitive verbs, subject, time and space adverbial, complement of adposition:

- (1) *óphra píoi oínoio*  
for drink:3SG.OPT wine:GEN  
“in order to drink some wine” (*Od.* 22.11);
- (2) *epei k’ olooío tetarpōmestha góoio*  
when PTC dire:GEN.M enjoy:PF.M/P.1PL groan:GEN.M  
“when we have taken our fill of dire lamenting” (*Il.* 23.10);
- (3) *eisì gàr autôn kai parà basiléi tôn Perséōn*  
be:PRES.3PL PTC DEM.GEN.PL and by king:DAT ART.GEN.PL.M Persian:GEN.PL.M  
“there are (some) of these (*sc.* ants) even by the king of the Persians” (*Hdt.* 3.102.2);
- (4) *pínein te kai eupathéein, oute hēmerēs oute nuktós aníenta*  
drink:INF PTC PTC enjoy:INF NEG day:GEN NEG night:GEN let.go:PART.PRS.ACC  
“and would drink and enjoy himself, not letting up day or night,” (*Hdt.* 2.133.4):
- (5) *ē halòs ē epi gēs*  
or sea:GEN or on land:GEN  
“either at sea or on land” (*Od.* 12.26-27)

In spite of such a wide variety of usages, the Ancient Greek partitive genitive is comparatively infrequent: partitive subjects and objects are not numerous and never obligatory; space adverbials with or without adpositions, which have no clear parallels in the other Indo-European languages, are peculiar of Homeric Greek and disappeared later.

Typologically interesting issues include:

Partitive subjects: While partitive objects occur in principle with all types of verb, partitive subjects are limited to unaccusatives (Conti forthcoming): in a similar fashion, the Basque partitive occurs in negated sentences only in the place of the absolutive, i.e. limited to patients of transitive verbs and subjects of inaccusatives (unergatives take ergative subjects in Basque; note that the Finnish partitive can extend to unergatives, but apparently not to transitives, Huumo 2003).

Adpositional partitive: The feature of affectedness explains possible alternation of the genitive and the accusative as partially affected vs. fully affected object of transitive verbs, and is also relevant for alternation of the partitive genitive and the accusative with adpositions, connected with the internal structure of landmarks (discrete vs. continuous), the structure of the trajectory with motion verbs (unidirectional vs. multidirectional), the position of the trajector (covering a limited portion vs. the whole extension of a landmark; Luraghi 2003, 2009). Partitive complements of adpositions occur in typologically and genetically distant languages:

- (6) *juoks-i-mme ympäri kaupunki-a*  
run-PAST-1PL around city-PART  
“We were running around in the city” (Finnish; from Lestrade 2006)
- (7) *complications dues à des erreurs techniques*  
complications due to PART errors technical  
“complications due to technical errors” (French; from *Le Monde*)

Again, similarities can be found: in Finnish as in Ancient Greek some adpositions admit case alternation; in French, the partitive article is limited to mass nouns or count nouns in the plural, hence types of landmark are also constrained.

In our paper we will address the following issues:

- How does the Ancient Greek partitive genitive relate to the partitive genitive in other IE languages (types of usage; degrees of obligatoriness/grammaticalization);
- How does it compare with partitives across languages (restrictions on occurrence; semantic contribution);
- What reasons prevented its further extension.

## References

- Conti, Luz forthcoming. Synchronie und Diachronie des altgriechischen Genitivs als Semisubjekt. In *Historische Sprachwissenschaft*.
- Huumo, Tuomas 2003. Incremental Existence: The World According to the Finnish Existential Sentence. *Linguistics* 41/3: 461–493
- Lestrade, Sander 2006. Marked Adpositions. Paper read at the SIGSEM Workshop On Prepositions.
- Luraghi, Silvia 2003. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases. A Study of the Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Luraghi, Silvia 2009. The internal structure of adpositional phrases. In J. Helmbrecht Y. Nishina, Y.M. Shin, S. Skopeteas, E. Verhoeven, eds., *Form and Function in Language Research: Papers in honour of Christian Lehmann*. Berlin/ New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 231-254.

## The partitive genitive in Baltic and Slavic as compared to Ancient IE languages

Ilja A. Seržant (University of Bergen)

The partitive genitive (henceforth PG) as such has been inherited by both East Slavic and Baltic. Both East Slavic and Baltic continue not only the old Indo-European genitive case endings but also their semantic properties.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, one finds a number of deviations from the pattern that is attested in the ancient IE languages.

### 1 Syntactic properties

There are several changes concerning the subjecthood of the PG that distinguish the PG of Baltic and East Slavic from the PG of the ancient IE languages. While the PG subject in the ancient IE languages did trigger verbal agreement on the bases of its logical number (henceforth *semantic agreement*) (Seržant, in prep.), no semantic agreement can be found neither in Baltic nor in Slavic. The PG subject of these languages always combines with the default third person singular (neuter) verb form and the semantic number of the PG has no access to verb morphology. The PG subject partly loses, thereby, its original subjecthood, verbal agreement being the prototypical subject coding property, cf. Keenan (1976). Compare the following example from Russian with the genitive subject:

- (1) *Na ulice ne bylo fonarej* (Russian)  
on street NEG be:PAST.3.SG.NEUTR lantern:GEN.PL  
'There were no lanterns on the street.'

The PG subject renders, thereby, the common impersonal pattern of the oblique subject-like constituents in these languages, cf. (2) from Lithuanian:

- (2) *Man / Mums buvo pagaile tavęs* (Lithuanian)  
I:DAT / we:DAT be:PAST.3 like:PART.ACT.NEUTR you:GEN.SG  
'We had felt sorry about you.'

As can be observed the compound predicate does not agree in number with the experiencer dative, the predicate form remaining to be singular neuter all the way.

Furthermore the PG neither in Baltic nor in Russian can be coordinated with a nominative constituent as their Ancient Greek counterpart; the coordinated NPs generally have to agree in case here (Seržant, forthc.):

- \*(3) *Jesli on ili rodstvennikov ili druzej ...* (Russian)  
\*(4) *Jeigu ji arba giminaičių arba draugų ...* (Lithuanian)  
if he:NOM or relatives:GEN.PL or friend:GEN.PL  
Intended meaning: 'If he or [any] of [his] relatives or [any] of [his] ...'

Interestingly, both the inability to coordinate with nominatives as well as having no access to verb agreement are properties of the partitive case-marked subject in Finnic languages. In these languages the partitive case-marked subject can neither be coordinated with nominatives nor it can trigger verbal agreement. Hence, the syntactic changes that the Indo-European PG has gone through

---

<sup>3</sup> East Slavic and Baltic continue the Indo-European genitive case endings in their *-ā-*, *-i-*, *-ī-*, *-u-*, *-ū-*, *-C-* declensions in both singular and plural sets and with the *-o-* declension in the plural set while the singular of the *-o-* declension represents the old ablative ending.



both in Baltic and Russian are conditioned by the influence of the parallel category in Finnic languages.

Another development that is found in Baltic and East Slavic is the tendency for unaccusative subjects to lose the combinability with the PG in affirmative contexts. Thus, Standard Latvian does no longer allow the PG in the subject position of affirmative clauses. Russian and Lithuanian typically use the PG as subject marking with the quantified unaccusatives such as Russian *po-na-jexat* 'to be', Lithuanian *pri-važiuoti*. Additionally, Lithuanian allows existential predicates (such as *būti* 'to be', *atsirasti* 'appear') to take the PG subject. North Russian and Belorussian varieties attest the PG in at much broader range than Standard Russian (Filin 1972: 514-5; Karskij 1956: 319, 403), cf.:

- (5) *Segodn'a budet dožd'a*  
 Today be:FUT.3.SG rain:GEN.SG  
 'There will be rain today.'

## 2. Semantic properties

The semantics of the PG remains in Baltic and Russian the same as in the ancient languages, i.e. non-referentiality and low discourse prominence (Seržant, fortch.). Thus, the subject PG is closer tied with the VP which is reflected in its linear postverbal position in an unmarked word order:

- (6) *Kaczynskio lėktuvo kabinoje prieš pat katastrofą buvo žmoniu*  
 in cabin of plain of Kacziński even before very catastrophe be:pres.3 people:GEN.PL  
*kurie nebuvo igulos nariai*  
 which were not members of the stuff  
 'There were people in the cabin of Kacziński's plane even immediately before the catastrophe which were not members of the stuff.'<sup>4</sup>

The Lithuanian example (6) represents the unmarked word order in respect to the position of the PG subject, the overall word order in Lithuanian being SVO (or SOV).

Comparing with the data from Ancient Greek one can state that the occurrence of the PG in Baltic and Slavic has been restricted to particular verb classes such as verbs of consumption. The PG cannot be used as freely as in Ancient Greek: there are only some verbs that generally require the PG while the most verbs do not allow the PG. Both are indications for a lexicalization of the PG in these languages as compared to the ancient languages. Thus, there are certain verbs that have lexicalized the PG, e.g., the verbs of lacking (7) in the object position and the verbs with a quantifier *pri-* in Lithuanian and *po-na-* in Russian in the subject position (8):

- (7) *Mēs pritrūkome pinigų / tavęs* (Lithuanian)  
 we:NOM be.short.of:PAST.1.PL money:GEN.PL / you:GEN.SG  
 'We were short of money' / 'We were in need of you'

- (8) *Pri-važiavo svečų* (Lithuanian)  
 QUANT-arrive:PAST.3 guest:GEN.PL  
 'There have arrived too many guests'

## 3. Genitive of negation rule

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.15min.lt/naujiena/aktualu/pasaulis/kaczynskio-lektuvo-kabinoje-pries-pat-katastrofa-buvo-zmoniu-kurie-nebuvo-igulos-nariai-nustate-tyrejai-57-99670>

(9) <i>Jono</i>	<i>nebuvo</i>	<i>namuose</i>	(Lithuanian)
<i>Jāņa</i>	<i>nebija</i>	<i>mājās</i>	(Latvian)
<i>Ivana</i>	<i>ne bylo</i>	<i>doma</i>	(Russian)
John:GEN not.be:PAST.3.SG.NEUTR home			
QUANT-arrive:PAST.3 guest:GEN.PL			
‘John wasn’t at home.’			

This rule targets direct objects, which change into genitive, when the predicate is negated. Nominative subjects, in contrast, do not generally show up in the genitive case when the predicate is negated. Exceptions are only subjects of some unaccusative verbs. This rule is almost extinct in Latvian while it is rigid in Lithuanian, Russian being an intermediate case. Russian usually allows for both options: the structural case (i.e. the nominative with subjects and accusative with objects) or the genitive. Even though there are different explanations on how the PG was grammaticalized as the subject case-marker of some unaccusative verbs, there is a consensus that the genitive under negation rule is rooted in the partitive genitive.

Even though there are some indications that the genitive under negation was not completely unknown in the ancient IE languages, the degree of entrenchment and grammaticalization it has acquired in Baltic (especially Lithuanian) and Slavic (especially Polish) is an innovation. Interestingly enough, the same rule with a similar degree of entrenchment exists in the Finnic languages. In these languages it is the partitive case that marks the subject if it is in the scope of negation.

#### 4. Conclusions

Even though the PG is an inherited category in Baltic and Slavic it shows considerable correspondences with the partitive case in the neighbouring Finnic languages. The properties that have been discussed in Sections 1 to 3 can be, thus, regarded as an indication of an areally-induced accommodation of an already existing pattern in terms of *paired structural similarity* (cf. Heine 2009: 39).

#### References

- Filin 1972: *Proisxoždenije Russkogo, ukrainskogo i Belorusskogo jazykov. Istoriko-dialektologičeskij očerk*. Leningrad. Nauka. Helasvuo (1996)
- Heine, B. 2009: Identifying instances of contact-induced grammatical replication. In: Samuel Gyasi Obeng (ed.), *Topics in Descriptive and African Linguistics. Essays in Honor of Distinguished professor Paul Newman*. München, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa, 2009. 29–56.
- Karskij, E. F. 1956: Belorussy. Jazyk Belorusskogo naroda. Vyp. 2. and Vyp. 3. Moscow. Izdatelstvo ANSSR.
- Seržant, A., in prep.: *The partitive genitive in Ancient Greek*. A paper.

## Russian Partitive and the Verb Aspect

Katia Paykin

When applied to Russian, the label “partitive” can refer to two different linguistic phenomena: a separate case or a particular use of the genitive. Indeed, it has been argued (*cf.* Jakobson 1936, Neidle 1988, Paus 1994, Franks 1995) that Russian has a partitive case, a second genitive form ending in *-u* (*saxar-a*-GEN<sub>a</sub> + *saxar-u*-GEN<sub>u</sub> ‘sugar’), morphologically identical to the dative case, available for some singular masculine nouns. This *u*-form does often appear in semantically partitive contexts, but it can always alternate with the *a*-genitive (*cf.* Brown & Franks 1995). Moreover, the *u*-morphology is also possible with count nouns, such as *čas* ‘hour’, *dom* ‘house’, *etc.*, and it can be used without partitive meaning, namely when governed by prepositions.

(1)a. kusok *saxar-a/saxar-u*

piece.NOM sugar-GEN<sub>a</sub>/sugar-GEN<sub>u</sub>

“a piece of sugar”

b. ujtí iz *dom-a/dom-u*

leave from house-GEN<sub>a</sub>/house-GEN<sub>u</sub>

“leave home/the house”

Therefore we will consider the *u*-form as a variant of the *a*-form and reserve the label “partitive” for a particular use of the genitive, *i.e.* the genitive that appears on internal verb arguments containing mass nouns and bare plurals, as in (2).

(2) Ja prinesla *vod-y/drov*.

I.NOM brought water-GEN/firewood.GEN

“I brought (some) water/firewood.”

In most cases, the partitive genitive competes with the accusative, but it can also appear on subjects of unaccusative verbs used in their impersonal form, thus competing with the nominative.

(3)a. Ja prinesla *vod-y/vod-u*.

I.NOM brought water-GEN/water-ACC

“I brought (some) water/(the) water.”

b. *Ljud-ej* nabežal-o!/*ljud-i* nabežal-i!

people-GEN came.running-IMPERS/people-NOM came.running-PL

“People came running!”

We will argue that the opposition between the partitive and the accusative or the nominative does not coincide with the opposition between definite and indefinite NPs as expressed by articles in such languages as English or French, since the accusative and the nominative can give rise to both interpretations. Our hypothesis is that the indefiniteness expressed by the genitive is semantically different: the genitive NP emphasises quantity, while the accusative and the nominative NP denote a class.

Yet, the main emphasis of our presentation will be on the relationship between the partitive genitive and the aspect of the verb assigning it. According to Klenin (1978), the fact that Russian partitive genitive is much more frequent with perfective rather than imperfective verbs can be viewed as an “unexpected wrinkle”. Indeed, many studies assimilate partitive case to imperfective aspect. Kiparsky (1998), for instance, claims that the partitive case in Finnish and the imperfective aspect in Russian both express the unboundedness of the VP. In French, the use of a partitive article in the object confers a non-bounded reading to the predicate (*cf.* Bosveld 2000:52-54). However, in Russian, the imperfective aspect is hardly ever compatible with the partitive case.

(4) \*Ja vižu *xleb-a*.

I.NOM see bread-GEN

“I see (some) bread.”

Russian marks verb aspect independently from tense and from the case of the object. We will argue that since the partitive in Russian denotes a quantity, it always needs bounding by the process, which is provided by the perfective aspect.

## References

- Bosveld-de Smet, Leonie. 2000. "Les syntagmes en *des* et *du*: un couple curieux parmi les indéfinis". In *De l'indétermination à la qualification: les indéfinis*, L. Bosveld, M. Van Peteghem & D. Van de Velde (eds), 17-116. Artois Presses Université.
- Brown, Sue & Steven Franks. 1995. "Asymmetries in the Scope of Russian Negation". *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 3:2.239-287.
- Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1936/1962. "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. Gesamtbedeutungen der Russischen Kasus". In *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2.23–71. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1998. "Partitive Case and Aspect". In *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, M. Butt & W. Geuder (eds), 265-307. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Klenin, Emily. 1978. "Quantification, Partitivity, and the Genitive of Negation in Russian". *International Review of Slavic Linguistics*, Special Issue 1978, B. S. Comrie (ed.), 163-82.
- Neidle, Carol. 1988. *The Role of Case in Russian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Paus, Charles. 1994. "Social and Pragmatic Conditioning in the Demise of the Russian Partitive Case". *Russian Linguistics* 18:2.249-266.

## Russian second genitive: partitive or not? a corpus study

Michael Daniel  
(Moscow State University)

As other case-inflecting Indo-European languages, Russian has a high degree of homophony between various case forms that may be distinguished only through comparing them across inflection types. Thus, zero marking is used on nominative and accusative singular as well as genitive plural. Some case syncretisms may be explained in functional terms: accusative may be identical to the nominative or genitive depending on the animacy. Some cases exist for a small subclass of nouns only (cf. Zalizniak 1967, Corbett 2008). Thus, second locative is only distinct from the regular locative (prepositional) case on some locational nouns, and the new (truncated) vocative exists for human nouns in the first declension. These 'secondary' cases have been analyzed in e.g. (Plungian 2002) and (Daniel 2009).

Second genitive, or partitive, is not only a secondary case in this sense, but is also always identical to the dative. It is typical for mass nouns of the second declension (*čaj* 'tea', *sup* 'soup'). The form occurs in those contexts in which one would expect an accusative (which, for these nouns, is identical to the nominative) or a genitive. As noted in (Zalizniak 1967), second genitive may be substituted by the genitive in virtually all contexts, similarly to the new vocative (which may be substituted by a nominative form) but unlike the second locative (changing second locative to regular locative / prepositional case creates clear stylistic and semantic contrasts).

An established fact about the second genitive is that its scope decreases over time, not only in terms of nouns on which it occurs but probably also in terms of syntactic/semantic contexts where it appears; this is similar to what happens to the second locative but different from the new vocative which is an innovation that quickly expands. The present research will focus on residual second genitive and its dynamics in the Russian literary texts. It is a micro-historical research in terms of (Plungian 2009) and is based on considering the distribution of the second genitive in the Russian National Corpus ([www.ruscorpora.ru](http://www.ruscorpora.ru)). The study considers the distribution of the three competing forms (accusative / genitive / second genitive) for various nouns and in different constructions (direct object vs. measure constructions vs. etc), tracing where the form is being preserved and where it is being lost.

A rough classification of the contextual functions of the second genitive includes adnominal uses in measuring contexts (*dve butyločki limonadu* 'two bottles of lemonade'), direct object in mass-noun or similar contexts, quantified or not (*ja ne sobirals'a pit' ni konjaku, ni šampanskogo* 'I was not going to drink either brandy or champagne', *dobavili nemnogo saxaru* 'they added some sugar'), or subject, typically quantified (*polno pesku v volosax* 'plenty of sand in the hair'). In addition to these clearly partitive contexts, the same form is used in prepositional contexts (*ušla iz domu doč* 'his daughter left them'), or some more specific uses such as descriptive (*vysokogo rostu* 'tall', lit. 'of a high tallness') and various idioms (*bez tolku* 'without sense, purposeless'). These functions are summarized in the following table:

<b>adnominal</b>	with a quantifier	PARTITIVE DOMAIN
<b>direct object</b>	contrasted with accusative	
<b>subject</b>	negated or quantified	
<b>idioms</b>	often, semantically partitive	
<b>prepositional</b>	all kinds of prepositions, including spatial contexts	GENITIVE DOMAIN
<b>descriptive</b>	with a number of nouns depicting human features, both external and internal	

While the first four functions are typical of partitives, the last two are not connected to them. Judging from the data in the Russian National Corpus, the share of prepositional uses is so high that, according to sample counts, they alone account for more than one third of the occurrences. May this category be called a partitive? According to the observed change in statistics of the usage between two time cuts (the last third of the 19th century vs. from 1980 to the present), the partitive uses of the second genitive fall down (except idioms and direct object functions), while the share of the prepositional uses increase, from approx 27 to over 35%. More generally, the frequency of the second genitive seems to decrease gradually in the Russian National Corpus from 615 words per million in 1866-1900 to 362 words per million in 2001-to-the-present fiction and 232 words per million in 1990-to-the-present press. In other words, according to these calculations, the category is in decline, and its uses in the partitive domain fall quicker than in the genitive domain.

Another important trend that is shown by the statistics is a gradual idiomatization of the category. While in the 1866-1900 period the second genitive occurs on 63 different lexical items, in the 1980-to-the-present subcorpus the number of the lexical items involved into second genitive formation falls to 24, yielding a mid-occurrence-per-item value increase from 1,6 to 4,1. Parallely to this 'lexical idiomatization', the idiomatic expressions are the only category outside prepositional contexts whose share in the overall use of the second genitive increases over time.

To sum up all these statistics, the second genitive is both going own and becoming less partitive over time, the only relatively stable partitive function being the direct object position. In the same time, the category is being idiomatized in certain expressions and around certain lexical items, and especially under certain prepositions. All three clues indicate a possible trend from free variation between the regular and the second genitive to their complimentary distribution.

#### References:

- Corbett 2008: Determining morphosyntactic feature values: The case of case. Greville G. Corbett and Michael Noonan (eds) *Case and grammatical relations. Studies in honor of Bernard Comrie*. Benjamins, 2008.
- Daniel 2009: Novyj russkij vokativ: istorija formy usechennogo obrasheniya skvozj prizmu korpusa pismennyx tekstov. In: K. Kiseleva, E. Rakhilina, V. Plungian, S. Tatevosov (eds) *Korpusnyje issledovanija po russkoj grammatike*.
- Plungian 2002: Vladimir Plungian. K semantike russkogo lokativa (vtorogo predlozhnogo padezha) *Semiotics and Informatics*, 37.
- Plungian 2008: Vladimir Plungian. Korpus kak instrument i kak ideologija: o nekotoryx urokax sovremennoj korpusnoj lingvistiki. *Russkij jazyk v nauchnom osveshenii*, No. 16 (2).
- Spencer, Otoguro 2005 - Andrew Spencer and R. Otoguro. Limits to case: a critical survey of the notion. In: Mengistu Amberber and Helen de Hoop (eds.) *Competition and variation in natural languages: the case for case*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Zalizniak 1967: Zaliznjak, Andrej. 1967. *Russkoe imennoe slovoizmenenie* Moscow: Nauka.

## The Finnish Partitive revisited : a discourse-cognitive approach, in comparison with some other Finno-Ugric and Indo-European languages

We have collected from a textual corpus of both narratives and dialogues occurrences of resultative verbs which can, under certain conditions, take a FIP O. The diversity of factors which contribute towards the choice of the FIP, in particular the interaction of syntactic and semantic features of the verbs, combined with enunciative and situational criteria, can be analyzed in terms of cognitive processes underlying the aspectual constructions (see Desclés & Guentcheva, to appear). Usually approached through word order (Huomo 1993, Fernandez-Vest 2007), the contrasts of Information Structure will be enlightened by the thematic role of FIP, marginally as subject (see Helasvuo 2001), mainly as O.

After placing each verb of the corpus with a nominal O into one of the 3 aspectual verb categories /resultative (RES), irresultative (IRR) or resultative-irresultative (RES-IRR)/, to find out whether the choice of the object's case is governed by the inherent aspect of the verb, or whether this choice is equally – or primarily – affected by the context, the aspect of the sentence and/or the situation.

I have adopted for my own study a classification based on + and – values : the V is [–decisive change] and the situation is [–end point] (Askonen 2001).

### FIP in translation

A comparison will be made between A/ Finnish and its close Finnic relative, Estonian (see Sulkala 1993), B/ Finnish and another neighboring Finno-Ugric language, Northern Sami, which has lost the partitive, and C/ with some Indo-European languages, Scandinavian (Swedish and Norwegian) languages which have no partitive (but an indefinite article) and a Romance language, French, where the partitive article corresponds a limited number of the FIP uses. The role of this special case for the information structuring of the sentence and discourse will be apprehended through the variations of translation in the different languages : fictive dialogues (novels, theater) and how the translator 1/ transfers a selection of the combined features of FIP into a partitive lacking language, 2/ tries to reconstruct a difference of topicality or definiteness when FIP has neutralized it (e.g. in negative sentences, see Fernandez-Vest 2009), 3/ makes explicit with FIP a polarity which was only latent in the other language.

I will place all the verbs of the examples chosen in one of the three categories adopted, and distinguish them by colours

RES (Resultative)

IRR (Irresultative)

RES-IRR (Resultative-Irresultative)

### Temporary conclusion from a cross-linguistic evaluation of FIP

#### From Finnish to Sami

– the translator sometimes drops the nuances brought about by the FIP, ex.

(1) *Hän istui aivan liikkumatta, mutta kun olin usean minuutin ajan tuijottanut häntä ikkunastan, hän **käänsi** päätään ja katsoi suoraan minuun.*

Son čohkkái áibbas lihkaskeahhtá, muhto go ledjen mánggaid minuhtaid gaiván su lássaráigge, de son jorggihii ja geahčastii munnje



« She sat completely motionless, but when I had several minutes stared at her from the window, she turned her head and looked directly at me. »

- Finnish : The 1st transitive V is NonR, a V of perception, PART.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> transitive V is R-nonR, a classic example studied by Fennists : Acc. Would be normal (usual), but PART. introduces an impression of carelessness or improvisation – not a decisive movement.

- Sami : « she turned » (no O, no mention of « head » or « back »).

– most often the aspectual values are rendered by a different construction, for instance the progressive form

(2) *Join monta pannullista laihaa kahvia ja **sulatin** suussani vain yhden sokeripalan kuppia kohti. Kirjoitin* romaanini viimeistä lukua, kohtaa jossa käsitellään Vernerin Krookin murhaan liittyviä asioita ja Heikki Väkkäräistä joka tuon teon teki.

Juhken mánga káffegievnni dievva goida káfe ja suddadin njálmmis dušše ovttá sohkarbihtá káffegohpa nammii. Ledjen aiddo čállimin iežan romána manimus logu, mas gieđahallen Krooka-Vernerin goddimii guoskevaš áššiid ja Väkkäräš-Heikka, guhte duon dagu dagai.

« I drank many (PART.SG.) pots (PART.SG.) of thin (PART.SG.) coffee (PART.SG.) and melted only one (ACC.SG) sugar lump (ACC.SG.) per cup. I was writing of-my-novel the last (PART.SG.) chapter (PART.SG), the passage (PART.SG) where one deals with of-VK to-the-murder related (PART.PL.) things (PART.PL.) and with HV (PART.SG.) who that (ACC.SG.) – action (ACC.SG.) did. »

- Finnish : *juoda* « to drink », RES-IRR, here IRR as the O is partly bounded (*pannullinen*, the content of a pot is not a count name), *sulattaa* « to melt » here RES with a restricted / delimited result : only one sugar lump.

2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, *kirjoittaa* « to write » RES-IRR here IRR : the chapter is a work in progress

[different from ex.

(2') *Kirjoitin* puolen tunnin ajan ja *sain* valmiiksi yhden liuskan

Čállen su birra diibmobeale, oktiibuot ovttá árkká

« I wrote half an hour (ACC.SG.) and I got ready (TRANSL.SG.) one (ACC.SG.) sheet (ACC.SG.) »]

V *käsitellä* « to treat, deal with », IRR. Final V *tehdä* « to do », here RES.

- Sami : same constructions for both in the first sentence, but personal form in the 2<sup>nd</sup> « I dealt with ».

2<sup>nd</sup> sentence : progressive form (Gerund II) where there was a PART in Finnish.

## From Sami to Finnish

– the durative value of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Sami progressive form is rendered by a PART

–

(3) *Piera goavrái návetuvssa ovddas. Čoarverieban lei buviheamen su. (...) Dávvet čuoččui dobbelaččas ja fuoikkui. Son lei čuovvumin, mo biro borai su kránnjá.*

*Piera makasi navetan oven edessä. Sarvikettu oli kuristamassa häntä. (...) Taavetti seisoi vähän kauempana ja voihki. Hän seurasi kun pahalainen söi hänen naapuriaan.*

“Piera lied in front of the cowshed door. The horned fox was eating (INF. 3 INESS.) him (PART.SG.). (...) T/ stood a little further away and groaned. He followed when the devil was eating his neighbor (PART.SG.)”

- Finnish: *kuristaa* “to strangle” V of Action, RES; *syödä* “to eat” V of prehension, RES-IRR
- Sami: in the two sentences 1 and 4 there is a progressive form (Gerund II)

– a specific inchoative form of the Sami V is rendered by the Finnish PART

(4) *Máhte-Máhtte jugistii káffegohpa ja ráhkkanišgođii Pentte manimus hášiid rádjat. (...) Dalle heastaáigge Máhtte lávii rádjat manimus hášiid borgemánu gaskkamuttos, dál áiggui geargat vel suoidnemánu bealde.*

*Matti hörppäsi kahvikupin tyhjäksi ja lähti korjaamaan Pentan viimeisiä haasioita. (...) Silloin hevosaikaan Matilla oli tapana korjata viimeiset haasiat elokuun puolivälissä.*

Matti tömde sin kaffekopp med en slurk och gick ut för att köra in de sista hässjorna för Pentti. (...) Då på hästarnas tid brukade Matti bärja in de sista hässjorna i mitten av augusti.

« Matti tossed off the cup of coffee (ACC.SG.) empty (TRANSL.SG.) and went out to gather Pentti's last hayricks (PART.PL.). (...) At the time of horses Matti used to gather the last (ACC.PL.) hayricks (ACC.PL.) in mid-August ».

Finnish : *hörpätä* « to empty with a strong noise » *korjata* « to gather, pick up, take away », V of Action-movement, RES-IRR, used here with the 2 different constructions : 1/ Matti went out in order to gather + PART (an objective, but no guaranteed result) ; 2/ [remembering the past] Matti used to gather + ACC (global, accomplished perspective)

Sami : 1/ *jugistit* « to drink quickly and noisily », derivative V of *juhat* « to drink », the descriptive aspect is transferred in Finnish on an additional noun (adjective) in the TRANSLative ; 2/ no difference of construction of the V *rádjat* « to gather » in the 2 sentences, apart from what precedes the 1st « gathering » - an inchoative V (*ráhkanišgoahtit* “to begin to prepare”), « he began to prepare/equip himself in order to gather », rendered in Finnish by a simpler « he went out and gathered » + PART O. The inchoative aspect is thus transferred on the PART in Finnish.

– The translator can interpret further the components of the situation : e.g. the coffee as an obligatory drink on a visit

(5) Nuba son ii álgán vuorddašit eamida, fal válddii skáhpe siste láibbi, vuoššai káfe ja lei juo boradeamen, go Ingá easkka bođii.

*Niinpä hän ei ruvennut odottelemaan emäntää, vaan otti kaapista leipää, keitti kahvin ja oli jo aterioimassa, kun Inka vasta tuli.*

“And so he did not begin to wait for the lady of the house, he took from the cupboard bread (PART.SG.), cooked the coffee (ACC.SG.) and was already eating, when Inka at last arrived.”

• Finnish: *odotella* “to wait” Action V, IRR + FREQuentative suffix; *keittää* “to boil” RES-IRR; partitive O is the most usual, but the accusative adds a nuance : he boiled the coffee “as belongs to a visit” / or “as he was used to”; *ottaa* “to take” RES but indefinite Ø.

Or the « difficulty » of the task rendered by a PART O of the RES verb « to get »

(6) [To Heaika Ivvár was a bit strange]

Das lei viehka váttis fáhtet gitta. Sáhtii leat dasto áigebotta jaska, dušše geahčai apmasit sutnje ja ain moddjii (...) de čilgii vuđolaččat uhcimušge ášši. Ja de fas jaskkodii, dutkkai mihtidii Heaikka, guhket ja dárkilit, ovdalgo rohttehii ođđa ášši ja čilgii danges gitta botni ráje.

*Hänestä oli vaikea saada otetta. (...) Saattoi sitten olla minuuttikaupalla vaiti, katseli vain omituisesti vierastaan ja hymyili (...), niin selitti perusteellisesti pienimmän+kin asian. Taas vaiken, tutkia mittaili Heikkiä, pitkään ja tarkasti, ennen kuin tarrasi uuteen asiaan ja selitti sen pohjia myöten.*

(Swedish : Det var svårt att få grepp om honom (...) Sedan kunde han tga flera minuter, såg bara underligt på sin gäst och log (...), förklarade grundligt den minsta saken (...). Och så teg han igen, granskade Heikki med blicken länge och väl innan han hakade sig på en ny sak och förklarade den grundligt.)

« On him was difficult to get a grip (PART.SG.). He could then be for minutes silent, watched only strangely his guest (PART.SG.) and smiled (...), he explained thoroughly the smallest (ACC.SG.) thing even (ACC.SG.+ DIP) (...). Again he was silent, measured up and examined H. (PART.SG.), long and closely, before he grasped a new (ILLAT.SG.) thing (ILLAT.SG.) and explained it (ACC.SG.) to the bottom. »

- Fi. *saada* « to get » RES but here uncompleted action, negative adjective -> PART ; *katsella* « to watch », diminutive-frequentative, PART ; *selittää* « to explain », RES-IRR, resultative in this context, ACC.
- Sami : all O are normally in the Acc/gen., apart from the O of *geahčai* “looked at” which is in the directive (“looked towards him”).

### **FIP and cognitive semantics of discourse**

Several notions put forward by Cognitive linguistics can be referred to in this context, specially Talmy's notions of synoptic perspectival mode (with global scope of attention), as opposed to a sequential perspectival mode (with local scope of attention) – see also Huomo 2009.

Elżbieta Tabakowska  
Jagiellonian University of Kraków,  
Poland

### **Double government in Polish: semantic and pragmatic motivation for the use of *genetivus partitivus***

In contemporary Polish, direct object is typically coded as either the Accusative or the Genitive case of the noun (or the nominal), with the former being what Polish linguists describe as “almost the categorical form” in constructions with transitive verbs. Polish does not use a separate case or a specialized case marking for partitives; within the rich case system of contemporary Polish, the “partitive meaning” is considered as an extension of the prototypical meaning of the Genitive (reference-point constructions).

In the article, I intend to focus on some cases of what is called *dwojaki rząd* (“double government”), i.e. an alteration of direct objects in either the Genitive or the Accusative case. In standard grammar books, the difference between the two structures is described in terms of the “holistic” meaning of nouns in the Accusative case as opposed to the “part-of-the-whole” meaning of the Genitive, which is then interpreted as *genetivus partitivus*.

In the case of verbs displaying double government the Accusative : Genitive opposition is generally either ignored or taken for granted ( interestingly enough, this is also true about the earliest account of double government with verbs prefixed by *wy-* made in the cognitivist vein; Rudzka-Ostyn 1984), and the motivation behind this opposition seems often unclear for linguists and native speakers alike. Whenever explanations are provided, they are impressionistic, vague and non-systematic, while simple Internet search engines supply the interested searcher with corpora in which both structures are listed indiscriminately, that is, are treated as free variants. Moreover, while some linguists claim that in contemporary Polish one can observe the tendency towards generalization, “with ACC taking over as the case of direct object, and GEN being gradually eliminated” (Kempf 2007:98), the claim is counterbalanced by opposite statements, e.g. that “today collocations with ACC seem obsolete” (Internet; a linguistic counseling service). Analysis of actual data clearly points to the need of a more subtle description.

In the paper, I wish to substantiate the claim that the opposition between the two structures in question reveals a significant difference in meaning, which results from an intricate interplay of lexical semantics, aspectual meaning, the meaning of verbal prefixes, pragmatic factors and discourse structure. An attempt at such an integrated approach was actually made about 30 years ago – in what would be today called the cognitivist vein – by the Polish linguist Zdzisław Kempf (2007), who postulated two subcategories, which he called “the *partitivus* of a weakened activity” and “ the temporal *partitivus*”, used to convey, respectively, the meaning of a low extent of involvement of the object in the event described (cf. Moravcsik 1978) or its short duration.

In the article, a corpus-illustrated analysis will be presented, stemming from a single case study: the priest’s invocation following the intercessions during the Holy Mass, which is found to alternate between

- (1) *Panie, wysłuchaj nasze modlitwy*  
 (“Lord, hear our prayers-ACC”)  
and (2) *Panie, wysłuchaj naszych modlitw*  
 (“Lord, hear our prayers-GEN”).

The overall meaning of (1) as opposed to (2) will be shown to result from an interplay of the following factors:

1. lexical semantics of the verb:

(3) *śluchać* [listen]: consciously receive auditory signals by means of one's sense of hearing" (SWJP: A Dictionary of Contemporary Polish Language)

2. semantics of preverbal prefix *wy-*: two schemas (Rudzka-Ostyn 1997: 228):

(4) (a) out of container: *wypić wody/ę*:

(out-drink water [GEN/ACC]) (Janowska/Pastuchowa

2005:148)

(b) expanding to fill in container: *wypełnić pustkę*,

(out-fill the void- ACC)

*wymalować mieszkanie*

(out-paint

the flat-ACC)

(c) function: "aspectual" AND "creative" (Janowska/Pastuchowa 2005: 150)

3. lexical semantics of the prefixed verb:

(5) *wysłuchać*: [cf obsol. *wysłuchnąć*] vs. *wysłuchiwać*

(out-listen)

(out-listen [ again and again]

Semantic extensions:

(a) *spełnić czyjeś prośby*

(hear someone's prayers-ACC = answer)

(b) *śluchać czegoś do końca/w całości*

(hear something-GEN out)

4. aspect:

(a) Aktionsart: accomplishment as opposed to achievement (Vendler; quot in Dickey 2000:13).

(b) "temporal definiteness" vs. "totality" (Dickey 2000, *passim*)

[ "change of state" – Kardela 2001:305) [boundedness (RWL 1991)

Contingent to qualitatively different "a single indivisible whole"

states – Dickey 2000: 20]

Dickey 2000: 16]

*wysłuchać* + N-Gen

*wysłuchać* + N-Acc

5. semantics of case:

(a) verb + N-Gen part: "*partitivus* czynności osłabionej" ("partitive of weakened activity" Kempf 2007: 103); (cf. *attenuation*; Langacker 1991a)

(6) *Jan wysłuchał koncertu i poszedł do domu*

(J. out-listened the koncert-GEN and went home)

(b) verb + N-ACC: change of state + final result

(7) *Bóg wysłuchał nasze modlitwy i dał Janowi zdrowie*

(God out-heard our prayers-ACC and gave Jan-DAT health)

(c) verb+ N-ACC+ N-GEN (totality of object + Gen proper: reference point):

(8) *Dane nam było wysłuchać część kompozycji*

([It] was given to us to out-hear part-ACC composition-GEN)

6. semantics of the direct object: *prośba* [ request], *modlitwa* [prayer]

7. pragmatics: Who is authorized to actually listen to/answer our prayers?

Are effects of action salient? (good God vs., e.g. attentive child)

The analysis of the corpus reveals some pragmatic factors that restrict the use of either of the two types of partitives, thus pointing out discursive motivation for their use in opposition to structures with the Accusative. In conclusion, I will present some general observations on the "conspiracy" between verbal aspect and case.

## References:

- Janowska, Aleksandra i Magdalena Pastuchowa. 2005. *Słowotwórstwo czasowników staropolskich. Stan i tendencje rozwojowe*. Kraków: Universitas
- Kempf, Zdzisław. 2007. *Próba teorii przypadków. Część II*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume II: Descriptive Application*. Stanford; Stanford University Press
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991a. *Concept. Image and Symbol*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. "On the case marking of objects". In: Joseph Greenberg & al. (eds.). *Universals in human language*. Vol. IV. *Syntax*. Stanford: Stanford UP. 249 – 290.
- Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida. 1984. „Cognitive Grammar and word formation. The case of Dutch *uit* and Polish *wy*”. In: Kałuża, Irena & I. Przemecka, M. Gibińska, E. Tabakowska (ed.). *Litterae et lingua. In honorem Premislavi Mroczkowski*. Wrocław etc. Ossolineum. 227 – 240.
- Śmiech, Witold. 1986. *Derywacja prefiksalna czasowników polskich*. Warszawa: Ossolineum
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2001a. “O szyku wyrazów w obrębie wyrażen argumentowych przedmiotowych”. *Prace Filologiczne. Tom XLVI*. Warszawa: Instytut Języka Polskiego UW. 577 – 589
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2001b. „O motywacji związku rzędu derywatów prefiksalnych polskich czasowników z dopełnieniem”. In: Wojciech Kubiński & Danuta Stanilewicz (eds.) *Językoznawstwo kognitywne II. Zjawiska pragmatyczne*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego. 212 – 224.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. In print. „Podwójne standardy: o związku dwojakiego rzędu w gramatyce kognitywnej i w gramatyce komunikacyjnej”. In: Grażyna Habrajska (ed.). *Festschrift for Aleksy Awdiejew*.

## On the partitive-diminutive correlation in the Russian language

*Evgenia Chernigovskaya*

A number of Russian nouns has a double set of genitive endings (**-a/-ya** and **-u/-yu**), one of which can only manifest in the quantitative context and is therefore known as “partitive” genitive. While the more common **-a/-ya** genitive can easily replace the partitive ending (and it would appear that cases of such usage are increasing, cf: [Panov, 1968], [Comrie et al, 1996] ), the opposite is not true.

- (1) **On vypi-l cha-ya / cha-yu**  
He drink-PST tea-Sg.Gen tea-PART  
He drank some tea

- (2) **Tsvet cha-ya / \* cha-yu**  
Colour tea-Sg.Gen/ tea-Sg.PART  
The colour of the tea

The use of the partitive ending is also lexically restricted, since it can only be used with masculine mass-nouns. The partitive ending is thus often treated as completely optional. However, this is not entirely true, since there is a certain group of nouns where the partitive form is either highly preferable or the only one available, and which is generally overlooked in the studies. For some reason the diminutive forms tend to preserve the partitive ending.

Another interesting partitive quality diminutives demonstrate is how they function in the Accusative Vs Genitive (Partitive) alternation in the position of the direct object of the transitive verb. Nouns in the genitive form have the partitive meaning, whereas in the accusative they are reinterpreted as definite (the beer) or completeness of the action (all the beer).

- |                               |                                     |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (3) <b>On vypi-l piv-a</b>    | (4) <b>On vypi-l piv-o</b>          |
| He drink-PST.Sg.M beer-Sg.Gen | He drink-PST.Sg.M beer-Sg.Acc       |
| He drank some beer            | He drank the beer (or all the beer) |

Now, this opposition just doesn't seem to work for the diminutive forms, because they don't easily accept the non-partitive interpretation.

- |                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (5) <b>On vypi-l piv-k-a</b>      | (6) <b>?On vypil piv-k-o</b>      |
| He drink-PST.Sg.M beer-Dim-Sg.Gen | He drink-PST.Sg.M beer-Dim-Sg.Acc |
| He drank some beer                |                                   |

The above examples clearly show that a diminutive form may behave differently from the non-diminutive one in the very same context. The paper will then deal with the following questions:

- 1) to perform a systematic check of the diminutive forms against the general “partitive” contexts and to compare the results and the level of acceptability by native speakers (questionnaire).
- 2) To explain the fact that in case of the diminutive forms, the preference for partitive choices is more marked. The analysis that I propose is based on the assumption that both partitives and diminutives have overlapping quantitative semantics, which is responsible for the resulting proximity.

Although the paper deals only with the data of the Russian language, it must be noted that this proximity can be observed cross-linguistically. E.g. according to [Zhuravsky, 1996] and [Koval, 1997] diminutive classifiers are one of the sources for the development of partitive semantics.

A detailed study of the correlation of the Russian partitive and diminutives can thus possibly give some insight on the phenomena in other languages.

### **References:**

- Comrie, Bernard; Stone, Gerard; Polinsky, M., 1996* The Russian language in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Oxford, Clarendon Press
- Fischer, Susann 2004.* Partitive vs. Genitive in Russian and Polish: an empirical study on case alternation in the object domain. In S.Fischer, R. van de Vijver and R. Vogel (eds.), *Experimental Studies in Linguistics. I*, LiP 21. 123-137.
- Jurafsky, D. 1996.* Universal Tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive. // *Language*, 72
- Koval, A.I. 1997.* Imennye kategorii v pular-fulfulde // *Osnovy afrikanskogo yazykoznaniya*. Moscow, Aspect-Press.
- Panov M.V. , 1968.* .Russkii yazyk I sovetskoe obshchestvo: sotsiologo-lingvisticheskoe issledovaniye / AN USSR. Institut russkogo yazyka. Moscow, Nauka.
- Shulga, M.V., 2003* Razvitie morfologicheskoi sistemy imeni v russkom yazyke. Moscow, Izd. Moskovskogo Gosudarstvennogo universiteta Lesa.



## Partitives in Oceanic languages

Peter Budd, SOAS

The Oceanic languages form a subgroup of the vast Austronesian family. Stretching from Papua New Guinea and the Micronesian islands in the West to New Zealand in the South, Hawai'i in the north and Rapa Nui in the east, this diverse subgroup includes between 450 and 600 languages (Lynch et al 2002:ix). Part of the uncertainty over this figure is due to inadequate documentation and description of the languages in the region, particularly in parts of Melanesia. Nonetheless, grammars or grammar sketches exist for a large number of languages and much work has been conducted on reconstructing many aspects of the grammar of Proto-Oceanic. Of particular relevance to the present study, an "indefinite common non-human article" *\*ta* has been reconstructed (Lynch et al 2002:71) on the basis of a number of contemporary indefinite and partitive markers in various languages. However it is clear that partitive morphemes in Oceanic languages have evolved from diverse sources and exhibit both similar and dissimilar traits. To date there are no studies which look in detail at partitives in the Oceanic context.

The geographical area in which Oceanic languages are spoken is divided into three main regions - Micronesia, Melanesia, and Polynesia and Fiji. Preliminary investigation has revealed that morphological partitives can be identified in languages of each of these regions and this chapter will aim to survey the available data and present a synthesis of the findings. Particular attention will be paid to diachrony, syntactic distribution, the role of partitive morphemes in negation, and aspectual functions of the partitive.

### Syntactic distribution

Partitive morphemes vary syntactically across Oceanic languages occurring as either noun or verb dependents. Within the NP they occur as preposed or postposed elements, *cf.* Lenakel post-nominal *nivin* and Samoan pre-nominal *sina*,

(Lenakel)

[N-eramim ka nivin] k-n-ar-va            ita  
Pl-person    that some 3:ns-perf-pl-come already  
*Some of those people have already come*

(Lynch 1978:40)

(Samoan)

'Aumai [sina            wai]  
bring    ART(part.sg) water  
*Bring a little water*

(Mosel 1992:265)

Apparently relatively common in Vanuatu languages is for a partitive morpheme to occur within the VP (post-verbally), but to have semantic scope over the entire predicate tire predicate. Thus Crowley (1982:144) states that in the following Paamese example "the referent of the object is an indefinite subset of the total possible class of objects...the object *raise* 'rice' does not refer to any particular quantity of rice, only to some indefinite quantity of rice:

(Paamese)

**[Ma-ani-tei]                      raise**  
 1SG.IMM-eat-PART rice  
*I'd like to eat some rice*

(Crowley 1982:145)

Similarly, Sye (Erromangan) has a verbal suffix which behaves in the same way:

(Sye)  
**[U-ovo-yau-wi]                      nacave**  
 PL:IMP-BR:give-1SG-PART kava  
*You all give me a little kava*

Crowley (1998:129)

and equivalent post-verbal partitive markers are attested in a number of other Vanuatu languages, including Bierebo (Budd 2010), Lewo (Early 1994), Ske (Johnson pers. comm), and Abma (Schneider 2010:166):

"With transitive verbs, Abma features the partitive refers to some portion of a whole NP, expressing an indefinite quantity (for example, 'some')..., inclusion of *te* 'partitive (PART)' highlights the fact that the amount of *bwet* 'taro' to be grated is imprecise":

**Ba            nanong, ba            na=ma            sawiri=te            bwet si=ah**  
 COMM now            COMM 1SG=PRSP grate=PART taro    POL=EMPH  
*But now I'll grate some of this taro first*

Such constructions share some similarity to the post-verbal *of* in English *eat of, drink of*, also found in Dutch:

*De discipelen aten van het brood en de vissen*  
 The disciples ate of the bread and the fish

(Hoeksma 1996: 15)

Hoeksma (1996:15) explains, "Here the regular object NP is replaced by an *of*-PP, to indicate that the object does not wholly but only partly undergoes the action of the verb... "

In these kinds of constructions the partitive only has scope over the direct object relation, whereas a form like Samoan *sina* or Lenakel *nivin*, an NP dependent, is not restricted in the same way. Compare the Lenakel example given above with the following:

(Lenakel)  
**Ofa                      nimilh un    nivin!**  
 Give:to:speaker orange that some  
*Give me some of those oranges (near you)!*

(Lynch 1978:41)

It is interesting to note that within Vanuatu languages the same proto-form *\*ta* has evolved into a post-verbal partitive marker (i.e. a VP element) in some languages, such as Paamese *-tei*, but a NP element in other languages, such as the pre-nominal determiner *tah* in Anejom. The functions and distributions of cognate forms evidently warrants investigation.

Another area of research will include the distribution of the partitive with regard to object marking, since in Paamese, for example, the partitive morpheme would appear to be in

complementary distribution with the bound third person singular object or an object cross-reference suffix:

(Paamese)

**Longe-e**

3SG.REAL.hear-3SG

*I heard him*

**Ro-longe-tei**

3SG.REAL.NEG-hear-PART

*He didn't hear him*

**Longe-nV**

**ree-ku**

3SG.REAL.hear-COMM<sup>5</sup> voice-1SG

*He heard my voice*

**Ro-longe-tei**

**ree-ku**

3SG.REAL.NEG-hear-PART voice-1SG

*He didn't hear my voice*

### Aspectual functions of partitives

Aspectual functions can also be identified for partitives, for example "partial execution of an event" (Schneider 2010).<sup>6</sup> In the following example the author states that "an attempt to break is marked with the partitive, whereas a successful execution of the verb takes regular transitive marking":.

**Kaa=ga,u=bma ne-bwah=te**

2PL=MIN ADD=come CONN-break=PART

*Now you guys come and try to break it*

**Mwa=bwah-a, ra=mwa bwah-a vet nong**

3SG.IPFV=break-TR 3PL=IPFV break-TR stone this

*He breaks it, they break this stone*

(ibid:167)

And the same author (Schneider 2010:166ff) compares the following example, in which a series of 'tentative' incomplete actions is expressed by the partitive (in conjunction with the repetition of the verb) with an example of the Finnish partitive which expresses a progressive interpretation:

(Abma)

**Nema siba=te ba, nema siba=te ba**

3SG.PRSP peel=PART COMM 3SG.PRSP peel=PART COMM

**Mabonmwel nema siba i biri bu**

Mabonmwel 3SG.PRSP peel INSTR small knife

*She'll peel it, she'll peel it, Mabonmwel will peel it with a small knife*

<sup>5</sup> COMM is the gloss for common noun (object cross-reference suffix).

<sup>6</sup> It will be necessary to investigate ways of defining by formal and/or semantic means the distinction between aspectual and partitive interpretations i.e. the difference between *to perform X to a limited extent (on Y)* versus *to perform X to a part of Y*.

(Finnish)

**Tyttö lakaisi lattiaa**  
Girl-NOM swept floor-PART  
*The girl was sweeping the floor*

(Lyons 1999:101-102)

For Sye/Erromangan, Crowley also states that for intransitive verbs the partitive *-wi* can be used to express a partitive meaning, indicating that the action expressed by the verb is performed only to a limited extent, though no examples are provided.

This is an area of research which will clearly be of value crosslinguistically in understanding the relationship between partitives and verbal aspect.

### The role of partitives in negation

A feature of partitive morphemes in Oceanic languages which fits with cross-linguistics tendencies is their role in the marking of negation. In Paamese, Lewo, and Bierebo cognate post-verbal partitive forms (which previously would have functioned as minimisers in negated clauses) have grammaticalised into negative markers:

(Paamese)

**Ro-lesi-ko-tei**  
3SG.REAL.NEG-see-2SG-PART/NEG  
*He didn't see you*

(Crowley 1982:144)

(Lewo)

**Ve a-tol inu re**  
NEG1 3PL.S-touch 1SG NEG2  
*Don't touch me!*

(Early 1994:78)

(Bierebo)

**Ko-teng re**  
2SG.S-IRR.cry NEG2  
*Don't cry*

Related to this phenomenon is the function of the partitive in negatives (attested in a number of languages) to emphasise the total unaffectedness of the object, in contrast to the less emphatic meaning from simple transitive marking:

(Abma)

**Ko=t ih bamte abma nanib?**  
2SG=PFV hit make.die what yesterday  
*What did you kill yesterday?*

**Na=t=ba if bamte abma=nga**  
1SG=PFV=NEG.1 hit make.die something=NEG.2  
*I don't kill things*

**Na=t=ba            if bamte=te            abma=nga**  
 1SG=PFV=NEG.1 hit make.die=PART something=NEG.2  
*I didn't kill anything*

(Schneider 2010)

The same emphatic meaning can be found in intransitives, as well as clauses where the direct object is not overtly marked, as in the Bierebo and Samoan examples below:

(Bierebo)

**Mara kama ø-pinim            ja            Bonkovio rui**  
 NEG1 EMPH 3SG.S-R.come PART PLACE    already  
*He never ever came to Bonkovio.*

(Samoan)

**'ua    leai            lava    sina            ofi**  
 PERF not.exist EMPH ART(part.sg.) room  
*There was absolutely no room at all.*

The proposed chapter on Oceanic partitives will explore each of the areas outlined above, providing a greater range of data than what has been offered here. The findings will be cross-referenced with those of the volume's other contributions in order to contextualise the properties of Oceanic partitives and offer further empirical evidence or counter-evidence for current theoretical and typological work.

## References

- Budd, Peter. 2010. Topics in the grammar of Bierebo, with a focus on the Realis/Irrealis categories. Unpublished PhD dissertation. SOAS, University of London.
- Crowley, Terry. 1982. *The Paamese language of Vanuatu*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.  
 ———. 2000 *An Erromangan (Sye) grammar*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Early, Robert. 1994. A grammar of Lewo, Vanuatu. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Hoeksma, Jacob. 1996. Introduction. In Hoeksma, Jacob (ed). *Partitives*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lynch, John. 1978. *A grammar of Lenakel*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Lynch, John; Malcolm Ross and Terry Crowley (eds). 2002. *The Oceanic Languages*. Richmond: Curzon Press.
- Lyons, C. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mosel, Ulrike and Even Hovdhaugen. 1992. *Samoan Reference Grammar*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Schneider, Cynthia. 2010. *A grammar of Abma: a language of Pentecost island, Vanuatu*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.



## The grammaticalization of the prepositional partitive in Romance

Béatrice Lamiroy

Anne Carlier

Cases mark in principle dependency relations, both syntactic and semantic, with respect to another term. The partitive use of the genitive, as observed in several Indo-European languages (Slavonic, Old Germanic, Ancient Greek, ...) is atypical, because, unlike other inflectional cases, it does not create a relationship between the NP and some external element (Carlier 2007). This explains why it can be used in a flexible way instead of other inflectional cases. The Homeric epics provide some nice illustrations of the syntactic flexibility of the partitive genitive: it occurs not only in the object position of verbs meaning 'drink' or 'eat' (1), but is also used in other syntactic functions such as subject, locative (2) or instrumental function.

- (1) a. αἷματος[Genitive] ὄφρα πίω [instead of: αἷμα [accusative]] (Homer, *Odyssey* 11, 96)  
*so that I drink of the blood* [Genitive]  
b. ἐπεὶ πίνω αἷμα κελευστόν[accusative] (Homer, *Odyssey* 11, 98)  
*after having drunk the dark blood* [accusative]
- (2) λοεσσάμενος ποταμοῖο[Genitive] [instead of: ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ [dative]] (Homer, *Iliad* 21, 560)  
*after taking a (little) bath in the river*[Genitive]

The partitive genitive is however not a syntactic 'joker' (Meillet & Vendryes 1927: § 797, Serbat 1996) because its use instead of another inflectional case is not indifferent: the partitive genitive marks an operation within its constituent, which consists in isolating an indeterminate quantity from the whole. Humbert (1960:269–70) explains the difference between the two examples in (1) along this line: the first example, with the partitive genitive, relates the desire of Tiresias to drink some of the blood of the victims killed by Odysseus, whereas the second example, with the accusative, evokes the strength he draws from drinking the substance of blood.

In Latin, the genitive case marks dependency upon a noun and is thus fundamentally an adnominal case. The use of a genitive case that is not directly related to a nominal element, as exemplified by (3)

- (3) Manus, mortarium bene lavato; farinam[accusative] in mortarium indito; aquae[genitive] paulatim addito (Cato, *Agr.* 74, quoted by Serbat 1996: 364)  
*Wash well your hands and the mortar; put (some) wheat[accusative] in the mortar; add little by little of the water*[Genitive].

is infrequent and would perhaps even have passed unnoticed were it not widely attested in other Indo-European languages. The tendency to make use of a partitive genitive instead of another case was nevertheless present during the preclassical period and is mainly manifested in non-literary, technical texts, such as medical and culinary treatises (Väänänen 1981). It was repressed in the classical Latin period, because the marking of clear syntactic relations was privileged over the expression of subtle semantic distinctions (Serbat 1996). But the partitive construction surfaced again in Late Latin with a higher frequency, not only in the form of the genitive case but also as a prepositional construction with *de*. Examples are legion in popularizing texts of the 4th and 5th century, in particular by Christian authors.

- (4) Et sic *de pane illo* edat (*Vulgate*, I *Corinthians* 11, 28)  
*and so let him eat of the/that bread*

The destiny of this partitive construction marked by a preposition is very unequal in the Romance area: it evolved into a fully grammaticalized article in French, endowed with the features of indefiniteness and non singular, whereas it did not grammaticalize at all in Spanish and Portuguese, (North-)Italian occupying an intermediate position, showing up variation between the partitive article and zero marking.

In our contribution to the workshop, we will focus on the following research questions:

- (i) Which are the different stages of the grammaticalization from partitive construction to article that can be distinguished on the basis of the comparison between the Romance languages?

- (ii) How can we account for the difference between the Romance languages with respect to the grammaticalization of the partitive?
- (iii) Does the expression of the partitive under the form of a prepositional phrase rather than a case marker have an impact on the degree of grammaticalization?

#### References

- Blake, Barry 2001. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bosque, Ignacio - Demonte, Violeta. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Carlier, Anne. 2004. "Sur les premiers stades de développement de l'article partitif". *Scolia* 18: 115-146.
- Carlier, Anne. 2007. "From Preposition to Article : The Grammaticalization of the French Partitive". *Studies in Language* 31: 1-49.
- De Mulder, Walter - Lamiroy, Béatrice. "Stages of Grammaticalization: the position of French among the other Romance languages", in Cornillie B. & Cuyckens H. *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. (??)
- Korzen, Iorn. 1996. *L'articolo italiano fra concetto ed entità*. (*Etudes romanes* 26), Copenhagen : Museum Tusulanum Press
- Lamiroy, Béatrice - Goyens, Michèle - Melis, Ludo 2002. "Déplacement et repositionnement de la préposition A en français". *Linguisticae Investigationes* 25/2.
- Meillet, Antoine. & J. Vendryes. 1927. *Traité de grammaire comparée*. Paris: Champion.
- Presslich, Marion. 2000. *Partitivität und Indefinitheit*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- Renzi, Lorenzo *et al.* 2001. *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, vol. I. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Serbat, Guy. 1996. *Grammaire fondamentale du latin, Tome VI, 1: L'emploi des cas en latin: nominatif, vocatif, accusatif, génitif, datif*. Louvain: Peeters.