

Explorations in partitives and indefinite forms in Occitan and Franco-Provençal

Leonardo M. Savoia & Benedetta Baldi

In this contribution partitives and indefinite forms in Franco-Provençal and Occitan varieties of Piedmont will be investigated, also in comparison with other North-Italian systems. The central issue is the nature of the constructions where the preposition *de/di* (*DE*) ‘of’ does not introduce the usual possessive or partitive reading but an indefinite reading, as in the case of bare partitives/Partitive articles of Italian varieties; in negative contexts, these sequences can be generally associated with the wide vs narrow scope of negation. Our presentation focuses on these phenomena based on the revised framework proposed by Chomsky (2020, 2021) in terms of the operation of pair-merge.

1. In some Piedmontese dialects, such as that of Trecate, in (1)-(3), negation is introduced by a negative marker NM that selects a DE phrase including a bare plural count noun or a bare mass noun. In these varieties we find a distribution similar to that of French, where PAs introduce indefinite forms in positive contexts, in (1a,b), whereas in negative contexts indefinite forms are bare nouns selected by a partitive construction, in (2a,b), triggering the narrow reading of the indefinite within the scope of negation, in (3).

(1) a. ɔ vist d-i dɔn / d-i ɔm
 have.1SG.PRES seen of-ART.PL women / of-ART.PL men
 ‘I have seen (some) women/ men’

b. ɔ bi’vy d a vvik
 have.1SG.PRES drunk of-ART.SG wine
 ‘I have drunk (some) wine’

(2) a. ɔ vist mia ad dɔn / d ɔm
 have.1SG.PRES seen NM of women / of men
 ‘I didn’t see women / men’

b. mi bev-a mia ad vik
 I drink-1SG.PRES NM of wine
 ‘I don’t drink wine’

(3) $[\neg [\exists x [I \text{ beva } [_{VP} [VP [N \text{ mia } (x)]_{\subseteq P} \text{ ad } [NP \text{ vik }]]]]]$
 ‘I do not drink wine’

2. A different distribution characterizes Franco-Provençal and Occitan varieties, such as those of Coazze (Sangone Valley), and Pomaretto (Germanasca Valle), where the indefinite (non-presuppositional) is realized by the sequence *d+bare nouns* in any context. Thus, the dialect of Coazze, like French and Trecate, selects the partitive with bare nouns in contexts of the negative marker, here *pa*, as in (4a) and (4b), but unlike French it uses *d+bare noun* also in positive contexts, as in (5a,b) for objects and (6) for subjects. In other words, this dialect excludes PAs including the definite article, occurring instead in French, Italian and several Northern Italian dialects (cf. Baldi, Savoia 2021), and uses bare plural or mass nouns introduced by *of* in all contexts.

(4) a. i ei vy d dɔn-e / d ɔm
 SCI have.1SG seen of women-FPL/ of men
 ‘I have seen women/ men’

b. i ei by d viŋ
 SCI have.1SG drunk of wine
 ‘I have drunk wine’

(5) a. i ei pa vy d dɔn-e / d ɔm
 SCI have.1SG NM seen of women-FPL/ of men

- ‘I did not see women/ men’
- b. i ei pa by d viŋ
 SCI have.1SG NM drunk of wine
- ‘I did not drink wine’
- (6) a j ø d dɔn-e k i drøm-unt
 SCI has of women-FPL that SCI.PL sleep-3PL
- ‘there are women that are sleeping’

A similar distribution characterizes Occitan dialects, as the data from Pomaretto illustrate:

- (7) a. ai vi:t də dɔnn-a / d ɔm
 have.1SG seen of women-FPL / of men
- ‘I have seen women/ men’
- b. ai bə'gy də viŋ
 have.1SG drunk of wine
- ‘I have drunk wine’
- (8) a. ai pa vit də dɔnn-a / d ɔm
 have.1SG NM seen of women-FPL / of men
- ‘I did not see women/ men’
- b. ai pa bə'gy də viŋ
 have.1SG NM drunk of wine
- ‘I did not drink wine’
- bevu (pa) də viŋ / l viŋ
- (9) də dɔnn-a a dørməŋ də d lai
 of women-FPL SCI.fPL sleep-3PL there
- ‘women are sleeping’
- ɲ a bjən də dɔnn-a
 of.them have.3sg a.lot of woman-pl
- ‘there are many women’

3. Differently from the dialect of Trecate, in these dialects indefinite forms are however expressed by bare plural/ mass nouns, excluding the definite article: (i) indefinite forms are partitive constructs excluding a presuppositional reading; (ii) the sequence DE+*bare noun* determines the agreement of the verb, as in (6)-(9), suggesting that the plural inflection of the noun is somehow read by T/v. The lack of a definite article entails the narrow scope. Naturally, generic definite articles are otherwise usual. Resuming the analysis in Baldi and Savoia (2022), *de* introduces a subset of a set of individuals or parts of a mass as it normally does (as an instantiation of the elementary part-whole relation, [\subseteq], cf. Manzini and Savoia 2011), where inclusion encompasses partitives and genitives (Lorusso and Franco 2017). Moreover, DE+*bare noun* gives rise to the agreement, however exactly as in partitives. The proposals whereby PAs belong to the special category of ‘plural indefinite determiners’ (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2016) or are prepositional heads moving to a higher position (Chierchia 1998) are discussed in Baldi and Savoia (2022). Against these proposals, is also the fact that in these dialects DE introduces a bare noun, thus excluding the problem represented by the definite determiner. Even if we consider these constructs true partitives, the question shoes up on how the agreement with the verb can be realized in contexts where DE+*bare noun* is the subject, as in (6)-(9). Lorusso and Franco (2017), addressing quantified NPs, propose that P may or may not behave like a phase boundary. Taking into account their insight, we maintain the idea that indefinite, partitive, and genitive constructs are based on the same elementary predicate [\subseteq], expressed by *de/ of*, which introduces the super-set of individuals or parts the head noun belongs to. As to the issue of agreement, we retain the analysis in Manzini and Savoia (2018), and Baldi and Savoia (2022), that treats agreement as the result of the identification of phi-feature bundles specifying the same argument, i.e. denoting a single

