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---

1 This paper offers an explanation for a little-known but striking phenomenon first discussed by Jackendoff (1968b) that I will call ANTI-UNIQUENESS: partitives are incompatible with the definite determiner (*I met the one of John's friends*), unless the partitive first receives additional modification (*I met the [[one of John's friends] that he traveled with from Mexico]*). I argue that an independently needed refinement of the semantic analyses of the partitive of Ladusaw (1982) and Hoeksema (1984) automatically predicts these anti-uniqueness facts. More specifically, I propose that partitivity is always proper partitivity. This will guarantee that any property denoted by a partitive will have at least two entities in its extension, and cannot uniquely identify an individual; thus partitives are anti-unique. In addition, this paper makes a new case for analyzing double genitives as partitives. A number of syntactic and semantic arguments will show that despite appearances, so-called double genitives (*a friend of John's*) have less in common with a superficially quite similar type of simple genitive (*a friend of John*) than with standard partitives (*one of John's friends*). If double genitives are indeed a type of partitive, this explains why they also exhibit anti-uniqueness effects: *I met [the friend of John's] is bad but I met the [[friend of John's] that he traveled with from Mexico}* is perfectly fine.

2 from abstract of article: “whereas a post-N adjective combines with the head N as a fully closed-off functor category, a pre-N adjective modifies a component internal to N"
This paper discusses possible structural analyses of attributive adjectives. It argues that attributive adjectives should be given the same basic structure as predicative adjectives. Attributive adjectives are analysed as lexical heads, taking the noun as its right-hand specifier. This analysis, the SpecA-analysis, can account for a wide range of data concerning attributive adjectives. The paper addresses questions such as adjectival agreement, independently used adjectives, blocking effects caused by adjectives, head-movement of adjectives, and binding relations within the adjectival phrase.
complements of functional categories DET, COMP, and INFL, but not of lexical categories. The analysis is supported by interpretive processes of reconstruction and identified through strong agreement. In the case of ellipsis, agreement-type features make the empty category visible to proposes that both types of empty pronominals must be licensed under head-government to satisfy the Empty Category Principle, are empty, non-referential pronominals, subject to the same licensing and identification conditions as referential

general and universal principles. Lobeck argues that ellipted categories in IP (VP Ellipsis), DP (N’ Ellipsis), and CP (Sluicing)

pseudo-partitives, and complement prepositional phrases. illustrated in the appendix, shows the failure of all syntactic tests which purport to distinguish among measure phrases, partitives, and no special information need be included in the lexicon. Novel uses of words in classifier constructions require pragmatic meaning, as is evident in extended senses of these words. In many cases, classifier meaning follows from the normal meaning, properties must be directly represented in the lexicon, e.g.

partitives, pseudo-partitives, and measure phrases. For some words which function as classifiers, the lexical and collocational

(Thu is ‘generic’) vs. the Thursday meeting (Thu is deictic).


6 This book elaborates a theory of ellipsis that sheds new light on a well-known phenomenon, bringing it under the aegis of general and universal principles. Lobeck argues that ellipted categories in IP (VP Ellipsis), DP (N’ Ellipsis), and CP (Sluicing) are empty, non-referential pronominals, subject to the same licensing and identification conditions as referential pro. She proposes that both types of empty pronominals must be licensed under head-government to satisfy the Empty Category Principle, and identified through strong agreement. In the case of ellipsis, agreement-type features make the empty category visible to interpretive processes of reconstruction. These licensing and identification conditions derive the result that ellipses are complements of functional categories DET, COMP, and INFL, but not of lexical categories. The analysis is supported by

4 discusses adjectives coming in two distinct positions and relative meaning differences. thinks about: The Thursday meetings (Thu is ‘generic’) vs. the Thursday meeting (Thu is deictic).

5 Although not a classifier language, English has an open class of words functionally similar to classifiers, which include partitives, pseudo-partitives, and measure phrases. For some words which function as classifiers, the lexical and collocational properties must be directly represented in the lexicon, e.g. pride as the collective classifier for hon. Classifiers are not without meaning, as is evident in extended senses of these words. In many cases, classifier meaning follows from the normal meaning, and no special information need be included in the lexicon. Novel uses of words in classifier constructions require pragmatic rules of interpretation which depend on the prior existence of conventional classifiers. The syntax of classifiers in English, as illustrated in the appendix, shows the failure of all syntactic tests which purport to distinguish among measure phrases, partitives, pseudo-partitives, and complement prepositional phrases.
contrastive evidence from ellipsis in French and German, in which licensing and identification interact with Verb Raising, feature checking, and a parameter defining "strong" agreement

7 [distinguishes three types of locative modifiers semantically and syntactically. Eva signed the contract on the last page/in Argentina. In Argentina, Eva is very popular. First two are internal, external respectively and the last one is frame-setting.

Syntax, modifiers base-generated in German at periphery of ___: Internal: V, External: VP, Frame-setting: TopP. Semantics: Frame: linked to referent related to sentence topic, External: linked to verb’s eventuality argument, Internal: linked to a referent related to the verb’s eventuality.]

8 This is a simplified version of the analysis in "Quantifiers in Comparatives" with some additional arguments for the point of view taken there

---

9 A comparative study is treated here in which the differences and similarities between Dutch and Spanish systems are discussed that are constituted for nominal quantifier followed by another number, for example, een hoop toeristen/un montó de turistas. Various subtypes are presented and it is shown that, in spite of the difference caused by the absence/presence of the preposition, Dutch and Spanish systems have many characteristics in common. It is argued that in essence there are two distinguishable types of nominal quantifiers, that are characterized as 'lexical' or 'functional'. The most recent are transparent, in the sense that they do not block the accessibility of the second number's exterior processing of selection and concordance.