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Partitive/quantitative pronouns

**Romance:**

French: (1a) J’ai lu **deux livres.** > J’en ai lu **deux.**
I have read two books > I EN have read two
‘I read two books.’ > ‘I read two.’

Italian: (1b) Ho visto **tre ragazzi.** > Ne ho visti **tre.**
have-1.SG seen three boys > NE have-1SG seen-M.PL three
‘I saw three boys.’ > ‘I saw three.’

**Germanic:**

Dutch: (2a) Ik heb **er twee** gekocht. [boeken]
I have ER two bought [books]
‘I bought two.’

Luxembourgish: (2b) Si huet **der dräi.** [Kanner]
she has DER three [children]
‘She has three.’

(Central) Hessian: (2c) Eich hun **ere finf.** [Geschwesder]
I have ERE five [siblings]
‘I have five.’

⇒ micro- and mesocomparative analysis
Previous work on partitive/quantitative pronouns:

French:

Italian:
Belletti & Rizzi (1981), Burzio (1986), Cordin (in Renzi 1988),

Dutch:
Bennis & Hulk (1979), Bennis (1986), De Rooij (1991), De Schutter (1992),
Corver, Van Koppen & Kranendonk (2009), Kranendonk (2010)

German dialects:
French clitic pronoun *en*
(Pollock 1986, 1998; Ihsane 2013)

- **partitive:**
  (3) Jean a acheté *trois de mes peintures*. > Jean *en* a acheté *trois*.
  J. has bought three of my paintings > J. EN has bought three
  ‘Jean bought three of my paintings.’ > ‘Jean bought three of them.’

- **quantitative:**
  (4a) J’ai lu *beaucoup/peu de livres*. > J’en ai lu *beaucoup/peu*.
  I have read many/few of books > I EN have read many/few
  ‘I read many/few books.’ > ‘I read many/few.’
  (4b) J’ai lu *deux/plusieurs livres*. > J’en ai lu *deux/plusieurs*.
  I have read two/several books > I EN have read two/several
  ‘I read two/several books.’ > ‘I read two/several.’

- **des/du NPs (partitive article):**
  (5) Marie cherche *des souris/du sel*. > Marie *en* cherche.
  M. is-looking-for of-the mice/of-the salt > M. EN is-looking-for
  ‘Marie is looking for mice/salt.’ > ‘Marie is looking for some.’

cf. also
*beaucoup des livres*
‘a lot of the books’
*beaucoup de livres*
‘a lot of books’
= **quantitative** (Ihsane 2013)
French clitic pronoun *en*
(Pollock 1986, 1998; Ihsane 2013)

- **genitive/adnominal:**

   I know the author of this book > I EN know the author
   ‘I know the author of this book.’ > ‘I know the author of it.’

- **prepositional:**

(7a) Jean se souvient de tous ses étudiants. > Jean s’en souvient.
   J. REFL remembers of all his students > J. REFL EN remembers
   ‘Jean remembers all his students.’ > ‘Jean remembers them.’

(7b) Il est drôlement fier de son idée. > Il en est drôlement fier.
   he is terribly proud of his idea > he EN is terribly proud
   ‘He is terribly proud of his idea.’ > ‘He is terribly proud of it.’
Dutch *er*
(e.g. ANS, De Rooij 1991, De Schutter 1992, Kranendonk 2010)

- **partitive/quantitative:**

  (8a) *Hoeveel kinderen* heeft u? – Ik heb *er vier.*
  how many children have you – I have ER four
  ‘How many children do you have? – I have four (of them).’

  (8b) Hebben jullie *veel boeken*? – Ja, wij hebben *er veel.*
  have you many books – yes we have ER many
  ‘Do you have many books? – Yes, we have many (of them).’

**Germanic:**
Dutch and
(Central) German dialects:

- **partitive pronominals**
  but – like Catalan
  (cf. Martí-Girbau 2010) –
  **no partitive articles**
  (except for faded partitive construction in Dutch?
  cf. e.g. De Hoop 2003)
Dutch er
(e.g. ANS, De Rooij 1991, De Schutter 1992, Kranendonk 2010)

• expletive/replete/existential/presentative:

(9a) Er loopt een man op straat.
ER goes a man on street
‘There is a man on the street.’

(9b) Toen kwam er een pastoor.
then came ER a priest
‘Then came a priest.’

(9c) Er is/zijn ...
ER is/are ...
‘There is/are …’

• locative:

lives he in A. – he lives ER already years
‘Does he live in Amsterdam? – He has already lived there for years.’

• prepositional/pronominal:

(11) Dat ongeluk is al zo lang geleden gebeurd, ik denk er nooit meer aan.
that accident is already so long past happened I think ER never anymore PREP
‘That accident already happened such a long time ago, I never think about it anymore.’
Structural properties of partitive/quantitative pronouns

Romance:
French and Italian partitive pronouns *en/ne* ↔

Germanic:
Dutch quantitative pronoun *er*
dialectal German indefinite-partitive pronouns *(d)(e)r(e), s(e)n, es* ...

→ **Micro- and mesovariation** with respect to
  - the interpretative gap and its antecedent
  - the quantificational element
  - their distribution (restrictions/asymmetries)
  - their syntax (syntactic nature of the interpretative gap, level of pronominalization ➔ analyses)
The interpretative gap and its antecedent: (In)definiteness

- **Romance** and **Germanic** partitive/quantitative pronouns
  (Fr. *en*/It. *ne* and Du. *er*) = indefinite:

**French** (Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002):

(12a) J’ai acheté **une voiture rouge**, et Marie *en* a acheté **une jaune**.
- I have bought a car red and **M. EN** has bought a yellow
  ‘I bought a red car and Marie bought a yellow one.’

(12b) J’ai acheté **la voiture rouge**, et Marie (*en*) a acheté **la jaune**.
- I have bought the car red and **M. (EN)** has bought the yellow
  ‘I bought the red car and Marie bought the yellow one.’

**Dutch** (Broekhuis & Den Dikken 2012):

(13a) Jan heeft **drie boeken** meegenomen. > Jan heeft **er drie** meegenomen.
- J. has three books taken-along > J. has ER three taken-along
  ‘Jan took along three books.’ > ‘Jan took along three.’

(13b) Jan heeft **de drie boeken** meegenomen. > *Jan heeft **er de drie** meegenomen.
- J. has the three books taken-along > *J. has ER the three taken-along
  ‘Jan took along the three books.’ > ‘Jan took along the three.’
The interpretative gap and its antecedent: (In)definiteness

⇔ **English one-anaphora**: in indefinite & definite phrases

(14a) I bought a red car, and Mary bought a yellow one.
(14b) I bought the red car, and Mary bought the yellow one.

⇔ **antecedent = non-specific** (Cordin in Renzi 1988, Cardinaletti & Giusti 1992):

(15a) Volevo una bicicletta, ma non ne/*la vendono più del tipo che piace a me. ⇔
wanted-1.SG a bike but not NE/*it sell-3.PL anymore of-the kind that pleases to me
‘I wanted a bike but they don’t sell the kind I like anymore.’

(15b) Ho trovato [una bicicletta che avevo messo in cantina] dopo che l’/*ne avevo rotti.
have-1.SG found a bike that had-1.SG put in basement after that it/*NE had-1.SG broken
‘I found a bike which I had put in the basement after I had ruined it.’

(16a) Ne ho visti molti (= non-specific individuals) ⇔
NE have-1.SG seen-M.PL many
‘I saw many.’

(16b) Ho visto molti di loro (= a specific group)
have-1.SG see many of them
‘I saw many of them.’
The interpretative gap and its antecedent:
Countability

- **Romance** (and **Belgian Dutch**): same morphological form, i.e. **one pronoun** Fr. *en*/*It. ne* (Du. *er*) for both masc. and fem. as well as sing. or plur. antecedent nouns (**plur. terms** and **mass nouns**):

(17a) **Quanti anni** ha? – Secondo me **ne** ha **trentadue**. [**MASC. PLUR.**]
how-many years has-3.SG – according-to me NE has-3.SG thirty-two
‘How old is he? – I think he’s thirty-two.’

(17b) Hai visto **molte persone**? – No, **ne** ho viste **poche**. [**FEM. PLUR.**]
have-2.SG seen many people – no NE have-1.SG seen-F.PL few
‘Have you seen many people? – No, I have seen few.’

(17c) Hai bevuto **molto/-a vino/birra**? – Si, ne ho bevuto/-a **molto/-a**. [**MASC./FEM. MASS**]
have-2.SG drunk much wine/beer – yes NE have-1.SG drunk much
‘Did you drink much wine/beer? – Yes, I drank much.’
The interpretative gap and its antecedent: Countability

- **Standard Dutch** *(Du. *er*): antecedent must be a *count noun*:

  (18a) Jan heeft *twee boeken* en Piet heeft *er drie*.  
  J. has two books and P. has ER three  
  ‘Jan has two books and Piet has three.’

  (18b) *Jan heeft *veel wijn* maar Piet heeft *er weinig*.  
  *J. has much wine but P. has ER few  
  ‘Jan has much wine but Piet has few.’
The interpretative gap and its antecedent:

Countability

- **(Central) German** (and some Dutch dialects: e.g. Brabantish and Limburgish): distinct forms for plur. count nouns & fem. mass nouns: *(d)(e)r(e)* and masc./neut. mass nouns: *(s)e(n)/es* (Brab./Limb.: *es/‘t*)

  e.g. Luxembourgish:

  (19a) Huet si Kanner? – Ech mengen, si huet der dräi.  
  
  has she children – I think she has DER three  
  ‘Does she have children? – I think that she has three.’

  
  have you milk – yes I have DER still  
  ‘Do you have milk? – Yes, I still have some.’

  
  want you still wine – no thanks I have ES still  
  ‘Would you like some more wine? – No, thanks, I still have some.’

  
  drink you still water – now have I ES enough drunk  
  ‘Do you want some more water? – Now I have drunk enough (of it).’
The interpretative gap and its antecedent: Mismatch in number

- gap and antecedent may exhibit a mismatch in number:

**Dutch** (Broekhuis & Den Dikken 2012):

(20a) Jan heeft **één boek** en Piet heeft **er drie**. → anteced. = SING. ⊄ gap = PLUR.

  J. has one book and P. has ER three
  ‘Jan has one book and Piet has three.’

(20b) Jan heeft **twee boeken** en Piet heeft **er één**. → anteced. = PLUR. ⊄ gap = SING.

  J. has two books and P. has ER one
  ‘Jan has two books and Piet has one.’

= **Italian** (Cresti 2003):

(21a) Maria ha **un cappello verde** ed io **ne** ho **due rossi**. → anteced. = SING. ⊄ gap = PLUR.

  M. has a hat green and I NE have-1.SG two red
  ‘Maria has a green hat and I have two red ones.’

(21b) Voi avete **tre cavalli** ed io **ne** ho **uno**. → anteced. = PLUR. ⊄ gap = SING.

  you have-2.PL three horses and I NE have-1.SG one
  ‘You have three horses and I have one.’
The interpretative gap and its antecedent: Mismatch in number

Note: a paraphrase of

Maria ha un cappello verde ed io ne ho due rossi

would be ... ed io ho due cappelli rossi

and the English equivalent to ne involves one-insertion/one-anaphora:
‘... and I have two red ones’

→ quantitative, not partitive:
‘Mary has a green hat and I have two of them (which are red)’

→ antecedent = hat-, a constituent not marked for number! (Cresti 2003)
The interpretative gap and its antecedent:
No unitary status: various subparts of a DP

- Fr. *en*/*it. ne* and Du. *er* can stand in for a *variety* of *subconstituents* of a DP 
  ➔ no unitary status as a *pro-form*: pro-*N*, pro-*N’*, pro-*NP*

Italian (Cinque 1991, Cresti 2003):

(22a) Carlo ha letto un *lavoro* su Jung ed io ne ho letto uno __ (= *lavoro*) su Freud
    C. has read a paper on Jung and I NE have read one on Freud
(22b) Carlo ha letto un *lavoro* su Freud e anch’io ne ho letto uno __ (= *lavoro su Freud*)
    C. has read a paper on Freud and also I NE have read one
(22c) Carlo ha letto un *lavoro* su Freud di Marianne Krüll e anch’io ne ho letto uno __
    (= *lavoro su Freud di Marianne Krüll*)
    C. has read a paper on Freud of Marianne Krüll and also I NE have read one

(23) Gianni ha comprato *una grande foto di Venezia*
    G. has bought a big photo of Venice
    (a) ... e Mario ne ha comprata una *piccola* __ (= *foto / foto di Venezia*)
        ... and M. NE has bought a/one small ‘... and Mario bought a small one.’
    (b) ... e Mario ne ha comprata una __ (= *foto / grande foto*) di Firenze
        ... and M. NE has bought a/one of Florence ‘... and Mario bought one of Florence.’
The interpretative gap and its antecedent: No unitary status: various subparts of a DP

Dutch (Broekhuis & Den Dikken 2012):

(24a) Ik heb **twee** poppen **met blond** haar  
I have two dolls with blond hair  
en Jan heeft **er drie** (= **poppen**) **met donker** haar  
and J. has ER three with dark hair  
‘I have two dolls with blond hair and Jan has three with dark hair.’

(24b) Jan gaf **een bewijs** dat **de aarde rond is**  
J. gave a proof that the earth round is  
en Piet gaf **er drie** (= **bewijzen** dat **de aarde rond is**)  
and P. gave ER three  
‘Jan gave a proof that the earth is a sphere and Piet gave three.’
The quantificational element:
Co-occurrence with certain quantifiers

- **existential** quantifiers:
  - cardinals and degree quantifiers / vague numerals ‘(many, few, some)’

(25a) It.: Di ragazzi, ne ho visti molti.
    of boys NE have-1.SG seen-M.PL many
    ‘I saw many (boys).’

(25b) Du.: Jan heeft weinig boeken maar Marie heeft er veel.
    J. has few books but M. has ER many
    ‘Jan has few books but Marie has many.’

- **other** quantity expressions: quantificational element *enough*,
  binominal constructions with quantificational nouns *(a couple of, a lot of)*
  and measure nouns *(a bottle of)*

(26a) It.: Ne ho visti abbastanza.
    NE have-1.SG seen-M.PL enough
    ‘I have seen enough (of them).’

(26b) Du.: Ik heb er nog een paar/een boel.
    I have ER still a couple/a lot
    ‘I still have a couple/a lot (of them).’
The quantificational element:
Co-occurrence with certain quantifiers

- **universal** quantifiers *(all, both)*

  (27a) It.: *Ne ho visti **tutti**.
  *NE have-1.SG seen-M.PL all
  ‘I saw all (of them).’

  (27b) Du.: *Jan heeft **er alle** meegenomen.
  *J. has ER all taken-along
  ‘Jan took along all (of them).’

- **distributive** quantifiers *(every, each)*

  (28a) It.: *Ne ho visti/o **ogni** / **ognuno/ciascuno**.
  *NE have-1.SG seen(-M.PL) each/every (one) / everyone
  ‘I saw each/every (one) / everyone (of them).’

  (28b) Du.: *Ik heb **er elk(e)**/ieder(e) / **iedereen** gezien.
  *I have ER each/every (one) / everyone seen
  ‘I saw each/every (one) / everyone (of them).’

(cf. also Cardinaletti & Giusti 2006, Broekhuis & Den Dikken 2012)
The **quantificational element**:

**Co-occurrence with certain quantifiers**

→ **weak vs. strong quantifiers:**

cf. also Du. *enkele* (‘sm’) ⇔ *sommige* (‘some’) (Broekhuis & Den Dikken 2012):

(29) Jan heeft **er enkele /som**mige**ge** meegenomen.

J. has ER sm/*some taken-along
‘Jan took along some (of them).’

(although **some strong det.** seem to be able to be stranded by ne-cliticization in **Italian**: ‘most’ and other **proportional det.**, cf. Cresti 2003)

(30) Ieri ho comprato **un chilo di** farina; ne ho usata **la maggior parte** per fare il pane.

yesterday have-1.SG bought a kilo of flour NE have-1.SG used-F.SG the biggest part for make the bread
‘Yesterday, I bought a kilo of flour; I have used most of it in order to make bread.’
The quantificational element:
Co-occurrence with ONE/NO

- **Du. quant. er** is obligatorily present with the singular quantifier **ONE** (één) and the negative quantifier **NO** (geen), whereas in **(Central) German dialects** the **pronominal genitive (e)r(e)** is **ungrammatical** in these cases (ein-/kein-):

(31) Du.: **Hoeveel boeken** heb jij? – Ik heb *(er) één/geen.
    how-many books have you – I have *(ER) one/none
    ‘How many books do you have? – I have one/none.’

⇔ Eastern Thur. (Weise 1906):

(32) Hast du **Äpfel**? – Ich håå *(er) enn/kenn.
    have you apples – I have *(ER) one/none
    ‘Do you have apples? – I have one/none.’

Hess. (SyHD): **all dialects** with partitive genitive pronouns:

(33a) **Wie viele Gummibärchen** hat Helmut? – Helmut hat *(ere) ein(e)s.
    how many jelly-babies has H. – H. has *(ERE) one
    ‘How many jelly babies does Helmut have? – Helmut has one.’

(33b) Haben wir noch **Plätzchen**? – Nein, wir haben *(ere) keine(/-s) mehr.
    have we still biscuits – no we have *(ERE) none anymore
    ‘Do we still have biscuits? – No, we don’t have any anymore.’
The quantificational element: Co-occurrence with ONE/NO

.equivalence

Lux.: difference between full and reduced forms of the partitive genitive pronouns:
full forms där/däers = possible (facultative), reduced forms der/es = ungrammatical:

(34a) Ech hunn där keng. ⇔ *Ech hunn der keng. (PLUR. & FEM. SING.)
I have DÄR none
‘I don’t have any.‘

*I have DER none

(34b) Ech hunn däers keen. ⇔ *Ech hunn es keen. (MASC./NEUT. SING.)
I have DÄERS none
‘I don’t have any.‘

*I have ES none

(Thanks to Caroline Döhmer for the data on Luxembourgish!)
The quantificational element:

No quantifier

- Part./quant. pronouns without any quantitative (or qualitative) specification:

  Italian (Cordin in Renzi 1988):
  
  (35) Se trovi delle paste come quelle che piacciono a me, compramene (otto/alcune)!
  
  ‘If you find pastries like those I like, buy me some (/eight/a few).’

  (↔ cases with no overt, but an understood quantifier, cf. Bentley 2006:
  *Il prof. ne ha bocciati, studenti → rising intonation, typical of exclamations: ’many/a lot’,
  Libri, Lucia ne legge → absence of rising intonation: ’some’*)
The quantificational element:

No quantifier

⇔ Dutch: in the **prototypical case**, a quantificational element is present
→ **not all speakers** accept examples with **quant. er “alone”**
(not in Northern varieties):

(36) **Handdoeken**? %Ik heb er (nog).
towels? %I have ER (still)
‘Towels? I (still) have some.’

(⇔ **without quantification**, but **with further qualification** (adjunct-PP or relative clause):

**Handdoeken**? *Ik heb er van uitstekende kwaliteit/die pas nieuw zijn*
= acceptable in **all** varieties of Dutch)
The quantificational element:
No quantifier

\( \Rightarrow \) (Central) German dialects, e.g. Hess.:

*ere/sen* is also grammatical without a remnant
(and contrary to Dutch, these pron. are only facultative
when a quantifier is present):

(37a)  Hei sein *ere!* [Pilze]
       here are ERE [mushrooms]
       ‘Here are some.’

(37b)  Soll eich *sen* holle? [Fleisch]
       shall I SEN fetch [meat]
       ‘Shall I get some?’

\( \Rightarrow \) cf. Standard & Low/Northern Ge. indefinite(-partitive) pronouns
*welch-/we(l)k*- and Bav. generalized *ein*-
**wat voor/was für-construction**

- Du. quant. *er* may also occur in the *wat voor*-construction
  = surprising because this is **not a quantificational** but a **type-denoting** expression!

  (38a) **Wat** heeft Peter *er voor* één? *[auto]*
  what has P. ER for a/one [car]
  ‘What kind (of car) does Peter have?’

  (→ **spurious article** *een* = obligatorily **stressed**,
  **interpretative gap** must be construed as **sing**.)! cf. Broekhuis & Den Dikken 2012)

  (↔ **Northern colloquial Dutch**, cf. Corver & Van Koppen 2009:
  (Over *schoenen* gesproken) **Wat voor** heb jij (er) gekocht?)

  = (Central) **German dial.**, e.g. Rhine Franc., Central & East Hess. (SyHD):
  **ere** in the analytic interrogative construction **was für**?

  (38b) **Was** sinn des *fer(re)?/Was* *fer(re) sin des?* *[Pilze]*
  what are that for (ERE)/what for (ERE) are that [mushrooms]
  ‘What kind (of mushrooms) are those?’

  (Over *schoenen* gesproken) **Wat voor** heb jij (er) gekocht?)
Extraction of partitive/quantitative pronouns: Restrictions/Asymmetries

Italian:
(cf. e.g. Belletti & Rizzi 1981, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2006)

• direct obj.: ✓

(39) Ne visiterò alcuni.
NE visit-FUT-1.SG some
‘I will visit some (of them).’

⇔ indirect/prepositional obj.: X

(40a) *Gianni ne parlerà a due.
G. NE speak-FUT-3.SG to two
‘Gianni will speak to two (of them).’

(40b) *Me ne sono occupato di alcuni.
REFL NE be-1.SG occupied-M.SG of some
‘I occupied myself with some (of them).’

(40c) *Me ne sono concentrata su alcuni.
REFL NE be-1.SG concentrated-F.SG on some
‘I concentrated myself on some (of them).’

\( ne = \text{obligatory in dir. obj. pos. (selected):} \)

- Gianni trascorrerà tre settimane a Milano.
  > Gianni *(ne) trascorrerà tre a Milano.

⇔ contrasts with adverbial phrase:

- Gianni è rimasto tre settimane a Milano.
  > *Gianni (ne) è rimasto tre a Milano.

(Belletti & Rizzi 1981)
Extraction of partitive/quantitative pronouns: Restrictions/Asymmetries

• postverbal unaccusative/ergative subj.: ✓
  (41) Ne sono arrivati/venuti molti.
  NE be-3.PL arrived/come many ‘Many have arrived/come.’
  ⇔ preverbal unaccusative/ergative subj.: X
  (42) Molti (*ne) sono arrivati/venuti.
       many (*NE) be-3.PL arrived/come ‘Many have arrived/come.’

• preverbal/postverbal (in)trans. subj.: X
  (43a) Molti (*ne) hanno partecipato alla festa.
       many (*NE) have-3.PL participated at-the party
       ‘Many (of them) participated at the party.’
  (43b) *(Ne) hanno partecipato alla festa molti.
       *(*NE) have-3.PL participated at-the party many
       ‘Many (of them) participated at the party.’
  (44a) Molti (*ne) hanno visto Maria.
       many (*NE) have-3.PL seen M.
       ‘Many (of them) saw Maria.’
  (44b) *(Ne) hanno visto Maria molti.
       *(*NE) have-3.PL seen M. many
       ‘Many (of them) saw Maria.’

  cf. also adjectival predicates
  (Cinque 1990):
  – Ne sono note
    solo alcune (...) poesie ⇔
  – *Ne sono buoni
    pochi (...) articoli

Semantic representation (Bentley 2006):
ne-cliticization = only available for an argument of a state predicate
(states, achievements, accomplishments)
→ rules out ne-cliticization of the argument of activity predicates:
  – *Attori, ne cantano molti.
    *actors NE sing-3.PL many
    ‘Many (actors/of them) sing.’
Extraction of partitive/quantitative pronouns:
Restrictions/Asymmetries

⇔ Dutch (cf. e.g. Bennis 1986):

• subj.:
  - ergative subj.:
    (45a) Gisteren zijn *(er) twee gekomen.
    yesterday are *(ER) two come
    ‘Yesterday, two came.’
  - non-ergative subj. of an intrans. verb:
    (45b) Gisteren hebben *(er) twee gewandeld.
    yesterday have *(ER) two walked
    ‘Yesterday, two went for a walk.’
  - subj. of a trans. verb:
    (45c) Gisteren hebben *(er) twee een boek gekocht.
    yesterday have *(ER) two a book bought
    ‘Yesterday, two bought a book.’

quant. er cannot occur in sentence-initial pos.
⇔ prepositional, locative, expletive er:
*Er zijn twee verschenen
*Er hebben enkele mensen haar twee gegeven

Du. quant. er with subj.:
- Vier zijn (er) geslaagd. [studenten]
- Twee moeten er oproimen/
  Er moeten er twee oproimen. [kinderen]

= (Central) German dialects:
- (East) Hess.: Fia sinn ere
  (da devou) scho ferhaired. [Kinder]
- Mos. Franc. (Hunsr.): Feier hon er
  sisch gemelt. (Reuter 1989)
Extraction of partitive/quantitative pronouns: Restrictions/Asymmetries

- **dir. obj.:**
  (46) Gisteren heb ik *(er) twee gekocht.
  yesterday have I *(er) two bought
  ‘Yesterday, I bought two (of them).’

- **indirect obj.:**
  (47) Ik heb er een paar chocola gegeven. [kinderen]
  I have ER a few chocolate given [children]
  ‘I gave some (of them) chocolate.’

- **out of a complement-PP:**
  (48a) Ik heb (er) aan een paar geschreven. [studenten]
  I have (ER) to a few written [students]
  ‘I wrote to some (of them).’
  (48b) Ik heb (er) al met veel gesproken. [studenten]
  I have (ER) already with many spoken [students]
  ‘I have already spoken with many (of them).’

(Thanks to Hanneke Berends for some grammaticality judgements on Dutch!)

**quant. er** can also bind empty category of two quantified noun phrases (subj. & obj. pos.):
- ... dat **er [twee e]** [één e] gekocht hebben.
  (Bennis 1986)

**quant. er** can be associated with a noun phrase in a complement-PP:
- Ik heb er lang **over twee gepiekerd.**
  [problemen]
  ⇔ but not in a time adverbial:
  - *(Ik heb dat boek **er tijdens twee** gelezen. [vergaderingen]
  (Broekhuis & Den Dikken 2012)
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns: Adjectives

Italian (cf. e.g. Cinque 1991; Cardinaletti & Giusti 1992, 2006): pre- vs. postnominal APs: postnominal adj. can be stranded by ne-cliticization, but prenominal adj. can’t:

(49a) Ho letto **un libro bello**. > **Ne ho letto uno bello**.
    have-1.SG read a book nice > NE have-1.SG read a nice
    ‘I read a nice book.’ > ‘I read a nice one.’

(49b) Si è fatta **una mera illusione**/*una illusione mera**. > * **Se ne è fatta una mera**.
    REFL be-3.SG made-F.SG a mere illusion/*an illusion mere > *REFL NE be-3.SG made-F.SG a mere
    ‘She made herself a mere illusion.’ > ‘She made herself a mere one.’

→ **mero** = only prenominal  ➔ ungrammatical with ne-cliticization

(49c) Hanno dato **una certa notizia** ⇔ **una notizia certa**.
    have-3.PL given a **certain** (= particular) piece-of-news ⇔ a piece-of-news **certain** (= sure)
    ‘They gave a **certain** (= particular ⇔ sure) piece of news.’
    > **Ne** hanno data **una certa** (‘certain’ = **sure**).
    NE have-3.PL given-F.SG a **certain** (= **sure**)
    ‘They gave a **certain** (= **sure**) one.’

→ **certo** maintains only postnominal interpretation in the cliticization construction
    (cf. also **diversi, grande, numerosi, nuovo, semplice, unico** etc.)
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns:
Adjectives


(50) Ho un argomento principale/*un principale argomento. > #Ne ho uno principale.
    have-1SG an argument main/*a main argument > #NE have-1.SG a main
    ‘I have a main argument.’ > ‘I have a main one.’

→ principale can only be attributive, ungrammatical in predicative constructions:
   *Questo argomento è principale/*Ritengo questo argomento principale

→ only those adj. that can occur in predicative pos. can appear in ne-constructions

(51) *Ne ho comprati (gli) interessanti.
    *NE have-1.SG bought-M.PL (the) interesting
    ‘I have bought (the) interesting (ones).’

→ prep. di = optional with predicative adj.: Ne conosco due (di) simpatici,
    but obligatory with a non-overt/empty quantifier: Ne conosco ∅ *{di) simpatici

prenominal adj. giving rise to grammatical results:

(52a) Fr. J’ai vu un grand livre. > J’en ai vu un grand.
    I have seen a big book > I EN have seen a big ‘I saw a big book.’ > ‘I saw a big one.’

(52b) It. Gianni ha comprato una grande foto (di Venezia) e Mario ne ha comprata una piccola.
    G. has bought a big photo (of Venice) and M. NE has bought a small
    ‘Gianni bought a big photo (of Venice) and Mario bought a small one.’
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns: Adjectives

It. Maria ha un cappello verde ed io ne ho due rossi.
(‘two red ones’)

⇌ (Northern Standard) Dutch:

(53a) Hij heeft vijf rode appels en ik heb (*er) vier groene.
      he has five red apples and I have (*ER) four green
      ‘He has five red apples and I have four green (ones).’

= (Central) German dialects, e.g. Hess. (SyHD):

(53b) Hier sind (*ere) bloß kleine. [Erdbeeren]
      here are (*ERE) only small [strawberries]
      ‘Here are only small ones.’

⇒ Du. er and Hess. ere do not co-occur with adjectives
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns: Adjectives

- **but:** part./quant. pronouns can co-occur with adjectives in Southern/Belg. Dutch varieties as well as in High/Highest Alem. dialects (language contact with French and/or Italian?):

  East Flemish (Corver, Van Koppen & Kranendonk 2009):

  (54a) Hij hee *vijf ruuë appels* en ik he *(der) vier groene*.
      he has five red apples and I have (DER) four green
      ‘He has five red apples and I have four green (ones).’

  Bernese German (Hodler 1969):

  (54b) Wi gsez *d’Öpfel us?* – Es hat *ere schöni*, aber es syn *ere fuli* drunder.
      how look the apples PRT – it has ERE nice but it are ERE rotten among
      ‘How about the apples? – There are nice ones but there are rotten ones among them, too.’
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns: Modification vs. complementation

well-known **contrast**, e.g. from Engl. (cf. e.g. Corver & Van Koppen 2011, Günther 2013):

nominal ellipsis as well as **one-insertion**

 = possible with **postnominal modifiers (adjuncts)**,
  
but not with **arguments (complements)**:

• **adjunct- vs. complement-PPs:**
  
nominal ellipsis:
  
(55a) I talked with these students from Germany and with these from Italy. ⇔
  
(55b) *I talked with these students of physics and with these of chemistry.
  
**one-insertion:**
  
(56a) I met the student from Germany but I didn’t meet the one from Italy. ⇔
  
(56b) *The destruction of Rome was as cruel as the one of Carthage.

• **relative vs. complement clauses:**
  
**one-insertion:**
  
(57a) the rumor that John heard yesterday and the one that Mary had heard the day before ⇔
  
(57b) *the rumor that Bill would be fired and the one that John would keep his job
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns: Modification vs. complementation

Italian (cf. e.g. Cinque 1991; Cardinaletti & Giusti 1992, 2006):

• **adjunct- vs. complement-PPs:**

(58a) **Ne ho alcuni di buona qualità.**
NE have-1.SG a-few of good quality
‘I have a few of good quality.’

(58b) ***Di studenti, ne conosco due in medicina.**
*Of students NE know-1.SG two in medicine
‘I know two (students) of medicine.’

(⇔ *Maria conosce tre racconti del nonno > Maria ne conosce tre del nonno*
= argument of the noun or modificational/adjointed?
⇒ *not a real argument* of the noun, but a *modifier* occurring in the postnominal predicative position ⇔ *complements* that *cannot* occur as *predicates* are also *ungrammatical with ne*, cf. Cinque 1991, Cardinaletti & Giusti 1992)
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns: Modification vs. complementation

• relative vs. complement clauses:

(59a) Di libri, ne ho letti due di cui non ricordo ora il titolo.
Of books NE have-1.SG read-M.PL two of which not remember-1.SG now the title
‘I read two (books) of which I don’t remember the title now.’

(⇔ ne can also pronominalize a noun phrase that contains a relative clause: 
Di libri di cui non ricordo ora il titolo, ne ho letti due, cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2006)

(59b) C’è una possibilità che Maria venga. > *Ce n’è una che Maria venga.
there is a possibility that M. comes > *there NE is a/one that M. comes
‘There is a possibility that Maria comes.’ > *‘There is one that Maria comes.’
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns: Modification vs. complementation

Dutch & (Central) German dialects (Hess.):

- **adjunct- vs. complement-PPs:**

  **Standard Dutch** (Kranendonk 2010):
  
  (60a) Ik heb er twee uit Frankrijk. [stoelen]
  
  I have ER two from France [chairs] ‘I have two from France.’

  **Central Hessian** (SyHD):
  
  (60b) Letzten Winter hu eich ere von sehr gouter Qualität gekaafft. [Stiefel]
  
  Last winter have I ERE of very good quality bought [boots]
  ‘Last winter I have bought some of very high quality.’

  **Standard Dutch** (Kranendonk 2010):
  
  (61a) Jij hebt er tween (*aan mij) geschonden. [beloftes]
  
  you have ER two (*to me) broken [promises] ‘You have broken two (promises) to me.’

  ⇔ **Central Hessian** (SyHD):
  
  (61b) Ich hu kaa Froe mehr aa dich, awwer host douere noch aa mich? [Fragen]
  
  I have no questions anymore to you but have you ERE still to me [questions]
  ‘I don’t have any questions anymore to you but do you have some (questions) to me?’

  (cf. also StGe. welch- and Bav. ein-)
Syntactic distribution of part./quant. pronouns:  
Modification vs. complementation

- **relative vs. complement clauses:**

  **Standard Dutch (ANS 8·6·5·2·i):**

  (62a) Hij had *veel goede leerlingen*, maar hij had *er* ook *(drie) die absoluut niet konden rekenen.*
          he had many good pupils but he had ER also (three) who absolutely not could calculate
          ‘He had many good pupils but he had also some/three who couldn’t do the maths at all.’

  **Central Hessian (SyHD):**

  (62b) Es gebd *ere, dej giehn goar net en die Kirch.*
          it gives ERE who go at-all not in the church
          ‘There are some who don’t go to church at all.’

  **Standard Dutch (Blom 1975/76):**

  (63a) Ik heb *er* nog nooit *een* gezien (*dat de aarde plat was*). [bewijs]
          I have ER still never a/one seen (*that the earth flat was) [proof]
          ‘I have never seen any (proof) that the earth is flat.’

  **North Hessian (SyHD):**

  (63b) Es gerr*er, dass hei mu Römer geläbt hun.* [Beweise]
          it gives ERE that here once Romans lived have [proofs]
          ‘There are (proofs) that Romans once lived here.’

  (cf. also *StGe. welch-* and *Bav. ein-*)
Syntax of partitive/quantitative pronouns:
The syntactic nature of the interpretative gap

→ **nature of the interpretative gap** within the **noun phrase** associated with quant. *er* (cf. Broekhuis & Den Dikken 2012)?

→ **the interpretative gap** =

  * the result of **deletion**:  
    *er* ... [Num/Q [...N]]

  * **base-generated** as a (phonetically empty) pronominal element, which must be **licensed/bound** by quant. *er* (Kester 1996):  
    *er*$_i$ ... [Num/Q [pro$_i$]]

  * the result of **movement** (Coppen 1991, Barbiers 2009):  
    *er*$_i$ ... [Num/Q [t$_i$]]

→ **quant. *er*** pronominalizes a **certain part** of the **nominal structure**

→ ***er*** = **base-generated** as **part** of the **noun phrase** and then **obligatorily moved into** some **NP-external position**
Syntax of partitive/quantitative pronouns:
Analyses

→ level of pronominalization?
  
  • traditionally: En. *one* substitutes for the *constituent N’* → *one* cannot occur with arguments

Fr./It. *en/ne* = a non-maximal (*N’*) or a maximal category (*NP/PP/DP*)?
  
  • Kayne (1975), Belletti (1979):
    
    *en* = a *prepositional clitic*: quantified noun phrases have the *underlying form* *deux de sœurs*
    
    → Fr. quant. *en* pronominalizes complement *de sœurs/de elles /
      
    It. *ne* stands for *partitive phrase* introduced by *di*
    
    → hypothesis of *categorial uniformity* (= unified analysis of all uses of *ne*):
      
      quant. & non-quant. instances of *en/ne* stand for *PPs* with *de / di/da*
  
  • Belletti & Rizzi (1981):
    
    *ne* = an *intermediate proj. N’, not a max. proj.
    
    → pronominalizes head noun and its *complements*, while *quantifier* remains in place
  
  • Cardinaletti & Giusti (1992, 2006):
    
    *ne* = a *max., not* an *intermediate proj.* → the *clitic form* of the *quantitative DP*
    
    in the *complement* of *Q* (quantifier occupies a pos. outside of the noun phrase: head of proj. *QP*)
    
    → of *category D* (not *Ps*)
  
  • Cinque (1991), Belletti (1993):
    
    *ne* = an *NP, not a DP* (binding properties & co-occurrence with relative clauses)
Syntax of partitive/quantitative pronouns: Analyses

• Ihsane (2013):
  in addition to PPs, *en* can replace different layers of a nominal structure
  with an articulated left periphery ((SRefP) > ... PropP >)
  and a fine-grained inflectional domain (... NumP > (FP_{quantity}) > (FP_{de}) > (FP_{count}) > NP)
   clitic *en* can pronominalize PropPs (property-denoting interpretation)
  but not SRefPs (*en* cannot involve reference)
   quantitative *en* replaces a subpart of the nominal inflectional domain: FP_{de}
  ⇔ genitive *en* and partitive *en* as PPs
   no uniform proposal like Kayne’s (*en* = not uniformly a pro-PP)

Du. quant. *er* (⇔ other instances of *er* = presumably pro-PPs):

• Blom (1977), Bennis (1977), Van Riemsdijk (1978):
  quant. *er* = an N’ (does not occur with the head noun, nor with adj.
  ⇔ does occur with relative clauses)

• Cardinaletti & Giusti (2006):
  *er* pronominalizes DP complement of the quantifier (= in line with proposal for Fr./It. *en/ne*)

• Kranendonk (2010):
  quant. *er* = a pro-nP (a category including adjectives and complement-PPs, but not adjunct-PPs and relative clauses, which can co-occur with *er*)
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