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0. Introduction

In French, the demonstrative pronoun (celui, celle, ceux, celles) has to be combined with a restrictive relative clause or a functional equivalent such as a PP. But although the combination with the possessive PP in (1b) makes the use of the demonstrative pronoun grammatical, the combination with a partitive PP does not have this effect, unless a restrictive relative clause is added:

(1) a. Celui *(que j’ai lu est là).
   ‘The one (that I have read) is there.’
   b. Celle *(de la cuisine) est cassée.
      ‘The one (of the kitchen) is broken.’

(2) Je préfère ceux de ses livres *(qui ont gagné un prix).
    ‘I prefer those of his books (that have won a prize).’
   *Le seul ‘the only’ behaves in the same way:

(3) a. Les seuls livres *(qui me plaisent) sont là.
     ‘The only books (that please me) are there.’
   b. La seule sœur *(de Paul) s’est mariée hier.
      ‘The only sister (of Paul) married yesterday.’

*Many thanks to Jacqueline Guéron, Brigitte Kampers-Manhe, Tal Siloni and Anne Zribi-Hertz for their comments on earlier versions of this paper, which was presented at the Incontro di Grammatica Generativa at Urbino in February 2003 and at the Institut Charles V in Paris in May 2003.
Les seuls de ses livres *(qui me plaisent) sont là.  
‘The only ones of his books (that please me) are there.’

There are thus determiners in French that:

A. do not combine with a bare partitive PP but that

B. need to be modified by a restrictive relative clause or a functional equivalent such as a PP.

According to Barker (1998), who discusses similar cases in English, B is the consequence of A. Barker calls A the Anti-Uniqueness Constraint. Barker claims that sentence (5a) is ungrammatical because of the Anti-Uniqueness constraint (A), unless a restrictive relative clause is added (B):

(5) a. *The one of Paul’s friends is a dentist.

b. The one of Paul’s friends that we met yesterday is a dentist.

Barker gives a semantic explanation for the Anti-Uniqueness Constraint, the Partitivity Constraint, which operates on partitive constructions and which requires that the first part of the partitive construction be a subset of the second part. In (5a) there is an incompatibility between the pluriel ‘Paul’s friends’ and ‘the one’: ‘the one’ presupposes that Paul has only one friend. In (5b) the Partitivity Constraint is respected. Paul has several friends one of whom we met yesterday. In this semantic approach, B is the consequence of A, but in fact B should be respected independently of A (cf. 1):

(6) *The one is a dentist.

In this paper I propose another analysis. In my account, which is based on Kayne (1994), A results rather from B.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 1, I discuss Kayne’ analysis of the dependency relation B. In 2, I present and analyze the types of constituents that celui and seul can combine with and conclude that A is the consequence of B and not the reverse. In 3, I show how the primary relation with the clausal complement can be syntactically represented and what is the syntactic status of the partitive constituent. In 4, the results of the paper are summarized.


In early generative analyses the restrictive relative clause was the complement of the determiner in Spec.NP at D-structure and moved to a position following N (Smith 1969, Ronat 1977):
(7) a. \[ \text{NP the } [S^* \text{ that I bought}] [N \text{ book}] \]
   b. \[ \text{NP the } t_3 [N \text{ book} ] [S^* \text{ that I bought}] \]

For Kayne (1994), this analysis is a motivation for his raising analysis of relative clauses. Since right-adjuncts are not allowed according to his Antisymmetry theory, Kayne proposes a promotion analysis of relative clauses as developed in Vergnaud (1974): in the raising analysis, the relative clause is also the complement of the determiner, just as in the analysis in (7), but this time the “antecedent” noun originates in the relative clause and raises to Spec,CP, the initial position of the relative clause, see (8):

(8) \[ \text{DP the } [CP \text{ book}, [C^* \text{ that } [IP \text{ I bought } t_1 ]]] \]

To account for the dependency relation in (1), the demonstrative pronoun followed by a restrictive relative clause or a possessive phrase, Kayne proposes that the demonstrative pronoun can only be interpreted in the Spec of a clausal structure that is selected by a necessarily empty determiner (9a), because it has a defective character: it is an XP in which no further material is possible (9b).

(9) a. \[ \text{D}^* [CP \text{ celui}, [C^* \text{ que } [IP \text{ j’ai lu } t_1 ]]] \]
   ‘the one that I have read’

   b. \[ *\text{celui jaune} \]
   ‘the yellow one’

Kayne states that presumably because of its internally defective character, the XP celui cannot be interpreted in isolation, that is, (10) is not grammatical. This is why the CP in (9a) has to be added.

(10) \[ \text{Jean a vu celui. } \]
‘John has seen the one.’

The grammaticality of (11a) suggests, in Kayne’s view, that possessive constituents also involves a clausal structure, which has the D/P de as its head (11b).

(11) a. \[ \text{celui de Jean} \]
   ‘the one of John’

   b. \[ \text{D}^* [DPP \text{ celui}, [D/P^* \text{ de } [IP \text{ Jean } \text{I° } t_1 ]]] \]

In Kayne’s (1994) analysis, celui is in Spec,CP. CP is selected by an empty determiner. An alternative analysis could be one in which ce ‘that’ is in DP whereas lui ‘him’ is in Spec,CP (Gross 1977):

(12) \[ \text{DPP ce } [CP \text{ lui}, [C^* \text{ que } [IP \text{ j’ai lu } t_1 ]]] ]\]
   ‘the one (litt. that him) that I have read’
In this paper I will adopt a third analysis in which *celui* is a determiner that selects a clausal structure. The clausal structure contains an empty category that moves to the Spec of the clause:

(13) a. \[ [DP \text{ celui} [CP \text{ pro} [C \text{ que} [IP \text{ j’ai lu} t_1]]]] \]
    ‘the one that I have read’

b. \[ [DP \text{ celle} [DPP \text{ pro} [D/P \text{ de} [IP \text{ Jean} [C \text{ que} [IP \text{ j’ai lu} t_2]]]]]] \]
    ‘the one of John’

Since, in this paper, nothing hinges on the exact analysis of *celui*, I will not motivate this latter analysis, but see Sleeman (2003).

Since *le seul* (N) is not a syntactically defective XP, as illustrated by (14), in which the adjective *rouge* ‘red’ is also inside the DP, there would be no reason for interpreting *le seul* in the Spec of a clausal structure. In my analysis *(le) seul* is also a determiner that selects a clausal structure containing a noun or an empty noun that moves to the specifier position, see (15):

(14) \[ [DP \text{ le seul livre rouge qui soit là} [CP \text{ que} [IP \text{ je connaisse} t_1]]]] \]
    ‘the only red book that is there’

(15) a. \[ [DP \text{ les seuls [CP } [CP \text{ livre} [C \text{ que} [IP \text{ je connaisse} t_1]]]]] \]
    ‘the only books that I know are there’

b. \[ [DP \text{ les seuls [CP } [CP \text{ pro} [C \text{ que} [IP \text{ je connaisse} t_2]]]]] \]
    ‘the only books that I know are there’

I have adopted an analysis in which *celui* and *(le) seul* are determiners that select a clausal constituent. In the next section I discuss the nature of the clausal constituent.

2. The complements of *celui* and *(le) seul*

In Kayne’s analysis of *celui*, the syntactic defectiveness of *celui* determines its combination with a clausal constituent, which is the complement of an empty determiner. I have adopted an analysis in which the clausal complement is selected by *celui* and *(le) seul* themselves. In this section I will show that *celui* and *(le) seul* combine with several kinds of clausal constituents, which are all complements, and I will propose that they take these clausal complements for a semantic reason.

2.1. Syntactic nature of the complements

*Celui* and *(le) seul* can be combined with a PP, a relative clause, past and present participles, adjectives followed by a complement, and à + infinitive. *(Le) seul* differs from *celui* in that it can be followed by an overt noun before the clausal constituent:
(16) ceux sur la table
   ‘the ones on the table’

(17) celui que tu as lu
   ‘the ones that you have read’

(18) le seul envoyé à Jean
   ‘the only one sent to John’

(19) les seules personnes parlant quatre langues
   ‘the only persons speaking four languages’

(20) ceux contents de leur sort
   ‘the ones satisfied with their fate’

(21) les seuls à avoir lu ce livre
   ‘the only ones to have read this book’

Sleeman & Verheugd (1998) argue that all these modifiers are predicates. Prepositions, participles, adjectives followed by a complement and infinitives all project argument structure and are therefore inherently licensed as predicates, just like full relative clauses. Externalization of one of their arguments gives a subject/antecedent-predicate configuration. It is in this sense that they are reduced relatives. The predicate and the externalized noun are related by means of theta-marking.

Sleeman & Verheugd argue, contra Kayne (1994), that simple adjectives do not project syntactic arguments on their own. They are generated in a functional projection of NP and modify the noun by way of theta-identification (Higginbotham 1985), i.e. in an attributival way. Since they cannot be analyzed as reduced relative clauses, i.e. as predicates, they cannot combine with celui and le seul:1

(i) Nous préférons ceux réutilisables.
   ‘We prefer those that can be used again.’

(ii) les bouteilles en plastique non recyclables et aussi celles recyclables
   ‘the plastic bottles that cannot be recycled and also those that can be recycled’

(iii) les seules solubles
   ‘the only soluble ones’

Sleeman & Verheugd argue that adjectives ending in –ble have argument structure if they still have a verbal meaning (‘that can be X-ed’) and therefore can be analyzed as predicates, i.e. as reduced relative clauses.

---

1 Cela and le seul can, however, be followed by adjectives ending in the suffix able, ible or uble without a complement, although judgments vary:
(22) *celui jaune
the one yellow

(23) *les seuls livres jaunes
the only yellow books

In the complements of *celui and *le seul, which are all clausal, one of the arguments – an empty pronoun or a noun - moves to a specifier position in the left periphery of the clause:

(24) a. [\[DP le seul \[XP pro_i \[IP envoyé t_i à Jean \]][\]]]
   b. [\[DP ceux \[XP pro_i \[AP t_i contents de leur sort \]][\]]]

Siloni (1995) observes that the clausal modifiers of *le seul (N) do not all behave in the same way. Whereas extraction from the infinitival constituent is possible, extraction from a relative clause is not:

(25) a. Qu’est-ce qu’il est le seul à avoir fait?
   “What is he the only one to have done?”
   b. *Qu’est-ce qu’il est le seul qui ait fait?
   what is he the only one who has done?

The following examples, found in the database Frantext, are equivalent to (26), but involve a relative pronoun instead of an interrogative pronoun:

(26) a. ces paroles épouvantables que je fus le seul à entendre
   ‘these horrible words that I was the only one to hear’
   b. cette vérité que je suis le seul à écrire
   ‘this truth that I am the only one to write’

Siloni adopts a traditional analysis of relative clauses. She claims that the ungrammaticality of (25b) results from a Subjacency violation, since Spec,CP of the relative clause is filled by an empty operator:

(27) *Qu’est-ce qu’il est le seul [\[CP OP_i qui ait fait t_i \]][\]?

In the infinitival construction there would be no empty operator in Spec,CP but PRO as the subject of the infinitive:

(28) Qu’est-ce qu’il est le seul à [\[CP PRO avoir fait t_i \]][\]?

Siloni is not explicit about the structure of the sentence containing the infinitival clause. Probably the infinitival clause is not an adjunct, i.e. a kind of relative clause, but rather the complement of a preposition. The PP itself is probably the complement of the adjective seul:

(29) le seul [\[PP à [\[CP PRO avoir fait \]][\]]]
The adoption of such a structure becomes, problematic, however, if we consider the next sentence:

(30) Il est le seul homme à avoir fait cela.

‘He is the only man to have done that.’

In (30), the infinitival constituent cannot be the complement of the adjective seul, but must rather be a relative clause, which is adjoined to the DP in Siloni’s framework, see (27). However, (31) shows that extraction from the infinitival constituent in (30) is possible just as in (28):

(31) les sommets qu’il a été le seul Français à atteindre

‘the peaks that he has been the only Frenchman to reach.’

To solve this problem, I claim that in all cases seul takes a clausal constituent as is complement, in line with Kayne’s Antisymmetry theory. However, if in all cases we are dealing with a real complement of seul, how can we explain that extraction is possible from some complements but not from others? Recall that in Siloni’s approach extraction is possible from à + infinitive, which is a complement, but not from canonical relative clauses, which are adjuncts. I have adopted Kayne’s framework in which relative clauses and their alternative forms are complements. I have to account then for the fact that extraction is not possible from all complements, e.g. not from full relative clauses. In (32a) the clausal constituent is a CP, to the specifier of which the empty noun moves, just like the overt noun in (32b):

(32) a. Il est le seul [CP pro, [C qui [IP t, avoir fait cela]]]
    b. Il est le seul [CP homme, [C qui [IP t, avoir fait cela]]]

In (33), on the other hand, Spec,CP is empty and à is in a lower functional head, probably between C and I (Rizzi 1997). The noun or the empty pronoun, which I assume to be small pro because it is the semantic head of the DP and will be governed by the verb of the main clause, originates as the subject of the infinitive but moves to a higher position:

(33) a. Il est le seul [CP [I- homme, à [IP t, avoir fait cela]]]
    b. Il est le seul [CP [I- pro, à [IP t, avoir fait cela]]]

The presence of à in the head of a functional projection creates thus an extra specifier position to which the noun or the empty pronoun can move. This leaves Spec,CP empty, so that another constituent can be moved through this position:

(34) les [CP sommets, qu’il a été le seul [CP t, Français à atteindre t,]]

Besides a full relative clause and an infinitival clause introduced by à, seul can also take a participial clause and a complex adjectival phrase as it complement. Siloni states that extraction from a participial clause is not possible, which means
according to her that the participial clause contains an empty operator, just like a full relative clause:

(35) a. *[A qui] Jean est-il le seul [CP OP, [t_t parler régulièrement t_j]]?
   to whom is John the only only speaking regularly

   b. *[D'où] Jean est-il le seul [CP OP, [t_t revenu content t_j]]?
   from where is John the only one returned satisfied

(36) *[A qui], Jean est-il le seul [CP OP, qui [t_t parler régulièrement t_j]]?
   to whom is John the only one who speaks regularly

   Siloni does not mention the combination of seul with a complex AP. Extraction from this type of complement of seul seems not to be possible either:

(37) *le prix qu'elle est la seule personne fière d'avoir gagné
   the prize that she is the only person proud to have won

   Extraction would thus be possible from infinitival complements of le seul, but not from canonical relative clauses, participial complements and complex adjectives. I have proposed that infinitival clauses are CPs (34) the specifier of which can be used as a landing site for extraction (see also Stowell 1982 for the idea that to-infinitives are CPs). They differ from canonical relative clauses because they contain a functional projection dominated by CP that can host the “antecedent” noun or empty pronoun, whereas both the extracted constituent and the antecedent noun compete for Spec,CP of the relative clause. I suggest that participial clauses and complex adjectival constituents are really reduced and are not CPs, so that no landing site for extraction is available. In the canonical relative clause, the extracted constituent and the “antecedent” noun or pronoun are competing for the same position, viz. Spec,CP. In all other cases, the “antecedent” noun or empty pronoun move to the specifier of a functional projection. In infinitival clauses (but not in participial clauses and complex APs) this projection is dominated by CP, so that Spec,CP is available as a landing site for the extracted constituent:

(38) les [CP sommets, qu'il a été le seul [CP t_t [IP Français [IP à atteindre t_j]]]]

(39) *A qui, Jean est-il le seul [CP pro, [CP qui [IP t_t parler régulièrement t_j]]]?

(40) *A qui, Jean est-il le seul [IP pro parler régulièrement t_j] ?
   *le prix, qu'elle est la seule [AgrAP personne fière d'avoir gagné t_j]

2.2. Semantic complementation

I have shown that celui and le seul combine with all kinds of complements, the category of which is not determined. The only requirement is that the complement be a clausal constituent. Whereas in Kayne’s analysis celui is syntactically defective
– it is an XP that cannot dominate any other material than celui – in my view celui, and this also holds for le seul, is rather semantically defective: they are weak elements in a semantic sense, just like articles. They are not interpretable in isolation. They bind the open position of the predicate, yielding a semantically interpretable construction. They only express uniqueness, for seul combined with exclusiveness, but a predicate is required to make them function as an argument. But whereas articles can be combined with a simple predicate such as an NP, celui and le seul select a proposition.

Why should this be a proposition and not an adjective? According to Bouchard (1998), celui is a closed off functor category, in which no further modification is possible. That is, attribution, or in Higginbotham’s (1985) sense theta-identification, is not possible. Only predication is possible. Predication means that there is a predicate-argument structure, a proposition. The same could hold for (le) seul. (Le) seul could also be a closed off functor category, which only allows the combination with a propositional predicate, the Spec of which can be filled by a noun or a noun + adjective combination.

This is at the same time the solution for the Uniqueness Constraint that was discussed by Barker (1998). The problem that I raised in the Introduction was why are (42a,b and c) not possible,

(42) a. *the one of Paul’s friends
   b. *celui de ses livres
   c. *les seuls de ses livres

but why do you have to add something as in (43):

(43) a. the (one of Paul’s friends) who is a dentist
   b. ceux (de ses livres) qui ont gagné un prix
   c. les seuls (de ses livres) qui me plaisent

I reject Barker’s solution in terms of proper partitivity, because the one, celui and le seul always require the complementation by a predicate, even if they are not part of a partitive construction. Property B (complementation) does thus not depend on property A (no bare partitive), but is a consequence of the meaning of celui and le seul.

In my view, property A rather depends on property B. Celui and le seul select a proposition, a predicate – argument combination, but a partitive constituent is not a semantic proposition. This is why a bare partitive constituent is not possible in combination with celui and le seul. In the next section I will show how the primary

---

2 Notice, however, that the one can also be modified by a prenominal adjective, as in the blue one.
dependency between *celui* and *le seul* and the clausal constituent can be syntactically expressed and how the partitive constituent can be analysed.

3. Stacking

In section 1, I observed that in the sixties and seventies, relatives clauses were analyzed as the complement of the determiner in Spec,NP, and moved to a position following the noun (Smith 1969, Ronat 1977). The partitive construction has been analyzed in a similar way. In Milner’s (1978) analysis, the partitive construction is analyzed as an NP with an empty nominal head. In the underlying structure the partitive phrase is the complement of the specifier in Spec,NP (44) and moves to the right of the noun (45).

(44) [\[QP trois ] [N \ø \[PP de ses livres ]]]

(45) [\[QP trois t₁ ] [N \ø \[PP de ses livres ]]]

‘three of his books’

According to Kayne’s Antisymmetry Theory (1994), which has influenced importantly the conception of the form of syntactic structures in generative theory, movement to the right is forbidden. Furthermore, since movement to a complement position is not possible, the relative clause could only be right-adjointed to the noun or one of its projections, but in Antisymmetry Theory right-adjunction is also forbidden. I have shown that in Kayne’s analysis, relative clauses are not right-adjointed to the noun, but are the complement of the noun. The “antecedent” is one of the arguments inside the relative clause and moves to the highest specifier position in the left periphery of the clausal constituent, see (46) repeated from (7b):

(46) [DP the [CP book, [C that [Ip I bought t₁]]]]

I have adopted this analysis for *celui* and *le seul* followed by a complement, see (47a-b), repeated from (13a) and (15a) respectively:

(47) a. [DP celui [CP pro₁, [C que [Ip j’ai lu t₁]]]]

‘the one that I have read’

b. [\[Ip les seuls [CP livres, [C que [Ip je connaisse t₁]]] sont là.

‘the only books that I know are there’

In a similar way, in (48-49), *celui* and *le seul* could also select a relative clause in which a partitive constituent instead of a simple NP moves to Spec,CP:

(48) [Ip celui [CP (de) ses livres, [C que [Ip j’ai lu t₁]]]]

‘the one of his books that I have read’

(49) [Ip le seul [CP (de) ses livres, [C que [Ip j’ai lu t₁]]]]

‘the only one of his books that I have read’
How should the partitive constituent be analyzed? If it originates as an argument inside the relative clause, it cannot simply be a PP, since it would not meet the subcategorization requirements of transitive verbs:

(50) [DP celui [CP [C que [IP j’ai lu [PP de ses livres ]]]]]

In Kupferman’s (1999) analysis, the partitive construction involves a DP selected by a quantificational head, as in (51):

(51) [QP beaucoup [O de [DP mes livres ]]]

‘many of my books’

In this way, the partitive construction minimally differs from the quantitative construction which involves an NP selected by Q° as in (52).

(52) [QP beaucoup [O de [NP livres ]]]

‘many books’

Kupferman’s analysis of the partitive constituent as a DP can account for the possibility of combining celui + relative clause with a partitive constituent. In this analysis, the CP selected by celui would contain a DP in its specifier position:

(53) [QP celui [O de [CP [DP ses livres ]], [C que [IP j’ai lu t]]]]

A problem with this analysis, however, is that it is unclear how to account for the fact that the verb in the relative clause does not agree with ses livres:

(54) a. celui de [CP[DP ses livres ]], [C que [IP j’ai lu(*s) t]]

‘the one of his books that I have read (MASC PL)’

b. celui de [CP[DP ses livres ]], [C qui [IP t, a*ont gagné un prix ]]

‘the one of his books that has won a prize’

If the partitive phrase is analyzed as a constituent containing an empty pronoun the agreement facts can be accounted for. In my analysis, the verb in the relative clause agrees with pro, which agrees with celui after movement of pro out of the clausal constituent. The relative clause therefore agrees with celui and not with livres:

(55) celui pro [CP[IP t, de ses livres ], [C que [IP j’ai lu(*s) t]]]

‘the one of his books that I have read’

(56) le seul pro [CP[IP t, de ses livres ], [C qui [IP t, a*ont gagné un prix ]]]

‘the only one of his books that has won a prize’

The analysis in (55-56) is in line with the conception of relative clause formation as the selection by a determiner of a clause containing a noun or an empty pronoun in Spec,CP, as in (47a-b). Instead of the simple nominal predicate, there is a more complex nominal predicate in Spec,CP in (55-56), viz. a nominal predicate in which a subset out of a larger domain is formed.
Although I assume that the partitive constituent contains an empty category, the exact analysis of the FP in (55-56) remains to be established. In Zamparelli’s (1998) analysis of the partitive construction, a quantifier selects the ‘of’-part as its complement, as a Residual Phrase, an RP:

\[(57)\ \text{deux} \ [\text{RP} \ \text{livres}] \ [\text{de} \ [\text{DP} \ \text{ses} \ \text{livres}]]\]

‘two of his books’

In Zamparelli’s analysis the partitive construction results from erasure of the first noun under identity with the second noun of the construction, in line with Chomsky’s (1995) conception of ellipsis as a phonological phenomenon. Because of restrictions on noun ellipsis, e.g. semantic restrictions in French (see Barbaud 1976, Sleeman 1996), I have not adopted a phonological erasure analysis, but have analyzed the first part of the partitive construction as a base-generated empty pronoun that has to be licensed and identified (see Sleeman 1996 for French). In Zamparelli’s analysis the head of RP is selected by the quantifier. Although this analysis can account for the agreement facts presented above, there is a strong syntactic relation between the quantifier and the partitive phrase, which makes that it seems to be less plausible for the RP to be an argument within a relative clause, which would itself be the complement of the determiner:

\[(58)\ \text{celui} \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{RP} \ \text{livres}] \ [\text{de} \ [\text{DP} \ \text{ses} \ \text{livres}]]], \ [\text{C- que} \ [\text{IP} \ j’\text{ai lu} \ t,]]\]

Sleeman & Kester (2002) propose another analysis of the partitive phrase, which is presented in (59):

\[(59)\ \text{[NumP} \ \text{deux pro}, \ [\text{PP} \ t, [\text{F} \ \text{de}]] [\text{PP} \ t, [\text{P} \ t, \text{ses amis}]]\]

‘two of his friends’

This analysis strongly resembles the analysis of possessives proposed by Hulk & Tellier (2000), as presented in (60):

\[(60)\ \text{[DPr le [NumP livre], [PP} \ t,[\text{F de}]], [PP} \ t, [\text{P} \ t, \text{Jean}]]\]

‘John’s book’

Both in (59) and in (60), the determiner selects a clausal constituent, the FP, which expresses a BELONG relation. An empty preposition, which is the head of the PP expressing the BELONG relation, is expressed as de after its movement.

The BELONG order for the partitive construction is motivated by the fact that underlyingly the quantifier seems to take the predicate de ses amis, which has pro in its specifier position, as its complement. This is also reflected in Milner’s (1978) analysis (44-45), in which the partitive phrase is generated as the complement of the quantifier in Spec,NP in the underlying structure and subsequently moves to the complement position of the empty noun.

This analysis is reminiscent of Kayne’s (1994) analysis of possessive constructions that require the presence of a relative clause (61-62).
(61) I found the (two) pictures of John’s *(that you lent me).

(62) [DP the [CP (two) pictures of John’s], [CP that [IP you lent me [t], [[]]]]

In (62) the determiner selects a CP, which contains the possessive construction in its specifier position. The internal structure of the possessive construction is as in (63), where John occupies Spec,IP and ‘s corresponds to I (at least in Den Dikken’s 1998 analysis), so that this structure can be related to Kayne’s analysis of stacked relatives:

(63) [DP [two pictures [, [I of ] [DP John [‘s [t], [][]]]]]]

This possessive construction has also been related to the partitive construction in (64), see Barker (1998) and Zamparelli (1998), which further motivates a clausal analysis of the partitive construction:

(64) two of John’s pictures

Just like Zamparelli’s analysis, the clausal analysis can account for the agreement facts observed above. The clausal analysis has to be preferred, however, because in this analysis there is no strong syntactic relation between the quantifier and the partitive phrase, which makes that syntactically the partitive constituent can be an argument within the relative clause, which is itself the complement of the determiner, as was shown in (55-56).

The idea is thus that celui and le seul select a clause, with an NP as in (47) or a clausal constituent, the partitive phrase, as in (55-56), in its specifier position. However, it has to be accounted for why celui and le seul cannot take directly the partitive clausal constituent as their complement. A solution that could be proposed is that the syntactic category of the possessive and the partitive clausal constituent differ. However, it would be difficult to show what the categorial difference between the two constituents is. Furthermore I have argued that celui and le seul combine with different kinds of clausal constituents. Instead of proposing a different categorial status of the clause, I propose that the syntactic form and the semantic form of the clausal constituent have to be separated. Although a partitive construction has a clausal structure, just like a relative clause or a possessive PP, it is semantically different. In section 2.2 I suggested that, whereas a relative clause or a possessive PP semantically are propositions, predicate-argument structures, a partitive construction is not. It just denotes a subset of an argument. Therefore the BELONG relation has another semantic value in the possessive construction than in the partitive construction. Syntactically, however, the relation is the same in my analysis. The idea is thus that celui and le seul select a proposition rather than a CP. The solution as to why *ceux de ses livres is not grammatical is that de ses livres is not a (semantic) proposition.
4. Conclusion

I have argued that in the dependency relations discussed in this paper a determiner operates on a proposition. The nominal predicate that raises to the specifier of the clausal structure can be an NP (which can also be empty) or a more complex nominal predicate, a partitive phrase, with a clausal structure.

There are however questions that I have not answered. For instance, what is the exact difference between the several types of clausal constituents that I have discussed in this paper? Why is it for instance difficult to insert a partitive PP within another PP (?celui de ses amis d’avant la guerre)? I leave this kind of questions for future research.
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