Two notes on *ne*-cliticization

Ur Shlonsky
Université de Genève

This talk addresses two outstanding syntactic problems posed by *ne/en*-cliticization, namely, the identity of the constituent pronominalized by *ne/en* (problem A) and the subject-object asymmetry in its extraction (problem B).

Problem A. Our discussion is restricted to quantificational *ne/en*, as in (1).

(1)   (de gravures flamandes,) j'en ai acheté trois.
      (Of Flemish etchings), I EN bought 3.

The clitic *en* pronominalizes a portion of DP, stranding *trois*. The numeral is merged as a specifier of NumP, situated above the category housing Adjectives and NP, as in Cinque (1996), etc. NumP is also home to non-partitive weak quantifiers and quantity expressions like *many, some* etc., all of which 'license' *en*.

(2)   DP >...Num > Adj > NP

The adoption of (2) implies that *en* corresponds to some constituent which is smaller than DP. Cardinaletti & Giusi (2006) show that some adjectives can be stranded, as it were, by *ne*-cliticization. They argue, correctly, that only predicative adjectives which appear to the right of N have this capacity. For example, prenominal (non-predicative, non-intersective) *vieux* in e.g., *un vieux copain* 'an old buddy', is a buddy I have known for a long time, whereas in *un copain vieux*, it has the predicative, intersective meaning 'old in years.' Under *en*-cliticization, *vieux* can only have the second, postnominal interpretation.

(3)Parmi mes copains, il y'en a plusieurs vieux.
    'Among my friends, there are many who are old.'

The question is how to force non-intersective/non-predicative adjectives to be included in the DP fragment pronominalized by *ne/en*, while allowing the intersective, relative clause-like predicative ones to remain in DP.

Cinque (2010) argues that in Italian/French, NP -rather than N alone – raises to a position above the intersective/predicative Adj and below Num. Either it first raises above $Adj_{NON-INT}$ and then pied-pipes it along, giving rise to the order in (4a), or it is itself pied piped by $Adj_{NON-INT}$ as in (4b). The option of moving NP alone above Adj_{INT} is unavailable (in Romance), so that (4c) is correctly predicted to be ungrammatical.

(4)a. [N $Adj_{NON-INT}$] Adj_{INT}
    b. [$Adj_{NON-INT}$ N] Adj_{INT}
    c. *N Adj_{INT} $Adj_{NON-INT}$.

In both (4a) and (4b), N+ $Adj_{NON-INT}$ form a constituent to the exclusion of the predicative/intersective adj. This, we argue, is the constituent targeted by *ne/en*-cliticization. Some quantity expressions in French require *de*:

(5)J'ai   vu   beaucoup/peu/assez *(d')   ingénieurs intéressants.
    I have   seen   many/few/enough   DE   engineers   interesting

I argue, following Ihsane (2013), that *de* heads a projection below Num. In the derivation leading to the cliticization of *ne/en, t*he constituent [N $Adj_{NON-INT}$] or [$Adj_{NON-INT}$ N], moves to Spec/*de.* At that point, it either continues to move alone out of DP, eventually yielding (6a) or it pied pipes *de*P, yielding (6b).

(6)a. J'en ai   vu   beaucoup.
       I EN have seen   many
    b. J'en ai   vu   beaucoup d'intéressants.
       I EN have seen many DE   interesting

The derivation of *ne/en* should be modelled on the derivation of Romance object clitics.

Suppose the fairly conventional view that the (say, accusative) clitic is merged in a BIG DP, that phrasal DP movement brings the clitic into the functional zone of the clause and that this is followed by short head-movement of the clitic to T. I argue that *ne/en* is merged below the "high", intersective, predicative, relative-clause like Adjs but above the "low", non-intersective ones, as the head of dP, the category corresponding to the bracketed constituents in (4a,b). Like D, d assigns some referential import to N (though not the uniquely individuating referential import of D). The position of d correlates with the semantic role of direct modification adjectives, which are below d. They "modify something that is still predicative in nature, while the adjectives which are higher than d modify something that already has some referential status." (Cinque 2010).

Problem B. *Ne* cliticization is a classic test for unaccusativity. Briefly, *ne* can be cliticized from direct objects and (postverbal) subjects of unaccusative verbs but not from postverbal subjects of unergative ones. Although this generalization is surely too strong as stated and admits of many exceptions, its core is valid. We assume the classical description and ask how the unaccusative/ergative asymmetry in clitic extraction can be formally characterized. *Ne*-cliticization involves subextraction from DP. The previous section discussed the constituent targeted by quantitative *ne*-cliticization, but subextraction characterizes all relevant cases of *ne*-cliticization (though the constituent "pronominalized" by *ne/en* may not be the same).

To state the problem, why is subextraction licit from object position but not from vP subject position? Chomsky (2013) argues that subject raising from vP to TP is forced by labeling: If the subject fails to raise, α in $[_\alpha \text{DP}_{\text{SUBJ}} \text{ vP}]$ cannot get a label. We argue that subextraction from DP_{SUBJ} merged to vP does not resolve the labeling issue, because the label of DP_{SUBJ} remains in situ. *Ne*-cliticization is possible only where no labeling issue arises. This is the case when the clitic emerges from object position but not from the subject position of unergatives/transitives. We suggest that those unergative verbs which have been argued to allow *ne*-cliticization in e.g., Lonzi (1986), are merged with a lower V head which then incorporates with v. From a labeling perspective, such subjects receive the same analysis as objects do in Chomsky (2013).

Subextraction from postverbal subjects **is** possible from a QP leaving behind a floating quantifier. Why is (7b) grammatical but not (7a)?

(7)a. *Ne hanno mangiato tre.
        NE have eaten 3.

   b. pro hanno mangiato tutti.
           have eaten all.

We argue (with McCloskey 2000 and others) that quantifier-float (read: subextraction and stranding of Q) is actually never launched from Spec/vP but from a higher position. "Floating" quantifiers and the DP they select are first attracted to an adverbial position above vP. If the subject QP evacuates its first merge position, α in $[_\alpha \text{DP}_{\text{SUBJ}} \text{ vP}]$ can be correctly labeled v. The DP containing the constituent pronominalized by *ne* is not probed by a head in the functional field. Thus, it remains in situ, engendering the labeling paradox.