



*THE SEMANTIC AND
PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF
PARTITIVE CLITIC NE IN
STANDARD ITALIAN*



A Dissertation Presented By
Kimberly Page Will
August 2019

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Linguistics
Cornell University

© 2019 Kimberly Page Will

THE SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF PARTITIVE CLITIC *NE* IN
STANDARD ITALIAN

Kimberly Page Will, Ph. D.

Cornell University 2019

This study explores the distribution of partitive *ne* in Standard Italian. Over the course of five chapters, the study considers *ne*'s historical usage as well as its functions in the present-day language. The following conclusions were reached:

- (1) pre-modern *ne* was compatible with specificity and could refer to all non-oblique arguments, including subjects of transitive verbs,
- (2) modern *ne* is obligatorily non-specific,
- (3) modern *ne* can refer to non-objects in some circumstances, and
- (4) modern quantifiers may appear pre-verbally in some circumstances.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Kimberly Page Will attended Cornell University at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. She graduated *magna cum laude* with a bachelor's degree in linguistics in 2011.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the faculty of the Linguistics Department, most of whom have contributed significantly to my education both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Special thanks to Sarah Murray, Michael Weiss, and Carol Rosen for the time and effort that they devoted to my work. I have benefited greatly from my discussions with Sarah, and I am truly grateful for her assistance. To Michael, the chair of my committee, I express my heartfelt appreciation for the guidance that he has given me throughout the years. I have never turned to him for help without receiving a satisfying answer, and I can't thank him enough for everything he has done. To Carol, who served as my undergraduate advisor and stayed on as a member of my graduate committee, I can only say that I could not have asked for a better mentor. I was extraordinarily fortunate to meet her as soon as I came to Cornell, and ever since, she has helped me in every conceivable manner, never failing to take an interest in my work even after her retirement. This dissertation would not have been possible without her constant guidance and support.

Last but not least, I would like to express my sincere appreciation for the native speakers who participated in this study. While some speakers received compensation for their feedback, virtually everyone has gone above and beyond what could be reasonably expected of them. One speaker, in particular, responded to my pestering emails about ungrammatical sentences virtually everyday, sometimes several times a day, for a period of over one year. She received no payment for her service, and I can never forget her extraordinary patience and kindness.

Contents

Information on the native speakers consulted for this study.....	3
I. The Scope of the Present Investigation	6
A. Partitive <i>NE</i> vs. non-partitive <i>NE</i>	6
B. Questions to be investigated	10
1. Summary of Previous Research	10
2. Summary of results; outline of study	26
II. The Distribution of <i>NE</i> in Pre-Modern Italian	29
A. The historical data.....	29
1. <i>NE</i> in Latin.....	29
2. <i>NE</i> in Pre-Modern Italian.....	30
B. Conclusion of chapter 2	53
III. <i>NE</i> in Present-Day Italian – The Canonical Cases	53
A. Situations in which <i>NE</i> is impossible.....	54
B. <i>NE</i> in reference to objects of transitive verbs	58
1. Declarative sentences	58
2. Interrogative sentences.....	60
C. <i>NE</i> and subjects of unaccusatives and passives	60
1. <i>NE</i> is compatible with all tenses and aspects.....	62
2. Spatio-temporal topics in <i>NE</i> constructions.....	64
3. The distribution of <i>NE</i> in <i>quanto/a/i/e</i> ‘how many’ clauses	73
IV. <i>NE</i> in Non-Canonical Examples	81
A. Past participial agreement and auxiliary selection in Italian	81
1. Auxiliary selection	81
2. Participial agreement	94
B. Extractions from a non-argument NP	97
C. Extractions from subjects of unergatives	106
1. The role of participial agreement	107
2. The choice of auxiliary	111
3. A rare case of consensus	114
4. Actual attestations	115
D. <i>NE</i> in reflexive-transitive constructions.....	117
E. <i>NE</i> and adjectival predicates	121

F. Conclusion	127
V. The Position of The Quantifier	127
A. Introduction.....	127
1. The prohibition on pre-verbal quantifiers	127
2. Reported exceptions.....	129
B. Pre-verbal quantifiers and the mechanisms of fronting	133
1. The fronting mechanisms.....	134
2. Pre-verbal quantifiers and the fronting mechanisms	148
C. The analysis	153
1. Why do pre-verbal quantifiers seem ungrammatical?	153
2. Quantifiers as familiar topics	155
3. Quantifiers as contrastive topics	158
D. Conclusion	167
VI. Conclusion	167
VII. Bibliography	169

Information on the native speakers consulted for this study

This study is based on responses collected from six speakers who have served as my Italian teachers, plus their friends and relatives. According to the six speakers, they are all college-educated and their demographics are as follows:

- One woman from the Emilia-Romagna area. She is an architect.
- One woman from the Piedmont area. She is a professional singer.
- One man from the Piedmont area. He studies geography.
- One woman from Sicily. She has a degree in literature.
- One woman from the Lombardy area. She works in communications.
 - I have not been in touch with this speaker for several years.
- One man from somewhere about an hour south of Rome. He studies philosophy.
 - I have not been in touch with this speaker for several years.

Not all speakers reviewed all sentences.

Chapter 1 does not contain original data and does not require input from native speakers.

Chapter 2 mostly discusses historical data. To the extent that it pertains to present-day Italian at all, it is entirely consistent with previous research. Because this chapter is not controversial, the sentences it contains were evaluated by whichever speaker was likely to respond the soonest when I came up with the data. I did not feel that a second opinion was necessary considering the general consensus in the literature.

Chapter 3 is also largely uncontroversial and for the most part, I followed the same procedure as in Chapter 2. One subsection, however, contradicts standard accounts, which hold that *quanto/i/a/e* ‘how many’ requires *NE* whenever the verb is passive or unaccusative. I don’t believe that any such requirement exists, and in reaching this conclusion, I consulted with the four teachers with whom I am still in touch. All four were unanimous that passivity/unaccusativity alone does not license *NE*, and adding *NE* where it doesn’t belong can render the *quanto/i/a/e* ‘how many’ clause highly marked, or altogether incomprehensible.

Chapter 4 explores the relationship between *NE* and objecthood. This topic was my main area of interest when I first started to study *NE-cliticization*, and initially, I confined my inquiries to two questions: (1) whether *NE* can combine with unergatives in compound tenses, and (2) whether *NE* can combine with unaccusatives like *costare* ‘cost.’ Because I have been interested in these questions for years, I have been able to gather data from more than 14 speakers, some of whom were friends and relatives of the teacher from Lombardy, with whom I am no longer in touch. This teacher forwarded the sentences to contacts by email. Other teachers also helped me pass information on to their friends and family, sometimes by phone and other times by email.

There are two other questions in Chapter 4: (1) whether *NE* may refer to the subject of a reflexive-transitive, and (2) whether *NE* may refer to the argument of i-level adjectives. Scholarly sources have answered both questions in the negative, and I largely concurred with this position even as I started to draft this dissertation. With respect to the first question, my response would have been a firm and resounding “NO!!!” With respect to the second question, my “no” would have been softer. On the one hand, certain terms of color and appearance created problems for most speakers. On the other hand, some i-level adjectives were entirely unproblematic, and the person from Lombardy was willing to accept all adjectives. All in all, I felt that standard assumptions on adjectives were not entirely wrong. However, later on in the drafting process, it occurred to me that there were contexts in which *NE* could combine with problematic adjectives or refer to subjects of reflexive-transitives. I composed sentences reflecting the contexts I had in mind and had them reviewed by the four teachers. All four confirmed that the use of *NE* was appropriate.

Chapter 5 concerns whether the quantifier of *NE* may appear pre-verbally in the absence of contrastive focus. This chapter relies primarily on attested examples. Examples constructed by

me were reviewed by four speakers if they contradict previous research. Otherwise, they were reviewed by at least one speaker.

I. The Scope of the Present Investigation

A. Partitive *NE* vs. non-partitive *NE*

The present study is dedicated to the semantic and pragmatic functions of partitive clitic *NE* in Standard Italian. *NE*, a reflex of Latin *inde* ‘from there,’ is a third-person pronoun that can replace certain PPs headed by *di* ‘of’ or *da* ‘by/from’ (Cordin, 1988). As we shall see, not all of these PPs can be properly characterized as partitive. Some preliminary examples are provided in (1.1), (1.2), (1.3), (1.4), (1.5) and (1.6).

- 1.1 a. *Conosco pochi di loro.*
I.know few of them
‘I know only a few of them.’
- b. *(Di loro) ne conosco pochi.*
Of them NE I.know few
‘I know only a few of them.’
- c. *Ne conosco pochi (di loro).*
NE I.know few of them
‘I know only a few of them.’
- 1.2 a. *Conosco pochi di voi.*
I.know few of you
‘I know only a few of you.’
- b. **(Di voi) ne conosco pochi*
Of you NE I.know few
‘I only know a few of you.’
- 1.3 a. *Se trovi delle paste come quelle che piacciono*
if you.find of.the pastries like those that please.3rd.PL

a me, compramene otto.
to me buy.me.of.them eight

‘If you find the kind of pastries that I like, get me eight of them.’
- b. *Comprami dell’altro pane perché non*
Buy.me of.other bread because not

ne ho a sufficienza.
of.it I.have at sufficiency

‘Buy me more bread because I don’t have enough.’

[Cordin, 1988; glosses and translation mine]¹

c. *Ne voglio altro (di yogurt).*
of.it I.want other (of yogurt)
‘I want more yogurt.’

d. *Ne sono venuti 5 su 10.*
of.them are come 5 over 10
‘Of them, five came out of ten.’

e. *L'agenzia ne accoglie il 45,8 per cento.*
The.agency of.them accepts the 45.8%
‘The agency accepts 45.8%’

1.4 a. *Se trovi delle paste come quelle che*
if you.find of.the pastries like those that

piacciono a me, compramene.
please.3rd.PL to me, buy.me.of.them

‘If you find the pastries that I like, get me some.’

[Cordin, 1988; glosses and translation mine]

b. *Non ne voglio.*
not of.it/them I.want
‘I don’t want any of them/it.’

1.5 a. *Ottenne la patente; e ne approfittò subito. (ne = della patente)*
Obtained the license and of.it made.use right.away (NE = of.the license)
‘He/she obtained a license and made use of it immediately.’

b. *Mi piace l'ultimo quadro che ho dipinto;*
me pleases the.last picture that I.have painted

nej sono proprio fiero. (ne = dell'ultimo quadro che ho dipinto)
of.it I.am really proud (NE = of.the.last picture that I.have painted)

‘I like the last picture that I painted; I am really proud of it.’

¹ Where examples are drawn from another study, the grammatical judgment displayed reflects the opinion of the original author, unless otherwise noted.

- c. *Sono stanca di questa città e non so ancora*
I.am tired of this town and not I.know still

quando ne scoprirò i lati piacevoli (*ne = questa città*)
when of.it I.will.find the sides pleasant (NE = this town)

‘I am tired of this town and I still don’t know when I will discover its more pleasant sides’

[Cordin, 1988]

- 1.6 a. *Ho visto una sola volta quel quadro,*
I.have seen one only time that picture

ma ne sono rimasto molto colpito.
but by.it I.am remained very struck

‘I saw that picture only once, but I was very impressed by it.’

- b. *Avendo sentito il discorso di Mario,*
Having heard the speech of Mario

ne sono rimasto offeso.
by.it I.am remained offended

‘Having heard Mario’s speech, I was offended by it.’

- c. *Quando zio Lino riceverà la tua lettera,*
when uncle Lino will.receive the your letter

ne sarà commosso.
by.it he.will.be moved

‘When uncle Lino receives your letter, he will be moved by it.’

- d. *Erano rinchiusi in una prigione*
they.were locked.up in a prison

apparentemente molto sicura ma ne
apparently very secure but from.it

sono fuggiti con estrema facilità.
they.are escaped with great ease

‘They were locked up in a prison that was apparently very secure, but they escaped from it with great ease.’

[Cordin, 1988]

The sentences in (1.1) and (1.2) show that *NE* is only compatible with the third-person. (1.1b) is a grammatical paraphrasing of (1.1a): because *loro* ‘them’ is third-person, *di loro* ‘of them’ in (1.1a) may be replaced with *NE* in (1.1b). In contrast, *di voi* in (1.2a) cannot be replaced with *NE* in (1.2b) because *voi* ‘you’ is second person. Notice that the use of *NE* in (1.1b-c) does not bar the presence of *di loro* ‘of them’. While *di loro* may be omitted (1.1b), it may also appear sentence-initially (1.1b), or sentence-finally (1.1c).

Sentences (1.1a-c), (1.3), and (1.4) illustrate the use of partitive *NE*. According to one corpus study, partitive *NE* makes up about 25% of all *NE* tokens in Italian wire news (Nissim & Perboni, 2008). Where *NE* functions as a partitive clitic, it stands in apposition with an explicit or implicit expression of quantity. Examples of explicit expressions of quantity include: *pochi* ‘few’ (1.1b-c), *otto* ‘eight’ (1.3a) *a sufficienza* ‘enough’ (1.3b), *altro* ‘more/additional’ (1.3c), *5 su 10* ‘five out of 10’ (1.3d), and *il 45.8 per cento* ‘45.8 percent’ (1.3e). The sentences in (1.4) show two instances in which *NE* is to be construed with an implicit quantifier. The implicit quantity is ‘some’ in (1.4a) and ‘none/not any’ in (1.4b).

Sentences (1.5-1.6) exemplify the various uses of *NE* that do not fall within the scope of this study. (1.5a-c) illustrate what is commonly known as *genitive NE* (Cordin, 1988), since *NE* in these sentences replaces a PP headed by *di* ‘of.’ In (1.5a) and (1.5b), *NE* replaces ‘of the license’ and ‘of the picture,’ respectively. In (1.5c), *NE* serves as a substitute for *di questa città* ‘of the city,’ and here, unlike in (1.5a-b), *NE* was “extracted”² from an NP, leaving behind a trace. This is illustrated in (1.5c’) below:

1.5 c’. *Sono stanca di questa città e non so ancora*
 I.am tired of this town and not I.know still

² I express no opinion at this point on the underlying syntactic structure of (4c). The term “extracted” is used here as a matter of mere convenience; it neither endorses nor rejects a minimalist analysis of *NE*-cliticization.

quando *nej* *scoprirò* [*i lati piacevoli tj*]³
when NE I.will.find the sides pleasant

‘I am tired of this town and I still don’t know when I will discover its more pleasant sides’

Sentences (1.6a-d) exemplify various other oblique functions of *NE*. In (1.6a-c), *NE* serves as an expression of agent/instrument and in (1.6d), it conveys a sense of separation.

The types of usage shown in (1.5-1.6) bears little resemblance to partitive *NE* and will not be discussed in the study.

B. Questions to be investigated

1. Summary of Previous Research

Partitive *NE* has attracted considerable scholarly attention and has been the subject of intensive research in at least three different grammatical traditions: Generative Grammar, Relational Grammar, and Role and Reference Grammar. In the vast majority of accounts, partitive *NE* is described as having the properties shown in (1.7).

1.7. Alleged properties of partitive *NE*

- a. Incompatibility with universal quantifiers, such as *tutto* ‘all’ and *ognuno* ‘every’
- b. Incompatibility with expressions that refer to a specific subset within the set denoted by *NE*, such as *questi* ‘these’ and *quelli* ‘those.’
- c. Limited compatibility with non-verbal predicates and complete incompatibility with I-level predicates, such as *bianco* ‘white’ and *buono* ‘good.’
- d. Exclusive compatibility with NPs that are
 - (i) underlying direct objects, and
 - (ii) do not appear in pre-verbal position, or otherwise qualify as subjects at some level in the derivation.

³ This notation, too, is used as a matter of convenience – it does not endorse or reject a minimalist analysis.

Properties (1.7a-c) are illustrated below. Property (1.7d) will be illustrated in its own subsection because the data supporting it are more extensive.

1.8. **Incompatibility with universal quantifiers (7a)**

- a. *Gianni ne ama alcune.*
Gianni of.them loves a.few
'Gianni loves a few of them.'
- b. **Gianni ne ama ogni/tutte/entrambe.*
Gianni of.them loves every/all/both
'Gianni (of) them loves every, all, both, the second'

[Casadio, 1992]

1.9. **Incompatibility with expressions referring to specific subsets (7b)**

- a. *Sono arrivati tre uomini.*
are arrived three men
'Three men have arrived'
- b. *Ne sono arrivati tre*
Of.them are arrived three
'Three of them arrived'
- c. **Ne sono arrivati quei tre.*
of.them are arrived those three
'These three of them have arrived.'

[Casadio 1992]

- d. **Ne sono arrivati questi*
of.them are arrived these
'These ones of them have arrived.'

[La Fauci & Loporcaro, 1997]

1.10. **Limited compatibility with non-verbal predicates**

- a. **Ne sono studenti molti.*
of.them are students many
'Many of them are students.'
- b. **Ne sono sul tavolo alcuni.*
of.them are on.the table a.few
'A few of them are on the table.'

[Bentley, 2006]

- c. *Ne sono note solo alcune*
of.them are known only a.few
‘Only a few of them are known.’
- d. **Ne sono buoni pochi (dei suoi articoli)*
of.them are good few (of.the his articles)
‘Only a few of his articles are good.’
[Cinque, 1990a]
- e. ^(?) *Ne sono stati buoni alcuni.*
of.them are been good a.few
‘A few of them were good.’
- f. ^{??} *Porte, ne sono aperte due.*
doors of.them are open two
‘Doors, two of them are open.’
[Bentley, 2006]

In (1.8), the contrast between (1.8a) and (1.8b) is due to the fact that (1.8b) contains a series of universal quantifiers: *ogni* ‘each,’ *tutte* ‘all,’ and *entrambe* ‘both.’ According to Cardinaletti & Giusti (2006), universal quantifiers may not combine with *NE* because their semantics do not pick out a subset within a set. In (1.9), the quantifiers are not universal, but they are ungrammatical because they select a particular subgroup within the group of entities denoted by *NE* (*quei tre* ‘those three’ in (1.9c) and *questi* ‘these’ in (1.9d)). The sentences in (1.10) illustrate that not every non-verbal predicate may combine with *NE*. It is generally agreed that nouns (1.10a) and PP arguments (1.10b) are not eligible for cliticization. The status of adjectives is more ambiguous: *NE* cliticization with *note* ‘known’ (1.10c) is said to be more acceptable than with *aperte* ‘open’ (1.10e), which, in turn, is more acceptable than *buoni* ‘good’ (1.10b). It has been suggested that the argument of an I-level predicate is generally an inappropriate host, as evident by the fact that (1.10e), which has perfective aspect, is better than (1.10c), which is imperfect (Calabrese & Mailing, 2009; Bentley 2006).

A number of scholars have argued that the properties illustrated in (1.8-1.10) are all linked to (1.7d) – *NE*'s apparent incompatibility with non-objects. In the next subsection, we will explore the data that have been used to support this alleged incompatibility (1.7d).

a) *NE* & Objecthood

(1.7d) was posited on the basis of the following examples:

1.11 a. *Giorgio ha comprato due macchine.*
 Giorgio has bought two cars
 'Giorgio bought two cars.'

b. *Giorgio ne ha comprate due.*
 Giorgio of.them has bought two
 'Giorgio bought two of them.'

[Perlmutter, 1983]

1.12. a. *Due persone hanno comprato macchine come questa.*
 two people have bought cars like this.one
 'Two people have bought cars like this one.'

b. **Due_j ne_j hanno comprato/comprate*
 two of.them have bought.M/F

macchine come questa.
 cars like this.com

'Two of them have bought cars like this one.'

[Perlmutter, 1983]

1.13. a. *Due persone hanno reagito.*
 two people have reacted
 'Two people have reacted.'

b. **Ne_j hanno reagito due_j.*
 of.them have reacted two
 'Two of them have reacted.'

[Perlmutter, 1983]

1.14. a. *Giovanni parlerà a due persone.*
 Giovanni will.speak to two people
 'Giovanni will speak to two people.'

- b. **Giovanni nej parlerà a duej.*
 Giovanni of.them will.speak to two
 ‘Giovanni will speak to two of them.’
 [Burzio, 1986]
- 1.15 a. *Si sono denunciate molte persone.*
 REFL.CLITIC are denounced many people
 ‘Many people denounced themselves.’
 ‘Many people were denounced.’ (impersonal)
- b. **Se ne sono denunciate molte.*
 REFL.CLITIC of.them are denounced many
 ‘Many of them denounced themselves.’
 [Perlmutter, 1983]
- 1.16 a. *Saranno invitati molti esperti.*
 will.be invited many experts
 ‘Many experts will be invited.’
- b. *Ne saranno invitati molti.*
 of.them will.be invited many
 ‘Many of them will be invited.’
- c. **Molti ne saranno invitati.*
 many of.them will.be invited
 ‘Many of them will be invited.’
- d. *Molti saranno invitati.*
 many will.be invited
 ‘Many will be invited.’
 [Burzio, 1986]
- 1.17 a. *Sono rimaste due persone*
 are remained two people
 ‘Two people remained.’
- b. *Ne sono rimaste due.*
 of.them are remained two
 ‘Two of them remained.’
- c. **Molte ne sono rimaste*
 many of.them are remained
 ‘Many of them remained.’
- d. *Molte sono rimaste.*
 many are remained

“Many remained.”

[Perlmutter, 1983]

The (b) and (c) sentences in (1.11-1.17) are attempted paraphrases of the corresponding (a) sentences. In (1.11b), *NE* is grammatical because its host is *due macchine* ‘two cars,’ a direct object that is incontrovertibly in object position. (1.12b), (1.13b) and (1.14b) are allegedly ungrammatical because they fail to comply with (1.7.d.i). In (1.12b), the host of *NE* is the subject of a transitive predicate rather than a direct object. In (1.13b), *NE* is extracted from the subject of *reagire* ‘react’ – an unergative that selects perfect auxiliary *avere* ‘have.’ Because an unergative predicate does not select a direct object, (1.7.d.i) is not satisfied. In (1.14b), partitive cliticization is ruled out because the argument of *parlare* ‘speak’ is an indirect object, not a direct object.

(1.15b), (1.16c) and (1.17c) are all ruled out by (1.7.d.ii). In (1.15b), the source of *NE* is both the direct object and the subject of *denunciare* ‘dress,’ so (1.7.d.i) is satisfied, but (1.7.a.ii) isn’t. In (1.16c) and (1.17c), *NE* is extracted from the underlying direct object of a passive predicate and an unaccusative verb, respectively. However, because the source of *NE* appears in subject position, these sentences are purported to be ungrammatical. Where the same sentences are rendered with a post-verbal quantifiers (1.16b, 1.17b), all scholars agree that they are acceptable. Notice further that in (1.16d, 1.17d), the quantifiers are pre-verbal, but these sentences are not marked ungrammatical because they do not contain *NE*. The status of (1.16b) and (1.17b) is uncontroversial – no one has ever disputed their grammaticality.

Some syntacticians also claim that *NE*-extraction “out of non-argument NPs, including adverbial NPs, is marginal” (Belletti & Rizzi, 1981; *see also* Calabrese & Mailing, 2009). Because non-argument NPs are not underlying direct objects, they fail to comply with (1.7.d.i). Examples of extractions from these NPs are shown in (1.18-1.19).

- 1.18. a. *Questo pacco pesa tre chili*
 this package weighs three kilograms
 ‘This package weighs three kilograms.’
- b. *?Questo pacco ne pesa tre.*
 this package of.them weighs three
 ‘This package weighs three of them (kgs)’
 (Belletti & Rizzi, 1981)
- 1.19. a. *Quel film dura due ore.*
 that film lasts two hours
 ‘That film lasts two hours.’
- b. *?Quel film ne dura due.*
 that film of.them lasts two
 ‘That film lasts two of them (hours)’
 [Belletti & Rizzi, 1981]

Relational Grammarians account for the data in (1.11-1.19) by positing that *NE* combines exclusively with underlying direct objects that do not serve as subjects at any level in the derivation (Perlmutter, 1983; *see also* La Fauci & Loporcaro, 1997). Because all pre-verbal controllers of finite agreement are surface subjects (La Fauci & Loporcaro, 1997), pre-verbal quantifiers are not compatible with *NE*.

Scholars in the generative tradition generally posit that *NE* must C-command its host (Baltin, 2001). Where the **direct object** of an unaccusative, transitive, or passive predicate remains in situ, it is VP-internal and lies within the C-command domain of *NE*. Where such an object is pre-verbal, it is not C-commanded by *NE* and extraction is not possible. **Subjects of transitive verbs** cannot be coindexed with *NE* because they appear pre-verbally by default. Where they appear post-verbally, as in (1.20), they are adjoined to VP rather than VP internal, and as such, are not C-commanded by *NE* (Baltin, 2001). Extraction from these subjects is therefore unsuccessful.

20. **Ne esamineranno il caso molti.*
 of.them will.examine the case many

presumably, being spoken to, as in (1.14b), does not count as a state. As regards the ungrammaticality of (1.15b), Bentley suggests that reflexive subjects of transitives are inappropriate hosts because *NE* “targets the lowest argument,” and “if the lowest argument is co-referent with a higher argument, it is not as good a candidate . . . as the lowest-ranking argument of the corresponding structure without co-indexation” (2006:309). The Role and Reference framework treats the position of the quantifier as a biproduct of informational structure. Per (1.21ii), the quantifier should appear post-verbal in most instances, as foci tend to occur post-verbally in Italian (Bentley 2006:255). This accounts for (1.16c) and (1.17c). Under contrastive focus, the quantifier may appear before the verb, as is consistent with the typical position of contrastive elements:

- 1.23. a. *Mah, io penso che questi libri che*
 meh I think that these book that
spedisci quasi tutti andranno persi.
 you.mail almost all will.go lost

‘Uh I think these books that you are mailing almost all of them will be lose.’

- b. *Ma no, vedrai che MOLTI ne arriveranno.*
 but no you.will.see that many of.them will.get.there
 ‘No, many of them will get there.’

[Lepschy, 1989:430, as cited by Bentley 2006:255].

The speaker in (1.23b) denies the assertion in (1.23a) that most of the books will be lost. Hence, *MOLTI* ‘many’ is under contrastive focus and can appear pre-verbally.

b) Controversies surrounding *NE* and objecthood

Although (1.7d) is the commonly accepted wisdom, all scholars acknowledge that not all verbs taking *avere* ‘have’ in the perfect are incompatible with *NE* in all tenses (*see e.g.* Lonzi 1986, Lonzi 2009, Mackenzie 2006, Bentley, 2006, Alba-Salas, 2004). Consider the examples below:

- 1.24. a. *Ne telefonarono alcuni, (di tifosi), dopo la partita!*
of.them will.telephone a.few (of fans) after the game
‘A few of them (fans) will phone after the game.’
- b. *Ne camminerà tanta, (di gente), su quei marciapiedi.*
of.them will.walk a.lot (of people) on these sidewalks
‘A lot of them (people) will walk on these sidewalks’
- c. *Ne starnutiscono tanti, (di bambini), qui.*
of.them will.sneeze many (of children) here
‘Many of them (children) will sneeze here.’
- d. *Ne attecchirono pochi, (di bulbi)*
of.them will.take.root few (of bulbs)
‘Few (of bulbs) will take root.’
- e. *Ne funzionano solo due (di orologi)*
of.them work only two (of clocks)
‘Only two of them (clocks) work.’
- f. *Ne oscillano regolarmente solo tre (di metronomi)*
of.them oscillate regularly only two (of metronomes)
‘Only two of them (metronomes) oscillate regularly.’
- g. *Non ne trilla forte nessuna, (di sveglia).*
not of.them rings loudly no.one (of alarm)
‘None of them ring (alarms) loudly.’
[Calabrese & Mailing, 2009]
- h. *Ne dormono tanti, di bambini, qui fuori.*
of.them sleep many of children here outside
‘Many of them (children) sleep out here.’
[Lonzi, 2009]
- 1.25. *Ne giocano sempre solo tre (di bambini).*
of.them play always only three (of children)
‘Only three of them (children) play, always.’
[Calabrese & Mailing, 2009]

All verbs in (1.24-1.25) take auxiliary *avere* ‘have’ in the perfect. As such, (1.24) and (1.25) require an explanation if (1.7d) is to be maintained. Lonzi, who brought most of these data to light, generally posits that these examples are all unaccusative structures with the quantifier in VP-internal position. Lonzi observes that in general, whether a verb takes *essere* ‘be’ or *avere*

‘have,’ *NE* is only possible if the sentence is “eventive,” the host of *NE* is [-agentive, -human], and the predication provides information about the set denoted by *NE* rather than the individuals denoted by the quantifier. As I understand Lonzi’s analysis, (1.24a) is “eventive” in that it describes the location where the phones are ringing, and because it focuses on such location, the agentive nature of *telefonare* is de-emphasized, and *NE* is grammatical (1986:112). Lonzi also observes that the verbs in (1.24-1.25) all “*colpiscono i sensi*” ‘strike one’s senses,’ and normally require VS structure – a fact that renders them more likely to be eligible for *NE*-cliticization. However, if these verbs are put into the periphrastic perfect, Lonzi finds *NE* to be ungrammatical (1.26). She attributes the ungrammatical results to the fact that *NE* requires participial agreement, and the structure imposed by *avere* ‘have’ does not permit agreement (2009):

- 1.26. a. **Ne hanno telefonato alcuni.*
of.them have phoned a.few
‘A few of them have called.’
- b. **Ne ha camminato tanta.*
of.it has walked a.lot
‘A lot of them have walked.’
- c. **Ne hanno starnutito tanti.*
of.them have sneezed many
‘Many of them have sneezed’
- d. **Ne attecchito pochi.*
of.them taken.root few
‘Few of them have taken root.
- e. **Ne hanno funzionato solo due.*
of.them have worked only two
‘Only two of them have worked.’
- f. **Ne hanno oscillato regolarmente solo tre.*
of.them have oscillated regularly only three
‘Only three of them have oscillated regularly.’
- g. **Non ne ha trillato forte nessuna.*
not of.them has rung loudly none

- ‘None of them rang loudly.’
- h. **Ne* *hanno* *dormito* *tanti*.
of.them have slept any
‘Many of them slept.’
- [Lonzi, 1986; glosses and translation mine]
- i. **Ne* *hanno* *dormiti* *tanti*.
Of.them have slept.MASC.PL many.MASC.PL
‘Many of them slept.’
- [Lonzi, 2009; glosses and translation mine]

In (1.26h), if agreement were possible, we would have the form in (1.26i). However, according to Lonzi, because *avere* ‘have’ does not permit agreement, (1.26i) is unacceptable. As regards reflexive-transitive examples like (1.15), where agreement is satisfied, Lonzi posits that these are too agentive to permit *NE*-cliticization.

Building on Lonzi’s work, Glushan & Calabrese posits a “perspective structure,” according to which *NE* constructions are predications of a location rather than of the argument of the verb (2014). Where *NE* is combined with unergatives, a form of semantic “bleaching” occurs, and the argument of *NE* is VP-internal. In the periphrastic tenses, the lack of participial agreement causes the ungrammaticality seen in (1.26).

It seems that Relational Grammarians also agree that the sentences in (1.26) are ungrammatical (*see* Alba-Salas, 2004). Because *NE* appears incompatible with *avere* ‘have,’ Relational Grammar scholars continue to use it as a test for objecthood.

In the Role and Reference Grammar frame work, (1.24-1.26) are assumed to be stative existential constructions. According to Bentley (2006), these sentences should be translated using English *there*, with the quantifier inside a relative clause that describes the “activity” involved. For example, (1.24b), which involves the activity ‘walk’ should be rendered as:

- 1.24 b’. People, there are many who (/and they) walk on those pavements.
[Bentley 2006: 275]

As for the sentences in (1.26), Bentley notes that some speakers allow *NE* to combine with unergatives in the periphrastic tenses, while others reject such combinations (2006: 283-285). These combinations cannot win universal acceptance because they engender a mismatch in auxiliary requirements. On the one hand, they are existential and as such, must take *essere* ‘be.’ On the other hand, their predicate is unergative and can only take *avere* ‘have.’ A mismatch therefore ensues, causing difficulty for some speakers.

It has also been suggested that acceptance of *NE* + unergative is a matter of dialectal variation. According to Calabrese & Mailing, *NE* combines more readily with unergatives in the northern dialects than in other dialects (2009:28). In the northern dialects, such combinations “tend[] to be more acceptable or even fully acceptable” in the periphrastic tenses.

Some scholars believe that the periphrastic tenses do not, in and of themselves, bar *NE* from combining with unergatives. Mackenzie (2006), for example, claims that *NE* can appear with any intransitive in any tense, as long as the construction has “presentational meaning.” Regarding the term “presentational,” Mackenzie states, “*By far the most common presentational verbs are those that indicate appearance, arrival, occurrence, presence, absence and so forth, and typically these are classified as unaccusative*” (p. 35). As far as I can tell, Mackenzie cites only one example of *NE* with an unergative verb in the periphrastic perfect:

1.27.	<i>Come</i>	<i>già</i>	<i>comunicato</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>precedenza</i>	<i>su</i>	721
	As	already	communicated	in	the.past	out.of	721
	<i>elettori</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>hanno</i>	<i>votato</i>	635.		
	voters	of.them	have	voted	635		

‘As previously indicated, out of 721 voters 635 voted.’

[Mackenzie, 2006; glosses mine]

The above sums up scholarly opinions on *NE*'s incompatibility with unergatives. Next, we will explore the theoretical consequences of this alleged incompatibility.

c) *Attempts to derive other properties of NE from its alleged incompatibility with subjects*

As mentioned in (1.7a-c), *NE* is said to be incompatible with definite quantifiers and certain adjectives. Some scholars have suggested that these restrictions on *NE* result from the restriction in (1.7d) – *NE*'s alleged incompatibility with subjecthood (La Fauci & Loporcaro, 1997; Cinque, 1990a). Consider the following examples:

1.28. **Incompatibility with universal quantifiers (7a)**

- a. *Arrivano tutti gli amici.*
arrive all the friends.
'All the friends arrive.'
- b. **Ne arrivano tutti*
of.them arrive all
'All of them arrive.'

[La Fauci & Loporcaro, 1997]

1.29. **Incompatible with references to a specific subset within the set denoted by *NE* (7b)**

- a. *Arrivano questi amici.*
arrive these friends.
'These friends arrive.'
- b. **Ne arrivano questi.*
of.them arrive these
'Out of them, these arrive.'
- c. *Quanti ce ne sono?*
how.many there of.them are
'How many of them are there?'
- e. **Quali ce ne sono?*
which.ones there of.them are
'There are which ones of them?'

[La Fauci & Loporcaro, 1997]

1.30. **Limited compatibility with adjectival predicates (7c)**

- a. *Ne sono note solo alcune*
of.them are known only few
‘Only a few of them are known.’
- b. **Ne sono buoni pochi (dei suoi articoli)*
of.them are good few (of.the his articles)
‘Few of them (his articles) are good’
[Cinque, 1990a]

La Fauci & Loporcaro essentially argue that (1.28b), (1.29b), and (1.29e) are ungrammatical because the source of *NE* in these sentences are the surface subject. This is because, according to them, the definite nature of the quantifier forces it to advance to final 1-hood, disallowing an impersonal construction that would otherwise result. In other words, La Fauci & Loporcaro determined that *tutti* ‘all’ (1.28b) *questi* ‘these’ (1.29b), and *quali* ‘which’ (1.29e) are all surface subjects, even though *quanti* ‘how many’ (1.29c) is not. Similarly, Cinque claimed that *note* ‘known’ (1.30a) is unaccusative because it allows *NE*, whereas *buoni* ‘good’ is unergative because it disallows *NE*. This is so even though all adjectives take *essere* ‘be’ in Italian, as shown in both (1.30a) and (1.30b).

Other scholars do not link (1.7a-c) to objecthood directly; however, they posit the same line of analysis to account for the data in (1.26) as well as those (1.7a-c). For example, Bentley (2006) states the following regarding *NE*’s incompatibility with universal quantifiers:

- 1.31. Evidence in favour of the proposed existential analysis is provided by the fact that *ne*-cliticization is subject to a number of constraints which are at work in existentials cross-linguistically. Observe the following example:

(a)⁴ *Tifoni, se ne scatenano in questa parte del Pacifico*
Typhoons RFLQCLbreak.out.3PL in this part of.the Pacific
‘Typhoons, there arise some in this part of the Pacific.’

The example in (a) can only mean that it is typical of this part of the that typhoons arise in it, and not that it is a property of typhoons they arise in this part of the Pacific (Casadio 1992). **This means that universal reading of the nominal which is *ne*-cliticized is ruled out. *Ne*-cliticization is, in fact, ruled out with strong**

⁴ I have changed Bentley’s original numbering to (a) and (b) so that her examples will not be confused with mine.

quantification (Milsark 1974, 1979), as is shown by its incompatibility with *tutto* 'all', *entrambi* 'both', and *ogni* 'each':

(b) **Ne arriva*(no) *tutti* / *entrambi* / *ogni*.

QCL arrive.3SG/PL all both each

'Everybody/ both/ each *ne* is arriving.'

[Bentley, 2006: 279; emphasis mine]

In the above passage, Bentley appears to suggest that universal quantifiers cannot be combined with *NE* because *NE* constructions are existential constructions. However, Bentley also claims that the existential analysis is only applicable to non-canonical *NE* structures like those in (1.26). As for the other structures, she states, "*I do not wish to postulate an existential predicate for all structures with ne-cliticization. This would certainly seem inappropriate in the case of transitive constructions*" (p.280). Here, Bentley's argument seems inconsistent. If only non-canonical structures are existentials, why is (b) ungrammatical? The verb in (b) *arrivare* 'arrive' is a classic unaccusative. Furthermore, if an existential reading "*seem[s] inappropriate in the case of transitive constructions,*" why do these constructions rule out universal quantifiers? As we already saw in (1.8) (repeated below as (1.32a)), transitivity will not render universal quantifiers compatible with *NE*:

1.32. a. **Gianni ne ama ogni/tutte/entrambe.*
 Gianni of.them loves each/all/both
 'Gianni loves each/all/both of them'
 'Gianni (of) them loves every, all, both, the second'
 [Casadio, 1992]

b. **Ne ho visti tutti.*
 of.them I.have seen all
 'I have seen all of them.'

c. **Ne ho visti/o ogni/oguno/ciascuno.*
 Of.them I.have seen.PL/SG each/all
 [Cardinaletti & Giusti, 2006]

Like Bentley, Mackenzie also attempts to derive other characteristics of *NE* from its alleged incompatibility with unergatives. Recall that according to Mackenzie, *NE* does not

combine readily with unergatives because in most contexts, these verbs are not sufficiently “presentational.” Mackenzie applies this same analysis to adjectives. Specifically, he claims that *NE* cannot combine with I-level adjectives because “*individual-level predicates necessarily imposes a topic-comment division that matches the grammatical subject-predicate division, whereas state-level predicates may also be used in so-called ‘thetic judgments’ . . . in which topic-comment and subject-predicate are dissociated*” (2006:63). Mackenzie then concludes that thetic-judgments are presentational, and “given that individual-level predicates can never be involved in thetic judgments,” I-level adjectives are incompatible with *NE* (2006:64).

In sum, it appears that most scholars consider *NE*'s supposed incompatibility with subjects to be its most important property. They also assume that this property is linked to various other traits displayed by *NE*, such as the tendency for the quantifier to be post-verbal, the ban on definite quantifiers, and the difficulty with adjectives. In the next subsection, I will briefly summarize my position on the various properties of *NE* and lay out the precise questions that this study will address.

2. Summary of results; outline of study

In this study I will show that while the properties presented above are widely accepted and have some basis in reality, they cannot be maintained without significant modification. All in all, I argue that in Pre-Modern Italian, *NE* had the meaning ‘of them/of it’ – the meaning that is still its closest equivalent in English today. When it had this meaning, its semantic and syntactic functions were less restricted, and its distribution was more similar to that of its English counterpart. However, over time, *NE* underwent semantic specialization, and it is this specialization process that is responsible for some of the data we have seen. I do not have the expertise to track the different stages of the specialization process; such a task must be left to a

scholar who can appreciate the nuances of historical texts. Here, I will merely offer sufficient data to show that semantic specialization occurred – how it occurred is beyond the scope of this study.

The rest of the study will be organized as follows. Chapter 2 will discuss the distribution of *NE* in the older versions of the language. Chapter 3, 4, and 5 will be dedicated to *NE* in present day Italian. In Chapter 3, I will explore *NE* in its canonical usage – that is, cases where *NE* is extracted from an (underlying) object. Chapter 4 will be devoted to the more controversial usages of *NE*, such as examples involving an unergative verb or an i-level adjective. Chapter 5 will discuss situations where *NE*'s quantifier may appear pre-verbally, contrary to the commonly accepted wisdom. In order to orient the reader, I have summarized my position on the various allegations about *NE* in the chart below:

Chart

	At present	Histor.	Position of other scholars	My position
<i>NE</i> is not compatible with expressions that denote a specific subset, such as <i>questi</i> 'these' or <i>quelli</i> '	True	False	These are subjects so they are not compatible with <i>NE</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These don't make sense because <i>NE</i> has undergone semantic specialization. • In its present form <i>NE</i> cannot have a specific referent (Casadio, 1992), so these are ungrammatical.
<i>NE</i> is not compatible with universal quantifiers.	True	False	Semantically, <i>NE</i> must pick a subset within a set (Giusti & Cardinaletti, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is true, but things like <i>tre su tre</i> 'three out of three' are grammatical.
<i>NE</i> has limited compatibility with non-verbal predicates	Partially true	False	These predicates are not unaccusative, or they impose topic-comment structure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all i-level adjectives are barred. On the other hand, all PP predicates seem to be incompatible with <i>NE</i>.

<p><i>NE</i> requires an underlying object that is not also a subject</p>	<p>Mostly false</p>	<p>False</p>	<p><i>NE</i> can detect underlying objecthood</p> <p><i>NE</i> imposes topic-comment structure</p> <p><i>NE</i> is existential</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As far as I can tell, <i>NE</i> is not, and has never been a reliable test for objecthood. This is the case for all varieties of Italian that I have ever encountered. No speaker rejects non-object referents in all circumstances. • Equally false is the assertion that some varieties of Italian always tolerate <i>NE</i> with unergatives in the periphrastic tenses. Toleration of these constructions is a matter of speaker variation, not dialectal variation. • There is no correspondence whatsoever between a speaker's willingness to accept unergatives and their view of other issues on <i>NE</i>. The attempts to link these various restrictions are therefore misguided.
<p><i>NE</i> cannot combine with unergatives in compound tenses because of participial agreement/ the fact that <i>NE</i> constructions are existential</p>	<p>At least partially true</p>	<p>False</p>	<p>Existentials require <i>essere</i> 'be'</p> <p><i>NE</i> typically requires agreement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very difficult to determine why <i>NE</i> seems incongruous with unergatives in compound tenses, but participial agreement probably plays a role in creating this incongruity.
<p>The quantifier of <i>NE</i> must appear post-verbally</p>	<p>False</p>	<p>False</p>	<p>Pre-verbal entities are subjects.</p> <p>Pre-verbal entities are topics, and quantifiers cannot be topics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantifiers may appear pre-verbally. • They tend to appear post-verbally, but that's not an absolute requirement.

Table 1: Summary of Main Conclusions

II. The Distribution of *NE* in Pre-Modern Italian

A. The historical data

1. *NE* in Latin

NE originates from Latin *inde* ‘from there,’ which, already in Latin, had partitive meaning (Sornicola, 2014). *Inde* ‘from there’ could be co-referent with a quantifier, as shown in the examples below:

2.1. a.	<i>Ex</i>	<i>praedatoribus</i>	<i>Aequorum</i>	<i>qui</i>	<i>populabundi</i>	
	out.of	ravagers	of.Aequian	who	ravage.FUT.PART	
	<i>in</i>	<i>finibus</i>	<i>Romanis</i>	<i>vagabantur</i>	<i>ab</i>	<i>A. Postumio</i> <i>consule</i>
	in	borders	roman	roamed	by	A.Postumius consul
	<i>duo</i>	<i>milia</i>	<i>et</i>	<i>quadringentos</i>	<i>caesos:</i>	<i>ceteram</i>
	two	thousand	and	four.hundred	killed	the.rest
	<i>multitudinem</i>	<i>praedam</i>	<i>agentem,</i>	<i>quae</i>	<i>inciderit</i>	<i>in</i>
	crowd	booty	carrying	which	ran	into
	<i>Quinctium,</i>	<i>nequaquam</i>	<i>pari</i>	<i>defunctam</i>	<i>esse</i>	<i>caede:</i>
	Quinctius	not.at.all	equal	perished	be	with.slaughter
	<i>interfecta</i>	<i>inde</i>	<i>quattuor</i>	<i>mila</i>	<i>et,</i>	<i>exsequendo</i>
	killed	of.them	four	thousand	and	for.the.sake.of.giving
	<i>subtiliter</i>	<i>numerum,</i>	<i>ducentos</i>	<i>ait</i>	<i>et</i>	<i>triginta.</i>
	exactly	number	two.hundred	he.says	and	thirty

‘Out of the Aequian ravagers who roamed around ravaging within Rome’s borders, two thousand four hundred were killed by Consul A. Postumio; and the rest of the crowd, which ran into Quinctius as they were carrying booty, were killed in a far greater massacre: of them four thousand perished, and, for the sake of giving an exact number, he says (four thousand) two hundred and thirty.’

[Livy 3, 5, 13; as quoted by Sornicola, 2014, glosses and translation mine]

b.	<i>Nec</i>	<i>plus</i>	<i>quam</i>	<i>quattuor</i>	<i>milia</i>	<i>hominum</i>	<i>effugerunt.</i>
	not	more	than	four	thousand	of.people	escaped

<i>Inde</i>	<i>tria</i>	<i>milia</i>	<i>fere</i>	<i>qui</i>	<i>arma</i>	<i>retinuerant</i>
of.them	three	thousand	almost	who	weapons	had.retained

<i>montem</i>	<i>propinquum</i>	<i>ceperunt.</i>
mountain	near.by	took.up

‘Not more than four thousand people escaped. Out of them, almost three thousand, who had retained their weapons, went to occupy a mountain nearby.’

[Livy 39, 31, 13; as quoted by Sornicola, 2014; glosses and translation mine]

c.	<i>Quantus</i>	<i>numquam</i>	<i>ante</i>	<i>exercitus,</i>	<i>legiones</i>	<i>decem</i>
	that.much	never	before	army	legions	ten

<i>effectae;</i>	<i>ternae</i>	<i>inde</i>	<i>datae</i>	<i>consulibus,</i>
formed	three	of.them	given	to.the.consuls

<i>quattuor</i>	<i>dictator</i>	<i>usus.</i>
four	dictator	using

‘There had never been an army of that size; ten legions were formed. Three of them were given to the consuls, and four to the dictator.’

[Livy 2, 30, 7; as quoted by Sornicola, 2014, glosses and translation mine]

As can be seen in (2.1), *inde* was not a clitic. It did not need to appear before the verb, and its referent could be a subject (2.1b). None of the restrictions previously mentioned can be argued to exist at this stage.

2. *NE* in Pre-Modern Italian

a) *NE* was compatible with all predicates

Inde developed into clitic *NE* on the way from Latin to Old Italian. Because of its status as a clitic, *NE* was restricted to immediate pre-verbal position. According to Giusti (2010), *NE* was also required to refer to either a direct object, or the subject of an unaccusative.⁵ However,

⁵ Original quote: “A differenza di un quantificatore universal, un quantificatore esistenziale può trovarsi disgiunto dal proprio SN solo se questo è espresso dal clitico *ne*. Ciò si verifica, come in *it. mod.*, solo con SN in funzione di soggetto di costruzione inaccusativa (60a-b) o di oggetto diretto (60c)” (Giusti, 2010: 396).

this generalization is incorrect. Pre-modern *NE* does not distinguish between subjects and objects. In fact, it does not distinguish between nouns and verbs. Consider the examples below:

2.2. Examples with unergatives

- a. *Imperò intra voi ne sono molti infermi*
 for among you of.them are many sick

e deboli; e molti ne dormono.
 and weak and many of.them sleep

‘For among you many [of you] are sick and weak, and many [of you] sleep’
 [Bibbia volgare, 1500]

- b. ... *il quale avea nome Argo, e aveva cento occhi*
 the which had name Argo and had 100 eyes

co' quali non dormiva mai se non con due
 with which not slept ever if not with two

occhi, cioè, come due n'avevano dormito e
 eyes that.is as two of.them.had slept and

destavansi, e egli ne dormivano altri due, sì
 waking.up and expletive of.them slept others two so

che sempre ne vegghiavano novantotto.
 that always of.them wake 98

‘...who had the name Argo, and had 100 eyes, with which he never slept except with two, that is, as two of them have slept and waking up, and it (expletive) slept two more, so that always, 98 of them are awake.’
 [Boccaccio, Giovanni [1375], Teseida delle nozze d'Emilia. Chiose]

- c. *Nel detto anno, a dì primo di febraio,*
 in said year on day first of February

essendo il tempo sereno e bello, senza
 being the weather calm and nice, without

avere o da lunga o da presso alcuno segno
 having either from a.far or from close.by any sign

di nuvole, tonò smisurato più volte, e
of clouds thundered immensely more times and

caddono in Firenze più saette, fra lle quali
fell in Florence more thunderbolts among the which

una ne percosse nel campanile de'
one of.them hit in.the bell.tower of.the

frati predicatori . . .
friars preachers

‘In said year on February 1st, while the weather was calm and clear, without any sign of clouds from a far or from close by, (suddenly) it (began to) thunder furiously, and multiple thunderbolts descended upon Florence, of which thunderbolts, one (of them) struck the bell tower of the Franciscans.’

[Cronica, 1363]

2.3. Examples with extraction from subjects of transitive verbs

a. *. . . e l'ale loro erano stese; due ale*
and the.wings their were stretched two wings

di ciascuno si giungevano, e due ne
of one REFL reached and two of.them

coprivano li loro corpi.
covered the their bodies

‘. . . and their wings were spread; two wings of each joined together, and two of them covered their bodies.’

[Anonimo, 1334]

b. *Delle due figlie da lei avute da Antonio*
of.the two daughters by her had by Anthony

una ne sposò Domizio Enobarbo, l'altra famosa
one of.them married Domizio Enobarbo the.other famous

per bellezza, e per pudicizia fu data a
for beauty and for modesty was given to

Bruto figlio di Livia, e figliastro di Cesare istesso.
Bruto son of Livia and stepson of Caesar himself

‘Of the two daughters she had by Anthony, one of them married Domizio Enobarbo, and the other, who was famous for her beauty and modesty, was given to Bruto, son of Livia and stepson of Caesar himself.’

[Antonio e Cleopatra, 1788]

- c. *Appresso, alcune ne hanno di loro natura*
 near.by some of.them have by their nature
- quasi una figura quadra: de le quali altre*
 almost a figure quadruple of the which others
- ne sono lunghe*
 of.them are long.

‘Nearby, some of them have by their nature almost a four shapes: of which some are long.’

[Agricola, 1550]

- d. ... *messo in prigione Manlio, gran parte della plebe cambiò*
 put in prison Manlius great part of.the plebians changed
- veste e molti se ne lasciavano crescere*
 clothes and many REFL of.them left to.grow
- i capelli e la barba...⁶*
 the hair and the beard

‘Once Manlius was imprisoned, a great part of the plebians changed their clothes and many of them allowed their hair and beard to grow.’

[Le Deche di T. Livio, 1842]

2.4. Examples with extraction from subjects of reflexive-transitives

- a. *I Neri temeano forte i loro adversari,*
 the Neri feared strongly the their adversaries
- e cominciavano a dire parole umili.*
 and began to say words humble
- E molti se ne nascono ne' munisteri,*
 and many REFL of.them hid in.the monasteries

⁶ Original Latin: *Coniecto in carcerem Manlio satis constat magnam partem plebis vestem mutasse, multos mortales capillum ac barbam promisisse...*

e molti si vestivano come frati per paura
and many REFL dressed like friars for fear

di loro nimici: chè altro riparo non aveano . . .
of their enemies because other cover not had

‘The Neri were very fearful of their adversaries, and they began to say humble words. And many of them hid themselves in monasteries, and many dressed themselves like friars for fear of their enemies, as they had no other cover...’

[Cronica delle cose occorrenti ne' tempi suoi, 1310]

b. *La qual cosa poi che fu saputa, a turme correvano*
the which thing because it.was known in droves ran

le genti a lui di Siria e d'Egitto, e
the people to him of Syria and of.Egypt and

molti se ne fecero cristiani; e di quelli, che
many REFL of.them made Christians and of those that

erano già cristiani, lasciando lo mondo, in tutto
were already Christians leaving the world in all

diventarono monaci e discepoli d'Ilarione.
they.became monks and disciples of.Ilarione

‘Once this became known, the people of Syria and Egypt ran to him in droves and many of them made themselves Christians, and as for those who were already Christians, they left the world to become monks and disciples of Ilarione.’

[Vita di Paolo, 1321]

c. *...quindi in grande scompiglio si posero i barbari, e a*
so in great confusion REFL put the barbarians and to

fuggir si diedero, e moltissimi se ne ucciser fra
fleeing refl they.gave and many refl of.them killed among

loro
them

‘...then there was great confusion among the barbarians and they as they set out to flee, many of them killed each other in the chaos.’

[Le vite degli uomini illustri, 1800s]

2.5. **Examples with extraction from arguments of nouns and adjectives**

- a. ... *perché* ***tre*** ***n'erano*** *Diaconi* *Cardinali*,
because three of.them.were deacons cardinals,

il *quarto*, *ch'era* *prima* *stato* *canonico* *regolare*,
the fourth who.was before been canon regular

era *prete* *cardinale*
was priest cardinal.

‘... for three of them were deacons cardinals, and the fourth, who had previously been a regular canon, was a cardinal priest.’
[Le Vite de' Pontefici, 1600s]

- b. ... *de'* *quali* ***due*** ***ne*** ***sieno*** ***secreti*** *e* *li*
of.the which two of.them let.them.be secret and the

altri *manifesti*;
others manifest

‘...of which let two be undisclosed, and the others disclosed.’
(*Statuto della Società del Piano del Palude d'Orgia*, 1303)

- c. ...*il* *quale* *d'una* *sua* *donna* *avea* *più* *figliuoli*,
the which by.a his wife had multiple children

de' quali ***tre*** ***n'erano*** ***femine*** *e* *eran*
of.whom three of.them.were female and were

di *tempo* *maggiori* *che* *gli* *altri* *che*
of time greater than the other that

maschi *erano*.
male were

‘...who by a wife had a number of children, of whom three of them were female and were older than the other ones, who were male.’
[Boccaccio, Decameron]

- d. ...***alcuni*** ***ne*** ***sono*** ***assai duri***, *altri* *meno*
a.few of.them are quite hard others less
‘...some of them are quite hard, others less so’
[Agricola, 1550]

- e. *Et è da sapere che dele cose altre sono*
 and is to know that of.the things others are
- corporale che si possano toccare (et) vedere –*
 corporal that REFL.IMP can touch and see
- sì come terra, (et) oro, (et) arge(n)to, vestiri, (et)*
 such.as earth and gold and silver clothing (?) and
- pecunia (et) altre cose assai -*
 money and other things enough
- et altre ne sono incorporali, che no(n)*
 and others of.them are incorporal that not
- si puono né vedere né toccare –*
 REFL.IMP can neither see nor touch
- sì come giustizia, ragione, scientia . . .*
 such.as justice reason knowledge

‘One should know that of things, some are physical, that is, it is possible to touch and see them, such as soil, gold, silver, clothing, and money, and many others; and other ones of them (things) are non-physical, that is it is not possible to see or touch them, such as justice, reason, knowledge ...’

[*Trattati morali di Albertano da Brescia volgarizzati*, 1268]

- f. *Questa è di varii colori, ma per lo più del*
 this.one is of different colors but for.the.most.part of.the
- colore della Nespola. Altre ne sono berettine.*
 color of.the medlar others of.them are grey-ish

‘This one (stone) comes in different colors, but most are of the same color as medlars. Other ones of them are grey-ish.’

(*Tesoro delle gioie*, 1670)

- g. *Imperò intra voi ne sono molti infermi*
 for among you of.them are many sick
- e deboli; e molti ne dormono.*
 and weak and many of.them sleep

‘For among you many [of you] are sick and weak, and many [of you] sleep’
 [Bibbia volgare, 1500]

2.6. **Examples with extraction from arguments of PPs predicates**

- a. ... *queste sette teste che sono, come ditto è,*
 these seven heads that are as stated is
- sette sacramenti de la Chiesa rispondenti ai sette*
 seven sacraments of the church corresponding to.the seven
- doni de lo Spirito Santo, dei quali sono segno,*
 gifts of the spirit holy of.the which are sign
- come mostrato fu di sopra nel canto XXIX.*
 as shown was of above in.the canto 29
- Dei quali tre ne stanno sopra 'l timone*
 of.the which three of.them stay above.the steering.wheel
- del carro che figura lo chericato;*
 of.the cart that depicts the cleric

‘These seven heads that are, as has been said, seven sacraments of the church corresponding to the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, of which they are signs, as shown in Canto 29. Of these three of them stay above the steering wheel of the cart which depicts the cleric.’

(Commento al Purgatorio, 1385)

- b. *In uomini dovete sapere che molti ne sono di*
 in people you.must know that many of.them are of
- sì mala natura che per la loro mala natura non*
 such bad nature that by the their bad nature not
- dovrebbono fare se non male; e per lo insegnamento*
 must do if not evil and by the teaching
- e per la dottrina delli savi omini divegnono buoni*
 and by the doctrine of.the sages men become good
- e fanno altre cose che loro natura non porta*
 and do other things that their nature not brings

‘You should know that in people many of them are of such an evil nature that by their evil nature they cannot do but evil; and by the teaching and doctrine of the sage men they become good and do other things their nature does not bring about.’

(Fisiognomia (La), 1320)

- c. *E ha mandato più uomini in più parti del*
and has sent multiple people in multiple parts of.the
mondo, degli quali due ne sono in questa
world of.the which two of.them are in this
terra che mi vanno cercando, e troverrannomi quando
land who me go searching and will.find.me when
vorrò e non prima.
I.will.want and not before

‘And he has sent multiple to multiple parts of the world, of which people two (of them) are in this land who go searching for me, and they will find me when I want them to and not before.’

(Storia di Merlino, 1310)

2.7. Other examples

- a. *Voi siete appropriati agli asini; la natura dell' asino*
you are like to.the donkeys the nature of.the.donkey
è questa: che quando molti ne sono insieme,
is this that when many of.them are together
dando d' uno bastone a uno, tutti si disserrano,
giving of.one rod to one all REFL disperse
e qual fugge qua, e qual fugge là, tanto è
and one flees here and one flees there such is
la lor viltà; e questa è proprio la natura vostra.
the their cowardice and this is really the nature your

‘You are like donkeys; the nature of donkeys is as follows: when many of them are together, if you strike one with a rod, they all disperse, one running over here, another over there – such is their cowardice, and such cowardice is really your nature.’

(Trecentonovelle)

- b. *Perché nelle questioni naturali, delle quali questa,*
because in.the questions natural of.the which this

che *abbiamo* *alle* *mani,* *ne* *è* *una,* *la*
 which we.have at.the hands of.them is one the

cognizione *de* *gli* *effetti* *è* *quella* *che* *ci* *conduce*
 cognition of the effect is that which us leads

all'investigazione *e* *trovamento* *delle* *cause...*
 to.the.investigation and finding of.the causes

‘For in questions regarding nature, of which this one that we have at hand is one (of them), the cognition of the effects is what leads us to investigation and discovery of the causes...’

[Galileo Galilei, Sistemi Tolemaico e Copernicano]

The examples above show that *NE* was capable of a wide range of functions in Pre-Modern Italian. That it was compatible with unergatives is rendered certain by the presence of perfect auxiliary *avere* ‘have’ in (2.2b). Note that the subject of *avere* has to be the two eyes: if it were *Argo*, the verb would be singular. (2.3) shows that *NE* could refer to the subject of a transitive verb: *NE* is coindexed with the subjects of *coprivano* ‘cover’ in (2.3a), *sposò* ‘marry’ in (2.3b), *hanno* ‘have’ in (2.3c), and *lasciavano* ‘allowed’ in (2.3d). All four sentences contain an overt direct object (*li loro corpi* ‘their bodies’ in (2.3a), *Domizio Enobarbo* in (2.3b), *una figura quadra* ‘a squared figure’ in (2.3c), and *i capelli e la barba* ‘hair and beard’ in (2.3d)), ensuring that the verb is transitive. (2.4) shows that *ne* was compatible with reflexive-transitives: *NE* refers to the subjects of *nascosono* ‘hid’ in (2.4a), *fecero* ‘made’ in (2.4b), and *ucciser* ‘killed’ in (2.4c). (2.5) shows that *NE* could be combined with noun and adjectival predicates, including those denoting inherent states, such as *femine* ‘female’ in (2.5c) and *incorporali* ‘non-corporal’ in (2.5d). (2.6) shows attestations of *NE* with PP predicates. The predicates are *sopra l’ timone* ‘over the rudder’ in (2.6a), *di sì mala natura* ‘of such an evil nature’ in (2.6b), and *in questa terra* ‘in this land’ in (2.6c). Finally, (2.7) shows two other types of examples. In (2.7a), *NE* is attested with *insieme* ‘together,’ and in (2.7b) *NE* was extracted not from the argument of a

nominal predicate, but from the predicate itself. The subject is *questa* ‘this (question),’ the finite verb is *è* ‘is,’ and the predicate is *una* ‘one.’ *Una* ‘one’ is coindexed with *questioni naturali* ‘questions regarding nature.’

The attestations in (2.2-2.7) demonstrate that *NE* underwent some sort of specialization: the constructions they exemplify are now either altogether impossible or highly unproductive. For instance, *NE* no longer combines readily with reflexive-transitives, adjectives, or unergatives in compound tenses, and subjects of non-reflexive transitives are completely ineligible for cliticization. The functions of modern *NE* will be discussed at length in Chapters 3 & 4. For now, we will continue to explore the distribution of *NE* in pre-modern texts. The rest of this chapter will be dedicated to two other characteristics of historical *NE*: compatibility with universal quantifiers and referentiality.

b) *NE was compatible with universal and definite quantifiers*

Historical *NE* is attested with both universal quantifiers and definite quantifiers. Consider the examples below:

2.8. a. ...*e che se stante il comperatore ne volesse*
 and that if standing the buyer of.it wanted

vendere tutto o parte, il possa vendere...
 to.sell all or part it can sell

‘...and if the buyer wants to sell all or a part of it, he should be able to do so...’

[Balducci Pegolotti, *Pratica della Mercatura*]

b. *Deh, or non sai tu quante e quali donne*
 come.on now not know you how.many and which women

m' hanno per maritale legge al mio padre
 me.have for marital law to.the my father

adimandato, e quante e quali egli me ne
 asked and how.many and which he to.me of.them

ha già volute dare per volermi levare a te?
has already wished to.give for wanting.me lift from you

‘Come on, don’t you know how many and which women have asked my father for my hand, and how many and which ones of them he has wanted to give to me to take me away from you?’

[Boccaccio, Filocolo]

- c. *De' due quadri laterali, Giambattista Pellizari fece quello*
of.the two pictures sides Giambattista Pellizari made the.one
- con S. Filippo che prega M. V., e Giambattista Bissoni*
with S. Filippo who prays M.V. and Giambattista Bissoni
- ne fece l'altro con S. Girolamo innanzi al Crocifisso,*
of.them made the.other with S. Girolamo in.front of.the cross
- che vien svegliato dalla tromba celeste*
that gets woken by.the trumpet heaven

‘Of the two lateral pictures Giambattista Pellizari made the one of St. Filippo praying to M.V (Virgin Mary?), and Giambattista Bissoni made of them the other with St. Girolamo in front of the cross that was wakened by the heavenly trumpet.’

[Gandini, 1800s]

- d. *Desiderando nui de havere una viola grande dal maestro*
desiring we to have a viola big from.the maestro
- che ne fece le altre quattro, haveremo charo*
that of.them made the others four we.have clear
- che siati cum lui...*
that you.are with him

‘We desire to have a big viola from the maestro who made the other four, we know that you are with him...’

[Isabella d’Este, 1499, as quoted by Hoffmann in *La Viola da Gamba*, 2018]

- e. *Io non ho fatto più bagno dacché ne feci*
I not have made more bath since of.them I.made

quei 10 in 2 giorni. Mi lavo ogni giorno una
 those 10 in 2 days Me wash every day a
parte del corpo e sono tuttavia raffreddato
 part of.the body and I.am anyway cold.

‘I have not bathed since the time I took 10 baths in 2 days. Everyday I wash a part of my body and I get cold anyway.’

[Italo Svevo⁷, 1908]

In the sentences above, *NE* appears with either a universal quantifier (*tutto* ‘all’ in (2.8a)) or a definite quantifier (*quali* ‘which’ in (2.8b), *l’altro* ‘the other’ in (2.8c), *le altre quattro* ‘the other four’ in (2.8d), and *quei 10* ‘those 10’ in (2.8e)). These attestations show that pre-modern *NE* was compatible with all quantifiers. Thus, the prohibition on universal and definite quantifiers is only valid for Present-Day Italian.

c) *NE and referentiality*

The definite quantifiers in the previous subsection illustrate a fundamental difference between historical *NE* and its present-day counterpart: whereas the former could be used referentially or quantificationally (Fodor & Sag, 1982), the latter is obligatorily quantificational. The distinction between quantificational and referential is illustrated in (2.9):

2.9. a. *Umberto Eco: “I desired to poison a monk.”*

[von Heusinger & Kaiser, 2003]

b. *Cada estudiante entrevistará a un personaje conocido*
 each student will.interview to a celebrity

‘Each student will interview a celebrity.’

[Leonetti, 2004]

⁷ Svevo is known for using dialectalisms and arcaisms. It is not clear if *quei 10* ‘those 10’ would have been acceptable to Standard Italian speakers in 1908.

Each of the sentences in (2.9) can have a referential or a quantificational reading. Under the referential reading, the underlined portion in (2.9a) refers to a particular monk. If the speaker is permitted to kill one monk, but not the one he has in mind, he will not be satisfied. Under the quantificational reading, the speaker will be happy to kill any monk, as long as the victim is a monk. In (2.9b), a referential reading would mean that all students will interview the same celebrity, whereas a quantificational reading would mean that each student will interview a celebrity, but they do not necessarily interview the same celebrity.

As the examples illustrate, a referential reading yields a specific individual, whereas a quantificational reading does not. Because of its link to specificity, referentiality is sometimes called *specificity* in the literature (von Heusinger & Kaiser, 2003; Geist, 2010). Here, *referential* and *specific* will be used interchangeably.

Some expressions are specific even if the speaker cannot identify their referent (von Heusinger & Kaiser, 2003). For example, *a monk* in (2.10a) is a specific monk even though the speaker explicitly states that they don't know who the monk is. Similarly, *some ghosts* in (2.10b) is specific regardless of whether the speaker knows which ghosts they are. The identity of these ghosts is fixed and distinct from *other ghosts*, even if the speaker cannot identify them.

- 2.10. a. *He wants to kill a monk but I don't know which one.*
b. *Some ghosts live in the pantry; others live in the kitchen.*
(von Heusinger, 2007)

We have seen in (2.8) that historical *NE* could be used referentially. If this were not the case, *quali* 'which' in (2.8b) and *l'altro* 'the other' in (2.8c) would be ungrammatical, as they refer to specific individuals. It is undeniable that these definite expressions cannot combine with *NE* in Present-Day Italian. However, present-day *NE* does not just exclude definite quantifiers. It

excludes all specific quantifiers, definite or otherwise. Consider the following example from Casadio (1992):

2.11 *Molti* *ragazzi* *ne* *amano* *due* (*di* *ragazze*).
 Many boys of.them love two of girls

2.12 *Molti* *ragazzi* *amano* *due* *ragazze*.
 Many boys love two girls

- 2.13. a. ‘Many boys love two girls, but they don’t necessarily love the same girls.’
 b. ‘There are two girls who are loved by many boys.’

[Casadio, 1992; translation modified]

According to Casadio, (2.11) can only have the interpretation in (2.13a), whereas (2.12) is compatible with both (2.13a) and (2.13b). This is because (2.11) contains *NE* and a quantifier, whereas (2.12) contains *due ragazze* ‘two girls.’ Because modern quantifiers cannot refer to specific individuals, the reading in (2.13b) is not possible. Consider also (2.14-2.15):

2.14. a. *Nessuno* *ha* *risolto* *molti* *problemi*
 No.one has solved many problems

b. *Nessuno* *ne* *ha* *risolti* *molti*
 No.one of.them has solved many

- 2.15. a. There is no person x such that x solved many problems.
 b. There are many problems x such that no one solved x.

[Cresti, 2003, glosses and translation paraphrased]

According to Cresti, (2.14a) is compatible with both readings shown in (2.15). (2.14a) is true if (i) the number of problems solved by each person is less than ‘many,’ or (ii) there are many problems that are left unsolved because they were too difficult for everyone. In contrast (2.14b) is only compatible with (2.15a). Once again, we see that synchronically, *NE* blocks specificity in

its quantifier. Further evidence for this notion comes from examples like (2.17), which is based on Fodor & Sag (1982)'s sentence in (2.16):

2.16. *If a friend of mine from Texas had died, I would have inherited a fortune.*
[Fodor & Sag, 1982]

2.17 a. *Se muore un mio amico in Texas, eredito una casa.*
If dies a my friend in Texas I.inherit a house
'If a friend of mine, who lives in Texas, dies, I will inherit a house.'

b. #*Se ne muore uno (dei miei amici in Texas),*
if of.them dies one of.the my friends in Texas

eredito una casa
I.inherit a house

'If one of them dies (and it doesn't matter which one), I will inherit a house.'

The context in (2.17) requires a specific friend because it is improbable that the speaker stands to inherit a house from each of their friends in Texas. Because specificity is required, the use of *NE* in (2.17b) is inappropriate. This sentence is acceptable only if a house will be available as soon as one friend in Texas dies, regardless of which one.

Further evidence for this line of analysis comes from the distribution of modern *NE* in relative clauses. Consider the examples below:

2.18. a. *Questa è una che hai scelto.*
this is one that you.have chosen.
'It's one that you chose.'

b. **Questa è una che ne hai scelto.*
This is one that of.them you.have chosen
'It's one that you chose out of them.'

2.19. a. *Con alcune che hai raccolto bisogna*
with a.few that you.have harvested it.is.necessary
fare attenzione.
to.make attention

‘With a few that you harvested we have to be careful.’

- b. **Con alcune che ne hai raccolte bisogna fare attenzione.*
with a.few that of.them you.have harvested it.is.necessary
to.make attention

‘With a few that you harvested we have to be careful.’

- 2.20. *I gatti quell'estate non finivano più. Per uno che ne facevo adottare ne arrivavano 5.*
the cats that.summer not ended anymore for one
that of.them I.made adopt of.them came 5.

- a. ‘That summer there was an infinite number of cats. For each one that I managed to have people adopt, five (new ones) came.’
b. *That summer there was an infinite number of cats. At one point I got one of them adopted and then five others showed up.’

In all sentences in (2.18-2.20), the quantifier is followed by a relative clause. The quantifiers in (2.18) and (2.19) are referential: *una* ‘one’ in (2.18) refers to *questa* ‘this,’ *alcune* ‘some’ in (2.19) refers to certain items that the speaker has in mind. Because these quantifiers are referential, they cannot be coindexed with *NE*, as in (2.18b) and (2.19b). (2.20) also contains *NE*, but it is correct because a non-referential reading is available. Where the statement is true for all cats, *NE* is unproblematic (2.20a). Where the statement pertains to a specific cat, as in (2.20b), *NE* is impossible.

Interestingly, the type of sentences illustrated in (2.18-2.20) are amply attested in Pre-Modern Italian. Consider the examples below:

- 2.21. a. *Questi tutti sono ripieni di bonissima grazia, - ma pure ve ne sono alcuni molto più perfetti*
these all are full of greatest grace but
pure ve ne sono alcuni molto più perfetti

still there of.them are a.few a.lot more perfect
degli altri, come quello delle Murata di Fiorenza,
 than.the others like the of.the Murata of Florence
ed uno che ne è in S. Pietre Maggiore ...
 and one that of.them is in S. Peter Maggiore ...

‘These (crosses) are all full of the greatest virtue, but still there are some of them that are more perfect than others, such as the one of the Murata in Florence, and one that is of them in S. Peter Maggiore...’

[Vasari]

- b. *E fu Riccardo uomo dottissimo, e grandemente benemerito*
 and was Riccardo man learned and greatly worthy
delle lettere per la cura che si dette di raccogliere
 of letters for the care that REFL gave of collecting
e conservare le opere degli antichi, che riunì in
 and preserving the works of.the ancients that he.compiled in
una ricca biblioteca: e per una che ne compose
 a rich library and for one that of.them composed
egli stesso sull'amore delle medesime e sull'arte
 he himself on.the.love of.the same and on.the.art
di sceglierle intitolato philioblibion, dalla quale
 of choosing.them entitled philioblibion from.the which
si raccoglie che egli fu il primo ad introdurre
 REFL.IMP gathers that he was the first to introduce
le grammatiche della lingua greca e della ebraica.
 the grammars of.the language Greek and of.the Hebrew

‘And Riccardo was a most learned man, greatly worthy of letters, for the care he took to collect and preserve the works of the ancients, which he compiled into a rich library, and for one that he himself composed of them (for one work that he himself composed) on the love of the ancient works and the art of collecting them, which was entitled *philioblibion*, from which work it may see be seen that he was the first to introduce the grammars of the Greek language and that of Hebrew.’

[Fracassetti, 1863]

- c. *La rota cronologica è un giusto delineamento*
 the wheel chronological is a just delineation
- del modo messicano di computare il tempo tal*
 of.the way Mexican of computing the time such
- quale è descritta da Acosta. Pare che somigli*
 which is described by Acosta. it.seems that it.resembles
- una che ne vide quel dotto gesuita . . .*
 one that of.them saw that learned Jesuit

‘The chronological wheel is a just delineation of the Mexican mode of computing time, as described by Acosta. It seems to resemble one which that learned Jesuit had seen...’⁸

[Pillori, 1827]

In all of the sentences above, the quantifier is referential. (2.21a) refers to a particular cross in S. Peter Maggiore, (2.21b) refers to a particular work that made Riccardo famous, and (2.21c) refers to a particular wheel that the learned Jesuit saw. This type of construction is no longer acceptable.

Referentiality also creates another contrast between historical quantifiers and modern quantifiers. In pre-modern texts, the quantifier of NE is often attested in the role of contrastive topic, as in the examples below:

- 2.22. a. *Molte di queste torri esistono tuttora,*
 many of these towers exist still
- ed altre ne sono state successivamente distrutte.*
 and others of.them are been subsequently destroyed.’

‘Many of these towers are still around, and others were subsequently destroyed.’

[Teatro universale, 1832)]

- b. *...coloro i quali hanno qualche controversia si*

⁸ This example is a quote from an Italian translation of William Robertson’s *History of America*. The translation I provided is Robertson’s original wording.

they	the	who	have	some	dispute	REFL
<i>recano</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>quel</i>	<i>luogo,</i>	<i>ed</i>	<i>ascendono</i>	<i>sopra una</i>
come	to	that	place	and	ascend	on a
<i>certa</i>	<i>parte</i>	<i>elevata,</i>	<i>dove</i>	<i>ciascuno</i>	<i>dei</i>	<i>contendenti</i>
certain	part	elevated,	where	each	of.the	contestants
<i>colloca</i>	<i>sopra una</i>	<i>tavola</i>	<i>alcuni</i>		<i>cibi;</i>	
place	on a	table	some (pieces of)		food	
<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>corvi</i>	<i>traendo</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>quel</i>	<i>sito, alcuni</i>
and	the	crows	coming	to	that	site some
<i>ne</i>	<i>mangiano,</i>	<i>alcuni</i>	<i>invece</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>disperdono:</i>	
of.them	they.eat	some	instead	of.them	they.scatter	
<i>vince</i>	<i>colui</i>	<i>le</i>	<i>cui</i>	<i>offerte</i>	<i>vengono</i>	
wins	the.one	the	whose	offers	are	

dissipate.
Scattered

‘Those who have some dispute get themselves to that place and climb on a certain elevated part, where each party places pieces of food on a table, and the crows coming to that site, some of them they eat, some of them, instead, they spread around, and the party whose food was spread around wins the dispute.’

[Ambrosoli, 1832]

In (2.22a), some towers are said to have survived and are contrasted with other towers, which have been destroyed. In (2.22b), some pieces of food are contrasted with other pieces of food, as evident by the presence of *invece* ‘instead.’ If the same contrast is attempted in modern *NE*, ungrammaticality ensues. This is so regardless of whether the quantifier is pre-verbal or post-verbal:

- 2.23. a. **Molte di queste torri esistono tuttora,*
many of these towers exist still
- ed altre ne sono state distrutte*
and others of.them are been destroyed.

‘Many of these towers still exist, and others have been destroyed.’

b. **Molte di queste torri esistono tuttora,*
many of these towers exist still

e ne sono state distrutte altre
and of.them are been destroyed others

‘Many of these towers still exist, and others have been destroyed.’

2.24. a. **i corvi... alcuni ne mangiano, alcuni invece ne disperdono*
the crows some of.them they.eat some instead of.them they.spread
‘The crows ... some of them they eat, and some of them, instead, they spread around.’

b. **i corvi... ne mangiano alcuni, invece ne disperdono alcuni*
the crows of.them eat some instead of.them they.spread some
‘The crows ... some of them they eat, and some of them, instead, they spread around.’

c. **i corvi... ne mangiano alcuni, ne disperdono invece alcuni*
the crows of.them eat some of.them they.spread some some
‘The crows ... some of them they eat, and some of them, instead, they spread around.’

d. **i corvi... ne mangiano alcuni, ne disperdono alcuni invece*
the crows of.them eat some of.them they.spread some instead
‘The crows ... some of them they eat, and some of them, instead, they spread around.’

Because modern quantifiers are non-referential, they do not have a referent that can be contrasted with other entities, as required by a contrastive topic construction. The correct way to form such a construction in Modern Italian is to remove *NE*:

2.25. a. *Molte di queste torri esistono tuttora,*
many of these towers exist still

ed altre sono state distrutte
and others are been destroyed.

‘Many of these towers still exist, and others have been destroyed.’

b. **i corvi... alcuni li mangiano, alcuni invece li disperdono*
the crows some them they.eat some instead them they.spread

‘The crows ... some of them they eat, and some of them, instead, they spread around.’

As soon as *NE* is removed in (2.23a), *altre* ‘others’ becomes referential, and the sentence is grammatical (2.25a). Because a direct object cannot be pre-posed in Italian without a clitic, *NE* was substituted with the referential pronoun *li* ‘them’ in (2.25b). This change renders the sentence grammatical even in its original word order, with *invece* ‘instead’ after *alcuni* ‘a few.’

I will close this subsection by commenting on whether modern *NE* bars universal quantifiers, which, as will be seen, is related to the issue of referentiality. According to Cardinaletti & Giusti (2006), the semantics of *NE* requires a subset within a set (cf. (1.32), repeated below as (2.26)). I believe this claim is true, although it is imprecise in two ways. First, *tutti* ‘all’ is barred whether or not it picks out the entire set. As shown in (2.27), *quasi tutti* ‘almost all’ is not any better than *tutti* ‘all.’

- 2.26. a. **Gianni ne ama ogni/tutte/entrambe.*
Gianni of.them loves each/all/both
 ‘Gianni loves each/all/both of them’
 ‘Gianni (of) them loves every, all, both, the second’
 [Casadio, 1992]
- b. **Ne ho visti tutti.*
of.them I.have seen all
 ‘I have seen all of them.’
- c. **Ne ho visti/o ogni/oguno/ciascuno.*
Of.them I.have seen.PL/SG each/all
 [Cardinaletti & Giusti, 2006]
- 2.27. **Ne ho visti quasi tutti.*
of.them I.have seen almost all
 ‘I have seen all of them.’

Second of all, *tre su tre* ‘three out of three’ seems to pick out the entire set, and nevertheless it is perfectly acceptable (2.28a):

2.28. a. *Ne ho visti tre su tre.*
of.them I.have seen three out.of three
‘I have seen three out of three.’⁹

b. *Io come tutti ne vedo una di luna*
I like everyone of.it I.see one of moon

Se tu ne vedi due dobbiamo farti esaminare
if you of.them see two we.must have.you checked.out

da un medico
by a doctor

‘I, like everyone else, only see one (moon). If you see two we should have you checked out.’

What is the different between *tutti* ‘all’ and *tre su tre* ‘three out of three’? In my view, the former is referential and the latter is not. *Tutti* ‘all’ obligatorily refers to entities already mentioned – namely the items that there were to be seen. *Tre su tre* ‘three out of three,’ on the other hand, is an expression of quantity. Through our knowledge of the world, we know that this expression must refer to all three items that there were to be seen, but this is an inference rather than what is required by the grammar. *Tre su tre* ‘three out of three’ is not any more universal or referential than *una* ‘one’ in (2.28b). Here, too, we know that *una* ‘one’ has to refer to the moon, but *una* ‘one’ in and of itself does not say this, and in fact, other moons are possible in the universe of discourse. Consider also (2.29), where the speaker asserts that he saw six out of three:

2.29. *Ne ho visti sei su tre*
of.them I.have seen six out.of three

perché ero ubriaco
because I.was drunk.

‘I saw six out of three because I was drunk.’

⁹ This sentence was reviewed by at least seven speakers. All seven accepted it.

(2.29) shows that the set of items seen are not necessarily a subset of the items there were to be seen. Rather, the language treats both of these sets as subsets of an abstract set containing all items that could be seen, imaginary or real. Because the number of items that can be seen is theoretically unlimited, *tre su tre* ‘three out of three’ is not a universal quantifier.

B. Conclusion of chapter 2

In this chapter we have seen that *NE* in Pre-Modern Italian was compatible with a wide variety of predicates. *NE* could refer to the argument of verbs, nouns, adjectives, or PPs. It could even be hosted by the subject of a transitive verb.

Historical *NE* could be used referentially. In contrast, modern *NE* is strictly quantificational. As a result, historical quantifiers could serve as contrastive topic, whereas modern quantifiers cannot. Finally, although modern *NE* allows expressions such as *tre su tre* ‘three out of three,’ such expressions do not turn out to be universal quantifiers upon careful examination.

III. *NE* in Present-Day Italian – The Canonical Cases

This chapter is devoted to the distribution of *NE* in Present-Day Italian. In Chapter 2, we have seen that historical *NE* was not subject to any of the (alleged) restrictions described in Chapter 1. But what about modern *NE*? Is it subject to these restrictions? If yes, to what extent do the restrictions apply? Are there other restrictions besides them? These questions will be answered in this chapter and the next.

In general, I posit that the distribution of *NE* is controlled partly by syntax and partly by semantics. In some environments, semantics does not play a role; *NE* is either barred or required irrespective of semantic factors. In other environments, certain pragmatic and semantic factors influence whether or not *NE* appears. Overall, these factors can be summed up as follows: (1) *NE*

tends to be required where the items under discussion are non-real or hypothetical (i.e. number of eggs short for a recipe); (2) if the items under discussion are real, *NE* may or may not appear, depending on factors such as whether their identity is known or matters to the interlocutors, and (3) as already pointed out in chapter 2, *NE* may not refer to specific items. In short, the more concrete something is in the interlocutors' minds, the less likely it is that *NE* appears.

The rest of the chapter is organized as follows. Section A will address the environments in which *NE* cannot appear. Section B will discuss the use of *NE* in non-reflexive transitive sentences. Section C will discuss the use of *NE* in unaccusative and passive sentences. The role of *NE* in unergative, intransitive-reflexive, and adjectival constructions will be left to Chapter 4.

A. Situations in which *NE* is impossible

There are three situations in which *NE* absolutely cannot appear in modern Italian. First, ***NE* cannot refer to the subject of a transitive verb in a non-reflexive construction.** This was not the case in Pre-Modern Italian, but it is the case now. Not only is *NE* impossible in examples like (12) above (repeated below as (3.1) for convenience), it is also impossible even if the predicate in question is idiomatic, as in (3.2):

3.1 a. *Due persone hanno comprato macchine come questa.*
 two people have bought cars like this.one
 'Two people have bought cars like this one.'

b. **Due_j ne_j hanno comprato/comprate*
 two of.them have bought.M/F

macchine come questa.
 cars like this.com

'Two of them have bought cars like this one.'
 [Perlmutter, 1983]

3.2 a. *Due persone perdono i sensi?*
 two people lose the senses
 'Two people pass out (lit. lose their senses).'

- b. **Ne* *perdono* *i* *sensi* *due*
of.them lose their senses two
‘Two of them pass out (lit. lose their senses).’
- c. *Ne* *svengono* *due*
of.them pass.out two
‘Two of them pass out.’

In (3.2a-b), *perdere i sensi* ‘lose the senses’ is an idiomatic expression that means ‘pass out.’

Because this expression is transitive, *NE* cannot refer to the subject in (3.2b). In (3.2c), the verb *svenire* also means ‘pass out,’ but it is not transitive. Here, *NE* is perfectly acceptable.

NE extraction is also barred **from any nominal that appears inside a PP**. If the extraction occurs from a PP headed by *a(d)*¹⁰ ‘to’ – a dative marker – the construction is somewhat more plausible (3.3a), although it is still incorrect. Consider the examples below:

- 3.3. a. ^{??}*Dopo* 4 *mail* (*ne* *hanno* *risposto* *solamente* *ad*
after 4 emails of.them they.have responded only to

una *dicendo* *che* *avrebbero* *avvisato* *la* *banca*) . . .
one saying that they.would notify the bank

‘After four emails (they have responded to only one of them saying that they would notify the bank). . .’

- b. **Me* *ne* *sono* *concentrata* *su* *alcuni*
me of.them I.am concentrated on some
‘I concentrated on some of them.’

[Cordin, 1988]

It is possible that (3.3) would not have been acceptable even in Pre-Modern Italian. I have not been able to find any attestation of this type.

¹⁰ This preposition occasionally ends in /d/ if the next word starts with a vowel.

The last environment from which *NE* is completely barred involves instances where *NE* is coindexed with the argument of a PP predicate (cf. Bentley, 2006). Such coindexations are not possible. This is illustrated below in (3.4):

3.4. a. *Gli scarafaggi hanno paura dell'altezza. Strisciano sempre*
 the roaches they.have fear of.the.height they.crawl always

sul pavimento e non vanno mai sui mobili.
 on.the floor and not they.go ever on.the furniture

‘Cockroaches are afraid of height. They crawl on the floor and they don’t ever go on the furniture’

b. **No non è vero. L'altro giorno quando sono tornato ne*
 no not it’s true the.other day when I.am returned of.them

erano almeno tre sul tavolo
 were at.east three on.the table

‘No, that’s not true. The other day when I got back three of them were on the table.’

c. **No non è vero. L'altro giorno quando sono tornato ne*
 no not it’s true the.other day when I.am returned of.them

stavano almeno tre sul tavolo
 stayed at.east three on.the table

‘No, that’s not true. The other day when I got back three of them stayed on the table.’

d. *No non è vero. L'altro giorno quando sono tornato ce*
 no not it’s true the.other day when I.am returned there

ne erano almeno tre sul tavolo
 of.them were at.east three on.the table

‘No, that’s not true. The other day when I got back there were three of them on the table.’

(3.4b) is completely impossible, despite the extensive context in (3.4a). It does not become better even if *erano* ‘were’ is replaced with *stavano* ‘stay’ (3.4c). The only way to make it acceptable is to turn it into an existential construction by adding expletive *ce* ‘there,’ as in (3.4d) (Bentley, 2006).

PP predicates become less awkward when they are part of an idiomatic expression, such as *stare in piedi* ‘stand.’ This is shown in (3.5):

- 3.5. a. ?*Quando sono entrato ne stavano in piedi alcuni*
 when I.am entered of.them they.stayed in feet a.few
 ‘When I came in some of them were standing.’
- b. **Quando sono entrato ne stavano alcuni in piedi*
 when I.am entered of.them they.stayed a.few in a.few
 ‘When I came in some of them were standing.’

Notice that as soon as *in piedi* ‘in feet’ is separated from *stare* ‘stay,’ as in (3.5b), the sentence becomes completely unacceptable. This shows that *stare in piedi* ‘stand’ must be treated as one expression, as the quantifier of *NE* appears in immediate post-verbal position by default (Belletti, 1999):

- 3.6. a. *Ne è arrivato uno al giornale*
 of.them is arrived one at.the newspaper
 ‘One of them arrived at the newspaper’
- b. ??*Ne è arrivato al giornale uno*
 of.them is arrived at.the newspaper one
 ‘One of them arrived at the newspaper.’
 [Belletti, 2001]

(3.6a) is acceptable because the quantifier *uno* ‘one’ appears immediately after the verb. (3.6b) is marginal because *uno* ‘one’ does not appear until the end of the sentence. This is the opposite from what we saw in (3.5), where *alcuni* ‘a few’ obligatorily follows *in piedi* ‘in feet.’ As such, *stare in piedi* ‘stand’ should be treated as a single idiomatic expression.

B. *NE* in reference to objects of transitive verbs

Having addressed situations in which *NE* cannot appear, we will now discuss the environment in which *NE* is the least restricted. As far as I am aware of, there is virtually no restriction on *NE* when it is used to refer to the object of a transitive verb. In fact, it is easier to speak of contexts in which *NE* is preferred or required. As a general rule, bare quantifiers cannot function as direct objects without *NE*. This is true for both declarative and interrogative sentences.

1. Declarative sentences

Bare quantifiers cannot appear as a direct object in the absence of *NE* (Cardinaletti & Giusti, 2006), unless it is followed by a PP denoting group membership. This is illustrated in (3.7-3.8):

- 3.7. a. **Ieri ho letto molti in biblioteca*
Yesterday I.have read many (things) in the library
'Yesterday I read many things in the library.'
[Cardinaletti & Giusti, 2006]
- b. *Ieri ne_j ho letti molti_j in biblioteca*
Yesterday of.them I.have read many (things) in the library
'Yesterday I read many of them in the library.'
- 3.8. a. *Ieri ho letto molti di questi libri*
Yesterday I.have read many (things) of these books
'Yesterday I read many of these books.'
- b. *Ieri ne ho letti molti di questi libri*
Yesterday of.them I.have read many (things)of these books
'Yesterday I read many of them, these books.'

(3.7a) is ungrammatical because the bare quantifier *molti* 'many' is a direct object, but it is not coindexed with *NE*. In (3.7b), where *molti* 'many' is coindexed with *NE*, the sentence is acceptable. (3.8a) is without *NE*, but it is acceptable because *molti* 'many' is followed by a PP

denoting group membership, *di questi libri* ‘of these books.’ In the presence of such a PP, *NE* is optional (3.8b).

According to Cardinaletti & Giusti (2006), the pattern in (69) holds true unless the quantifier refers to human beings, as in (3.9):

- 3.9. *Ieri ho incontrato molti per la strada*
 Yesterday I.have met many(people) on the way
 ‘Yesterday I met many people on my way.’
 [Cardinaletti & Giusti, 2006]

In my view, (3.9) is highly marked. To the extent that it is acceptable, *molti* ‘many’ must refer to individuals that are known to the participants in the conversation (3.10a). But even if this condition is fulfilled, the version with *NE* (3.10b) is vastly preferable to the one without it:

- 3.10. a. *??Ho paura di quei maledetti*
 I.have fear of those accursed.people

Ieri ho incontrato molti per la strada
 Yesterday I.have met many on the way
 ‘I am afraid of those accursed people. Yesterday I met many on my way.’
- b. *Ho paura di quei maledetti. Ieri*
 I.have fear of those accursed.people Yesterday

ne ho incontrati molti per la strada
 of.them I.have met many on the way
 ‘I am afraid of those accursed people. Yesterday I met many of them on my way.’

If the quantifier introduces new individuals into discourse, skipping *NE* will result in complete incoherence:

- 3.11. **Sono andata alla festa per fare nuovi*
 I.am gone to.the party to make new

amici e ho fatto molti
 friends and I.have made many

‘I went to the party to make new friends and I made many.’

It is clear from the context in (3.11) that the friends are not a familiar referent. In such a context, omitting *NE* won’t just result in a highly marked sentence – it will result in incomprehensibility.

2. Interrogative sentences

NE is also obligatory where the interrogative pronoun *quanto/a/i/e/* ‘how many/ how much’ refers to the object of a transitive verb. This is so even if the referent is human (3.13):

3.12. a. **Quanti hai venduto/i?*
 how.many you.have sold
 ‘How many did you sell?’

b. *Quanti ne hai venduti?*
 how.many of.them you.have sold
 ‘How many of them did you sell?’
 [Samek-Lodovici, 2015:112]

3.13. a. **Quanti impiega?*
 how.many it.employs
 ‘How many does it employ?’

b. *Quanti ne impiega?*
 how.many of.them it.employs
 ‘How many of them does it employ?’

As far as I know, there are no exceptions to the generalization in (3.12-3.13).

C. *NE* and subjects of unaccusatives and passives¹¹

Unlike direct objects of transitive verbs, the argument of an unaccusative or passive predicate can only serve as hosts for *NE* under certain circumstances. This is by and large a consequence of the fact that the quantifier is non-referential. Because it lacks a referent, the

¹¹ This section relies exclusively on passive and unaccusative examples because the complications surrounding unergative verbs have not been discussed. However, what is said here is applicable to unergative constructions as well.

quantifier cannot denote an individual about whom information can be stored.¹² This is of no consequence in a transitive clause because in such a clause, the subject (which cannot be *NE*-cliticized) is available to fulfill the role of topic. In an intransitive clause, something else must serve as the topic when the subject is co-indexed with *NE*. This is because a sentence's truth value is calculated with respect to its topic (Erteschik-Shir, 2006). In the absence of a topic, all sentences are unacceptable as their truth value cannot be determined.

Following previous scholarship, I suggest that the default topic in intransitive *NE* constructions is a **stage topic**, or **the spatiotemporal location of the occurrence** described by the verb (Erteschik-Shir, 1997, 2006; Lonzi, 1986, 2009; Casadio 1992; Bentley 2006, Glushan & Calabrese, 2014). The ideas I am proposing are not novel, but I will provide novel data to support them from a semantic-pragmatic point of view.

Because this section discusses spatiotemporal topics, I will first show that *NE* is compatible with all tenses and aspects so that the ungrammaticality that arises in the absence of a suitable topic will not be attributed to tense or aspect requirements. I will then provide evidence to show that the topic in an intransitive *NE* construction is spatio-temporal. Finally, I

¹² This does not mean that the quantifier itself is not eligible for topic-hood. In certain cases, a quantifier can serve as a contrastive topic in the sense of Krifka (2008). Below is one example. Note that the contrast is between quantities *così tanti* 'this many' and smaller quantities, not between some individuals and other individuals. Chapter 5 will be devoted to examples of this type.

- i. *Conta* *i* *soldi* *dieci* *volte* *perché* [*così* *tanti*]_{CT}
 he.counts the money ten times because this many
- non* *ne* *ha* *mai* *visti*
 not of.them he.has ever seen

'He counts the bills ten times because this many of them he has never seen.'

[<https://www.lastampa.it/2010/01/14/cultura/la-mamma-del-tassista-1PKxzv79d5GTMnB8iXzX0O/pagina.html>]

will discuss the role of *NE* in unaccusative and passive questions headed by *quanto/i/a/e* ‘how many.’

1. *NE* is compatible with all tenses and aspects

NE has no tense or aspect requirement. It can appear in past, present, and future constructions, and its verb can be punctual or stative. This is illustrated in (3.14):

- 3.14. a. *Ne esistevano cinque di torri*
 Of.them exist.IMP five of towers
 ‘Five of them existed, towers.’
- b. *Ne esistono cinque di torri*
 Of.them exist five of towers
 ‘Five of them exist, towers.’
- c. *Ne sono state costruite cinque di torri*
 of.them they.are been constructed five of towers
 ‘Five of them were constructed, towers.’
- d. *Ne verranno costruite cinque di torri*
 of.them will.be constructed five of towers
 ‘Five of them will be constructed, of towers.’

NE is grammatical in all sentences in (3.14). (3.14a-b) are stative, while (3.14c-d) are punctual. It should be further noted that intransitive *NE* constructions can refer to various points in time or intervals of time (3.15-3.16). They can also denote a fact that is always true, as in (3.17):

- 3.15. a. *Qua alle cinque ne sono stati*
 here at.the five of.them are been

avvistati tre di fantasmi
 sighted three of ghosts
 ‘Here at 5 o’clock three of them were sighted, ghosts.’
- b. *Di piramidi ne furono costruite molte nell’antichità*
 of piramids of.them were constructed many in.antiquity
 ‘Of piramids many were constructed in antiquity.’
- c. *Quando ero in Egitto, ne sono state*
 when I.was in Egypte of.them they.are been

costruite *molte* *di* *piramidi*
constructed many of pyramids

‘When I was in Egypt, a lot of them were constructed, pyramids.’

3.16. a. *Nel* *corso* *della* *storia,* *ne* *sono* *esistiti* *molti.*
in.the course of.the history of.them are existed many
‘Many of them have existed in history.’

b. *Sulle* *piramidi* *ne* *sono* *state* *dette* *molte*
on.the pyramids of.them are been said many
‘Many of them (words) have been said on the pyramids.’

3.17. *Sono* *piante* *selvatiche* *da* *ombra.* *Ne* *cregono*
they.are plants wild of shade of.them they.grow

anche *al* *sole,* *ma* *poche.*
too in.the sun but few

‘They are shade-loving wild plants. Some of them grow in the sun, but very few.’

All sentences in (3.15-3.17) have a spatio-temporal topic – that is, they answer the question

“what happened?” at some salient location during some salient time, or characterize the state of affairs at such location and such time. The time and location can be explicit, as in (3.16a).

However, they can also be implicit. For example, in (3.14a), the time is whatever point in time is being discussed, and the relevant location can be a particular country, or all of the world,

depending on the context. Similarly, in (3.16b), the time is all points in time up until now, and

the location is wherever the discussion is being held, or all over the world – again, depending on what is being discussed. In short, there is no requirement that the time or location be explicitly

named.

These sentences provide an overview of what a spatio-temporal topic can be, but how do we know that the topic is spatio-temporal? The next subsection will be dedicated to answering this question.

2. Spatio-temporal topics in *NE* constructions

a) *Preliminary comments*

Superficially, unaccusative and passive clauses with *NE* seem to be equivalent to those without it. For example, in (3.18-3.19), the (a) sentences seem the same as the (b) sentences, and in isolation, neither type is preferable to the other:

3.18. a. **Due** (*pacchi*) *sono* *arrivati*
two (packages) are arrived
'Two (packages) have arrived'

b. *Ne* *sono* *arrivati* *due*
of.them are come two
'Two of them come.'

3.19. a. **Molte** (*foglie*) *cadono*
many (leaves) fall
'Many (leaves fall)'

b. *Ne* *cadono* **molte** *di foglie*
of.them fall many. of leaves
'Many of them fall.'

However, if we topicalize a spatiotemporal location, the sentence with *NE* will sound better than the one without it:

3.20. a. *Ieri* *sono* *arrivati* *tre* *pacchi*
yesterday are come three packages

Quanto *ad* *oggi*, *ne* *sono* *arrivati* *due*
as for today of.them are come two

'Yesterday, three packages came. As for today, two of them came.'

b. #*Ieri* *sono* *arrivati* *tre* *pacchi*
yesterday are come three packages

Quanto ad oggi, due sono arrivati
 as for today two are come

‘Yesterday, three packages came. As for today, two came.’

Both sentences in (3.20) show a spatio-temporal topic. The timing of the event in question is *oggi* ‘today’ and the location is ‘here,’ as implicitly indicated by *arrivare* ‘arrive.’ *Quanto ad oggi* ‘as for today’ serves as a topicalizer (Gundel, 1988). Because the topic is ‘here, today,’ the sentence with *NE* (3.20a) is fully acceptable, while the one without it (3.20b) is marked and awkward. (3.20b) would be fully acceptable if the topic were some specific two packages, but *quanto ad oggi* ‘as for today’ indicates that the topic is ‘here, today.’

The distinction between *NE* constructions and those without *NE* can also be seen if we add imperfect aspect to the verb, as in (3.21). Here, the sentence with *NE* (3.21a) makes perfect sense, where as the one without it makes no sense (3.21b):

- 3.21 a. *Ne cadono molte da parecchi giorni*
 of.them fall many for a.lot.of days
 ‘Leaves, they have been falling a lot for a many days.’
- b. **Molte cadono da parecchi giorni.*
 many fall for a.lot.of days
 ‘Many have been falling for many days.’

In (3.21), the location is implicitly ‘here,’ and the timing is the interval that started many days ago and is still on going. (3.21a), the sentence with *NE*, is a predication of this location in this time period. In essence, the sentence states that at all times during the relevant period, if one were to look outside in this location, one would see many leaves falling. This scenario is plausible, and the sentence is grammatical. (3.21b), on the other hand, cannot yield a plausible reading. The sentence predicates the leaves denoted by *molte* ‘many,’ and it says that with respect to these leaves, they have been falling for many days. This is implausible because it takes

only a few seconds for a leaf to hit the ground. (3.21b) is therefore unacceptable. A similar contrast can be observed in (3.22):

- 3.22 a. **Cinque mila persone sono ora in piazza*
 five thousand people are now in the.piazza
così tante non sono mai venute
 this many not are ever come

‘Five thousand people are now in the piazza. This many people have never come before.’

- b. *Cinque mila persone sono ora in piazza*
 five thousand people are now in the.piazza
non ne sono mai venute così tante
 not of.them are ever come so many

‘Five thousand people are now in the piazza. This many people have never come before’

(3.22a) is without *NE*. The topic is the pre-verbal subject *così tante* ‘this many,’ and the sentence asserts that with respect to some 5000 people (*così tante* ‘this many’ refers to 5000 in the previous clause), they have never come to the piazza. This assertion misses the mark. The intended meaning is not that there are five thousand people somewhere in the world who have never come, but that the piazza has never been visited by 5000 people at once. Because the intended topic is the piazza, *NE* should be used (3.22b).

Further support for this line of analysis comes from the discourse fragments in (3.23). These fragments are an imaginary radio broadcast that was aired after humans invaded a planet known as Pausia. On this planet, there were certain odd shape structures known as *multigons*. The human team sent to bombard Pausia was under fire for not destroying enough multigons. To defend their work, the team sent the radio station the following statement, which was read during the broadcast:

- 3.23 a. *Abbiamo distrutto tantissimi edifici: 56000 scuole, 100000*
 we.have destroyed many buildings 56000 schools 100000
- case, 100000 palazzi del governo etc. Vero è*
 houses 100000 buildings of.the government etc. true it.is
- che tra questi ci sono solo due multigoni*
 that among these there are only two multigons
- e quindi di multigoni non ne sono stati*
 and so of multigons not of.them are been
- distrutti molti a differenza degli altri tipi. Ma*
 destroyed many at difference of.the other types but
- dobbiamo precisare che i pausiani avevano costruito*
 we.must point.out that the Pausians had constructed
- pochissimi multigoni. Infatti, ce n'erano solo*
 very.few multigons in.fact there of.the.were only
- tre e ne abbiamo distrutto la maggioranza*
 three and of.them we.have destroyed the most.part
- anche se con "due" non si può usare la*
 even.though if with two not Imp can use the
- parola "molti."*
 word molti

‘We have destroyed a lot of buildings: 56000 schools, 100000 houses, 100000 government structures etc. It is true that among these there are only two multigons so of multigons, not many were destroyed, unlike the other categories. But we have to point out that the Pausians had constructed very few multigons. In fact, there were only three, and we destroyed most of them even though with two you can’t use the word “many.”

- b. **Abbiamo distrutto tantissimi edifici: 56000 scuole, 100000*
 we.have destroyed many buildings 56000 schools 100000
- case, 100000 palazzi del governo etc. Vero è*
 houses 100000 buildings of.the government etc. true it.is
- che tra questi ci sono solo due multigoni*
 that among these there are only two multigons

<i>e</i>	<i>quindi</i>	<i>molti (multigoni)</i>	<i>non</i>	<i>sono</i>	<i>stati</i>		
and	so	many multigons	not	are	been		
<i>distrutti</i>		<i>a</i>	<i>differenza</i>	<i>degli</i>	<i>altri</i>	<i>tipi.</i>	<i>Ma</i>
destroyed		at	difference	of.the	other	types	but
<i>dobbiamo</i>	<i>precisare</i>	<i>che</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>pausiani</i>	<i>avevano</i>	<i>costruito</i>	
we.must	point.out	that	the	Pausians	had	constructed	
<i>pochissimi</i>	<i>multigoni.</i>	<i>Infatti,</i>	<i>ce</i>	<i>n'erano</i>	<i>solo</i>		
very.few	multigons	in.fact	there	of.the.were	only		
<i>tre</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>abbiamo</i>	<i>distrutto</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>maggioranza</i>	
three	and	of.them	we.have	destroyed	the	most.part	
<i>anche</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>con</i>	<i>“due”</i>	<i>non</i>	<i>si può</i>	<i>usare</i>	<i>la</i>
even.though	if	with	two	not	Imp can	use	the
<i>parola</i>	<i>“molti.”</i>						
word	molti						

‘We have destroyed a lot of buildings: 56000 schools, 100000 houses, 100000 government structures etc. It is true that among these there are only two multigons so of multigons, not many were destroyed, unlike the other categories. But we have to point out that the Pausians had constructed very few multigons. In fact, there were only three, and we destroyed most of them even though with two you can’t use the word “many.”

In (3.23), the speaker essentially states that their team did not destroy many multigons, but that’s not their fault because there were never many multigons to start with. Given this intended meaning, the version with *NE* (3.23b) is acceptable, whereas the one without it makes no sense. This is because *molti* ‘many’ in (3.23b) is the topic of its clause, but the speaker claims that its referent does not exist, so there is no entity about which the information communciated can be stored (cf. Diesing, 1992). Consider also (3.24), which displays a similar pattern:

3.24. a.	<i>Quante</i>	<i>uova</i>	<i>hai?</i>	<i>Due?</i>	<i>Allora</i>	<i>non</i>	<i>puoi</i>
	How.many	eggs	you.have	two	Then	not	you.can
	<i>preparare</i>	<i>questa</i>	<i>torta</i>	<i>perché</i>	<i>richiede</i>		
	make	this	cake	because	it.takes		

otto *uova.* *Te* *ne* *mancano* *sei*
 eight eggs you.DAT of.them lack six

‘How many eggs do you have? Two? Then you can’t make this cake because it requires 8 eggs. Six of them are missing.’

b. **Quante* *uova* *hai?* *Due?* *Beh* *non* *puoi*
 How.many eggs you.have two uh not you.can

preparare *questa* *torta* *perché* *richiede*
 make this cake because it.takes

otto *uova.* *Sei* *ti* *mancano*
 eight eggs six you.DAT lack

‘How many eggs do you have? Two? Then you can’t make this cake because it requires 8 eggs. Six are missing.’

In (3.24), the listener is said to be six eggs short of what is required for a certain cake. Because the six eggs don’t exist, (3.24b) is unacceptable, while the sentence with *NE* is perfectly acceptable. Consider also (3.25), which also contains *mancare* ‘be missing’ and a dative clitic, but does not require *NE*:

3.25 *Ho* *avuto* *tutti* *i* *numeri* *di* *maglia,*
 I.have had all the numbers of shirt

solo *uno* *mi* *manca*
 only one me.DAT misses

‘I have worn all the numbers on my shirt. Only one is missing on me.’

[<https://www.ilnapolionline.com/2018/10/11/celestini-maglia-maardona/>]

Here, *uno* ‘one’ refers to a specific number that actually exists and can serve as the topic. As such, *NE* ‘of them’ is not required.

b) *Sentences that crash for lack of a spatio-temporal topic*

In this subsection we will see that *NE* is not felicitous in the absence of a salient spatio-temporal location. This follows straight forwardly from the fact that intransitive *NE* constructions answer the question “What happened?” or “How was the state of affairs?” at some

salient place and time. Of course, this does not mean that *NE* must co-occur with an exact date and GPS coordinates. Rather, all that is required is sufficient cues in the context to permit an assumption that the speaker is attempting to describe some spatio-temporal location. If the speaker disavows having knowledge of any such location, *NE* is infelicitous. Consider the sentences in (3.26):

87. a. ANNA: *Secondo te queste persone che vediamo*
 according.to you these people that we.see

davanti a noi sono state battezzate?
 in.front of us are been baptized

‘Do you think these people that we are seeing in front of us have been baptized?’

b. MARIO: *Non le conosco ma secondo me molte*
 not them I.know but according.to me many

di loro sono state battezzate
 of them are been baptized

‘I don’t know them but I think many of them have been baptized.’

c. MARIO: *#Non le conosco ma secondo me ne*
 not them I.know but according.to me of.them

sono state battezzate molte
 are been baptized many

‘I don’t know them but I think many of them have been baptized.’

d. MARIO: *Sì ne sono state battezzate molte ieri*
 yes of.them are been baptized many yesterday

sera lo so perché c’ero
 evening it I.know because I.was.there

‘Yes, many of them were baptized yesterday evening. I know because I was there.’

(3.26b-d) are all responses to the question in (3.26a). In (3.26b-c), Mario asserts that many of the individuals in question have been baptized, but he cannot be assumed to be describing the spatio-temporal location where the baptisms took place. This is because he does not know these people and consequently, has no knowledge of where or when they were baptized. As such, no spatio-temporal topic is available, and the use of *NE* in (3.26c) is anomalous (notice that (3.26b), which does not contain *NE*, is fully grammatical).

In contrast to (3.26c), (3.26d) also contains *NE* but it is acceptable. This is because the timing and location of the baptisms are salient in (3.26d). Not only is a time explicitly mentioned (*ieri sera* ‘yesterday evening’), Mario claims to have witnessed the event. Thus, a stage topic is available and is anchored to the speaker (Kumo & Takami, 2004). Ideally, Mario has disclosed to Anna where he was the night before. If he has neglected to do so, his response is likely to prompt her to ask “Wait! What? Where were you last night?” However, even if Anna has to ask this question, (3.26d) would still be acceptable because based on the context, Anna can reasonably assume that Mario has a time and location in mind. In other words, Anna can pragmatically accommodate Mario’s error (Lambrecht, 1994).

Further support for this line of analysis comes from (3.27), where the version with *NE* (3.27b) is either fully grammatical or defective depending on who utters it. Assume for the purposes of this sentence that the listener’s name is John, and that John is shopping for dog toys when he hears:

3.27. a. *Fai attenzione al gioco che scegli, alcuni sono stati creati per i cani più grandi e nel caso dovessi dare uno di questi ad un cane*
 pay attention to.the toy that you.choose some are
 been created for the dogs more big and in.the
 case you.should give one of these to a dog

troppo piccolo per queste dimensioni rischierebbe
too small for these dimensions he.would.risk

di spezzarsi i denti o di fratturarsi la mandibola¹³
of breaking the teeth or to fracture the jaw

‘Pay attention to the toy that you choose. Some were made for bigger dogs and in case you give one of these for a dog that’s too small for these dimensions they would risk breaking their teeth or fracturing their jaw.’

b. (#)*Fai attenzione al gioco che scegli, ne sono*
pay attention to.the toy that you.choose of.them are

stati creati alcuni per i cani più grandi e nel
been created some for the dogs more big and in.the

caso dovessi dare uno di questi ad un cane
case you.should give one of these to a dog

troppo piccolo per queste dimensioni rischierebbe
too small for these dimensions he.would.risk

di spezzarsi i denti o di fratturarsi la mandibola
of breaking the teeth or to fracture the jaw

‘Pay attention to the toy that you choose. Some of them were made for bigger dogs and in case you give one of these for a dog that’s too small for these dimensions they would risk breaking their teeth or fracturing their jaw.’

(3.27b), which contains *NE*, is not acceptable if it is uttered by another customer. Because customers generally do not have any knowledge as to where or when merchandise were produced, John would not be able to assume that (3.27b) is a description of some spatio-temporal location. (3.27b) is therefore infelicitous. However, if this sentence is uttered by an employee of the store, and the store produces its own dog toys, *NE* is potentially acceptable. If John knows the toys were made in-house, he can accommodate the employee and assume that they mean “earlier, when I was watching them make the toys, I saw that some of them were made for bigger

¹³ This sentence is a paraphrase of an actually attested sentence on this website <https://www.petyoo.it/blog/cani/segnali-problemi-dentali-cani.html>

dogs.” In this scenario, the spatio-temporal topic is anchored to the speaker even though it is not explicitly mentioned.

The above analysis can also account for the contrast between (3.28a) and (3.28b):

3.28. a. *Molti immigrati di New York sono nati in*
many immigrants of New York are born in

Sud America
South America.

‘Many of the immigrants of New York were born in South America.’

b. **Degli immigrati di New York, ne sono*
of.the immigrants of New York of.them are

nati molti in Sud America
born many in South America

‘Of the immigrants of New York, many were born in South America.’

In (3.28), the sentence without *NE* (3.28a) is perfectly acceptable, while the one with *NE* (3.28b) is virtually incomprehensible to most speakers. (3.28a) provides information about a subgroup of immigrants; (3.28b), because it contains *NE*, captures the situation in South America at some temporal location. But the description it gives does not match up to South America at any point in time: when the immigrants were born, they were natives of South America rather than immigrants of New York. As such, (3.28b) can only make sense if it is part of the following sequence of events: (1) The immigrants of New York died, (2) they reincarnated, and (3) many of them were re-born in South America. Because this is a highly improbable context (3.28b) is not acceptable.

3. The distribution of *NE* in *quanto/a/i/e* ‘how many’ clauses

In questions headed by *quanto/a/i/e* ‘how many,’ *NE* is traditionally described as required for unaccusatives (3.29) and passives (3.30) (Cinque, 1990b; Shlonsky, 2017; Samek-Ludovici, 2015). According to standard accounts, the (b) sentences in (3.29-3.30) are incorrect because *NE* is missing; only the (a) sentences, where *NE* appears, are acceptable:

3.29. a. *Quanti ne sono venuti?*
 how.many of.them are come
 ‘How many of them have come?’

b. **Quanti sono venuti?*
 how.many are come
 ‘How many have come?’

[Shlonsky, 2017]

3.30 a. *Quanti hai detto che ne sono stati venduti?*
 how.many you.have said they of.them are been sold
 ‘How many of them did you say were sold?’

b. **Quanti hai detto che sono stati venduti?*
 how.many you.have said they are been sold
 ‘How many did you say were sold?’

[Samek-Ludovici, 2015]

In my opinion, Italian does not require *NE* whenever *quanto/a/i/e* ‘how many’ appears in a passive or unaccusative question construction. That no such requirement exists is confirmed by the following actual attestations:

3.31. a. *La Consigliera SQUARZINO chiede:*
 the councilwoman Squarzino asks

• *quali sono i volumi delle aree costruite*
 which are the volumes of.the areas constructed

con i finanziamenti della Comunità europea,
 with the financing of.the community European

quanti sono stati venduti, quanti sono
 how.many are been sold how.many are

stati affittati e quanti sono stati
 been rented and how.many are been

sottratti *alla* *finalità* *industriale* *per* *essere*
taken to.the finality industrial for being

utilizzati *con* *altra* *destinazione;*
used with other destination

‘Councilwoman Squarzino asks what are the volumes of the areas constructed with financing from the European Communities, how many have been sold, how many have been rented, and how many were taken from industrial use to be utilized for another purpose.’

[www.consiglio.regione.vda.it/app/.../downloadallegato?id=3864]¹⁴

b. ... *bisogna* *dire* *quanti* *francobolli* *di* *ogni* *tipo*
it.is.necessary to.say how.many stamps of each tipo

sono *stati* *distrutti* *e* *quanti* *sono* *stati* *venduti,*
are been destroyed and how.many are been sold

senza *lasciare* *il* *sospetto* *che* *una* *parte* *sia*
without leaving the suspicion that a part is

stata « *accantonata* »¹⁵
been set.aside

‘...it is necessary to indicate how many stamps of each type have been destroyed, and how many have been sold, without leaving room for suspicion that some part has been set aside.’

[<http://www.senato.it/service/PDF/PDFServer/BGT/433746.pdf>]

c. ...*chiediamo* *alla* *Regione* *a* *partire* *da* *Presidente*
we.ask to.the region and starting with the.president

e *Assessore* *competente,* *di* *sapere* *quanti* *mezzi*
and assessor competent to know how.many means.of.transporation

sono *stati* *acquistati* *negli* *ultimi* *anni* *con* *il*
are been acquired in.the last years with the

¹⁴ This quote was extracted from a document that appears to be the minutes of a legislative session of the Valle d’Aosta region.

¹⁵ This utterance is part of a speech by Giusto Tolloy, an Italian senator.

finanziamento regionale, quali sono tali mezzi . . . se e
funding regional which are such means if and

quanti sono stati poi venduti o utilizzati per
how.many are been later sold or used for

*altre finalità . . .*¹⁶
other purposes

‘... We ask the Region, starting with the president and the responsible assessor, to let us know how many means of public transport have been acquired in the past few years with the Region’s funding and what are such means . . . if and how many have been sold or used for other purposes...’

[<http://www.regione.basilicata.it/giunta/site/giunta/detail.jsp?otype=1012&id=2981329&dep=525396>]

- d. *Ternana-Perugia, prevendita dei biglietti a gonfie vele:*
Ternana-Perugia pre-sale of.the tickets at puffy sails

*ecco quanti sono stati già venduti*¹⁷
here.is how.many are been already sold

‘Ternana-Perugia, pre-sale of tickets in full sail: here is how many (that) have already been sold’

[<http://www.perugiatoday.it/sport/ternana-perugia-prevendita-dei-biglietti-a-gonfie-vele-ecco-quant-gia-venduti.html>]

- 3.32. a. *Quanti sono venuti a chiederle un selfie?*
How.many are come to ask.you.for a selfie

‘How many have come to ask you for a selfie?’

[<https://www.ravennaedintorni.it/societa/2019/03/05/intervista-giada-papetti-nuova-bonas-avanti-altro-paolo-bonolis/>]

- b. *Chissà quanti sono venuti prima di me*
who.knows how.many are come before of me

in questo posto!
in this place

‘Who knows how many came to this place before me!’

[https://www.poetare.it/zucchiau_racconti.html]

¹⁶ This quote appears in a note from a labor union to the Basilicata region.

¹⁷ This is a newspaper headline.

I have selected only examples that use *vendere* ‘sell’ (3.31) and *venire* ‘come’ (3.32) – the same verbs as in (3.29-3.20). These examples show that *NE* may be preferred in *quanto/i/a/e* clauses, but it is not required. At any rate, *NE* cannot be said to be preferred in all *quanto/i/a/e* clauses. There are at least two situations in which the version of *NE* is no better than the one without it. These situations are (a) clauses describing volitional actions, and (b) negative clauses.

a) *Volitional actions*

First, as pointed out above and in previous research, *NE* describes occurrences at a salient spatio-temporal location. Because it describes locations rather than individuals, it does not combine readily with expressions of intention, as shown in (3.33):

3.33. a. *Molti se ne sono andati però alcuni sono*
 many REFL loc are gone but some are

rimasti a giocare con la bambina
 remained to play with the girl

‘A lot of people left, but some stayed to play with the girl.’

b. ? *Molti se ne sono andati però ne sono*
 many refl loc are gone but of.them are

rimasti alcuni a giocare con la bambina
 remained some to play with the girl

‘A lot of people left, but some stayed to play with the girl.’

In (3.33), *a giocare con la bambina* ‘to play with the girl’ expresses the purpose for staying. As a description of a location, *ne sono rimasti alcuni* ‘some of them remained cannot have a purpose. As such, (3.33b) is defective.

It follows that in a *quanto/i/a/e* clauses that denotes a conscious decision, *NE* is not preferable even if the clause is unaccusative. This is illustrated in (3.34-3.35):

3.34. a. *Il re come sai ha ordinato a tutti di*
 the king as you.know has ordered to everyone to

non venire. Ha minacciato di incarcerare
not come he.has threatened to imprison

quelli che sono venuti.
those who are come

‘The king, as you know, ordered everyone not to come. He threatened to imprison those who came.’

- b. *Sì lo so. Ma quanti, nonostante l'ordine, sono*
Yes it i.know but how.many notwithstanding the.order are

venuti lo stesso
come the same

‘Yes, I know. But how many, notwithstanding the order, came anyway?’

- c. *(?)Sì lo so. Ma quanti, nonostante l'ordine ne*
Yes it i.know but how.many notwithstanding the.order of.them

sono venuti lo stesso
are come the same

‘Yes, I know. But how many of them, notwithstanding the order, came anyway?’

- 3.35. a. *Posso anche vedere quante persone hanno cliccato*
I.can even see how.many people have clicked

sull'affare specifico, quante invece sono tornate
on.the.deal specific how.many instead are returned

*alla pagina precedente*¹⁸
to.the page before

‘I can even see how many people clicked on a deal, and how many, instead, went back to the previous page.’

- b. *(?)Posso anche vedere quante persone hanno cliccato*
I.can even see how.many people have clicked

sull'affare specifico, quante invece ne sono tornate
on.the.deal specific how.many instead of.them are returned

¹⁸ This sentence is modelled after a sentence found at this website <https://medium.com/uxtales/il-magico-potere-del-microcopy-sulla-user-experience-2f115add682a>.

alla pagina precedente
to.the page before

‘I can even see how many people clicked on a deal, and how many of them, instead, went back to the previous page.’

In (3.34), B is interested in knowing how many *chose* to ignore the order, and in (3.35), the speaker is interested in the number of people who *chose* to return to the previous page. In these examples, the version with *NE* cannot be said to be better than the one without it. If anything, the presence of *NE* erases any connotation of intent, rendering the sentence less coherent. The defect is particularly noticeable in (3.35), where *invece* ‘instead’ calls for an appropriate comparison between the two *quante* clauses. (3.35a), which does not contain *NE*, provides such a comparison – the two clauses describe two different reactions to the advertisement: click on it, or click away. In (3.35b), *NE* instructs the reader to pay no attention to the thought process of the individuals denoted by *quante*. As such, it is difficult to construe the act of returning to the previous page as a response to the ad, and the listener is left wondering why the number of people who went to the last page should be contrasted with the number who decided to click on the advertisement.

b) *Negative clauses*

NE is normally permissible in negative questions (3.36). However, in some negative questions, it is dispreferred, as illustrated in (3.37b, 3.38b-c):

3.36. a. *Quante non ne sono amate?*
how.many not of.them are loved
‘How many of them are not loved?’

b. *Quanti non ne sono venuti?*
how.many not of.them are come
‘How many of them did not come?’

3.37. a. *Quanti non sono venuti solo due volte?*
how.many not are come only two times
‘How many didn’t come only twice?’

b. % *Quanti non ne sono venuti solo due volte?*
 how.many not of.them are come only two times
 ‘How many of them didn’t come only twice?’

3.38. a. *Vedi queste concubine. Quante, secondo te, non*
 you.see these concubines how.many according to you not

sono più amate dal re?
 are anymore loved by.the king

‘See these concubines? How many do you think are no longer loved by the king?’

b. % *Vedi queste concubine. Quante, secondo te, non*
 you.see these concubines how.many according to you not

ne sono più amate dal re?
 of.them are anymore loved by.the king

c. % *Vedi queste concubine. Quante, secondo te, non*
 you.see these concubines how.many according to you not

ne sono amate più dal re?
 of.them are loved anymore by.the king

In (3.37-3.38), the (a) version contain a fully grammatical utterance without *NE*. The (b) version contains *NE* and is dispreferred. Notice that (3.38b) is marked regardless of whether *più* ‘anymore’ appears before or after the verb (3.38c). What renders (3.37-3.38) difficult to account for is the fact that negative questions with *NE* are not always marked. For example, the following question is perfectly acceptable:

3.39 *Sei persone su dieci vengono regolarmente. Quanti*
 six people over ten come regularly how.many

non ne vengono più?
 not of.them come anymore

‘Six people out of ten come regularly. How many of them do not come anymore?’

I do not know what might be responsible for the defect in (3.37b) and (3.38b-c). I will leave this question to future research.

IV. *NE* in Non-Canonical Examples

In this chapter we will discuss four types of *NE* constructions that have been alleged to be impossible: (1) extraction from non-argument NPs, (2) extraction from the subject of an unergative, (3) extraction from the subject of a reflexive-transitive, and (4) extraction from the argument of an i-level adjective. It will be shown that all four types are possible, with extraction from non-argument NPs being the most productive and the other three types subject to various constraints that prevent them from occurring in many circumstances.

We will start with a general discussion on auxiliary selection and participial agreement in Italian – a topic that will prove relevant for the first three of the four types of construction mentioned above. Following this discussion, the four types will be addressed in the order in which they are listed.

A. Past participial agreement and auxiliary selection in Italian

1. Auxiliary selection

a) *Preliminary comments*

In Italian, periphrastic tenses are formed by combining the lexical verb with one of two auxiliaries: *essere* ‘be’ or *avere* ‘have.’ The choice between these two auxiliaries is determined largely by the verb. If the verb is **transitive** (4.1), the auxiliary is *avere* ‘have’ (with certain exceptions, to be mentioned momentarily). If the verb is **passive** (4.2), the auxiliary is *essere* ‘be’:

4.1. a. *Maria ha mangiato la mela*
Maria has eaten the apple

‘Maria ate the apple.’

- b. *Maria l’ha mangiata.*
Maria it.has eaten
‘Maria ate it.’

- 4.2 *La mela è stata mangiata*
the apple is been eaten
‘The apple has been eaten.’

Notice that if the verb is transitive, *avere* must be selected even if the direct object is expressed as a clitic (4.1b).

In all constructions involving a **reflexive clitic**, *essere* ‘be’ must be used. This applies to constructions with reflexive meanings as well as those with a *pronominal* verb (a verb that requires a reflexive clitic even though it is not used reflexively). An example of a pronominal verb is *lamentarsi* ‘complain.’ This verb does not mean ‘complain about oneself.’ However (Sorace, 2000), it cannot appear without a reflexive clitic:

- 4.3. a. *Mi sono lavata le mani*
1st.SG.REFL. am washed the hands
‘I wash my hands.’
- b. *Mi sono lamentata di lui*
1st.SG.REFL. am complained about him
‘I complained about him.’

If the verb is **intransitive and nonreflexive**, the choice of auxiliary is largely lexically determined. There are some general tendencies that correspond to the verb’s semantics, but these tendencies are quite vague and cannot account for all cases. In general, verbs that denote a state (including existence) and a change of state (including motion verbs and verbs of appearance or happening) tend to select *essere* (Sorace, 2000):

- 4.3. a. *I dinosauri sono esistiti 65 milioni di anni fa*
the dinosaurs are existed 64 millions of years ago
‘The dinosaurs existed 65 million years ago.’

- b. *Sono arrivati ospiti per ore e ore*
 are arrived guests fo ours and ours
 ‘Guests arrived for hours.’
 [Sorace, 2000]
- c. *Cos’è successo?*
 what.is happened
 ‘What happened?’
- d. *Sono apparsi tre fantasmi*
 are appeared three ghosts
 ‘Three ghosts appear.’

Verbs that denote activities tend to select *avere* ‘have,’ especially if the activity is volitional (4.4) (Bentley, 2004; Sorace, 2000). If an activity results in a change of state, some verbs allow an alternation between *essere* ‘be’ and *avere* ‘have’ (4.5-4.6):

- 4.4. a. *Molte persone hanno lavorato*
 many people have worked
 ‘Many people worked.’
- b. *Molti persone hanno pregato.*
 many people have prayed
 ‘Many people prayed.’
- 4.5 a. *Ha saltato anche sopra il tavolo*
 has.3rd.SG hopped also on the table
 ‘He also hopped on the table.’
- b. *È saltato sopra anche al tavolo*
 Is.3rd.SG hopped on also to.the table
 ‘He also jumped on the table.’
 [Garzonio & Rossi, 2016]
- 4.6 a. *Maria è corsa in farmacia*
 Maria is run to the.pharmacy
 ‘Maria ran to the pharmacy.’
- b. **Maria ha corso in farmacia*
 Maria has run to the.pharmacy
 ‘Maria ran to the pharmacy.’
- c. *Maria ha corso velocemente.*
 Maria has run quickly
 ‘Maria ran quickly.’

[Sorace, 2000]

(4.4) shows that *avere* ‘have’ is the correct auxiliary for studying and praying, both of which are volitional activities. (4.5) shows *saltare* ‘jump,’ another volitional activity alternating between *essere* ‘be’ and *avere* ‘have.’ What enables the alternation is that the jumper underwent a change of state from being elsewhere to being on the table. With some verbs, such as *correre* ‘run,’ *essere* ‘be’ is mandatory (4.6a-b) if a destination is specified.

Not every verb permits an alternation with *essere* ‘be.’ *Guidare* ‘drive,’ for example, does not allow *essere* ‘be’ even if a location is provided:

4.7 a. *Ho guidato fino a San Francisco*
I.have driven until to San Francisco
‘I drove to San Francisco.’

[Centineo, 1996]

b. **Sono guidato a San Francisco*
I.am driven to San Francisco
‘I drove to San Francisco.’

The above generalizations are limited in many ways. First, it is not easy to distinguish a state from an activity. Is living (*vivere*) a state or an activity? What about floating (*galleggiare*) and shining (*brillare*)? It may be said that these are attested with both *avere* ‘have’ and *essere* ‘be’ because of their ambiguous nature. But if this is true, then the ambiguity is not evident to all speakers, for some only accept *avere* ‘have’ for all three verbs. Furthermore, *dormire* ‘sleep’ is also ambiguous between a state and an activity, but it is not acceptable with *essere* ‘be.’ This shows that auxiliary selection is by and large lexically determined, and at the same time, highly individualistic.

To understand the extent to which auxiliary selection varies from speaker to speaker, consider the following data:

- 4.8 a. *La libertà di parola non ha importato molto*
 the freedom of speech not has mattered a.lot
 ‘Freedom of speech did not matter a whole lot.’
- b. *La libertà di parola non è importata molto*
 the freedom of speech not is mattered a.lot
 ‘Freedom of speech did not matter a whole lot.’

Which one of these two sentences is correct is a matter of speaker variation. I have received responses that ranged from (4.8a) is definitely correct, while (4.8b) may be wrong, to (4.8a) is definitely wrong, while (4.8a) is definitely correct. Other responses include both are incorrect, and “this is really tricky, there must be a rule somewhere but I don’t know what it is.” Similarly, speakers cannot agree on what auxiliary to use with *cedere* ‘yield.’ According to Sorace, this verb is sensitive to agentivity, as illustrated in (4.9-4.10):

- 4.9. a. *Maria ha ceduto alle tue insistenze*
 Maria has yielded to your pressure
 ‘Maria yielded to your pressure.’
- b. **Maria è ceduta alle tue insistenze*¹⁹
 Maria is yielded to your pressure
 ‘Maria yielded to your pressure.’
 [Sorace, 2000]

- 4.10 a. *Il pavimento ha ceduto all'improvviso*
 the pavement has yielded suddenly
 ‘The pavement suddenly yielded.’
- b. ?*Il pavimento è ceduto all'improvviso*
 the pavement is yielded suddenly
 ‘The pavement suddenly yielded.’
 [Sorace, 2000]

According to Sorace, the contrast between (4.9b) and (4.10b) lies in the fact that *cedere* ‘yield’ is too agentive with Maria as subject. This hypothesis is no doubt correct for some speakers.

However, I have met speakers who accepted all four sentences, as well as someone who

¹⁹ Most speakers do not accept this sentence, but some do.

preferred (4.9b) – the agentive sentence to the following example, which closely resembles

(4.10b):

- 4.10 c. *La grata è ceduta sotto il peso di una*
the grate is yielded under the weight of some
trentina di persone
thirty of people

‘The grate yielded under the weight of thirty some people.’

[<https://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/2014/10/17/corea-del-sud-16-morti-a-concerto-rock-crollata-la-griglia-di-ventilazione/1158999/>]

This shows that auxiliary selection is a matter of personal preference. While some general tendencies exist, it is not possible to predict how any individual speaker will react to a particular verb. Consequently, any phenomenon that interacts with auxiliary selection (as *NE* does – see below) will generate different responses from different speakers. An overarching generalization regarding such a phenomenon is neither possible nor advisable.

b) *Preference for essere ‘be’ in impersonal constructions*

Some comments are called for regarding impersonal constructions in Italian, which, to some extent, favor the selection of *essere* ‘be.’ For instance, all impersonal *si* constructions are compatible with *essere* ‘be’ even if they contain a lexical verb that requires *avere* ‘have’ in non-impersonal constructions:

- 4.11 a. *Qualche risultato apprezzabile lo si è avuto recentemente*
some result appreciable it IMP is had recently
‘Some appreciable result, it was had recently.’

[https://www.quotidianodipuglia.it/pensieri_e_parole/di_domenico_lenzi_all_inizio_del_mese_di_aprile_il_problema_dell_autismo_ha_avuto-4446611.html]

- b. *%Qualche risultato apprezzabile lo si ha avuto recentemente*
some result appreciable it IMP has had recently
‘Some appreciable result, it was had recently.’

- 4.12 a. *Qualche risultato apprezzabile lo abbiamo avuto recentemente*
 some result appreciable it we.have had recently
 ‘We have had some appreciable result recently.’
- b. **Qualche risultato apprezzabile lo siamo avuti recentemente*
 some result appreciable it we.have had recently
 ‘We have had some appreciable result recently.’

Where the construction is personal, as in (4.12), the lexical verb *avere* ‘have’ requires auxiliary *avere* ‘have’ (4.12a). Using auxiliary *essere* will result in ungrammaticality (4.12b). However, if the construction is impersonal, as in (4.11), *essere* ‘be’ becomes possible. In fact, the version with *avere* ‘have’ is disfavored by some speakers (4.11b).

Similarly, all existential constructions with expletive *ci* ‘there’ require *essere* ‘be.’ In (4.13a), where auxiliary *essere* ‘be’ is used, the sentence is grammatical. Where *avere* ‘have’ is used (4.13b), the sentence is impossible:

- 4.13 a. *Ci sono state molte case*
 there are been many houses
 ‘There have been many houses’
- b. **Ci hanno stato molte case*
 there have been many houses
 ‘There have been many houses’

There are also verbs that appear to require *essere* ‘be’ in constructions that are arguably impersonal. For instance, consider the following examples:

- 4.14 a. *È saltato fuori che i magistrati erano corrotti*
 is jumped out that the magistrates were corrupt
 ‘It turned out that the magistrates were corrupt.’
- b. ?*Ha saltato fuori che i magistrati erano corrotti*
 has jumped out that the magistrates were corrupt
 ‘It turned out that the magistrates were corrupt.’

[Sorace, 2000]

We saw in (4.5) that *saltare* ‘jump’ is possible with both *essere* ‘be’ and *avere* ‘have.’ However, according to the data in (4.14), *avere* ‘have’ is marginal with a sentential subject. It may be argued that (4.14) is impersonal in that it does not predicate any individual. Rather, it answers the (implicit) question “*what happened?*” at some salient spatio-temporal location. In this usage, *saltare* ‘jump’ does not seem to combine well with *avere* ‘have.’

The same maybe said of the verb *correre* ‘run.’ This verb does not permit *essere* ‘be’ where there is no destination (4.15a). However, if the construction is impersonal, *essere* ‘be’ is required:

- 4.15 a. **Maria è corsa per molto tempo*
 Maria is run for a.long time
 ‘Maria ran for a long time.’
- b. *È corsa voce che Maria si sposa*
 is run rumor that Maria self marries
 ‘The rumor has spread that Maria is getting married.’
- c. ?*Ha corsa voce che Maria si sposa*
 has run rumor that Maria self marries
 ‘The rumor has spread that Maria is getting married.’
 [Sorace, 2000]

Like *saltare* ‘jump’ in (4.14), *correre* ‘run’ in (4.15b-c) does not predicate any individual. Rather, it answers an implicit question, “*what happened?*” This usage renders *avere* ‘have’ an inappropriate auxiliary.

It has also been suggested that *squillare* ‘ring,’ which normally accepts both auxiliaries (4.16), is not compatible with *avere* ‘have’ in constructions that respond to the question “*what happened?*” (Bentley, 2006). This is illustrated in (4.17):

- 4.16 a. *Il telefono ha squillato*
 the phone has rung
 ‘The phone rang.’
- b. *Il telefono è squillato*

the phone is rung.
'The phone rang.'

[Bentley, 2006]

- 4.17 a. *Cosa è successo?*
what is happened
'What happened?'
- b. *È squillato il telefono*
is rung the phone
'The phone rang.'
- c. **Ha squillato il telefono*
has rung the phone
'The phone rang.'

[Bentley, 2006]

Notice that both sentences in (4.16) are predications of the phone. They both would respond perfectly to the question "What about the phone?" and in this configuration, either auxiliary is acceptable. (4.17b), on the other hand, describes an occurrence that took place without reference to the phone as a "point of departure" (Halliday, 1984). Here, some speakers refuse to accept *avere* 'have' (4.17c).

Not all speakers agree with Bentley that (4.17c) is unacceptable. Nevertheless, this example serves to demonstrate a preference for *essere* 'be' in response to the question "what happened?" The existence of disagreement among speakers is in and of itself informative in that it illustrates an important point: impersonal constructions can cause a shift in auxiliary, but when this shift occurs varies from person to person. Impersonality is thus a factor that promotes the use of *essere* 'be,' but it does not guarantee that this usage will occur.

c) *The role of clitics in promoting essere 'be.'*

We saw in the previous subsection that the two impersonal constructions that reliably select *essere* 'be' involve a clitic: the impersonal clitic *si* and expletive *ci* 'there.' Here, evidence will be presented to show that clitics in generally promote the choice of *essere* 'be.'

Consider the verb *piovere* ‘rain,’ which, despite the fact that it is impersonal, is normally compatible with both *essere* ‘be’ and *avere* ‘have’:

- 4.18 a. *Ha piovuto ieri*
it.has rained yesterday
‘It rained yesterday.’
- b. *È piovuto ieri*
it.is rained yesterday
‘It rained yesterday.’

Both examples in (4.18) are incontrovertibly grammatical. However, according to Benincà & Cinque (1992), Sorace (2000), and Lorenzetti (2010), *avere* ‘have’ is not acceptable in (4.19):

- 4.19 a. **Mi ha piovuto sulla testa*
me it.has rained on.the head
‘It rained on my head.’
- b. *Mi è piovuto sulla testa*
me it.is rained on.the head
‘It rained on my head.’

[Benincà & Cinque, 1992]

Benincà & Cinque (1992), Sorace (2000), and Lorenzetti (2010) do not attribute their judgment of (4.19a) to the presence of the clitic *mi* ‘me.’ However, their discussion permits an inference that *mi* has a role to play.

Benincà & Cinque (1992) and Sorace (2000) analyze (4.19a) as a consequence of telicity: with the speaker’s head serving as a destination, *piovere* ‘rain’ may not combine with *avere* ‘have.’ This analysis was contested by Lorenzetti (2010), who does not suggest her own interpretation, but claims that a destination makes no difference to the choice of auxiliary. She cites the following data in support of her claim:

- 4.20 a. *Ha piovuto sul terrazzo*
it.has rained on.the terrace
‘It rained on the terrace.’

- b. *È piovuto sul terrazzo*
 it.is rained on.the terrace
 ‘It rained on the terrace’

[Lorenzetti, 2010]

Lorenzetti argues that the terrace in (4.20) does not require *essere* ‘be’ even though it is a destination. As such, she concludes, telicity does not matter in all circumstances. From Lorenzetti’s comments it may be observed that in her variety of Italian, a clitic induces a shift in the choice of auxiliary, whereas a destination in and of itself does not. This does not mean that Benincà, Cinque, and Sorace are wrong. Each author may have simply described their own linguistic variety.

It should be pointed out that some speakers disagree with all four authors. According to these speakers, (4.19a) and (4.19b) are equally acceptable; neither a clitic nor a destination forces the choice of *essere* ‘be’. However, all speakers shift to *essere* ‘be’ in the presence of a clitic in some circumstances. Precisely what those circumstances are is a matter of speaker variation.

Below are some examples where speakers have reported that they experience the shift:

- 4.21 a. *%Gli edifici sono tremati*
 the building are trembled
 ‘The buildings shook.’

- b. *Gli edifici hanno tremato*
 the building have trembled
 ‘The buildings shook.’

- 4.22 a. *%Mi sono tremate le mani*
 me.DAT are trembled.FEM.PL the hands.FEM.PL
 ‘My hands were shaky,’

- b. *%Mi hanno tremato le mani*
 me.DAT are trembled the hands
 ‘My hands were shaky,’

- 4.23 a. *Il computer ha rallentato.*
 the computer has slowed.down
 ‘The computer got slow.’

b. *Il computer si è rallentato.*
 the computer self is slowed.down
 ‘The computer got slow.’

4.24 a. *%Il computer mi ha rallentato*
 the computer me.DAT has slowed.down
 ‘The computer got slow on me’

b. *Il computer mi si è rallentato.*
 the computer me.DAT self is slowed.down
 ‘The computer got slow on me.’

(4.21-4.22) feature the verb *tremare* ‘tremble.’ In the absence of a clitic (4.21), *tremare* ‘tremble’ favors (if not requires) *avere* ‘have.’ However, where a clitic occurs, as in (4.22), some speakers refuse to accept the version with *avere* ‘have’ (4.22b). This is so even though other speakers are not willing to accept the version with *essere* ‘be.’ Thus, the speaker who wishes to make the statement in (4.22) is in a dilemma: regardless of which auxiliary they choose to use, their utterance will sound ungrammatical to some speakers.

(4.23-4.24) feature the verb *rallentare* ‘slow down,’ which optionally allows a version with *essere* ‘be’ that requires an inherent reflexive clitic (4.23b). This version is either preferred or obligatory, depending on the speaker, where *rallentare* ‘slow down’ co-occurs with a clitic, such as *mi* ‘me’ in (4.24). Where there is no clitic, *rallentare* may take either form (4.23a). There does not seem to be disagreement among speakers regarding the preferability of (4.24a). However, considering the significant degree of variation in auxiliary usage, it is not possible to guarantee that no speaker will produce a different judgement.

It should be further noted that the extent to which clitic promotes *essere* ‘be’ does not only vary from speaker to speaker, but also from verb to verb. For instance, a speaker who requires *essere* ‘be’ where *tremare* ‘tremble’ co-occurs with a clitic may not impose the same

requirement on *girare* ‘turn’ (4.25). This is so even though in this speaker’s grammar, *girare* ‘turn’ on its own requires *avere* ‘have,’ just like *tremare* ‘tremble’ (4.26):

- 4.25 a. *Mi ha girato la testa*
 me.DAT has turned the head
 ‘I was dizzy.’
- b. *Mi è girata la testa*
 me.DAT has turned the head
 ‘I was dizzy.’
- 4.26 a. *La macchina ha girato per una strada*
 the car has turned for a street

che non è nemmeno sulla mappa
 that not is even on.the map

 ‘The car turned onto a street that is not even on the map.’
- b. **La macchina è girata per una strada*
 the car has turned for a street

che non è nemmeno sulla mappa
 that not is even on.the map

 ‘The car turned onto a street that is not even on the map.’

In sum, the choice of auxiliary in intransitives is largely lexically determined and highly individualistic. Impersonal constructions and clitics tend to favor *essere* ‘be.’ However, this tendency manifests itself differently in different speakers, and even within the same speaker, there is no consistency. Consequently, any phenomenon that interacts with clitics and auxiliary selection is likely to generate disagreement among speakers. As we will see later on in this chapter, judgment regarding *NE* is hardly ever unanimous.

2. Participial agreement

a) *Preliminary comments*

Leaving aside the complications caused by *NE* in intransitive clauses, the rules for participial agreement in Italian can be summed up as follows:

4.27 **Participial agreement rules**

- a. **No nominal may** control participial agreement except:
 - i. *NE* and *lo/la/li/le* ‘it/them,’ (hereinafter, “group 1 clitics.”)
 - ii. first and second person direct object clitics in certain circumstances,²⁰ and
 - ii. the subject of a clause taking *essere* ‘be.’
- b. Where a group 1 clitic is present, the past participle **must** agree with it.²¹
- c. The subject of a clause taking *essere* ‘be’ **must** agree with the participle.
- d. In case of conflict between (4.27b) and (4.27c), the former **overrides** the latter.

(4.27b) is exemplified in (4.27). Both sentences in (4.27) contain *li* ‘them,’ a group 1 clitic.

(4.27a) shows agreement between *li* ‘them’ and the participle *comprati* ‘bought’: both are masculine plural. (4.27b) is therefore satisfied, and (4.27a) is grammatical. (4.27b) is ungrammatical because there is no agreement between *li* ‘them’ and *comprato* ‘bought’: the former is masculine plural, while the latter is masculine singular. Because agreement is lacking, (4.27b) is not satisfied, and (4.28b) is unacceptable:

- | | | | | |
|----------|----------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|
| 4.28. a. | <i>Maria</i> | <i>li</i> | <i>ha</i> | <i>comprati</i> |
| | Maria | them.MASC.PL | has | bought.MASC.PL |
| | ‘Maria bought them.’ | | | |
| b. | * <i>Maria</i> | <i>li</i> | <i>ha</i> | <i>comprato</i> |
| | Maria | them.MASC.PL | has | bought.MASC.SG |
| | ‘Maria bought them.’ | | | |

²⁰ Speakers generally consider agreement with these clitics to be old-fashioned. Whether this holds true in all circumstances really does not concern us here. None of these clitics are of any relevance to the questions we need to address.

²¹ Again, this is barring certain complications caused by *NE* to be discussed later.

(4.27c) is illustrated in (4.29). Here, the verb *venire* ‘come’ calls for auxiliary *essere* ‘be.’ As a result, the past participle must agree with *Maria* in number and gender. (4.29a) shows agreement and is grammatical. (4.29b) lacks agreement and is unacceptable:

- 4.29 a. *Maria* è *venuta*.
 Maria is come.FEM.SG
 ‘Maria came.’
- b. **Maria* è *venuto*.
 Maria is come.MASC.SG
 ‘Maria came.’

Outside of the situations listed in (4.27a), agreement is impossible. For instance, if the verb takes *avere* ‘have,’ the participle cannot agree with the subject:

- 4.30 a. *Maria* ha *parlato*
 Maria has spoken.MASC.SG
 ‘Maria has spoken.’
- b. **Maria* ha *parlata*
 Maria has spoken.FEM.SG
 ‘Maria has spoken.’

(4.30a) shows no agreement and is acceptable. (4.30b) is unacceptable because *Maria* agrees with *parlata* ‘spoken,’ and the auxiliary is *avere* ‘have.’

b) Conflict between (4.27b) and (4.27c)

At times, a conflict arises between (4.27b) (which requires agreement with group 1 clitics) and (4.27c) (which requires agreement with the subject of all *essere* ‘be’ clauses). Such a conflict originates from the fact that sentences with a reflexive clitic call for *essere* ‘be’ even if they are transitive. Thus, although (4.31a) is transitive, auxiliary *avere* ‘have’ is inappropriate. Because the reflexive clitic *si* is present, *essere* ‘be’ should be used (4.29b):

- 4.31 a. **Maria* si ha *comprato* due libri
 Maria REFL has bought two books

‘Maria bought herself two books.’

- b. *Maria si è comprata due libri*
Maria refl has bought.SG.FEM two books
‘Maria bought herself two books.’

In (4.31b), there is no conflict because the two books are not expressed with a clitic, and the only thing that can impose agreement is Maria. However, the books can be expressed with a clitic, and where they are so expressed, both they and Maria impose agreement, as per (4.27b) and (4.27c). In this case, the clitic wins out per (4.27d). The participle must reflect the gender and number of the clitic, not Maria:

- 4.32 a. ^{??}*Maria se li è comprata*
Maria.SG.FEM REFL them.PL.MASC is bought.SG.FEM
‘Maria bought them for herself’
- b. *Maria se li è comprati*
Maria.SG.FEM REFL them.PL.MASC is bought.PL.MASC
‘Maria bought them for herself’

NE behaves in the same way as *li* ‘them.’ Where *NE* is present, the participle agrees with the number and gender of its referent:

- 4.33 a. ^{??}*Maria se ne è comprata due*
Maria.SG.FEM REFL of.them is bought.SG.FEM two.PL.MASC
‘Maria bought two of them for herself’
- b. *Maria se ne è comprati due*
Maria.SG.FEM REFL of.them is bought.PL.MASC two.PL.MASC
‘Maria bought two of them for herself’

This concludes our discussion of participial agreement. We are now ready to address our first non-canonical construction: extraction from non-argument NP.

B. Extractions from a non-argument NP

The term extraction from a non-argument NP refers to constructions like those exemplified in (4.34-4.35), where *NE* is coindexed with a number indicating degree or measurement:

4.34 a. *Questo scaffale misura due metri*
 this shelf measures two meters
 ‘This shelf measures two meters.’

b. *?Questo scaffale ne misura due*
 this shelf of.them measures two
 ‘This shelf measures two of them.’

[Belletti & Rizzi, 1981]

4.35 a. *(Di chilometri) la città ne dista due*
 of kilometers the city of.them is.far two
 ‘The distance to the city is two of them, kilometers’

b. *(Di ore) ne dorme otto*
 of hours of.them sleeps eight
 ‘S/he sleeps eight of them, hours.’

[Benincà, 1988]

The original authors of these examples refer to them as “marginal” (Belletti & Rizzi, 1981) and “poco eleganti” ‘not very elegant’ (Benincà, 1988). While such terms might be applicable to (4.34b) and (4.35), they are not applicable to all extractions from a non-argument NP. *Costare* ‘cost,’ for example, is frequently attested with *NE* in all registers of the language. Unlike *cost* in English, *costare* is not transitive. It tests out as unaccusative in the periphrastic perfect, requiring *essere* ‘be’ rather than *avere* ‘have’:

4.36 a. *Il libro è costato cinque dollari*
 the book is cost five dollars
 ‘The book cost five dollars.’

b. **Il libro ha costato cinque dollari*
 the book has cost five dollars
 ‘The book cost five dollars.’

(4.36) shows that *cinque dollari* ‘five dollars’ is not a direct object. If it were, (4.36b) would be correct, since transitive constructions require *avere* ‘have’ (see § IV.A.1 above). In light of the data in (4.36), *cinque dollari* ‘five dollars’ qualifies as an expression of degree, like *due metri* ‘two meters’ in (4.34). However, *costare* ‘cost’ is not incompatible with *NE*. Consider the following actual attestations:

4.37 a. ...sono messi a disposizione per i Nidi gratis 11,5
 are put at disposition for the nests free 11,5
 milioni. Complessivamente la misura **ne** **costa** almeno 35:
 million totally the measure of.them costs at.least 35

‘11,5 million are made available for free daycare, but the program costs at least 35 of them in total.’

[https://milano.corriere.it/notizie/cronaca/18_dicembre_13/asili-nido-gratis-servono-23-milioni-caccia-fondi-dall-europa-o-piano-salta-638177ae-fea7-11e8-81df-fed98461c4ee.shtml]

b. Perché sul mercato arrivano tonnellate di olio greco
 because on.the market arrive tons of oil greek
 e spagnolo, che costa poco più di due euro al
 and Spanish that costs little more than two euros per.the
 litro e sottrae spazio a quello italiano, che **ne**
 litre and takes.away space from the.one italian that of.them
costa invece circa 6.
 costs instead around 6

‘Because on the market there’s Greek and Spanish oil, which costs little more than two euros per litre, and does not leave much room for Italian oil, which, in contrast, costs 6 of them.’

[<https://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2019/05/18/il-brutto-della-concorrenzaPalermo04.html?ref=search>]

c. Il resto del danno lo fa un mercato malato per cui
 the rest of.the damage it did a market sick for which

un chilo di mele viene pagato 4 centesimi al
a kg of apples gets paid 4 cents to.the

produttore, mentre la sola raccolta ne costa 18
producer while the alone harvest of.them costs 18

‘The rest of the damage was done by a slow market, because of which, a producer gets 4 cents per kg of apples, even though harvesting alone costs 18 of them.’

[https://www.corriere.it/cronache/19_giugno_02/campagna-si-muoredi-burocrazia-c41bfc2-849c-11e9-b1c4-7ac365a010cf.shtml]

d. *Che altra auto potrebbe desiderare un cliente Bugatti, un*
what other car could desire a client Bugatti a

'privilegiato' che ha speso almeno 2-3 milioni di
privileged.person that has spent at.least 2-3 million of

euro per comprare l'ultimo modello della Casa di Molsheim
euros for buying the.last model of.the house of Molsheim

(ma ce ne sono molte che ne costano 5 e più)...
but there of.them are many that of.them cost 5 and more

‘What other car could be desired by a Bugatti customer, a privileged individual who has spent 2-3 million euros on the latest model of the Molsheim company (but there are many (cars) that cost five of them or more)...’

[http://www.ansa.it/canale_motori/notizie/industria/2019/03/20/bugatti-pronta-a-far-rinascere-mito-dellammiraglia-royale_633972a1-5fa0-4670-9da1-6bfbf3a2527f.html]

e. - *“...dovrebbe costare almeno 20 euro al chilo”.*
it.has.to cost at.least 20 euros per kg

-*“Eheheh. Invece ne costa 1.000, ma io lo vendo a 700”.*
uh instead of.them it.costs 1000 but I it sell at 700

- ‘It has to cost at least 20 euros per kg.’

- ‘Uh, no. It costs 1000, but I will sell for 700.’

[<https://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/in-edicola/articoli/2019/02/14/la-vendetta-del-somaro-e-il-latte-perduto/4971060/>]

f. ... *un giorno gli agenti incasseranno più soldi di*
 one day the agents will.make more money then

quanti ne costa un calciatore.
 how.many of.them costs a football.player

‘One day the agents will make more money than how much of it a football player costs.’

[<https://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/in-edicola/articoli/2019/02/14/la-vendetta-del-somaro-e-il-latte-perduto/4971060/>]

e. *I fondi a disposizione sono, infatti, poco più di*
 the funds at disposition are in.fact little more than

quattro miliardi e mezzo, quanti ne costa, in
 four billion and half how.many of.them costs in

effetti, l'impianto stesso.
 effect the.system itself

‘The available funds are in fact, little more than four and a half million, which is the amount (of them) that the system itself costs.’

[<http://consiglio.regione.sardegna.it/resoconti/pdf/3/030113.PDF>]

The above examples consist of quotes from newspapers (4.37a-d), a dialogue printed in a newspaper (4.37e), and an excerpt from a legislative speech (4.37f). As a simple Google search will demonstrate, examples of this type are abundant. In light of such overwhelming attestations, I find it impossible to describe *costare + NE* as anything but acceptable and fully productive.

But if *costare* ‘cost’ may combine with *NE*, how should its past participle be inflected in compound tenses? For instance, what should appear above the [_] in the following example?

4.38 a. *Il libro ne è costat__ cinque*
 the book.MASC.SG of.them is cost five.MASC.PL

(*di dollari.*
 of dollar.MASC.PL

‘The book has cost five of them, dollars.’

Because the auxiliary in (4.38a) is *essere* ‘be,’ the participle should agree with the subject. This means that the space should be filled with *-o*, the masculine singular ending matching the book. But the book is not the only thing that imposes agreement in this sentence; *NE* also requires agreement because it is a group 1 clitic. And agreement with *NE* would mean that the space needs to be filled with *-i*, the masculine plural inflection matching *cinque* ‘five.’ If *cinque* ‘five’ referred to a direct object like *due* ‘two’ in (4.38), *NE* would override the subject. However, *cinque* ‘five’ is not the direct object because *costare* ‘cost’ is not transitive. Given this, should *NE* still override the book?

The above considerations yield different results in different speakers. For some speakers, the correct answer is agreement with the subject, as shown in (4.38b):

4.38 b. *Il libro ne è costato cinque*
 the book.MASC.SG of.them is cost.MASC.SG five.MASC.PL
 (*di dollari*)
 of dollars

‘The book has cost five of them, dollars.’

For other speakers, *NE* overrides the subject of *costare* ‘cost’ just as it does the subject of a transitive clause. The correct answer for these speakers is (4.38c):

4.38 c. *Il libro ne è costati cinque*
 the book.MASC.SG of.them is cost.MASC.PL five.MASC.PL
 (*di dollari*)
 of dollars

‘The book has cost five of them, dollars.’

For yet other speakers, the conflict between the subject and *NE* renders both (4.38b) and (4.38c) mal-formed. On the other hand, some speakers consider both of these sentences to be correct. In

fact, both sentences have real life parallels. Below are some actually attested examples. (4.39)

displays the same agreement pattern as (4.38b), and (4.40) displays the pattern in (4.38c):

- 4.39 a. ... *il film ha incassato fin'ora nel mondo quasi*
the movie.MASC.SG has generated up.to.now in.the world almost

200 milioni di dollari (ne è costato circa
200 million of dollars of.them it.is cost.MASC.SG about

50) tanto da far decidere alla Fox di adattare
50 so.much enough to.make decide to.the Fox to adapt

un altro classico della Christie...
a other classic of.the Christie

‘...at this point the film has brought in 200 million dollars world wide (it cost about 50 of them), so Fox has decided to adapt another classic of Christie’s...’

[https://www.repubblica.it/spettacoli/cinema/2017/11/28/news/_assassinio_sul_l_orient_express-182424834/]

- b. *Il bonus degli 80 euro ha fatto aumentare i*
the bonus.MASC.SG of.the 80 euro has caused increase the

consumi di 3 miliardi, ma ne è costato 10”.
consumption by 3 billion but of.them it.is cost.MASC.SG 10

‘The eighty euro bonus increased consumption by 3 billion, but it cost 10 of them (billion).’

[https://www.wired.it/attualita/politica/2018/02/22/elezioni-2018-costoriforme/?refresh_ce=]

- c. *Al momento ha perso 29,7 milioni di dollari, ne è*
at.the moment it.has lost 29,7 million of dollars of.them it.is

costato 30.
cost.MASC.SG 30

‘Right now it has lost 29,7 million dollars; it cost 30 of them (million).’

[<https://www.grazia.it/stile-di-vita/cinema-e-tv/i-film-piu-brutti-del-2011>]

4.40 a. *Un calciatore può arrivare a milioni di euro:*
a soccer.player can arrive at millions of euros

David Beckham ne è costati 35 al Real Madrid.
David Beckham of.them is cost.MASC.PL 35 to.the Real Madrid

‘A soccer player can cost millions: Davide Beckham cost Real Madrid 35 of them.’

[http://www.repubblica.it/2003/j/sezioni/scienza_e_tecnologia/costouomo/costouomo/costouomo.html]

b. *La mostra sulla famiglia Benigni fa flop. Incassa*
the exhibit.fem.sg on.the family Benigni makes flop it.brings.in

50 mila euro ma ne è costati 450 mila²²
50 thousand euro but of.them it.is cost.MASC.PL 450 thousand

‘The exhibit on the Benigni family was a flop. It brought in 50 thousand euros but it cost 450 thousand of them.’

[<http://www.ilgiornale.it/news/bologna-mostra-sulla-famiglia-benigni-fa-flop-incassa-50.html>]

c. *Un ritardo che sta costando miliardi di dollari a Boeing*
a tardiness that is costing billions of dollars to Boeing

così come ne è costati miliardi all'europea
so as of.them it.is cost.MASC.PL billions to.the.european

Airbus per il lancio del colosso A380
Airbus for the launching of.the colossal A380

‘A tardiness that is costing Boeing billions of dollars, as it cost European Airbus billions of them to launch the colossal A380.’

[https://www.ilsole24ore.com/art/Newsletter2007/Tech24/Articoli/2009/03/27/4_A_PRN.shtml]

²² This appears in the headline of an article. For other headlines, visit:

- <https://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/2017/04/19/mediaset-nel-2016-perdita-record-295-milioni-lo-scontro-con-vivendi-su-premium-ce-ne-e-costati-341/3532016/>
- <http://www.provincia.biella.it/on-line/Home/Rassegnastampa/documento5005.html>

A different pattern emerges when *il libro* ‘the book’ in (4.38a) is replaced with *questi libri* ‘these books, as in (4.41a):

4.41 a. *Questi libri ne sono costat_ cinque*
 these book.MASC.PL of.them are cost five.FEM.PL
 (*di lire*).
 of lira.FEM.PL

‘These books have cost five of them, liras.’

The currency has been changed from euro to lira to create an agreement conflict. Here, speakers who prefer agreement with the subject continue with their preference. They fill the blank with *-i*, the masculine plural ending matching the books:

4.41 b. *Questi libri ne sono costati cinque*
 these book.MASC.PL of.them are cost.MASC.PL five.FEM.PL
 (*di lire*).
 of lira.FEM.PL

‘These books have cost five of them, liras.’

Speakers who prefer agreement with the quantifier show varied reactions to (4.39a). Some of them declare the space to be impossible to fill out. Others switch their preference and accept (4.41b). Yet others continue to require agreement with the quantifier, as shown in (4.41c):

4.41 c. *Questi libri ne sono costate cinque*
 these book.MASC.PL of.them are cost.FEM.PL five.FEM.PL
 (*di lire*).
 of lira.FEM.PL

‘These books have cost five of them, liras.’

If the quantifier is changed to the singular, as in (4.42a), the blank is obligatorily filled out with the masculine plural ending (4.42b) or not filled out at all. That is, speakers who require agreement with the quantifier find the sentence to be impossible (4.42c):

4.42 a. *Questi libri ne sono costat_ una*
 these book.MASC.PL of.them are cost one.FEM.SG

(*di lira*).
 of lira.FEM.SG

‘These books have cost one of them, lira.’

b. *Questi libri ne sono costati una*
 these book.MASC.PL of.them are cost.MASC.PL one.FEM.SG

(*di lira*).
 of lira.FEM.SG

‘These books have cost one of them, lira.’

c. **Questi libri ne sono costata una*
 these book.MASC.PL of.them are cost.FEM.SG one.FEM.SG

(*di lira*).
 of lira.FEM.SG

‘These books have cost one of them, lira.’

In sum, *costare* ‘cost’ may combine with *NE*. In the simple tenses, the construction is unproblematic. In compound tenses, the conflicting requirements imposed by *NE* and by the subject result in difficulty for some speakers. Nevertheless, *costare* ‘cost’ is attested with *NE* in all tenses, including in headlines of newspaper articles.²³ As such, it is not possible to maintain that all extractions from non-argument NPs are ungrammatical.

²³ Four out of the fourteen speakers consulted on *costare* rejected both the form where the quantifier controls agreement and the form where the subject controls agreement. I collected these data years ago and at the time, I did not check with these four speakers on the possibility of using *costare* where there is no agreement conflict. Unfortunately, I am no longer in touch with three of the four speakers. I have contacted the remaining speaker and verified that she accepts *costare* if there is no conflict. She was asked to judge the following sentence, where both the subject and the quantifier are masculine plural:

i. *Inizialmente avevamo ipotizzato una spesa di 125mila euro,*
 initially we.had hypothesized a cost of 125000 euros

invece i lavori complessivamente ne sono costati 85mila
 instead the work.MASC.PL in.total of.them are cost.MASC.PL 85000.MASC.PL

C. Extractions from subjects of unergatives

As mentioned in chapter 1, scholars do not agree on whether *NE* may be extracted from the subject of an unergative in the compound tenses. Some maintain that there is no prohibition on such extractions (Sornicola, 2014), or that the prohibition is only applicable in the absence of “presentational” meaning (Mackenzie, 2006), or that the prohibition is neutralized if there is a locative argument (Saccon, 1992). Others maintain that the prohibition is always operative (Loporcaro, 2006; Alba-Salas, 2004; Lonzi, 2009; Calabrese & Mailing, 2009; Glushan & Calabrese, 2014). According to Lonzi (2009) and Glushan & Calabrese (2014), the prohibition is caused by the conflict between *NE*, which requires participial agreement, and the unergative participle, which, because it is unergative, is incapable of agreement. It has also been suggested that the conflict has to do with the choice of auxiliary. According to Bentley (2006), *NE* constructions are existential if they contain an unergative verb, and as they are existential, they require auxiliary *essere* ‘be.’ However, unergative verbs are not compatible with *essere* ‘be.’ This clash in auxiliary requirements causes some speakers to reject *NE* + unergative in compound tenses. Finally, according to Calabrese & Mailing (2009), toleration of *NE* + unergative is a matter of dialectal variation. Specifically, the northern dialects may consider such a combination fully acceptable .

In my view, no dialect or individual grammar bans or accepts all instances of *NE* + unergative. Out of the fourteen speakers I consulted on unergative extractions in compound

‘Initially we had supposed that the cost would be 125,000 eros. Instead, all of the works cost 85,000 of them in total,’

[<http://www.monteargentario.net/piazzale-candi-prima-e-dopo.html>]

The speaker commented that using *NE* is the best way she knows to communicate the ideas in (i). In the absence of *NE*, *euro* would have to be repeated, rendering the sentence cumbersome and repetitive.

tenses, all fourteen accepted such extractions some of the time and rejected them some of the time. This is so even though at least three²⁴ of the fourteen were from the South. These three accepted *NE* at about the same rate as everyone else. It should also be noted that for five of the fourteen speakers, I only had the opportunity to ask them to judge three verbs: *funzionare* ‘function,’ *camminare* ‘walk,’ and *brillare* ‘shine.’ All five accepted at least one of these verbs with *NE* in the periphrastic perfect. However, they did not agree on which verb or which person and number should be used with the verb in order for *NE* to be acceptable. This is generally true of all speakers’ responses to *NE* in unergative constructions. They all agree that such constructions are possible, even in the periphrastic perfect. However, they do not agree on when they are possible.

What causes a speaker to reject a construction? The answer to this question is necessarily complex and multi-faceted. While there is no generalization that works for all speakers and all verbs, it appears that participial agreement and the choice of auxiliary play a role in *NE*’s acceptability. We will explore each of these two factors in turn.

1. The role of participial agreement

Some evidence suggests that participial agreement is partially for the acceptability of *NE*. As noted by Lonzi (2009), where the subject is masculine singular and thereby matches the default form of the participle, “the offensive effect decreases/disappears, and the sentence is marginally acceptable.”²⁵ This observation is valid at least to some extent. Consider, for example, the sentences in (4.43). Out of the ten speakers who evaluated these sentences, nine

²⁴ Some data were collected through native speakers who passed on a survey to their friends. I do not have information on where these speakers’ friends are from. I have also lost contact with the speakers themselves so I am unable to seek this information from them. In addition to the three Southern speakers, I also collected data from someone who grew up in Napoli but spent most of her adult life in the north.

²⁵ Original Italian: “l’effetto di offesa si riduce/scompare, e la frase è marginalmente accettabile.” (Lonzi, 2009: 129)

found (4.43a) to be completely acceptable, and one was willing to accept it in the spoken register.²⁶ (4.43b), on the other hand, produced only five unqualified yes-es. The other five consisted of three no-s, and two yes-es for the spoken register:

- 4.43 a. *Ne ha funzionato solo uno (di orologio)*
of.them has worked.MASC.SG only one.MASC.SG of clock
‘Only one of them worked’ (clock).’
- b. %*Ne hanno funzionato solo due (di orologio)*
of.them have worked.MASC.SG only two.MASC.PL of clock
‘Only two of them worked’ (clock).’

In (4.43a), the participle *funzionato* ‘worked’ is in its default form, which happens to have the same ending as the masculine singular ending. This matches the gender and number of the quantifier, even though no inflection has taken place. Thus, there is no agreement conflict, and

²⁶ This data suggest that (4.43a) is fully acceptable. The fact that one speaker out of ten only accepts this sentence in the spoken register does not mean that it is marginal. Even incontrovertibly correct sentences do not receive a more favorable response. For instance, one speaker declared both (ia) and (ib) to be acceptable only in the spoken register. The fact that both the version with *essere* ‘be’ and the one with *avere* ‘have’ seem imperfect to this speaker means that the perceived defect is not related to the choice of auxiliary:

- i. a. *Le stelle hanno brillato nel cielo*
the stars have shined in.the sky
‘The stars shined in the sky.’
- b. *Le stelle sono brillate nel cielo*
the stars have shined in.the sky
‘The stars shined in the sky.’

I find it impossible to mark (4.43a) as marginal when constructions like (ii) are routinely marked as correct in the linguistic literature:

- ii. *In Italia si mangia gli spaghetti a tutto spiano*
in Italy si eat.3RD.SG the spaghetti.PL continuously
‘In Italy they eat spaghetti all the time.’

[D’Alessandro, 2007:42]

(ii) shows an impersonal *si* construction where the verb is singular and the logical object is plural. This contradicts the unmarked pattern in Italian, which requires agreement between the logical object and the verb. According to D’Alessandro, (ii) was found to be fully acceptable by only one out of ten speakers. This is so even though two of the ten speakers were from Florence, where the lack of agreement is more likely to be tolerated. If sentences like (ii) can be treated as correct (Salvi, 1988:102; la Fauci & Loporcaro, 1997, among many others), (4.43a) is most definitely not marginal. In any case, all fourteen speakers found unergative extractions in compound tenses to be fully grammatical in some circumstances.

(4.43) is acceptable. In (4.43b), the quantifier is masculine plural, and the participle is masculine singular. Because of this conflict, (4.43b) was not as well-received as (4.43a).

That participial agreement affects judgment of *NE* is also confirmed by the data in (4.44). These data consist of three actually attested examples collected from sources with known authorship: the newspaper *La Nuova Ferrara* (4.44a), the Italian parliament's website (4.44b), and the wellness website *benessere.com* (4.44c). In each of these examples, participial agreement occurs even though the auxiliary is *avere* 'have.'

4.44 a. ... *a Reno Centese di cose non ne hanno*
 at Reno Centese of things not of.them have

funzionate *parecchie*
 worked.FEM.PL many.FEM.PL

'At Reno Centese a lot of them (things) didn't work.'

[http://ricerca.gelocal.it/lanuovaferrara/archivio/lanuovaferrara/2013/05/12/NZ_18_01.html]

b. ... *io sulle barriere fisiche sono molto dubbioso*
 me on.the barriers physical I.am very dubious

non ne ha funzionata una in Italia
 not of.them has worked.FEM.SG one.FEM.SG in Italy

'Me, I don't trust physical barriers. Not one of them has worked in Italy.'

[http://parlamento17.camera.it/application/xmanager/projects/parlamento17/attachments/auditi_pdf/pdfs/000/000/492/Rif_M_20170621_06_Ambientalisti.pdf]

c. ... *di skateboard ne hanno circolati tanti*
 of skateboards of.them have circulated.MASC.PL many.MASC.PL

in casa...
 at home

'Skateboards, many of them have circulated in my home.'

[http://www.benessere.com/blog/allegria_e_benessere/421_una_tavola_e_quattro_ruote_di_allegria.htm]

The existence of (4.44a-c) shows that *NE* cliticization is not nearly as clear-cut as we wish it to be. Although the agreement mismatch creates difficulties in the compound tenses, some speakers are willing to change agreement rules (*see* 4.30 above) to enable the *NE* construction. Speakers who utilize this strategy are not necessarily in the minority. Out of the 14 speakers I consulted, seven accepted agreement with *avere* in at least some circumstances. These seven included: (a) three of the five who only judged three verbs, (b) two speakers from the North, and (c) two speakers from the South. If we count acceptability in the spoken register, the total number is eight: one speaker who grew up in Napoli but has lived for a long time in the North stated that she would use unergative agreement in spoken language, but not in written language.

It should be noted that the eight speakers do not agree on when unergative agreement may be used. For some of these speakers, (4.45a) is correct; for others, it's (4.45b), (4.45c), or (4.45d):

- 4.45 a. %*Ne* *ha* *camminata* *tanta* (*di* *gente*)
of.them has walked.FEM.SG much.FEM.SG of people.FEM.SG
'A lot of them walked, people'
- b. %*Ne* *ha* *funzionata* *solo* *una* (*di* *penna*)
of.them has worked.FEM.SG only one.FEM.SG of pen.FEM.SG
'Only one of them worked, pen'
- c. %*Ne* *hanno* *funzionati* *solo* *due* (*di* *orologi*)
of.them have worked.MASC.PL only two.MASC.PL of clocks
'Only two of them worked, clocks.'
- d. %*Ne* *hanno* *telefonati* *in* *tanti*
of.them have called.MASC.PL in many.MASC.PL
'Many of them called.'

All sentences in (4.45) have detractors among the eight speakers. A speaker who thinks (4.45b) is fully acceptable may deem (4.45c) to be outside of native variation. This is so even though the

two sentences use the same verb. There is thus no way to predict when unergative agreement will be acceptable to an individual speaker. A prediction that holds across speakers would be all the more impossible.²⁷

2. The choice of auxiliary

It has often been reported that some native speakers will attempt to use *essere* ‘be’ with unergative verbs if asked to use *NE* in the compound tenses (Calabrese & Mailing, 2009; Centineo, 1996). This is not unexpected for two reasons. First, as mentioned in chapters 2 and 3, the quantifier of *NE* is non-referential and does not provide a valid address where information can be stored. This means that intransitive *NE* constructions describe “that which happened” rather than provide information about individuals. As a result, these constructions tend to favor *essere* ‘be’ (see § IV.A.1.b). Second, *NE* is a clitic, and per § IV.A.1.b, clitics increase the likelihood that *essere* ‘be’ will be chosen.

But what verbs select *essere* ‘be’ in the presence of *NE*? Unfortunately, no categorical generalization can be provided due to the high degree of speaker variation. As previously mentioned, neither clitics nor the impersonal nature of a construction produce uniformed effect across speakers. Consequently, where some speakers choose to use *essere* ‘be,’ others will assert that such a choice makes no sense. For instance, when *galleggiare* ‘float’ is combined with *NE*, speakers cannot agree on the auxiliary. The result of this is that neither *essere* ‘be’ nor *avere* ‘have’ achieves universal acceptance:

²⁷ A speaker’s preference with respect to *costare* ‘cost’ does not reflect whether they will accept unergative agreement. The same person may reject (i) but accepts one of the sentences in (4.49). Vice versa, acceptance of (i) does not translate into acceptance of unergative agreement

- i. *Ne* *è* *costati* *cinque*
 of.them it.is cost.MASC.PL five.MASC.PL
 ‘It cost five of them.’

- 4.46 a. *%Ne sono galleggiati solo tre*
of.them are floated only three
‘Only three of them floated.’
- b. *%Ne hanno galleggiato solo tre*
of.them are floated only three
‘Only three of them floated.’

It has been reported that speakers do not convert agentive verbs into unaccusatives in the presence of *NE* (Calabrese & Mailing, 2009). In my experience, all verbs are liable to being converted, agentive or otherwise. Thus, both *tremare* ‘tremble,’ which is non-agentive, and *camminare* ‘walk,’ which is agentive have been converted to unaccusative by some speakers:

- 4.47. a. *%Ne sono tremati molti.*
of.them are trembled many
‘Many of them trembled.’
- b. *%Ne è camminata tanta di gente*
of.them is walked a.lot of people
‘A lot of them walked, people’

A weaker generalization based on agentivity might be possible: agentive verbs are not subject to conversion if they are not a verb of motion. However, even this hypothesis is not perfectly safe: one speaker was willing to accept both *telefonare* ‘phone’ and *giocare* ‘play’ with *essere* ‘be’ in the spoken register:

- 4.48 a. *%Ne sono giocati sempre solo tre*
of.them are played always only three
‘Only three of them played.’
- b. *%Ne sono telefonati molti (di tifosi) dopo la partita*
of.them are called many of fans after the game
‘A lot of them called after the game, fans’

The same speaker also asserted that only a non-native would accept either (4.47a) or (4.46a), where *tremare* ‘tremble’ and *galleggiare* ‘float’ – two far less agentive verbs - are converted to unaccusatives.

In the end, what auxiliary to use is up to the individual lexicons. This is the case even where *NE* is not involved. It is unsurprising that where *NE* is involved, no consensus can be reached. There is no consensus regarding how to say “*My hands were shaky*” either (the relevant examples (4.22) are repeated below). This is so even though the clitic *mi* ‘me’ does not impose agreement:

- 4.49 a. %*Mi* *sono* *tremate* *le* *mani*
 me.DAT are trembled.FEM.PL the hands.FEM.PL
 ‘My hands were shaky,’
- b. %*Mi* *hanno* *tremato* *le* *mani*
 me.DAT are trembled the hands
 ‘My hands were shaky,’

It should be further pointed out that the two strategies discussed here - allowing participial agreement and switching to *essere* ‘be’ – are not able to rescue all *NE* constructions within each individual grammar. That is, sometimes speakers refuse to use either strategy even though their grammar tolerates both in some circumstances. For instance, a speaker may reject all sentences in (4.50):

- 4.50. a. %*Ne* *hanno* *brillato* *due* *di* *stelle*
 of.them have shined two of stars
 ‘Two of them shined, stars.’
- b. %*Ne* *sono* *brillate* *due* *di* *stelle*
 of.them are shined two of stars
 ‘Two of them shined, stars.’
- c. %*Ne* *hanno* *brillate* *due* *di* *stelle*
 of.them have shined.FEM.PL two.FEM.PL of stars
 ‘Two of them shined, stars.’

This is so even though the same speaker accepts:

- 4.51 a. *Non ne è brillata nessuna di stella*
not of.them is shined no.one of star
'None of them shined, stars.'
- b. *Ne hanno circolate molte di macchine*
of.them have circulated.FEM.PL many.FEM.PL of cars
'A lot of them circulate, cars.'

These examples serve to underscore the idiosyncratic nature of judgment on *NE*. The correct generalization, therefore, is that how to use *NE* is a matter of individual preference.

3. A rare case of consensus

For some reason, speakers unanimously welcomed extractions from the argument of *dormire* 'sleep' and *aderire* 'sign up.' These two verbs are illustrated in (4.52a) and (4.52b) respectively:

- 4.52 a. *Ne hanno dormito molti*
of.them have slept many
'Many of them slept.'
- b. *Ne hanno aderito cinque*
of.them have signed.up five
'Five of them signed up.'

(4.52a) was accepted by nine out of nine speakers, although one of the nine confined it to the spoken register, and another could not quite decide if it belonged in the written register.²⁸ (4.49b) was accepted by seven out of seven speakers. This is so even though the quantifier is plural in either case. It may be said of *aderire* 'sign up' that it has presentational meaning. However, I am not sure how *dormire* 'sleep' is presentational.

²⁸ This does not mean that (4.52a) is somehow defective. See note (24) above.

I have no suggestion for why these two verbs seem more compatible with *NE* than other unergatives. This question will be left to further research. Here, I will only add that the addition of a clitic reduces the acceptability of both verbs:

- 4.53 a. %*Ce* *ne* *hanno* *dormito* *molti*
 there of.them have slept many
 ‘Many of them slept there.’
- b. %*Ce* *ne* *hanno* *aderito* *molti*
 it of.them have slept many
 ‘Many of them signed up for it.’

If *ce* ‘there’ is added, judgment regarding these verbs becomes ambiguous. Perhaps the addition of another clitic increases *essere*’s eligibility as an auxiliary in a sentence that would otherwise clearly call for *avere* ‘have.’ That is, without *ce* ‘there,’ *avere* ‘have’ is clearly the correct choice, whereas with *ce* ‘there,’ the scale does not tip decisively in favor of either auxiliary, rendering both *essere* ‘be’ and *avere* ‘have’ unacceptable.

4. Actual attestations

If, as it is hypothesized here, all speakers find unergative extractions to be fully grammatical in some instances, we expect written sources to reflect this intuition. A quick Google search will demonstrate that the written sources do so reflect: attestations of unergative extractions are not difficult to find. Here, I will only list a few examples that were selected exclusively from Southern sources:

- 4.54 a. *Dall’esame* *del* *verbale* *del* *seggio* *elettorale,*
 from.the.examination of.the record of.the seat electoral
- si* *evince* *che* *su* 115 *elettori* *aventi* *diritto*
 imp shows that over 115 votes having right
- ne* *hanno* *votato* 110 (95,65 % *suddiviso*
 of.them have voted 110 95,65% divided

in 57 maschi e 53 femmine).
in 57 males and 54 females

‘The examination of the record reveals that out of 115 eligible voters, 111 of them voted (95,65% consisting of 57 men and 53 women)’

[<https://www.vaitaormina.com/giardini-i-dipendenti-del-comune-hanno-la-loro-nuova-rappresentanza-sindacale-unitaria-formata-da-7-unita/>]

b. *Sotto processo per tre estorsioni, alla fine ne*
under trial for three extorsions in.the end of.them

hanno retto solo due al vaglio Tribunale.
have held.up only two to.the sieve court

‘On trial for three counts of extorsions. In the end, only two of them held up in court.’

[https://livesicilia.it/2014/07/17/mafia-pizzo-e-politica-quattro-condanne-a-misilmeri_517577/]

c. *A Crosia su 8742 elettori ne hanno*
at Crosia out.of 8742 votes of.them have

votato 3479 (39,79%).
voted 3479 (39,79%)

‘In Crosia out of 8742 voters 3479 (39,79%) voted.’

[www.ionionotizie.it/articolo-24310.php]

d. *Dal 2008, una serie di difficoltà tecniche hanno sempre*
from.the 2008 a series of difficulties technical have always

bloccato la loro disponibilità: per un periodo ne
blocked the their availability for a period of.them

hanno funzionato soltanto 3, su 26 in totale.
have worked only 3 out.of 26 in total

‘From 2008 a series of difficulties have blocked their availability: in one period, only three of them worked out of 26 in total.’

[https://www.ilmattino.it/napoli/cronaca/circumvesuviana_dopo_dieci_anni_tornano_a_correre_i_metrostar-3510599.html]

(4.54a-b) are from Sicilian news sources. (4.54c) is from a Calabrian source, and (4.54d) is from a newspaper of Napoli. As the attestations show, unergative extractions are not restricted to Northern Italy. There is no evidence that such extractions are a matter of dialectal variation.

D. *NE* in reflexive-transitive constructions

It has often been reported that *NE* cannot be extracted from the subject of a reflexive-transitive (Perlmutter, 1983; La Fauci & Loporcaro, 1997; Reinhart & Siloni, 1999; Baltin, 2001; Bentley, 2006). To the best of my knowledge, scholarly sources are unanimous on this point.

Thus, (4.55a) is said to be impossible because it allows *NE* to refer to the subject of *vedere* ‘see’:

4.55 a. **Se ne vedono molti*
 REFL of.them see many
 ‘Many of them see themselves’

b. *Se ne vedono molti*
 IMP of.them see many
 ‘Many of them were seen’

[Bentley, 2006; glosses mine]

(4.55a) could have the meaning in (4.55b), where *se* is an impersonal morpheme rather than a reference to the entities that are seen. This meaning is grammatical – here, *NE* does not refer to the seer.

I agree that (4.55a) is ungrammatical and (4.55b) is grammatical. However, I do not agree that *NE* can never refer to the subject of a reflexive-transitive.

First, it should be pointed out that reflexive-transitives impose stringent requirements upon *NE*. While these requirements vary from speaker to speaker, it is possible to identify sentences that are likely to achieve unanimous acceptance, and those that are likely to be universally rejected.

A sentence is likely to be accepted if it refers to the appearance of the entities denoted by *NE*. For instance, reflexive-intransitives that can be paraphrased as ‘turn up’ are likely to be compatible with *NE*:

4.56 a. *Finora di testimoni in polizia non se ne sono*
 til.now of witnesses in police non REFL of.them are

fatti vedere e la domanda che ci si pone è
 allowed to.see and the question that imp imp poses is

come Bedetti ci sia potuto finire nel fiume.
 how Bedetti there is could end.up in.the river

‘Up until now of witnesses none have presented themselves to the police and the question that we have to ask ourselves is how Bedetti ended up in the river.’

[<https://www.tio.ch/svizzera/cronaca/659686/mistero-sulla-morte-di-mattia-bedetti>]

b. *Dei 207 che avevano firmato per la convocazione,*
 of.the 207 that had signed for the convocation

se ne sono fatti vedere 93: meno della metà.
 REFL of.them are allowed see 93 less tha.the half

‘Of the 207 that signed the convocation, 93 allowed themselves to be seen: less than half.’

[<http://aconservativemind.blogspot.com/2005/12/la-legge-per-lamnistia-e-lemergenza.html>]

c. ... *l'83,5% dei vigili urbani di Roma che doveva*
 83,5% of.the traffic police of Rome who were.supposed.to

lavorare era assente per malattia, donazione sangue,
 work was absent for sickness donation blood

disabilità. Cioè su 1000 agenti necessari se ne
 disability that.is out.of 1000 agents necessary REFL of.them

sono resi disponibili solo 165...
 are made available only 165

‘...83,5% of the traffic police of Rome who were supposed to work were absent due to illness, blood donation, and disability. That is, out of 1000, the number that was required, only 165 of them made themselves available...’

[<https://www.mipiaceroma.it/notizie/vigili-roma-proseguono-la-protesta-san-silvestro-dallalto-minacce-di-azioni-disciplinari>]

d. ... *ha chiesto se tra il numerosissimo pubblico vi*
 he.has asked if among the very.numerous public there

fosse un ginecologo; prontamente tra i presenti
 was a gynecologist promptly among those present

se ne sono resi disponibili ben cinque che sono
 REFL of.them are made available a.whole five that are

stati urgentemente trasportati con la nostra
 been urgently transported with the our

automedica al Pronto Soccorso...
 medical.car to.the emergency.room

‘...he asked if among those present there was a gynecologist and immediately a whole five of them made themselves available and they were urgently transported with our medical vehicle to the emergency room...’

[http://www.laltraagrigento.it/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5141:oscia-2012-raccontato-da-una-volontaria-dellaep&catid=106:lettere-in-redazione&Itemid=431]

e. *Di giovani volenterosi non se ne sono fatti sentire*
 of youths willing not REFL of.them are allowed hear
 ‘We have not heard from any willing young person (lit. ‘Of willing young people, none have allowed themselves to be heard’)’

Notice that the verbs in (4.56) test out as transitive. They are all eligible to combine with a direct object clitic *lo* ‘it’:

4.57 a. *L’ho reso disponibile.*
 I.it.have rendered available
 ‘I made it available.’

b. *Te l’ho fatto vedere.*
 you.DAT I.it.have made seen

‘I showed it to you (lit. I made it seen by you)’

- c. *Me l’hai fatto sentire più volte.*
me.dat you.it.have made heard more times
‘You made me hear it more than once (lit. You had it heard by me more than once.)’

Verbs of disappearance yield inconsistent results. While some speakers are willing to tolerate them, others are not:

- 4.58 % *I fantasmi sono apparsi. Abbiamo discusso molti*
the ghosts are appeared we.have discussed many
argomenti. Poi, all’improvviso, se ne sono
arguments then suddenly REFL of.them are
*nascosti alcuni.*²⁹
hidden some

‘The ghosts appeared. We talked about many things. Then, suddenly, some of them hid themselves’

If a verb does not pertain to either appearance or disappearance, it is unlikely to be compatible with *NE*. Thus, *NE* cannot cliticize onto either *schiaffeggiarsi* ‘slap themselves’ and *vedersi* ‘see themselves’ in the following examples:

- 4.59 a. *??I fantasmi sono apparsi. Abbiamo discusso molti*
the ghosts are appeared we.have discussed many
argomenti. Poi, all’improvviso, se ne sono
arguments then suddenly REFL of.them are
schiaffeggiati alcuni da soli
slapped some by alone

‘The ghosts appeared. We talked about many things. Then, suddenly, some of them slapped themselves’

- b. **I fantasmi non vedono bene. Di solito non*
the ghosts not see well usually not
sono capaci neppure di vedere se stessi.

²⁹ Acceptance rate = 2/4.

are capable not.even of seeing refl selves

Però ieri se ne sono visti alcuni
but yesterday REFL of.them are seen some

in questo specchio speciale.
in this mirror special

‘Ghosts don’t see well. Usually, they can’t even see themselves. However, some of them saw themselves in this mirror yesterday.’

In light of the above data, I conclude that *NE* may cliticize onto reflexive-transitives that denote appearance.

E. *NE* and adjectival predicates

It has often been suggested various adjectives cannot combine with *NE*, either because they are not unaccusative (Cinque, 1990a; La Fauci, 1988) or because they impose an information structure that *NE* cannot tolerate (Mackenzie, 2006; Bentley, 2006). According to Mackenzie (2006) and Bentley (2006), the class of adjectives that are incompatible with *NE* is individual-level adjectives. Mackenzie claims that such adjectives, like most unergative verbs, impose a topic-comment division whereas *NE* requiresthetic judgment. Bentley also relies on information structure. She posits that “*copular constructions normally predicate the relation between a topical argument and a focal predicate, [and] ne-cliticization does not occur in predicate focus*” (p. 295). Consequently, all adjectives are somewhat incongruous with *NE*, but a lower degree of compatibility is shown by individual-level adjectives, particularly those denoting colors and physical appearance. This is because these adjectives do not permit an alternative stage-level construal, as evident by their inability to appear in perfect constructions:

4.60 a. *Due sono verdi*
two are green
‘Two are green.’

- b. *? *Due sono stati verdi*
 two are been green
 ‘Two have been green.’

[Bentley, 2006: 297]

Bentley also observes that terms of colors and physical appearance are “more resilient to the existential reading” and require an overt existential clitic *ci* ‘there’ in order for *NE* to be acceptable:

- 4.60 c. *Ce ne sono due verdi*
 there of.them are two green
 ‘There are two (which are) green.’

[Bentley, 2006; glosses simplified]

In my opinion, (4.60b) is not ungrammatical, and in any case, I do not agree that i-level adjectives can never co-occur with *NE*.

First, it is important to acknowledge that some form of restriction does operate on adjectives. For instance, a sentence like (4.61a), if uttered out of the blue without a context, would be rejected by most speakers, whereas a sentence like (4.61b) requires no context at all to make sense:

- 4.61 a. **Ne sono biondi solo due*
 of.them are blond only two
 ‘Only two of them are blond.’

[Bentley, 2006:297; glosses mine]

- b. *Ne sono venuti solo due*
 of.them are come only two
 ‘Only two of them came.’

However, the constraint illustrated in (4.61a) does not hold true for all speakers, nor does it indicate that certain adjectives are somehow comparable to unergatives. In my research, I was fortunate enough to encounter someone who accepts *NE* with all adjectives, including those denoting colors and physical appearance. If, as previous studies suggest, the stricture on

adjectives is one and the same as the one that operates on unergatives, this speaker would accept all unergatives in all tenses. But the speaker does not do so. She does not accept unergatives extractions any more often than anyone else.

But what causes the imperfection in (4.61a)? Unfortunately, I am unable to offer a thorough explanation. What I have seen in my research is that all speakers (excepting the person who tolerates all adjectives) allow some adjectives to combine with *NE* while barring others from doing so.³⁰ For instance, all sentences in (4.62) failed to achieve unanimous acceptance:

- 4.62 a. %*Il Genio del mio ex Jack non ha pagato*
 the genius of.the my ex Jack not has paid
le 60 magliette con la scusa “ne hai fatte
 the 60 shirts with the excuse of.them you.have made
60 ma ne sono belle solo 51.”
 60 but of.them are pretty only 51

‘The genius Jack, my ex, refused to pay for the 60 shirts with the excuse, “you made 60 of them but only 51 of them are pretty.’

- b. %*Il Genio del mio ex Jack non ha pagato*
 the genius of.the my ex Jack not has paid
le 60 torte con la scusa “ne hai fatte
 the 60 cakes with the excuse of.them you.have made
60 ma ne sono rotonde solo 51.”
 60 but of.them are round only 51

‘The genius Jack, my ex, refused to pay for the 60 cakes with the excuse, “you made 60 of them but only 51 of them are round.’

On the other hand, acceptance of (4.63) was unanimous. This is so even though validity, or the lack thereof, lasts throughout the existence of an item, just like its beauty and shape:

- 4.63 *Il Genio del mio ex Jack non ha pagato*
 the genius of.the my ex Jack not has paid

³⁰ The lack of native consensus was also observed by Cinque (1990a:7), in note 7.

le 60 demo con la scusa “ne hai fatte
 the 60 demo with the excuse of.them you.have made

60 ma ne sono valide solo 51.”³¹
 60 but of.them are valid only 51

‘The genius Jack, my ex, refused to pay the 60 demos with the excuse, “you did 60 of them but only 51 of them are valid.”’

Furthermore, *malato* ‘sick’ does not combine well with *NE* even though it denotes a transient quality:

4.64 **Ne sono malati molti*
 of.them are sick many
 ‘Many of them are sick’

[Bentley, 2006:289; glosses mine]

The above data suggest that the distinction between stage-level and individual-level is of limited relevance. Something else must separate highly-eligible adjectives like *valido* ‘valid’³² from poorly-compatible adjectives like *malato* ‘sick’ or *biondo* ‘blond.’ While I cannot define that “something else” in precise terms, I believe that it consists of multiple factors instead of a single feature serving as an on-off switch.

It is possible that *NE* is more compatible with adjectives that denote a measure of judgment on the part of the speaker rather than an obvious quality. For instance, one speaker found (4.62b) to be acceptable if *perfettamente rotonde* ‘perfectly round’ replaces *rotonde* ‘round’:

4.65 *Il Genio del mio ex Jack non ha pagato*
 the genius of.the my ex Jack not has paid

le 60 torte con la scusa “ne hai fatte
 the 60 cakes with the excuse of.them you.have made

³¹ This example is a modified version of a sentence found in an internet forum. The original sentence contained certain tense and aspect usage that was found to be unacceptable by one speaker. As a general rule, I do not treat forum posts and product reviews as appropriate sources for actual attestations. (4.63) counts as a constructed example in keeping with this policy.

³² I have tried various sentences with *NE* + *valido* on over ten speakers, and to date, no one has ever rejected such a combination.

60 *ma ne sono perfettamente rotonde solo 51.*
 60 but of.them are perfectly round only 51

‘The genius Jack, my ex, refused to pay for the 60 cakes with the excuse, “you made 60 of them but only 51 of them are perfectly round.’

This is in-line with the fact that the word *valido* ‘valid’ hints at a measure of judgment. *Valido* ‘valid’ also denotes a quality that the speaker presumably is looking for. It is possible that where a speaker is looking for a quality, that quality becomes more compatible with *NE*. For instance, one speaker is willing to accept *malato* ‘sick’ in (4.66a), but not in (4.66b):

4.66 a. *Ha bisogno di persone malate ma oggi*
 he.has need of persons sick but today
ne sono malate davvero poche
 of.them are sick truly few

‘He needs sick people, but today very few of them are sick.’

b. **Ne sono malati ancora tre*
 of.them are sick still three
 ‘Three of them are still sick.’

When the factors in (4.65-4.66) are combined, the four speakers with whom I am still in touch are willing to accept *NE* with terms of colors and physical appearance:

4.67 *Ogni giorno i cacciatori mi portano degli*
 every day the hunters me.DAT bring some
animali vivi che devo esaminare e decidere se
 animals live that I.have.to examine and decide if
siano carini. Se lo sono, li compro e li
 they.are cute if it they.are them I.buy and them
porto dal re per un piccolo zoo nel castello.
 I.bring to.the king for a little zoo in.the castle
Vedo sia uccelli sia scoiattoli tutti i giorni
 I.see be.it birds be.it squirrels all the days

e devo dire che di scoiattoli ne sono carini
 and I.have.to say that of squirrels of.them are cute

davvero pochi.
 really few

‘Everyday the hunters bring me live animals for me to examine and decide whether they are cute. If they are, I buy them and bring them to the king to put in his mini-zoo in the castle. I see both birds and squirrels everyday, and I have to say that squirrels, very few of them are cute.’

Carini ‘cute’ may be replaced with *belli* ‘beautiful’ and *neri* ‘black’ without affecting grammaticality. The two factors mentioned above – judgment and a quality that is sought out – appear to render all adjectives compatible with *NE* in the grammar of these four speakers. If these factors were removed, judgment would become mixed. For instance, if the second *carini* ‘cute’ were replaced with *neri* ‘black,’ some speakers will reject the example:

4.68 % *Ogni giorno i cacciatori mi portano degli*
 every day the hunters me.DAT bring some

animali vivi che devo esaminare e decidere se
 animals live that I.have.to examine and decide if

siano carini. Se lo sono, li compro e li
 they.are cute if it they.are them I.buy and them

porto dal re per un piccolo zoo nel castello.
 I.bring to.the king for a little zoo in.the castle

Vedo sia uccelli sia scoiattoli tutti i giorni
 I.see be.it birds be.it squirrels all the days

e devo dire che di scoiattoli ne sono neri
 and I.have.to say that of squirrels of.them are black

davvero pochi.
 really few

‘Everyday the hunters bring me live animals for me to examine and decide whether they are cute. If they are, I buy them and bring them to the king to put in his mini-zoo in the castle. I see both birds and squirrels everyday, and I have to say that squirrels, very few of them are black.’

I leave further explorations of the factors I mentioned to further research.

F. Conclusion

In this chapter we have discussed four constructions that are purportedly impossible: (i) extractions from non-argument NPs, (ii) extractions from the subject of an unergative, (iii) extractions from the subject of a reflexive-transitive, and (iv) extractions from the argument of an i-level adjective. All four constructions have been proven to be permissible. The fact that constructions (i-iii) are accepted shows that objecthood is not a prerequisite for *NE*. In the last chapter, we will discuss the last alleged link between objecthood and *NE*: the position of the quantifier.

V. The Position of The Quantifier

A. Introduction

1. The prohibition on pre-verbal quantifiers

It has long been the conventional wisdom that the quantifier of *NE* always appears after the verb. As stated by Rizzi (1982, p.149), “if the noun phrase is in pre-verbal subject position...the ‘zero’ pronominal option is permitted, while the *ne* option is excluded.” This view has frequently been adopted in the literature both in the past (Perlmutter, 1984; Burzio, 1986; Cordin, 1988, Cinque, 1990a, 1990b; Saccon, 1992; Van Valin, 1993; Boivin, 1999) and in more recent times (Baltin, 2000; Bocci, 2007; Barbosa, 2011; Pesetsky, 2015). Below are some examples:

- 5.1 a. *Alcune pietre sono cadute in mare*
some stones are fallen in sea
'Some stones fell into the sea.'

- b. *?*Alcune ne pietre sono cadute in mare*
 some of.them stones are fallen in sea
 ‘Some of them fell into the sea.’
- c. *Alcune sono cadute in mare*
 some are fallen in sea
 ‘Some fell into the sea.’

[Rizzi, 1982, p.149]

- 5.2 a. *Due persone sono rimaste*
 two people are remained
 ‘Two people remained.’
- b. **Due ne sono rimaste*
 two of.them are remained
 ‘Two of them remained.’
- c. *Ne sono rimaste due*
 of.them are remained two
 ‘Two of them remained.’

[Perlmutter, 1983]

In both (5.1) and (5.2), the sentence in (a) is paraphrased in two different manners in (b) and (c). As the original authors of these examples see it, the (b) sentences are ungrammatical because the quantifiers of *NE* (*alcune* ‘some’ in (5.1a) and *due* ‘two’ in (5.2b)) precede the verb. On the other hand, the (c) sentences are considered unproblematic: (5.1c) illustrates that quantifiers may appear before the verb in the absence of *NE*, and (5.2c) shows a *NE*-construction with an expected post-verbal quantifier.

The idea that *NE* cannot be coreferent with a pre-verbal quantifier is perhaps appealing because of other widely held assumptions with regard to this morpheme. As mentioned before, it is generally believed that *ne* cliticization requires objecthood at some level: *NE* is only compatible with the direct object of a transitive verb, the subject of a passive construction, or the subject of an unaccusative. If the quantifier is in post-verbal position, we have an elegant and

make reference to the general topic-focus structure of the language. For example, Van Valin (1993) relied on the long-established notion that topic-hood in Italian is strongly associated with pre-verbal position (Ferrari & de Cesare, 2009; Lambrecht, 1994; Wandruszka, 1986).

According to him, “*ne* realizes the topical head of an NP with a focal quantifier.” *NE* must be topical because “it is a third-person pronoun... and therefore it must occur preverbally.” As for the quantifier, it “is focal and therefore must be postverbal.” Van Valin’s ideas were subsequently endorsed by Bentley (2006) in her study.

Although Van Valin and Bentley base their analysis on information structure, it appears that neither contemplates any possibility for a pre-verbal quantifier except in cases of contrastive focus. Thus, Role and Relational Grammar scholars seem to be in agreement with the other two schools of thought on the distribution of quantifiers. Relational grammar and generativist authors have long recognized contrastive quantifiers as exceptions to the general rule:

- 5.4 a. *Molte ne sono rimaste, non poche*
many of.them are remained not few
‘Many of them are remained, not few.’

[Perlmutter, 1983]

- b. *CINQUE ne sono stati pubblicati*
five of.them are been published
‘FIVE of them were published.’

[Boivin, 1999]

In both (5.4a) and (5.4b), the preverbal quantifier negates a presupposed quantity and bears the main stress of the clause.

To the best of my knowledge, almost all instances of pre-verbal quantifiers reported thus far involve corrective import – which is just one category³³ within contrastive focus. The only

³³ See discussion in § V.B.1

exceptions to this are the following: (i) a number of examples discussed by Beninca (1988), (ii) one example briefly mentioned in Falco & Zamparelli (2016), (iii) some cases of resumptive fronting (Cinque, 1990b), and (iv) some data brought to light by Lepschy (1989). As regards (i), all of Beninca's examples show a pre-verbal quantifier followed by a comma, as shown below:

- 5.5. a. *Molte, ne ho già lette*
 Many of.them I.have already read
 'I have already read many of them.'

Because Beninca's account is dedicated to all dislocated constituents rather than to *NE*, she does not comment on when the quantifier of *NE* may appear pre-verbally.

Falco & Zamparelli's example is reproduced below:

- 5.5. b. % *Tre, ne sono arrivati ieri*
 three of.them are arrived yesterday
 'Three of them arrived yesterday.'

Since Falco & Zamparelli's contribution focuses primarily on other aspects of *NE*, all they have to say regarding (5) is that it is marginal for some speakers, and that *tre* 'three' is a topicalized remnant of a post-verbal subject. The authors make no comment on what might motivate such a topicalization process.

Resumptive fronting³⁴ - the process mentioned by Cinque - serves the function of "highlighting the relationship between the fronted constituent and another constituent already mentioned in discourse³⁵" (Beninca, 1988: 141). According to Cinque, it occurs under the following conditions:

- 5.6 The fronted phrase must either directly resume an identical phrase in the immediately preceding discourse or be inferentially linked to such a phrase (much as in the English VP-preposing construction: ...*and kill himself he did*) [Cinque, 1990b, p. 87]

³⁴ Resumptive fronting is also known as *anaphoric fronting* or *anteponizione anaforica* (Beninca, 1988).

³⁵ Original Italian, "...la funzione dell'anteponizione anaforica è infatti quella di sottolineare la relazione del sintagma anteposto con un sintagma già citato nel discorso." (Beninca, 1988:141).

The sentences in (5.7) are considered cases of resumptive fronting in Cinque’s analysis. Given the rule in (5.6), I assume that there is some “identical” or “inferentially linked” phrase in the context immediately preceding *una* ‘one’ (5.7a) and *molti* ‘many’ (5.7b), even though Cinque did not include them in his data. Cinque’s examples are reproduced below in their entirety:

- 5.7 a. ... *e* *una* *ne* *cadde* *anche* *il* *giorno* *dopo*.
 and one of.them fell also the day after
 ‘And one of them also fell the next day.’
- b. ... *e* *molti* *ne* *furono* *pubblicati* *anche* *l’anno* *seguinte*.
 and many of.them were published also the.year following
 ‘And many of them were also published the following year.’
 [Cinque, 1990b]

Lastly, Lepschy’s review (1989) of Burzio (1986)’s *Italian Syntax* raises the possibility of other environments for pre-verbal quantifiers. Lepschy mentions the following examples from Burzio’s book:

- 5.8 a. **Molti* *ne* *arrivano*
 many of.them arrive
 ‘Many of them arrive.’
- b. **Molti* *ne* *saranno* *invitati*
 Many of.them will.be invited
 ‘Many of them will be invited.’

[Lepschy 1989, citing Burzio 1986]

The sentences in (5.8) are treated as ungrammatical by Burzio, and the asterisks preceding them reflect this fact. However, both sentences are fully grammatical in Lepschy’s judgment. Lepschy states that in his variety of Italian, these same sentences are completely acceptable even if the main accent falls on the verb rather than the quantifier *molti* ‘many’. Lepschy further points out that preverbal quantifiers are not limited to intransitive clauses. As evidence for this, he cites the following examples:

5.9 a. *Sono piaciute le matite a Mario?*
 they.are pleased the pencils to Mario
 ‘Were the pencils to Mario’s liking?’

b. *Mah, alcune ne ha preso,*
 Meh some of.them he.has taken

molte ne ha scartato.
 many of.them he.has discarded

‘Meh, some of them he took, many of the he discarded.’

[Lepschy, 1989]

Despite the scarce attention they have received in the linguistic literature, pre-verbal quantifiers are described as grammatical in Treccani’s *Enciclopedia dell’Italiano*.³⁶ My own investigation has shown that these quantifiers are far less restricted than commonly supposed. In what follows, I will first discuss the fronting mechanisms in Italian and show that these mechanisms cannot account for the full range of pre-verbal quantifiers.

B. Pre-verbal quantifiers and the mechanisms of fronting

We have seen in the introduction that pre-verbal quantifiers are generally dismissed as resulting from special circumstances, namely contrastive focus and resumptive fronting. Since these two processes also permit full DP object preposing, we may wonder if pre-verbal quantifiers are indeed as limited as fronted objects. An overview of the fronting mechanisms in Italian will help us answer this question, as well as provide us with the tools to account for some instances of pre-verbal quantifiers we will see in section III.

³⁶ Follow link for article [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/partitivo_\(Enciclopedia-dell’Italiano\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/partitivo_(Enciclopedia-dell’Italiano)/)

1. The fronting mechanisms

In order to understand fronting in Italian, we must first address a highly productive process known as *clitic left dislocation* (CLLD). CLLD is a topicalization device by which the direct object is pre-posed and obligatorily doubled by a clitic:

- 5.10. a. *Dove è il vaso che ti ho regalato?*
where is the vase that to.you I.have gifted
'Where is the vase that I gifted to you?'
- b. *Oh, il vaso, qualcuno *(lo) ha rotto.*
oh the vase someone it has broken
'Oh, the vase, someone broke it.'

While *il vaso* 'the vase' is pre-verbal in (5.10b), it can be regarded as extra-clausal. Thus, (5.10b) does not exhibit a pre-verbal object. Within the clause, *lo* 'it' appears immediately before the verb – precisely where it is supposed to appear in all sentences. Therefore, (5.10b) can be said to display an unmarked order.

The presence of the resumptive clitic (*lo* 'it' in (5.10b)) distinguishes CLLD from the five fronting phenomena that we will address in this section: resumptive fronting, contrastive focus, mirative fronting, quantifier fronting, and an un-named category brought to light by Berretta (1998). It should be noted that in casual, unplanned speech, speakers may mention fragments of information as they occur to them, creating an illusion of fronting:

- 5.11 a. *Ma è la f che non capisco.*
but it's the f that not I.understand
'But it is the f that I don't understand.'
- b. *La finalità di parole magari vorrà dire.*
the end of words maybe it.will.turn.out to.say
'The end of words, maybe that's what it is meant to say.'

[Augendre, 2012]

In response to (5.11a), the speaker in (5.11b) focuses on the phrase containing the <f> and utters his or her guess as soon as s/he comes up with one. Then, to ensure that the first speaker connects *la finalità di parole* ‘the end of words’ to the <f> in question, s/he adds the rest of the sentence. The word order in (5.11b) is merely a product of the lack of planning and is not a genuine case of fronting. As such, the five phenomena we are about to discuss will not account for this type of examples.

a) *Resumptive fronting (anaphoric fronting in Benincà (1988))*

As mentioned in the introduction, resumptive fronting involves cases where the pre-posed element has an antecedent in the preceding context. This process often involves noun phrases containing *questo* ‘this,’ *quello* ‘that’ or adjectives like *stesso* ‘same’ (5.12b) and *uguale* (5.12c) (Benincà, 1988). Resumptive fronting sounds the most natural in **literary language** (Benincà, 1988; Rizzi, 1990; Cardinaletti, 2009), and is subject to a number of syntactic constraints, four of which are illustrated in (12c-f):

5.12 a. *La stessa proposta fece poi il partito di maggioranza.*
 the same proposal made then the party of majority
 ‘The majority party then made the same proposal.’

b. *Uguale sorte ebbe il vicepresidente.*
 equal fate he.had the vice-president
 ‘The vice-president was subject to the same fate.’

[Benincà, 1988]

c. **Se la stessa proposta fa anche l'altro candidato,*
 if the same proposal makes also the.other candidate

non otterrai quel posto.
 not you.will.obtain that post

‘If the other candidates makes the same proposal, you will not get the job.’

d. **La stessa proposta fece anche il direttore del museo?*
 the same proposal made also the director of.the museum

‘Did the director of the museum make the same proposal?’

- e. **La stessa proposta il partito di maggioranza fece*
the same proposal the party of majority made
il giorno successivo.
the next day

‘The same proposal the party of majority made the next day.’
[Cardinaletti, 2009]

- f. **La stessa proposta ripeté Gianni/ lui*
the same proposal made Gianni he
‘Gianni/he made the same proposal.’
[Cardinaletti, 2018]

(5.12c) shows that resumptive fronting cannot occur outside root contexts³⁷. It is also barred from three other syntactic environments. First, it cannot occur in yes/no question (5.12d) (Cardinaletti, 2009). Second, it cannot occur if the subject is preverbal: (5.12e) crashes because *la stessa proposta* ‘the same proposal’ is fronted, but *il partito di maggioranza* ‘the party of majority’ appears before the verb. Third, resumptive fronting is not possible if the post-verbal subject is a proper name or a pronoun, as shown in (5.12f). These restrictions do not apply to pre-verbal quantifiers, as will be seen later in this chapter.

³⁷ Although they are acceptable in complements to bridge verbs

- i. *Gianni ha detto che la stessa proposta fece*
Gianni has said that the same proposal made
il partito di maggioranza.
the party of majority

‘Gianni said that the majority party made the same proposal.’
[Cardinaletti, 2009]

b) *Contrastive focus and mirative fronting*

The next two categories we will discuss are closely related to each other, as they both require contrast. The main difference is contrastive focus has corrective import, while mirative focus does not. Consider the examples below:

5.13 a. - *Hanno invitato Marina* **Contrastive focus**
they.have invited Marina
'They invited Marina.'

- *GIULIA hanno invitato (, non Marina).*
Giulia they.have invited not Marina

[Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina, 2013]

b. *Non ne potevo più!* **Mirative fronting**
not of.it I.can more

Per un solo esame sette libri ho dovuto studiare!
for a single exam seven books I.have had to.study

'I can't take it anymore. For a single exam I had to look through seven books!'

[Cruschina, 2012]

Contrastive focus is exemplified in (5.13a). The fronted constituent in the response, *Giulia*, contrasts with *Marina* – an alternative suggested in previous discourse. Mirative fronting is exemplified in (5.13b). Unlike contrastive focus, mirative fronting does not correct any specific statement on the part of the listener. Rather, it simply conveys a sense of surprise or unexpectedness, and thus contrasts with an expectation (Crushina, 2012). As seen in (5.13b), the implication of the OV word order is that seven books is an inordinate number to have to study for one test. However, unlike *Giulia* in (11a), *sette libri* 'seven books' does not correct a specific antecedent. The listener may never have heard of the test before, and consequently, could not have had a guess as to how many books the speaker has to look through.

It should be noted that contrast can motivate fronting only if the stated alternative refutes other possibilities (or expectations) from outside the utterance. As can be seen in (5.14), fronting based on utterance-internal contrast does not produce grammatical results (Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina, 2013):

- 5.14 a. *Io vi salute, devo rientrare a casa*
 I you salute I.have to.re-enter at home
 ‘I am gonna say goodbye. I have to go home.’
- b. *Ti conviene prendere il taxi, non la metro...*
 to.you it.requires taking the taxi not the subway
 ‘You need to take the taxi, not the subway...’
- c. **Il taxi ti conviene prendere, non la metro...*
 the taxi to.you it.requires taking not the subway
 ‘The taxi you need to take, not the subway...’

[Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina, 2013]

In this context, there is no evidence that the first speaker assumes they need to take the subway, or that it’s surprising for the taxi to be the preferred method. As such, fronting in (5.14c) is unjustified.

There are at least two syntactic environments in which fronting can occur under contrastive focus, but not under mirative fronting. The first of these environments is subordinate clauses. Mirative fronting is completely banned from such clauses (Cruschina, 2012), while contrastive focus fronting isn’t (Jiménez-Fernández, 2015):

- 5.15 a. *-Gianni ha detto che ha venduto la moto.*
 Gianni has said that he.has sold the motorbike
 ‘Gianni said he had sold the motorbike’
- No, ha detto che LA MACCHINA ha venduto.*
 no he.has said that the car he.has sold
 ‘No, he said he had sold the car.’

[Jiménez-Fernández, 2015]

- b. *Non ci posso credere! Due bottiglie ci siamo bevuti!*
 not to.it I.can believe two bottles REFL we.are drunk

‘I can’t believe it. We drank two bottles!’

[Cruschina, 2012]

c. ??/* *Non ci posso credere! Ha raccontato che due*
not to.it I.can believe he.has recounted that two

bottiglie ci eravamo bevuti!
bottles REFL we.were drunk

‘I can’t believe it. He told people that we drank two bottles.

[Cruschina, 2012]

In (5.15a), the fronted constituent *la macchina* ‘the car’ is inside a subordinate clause, but the sentence is grammatical because *la macchina* ‘the car’ is under contrastive focus – it corrects *la moto* ‘the motorbike’ in the previous assertion. In (5.15b), the fronting of *due bottiglie* ‘two bottles’ is licensed solely by the speaker’s surprise at the quantity that was drunk. As such, (5.15b) is a case of mirative fronting and cannot be embedded inside a subordinate clause (5.15c).

It should be noted that even contrastive focus is not allowed in all subordinate clauses.

Notably, it cannot appear inside the complement of a factive verb (5.16) (Bianchi, 2015). It also cannot operate in a conditional clause (5.17):

5.16 a. *Gianni si rammarica che abbiano licenziato Maria*
Gianni REFL regrets that they.have fired Maria
‘Gianni regrets that they have fired Maria

b. ??*No, si rammarica che LUCIA abbiano licenziato*
No REFL regrets that Lucia they.have fired
‘No, he regrets that Lucia they fired.’

[Bianchi, 2015; glosses and translation mine]

5.17 a. *Sarà ricco se sposterà Maria*
he.will.be rich if he.marries Maria
‘He will be rich if he marries Maria.’

b. ??*No, sarà ricco se LUCIA sposterà*
No he.will.be rich if Lucia he.will.marry
‘No, he will be rich if Lucia he will marry.’

Contrastive focus also differs from mirative fronting in that the it does not impose an adjacency requirement. (Cruschina, 2012 (pp. 105-112; 143); Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina, 2016). That is, if fronting is licensed by corrective import, the fronted constituent is not required to appear immediately before the verb (5.18). However, if it is licensed by mirative import, the fronted constituent must appear immediately before the verb (5.19).

5.18 ??/* *Non ci posso credere! Due bottiglie, al pub,*
 not to.it I.can believe two bottles at.the pub

ci siamo bevuti!
 REFL we.are drunk

‘I can’t believe it! We drank two bottles.’

[Cruschina, 2012]

5.19 A: *Alla fiera Gianni ha venduto la moto.*
 at.the show John has sold the motorbike
 ‘John sold his motorbike at the show.’

B: *LA MACCHINA alla fiera, ha venduto, non la moto*
 the car at.the show has sold not the motorbike
 ‘He sold his car at the show, not his motorbike.’

[Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina, 2016]

(5.18) is the same as (5.15b), with the exception that in (5.18), *al pub* ‘at the pub’ separates the fronted constituent *due bottiglie* ‘two bottles’ from the verb. Because adjacency is violated, (5.18) is not acceptable. Adjacency is also violated in (5.19), as *alla fiera* ‘at the show’ intervenes between the verb and *la macchina* ‘the car.’ However, because the fronting is licensed by contrastive focus, the sentence is acceptable.

In sum, mirative fronting communicates surprise or unexpectedness, while contrastive focus requires corrective import. Mirative fronting imposes an adjacency requirement and is limited to the matrix clause. Contrastive focus is not subject to these restrictions. However, it

cannot operate inside the complement of a factive verb; nor can it appear in conditional clauses. As we will see, none of these restrictions are applicable to the quantifier of *NE*.

c) *Quantifier fronting*

Quantifier fronting is a highly elusive phenomenon. While scholars agree that it exists, they do not seem to agree on what it is, or how to distinguish it from other fronting mechanisms. Here, I will only address quantifier fronting to the extent that it can affect *NE*. Other intricacies of this complex phenomenon are beyond the scope of this study.

For the most part, quantifier fronting operates on quantifiers that cannot combine with *NE*, either because they are being used adverbially, or because they do not quantify over a set as required by *NE*:

- 5.20 a. *Abbastanza ha fatto, di non addormentarsi*
 enough have.PRS.3SG done of not falling-asleep
 ‘It is enough if he didn’t fall asleep.’³⁸
 [Leonetti, 2016]
- b. *Niente concludi, stando in questo buco.*
 nothing you.conclude standing in this hole
 ‘You will conclude nothing standing in this hole.’
 [Beninca, 1988]
- c. *Qualcosa avrà fatto, nella vita.*
 something he.will.have done in.the life
 ‘He must have accomplished something in life.’
 [Beninca, 1998]
- d. *Penso – aggiunge – che molti siano i motivi per*
 I.think he.adds that many are the reasons for

avere fiducia ed essere ottimisti.
 having trust and being optimistic
 ‘I think – he adds – that there are many reasons to trust and to be optimistic.’
 [Sleman, 2012]

³⁸ I personally would translate this sentence as ‘He has done enough by not falling asleep.’ I don’t see a conditional clause in it.

Abbastanza ‘enough’ in (5.20a) is adverbial. *Niente* ‘nothing’ (5.20b) and *qualcosa* ‘something’ (5.20c) do not quantify over sets and cannot appear with *NE* under any circumstances. *Molti* ‘many’ (5.20d) also cannot combine with *NE* because it is a predicate. None of these examples are of interest to us.

Equally irrelevant are examples of quantifier fronting that have mirative import, such as (5.21) below:

5.21 *Nessun* *turista* *ho* *incontrato* *oggi* *per* *strada!*
no.one tourist I.have met today for street
‘I didn’t meet any tourists on the street today.’
[Cruschina, 2012]

According to Cruschina, (5.21) implies that the speaker expected to meet tourists on the street, so the quantifier communicates unexpected information. In this instance, “the line between mirative fronting and quantifier fronting is not ... clear cut.” I feel that this type of examples has been adequately addressed in the subsection on mirative fronting, so I will not address them any further.³⁹

Quantifier fronting is severely restricted in Italian (Leonetti, 2016), and once we have eliminated all irrelevant data from the examples that have been reported, there are only two sentences that are of interest to us:

5.22 a. *Molti amici non si è fatto, di sicuro.*
many friends not REFL is made for sure
‘He did not make many friends for himself for sure.’
[Benincà, 1988]

b. *Almeno un esempio abbiamo visto abbastanza*
at.least one example we.have seen pretty
da vicino [frammento di lezione accademica].
from close.by fragment of lesson academic

‘At least one example we have seen pretty closely (fragment of a lecture).’

³⁹ See Leonetti (2016) for more examples of this type.

question seeks information about the listener's siblings. Each of the siblings is therefore a topic, but they are *contrastive* because each of them is an alternative in the set that contains all of them.

A typical situation involving contrastive topic-hood occurs where the speaker is asked to identify a member out of some salient contrastive set. For example, in the following Japanese example, the salient set contains John and Mary. The first speaker asks who out of the two passed the exam, and the second speaker responds that Mary did, with Mary marked with *-wa* as contrastive topic:

- 5.25 a. *Dare-ga siken-ni ukatta no?*
 who-NOM exam-DAT passed Q
 'Who passed the exam?'
- b. *MARY-WA ukatta.*
 Mary-WA passed
 'Mary passed' (Implicature: 'John probably didn't pass')
 [Vermeulen, 2011]

A similar phenomenon occurs in Italian, where the focused element is obligatorily post-verbal, unless it is a member of some salient contrastive set (Kiss, 1998; Brunetti, 2009). For example, in response to (5.26a), only (5.26c) is felicitous, whereas both (5.27b) and (5.27c) are acceptable as a response to (5.27a):

- 5.26 a. *Chi ha rotto il vaso?*
 who has broken the vase
 'Who broke the vase?'
- b. *#Maria l'ha rotto*
 Maria it.has broken
 'Maria broke it.'
- c. *L'ha rotto Maria.*
 it.has broken Maria
 'Maria broke it.'
- 5.27 a. *Chi di voi due ha rotto il vaso?*
 who of you two has broken the vase
 'Who between the two of you broke the vase?'

- b. *Maria l'ha rotto.*
 Maria it.has broken
 'Maria broke it.'
- c. *L'ha rotto Maria.*
 it.has broken Maria
 'Maria broke it.'

[Adapted from Kiss, 1998]

In both (5.26) and (5.27), the question seeks the identity of the person who broke the vase.

Where there is no presupposition as to who that person might be, *Maria* can only appear post-verbally, as illustrated in (5.26b-c). However, if *Maria* belongs to a set of salient alternatives like *voi due* 'you two' in (5.27a), it can appear pre-verbally as a contrastive topic, or post-verbally as a regular focus.

Returning to (5.22), *almeno un esempio* 'at least one examples' in (5.22a) evokes two other alternatives: no examples, and more than one example. *Almeno un esempio* 'at least' is therefore a contrastive topic. It is the one that is selected, just like *Maria* in (5.27). If *almeno* 'at least' is removed, and this set of alternative is no longer evoked, the sentence becomes non-sense.

- 5.28 a. **Un esempio abbiamo visto abbastanza da vicino.*
 one example we.have seen enough from close.by
 'We have seen one example pretty closely.'

Additionally, *almeno* 'at least' can only save (5.28) if the quantity is one example. If it is two examples, the sentence is unacceptable even if *almeno* 'at least' is present.'

- 5.28 b. **Due esempi abbiamo visto abbastanza da vicino*⁴¹.
 two examples we.have seen enough from close.by
 'We have seen two examples pretty closely.'
- c. **Almeno due esempi abbiamo visto abbastanza da vicino.*
 at.least two examples we.have seen enough from close.by

⁴¹ (25b) is possible under cataphoric fronting where the two examples are then mentioned and discussed (see (II.1.d)).

‘We have seen at least two examples pretty closely

Furthermore, if placed inside a conditional clause, even *almeno* ‘at least’ would not be able to save (5.28a)⁴²:

5.29 **Se* *almeno* *un* *esempio* *abbiamo* *visto* *abbastanza*
if at.least an example we.have seen enough

da *vicino...*
from close.by

‘If at least one example we have seen pretty closely...’

In conclusion, quantifier fronting mostly does not operate on quantifiers that can combine with *NE*. Where it does operate on such quantifiers, the resulting construction is marginal, and in any event, no cardinal number other than one may participate in this process.⁴³ As we will see, these restrictions do not apply to quantifiers of *NE*.

d) *Cataphoric fronting*

The mechanism we are about to discuss was first brought to light by Berretta (1998), although she never gave it a name. For the sake of convenience, it will be known as *cataphoric fronting* in this paper. The reason for this name is that the fronted constituent refers to an entity about to be addressed. In most cases, the verb involved is a verb of saying, or thought:

5.30 a. *Trascorro* *normalmente* *le* *vacanze* *nella* *meravigliosa*
I.pass normally the vacation in.the marvelous

val *Badia* *e* ***un*** ***episodio*** *vorrei* *raccontare:*
valley Badia and an incident I.wish to.tell

[*segue* *la* *narrazione;* *lettera* *a* *Lo* *Scarpone* *giugno* *1995,* *p.2*]
follows the narration letter to Lo Scarpone June 1992 p.2

⁴² According to Cruschina (2012), quantifier fronting shares this restriction with mirative fronting.

⁴³ *Un/una* ‘one’ is ambiguous between a quantifier and an indefinite article (Calabrese, 1988). The fact that no other number participates in quantifier fronting renders it difficult to determine whether any cardinal number can participate in this process at all. Leonetti (2016) believes that all cardinal numbers are excluded.

‘I spend my vacation normally in the valley Badia and I wish to recount an incident (that occurs there): [the account follows; letter to Lo scarpone June 1995, p.2]’

- b. *Due cose mi preme, inoltre, sottolineare: accade che*
 two things me.DAT it.presses further to.emphasize it.happens that
i genitori, preoccupati per l’arrossamento, ricorrono a colliri
 the parents worried for the.reddening resort to eye.drops
astringenti. Non c’è niente di più sbagliato, [...] [Corriere
 astringent not there.is nothing of more wrong Courier

Salute 1.5.95, p/5]
 Health 1.5.95, p/5

‘Two things I feel compelled to emphasize: sometimes parents make use of astringent eyedrops because they are worried about the reddening. There is nothing wronger than that...’

[Berretta, 1998]

In (5.30a), the fronted constituent *un episodio* ‘an incident’ refers to what is about to be narrated by the speaker. Similarly, in (5.30b), *due cose* ‘two things’ refer to two things that are about to be named. Some instances of pre-verbal quantifiers, such as the one below, can be attributed to cataphoric fronting:

- 5.31 *Tre ne ha accennate l’economista romano:*
 three of.them has mentioned the.economist roman
progresso tecnico ed organizzativo e conseguente
 progress technical and organizational and resultant
aumento delle dimensioni delle imprese moderne
 increase of.the dimension of.the businesses modern
e crescente intervento dello Stato; opera
 and increasing intervention of.the state work
di <<mediazione- sociale>> ...
 of mediation social

‘Three of them the roman economist has mentioned: technical and organizational progress with the resulting increase of in the size of modern

businesses, the greater involvement of the government, and “social mediation.”

[https://avanti.senato.it/avanti/files/Avanti%201896-1993%20PDF_OUT/15.%20Avanti%20Ed.%20Nazionale%201969-1976%20OCR/Ocr%20-D-/D-%20dal%201969%20-02%20Gennaio%20pag.%2001%20al%201972%20-02%20Luglio%20pag.%2014/CFI0422392_19720321.76-68_0001_d.pdf]

However, as will be shown below, neither this mechanism nor the other three can account for all instances of pre-verbal quantifiers.

2. Pre-verbal quantifiers and the fronting mechanisms

In §V.II.1, we examined the fronting mechanisms of Italian and the environments in which they operate. It will be demonstrated here that these mechanisms are insufficient to account for the full range of pre-verbal quantifiers. Consider the data in (5.32-5.37). All quantifiers in these examples are pre-verbal. Catephoric fronting is clearly inapplicable: these quantifiers do not refer to items that will be listed. They also do not conform to any of the restrictions applicable to resumptive fronting, contrastive focus, mirative fronting, or quantifier fronting. There is no adjacency requirement (5.32), prohibition against pre-verbal subjects (5.32), no ban on conditional clauses and other non-root contexts (5.33), no exclusion of yes/no questions (5.34), no restriction against cardinal numbers (5.35), and pronoun subjects are likewise perfectly acceptable (5.37).

5.32 Lack of adjacency requirement/ Compatibility with pre-verbal subjects

- a. ...*giravano* *i* *partigiani* *con* *i* *fazzoletti* *colorati* *al*
went.around the partisans with the scarves colored at.the
- collo,* *e* *così* *tanti* *io* *non* *ne* *avevo*
neck and so many I not of.them had
- mai* *visti*
ever seen

‘...the partisans went around with colorful scarves around their necks, and I had never seen this many of them.’

[http://anpi.it/media/uploads/patria/2011/D_INSERTO_Lutti_XI-XIV.pdf]

- b. *...credo che di conseguenza il Parlamento non*
I.believe that as.a consequence the parliament not
- può che aspettarsi qualche contributo di carattere*
can except waiting.for some contribution of character
- positivo e alcuni io ne ho sentiti in termini*
poistive and some I of.them have heard in terms
- anche originali.*
even original

‘I believe that as a result, parliament can only wait for positive contributions, and some of them I have heard, even original ones.’

[http://legislature.camera.it/_bicamerali/questreg/missioni/venezia.htm]

5.33 No ban in non-root contexts

- a. *Un titolo appartenente ad una emissione di 100.000*
a title belonging to an emission of 100.000
- certificati può essere rarissimo se molti ne*
certificates can be very.rare if many of.them
- sono andati distrutti; analogamente un titolo di piccola*
are gone destroyed similarly a title of small
- emissione si può considerare abbastanza comune*
emission REFL.IMP can consider enough common
- se quasi tutti gli esemplari sono ancora*
if almost all the examples are still
- presenti sul mercato.*
present on.the market

‘A title that was part of an emission of 100,000 certificates can be very rare if many of them have been destroyed; on the other hand, a title that was part of a small emission can be considered common if almost all of the copies are still present on the market.’

[http://www.portafoglio-storico.it/valutazione_dei_titoli.html]

- b. ... *che cosa faresti se dovessi scegliere tra*
what thing you.would.do if you.had.to choose between
- l'una e l'altra e se solo una ne*
the.one and the.other and if only one of.them
- potessi salvare quale salveresti?*
you.could save which you.would.save

‘What would you do if you had to choose between the one and the other, and if you could save only one of them, which one would you save?’

[Annamaria Testa: Leggere e Amare]

- c. «*Abbiamo oltre 170 chiese chiuse*», *ha detto Leuzzi,*
we.have over 170 churches closed has said Leuzzi
- «*anche se molte ne abbiamo già riaperte...*»
even if many of.them we.have already reopened

‘We have over 170 closed churches,’ said Leuzzi, ‘even though we have already reopened many...’

[<http://www.ilcentro.it/teramo/per-natale-riapre-l-annunziata-e-la-torre-del-duomo-torna-libera-1.2067220>]

5.34 Compatibility with yes/no questions

Lo so bene per la Madre Montagna! Se non
it I.know well for the mother mountain if not

bastassero nemmeno i golem, sarebbe davvero
suffice even the golems it.would.be really

ardua. Dieci ne sono stati distrutti? (ne = golem)
hard ten of.them are been destroyed of.them golem

‘I know that, for the love of the Mother Mountain! If the number of golems is insufficient, it will be really hard. Ten of them were destroyed? (them = golems)’

[Andrea Micalone, Il Tramonto Della Luna - Volume Terzo - L'Alba Di Sangue]

5.35 Compatibility with cardinal numbers

- a. *Il supporto quad-channel offre la possibilità di avere*
the support quad-channel offers the possibility of having
- fino a 4 dispositivi Thunderbolt collegati, ovviamente previa*
up to 4 devices thunderbolt connected obviously assuming
- disponibilità del sufficiente quantitativo di porte. E se*
availability of.the sufficient quantity of ports and if
- 4 non ne bastano, il Daisy Chain permette di collegarne**
4 not of.them suffice the Daisy Chain allows to connect.of.them
- altri di più in serie uno dopo l'altro.*
others of more in series one after the.other

‘The quad-channel support allows up to four thunderbolt devices to be connected, assuming that there are sufficient ports. And if four of them don’t suffice, more can be connected, one after another, through the Daisy Chain.’
[<https://www.saggiamente.com/2012/04/thunderbolt-nuovi-chip-pc-mac/>]

- b. ***Perlomeno due o tre ne abbiamo contati di***
at.least two or three of.them we.have counted of
- soggetti che in qualche modo hanno redatto . . .*
subjects that in some way they.have redacted

‘At least two or three of them we have counted of subjects that they have redacted in some way...’

[https://www.comune.frosinone.it/moduli/output_immagine.php?id=2434]

5.37 Compatibility with pronoun subjects (See also (5.32))

Rondine raccontò l'accaduto dando tutto il merito a Piero...
Rondine recounted what.happened giving all the credit to Piero

- ‘*Ho capito, Rondine, – gli disse Lupo battendogli*
I.have understood Rondine to.him said Lupo hitting.him

la mano sulla spalla – almeno un paio ne hai
the hand on.the shoulder at.least a pair of.them you.have

stesi tu. Ma non capisco come i fascisti abbiano
 laid.flat you but not I.get how the fascists have

fatto a prendere Balilla ...
 done to take Balilla

‘Rondine recounted what happened, giving all the credit to Piero ... “I got it, Rondine,” Lupo said to him, patting him on the shoulder, “at least a couple of them, you knocked them out yourself. But I don’t get how the fascists could have taken Balilla...”’

[Luisito Bianchi, *La messa dell’uomo disarmato*]

If pre-verbal quantifiers were just a reflex of focus fronting, as it is traditionally believed, we would expect quantified DPs to show the same distribution as in (5.32-5.37). However, they do not show such a distribution. Below are some examples:

- 5.38 a. **...giravano i partigiani con i fazzoletti colorati al*
 went.around the partisans with the scarves colored at.the
- collo, e così tanti partigiani io non avevo*
 neck and so many partisans I not had
- mai visto*
 ever seen

‘...the partisans went around with colored scarves around their necks, and I had never seen this many partisans.’

- b. ??*«Abbiamo oltre 170 chiese chiuse», ha detto Leuzzi,*
 we.have over 170 churches closed has said Leuzzi
- «anche se molte chiese abbiamo già riaperto...»*
 even if many churches we.have already reopened

‘We have over 170 closed churches,’ said Leuzzi, ‘even though we have already reopened many churches...’

- c. **Rondine raccontò l’accaduto dando tutto il merito a Piero...*
 Rondine recounted what.happened giving all the credit to Piero
- *“Ho capito, Rondine, – gli disse Lupo battendogli*
 I.have understood Rondine to.him said Lupo hitting.him

la mano sulla spalla – almeno due nemici hai
 the hand on.the shoulder at.least a enemies you.have

steso tu. Ma non capisco come i fascisti abbiano
 laid.flat you but not I.get how the fascists have

fatto a prendere Balilla ...
 done to take Balilla

‘Rondine recounted what happened, giving all the credit to Piero ... ‘I got it, Rondine,’ Lupo said to him, patting him on the shoulder, ‘at least two enemies you knocked them out yourself. But I don’t get how the fascists could have taken Balilla...’

The above shows that pre-verbal quantifiers cannot be analyzed in the same way as fronted DP objects. They have a far wider distribution and call for their own set of generalizations. These generalizations will be provided in the next section.

C. The analysis

1. Why do pre-verbal quantifiers seem ungrammatical?

When native speakers are asked to evaluate a sentence of the format *quantifier-ne-verb* with no additional constituent and no context provided, their judgment ranges from “completely acceptable” to “very strange.” We have seen several such sentences in section (I), two of which ((5.2b) & (5.7a)) are repeated below as (5.39a-b)

- 5.39 a. **Due ne sono rimaste.*
 two of.them are remained
 ‘Two of them remained’
 [Perlmutter, 1984]
- b. **Molti ne arrivano*
 many of.them arrive
 ‘Many of them arrive.’
 [Burzio, 1986]

I have no doubt that many native speakers would concur with the asterisks shown in (5.38).

Nevertheless, others would disagree. This, I believe, is due to the fact that not all speakers can think of an appropriate context for these sentences.

As compared to the version without *NE* (5.40), (5.39a-b) have the distinct disadvantage of having non-referential quantifiers (see Chapter 2). Whereas (5.40) has the meaning ‘as for the *individuals* denoted by the quantifier, they remained (5.40a) or arrived (5.40b),’ the sentences in (5.39) are obligatorily understood as ‘with regard to the *number* represented by the quantifier, it is the quantity that remained (5.39a) or arrived (5.39b):

- 5.40 a. *Due sono rimaste.*
 two are remained
 ‘Two remained’
- b. *Molti arrivano.*
 many arrive
 ‘Many arrive.’

It is interesting to compare the distribution of pre-verbal quantifiers with that of preposed topics in Japanese. According to Vermeulen (2011), a direct object may be fronted as a contrastive topic, as shown in (5.41):

- 5.41 a. *John-ga ANO HON-WA katta.*
 John-NOM that book-WA bought
 ‘John bought that book.’
- b. *ANO HON-WA_i John-ga _{ti} katta.*
 that book-WA John-NOM bought
 ‘John bought that book.’

[Vermeulen, 2011]

(5.41a) shows the object, *ano hon-wa* ‘that book,’ in its default position, and (5.41b) shows it as a fronted topic. To be a topic, the fronted constituent must refer to specific entities. If it is quantificational, as in (5.42), the sentence is not felicitous:

- 5.42 *#3-NIN-WA_i JOHN-GA _{ti} tasuketa.*
 3-CL.-WA John-NOM rescued
 ‘John rescued at least three people.’

[Vermeulen, 2011]

Vermeulen reports that (5.42) is only felicitous for speakers who are willing to accept ‘at least three’ as referring to three specific people. For those who reject this reading, the sentence is not acceptable.

Pre-verbal quantifiers in Italian show the opposite distribution as pre-posed topics bearing *-wa*. Because they are co-indexed with *NE*, these quantifiers are necessarily non-specific. However, their lack of specificity does not render them altogether impossible. It merely restricts them to contexts where a quantity (instead of an individual) may serve as the subject of predication.

Such a context is available if the quantity in question is salient in discourse. As with other constituents, a quantifier’s eligibility for topic-hood increases if it is familiar, or if it is contrasted with a familiar entity. Put differently, pre-verbal quantifiers may serve as familiar or contrastive topics.

2. Quantifiers as familiar topics

Situations involving familiar quantifiers typically arise where an open proposition (Ward, 1984) or QUD (Umbach, 2001) exists with respect to a known quantity. Typically, this happens if the speaker wishes to indicate whether the quantity that exists is the one that is required. The existing quantity is often denoted with *tanto/i/a/e* ‘that many’:

- 5.43 a. *I medici imbalsamarono Israele e vi impiegarono quaranta*
 the doctors embalmed Israel and to.it put forty
*giorni, perché tanti **ne** occorrono per l'imbalsamazione.*
 days because that.many of.them are.needed for the.embalming

‘The doctors embalmed Israel and spent forty days doing so because that many of them (days) are needed for embalming.’

[Genesis, 50]

- b. *Continuate a mescolare piano, senza sbattere per*
 continue to stir slowly without beating to

non raffreddare eccessivamente le uova, per circa 10 minuti.
not cool.down excessively the eggs for about 10 minutes

Tanti ne occorrono per ottenere delle uova strapazzate
that. of.them are.needed to obtain of.the eggs beaten

a regola d'arte
according rule of.art

‘Continue to stir slowly, without beating so as to avoid cooling the eggs down too much, for about 10 minutes. That many of them (minutes) are needed to do it right.’

[http://www.cucinaconme.it/uova_strapazzate.htm]

However, there is no requirement that *tanto/i/a/e* be used. Cardinal numbers may be fronted as well. We have already seen one example of this type in (5.35a), where the speaker explains what happens *se 4 non ne bastano* ‘if four of them is not enough’ (repeated below as (5.44a). A new example is provided in (5.44b):

- 5.44 a. *Il supporto quad-channel offre la possibilità di avere*
the support quad-channel offers the possibility of having
- fino a 4 dispositivi Thunderbolt collegati, ovviamente previa*
up to 4 devices thunderbolt connected obviously assuming
- disponibilità del sufficiente quantitativo di porte. E se*
availability of.the sufficient quantity of ports and if
- 4** non ne bastano, il Daisy Chain permette di collegarne*
4 not of.them suffice the Daisy Chain allows to connect.of.them
- altri di più in serie uno dopo l'altro.*
others of more in series one after the.other

‘The quad-channel support allows up to four thunderbolt devices to be connected, assuming that there are sufficient ports. And if four of them don’t suffice, more can be connected, one after another, through the Daisy Chain.’

[<https://www.saggiamente.com/2012/04/thunderbolt-nuovi-chip-pc-mac/>]

- b. *A quanto pare, Marvel ha girato tre versioni differenti*
from what it.seems Marvel has shot three versions different

di una scena: una con Bucky, una con Falcon e una
of one scene one with Bucky one with Falcon and one

*con l'Agente 13.... Ma siccome tre non **ne** possono*
with the.agent 13 but since three not of.them can

esistere, solo una sarà la scena realmente utilizzata
exist only one will.be the scene actually used

all'interno del film.
in.the.inside of.the movie

‘It appears that Marvel has shot three different versions of the same scene: one with Bucky, one with Falcon, and one with Agent 13...But since three of them (scenes) cannot exist, only one will really be actually used a scene in the movie.’

[<http://www.tomshw.it/forum/case-e-alimentatori/549326-zalman-z11-neo-vs-corsair-spec-02-03-vs-cooler-master-n400-efficienza-nellaerazione-e-nelle-temperature.html>]

It should be noted that a quantity does not need to be explicitly mentioned before it qualifies for familiar topic-hood. An implied quantity can be fronted as well:

5.45 *Non arriva il quarto asso, ma tre ne bastano*
not arrive the fourth ace but three of.them suffice

e avanzano per piegare l'Albalong e centrare
and advance for bending the.Albalong and securing

la ventiquattresima vittoria stagionale
the twenty.third victory seasonal

‘The fourth ace does not come, but three of them (aces) are more than enough to bend Albalong and secure the twenty-third seasonal victory.’

[<http://www.fuoriareaweb.it/risultati-dilettanti/promozione/girone-d/nextmatch/26-juniores-regionali-girone-c/4879.html>]

Implicit in the notion that the fourth ace did not arrive is the fact three were available. As such, the pre-verbal quantifier, *tre* ‘three’, refers to a known quantity. (5.45) is therefore the same type of example as the other three sentences.

3. Quantifiers as contrastive topics

a) *Contrast and eligibility for topic-hood*

The vast majority of cases involving pre-verbal quantifiers are those in which the quantifier functions as a contrastive topic. Crosslinguistically, it has been observed that contrast increases a constituent's eligibility for topic-hood. For example, in Danish, non-specific, indefinites cannot be topicalized, unless they are contrastive (Erteschik-Shir, 2007):

- 5.46 a. *Pigen mødte jeg i gar*
 the.girl met I yesterday
 'I met a girl yesterday.'
- b. **En pige mødte jeg i gar*
 a girl met I yesterday
 'I met a girl yesterday.'
- c. *Et museum besøgte jeg allerede i gar*
 a museum visited I already yesterday

en kirke ser jeg først i morgen.
 a church see I only tomorrow

'I visited a museum already yesterday. I will see a church only tomorrow.'
 [Erteschik-Shir, 2007]

All sentences in (5.46) contain a topicalized constituent. (5.46a) is grammatical because the topicalized constituent is definite. (5.46b) is ungrammatical because the topicalized constituent is a non-specific indefinite. In (5.46c), the topicalized constituents are also non-specific indefinites, but the sentence is acceptable because *et museum* 'a museum' and *en kirke* 'a church' are contrasted with each other.

A similar phenomenon may be observed in Spanish. According to Leonetti (2013), bare nouns in Spanish cannot serve as topics in the absence of contrast, as illustrated in (5.47):

- 5.47 **Turistas llegaron a la ciudad.*
 Tourists arrive.PST.3PL to the city
 'Tourists arrived in the city.'

[Leonetti, 2013]

(5.47) is defective because *turistas* ‘tourists’ is a bare-plural topic. When *turistas* ‘tourists’ is not contrasted with other entities, (5.47) is not acceptable. However, where contrast exists, (5.47) is grammatical:

- 5.48 a. *Turistas, llegaron (pero no demasiados).*
tourists-TOP arrive.PST.3PL (but not too.many)
[Leonetti, 2013]
- b. *Petróleo no surgió, pero sí agua.*
Oil not bubble.up-PST-3SG but yes water
‘Oil did not bubble up, but water did’
[Leonetti, 2012]

The judgment shown in (5.48a) is premised upon the presence of “contextual alternatives” that are to be predicated. That is, (5.48a) is grammatical if information is also provided about other groups, such as workers, immigrants, or pilgrims. In (5.48b), the contrastive topics are made explicit: they are oil and water. Because contrast exists, both (5.48a) and (5.48b) are grammatical.

b) *Pre-posed quantifiers as contrastive topics*

As is the case with topicalization in Danish and Spanish, pre-verbal quantifiers in Italian are licensed if they are contrasted with another quantity that is salient in discourse. Such a contrast is sometimes obvious, as in the case of *poche* ‘few’ in (5.49), which stands in opposition with *tante* ‘many’ in the previous clause:

- 5.49 ...*sono* *state* *promesse* *tante* *cose* *e* *poche* *ne*
 are been promised many things and few of.them
- sono* *state* *realizzate*
 are been realized

‘...a lot of things have been promised, and few of them have been done’

[<https://www.comune.dolo.ve.it/documenti/norme-delibere/delibereConsiglio12/070.pdf>]

Contrastive topichood may also be created by the presence of *solo* ‘only.’ We have already seen one example of this type in (5.33b), which is repeated below for convenient as (5.50a). An additional example is provided in (5.50b):

5.50 a. ...*che cosa faresti se dovessi scegliere tra*
what thing you.would.do if you.had.to choose between
l'una e l'altra e se solo una ne
the.one and the.other and if only one of.them
potessi salvare quale salveresti?
you.could save which you.would.save

‘What would you do if you had to choose between the one and the other, and if you could save only one of them, which one would you save?’

[Annamaria Testa: Leggere e Amare]

b. *I nostri due preferiti sono allo scontro diretto, solo*
the our two favorites are at.the contest direct only
uno ne rimarrà, in una sfida all'ultimo mestolo
one of.them will.remain in a duel to.the.last spatula
con ingredienti incompatibili e non combinabili tra loro.
with ingredients incompatible and not combinable among them

‘Our two favorites are in a direct contest, only one of them will remain, in a duel to the last spatula, with ingredients that are incompatible incompatible with one another.’

[<http://www.badtv.it/2016/02/masterchef-italia-decima-serata-cinema/>]

In both of the examples above, the proposed quantifier acts as a contrastive topic. The alternative with which they contrast is *two*. In (5.50a), the idea is that only one (not two) can be saved, and in (5.50b), *solo* ‘only’ makes clear that one, rather than both contestants will remain.

In addition to *solo* ‘only,’ *almeno* ‘at least,’ and *perlomeno* ‘at least’ can also serve as marker of contrast. We have seen two examples of this type in (5.35b) and (5.37), which are repeated below for convenient (5.51a-b). A new example is available in (5.51c):

5.51 a. ***Perlomeno due o tre ne abbiamo contati di***
 at.least two or three of.them we.have counted of

soggetti che in qualche modo hanno redatto . . .
 subjects that in some way they.have redacted

‘At least two or three of them we have counted of subjects that they have redacted in some way...’

[https://www.comune.frosinone.it/moduli/output_immagine.php?id=2434]

b. ***Rondine raccontò l'accaduto dando tutto il merito a Piero...***
 Rondine recounted what.happened giving all the credit to Piero

- “*Ho capito, Rondine, – gli disse Lupo battendogli*
 I.have understood Rondine to.him said Lupo hitting.him

la mano sulla spalla – almeno un paio ne hai
 the hand on.the shoulder at.least a pair of.them you.have

stesi tu. Ma non capisco come i fascisti abbiano
 laid.flat you but not I.get how the fascists have

fatto a prendere Balilla ...
 done to take Balilla

‘Rondine recounted what happened, giving all the credit to Piero ... “I got it, Rondine,” Lupo said to him, patting him on the shoulder, “at least a couple of them, you knocked them out yourself. But I don’t get how the fascists could have taken Balilla...”

[Luisito Bianchi, *La messa dell'uomo disarmato*]

As indicated in the previous section, *perlomeno/almeno* ‘at least’ signals that the speaker feels certain about the indicated quantity and less certain about greater quantities (Giurgea, 2015). In (5.51a), the speaker is not sure if he has counted four subjects, but he is certain about two or three. In (5.51b), because Rodine gives all the credit to Piero, Lupo can’t be sure if Rodine

knocked out more than a couple. However, he is sure that at Rodine knocked out *at least* a couple.

The opposite of *almeno/perlomeno* ‘at least’ is *anche* ‘even.’ Examples with *anche* ‘even’ followed by a number are abundant:

5.52 a. *Non è meglio avere due festival anziché uno?*
 not is.it better to.have two festivals instead.of one
 ‘Isn’t it better to have two festivals instead of one?’

b. *Io anche dieci ne farei, se servono a aiutare*
 I even ten of.them I.would.do if they.serve to help

il cinema italiano.
 the cinema Italian

‘Me, I would do even ten of them if they help Italian Cinema.’

[http://www.corriere.it/Primo_Piano/Spettacoli/2007/08_Agosto/02/sofia.html]

5.53 a. *Alla domanda di Lilli Gruber se sia intenzionato a fare*
 to.the question of Lilli Gruber if he.is intent on doing

anche un comizio insieme all’ex competitor delle
 also a meeting together with.the.ex.competitor of.the

primarie, Bersani replica: “Nessun problema, anche se
 primaries Bersani replies no problem even though

in campagna elettorale conviene ripartire le forze.
 in campagne electoral it.is.necessary to.restart the forces

Ma se valuteremo che ci convenga, perché no?
 but if we.think that to.us it.is.necessary why not

Anche due ne facciamo...”
 even two of.them we.do

‘In response to a question by Lilli Gruber regarding whether he plans to hold a rally with his ex-competitor during the primaries, Bersani replies, “No problem, although we need to restart the forces in the electoral campagne. But if we think that we need to hold a rally, why not? Even two of them we will do.’

[<http://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/2013/01/07/elezioni-2013-bersani-non-ci-saranno-candidati-impresentabili/463471/>]

The contrasting alternatives are one and ten in (5.52) and one and two in (5.53). In each case, the speaker provides information about a larger quantity in order to answer questions about a smaller quantity.

Another marker of contrastive topic-hood is *così tanti* ‘this many,’ as illustrated in (5.32), repeated below as (5.54a). (5.54b-c) contain new examples:

- 5.54 a. ...*giravano* *i* *partigiani* *con* *i* *fazzoletti* *colorati* *al*
went.around the partisans with the scarves colored at.the
collo, *e* *così* *tanti* *io* *non* *ne* *avevo*
neck and so many I not of.them had
mai *visti*
ever seen

‘...the partisans went around with coloral scarves around their necks, and I had never seen this many of them.’

[http://anpi.it/media/uploads/patria/2011/D_INSERTO_Lutti_XI-XIV.pdf]

- b. *Conta* *i* *soldi* *dieci* *volte* *perché* *così*
he.counts the money ten times because this
tanti *non* *ne* *ha* *mai* *visti*
many not of.them he.has ever seen

‘He counts the bills ten times because this many of them he has never seen.’

[<https://www.lastampa.it/2010/01/14/cultura/la-mamma-del-tassista-1PKxzv79d5GTMnB8iXzX0O/pagina.html>]

- c. *5000* *sono* *ora* *in* *piazza.* *Così* *tanti*
5000 are now in piazza this many
non *ne* *sono* *mai* *venuti.*⁴⁴
not of.them are ever come

‘5000 are now in piazza. This many have never come before.’

⁴⁴ Acceptance rate = 8/8.

Così tanti ‘this many’ draws a contrast between the present quantity and smaller quantities. The individual in (5.54a) may have seen less partisans, but this many he had not seen. Similarly, the individual in (5.54b) may have seen smaller quantities of money, but had never come by this much before. In (5.54b), a lesser number of people may have come to the piazza, but 5000 had never come all at once. Not only is (5.54b) acceptable, the removal of *NE* from it would result in incoherence because the quantifier will become referential, and the sentence would mean that some 5000 people somewhere have never come to the piazza. As already explained in chapter 3, this is not the intended meaning.

In the remaining cases, the contrast is less obvious, but it is still palpable. For instance, in (5.32b) (repeated below as (5.55)) the relevant contrast is between *alcuni* ‘some’ and zero. The notion that parliament should wait for a positive contribution suggests that no such contribution exists at present. Zero is therefore a salient alternative in discourse, and the position of *alcuni* ‘some’ is licensed by the contrast with this alternative:

5.55 ...*credo* *che* *di* *conseguenza* *il* *Parlamento* *non*
 I.believe that as.a consequence the parliament not

può *che* *aspettarsi* *qualche* *contributo* *di* *carattere*
 can except waiting.for some contribution of character

positivo *e* *alcuni* *io* *ne* *ho* *sentiti* *in* *termini*
 positive and some I of.them have heard in terms

anche *originali*.
 even original

‘I believe that as a result, parliament can only wait for positive contributions, and some of them I have heard, even original ones.’

[http://legislature.camera.it/_bicamerale/questreg/missioni/venezia.htm]

Similarly, *molte* ‘many’ in (5.33c) (repeated below as (5.56) stands in opposition with ‘few.’ The large number of closed churches mentioned in the first clause suggests that few have been reopened. *Molte* ‘many’ in the next clause negates this suggestion:

5.56 «*Abbiamo* *oltre* *170* *chiese* *chiuse*», *ha* *detto* *Leuzzi*,
 we.have over 170 churches closed has said Leuzzi

 «*anche* *se* *molte* *ne* *abbiamo* *già* *riaperte*...»
 even if many of.them we.have already reopened

‘We have over 170 closed churches,’ said Leuzzi, ‘even though we have already reopened many...’

[<http://www.ilcentro.it/teramo/per-natale-riapre-l-annunziata-e-la-torre-del-duomo-torna-libera-1.2067220>]

At times, the contrast is not created by any suggestion of previous utterances, but by the speaker’s own deliberation process. For instance, in (5.34), repeated below as (5.57) *dieci* ‘ten’ contrasts with a smaller quantity desired by the speaker. The speaker knows that his task would be difficult without sufficient golems; he also knows that if ten were destroyed, the number of golems will not be sufficient. These concerns caused him to seek a verification that ten, rather than some lesser number, was the quantity destroyed:

5.57 *Lo* *so* *bene* *per* *la* *Madre* *Montagna!* *Se* *non*
 it I.know well for the mother mountain if not

bastassero *nemmeno* *i* *golem,* *sarebbe* *davvero*
 suffice even the golems it.would.be really

ardua. ***Dieci*** ***ne*** *sono* *stati* *distrutti?* (*ne* = *golem*)
 hard ten of.them are been destroyed of.them golem

‘I know that, for the love of the Mother Mountain! If the number of golems is insufficient, it will be really hard. Ten of them were destroyed? (them = golems)’

[Andrea Micalone, *Il Tramonto Della Luna - Volume Terzo - L'Alba Di Sangue*]

It is also possible for a pre-verbal quantifier to contrast with the typical amount. For instance in (5.33), repeated below as (5.58), *molti* ‘many’ stands in contrast with the number of certificates that normally went missing with the passage of time. A title belonging to an emission of 100,000 certificates cannot become rare if the quantity that went missing is ordinary. However, if *molti* ‘many’ of them went missing, such a title can become rare. Thus, *molti* ‘many’ contrasts with a salient alternative in discourse:

5.58	<i>Un</i>	<i>titolo</i>	<i>appartenente ad</i>	<i>una emissione di</i>	<i>100.000</i>				
	a	title	belonging to	an emission of	100.000				
		<i>certificati</i>	<i>può</i>	<i>essere</i>	<i>rarissimo</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>molti</i>	<i>ne</i>	
		certificates	can	be	very.rare	if	many	of.them	
	<i>sono</i>	<i>andati</i>	<i>distrutti;</i>	<i>analogamente</i>	<i>un</i>	<i>titolo</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>piccola</i>	
	are	gone	destroyed	similarly	a	title	of	small	
	<i>emissione</i>	<i>si</i>	<i>può</i>	<i>considerare</i>	<i>abbastanza</i>	<i>comune</i>			
	emission	REFL.IMP	can	consider	enough	common			
	<i>se</i>	<i>quasi</i>	<i>tutti</i>	<i>gli</i>	<i>esemplari</i>	<i>sono</i>	<i>ancora</i>		
	if	almost	all	the	examples	are	still		
	<i>presenti</i>	<i>sul</i>	<i>mercato.</i>						
	present	on.the	market						

‘A title that was part of an emission of 100,000 certificates can be very rare if many of them have been destroyed; on the other hand, a title that was part of a small emission can be considered common if almost all of the copies are still present on the market.’

[http://www.portafoglio-storico.it/valutazione_dei_titoli.html]

If this line of analysis is correct, we expect pre-verbal quantifiers to be difficult to accept where the listener cannot understand what they stand in contrast with. This is indeed the case:

5.59 a.	#« <i>Abbiamo</i>	<i>oltre</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>chiese</i>	<i>chiuse</i> »,	<i>ha</i>	<i>detto</i>	<i>Leuzzi,</i>
	we.have	over	170	churches	closed	has	said	Leuzzi

«*anche se una ne abbiamo riaperta...*»
 even if one of.them we.have reopened

‘We have over 170 closed churches,’ said Leuzzi, ‘even though we have reopened one of them...’

b. #*Sapete cosa? Alcuni io ne ho sentiti di contributi*
 you.PL.know what? some I of.them have heard of contributions

di carattere positivo.
 of character positive

‘You guys know what? Some of them I have heard, contributions of a positive character.’

The pre-verbal quantifiers in (5.59) are awkward because they are completely unanchored.

Whereas *molte* ‘many’ in (5.56) is contrasted against few, *una* ‘one’ in (5.59a) is just a random number. Whereas *alcuni* ‘two’ in (5.55) is contrasted against zero, *due* in (5.59b) does not eliminate any salient alternatives. In the absence of an appropriate contrast, these quantifiers are not appropriate topics.

D. Conclusion

In conclusion, pre-verbal quantifiers sound ungrammatical if they appear without an appropriate context. This is because the quantifier of *NE* is non-referential and cannot normally serve as the topic of predication. However, where a quantity, rather than an individual, is eligible for topic-hood, *NE* does not bar it from appearing pre-verbally.

VI. Conclusion

Over the course of five chapters, we have seen that *NE* in its origin was a fairly “normal” morpheme: like English *of them*, *NE* did not discriminate between subjects and objects, verbs and non-verbs, or definite quantifiers and indefinite quantifiers. However, semantic narrowing

has turned *NE* into a highly specialized morpheme that imposes numerous restrictions on the entities with which it co-occurs.

First, *NE* is now incompatible with specific quantifiers. Because the quantifier of *NE* now denotes a quantity rather than individuals, intransitive *NE* clauses cannot predicate the individuals denoted by the quantifier. Rather, they describe that which happened at some salient place and time.

Second, *NE* is now incompatible with the subject of (non-reflexive) transitives. Conflicting auxiliary selection and participial agreement rules also render *NE* difficult with most unergatives. These two restrictions work hand-in-hand to create an impression that *NE* requires objecthood. However, objecthood is not actually required. All speakers accept *NE* with some unergatives, and *NE* combines readily non-argument NPs (the *costare* ‘cost’ type). Additionally, *Ne* can be coindexed with the subject of certain reflexive-transitives.

Third, *NE* is now difficult with non-verbal predicates. It can combine with adjectives, but for some reason, some adjectives work better than others. Combinations of *NE* + *valido* ‘valid,’ for example, are unproblematic. Because *valido* denotes a desirable trait and reflects the speaker’s judgment of the item said to be valid, I inferred that adjectives are more eligible to combine with *NE* if they denote desirable traits and reflect the speaker’s judgment. The context that I constructed based on this inference seems to render adjectives unproblematic, at least for some speakers. However, further research is needed to verify my intuition. In any case, the difficulties created by adjectives are not the same as those created by subjects of unergatives. The person who accepts all adjectives was not any more likely to accept unergatives than anyone else.

Fourth, the quantifier of *NE* can only appear in topic position under limited circumstances. Because such a quantifier does not denote individuals, it can only serve as topic if information is to be provided about a quantity. Where a quantity is familiar or contrasted with other quantities, it becomes more eligible for topic-hood. This is in-line with how topics behave in general.

In sum, *NE*-cliticization is a highly complex phenomenon. Although I did not reach the same conclusion as previous studies, I have benefited greatly from the insight that they offer. No one person can purport to fully understand such a nuanced and multi-faceted phenomenon, and some of my ideas will doubtlessly be proven wrong as new data surface. I can only hope that this proposal is a step in the right direction, as all other studies have been.

VII. Bibliography

- Alba-Salas, J. (2004). Lexically Selected Expletives: Evidence from Basque and Romance. *SKY Journal of Linguistics*, 17, 35-100.
- Augendre, S. (2012). Properties of fronted direct object in Italian. *Proceedings of the VIIIth GSCP International Conference : Speech and Corpora*, (pp. 369-374).
- Baltin, M. (2001). A-Movements. In C. Collins, & M. Baltin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory* (pp. 226-254). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Barbosa, P. P. (n.d.). Pro-drop and Theories of pro in the Minimalist Program Part 2: Pronoun Deletion Analyses of Null Subjects and Partial, Discourse and Semi pro-drop. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(8), 551–567. Retrieved 6 21, 2019
- Belletti, A. (2001). Inversion as Focalization. In A. Hulk, & J.-Y. Pollock (Eds.), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar* (pp. 60-90). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Belletti, A., & Rizzi, L. (1981). The Syntax of "Ne": Some Theoretical Implications. *The Linguistic Review*, 1, 130-131, 149.
- Belletti, A., & Shlonsky, U. (1995). The Order of Verbal Complements: A Comparative Study. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 13(3), 489-526.
- Benincà, P. (1988). L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate. In L. Renzi (Ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione* (Vol. 1, pp. 115-227). Bologna: il Mulino.
- Benincà, P., & Cinque, G. (1992). *Sur l'ambiguité structurale des verbes météorologiques en italien*. Retrieved 6 21, 2019, from <http://lear.unive.it/jspui/handle/11707/124>
- Bentley, D. (2004). Ne-Cliticisation and Split Intransitivity. *Journal of Linguistics*, 40(2), 219-262.

- Bentley, D. (2006). *Split Transitivity in Italian*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bentley, D. (n.d.). *On 'ne'-cliticization*. Retrieved from http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~rrgpage/rrg/vanvalin_papers/Ne-doc.pdf
- Berretta, M. (1998). Valori pragmatici diversi dell'ordine OV (OVS/OSV) nell'italiano contemporaneo. In G. Ruffino (Ed.), *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale* (pp. 82-90). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Bianchi, V. (2015). Focus fronting and the syntax-semantics interface. In U. Shlonsky (Ed.), *Beyond the functional sequence* (pp. 60-72). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bianchi, V., Bocci, G., & Cruschina, S. (2013). Focus fronting and its implicatures. In E. O. Aboh, J. C. Schaeffer, & P. Sleeman (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013: Selected Papers from Going Romance, Amsterdam 2013* (pp. 3-20). John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved 6 21, 2019, from <http://jbe-platform.com/content/books/9789027267818-01bia>
- Bianchi, V., Bocci, G., & Cruschina, S. (2016). Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative. *Semantics & Pragmatics*, 9, 1-54.
- Bocci, G. (2007). Criterial positions and left periphery in Italian: Evidence for the syntactic encoding of contrastive focus. *Nanzan Linguistics*, 1(Special Issue 3), 35-70.
- Boivin, M. C. (1999). Case feature checking and its consequences: evidence from en-cliticization in French. In J.-M. Authier, B. Bullock, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Formal perspectives on romance linguistics : Selected papers from the 28th linguistic symposium on romance languages (lsrl xxviii), university park, 16–19 april 1998* (pp. 39-56). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Brunetti, L. (2009). On links and tails in Italian. *Lingua*, 119, 756–781.
- Burzio, L. (1986). *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Calabrese, A. (1988). I pronomi personali. In L. Renzi (Ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione* (Vol. I, pp. 549-592). Bologna: il Mulino.
- Calabrese, A., & Mailing, J. (2009). Ne-Cliticization and Auxiliary Selection: Agentivity Effects in Italian. Ms. University of Connecticut.
- Cardinaletti, A. (2009). On a (wh-)moved Topic in Italian, compared to Germanic. In A. Alexiadou, J. Hankamer, T. McFadden, J. Nüger, & F. Schäfer (Eds.), *Advances in Comparative Germanic Syntax* (pp. 3-40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cardinaletti, A. (2018). On different types of postverbal subjects in Italian. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 30(2), 79-106.
- Cardinaletti, A., & Giusti, G. (2006). The Syntax of Quantified Phrases and Quantitative Clitics. In M. Everaert, & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax* (Vol. V, pp. 23-93). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Casadio, C. (1992). Ne-cliticization and partitive interpretation. In E. Fava (Ed.), *Proceedings of the XVII meeting of Generative Grammar* (pp. 143-158). Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Centineo, G. (1996). A lexical theory of auxiliary selection in Italian. *Probus*, 8(3), 223-271.
- Cinque, G. (1980). On Extraction from NP in Italian. *Journal of Italian Linguistics*, 47-99.
- Cinque, G. (1990). The Lexicalist Hypothesis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 8, 1-39.
- Cinque, G. (1990). *Types of A-Dependencies*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cordin, P. (1988). Il clitico <<ne>>. In L. Renzi (Ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione* (Vol. I, pp. 633-641). Bologna: Il Mulino.

- Cresti, D. (2003). Aspects of the Syntax and Semantics of Ne. In C. Tortora (Ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects* (pp. 67-101). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, S. (2012). *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- D'Alessandro, R. (2007). *Impersonal "si" constructions: Agreement and Interpretation*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (1997). *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (2006). On the architecture of topic and focus. In M. Valéria , & S. Winkle (Eds.), *The architecture of focus* (pp. 33-57). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (2007). *Information Structure : The Syntax-Discourse Interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Falco , M., & Zamparelli, R. (2016). The only real pro-nouns. In P. Grosz, & P. Patel-Grosz (Eds.), *The Impact of Pronominal Form on Interpretation* (pp. 107-134). Boston: de Gruyter.
- Ferrari, A., & de Cesare, A. M. (2009). La progressione tematica rivisitata. *Vox Romanica*, 68, 98-128.
- Fodor, J. D., & Sag, I. A. (1982). REFERENTIAL AND QUANTIFICATIONAL INDEFINITES. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 5(3), 355-398. Retrieved 6 21, 2019, from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/bf00351459>
- Garzonio, J. (2016). Case in Italian complex PPs. In E. Carrilho, A. Fieis, M. Lobo, & S. Pereira (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistics Theory 10* (pp. 121-138). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Geist, L. (2010). Bare Singular NPs in Argument Positions: Restrictions on Indefiniteness. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 2(2), 191-227. Retrieved 6 21, 2019, from <https://brill.com/content/journals/10.1163/187731010x528340>
- Giurgea, I. (2015). Bare Quantifier Fronting as Contrastive Topicalization. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 17(2), 23-38.
- Giusti, G. (2010). Le espressioni di quantità. In G. Salvi, & L. Renzi (Eds.), *Grammatica dell'italiano antico* (pp. 377-400). Bologna: il Mulino.
- Gundel, J. K. (1988). *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. Garland.
- Halliday, M. A. (1984). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved 6 21, 2019
- Heusinger, K. v. (2007). Referentially Anchored Indefinites. In G. Chierchia, K. Fintel, & J. Pelletier (Eds.), *Existence: Semantics and Syntax* (pp. 273-292). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Heusinger, K. v., & Kaiser, G. A. (2003). The Interaction of Animacy, Definiteness, and Specificity in Spanish. *Proceedings of the Workshop "Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Specificity in Romance Languages"*, (pp. 41-66).
- Jiménez-Fernández, Á. (2015). Towards a typology of focus: Subject position and microvariation at the discourse–syntax interface. *Ampersand*, 2, 49-60.
- Kiss, K. É. (1998). Identificational Focus versus Information Focus. *Language*, 74(2), 245-273.
- Krifka, M. (1998). Additive Particles under Stress. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 8, 111-128. Retrieved 6 21, 2019, from <http://amor.cms.hu-berlin.de/~h2816i3x/publications/addpart.pdf>

- La Fauci, N. (1988). *Oggetti e Soggetti nella Formazione della Morfosintassi Romanza*. Pisa: Giardini.
- la Fauci, N., & Loporcaro, M. (1997). Outline of a Theory of Existentials on Evidence From Romance. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata*, 1-55.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leonetti, M. (2004). Specificity and Differential Object Marking in Spanish. *Catalan journal of linguistics*, 3(1), 75-114. Retrieved 6 21, 2019, from <http://www3.uah.es/leonetti/papers/specif&dom.pdf>
- Leonetti, M. (2012). *Information structure and the distribution of Spanish bare plurals*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Manuel_Leonetti2/publication/270282136_Information_Structure_and_the_distribution_of_Spanish_Bare_Plurals/links/54a686310cf267bdb90966a1/Information-Structure-and-the-distribution-of-Spanish-Bare-Plurals
- Leonetti, M. (2013). On contrastive readings in the interpretation of NPs/DPs. In C. Sofiana (Ed.), *Proceedings of the VI Nereus International Workshop "Theoretical implications at the syntax/semantics interface in Romance."* *Arbeitspapier 127* (pp. 99-116). Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft Universität Konstanz.
- Leonetti, M. (2016). *On Non-Focal Fronting in Italian and Spanish*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Manuel_Leonetti2/publication/297463771_On_Non-Focal_Fronting_in_Spanish_and_Italian/links/58d4f443aca2727e5e9c6f07/On-Non-Focal-Fronting-in-Spanish-and-Italian
- Lepschy, G. (1989). Teoria e descrizione nella sintassi italiana. Reggenza, legamento, e un uso di ne. *Romance Philology*, 42(4), 422-435.
- Lonzi, L. (1986). Pertinenza della struttura tema-rema per l'analisi sintattica. In H. Stammerjohann (Ed.), *Tema-Rema in italiano* (pp. 99-120). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Lonzi, L. (2009). Caratteri della Cliticizzazione di ne. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 34, 115-135.
- Loporcaro, M. (2006). L'allineamento attivo-inattivo e il rapporto fra lessico e morfosintassi. *Atti SILFI. I*, pp. 311-320. Firenze: FUP.
- Lorenzetti, L. (2010). *Treccani*. Retrieved from Atmosferici, verbi: http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/verbi-atmosferici_%28Enciclopedia-dell%27Italiano%29/
- Mackenzie, I. (2006). *Unaccusative verbs in Romance Languages*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nissim, M., & Perboni, S. (2008). The Italian Particle "ne": Corpus Construction and Analysis. *LREC*.
- Perlmutter, D. M. (1983). Personal vs. Impersonal Constructions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 1(1), 141-200.
- Pesetsky, D. (2015). *Complementizer-trace effects*. Retrieved from <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002385/v9.pdf>
- Reinhart, T., & Siloni, T. (1999). Against the unaccusative analysis of reflexives. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*. Retrieved 6 21, 2019, from http://let.uu.nl/~tanya.reinhart/personal/papers/pdf/rs_refl.pdf
- Rizzi, L. (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

- Rooth, M. (1985). *Association with Focus*. University of Massachusetts at Amherst: Phd Dissertation.
- Saccon, G. (1992). VP-internal arguments and locative subjects. *Proceedings of the 22nd Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*, (pp. 383–397).
- Salvi, G. (1988). La frase semplice. In L. Renzi (Ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana* (pp. 29-114). Bologna: il Mulino.
- Samek-Ludovici, V. (2015). *The Interaction of Focus, Givenness, and Prosody*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shlonsky, U. (2017). Wh in situ and criterial freezing. In E. Aboh, E. Haeberli, G. Puskàs, & M. Schonenberger (Eds.), *Elements of Comparative Syntax* (pp. 349-369). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Sleeman, P. (2012). Quantifier preposing in French and Italian as a root phenomenon: a syntactic or pragmatic approach? *Bucharest working papers in linguistics*, 11(1), 5-22.
- Sorace, A. (2000). Gradients in Auxiliary Selection with Intransitive Verbs. *Language*, 76(4), 859-890. Retrieved 6 21, 2019, from [http://research.ed.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/gradients-in-auxiliary-selection-with-intransitive-verbs\(517e0a21-6854-4def-bc68-069f160de242\).html](http://research.ed.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/gradients-in-auxiliary-selection-with-intransitive-verbs(517e0a21-6854-4def-bc68-069f160de242).html)
- Sornicola, R. (2014). Permanenza e discontinuità delle Relazioni Grammaticali nel Tempo: Il caso del latino inde e dell'Italoromanzo ne. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 115(2), 163-186.
- Van Valin, R. (1993). A Synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar. In R. Van Valin (Ed.), *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar* (pp. 1-158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vermeulen, R. (2011). *Contrastive topics in Japanese: An interface-based approach*. Retrieved from <http://www.gist.ugent.be/file/166>
- Wandruszka, U. (1986). Tema e soggetto in italiano. In H. Stammerjohann (Ed.), *Tema-remà in Italiano. Theme-Rheme in Italian. Thema-Rhema Im Italienischen : Symposium , Frankfurt Am Main, 26/27 - 4 - 1985* (pp. 15-24). Tübingen: G. Narr.