

Marija Golden, University of Ljubljana
 Milena Milojević Sheppard, University of Ljubljana

The pronominal clitic of quantified noun phrases in Slovenian

0. Introduction. Prosodically, clitics are like affixes. They are phonologically weak elements and need a host. In Romance languages, the host is typically a finite verb, hence their descriptive term "verbal" clitics. Slovenian clitics, on the other hand, belong to the "second position" (2P) or "Wackernagel" clitics because they occur in the second position. The standard account identifies this position prosodically. Bošković (2001: 83, 156; cf. also Franks 1998) formalizes it with the phonological constraint stating that in phonological form (PF), Wackernagel clitics are initial in their intonational phrase ("#" in (1)). The variation among Wackernagel languages with respect to the direction of cliticization can then be restricted with parameter (2). While Slovenian clitics can either procliticize or encliticize to their host, as exemplified in (3), Serbo-Croatian clitics only encliticize, (4). At PF, the Slovenian pronominal clitic *jim* in (3a) merges with the preceding phonological word *jaz*, satisfying both requirements. The clitic is initial in its intonational phrase and a suffix. The accusative clitic encliticizes to the phonological word resulting from the phonological merger in the previous step. The pronominal and negative proclitics in (3b) are described in a similar way, the difference being in the location of the host.

- (1) #__
- (2) suffix/ prefix
- (3) a. # *Jaz jim* _{DAT} *jo* _{ACC} *hvalim* #¹
 'I praise her to them.'
 b. # *Ga* _{ACC} *ne* *poznam* #
 'I don't know him.'
- (4) suffix
 #*Ja im* _{DAT} *je* _{ACC} *hvalim* #
 *#*Im* _{DAT} *je* _{ACC} *hvalim* #
 'I praise her to them.'

The obligatory nature of clitic clustering in 2P thus follows from their phonological properties. The two constraints, (1) and (2), force the clitics located in the same intonation phrase to form a prosodical 2P clustering in PF.

In addition to their 2P PF placement, the clitics are also strictly ordered with respect to each other. Thus, the Slovenian cluster of clause-mate clitics begins with the auxiliary clitic, more specifically, with the present tense forms of the auxiliary verb *biti* (Aux₁) except for the 3rd person singular form *je*, which ends the clitic cluster, (Aux₂). Of the pronominal clitics, first comes the reflexive clitic, irrespective of its syntactic, morphological or lexical origin, (5a); the dative clitic precedes the accusative clitic, (5b). If there are two accusative clitics in the sentence, the preference is for the accusative clitic denoting animate (human) referent(s) to precede the accusative clitic denoting inanimate referent(s), (5c), cf. Orešnik 1986. The

¹ Clitics appear in italics, the genitive-of-quantification clitic in boldface.

genitive-of-negation clitic occupies the position of its accusative counterpart, (5d). In this article, we restrict our discussion to 2P placement of pronominal clitics and their relative order.

- (5) a. Janez *se*_{REFL} *je*_{GEN} *je*_{AUX 2} rešil.
'Janez got rid of her/it.'
- b. Janez *mu*_{DAT} *jo*_{ACC} *je*_{AUX 2} dal.
'Janez gave him it/her.'
- c. Jaz *sem*_{AUX 1} *mu*_{DAT} *jo*_{ACC} *jo*_{ACC} učil.
'I taught him her it.'
- d. Janez *mu*_{DAT} *je*_{GEN} *ni*_{NEG+AUX 2} dal.
'Janez did not give it to him.'

- (6) Aux₁ > Reflexive > Dative > Accusative/ Genitive > Aux₂

Pronominal clitics show morphological case, number, and gender distinctions. In minimalist generative grammar (Chomsky 1993, 1995, 2000, 2001, and related work), formal features of lexical items, e.g. Case features, number, person, gender features (s.c. ϕ -features), play a major part in sentence structure. Since they are relevant to the structure-building computational system only, they must be eliminated in the course of derivation. This is achieved by feature-checking – matching of features of lexical and corresponding functional categories, which is brought about by the operation Move. Formal features and movement for feature-checking purposes thus ultimately determine the constituent (word) order in the sentence.

The standard approach to Wackernagel clitics (Franks 1998, Bošković 2001) adopts the early version of minimalist syntax (Chomsky 1993), whereby the surface structure position of the pronominal clitic depends on the checking of its Case feature. The Case feature that the clitic checks is assumed to be strong because it is checked by overt movement of the clitic to the specifier position of the corresponding functional projection.² In a simplified derivation of sentence (3a), the accusative clitic *jo* enters the syntactic structure as internal object of its θ -marking and Case-assigning participle: [_V V° [_{NP} *jo*]]; the dative clitic *ji* (the indirect object) is merged in the Specifier position of the verb phrase, [_{VP} *jim* V']. The structure would continue to be built according to the "functional head – complement" configuration of the universal hierarchy of functional projections: "subject agreement phrase (AgrsP) > tense phrase (TP) > indirect object agreement phrase (Agr Io P) > direct object agreement phrase (Agr Do P) > verb phrase (VP)", (">" : 'c-command'). In the standard approach, the structural Accusative and Dative Cases of the clitics *jo* and *jim* are checked by the clitic raising as XP from its base position into the specifier position of the direct and indirect object agreement phrases, after the participle, the Case-assigner, has moved consecutively into the head positions of the two agreement phrases, (cf. Golden 2003). The Case feature is "checked off" if the feature agrees with the Case feature of the verb raised for that purpose into the Head position of the corresponding agreement projection. Structure (7) is a simplified derivation of

² Following Chomsky 1995, the standard approach allows that the clitic moves either as a head or as a phrase; cf. Bošković 2001: 129.

clitic placement in sentence (3a). Assuming the copy theory of movement and allowing for the pronunciation of lower chain links, it predicts the acceptable linearization of the clitics.³

(7) [AgrsP jaz [Agrs' [Agrs° [TP hvalim [Agr iOP jim hvalim [Agr dO P jo hvalim [VP [v' jim
[v' hvalim jθ]]]]]]]]]]]

The feature-checking movement of clitics is subject to economy principles requiring movements to be as short as possible and banning a category from skipping its closest landing site (known also as The Minimal Link Condition). This requirement rules out the order of "accusative > dative" in (3) since for the (unacceptable) order **Jaz jo jim hvalim* to obtain, the dative clitic *jo* would have to check its Case before the accusative clitic does, skipping its nearest, i.e. Spec, Agr dO P landing site.

Some approaches assume that once the clitics reach their feature-checking positions, they undergo a further syntactic movement in order to form a 2P cluster.⁴ By contrast, the standard approach, taking advantage of the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1993, 1995) and allowing for the pronunciation of lower chain links, maintains that 2P clitics do not undergo any specific cluster-forming syntactic movement to a single position once they land in their feature-checking positions. The relative order of clitics is expected to follow from the structural height they occupy as a result of regular feature-checking syntactic movement. The Minimal Link Condition takes care of the relative order among the clause-mate pronominal clitics, while the phonological constraints restrict the clitic group to the PF second position.

In this paper we examine whether the standard assumption that the 2P placement of Wackernagel clitics is determined by regular feature-checking operations in syntax can account for the placement of the Slovenian genitive clitic in noun phrases (NPs) quantified by an indefinite numeral. In our analysis of the Slovenian genitive-of-quantification (GQ) clitic we extend Bošković's 2006b analysis of Russian, Bošković's 2008 analysis of SC (non-clitic) numeral NPs, and Golden & Milojević Sheppard (*forthcoming*) analysis of the Slovenian genitive clitic in NPs with cardinal numerals.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 is an outline of Bošković's analysis of Slavic NP quantified by a cardinal numeral and its extension to Slovenian data. Section 3 deals with the placement of the GQ clitic in Slovenian NPs quantified by a cardinal or indefinite numeral. Section 4 shows that the standard approach fails to predict the placement of the GQ clitic in Slovenian. Section 5 concludes the paper.

1. The structure of the numeral noun phrase. A cardinal numeral is a common way of quantification in the nominal domain. In Slovenian, cardinal numerals generally display

³ The optimal linearization of chains deletes all but the highest link of the non-trivial chain and deletion affects whole links of the chain. To explain some mismatches between syntax and phonology in the PF placement of clitics in general, and in the 2P placement of Wackernagel clitics in particular, the standard approach utilizes two strategies, pronunciation of lower copies and scattered deletion. Bošković 2001 (cf. also Bošković & Nunes 2007) elaborates Franks's 1998 "Pronounce a Lower Copy" strategy which essentially allows that phonological constraints rather than syntax determine which copy of the clitic will be pronounced. Scattered deletion is employed as a last resort operation when competing derivations with fewer applications of deletion violate a phonological constraint.

⁴ For such an approach to Slovenian clitics, see Golden and Milojević Sheppard 2000.

adjectival agreement with the noun they quantify. Both, the numeral 'one' and the noun 'girl' in the subject phrase in (8a) are in the morphological nominative case; they also agree in number (singular) and gender (feminine). Agreement in case, number and gender obtains also in the object numeral noun phrase in (8a): the numeral 'two' and the noun 'ice-cream' are both in the morphological accusative case, dual and masculine. Because of their adjectival type of agreement with the head noun, numerals have traditionally been described as inflecting adjectival modifiers of nouns in noun phrases.

- (8)a. Ena deklica je kupila dva sladoleda.
'One girl bought two ice-creams.'
- b. Tri deklice so pomagale petim dečkom.
'Three girls helped five boys.'
- c. Janez je prišel domov s petimi sladoledi.
'Janez came home with five ice-creams.'

However, numerals do not always follow the adjectival pattern. Traditional Slovenian grammar (Toporišič 1976/2000) observes that when a subject or an object numeral NP contains a higher numeral (i.e. when the spoken form of the numeral does not end in a numeral from 1 – 4) the adjectival agreement does not obtain. The numeral is said to be in the syncretic nominative or accusative case, and the complement noun in the "genitive of quantification" case. In (9) the numeral 'five' is in the syncretic nominative/ accusative, the complement noun 'girls' and 'ice-cream' in the GQ case.

- (9) Pet deklic_{GEN PL} je kupilo pet sladoledov_{GEN PL}.
'Five girls bought five ice-creams.'

The GQ has traditionally been recognized as a characteristic property of Slavic numeral noun phrases, although individual languages may differ with respect to the inflectional properties of the numerals and the subject-verb agreement pattern. Thus, for instance, Slovenian but not also Serbo-Croatian higher numerals display adjectival agreement in oblique case positions; Russian but not also Slovenian has optional subject-verb agreement in sentences with quantified subjects.

In his analysis of numeral NPs in Russian and Serbo-Croatian, Bošković 2006b, 2008 posits a uniform structure for the extended nominal phrase projection containing agreeing and non-agreeing numerals, for convenience labelled FP, with F a phonetically empty head.⁵ The difference in the morphological behaviour of the numerals is represented structurally as a difference in the location of the numeral. Agreeing numerals (10a) are adjectival phrases (AP) merged in the specifier position of the complement NP, (10b). The adjectival numeral undergoes the standard Spec-Head agreement with the noun. The numeral NP receives the Case of its Case-assigner, in (10) Instrumental from the preposition *s*.

- (10) *s* petimi sladoledi

⁵ The projected FP is introduced by Franks 1994 to avoid the theoretically undesirable situation where the numeral would simultaneously assign the Genitive Case to the complement NP and itself receive Case from an external Case assigner, cf. Bošković 2008: 274.

'with five_{INS PL MASC} ice-creams_{INS PL MASC}'
 [Prep P S [FP [INSTRUM.] [F' F [NP [AP [INSTRUM.] *petimi* [N [INSTRUM.] *sladoledi*]]]]]]]

In non-agreeing, GQ-containing numeral NPs (11a), the numeral is universally located in Spec, FP, (11b), and the phonetically silent head F assigns the Genitive Case to the complement NP.⁶

- (11) *pet sladoledov*
 'five_{NOM/ACC} ice-creams_{GEN PL MASC}'
 [FP *pet* [F' F [NP [N *sladoledov...*]]]]]

Bošković 2006b/2008 demonstrates that Case checking by the proposed empty head F of the numeral noun phrase FP is the more economical derivation of the two structures, (10) and (11). In the agreeing structure (10b), Case-licensing feature movement of the complement head noun is shorter when the checked features move to F than when they move to a Case-licenser outside the FP projection, such as P or V. The GQ pattern is thus forced in the structural case environment by the economy of derivation. In inherent-Case positions, on the other hand, θ -theoretic reasons force the longer movement to an external Case assigner as the only convergent derivation. The structure with the GQ in the inherent Case position is excluded as a θ -theory violation. Cf. the unacceptable GQ in (12), where the verb *pomagati* 'help' has not checked its inherent Dative against the intended object FP *pet prijateljev* 'five friends'.

- (12) **Janez je pomagal pet prijateljev*_{GEN PL}.
 'Janez helped five friends.'

In the discussion that follows, we extend the FP analysis to Slovenian NPs with indefinite numeral quantifiers such as *veliko* 'a lot', *mnogo* 'many' / 'much', *malo* '(a) little' / '(a) few', *nekaj* 'some'.⁷ Building on our analysis of Slovenian cardinal numeral NPs (Golden & Milojević Sheppard, *forthcoming*) we argue that contrary to the expectations raised by the standard approach to Wackernagel pronominal clitics, the GQ clitic originating in the noun phrase quantified with an indefinite numeral cannot get to its Wackernagel position in the clause-mate pronominal clitic group by Case-checking operations alone.

3. The genitive-of-quantification clitic. The genitive complement is restricted to quantified noun phrases in structural case position. In addition to a higher cardinal numeral, the quantifier may also be an indefinite numeral. The two quantifiers share the semantic role in quantifying over the NP referents, but differ in their morphosyntactic features. Indefinite numeral quantifiers do not decline, in this respect they resemble Serbo-Croatian higher numerals; second, indefinite numerals quantify over (denotations of) count as well as uncount nouns, (13).

- (13) *Janez je pojedel nekaj orehov*_{GEN PL} / *kruha*_{GEN PL} (*pet orehov*_{GEN PL} / **pet kruha*_{GEN PL}).
 'Janez has eaten some walnuts/ bread (five wallnuts /five bread).'

⁶ F assigns Genitive to the complement NP only if it has a specifier, which is analogous to *V* assigning Case to its complement only if it has a specifier in Burzio's generalization (Bošković 2006b:6).

⁷ Slovenian grammar describes them as undeclined indefinite numerals.

The complement in the numeral noun phrase may be a clitic. As a clitic, it joins the 2P clause-mate clitic group in spite of the fact that it starts out as a constituent of a separate, nominal phrase domain.^{8,9} The overt constituents of the quantified NP 'some of them' in (14a) happen to be adjacent to each other in PF, yet we argue that in (14a), the GQ clitic 'them' is not pronounced in its base position but becomes, during the derivation, part of the 2P clustering of clause-mate clitics. That the GQ clitic combines with the clause-mate clitics is suggested by the clitic ordering in (14b), where the GQ clitic is flanked by the dative and the auxiliary clitics of the 2P clause-mate clitic group, as well as by the observation that the pronunciation of the GQ clitic in its base, i.e. complement position of the quantified noun phrase, as in (14c), is unacceptable.

- (14) a. Nekaj **jih** je naredilo izpit.
 'Some of them passed the exam.'
 b. Očitno *se mu* **jih** je nekaj prilizovalo.
 'Evidently some of them flattered him.'
 c. *Očitno *se mu je* [nekaj **jih**] prilizovalo.

Like clause-mate clitics, illustrated in (3), the GQ clitic can be enclitic or proclitic; when enclitic, it forms a phonological word with the last word of the leftmost maximal projection, which can be of any size and category. In (15), the 2P for the main-clause GQ (pro)clitic is

⁸ Slovenian data on the GQ clitic contradict Halpern's claim (Halpern 1995: 227-31) that clitics from distinct domains never combine into a single cluster, even if they happen to be adjacent.

⁹ Clitic extraction from quantified NPs has been studied in Romance languages but not in Slavic languages. In Italian, for example, clitic extraction is restricted to object noun phrases. The Italian partitive clitic *ne* ('of it,' 'of them') can be extracted when the containing quantified NP is in direct object position (Beletti & Rizzi 1981, Burzio 1986). In (i), the clitic *ne* successfully attaches to Infl because it is extracted from the direct object phrase, (Burzio 1986: 23). Extraction is not possible in (ii) because the quantified NP is subject, in spite of the fact that it is in the inverted, postverbal position. *Ne*-cliticization is thus predictably successful from object noun phrases of unaccusative verbs, (iii), and passives, (iv). The unaccusative postverbal subject in (iii) and the inverted passive subject in (iv) is complement to V, and *ne* cliticization is allowed. In unergative (intransitive) structure (v), however, the inverted subject is not a deep structure object in the relevant sense, and *ne*-cliticization is not allowed. In Slovenian, the genitive clitic extraction is not restricted to quantified NPs in direct object position, extraction from subject phrases is allowed, cf. (14).

- (i) Giovanni *ne*_i inviterà [molti e_i].
 'Giovanni will invite many of them.'
 (ii) **Ne*_i esamineranno il caso [molti e_i].
 'Many of them will examine the case.'
 (iii) *Ne*_i arriveranno [molti e_i].
 'Many of them will arrive.'
 (iv) Saranno invitati molti esperti.
 'Many experts will be invited.'
*Ne*_i saranno invitati [molti e_i].
 (v) **Ne* telefoneranno molti.
 'Many of them will telephone.'

following the initial constituent, an adverbial clause; in the embedded adverbial clause, the GQ clitic is enclitic to the adverbial complementizer *ker*. That the GQ clitic moves out of the containing quantified noun phrase, leaving behind a stranded quantifier, is compatible with the observation that the split quantified noun phrase can be intervened by a sentential and an aspectual/VP adverb, (*verjetno* 'probably' and *vedno* 'always' in (15)).

- (15) #*Ker jih* verjetno vedno nekaj pride, # *jih* verjetno vedno nekaj tudi odide.
'Because probably some of them always come, some of them also always leave.'

Further evidence for the proposal that the GQ clitic joins the 2P clause-clitic group is provided by clitic climbing. Example (16) demonstrates that the GQ clitic climbs into the main clause 2P group from the quantified phrase in the object position of the embedded object control clause.

- (16) Janez *ji ga* je prepovedal [PRO_i kupiti [FP veliko e_j]]
'Janez forbade her to buy a lot of it.'

The idea that the GQ clitic joins the 2P group of clause-mate clitics is further supported by the behaviour of the GQ clitic in multiple questions: the clitic interrupts a string of interrogative *wh*-phrases beginning multiple questions. In Slovenian multiple questions, the first *wh*-phrase lands in the Spec CP position, the remaining interrogative phrases adjoin to the IP (later AgrSP/TP) node, (Golden 1997). Under this analysis, the clitic cluster *jih je* in (17) appears outside the IP (i.e. AgrSP /TP) projection.

- (17) [_{Spec CP} Kdo *jih je* [_{IP} komu [_{IP} obljudil veliko]]]?
'Who promised to whom a lot of them?'

We have observed that in PF, the GQ clitic cannot remain in its base position within the quantified NP, even if it would occupy FP-internal 2P, cf. (14c). The PF unacceptability of the clitic in its base position is expected under the uncontroversial assumption that in the unmarked intonational pattern, the quantified NP in (14c) is not a separate intonational phrase. The clitic inside the FP thus violates the prosodic constraint in not being right-adjacent to the intonational-phrase boundary. In the theoretical framework which eliminates the need for PF movements with the Pronounce the Lower Copy Principle and scattered deletion strategy (Bošković 2001, Bošković & Nunes 2007), and at the same time avoids the introduction of new, clitic-specific features, the genitive clitic is expected to get to its position in the 2P clitic group through regular Case-checking mechanism. In what follows we argue that the observed surface structure placement of the GQ clitic cannot be derived through the Case-checking operations. The 2P placement of the genitive clitic can result neither from the Genitive Case checking of the clitic itself nor from the checking of the Nominative or Accusative Case feature of the containing quantified NP.

4. The GQ clitic placement and feature-licensing. The assumption that a regular Case-checking mechanism is sufficient to account for the 2P placement of Wackernagel pronominal clitics could be maintained within an earlier minimalist framework (Chomsky 1993), whereby clitics check their Case features by overt phrasal movement (cf. Section 1). Bošković's (2006b, 2008) analysis of NPs with higher numerals, however, assumes a more recent framework of minimalist grammar (Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001), where overt movement is a last resort strategy, the preferred choice being covert feature movement. Thus in structure (11b), the complement NP would check its Genitive Case by covert feature

movement of N to the functional head F. This step is equivalent to the Agree and feature-valuation operation of Chomsky 2000, 2001. An Agree relation is established between the uninterpretable ϕ -features of the head F (probe) and the interpretable ϕ -features of the N (goal) of the NP complement. As a result, the structural Case feature on the complement N is valued by the value [Genitive] of the head F. The uninterpretable structural Case feature is deleted, and consequently the complement NP becomes inactive for any syntactic movement. This probe-goal interaction has thus no effect on the placement of the clitic within the FP (pet jih gen 'five of them'); it leaves the clitic in its base position. In this position, the clitic violates the PF constraints. Covert checking of the clitic's Genitive Case does not get the clitic to leave the containing numeral phrase, nor does it predict its PF placement within the 2P clitic group.

Example (14b), repeated below as (17a), shows that the GQ clitic follows the Dative clause-mate clitic even when the clitic originates in the subject numeral noun phrase. In fact, examples in (17) show that the GQ clitic integrates into the 2P clause-mate clitic group in PF as if it were itself a clause-mate clitic and not embedded in the numeral NP. In the 2P group, the genitive clitic follows reflexive and dative clause-mate object clitics. In example (17a), the GQ clitic *jih* from the subject numeral NP follows the clause-mate reflexive *se* and dative *mu* clitics.¹⁰ In (17b), the GQ clitic from the object quantifiedNP follows the dative clitic *mu*. The subject phrase in (17a) is syntactically higher than the dative object, yet its GQ clitic follows the dative clitic in the PF clitic group.

- (17) a. Očitno *se mu* DAT *jih* GEN *je* nekaj prilizovalo.
'Evidently some of them flattered him.'
b. Očitno *mu* DAT *jih* GEN PL *je* kupila nekaj.
'Evidently she bought him some of them.'

If the height of the clitic in syntax determines where it is pronounced (Bošković 2001, 2002) and this structural height is the result of some feature-checking mechanism, then the determining feature in the linearization of the GQ clitic in (17) cannot be the Genitive Case. Some other feature(s) must be responsible for extracting the GQ clitic from the FP-internal position and placing it in the 2P clitic group. We propose that the relevant feature cannot be the Case feature of the quantified noun phrase either.

Bošković (2007: 622, ft.58) identifies the GQ context as one instance where verbs that otherwise assign structural Accusative may fail to do so. In his Serbo-Croatian example (18), the verb 'to buy' fails to assign the Accusative Case because there is no such element in the numeral noun phrase 'five cars' that could receive the Case feature. The Serbo-Croatian higher numeral does not decline, the silent head F is itself the Genitive Case assigner to the complement noun phrase.

- (18) On će kupiti kola ACC / pet kola GEN

In Golden & Milojević Sheppard (*forthcoming*) this leads to the proposal that the higher-numeral NP in object position may not be assigned the Accusative Case. This proposal extends easily to object NPs quantified by indefinite numerals, which are inherently

¹⁰ On the variability of native speakers' judgements of the pronunciation site of the GQ clitic contained in subject numeral phrase, cf. Golden & Milojević Sheppard (*forthcoming*).

indeclinable. In (17b), with the relevant part of the structure given in (19), the clitic originates in an object numeral NP.

(19) ... [_{VP} [_{VP} V [_{FP} nekaj **jih**]]]

The absence of Accusative on FP in object position predicts that the object FP with the contained GQ clitic does not leave the VP domain, yielding the unacceptable FP-internal Genitive clitic (20).

(20) **Očitno je* [_{VP} *kupil* [_{FP} *nekaj jih*]].

Clearly, the clitic must leave the FP containing it, but with the FP Caseless, the trigger for movement is lacking. We could stipulate an EPP feature as a way of implementing overt movement (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001), effecting the raising of FP to Spec, vP, (21). However, this is not the position in which the GQ clitic is pronounced, as witnessed by (22). Not only does the clitic precede VP adverbials (e.g. *včeraj* 'yesterday'), it can also precede subject-oriented adverbials (e.g. *namenoma* 'deliberately'), which shows that it is pronounced high in the tree.

(21) ... [_{VP} [_{FP} nekaj **jih**] V + v] [_{VP} ~~V~~ [_{FP} ~~nekaj jih~~]]]

(22) Janez *mu*_{DAT} **jih**_{GEN} *je* *namenoma* *včeraj* *kupil* *veliko*.
'Janez bought him a lot of them deliberately yesterday.'

The proposal that quantified NPs with genitive complement in structural case positions are caseless extends to subject phrases in sentences with default subject-verb agreement. Bošković's analysis 2006b, 2008 suggests that case specification of Slavic higher numerals in the GQ subject phrase can be ambiguous.¹¹ In Russian, for example, it is either in the syncretic nominative/ accusative or caseless. When the numeral is nominative, the subject numeral phrase agrees with the verb; when it is caseless, the verb bears default 3rd Sg marking and the non-agreeing subject numeral phrase stays in situ. In Slovenian, agreement obtains when the subject phrase bears the nominative case, non-nominative subjects occur with default verbal form only. Absence of agreement obtains also in sentences with higher- numeral NP subjects, cf. (17a) with 3rdSg auxiliary *je* and neuter participle *prilizovalo*.¹² In Golden & Milojevič Sheppard (*forthcoming*) we interpret this absence of subject-verb agreement as indicating that the subject cardinal numeral NP is Caseless, and as

¹¹ Bošković's analysis of higher-numeral phrases as subjects in Russian and Serbo-Croatian relies on the proposed correlation in Slavic languages between the nominative case and subject-verb agreement: the morphological nominative case induces morphological subject-verb agreement. The correlation is part of a more general hypothesis that Slavic case inflection and agreement directly reflect abstract Case and abstract agreement.

¹² The assumption that the discontinued numeral noun phrase *pet jih* in (14) is subject in Spec, vP position is compatible with the observation that it can antecedent reflexive pronouns (Slovenian reflexive binding is subject-oriented) and that it can control PRO, (i).

(i) *Očitno se jih je pet želelo PRO hvaliti.*
'Evidently five of them wanted to praise themselves.'

such expected to remain *in situ*, with the GQ clitic "trapped" within it. The inherently indeclinable indefinite numerals now provide supporting evidence for the Caseless approach. The trapped GQ clitic is unacceptable with both quantified noun phrases, those with a cardinal and those with an indefinite numeral, in (23) *pet* 'five' and *nekaj* 'some' respectively.

(23) *Očitno *se mu je* [nekaj / pet *jih*] prilizovalo.

(24) [_{TP} T [_{3rd SG}] [_{vP} [_{FP} nekaj /pet caseless, PL] F *jih*]] v VP]]

Let us assume then that the GQ-clitic subject *nekaj jih* 'some of them' in (17a) is a Caseless numeral noun phrase, merged in Spec, *vP*, with T bearing default specification, (24). The assumption that the subject numeral NP stays in Spec, *vP* predicts that the clitic-containing subject numeral NP will precede clause-mate indirect object and direct object clitics. This is not the position of the GQ clitic from the subject numeral phrase in the sentence. Example (17a) shows the GQ clitic "excorporated" from the numeral phrase and wedged between the dative the accusative clause-mate clitics. This position is unexpected under the standard approach: the agentive subject is syntactically higher than the indirect object.

As in the case of QG-clitic object, it is not at all obvious how the observed clitic placement can be derived by feature-licensing needs. Being Caseless, the numeral NP has no Case feature to check. Resorting to an EPP feature cannot provide a solution either. For, as pointed out by Bošković (2007: 621), the EPP feature does not actually involve feature checking but rather piggy-backs on it. This means that the element that moves to satisfy the EPP must first Agree with the target in some uninterpretable feature independent of the EPP. In (24), Agree between the Caseless FP and T cannot be established and thus the prerequisite for the EPP-driven movement of FP to Spec, TP is not met.

In sum, the GQ clitic must move from its base position within the numeral NP, regardless of whether the latter is subject or object, and join the 2P clause-mate clitic group. Based on all of the above, it seems that this cannot be achieved through syntactic movement triggered by feature-licensing needs.

5. Conclusion. In this paper we have examined Slovenian GQ clitics in quantified NPs against the background of the standard approach to second position cliticisation within the minimalist theory of grammar. We have argued that the basic assumption of the standard approach to Wackernagel clitics that the surface ordering of clitics follows from the positions they come to occupy through regular feature-checking mechanisms cannot predict the GQ placement within the 2P clause-mate clitic group. The observed placement suggests that something must move the GQ clitic from its base, NP-internal position to the position it occupies in the 2P clause-mate clitic group. We have shown that this cannot be achieved through syntactic movement triggered by feature-licensing needs.

References

- Belletti, Adriana, and Luigi Rizzi. (1981) "The Syntax of *ne*: some theoretical implications". *The Linguistic Review* 1: 117 – 54.
- Bošković, Željko. (2008) "A minimalist account of genitive of quantification". Gerhild Zybatow, Luka Szucsich, Uwe Junghanns, and Roland Meyer, eds.

- Formal description of Slavic languages*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 270 – 87.
- Bošković, Željko. (2007) "On the locality and motivation of move and agree: An even more minimal theory". *Linguistic inquiry* 38: 589 – 644.
- Bošković, Željko. (2006a) "Case checking versus case assignment and the case of adverbial NPs". *Linguistic inquiry* 37: 522 – 33.
- Bošković, Željko. (2006b) "Case and agreement with genitive of quantification in Russian". Ms. Univ. of Connecticut.
- Bošković, Željko. (2002) "Clitics as nonbranching elements and the linear correspondence axiom". *Linguistic inquiry* 33: 329 – 40.
- Bošković, Željko. (2001) *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Bošković, Željko and Jairo Nunes. (2007) "The copy theory of movement: A view from PF". Norbert Corver and Jairo Nunes, eds. *The copy theory of movement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 14 – 74.
- Burzio, Luigi. (1986) *Italian syntax: a government-binding approach*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2001) "Derivation by phase". Michael Kenstowicz, ed. *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1 – 52.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2000) "Minimalist inquiries: The framework". Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, eds. *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 89 – 155.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1995) *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1993) "A minimalist program for linguistic theory". Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, eds. *The view from building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1 – 52.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1986) *Knowledge of language*. New York: Praeger.
- Franks, Steven. (1998) "Clitics in Slavic". Paper presented at the *Comparative Slavic morphosyntax workshop*, Indiana University, Bloomington, June 1998. (<http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/index.html>)
- Franks, Steven. (1995) *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franks, Steven. (1994) "Parametric properties of numeral phrases in Slavic". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 11: 570 – 649.
- Golden, Marija. (2003) "Clitic placement and clitic climbing." *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56. Berlin: Academic Verlag. 208 – 33.
- Golden, Marija. (1997) "Multiple wh-questions in Slovene". W. Browne, E. Dornisch, N. Kondrashova and D. Zec, eds. *Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting, 1995*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. 240 – 66.
- Golden, Marija and Milena Milojević Sheppard. (2000) "Slovenian pronominal clitics". Fritz Beukema and Marcel den Dikken, eds. *Clitic phenomena in European languages*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 191 – 207.
- Golden, Marija and Milena Milojević Sheppard. (2008, *forthcoming*) "The Genitive-of-quantification clitic in Slovenian". Bloomington, Indiana.
- Halpern, Aaron. (1995) *On the placement and morphology of clitics*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications, Center for the study of language and information.
- Orešnik, Janez. (1986) "O naslonskem nizu v knjižni slovenščini". *Jezik in slovstvo* 31: 214 – 5.
- Toporišič, Jože. (1976/2000) *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.