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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>anaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An</td>
<td>Ancona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>adjective phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>Basque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS</td>
<td>Bare Phrase Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Basque Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>clitic doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLLD</td>
<td>clitic left dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLRD</td>
<td>clitic right dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>comp (complementizer) phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>determiner phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS</td>
<td>Discourse Representation Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/CSR</td>
<td>Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>Extended Projection Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPV</td>
<td>Extended Projection of the Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FinP</td>
<td>Finite Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fio</td>
<td>Fiorentino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ForceP</td>
<td>Force Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPR</td>
<td>Focus Prominence Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>Focus Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FocP</td>
<td>Focus Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Government and Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HTLD</td>
<td>Hanging Topic Left Dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice</td>
<td>Icelandic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Improper Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA</td>
<td>Linear Correspondence Axiom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC</td>
<td>Minimal Link Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>morphosyntactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR</td>
<td>Nuclear Stress Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>phonetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>phonetic form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>Principle of Feature Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC</td>
<td>Phase Impenetrability Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB</td>
<td>Principle of Unambiguous Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>Principle of Unambiguous Chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVP</td>
<td>Point of View Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Rioplatense Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>semantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDRT</td>
<td>Segmented Discourse Representation Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TocP</td>
<td>Topic Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Vata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
<td>'little v' verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>verb–subject–object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCO</td>
<td>Weak Cross Over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

1.1 The theoretical problem: phases and information structure

Syntax is a computational system that takes symbols and sets of symbols and combines them forming new sets. The output of syntax is an object $\Sigma$ that is interpreted by means of two types of information: the symbols themselves and the structure that they form. Discourse is a combinatorial system that takes $\Sigma$s to form new texts.

Take the following Spanish sentences:

(1.1) a. Juan ha llegado. 
   ‘Juan has arrived.’

b. Ha llegado Juan.

The truth conditions of (1.1a) and (1.1b) are identical, but their use is not random, since they fit into different types of discourses. Spanish speakers find that (1.1a) is a good answer to the question “What has Juan done?” while (1.1b) is a good answer to the question “Who has arrived?” If we place (1.1a) or (1.1b) in the wrong context, the result is an infelicitous discourse.

Let us call pragmatics the linguistic module that takes a syntactic object $\Sigma$ as input and yields an annotated structure $\Sigma_{[p]}$ as output. $\Sigma_{[p]}$ is a syntactic object in which constituents are tagged with features relevant for the integration of $\Sigma$ into a discourse. $\Sigma_{[p]}$ is the information structure of $\Sigma$. Discourses are viewed as Discourse Representation Structures in the Discourse Representation Theory tradition (see Kamp and Reyle 1993).

All through the 1980s and the better part of the 1990s, linguists assumed that interpretation—including information structure—took place at the sentence level: syntax would construct full sentences, which were then fed to the interpretive mechanisms. In the 1990s this view started to change. The classic model of the 1980s consisted of a set of representations linked by the application of the movement rule Move-\(\alpha\). Only the last pair of representations (LF and PF) was interpreted, the others remained fully module-internal. But as syntactic derivations began to be explored in more detail, alternatives to the standard
model started to appear. Thus, Epstein et al. (1998) argues that there are no syntactic representations, the combinatorial system interfaces with the interpretive modules after every application of a syntactic rule. Uriagereka (1999) argues that subjects and adjuncts are fully derived and spelled-out before they merge with the main sentence.

However, the most influential model has undoubtedly been that of Chomsky’s phases (Chomsky 2000 and subsequent work). He argues that (transitive) vP and CP constitute syntactic units with specific properties. He calls them phases:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(1.2) } & \quad [\text{CP} \ C [\text{TP} T [\text{vP} \ EA \ v [\text{vP} \ V \ IA]]]] \\
& \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
& \text{phase} \quad \text{phase}
\end{align*}
\]

The concept of phase involves two roles. The first role is computational: the head of the phase drives the derivation, bearing the features that trigger movement (more clearly so since Chomsky’s (2005) proposal that the \( \phi \)-features of T are actually inherited from C). The second function is interpretive: the phase is the unit that interfaces with interpretive systems. In particular, Chomsky’s (2001a) analysis of object shift in Icelandic privileges the edge of a phase (roughly, Spec,v and Spec,C) as the locus of interpretive rules.

The first role of the phase I critiqued in detail in López (2007), as I discuss below. The second role is the focus of this monograph: can it be shown that the interface between syntax and the interpretive systems takes place at the phase rather than the sentence level? The answer provided here is that there is indeed evidence that information structure in southern Romance languages is determined at the phase level.

In a nut-shell, these are the main theoretical findings in this book:

(i) Traditionally, information structure theories gravitate around two-way partitions such as: Topic–Comment, Focus–Presupposition, Theme–Rheme, etc. I show that the notions of Topic and Focus provide no insight into the nature of sentence grammar. I argue that the crucial information structure notions are (discourse)anaphor and contrast, giving rise to the binary features \([\pm a(\text{anaphor})]\) and \([\pm c(\text{contrast})]\). “Topic” and “Focus” are seen as descriptive terms for particular bundles of features, not theoretical primitives.

(ii) Phase edges are the places where pragmatic rules apply. In particular, the positive values of the dichotomies above—[+a] and [+c]—are
assigned to phase edges while the negative values are assigned to the complement domain of the phase head.

(iii) Pragmatic features stay with constituents as they proceed with their derivation. The values of these features constrain the set of possible derivations that the constituents can engage in.

(iv) Phase-internal movement has interpretive consequences distinct from movement to phase edges. I show that a vP-internal position is also relevant for interpretation because movement into this position makes a constituent visible for binding or anchoring, giving rise to specific/referential or generic interpretations. However, phase-internal positions are not involved in rule-governed, obligatory assignment of an interpretive feature. In Chomsky (2001a) all movement is to the edges of phases (with movement to Spec,T a curious exception) while Chomsky (2005) claims that all movement is to phase-internal positions (Spec,T and Spec,V). I argue that both types of movement exist, with different interpretive consequences.

(v) It has often been argued that movement of, for example, dislocates is triggered by information-structure features such as topic or focus (e.g. see Rizzi’s 1996, 1997, 2004b Criteria approach). Alternatively, prosody has been claimed to be a sufficient trigger for movement (Reinhart 1995; Zubizarreta 1998). I show that there is clear empirical evidence against these approaches. Instead, I claim that movement is triggered by feature valuation/checking exclusively.

1.2 Brief description of the database

The constructions that I discuss in this book are briefly listed in Sections 1.2.1 to 1.2.6. The descriptions included in this introduction are the minimum required to delimit the object of study. Detailed argumentation of the features that I attribute to these constructions is to be found throughout this book.

1.2.1 Clitic left dislocation and hanging topics

It goes to Cinque’s credit (1983/1997, 1990) to have identified two types of dislocations in Romance, referred to as Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD) and Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD). They are exemplified in (1.3):

\[ (1.3) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{a. A María no le enviaré ningún package.} \\
\text{DAT María NEG Cl.dat send.1st.fut no} \\
\text{paquete.} \\
\end{array} \Rightarrow \text{CLLD [Sp]} \]
b. María, no le enviaré ningún paquete.  
‘(To) Maria I won’t send (her) a package.’

c. A María, hace tiempo que no la veo.  
A Maria does time that NEG Cl.acc see.1st  
‘Maria, I haven’t seen (her) in a long time.’

d. María, hace tiempo que no la veo.  
‘Maria, I haven’t seen (her) in a long time.’

e. *A María, hace tiempo que no veo a esa sinvergüenza  
A Maria does time that NEG see.1st a esa sinvergüenza  
A that shameless  
‘Maria, I haven’t seen that shameless woman in a long time.’

f. María, hace tiempo que no veo a esa sinvergüenza.  
‘Maria, I haven’t seen that shameless woman in a long time.’

g. María, ella sí sabe jugar al tenis.  
Maria she indeed knows play.inf at.the tennis  
‘Maria, she can play tennis.’

Notice that in (1.3a) and (1.3c) the dislocated constituent is introduced by the morpheme a. In (1.3a), the morpheme is a dative case marker. In (1.3c) a is an accusative case marker with additional restrictions in its distribution and I simply gloss it as ‘A’. This case marking is a surface hallmark of CLLD. In (1.3b) and (1.3d) the dislocate appears in an invariant form, a sort of ‘default’ nominative. This is HTLD.

In examples (1.3a–d) the dislocated constituent is resumed by a clitic. HTLD can also be resumed by a strong pronoun or an epithet. The contrast between (1.3e) and (1.3f) shows that a CLLDed constituent cannot be resumed by an epithet. Example (1.3g) exemplifies HTLD resumed by a strong pronoun.

While HTLD is always a specific indefinite or referential definite DP, a variety of constituents can be CLLDed. Definite and specific DPs can be CLLDed, but also non-specific indefinite DPs, APs, PPs, and CPs:

(1.4) a. D’històries, jo no en vull sentir cap.  
of’stories I NEG Cl.part want.1st hear any  
‘I don’t want to hear any stories.’
Thus, every argument of the clause can be dislocated. However, verbs, auxiliaries, and functional elements of the extended verbal projection cannot be.

Cinque’s discussion shows that while CLLD is, at some level, a constituent of a sentence, HTLD is not. For instance, consider the following contrast:

(1.5) a. *Al arbitro, el muy tonto, dice que el jugador no lo vio. [Sp]
    b. El árbitro, el muy tonto, dice que el jugador
       The referee the very silly says that the player
       no lo vio.
       NEG Cl.acc saw
       ‘The referee, that idiot says that the player didn’t see him.’

Why is (1.5a) ungrammatical while (1.5b) is fine? One way to analyze this difference is to take CLLD to be the output of a movement rule while HTLD is base generated in the left periphery. Under this assumption, (5a) would be a classic violation of Principle C of Binding Theory. If there is no movement in (5b), there can be no Binding Theory violation.

Sensitivity to islands is another fact that teases CLLD and HTLD apart. HTLD is insensitive to any islands, which suggests again a sentence-external base generation analysis. Cinque (1990) claimed that CLLD is sensitive to strong islands but not weak islands, a claim that has become received knowledge. However, this conclusion is mistaken, a consequence of considering only dislocates that are definite object DPs. As is well-known, definite object DPs are easily extractable, whether as a CLLD or a wh-phrase. I show this in (1.6) with a factive island:

(1.6) a. Aquest llibre, em penedeixo d’haver-lo llegit. [Cat]
    this book Cl.dat regret.1st of’have.inf-Cl.acc read
    ‘I regret having read this book.’
Once we control for these variables, we find that CLLD is sensitive to weak islands. In the following example, we see that, simply by making the dislocated constituent an indefinite DP, extraction across a weak island sounds a lot worse:

\[(1.7) \quad \text{D’històries, m’ avergonyeixo d’haver-ne explicat diumenge.} \quad \text{[Cat]}\]

\text{‘I’m ashamed to have told stories on Sunday.’}

Another difference that has often been posited between CLLD and HTLD is that the former, but not the latter, can be found in a subordinate clause (Cinque 1990: 58). As a matter of fact, the ungrammaticality of HTLD in subordinate clauses is not uniform, ranging from total unacceptability to mild ungrammaticality—and Lahne (2005) presents some examples in Occitan that are judged to be grammatical by her consultants. The reasons for this variability are not clear to me at this point.\(^1\) In this work, I will cut the knot in the middle, assuming that in the general case HTLD in subordinate clauses gives rise to some degree of ungrammaticality.

As for the interpretive import, we are going to see that CLLD is consistently a discourse anaphor with a somewhat complex relationship with its antecedent—the relationship can be part/whole, set/subset etc. (Villalba 2000). For instance, (1.6a) could be uttered in a context in which the subject matter of the conversation is a certain set of books: \text{aquest llibre} would be connected to the antecedent ‘books’ as a member of the set.

HTLD, on the other hand, seems to have a more flexible array of possible values. I will claim that the “rigidity” of CLLD is due to its being a sentence-grammar phenomenon, thus restricted by sentence-grammar pragmatic rules. HTLD, on the other hand, is not a sentence constituent and therefore is not subject to the sort of rules that are the focus of this book. The interpretation of HTLD can be exclusively defined by context.

The distinction between CLLD and HTLD that we find in Romance seems to have correlates in other languages. In English, we have the pair

\(^1\) “CLLD contrasts with (HT)LD, which typically occurs in root contexts and (to different degrees of marginality) in the complement of only a few classes of propositional attitude verbs” (Cinque 1990: 58).
Topicalization/Left Dislocation while in German and Dutch we have Contrastive Left Dislocation/Left Dislocation (see Van Riemsdijk’s 1997 discussion, among many others). In order to maintain this work within reasonable limits, I will not try to extend my analyses to these languages. However, from a Universal Grammar perspective, one has to view these constructions as built from similar sets of ingredients and therefore as having similar properties (see Anagnostopoulou 1997, Grohmann 2003 among others who have presented explicit comparative/contrastive analyses of these constructions).

1.2.2 Clitic right dislocation

Until recently, right dislocation (CLRD) could be considered the Cinderella of Romance syntax. This situation holds no more, the seminal work of Cecchetto (1999) and Villalba (1999, 2000) has taught us that there are important theoretical implications from the analysis of this construction. It is exemplified in (1.8):

(1.8) Jo no el tinc, l’ordinador. [Cat]
 I NEG Cl.acc have.1st the’computer
 ‘I don’t have the computer’ (or: I don’t have it, the computer)

The CLRDed constituent is also anaphoric with respect to a discourse antecedent and the relationship is direct, based on identity (unlike the complex relationship that CLLD maintains with its own antecedent). CLRD is pronounced with a distinct low intonation and forms its own intonational phrase separate from that of the clause. As far as I can tell, any type of XP that can be CLLDed can also CLRDed.

CLRD must be distinguished from two similar constructions. The first one is emarginazione (marginalization), present in Italian but not in Catalan, Spanish, or Portuguese. Like CLRD, the constituent appears with low intonation. The main apparent difference with respect to CLRD is the absence of a clitic:

(1.9) Porterà Mara, la macchina. [It]
 carry.fut Mara the car
 ‘Mara will drive the car.’

(Frascarelli 2000)

Cardinaletti (2001, 2002) argues that there are important syntactic differences between marginalization and CLRD: while the former leaves the constituent in situ, the latter is outside the clause proper (I would say, as a result of
movement). As for interpretation, I will suggest in Chapter 5 that there is a subtle difference between them too.

Another construction that we need to tease apart from CLRD is the afterthought (Grosz and Ziv 1998, Villalba 2000). An afterthought is a clarification and therefore it is not anaphoric, but rather, a form of focus. Although it is dislocated, it does not exhibit the low intonation typical of CLRD. The following is an example:

(1.10) John and Peter had a fight with Mary. In the end he decided not to talk to her again, John, I mean.

I do not discuss afterthoughts again in this book.

1.2.3 Focus fronting

Focus Fronting (FF) consists of displacing a focus constituent to the beginning of a clause. There is an agreement that the interpretive effect of FF is contrast—although what this term means will require some discussion, since I depart from earlier linguists. I conventionally represent a constituent in contrastive focus with capital letters:

(1.11) LES MONGETES m’ agraden. [Cat]
the beans Cl.dat’ like.pl
‘BEANS I like.’

FF is easy to distinguish from CLLD. Notice, first, that the FFed is not doubled by a clitic. Second, Arregi (2003) has designed a test that clearly separates the two in Spanish (the test also works in Catalan): CLLD can be followed by the emphatic particle sí (que) while FF cannot be:

(1.12) a. Las judías sí me las he comido. [Sp]
the beans indeed Cl Cl.acc have.1st eaten
‘I have in fact eaten the beans.’

b. *LAS JUDIAS sí me he comido.

As for interpretation, FF is also easily distinguished from CLLD. The latter is linked to an antecedent, as discussed above, while the former is not.

1.2.4 P-movement, scrambling, and object shift

The constructions described above exhibit a constituent in the periphery of the clause. P-movement, scrambling and object shift consist of moving a complement to an intermediate position within the clause:
P-movement exists in Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian, but not in (most varieties of) Catalan. Scrambling has been described in German, Dutch, and Afrikaans. Object shift is a Scandinavian phenomenon. Given their formal similarities, it has proved tempting to take p-movement and scrambling to be the same construction (Reinhart 1995, Costa 2004). An interesting difference between them is that scrambling cannot apply to non-specific indefinites (Lenerz 1977), while p-movement is felicitous in such a context:

(1.15) *Ich glaube dass John Tomaten gestern gegessen hat. [Ger]
I think that John tomatoes yesterday eaten has

(1.16) Juan comió ayer tomates ➔ Juan comió tomates ayer. [Sp]
Juan ate yesterday tomatoes
Juan ate tomatoes yesterday.’

As I will show, p-movement only requires that the displaced constituent be anaphoric while scrambling and object shift add a requirement of specificity. Spanish and Italian have both p-movement and CLRD:

(1.17) a. Ayer los trajo Juan, los libros. ➔ CLRD [Sp]
yesterday Cl.acc brought Juan the books
‘Yesterday, Juan brought the books’

b. Ayer trajo los libros Juan. ➔ p-movement

The two constructions look very different on the surface, with respect to word order and intonation. However, I will show that they actually have identical syntax: in particular, both instances of los libros are located in a mid-position where they c-command the post-verbal subject. Moreover, both instances of los libros are anaphoric to a discourse antecedent. I will argue that this strict correspondence between structure and pragmatic interpretation is not chance and both sentences in (1.17) have the same syntax—regardless of surface appearance.
1.2.5 Accusative A

I already mentioned the accusative case marker *a*. It introduces animate direct objects in Spanish:

(1.18) a. Busco un secretario (que escriba/*escribió una carta en ruso). [Sp]
    b. Busco a un secretario (que escriba/escribió una carta en ruso).

    ‘I’m looking for a secretary to write/ that wrote a letter in Russian.’

The difference in meaning between (1.18a) and (1.18b) is subtle but real: the accusative marker allows the object to be specific or generic, while (1.18a) can only be non-specific. Notice that the specific interpretation of (1.18b) is only optional.

The Southern Romance languages have a beautiful test for the specificity of a DP: the mood in the relative clause. If the mood is subjunctive, then the DP must be non-specific, if the mood is indicative, then it is specific.

The same difference can be felt if the direct object is definite:

(1.19) a. Busco la mujer que me quiera como soy.
    b. Busco a la mujer que me quiera como soy.

    ‘I’m seeking the woman that will love me as I am /* loved me as I am.’

In (1.19a), *la mujer que*... is non-referential: there is no particular woman in mind. Sentence (1.19b) allows for a second reading, in which I am looking for someone in particular, who happens to be the woman that loved me the way I am (see von Heusinger 2002 for arguments that [± specificity] and [± referentiality] should be equated). I will argue that the possibility of a specific/referential reading correlates with a syntactic position, internal to the phase but higher than the initial merge position.

One *leit motiv* of this book is that “specificity/referentiality” and “anaphoricity” should be clearly distinguished. A constituent can be anaphoric
and non-specific (see examples 1.4a–1.4d) and a constituent can be specific and non-anaphoric (for instance, (1.18b) and (1.19b) could be answers to the question “What are you looking for?”).

### 1.2.6 Clitic doubling

Rioplatense Spanish (as well as some other Spanish dialects) permit the co-occurrence of an object clitic and a direct object without forcing the latter to dislocate (many Romance varieties allow for doubling of dative arguments):

(1.20) La voy a llamar a esta mina

Cl.acc going.\textsuperscript{1\text{st}} to call A that girl
de la que hablábamos anoche. \[RP\]
of the that spoke.\textsuperscript{1\text{st}.pl} last-night

‘I’m going to call that girl we were talking about last night.’

(Estigarribia 2006)

In clitic doubling (CLD) structures the direct object is obligatorily specific (Suñer 1988). Syntactically, I will show that it occupies the same position as accusative $A$.

### 1.3 Assumptions

As for clause structure, I depart from the simplest assumptions only in that I allow CP to be split into Finite Phrase and Force Phrase (as in Rizzi 1997):

(1.21) \([\text{ForceP} \text{ Force } [\text{FinP} \text{ Fin } [\text{TP} \text{ T } [\text{vP} \text{ v } [\text{VP} \text{ V } ]]]]]\)

The empirical evidence for this partition seems large enough and will become important in some of my analyses.

As mentioned, I assume a derivational approach to syntax in which the units called phases interface with interpretive systems leading to transfer of the complement of the head of the phase, mostly as in Chomsky (2000) and subsequent work. I take it that the heads of phases are $v$ and Fin, for reasons that will become clear later in the book, particularly in Chapter 3.\textsuperscript{2}

The main conclusions of this book are independent of the theory of syntactic dependencies one assumes. However, a few detailed analyses will rely on the assumptions of López (2007) rather than Chomsky’s.\textsuperscript{3} Thus, a brief introduction to the relevant points of López (2007) is in order.

---

\textsuperscript{2} I leave open whether Force Phrase is also a phase or not. Nothing hinges on the choice.

\textsuperscript{3} This is only relevant in Ch. 3 Sect. 2, Ch. 5 Sect. 5, Ch. 6 Sect. 3.
Chomsky makes syntactic dependencies pivot around the head of a phase. In Chomsky’s model, heads endowed with unvalued features probe their c-command domain until they find valued features of the same type. Once these features are found, an operation Agree(probe,goal) takes place that values the features of the probe and assigns Case to the goal. Finally, if the probe has an additional Extended Projection Principle (EPP) feature, the goal is attracted/pied-piped to the spec of the probe. Once all the syntactic operations of the phase are completed, the complement of the phase head is transferred to the interpretive modules, the cognitive-intensional systems and the articulatory-perceptual systems.

The only locality conditions on probing are the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) and the Minimal Link Condition (MLC). The PIC prevents probing into the complement of a phase head, under the assumption that material that has been transferred is not part of the derivation anymore—with one important exception: T, which in Chomsky (2000, 2001a) is allowed to penetrate the vP phase so it can agree with a nominative object in quirky Case constructions. The MLC prevents Agree taking place between a probe and a goal if there is another potential goal closer to the probe.

In López (2007) I argue quite extensively that this view of syntactic dependencies leads to numerous conceptual and empirical problems. Instead, I argue that probing is more strictly local than what Chomsky argues: it can only reach the edge of the complement of the probe. In (1.22), X can probe YP and ZP, but no further:

(1.22)

The reader can see at once that the PIC and the MLC (as well as some other assumptions that I am skipping here) become unnecessary if probing is strictly local as depicted in (1.22).

Chomsky’s system entails that Move presupposes Agree. Indeed, most instances of Agree involve Move, but it is hard to see if Agree causes Move or vice versa. Noun incorporation allows us to extricate the two. As Baker (1988) explains, when there is noun incorporation, the noun that incorporates does not agree with or receive Case from the predicate that it incorporates into. Interestingly, if the
noun has a possessor phrase, it is this phrase that ends up agreeing and receiving Case from the verb. Consider the following examples:

(1.23) a. Ka-rakv ne sawatis hrao-nuhs-a?. [Mohawk]
   3rd.n.white John 3rd.m.house SUF
   ‘John’s house is white.’

   b. Hrao-nuhs-rakv ne sawatis
      3rd.m.house.white John
      ‘John’s house is white.’

   (Baker 1988: 98)

In (1.23a) the predicate ‘white’ agrees with the noun ‘house’, in number and gender (neuter). In (1.23b), with ‘house’ incorporated into ‘white’, the predicate instead agrees with the possessor ‘John’.

(1.24) So the constituent that moves does not agree, the constituent that agrees is the one that does not move. Noun incorporation leads to the conclusion that we should turn Chomsky’s system on its head: a constituent α moves because there is an unvalued feature of α that needs to be satisfied.

   I view movement/internal merge as a reaction caused by an unvalued feature in the moving item. Since Move is conceived of as reactive, α moves as soon as the possibility opens up, not at some random specified point (i.e. when a sentence has been fully constructed, as in the Government and Binding (GB) framework, or when a phase is, as in current minimalist thinking). As new heads merge, α moves to each new spec formed until it finds itself in a position where it can be probed by a head that has the valued version of the unvalued feature of the goal. In that configuration, Agree (p,g) satisfies the unvalued feature of the goal and movement stops:4

   4 In López (2007) I explain why this conception of movement does not lead to the internal contradictions that the Greed model (Chomsky 1993; Collins 1997) led to.
A direct consequence of this model is that nominative Case assignment in Spec,T in languages like English must be assigned by C or Fin if one assumes (1.21). López (2007: 37–40) discusses in detail how displacing the assigner of nominative Case from T to C/Fin simplifies considerably our theory of A-dependencies.

Assignment of accusative Case must take place with the object in Spec,V (or in the closest spec that v c-commands), which derives Stowell’s Case adjacency effects directly:

(1.26) a. Chris kissed Pat tenderly.
   b. *Chris kissed tenderly Pat.

Another point in which I depart from Chomsky’s assumptions regards what can be a probe. Chomsky (2000, 2001a) assumes that a probe must necessarily be a head. This means that if a constituent is [+max, −min] it cannot probe. Within strict minimalist hypotheses, this assumption seems to be arbitrary: there is no principled reason why a maximal projection could not also be a probe. If a maximal projection inherits all the features of its head, it should also inherit the feature that triggers probing. Consider the following tree:

Assume X is a probe with an unvalued feature [ug]. Assume further that ZP cannot satisfy [ug]. XP will inherit it, as part of the label of X. Presumably, XP should also inherit the probe property from X and be able to inspect WP for a valued version of [ug]. A probe can be any unvalued feature, including [uCase].

Finally, I also depart from Chomsky in his view of how features are associated to lexical items. Chomsky’s system is designed roughly like this.
Constituents come into the computation with unvalued (= uninterpretable) or valued (= interpretable) features. For instance, number on a noun is interpretable, while number on T or a participle is uninterpretable. The unvalued features drive the computation by probing in search of valued features. This system is built on the implicit assumption that interpretable morphosyntactic features translate directly into the semantics. Although this assumption holds for many lexical items, it fails for others. For instance, in Spanish a singular DP will normally translate onto a singular semantics, but there are examples in which this is not the case; for instance, the word *gente* “people” has a plural referent although it is morphosyntactically singular. Within the clause, the word *gente* will control singular agreement on T and singular and feminine agreement on determiners, adjectives, and participles. In discourse, however, a pronoun that refers back to *gente* will show up in plural form:

(1.28) La gente está equivocada. Pro piensan que pro llegaran a tiempo.  
The.fem people is wrong.fem. think.pl that arrive.fut.pl at time  
‘The people are wrong. They think they will arrive on time.’

In Portuguese, the word *gente* is morphosyntactically third person feminine singular but its meaning is actually first person plural. Thus, we need to develop a feature structure that incorporates these instances of mismatch between morphosyntactic and semantic features.

López (2007) argues that a lexical item consists of three feature matrices for morphosyntactic, semantic, and phonetic features (as in Chomsky 1965):

(1.29)  
\[
\begin{array}{c|cc}
W \\
S & MS & P \\
\end{array}
\]

The S and P matrices are in communication with the MS matrix. So, if the lexical item “chair” gets the MS feature “plural” in the course of the computation, this feature is copied on the semantic matrix and on the phonetic matrix. The semantic and phonetic matrices are in contact with (or transferred to) the performance systems. The features in P are transferred to the phonetic system that will spell out the feature “plural” as /-s/. The features in S are transferred to a Discourse Representation Structure (DRS).

The Spanish *gente* has an inherent MS feature “singular” and an inherent S feature “plural”—unusual but apparently not impossible. The MS feature
regulates agreement within the phrase and forces a singular feature on P. However, relations within discourses are regulated by the S matrix, since S is transferred to DRS. In (1.28), the two instances of pro in the second clause are anaphorically dependent on the M matrix of la gente in the first clause and pro regulates agreement within its clause, hence the plural form of the verbs piensan and llegarán.

Since maximal projections inherit the features of their heads, maximal projections are also constituted of three feature matrices. The mechanics of structure building, tagging of pragmatic features and transfer work roughly as follows:

(1.30) 1. Build vP
       2. Interpretive rules apply: vP[ϕ]
       3. Transfer S and P of VP
       4. Form FinP
       5. Interpretive rules apply: FinP[ϕ]
       6. Transfer S and P of TP
       7. ...

1.4 Sketch of the analyses and theoretical proposals

Chapter 2 is devoted to information structure. I argue that Catalan/Romance CLLD and CLRD are what I call strongly anaphoric, which I encapsulate by means of the feature [+a]. A strong anaphor has three properties: it is obligatorily linked to an antecedent and there are conditions of locality and structural asymmetry between antecedent and anaphor. Locality is defined as “closest accessible” and structural asymmetry is described using the classification of discourse structures in Asher and Vieu (2005).

Constituents in the left periphery are all contrasts, meaning that they open up domains of quantification (borrowing the concept from Vallduví and Vilkuna 1998). I annotate this with the feature [+c]. Thus, a CLLDed constituent is both [+a] and [+c] while FF is only [+c]. For instance consider the following example:

(1.31) CONTEXT: What did John buy?
       John bought furniture.

In 1.(30) “furniture” is regular focus or rheme. The previous context left a variable open {x | John bought x} which is resolved by the focus in the answer (x = furniture). Consider now these examples:
(1.32) CONTEXT: John bought the furniture

a. LA CATIFA va comprar (no els mobles). FF [Cat]
   ‘THE RUG he bought (not the furniture)’

b. Les cadires sí que les va comprar, pero les taules... CLLD [Cat]
   ‘The chairs he did indeed buy, but the tables...’

The context makes an assertion, leaving no variable open. FF opens up a variable \{x | John bought x\} and simultaneously resolves it (x = the rug). The opening up of the variable is the [+c] feature of FF. CLLD is also [+c] because it also opens up a variable. But since it is also [+a], this variable must be linked to an antecedent: \{x | xR\{furniture\} & John bought x\} (where R stands for relations such as set/subset, set/member, etc.).

I argue in some detail that the notion topic either as “aboutness topic” or as “old information topic” fails to characterize the grammar of dislocates. Consequently, the notion topic—as well as its syntactic derivatives, such as Topic Phrase—is of no use in sentence grammar. The notion Focus presents the same problem: once a constituent has been described as being “focus”, we can make no predictions whatsoever concerning its behavior: it may stay in situ, it may move or it may dislocate. Therefore, focus is not a useful concept either. Instead, the features [+a] and [+c] make very precise predictions. Chapter 2 ends with a critique of the theory that focus is derived directly from stress (Reinhart 1995, 2006, Szendrői 2001, 2006, among others)

Chapter 3 is an introduction to the syntax of dislocations and focus fronting in Catalan/Romance. I argue that CLRD involves movement of a constituent to the middle field, Spec,v. A constituent in Spec,v that is engaged in a feature-sharing dependency with a feature of v is assigned the feature [+a] by the grammatical module that I have called pragmatics. The feature [+a] correctly captures the notion that CLRDed constituents are strongly anaphoric. A second rule, sort of “default” assigns the feature [−a] to the complement of v:

(1.33) a. [+a] is assigned to Spec,v.
   b. Default rule: complement of v is [−a].

---

5 I hasten to add that I am aware that the term “old information” is a simplistic term. I use it here only because of its widespread use.

6 The actual rule that I propose in Ch. 3 is slightly more complex than (1.33).
What is $[-a]$? Any constituent that is not strongly anaphoric. The feature $[-a]$ includes regular focus or “rheme”, but not exclusively. A non-D-linked wh-phrase is also $[-a]$ although wh-phrases can hardly be called foci, despite a long tradition in syntactic literature. Even constituents that would be considered “topics” because they are co-referent (but not anaphoric) with a constituent in the previous discourse would be $[-a]$.

CLLD, FF, and wh-phrases all move to the left periphery. I argue that they are all stacked as specs of Fin. In particular, I present empirical evidence based on ATB movement that these constituents could not have raised to a Spec,Top or Spec,Foc as in Rizzi’s (1997) model.

Spec,Fin is the locus of my second pragmatic rule:

(1.35)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a. } & [+c] \text{ is assigned to Spec,Fin.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Default rule: complement of Fin is non-contrastive.} 
\end{align*} \]

FF receives a $[-a]$ feature in situ (following rule (1.32b)) and then raises to Spec,Fin, where it becomes $[+c]$. CLLD involves movement to Spec,v, where it is assigned $[+a]$, followed by movement to the CP area, Spec,Fin, where it is assigned the feature $[+c]$. 

\[ \text{(1.36)} \]
HTLD is generated outside the clause structure proper and is connected with a clitic, epithet, or strong pronoun in the clause only by means of a loose discourse connection (as that between a name and a pronoun, see Cinque 1983/1997). It is an orphan (Haegeman 1991; Shaer and Frey 2005), a term not integrated into the syntactic structure but added at specific junctures as the discourse structure is assembled. It can be a shift-topic or it can be anaphoric, contrastive or not.

Additionally in Chapter 3 I present arguments against the framework developed in Rizzi (1997), according to which CLLD and FF (and in later work by Cecchetto (1999) and Belletti (2004) also CLRD) move to dedicated positions: Topic Phrase and Focus Phrase. I also show that co-occurrence restrictions (e.g. one can have two CLLDed constituents but not two FFed ones) should be understood as restrictions imposed by the interpretive interfaces and not derived by X’-theory assumptions. Finally, I show that Rizzi’s framework provides no insight into relatively “impoverished” left peripheries like that of Finnish.

Chapter 4 provides empirical substance to the analyses presented in Chapter 3. In particular, I argue that a detailed analysis of sub-extraction phenomena yields the consequence that the pragmatic features [+a] and [+c] are indeed assigned at the end of each phase. In particular, some crucial grammaticality contrasts cannot be accounted for if constituents are drawn into the derivation with those features (or features such as [+topic] or [+focus]) already in tow or if the derivational system interfaces with interpretive systems each time a syntactic operation applies.

Chapter 5 discusses the other constructions listed above: p-movement, accusative A, CLD, scrambling and object shift. I show that there is a close correlation between interpretation and structural position. P-movement, scrambling, and object shift can be shown to have moved to Spec,v and they are all [+a]. CLD and accusative A are not in situ either but they do not move as high as Spec,v (unless they are additionally p-moved or dislocated). I posit movement to Spec,V or some other phase-internal position for accusative A and CLD. CLD and accusative A are not [+a], instead, the former is obligatorily specific while the second is optionally so. Thus, I argue that while the edges of phases are interface points where obligatory interpretation rules apply, movement to phase-internal positions can enlarge the available interpretations of objects because they can be bound or anchored (von Heusinger 2002) to higher constituents. But phase-internal positions do not seem to be positions of interface with interpretive modules. Finally, in situ objects must be interpreted as non-specific, existential, weak, etc., because they cannot be anchored or bound in that position, maybe because of some form of incorporation (van Geenhoven 1996).
Additionally, I show in this chapter that p-movement and scrambling cannot be triggered by prosodic reasons (contra Reinhart 1995; Neeleman and Reinhart 1997; Zubizarreta 1998). In example (1.36) we can see p-movement at work: in (1.36a) the indirect object precedes the direct object, in (1.36b) the order of the two has been switched. In both examples, there is a beneficiary that does not change positions. The above-mentioned authors claim that p-movement/scrambling take place when there is a conflict between the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR), which requires stress to fall on the lowest constituent of the c-command chain and the Focus Prominence Rule (FPR), which requires stress to fall on the focused constituent. But notice that in (1.36) both the NSR and the FPR target para mi madre. Consequently, there is no prosodic motivation for short displacement of dos pimientos. Similar examples can be constructed for German/Dutch scrambling:

(1.37) a. Le di a mi hermana dos pimientos para mi madre. 
[Sp] I gave my sister two peppers for my mother.

b. Le di dos pimientos a mi hermana para mi madre.

I also use Spanish accusative A to argue against movement for semantic reasons (contra Diesing 1992, 1996; Diesing and Jelinek 1995). The reason why accusative A provides the decisive datum is because in this construction short movement of the object always takes place, although the specific reading is only possible, not obligatory (an animate object without accusative A can only be non-specific). I conclude that feature valuation/checking is the only plausible trigger for these instances of movement.

Chapter 6 returns to the syntax of dislocations, seeking to contribute to some recent debates on their derivation. I start by arguing that CLLD and CLRD are the output of movement and not base-generated where they surface. Then I use sub-extraction again to argue against the Attract/Pied-pipe analysis of movement in Chomsky (1995, 2000) as well as against the criterion approach of Rizzi (1996). Finally, I present arguments against alternative analyses of CLRD that merge it in a very high position (Frascarelli 2000; Samek-Lodovici 2006) or a very low position (Cardinaletti 2002).

1.5 Conventions for glosses and translations

Clitics in the Romance language may appear in an invariant form (partitive en, for instance) or may inflect for φ-features and case. In my glosses I have
only included the minimum of information so that the clitic can be identified with the associate, that is, I gloss Spanish *le* as ‘Cl.dat’, which allows the reader to see that it is associated with a dative argument. Some Romance clitics are hard to gloss in any particular way: ethical datives, aspectual clitics, etc. These I have glossed simply as ‘Cl’, since they play no role in the analyses.

Verbal morphology may inflect for tense, aspect, mood, person, and number. Again, I have only included the minimum information in the glosses: if a verb is infinitive, I indicate it as ‘.inf’, otherwise it is finite. If the verb is finite and I do not indicate tense, it should be taken to be present. Likewise, if I do not indicate person or number on verbal morphology, it should be understood to be third singular. Subjunctive mood is glossed only in the few examples in which it is relevant. I have not glossed aspect, since nothing hinges on it.

The English translations are almost always in a neutral word order. Very rarely have I tried to reproduce the information structure of the original in the English translation. This seems to me the prudent approach, since I find it very hard to judge if the information structure of, for example, a Catalan CLLD is really identical to that of an English topicalization. Some earlier authors tried to reproduce the pragmatic effects of CLRD, p-movement, or scrambling by using accentual patterns in English. However, deaccenting in English does not have the same import as CLRD or p-movement, as will become clear in this book. I conclude that translation in neutral word order is the least misleading choice.
2

Information structure

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I develop the first installment of my approach to information structure. Information structure in this work is taken to involve those aspects of sentence grammar relevant for the integration of sentences into discourses: certain sentential configurations can be felicitously integrated into certain discourses while others cannot.

To recapitulate Chapter 1, Section 1.1: Take “syntax” to be a computational module ($C_{HL} =$ computational system of human language, as in Chomsky 1995) that assembles words into structures by means of combinatorial operations. I take “discourse” to be a computational module that assembles sentences (and possibly other units) into Discourse Representation Structures (as in Kamp and Reydel 1993). I further posit a module pragmatics that assigns features relevant for the insertion of a syntactic object into a discourse structure to constituents in certain positions. The information structure of a syntactic object $\Sigma$ is $\Sigma_{[p]}$, the same syntactic object augmented with the features assigned by pragmatics and which consequently is ready to be mapped onto a discourse structure. The goal of this chapter is to define those features. Figure 2.1 presents the general outline of the model I assume.

Some mainstream pragmatic approaches to information structure make reference to “speaker’s intentions”, “speaker’s assumptions regarding what the hearer knows”, “what the speaker wants the hearer to pay attention to”, etc. Take for instance Erteschik-Shir’s (1997: 11) definition of focus: “the Focus of a sentence $S =$ the (intension of a) constituent $c$ of $S$ which the speaker intends to direct the attention of his/her hearer(s) to, by uttering $S$. If we adopt this understanding of information structure, we are led to the view that information structure involves a computation that maps a syntactic structure onto a state of affairs in the speaker’s mind.

Ultimately, language does have to interface with external modules and if Mary speaks it is because she wants to say something to Susan—the question is whether these aspects of language use should be part of grammatical
description. In this respect, it seems to me that appealing to “speakers’ assumptions” to explain why a certain construction is used leads to a circular argument. A speaker S uses a particular construction C because S assumes a certain state of affairs in the hearer’s mind. But we have no independent means to ascertain S’s assumptions, these are revealed only by inspecting C.¹

The approach presented here avoids this circularity. Hypotheses concerning the information structure of a certain construction can be falsified empirically by looking at the discourses in which dislocations are used and tapping speakers’ intuitions concerning appropriateness. Speaker’s intentions may or may not be somewhere out there, just not in the analysis.²

Let me now introduce the database. In Catalan, a sentence without dislocations or FF exhibits a rigid S–V–O–PP order—that is, there is no prosodic

¹ As Manfred Krifka (p.c.) points out, speakers’ intentions could actually be testable. In effect, one can imagine an experiment in which a subject is presented with a list of sentences and a list of “intentions” and asked to pair them up. If this experiment is carried out and systematic results obtained, then the circularity mentioned in the main text would be avoided. As I write these lines, I am not aware of such an experiment.

² As a matter of fact, I am skeptical that the word “intention” can be used meaningfully when talking about these phenomena. If I say “I’ll meet you in the office at 3:00”, the hearer does infer an intention on my part. If I don’t show up at the place and time indicated, the hearer might well conclude that I lied. But if I use a sentence with a certain information structure in the wrong discourse, the hearer will simply perceive the discourse as awkward. She will not conclude that I misled her into paying attention to the wrong referent. It may be the case that I am taking the word “intention” too literally, but linguists who define information structure in terms of speaker’s intentions do not articulate what they mean with this word.
movement as described by Zubizarreta (1998) for Spanish. With this neutral word order, the entire sentence is a regular focus (non-presupposed, new information), also called information focus or rheme. This is exemplified in (2.1).

(2.1) REGULAR FOCUS/RHEME

Trobo molt maca aquesta samarret.a.
find.1st very pretty this T-shirt
'I find this T-shirt very pretty.'

This placid state of affairs can be broken by three different types of constructions that alter the syntactic structure of the clause:

(2.2) FOCUS FRONTING (FF)

AQUESTA SAMARRETA trobo molt maca
this T-shirt find.1st very pretty

(2.3) CLITIC LEFT DISLOCATION (CLLD)

Aquesta samarreta la trobo molt maca.
this T-shirt Cl.acc find.1st very pretty

(2.4) CLITIC RIGHT DISLOCATION (CLRD)

La trobo molt maca, aquesta samarreta.
Cl.acc find.1st very pretty this T-shirt

These constructions have been analyzed using the notions of topic, focus, and contrastive focus. In particular, CLLD and CLRD are claimed to be topics, in situ constituents are foci (or rhemes) and FFed constituents are contrastive foci (see Vallduví 1992; Villalba 2000 for Catalan, although the former uses different labels; see also the rich literature on Italian spawning from Cinque 1983/1997 and Rizzi 1997).

Section 2.2 discusses the notions of topic and focus. I show that topic, under any definition that can be adopted, fails to identify a coherent class of constructions in Catalan and, at least, Italian and Spanish. Second, I submit focus to the same sort of scrutiny and find the same problem: once we identify a constituent as “focus” we are unable to make any further predictions concerning its syntactic behavior. Given the lack of empirical mileage provided by the notions of focus and topic, I suggest a different way of approaching the role that dislocations and fronting play.

3 Vallduví argues that the basic word order in Catalan is V–O–PP–S, the subject being a right-hand specifier. The issue is not important for our purposes in this chapter. Chapter 5 presents an analysis of both word orders.

4 Unless otherwise indicated, all the examples in this chapter are Catalan.
Additionally, contrastive focus is also revisited. An influential tradition—best represented by Kiss (1998)—holds that what defines contrastive focus against regular focus is that focus is “[+contrastive] . . . only if the domain of identification is a closed set of individuals known to the participants in the discourse” (Kiss 1998: 268). Taking FF to exemplify contrastive focus, I show that this approach is empirically wrong, as a matter of fact, anything that can be a regular focus can also be contrastive focus with no restriction on the domain of quantification. I argue that the difference between regular focus and contrastive focus lies on how they integrate into previous discourse. A regular focus simply resolves a variable left open in the previous discourse (i.e. it is an answer to an explicit or implicit wh-question). A contrastive focus is uttered when the previous discourse offers no such variable: contrastive focus does not answer a wh-question. Thus, contrastive focus opens up a variable and simultaneously resolves it. More generally, I will adopt the proposal in Vallduvi and Vilkuna (1998) of assigning the label contrast to any constituent that opens up a domain of quantification.

Section 2.3 is devoted to dislocations. Dislocations are defined as strong anaphors. I define an anaphor as strong if it bears the following three properties: (i) it obligatorily takes an antecedent that (ii) is local in the way specified below and (iii) there is a discourse-structural asymmetry between antecedent and dependent. Then I discuss the difference between CLRD and CLLD and show—following mostly Villalba’s (2000) ideas—that CLLD is contrastive in the sense proposed above.

Section 2.4 is about the locus of regular focus and contrastive focus. My main argument is that a regular focus is always in situ while contrastive focus is always FF. This goes against a long-standing assumption in Romance linguistics that in situ foci can be contrastive; it also goes against some recent analyses that claim to identify high regular foci.

Section 2.5 develops some consequences of the analysis. First, I discuss strong and weak pronouns, and I show that they are not strong anaphors. Strong pronouns, which are focused but also anaphoric, have generally been considered to be a difficult piece of data for any theory of information structure—I show that they present no problem within my assumptions.

Then I discuss the supposed topicality of answers to questions that provide a list of alternatives and other D-linked wh-questions (Erteschik-Shir 1997, 2006). Finally I present a first objection against having topic and focus as syntactic categories.
For most of the chapter I leave out a fourth type of construction, HTLD:

\[(2.5) \text{Aquesta noia, a ella si que no la vull veure mai més.}\]

This girl ACC her indeed that NEG Cl.acc want.1st see.inf never more

‘This girl, I do not want to see her again.’

In this example, \textit{aquesta noia} is HTLD while \textit{a ella} is CLLD. I discuss HTLD at the end of Section 2.5. It presents a curious phenomenology: while the other constructions seem to have fairly well circumscribed discourse functions, HTLD is very free. I sketch an account for this phenomenon. In essence, FF, CLLD, and CLRD are sentence grammar rules submitted to specific sentence grammar rules of interpretation. The freedom of HTLD comes precisely from being outside sentence grammar, thus heavily relying on context for interpretation.

The final section briefly discusses the connection between stress and focus in English, suggesting that focus is not predictable from stress.

Most of the discussion in this chapter revolves around Catalan. However, as far as I know, the results hold also of Peninsular Spanish and Italian. Portuguese dislocations seem also to work along the same lines as in Catalan but Portuguese has clitic-less dislocations for definite DPs and no focus fronting. The description in Gutierrez-Bravo (2002) suggests that Mexican Spanish also disallows focus fronting. An account of why focus fronting is absent in some languages is provided in Section 2.4.2. Portuguese clitic-less dislocations are postponed for future research.

\subsection{2.2 Deconstructing Topic, Focus, and Contrastive Focus}

\subsubsection{2.2.1 Topic}

The dominant paradigm for the study of the mapping between sentence structure and information structure pivots around the central concepts of topic and focus (see Lambrecht 1994, Erteschik-Shir 1997, 2006 among many others). This paradigm has influenced the Romance field—particularly since Rizzi 1997, which has thus taken FFed constituents to be focused constituents moved to a Spec, Foc, while dislocated constituents are taken to be topics moved to a Spec, Top. I think it is fair to say that this approach is hegemonic nowadays. However, this tradition has not explored these notions in detail. Obviously, if the notions of topic and focus turned out not to be useful concepts for grammatical analysis, one should also be led to the conclusion that TopP and FocP should be removed from the theory of grammar. As a matter of fact, leading the reader to this conclusion is one of the goals of this chapter.
“Topic” is usually defined as “what the sentence is about”, following Reinhart (1981). Very often, topic is also taken to be synonymous or near synonymous with “old information” (even though Reinhart herself argued that topics do not have to be old information).\footnote{Reinhart (1981: 73–8).} \footnote{Moreover, as has often been pointed out, the term “old information” is misleading, because a DP is not “information”, a term that is more appropriate to use for propositions—hence my scary quotes.}

Neither definition of topic characterizes Romance dislocations.

2.2.1.1 Aboutness topic  Reinhart (1981) provides a battery of tests for topic-hood: (i) a topic can be introduced by the expression “as for”; (ii) a topic can be introduced by the expression “she said about”; (iii) a topic must be referential; (iv) presentational and existential sentences have no topics; (v) topics carry existential presuppositions.

Let us start with tests (i) and (ii). Since APs, CPs, and PPs can be dislocated (see Chapter 1), we have at least a subset of dislocates that will always sound awkward with this test:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(2.6)] a. Intel.ligent, el Joan ho és.  
\hspace{1cm} intelligent the Joan Cl is  
\hspace{1cm} ‘Joan is intelligent.’
\item b. *En quant a intel.ligent, el Joan ho és.  
\hspace{1cm} *‘As for intelligent, Joan is.’
\item c. *Va dir sobre intel.ligent que el Joan ho és.  
\hspace{1cm} *‘She said about intelligent that Joan is.’
\end{enumerate}

Additionally, tests (i) and (ii) also fail in the opposite direction: we find that non-dislocated DPs pass the test:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(2.7)] a. El diari va dir que el Joan es volia divorciar de la Jennifer.  
\hspace{1cm} ‘The newspaper said that Joan wanted to divorce Jennifer.’
\item b. En quant a la Jennifer, el diari va dir que el Joan es volia divorciar d’ella.  
\hspace{1cm} ‘As for Jennifer, the newspaper said that Joan wanted to divorce her.’
\item c. El diari va dir de la Jennifer que el Joan es volia divorciar d’ella.  
\hspace{1cm} ‘The newspaper said about Jennifer that Joan wanted to divorce her.’
\end{enumerate}

The DP \textit{la Jennifer} in the first sentence can be regarded as an aboutness topic according to the “said about” test, as shown in (2.7b, 2.7c). However, \textit{la Jennifer} is not dislocated. Thus, the “said about” test embraces constituents that are not dislocated and does not reach several types of examples of dislocates.
Since APs and PPs can be dislocated, test (iii) is not going to work either: APs are not referential under a standard notion of this term. As for DPs, if “referential” is taken to mean “definite” or “specific”, Catalan dislocations are not topics either. Non-specific DPs can be dislocated (contra the received opinion summarized in Alexiadou 2006).7

(2.8) -¿Vas comprar mobles ahir?  
‘Did you buy furniture?’  
-De cadires, no en vaig comprar, pero de taules sí.  
of chairs NEG Cl PAST.1st buy.inf but of tables indeed  
‘Chairs I did not buy, but tables I did.’

In Italian one can construct examples of dislocated non-specific indefinites just as easily as in Catalan.

(2.9) Di sedie, no n’ ho comprato…  
of chairs NEG Cl.part bought.ptc  
Cadires, taules, and sedie are all dislocated (and anaphorically dependent on mobles). But all three are non-specific indefinites.

The following example allows us to further test this conclusion:

(2.10) CONTEXT: Do you want any furniture?  
-De cadires, ja en voldria. I una taula  
of chairs indeed Cl.part want and a table  
que anés bé amb les cadires, tambè.  
that goes.subj well with the chairs too  
‘I want chairs. And a table that goes well with the chairs too.’

Cadires is dislocated. Notice that it takes scope inside the volitional verb, that is, the sentence means that the speaker wants some unspecified chairs, not that there are some chairs that she/he wants. This indicates once again that a dislocated DP does not need to be specific. Una taula…is also dislocated; it includes a relative clause with a verb in the subjunctive. It is well-known that subjunctive mood in a relative clause is a clear indicator that the DP that the relative clause modifies is not specific (see Chapter 1).

The following sort of example is sometimes taken to be evidence that dislocates need to be specific (Rizzi 1997, Samek-Lodovici 2006):

7 Alexiadou (2006) uses Greek examples. A Greek consultant confirms that in this language dislocates are indeed specific. Romance dislocates, however, exhibit a clearly different feature structure. More on this below.
(2.11) **Context:** I think no one came to the lecture.
  
  a. *Ningú, no el/en vaig veure.*
  
     no one \ NEG \ CL.acc/Cl.part \ PAST.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg \ see.inf
  
  b. *No el/en vaig veure, ningú.*

The dislocation of negative words is indeed ungrammatical. However, this ungrammaticality has nothing to do with specificity. Rather, the correct generalization is that downward entailing quantifiers, specific or not, have a hard time getting dislocated. Consider the two examples in (2.12). In (2.12a) *pocs dels homes* “few of the men” is specific, as made overt by the indicative mood in the relative clause. The example is ungrammatical because *pocs dels homes*, a downward entailing quantifier, cannot be dislocated. In (2.12b), the subjunctive mood forces a non-specific interpretation on *uns pocs homes* ’a few men’, an upward entailing quantifier. The sentence is grammatical:

(2.12)  

a. **Context:** I saw few of the men that you mentioned.

    *Doncs jo, pocs dels homes que*

    well \ I \ few \ of.the \ men \ that

    vaig esmentar, no crec que n’

    PAST.1\textsuperscript{st} \ mention.inf \ NEG \ think.1\textsuperscript{st} \ that

    hagis vist.

    have.2\textsuperscript{nd} \ seen

    ‘Intended meaning: I don’t think you saw few of the men that I mentioned.’

b. **Context:** I saw a few brave men yesterday.

    Doncs jo, uns pocs homes que

    well \ I \ some \ few \ men \ that

    tinguin coratge, encara no n’ he

    have.pl.subj \ courage \ still \ NEG \ Cl.Part \ have.1\textsuperscript{st}

    trobat.

    found

    ‘I have not yet found a few courageous men.’

As for test (iv), one can easily construct examples in Catalan and Italian in which the complement of the existential verb is dislocated. (2.13) is Catalan, (2.14) is Italian:

(2.13) **Context:** There are no chairs here.

a. Sí que n’hi han, de cadires.

    indeed \ that \ Cl.Cl \ have.3\textsuperscript{rd}.pl \ of \ chairs

b. De cadires sí que n’hi han.

    ‘There are tables.’
(2.14) CONTEXT: There are no chairs here.
   a. Sí che ce ne sono, di sedie.  
      yes that Cl Cl are of chairs  [It]
   b. Di sedie, sí che ce ne sono.  
      ‘Yes, there are chairs.’

The following example makes a similar point. The arguments of a presentational sentence can be dislocated:

(2.15) CONTEXT: No sailors arrived at the station.
   Sí que n’hi van arribar, de mariners.  
   indeed that Cl.part’Cl.loc PAST.pl arrive.inf of sailors
   ‘There arrived sailors.’

Finally, a “unicorn” example will show that dislocates do not carry existential presuppositions:

(2.16) Jo no en vaig trobar cap, d’unicorn.
   I NEG Cl PAST.1st find.inf no of’unicorn
   ‘I didn’t find any unicorns.’

I have shown that in Catalan and Italian one can dislocate non-specific indefinites with the help of a “partitive” clitic. What about languages without an overt partitive clitic? Take the following Spanish example:

(2.17) CONTEXT: There is no furniture left, is there?
   Sillas sí hay.  
   chairs indeed have
   ‘There are chairs.’

In (2.17) sillas is fronted. Notice that the example includes the emphatic particle sí. Could sillas be classified as CLLD or FF? It is not FFed: as Arregi (2003) shows, FFed constituents are incompatible with the emphatic particle sí:

(2.18) CONTEXT: You bought chairs, didn’t you?
   MESAS compré.  
   ‘TABLES I bought.’

CLLD is perfectly comfortable with sí:

(2.19) CONTEXT: You bought the furniture, didn’t you?
   Las mesas sí las compré.  
   the tables indeed Cl.acc bought.1st
   ‘I did buy the tables.’
Thus, (2.17) looks more like an instance of CLLD than FF.
Additionally, as I discuss in more detail in Chapter 3, CLLDed constituents can be multiple and appear in any order. Casielles (2004) shows that the clitic-less constituent can be mingled with CLLDed constituents:

(2.20) a. A mí dinero Juan nunca me deja. [Sp]
    DAT me money Juan never Cl.dat lends
    ‘Juan never lends me money.’

b. Dinero, a mí, Juan nunca me deja.

Thus, at this point we have two possibilities. The first possibility is to conclude that sillas in (2.17) and dinero in (2.20) instantiate a third type of left periphery construction. Alternatively, since these constituents behave like CLLDed constituents, we can simply assume that it is in fact another instance of CLLD with a phonetically null clitic. Following Casielles, among others, I adopt the second solution. If so, we can conclude that Catalan, Spanish, and Italian all allow for CLLD of non-specific indefinite DPs.

Finally, the datum of multiple dislocation presents one additional problem for the “aboutness” view:

(2.21) Els llibres, a la Maria, no els hi vull deixar.
    the books DAT the Maria NEG Cl.acc want.1st lend
    CL.dat

If we want to maintain that dislocates are aboutness topics, then we need to find a coherent way of showing that the sentence is about the books and about Maria. Alternatively, one can assume that the order of the dislocates matters, so the second dislocate is part of the comment of the first—this is in essence Rizzi’s (1997) proposal. I discuss Rizzi’s proposal in Section 2.5.4, where I present his syntactic theory of focus and topic.

In Greek one can also find a non-specific indefinite in the left periphery, in what appears to be the parallel of the Spanish clitic-less CLLD:

(i) CONTEXT: Did you buy furniture?
    Karekles den agorasa, mono trapezia.
    chairs NEG bought.1st only tables

However, my language consultant does not accept mingling it with regular CLLDed constituents:

(ii) *Lefta se mena o Janis pote den ta dini.
    money to me the Janis never NEG Cl.dat gives

I leave the status of (i) for future research.
I conclude that Romance dislocates cannot be considered aboutness topics, since they do not pass any of the relevant tests.

2.2.1.2 *Old information topics*  Erteschik-Shir’s and Vallduví’s approaches in which sentence topics (or links in Vallduví’s terminology) refer to “salient cards” in a file cabinet (following Reinhart’s 1981 library metaphor) provide an architecture that articulates the equation of topic with old information and focus with new. For detailed analysis, I pick Erteschik-Shir (2006) simply because it is the most recent.

In a nutshell, this is Erteschik-Shir’s approach. A clause is divided into a Topic, a Focus, and an Update. Using the file-card metaphor, she takes Topic to be that constituent that directs you to a certain salient card in the file while Focus opens a new card or makes an old one salient. Update is an instruction to enter the focus into the topic card. This is shown in the following example:

\[(2.22) \text{John}_{\text{top}} \text{ likes cake}_{\text{foc}}.\]

Erteschik-Shir (2006) takes ‘John’ to receive the [topic] feature as it enters the numeration, while ‘cake’ is similarly valued as [focus]. The introduction of this proposition into the pragmatic component of the grammar triggers the following operations:

1. Pick the card for ‘john’ from the top of the file.
2. Enter the information ‘he likes cake’ on the card for ‘john’ (this is the update).
3. Open a new card, label it ‘cake’. Put it on top.
4. Enter ‘john likes it’ on this card (another update).

It is important to note here that this approach to the notion “topic” does not render the notion equivalent to “anaphor”. I define an anaphor as a constituent that necessarily looks for an antecedent in the previous discourse or the immediate context (See p. 25). A constituent that accidentally happens to be co-referential with something else is not anaphoric. The point here is that there is nothing in the file-card system that derives this distinction between anaphoricity and accidental coreference. Take the following abstract example:

\[(2.23) \quad [\text{XP}_{\text{disl}} \ldots \text{YP} \ldots ]]\]

XP is dislocated while YP remains in situ. Let’s take XP and YP to be coreferential with another constituent in the previous discourse. A topic approach to information structure analyses them both as topics without making a distinction between them (Erteschik-Shir 1997, Lambrecht 1994 are examples). Let us assume, as I suggested in the introduction, that
dislocates are anaphoric. If such is the case, only the dislocated XP is obligatorily dependent on an antecedent. YP is only accidentally coreferential with another constituent. The difference can be tested very simply by using substitution: XP can only be replaced for something that is also linked to the antecedent while YP can be replaced by anything. We are going to see that this simple test is very useful to extricate ourselves from some apparent problems. For now, let’s consider the following example, inspired by one by Jacobs (1984) (also discussed by Breul 2005):

(2.24) Ahir vaig conèixer el Joan i la Maria. La Maria crec que és la nòvia del Joan.
‘Yesterday I met Joan and Maria. Maria I think is Joan’s girlfriend.’

As Jacobs argues (for the equivalent German example), both la Maria and el Joan in the second sentence can qualify as topics. To use Erteschik-Shir’s terminology, they both refer to a salient card. However, one is dislocated while the other one is not. So, what is the difference between the dislocated constituent and the non-dislocated one? The notion of topic does not give us an analysis of the properties of dislocation. Identifying a constituent as topic leads to no predictions concerning the behavior of this constituent.

As mentioned, my claim is different: dislocates are anaphors, other constituents can be co-referent with something else only accidentally. Consequently, la Maria is anaphoric while el Joan is not. This leads to the prediction that el Joan can be replaced by any DP, present or absent in the discourse, while replacing Maria for a DP that cannot be construed as anaphoric gives infelicitous results. The following pair of sentences confirms this prediction:

(2.25) Ahir vaig conèixer el Joan i la Maria. La Maria crec que és la nòvia del Pere.
(2.26) Ahir vaig conèixer el Joan i la Maria. #La Susana crec que és la nòvia del Joan.

This leads to the conclusion that the concept that is relevant for the analysis of sentence grammar is anaphoricity and not topicality.

Moreover, Erteschik-Shir (1997) argues that topics must be referential if definite and specific if indefinite. However, a CLLD or CLRD constituent can be an existential indefinite, an adjective or a PP, as I showed above:

(2.27) -¿Has comprat mobles?
‘Did you buy furniture?’
-De cadires, encara no n’he comprat, pero de taules sí.
‘Chairs I have not bought, but tables I have.’
To conclude, the “topic as old information” approach does not provide us with a useful conceptual framework to study dislocations: “topic things” can stay in situ while “non-topic things” can be dislocated. Clearly, we need a different way of conceptualizing dislocations. As already hinted above, what makes a constituent dislocated is being anaphoric, a notion that is quite independent of “topicality,” “specificity,” “referentiality,” or some such. Let us say that a discourse anaphoric constituent bears the feature [+a]. I develop what [+a] means in Section 2.3. But first I need to similarly scrutinize the notion of focus and introduce the notion contrast.

2.2.2 Focus

There are many definitions of “focus” in the literature, so I will take the blandest, least controversial one. I take the focus to provide a resolution for a variable left open in previous discourse (Jackendoff 1972). Take the following simple exchange:

(2.31) -What did John bring?  [x | John brought x]
       -John brought the wine.  [x = the wine, ‘the wine’ is focus]

In sentence (2.31), the discourse set up by the wh-question leaves a piece of information unresolved, represented by the variable x. “Focus” is that part of the answer sentence that provides a resolution for the variable.

In Catalan, focus constituents can be displaced. This is what we call focus fronting (I continue to use the shorthand FF):

(2.32) CONTEXT: You gave him the spoons.
       -ELS GANIVETS li vaig donar.
        the knives Cl.dat PAST.1sg give.inf
       ‘THE KNIVES, I gave him.’

The capitalized constituent performs two functions at the same time. It is unquestionably a focus—but notice that the previous discourse leaves no
variable open for resolution. Thus, the first function that FF performs is to create this variable, transforming the assertion ‘you gave him/her the spoons’ into the predicate ‘λx you gave him/her x’, thus opening up the set (\{x | x = things I may give him/her\}). Second, FF also provides a value for x (x = the knives). It is the combination of these two functions, I argue, that constitutes a “contrastive focus”. Let us take it then that what distinguishes plain focus from contrastive focus is a feature that I annotate as [+c]. Opening up a quantificational domain is the [+c] value of FF.\(^9\) Notice that this analysis is in keeping with the framework sketched at the outset of the chapter: the difference between FF and regular focus is not related to “speaker’s intentions” but only to the type of discourses they can be integrated into: if the discourse includes a variable then regular focus is felicitous, if not, then FF becomes available (there are other possibilities that I detail in Section 2.4.2). The speaker may have the intention of correcting his interlocutor, as has often been claimed, I think correctly, but that is not part of an analysis of I-language.

Anything that can be a regular focus can also be FFed. In example (2.32), anything that can be given or delivered can be fronted felicitously: if we had “the milk,” “the tractor,” or “the check,” the discourse would be equally felicitous. This contrasts with CLLD:

(2.33) Context: You gave him the spoons.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{-LA LLET/ EL TRACTOR/ EL XEC li vaig donar. FF} \\
& \quad \text{the milk the tractor the check Cl.dat PAST.1st give.inf} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{-#La llet/el tractor/el xec l’hi vaig donar... CLLD} \\
& \quad \text{the milk/the tractor/the check Cl.acc’Cl.dat PAST.1st give.inf}
\end{align*}\]

CLLD has a requirement that the dislocated constituent must be linked to something previously mentioned (the nature of this link I discuss in section 2.3). FF has no such restriction: anything that can be “given” can be fronted in this example.

Kadmon (2001: 252), following a long tradition, claims that focus triggers the presupposition that the set of possible values for the variable x is coherent, or

\(^9\) To put it in Vallduví and Vilkuna’s (1998) words, “contrast” (or “kontrast”, in their spelling) operates as follows:

If an expression a is kontrastive, a membership set \(M = \{\ldots a, \ldots\}\) is generated and becomes available to semantic computation as some sort of quantificational domain.

(Vallduví and Vilkuna 1998: 83)
under discussion, etc. I agree that if someone asks me if I brought the milk and I answer that I brought the tractor instead my interlocutor might be confused. However, this is a matter of cooperative conversation, as Grice would put it, and there is nothing wrong with the discourse itself. Hence the clear difference between the well-formed (if confusing) discourse (2.33a) and the ill-formed (2.33b).

These observations point out that the standard definition of contrastive focus is on the wrong track. Take Kiss (1998: 268): “[+contrastive] . . . only if the domain of identification is a closed set of individuals known to the participants in the discourse.” Similar definitions appear in Rochemont (1986) and Erteschik-Shir (2006), discussing English FF. But defining FF in this way is empirically false: in (2.32) els ganivets (or the English “the knives,” as in the translation) is not necessarily known to the participants, as I said, anything can replace it. What defines contrastive focus is the opening of a quantification domain and resolving it.10

Incidentally, notice that wh-phrases also involve contrast in the sense discussed here (as pointed out by Vallduví and Vilkuna 1998). A long tradition in the semantic literature (Hamblin 1973) has posited that the meaning of a wh-question is the set of propositions that would provide an answer for the question. Since the set of propositions is opened up by the wh-phrase, it should follow that wh-phrases are [+c].

At this point it is worthwhile to submit the notion of focus to scrutiny, as I have done with topic. The question is whether this is a notion that is operational in sentence grammar. If it is, then a constituent identifiable as [+Focus] will have predictable behavior.

It turns out that [+Focus] does not make any predictions. As we have seen, a constituent marked as [+Focus] may stay in situ or it may move—but whatever makes it move is not the focus feature, since focus can contentedly stay in situ. I suggest that movement to left periphery position, either by FF or wh-phrases, is connected with [+c].

Consider now the following Catalan example:

(2.34) **Context:** Did you buy furniture?

Doncs, de cadires no en vaig comprar . . .
well of chairs NEG Cl.part PAST.1st buy.inf

10 Cinque (1990: 15) and Barbosa (2000: 49) discuss the fronting of bare quantifiers, pervasive in Romance:

(i) Qualcuno troveremo
someone find.1st.pl
‘We’ll find someone.’

This moved quantifier is arguably also [+c]. A sentence like (i) is most naturally uttered in the context in which someone asserts that we will find no one. Thus, a set of two constituents is created {no one, someone} and one of the two is chosen.
In this example, *de cadires* is left dislocated. Notice also that, under the definition of focus provided above, this could qualify as focus. The context asks if there is an x, such that x belongs to a set of furniture and you bought x. *de cadires* makes a (partial) contribution to resolving x (see Krifka 1991 on the notion that contrastive topics contain a focus, an idea that has had many followers).

Thus, a constituent marked as [+Focus] may stay in situ, may be FFed or may be CLLDed. This is telling us that syntax shows no sensitivity whatsoever to the [+Focus] feature. I propose that we abandon the feature focus from sentence grammar analysis.

### 2.2.3 [+a] and [+c]

Once both [+Topic] and [+Focus] have been abandoned as operational features of syntactic analysis, a new task emerges: what are the features that can allow us to understand when a constituent in Catalan/Romance will dislocate, front or stay in situ? Let’s take a first stab at it.

Above I have taken dislocations to be anaphoric, meaning that they are obligatorily linked to an antecedent. Let us then say that dislocations bear the feature [+a]. Let us further take it that plain focus and contrastive focus are [−a], not anaphoric. This feature choice provides several advantages.

A first advantage is that there are constituents that are neither anaphoric nor focused, that is, non-D-linked wh-phrases. Although after Culicover and Rochemont (1983) and Horvath (1986), syntacticians have often referred to wh-phrases as “focus,” it is obvious that wh-phrases do not resolve a free variable (pretty much the contrary). I suggest that what non-D-linked wh-phrases and regular focused phrases have in common is simply that they are not anaphoric, that is, they are [−a].

But there are also substantial similarities between fronted focused constituents and wh-phrases, D-linked or not. The clearest similarity is that they both move to the left periphery. The second one is that both open up quantificational sets. Thus, both FF and wh-phrases are [+c] (Vallduví and Vilkuna 1998) and the feature [+c] is connected with the left periphery.

A second advantage is conceptual. It has often been pointed out (see McNally 1998, in particular) that “regular focus” or “rheme” is the least marked situation from the point of view of syntax (nothing happens to regular focus), semantics, and pragmatics. It seems intuitively adequate that the feature system that we employ reflect this unmarkedness: regular focus is simply [−a,−c].
A third advantage of using these binary features is that they seem to give us predictions: if something is [+a], it is dislocated, otherwise it is [−a]. This prediction is correct. So far, FF and wh-movement seem to lead to the conclusion that if something is [+c] it is in the left periphery of the clause. As we proceed with the chapter, we will see that this prediction is also correct.11

2.3 Dislocations

2.3.1 Introduction

In Section 2.2.1 I argued that the notion topic is not a useful notion to describe the syntax of dislocates. Instead, the notion of anaphor, involving an obligatory link to an antecedent (as opposed to accidental co-reference) is what unifies all and only the instances of dislocation. I chose to encapsulate this linguistic property with the feature [+a]. Further, I showed that dislocation and the feature [+a] are not related to definiteness or specificity at all. I showed that a dislocated [+a] constituent can be a non-specific indefinite. Likewise, a referential definite DP can be [−a]:

(2.35)  -Who did you see?  
- I saw the teacher.

As far as I can tell, using a definite or specific DP has nothing to do with the structure of the previous discourse but on the broader notion of common ground. On the other hand, syntactic operations like dislocation or fronting are about the immediate context and how new linguistic material is integrated into the previous discourse.

Let us now investigate what [+a] means. The concept of anaphor involves clause 1 in (2.36). Further, I would like to propose that discourse anaphors can be strongly anaphoric. Anaphora in a strong sense includes clauses 2 and 3:

(2.36)  1. There is obligatory dependency with respect to an antecedent.  
  2. The antecedent is local with respect to the anaphor.  
  3. There is structural asymmetry between antecedent and anaphor.

The first goal of this section is to argue that CLLD and CLRD are strongly anaphoric. Clause 1 is self-explanatory: CLLD and CLRD must link to an

11 This seems like a good opportunity to point out that I did not invent the idea of using binary features to study information structure. Choi (1997) and Villalba (2000) used them before. Their systems, however, are markedly different from mine.
antecedent. This is a well-known feature of dislocations (Vallduvi 1992, Villalba 2000, among others).\textsuperscript{12} Clauses 2 and 3 have not been discussed in the literature on dislocations, as far as I know. Clause 2 says that a dislocate will associate with the closest available antecedent.

Structural asymmetry between antecedent and anaphor has been abundantly explored in the realm of sentence level anaphors and it has successfully been captured with the concept of c-command (Reinhart 1983). The relationship between dislocated constituents and their antecedents is also asymmetrical, but this asymmetry is reflected in the kinds of discourses in which they can appear felicitously. Let us assume a classification of discourses in two classes, coordinate and subordinate, as in the Segmented Discourse Representation Theory developed by Nicholas Asher and his associates. It turns out that the dislocate appears in a sentence discourse-subordinated to the sentence that contains the antecedent.

If both CLLD and CLRD are discourse anaphors, what is the difference between them? This leads us to the second goal of this section. A careful consideration of the analyses presented in Villalba (2000) leads me to the conclusion that CLLD is [+c] while CLRD is [−c]. As a consequence of this analysis, the feature [+c] is further linked to the left periphery.

This section is organized as follows. Section 2.3.2 articulates the notion of locality. Section 2.3.3 compares CLRD and CLLD and shows that while the former is linked to its antecedent by a relation of identity, CLLD has a more complicated connection, which I analyse using the feature [+c]. This sets up the field for a discussion of the discourse structures in which dislocates appear in Section 2.3.4. Section 2.3.5 presents some brief remarks on Vallduvi’s (1992) famous analysis of dislocations. Section 2.3.6 presents a summary and some conclusions.

2.3.2 Locality

As extensively argued by Villalba (2000), dislocates in Catalan are anaphorically dependent on an antecedent, which has to be explicitly mentioned in the discourse or very prominent in the physical context. In particular, they cannot be used to answer wh-questions:

(2.37) Context: What do you think of these clothes?

- La trobo molt maca, aquesta roba.

Cl find.1st very cute these clothes

\textsuperscript{12} English topicalization has also been described as an anaphoric construction, i.e., \textit{e-construable} in Rochemont (1986), \textit{backward-looking center} in Ward (1988), among others.
'I find them very cute, these clothes.'
-La samarreta, la trobo molt maca.

the T-shirt Cl find.1st very nice

(2.38) CONTEXT: What did you buy?
-#El vaig comprar, el ganivet

Cl PAST.1st buy.inf the knife

'I bought the knife.'
-#El ganivet, el vaig comprar

This antecedent must bear the most accessible index available in the previous discourse. The notion of “accessibility” I borrow directly from Ariel (1990), who elaborates a classification of discourse anaphors according to whether their antecedent must be of high, intermediate, or low accessibility. CLLD and CLRD are anaphors that require high accessibility. As a matter of fact, their antecedent must be the highest accessible one. The following Catalan example shows what I mean by this:

(2.39) -Llavors, ahir vas anar a missa, oi? Que ` hi vas veure el Joan?

'So then, yesterday you went to the Mass, right? Did you see John?

A1: -#Si, l’hi vaig veure, a missa.

Yes Cl.ACC’ Cl.LOC PAST.1st see.inf at Mass

A2: -Si, l’hi vaig veure, el Joan.

Yes Cl.ACC’ Cl.LOC PAST.1st see.inf the Joan

The reason why A1 is infelicitous while A2 is fine is because the most accessible antecedent in the preceding discourse, as selected by the question, is not missa but Joan. However, if we dislocate both el Joan and a missa, then the discourse becomes perfect (with a slight preference for dislocating el Joan to the left of a missa):

(2.40) -Llavors, ahir vas anar a missa, oi? Què hi vas veure el Joan?

'So then, yesterday you went to the Mass, right? Did you see John?

A: -Si, l’hi vaig veure, el Joan, a missa.

Yes Cl.ACC’Cl.LOC PAST.1st see.inf the Joan at Mass

The intriguing conclusion seems to be that the dislocated constituent refers to the most accessible antecedent available. In examples (2.39) and (2.40) that would be el Joan, the last antecedent that has been introduced into the discourse and the focus of the very last sentence before dislocation. But if the most accessible antecedent is taken, then a dislocated constituent can look for the next one, forming nested paths:
Thus, locality in this context is similar but not identical to what we find in purely syntactic relations. For instance, an anaphor must refer to an antecedent within a domain, but not necessarily the closest antecedent: in ‘Mary showed Susan to herself’, *herself* can refer to Mary or to Susan. A deeper exploration of this matter would lead us too far afield. Here, I limit myself to pointing out the locality between dislocate and antecedent.

2.3.3 **Contrast**

CLRD and CLLD cannot be used in exactly the same contexts. As pointed out by Villalba (2000), CLRD is only felicitous when there is a relation of identity between it and the antecedent. If antecedent and anaphor are, for example, APs, this identity can be understood as conceptual identity, as shown in (2.42a). If antecedent and anaphor are DPs, they must be co-referential, as shown in the contrast between (2.42b) and (2.42c):

(2.42) a. -La Maria és molt llesta, oi?
   the Maria is very clever, isn’t she
   -Sí que ho és, d’intel.ligent
   yes that Cl is of intelligent
   ‘Indeed, she is intelligent.’

b. **Context:** So, what do we do with the furniture?
   Els pots posar allà, els mobles.
   Cl.acc can.2^nd.sg put.inf there the furniture
   ‘You can put the furniture over there.’

c. **Context:** So, what do we do with the furniture?
   #Les pots posar allà, les cadires.
   Cl.acc can.2^nd.sg put.inf there the chairs
   ‘You can put the chairs over there.’

When generics are introduced into the picture, matters become more complicated in an interesting way. It is possible for the CLRDed constituent to be a generic referring back to a generic as shown in (43a). Intriguingly, a generic
CLRD can take a non-generic DP as antecedent, in apparent violation of the identity restriction. This is shown in (43b).

(2.43)  a. [CONTEXT: So, Joan likes meat, doesn’t he?]
   -Si, ja ho crec, que li agrada, yes already Cl.neut believe.1st that Cl.dat like.3rd
   la carn the meat
   ‘Indeed, he likes meat.’

   b. El Joan va comprar aquesta carn. Li the Joan PAST buy.inf this meat. Cl.dat
   agrada molt, la carn. like.3rd much the meat
   ‘Joan bought this meat. He likes meat very much.’

But if the antecedent is generic and the dislocate is not, the discourse is mildly infelicitous, as expected:

(2.44) [CONTEXT: So, Joan likes meat, doesn’t he?]
   -#Si, de fet la va comprar ell, yes of deed Cl.acc PAST buy.inf he
   aquesta carn. this meat
   ‘Yes. As a matter of fact, it was he who bought this meat.’

Under the assumption that CLRD and antecedent are linked by a relation of identity, the infelicitousness of (2.44) can be accounted for by assuming that a referential, deictic DP is not identical to a generic DP. Under this assumption, the more interesting puzzle is the one presented by (2.43b), which is the mirror image of (2.44). In (2.43b) a referential DP serves as an antecedent for a generic CLRD and the result is felicitous.

Villalba (2000) discusses the possibility of generic antecedents for CLLD (but he does not discuss this possibility with CLRD). He claims that the generic antecedent instantiates a superset–set relation with the dislocate. This solution cannot be transplanted to CLRD, since the superset–set relationship is not available:

(2.45) CONTEXT: So, what do we do with the chairs?
   -#Et vaig dir que els deixem a casa, els mobles.’
   Cl.dat PAST.1st say.inf that Cl.acc leave.1st.pl at home the furniture
   ‘I told you that we leave the furniture at home.’

13 The idiom *ja ho crec*, literally, “I already believe it” is an emphatic equivalent to “indeed.”
Generic CLRDeed must remain on the back burner until Chapter 4. There, I provide a solution dependent on a derivational view of the syntax–information structure interface. To advance matters further, I will argue that in (2.43a) the anaphoric relation is established before the dislocated constituent is bound by a generic operator.

The relationship between CLLD and its antecedent is more complex and falls into one of the following categories: subset, superset, set-membership, and part/whole (Villalba 2000). Antecedent and dislocate can also be identical, but even in this situation we are going to see that the relationship is more complex than that of CLRD and its antecedent.

Consider examples (2.46) and (2.47). In both of them the discourse antecedent is “furniture”. Using CLLD, as in (2.46), allows us to refer to different sub-sets: chairs, tables, etc. CLRD, as shown above and again in (2.47), does not allow us to do this.

(2.46) Context: What did you do with the furniture?
Les taules les hi vaig portar al matí,
the tables Cl.acc Cl.loc PAST.1st bring in-the morning,
però les cadires les hi vaig portar al vespre.
but the chairs, Cl.acc Cl.loc PAST.1st leave in-the evening
‘The tables I brought in the morning, but the chairs I brought in the evening.’

(2.47) Context: What did you do with the furniture?
# Les hi vaig portar al matí, les taules,
Cl.acc Cl.loc PAST.1st bring in-the morning, the tables
però les hi vaig portar al vespre, les cadires.
but Cl.acc Cl.loc PAST.1st bring in-the evening the chairs
‘The tables I brought in the morning, but the chairs I brought in the evening.’

CLLD can also be used when its relationship with the antecedent is that of set-membership:

(2.48) Context: What did you do with the tables?
La blanca, la vaig posar a dintre.
the white Cl.acc PAST.1st put.inf at inside
La negra, la vaig deixar al camió.
the black Cl.acc PAST.1st leave.inf in.the truck
‘I put the white one inside. I left the black one in the truck.’

Also, when the relationship is that of part/whole:
What shall we do with the table? It is too big!

‘Look, you can fold the legs like this. You can take the board off.’

And the CLLDed constituent can be a superset of the antecedent:

Notice that in all these examples, CLLDed constituents come in pairs—in fact, they form symmetric contrasts. This is, as a matter of fact, the most natural way of using CLLD. But when we request identity, CLRD is appropriate:

When CLLD is used in this type of context, the hearer expects a continuation. Without this continuation, the hearer needs to find some way to accommodate an alternative set (although, to be fair, this accommodation is easy to carry out). Consider the following pair:

(2.52) **Context:** Did you take the pens to Maria?

a. No, no, a la Maria crec que no l’hi he portat, els bolis. Cl.acc’Cl.dat have.1st brought the pens
b. No, no, crec que no l’hi he
brought the pens, to the Maria
‘No, I don’t think I gave Maria the pens.’

In (2.52a), the indirect object is left dislocated, in (2.52b) it is right dislocated. Both sound felicitous in this context, but (2.52a) implies a contrastive set—there is someone else who may have received the pens.

Finally, if there is no appropriate antecedent neither CLLD nor CLRD are felicitous and accommodation is not possible. I repeat here an example from Section 2.2.2. Compare (2.53a) with (2.53b) and (2.53c):

(2.53) CONTEXT: Joan brought the furniture.
   a. La LLET va portar, res mes.
      ‘He brought the milk, nothing else.’
   b. *La llet, la va portar . . .
   c. Les cadires les va portar el Joan, pero les taules . . .
      ‘Joan brought the chairs, but the tables . . .’

In the present context, (2.53a) is acceptable while (2.53b) is not. Sentence (2.53a) is felicitous because, as argued in Section 2.2.1, FF can be effected as long as the fronted constituent is something that can be carried. As I argued, a contrastive focus is not drawn from a set of known individuals. The comparison with the CLLD example in (2.53b) is revealing. Example (2.53b) is not felicitous because CLLD requires that the dislocated constituent be anaphoric, hence somehow linked to “furniture”—it is CLLD and not FF that has the requirement of connecting with a known set of individuals. Sentence (2.53c), on the other hand, is fine because cadires can be construed as being part of the set furniture.

Given the sort of relationships that CLLD and antecedent display, Villalba (2000) claims that the relation can be defined as that of a poset (borrowing a concept from Birner and Ward (1998) for an analysis of topicalization in English, see the detailed discussion in Villalba 2000: 60–80). However, this is inexact, since a poset relation is transitive and the relation between antecedent and anaphor is not transitive. Thus, although chairs are part of the set of furniture and the legs of the chairs are parts of the chairs, furniture cannot be an antecedent for a dislocated “legs of the chairs”:

(2.54) CONTEXT: What did you do with the furniture?
   -#Las potes de les cadires les vaig deixar al magatzem.
      the legs of the chairs Cl PAST.1st leave.inf in.the storage area
      ‘The legs of the chairs I left in the storage area.’
Or to take one extra step: the library is part of the city, the reading room is part of the library, the stacks are part of the reading room, and the shelves are part of the stacks; however the following exchange is completely incoherent:

\[(2.55)\] **Context:** Isn’t this a beautiful city?

- #Si, però els prestatges els hauríem de netejar.
  
  yes but the shelves Cl should.1st.pl of clean.inf

‘Yes, but we should clean the shelves.’

As a matter of fact, Birner (2004) has already noticed this same problem for topicalization in English (thanks to Benjamin Shaer for pointing out Birner’s article to me and for fruitful discussion). In a way, this is to be expected: if the relationship between antecedent and anaphor were transitive, the number of potential anaphoric relationships would grow enormously and there would not be any point in having syntactic operations indicating them—indeed, there would be little substance to the notion of discourse coherence. Thus, the relationship between CLLD and antecedent cannot be defined as a poset relation and, as a matter of fact, I cannot think of any other mathematically defined relation that we could use. For our purposes, the intuitive characterization presented above should suffice.

Like FF, CLLD also opens a variable and closes it. The only difference between FF and CLLD is that in the latter this variable has to stand in a (minus transitive) poset relation with an antecedent. Taking the example above, FF opens up the predicate \[x \mid \text{Joan brought } x\] while CLLD opens up the more restricted \[x \mid x \text{R\{furniture\} & Joan brought } x\] (where R stands for any one of the relations listed above). I conclude that the feature composition of CLLD is \[+a,+c\].\(^{14}\)

We see that the features \[\pm a\] and \[\pm c\] exhaustively define the Catalan constructions that we set out to explore: regular focus is \([-a, -c]\), FF is \([-a, +c]\), CLRD is \[+a, -c\], and finally CLLD is \[+a, +c\] (Figure 2.2). HTLD remains out of the loop. In Section 2.5.5 I discuss HTLD. What we have referred to as information focus or rheme is neither anaphoric nor contrastive.

\(^{14}\) Vallduvi and Vilkuna (1998) argue that *kontrast* is independent of “focus” or “topic” and can be combined with either (although they would not agree with my conclusion that CLLD is contrastive). See also Büring’s (1999) study of S-topics in German, which seem to have a range of meanings very close to that of Catalan CLLD and for which he provides an analysis in terms of sets of alternatives (as does Von Fintel 1994).
The mini-discourse in (2.56b) is felicitous. The one in (2.56a) is not:

(2.56) El Joan va comprar la carn.  
‘Joan bought the meat.’

a. #Després se la va menjar, la carn.  
Later SE cl.acc PAST.3rd.sg eat.inf the meat  
‘Later, he ate the meat.’

b. Li agrada molt, la carn.  
Cl.dat like.3rd.sg much the meat  
‘He likes meat very much.’

The question is why. The answer is because the discourse structures of (2.56a) and (2.56b) are different. In (2.56a) the clause that contains the CLRDed constituent is coordinated to the one that contains the antecedent. In (2.56b), it is subordinated. Discourse subordination is a condition of dislocation. This structural asymmetry is a component of what I call a strong anaphor (see 2.36).

Linguists working on discourse structure, particularly in the Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (SDRT) framework spanned from Asher and Lascarides (2003) distinguish between coordinating and subordinating discourse structure. For instance, when we have a plain narrative, the successive sentences forming the narrative form a coordinating structure:

(2.57) 1. Mary took out the screwdriver from the box.  
2. She proceeded to assemble the bed.

A sentence or group of sentences form a subordinate discourse structure if they expand, elaborate, or support the idea contained in another sentence, the superordinate sentence. For instance, the example above could be expanded as follows:
1. Mary took the screwdriver from the box.
2. It had to be a screwdriver of the right size and shape.
3. She proceeded to assemble the bed.

The structures of (2.57) and (2.58) can be represented by means of the following graphs. Horizontal arrows represent coordination and vertical arrows subordination, II means proposition and the sub-index refers to the numbers in the example:

\[(2.59) \quad \Pi_1 \rightarrow \Pi_2 \]

\[(2.60) \quad \Pi_1 \rightarrow \Pi_3 \]
\[\downarrow \]
\[\Pi_2 \]

In (2.57), sentences 1 and 2 are linked by the coordinating relation of narration. In (2.58), the coordinating relation between 1 and 3 is interrupted by a sentence subordinated to 1.

Asher and Vieu (2005: 596) list the following discourse relations that involve coordination or subordination, as well as tests to tease them apart:

\[(2.61) \quad \text{Coordination: narration, background, result, continuation, parallel, contrast.} \]
\[\text{Subordination: elaboration, instance, topic, explanation, precondition, commentary, question-answer pairs.} \]

Both CLRD and CLLD require discourse subordination and find their antecedent in the superordinate sentence in order for them to be felicitous. This can be seen in the following examples:

\[(2.62) \quad \text{Narration} \]
1. El Joan va cuinar la carn.
   ‘Joan cooked the meat.’
2. #Després se la va menjar, la carn.
   Afterwards Cl Cl.acc PAST eat.inf the meat
   ‘Afterwards he ate the meat.’

Sentences (2.62.1) and (2.62.2) are connected by the discourse function of narration, a coordinating relation and there is no superordinate sentence that includes the antecedent for the dislocate. Instead, the antecedent of the CLRD in (2.62.2) is found in the coordinate sentence (2.62.1). The result is a strongly incoherent discourse. The same holds for the following examples:
(2.63) **Result**

1. El Joan es va oblidar d’agafar les claus.
   ‘Joan forgot to take the keys.’

2. #i com a consequència les va perdre, les claus.
   and as to consequence Cl.acc PAST lose.inf the keys
   ‘and that is why he lost the keys.’

(2.64) **Continuation**

1. El gos li va mossegar la ma.
   ‘The dog bit his hand.’

2. #i el gat se la va esgarrapar, la ma.
   and the cat Cl Cl.acc PAST scratch.inf the hand
   ‘and the cat scratched his hand.’

On the other hand, when we have discourse subordination CLRD can take place easily:

(2.65) **Elaboration**

1. El Joan va cuinar la carn.
   ‘Joan cooked the meat.’

2. La fa molt be, el Joan, la carn.
   Cl.acc makes very well the Joan the meat
   ‘He cooks the meat very well.’

(2.66) **Explanation**

1. El Joan no cuina mai carn.
   ‘Joan never cooks meat.’

2. Això és perquè és vegetarian, el Joan.
   thus is because is vegetarian the Joan
   ‘That’s because Joan is vegetarian.’

(2.67) **Question–answer pairs**

1. -Vols que cuini la carn?
   ‘Do you want me to cook the meat?’

2. -Ja l’he feta jo, la carn.
   already Cl.acc’have.1st made I the meat
   ‘I already cooked the meat.’

Discourse subordination is also obligatory for CLLD. Compare the discourse in (2.68) with that in (2.69):

(2.68) 1. El Joan va portar el mobles en un camió.
   ‘Joan brought the furniture in a truck.’
2. Va obrir el camió i
   ‘He opened the truck and
3. #La taula de fòrmica, la va portar a la cuina…
   the table of formica Cl.acc PAST bring.inf to the kitchen
   he took the formica table to the kitchen…’
   (cf. va portar la taula de fòrmica a la cuina.)

(2.69) 1. El Joan va portar el mobles en un camió.
   ‘Joan brought the furniture in a truck.’
2. Va obrir el camió i va començar a portar-los cap a casa
   ‘He opened the truck and began to take them to the house.’
3. La taula de fòrmica, la va portar a la cuina…
   the table of formica Cl.acc PAST bring.inf to the kitchen
   ‘He took the formica table to the kitchen…’

Notice that in both (2.68) and (2.69) there is a suitable antecedent for ‘the
formica table’, so the difference in acceptability between one and the other has
to come from somewhere else. In (2.68), (2.68.2) and (2.68.3) are related by
coordination, since (2.68.3) pursues the narrative initiated in (2.68.1) and
(2.68.2). In (2.69), (2.69.3) is related to (2.69.2) by means of elaboration,
which makes (2.69.3) subordinate to (2.69.2). This is the configuration that
permits the usage of CLLD.

As shown above, a CLLD is related to its antecedent by means of an almost
poset relation. Consequently, we also saw that a CLLD is most naturally to be
found in a symmetric contrast relationship with another CLLD in another
clause, the two of them maintaining the same relation with the antecedent.
With our understanding of discourses as being coordinated or subordinated,
we have now the tools to sharpen our analysis. Thus, a typical configuration
for CLLD is as follows:

\[ \Pi_{1\text{Antec}} \quad \Pi_{2\text{(CLLD)}} \quad \Pi_{3\text{CLLD}} \]

A CLLD-ed constituent is in a symmetric contrast with another constituent
(almost always dislocated as well)\(^{15}\) and the discourse relation holding

\(^{15}\) The following two discourses are acceptable:

(i) El Joan va portar la compra.
   ‘Joan brought in the groceries.’
between them is coordinating. Both clauses are subordinated to the sentence that contains the antecedent. This structure is exemplified prototypically in (2.71):

(2.71)  -¿Qué farem amb [els mobles]_{Antec}?
   'what are we doing with [the furniture]_{Antec}?'
-\alpha \cdot [\text{CLLD Les taules de fòrmica}, les posarem a la cuina.]
   the tables of formica Cl.acc put.fut.1st.pl in the kitchen
[\text{CLLD Les de fusta}, de moment les deixem per aquí.]
   the of wood of moment Cl.acc leave.1st.pl by here
   'We will put the formica tables in the kitchen. For the time being, we will leave the wood tables here.'

In the following I show that, as long as the structure of discourse in (2.70) is respected, adjacency between the antecedent and the dislocate is not necessary. For instance, taking (2.70) as our baseline, can (P2) take additional subordinate sentences without breaking the bond with (P3)? As a matter of fact, it is possible, as shown in the following example:

(2.72)  1. John brought in the food.
  2. He put the fish in the fridge.
  3. It was an excellent fish
  4. and he didn’t want it to go bad.
  5. De la carn, se’n va oblidar completament.
      of the meat Cl Cl.part PAST forget.inf completely
      'He completely forgot about the meat.'

a. Va deixar el peix sobre la taula mentre que la carn, la va PAST leave.inf the fish on the table while that the meat Cl.acc PAST posar a la nevera.
   put.inf in the fridge
   'He left the fish on the table while he put the meat in the fridge.'

b. El peix el va deixar sobre la taula i la carn la va Cl.acc PAST leave.inf on the table and the meat Cl.acc PAST posar a la nevera.
   put.inf in the fridge

In (ib), “the fish” must be a member of the set “the groceries.” In (ia) this is not the case. Sentence (ia) is compatible with a situation in which someone put some fish on the table and therefore “the fish” is not part of Joan’s groceries; “Joan” simply left the fish where it was. In situ XP can accidentally co-refer but it is not [+a].
In (2.72), sentences (2.72.3) and (2.72.4) are subordinate to (2.72.2). This does not break the links of (2.72.2) with (2.72.5) and the latter can still take (2.72.1) as antecedent:

\[
(2.73) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\Pi_1^{\text{Antec}} \\
\Pi_2 \\
\Pi_3 & \Pi_4 \\
\Pi_5^{\text{CLLD}}
\end{array}
\]

This example shows that the claim that the connection between CLLD and antecedent depends on discourse structure and not on, for example, adjacency is robust.

Adjacency between the two coordinated/contrasted sentences is not important either, what is important is that the CLLDed constituent establishes the contrastive relationship with a constituent in the other sentence. If we have three coordinated sentences 1, 2, and 3, a CLLDed constituent in 3 can be in a contrastive relation with a constituent in 1 across 2. I exemplify this with the following example. The first four sentences should be followed by either (5') or (5'') but, as a matter of fact, only the first one is felicitous:

\[
(2.74) \quad \begin{align*}
1. & \text{ John brought in the food.} \\
2. & \text{ He put the fish in the fridge} \\
3. & \text{ and went out to the terrace for a second to smoke.} \\
4. & \text{ Then he spoke to Teresa on the cell for a little while.} \\
5'. & \text{ de la carn, se’n va oblidar completament.} \\
& \text{ of the meat Cl’Cl.part PAST forget.inf completely} \\
& \text{ ‘He forgot about the meat completely.’} \\
5''. & \text{ #a l’entrar, la carn la va posar al congelador.} \\
& \text{ to the’enter.inf the meat Cl.acc PAST put.inf in.the freezer} \\
& \text{ ‘When he came in, he put the meat in the freezer.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Why this difference between (2.74.5') and (2.74.5'')? Sentence (2.74.5') establishes a symmetric contrast with (2.74.2) involving “the fish” and “the meat,” ignoring (2.74.3) and (2.74.4). Sentence (2.74.5'') is introduced by “when he came in,” which makes (2.74.5'') coordinated to (2.74.4), and we obtain a sequence of coordinated sentences: (2.74.2–3–4–5''). This coordinate structure
Prevents a direct connection with (2.74.2). Examples (2.75) and (2.76) illustrate the corresponding structures:

(2.75)

\[ \Pi_{1\text{Antec}} \]

\[ \Pi_2 \rightarrow \Pi_3 \rightarrow \Pi_4 \rightarrow \Pi_5' \]

Contrast

(2.76)

\[ \Pi_{1\text{Antec}} \]

\[ \Pi_2 \rightarrow \Pi_3 \rightarrow \Pi_4 \rightarrow \Pi_5' \]

Weak pronouns and clitic pronouns are also discourse anaphoric. However, their antecedent can be found in a coordinate sentence:

(2.77) El Pere va veure la Maria. Després la Susanna també la va veure.

‘Pere saw Maria. Later, Susanna saw her too.’

Thus, weak and clitic pronouns are only weakly anaphoric, since they do not involve any sort of structural asymmetry in discourse (more on this later). However, if a pronoun is dislocated, the requirement of structural asymmetry reappears:

(2.78) a. El Pere va veure la Maria. La Maria li agrada molt, a ell.

‘Peter saw Mary. He likes her a lot.’

Thus, it seems that strong anaphoricity is related to constituents in a certain position, the dislocated position.
2.3.5 Links and tails

It is worthwhile contrasting the approach to CLRD and CLLD taken here with the influential approach of Vallduví (1992, 1995). He takes CLLD to be what he calls a link, an aid for the interlocutor to store the new information in the right place. In his 1995 article he identifies it with the more common label of topic, which I have already critiqued in detail in Section 2.2.2. It is of additional interest that Vallduví never discusses the contrastive property of CLLD and in Valduví and Vilkuna (1998) he never claims that CLLD is a kontrast.

As for CLRD, Vallduví argues that it is a tail. The function of a tail seems to be that of making the rheme contrastive (see in particular Vallduví 1992: 64, see also Cardinaletti 2002 and Samek-Lodovici 2006 for similar conclusions). While a sentence like (2.79a) only requests the hearer to add the new information “the boss likes broccoli” in his/her knowledge store, (2.79b) requests a substitution of the new information for some older one: that is, the common ground had something like “the boss hates broccoli” or “the boss never eats broccoli”:

(2.79) a. A l’amo li agrada el bròquil.
   ‘The boss likes broccoli.’

   b. A l’amo li agrada, el bròquil.
   ‘The boss likes broccoli.’

Although it is true that this sort of substitution is apparent often, it does not define the conditions for right dislocation. We can see this in the following example:

(2.80) CONTEXT: Joan likes broccoli, doesn’t he?
   -Si, ja ho crec, que li agrada, el bròquil.
   ‘Yes, indeed, he likes broccoli.’

In this example, the sentence confirms an assumption already present in the context, there is no substitution of “liking” for another predicate. However, CLRD is perfectly felicitous.

As seen above, what distinguishes CLLD from CLRD is that the former bears the feature [+c] while the latter does not.

2.3.6 Summary

To summarize Section 2.3, constituents not displaced in any way are neither anaphoric nor contrastive: they are what is usually called regular focus, plain
information focus, or rheme. The constructions we are looking at involve some displacement that has interpretive consequences: CLRD is anaphoric ([+a]), FF is contrastive ([+c]), CLLD is both anaphoric and contrastive ([+a, +c]). The antecedent of a [+a] constituent is subject to a condition of locality. Discourse anaphoric constituents must be found in sentences discourse-subordinated to the sentences that contain their antecedents.

Let us suppose there is a one-to-one mapping between syntactic derivation and pragmatic interpretation. This would entail that CLLD ([+a,+c]) must have a derivational step in common with CLRD ([+a]) and a derivational step in common with FF (+c]). I explore in Chapter 3 this hypothesis.

In the remainder of this chapter, I explore other aspects of the information structure framework presented here with the aim of building my argument further. I also look at some (apparently) complicated cases in which attribution of [±a] to some constituent seems to be non-trivial.

2.4 Focus, high and low

2.4.1 Introduction

In Section 2.2.2 I made a strong claim: regular focus is always in situ, contrastive focus is always in the left periphery. This claim runs against received knowledge. In particular, it is generally assumed that in situ focus can be contrastive, on the basis of examples such as the following:

(2.81) John reads books (not magazines).

However, I argue that, when this sort of example is placed in context, we can see that it requires some particle on the left periphery that actually carries out the contrast—that is, opens up the quantification domain.

There is, of course, a third possibility: that a contrastive constituent moves to an intermediate position. This is as a matter of fact attested in the literature (see López and Winkler’s 2003 discussion) and leads us to a more nuanced understanding of how syntax and pragmatics interact.

Recently, it has also been claimed that regular focus can appear high in the clause, either in full clauses (Benincà and Poletto 2004) or in fragment answers (Brunetti 2003; Merchant 2004). As for full clauses, I show that once we place Benincà and Poletto’s examples in context we see that high constituents are not regular focus. I show that Brunetti and Merchant’s analysis of fragment answers do not necessarily affect my proposals here.

Finally, I discuss Hungarian pre-verbal focus and show that it is a variant of [+c].
2.4.2 Are there low contrastive foci?

Romance linguists generally take it that contrastive focus can be in situ (see Rizzi 1997, Samek-Lodovici 2005, etc.). For instance, in example (2.82) Samek-Lodovici (2005) simply assumes without discussion that the constituent in situ is contrastively focused (example in Italian):

(2.82) Context: You gave the winner a T-shirt.
No. Abbiamo dato al vincitore una MEDAGLIA. [It]
‘No. We gave the winner a medal.’

As a variant of the same approach, Belletti (2004) agrees that this sort of focus is contrastive, but disagrees that it is low in the structure. Instead, she claims that *una medaglia* is in the left periphery while the rest of the clause is raised to a higher Spec,Top. Brunetti (2003) asks the interesting question why contrastive focus ever surfaces in the left periphery, since movement of TP to Spec,Top should, presumably, be obligatory so that the TP be interpreted as a topic.

However, is it really the case that *una medaglia* is contrastive focus? There is indeed a contrast and a focus in this sentence—an opening and resolving of alternatives—the question is whether the focus itself is contrastive. It is hard to tell in this example because the negation that prefixes the sentence creates the contrast and introduces several possible variables:

(2.83) Variables that *no* may introduce:
- x gave the winner a T-shirt
- we x the winner a T-shirt
- we gave x a T-shirt
- we gave the winner x

Since negation does the contrast work, the focused constituent may just be plain information focus and the functions “contrast” and “focus” are distributed among two different constituents. In order to test if in situ focus can be contrastive we have to have a focus constituent without any contrast-inducing prefix (negation or expressions like “on the contrary,” “on the other hand,” or the very famous “only” and “even,” etc.).16 The result is infelicitous:

(2.84) Context: You gave the winner a T-shirt.
#Abbiamo dato al vincitore una MEDAGLIA. [It]

---

16 I view “only” and “even” as contrast inducers, associated with a regular focus. This view is different from Vallduvi and Vilkuna’s, who see these particles as associated with a contrastive focus. However, a focus in situ is not contrastive unless associated with one of these particles. So, it is the particle that creates a quantificational domain.
Thus, I conclude that focus-in-situ is insufficient to establish a contrast. A FFed constituent, on the other hand, does have this capacity:

(2.85) CONTEXT: You gave the winner a T-shirt.
Una MEDAGLIA abbiamo dato al vincitore. [It]

Once we understand that “contrastive” and “focus” are two separate linguistic features that may or may not go together, we can see that FF is, so to speak, a superfluous construction in a language. Apart from delimiting the domain of focus and a performance value of “emphasis,” “contradiction,” or some such, everything linguistically that FF does can be achieved by a rheme in situ in conjunction with a contrast-inducing constituent. Thus, it is easy to understand why some languages do not have FF. Portuguese and Mexican Spanish are examples:

(2.86) *ESSE LIVRO, o João leu.
That book the João read [Port] (Costa 2004: 72)

To conclude: “contrast” is linked to the left periphery and in situ foci can only be rhemes. However, contrasts can also be found in the middle field under certain circumstances, as I show in the following section.

2.4.3 Are there mid-level contrasts?

Tuller (1992) shows that in Chadic languages wh-phrases and contrastive foci move to a mid-level position, what we now would consider to be the edge of vP. Further, López and Winkler (2003) argue that in English we can also see wh-phrases and other left peripheral elements sitting in Spec,v. However, in this language, we only see this phenomenon in gapping contexts. Let us see how.

The starting point of the analysis is Oehrle’s (1987) observation that an operator in the first conjunct of a gapping construction takes scope over the second conjunct;

(2.87) a. Mrs J. can’t live in Boston and Mr J. in LA.
   b. Mrs J. can’t live in Boston and Mr J. can’t live in LA.

The Ross (1967) analysis of gapping has it that this construction involves conjunction of two sentences followed by deletion. Thus, (a) would be derived from (b) after deletion of “can’t live.” However, (a) and (b) do not mean the same. In (a), the negative and the modal in the first conjunct take scope over the second conjunct, and the meaning can be paraphrased as “it is not possible that Mrs J. lives in Boston and Mr J. lives in LA” (i.e.: (a) means \[\sim \Diamond [p \amp q]\], it does not mean \[\sim \Diamond p \amp \sim \Diamond q]\).
Basing himself on these and other phenomena, Johnson (1996) proposes an analysis of gapping in which gapping in fact instantiates VP (or vP) coordination and the verb raises across the board to a higher head, which here I gloss as “F”:

(2.88) John reads *War and Peace* and Peter the *New York Times*.

So far so good. However, it is well-known that the second conjunct of gapping constructions can host wh-phrases and other constituents usually associated with Spec,C (or any of its descendents in a complex left periphery):

(2.89) a. Bill asked which books we gave to Mary and which records to John.

b. The beans, Harry cooked, and the potatoes, Henry.

Johnson’s analysis entails that “which records” and “the potatoes” are both in Spec,v, which is impossible in a regular sentence. Lópe and Winkler (2003) propose the following solution to the problem. UG provides for assignment of [+c] at the end of each phase, both the vP and the CP phase. However the rules that assign [+c] are ranked. In English the ranking would be:


This entails that wh-phrases and contrastive foci appear in Spec,C in the unmarked case. In gapping, the second vP is trapped within the coordinate phrase, where there is no CP:

(2.91) CoordP

Coord       vP

Wh/FF       v'
Since there is no CP, the ranking in (2.90) is inapplicable (see López and Winkler 2003 for a more technical presentation in terms of phases). Thus, [+c] can be assigned to Spec,v without interference.

These data lead to the following hypothesis: each time C_HL interfaces with pragmatics, all the pragmatic rules are available: the [±a] rule, the [±c] rule and any others that I may not be aware of. Which rule(s) end up having an effect at each phase depends on their ranking.

Thus, mid-level contrasts are possible, given appropriate conditions. This phenomenon does not get any more attention in this work.

2.4.4 Are there high non-contrastive foci?

Benincà and Poletto (2004) and Brunetti (2003) argue that both information and contrastive focus can be found low or high. I have already shown that contrastive focus cannot be low. Can information focus be high? The basic data seems to be very clear: the answer to a wh-question cannot be fronted in Romance, whether the wh-phrase is D-linked or not (pace Kiss 1998):

\[
\text{(2.92) } -\text{Què va llegir el Pere? // Quin} \quad \text{PAST.3rd.sg read.inf the Pere // which} \\
\quad \text{diari va llegir el Pere? \quad newspaper} \\
\quad \text{‘What did Pere read? // Which newspaper did Pere read?} \\
\quad \text{a. -Va llegir l’Avui.} \quad \text{PAST.3rd.sg read.inf l’Avui} \\
\quad \text{‘He read l’Avui.’} \\
\quad \text{b. -#L’AVUI va llegir} \\
\]

Taking the answer to a wh-question to be the paradigmatic example of information focus, I take (2.92b) to be evidence that information focus obligatorily stays in situ. Neither Brunetti nor Benincà and Poletto question example (2.92), rather, they bring to light other types of more eccentric

\[17\] Frascarelli (1997) presents the following Italian example:

(i) -Che cosa ha mangiato Piero?
   ‘What did Piero eat?’
   -La PIZZA, Piero ha mangiato.
   ‘Piero ate the pizza.’

As far as I know, (i) would be infelicitous in the other Romance languages. The question is whether (i) challenges the hypothesis that FF is always [+c]. I believe not. Language consultants report that the preposed answer involves an implicit scale, so (i) ends up meaning something like “even the pizza Piero ate.” If this understanding of (i) holds, (i) does imply an opening of a quantification set, so it is [+c].
constructions. I discuss Brunetti first and move on to Benincà and Poletto below.

Brunetti shows that the answer to a wh-question can be an isolated phrase;

\[(2.93)\] -Què va llegir el Pere? // Quin
What PAST.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg read.inf the Pere // which
diari va llegir el Pere?
newspaper
‘What did Pere read? // Which newspaper did Pere read?’
-L’Avui.

Like Merchant (2004), she proposes that a short answer actually involves an entire sentence. The focused constituent is moved to the left and the rest is deleted (I indicate non-contrastive focus in bold).

\[(2.94)\] -Què va llegir el Pere? // Quin
What PAST.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg read.inf the Pere // Which
diari va llegir el Pere?
newspaper
‘What did Pere read? // which newspaper did Pere read?’
1. -Va llegir l’Avui.
PAST.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg read.inf l’Avui
‘He read l’Avui.’
2. -L’Avui va llegir t.
3. -L’Avui va llegir t.

Brunetti and Merchant bring in some traditional tests for structure (binding conditions, NPI licensing, etc.) that provide strong evidence that there is some structure in a short answer. If there is indeed a deletion operation going on, and deletion should affect syntactic constituents, then the focused constituent should get out of the way. However, the movement + deletion approach is not without problems. The first problem is that this movement is, as far as I can tell, unmotivated in either Merchant or Brunetti’s analyses. The second problem is that short answers are not interpreted as displaced constituents. As shown above, \([-a]\) constituents that are displaced to the left periphery acquire the feature \([+c]\), however short answers are \([-c]\). The third problem is that movement and deletion have to take place together, you simply cannot have one without the other. This sets this sort of ellipsis apart from regular ellipsis, which is always optional. So, what to do with short answers? Here I provide two possible approaches to resolve this quandary.
In the first approach, we take Brunetti’s and Merchant’s analysis of short answers as good, despite the doubts expressed above. One could get around the problems pointed out above in the following way. Merchant proposes that ellipsis is triggered by a feature E that can be associated with various functional categories. E has a semantic and a phonetic effect. The semantic effect is to make the complement of E given (in Schwarzschild’s 1999 sense, that is, discourse anaphoric). The phonetic effect is an instruction in the phonetic component that the complement of E requires no phonetic matrices. As for the syntax of E, Merchant reduces it to a feature combination that allows it to associate with various heads. We could add a syntactic effect to E: it could be a feature that triggers movement, for instance, E could be a probe that would attract the closest \([-a]\) constituent in its c-command domain and merge it in its spec:

(2.95) 1. \([\CP E \text{ va llegir } \l’Avui]\)

\[\text{probe}\]

2. \([\CP \l’Avui] E \text{ va llegir } t]\)

3. \([\CP \l’Avui] E \text{ va llegir } t]\)

This would suffice to motivate movement of plain information focus constituents exactly when there is ellipsis and we could maintain the claim (based on (2.92)) that in the general case information focus does not move.

A second approach is to give up on the idea that PF-deletion targets syntactic constituents and assume instead that it targets prosodic constituents. In the example above, the long answer consists of two prosodic phrases:

(2.96) \((\emptyset \text{ va llegir}) (\emptyset \l’Avui)\)

Thus, all we require is to ensure that the computation of prosodic trees be made sensitive to the information structure of its components, so it can read that \(l’Avui\) is focus and \(va\ \text{ llegir}\) is presuppositional. This sensitivity has to be there anyway, for the computation of stress, which is connected to the focus structure of the sentence (among other factors, see Section 4.2). Furthermore, to my mind, the notion of PF-deletion is more coherent with the idea that it targets phonological constituents than syntactic constituents.

Benincà and Poletto (2004) claim that when a sentence includes a contrastive focus in the left periphery, it can also sandwich a rheme right underneath. This rheme is syntactically a CLLD. Thus, the sentence (2.97a) should be analyzed as in (2.97b):\(^{18}\)

\(^{18}\) The punctuation used by Benincà and Poletto might be of importance in analyzing this kind of example (I thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to me). In (2.97) no comma isolates the
Benincà and Poletto do not present us with a context in which this sentence would be used, and therefore it is impossible to evaluate their claim as is. That is, we do not know if a Gianni is truly information focus unless we see the sentence at work. Let us therefore place this sentence in an appropriate context. This should be a context in which the indirect object of dire answers a wh-question neutrally and in which the direct object is part of the assertion but wrongly so and therefore the direct object must open up a second variable:

\[
\text{(2.98) \textbf{Contrast: Who should we tell that?}}
\]

-#QUESTO a Gianni, gli dovremmo dire.

\text{This to Gianni Cl.dat should.1st.pl tell.inf}

\text{‘We should say this to Gianni.’}

This discourse is considered to be infelicitous by my language consultants. This would seem to suggest that C HL does allow you to move things to the left periphery (which we already knew) but certain combinations of things are not felicitous. In this example, it is unclear whether a Gianni is indeed information focus. As only argument that a Gianni is focus, Benincà and Poletto tell us that it is sensitive to WCO effects:

\[
\text{(2.99) A MARIA, Giorgio\textsuperscript{i}, sua\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} madre presenterà. \quad \text{[It]}}
\]

\text{To Maria Giorgio his mother introduce.FUT.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg}

\text{‘His mother will introduce Giorgio to Maria.’}

(Benincà and Poletto 2004: 57)

However, as I discuss in detail in Chapter 6, the facts surrounding WCO phenomena are extremely complicated. In English, for instance, topicalization is sensitive to WCO, even if the displaced constituent is not focused (Lasnik and Saito 1992).

Consider now the following example:
(2.100) -Mi ha detto che il tappeto, lo compra l’anno prossimo. [It]
‘He has told me that he will buy the carpet next year.’
-No, ti sbagli. Il divano lo compra l’anno prossimo.
‘No, you’re wrong. He will buy the sofa next year.’

According to Benincà and Poletto, *il divano* is left dislocated but its information value is that of information focus. If that were the case, one should wonder if leaving the direct object in situ makes any difference:

(2.101) -No, ti sbagli. L’anno prossimo compra il divano.

Benincà and Poletto predict that there would be no difference. But discussion is lacking.

I disagree with Benincà and Poletto in their evaluation of (2.100). In particular, leaving *il divano* in situ or moving it to the left periphery makes a difference. The exchange with dislocation only works if something like “furniture” is what is being discussed and *il divano* is anaphoric with respect to this discourse referent. But if we do not have a suitable antecedent, *il divano* does not dislocate. Let us place the two options in two different contexts:

(2.102) **Context A**: Juan has ugly floors in his apartment and wants to decorate them with new flooring.

A1: -Mi ha detto che il tappeto, lo compra l’anno prossimo.
‘He has told me that he will buy the carpet next year.’
B1: -#No, ti sbagli. Il divano lo compra l’anno prossimo.

Let us look at context A closely. The antecedent of *il tapetto* in A1 is the new flooring that Juan is going to buy. The CLLD in B1 is infelicitous while the focus in situ in B2 is fine. This can be accounted for if, as I argue in Section 2.3, dislocations are anaphoric with respect to an antecedent in the previous discourse while ordinary foci are not. The oddness of B1 in context A comes about because sofas cannot be construed as belonging to the category “new stuff that one buys to decorate floors”. B2 is fine, because *il divano* is in situ and hence needs no antecedent.
Let us now consider context b:

(2.103)  **CONTEXT b:** Juan is getting some new furniture for his apartment.

A1:-Mi ha detto che il tappeto, lo compra l’anno prossimo.
‘He has told me that he will buy the carpet next year.’

B1:-No, ti sbagli. Il divano lo compra l’anno prossimo.

B2:-No, ti sbagli. L’anno prossimo comprà il divano.

In context b, the subject under discussion is “furniture.” And in this context, B1 is fine. This is because *il divano* can be construed as being part of the furniture and therefore an anaphoric link with “furniture” can be established. Thus, I conclude that the dislocated constituent in (2.100) is not information focus but, like normal dislocates, an anaphoric constituent.

To conclude this section: the empirical data available to me at this point indicate that regular foci remain in situ (unless they are found in short answers, according to some analyses) while contrastive foci are displaced to the left periphery. When a vP is embedded in a coordination, Spec,v can also be a place where [+c] is assigned.

### 2.4.5 Exhaustive focus

As is well known to the student of focus, Hungarian has a focus position to the left of the verb that is noticeably different from Romance FF. Unlike Romance FF, Hungarian fronted focus can answer a wh-question:

(2.104)  **CONTEXT:** Who did they call up?

Jánost hívták fel [Hu]

John.ACC called.3rd.pl up

‘They called up John.’

(Horvath 2005: 18)

Hungarian also has an in-situ focus:

(2.105)  **CONTEXT:** Where could I find out about the train schedule?

Megtudhatod az interneten.
Perf.prt.know.can.2nd.sg the internet.on

‘You could find out in the internet.’

(Horvath 2005: 14)

So what is the difference between pre- and post-verbal focus? Post-verbal focus is no different from the Catalan regular focus discussed above. But when it is pre-verbal, focus is **exhaustive**, that is, it denies that anyone else values the variable left open in the previous discourse. Thus, in (2.105), the discourse given could be continued by saying “...or you could also find out at the station.” However, (2.104) means that they called John, and no one else.
As Kenesei (1986, 2006) argues, exhaustive focus is not only about identifying the unique element that answers the question and values the variable left open in the previous discourse, it also entails opening up a quantification set from which this element is chosen and denying that the complementary set satisfies the variable. The contrast in the following example is revealing:

(2.106)  

a. *A nap sütött ki a felhök mögül.  
The sun shone out the clouds from behind

b. A nap ki-sütött a felhök mogul.  
‘The sun is shining through the clouds.’

In (2.106a) a nap is an exhaustive focus, in (2.106b) it is a plain focus. We can see the difference in the position of the particle ki: the particle is post-verbal when there is exhaustive focus, pre-verbal if there is not. So, why is (2.106a) ungrammatical? If exhaustive focus in Hungarian were defined only by uniqueness of the focused constituent, then (2.106a) should be acceptable—certainly only the sun can shine through the clouds. However, precisely because there is only one sun, it is not possible to open a complementary quantification set and this is what makes exhaustive focus ungrammatical in this context (universal quantifiers also cannot be exhaustively focused). To put it in Kenesei’s words, there must be exclusion by identification. Thus, since Hungarian exhaustive focus implies an opening of a quantification set, I conclude that Hungarian exhaustive focus is a variety of [+c].

The syntactic analysis of Hungarian exhaustive focus invariably places it in the left periphery as evidenced, among other pieces of data, by the post-verbal position of normally pre-verbal particles (Brody 1990; Kiss 1998; Horvath 2005). Thus, the left periphery is confirmed as the position of [+c] constituents. Moreover, Horvath (2005), fully in agreement with the spirit of this work, argues that what drives the movement exemplified in the examples above is not focus per se—since focus in Hungarian can always stay in situ—but exhaustiveness. Although I do not agree that interpretive features drive movement (more on this in Chapters 3 and 6), I do agree that “focus” is not the feature associated with the left periphery—if I am right, that would be [+c].

A separate but very interesting question is why the feature [+c] turns out to yield different interpretations in Hungarian and Romance. I am not able to provide an articulated answer here. Instead, I suggest that syntax and pragmatics (the latter, as defined in the introduction to this chapter) are only two of the ingredients that contribute to the final meaning of a sentence.
2.5 Consequences

2.5.1 Introduction

Investigations into the nature of information structure prove their mettle in their treatment of some difficult data. Discussing these data is the goal of this section.

Section 2.5.2 discusses strong pronouns. They appear to have an ambivalent nature. On the one hand, they are focus—that is, they can answer wh-questions and attract accent. On the other, they do take their reference from something else, which suggests that they are anaphoric—should we conclude that they have a contradictory specification of features? Catalan strong pronouns add more complexity to the phenomenon: strong pronouns can be in situ or dislocated. In either case they take an antecedent but only the dislocated pronoun is strongly anaphoric, in the sense defined above.

The solution I provide goes along these lines. As argued above, the feature [+a] is assigned to dislocated constituents and only those. Consequently, non-dislocated pronouns are not [+a]. The fact that they have an antecedent is brought about by their own feature structure and not because a pragmatic feature has been assigned to them in a syntactic configuration.

In Section 2.5.3 I discuss answers to questions that include a list of the answers (Do you want the red or the black one? Which of these sweaters do you want?). Coherent with her approach, Erteschik-Shir (2006) treats the answers as topics. Again, I show that, from the point of view of sentence grammar, they are [−a].

Section 2.5.4 introduces Rizzi’s (1997) syntactic framework for the analysis of topics and focus. Section 2.5.5 discusses HTLD briefly.

2.5.2 Stressed pronouns

Consider the following sentence (phonetically prominent constituents are indicated by underlining in this section):

\[
(2.107) \text{ CONTEXT: Who did John’s mother praise?} \\
- \text{She praised } \underline{\text{him}}. \\
\text{(Schwarzschild 1999: 145)}
\]

\[
(2.108) \text{ CONTEXT: Did John’s mother praise John?} \\
- \text{Yes, she } \underline{\text{praised}} \text{ him.}
\]

It is customarily assumed that examples like Schwarzschild’s pose a challenge for an analysis of the information structure of a sentence that divides it into a
focus and a presupposition. In (2.107), “him” is clearly a focus, since it resolves the variable left free in the context. It is also phonetically prominent. However, it is generally assumed (by Schwarzschild and others) that it is also given, since it is a pronoun and pronouns are inherently given (given is taken to mean something similar to anaphoric without the strength provisions of (2.36)). In (2.108), the pronoun is given, it is phonetically deaccented and is not a focus. From the examples we can see that strong and weak pronouns can be found in different—complementary—types of discourses. Are there any additional differences between them? That is, do they have the same anaphoric properties?

The Catalan translations of the above sentences make the matter somewhat clearer. The focused pronoun stays in situ. The non-focused one is dislocated:\footnote{In example (2.109) the reader can notice that doubling of strong pronouns is obligatory in Catalan (as it is in Spanish). This is a well-known puzzle that resists principled explanation. I suggest that in these languages no constituent, not even a pronoun, can be discourse anaphoric unless it forms a dependency with a constituent on the edge of the vP phase. This requirement holds even for anaphoric relations that involve only clause (2.36.1). Thus, strong pronouns need to form a dependency with a clitic attached to v.

Notice also that accusative strong pronouns are introduced by the accusative marker a. The accusative marker a is discussed in Chapter 5.}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(2.109)] \textbf{CONTEXT:} Who did John’s mother praise?
\begin{verbatim}
-El a lloar a ell.
Cl.acc PAST praise.inf A him
\end{verbatim}
She praised him.
\item[(2.110)] \textbf{CONTEXT:} Did John’s mother praise John?
\begin{verbatim}
-Si, el va lloar, a ell.
yes Cl.acc PAST praise.inf A him
\end{verbatim}
Yes, she praised him.
\end{enumerate}

Let’s analyse these examples taking the three clauses of the notion of strong anaphoricity laid out in (2.36): (i) There is obligatory dependency with respect to an antecedent, (ii) the antecedent and the anaphor are in a local relation, (iii) there is structural asymmetry between antecedent and anaphor.

Strong pronouns are anaphors only in the sense of clause (i). Strong pronouns avoid co-referring with the closest available antecedent and they are insensitive to structural asymmetry. In the following example, the question sets “John” as the closest antecedent for the strong pronoun, but the strong pronoun refers back to “Mary.” As (2.11b) shows, it is infelicitous to use a strong pronoun to refer to the closest antecedent:
(2.111) **CONTEXT:** Yesterday Maria and John went to the Mass. Did you see John?

a. -No, la vaig veure a ella.
   ‘No, I saw her.’

b. -#Si, el vaig veure a ell.
   ‘Yes, I saw him.’

In the following example, the two sentences constitute a narration and so they are discourse coordinated. The strong pronoun can find an antecedent in the coordinated sentence.

(2.112) a. John met Paul and Mary. Later he talked to her.

b. El Joan es va trobar amb el Pau i amb la Maria. Afterwards Cl.acc PAST see.inf A her at.the market.

‘Joan met Pau and Maria. Afterwards, he saw her at the market.’

The English deaccented pronoun fulfills clauses 1 and 2. It has to refer to the closest available antecedent;

(2.113) **CONTEXT:** Yesterday Maria and John went to the Mass. Did you see John?

-Yes, I saw him.

-#No, I saw her.

Interestingly, the deaccented pronoun is not subject to clause 3. The following two sentences are connected by the relation of “result,” another instance of discourse coordination. The sentence is felicitous:

(2.114) John forgot to pick up Mary, as he promised. As a consequence, he lost her.

The equivalent of (2.114) in Catalan would have the clitic pronoun la in the role of her. The resulting sentence is felicitous, which suggests that the clitic pronoun is like a weak pronoun.
Only the Catalan dislocated pronoun meets all three properties: it has to refer to the closest available antecedent and it is infelicitous in coordinated discourses:

(2.115) **Context:** Yesterday Maria and John went to the Mass. Did you see John?
- Sí, el vaig veure, a ell.
  yes Cl.acc PAST.1st see.inf A him
  ‘Yes, I saw him.’
- No, la vaig veure, a ella.
  no Cl.acc PAST.1st see.inf A her
  ‘No, I saw her.’

(2.116) El Joan es va oblidar de recollir la Maria.
  the Joan Cl PAST forget.inf of pick-up.inf Maria.
  #Com a consequència la va perdre, for a consequence Cl.acc PAST lose.inf her.
  ‘John forgot to pick up Mary. As a consequence, he lost her.’

What can we conclude from these data? Only dislocated pronouns are truly [+a], because only they fulfill the three clauses of a strong anaphor. Strong pronouns are not [+a]. Although strong pronouns are obligatorily dependent on an antecedent that is because of an inherent lexical property and not because of a syntactic reason. In other words, the final interpretation of a constituent results from the interaction of the inherent properties of the constituent and its structural properties. For instance, this is clearly the case with non-D-linked wh-phrase and FF: although both have the [−a,+c] feature combination, the final interpretation is different because one bears a [wh]-feature while the other one does not.

Thus, the effects of the [−a] feature on a strong pronoun can be detected: although the pronoun still needs a co-referent in discourse, it avoids referring to the closest antecedent and the antecedent–anaphora relation takes place regardless of discourse structure.

The difference between Catalan dislocated pronouns and English deaccented ones is an intriguing result. Since Vallduví (1992) we have tended to see Catalan dislocations and English deaccenting as instantiating two alternative strategies to obtain the same result: a linguistic structure that would
make the information values of the constituents transparent. However, we see that choosing one strategy or the other is not without consequence, since weak pronouns and dislocated pronouns have different conditions of application. At this point, I can only leave it as it is, hoping that future research will clarify the issues.

2.5.3 Answers to D-linked questions

It is important to emphasize once again that the feature [+a] refers to a genuine anaphoric dependency, not just accidental or optional co-reference. For this reason, my interpretation of some famous examples in the literature of topic and focus is different from other scholars’. Take the following example, from Erteschik-Shir (2006):

\[(2.117)\] -What did John eat, the cake or the ice-cream?
   -He ate the cake.

We are interested in the second instance of “the cake.” Recall that in Erteschik-Shir’s theory of information structure, Topic is that constituent that directs you to a certain salient card in the file while Focus opens a new card or makes an old one salient. Update is an instruction to enter the focus into the topic card. As for the example above, Erteschik-Shir argues that “the cake” is both a topic and a focus. In her analysis, the question makes a complex file prominent, the one consisting of the subordinate files “the cake” and “the ice-cream.” The answer chooses one of them. “The cake” in the answer must be a topic because it refers to a salient card (the complex one). But “cake” is also a focus, since it chooses between two competing alternatives and places one of them on top. This is expressed by means of the following tree:

\[(2.118)\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{he}_{\text{top}} \\
\text{ate} \\
\text{the}_{\text{top}} \\
\text{cake}_{\text{foc}} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{top/foc}}
\end{array}\]

So, the question again is: is “the cake” [+a] or [−a]? Looking at Catalan proves to be useful again. In the corresponding Catalan sentence, *el pastís* “the cake” stays in situ.
(2.119) CONTEXT: What did John eat, the cake or the ice-cream?
- Es va menjar el pastís.
  Cl PAST eat.inf the cake
  ‘He ate the cake.’

This suggests that “the cake” in the equivalent English example is actually [-a]. Compare the previous Catalan example with the following, where el pastís is a typical [+a]:

(2.120) CONTEXT: What are we going to do with the cake?
- El pots menjar, el pastís.
  Cl.acc can.2nd eat.inf the cake
  ‘You can eat the cake.’

In both (2.119) and (2.120) el pastís is a topic in Erteschik-Shir’s model, since both refer to a salient card. But their syntactic position is quite different. We encounter again the problem mentioned above: the notion topic gives us no predictions concerning the behavior of individual syntactic constituents.

On the other hand, my model makes a clear prediction: the dislocated pastís is [+a] while the non-dislocated one is not. This prediction holds. We can see that the non-dislocated pastís is [-a] because the answer to the question does not need to incorporate any of the choices offered in the question, a behavior unlike that of true [+a] constituents, as we saw above. As a matter of fact, the answer could even be a negative quantifier, which is unavailable in dislocations (and, I would add, topic/focus frameworks do not include negative quantifiers among the things that can be topics):

(2.121) - What did John eat, the cake or the ice-cream?
  A1: - He ate the peanut-butter sandwich.
  A2: - He ate nothing.

Thus, “the cake” in (2.119) is not anaphoric. Back to the Catalan examples, we see that the answer to the question does not need to be any of the choices offered:

(2.122) CONTEXT: What did John eat, the cake or the ice-cream?
- Es va menjar el pernil.
  ‘He ate the ham.’
- No va menjar res.
  ‘He ate nothing.’

Sentence (2.122) contrasts with (2.123). In (2.123), the dislocated constituent cannot be any random entity, it has to be something present in the context:
(2.123) **CONTEXT:** What are we going to do with the cake?
   - #El pots menjar, el gelat.
     ‘You can eat it, the ice-cream.’

The same reasoning applies to the answers of D-linked-wh-phrases:

(2.124) - Which of the children went to the island?
   - Mary did.

Again, the question is whether “Mary” is anaphorically dependent on “the children.” The answer again is no, since the following answers are felicitous:

(2.125) - Which of the children went to the island?
   - A1: Mom did.
   - A2: No one did.

Thus, the answer to a D-linked wh-phrase is [-a] again.

### 2.5.4 Focus and Topic as syntactic categories

The Romance tradition unanimously takes CLLD to be a topic (particularly under the influence of Cinque 1983/1997 and Rizzi 1997; see Benincà and Poletto 2004; Frascarelli 2000; Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2006 among many others). Analyses of CLRD also take it to be topic (Cecchetto 1999; Frascarelli 2000; Villalba 2000; Belletti 2004). None of these works actually argues that dislocates are topics in detail or discusses what the term topic means. Instead, a few words are provided—aboutness, old information—and they proceed under the assumption that writer and reader both have the same concept in mind.\(^{20}\)

Not only are CLLD and CLRD taken to be topics, topicality is represented in the syntax by means of a functional category “Topic” which takes a complement and a spec. The same thing goes for focus: “Focus” is a syntactic head with a spec and a complement. Thus, this section provides an initial critique of the dominant paradigm for the syntactic investigation of information structure in Romance: the Topic Phrase (TocP) / Focus Phrase (FocP) approach. It should be viewed as a first installment, references to this paradigm are going to show up at different places in this book, as I explore and develop my own framework.\(^{21}\)

---

\(^{20}\)For instance, Rizzi (1997) defines “topic” as being old information. But the head Topic is supposed to partition the sentence into a topic and a comment, thus mixing up aboutness and old information. Moreover, since Focus divides the sentence between a focus and a presupposition, it is unclear to me what the difference between topic and presupposition is.

\(^{21}\)See in particular Sections 3.3 and 3.6; also Section 6.3.
Focusing now on Rizzi’s analysis, CLLD is housed in the spec of a Topic Phrase located in the left periphery. The spec of Top is the topic of the sentence, the complement is the comment:

This approach entails certain assumptions that, to my knowledge, have not been discussed in detail. It entails that the universal lexicon includes Focus and Topic as lexical-functional items that can be freely assigned to other lexical items as they are drawn into a derivation (an assumption explicitly made in Erteschik-Shir 2006, as I mentioned).

Further, this approach entails that the meanings of the functional categories Top and Foc are “assign the feature [topic] to my spec” and “assign the feature [focus] to my spec” respectively. This itself entails that the lexical items Topic and Focus have an in-built phrase structure, to ensure that [topic] and [focus] are not assigned to their complements. It is unclear whether our theory of the lexicon should be thus constituted.

Since this approach is based on the notions of topic and focus, and I have already demonstrated that these two notions are not useful for an analysis of sentence grammar, it should come as no surprise to the reader that I will not use TopP or FocP in my analyses.

Moreover, the particular syntactic implementation advocated by Rizzi presents an additional difficulty: there can be many CLLDed or CLRDed constituents in the clause:

If CLLDed constituents are taken to be topics, then CLLD is what the sentence is about. But, what are (2.138) about, “the books” or “to Mary”? Rizzi approaches this problem by allowing the comment to split again into a topic and a comment, recursively. In other words, a Top head can select for
another Top head (notice that this goes against a long tradition that identifies
the comment with the focus and in which a topic cannot be a part of a
comment, see Gundel and Fretheim 2004: 176):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{Force} & \text{TopP} \\
\text{CLLD = topic} & \text{Top'} \\
\text{Top} & \text{TopP = comment} \\
\text{CLLD = topic} & \text{Top'} \\
\text{Top} & \text{XP = comment (either a TopP, a FocP or a FinP)}
\end{array}
\]

However, it is difficult to see what this amounts to, interpretively. It seems to
me that this analysis would entail that sentences (2.138a) and (2.138b) should
be felicitous in different contexts. The first one should be felicitous in a
class in which we are talking about “books” and the second one in a
class where we are talking about “Maria”. However, this is not the case,
the two sentences are completely interchangeable. That is, if we want to use a
topic-comment framework to analyze these sentences, they both mean the
same: that talking about the books and talking about Maria, I don’t want to
give them to her.

On the other hand, if we take dislocated constituents to be simply ana-
phoric, no problem arises because there is no problem with having several
anaphoric constituenets in one clause.

Thus, I reinforce my conclusion that the topic-comment framework is not
useful to describe Catalan CLLD and CLRD. Consequently, Topic Phrases
(and Focus Phrases) need to be revisited and an alternative needs to be
worked out (which I do in Chapters 3 and 4.)(22)

---

(22) It is interesting to see how notions in other languages originally defined as “topic” have recently
been reanalyzed as contrasts. See Portner and Yushibita (1998) on Japanese -wa and Choi (1997) on
Korean -ul.
2.5.5 HTLD

So far, I have not discussed HTLD. I suggested in Chapter 1 that a HTLDed constituent is not integrated into sentence structure but should be regarded as an orphan (Haegeman 1991; Shaer and Frey 2005), a discourse structure unit smaller than a sentence that combines with other orphans or sentences as they are assembled into discourses.

Throughout this chapter, we have seen how the position of a constituent within the sentence is a pretty good predictor for its interpretation: [+a] constituents are dislocated, [+c] ones are fronted. The question arises whether a constituent that is not integrated into the structure of the sentence is subject to similar interpretation strictures.

The answer seems to be no: HTLD can fulfill a variety of discourse functions (as noted by De Cat 2002 for her French database). The Catalan tradition (Bartra 1985, Villalba 2000) shows that HTLD are shift-topics, as shown in the following example:

(2.140) -[...] De fet la literatura entra a l’editorial a partir del nou periodisme, de Bokowski i de Copi. I marcarà la segona etapa.

‘Actually literature came into the publishing house with the new journalism, Bukowski and Copi. It will determine a second stage.’

-El Copi, la seva vinguda a Barcelona, ¿te’n recordes? (El País, Quadern, 7 Jan, 1999, page 2).

‘Copi, his visit to Barcelona, do you remember it?’

(Villalba 2000: 99)

La seva vinguda a Barcelona is resumed by the partitive clitic en. We know that this must be an instance of HTLD because CLLD would be introduced by the case marker de (see Chapter 1). Notice that la seva vinguda a Barcelona is not anaphoric. In fact, it begins a new conversation topic. In the following example, the HTLDed constituent could be regarded as a contrastive focus. el Joan is resumed by the strong pronoun ell “he,” so there is no doubt this exemplifies HTLD:

(2.141) -El Pere juga molt bé.

‘Peter plays very well.’

-El Joan, ell sí que era un campió.

‘Joan, he was a champion.’

HTLD can also be used anaphorically. This is shown in (2.142), where the dislocated constituent is resumed by an epithet:
How did your date with Maria go?

-Mira, la Maria, no em parlis mai més d’aquesta bandarra.
‘Look, Mary, don’t you ever talk to me about that jerk.’

And HTLD can also be anaphoric and contrastive, like a CLLDed constituent. In the following example, the resumptive is in an adjunct island, which ensures that the dislocate must be HTLD:

Have you seen Pedro’s sisters recently?

-Doncs, la veritat és que no. La Susanna, per exemple, jo sempre surt de casa abans que la pugui trucar.
‘Well, actually I haven’t. Susanna, for instance, I always leave home before I can call her.’

Thus, HTLD can have all possible feature combinations of [±a] and [±c]. I conclude that the [±a] and [±c] rules apply at the sentence level or smaller. Since HTLD is not a sentence level constituent, it is free from them. The interpretation of HTLD depends exclusively on context.

2.6 From stress to focus?

In this section, I discuss the connection between stress and focus, basing the discussion on English data. I show that this connection is tenuous: although a focused constituent does indeed exhibit sentence stress somewhere, it does not seem to be possible to predict the position of stress from the structure of the focus or the structure of the focus from the position of stress. This reinforces the previous conclusion that focus is not really a category of grammatical analysis—although I fall short of providing a comprehensive analysis of all the phenomena involved.

2.6.1 Red convertibles

For a start, consider the following example (where underlining continues to indicate the place of phonetic accent) (from Schwarzschild 1999):

Mary drove her blue convertible. What did John drive?

-He drove her red convertible.

In order to gain a perspective on this example, consider also the following examples:

Mary drove her blue convertible. What did John drive?

-He drove her blue sedan. // -He drove a red sedan.
(2.146) **Context**: What did John drive?
-He drove her red convertible.

(2.147) **Context**: Mary drove her blue convertible. What kind of convertible did John drive?
-He drove her red convertible.

A long tradition in English linguistics (Jackendoff 1972; Selkirk 1995, etc.) assumes a close connection between accent and focus. The most famous approach is that of Selkirk’s F-projection rules, based on F-marking: if a constituent is F-marked, it will receive an accent in the phonology and, via F-projection, F-marking also delimits the boundaries of focus. Consider the rules in (2.148a):

(2.148) a. **Basic F-rule**: an accented word is F-marked.

**F-projection**: (i) F-marking on the head of a phrase licenses the F-marking of the phrase. (ii) F-marking on an internal argument of a head licenses the F-marking of the head.

(Selkirk 1995: 555)

Thus, F-marking on a direct object entails F-marking of the entire VP. As shown in (2.148b, 2.148c) accent on a modifier entails F-marking on the modifier only. Ultimately, the focus of a sentence is an F-marked constituent that is not dominated by another F-marked constituent.

If we take it that focus is the part of the sentence that resolves a variable left open by the previous discourse, we see that (2.144), (2.145), and (2.146) have the same focus, which is the DP that answers the question in the previous context: [what is the x s.t. John drove x]. In (2.147), the variable stands only for the adjective: [what is the x s.t. John drove x convertible], so (2.147) has only the adjective as a focus.

Selkirk predicts correctly that the focus of (2.147) is limited to the AP “red.” However, (2.144), with exactly the same accent pattern, must have a broader focus, which Selkirk does not predict (see Schwarzschild 1999; Büring 2006 for counterexamples to Selkirk’s projection rules and proposals that F-projections should be unconstrained).

Likewise, the information structures of (2.144) and (2.145) should be very different because they have different accent patterns. However, both “her blue sedan” and “her red convertible” appear in exactly the same context and make
exactly the same contribution to the discourse. Thus, the F-projection theory fails both ways: constituents which bear different information structure values bear the same accent while constituents with different accent structures make the same information structure contribution.

What can we conclude from this? There seems to be some connection between focus and accent, since the focused constituent has an accent somewhere, but this connection is clearly not direct or trivial. In particular, it seems difficult to derive the focus structure of an utterance from its stress structure (more on this below).

Schwarzschild’s (1999) seminal article turns the focus-accent tradition on its head by centering around the notion of *givenness*. The definitions in (2.149) and (2.150) ground his analysis:

(2.149) **Definition of given**

An utterance \( U \) counts as *given* iff it has a salient antecedent \( A \) and

a. if \( U \) is of type \( e \), then \( A \) and \( U \) co-refer.

b. otherwise: modulo \( \exists \)-type shifting, \( A \) entails the Existential F-closure of \( U \).

**Existential F-Closure of** \( U \) = def the result of replacing F-marked phrases in \( U \) with variables and existentially closing the result, modulo existential type shifting.

(2.150) **Givenness:** if a constituent is not F-marked, it must be given.  

*Avoid F:* F-mark as little as possible, without violating *Givenness.*

Let us see how these definitions work with example (2.144). Since “red” is accented, it is F-marked. However, the phrase “her red convertible” counts as given. First, we have to apply existential F closure of this phrase. Existential F closure consists of replacing the F-marked constituent (identifiable by accent) for a variable and existentially close this variable. Thus, we obtain \( \exists x[(\text{her } x \text{ convertible})] \). There is an antecedent in the discourse that entails this formula, namely “her blue convertible.” Consequently, “her red convertible” counts as given.

This is, of course, not the result we want for (2.144) since the whole phrase “her red convertible” is the answer to the wh-question, hence the focus. Schwarzschild (1999: 168–9) discusses an example similar to this one and agrees that F-projection can be extended to the whole DP—thus, I understand that *Avoid F* can be trumped by discourse-assembly considerations. Notice that extending the focus to the whole DP does not violate givenness, which allows for a constituent to be F-marked and given. As for example (2.149), with a phonology

---

23 He also provides a formal definition of *Given*. For our purposes, the less formal characterization suffices.
identical to (2.144), Avoid F ensures that F-marking does not go beyond the AP. It seems clear that accent distribution underdetermines F-marking.

Compare (2.144) and (2.145). Application of Schwarzchild’s rules yields different givenness structures because they have different accent distribution—“her blue sedan” counts as focus, “the red convertible” counts as given and it is also focused.

Thus, it seems to me that Schwarzchild’s theory is a successful theory of main stress accent. However, main stress location is not a good predictor of the information structure of a sentence.

Let us now turn to Catalan momentarily. As we have seen in extenso the information structure is transparent in the syntax in this language: whatever is rheme must remain in situ, whatever is [+a] must be dislocated. Thus, when translating the above sentences into Catalan we can clearly see what is [+a] or [−a]. The result is the following:

(2.151) Context: Mary drove her blue convertible. What did John drive?
- Va conduir el seu descapotable vermell.
  PAST drive.inf the her/his convertible red

(2.152) Context: Mary drove her blue convertible. What did John drive?
- Va conduir el seu sedan blau. // Va conduir
  PAST drive.inf the her/his sedan blue PAST drive.inf
  un sedan blau.
  a sedan blue

(2.153) Context: What did John drive?
- Va conduir el seu descapotable vermell.
  PAST drive the her/his convertible red

(2.154) Context: Mary drove her blue convertible. What kind of convertible did John drive?
- Va conduir un de vermell, de descapotable.
  PAST drive.inf a of red of convertible

So, the word descapotable is dislocated only in the fourth sentence. In particular, the word descapotable is not dislocated in (2.151), which tells us that this word is not [+a] in this sentence. I conclude that Catalan tells us the truth and that “convertible” is not [+a] in (2.144) or (2.151)—instead, it is just accidentally co-referent with the word “convertible” in the context.

But then, why is there a difference in accentual patterns between (2.144) and (2.145) if it is not related to information structure? Why do (2.144) and (2.147) have the same accent structure even if their information structures are so
different? Here I venture an answer, postponing a deeper exploration for future research. Let us adopt the Gricean maxim: avoid repetition. A “repeated” constituent is not the same as a [+a] constituent, repetition is not necessarily part of an anaphoric process (and an anaphor does not necessarily involve repeating), but may be just the result of accidental coreference. Since repetition of “convertible” in (2.144) is inevitable, deaccenting it allows the speaker to at least partially comply with the maxim by simply weakening the repetition.

2.6.2 Focus, the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR), and Stress Shift

Recent analysis of the correspondence between stress and focus propose that focus/presupposition structures are read from the phonology of the sentence—in other words, the module that I call pragmatics would assign the feature “focus” to the constituent that receives stress according to the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR) or, failing that, by application of a rule of stress shift (Reinhart 1995, 2006; Szendrői 2001, 2006). A Focus Prominence Rule (FPR) would presumably overrule the NSR to ensure that the focused constituent gets stress.

The purpose of this section is to cast some doubt on the “from-stress-to-focus” approach. I will show that sometimes the NSR gives a set of possible foci, sometimes it gives us no focus at all. Moreover, the contrast between (2.144) and (2.147) is unexplained.

The NSR, originally proposed by Chomsky and Halle (1968), is a phonological rule that determines the main stress of a sentence by applying cyclically to bigger syntactic domains. Cinque (1993) revives the old NSR of Chomsky and Halle (1968). His proposal is that the regular stress pattern of a sentence is predictable: it follows always on the most deeply embedded constituent. A Cinque-style NSR can be seen in the following example:

\[2.155\]

| Line 1 (word) | * | * | * |
| Line 2 (VP cycle) | [ | * | ] |
| Line 3 (TP cycle) | [ | * | ] |

Cinque further argues that focus can be defined in terms of stress: a FPR tells us that focus is any constituent that contains the main sentential stress.

Notice that in this framework, the same accentual pattern can give rise to several focus structures: for instance, (2.156) can have the three focus structures F₁, F₂, and F₃, depending on the context in which it is found. All three have the same stress pattern, with nuclear stress on “Jane”:
Thus, stress creates only a range of possible foci, which one is to be chosen needs to be decided by the context.

One famous challenge for this sort of approach is that stress can fall on a constituent different from the lowest, which alters the focus structure of the sentence. For instance, stress can fall on the verb (see Selkirk 1984 for detailed discussion):

(2.157) Mary \[ F_4 \text{ greeted} \] Jane

Context 4 for F4: What did Mary do to Jane?

Reinhart calls the operation that allows stress to target a constituent in apparent violation of the NSR *stress shift*, and it is intended to apply only when the NSR would give rise to a focus structure at odds with the context. With stress shift, focus does not project, so the focus structure involves only the verb. This is appropriate only in context 4. Could we use the stress pattern of (2.156) for F4? No, the FPR would be violated because stress on “Jane” would fall out of the F4.

More interestingly, could we use the stress pattern in (2.157) to express the focus structures of F3 and F4? Note that the FPR is not violated: the main sentential stress is inside the focus. Reinhart (1995, 2006) proposes an answer to this question, based on her notion of “Interface Economy”: the exceptional or “marked” stress assignment of (2.157) is blocked because an ordinary “less marked” option exists, the one derived by the NSR. Thus, the interface between phonology and pragmatics has to pull off quite a complex piece of work: it has to sort out which of the possible foci is appropriate for a given stress pattern and has to figure out if the stress pattern in the input is normal or marked.

Let us return to (2.144) and (2.147) for a second. In (2.144) and (2.147), the main stress is on the adjective. Example (2.147) is clearly an instance of stress-shift, given the context: if there is no stress-shift, the NSR targets “convertible” and we end up with the DP as focus in a context that requires only the AP to be focus.

How about (2.144)? Stress-shift seems unnecessary, since the NSR would target “convertible” and the resulting F-marking would project to the entire DP, as desired. Reinhart could argue that (2.144) is not the outcome of stress-shift but of anaphoric destressing. She defines anaphoric destressing as
applying “when a DP (or other constituent) denotes an entity already in the context set. . . . A denotation of this type is often found with definite DPs . . . , but is most noticeable with pronouns” (Reinhart 2006: 144). “Convertible” is not a definite DP, and not an “entity,” but presumably one could extend the notion of anaphoric destressing to this example. However, there are no detectable phonological differences between (2.144) and (2.147), so attributing one to stress-shift and the other to anaphoric destressing seems ad hoc. We are tempted to conclude that the assumption that focus derives from stress can only be maintained by using some heavy machinery.

As mentioned, it has always been understood that a difficulty of the stress to focus approach is that a stress structure supplied by the NSR can give rise to several focus structures. I would like to point out that the difficulty also goes in the opposite direction: the outcome of the NSR may also give rise to no focus structure. Consider the following sentence with a non-restrictive relative clause:

(2.158) Context: What happened to Napoleon, winner of a thousand battles?
Napoleon, the man who had won a thousand battles, eventually lost the war.

A coarse examination of the phonology of the relative clause reveals that application of the NSR gives us the correct stress pattern: the deepest c-commanded constituent gets sentential stress. However, the relative clause is not part of the focus. Thus, the NSR may not only generate a set of focus structures (as opposed to a unique focus structure), it may generate no focus at all.

Thus, it seems that the “from-stress-to-focus” approach generates no predictions. How about “from-focus-to-stress”? It does seem that every instance of focus includes the main stress, as the reader can check in any of the previous examples. As for where the stress exactly falls within the focus constituent, it seems that the lowest c-command rule is the default case, stress falls on a different constituent to avoid full repetition of a word.

Unstressed constituents in English may be out of the regular focus, as “Jane” is in example (2.156). But an unstressed constituent can also be part of a focused constituent, as is “convertible” in (2.144). Deaccenting itself does not seem to be connected to the feature [+a], a deaccented constituent is found in the previous discourse but does not necessarily fall within the stricter purview of [+a].

Example (2.156) would involve dislocation of “Jane” in Catalan, a displacement to Spec,v in order to receive the [+a] feature. However, I do not have any
evidence that such a movement takes place in English. It may well be the case that [+a] is simply not encoded in the grammar of English, instead, all that is encoded is a looser notion of “± novelty.” At this point, I have nothing interesting to add to the relationship between stress and information structure in English. In subsequent chapters, I limit the scope of my investigations to the Romance data and the clear connection between syntactic structure and information structure in this language family.

2.7 Conclusion

I have argued that the features [±a] and [±c] describe the information structure of dislocations and focus fronting in Catalan (and, I believe of Italian and Spanish). I predict that a constituent bearing one combination of these features will appear in a certain structural position: [+a] constituents are dislocated, [+c] constituents appear in the left periphery. I have further explored the properties of [+a], under the guise of “strong anaphor.” I have argued that notions like “focus” and “topic” are not useful for an analysis of sentence grammar in this language (family) because they make no predictions: a constituent identified as “topic” can be dislocated or in situ, or even FFed (as in Vallduví’s 1992 analysis of FF as a link); a constituent identified as “focus” can appear dislocated, fronted or in situ. Further, I have explored some of the consequences of this framework and presented some challenges to the idea that focus is derived from stress.

Are the conclusions in this chapter universal? Is it the case that the notions of topic and focus really play no role in sentence grammar in any language? Let us assume a language in which, for example, dislocated constituents are [+a] and additionally exhibit the properties of topics: they are what the sentence is about (in some empirically demonstrable way), they must be referential if definite and specific if indefinite, etc.—Greek may well be such a language, see Anagnostopoulou (1994) and Kallulli (1999). An analysis of the Romance/Greek contrast could go along the following lines: in Romance the feature [+a] is free to combine with any sort of constituent, with the result that any constituent can be dislocated and become a strong anaphor. In Greek, according to the literature on the topic, [+a] can only combine with a D[+spec/ref]. As a result non-specific, non-referential DPs in Greek can never dislocate and become [+a] (they can, of course, accidentally co-refer with constituents in the previous discourse).

What could we conclude from this? Only that “topic” is a particular amalgam of features that may surface in the grammars of some languages. But “topic” is not a grammatical primitive that predicts a certain grammatical
behavior since an alternative, less specified amalgam exists that yields the same behavior. The term “topic” is usable, provided that it be demoted to the status of an informal, descriptive term.

As for focus, a similar reasoning applies. I have shown that constituents that qualify as focus in Romance and have been labeled as such can actually behave quite differently. My approach has been to split apart the notion and use more elemental features that do make some predictions. Again, nothing prevents us from using the word “focus” informally to refer to a particular combination of features as long as we clarify which combination we are talking about.
The syntax of dislocations and focus fronting

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the syntax of CLRD, CLLD, and FF, with a few words on wh-phrases, maintaining my focus on the Catalan data. The following is a section by section breakdown of my main conclusions.

Section 3.2 is devoted to CLRD. I argue that CLRD involves movement of a constituent to Spec,v where, after a dependency is established with the clitic, pragmatics assigns it the feature [+a] (i.e. it becomes a strong anaphor, see Chapter 2). The rightward location of CLRD is due to prosodic constraints on intonational phrasing that trump Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA).

In Section 3.3 I present arguments that the landing site of CLLD, FF, and wh-phrases cannot be higher than Spec,Fin, contrary to what has been held as the standard assumption since Rizzi (1997). I further argue that having multiple specifiers does not necessarily conflict with the LCA, again contra standard assumptions (see Frascarelli 2000, among many others), multiple specifiers only conflict with the LCA in combination with the definition of c-command that Kayne assumes.

Sections 3.4 and 3.5 discuss CLLD, FF, and wh-movement. I show that they all move to Spec,Fin, where they become [+c] (i.e. they open up quantification domains, see Chapter 2). CLLD also stops at Spec,v and gets [+a]. This is how the similarities between CLLD and CLRD on one side and CLLD and FF on the other are captured.

Thus, in the model I present here C_{HL} builds syntactic objects, phases, which interact with the interpretive module pragmatics. vP and FinP are the phases. Figure 3.1 shows the general form of the grammatical architecture that I will be assuming.

The lexicon feeds the computational system, building phases. Once a phase has been built, pragmatics intervenes assigning the features [±a] and [±c] to
constituents according to their position and the types of dependencies they are in.

In Chapter 1, I briefly argued that lexical items and their projections include three feature matrices: a morphosyntactic, a semantic and a phonological matrix. The features \([±a]\) and \([±c]\) affect all three.

After the features are assigned, the semantic matrix is stripped and fed into the Discourse Representation Structure (DRS). The features \([±a]\) and \([±c]\) affect how the constituents of the new phase are integrated into the DRS. Likewise, the phonological matrix is fed to the phonetic module carrying the \([±a]\) and \([±c]\) features, with their well-known (if less than perfectly understood) roles in the placement of stress. Finally, \([±a]\) and \([±c]\) are also part of the morphosyntactic matrix. Their presence is felt as the derivation proceeds—as I show in Chapter 4, the derivations subsequent to pragmatic feature assignment must be consistent with these features and cannot give rise to outcomes that would involve an alteration or replacement of the assigned features.

Sections 3.2 to 3.5 present the mechanics of how the interpretation of syntactic chunks—phases—is derivationally carried out. However, the material presented here is—mostly—compatible to non-derivational approaches to information structure or even to derivational approaches that do not
assume phases. The bulk of the empirical argumentation that only a derivational framework that incorporates phases derives the right predictions is developed in Chapter 4.

In Section 3.6 I show that co-occurrence restrictions involving elements in the left periphery—for example, one can have two CLLDs but not two FFs—must be accounted for using interpretability restrictions, skewing the phrase structural solutions that Rizzi proposes.

Section 3.7 discusses subjects. First I discuss whether all pre-verbal subjects in a null subject language are dislocated—as argued in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998), among many others—and conclude that this is not the case. Then I briefly discuss right dislocated subjects.

Section 3.8 opens the empirical domain to Finnish, a language that allows only one constituent in the left periphery. I argue that the multiple specifiers analysis provides a better insight into the nature of Finnish than an alternative with dedicated functional categories to express topic and focus.

From the above summary, the reader may have noticed that this chapter enters a steadier dialogue/debate with the framework derived from Rizzi (1997), particularly in sections 3.3, 3.6, and 3.8. Recall that Rizzi argues that the left periphery should be split into at least four categories: Force, Fin, Topic, and Focus. I show that although the empirical evidence warrants splitting CP in two categories (corresponding to finiteness and force), the evidence accumulated throughout this chapter argues that integrating topic and focus in the syntax by means of syntactic categories is misguided.

The syntactic argumentation presented here takes several assumptions for granted that are currently subject to debate. Most important among them, I take it that CLLD and CLRD are derived by movement and this movement is driven by formal features of the moving items. The issues are complex enough to necessitate an independent chapter—Chapter 6, in fact.

As in the previous chapter, unless otherwise indicated all examples are in Catalan.

3.2 CLRD

3.2.1 The position of CLRD

The purpose of this section is to argue that a CLRD constituent is displaced to Spec,v. First, we have to make sure that the dislocated constituent has actually moved, rather than being simply deaccented. Villalba (2000) points out that, although the Catalan order of complements is fairly rigid (DO+IO+PP), the order of dislocates is free:
(3.1) a. Vaig enviar el paquet a la Joana.
   PAST.1st send.inf the package DAT the Joana
   ‘I sent Joana the package.’

b. *Vaig enviar a la Joana el paquet

c. L’hi vaig enviar a la Joana, el paquet.
   Cl.acc’Cl.dat PAST.1st send.inf DAT the Joana the package

Villalba takes this as evidence that CLRD involves movement. In Spanish, a language that allows for more flexibility in this area, we can find confirmation that right dislocates alter the relative c-command hierarchy of the verbal complements. As shown by Bleam (2004), when we have the structure DatCl+V+IO+DO, the indirect object asymmetrically c-commands the direct object:

(3.2) a. Le entregué a cada autor su libro. [Sp]
   Cl.dat gave.1st DAT each author his/her book
   ‘I gave each author her/his book.’

b. Le entregué a su autor cada libro
   Cl.dat gave.1st DAT its author each book
   (bound reading??)
   ‘I gave its author each book.’

c. No le entregué a ningún autor su libro.
   NEG Cl.dat gave.1st DAT no author her/his book
   ‘I gave no author her/his book.’

d. No le entregué a su autor ningún libro.
   NEG Cl.dat gave.1st DAT its author no book
   (bound reading *)
   ‘I gave its author no book.’

This asymmetry indicates that the indirect object is base-generated in a position higher than the direct object. The tree in (3.3), based on Demonte (1995) and Marantz (1993) represents it:

(3.3) $
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{IO} \\
le \text{v}_{\text{appl}} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DO}
\end{array}$

Syntax and Information Structure
But a CLRDed direct object can c-command an indirect object in the presence of le (in this example, showing up as se):¹

(3.4) **Context:** Who did you give each book to?
Se lo entregué a su autor, cada libro. (compare with 2b)

‘I gave its author each book.’ / ‘I gave each book to its author.’

This indicates that the dislocated object is in a position higher than the indirect object. We find the same result if we apply this test in reverse. A negative quantifier in indirect object position can bind a variable in the direct object. However, if the direct object is dislocated, this binding is not possible:

(3.5) a. No le entregué a ningún cliente su chaqueta.

‘I gave no customer his jacket.’

b. No se la entregué a ningún cliente, su chaqueta.

(bound reading *)

Data from Italian presented by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2006) provide cross-linguistic confirmation that dislocation alters the quantifier–variable relations among the verbal complements. In (3.6a) the quantifier can bind the pronoun but in (3.6b), where the constituent containing the pronoun is dislocated, this binding is not possible. This strongly suggests that the dislocated constituent is higher than its normal θ-position:

(3.6) a. Maria ha presentato ad ogni ragazzo il suo professore. [It]

Maria has introduced to every student the his teacher

b. Maria lo ha presentato ad ogni ragazzo il suo professore

(bound reading: *)

¹ Dislocated quantifiers always sound a little less than perfect, I assume because quantifiers, particularly universal and distributive quantifiers, do not make good anaphors. I provide a little context to make the example more palatable.
Principle-C effects help us reach the same conclusion. In (3.7a), the pronoun in IO position c-commands the DO, making co-reference impossible. In (3.7b), the same co-reference is possible, which suggests that the DO is out of the c-command domain of the IO:

(3.7) a. Le devolví a ella el libro de Anna Tusquets. [Sp] 
   Cl.dat return.PAST.1sg DAT her the book of A.T. 
   (bound reading *)

b. CONTEXT: What did you do with Anna Tusquets’ book? 
   Se lo devolví a ella, el libro de Anna T. 
   Cl.dat Cl.acc return.PAST.1sg DAT her the book of A.T. 
   ‘I returned the book by A.T. to her.’

Notice that (3.5) tells us that there is no reconstruction in CLRD, because reconstruction would place the dislocated constituent back in situ, where the quantifier could bind the variable. This datum suggests that we have an instance of A-movement (see Lasnik 2003 and references therein on this). Two more pieces of data confirm this. First, CLRD dumps floating quantifiers:

(3.8) Els vaig enviar tots, els paquets. 
   Cl.acc PAST.1sg send.inf all the packages 
   ‘I sent all the packages.’

   (López 2003)

Unlike Hiberno-English (McCloskey 2000), Catalan only dumps floating quantifiers in A-movement, never in A’-movement:

(3.9) a. Els homes semblen tots haver decidit la mateixa cosa. 
   ‘The men seem all to have decided the same thing.’

b. Els homes van ser tots castigats pels seus crims. 
   ‘The men were all punished for their crimes.’

c. *ELS HOMES, va veure Maria tots al mercat. 
   ‘*THE MEN, Maria saw all in the market.’

d. *Quins homes va veure Maria tots al mercat? 
   ‘*Which men did Maria see all in the market?’

Second, although CLRD does not intervene in A’-movement (Villalba 1996), it does so in A movement, as can be witnessed in the following examples:

(3.10) Quins paquets li van enviar, a la Joana? 
   ‘Which packages were sent to Joana?’

   (Villalba 1996)
Thus, three pieces of evidence suggest that CLRD involves A-movement.

The next question is, where is the target of CLRD? Some analyses have presented CLRD as being in a high position in the structure (Vallduví 1992; Frascarelli 2000; Samek-Lodovici 2006). Frascarelli’s analysis even entails that CLRD is higher than CLLD (as I explain in detail in Chapter 6). Evidence indicates that CLLD is higher than CLRD. For instance a quantifier in a CLLD can bind a variable in a CLRD but the opposite is not possible. This suggests that CLLD asymmetrically c-commands CLRD (as shown by Villalba 2000):

Villalba also shows that a constituent can be extracted from CLRD and left dislocated. But it is not possible to extract a constituent from CLLD and right dislocate it. This confirms once again that the relative positions of CLLD and CLRD are not symmetric:

Let us now see the position of CLRD with respect to the subject. The examples in (3.14) show that CLRD must be lower than the preverbal subject. Sentence (3.14a) shows that a quantifier in object position cannot bind a variable in the
preverbal subject, a judgment that likewise holds for a dislocated object, as shown in (3.14b). Both sentences contrast with CLLD: the left dislocated object is able to bind a variable in subject position, as shown in (3.14c).

(3.14) **Context:** Who did his best friend give a book to?

a. El seu millor amic li va regalar un llibre a cada noi.

‘His best friend gave a book to every boy.’ (bound reading *)

b. El seu millor amic li va regalar un llibre, a cada noi

(c. A cada noi, el seu millor amic li va regalar un llibre.

Thus, a left dislocated object is higher than Spec,T while a right dislocated object is lower than Spec,T. The crucial point now is the position of CLRD with respect to the post-verbal subject which, as generally assumed, should be taken to sit in Spec,v. Crucially, the post-verbal subject can be bound by a quantifier in a CLRDed direct complement:

(3.15) **Context:** Who gave a book to each boy?

L’hi va regalar el seu millor amic,

un llibre, a cada noi.

‘His best friend gave each boy a book.’

We can also take advantage of the availability of VSO orders in Spanish to broaden the point. When we have the VSO order, the subject c-commands the object, as shown in (3.16a). But this c-command configuration is broken when the object is CLRDed:

(3.16) a. Ayer no trajo ningún niño su libreta. [Sp]
‘Yesterday, no child brought her/his notebook.’

b. Ayer no la trajo ningún niño, su libreta.

(bound reading *)

Thus, we are finally able to pin-point that the position where CLRD goes is higher than the Spec,v where subjects are generated and lower than Spec,T, where pre-verbal subjects go. I assume that this intermediate position is a
higher Spec, v (and see McGinnis 1998 on how A-movement does not “tuck in”):

(3.17)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CLRD} \\
\text{SU}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{vP(3.17)}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{v'} \\
\text{v'}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{v} \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

In (3.17) and every tree in this book I draw specs to the left of heads and complements to the right. This should be taken to be a useful convention, I do not think there is any left or right in syntax, linearization issues being PF-interface issues (more on this in Section 3.2.4).

3.2.2 The structure of the clitic

Dislocated constituents are always doubled by a clitic in Catalan (except subjects). The shape of the clitic co-varies with the type of dislocate according to three parameters of variation. The first parameter is the syntactic category of the dislocate: thus, dislocated APs and CPs are doubled by ho, dislocated PPs are doubled by hi or en while dislocated DPs are doubled by a range of different clitics. Here are examples of dislocated AP, CP, and PP:

(3.18) Intel.ligent, no ho és.
     Intelligent NEG Cl is
     ‘Intelligent, he is not.’

(3.19) No ho crec, que hagi vingut.
     NEG Cl believe.1st.sg that has come.ptc
     ‘I don’t believe that he has come.’

(3.20) A Barcelona hi vaig a l’estiu.
     To Barcelona Cl go.1st.sg at the’summer
     ‘I go to Barcelona during the summer.’

The second and third parameters of variation affect only clitics that associate with DPs. The second parameter is the φ-feature: em for first person, et for second, ens for first plural, us for second plural:

(3.21) Jo, en realitat, no em vull quedar.
     I in reality NEG Cl want.1st.sg stay.inf
     ‘I do not really want to stay.’
(3.22) Doncs jo penso que tu, en realitat et vols quedar.  
So I think.1st.sg that you in reality Cl want.2nd.sg stay.inf  
‘Well, I think that in fact you want to stay.’

(3.23) Nosaltres, en realitat, no ens volem quedar.  
We in reality NEG Cl want.1st.sg stay.inf  
‘We in fact do not want to stay.’

(3.24) Doncs jo penso que vosaltres, en realitat us voleu quedar.  
So I think.1st.sg that you.pl in reality Cl want.2nd.pl stay.inf  
‘Well, I think that in fact you guys want to stay.’

In the third person plural, there are two possibilities, according to the feature specificity. The clitics els/les bear a visible mark for plural and gender (masculine and feminine respectively). They double specific or generic DPs. The clitic en bears no Φ-features and doubles non-specific DPs:

(3.25) Jo, les patates, no les vull.  
I the potatoes NEG Cl want.1st.sg  
‘I don’t want the potatoes.’

(3.26) Jo, unes noies d’aquest barri, no les vull trobar.  
I some girls from this neighborhood NEG Cl want.1st.sg meet.inf  
‘I do not want to run into some of the girls from this neighborhood.’

(3.27) Jo, unes noies com aquestes, mai les vull trobar.  
I some girls like these never Cl want.1st.sg meet.inf  
‘I do not want to run into this kind of a girl.’

(3.28) Jo, de patates, no en vull.  
I of potatoes NEG Cl want.1st.sg  
‘I don’t want potatoes.’

The final parameter of variation is case morphology, which is visible only in the third person singular: el/la/en are accusative and li is dative. Additionally, el/la double specific or generic DPs while en doubles non-specific DPs. Finally, el is masculine and la is feminine. The following are some examples:
Thus, clitics are the spell-out of feature matrices (as in Bonet 1995, among others) that include, minimally, a reference to category. If the category is D, and the case accusative, the picture is more complex, but it responds to the following generalization: if the feature matrix bears ϕ-features, the DP is specific/generic or definite. Or, in other words, there is a correlation between ϕ-feature agreement and specificity, as documented in other languages (see Lyons 1999 for an overview). I take these feature matrices to be affixes, merged with the functional head v in a parallel derivation before v enters the main derivation.\(^2\)

The next question to ask is what is the connection between the clitic and dislocation. The Catalan data are very clear: whenever there is a clitic, the XP associated with it must be displaced. One must conclude that the presence of the clitic triggers displacement (the crosslinguistic data make things more complicated, as is well-known, since in some languages the clitic does not force displacement; more on this in Chapter 5). Building on this correlation, Jaeggli (1982) proposes (for Spanish) that the clitic takes up the Case feature

\(^2\) There are two classes of analyses of Romance clitics. The traditional approach, reflected in Kayne (1975), assumes they are pronouns, merged as complements of a verb that adjoin to a host—the host can be the lexical verb itself, as in Kayne’s original proposal, or a higher functional category. A second tradition, represented by Strozer (1976), Borer (1984), and Suñer (1988), takes them to be agreement morphemes generated as part of the clitic host. Since I generate the clitic with its host I am more in line with this second tradition.

A third approach was initiated by Torrego (1992) and developed by Uriagereka (1995), Zubizarreta (1998), Ordoñez and Treviño (1999), and Cechetto (2000). The proposal is that the clitic is the complement of the verb and the doubled DP is an argument of the clitic in a BigDP headed by the clitic. In Cechetto’s (2000) analysis of CLLD, the dislocated constituent raises from out of the BigDP. An investigation of these matters is taken up in Chapter 6, where I argue that the clitic as verbal morphology is the best supported analysis (except for Wackernagel clitics, which should get a different analysis).
of the verb, thus forcing the doubled DP to dislocate. I take this intuition to be essentially correct, although with the caveat that the feature that the clitic takes up cannot be Case, since there are PP and AP clitics.

The following is a formalization of the connection between the clitic and movement (for those languages without clitic doubling). We start with the feature composition of v. It is commonly assumed that v has valued Case and unvalued \( \phi \)-features, the latter turning v into a probe. Let’s say that v has an extra feature, akin to Case, that we can call \([f]\). Let us further assume that verbal arguments have an unvalued version of \([f]\), which I notate as \([uf]\). Normally v values the \([f]\) feature of the argument when v probes, as shown in (3.32a). But let us assume that a feature matrix that I call X merges with v before v merges with its complement VP. The feature matrix X also has \([uf]\). Thus, the feature \([f]\) of v establishes a dependency with X instead of the argument, as shown in (3.32b):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(3.32) a.} \\
v' \\
v[v_f][u\phi] \\
\quad \text{XP}[u_f] \\
\quad \text{VP} \\
\text{Agree}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(3.32) b.} \\
v' \\
v \text{V} \\
x[u_f] \quad v[v_f][u\phi] \\
\quad \text{XP}[u_f] \\
\quad \text{VP} \\
\text{Agree}
\end{array}
\]

The feature matrix X is what will end up being spelled-out as the clitic in the module Morphology (see Bonet 1995).

In (3.32b), X has its \([uf]\) satisfied but XP does not. Let us assume the theory of Agree and Move sketched in Chapter 1. In this theory, probing is extremely local, reaching only the complement of the probe and the spec of the complement of the probe. Probes can be heads or maximal projections (since the latter inherit all the features of their heads). Movement is triggered by an unvalued feature in the moving object and movement stops only when a (local) dependency can be established with a head that can value the feature.

Within these assumptions, XP\([u_f]\] must raise to Spec, v. There it can probe and find the feature \([f]\) as part of the structure of v and of the (feature structure that will spell out as the) clitic. The clitic and the verbal argument form a dependency (as can be seen in the sharing of a category feature and \(\phi\)-features) that includes a valued version of \([f]\) and this is sufficient to value the \([uf]\) of XP. This configuration is depicted in (3.33):
To summarize section 3.2.2, the presence of the clitic prevents a regular dependency between v and the doubled XP, with v as probe and XP as goal. XP then needs to raise to Spec,v. XP in Spec,v can probe and establish a dependency with the clitic and v simultaneously.

### 3.2.3 Assignment of [+a]

In this section I connect the syntactic position of CLRD with its discourse anaphoric function. In an extremely influential proposal, Chomsky (2001a) has suggested that phases interface with interpretive systems with the result that the edges of phases are assigned special interpretations by means of interpretive rules. I take his general idea as a source of inspiration. Let me flesh out how.

Consider (3.33) again. When a verbal complement has raised to Spec,v, and the latter is transitive, we have a complex structure with two specs, each related to v in a different manner. The first spec is an external merge position, triggered by the selectional requirements of v and is assigned a θ-role: it is the External Argument. The second spec comes about as the result of internal merge from the VP. The sharing of φ-features indicates that X (the bundle of features that will spell out as a clitic) and XP (the constituent in Spec,v that will end up dislocated) stand in an Agree(p,g) relationship:
I now claim that the anaphoric interpretation of CLRD is a consequence of two necessary conditions: (i) Agree(p,g) relationship with X, and (ii) position in the edge of the phase, Spec,v. Let me elaborate on this further.

A constituent can be in a dependency with the clitic without raising to Spec,v: it is the case of Clitic Doubling, for those language varieties that allow for it. As I show in Chapter 5, Clitic Doubling is not anaphoric. Likewise, a constituent can be found in Spec,v without being in a dependency with a clitic: the external argument is an example. But there is also empirical evidence that wh-phrases and FFed phrases transit through Spec,v, as I show in Section 3.5. Obviously, FFed phrases and (non D-linked) wh-phrases are not anaphoric. This state of affairs is what (3.34) captures: we have to have both movement to Spec,v and a dependency with the clitic in order for a constituent to bear the feature [+a].

Let us assume that [+a] is assigned to the X feature by the interpretive module pragmatics. XP in Spec,v also becomes [+a], to the extent that it is in an Agree dependency with a feature that is [+a]. The effect of bearing [+a] is that when the semantic matrix of the phasal constituent is transferred to the DRS, the constituent bearing this feature will automatically seek an antecedent.

Thus, I take pragmatics to be invasive, in a sense approximate to that of Epstein et al. (1998), and therefore having the ability to inspect a syntactic structure and attach a feature to it. But, as in Chomsky’s system and unlike Epstein et al’s, I take interfaces to take place not after every operation but after a phase is completed. Thus, pragmatics can invade C_HL and assign [+a] only after the vP phase is completed.

Once the X position gets [+a] a default rule of pragmatics assigns [–a] to the rest of the structure—which satisfies the old intuition that focus is the unmarked pragmatic value. Thus, pragmatics includes two rules, represented in (3.35):

(3.35)  
   a. [+a] is assigned to X.
   b. The complement of v is assigned [–a].

The resulting structure is represented in (3.36):

(3.36)
A few points need to be clarified concerning (3.35) and (3.36) before I proceed. The first is that the trace of the constituent in Spec,v must also be [+a], therefore immune to (3.35b). One way to go about this is to assume Chomsky’s proposal that the elements of a chain are simply occurrences of the same object. Since head and tail are the same object, we do not need to posit a mechanism to transfer the feature from head to trace, the question is not even coherent because the feature is assigned to one single element. Once the head of the chain in Spec,v is [+a], the whole chain is, and further application of the [–a] rule will leave all the different occurrences unaffected.

Secondly, notice that the verb, adjoined to v at this point, is outside the range of both rules of (3.35). This is a good feature of the proposal, since the position of the verb is not affected by its anaphoricity. In (3.37a) it is regular focus, in (3.37b) it is anaphoric, but in no case is it dislocated:

(3.37)  
   a. -Què fa la Joana?  
      ‘What is Joana doing?’  
      -Menja un entrepà.  
      ‘She’s eating a sandwich.’  
   b. -Què ha menjat la Joana?  
      ‘What has Joana eaten?’  
      -Ha menjat un entrepà.  
      ‘She’s eaten a sandwich.’

It is well known that the position of the verb depends on its morphological properties and those of the functional nodes that c-command it and not on its information structure. Thus, designing the rules in (3.35) so that they leave the verb unaffected is adequate.3

3 Dahl (1974) notices the problem surrounding verbs. Consider the mini-discourse in (i):

(i)  
   -What does John drink?  
   -John drinks beer.

He argues that it is necessary to partition the answer sentence in two different ways, represented in (ii):

(ii)  
   a. (topic John) (comment drinks beer)  
   b. (background John drinks)(focus beer)  

However, this issue is not retaken in later work, that I know of. Vallduví (1992) mentions it but does not discuss it in any detail. In Vallduví’s system the verb in (i) would be defined as a tail. But the tail verb is indistinguishable, phonetically or syntactically, from the focus verb in (iii):

(iii)  
   -What does John do?  
   -{topic John} (focus drinks beer)

Once we understand that the grammar of verbs is independent of the information structure of the sentence, as reflected by rule (3.35), there is no need for parallel partitions of the sentence, as in Dahl (1974) nor do we have to place verbs in different information categories post hoc as in Vallduví (1992).
Thirdly, there is the domain of application of rule (3.35b). How far in the c-command domain of v should it apply? The simplest answer is that it applies until it encounters another vP. The fourth point is connected to the third: what happens if there is no X in the structure? Rule (3.35b) applies nonetheless, making everything focus.

Fourthly, the notion that [+a] has been assigned to a constituent has consequences. For instance, if a D has the MS feature matrix [øgender, βnumber, γcase], now it will have the feature structure [øgender, βnumber, γcase, ±a]. If the constituent continues moving, it drags its value of [±a] with it—and subsequent operations have to be consistent with it. This will become crucial in the next chapter.

Finally, one could question whether assignment of [+a] violates Inclusiveness, as defined in Chomsky (1995). I take it that the intent of Chomsky’s Inclusiveness Condition is to ensure that the derivation itself only consists of applications of Merge and Move (or Internal and External Merge). In particular, C_{HL} should not include extraneous operations that create or alter syntactic objects—for instance, a formulation of Move that includes something like “create trace” violates Inclusiveness. But notice that assigning features like Case to DPs as they enter C_{HL} is not taken to violate Inclusiveness.

Likewise, the feature [+a] is not created by C_{HL}, it is assigned by an external, if invasive, system. Drawing a feature from pragmatics cannot violate Inclusiveness any more than drawing it from an array/numeration.4

One could ask if it is not possible to have the feature [+a] as a feature in C_{HL}, triggering displacement without the need of a formal feature. As I show in my discussion of FF and wh-movement, there is no correlation between moving to Spec,v and being anaphoric. That is, if FF transits through Spec,v, it is clear that [+a] cannot be the trigger of movement.

This is a good point to go back to a puzzle left over from the previous chapter. At that point we saw that a CLRDeed constituent can be generic even if the antecedent is not:

(3.38) El Joan va comprar aquesta carn. Li agrada molt, la carn.

‘John bought this meat. He likes meat very much.’

4 Szendröi (2006) argues that the assignment of the [+Focus] feature in Jackendoff (1972) and Zubizarreta (1998) to items already in C_{HL} does violate Inclusiveness. I tend to agree with Szendröi in these cases, since the feature [+Focus] among these authors seems to come from nowhere or from C_{HL} itself. However, I do not believe that Szendröi’s criticism extends to my framework, in which feature assignment only takes place at interface points by external modules and not as an operation in C_{HL}.
As I explained, this is a puzzle, since any other instance of CLRD has a relation of identity to its antecedent. Let’s assume that DPs become generic when bound by a generic operator, Gen. Further, let’s assume that Gen is a sentential operator found very high in the structure of the sentence (Krifka et al. 1995, Moltmann 2006). In the clause structure suggested in Chapter 1, Gen could be associated with the head Force, higher than the phase boundary FinP. Finally, let’s take it that DPs have the range of interpretations given by the structure of the determiners and this structure is not altered until bound by Gen.

The semantic matrix of XP[+a] is transferred to the DRS when the FinP phase is completed. At this point XP[+a] is not generic yet. That is because the Force head has not been introduced and therefore Gen has not been introduced either. The anaphoric relationship can be established. Later, the ForceP is built, including Gen. When ForceP is transferred to DRS, Gen is able to bind XP[+a] without altering the anaphoric relationship established previously:

1. \([vP \ V XP]\) \(\rightarrow\) XP raises to Spec,v
2. \([vP \ XP \ v V t]\) \(\rightarrow\) XP is assigned [+a]
3. \([vP \ XP[+a] \ v V t]\) \(\rightarrow\) FinP is built
4. \([\text{FinP} \ \text{Fin T} \ [vP \ XP[+a] \ v V t]]\) \(\rightarrow\) TP is transferred to DRS
5. (XP[+a] seeks an antecedent in DRS) \(\rightarrow\) ForP is built
6. \([\text{ForceP} \ \text{Force Gen T} \ [vP \ XP[+a] \ v V t]]\) \(\rightarrow\) ForP is transferred to DRS
7. (Gen seeks an XP to bind) \(\rightarrow\) Gen binds XP
8. \([CP \ C \ Gen \ T \ [vP \ XP[+a] \ v V t]]\)

Thus, [+a] generics provide quite a surprising piece of evidence for the derivational approach to syntax–interpretation interfaces.

3.2.4 Order

One question that has long vexed the student of right dislocations is the reason why they appear on the far right, a problem that arises in a syntactic field heavily influenced by Kayne (1994). Recall that Kayne proposes that c-command is reflected directly in precedence relations, so (roughly) if a constituent A c-commands a constituent B, then the terminals they dominate are sequenced such as a precedes b. If CLRD c-commands the verbal phrase, why does it follow it?

In particular, see Moltmann’s (2006) arguments that Gen takes widest scope.
One possibility is to do away with Kayne’s theory and assume, as Vallduví (1992) and others did, that rightward movement is possible. However, the evidence that supports the c-command-precedence correlation is wide-ranging, encompassing NP-raising, wh-movement, focus-movement, etc. There should be a way to account for CLRD while maintaining the essence of Kayne’s idea.

The usual solution has been to posit leftward movement of the dislocate followed by remnant movement of the vP or some larger constituent (Belletti 2004; Cechetto 1999; Frascarelli 2000; Villalba 2000):

(3.40) 1. Jo els he llegit els llibres.  \(\rightarrow\) obj raising
       I Cl.acc have read the books
2. Jo [els llibres] els he llegit t  \(\rightarrow\) VP raising
3. Jo [els he llegit t] els llibres t

However, I would like to try a different tack (here I present only a sketch, a full account is developed in López to appear). Let us assume, following Chomsky’s (1995) suggestion, that syntax is only concerned with structural relations such as dominance and c-command, not with sequential ordering—to use Uriagereka’s (1999) metaphor, syntax is like Calder mobile, where you cannot say that something is “to the left” or “to the right” of something else. Instead, linearization takes place at the interface between syntax and PF and the LCA is a principle that regulates this mapping. Assume that other principles, of a prosodic nature, are also operative in this syntax–PF interface. One such principle is Truckenbrodt’s (2005) Wrap-CP, which requires that a sentence be contained within one intonational phrase, thus ruling out (3.41a). In (3.41b) and (3.41c) the CP is wrapped in an intonational phrase.

(3.41)  a. *\([\text{CP} \ (1\ldots) \ (1\ldots)]\]
       b. \(\sqrt{\text{CP} \ (1\ldots)}\]
       c. \(\sqrt{\text{CP} \ (1\ldots)} \ [(1\ldots)]\]

Let me reinterpret Wrap-CP along the following lines:

(3.42) \textbf{Wrap Extended Projection Verb (Wrap-EPV)}

The extended projection of the lexical verb (v,T,C) must be contained in one intonational phrase.
Plainly, with respect to the data types represented in (3.41), (3.42) makes the same predictions as Truckenbrodt’s Wrap-CP. Additionally, it allows us to avoid utilizing X’ terminology that is not assumed in this work (and it has some empirical advantage discussed in López to appear).

Let us further assume that CLRD erects an intonational boundary to its right (as argued for by Frascarelli (2000) for Italian, Prieto (2002) for Catalan and Zubizarreta (1998) for Spanish. Technically, we can propose a constraint such as the following:

(3.43) Align-(R,[+a]): Align the right boundary of a [+a] constituent with the right boundary of an intonational phrase.

Finally, let us assume the constraint ranking in (3.44):

(3.44) Align-(R,[+a]) // Wrap-EPV >> LCA

The high ranking of Align ensures that [+a] constituents always erect an intonational boundary. The higher ranking of Wrap-EPV over LCA ensures that the prosodic requirement beats the c-command requirement on linearization.

So, let us now assume that a constituent has moved to Spec,v and received the [+a] feature. In principle, this constituent could be linearized to the left or to the right, as shown in the following tree.

(3.45) TP
    /
   /   
subj T' T0 vP
    /   
   [+a]1 v' [+a]2
    /   
   v VP

Example (3.46.1) shows the outcome of linearizing [+a] to the left. Wrap-EPV is violated, because v and V are contained in an intonational phrase separated from T and C. Linearizing to the right yields (3.46.2). In (3.46.2) the extended projection of the verb is contained within one intonational phrase, thus respecting Wrap-EPV. However, this linearization violates the LCA because the [+a] constituent c-commands the VP but it is linearized to the right of it. Under the assumption that the LCA is ranked lower than Wrap-EPV, (3.46.2) ends up being the winning candidate.
3.2.5 Interim conclusions

To conclude: CLRD is the consequence of displacement to Spec,v, where it becomes [+a].

The sequence of operations involved in CLRD can be summarized as in (3.47):

(i) vP is built with an X feature matrix and an XP as complement of the lexical verb.
(ii) X takes up the [f] of v.
(iii) XP raises to Spec,v, triggered by [uf].
(iv) An Agree(p,g) is established between X and XP.
(v) vP interfaces with pragmatics. X and the spec associated with it receive a [+a] feature.
(vi) The complement of v gets [–a].
(vii) The P matrix of the complement of v spells out. The S matrix is fed to DRS.
(viii) The next phase (FinP) is built.
(ix) The complement of Fin is spelled-out. X on v is spelled-out as a clitic. XP is spelled-out as a rightward intonational phrase. The complement of Fin is transferred to DRS.

Notice that in (3.47) assignment of pragmatic features is ordered before the PF interface. This reflects a view of the grammar in which PF reads pragmatic features and translates them into phonetic features (Zubizarreta 1998). This is not generally accepted: Reinhart (1995, 2006), Szendrői (2001, 2006) among others propose analyses in which information structure is read off phonological structure. For discussion, see Section 2.6 of this book.

3.3 Movement to Spec,Fin

3.3.1 Split CP

CLLD, FF and wh-phrases all appear displaced to the left:

(3.48) a. Els llibres, els porto demà.
   the books Cl bring.1st tomorrow
   ‘I will bring the books tomorrow.’
b. ELS LLIBRES porto demà.
c. Què portes demà?
   what bring.2nd tomorrow
   ‘What will you bring tomorrow?’

Under the assumption that the left to right order normally indicates c-command, all three constituents should be located in the higher field of the clause. Rizzi (1997) provides the most influential analysis of the left periphery so far, so I will take it as the starting point of my analysis. It will turn out that, although I agree with him that the left periphery cannot consist of only one category, I disagree with his claim that “topic” and “focus” are syntactic categories on their own right. This section is therefore a continuation of the dialogue initiated in Section 2.5.

Let’s start with a quick summary of the features of Rizzi’s system relevant for our purposes. Rizzi notes that the head C encodes two types of information. The first involves the “clause type” (Cheng 1991) and decides if the sentence is, for example, declarative, interrogative, exclamative, relative, etc. This clause type can be selected by a matrix predicate. The second type of information can be encapsulated within the notion of finiteness, and it is a (somewhat fuzzy) reflection of the inflectional properties of the verbal head. This sensitivity to verbal inflection can be seen in the choice of complementizer in English: “that” for finite clauses, “for” for non-finite clauses. Thus, Rizzi proposes to separate the head C into two heads, Force and Fin. The first one “looks upward” while Fin “looks inward”. Force and finiteness are usually fused in one functional head and they are split into two heads only when the sentence includes a topic (a CLLD), a fronted focus or a wh-phrase. Evidence that the CP should be split in at least two categories is that we see the complementizer to the left of FF, CLLD, or wh-phrases:

\[(3.49)\] Creo que a María no la vas a ver. [Sp]
   Think.1st that ACC Maria NEG Cl go.2nd to see
   ‘I don’t think you’ll get to see Maria.’

I conclude that splitting CP in two separate categories is descriptively adequate.

According to Rizzi (1997), a CLLD constituent moves from its base generated position to the spec of a topic phrase, obtaining the following type of structure:
Likewise, interrogative wh-phrases and FFed phrases move to the spec of a Foc head:

\[ \text{[FocP FF/wh(focus) Foc YP(presupposition)]} \]

When we put everything together we obtain a C-domain as follows (TopP is recursive in order to accommodate multiple dislocates, more on this below):

\[ \text{[ForceP Force [TopP CLLD Top [FocP FF/wh Foc TopP CLLD Top [FinP Fin [TP]]]]]} \]

Putting other issues to the side, I concentrate on the surface position of CLLD, FF, and wh-phrases. In a model without TopP or FocP, the most natural assumption is that they are specs of Fin:

\[ \text{[Force [FinP CLLD [Fin' FF/wh Fin ...]]]} \]

Movement of CLLD, FF, wh-phrases, and other types of displacement in other languages, such as, for instance, English topicalization, are traditionally classified together as forming a type of dependency with common properties, so called $A'$-dependency. In agreement with the unity assumption, I claim that CLLD, FF, and wh-movement (and possibly topicalization in English) are triggered by an unvalued feature, call it $[f']$ (see Chomsky 2001a, P-features), lodged in the feature structure of the moving item. This unvalued feature is valued in Spec,Fin in the manner detailed below. Rizzi (2004a) has questioned the unity of $A'$-dependencies arguing that CLLD and wh-movement do not intervene with one another. In Chapter 6 I present empirical arguments for the unity of $A'$-dependencies.

The structure in (3.53) raises many questions, of which three stand out. One: how do we know that these constituents go to Spec,Fin and not anywhere else? Second, does a multiple specifiers structure entail that we must abandon Kayne’s (1994) LCA? Third, we know that there are some co-occurrence restrictions—for instance, we cannot have both a wh-phrase and an FF in the same sentence: How can the free generation of specs account for these co-occurrence restrictions? The first two questions are

---

7 The structure of the left periphery has been subject to numerous revisions within the cartographic program—see for instance Benincá and Poletto (2004), Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2006). As is to be expected, the different proposals are sometimes mutually incompatible. Thus, I have decided to focus my discussion on the seminal article. My criticisms to Rizzi (1997)—particularly those in Section 3.3.2—extend to the later proposals.
answered in sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3, the third question is answered in Section 3.6.

3.3.2 *Spec, Fin as landing site*

Here I present two arguments that indeed CLLD, FF, and wh-phrases are all in specs of Fin.

The first argument involves ATB movement. As Ross (1967) pointed out, wh-movement can violate the Coordinated Structure Constraint if the same wh-phrase is extracted from both conjuncts, as shown in (3.54):

(3.54)  
   a. What did John buy t and Peter read t?
   b. That is the book that John bought t and Peter read t.

It has not, to my knowledge, been noticed that CLLD and FF can also involve ATB movement:

(3.55)  
   Dije que los libros los vendió Susana t y [Sp]
   said.tst that the book Cl.acc sold Susana and
   los compró María t. Cl.acc bought María
   ‘I said that Susana sold the books and Maria bought them.’

(3.56)  
   LOS LIBROS DE ASTERIX vendió Susana t y [Sp]
   the books of Asterix sold Susana and
   compró María t. bought Maria
   ‘Susana sold and Maria bought the Asteri books.’

Let us proceed. One property of ATB movement is that the tenses of the coordinates do not need to be the same (Pesetsky 1982; Citko 2002):

(3.57)  
   a. I wonder what books John will buy t and Mary already bought t.
   b. LOS LIBROS compró Juan t y su esposa [Sp]
      the books bought Juan and his wife
      venderá t. sell.fut
      ‘John bought and his wife will sell the books.’
   c. Los libros los compró Juan t y los [Sp]
      the books Cl.acc bought Juan and Cl.acc
      venderá su esposa t. sell.fut his wife
This is accounted for straightforwardly if the structure includes two distinct TPs. Each of the Ts can have a different value for the same reason that, for example, the lexical verbs can also be distinct:

\[(3.58)\]

\[
&\text{P}\\
\text{TP} & \& & \text{TP}\\
\hat{T}_{\text{past}} & \hat{T}_{\text{past}}
\]

However, Pesetsky and Citko also point out that the two conjuncts must agree in finiteness. This is true in English, as shown in (3.59) and in Catalan, as shown in (3.60):

\[(3.59)\]

a. *I wonder what books to like t and you hate t.

b. I wonder what books to like t and therefore to buy t.

\[(3.60)\]

a. *No sé com empaquetarlos i (que) els NEG know.t\(^{st}\) how package.inf.Cl and that Cl.acc porti la Maria. take the Maria

b. No sé com empaquetar-los i portar-los. NEG know.t\(^{st}\) how package.inf-Cl.acc and bring.inf-Cl.acc ‘I do not know how to package and bring them.’

Proceeding with the same reasoning in reverse, this restriction entails that the structure includes only one FinP. And the observation that ATB movement must involve only one FinP can straightforwardly be accounted for if Spec,Fin is the target of the displaced constituent:

\[(3.61)\]

\[
\text{FinP}\\
\text{Spec} & \text{Fin’}\\
\text{Fin} & \&\text{P}\\
\text{TP} & \& & \text{TP}
\]

\(^8\) Note that only the first T is subject to T-to-C:

(i) Which books did Mary buy and Peter will sell?

\(^9\) I cannot provide an example with FF because FF cannot be found in a non-finite clause, as I explain below.
If we assume, as in Rizzi (1997), that Spec,Foc or Spec,Top are the positions where left peripheral constituents move, then the restriction on sharing finiteness becomes mysterious. If left peripheral constituents move to Spec, Foc/Top, then we should be able to have coordinated FinPs, each with its own value:

\[
(3.62) \quad \text{FocP} \\
\quad \text{wh/FF} \quad \text{Foc}' \\
\quad \quad \text{Foc} \quad \&P \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{FinP} \quad \& \quad \text{FinP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Fin}_{+\text{fin}} \quad \quad \text{Fin}_{-\text{fin}}
\]

I conclude that ATB constructions only have one Fin and this can only be accounted for if the target of wh-movement, FF, and CLLD is Spec,Fin or lower.

The other argument involves non-finite clauses. CLLD, wh-movement, and FF are normally not allowed in non-finite clauses:

(3.63) *El llibre comprar-lo serà difícil.
the book buy.inf.Cl be.fut difficult

(3.64) *EL LLIBRE comprar serà difícil.

(3.65) *¿Qué comprar serà difícil?
what buy.inf be.fut difficult

We can describe this state of affairs if we assume that the feature that we have called \([f']\), which triggers all movement to the left periphery, can normally only be associated with Fin\([+\text{fin}]\):

\[
(3.66) \quad \text{Fin}_{+\text{fin}}, [f'] \quad *\text{Fin}_{-\text{fin}}, [f']
\]

There is an interesting exception to (3.66). As is well-known, a matrix interrogative predicate like preguntar ‘ask’ can select for a non-finite complement with a wh-phrase:

(3.67) No sé quants comprar t.
‘I don’t know how many to buy.’
Thus, the selectional properties of the matrix predicate override the restriction in (3.66). One plausible way to approach this is that the matrix predicate assigns the \([f']\) to its complement.

But notice that we have a clear prediction now. If CLLD, FF, and wh-movement all seek the same spec and are all triggered by the same feature, then the presence of one entails the possibility that the others are present too. This holds: in interrogative non-finite clauses, CLLD is grammatical (FF is not, since wh-phrases and FF do not co-occur for independent reasons):

(3.68) **Context:** Do you know where to buy the Christmas gifts?

Donc la veritat és que no sé, els
calendars, on comprar-los t t.

Well, actually I don’t know where to buy the calendars.’

Again, within Rizzi’s approach this datum remains mysterious. Presumably, the matrix predicate can license the presence of a [+wh] Focus Phrase—but why should licensing a FocP lead to licensing a TopP?

3.3.3 *Multiple specifiers and the LCA*¹⁰

Let us now tackle the second of the questions laid out above: are multiple specifiers incompatible with the LCA? Kayne’s (1994) influential LCA puts forth the hypothesis that there is a direct mapping between c-command and linear order. Informally, it can be stated as in (3.69a). Example (3.69b) spells out his definition of c-command:

(3.69) a. **LCA:** Take X,Y, non terminal nodes that dominate the terminals x,y respectively. Take X to c-command Y while Y does not c-command X (asymmetric c-command). Then x precedes y.


Kayne sets up the LCA so that multiple specs are not possible. Consider the structure represented in (3.70):

¹⁰ For more extensive discussion on linearization of dislocated constituents, see López (to appear).
In (3.70), YP and ZP c-command one another, given the definition of c-command in (3.69b). That is because in this definition X' does not count as a category, but only as a segment of a category. As a consequence, the same categories that dominate YP also dominate ZP and YP and ZP c-command one another. Since there is no asymmetric c-command, there is no ordering of the terminals y and z. The terminals cannot be linearized and this leads to a crash.

But notice that the impossibility of multiple specs only follows if we adopt the definition of c-command that Kayne uses, with a segment-category distinction. If we adopt a definition of c-command inspired on Reinhart’s initial formulation in terms of first branching node, the problem does not arise (see also Epstein et al. 1998):

(3.71) 1. A c-commands B if Merge (A,B)
2. If A c-commands B and B dominates C, then A c-commands C.

Going back to the tree above, YP asymmetrically c-commands ZP and therefore y and z can be linearized so that y precedes z.

As a matter of fact, classic tests such as quantifier-variable relations show that when we have two dislocated constituents, the first one asymmetrically c-commands the second (as noted in Villalba 2000):

(3.72) a. A cada noi, el seu regal, l’hi donarem
   DAT each boy the his gift Cl.acc Cl.dat give.fut
   el dia de reis.
   the day of kings
   ‘We will give every boy his gift on Epiphany Day.’

b. El seu regal, a cada noi, l’hi donarem el dia de reis.
   (bound variable reading: *)

Thus, if multiple dislocates do instantiate multiple specs, then it must be the case that the first-branching-node definition of c-command is the correct one.
3.3.4 Why Spec,Fin?

In this section I would like to address one last question: Why should Spec,Fin be the landing site of CLLD, FF, and wh-movement? A priori, there seem to be at least three specs available for the task:

\[
[\text{ForceP Spec Force} [\text{FinP Spec Fin} [\text{TP Spec T }\ldots]]]
\]

If we assume that Spec,T is busy with other matters (even being the edge of its own phase, according to Gallego’s (2005) recent proposals), there are only two specs left, Spec,Force and Spec,Fin. In the following, I argue that Spec,Fin is the landing site for movement to the left periphery as a consequence of how syntactic dependencies are set up, following the model in López (2007).

We will assume the theory of movement of López (2007) as presented in Chapter 1 and above. Within this framework, movement is triggered by an unvalued feature—\([f']\), as we have been calling it—of the moving item and it takes place spec-to-spec. Satisfaction of the unvalued feature is carried out by the operation \(\text{Agree}(p,g)\), which is defined as strictly local, reaching only to the spec of the complement of the probe:

\[
\text{P'/H11032 (3.74)}
\]

Now, \([f']\) needs to be valued by a probe. Example (3.73) shows that the only probe available in the higher structure is Force. Spec,Force is the highest spec of the clause and, if the clause is matrix, there is no higher head that can act as a probe. It follows that the probe of \([f']\) can be in Force at the highest and that Spec,Fin must the target of \(A'\)-movement.

Notice that if we conceived of movement as Attract/Pied-pipe, both Spec, Force and Spec,Fin would be possible landing sites, and we would not have any particular reason to choose one or the other. The empirical data that shows that \(A'\)-movement can go no higher than Spec,Fin would be left unexplained.

Syntax and Information Structure
3.4 CLLD

As argued in Chapter 2, CLLD is both [+c] and [+a]. In Section 3.4.1 I show how the assignment of [±c] takes place. In Section 3.4.2 I argue that CLLD constituents stop in Spec,v, where they get the [+a] feature in the same manner as CLRD. Thus, the feature structure of CLLD is fully derivable from its derivational history.

3.4.1 Assignment of [+c]

As we saw, the left periphery structure that I assume includes only a ForceP and a FinP—no FocP or TopP. Wh-phrases, focus-phrases, and dislocated phrases occupy Spec,Fin. If more than one is present, then we have stacked specifiers:

(3.75)

```
ForceP
  Force
  FinP
  CLLD
    Fin'
    FF/wh
    Fin'
    Fin
    TP
```

Since wh-phrases, FF, and CLLD are contrastive, this must be a feature assigned in the left periphery. I continue to refer to it as [+c]. The argumentation developed in the previous sections leads to the conclusion that [+c] is assigned to Spec,Fin.

I propose that the assignment of the features [±c] goes along lines similar (but not identical) to [±a]:

(3.76)  a. [+c] is assigned to Spec,Fin.
    b. The complement of Fin is [−c].

Let us continue to assume that FinP is the head of a phase.11 At the end of the phase pragmatics can inspect the structure again. The appearance of spec on

---

11 Choosing FinP as the end of the phase raises the question of the status of ForceP. I do not have any particular reason to claim that it is or is not a phase. Presumably, if ForceP is matrix, it should be a phase by default because it closes the derivation. If ForceP is subordinate, on the other hand, it may well be a constituent of the superordinate vP phase. The issue is empirical and I do not have the data that would settle it.
Fin gives pragmatics the clue to assign it [+c], following rule (3.76a). The rest of the structure is [−c], following (3.76b). This is represented in (3.77):

(3.77) FinP

wh/FF/CLLD Fin’ [−c]

Fin TP [+c]

With this I have sketched a plausible scenario linking movement to Spec,Fin and assignment of [+c]. Note that what I said above regarding the properties of [+a] assignment holds here too: (i) the trace of wh/FF/CLLD is just another occurrence and consequently has the same [+c] feature; (ii) rule (3.76b) will reach as far down as the next FinP; (iii) if Fin has no spec, rule (3.76b) applies regardless; (iv) after [+c] has been assigned to a constituent, it remains in the feature matrix of that constituent.

Notice that the rules that assign [+a] and [+c] are different in one crucial respect. Every constituent that stops in Spec,Fin will get [+c] but not every Spec,v is assigned [+a], only those constituents that form a dependency with X (the clitic)—see (3.35). In other words, there are no clitics involved in A’-dependencies.12

The difference between (3.35) and (3.76) is a consequence of the difference in properties between v and Fin. The crucial difference is that only the former is a 0-assigner—indeed, if every Spec,v became [+a] there would never be regular focus subjects. But notice that this leads to a very important difference between the two phases. It is possible for a constituent to move to Spec,v without becoming [+a] (and FF and wh-movement instantiate this). But it is not possible to cross a CP barrier without becoming [+c]. As I show in Chapter 4, this derives what has always been known to be an important feature of grammar: movement from A to A’ positions is possible, movement from A’ to A positions is not.

3.4.2 Assignment of [+a]

The question now is how CLLD gets to be [+a]. Usual parsimony guidelines would suggest that there is only one mechanism for [+a] assignment in the

---

12 Clitic-doubling languages allow D-linked wh-phrases to co-occur with clitics (Demirdache 1991; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 among others). Boeckx (2003) argues that every instance of wh-movement with a resumptive clitic is derived from a clitic doubling structure. If so, the clitic is not involved in the A’-dependency, but in a lower dependency linked to the [+specific] feature of the wh-determiner. In Chapter 5 I present an analysis of clitic doubling.
grammar, namely, the account proposed above involving an X feature on v. Thus, I propose here that CLLD involves a first step to Spec,v, where it becomes [+a] in the same manner as CLRD. A second step to Spec, Fin is responsible for assignment of [+c]. I represent this in (3.78):

(3.78) **CLLD derivation**

Evidence that CLLD includes an A-movement step to Spec,v is that it allows for floating quantifiers. Sentence (3.79), with a CLLDed constituent, is contrasted again with a wh-phrase:

(3.79) Els cotxes japonesos vam poder vendre’ ls the cars japanese PAST.1PL be-able sell- CL.ACC tots l’ altre dia. all the other day ‘The other day we were able to sell all the Japanese cars.’

(3.80) * Quins vam poder vendre tots l’ altre dia. Which PAST.1PL be-able sell all the other day ‘Which could we sell all the other day?’

In keeping with the assumption that A’-movement does not leave floating quantifiers in Catalan, (3.79) would suggest that an A-movement step is

---

13 Cecchetto (1999, 2000) and Villalba (2000) argue that CLLD stops in the middle field. However, their analyses involve a Spec,TopP immediately dominating vP.
involved in CLLD. Notice that we have an interesting prediction on our hands now. Since CLLD A-moves to Spec,\(v\), and then A’-moves to Spec,\(\text{Fin}\), we predict that CLLD should strand quantifiers only within the \(vP\) but no higher. Contrariwise, subjects should not have this restriction: since they A-move to Spec, \(T\) (see Section 3.7) they should be able to strand quantifiers in \(vP\) external positions. This prediction is borne out, as shown in (3.81) and (3.82). In (3.81) we can see how a subject can strand a quantifier in its initial merge position as well as between the auxiliary and the main verb. In (3.82) we can see that a CLLDed constituent can strand a quantifier within the \(vP\) but not between the auxiliary and the main verb:

(3.81) a. Les meves germanes van arribar totes a la botiga.
the my sisters past.3pl arrive all to the shop
‘My sisters arrived all at the store.’

b. Les meves germanes van totes arribar a la botiga.
the my sisters past.3pl all arrive to the store

(3.81) a. Les meves germanes les vaig veure totes a
the my sisters cl past.1sg see all in
la botiga.
the shop
‘I saw all my sisters in the shop.’

b. * Les meves germanes les vaig totes veure a
the my sisters cl past.1sg all see in
la botiga.
the shop

The second piece of evidence that the first step is real I borrow from Zubizarreta (1998). Zubizarreta (1998: 114) has shown that CLLD in Spanish reconstruct to a position which is higher than the base position of the subject, not to the initial merge position. Her argument can easily be translated into Catalan. Consider the sentences in (3.83):

(3.83) a. El seu fill, cada mare, haurà d’acompanyar-lo
the her child each mother must.\text{fut.3sg} of-accompany-cl
el primer dia d’escola.
the first day of-school
‘Each mother must accompany her child on the first day of school.’

b. * El seu, fill haurà d’acompanyar-lo cada
the her child must.\text{fut.3sg} of-accompany-cl each
cada mare, el primer dia d’escola.
each mother the first day of-school
In (3.83a), the subject quantifier in a high position can bind the possessor in the CLLD. This indicates that CLLD must reconstruct. In (3.83b), instead, this binding is impossible, with the subject in a low position. Let us take the post-verbal subject to be in situ in Spec,v and the pre-verbal subject to have raised out of vP to Spec,T:

\[
\text{(3.84) } [\text{CLLD} \ldots [\text{TP SU} \ldots T \ldots \{ \ldots t(\text{SU}) \ldots V \ldots \{ \ldots ]}] \]
\]

I take it that (3.83) is evidence that CLLDed constituents reconstruct to an intermediate position, where it c-commands the post-verbal subject but is c-commanded by the pre-verbal subject—at this point, it is useful to recall that CLRDed constituents also c-command the post-verbal subject, see examples (3.15) and (3.16). Within my structural assumptions, it is plausible to posit that the reconstruction site of CLLD is a second Spec,v, the first one being reserved for the external argument. Further, it has been argued that, while A’-movement reconstructs, A-movement does not (see Lasnik 1999, 2003 for recent discussion and references, but also Fox’s 2000 challenge). Since CLLD cannot reconstruct to its initial merge position, we must conclude that this intermediate position must be an A-position. This reasoning confirms that this position is Spec,v and CLLD shares a derivational step with CLRD up to this point.14

### 3.5 FF and wh-movement

FF, like CLLD, also shows up in the left periphery, and is also contrastive. However, it is not anaphoric and it is not doubled by a clitic. The analysis of FF presents some complications because some evidence seems to indicate that it does not stop in Spec,v while other evidence indicates that it does.

I start with the evidence that FF does not stop in Spec,v. First, FF does not strand quantifiers:

\[
\text{(3.85) a. } *\text{ELS COTXES JAPONESOS vam poder vendre}
\]

The cars Japanese past be-able sell all the-other day

\[
\text{b. } *\text{Quins vam poder vendre tots l’altre dia.}
\]

Which past be-able sell all the-other day

14 Zubizarreta (1998) instead proposes a ClP and CLLDed constituents would be in Spec,Cl.
If FF A-moved to Spec,v, one would expect to see floating quantifiers, just like CLLD movement. Second, FF reconstructs to its initial merge position, not to a middle-field position. In the following example even a post-verbal subject can bind a variable in the FFed constituent.

\[(3.86)\] El seu Fill haurà d’acompanyar cada
the her CHILD must.FUT.3SG of accompany every
mareí el primer dia d’escola.
mother the first day of-school

‘Each mother must accompany her CHILD on the first day of school.’

This means that the reconstruction position of FFed constituents is lower than Spec,v. So, this seems to suggest that FF moves to Spec,Fin in one step.

\[(3.87)\] [FF...[TP SU...T...t(SU)...V...{ }]]

Reconstruction site and Initial Merge

But there is also empirical evidence that FF and wh-phrases do stop at Spec,v. This is shown in Tuller (1992) for some Chadic languages and in López and Winkler (2003) for Chinese. In López and Winkler (2003) an argument based on gapping is presented that FF and wh-phrases in English also stop in Spec,v. See Section 2.4.3. Likewise, Fox (2000) argues that wh-phrases stop at some intermediate point within the clause.

Given this contradictory data, I cut a Solomonic deal: FF does stop at Spec,v but without consequences at the pragmatics interface. How so? The solution is implicit in my formulation of rule (3.35a): a constituent in Spec,v gets [+a] only if this constituent is in an Agree dependency with X, the verbal morpheme that eventually is spelled-out as a clitic. Thus, the FFed constituent is not affected by the rule that assigns [+a]. However, the copy left behind within the VP will be affected by (3.35b), the rule that assigns [−a]. Since both copies of the moved constituent are occurrences of the same item, it follows that the head of the chain is also [−a].

\[(3.88)\] Syntax and Information Structure
In López (2003) I approached the problem of how FF and wh-phrases can go through Spec,v without becoming [+a] in terms of timing: raising takes place after the [+a] rules have applied. Although this provides for an elegant solution to the problem, it leads us to a wrong prediction: we should expect that something could move to Spec,v after [+a] have applied, and stay there, with the result that we would have a [−a] right dislocated constituent. Unless an appeal is made to a principle such as “Have an Effect on Output Condition,” which includes a dose of look-ahead, I do not see a way to prevent this. On the other hand, the current approach does account for why both external arguments and FFed arguments are not affected by [+a].

So why do we have reconstruction to initial merge position of FF, as opposed to reconstruction of CLLD? Movement of CLLD to Spec,v is of the A-type, since it involves an Agree operation with a head endowed with φ-features. A-movement cannot reconstruct—maybe because A-movement leaves no traces, as argued for by Lasnik (2003) and Ausín (2001). FF movement to Spec,v involves no Agree with the feature X of v, therefore it is an instance of A′-movement. A′-movement can always reconstruct.

A final question concerning FF constructions is what analysis should the rest of the sentence receive? Take a sentence like the following:

(3.89) ELS LLIBRES porto a casa demà.  
the books bring.1st.sg to home tomorrow

‘I will bring the books home tomorrow.’

Everything left behind els llibres is [+a]. The verb is in T, as usual—recall that verb syntax is independent of information structure. Since a casa and demà are [+a], they should presumably be in Spec,v. Vallduví (1992) shows that post-verbal constituents in FF contexts appear in a free order, quite unlike what is the case in regular, all-focus sentences, but closely reproducing what we see in multiple dislocation. This confirms the idea that post-verbal constituents in FF constructions must be in Spec,v.15

15 Actually, Vallduví (1992) and Samek-Lodovici (2006) claim that all the post-focus constituents are right dislocated, including the verb, auxiliaries, and negation. This would lead to the conclusion that the verb porto in example (3.89) would also be right dislocated, but evidence shows that verbs cannot be dislocated:

(i) *Els llibres a casa, porto.  
the books to home take.1st.sg

Moreover, notice that the post-FF free word order that Vallduví noticed affects only the post-verbal constituents, not the verb itself. I confirm that the syntax of verbs is unaffected by information structure.
We now turn to wh-phrases. As claimed above, wh-phrases should be regarded as [+c]. Here I discuss their status with respect to [+a] and their derivation.

Wh-phrases come in two versions: D-linked and non-D-linked:

(3.90)  a. Which of the boys saw the movie?
        b. Who saw the movie?

Evidence indicates that wh-phrases stop at Spec,v (Fox 2000; López and Winkler 2003). Focusing on non-D-linked wh-phrases, we can apply the same reasoning that we applied for focus fronting: they stop at Spec,v without consequences. The interesting question concerns D-linked wh-phrases.

D-linked wh-phrases seem to be clear cases of [+a] constituents, as has been known since at least Pesetsky (1987). However, D-linked wh-phrases in Catalan are ungrammatical with a clitic:16

(3.91) ??Quina pel·lícula la vas veure?
Which movie CL.acc PAST.2nd see.inf

Moreover, D-linked wh-phrases can reconstruct to their initial merge position, quite unlike CLLDed constituents. This is shown by the following sentences:

(3.92)  a. Quin fill seu, haurà d’acompanyar cada,
Which son her must of-accompany.inf each
mare demà?
mother tomorrow
‘Which of her sons must each mother accompany tomorrow?’

b. Quin fill seu, no haurà d’acompanyar cap,
Which son her NEG must of-accompany.inf no
mare demà?
mother tomorrow
‘Which of her sons must accompany no mother tomorrow?’

Answer: The youngest one.

“The youngest one” is a felicitous answer to either (3.92a) and (3.92b) and it brings about a pairing of mothers with their youngest sons. This pairing implies scoping of cada and cap over quin. Moreover, the quantifiers cada and cap can bind the pronoun seu even though the quantifiers are located in post-verbal subject position. This means that D-linked wh-phrases do not stop in

16 In other Romance varieties it is possible to have a clitic—Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994), Rioplatense Spanish. But these are varieties that allow clitic doubling. I argue in Chapter 5 that clitic doubling is not connected with [+a] but with specificity.
Spec,v to receive the [+a] feature—rather, they behave more like non-D-linked wh-phrases and FFed phrases. This conclusion is not surprising if we understand that wh determiners like quin or which are inherently [+a], unlike other determiners like el/la or the, which can be [-a]. If quin and which are inherently [+a], they do not require a syntax to do the job again (recall my remarks on pronouns in Chapter 2).

Thus, I assume that quin and which are listed in the lexicon with a [+a] feature in their feature structure, which makes them impermeable to the [-a] rules formulated above. Since establishing an Agree relationship with the morpheme X brings about no change in interpretation, it is not licensed. Since the clitic is the spell-out of X, the ungrammaticality of (3.91) is expected.

### 3.6 Co-occurrence restrictions without X’-theory

As pointed out above, there are some interesting co-occurrence restrictions that any theory of the syntax of information structure should account for. For instance, although multiple dislocation is acceptable, multiple FF is not:

(3.93) a. Els llibres, a la Maria, els hi vaig donar.
   The books to the Maria Cl.acc Cl.dat PAST.1st.sg give.inf
   ‘I gave Maria the books.’

   b. #ELS LLIBRES, A LA MARIA vaig donar.

In this section I discuss these restrictions and provide analyses for them—as suggested by my use of the pound sign, I consider all of these restrictions to be the result of interpretability problems, not syntactic per se, they are infelici-tous rather than ungrammatical. As a matter of fact, my model, in which all the constituents in the left periphery are stacked specifiers of Fin, predicts that all possible combinations and orderings are syntactically possible:

```
FinP
   /\    
  XP  Fin'
     /\    
    YP  Fin'
    / \    
   ZP  Fin'
        /\    
        Fin  TP
```
This contrasts with Rizzi’s \(1997: 297–300\) approach, the first one (to my knowledge) to provide a formal analysis of this issue. Rizzi assumes a structure with unique specifiers, each of which is dedicated to one type of constituent:

\[
\text{(3.95) } \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{TopP} \\
\text{CLLD} \quad \text{Top’} \\
\text{Top} \\
\text{FocP} \\
\text{Wh/FF} \\
\text{Foc’} \\
\text{Foc} \\
\text{TopP/FinP}
\end{array}
\]

Rizzi provides a mixture of X’-theoretical and interpretive solutions to the issue at hand. In the following, I show that the X’-theoretical solutions give wrong predictions and propose that co-occurrence restrictions should be accounted for exclusively in terms of language use and not in terms of syntactic principles. I break down the problem into four questions showing how Rizzi’s and my approach fairs for each one.

The first question is: Why are multiple dislocations possible? From a syntactic point of view, nothing prevents multiple specifiers. From an interpretive point of view, since I define dislocates as discourse-anaphoric, nothing to my knowledge prevents the appearance of several anaphors in one sentence.

Rizzi instead proposes recursive topic phrases:

\[
\text{(3.96) } \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{TopP} \\
\text{CLLD} \quad \text{Top’} \\
\text{Top}_1 \quad \text{TopP = comment of Top}_1 \\
\text{CLLD} \quad \text{Top’} \\
\text{Top}_2 \quad \text{TopP/FocP/FinP = comment of Top}_2
\end{array}
\]
In the first place, embedding a topic within a comment leads to the interpretability problem already discussed in Section 2.5, namely that altering the order of dislocates should lead to altering the topic-comment structure of the clause. However, no such altering is apparent, as far as I can tell. Second, this approach leads to minimality violations. Regardless of the theory of vP structure one assumes, one can always construct a grammatical example in which a lower argument by-passes a higher one.

(3.97) \[ \text{[TopP PP [TopP DP [ \ldots DP \ldots PP ]]]} \]

This problem does not arise within a multiple specs theory, under the reasonable assumption that constituents in the minimal domain of a head do not create intervention effects for one another (see, for instance, Chomsky 1993).

The second question is: Why is there only one FF? FF leads to a “correction” interpretation. I propose that it is odd to have two corrections simultaneously. Notice that the oddity remains even if one of the two contrastive foci stays in situ, as shown in (3.98b). In (3.98a) and (3.98b) “the books” and “to Mary” have to be read as contrastive (3.98b sounds a lot better if it is read as regular focus).

Compare now (3.98a) and (3.98b) with (3.98c). Notice that in (3.98c) there is only one contrasting constituent, the left-peripheral negation. The focused constituents “the books” and “to Mary” are plain information focus (according to my proposal in Section 2.2.2). Thus, we can see that having two foci in one sentence is fine, only having two contrasts is infelicitous:

(3.98) **CONTEXT:** John gave the CDs to Chris.

a. -#THE BOOKS, TO MARY he gave.

b. -#THE BOOKS, he gave TO MARY.

c. -No, he gave the books to Mary.

Rizzi also proposes an interpretability clash to account for examples of the form (3.98a), although I believe that his account is incorrect. He claims that focus partitions the clause into a focus and a presupposition, the latter being the complement of Foc. If there were two FocP in the clause, the lower FocP would also be a presupposition, a contradictory property. However, it is unclear how Rizzi would deal with example (3.98c). In this example, there are clearly two independently focused phrases, so they would presumably lead to the same interpretive clash as (3.98a) or (3.98b). So, the problem is the double correction, not the double focus.
The third question is: Why are FF and a wh-question not compatible?

(3.99)  
-#to the OFFICE, to whom did you give the keys?  
-#to whom to the OFFICE did you give the keys?

I argue this involves language use too. FF and wh-phrase involve a correction and a question. The result is gibberish: correcting someone entails an assertion, so we are in effect asserting and asking simultaneously. There is simply no good context in which such a thing can be uttered. In the following example I supply what such a context would look like. The first interlocutor asserts something, the second corrects part of the assertion and asks about some other part:

(3.100)  
CONTEXT: I gave someone the keys to the house.  
   a. -#to the OFFICE, to whom did you give the keys?  
   b. -#to whom to the OFFICE did you give the keys?

Adopting a language use approach to this phenomenon makes two clear predictions. The first prediction is that it should not matter if the focus or the wh-phrase stays in situ, the sentence should remain unacceptable. This is as a matter of fact the case.

Let us first look at example (3.101). Question (3.101b), with a wh-phrase in situ, is grammatical.

(3.101)  
   a. *Who what did you give?  
   b. Who did you give what?

In (3.102.a) I leave the wh-phrase in situ but the sentence is as unacceptable as (3.100). Question (3.102.b) is also unacceptable—recall that “to the office” must be read as contrastive focus, not as regular focus.

(3.102)  
CONTEXT: I gave someone the keys to the house.  
   a. -#to the OFFICE you gave the keys to whom?  
   b. -#to whom did you give the keys to the OFFICE?

The second prediction is that FF should be compatible with a wh-phrase that is not interrogative, since the pragmatic clash mentioned above would not arise. This prediction is also fulfilled, as shown in the following Catalan example:

(3.103)  
CONTEXT: Joan doesn’t know what Susana told Carles.  
   -El Joan no sap a la MARIA qué li the Joan NEG knows DAT the Maria what Cl.dat va dir la Susanna.  
   PAST say.inf the Susanna
The subordinate clause in this example is what is sometimes referred to as a pseudo-question (Plann 1980), since it is not a true interrogative. Correspondingly, the sentence is grammatical.

Rizzi’s account of the incompatibility of FF and wh-questions is X’-theoretical: one cannot have both a wh-phrase and an FF in the same clause because they would be competing for the same position. This account leads us to predict that you could raise one of the two while leaving the other one in situ, as is the case with multiple wh-phrases. This prediction is not fulfilled: as shown in the above example, we can have multiple wh-phrases as long as all but one stays in situ but we cannot have a wh-phrase and a contrastive focus in the same sentence. Rizzi also makes the wrong prediction with respect to example (3.103), involving a pseudo-question. He would, in effect, predict that this sentence would be ungrammatical, since the wh-phrase and the FF would be occupying the same position.

The fourth question is: Why are dislocates compatible with wh- and FF? Again, nothing in the syntax forbids it. From an interpretive point of view, there is nothing odd about having an anaphor with an assertion or a question. But notice how odd it is to say that the complement of a topic, the comment, is not a proposition but a question.

I would like to raise a fifth question not discussed in Rizzi’s paper. A sentence allows for multiple dislocates and multiple wh-phrases. However, only one of the wh-phrases raises to Spec,Fin:

(3.104) Els llibres, al Joan, els hi vaig portar
     the books to.the Joan Cl Cl PAST.1st bring
     aahir en un camió.
yesterday in a truck
     ‘I brought Joan the books yesterday in a truck.’

(3.105) a. Que li vas portar a qui
     what CL.dat PAST.2nd bring.inf DAT who
     en un camió?
in a truck
     ‘What did you bring to whom in a truck?’

     b. *Qué a qui li vas portar en un camió?

The ungrammaticality of (3.105b) is a language particular phenomenon; as is well known, multiple wh-fronting is possible in some languages. As is also well-known, the issue of multiple wh-fronting is complex and many analyses have been proposed (see Rudin 1988 for the original observation and analysis, as well as Richards 2001 for a recent approach, among many others). Thus, here I will only try a tentative answer.
I propose that the wh-determiner is able to establish Agree dependencies with other wh-determiners. Since all the wh-determiners are in a dependency, only one of them needs to raise to satisfy its [f’]. The others have their [f’] satisfied by virtue of being in a dependency with the highest one. Regular (non wh-) determiners cannot form dependencies and so if two regular determiners have [f’], each [f’] has to be valued/checked independently. I venture that wh-determiners in languages with multiple wh-movement are also unable to establish dependencies with one another.

The final—and, possibly most interesting—question involves ordering. My model predicts that all orderings should be possible. As a matter of fact, Rizzi argues that the order CLLD > FF and the order FF > CLLD are both possible, which supports my view (Rizzi proposes that Top can take FocP as complement and Foc can also take TopP as complement). However, the data in detail are fairly complicated:

1. Although some speakers accept the order FF > CLLD (as documented in Rizzi 1997) most speakers (of Italian, Catalan, and Spanish) reject it in the general case. The question is: Under what circumstances is the order FF > CLLD acceptable?
2. Romance equivalents of “why” can precede CLLD. Under what circumstances is the order why > CLLD acceptable?
3. The order CLLD > non-D-linked wh-phrase is possible. The order non-D-linked wh-phrase > CLLD is rejected. D-linked wh-phrases can precede or follow CLLD. Why is there this difference between D-linked and non-D-linked wh-phrases?

These kind of data seem to be the sort of playground that favors a cartographic approach with multiple functional categories, some of which can host one particular lexical item (i.e. a functional category for “why”). An alternative solution could go along the following lines:

(i) The answer to question 3 is that [+a] constituents are linearized before [−a] constituents. Since D-linked wh-phrases are [+a], their order with respect to CLLD is free.

(ii) Questions 1 and 2 suggest exceptions to the conclusion reached in (i). However, a closer examination of the contexts in which the orderings why > CLLD and FF > CLLD are produced suggests that they are not an exception after all. The orderings why > CLLD and FF > CLLD only appear in echo or citation contexts, in which the constituent that is CLLDed is already dislocated in the context sentence. In the following two mini-dialogs the constituent aquests llibres is dislocated already in the first sentence. The second sentence merely repeats it:
(3.106) Maria: -Fixa’t, aquests llibres els he portat jo. Look, these books Cl.acc have.1st brought I.

Anna: -I per què aquests llibres els has portat tu? And for what these books Cl.acc have.2nd brought you

‘And why have you brought these books?’

Inés: -#I per què Hamlet l’has portat tu? and for what Hamlet Cl.acc’have.2nd brought you

(3.107) Joan: -Aquests llibres els va enviar el Carles these books Cl.acc PAST send.inf the Carlos a Nova York. to NY.

‘Carles sent these books to New York.’

Pere: -a CHICAGO aquests llibres els va enviar to Chicago these books Cl.acc PAST send.inf el Carlos.
the Carlos

‘Carles sent these books to Chicago.’

Pau: -#a CHICAGO Hamlet el va enviar el Carles.

The infelicitous responses of Inés and Pau are of particular interest to us. In Chapter 2 we saw that CLLDed constituents link to their antecedents by means of a sort of *faux* poset relation: they are subsets, members of a set, etc. However, in (3.106) and (3.107) the CLLDed constituent can only be identical to its antecedent. This reinforces the claim that the why/FF > CLLD ordering is only present if the clause that contains the CLLD is an echo.

In the following examples, the constituent *aquests regals* is not dislocated in the first sentence. The constituent *aquests llibres* in the second sentence is dislocated and must precede the interrogative wh-phrase:

(3.108) Juan: Mira, t’he portat aquests regals. ‘Look, I got you these gifts.’

   a. Marı́a: *I per què aquests llibres els has portat? and why these books Cl have.2nd brought
   b. Marı́a: I aquests llibres, per què els has portat?

(3.109) Juan: Mira, he portat aquests regals per la Marı́a. ‘Look, I got these presents for Marı́a.’
Thus, what we have is [+a] > [−a] as a general rule, which can be violated in echo contexts. I propose viewing the general rule as a preference imposed by the assembling of discourse structures. That is, having [+a] constituents at the very edge of the phase, c-commanding all other constituents in the phase, facilitates the anaphoric linking. This principle seems to be operative in both phases: CLRDeD constituents in the vP phases c-command the external argument, as we saw above, and CLLDDeD constituents in the FinP phase c-command (in the general case) wh-phrases and FFed phrases. This general requirement can be overruled in quoting contexts because the anaphoric connection has already been established in the previous sentence.

Notice that I am not proposing a functional principle of iconicity or communicative efficiency, according to which “topics” have to go first in the sentence in order to satisfy some communicative need (Halliday 1967; Shen 2003). The linear order of [+a] constituents seems unpredictable from a functional/cognitive point of view: we see that [+a] constituents can appear left or right dislocated—and in Chapter 5 we are going to see examples of [+a] constituents that appear right in the middle of the sentence (German/Dutch scrambling, Spanish p-movement). Instead, I am proposing a computational principle that applies at the interface between two computational modules and states that the structural position of [+a] constituents (i.e.: dominance/c-command) is relevant for the fluent assembling of discourse structures. C-command may be reflected in linear order (LCA) but other factors may affect linearization (see Section 3.2.4) with the effect that we cannot look at a surface string and predict, without further ado, where the [+a] constituent will sit.

Thus, I present as conclusion what I only presented as assumption at the beginning of Chapter 2: the grammar of [+a] constituents is understandable if we take pragmatics to be an interface module between two computational modules (syntax and discourse), both of which are sensitive to hierarchy rather than linear order. The empirical data suggest that pragmatics is not a device to direct the hearer’s/reader’s attention to a certain chunk of discourse.

17 For instance, Shen (2003) argues that inversion in English has the effect of placing the ground before the figure, thus bringing the hearer’s/reader’s attention to the figure.
A further conclusion that we can draw from this section is that the cartographic methodology—based on the idea of creating a functional category for each word order one finds—provides uninsightful analyses. One needs to engage the data more closely, try different alternatives (e.g. What happens if I substitute this constituent for this other constituent?) and consider the types of discourses in which given sentences can appear.

3.7 Dislocated subjects

3.7.1 Introduction

The comparative syntax of subjects in the Romance language area presents a broad range of phenomena that, as far as I can tell, are still only partially understood, despite intensive investigation. The following data are attested:

SVO is possible in all Romance languages:

\[(3.110) \quad \text{La Joana ha comprat el pa.} \quad \text{‘Joan has bought the bread.’} \]

VOS, OVS, and VS are also possible orders in European Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan, and Italian (see Belletti and Shlonsky 1995; Bonet 1989; Costa 2004; Vallduvi 1992, among many others):

\[(3.111) \quad \text{Ha comprat el pa la Joana.} \quad \text{has bought the bread the Joana} \]
\[(3.112) \quad \text{El pa l’ha comprat la Joana.} \quad \text{the bread Cl’has bought the Joana} \]
\[(3.113) \quad \text{Ha arribat la Joana.} \quad \text{has arrived the Joana} \]

Only Spanish and Portuguese have full-fledged VSO (Italian only accepts VSO if the object is “marginalized”, more on this in Chapter 5):

\[(3.114) \quad \text{Ayer compró Juana el pan. \quad [Sp]} \quad \text{yesterday bought Juana the bread} \]

The subject can also be right dislocated. In languages without subject clitics, this dislocation can be detected just by looking at the word order and intonation:

\[(3.115) \quad \text{Ha comprat el pa, la Joana.} \quad \text{has bought the bread the Joana} \]

In languages with subject clitics, the subject can be right dislocated doubled by the clitic. The following example is from Fiorentino:
The vicissitudes of VSO and VOS order are discussed in Chapter 5. Here I discuss only those aspects of the syntax of subjects that relate to dislocation. In particular I address the following questions:

(i) In the SVO order, is it the case that subjects are always dislocated, as argued for by Contreras (1991) and many others (most notably, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998)?

(ii) If the subject is right dislocated, is it adjoined to vP, like a right dislocated object, or is it adjoined to a higher position?

3.7.2 The SVO order

We will start with the SVO order. There is no doubt that pre-verbal subjects can be left dislocated. The following sentence is an example:

(3.117) El Joan, jo no cred que pugui ensenyar un curs d`algebra.
Josm g don t think he`s able to teach an algebra class.

The next question is whether this left dislocated position is CLLD or HTLD or whether either is possible. Under the assumption that HTLD is insensitive to islands, examples can be constructed that show that pre-verbal subjects can be HTLD. In the following, Juan is interpreted as the subject of the verb visités in the adjunct clause. Juan must be HTLD in (3.118):

(3.118) El Joan, em vaig sentir malalt després de que em visités.
Joan I felt sick after he visited me.

Can subjects also be CLLDed? Morphologically we cannot tease CLLD and HTLD apart. But we can look at the syntactic/semantic property of reconstruction. As pointed out in Chapter 1, CLLD constituents exhibit reconstruction effects while HTLD do not. For instance, in the following sentence the quantifier cap can bind the possessor seu in the CLLDed object. This is taken to indicate that the CLLDed constituent originated in a position lower than the subject’s, indicated with a trace:

(3.119) El seu fill, cap mare el vol castigar t.
the her son no mother Cl.acc wants punish.inf
‘No mother wants to punish her son.’
Moreover, the surface position of CLLD is also a position from which it can bind. Thus, the dislocated quantifier *cada* can bind the pronoun *seva*, in pre-verbal subject position, obtaining the reading that for each boy the mother of that boy wants to punish him:

(3.120) Cada noi, la seva mare el vol castigar t.
    each boy the his mother Cl.acc wants punish.inf
    ‘His mother wants to punish each boy.’

Now we have the tools to test if dislocated subjects are CLLDed or HTLDed. In the following example, I dislocate both an object and a subject:

(3.121) a. La seva mare, cada noi el vol castigar.
    the her mother each child Cl.acc wants punish.inf
    (bound reading *)
    ‘His mother wants to punish each boy.’

b. La seva mare, cada noi e, el vol castigar e

If the subject reconstructed to position e, it should be possible for the quantifier *cada* to bind the pronoun *seva*. This would yield the reading according to which for every boy, his mother wants to punish him. As a matter of fact, this reading is not possible. Therefore, I conclude that dislocated subjects do not reconstruct. If they do not reconstruct, they are not CLLDed, only HTLDed.

Now that we have concluded that pre-verbal subjects *can* be HTLDed, the next question is whether they *must* be dislocated. Many linguists have argued for this, but their arguments generally only amount to maintaining what we already know, that is, that pre-verbal subjects can be dislocated. To choose from the most famous article on this matter, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998: 503) show that pre-verbal subjects can precede complementizers. Fair enough, but this only shows that pre-verbal subjects can be dislocated, not that they must. Other arguments, revolving around the scope of quantifiers and interpretation of indefinites, depend on judgments that I found difficult to reproduce in Romance.¹⁸

¹⁸ For instance, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) claim that pre-verbal subjects must take scope over modals and negation. However, it is possible to construct examples in which a modal takes scope over a pre-verbal subject. Consider (i):

(i) Un estudiante debe hacer una presentación. ¿Quién quiere hacerla? [Sp]
    a student must make.inf a presentation. Who wants do.inf-cl.acc

This exchange is felicitous. But notice that the question only makes sense if *un estudiante* is within the scope of *debe*.18
In any case, there is clear evidence that there is A-movement of subjects. As shown in Torrego (2002), an experiencer argument can interfere with NP-raising in every Romance language:

(3.122)  a. El Joan sembla ser intel·ligent.
         ‘Juan seems to be intelligent.’
        b. *El Joan em sembla ser intel·ligent.
           the Joan Cl.dat seems be.inf intelligent
           (Cf: ‘John seems to me to be intelligent.’)

As shown in López (2007), this intervention effect does not arise when we have a clear instance of dislocation. In the following example, the subordinate verb és “is” is finite and therefore an analysis in terms of raising to subject is not available. In (3.123) “Juan” can only be dislocated and the presence of the experiencer does not alter the ungrammaticality of the sentence:

(3.123) El Joan em sembla que és intel·ligent.
        the Joan Cl.dat seems that is intelligent
        ‘Juan it seems to me that he is intelligent.’

The contrast between (3.122) and (3.123) leads to the natural conclusion that there exists A-movement of the subject from Spec,v to Spec,T.

Another test that can be used to see if a pre-verbal subject must be dislocated is all-focus sentences. Dislocated constituents are not part of the rheme. If the context forces the whole sentence to be a rheme, no constituents can be dislocated:

(3.124)  CONTEXT: What happened?
        -(que) el Joan finalment va portar els llibres.
           that the Joan finally PAST bring.inf the books
           ‘that Juan finally brought the books’
        - #(que) els llibres finalment els va portar el Joan.

It follows that proponents of the pre-verbal subject = dislocated subject analysis should predict that the basic word order in all-focus sentences would be VSO. However, it turns out to be SVO, as can be seen in the previous example (3.124). Thus, we find some evidence that shows that pre-verbal subjects do not need to be dislocated (see also Costa 2004, ch. 2 for a full battery of tests).

19 As Torrego shows, there is some interesting variability with respect to the clitic, since the clitic does not give rise to intervention in all Romance languages. However, in all Romance languages a full-fledged experiencer DP creates this intervention.

20 Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) claim that the neutral word order in Greek is VSO. It seems that this claim is not uncontroversial, judging from the following example:
However, it is the case that, when the subject is a narrow focus, it remains in post-verbal position:

(3.125)  **CONTEXT:** Who broke the window?
- La rompió ese niño
  Cl.acc broke that child
  ‘That child broke it.’

If so, non-dislocated pre-verbal subjects only occur in all-focus sentences, those that can answer the question “what happened?” because they appear without a previous discourse to attach to. Idealizing things somewhat, I take it that all-focus sentences initiate discourses. Sentences with narrow foci include an anaphoric constituent that connects the sentence and integrates it with the previous discourse. Thus, we have the following generalization: non-dislocated pre-verbal subjects only occur at the beginning of discourse.

I suggest the following analysis. Under normal circumstances, T assigns [nominative] in the Romance languages under consideration here (see Chapter 1). This yields the in situ position of subjects:

(3.126)

```
TP
   T[nom]  vP
     Subj[uC]  v'
```

However, subjects can also bear an additional unvalued feature, call it [ud]. This [ud] triggers movement to Spec,T, where it is valued by Fin (I assume Fin has unvalued φ-features that allow it to probe):

(3.127)

```
FinP
   Fin[d]  TP
     Subj[ud]  T'
```

(i) **CONTEXT:** What happened?
- O Petros agorazi spiti.
  the Petros is buying house
  ‘Petros is buying a house.’

(Tzanidaki 1996: 15)
The [d] in Fin is an interpretable feature. Its interpretation is the following:

\[(3.128)\] The feature [d] initiates a new discourse.

This scenario provides an (admittedly sketchy) analysis for the preverbal position of subjects in all-focus sentences.\(^{21}\)

How about a language like English in which subjects are always (or almost always!) pre-verbal? There are two alternatives that we can consider. The alternative that we can call “traditional” has the EPP feature strong in English and optionally weak (or ranked lower, within an Optimality Theory framework) in languages that allow for SV and VS orders. A second alternative can be based on the framework of López (2007), as briefly summarized in Chapter 1 of this book. It is argued in López (2007) that [Case] is assigned by C/Fin in English. Since Agree is extremely local, this explains why subjects must always raise to Spec,T. Under the desideratum of making our analyses as general as possible, we can assume that English also has the feature [d] as well as the rule \[(3.128)\]. Its effects are not visible because subjects must always raise to Spec,T in this language. Only if language change displaced the locus of nominative Case assignment to T would [d] become detectable in English.

### 3.7.3 Right dislocated subjects

Let us now consider right dislocated subjects. We have two classes of languages to consider: those with subject clitics and those without. I start with languages without subject clitics. The following example is from Catalan:

\[(3.129)\]

\[\text{No va vindre, el Joan.}\]

\['Joan didn’t come.’\]

The question I ask is whether right dislocated subjects are specs of v, like object dislocates, or whether they adjoin to a higher position. The evidence available to me at this point suggests that subjects can adjoin to vP. If we have a subject and an object dislocate, they can appear in any order. Further, the first one c-commands the second, regardless of their grammatical role:

\[(3.130)\]

\[a. \text{No el va visitar, cada pare, el seu fill.}\]

\[\text{NEG Cl.acc PAST visit.inf each father the his son}\]

\['Every father did not visit his son.’\]

\[b. \text{No el va visitar, cada fill, el seu pare}\]

\['His father did not visit every son.’\]

\(^{21}\) There are, of course, many other analyses of the problem. See Gutiérrez-Bravo (2002) and Samek-Lodovici (2005) for two recent approaches and references therein.
In (3.130b), the quantifier can bind the pronoun. I take this to mean that the first dislocate always c-commands the second. As usual, I draw specs conventionally to the left (as for how a particular order is obtained, see López (to appear), as well as the brief remarks in Section 3.2.4):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{CLRd} & \text{v'} \\
\text{CLRd} & \text{v'}
\end{array}
\]

In other words, if object CLRDed constituents are in Spec,v and they can c-command a right dislocated subject, then the latter must also be in a Spec,v.

So, right dislocated subjects can be in Spec,v. Can they also be found in a higher position? We can test that they are in a position lower than that of CLLD. In (3.132a), the left dislocated object cada noi can bind the possessor seva. But binding of a quantifier in subject CLRDed constituent cannot reach a CLLDed constituent, as shown in (3.132b):

\[
(3.132) \quad \begin{aligned}
\text{a. Cada noi el & va veure molt maco, la} \\
\text{Each boy & PAST see.inf very cute the} \\
\text{seva & mare.} \\
\text{his & mother} \\
\text{‘His mother considers every boy very cute.’}
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
(3.132) \quad \begin{aligned}
\text{b. El seu fill & el va veure molt} \\
\text{the & son & PAST see.inf very} \\
\text{maco, cada mare.} \\
\text{cute & each mother} \\
\text{(bound reading *)} \\
\text{‘Every mother considers her son very cute.’}
\end{aligned}
\]

Thus, right dislocated subjects are lower than Spec,Fin. I cannot determine at this point if right dislocated subjects of languages without subject clitics could raise to Spec,T.

Finally, it is worth taking a look at a language that has dislocation and subject clitic, like Fiorentino (and here I am relying on the descriptions found in Brandi and Cordin (1989) and Suñer (1992)). Compare the following two Fiorentino sentences (constructed from the information provided by the above-mentioned authors):

\[
(3.133) \quad \begin{aligned}
\text{a. Loro le parlano} \\
\text{they & speak.3^rd.pl.fem} \\
\text{[Fio]} \\
\text{they & speak.3^rd.pl}
\end{aligned}
\]
b. E parla loro
   CL.3rd.sg speak.3rd.sg they
   ‘They speak’

In (3.133a) a fully inflected subject clitic appears in the sentence, the verb agrees with the subject and the subject is pre-verbal. In (3.133b), the subject is post-verbal, there is no subject–verb agreement and the clitic takes a neutral third person singular form. I take it that there is a correlation between raising (to Spec,T?) and agreement in this language.

Interestingly, if the subject is right dislocated, the clitic is obligatory. Both the clitic and the verb fully agree with the subject (Suñer p.c.):

(3.134) Le parlano, loro
   CL.3rd.pl.fem speak.3rd.pl they

Given my earlier conclusion concerning the data in (3.133), this example strongly suggests that right dislocated subjects in this language have raised, at least to Spec,T. This in turn suggests that the rules that assign the features [±a] can apply to Spec,T in a language that has subject clitics. If the rules that assign [±a] apply at the culmination of a phase, it follows that in such a language TP is a phase. I postpone a deeper exploration of this issue to future work (but see Gallego 2005 for a proposal that phases can be parameterized).

3.8 The left periphery: lush or sparse? The case of Finnish

Rizzi’s framework, with its complex set of functional categories replacing what used to be referred to as COMP, is intended to accommodate languages with lush left peripheries, such as the Romance family. Thus, it would be interesting to see how it works with a language that does not have the apparently limitless abundance of leftward constituents that Romance allows. One such language is Finnish; as a matter of fact, Finnish allows for only one XP in its higher field. One would think that a model like Rizzi’s should be able to handle Finnish easily, since it is designed for a more complex phenomenology. However, it turns out that the opposite is the case, and Rizzi’s model is unable to provide an insight on the Finnish data. On the other hand, my own approach can provide quite a simple analysis, based on the fact that Finnish syntactic heads reject multiple specifiers.

---

22 All the information on Finnish has been gleaned from Holmberg (1997, 2000), Mitchell (1993), Vainikka (1989), and Vilkuna (1995). The glosses and translation I provide are as in the original source.
3.8.1 *The difference with Catalan*

As Vainikka (1989) and Vilkuna (1995) explain “a Finnish sentence offers only one initial position for a contrastive topic or focus, a wh-phrase or a clitic host” (Vilkuna 1995: 261). The following examples have an underlined contrastive topic or contrastive focus:

\[(3.135) \;
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Anna } \underline{\text{sai}} \text{ kukkia.} \\
& \text{Anna.nom got flowers.part} \\
& \text{‘Anna got flowers’} \\
\text{b. } & \underline{\text{Anna}} \text{ sai kukkia.} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Kukkia } \underline{\text{Anna}} \text{ sai.} \\
\text{d. } & \text{Mikolta } \underline{\text{Anna}} \text{ sai kukkia} \\
& \text{‘From MIKKO Anna got flowers’} \\
\text{e. } & \underline{\text{Sai}} \text{ Anna Kukkia.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Vilkuna 1995: 245–6)

Vilkuna refers to this initial position, the one occupied by the underlined constituents, as K. Although I eventually argue that this position should be identified with Spec,Fin or adjunction to Fin, I incorporate Vilkuna’s usage. However, I label TP and vP the categories that she refers to as IP and VP. Thus, (3.135a) is an ordinary sentence with neutral intonation and neutral word order. Finnish linguists agree that the subject in (3.135a) is in Spec,T, the verb in T, and the object remains in situ. Examples (3.135b), (3.135c), (3.135d), and (3.135e) show how a subject, an object, an adjunct, or even the verb can be found in K:

\[(3.136) \;
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \left[ \underline{\text{TP Anna}} \text{ sai kukkia} \right] \\
\text{b. } & \left[ \underline{\text{k Anna}} \right] \left[ \underline{\text{TP t sai kukkia}} \right] \\
\text{c. } & \left[ \underline{\text{k Kukkia}} \right] \left[ \underline{\text{TP Anna sai t}} \right] \\
\text{d. } & \left[ \underline{\text{k Mikolta}} \right] \left[ \underline{\text{TP Anna sai kukkia t}} \right] \\
\text{e. } & \left[ \underline{\text{k Sai}} \right] \left[ \underline{\text{TP Anna t Kukkia}} \right] \\
\end{align*}
\]

The interpretive import of K is somewhat complex. It seems that the default rule is that the constituent in K is interpreted as a contrast—either as a contrastive topic, as a contrastive focus or as a wh-question. However, when a sentential clitic is present, the interpretation of the constituent in K is going to depend on this clitic (see Vilkuna 1995: 260–1). I assume that K must be two heads in competition, and I will concern myself only with the contrastive kind. I assume, as above, that this contrastive reading is the result of assigning the feature [+c] to the constituent displaced to the left periphery.
Additionally, it seems that Finnish provides further evidence for splitting C into Fin and Force, since we can have a complementizer to the left of contrastive constituents—thus, we cannot simply say that the Finnish C does not split:

(3.137) Maija kysyi että mitä Pekka oli syönyt
Maija.NOM asked that what Pekka.NOM had eaten
‘Maija asked what Pekka had eaten’

(Vainikka 1989: 85)

If Finnish can split C like Italian, why can it have only one constituent in the C-domain?

Within Rizzi’s assumptions, K is Spec,Top or Spec,Foc or it is adjoined to either one of these heads:

(3.138) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{Force} \quad \text{Top/FocP} \\
\quad \quad \text{K} \quad \text{Top/Foc'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{Top/Foc} \quad \text{FinP} \\
\quad \text{K} \quad \text{Top/Foc}
\end{array}
\]

Within my assumptions, K is a position related to Fin: either a spec of Fin or an adjunction to Fin.

(3.139) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{Force} \quad \text{FinP} \\
\quad \quad \text{K} \quad \text{FinP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{Fin} \quad \text{TP} \\
\quad \text{K} \quad \text{Fin}
\end{array}
\]

Thus, the empirical questions posed by the Finnish data can be articulated distinctly for each approach. In my model, the parametric difference between
Finnish and Catalan can be accounted for by invoking some version of a multiple specifiers parameter. Catalan allows several constituents in the left periphery—several specs of Fin—because there is nothing to prevent it. Finnish, however, has a unique K position because of an additional language-specific restriction (which will be revisited in a minute):

(3.140)  Fin only has one \([\text{assign } [f']]\) feature available.

Thus, although phrase structure allows for structures with multiple specifiers, these specifiers would have unvalued \([f']\) features, leading to crashed derivations. Notice that the formulation in (3.140) also rules out a Spec,Fin if the verb has adjoined to Fin, checking \([[[f']]\) and receiving a \([+\text{c}]\) interpretation.

Interestingly, it seems that we can make the ban against multiple specifiers general in the grammar of Finnish, since it seems to be apparent in T and v. As Vainikka (1989) points out, it is possible to have a subject or an object in Spec, T, but not both, as shown in (3.141):\(^{23}\)

(3.141)  a. Seija \(\text{ tapasi }\) Mervin.
\hspace{1cm}Seija.nom \(\text{ met }\) Mervin.acc
\hspace{1cm}‘Seija met Mervin’

b. Mervin tapasi Seija

\hspace{1cm}(Vainikka 1989: 35)

c. *Jussi \(\text{ romanain }\) kirjoitti
\hspace{1cm}Jussi \hspace{1cm} novel \hspace{1cm} wrote

\hspace{1cm}(Holmberg 2000: 124)

Under the assumption that the finite verb raises to T in Finnish, the object must be in Spec,T in (3.141b).

Example (3.141c) shows that we can’t have an object in Spec,T, “tucked-in” underneath the subject. As for the order OSV, it follows from Vainikka’s discussion (1989: 41 ff) that it is only possible if the object is in K.

Likewise, one can detect that in Finnish there can’t be more than one Spec, v. Vainikka (1989) shows that non-finite clauses in Finnish include no inflectional heads, no auxiliaries, no negation or left periphery constituents. She concludes that non-finite clauses in Finnish consist of a bare VP (vP in our terms). Sentence (3.142a) shows an example, (3.142b) presents an update of Vainikka’s analysis:

\(^{23}\) At least in sentences in which the K position is not filled. When the K position is filled a wider range of word orders becomes possible. See Holmberg (1997, 2000), Vainikka (1989), and Vilkuna (1995) for discussion.
Vainikka also shows how the direct object cannot shift to any position between the two main verbs, even if the subordinate clause includes no overt subject:

(3.143) a. ?? Jukka väätti Pekan minun tietokoneeni
   Jukka.nom claimed Peka.gen my computer
   rikkoneen.
   break.inf

b. * Jukka väätti minun tietokoneeni
   Jukka.nom claimed my computer
   Pekan rikkoneen.
   Peka.gen break.inf

   (Vainikka 1989: 97, 98)

c. Jukka kertoi Pekalle myynensä asuntosa.
   Jukka told Peka-all sell.inf apartment
   ‘Jukka told Petra to sell the apartment.’

d. * Jukka kertoi Pekalle asuntosa myynensä.
   Jukka told Peka-all apartment sell.inf

   (Vainikka 1989: 106)

All these facts put together make my approach to the Catalan/Finnish difference with respect to K even more likely: it seems to be the case that generally speaking Finnish functional categories take only one specifier, so actually the parameter in (3.140) above should be rewritten as:

(3.144) A syntactic category can only assign one formal feature.

Within Rizzi’s approach, it seems to me that the only account of the uniqueness of K in Finnish is that in some languages there are separate Foc and Top phrases while in others they are somehow mutually exclusive. In Section 3.8.2 I discuss several possible versions of this approach and show that none of them is adequate. Section 3.8.3 presents some speculative remarks on the syntax and pragmatics of Finnish.

3.8.2 Alternatives within a TopP/FocP framework

In this section I present three alternative accounts of the Catalan/Finnish parametric difference within a framework that includes FocP and TopP. Since
none of them succeeds in providing a real solution, the multiple specifiers proposal is reinforced. I present them in reverse plausibility order.

Alternative 1: In an early 1990s style of conceptualizing functional categories, it could be said that the linguistic features [Top] and [Foc] would be encapsulated in one functional category in some languages while in others they would project different categories. Laka’s \( \Sigma P \), encompassing negation, assertion, and some aspects of what is usually referred to as focus would be a manifestation of this way of thinking (Laka 1990). Uriagereka (1995) proposes a Point of View Phrase (PVP) that is used to express all discourse configurational aspects of sentence structure. Thus, along these lines, in Finnish we would have a PV category, while in Catalan we would have a Top and a Foc.

However, this approach would not cohere well with the model of grammar we assume. Essentially, it is steeped in an \( X^\ast \)-theory approach to phrase structure based on the notion that the phrase structural component is composed of fixed structures in which lexical items are “inserted”. In other words, the \( X^0 \) position is “there” before a lexical item takes it. In a Bare Phrase Structure (BPS) approach (Chomsky 1995), structure is built by combining lexical items. Thus, either Top combines with a term \( \alpha \) to project a Top\( P \) or Foc does and projects a Foc\( P \). But Laka and Uriagereka assume that a functional category \( F \) is distinct from the features that compose it, that is, there would exist a functional head PV whose content could vary without affecting its identity as long as it is involved in pragmatic relations. However, nowadays we do not think of functional categories as being anything but their features. It is not permissible within BPS to say that [Top] and [Foc] are assembled in one lexical item that somehow comprises both.

Alternative 2: The difference between Finnish and Catalan involves selection. In both languages Foc and Top select for Fin. But in Catalan Foc and Top also select each other and Top can select another Top (given the recursivity of CLLD). In Finnish Foc and Top select for Fin\( P \):

(3.145) Selectional properties of Top and Foc in Catalan and Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Top Selection</th>
<th>Foc Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>[__ {Fin, Top}]</td>
<td>[__ {Foc, Top, Fin}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>[__ Fin]</td>
<td>[__ Fin]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Finnish, Top\( P \) and Foc\( P \) are incompatible because they both select for the same category. This analysis would solve the problem at hand and it has a long tradition (see Ouhalla 1991 for an early proposal that there are cross-linguistic differences concerning the selectional properties of functional categories). But one should be concerned about its lack of restrictedness: if the c-selection
properties of functional heads are allowed to vary from language to language, what prevents us from having, for example, Top or Foc selecting for TP, Top or Foc selecting for Force, etc.? Notice that in other domains of grammar this selectional freedom does not hold: for instance, auxiliaries and modals in English appear in a fixed order, Tense always c-commands Aspect. This suggests that the selectional properties of functional categories, like those of lexical categories, are fixed (see Cinque 1999 as a detailed proponent of this).

Alternative 3: Finnish and Catalan do not grammaticalize the same features, as argued by Vallduvı´ and Vilkuna (1998). While the Romance lexicon includes a [Top] and a [Foc], in Finnish we have [Contrast] (Vilkuna 1995). Since we have different lexical items involved, it is to be expected that we will find different structures. This approach is undermined by the evidence presented in Chapter 2 that the Catalan/Romance left periphery is also linked to contrastiveness and that the notions of Topic and Focus are not useful to describe the grammar of this language family.

3.8.3 One final look at Finnish objects and the feature [+a]

From the discussion above, we can conclude that, as regards the left periphery and the feature [±c], there is no substantial difference between Finnish and Catalan. The question that I would like to address here is whether the same conclusion can be reached concerning the feature [+a]. In this section, I limit myself to some speculative remarks suggesting that such an approach is plausible.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the feature [+a] is assigned to Catalan objects in Spec,v. Interestingly, the same state of affairs seems to hold in Finnish non-finite clauses. As mentioned above, the object of the non-finite clause must appear to the right of the verb. However, if the subject of the subordinate clause moves to K, the object may shift to the left of the verb:

(3.146) Kenen Jukka väitti minun tietokoneeni rikkoneen?
who.gen Jukka.nom claimed my computer break.inf
‘Who did Jukka claim broke my computer?’

(Vainikka 1989: 98)

Interestingly, this object shift has a clear interpretive import: the pre-verbal object is interpreted as “presuppositional” (Holmberg 2000). I suggest that [+a] is assigned in Spec,v in non-finite clauses in Finnish, just like in Catalan.

Let us look at finite clauses now. As mentioned in footnote 23, the presence of an overt K allows for otherwise impermissible word orders. Concretely, it allows the object to shift to the left of the verb. Interestingly, this shifted object is again interpreted as anaphoric (Vainikka 1989, Vilkuna 1995):
In order to account for the SOV order, Holmberg (1997) argues that the verb may stay in situ (in $v$) when $K$ is filled. Although this solution is not entirely satisfactory—fronted constituents are known to attract heads, not to reject them—it is, as far as I can tell, descriptively adequate. Pending a better understanding of the phenomenon, I simply assume that Holmberg’s intuition is right and that an explanation of the verbal “freezing” will eventually come along. The interesting question now is where the object is. It could be in Spec,$v$ or in Spec,$T$ (assuming Richard’s (1998) “tucking-in”). Adopting the idea that the object is in Spec,$v$ would be parsimonious with what we see in non-finite clauses. Moreover, if the object were in Spec,$T$ in (3.147b), the sentence would probably violate the ban against multiple specifiers. Finally, McGinnis (1998) has argued that there is no “tucking-in” in A-movement so, if the object had raised to Spec,$T$, we would expect that it would precede the subject. Thus, we have three good reasons to assume that the object is in Spec,$v$ in (3.147b).

Finally, let us consider the case in which there is nothing in $K$, the object is pre-verbal while the subject is post-verbal:

\[
\text{(3.148) Mervin tapasi Seija.} \\
\quad \text{Mervin.acc met Seija.nom} \\
\quad \text{‘Mervin was met by Seija’} \\
\]

According to the sources consulted, the verb is in $T$, and therefore there is no doubt that the object must be in Spec,$T$. How does this square with the rest?

We have two possible scenarios to account for the appearance of the object in Spec,$T$. In the first scenario, the object moves directly to Spec,$T$, receiving

---

24 Holmberg (2000) proposes a very similar alternative. He maintains the idea that when there is an overt $K$ the verb does not move. However, he now argues that $V$ movement is not to $T$, but to a head that he calls New that selects for $vP$. His idea is that New$P$ and $V$-to-New are obligatory if there is no $K$. If there is a $K$, $K$ counts as new and New$P$ becomes unnecessary (but not impossible). Although this analysis suggests an explanation of what stops $V$ movement when there is a $K$, I cannot adopt it here, given my stricter assumptions. Vilkuna (1995) suggests feature percolation of a verbal feature that forces $K$ to be filled whenever the order OV obtains.
[+a] in that position. This analysis would entail that the grammar of Finnish would have two different strategies to assign [+a] to objects, unaccountably. In the alternative scenario, the object stops in Spec,v also in (3.148), getting the [+a] feature and movement to Spec,T is a later PF phenomenon:

\[(3.149)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&a. & [v_P \text{Obj} [v_\text{Subj} v \ldots t(\text{Obj})]] \\
&b. & [T_P \text{Obj} v+T [v_P t(\text{Obj}) [v_\text{Subj} t(v) \ldots t(\text{Obj})]]]
\end{align*}
\]

If we adopt this second analysis, we would have a uniform account of [+a] assignment in Finnish which would make Finnish identical in all relevant respects to Catalan/Romance. Given the conceptual advantage inherent in the second analysis, I suggest adopting it. Notice that it makes a clear prediction: movement from Spec,v to higher positions in the Middle-Field should have no effects on interpretation. Holmberg (2000) presents evidence that this seems to be the case: in (3.150), all instances of *romaanin* are interpreted as presuppositional but other than that there is no “discernible effect on the interpretation” (Holmberg 2000: 127; although notice that his example is not exactly parallel to (3.148)):

\[(3.150)\]
\[
\text{Miten Jussi (romaanin) olisi (romaanin) voinut (romaanin)}
\]
\[
\text{how Jussi novel would have could}
\]
\[
\text{kirjoittia?}
\]
\[
\text{write}
\]
\[
\text{‘How could Jussi have written a novel?’}
\]

(Holmberg 2000: 128)

Thus, raising of object to Spec,T would be an instance of PF movement with no effect on interpretation as the dislocations in Lebanese Arabic described by Aoun and Benmamoun (1998).

The question now is what triggers object movement to Spec,T. One likely candidate could be the ban on multiple specifiers discussed above: the object would have to abandon Spec,v in order to satisfy this restriction. However, if we adopt this solution, we will not be able to formulate this ban as in (3.144) since it is unlikely that both the object and the subject value a Case feature with v. Alternatively, Vainikka (1989) suggests that object raising to Spec,T is triggered to satisfy an EPP-type requirement. At this point, I prefer to leave this issue open.

If my speculations are on the right track, the grammars of Finnish and Catalan would then be fundamentally the same. In particular, the syntax/pragmatics interface would be carried out in exactly the same manner, despite appearances to the contrary. The surface differences would be a consequence of other properties of these languages.
3.9 Conclusions

I have presented a framework in which the syntactic derivations of CLLD, FF, and CLRD are tightly linked to their pragmatic interpretations. I have argued at several points that this framework is superior to the FocP/TopP framework popularized after Rizzi (1997). An assumption crucial to the analyses is that pragmatics can access $C_{HL}$ after every phase, as shown in Figure 3.1. The assigned pragmatic features become part of the constituent’s feature matrix and accompany it in later steps of the derivation.

However, my job is still incomplete. Although I have presented a framework of analysis I have presented little argument that a derivational, phase-based assignment of information structure features is empirically superior to more representational alternatives. In other words, the following alternative is still available:

1. XPs are assigned $[\pm a], [\pm c]$ as they are drawn from the lexicon.
2. XP raises to Spec,v/Fin in order to satisfy an $a$-criterion and a $c$-criterion respectively.

In other words, I need to present empirical argumentation that the features $+[a]$ and $+[c]$ are indeed derivationally assigned.

Likewise, nothing I have said so far directly discards a radical derivational approach such as Epstein et al. (1998), in which interfacing with interpretive systems takes place after each computational operation. I proceed to take care of this in the following chapter.
The derivation of information structure

4.1 Introduction

In the model developed in Chapter 3, I claimed that the features \([\pm a]\) and \([\pm c]\) are derivationally assigned. Constituents are not merged in the derivation with features related to their information structure, these features are assigned by the module pragmatics to constituents in certain structural positions: Spec,v and Spec,Fin. Rules (4.1) and (4.2) are the rules that assign the information structure features. Recall that \(X\) is the feature matrix that spells out as a clitic:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4.1)} & \quad a. \quad [+a] \text{ is assigned to } X. \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{The complement of } v \text{ is assigned } [-a].
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4.2)} & \quad a. \quad \text{Spec,Fin is assigned } [+c]. \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{The complement of Fin is assigned } [-c].
\end{align*}
\]

The purpose of this chapter is to give empirical flesh to the framework of assumptions presented in Chapter 3 and summarized in (4.1) and (4.2) as well as in Figure 3.1.

In Section 4.2 I present evidence, based on sub-extraction, that information structure is packaged derivationally and precisely in the manner summarized in (4.1) and (4.2). Crucial to my analyses is the claim that, once a pragmatic feature is assigned, it cannot be altered in later derivational steps. Rules (4.1) and (4.2), in combination with this principle of feature preservation, give rise to a web of intricate predictions. In Section 4.3, I discuss Rizzi’s (2004b) recent proposal for a Criterial Freezing, which impinges on my proposals. Finally, in Section 4.4 I contrast my derivational approach with two other approaches. First, I show that having lexical items merge in the derivation with pragmatic features like \([\text{top}]\) or \([\text{foc}]\) in tow (as in the otherwise quite different models in Rizzi 1997, Erteschik-Shir 2006, and Samek-Lodovici 2005) does not make the right predictions. Second, I show that the evidence presented here suggests
that the interface between syntax and pragmatics takes place at specific
points—Chomsky’s phases—and not at the end of every operation, as in

4.2 Derivational assignment of $[\pm a]$ and $[\pm c]$

4.2.1 Sub-extraction and feature conservation

Let us first remind ourselves of the main features of my proposed framework.
The information structure of Catalan consists of two features, $[\pm a]$ and
$[\pm c]$, which are assigned by a module that I call pragmatics in specific
syntactic configurations: $[+a]$ is assigned to constituents in Spec,vP, $[+c]$ in
Spec,Fin.

The crucial argument that shows the superiority of a derivational approach
to information structure revolves around sub-extraction. It is possible to
extract a constituent from another extracted constituent. For instance, take
(4.3). In (4.3) del seu avi is extracted from les històries:

(4.3) FF extracted from FF

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\alpha \text{ DEL SEU AVI}] \quad \text{dius que}[\beta \text{ LES of-the her grandfather say.2sg that the}} \\
&\text{HISTÒRIES t(}\alpha\text{)] coneix cada noia t(}\beta\text{). stories know each girl} \\
&\text{‘You say that each girl knows her grandfather’s stories.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Notice that both $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are FFed, as indicated by capitalization. Further, the
pronoun seu can be bound by the quantifier cada, which guarantees that $\alpha$ is
merged in the subordinate clause.

This example is derived as follows (including only the relevant steps):

(4.4) 1. Cada noia coneix les històries del seu avi.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{each girl knows the stories of the her grandad} \\
&\text{2. }[\beta \text{ Les històries del seu avi] coneix cada noia t(}\beta\text{)} \\
&\text{3. dius que }[\beta \text{ les històries del seu avi] coneix cada noia t(}\beta\text{)} \\
&\text{4. }[\alpha \text{ del seu avi] dius que }[\beta \text{ les històries t(}\alpha\text{)] coneix cada noia t(}\beta\text{)}
\end{align*}\]

That is, $\alpha$ is extracted out of $\beta$ when the latter is in the subordinate Spec,Fin.
A derivation in which sub-extraction takes place in-situ and both $\alpha$ and $\beta$
raise separately is not possible:

(4.5) 1. $[\nu P \text{ cada noia coneix les històries del seu avi}]$

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{2. }[\nu P \text{ del seu avi }[\nu \text{ cada noia coneix [les històries t]]}]$
\]
3. \[[vP \{les històries t\} [\forall del seu avi [\forall cada noia coneix t]]\]
4. \[[\text{FinP} \{les històries t\} [\text{Fin'} del seu avi] \text{Fin} [\text{TP} cada noia coneix t]]\]
5. dius que \[[\text{FinP} \{les històries t\} [\text{Fin'} del seu avi] \text{Fin} [\text{TP} cada noia coneix t]]\]
6. \[[\text{FinP} \{les històries t\} dius que t [\text{Fin'} del seu avi] \text{Fin} [\text{TP} cada noia coneix t]]\]

Notice that in step 4, we would have two FFed constituents within the same FinP. As we saw in Section 3.6, this is ruled out.

In (4,6), we can see that it is possible to left dislocate a constituent out of a CLLDed constituent (despite claims in the literature that dislocates are opaque for extraction).\(^1\)

\[(4,6) \text{(CL)LD extracted from CLLD}\]
\[[\alpha \text{ Del seu avi}] dius que [\beta \text{ les històries t(\alpha)}]\]
\of-the her grandfather say.\(2\text{sg}\) that the stories
cada noia les coneix totes t(\beta).
each girl Cl.acc knows all
‘You say that each girl knows all of her grandfather’s stories.’

Again, del seu avi could not be extracted from les històries del seu avi when \(\beta\) is in situ. Extraction of a possessive phrase from a DP in situ is possible, but it is licensed by the partitive clitic \(en\) (more on this below). The accusative clitic \(les\) is a sign that the entire \(\beta\) has been dislocated as a unit.

It is also possible to CLRD out of a CLRDed constituent:

\[(4,7) \text{ Cada noia les coneix, [\beta les històries t(\alpha)]}, [\alpha \text{ del seu avi}].\]
\every girl Cl.acc knows the stories of.the
her grandfather

\(^1\) Notice that \(\alpha\) in (4,6) is not doubled by a clitic, the obvious hallmark of CLLD. We can identify \(\alpha\) as a dislocated constituent in (4,6) because it is not focused, and correspondingly, does not have strong accent. Additionally, we can use Arregi’s (2003) test for dislocation (introduced in Chapter 1): he points out that the emphatic particle \(si\) “indeed” can co-occur with a dislocated constituent but not with FF. Example (i) shows that (4,6) passes this test:

\[(i) [\alpha \text{ Del seu avi}] tu si dius que [\beta les històries t(\alpha)] la Joana\]
\of-the her grandfather you indeed say. that the stories the Joana
les coneix totes t(\beta).
\Cl.acc know. all
‘you do say that Joana knows all of her grandfather’s stories.’

However, it is not clear to me why a clitic cannot appear in (4,6) and similar examples.
Thus, FF out of FF is possible, CLLD out of CLLD is also possible, and CLRD out of CLRD is possible too. However, “mixing” is not permitted. For instance, it is not possible to FF from within a constituent that has been CLLDed:

\[(4.8)\]

\[
\text{FF extracted from CLLD} \]
\[
\#_{\alpha} \text{DEL SEU AVI} \quad \text{dius que} \quad [_{\beta} \text{les}} \]
\[
of-the \quad \text{her \ grandfather \ say.2sg} \quad \text{that \ the} \]
\[
\text{histories} \quad \text{t(\alpha)} \quad \text{cada noia} \quad \text{les coneix totes.} \]
\[
\text{stories} \quad \text{each girl} \quad \text{CL.acc} \quad \text{knows all} \]
\[
\text{‘You say that each girl knows all of her grandfather’s stories.’} \]

Likewise, it is not acceptable to left dislocate a constituent extracted from a FFed one:

\[(4.9)\]

\[
\text{(CL)LD extracted from FF} \]
\[
\#_{\alpha} \text{Del seu avi}, \quad \text{dius que} \quad [_{\beta} \text{LES}} \]
\[
of-the \quad \text{her \ grandfather \ say.2sg} \quad \text{that \ the} \]
\[
\text{HISTORIES} \quad \text{t(\alpha)} \quad \text{coneix cada noia.} \]
\[
\text{stories} \quad \text{knows each girl} \]
\[
\text{‘You say that each girl knows all of her grandfather’s stories.’} \]

As for wh-extraction, it is somewhat awkward to extract a wh-phrase from a FFed phrase, for the reasons explained in Section 3.6. However, it is possible to extract a wh-phrase from a dislocated phrase provided that the wh-phrase is D-linking. Consider the examples in \[(4.10)\), \[(4.11)\), and \[(4.12)\). Example \[(4.10)\) involves extracting the wh-phrase from a CLLDed constituent. The answer, pairing girls with their older brothers, ensures that \textit{de qui} is within the scope of \textit{cada} and therefore that it started off as a constituent of the DP \textit{les històries}… The sentence is acceptable, even if somewhat difficult. Example \[(4.11)\), sporting an aggressive non-D-linked wh-phrase of the “what the hell” type (Pesetsky 1987), is unacceptable. The best sentence is \[(4.12)\), in which the wh-phrase is aggressively D-linked:

\[(4.10)\]

\[
\text{De qui dius que} \quad [\text{les històries t(wh)}] \quad \text{les} \]
\[
of \text{whom} \quad \text{say.}^{2\text{nd}} \quad \text{that \ the \ stories} \quad \text{Cl.acc} \]
\[
\text{coneix cada noia.} \quad \text{knows each \ girl} \]
\[
\text{‘Whose stories do you say that each girl knows?’} \]
\[
[\text{Answer: her \ older \ brother’s}] \]

\[(4.11)\]

\[
\#_{\text{De qui cony dius que} \quad [\text{les històries t(wh)}] \quad \text{les}} \]
\[
of \text{who} \quad \text{cunt say.}^{2\text{nd}} \quad \text{that \ the \ stories} \quad \text{Cl.acc} \]
coneix cada noia?
knows each girl
‘Who the hell’s stories do you say that every girl knows?’
[Answer: Joana knows Pere’s stories, Maria knows Pau’s stories . . .]

\((4.12)\) De quin dels seus germans dius que [les histo"
\(\text{2}\) mes her brothers say. of les stories les coneix cada noia?
\(\text{Cl.acc} \) knows each girl
[Answer: her oldest brother]
‘The stories of which of her brothers do you say that each girl knows?’

Given \((4.3)\), \((4.6)\), and \((4.7)\), it does not seem plausible that \((4.8)\) and \((4.9)\)
violate a syntactic constraint. Likewise, the contrast between \((4.10)\) and \((4.12)\)
and \((4.11)\) does not suggest a syntactic constraint. Instead, let me suggest that
the unacceptability of \((4.8)\), \((4.9)\), and \((4.11)\) involves interpretation—hence
my use of the pound sign rather than an asterisk. Let us now look at the
problem in broad terms, these will be sharpened soon. Take for instance \((4.8)\).
As I explained, CLLD is [+a]. As a result of CLLDing \(\beta\), the entire
\(\beta\) is interpreted as [+a], including \(\alpha\). Example \((4.8)\) is infelicitous because it is
required to have the features [+a] and [−a] simultaneously.

This entails that interpretive features are different from formal features.
Assignment of Case to a D does not affect the other DPs that may be
contained in the DP. Thus, although the first D in “the pictures of the
American artist” may be accusative or nominative, the second D is invariably
genitive. But interpretive features are different. If “the pictures of the Ameri-
can artist” is, say, [+a], then the entire DP is anaphoric with respect to an
antecedent. The following exchange is a non-sequitur:

\((4.13)\) -Has vist el quadre de Picasso?
‘Have you seen Picasso’s painting?’
#-No, no l’ he vist, el quadre de Dalí.
No, NEG Cl.acc’ have.1st seen the picture of Dali
‘No, I haven’t seen Dalí’s painting.’

Why is \((4.13)\) incoherent? Because the dislocated constituent \textit{el quadre de Dalí}
is not fully anaphoric—that is, \textit{el quadre} can be understood as being anaphoric but \textit{de Dalí} is not. This shows that the pragmatic features [±a] and
[±c] affect the whole phrase.

Let us go back to \((4.8)\). \(\beta\) is [+a]. Since \(\beta\) is [+a] so is \(\alpha\), a constituent of \(\beta\).
Displacing \(\alpha\) in the FF mode will force \(\alpha\) to assume a [−a] feature. \(\alpha\) is
therefore subject to contradictory interpretation requirements and the
sentence is unacceptable—or, to put it in Chomsky’s terms, the derivation converges as gibberish. As suggested in Chapter 3, pragmatic features are truly part of the feature structure of a category, constraining the set of possible subsequent derivations.

So it seems we have found a principle of feature conservation: a pragmatic feature is dragged but not altered or deleted. The following example confirms this impression:

\[(4.14) \#\text{La Maria diu que } [\beta \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)] \text{ la Joana les coneix totes } t(\beta), [\alpha \text{ del seu avi}].\]

This impression:

\[(4.15) \text{a. } [\text{FinP } [\alpha[-a] \text{ DEL SEU AVI}]. . . . [\text{FinP } [\beta [+a] \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)]]] \quad (8)\]
\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n\n}\]
is extracted and assigned a contradictory feature. PFC covers this sort of case as well.

But there are apparent counterexamples to PFC. Consider the following sentence:

\[(4.17)\] **CLLD extracted from \(\beta\) in right dislocated position**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Dius que [}_{\alpha}\text{ del seu avi]} & \quad \text{la say.}2\text{sg that of-the her grandfather the} \\
\text{Joana les coneix totes t(}\beta) & \quad [_{\beta}\text{ les històries t(}\alpha)]. \\
\text{Joana cl.acc knows all the stories} & \\
\text{‘You say that Joana knows all of her grandfather’s stories.’} & \\
\end{align*}\]

(Villalba 2000: 193)

In \(4.17\) \textit{del seu avi} has been extracted from \textit{les històries del seu avi}, a right dislocated constituent. The grammaticality of \(4.17\) is puzzling. A left dislocated constituent is \([+c]\) while the right dislocated one is \([-c]\), so this sentence should be out. Why should left dislocating out of a CLRDed constituent be grammatical?

The following examples add more pieces to the puzzle:

\[(4.18)\] **CLRD extracted from \(\beta\) in situ**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\begin{align*}
\text{La Joana en coneix [}_{\beta}\text{ les històries t(}\alpha)], [_{\alpha}\text{ del} \\
\text{the Joana cl.part know. the stories of-the} \\
\text{seu avi}. \\
\text{her grandfather} \\
\text{‘Joana knows her grandfather’s stories.’} & \\
\end{align*}\]

\[(4.19)\] **CLLD extracted from \(\beta\) in situ**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\begin{align*}
[_{\alpha}\text{ Del seu avi}], & \quad \text{la Joana en coneix [}_{\beta}\text{ les} \\
\text{of.the her grandfather the Joana cl.part knows the} \\
\text{històries t(}\alpha)]. \\
\text{stories} & \\
\end{align*}\]

In these examples a \([+a]\) constituent has been extracted out of a focused constituent, that is, a \([-a]\) constituent. This should give rise to a feature conflict, as we saw when we tried to dislocate a constituent embedded in a FFed one. But the feature conflict raises no problem: the sentences are perfectly grammatical.

So, why is it the case that the PFC appears to leak in some configurations? As I show below, the principle does not leak. The answer to the puzzle is a system in which pragmatic features are assigned derivationally, as structures are built up. Notice that apparent violations of PFC involve movement within
a phase, movement that crosses phase boundaries must always respect the PFC:

\[
\text{(4.20)} \quad \text{a.} \quad \{\text{Phase} \; XP \ldots \; [YP \; t(XP)]\}
\]

1. XP is extracted from YP. YP has no [pf]
2. Assignment of [pf] features
   \[\rightarrow\] XP and YP can have different features

\[
\text{b.} \quad \text{XP} \ldots \{\text{Phase} \ldots \; [YP \; t(XP)]\}
\]

1. YP is assigned [pf]
2. XP is extracted from YP, dragging [pf]
   \[\rightarrow\] XP and YP must have the same features

Why should this be the case? Recall that syntactic operations take place before syntax interfaces with the interpretive components. This means that when XP moves in (4.20a), YP has not been assigned a [pf] feature yet, which entails that XP is not dragging any [pf] features. Therefore XP is free to get any [pf] features at the edge of the phase without violating PFC. But when XP moves in (4.20b), the phase that contains YP has already interfaced with pragmatics and YP, which includes XP, has been assigned a [pf] feature—therefore, further displacement of XP must respect it. Apparent violations of PFC turn out to involve sub-extractions from constituents that have not yet been assigned the conflicting features—therefore, no violation ensues.

4.2.2 Some derivations in detail

In the following I present detailed (possibly excruciatingly detailed) derivations of all the relevant examples, with particular emphasis on the order of operations and pragmatic feature assignment.

I start with an abstract example without sub-extraction that will remind us how the system works. In (4.21a), we have an XP which is a complement of a lexical verb. In (4.21b), XP has raised to Spec,v where, in combination with the establishment of a dependency with the clitic, it is immediately interpreted by pragmatics as [+a]. The default [−a] rule makes the complement of v [−a]. If nothing else happens, XP ends up as a CLRD. In (4.21c) we see that the XP has continued to rise to Spec,Fin. When the FinP phase is completed, pragmatics inspects the structure and assigns the XP in Spec,Fin the feature [+c], while the complement of Fin becomes [−c]. This is what we call CLLD. XP ends up with the features [+a,+c] obtained in two different phases:
As for FF, we have two choices: either the FFed constituent moves to Spec,Fin directly or it stops at Spec,v, without consequences. In this work I have taken up the view that FF stops at Spec,v without consequences, as claimed in Section 3.5.

Let us now start with specific examples of sub-extraction. As mentioned, we can’t FF out of a CLLDed or CLRDed constituent and we can’t dislocate from within a FFed one. Let’s start with sub-extraction from a dislocated constituent (4.22 is 4.8 above):

(4.22) **FF extracted from CLLD**

# [α DEL SEU AVI] dius que [β les històries del seu avi] cada noia les coneix totes.

(4.23) **FF extracted from CLRD**

# [α DEL SEU AVI] dius que cada noia les coneix totes, [β les històries t(α)].

As mentioned, (4.22) is unacceptable due to a feature conflict, a violation of PFC. In (4.22) the constituent α, by virtue of being included in β, is necessarily [+a] and this feature cannot be switched to [−a]. The same applies to (4.23). Let us look at this in more detail.

The derivation that would give rise to (4.22) would have to go through the following steps: (i) the constituent β receives the feature [+a] in the spec of the subordinate v (the following representations abstract away from v to T movement and from subject raising to Spec,T):

(4.24) [vP [β les històries del seu avi] la Joana

les coneix totes t(β)]

cl.acc knows all
(ii) In the next phase, \( \beta \) moves to Spec,Fin, where it becomes \([+c]\):

\[
(4.25) \quad [\text{FinP} \ [\beta \ [+a] \ les \ històries \ del \ seu \ avi] \ [\text{vP} \ t(\beta) \ la \ Joana \ les \ coneix \ totes \ t(\beta)] ]
\]

Notice that \( \alpha \) only stops at Spec,v and Spec,Fin, where the \([-a]\) rule does not apply. As a result, \( \alpha \) should be \([+a]\), since it is never in a configuration in which it could have been focused. It could be said that \( \alpha \) sends mixed signals: we are trying to impose a focused interpretation on \( \alpha \), as indexed by capitalization/stress, but the syntactic derivation never allows for such an interpretation. The same applies to (4.23): \( \alpha \) wants to be focused but the derivation does not provide an opportunity to receive that feature.

\( \alpha \) in (4.22) and (4.23) cannot get a \([-a]\) feature because of the way derivations are configured. But, what if the derivation did place \( \alpha \) in a position where a contradictory feature bundle could obtain? Notice that there are three possible scenarios:

(i) \( \alpha \) would discard the old feature for the new one—in violation of PFC.
(ii) The new feature would simply bounce off. If so, \( \alpha \) would retain the original feature structure regardless of the subsequent derivation.
(iii) \( \alpha \) would end up with contradictory features, leading to gibberish.

Within this view, rule assignment is obligatory and \([\text{pf}]\) features limit the set of possible subsequent derivations.

I do not think there is any particular conceptual reason to choose (i), (ii), or (iii). \( C_{HL} \) could plausibly be constructed either way. The issue is empirical.

Consider now the following examples (4.27 is 4.9 above):
(4.27) CLLD extracted from FF

\[ [\alpha \text{ Del seu avi}], \text{ Maria diu que } [\beta \text{ LES HISTÒRIES } t(\alpha)] \text{ coneix la Joana. } \]

of-the her grandfather Maria says that the stories know the Joana

(4.28) CLRD extracted from FF

\#Maria diu que [\beta \text{ LES HISTÒRIES } t(\alpha)] \text{ coneix la Joana, Maria say. that the stories knows the Joana } [\alpha \text{ del seu avi}].

of-the her grandfather

In (4.27), a constituent has been extracted from a larger focused constituent and dislocated to the left. In (4.28), the same constituent has been dislocated to the right. Notice that the dislocated constituent could not have been extracted from \( \beta \) when \( \beta \) is in situ because in such a case a partitive clitic would be obligatory (more on this below). In either (4.27) or (4.28), the result is unacceptable. Let us see how.

The constituent \( \beta \) is focused, a feature obtained, according to my assumptions, by the lower occurrence of \( \beta \) in situ. The higher occurrence is immune to the \([+a]\) rule because it does not establish a dependency with \( X \) (see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3):

\[ (4.29) \quad [\nu P \beta \text{ Subj } v . . . V t(\beta)] \]

Then, \( \beta \) raises to Spec,Fin, where it becomes \([+c]\).

\[ (4.30) \quad [\text{FinP } \beta [\text{[-a]} \text{ Fin . . . } [\nu P \text{ t(\beta) } [\nu \text{ Subj } [\nu \text{ v . . . V t(\beta)]]]]]]] \]

At this point, \( \alpha \) can be extracted from within \( \beta \) and raised to the matrix Spec, \( \nu \) or Spec,Fin. The intonation in the example under discussion indicates that we are forcing \( \alpha \) to be \([+a]\). Notice that in this case, \( \alpha \) could receive \([+a]\) in the matrix Spec,\( \nu \), where it could stay until spell-out (as in (4.28)) or from where it could continue moving until Spec,Fin (as in (4.27)). That is, the following derivational step might \textit{a priori} be possible:
However, (4.31) is not possible and (4.27) and (4.28) are unacceptable. This leads to the conclusion that option (iii) is the winner. Option (i) does not agree with the data: the old feature cannot be discarded. Option (ii) does not agree with the data either: the new feature is not simply bounced off so that α can proceed its derivation unimpeded; when we place α in a certain configuration, application of the [+a] rule is obligatory. Instead, the datum indicates that α, as a constituent of β, bears a [−a] feature, which not only cannot be altered in the course of the derivation but also limits the set of possible subsequent derivations. As a consequence, the [+a] interpretation on α is unavailable.

In contrast, (4.32) and (4.33) are grammatical:

\[(4.32)\] CLLD extracted from β in situ
\[
[vP [α][-a,+c] del seu avi] \ldots [\text{ForceP que } [\text{FinP } [β [+c,−a] of-the her grandfather\ldots that LES HISTÒRIES t(α)]]]\ldots
\]

! [+a]

\[\text{You say that the stories of-the her grandfather say.}\]

In (4.32) and (4.33) we again have a FFed constituent and a dislocated constituent extracted out of it. However, in this case the result is unacceptable. Why? Notice that in sentences (4.32) and (4.33) there is a partitive clitic attached to the subordinate verb. This partitive clitic doubles α, and contrasts with (4.9) where we see an accusative clitic. This indicates that α in (4.32) and (4.33) moved to Spec, v independently of “the stories.” That is, the derivation of (4.32) and (4.33) is as in (4.34):

\[(4.34)\] (i) \[vP la Joana en coneix les the Joana CL.part know..sg the\]
histories del seu avi
stories of-the her grandfather

(ii) \( \alpha \) raises to Spec,\( v \).
\[ \text{[vP [\( \alpha \) del seu avi] [\( v \) la Joana en coneix les històries t(\( \alpha \))]}} \]

(iii) \( \beta \) raises to Spec,\( v \).
\[ \text{[vP [\( \beta \) les històries t(\( \alpha \))] [\( v \) [\( \alpha \) del seu avi] [\( v \) la Joana en coneix t(\( \beta \))]}} \]

(iv) \( \alpha \) receives feature [+a].
\[ \text{[vP [\( \beta \) les històries t(\( \alpha \))] [\( \alpha [+a] \) del seu avi] [\( v \) la Joana en coneix t(\( \beta \))]}} \]

(v) Complement of \( v \) receives \([-a]\).
\[ \text{[vP [\( \beta [\!-a\!] \) les històries t(\( \alpha \))] [\( \alpha [+a] \) del seu avi] [\( v \) la Joana en coneix t(\( \beta \))]}} \]

In other words, first \( \alpha \) moves to Spec,\( v \) and then \( \beta \) does. Since \( \alpha \) is engaged in an Agree dependency with the (feature that is spelled out as the) clitic, it gets the feature [+a]. Since [les històries t] is not engaged in such dependency, it is \([-a]\). From this point onwards, both \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) raise independently (and the Proper Binding Condition needs to be respected derivationally only). There is, as a consequence, no feature conflict.

Now we are ready to tackle the puzzling examples. Consider an ordinary CLRDed constituent, shown in (4.35) (which is the same as (4.18) above):

(4.35) CLRD extracted from \( \beta \) in situ

La Joana en coneix [\( \beta \) les històries t(\( \alpha \))], [\( \alpha \) del seu avi].
the Joana CL.PART know. the stories del seu avi).
of-the her grandfather

‘Joana knows her grandfather’s stories.’

This is a perfectly acceptable sentence in Catalan. However, notice that \( \alpha \) is \([+a]\) while its trace, as a vP constituent, should be \([-a]\). Syntactic position and intonation indicate clearly that \( \beta \) in (4.35) is a rheme. Thus, we have a contradictory specification of features in (4.35), which is exactly parallel to that in (4.27), but the sentence is acceptable. The question now is why it is possible to extract an \( \alpha \) constituent from a \( \beta \) which is \([-a]\), and assign it \([+a]\) in example (4.35) but not in (4.27):

(4.36) a. * [vP \( \alpha [+a] \) v... [ForceP Force [FinP [\( \beta [\!-a\!] \) t(\( \alpha \))] Fin... ]]] [cf (4.27)]  
b. [vP \( \alpha [+a] \) v... [vP V [\( \beta [\!-a\!] \) t(\( \alpha \))]]] [cf (4.35)]
If we assume a phase-based system, a solution to this quandary can be constructed based on the following observation: in example (4.36a), the head and tail of $\alpha$ are separated by a phase boundary, while in example (4.36b), the head and tail are within the same phase. Recall that the rules for $[\pm a]$ and $[\pm c]$ assignment apply after the phase has been constructed. As a consequence, when $\alpha$ is extracted from $\beta$ in (4.36a), it already has a feature specification, but when $\alpha$ is extracted in (4.36b) the $[\pm a]$ rules have not applied yet. Thus, in (4.36b), when $\alpha$ moves to Spec,v and becomes $[+a]$, it has no other feature specification. Let us make this solution explicit.

Take first (4.36b), where the head and tail are within the same phase. The derivation takes the following steps:

(4.37) (i) $[vP \text{ la } J. \text{ coneix } [\beta \text{ les històries del seu avi}]]$

$\text{the J. knows the stories of-the her grandfather}$

(ii) $\alpha$ raises to Spec,v.
$[vP [\alpha \text{ del seu avi}] [v' \text{ la J. coneix } [\beta \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)]]])$

(iii) $\alpha$ is assigned $[+a]$ (including all occurrences of $\alpha$).
$[vP [\alpha [+a] \text{ del seu avi}] [v' \text{ la J. coneix } [\beta \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)]]])$

(iv) $The complement of v is assigned $[-a]$.
$[vP [\alpha [+a] \text{ del seu avi}] [v' \text{ la J. coneix } [\beta [-a] \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)]]])$

The constituent $\alpha$ is displaced to Spec,v. Pragmatics can now inspect the structure and assign $[+a]$ to every occurrence of $\alpha$. The default $[-a]$ rule now applies, assigning a $[-a]$ feature to every constituent in the VP including $\beta$—but leaving the trace of $\alpha$ unaffected. Notice that the crucial point here is that movement takes place within the phase and, consequently, before the structure is interpreted. Notice also that this analysis requires that the default focus rule applies after the $[+a]$ rule. However, this order does not need to be stipulated, since being late is part of the definition of default rule.

Now take (4.36a) again, where the head and tail are in different phases:

(4.38) $\text{Dislocation extracted from FF (cf 4.27 and 4.28)}$

$[\text{ForceP que } [\beta \text{ LES HISTÒRIES } t(\alpha)] \text{ coneix la that the stories know. the Joana } [vP t(Subj) t(v) t(\beta)]]]$

Joana
In this case, the entire constituent $\beta$ has received the feature $[-a]$ within the subordinate vP. When $\alpha$ is extracted, it drags this $[-a]$ feature along with it as part of its feature structure. The crucial point here is that when a constituent crosses a phase boundary it already has a pragmatic feature that cannot be altered (some irrelevant steps are omitted in 4.39).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Dius que la Joana coneix les històries del seu avi.\footnote{say.2sg that the J. know. the stories of-the her grandfather}
  \item Complement of subordinate $v$ gets $[-a]$. \newline la Joana coneix $[_{\beta][-a]}$ les històries del seu avi]
  \item $\beta$ raises to Spec,Fin. \newline $[\text{FinP } [_{\beta}[-a]]$ les històries del seu avi $[\text{Fin'} coneix la J t(\beta)]]$
  \item $\alpha$ raises to Spec,v \newline $[vP[_{\alpha}[-a]]$ del seu avi $[v$ dius que $[\text{FinP } [_{\beta}[-a]]$ les històries $t(\alpha) ] [\text{Fin'} \ldots t(\beta)]]]]$
  \item $[!]$ $\alpha$ is assigned $[+a]$.\footnote{Let me remark again on the crucial difference between (4.37) and (4.39). In this example, we are assigning the feature $[+a]$ to a constituent that already bears the feature $[-a]$. In example (4.37) we are assigning the feature $[+a]$ to a constituent that has not yet been assigned the feature $[-a]$.}
\end{enumerate}

All the previous examples involved the $[\pm a]$ features. Let’s see what happens with $[\pm c]$. Consider first example (4.40):

\begin{enumerate}
  \item CL LD extracted from CL RD \newline \begin{align*}
    [_{\alpha} \text{Del seu avi},] & \quad \text{la Maria les coneix} \text{ of-the her grandfather the Maria cl.acc knows} \\
    & \quad \text{totes, } [_{\beta} \text{les històries } t(\alpha)]. \\
    \end{align*}
  \item ‘Maria knows all of her grandfather’s stories.’\footnote{In (4.40), les històries del seu avi has right dislocated and then del seu avi has been extracted and dislocated to the left. Notice that both $\alpha$ and its trace bear the feature $[+a]$, and so does $\beta$, so there is no problem in this respect. How about the $[\pm c]$ feature? The CLLDed constituent seems to have started off in a $[-c]$ position (see where $t(\alpha)$ is) and then added a contrast feature in Spec, Fin. However, notice that at the point when $\alpha$ is in Spec,v the $[\pm c]$ rules have not applied yet because, by assumption, these rules apply at the FinP level. Thus, when $\alpha$ reaches Spec,Fin, it does not have a $[\pm c]$ feature.}
\end{enumerate}
Example (4.41) presents the relevant steps of the derivation of (4.40):

(4.41) (i) \[ [vP \text{ la } J. \text{ coneix } [\beta \text{ les històries del seu avi}] \]
the J. knows the stories of-the her grandfather

(ii) \[ \beta \text{ raises to Spec, } v. \]
\[ [vP [\beta \text{ les històries del seu avi}] \text{ la } J \text{ coneix } t(\beta)] \]

(iii) \[ \alpha \text{ raises to Spec, } Fin. \]
\[ [\text{FinP } [\alpha \text{ del seu avi}] \ldots [vP [\beta \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)] \ldots \text{ la Joana coneix } t(\beta)] ] \]

(iv) \[ \text{(every occurrence of) } \alpha \text{ gets } [+c]. \]
\[ [\text{FinP } [\alpha [+c] \text{ del seu avi}] \ldots [vP [\beta \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)] \ldots \text{ la Joana coneix } t(\beta)] ] \]

(v) \[ \text{The complement of } \text{Fin gets } [-c]. \]
\[ [\text{FinP } [\alpha [+c] \text{ del seu avi}] \ldots [vP [\beta [-c] \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)] \ldots \text{ la Joana coneix } t(\beta)] ] \]

Likewise, consider sentence (4.42):

(4.42) \[ \text{LES HISTÒRIES coneix la Maria.} \]
the stories knows the Maria

‘Maria knows the stories’

\textit{les històries} also started off in an apparently \([-c]\) position but the same argument developed around (4.40) applies here too: the rules that assign the \([\pm c]\) features have not applied when \textit{les històries} is still in situ.

As mentioned, it is not possible to right dislocate from a CLLDed constituent. This is shown in (4.43), where, downward movement being illegal, \(\alpha\) is taken to move to the matrix Spec,\(v:\)

(4.43) \[ \text{CLRD extracted from CLLD } \]
* Dius que \([\beta \text{ les històries } t(\alpha)] \text{ la Joana les coneix totes } t(\beta), [\alpha \text{ del seu avi}] . \]
say.2sg that the stories the Joana CL.ACC knows all of-the her grandfather

Example (4.43) contrasts with (4.40). What needs to be accounted for is why the \([\pm c]\) feature mismatch in (4.40) creates no problems while the same feature mismatch in (4.43) gives rise to an unacceptable sentence. The account of (4.43) hinges again on the phase system: the head and the tail of the \(\alpha\) chain
are separated by a Fin phase: $\alpha$ has received a [+c] feature as a constituent of $\beta$ in the spec of the subordinate Fin and then it has moved to a position that is eventually defined as [−c]. This is shown in (4.44):

(4.44)  
(i) $\beta$ raises to Spec, Fin.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{que } [\text{FinP} [\beta \text{ les històries del seu avi}]]
\text{that } \text{the stories of-the her grandfather}\n\text{la } J. \text{ coneix } t(\beta)]
\text{the } J. \text{ know.}
\end{align*}
\]

(ii) $\beta$ is assigned [+c].

\[
[\text{FinP} [\beta[+c] \text{ les històries del seu avi}]] \text{ la J. coneix totes } t(\beta)]
\]

(iii) $\alpha$ raises to Spec,v.

\[
[\text{vP} [\alpha[+c] \text{ del seu avi}]] \text{ dius que } [\text{FinP} [\beta[+c] \text{ les històries}]
\text{t(\alpha)}] \ldots t(\beta)]
\]

(iv) The matrix Fin phase is built.

\[
[\text{FinP} [\text{vP} [\alpha[+c] \text{ del seu avi}]] \ldots [\text{FinP} [\beta[+c] \text{ les històries}
\text{t(\alpha)}] \ldots t(\beta)]]]
\]

(v) [!] (every occurrence of) $\alpha$ is assigned [−c].

The analysis presented in (4.44) has broader applications. As Villalba (2000) argues, CLRD is clause-bound. This is shown in (4.45). In (4.45a) I have underlined two dislocatable constituents, an indirect object in the matrix clause and a locative in the subordinate clause. Examples (4.45b, 4.45c) show that when we dislocate both of them the order is fixed: the matrix dislocation must be external with respect to the subordinate dislocation. If CLRD could raise beyond its own clause, either order should be available:

(4.45)  
a. Van suggerir a la Maria que anés a casa.
\text{PAST.pl suggest.inf DAT the Maria that goes to home}
\text{‘They suggested Mary to go home.’}

b. Li van suggerir que hi anés, a casa, a la Maria.
\text{CL.loc CL.dat PAST.pl suggest.inf that CL.loc goes to home to the Maria}

c. * Li van suggerir que hi anés, a la Maria, a casa.
\text{CL.loc CL.dat PAST.pl suggest.inf that CL.loc goes DAT the Maria to home}
The clause boundedness of CLRD can be derived from my assumptions. Simply put, if a constituent moves from Spec,Fin to Spec,v and establishes a dependency with X it will end up with a contradictory bundle of features:

(4.46) Li van \( [vP \left[ a \right. a casa] \) suggerir a Maria \( \ldots [\text{FinP} t(\alpha) \) que \( \text{anes t}] \) \]

This entails that, although a constituent can leave the vP phase without being [+a], the same is not true of the FinP phase: every element that leaves it must be [+c]. Technically, this follows from the way the rules for \( [\pm a] \) and \( [\pm c] \) assignment are designed (see (4.1) and (4.2)): every Spec,Fin is [+c] but only those Spec,v that are in a dependency with X are [+a]. But there is an intuition behind the technicality. The difference between (4.1) and (4.2) is derived from an important difference between Fin and v: v is a \( v \)-assigning head, while Fin is not. Thus, if we set up the [+a] rule so that every spec of v is [+a], then every external argument would have to be [+a]. Thus, the need to have an extra condition on the [+a] rule. As a consequence of this extra condition, other phrases can escape the vP without becoming [+a], simply by not agreeing with X: that is how we have FF and wh-movement. But since Fin has no external argument, the system mapping C HL onto pragmatics can set up the [+c] rule in the simplest possible way. As a consequence, no constituent can leave a clause without becoming [+c].

To sum up, these are the configurations with distinct [pf] features for \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). Notice that the crucial difference between the acceptable and unaccept able examples lies on whether \( \alpha \) crosses a phase boundary:

(4.47) a. \( \sqrt{[vP \left[ \alpha_{[+a]} \ldots [\beta_{[-a]} \ldots t(\alpha)]]} \) \]

\( \text{ex (4.18)} \)

b. \( \#[vP \left[ \alpha_{[+a]} \ldots [\text{FinP} [\beta_{[-a]} \ldots t(\alpha)] \ldots ]] \) \]

\( \text{ex (4.9)} \)

c. \( \sqrt{[\text{FinP} \left[ \alpha_{[+c]} \ldots [vP \left[ \beta_{[-c]} \ldots t(\alpha)] \ldots ]] \) \]

\( \text{ex (4.17)} \)

d. \( \#[vP \left[ \alpha_{[-c]} \ldots [\text{FinP} [\beta_{[+c]} \ldots t(\alpha)] \ldots ]] \) \]

\( \text{ex (4.43)} \)

4.2.3 Improper movement

Villalba suggests ruling out (4.45c) as a case of Improper Movement (IM): the dislocated constituent has been displaced from an A'-position (Spec,C) to an A-position (Spec,v). This prompts a brief discussion of the issue. In short, I propose an alternative perspective on the IM phenomena: it is not a problem of moving from an A'-position to an A-position; rather, the unacceptability arises because a constituent has been forced to bear a contradictory specification of features. Once you leave Spec, Fin, you have a [+c] feature. If you then
move to Spec, v, and stay there, you end up in the scope of rule (4.2b) with the outcome that you receive the feature $[-c]$. If you simply transit through Spec, v and end up in the spec of another Fin, then you are under the scope of rule (4.2a) and you are fine.

The phase approach to movement gives rise to numerous instances of IM: in effect, in every displacement from a subordinate Spec,C to a matrix one must pass through a Spec,v. I propose that IM be abandoned as a restriction against moving from an A’-position to an A-position.

What is lost empirically if the IM is eliminated? IM was originally proposed by May (1979) and Chomsky (1981) to rule out Superraising sentences such as the following:

\[(4.48)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{(a)} & \quad \text{*John seems that it is likely to win.} \\
  \text{(b)} & \quad \text{*John, seems [CP ti that it is likely t i to win]}
\end{align*}
\]

Sentence (4.48a) could be derived by allowing A-movement of John to stop at Spec,C, as in (4.48b). The underlying explanation of IM would be, according to Chomsky (1981) and May (1979), Principle C of Binding Theory: a variable is an R-Expression which must be A-free. Nowadays we have other tools to deal with this sort of sentence, such as Chomsky’s (1995) Minimal Link Condition or any other progeny of Relativized Minimality. Thus, IM seems unnecessary in this context.

Müller and Sternefeld (1993) and Müller (1995) have explored IM in depth, seeking to account for the clause boundedness of German scrambling:

\[(4.49)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{(a)} & \quad \text{dass Antje sagt dass Hygrometer niemand t mag.} \\
  \text{that Antje say. that hygrometers nobody like.} \\
  \text{‘… that Antje said that nobody likes hygrometers.’} \\
  \text{(Müller 1995: 5, 6)}
\end{align*}
\]

Notice that an IM approach based on Binding Theory will not prove useful with this phenomenon because scrambled positions are A’-positions. Instead, Müller and Sternefeld propose a Principle of Unambiguous Binding (PUB):

\[(4.50)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{PUB:} \\
  \text{A variable that is \(\alpha\)-bound must be \(\beta\)-free in the domain of the head of its chain.}
\end{align*}
\]

PUB forces A’-chains to be uniform in a strict sense: if the foot of an A’-chain is in Spec,C, all the intermediate links as well as the head of the chain must also be in Spec,C. If the foot of the A’-chain is in an adjoined position, all the
other positions must be adjunct. Thus, scrambling is clause-bound because you cannot leave a clause without stopping at Spec,C. Long-distance scrambling would involve a chain with a head and a foot in adjoined positions and an intermediate link in Spec,C—precisely the sort of configuration that PUB intends to rule out.

Notice that, as was the case with the Principle-C account, my analyses of dislocation and FF violate the PUB systematically. Although I am unable to present a detailed proposal, I would like to suggest that an analysis of (4.49) could go along the same lines as that of (4.45). Scrambling constituents in German are to be interpreted as [+a,−c] (see Meinunger 2000 as well as Chapter 5 of this monograph). Assume that feature assignment works in German along lines parallel to Catalan. Thus, the scrambled constituent in (4.49b) must have picked up a [+c] constituent in Spec,C, which is incompatible with the [−c] feature assigned in its final landing site (presumably, Spec,v).

4.3 Criterial Freezing

Rizzi (2004b) proposes the following principle:

(4.51) Criterial Freezing: a phrase meeting a criterion is frozen in place.

Principle (4.51) tells us that a wh-phrase satisfying the wh-criterion cannot move further. Likewise for FF (Focus Criterion), CLLD (Topic Criterion), etc. However, I propose that assignment of [+c] takes place to any constituent in Spec,Fin. If Criterial Freezing held, then no constituent would ever leave its clause, contrary to fact. The issue merits some discussion.

Rizzi compares his proposal to the θ-criterion. He proposes that a chain includes only one criterial position in the same way that a chain includes only one θ-position. Interestingly, he makes the analogy between criterial and θ-positions based on the fact that both positions involve interpretation. However, it has been argued numerous times that chains can indeed have two θ-positions (see for instance Hornstein 1999; López 2001; Manzini and Roussou 2000, among many others). Thus, the analogy is not fortunate. Instead, one could make an analogy between the different triggers of movement: let us take [f′] for A’-movement and Case for A-movement. In Case-triggered movement, once a formal feature on the moving item has been satisfied, the derivation ends. The assumption that a DP with Case cannot

---

4 I thank Werner Frey for pointing out to me the conflict between Rizzi’s Criterial Freezing and my approach.
move further has not been challenged, as far as I know. So it seems that extending it to any formal feature that triggers movement could be productive.

Moreover, an approach that stops movement only when the feature that triggers it is satisfied seems conceptually more appealing than the Criterial Freezing approach: I take it that it is a basic assumption that $C_{HL}$ is a mechanical combinatorial system that knows nothing about what happens to its outputs. Its principles and constraints should be of a purely formal nature. A principle that prevents a constituent from moving after its formal features are satisfied is coherent with this view, and it is captured in Chomsky (1993) with the Principle of Last Resort. However, a principle that prevents movement after some interpretive requirement is satisfied supplies $C_{HL}$ with a restriction that is alien to its nature, if the aforementioned assumption is right.

In the following, I show how the empirical evidence that Rizzi presents for his criterial freezing can be recast in terms of feature satisfaction.

This is the contrast that, according to Rizzi, supports Criterial Freezing:

\[(4.52)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Bill wonders which book he read.} \\
\text{b. } & *\text{Which book does Bill wonder she read?} \\
\text{c. } & ?\text{Which book does Bill wonder if she read?}
\end{align*}
\]

According to Rizzi, (4.52a) shows that a wh-phrase can satisfy the [Q(uestion)] feature of “wonder”. The ungrammaticality of (4.52b) comes about because we have forced the wh-phrase to satisfy two wh-Criteria: the one in the subordinate clause and the one in the matrix clause. This violates his principle of Criterial Freezing. In (4.52c), the wh-phrase satisfies the matrix [Q] while the complementizer “if” satisfies the lower one.

Let us first see how Criterial Freezing might seem to conflict with my own approach. A long-moved CLLD constituent is assigned the value [+c] as it leaves the subordinate clause:

\[(4.53)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Els llibres van dir que els llegiran abans} \\
\text{The books PAST.pl say.inf that Cl.acc read.fut before} \\
\text{de classe.} \\
\text{of class} \\
\text{‘They said they will read the books before class.’} \\
\text{b. } & [\text{FinP els llibres } \ldots [\text{que } [\text{FinP t } \ldots ]]] \\
\end{align*}
\]
It would seem that the Freezing Criterion should prevent this analysis. Once *els llibres* receives the [+c] feature it should stay in place. In order to get out of this problem, we could allow the feature [+c] to be assigned only at the matrix clause, that is, to be assigned in the complement clause only optionally. But this solution creates problems somewhere else: if [+c] is not assigned to the subordinate Spec,Fin obligatorily, some of the empirical results discussed in Section 4.2 would be gone: we are left without an account of why we cannot CLRD out of a CLLDed constituent (see example 4.43) and why CLRD and German scrambling are clause-bound (see 4.45 and 4.49).

In order to consider this issue in detail, I suggest that we return to something briefly discussed above (and in more detail in Chapter 6): the separation between the formal features, which belong in C_{HL} and trigger movement, and the interpretive features, which if I am right are assigned by an external system. My analysis in (4.53b) entails that they are independent. *els llibres* has been assigned the [+c] feature downstairs, so interpretively it is complete. If it needs to go on raising it must be because the formal feature that triggers movement—[f']—is not satisfied here. Hence it must go on. Since the constituent may stay in the subordinate clause, we must conclude that subordinate clauses may optionally be able to assign [f'].

Let us now turn to Rizzi’s example. Rizzi’s example is subject to an alternative analysis. Recall that he assumes that an embedded wh-phrase is sufficient to satisfy the [Q] feature of the selecting predicate “wonder”. But this does not need to be the case. In effect, wh-phrases are not inherently interrogative, since we can see them in relative clauses and in pseudo-questions (as in “I know what I want”). If wh-phrases are not inherently interrogative, the wh-phrase does not satisfy the selectional requirements of “wonder”. It follows that there is an interrogative complementizer deleted by the doubly-filled COMP filter:

(4.54) Bill wonders [\text{ForceP Force}[\text{Q}] which book he read]

In (4.52b) there is no deleted interrogative complementizer because the doubly filled COMP filter is not involved. Consequently, the ungrammaticality of (4.52b) comes about because the selectional requirement of “wonder” is not satisfied. In (4.52c), the selectional requirement of “wonder” is satisfied by “if”.

### 4.4 Derivations and representations

In this section I would like to include a few closing comments on how the phase-based derivational approach presented here compares favorably with alternatives. I will consider three sets of alternatives. Here is the first set:
Option (i) is the one argued for in this monograph. Option (ii) is the one articulated in Rizzi (1997) and subsequent work; (iia) is argued for by Erteschik-Shir (2006) and implicitly assumed in Samek-Lodovici (2005). Finally, option (iii) is argued in Reinhart (1995, 2006) and Szendrői (2001, 2006), among others. Option (iii) is discussed in Section 2.6. In the following, I focus on (4.55.i) and (4.55.ii).

The strategy of inserting lexical items into $C_{HL}$ with features such as [foc] and [top] is implicit in Rizzi (1997) and Samek-Lodovici (2005). In Rizzi’s system, constituents must be base-generated with [focus] or [topic] features from the start, since movement is motivated to satisfy a criterion inherent to the feature itself. In Samek-Lodovici’s application of Optimality Theory the candidates in competition have already been assigned a subscripted focus feature and this feature is crucial in the selection of the winning candidate. Assigning [focus] and [topic] to constituents as they are drawn from the numeration is explicitly assumed in Erteschik-Shir (2006). This strategy cannot provide an analysis of the sub-extraction data presented here. The crucial datum is represented abstractly in (4.20), repeated here:

\[(4.56)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(a)} & \quad \{\text{Phase } X P \ldots [Y P \ t(X P)]\} \\
& \quad 1. \ XP \text{ is extracted from } Y P. \ Y P \text{ has no } [p f] \\
& \quad \quad ([p f]: \text{pragmatic features}) \\
& \quad 2. \ Assignment \ of \ [p f]\text{features} \\
& \quad \quad \Rightarrow XP \text{ and } Y P \text{ can have different features} \\
\text{(b)} & \quad XP \ldots \{\text{Phase} \ldots [Y P \ t(X P)]\} \\
& \quad 1. \ Y P \text{ is assigned } [p f] \\
& \quad 2. \ XP \text{ is extracted from } Y P, \text{ dragging } [p f] \\
& \quad \quad \Rightarrow XP \text{ and } Y P \text{ must have the same features}
\end{align*}
\]
Take XP to be sub-extracted from YP. If this sub-extraction takes place within
the phase, then XP and YP can have different [pf] because movement took
place before [pf] were assigned. If this movement crosses a phase boundary,
XP and YP must have the same [pf] because movement took place after [pf]
were assigned. This allows us to make very specific predictions:

\((4.57)\)

\(\begin{align*}
  a. & \sqrt{[vP \alpha_{[-a]} \ldots [\beta[-a] \ldots t(\alpha)]]} \quad \text{ex (4.18)} \\
  b. & \#[vP \alpha_{[-a]} \ldots [\text{FinP} \beta[-a] \ldots t(\alpha)] \ldots ] \quad \text{ex (4.9)} \\
  c. & \sqrt{[\text{FinP} \alpha_{[+c]} \ldots [vP \beta[-c] \ldots t(\alpha)]]} \quad \text{ex (4.17)} \\
  d. & \#[vP \alpha_{[-c]} \ldots [\text{FinP} \beta[+c] \ldots t(\alpha)] \ldots ] \quad \text{ex (4.43)}
\end{align*}\)

If pragmatic features are assigned before the derivation begins, the pattern
just described is left without an account. For instance, if [foc] were assigned to
a constituent as it enters C HL, PFC should lead us to expect \((4.56a)\) to be
unacceptable due to feature conflict. If there is no PFC, then we do not know
why \((4.56b)\) is ungrammatical. Features must be assigned during the deriv-
ation, not before.

Let us consider now the next set of choices:

\((4.58)\)

(i) Interpretation of syntactic structures takes place on a complete
syntactic representation.

(ii) Interpretive systems can access C HL while the latter is still in
process.

Within traditional GB/early minimalist theory, all syntactic operations must
take place and a full sentence formed before it can be mapped to an interface
system like LF—this view seemed to follow naturally from the notion that
language was composed of different modules, each working on their own.

The set of predictions presented in \((4.57)\) is not available under \((4.58.i)\). As a
matter of fact, in such a system examples \((4.57a)\) and \((4.57b)\) would be
identical at LF in all relevant respects and we could not explain why \((4.57a)\)
is ungrammatical while \((4.57b)\) is grammatical. In other words, if we try to
rule out \((4.57a)\) arguing that head and tail have contradictory features, we are
unable to rule in \((4.57b)\). On the other hand, the interweaving of syntactic
operations and pragmatic interpretation that the phase system opens up turns
out to be crucial to make the right distinctions.

The final set of alternatives is the following:

\((4.59)\)

(i) C HL communicates with interpretive systems continuously.

(ii) C HL communicates with interpretive systems at some specified points.
Rule (4.59.i) summarizes the proposals in Epstein et al. (1998). According to Epstein et al., a structure is interpreted each time an operation applies: for every application of a syntactic operation there is a corresponding interpretive operation. What does this model entail in the present context? One way of interpreting their proposal is that the rules that assign [+a] and [+c] do apply after every syntactic operation. For instance, after merging a verb and its object, pragmatics would assign the result a [−a] value. Likewise, merging of v and VP would also be interpreted as [−a]:

\[(4.60)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Merge (V,XP)} & \Rightarrow \{V,XP\} \quad \Rightarrow \quad [−a] \\
\text{b. Merge (v\{V,XP\})} & \Rightarrow \{v,\{V,XP\}\} \quad \Rightarrow \quad [−a] \\
\text{c. . . . etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

However, if XP is to become [+a] at some point, the initial feature assignment must be discarded. But allowing for features to change overgenerates, as I argued above. Consider (4.57b) again: if a pragmatic feature could be altered then there is no reason for (4.57b) to be unacceptable: the old feature would be discarded and the new one adopted. (4.59.i) leaves us without an account for the contrasts that I have discussed in this chapter.

A second possible interpretation of Epstein et al.’s approach would be to assume that, although pragmatics interfaces with C HL after every operation, assignment of [+a] is withheld until vP is set up. However, this entails, in effect, incorporating the phase system into the analysis, with the disadvantage that C HL interfaces with pragmatics vacuously many times. The phase system turns out to be simpler.

4.5 Conclusions

The main goal of this chapter is to provide empirical support for a key point of the framework presented in Chapter 3: derivational assignment of the pragmatic features [+a] and [+c]. The empirical evidence comes from sub-extraction and shows that the point of the derivation when sub-extraction takes place makes all the difference concerning what pragmatic features the extracted constituent can bear. Additionally, I showed that alternative frameworks that do not involve pragmatic feature assignment at the phase level cannot account for the empirical data provided by sub-extraction. I additionally discussed Rizzi’s (2004b) proposal of Criterial Freezing and, after showing its shortcomings, presented an alternative analysis.
5

Moving objects

5.1 Introduction: [+a] and [+spec]

In this chapter I extend my database to other syntactic constructions that have been argued to have a role in information structure: p-movement (Spanish, Portuguese, Italian), accusative A (Spanish), Clitic Doubling (some dialects of Spanish, Greek, Romanian), clause-bound Scrambling (Dutch and German), Object Shift (Icelandic). Many linguists have understood that there are important similarities among these constructions that are worth exploring. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1997), Kallulli (1999), and Suñer (2000) argue that clitic doubling and German scrambling are equivalent, linked by the feature [+specific] ([+spec] from now on). Costa (2004, ch. 3) instead, connects Portuguese scrambling (or p-movement, in Zubizarreta’s terminology) with Germanic scrambling. Finally, Meinunger (2000) points out that there are important similarities between German scrambling and Catalan CLRD. One of the results of this chapter is that the Germanic and the Romance constructions indeed have some features in common that these analyses capture correctly. But there is no complete overlap.

Part of the difficulty with some of the analyses is that they seem to blend “discourse anaphor” with “specificity”. Yet they are different concepts, as shown in Section 2.3 and again in this chapter. Specific DPs are not necessarily discourse-anaphoric, instead, they are “anchored” (in the sense of Heusinger 2002) to some other sentential constituent. Consequently, specific DPs can be regular foci and non-specific DPs can be discourse-anaphors. The following are examples of all four combinations:

(5.1)  [+a, +spec]

CONTEXT: Yesterday I saw your family in the mall.

-Doncs jo, la meva germana, fa temps que no well I the my sister does time that NEG la veig.
Cl.acc see.1st
En canvi, els meus pares...
in change the my parents...
‘As for myself, I haven’t seen my sister in a while. But my parents...’

(5.2) [+a, −spec]

CONTEXT: I think I’ll buy some fish. And you?
-Home, un besuc, si em compraré.
man a besuc indeed CL.dat buy.fut.1st
‘I will buy a besuc (a type of fish).’

(5.3) [−a, +spec]

CONTEXT: Did you call Marta?
-Doncs no, vaig trucar la teva germana.
well no PAST.1st call.inf the your sister
‘No, I called your sister.’

(5.4) [−a, −spec]

CONTEXT: What would you like to buy in the Boqueria?
-M’ agradaria comprar un besuc.
Cl.dat’ like.cond buy.inf a besuc
‘I would like to buy a besuc.’

We are going to see in this section that p-movement has the same syntax and pragmatics as CLRD: it involves movement to Spec,v and it is [+a]. Accusative A and Clitic doubling (CLD) constituents are not [+a] (unless they are p-moved or CLRDed). The notion of “specificity” does not cover all their uses, since they can be generic and accusative A can optionally be a “weak” quantifier. I present evidence that they also involve some movement, although this movement is even shorter than that of p-movement or CLRD. I suggest movement to Spec,V or some vP-internal functional category for these constructions. Finally, I show that scrambled DPs/PPs in German and Icelandic shifted objects are both [+spec] and [+a].

The core hypothesis of this chapter is that both Spec,v and Spec,V are positions relevant for interpretation but in a different way. Spec,v is indeed the end of a phase and therefore is a point of interface with the interpretive modules. As a consequence, rules of interpretation apply to Spec,v. Spec,V is not the end of a phase and therefore it is not a position associated with a certain interpretation. Spec,V is only a visible position, from where it can be bound by sentential operators, thus becoming [+spec] or generic. These sentential operators cannot reach Compl,V, so a direct object that remains in situ—or is incorporated into V, as Geenhoven (1996) argues—is inaccessible to these operators and must be interpreted as a “weak” quantifier, existential, etc.
As the chapter progresses, I also argue that neither p-movement nor scrambling are triggered by prosodic conditions (contra Zubizarreta 1998; Reinhart 1995; Neeleman and Reinhart 1997). Additionally, accusative A provides evidence that movement is not semantically driven either (contra Diesing 1992, 1996; Diesing and Jelinek 1995). I conclude that the only possibility left is that the types of movements discussed in this chapter must be triggered by the familiar operations of feature checking/valuation and creation of syntactic dependencies between a head and an argument—although those mechanisms remain largely opaque.

5.2 P-movement

5.2.1 P-movement: empirical problems

P-movement is the name that Zubizarreta gives to a reordering of verbal arguments such that the neutral word order (i.e. the one that could lead to an all-focus sentence) is altered. The name comes from the idea that this sort of movement is triggered by prosodic requirements. Although I eventually present evidence against this account, I retain the name. There are two versions of this phenomenon. In the first version, two verbal complements trade places. This form of reordering is common in Spanish and other Romance languages but absent in most Catalan varieties. Sentence (5.6) is

1 P-movement is absent in the variety of Catalan discussed by Bonet (1989) and Vallduvi (1992). Domínguez (2004) shows that there are some Catalan speakers that accept p-movement.
an example involving a direct object and a prepositional complement. The PP has moved over the object:

(5.6) a. Se dejó el libro en su casa.  
    ‘He/she left the book at home.’

b. Se dejó en su casa el libro t.

The second kind of phenomenon reorders the object and the subject, with the result that we obtain a VOS order. This is available in Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan, and Italian:

(5.7) a. Mañana una mujer acompañará a un niño.  
    ‘Tomorrow, a woman will accompany a child.’

b. Mañana acompañará a un niño una mujer t.

Ordoñez (1998) and Costa (2004) analyze the Spanish and Portuguese (respectively) data and propose that a VOS order is the result of leaving the subject in situ and scrambling the object above the subject. One could entertain the idea of simply extending the analyses to Romance generally. There is, however, a crucial difference between Spanish and Portuguese and its sister languages: in Spanish and Portuguese the VSO order is fully grammatical, in Catalan and Italian it is not (in the latter language, it is acceptable if the object is deaccented or marginalized, following Cardinaletti’s (2001, 2002) analysis, more on this below). Sentence (5.8b) is from Costa (2004: 26) and (5.9b) is from Belletti and Shlonsky (1995: 522):

(5.8) a. Mañana acompañará una mujer a un niño.  
    b. Tinha comido o Paulo maçãs.

(5.9) a. *Demà acompanyarà una dona un noi.  
    b. *Ieri ha dato Gianni un libro a Maria.

This datum leads to a paradoxical situation. If VOS involves leaving the subject in situ, as Ordoñez and Costa argue, why is VSO not available in Italian and Catalan?

An optimal analysis should account for this cross-linguistic variation. Eventually, I argue that the cover term p-movement hides two different strategies of altering the word order. One strategy involves movement. The
other involves the syntax–prosody interface and it is analyzed as an alternative linearization strategy for the external argument that does not respect the c-command \( \rightarrow \) precedence connection posited by the LCA (see López to appear as well as Section 3.2.4 for argumentation that the LCA is a soft constraint). Spanish and Portuguese do have object movement or scrambling and rightward linearization while Catalan only has the latter. The syntax of objects in Italian, if I interpret the analyses in Cardinaletti (2001, 2002) correctly, ends up being more like Portuguese and Spanish than Catalan.

The rest of the section is organized as follows. In Section 5.2.2 I discuss p-movement in Spanish. In Section 5.2.3 I contrast p-movement and CLRD—and I show that the two constructions are surprisingly similar syntactically and interpretively although they look different on the surface. In Section 5.2.3 I argue that p-movement is not triggered by a prosodic requirement. Section 5.2.4 discusses Catalan and Italian.

5.2.2 P-movement in Spanish

Consider examples (5.6) and (5.7) again. The difference in interpretation between the (5.6a) and the (5.6b) examples as well as the difference between SO vs. OS orders in (5.7a) and (5.7b) is the familiar one in the literature on information structure. In the (a) examples the lower constituents are focused, a focus that can embrace the whole sentence. In the (b) examples the displaced constituent is \([+a]\), anaphoric with respect to an antecedent. In effect, p-movement is pragmatically equivalent to CLRD. Sentence (5.6a) is a good answer to the questions “where did he leave the book?” or “what did s/he do?” while (5.6b) is a good answer to the question “what did he leave at home?” Sentence (5.7a) is a good answer to the questions “who will a woman accompany?” or “what will happen tomorrow?” while (5.7b) is a good answer to the question “who will accompany a child?”

Recall the rule of \([\pm a]\) assignment that I proposed in Chapter 3:

\[
\begin{align*}
(5.10) & \quad \text{a. } [+a] \text{ is assigned to } X. \\
& \quad \text{b. The complement of } v \text{ is assigned } [-a].
\end{align*}
\]

Since \([+a]\) is assigned in Spec,\( v \), I predict that the outcome of p-movement must be Spec,\( v \). Evidence that p-movement targets Spec,\( v \) can be found in Ordóñez (1998).

Ordóñez (1998) shows that p-movement alters the c-command relations of the constituents involved (pace Zubizarreta 1998, see the discussion in Villalba 1999). This can be seen in (5.10). With VSO or SVO order, a quantifier in the object cannot bind a variable in the subject. However, with VOS order this becomes possible, as shown in (5.11c):
(5.11) a. Mañana entregará su autor cada capítulo.  (bound reading *)[Sp]
   ‘Tomorrow his author will turn in each chapter.’

   b. Mañana su autor entregará cada capítulo.  (bound reading *)

   c. **CONTEXT:** What’s up with the chapters? Who’s going to bring them here?
      Mañana entregará cada capítulo su autor.

Principle C data lead to the same conclusion. In (5.12a) *Eva* and *a ella* can be coreferential but in (5.12b) they cannot be. That is because in (5.12b) the pronoun c-commands the referential expression:

(5.12) a. Los hermanos de Eva le compraron el libro a ella.  [Sp]
   ‘Eva’s brothers bought her the book.’

   b. El libro, se lo compraron a ella los hermanos de Eva.

Consider now the p-movement that involves two verbal arguments, as exemplified in (5.6). The following example shows that in this case also the p-moved constituent has to be displaced to the left of the post-verbal subject:

(5.13) a. **CONTEXT:** What happened yesterday?
   Ayer se dejó Juan el libro en su casa.  [Sp]
   ‘Yesterday Juan left the book at home.’

   b. **CONTEXT:** What happened yesterday in his house?
   Ayer se dejó en su casa Juan el libro t.

   c. **CONTEXT:** What happened yesterday in his house?
      *Ayer se dejó Juan en su casa el libro t.

Example (5.13) leads us to the conclusion that there is only one type of p-movement, which displaces a verbal complement to a position to the left of the post-verbal subject.

Thus, the position of the p-moved argument seems to be intermediate. It is higher than the subject in situ position but lower than the subject in Spec, T—lower indeed than the verb in T. Therefore I propose that a p-moved constituent is in Spec,v:
This is, of course, the same configuration that I posited for CLRD in Chapter 3. Notice the feature X that I include in the structure of v. This is the same feature X that I introduced in Chapter 3 and that enters a dependency with DP in Spec,v. In Chapter 3 we saw that X is spelled-out as a clitic in Catalan. In Spanish, as can be seen in (5.6) and (5.7), this is not necessarily so.

The p-moved constituent in Spec,v receives the same [+a] feature that a CLRDed constituent receives, according to the rules presented (5.10).

It is interesting to contrast Catalan and Spanish at this point. In most varieties of Catalan there is no p-movement while CLRD is widespread. In Spanish p-movement is very common and CLRD is more limited, both in terms of the kind of XPs that can be dislocated and the frequency of use (I have found some Spanish speakers who rejected CLRD altogether). I do not believe this is chance: since both constructions end up with the same syntax/pragmatics, some “user’s economy” principle leads to the wilting of one.

Thus I conclude with Ordóñez that there is scrambling of argument DPs in Spanish, a bona fide instance of narrow syntax movement. The moved constituent acquires the feature [+a].

5.2.3 CLRD and p-movement
I have shown that the syntax and pragmatics of CLRDed and p-moved constituents is the same. But there are some surface differences between CLRD and p-movement that should be accounted for. The first one is the presence/absence of the clitic. The second one is the linear order of the constituents. Let us first summarize the comparative facts:

- Catalan has CLRD and no p-movement;
- Spanish has both CLRD and p-movement (at least for most speakers);
- Spanish does not have clitics for locative, and non-specific objects. That is, it only has dative clitics and clitics for specific objects, as well as a
“neutral” clitic for APs and CPs. Thus, many cases of “CLRD” have no apparent clitic (see Section 3.2.2):

(5.15) No, yo no he ido nunca, a Barcelona. [Sp] 
       Neg I neg have.1sg gone never to Barcelona
       ‘No, I have never been to Barcelona.’

I have argued that the c-command and interpretive data presented above reveal the hierarchical position of both CLRD and p-movement as being in Spec,v. Further, I suggest that they are derived in narrow syntax in the same way: a constituent moves to Spec,v triggered by some feature in their feature structure. Entering a dependency with X makes them amenable to the [+a] rule.

In Catalan, X invariably spells out as a clitic. In Spanish, X may spell out as a clitic if there is one available, but not necessarily:

(5.16) a. Ayer entregó los libros Juan. \(\rightarrow\) los libros is p-moved [Sp] 
       Yesterday delivered the books Juan

b. Juan los entregó ayer, los libros. \(\rightarrow\) los libros is CLRDed

The difference in interpretation between (5.16a) and (5.16b) is somewhat hard to pin down. It seems to me that all instances of right dislocation that I have found in Spanish involve some form of contrast in the non-dislocated part of the sentence (the substitution operation of Vallduvi 1992, see Chapter 2). In other words, my intuition is that CLRD in Spanish tends to be used for correction of the focused part while p-movement is not suitable for this purpose (however, recall that in Catalan contrast is not necessary for CLRD, see Section 2.3.5).

If X spells out as a clitic, then XP must be dislocated, both in Catalan and in general Spanish.\(^2\) Recall (Section 3.2.4) that the reason why [+a] constituents in Spec,v are linearized to the right in Catalan was the following constraint hierarchy applying at the syntax–phonology interface:

(5.17) \(\text{Align-(R,}[+a])//\text{Wrap-EPV} \gg \text{LCA}\)

The align constraint introduces an intonational phrase boundary to the right of every [+a] constituent. Wrap-EPV forces the lexical verb to be in the same intonational phrase as v, T, and C. LCA tells us that c-command relations must map to precedence relations. These principles are in conflict. If a [+a] constituent in Spec,v erects an intonational boundary, and it is linearized to the left as required by the LCA, Wrap-EPV cannot be respected, as shown in (5.18a).

\(^2\) With the exception of strong pronouns, which are obligatorily doubled. I will not be able to address the doubling of strong pronouns in this chapter, but see my remarks in Section 2.5.2.
However, if the [+a] constituent is linearized to the far right, the extended projection of the verb is now wrapped within an intonational phrase, as shown in (5.18b). This rightward linearization violates the LCA, which leads to the conclusion that the latter constraint must be low in the hierarchy:

(5.18)  
\[ (\text{C T [+a] v V}) \]  
Violation of Wrap-EPV, LCA respected
\[ (\text{C T v V}) \]  
Wrap-EPV respected, LCA violated

That was Catalan. What about general Spanish? We see that [+a] constituents do not need to be linearized to the right, hence p-movement. What we do see is that if there is a clitic, rightward linearization is obligatory. Thus, I take it that the spell out of X as a clitic triggers the high ranking of Align in Catalan and general Spanish (not in those dialects with CLD). When there is no clitic, Align can be demoted, so that the [+a] constituent in Spec,v erects no intonational boundary and it can be left linearized respecting both Wrap-EPV and the LCA. The ranking of the constraints without a clitic is shown in (5.19) (a by-product of demoting Align is that we have no particular reason to rank Wrap-EPV and the LCA anymore). In (5.19b) we see the resulting intonational phrase in which the [+a] constituent can be linearized to the left of the vP respecting Wrap-EPV and LCA:

(5.19)  
\[ \text{Wrap-EPV} // \text{LCA} >> \text{Align-(R, [+a])} \]
\[ (\text{C T [+a] v V}) \]  
The [+a] constituent is leftward linearized without violating Wrap-EPV

5.2.4 Is p-movement prosodic movement?

My analysis of p-movement makes it similar to Case-driven movement in the sense that it is triggered by an unvalued feature—[f], as in Chapter 3. Its information structure feature is a consequence of this movement and the syntactic dependency thus created. Prosody, including stress assignment, is only a consequence of the resulting syntactic structures. However, this is not the mainstream opinion on this topic. Since Zubizarreta’s (1998) work, p-movement has been taken to be triggered by the prosodic requirement that the focused constituent be the lowest in the tree so that it can receive accent according to the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR).

Zubizarreta proposes the following two principles that regulate prosodic prominence in the clause (1998: 124):

(5.20)  
**Focus Prominence Rule**
Given two sister nodes \( C_i \) (marked [+F]) and \( C_j \) (marked [−F]), \( C_i \) is more prominent than \( C_j \).
Given two sister nodes (where “sister” refers to “metrical sisterhood”, L.L.) \( C_i \) and \( C_j \), the one lower in the asymmetric c-command ordering is more prominent.

These two principles may be in conflict. Consider the structure in (5.22):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha \\
\beta_{[+\text{focus}]} & \gamma \\
\delta & \epsilon \\
\end{array}
\]

According to Zubizarreta \( \delta \) may be metrically invisible—for instance a trace of the verb. If so, \( \beta \) and \( \epsilon \) are metrical sisters while \( \beta \) asymmetrically c-commands \( \epsilon \). Further, both are entitled to prosodic prominence, \( \beta \) because of the FPR and \( \epsilon \) because of the NSR. In order to resolve this impasse, \( \epsilon \) moves upward, leaving \( \beta \) as the lowest node of the tree. Now \( \beta \) can be made maximally prominent without conflict with any other principle.

To exemplify Zubizarreta’s approach, take example (5.6) above, repeated here:

(5.23)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Se dejó el libro en su casa. \quad [Sp]  
‘He/she left the book at home.’
\item b. Context: what did he leave at home?  
Se dejó en su casa el libro t.
\end{enumerate}

Why has \textit{en su casa} moved above \textit{el libro}? In (5.23b), \textit{el libro} should get main prominence because, with the context as given, it is the focus of the sentence, but \textit{en su casa} should also get main prominence according to the NSR. If we move \textit{en su casa} up, both the FPR and the NSR target the same constituent and the conflict is resolved:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{FPR} & \text{NSR} \\
\text{en su casa} & \text{en su casa} \\
\text{el libro}_{[+\text{focus}]} & \text{el libro}_{[+\text{focus}]} \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus, in Zubizarreta’s view, p-movement is altruistic and not driven by feature checking/valuation.\(^3\) Moreover, since it alters c-command relations,

\(^3\) In Szendröi’s (2001) analysis of Hungarian, the constituent that moves is the one that has to receive focus, so this altruistic feature is avoided.
it must take place in narrow syntax, even though its motivation involves only the syntax–phonology interface—it is therefore a syntactic operation that presupposes a computational system with considerable look ahead.

Empirically, Zubizarreta’s approach only works with the simple examples that she presents. A more complex example makes its limitations clear:

(5.25) a. Le di a mi hermana dos pimientos
    Cl.dat gave.1st.sg DAT my sister two peppers
    para mi madre.
    for my mother
    ‘I gave my sister two peppers for my mother.’

    b. Le di dos pimientos a mi hermana t para mi madre.

We can place this example in a context in which para mi madre is the focus, for instance as the answer to the question “for whom did you give your sister two peppers?” the NSR and the FPR both select the PP para mi madre to have prosodic prominence, so there is no conflict between prosody and focus structure. Consequently, Zubizarreta predicts there should not be any p-movement. But p-movement is possible, involving the other two VP constituents, as shown in the contrast between (5.25a) and (5.25b). Example (5.25b) could be a good answer to the question “What did you do with two peppers?”. Thus, in each example the complement closest to the verb is the [+a] one, the other one is part of the same focus as the benefactive PP. I claim that this sort of example shows that the motivation of p-movement is not prosody and that prosodic structures are a by-product of syntactic operations and not the other way around:

(5.26)
According to Zubizarreta, the same principle of prosodic motivation applies to the VOS order. As a matter of fact, Zubizarreta claims that the VOS order is derived from VSO by leaving the subject in situ and moving the entire VP, not just the object. In example (5.27), (5.27a) is the source of (5.27b) via VP movement as shown in (5.27c):

(5.27) a. Ayer escondió el gato el queso.  [Sp]
    Yesterday hid.3rd.sg the cat the cheese
    ‘Yesterday the cat hid the cheese.’

b. Ayer escondió el queso el gato.

c. Ayer escondió \([VP \ t(V) \ el \ queso] \ [VP \ el \ gato \ t(v) \ t(VP)]\)

Why does the VP move and not just the object? Because p-movement by definition affects metrical sisters. The VP can be construed as a metrical sister of the subject if v is only a trace or an empty category, but the object is too low to be a metrical sister of the subject.

But there are two problems with the assumption that the whole VP moves to a position above the subject. First, as argued by Ordóñez and shown in (5.11) and (5.12), the object c-commands the subject in the VOS order. But if the entire VP moves, I do not see how the object can ever c-command the subject.

Second, if the VOS order is derived by movement of the VP, it is unclear how the following example is derived:

(5.28) a. Se los dio Juan a mi hermana
    Cl.dat Cl.acc gave.3rd.sg Juan DAT my sister
    para mi madre.  [Sp]
    for my mother
    ‘Juan gave them to my sister for my mother.’

b. Se los dio a mi hermana Juan t para mi madre.

If VOS is obtained by movement of the entire VP, one would expect that both the goal and benefactive arguments would necessarily leave the subject behind, but this is not the case. Thus, either the motivation of movement is not prosodic or the definition of metrical sisterhood has to be made more complicated. My own take on this is that, given the conceptual and empirical problems that it raises, the idea that movement can be prosodically motivated should be abandoned.\(^4\)

\(^4\) The reader is referred to Costa (2004: 35–70) for extensive argumentation that the VOS order cannot be obtained by movement of the VP in Portuguese.
5.2.5 *P*-movement in Catalan and Italian

Let us now look at the reordering of arguments in Catalan and Italian. I start with Catalan. The facts about Catalan are the following (see Bartra 1985; Vallduví 1992; among others):

A. VOS and VS orders are grammatical:

(5.29) a. Demà arriba un turista. [Cat]
   Tomorrow arrives a tourist.
   b. Avui juga el partit la selecció alemanya.
      today plays the game the team German.

B. VSO is ungrammatical:

(5.30) *Avui juga la selecció un partit de futbol. [Cat]
      today plays the team a game of football

C. Reordering of verbal complements is ungrammatical:

(5.31) a. Vaig cuinar un pastís per a la mare. [Cat]
      PAST.1st bake.inf a cake for the mother
      ‘I baked a cake for mother.’
   b. *Vaig cuinar per a la mare un pastís.

This combination of features seems almost paradoxical, if we try to analyze them within the paradigms presented so far. For instance, the possibility of VOS would suggest the possibility of p-movement—i.e. the subject stays in situ while the object raises to Spec,v. The VS order would seem to confirm that the subject can stay in situ. But if it is possible for the subject to stay in situ, why is the order VSO ungrammatical? And, if it is possible for the object to raise to Spec,v, why is the reordering of complements not possible?

It seems clear that the properties B and C suggest that the syntax of word order in Catalan is a lot more different from Spanish than one might suppose by looking at the data superficially. I conclude the following: I take the ungrammaticality of VSO order to indicate that subjects in Catalan always raise to Spec,T. I take the ungrammaticality of complement reordering to indicate that there is no p-movement in Catalan—that all movement of verbal complements to Spec,v leads to dislocation, as described in Chapter 3. The question then is how the VOS and VS orders are derived.

I propose that these orders do not reflect a syntactic operation but rather are the result of an alternative strategy for PF linearization. Let us assume we have a structure like the following (as usual, I draw specs to the left conventionally only since narrow syntax is not in the business of ordering constituents):
The diagram in (5.32) represents the following state of affairs: the subject in Spec,T receives regular narrow focus while the rest of the clause is [+a]. The whole TP is included within one intonational phrase.

The LCA would lead to the linearization Subj > T’. Assume, however, that a linearization principle requires that [+a] constituents be located at the beginning of the intonational phrase (following a version of the computational principle discussed in Section 3.6 that prefers [+a] phrases to be at the left edge of constituents). If this linearization principle is ranked higher than the LCA, the result is that the subject is linearized after all the VP constituents.

Evidence that this is the right approach is that VP adverbs must be found to the left of the post-verbal subject:

(5.33)  a. Va cuinar la carn d’olla acuradament el Joan. [Cat]  
        PAST cook.inf the stew carefully the Joan  
        ‘Joan cooked the stew carefully.’

b. *Va cuinar la carn d’olla el Joan acuradament.

Moreover, in the VOS order the object does not c-command the subject, unlike Spanish. The following sentences contrast with the Spanish equivalents shown above:

(5.34)  CONTEXT: What’s up with these children? Who’s going to take them home?  
        Demà acompanyarà cada noi la seva  
        tomorrow accompany.fut every boy the his  
        mare.  
        (bound reading *) [Cat]  
        mother  
        ‘Tomorrow his mother will accompany every boy.’

Thus, I conclude there is no p-movement in Catalan, only an alternative linearization strategy.

The facts in Italian present yet another twist:

A. **VOS and VS orders are grammatical (although VOS is slightly marginal):**

(5.35)  a. É arribato Gianni.  
        [It]  
        is arrived Gianni
b. Ha letto il discorso Gianni.
   has read the speech Gianni
   (Belletti and Shlonsky 1995: 522)

B. **VSO is ungrammatical, with the normal stress pattern that would accent the last constituent:**

(5.36) *Ieri ha dato Gianni un libro a Maria. [It]
   yesterday has given Gianni a book to Maria
   (Belletti and Shlonsky 1995: 510)

C. **Reordering of verbal complements is grammatical:**

(5.37) a. Maria ha messo il libro sul tavolo. [It]
   Maria has put the book on the table
   b. Maria ha messo sul tavolo il libro.
   (Zubizarreta 1998: 138)

Properties A and B make Italian similar to Catalan, but the possibility of altering the order of complements suggests that Italian has p-movement (as claimed by Zubizarreta 1998). If Italian has p-movement, then the order VOS can be derived by leaving the subject in situ and moving the object to Spec,v. But if so, why is the order VSO ungrammatical?

Zubizarreta (1998: 136) proposes that Italian subjects obligatorily raise to Spec,T and the VOS order is derived by raising the object to an even higher position, Spec,Foc, followed by remnant movement of the TP to a second Spec,Foc. There are three reasons why I cannot adopt this analysis. The first one is that it relies on the notion of movement triggered by a prosodic requirement, which I have shown is not tenable. Second, my structures do not include FocPs, I believe with good reasons (see my discussion in Sections 2.4.5, 3.2, 3.6, and 3.7, and Chapter 4).

Finally, it may be the case that the VSO order in Italian is grammatical after all, but it has an extra requirement: the object must be deaccented. The phenomenon exemplified in the following example is referred to as *emarginazione* or marginalization:

(5.38) Abbiamo invitato noi, Gianni. [It]
   have.1st.pl invited we Gianni
   ‘We have invited Gianni.’
   (Cardinaletti 2002: 33)

The traditional approach to marginalized objects has them adjoined to the right. However, Cardinaletti (2001, 2002) argues vigorously that marginalized objects remain in situ within the VP. Therefore I conclude that the order VSO
is acceptable in Italian, provided that the right intonation and pragmatic structure are assigned to the syntactic structure. If the order VSO is acceptable in Italian, then there is no obstacle to assuming that the syntax of Italian and Spanish is identical in this respect after all.

So now, what is the information structure of marginalized objects? Consider the following sentences (thanks to Silvio Cruschina for help in constructing the examples and grammaticality judgments):

(5.39)  -Potrò cucinare io?  
‘Can I cook?’
- No. Preparerà Mara, la cena.
‘No. Mara will prepare the dinner.’

(5.40)  -Potrò preparare io la cena?
  A2: -No. La preparerà Mara, la cena.

As we see in these examples, marginalization is preferred when we do not have an overt antecedent, but an antecedent can easily be inferred from the context. When the antecedent is explicit, the CLRDeed form is preferred. If Cardinaletti is right and marginalized objects remain in situ, we must conclude that a constituent referring to an inferable entity is not treated as discourse anaphoric [+a], although its predictability is signaled by means of deaccentuation (see also my few words on English at the end of Chapter 2).

What is left to explain is why the order VSO in Spanish allows for focus on the object while the same order in Italian requires the object to be marginalized. At this point, I do not have an answer for this question.

5.3 Accusative A

Animate accusative complements in Spanish may be introduced by the particle a:5

(5.41)  a. He visto un estudiante.  
have.1st seen a student  

b. He visto a un estudiante.  
‘I have seen a student.’

5 Sometimes a is referred to as a preposition and accusative A is discussed under the banner “prepositional direct object”. However, a does not behave like a preposition for the computation of c-command relations and it disappears when objects are promoted to subjects of passives. See Suñer 1988; Torrego 1998.
Accusative A allows for a specific reading of the object, absent in the DP object without A, as has been mentioned numerous times (see Torrego 1999 for an overview). This prompts a brief discussion of this notion. There are numerous theories of specificity and it would take us too far afield to review them (the reader is referred to von Heusinger and Schwabe 2002 for this purpose). Thus, what I will do is to adopt the broad lines of a particular approach, developed by Farkas 1997 and von Heusinger (2002, and references therein). In this approach, specific indefinites are “anchored”.

Traditionally, it has been assumed that specific indefinites are simply speaker-known. To use a classic example:

(5.42) A student in syntax 1 cheated in the exam. His name is John.  
(Fodor and Sag 1982)

In this example, “a student in syntax 1” is said to be specific because its referent is known by the speaker. However, Higginbotham (1987) shows that this not necessarily the case. Take the following example:

(5.43) James says “George met a certain student of his”

“A certain student of his” is certainly specific, although the speaker, “James” may have no idea who he is. Instead, it is the subject “George” who is the one that knows who the student is. From examples such as this one, von Heusinger (2002) concludes not only that specific DPs must be anchored, but also that if the anchor is not the speaker it must be found in the same sentence. I further conclude from this analysis that “specificity” entails no notion of discourse connectedness (contra Enç 1991: 21 and Diesing 1992: 81–90). Since specificity is compatible with both [+a] and [−a], this seems to be correct. As shown above, as well as in Chapter 2, the features “discourse connectivity” ([+a]) and specificity are orthogonal. I do not want to belabor the point, but I would like to show this once again. Sentence (5.44) is grammatical in Catalan with dislocation of the non-specific indefinite. The non-specificity of the dislocated constituent is ensured by the subjunctive mood in the relative clause:

(5.44) Ja en van buscar, una doctora que indeed Cl.part PAST.pl look-for a doctor that els pogués ajudar. Cl.acc could.subj help.inf [Cat]  ‘They did indeed look for a doctor that could help them.’

6 Torrego (1998) shows that accusative A affects the event semantics of the verb. This is an aspect of this construction that I am not able to discuss in this chapter.
And the example above, “a student in syntax 1” is specific and it is part of an all-focus sentence, hence [-a].

So, let’s go back to accusative A:

(5.45) a. He visto un estudiante. [Sp]
   b. He visto a un estudiante.
   ‘I have seen a student.’

The difference between (5.45a) and (5.45b) does indeed involve specificity. While (5.45a) “un estudiante” is not specific, (5.45b) can be read as specific or not. As Leonetti (2004: 82) argues, accusative A can also be a mark of genericity, as in the following example:

(5.46) Sólo admitimos a un profesor nuevo cuando tiene el título superior. [Sp]
   ‘We only accept a new teacher when s/he has an advanced degree.’

Accusative A is compatible with [+a] and [−a] features. In (5.47) it is the focus of the sentence while in (5.48) and (5.49) it is dislocated:

(5.47) CONTEXT: Who did you see?
   -Vi a una estudiante. Se llama María. [Sp]
   saw.1st A a student CL calls Maria
   ‘I saw a student. Her name is Maria.’

(5.48) CONTEXT: Did you see Maria’s sisters?
   -Sí, las vi en el parque, a las hermanas de Maria’. [Sp]
   yes Cl.acc saw.1st in the park A the sisters of Maria
   ‘Yes, I saw Maria’s sisters in the park.’

(5.49) CONTEXT: Did you see Maria’s sisters?
   -Sí, a una de las hermanas la vi en el parque,
   yes A one of the sisters Cl.acc saw.1st in
   a otra la vi en . . .
   A another Cl.acc saw.1st in
   ‘Yes, I saw one of the sisters in the park. I saw another one . . .’
Further, I take it that the ± specificity distinction cuts across the ± definite-
ness distinction (von Heusinger 2002). With definite DPs we find the same
pattern as with indefinites: when accusative A is present, the DP is optionally
(or obligatorily, depending on the context) interpreted as specific or generic
(or referential, the term normally used for definite DPs). When absent, the DP
has to be non-specific (or non-referential):

(5.50) Maria sigue esperando el/al hombre perfecto. [Sp]
    ‘Maria is still waiting for (A) the perfect man.’

Without accusative A, the sentence means that Maria is waiting for a perfect
man, no particular member of the species in mind. With accusative A this
meaning is available, but a second meaning, in which the meaning of “the
perfect man” is anchored to the subject (so Maria has someone in mind) is
also available.

With proper names and object pronouns A is obligatory, which follows
since they are always specific:

(5.51) a. Vi a María. / *Vi María. [Sp]
    ‘I saw Maria.’

    b. La vi a ella / *La vi ella. [Sp]
    ‘I saw her.’

Interestingly, the choice of accusative A alters the c-command relations of the
verbal arguments. The following contrast is due to Leonetti (2004: 92):

(5.52) Enviamos (a) un especialista a todos los departamentos afectados. [Sp]
    ‘We sent (A) a specialist to all the affected departments.’

As Leonetti argues, the absence of accusative A leads to a narrow scope inter-
pretation of the indefinite while its presence allows a wide scope. However, we
need to iron out a wrinkle before we reach any conclusions. It has been argued
that the scope of indefinites, at least when it goes beyond islands, depends on
semantic mechanisms (such as choice functions) and not on syntactic con-
figuration. Thus, it could be argued that choice functions also apply to provide
wide scope for indefinites in intra-sentential scope. In this case, it could be
argued that the effect of accusative A is to allow for the application of choice
functions and this example would show nothing with respect to configuration.
Thus, in order to test that a certain scope has been obtained configurationally I
need to use a quantifier that rejects choice functions.
Modified numerals are such quantifiers, as argued by Reinhart (1997: 384–5). The following examples show this. In (5.53a) the indefinite DP can scope over the conditional. Since a conditional sentence is a strong island, this wide scope must have been obtained by means of a semantic mechanism. The indefinite in (5.53b) cannot take wide scope, which entails that the modified numeral “three or more philosophers” rejects the semantic mechanism that allows for extra-island scope. Whatever scope “three or more philosophers” takes must be configurational.

The examples (5.53c) and (5.53d) are translations of the English (5.53a) and (5.53b) respectively. Consider (5.53c) first. Without accusative A, un filósofo cannot take scope over the conditional, but with accusative A it can. However, in (5.53d) wide scope for the indefinite is impossible with or without accusative A:

(5.53) a. If we invite a philosopher, Max will be offended.
   b. If we invite three or more philosophers Max will be offended.
   c. Si invitamos (a) un filósofo, Max se molestará. [Sp]
   d. Si invitamos (a) tres o más filósofos, Max se molestará.

Now we can go back to Leonetti’s example. I change the example minimally to include a modified numeral:

(5.54) Enviamos (a) tres o más especialistas a todos los departamentos afectados. [Sp]

‘We sent (A) three or more specialists to all the affected departments.’

The specific reading with wide scope for the indefinite remains with accusative A. That is, (5.54) with accusative A can be uttered in a context in which the same set of three or more specialists are sent to all the departments but this reading is not available without accusative A. Since choice functions are not at play, we must conclude that the indefinite with accusative A is structurally higher.

I confirm this conclusion with binding data. Consider the following example:

(5.55) Los enemigos entregaron a su hijo (a)

‘The enemies delivered.pl. DAT his son A
cada prisionero. [Sp]
every prisoner
‘The enemies delivered every prisoner to his son.’
Without accusative A, there is no bound reading for this sentence. It just means that the enemies delivered every prisoner to someone’s son. With accusative A, the distributive reading becomes available and the sentence may mean that the enemies delivered every prisoner to his own son.

The following example will help us sharpen the analysis:

(5.56) CONTEXT: What did the enemies do? The enemies delivered X to Y and Z to W, but . . .

Los enemigos no entregaron a su hijo (a) ningún prisionero. [Sp]
no prisoner
‘The enemies did not deliver any prisoner to his son.’

The DP ningún prisionero is non-specific in this context, but it can still be prefixed by accusative A (without any noticeable change in meaning as far as I can see). Interestingly, we find the same contrast again: the sentence without accusative A does not allow for the bound reading, the sentence with accusative A does allow it, even though the specific reading is unavailable. The following example reinforces the point:

(5.57) Los enemigos no entregaron a su hijo a nadie. [Sp]
the enemies NEG delivered.pl DAT his son A no-one
‘The enemies delivered no-one to his son.’

nadie is inherently non-specific. However, it can still bind the indirect object.

These examples tell us that accusative A places the direct object in a c-commanding position from where it can bind pronouns in an indirect object. In particular, they tell us that the bound readings are not the result of the specific interpretation (which is absent here) but exclusively the result of being in a certain configuration. Accusative A is not a specificity marker (contra Torrego 1999 and all the literature she cites) or a topicality marker (as in Leonetti 2004) but a particle whose presence forces the DP to raise and—as

---

7 ningún NP is only marginal with a specific/distributive reading anyway, since ningún de NP is much preferred for this use.

8 Margarita Suñer (p.c.) reminds me that traditional grammars tell us that nadie “no-one”, like alguien “someone” require accusative A. This is exact only if they remain unmodified. If they are modified, accusative A is optional:

(i) No encontré (a) nadie que pudiera encargarse
‘I didn’t find (A) anyone that could take charge.’

(ii) Busco (a) alguien que sepa tres idiomas.
‘I’m looking for (A) someone that speaks three languages.’

I do not have an explanation for this phenomenon at this time.
I argue in Section 5.5—to enter a certain type of syntactic dependency. Accusative A is a formal feature, not an interpretive one.

Thus, the object with accusative A raises high enough to c-command the other complements of the verb. But, how high does it go? The following contrast gives us the crucial datum:

((5.58) CONTEXT: Who attacked every child?

a. Ayer atacó su padre a cada niño. ➞ (bound reading *) [Sp]
   yesterday attacked his father each child
   ‘His father attacked every child yesterday.’

b. Ayer lo atacó su propio padre, a cada niño. ➞ (bound reading ok)

c. Ayer atacó a cada niño su propio padre. ➞ (bound reading ok)

In (5.58a) there is no bound reading; (5.58a) shows that a direct object with accusative A to which p-movement has not applied does not c-command the in situ subject. This contrasts with (5.58b). As argued above when discussing Catalan CLRD, the dislocated object c-commands the in situ subject. Finally, (5.58c) shows that p-movement has the same effect as dislocation.

I conclude that the accusative A raises to Spec,V, a position where it c-commands the other verbal complements but not the subject:9

\[
\begin{array}{c}
vP \\
| \quad v' \\
| \quad \quad v \\
| \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad VP \\
| \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad aDO_i \\
| \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad V' \\
| \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad IO \\
| \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad V' \\
| \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad V \\
| \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad t_j \\
\end{array}
\]

9 Torrego (1998: 45–7) claims that accusative a complements move to Spec,v on the basis of theory-internal considerations. She presents no empirical arguments.
Consider the consequences of this. When analyzing the feature [+a] we saw that it is assigned in a certain configuration: if a constituent is in Spec,v and enters a dependency with a feature of v, it becomes [+a], otherwise it does not. With specific objects, we have a different situation: the specific object is also in a well-defined position but being in this position does not lead necessarily to a certain interpretation, only to the possibility of it (which makes an approach along the lines of Diesing 1992 or De Hoop 1992 inapplicable for this database, as I explain below). Thus, I conclude that no particular rule applies to Spec,V and Spec,V does not interface with an interpretive module—in other words, Spec,V is not the edge of a phase. Being in Spec,V is a necessary condition to achieve a certain interpretation even if this interpretation is not obligatory. In Section 5.5 I sketch a syntactic analysis of how this could come about. But first we need to look at one more phenomenon.

5.4 Clitic Doubling in Rioplatense

Spanish also adds CLD of dative arguments to its repertoire. In this construction, we find both a dative clitic and the doubled argument in situ instead of dislocated:

(5.60) Le entregué el libro a mi madre. [Sp]
     Cl.acc delivered.1st the book DAT my mother
     ‘I gave my mother the book.’

Dative CLD does not correlate with any information structure value. Thus, I will not discuss it here any further.

Varieties of Spanish spoken in the Andes, Rio de la Plata, the Basque Country, and Madrid also have CLD of direct objects. Leaving the case of the Andes aside (see Luján 1987 for discussion), CLD of direct objects is not a [+a] constituent. It can, as a matter of fact, be found in focus position—provided that the question word is a D-linked wh-phrase (Suñer 1988):

(5.61) ¿A cuál de las hermanas de Carlos viste? [RP]
     ‘Which of Carlos’ sisters did you see?’
     -La vi a María.
     Cl.acc saw.1st A María
     ‘I saw Maria’

Additionally Estigarribia (2006: 126) provides the following example:

(5.62) CONTEXT: speaker B wants to borrow speaker A’s phone card.
     A: ¿La vas a llamar a Marta? [RP]
     Cl.acc going.2nd to call A Marta
     ‘Are you going to call Marta?’
B: No querido... La voy a llamar a esta mina de la que hablábamos anoche. ‘No, dear... I’m going to call this girl we were talking about last night.’

Notice that neither Marta nor esta mina de la que... can be construed as [+a], they are both rhemes. It is enough that they are known by the speaker for the usage of CLD to be acceptable—that is, CLD is not necessarily [+a].

Porteño Spanish, like general Spanish, performs p-movement on [+a] constituents, whether they are CLD or not. In (5.63) un regalo is [+a] and is p-moved. In (5.64) a mi prima is also p-moved and, additionally, it is CLDed:

(5.63) CONTEXT: Who did Maria send a gift?
-Le envío un regalo María a mi prima. [RP] Cl sent a gift María to my cousin ‘Maria sent a gift to my cousin.’

(5.64) CONTEXT: Who did you recommend your cousin?
-Se la recomendé a mi prima Cl.dat Cl.acc recommended.1st ACC my cousin al jefe de la Siemens. DAT.the boss of the Siemens ‘I recommended my cousin to the Siemens boss.’

Thus, as argued by Suñer (1988) for Rioplatense, Franco and Mejías-Bikandi (1998) for Basque Spanish and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2000) for Madrid Spanish, a feature that defines CLD is specificity. The examples (5.6a, 5.6b) are taken from Suñer (1988: 396):

(5.65) a. *Lo buscaban a alguien que los ayudara. [RP] ‘They were looking for somebody who could help them.’

b. Diariamente, la escuchaba a una mujer que cantaba tangos. ‘Daily, they listened to a woman that sang tangos.’

c. *No lo vieron a ningún hombre. NEG Cl saw.3rd.pl A no man (Intended meaning: They saw no man.)

Example (5.65a) is ungrammatical because the DP alguien que les ayudara, with the verb in the relative clause in the subjunctive, can only refer to a
non-specific referent. In (5.65b), the adverb *diariamente* triggers a specific reading for *una mujer que cantaba tangos*. Thus, CLD, unlike accusative A, cannot be [−spec]. Likewise, (5.65c) is hard to interpret as specific (i.e. “none of the men”).

Given the analysis proposed in (5.59) for specific DPs, a CLDed object should be found in Spec,V. Franco and Mejías-Bikandi (1998) already claim that the doubled argument raises to Spec,AgrO in Basque Spanish, another CLD variety. Their only piece of evidence in this regard is based on word order. Although the order V+adv+obj is perfectly acceptable in Spanish, it becomes ungrammatical in CLD contexts:

(5.66) Vimos desgraciadamente un marinero.  
*saw.pl.1st unfortunately a sailor*  
“We unfortunately saw a sailor.”

(5.67) *Le vimos desgraciadamente a un marinero.*

In their analysis, the regular acceptability of V+adv+obj is understandable if the object stays in situ while the lexical verb incorporates into little v. If this order is ungrammatical with clitic doubling, the object must have moved to the left of the adverb. Given the flexibility of word order in Spanish, any conclusions drawn from the position of the object vis à vis an adverb must be handled with care. However, I take this contrast to be suggestive evidence that the CLDed does indeed raise. Let us explore the matter of specific object movement further.

Classic c-command tests suggest short movement of the doubled DP—although, since CLD in Rioplatense always goes with accusative A, this is not surprising. Consider first (5.68). Although an object quantifier cannot bind a variable in an indirect object, a doubled object can (although, as pointed out above, accusative A is enough):

(5.68) a. El secuestrador devolvió a su madre cada niño.  
*the kidnapper returned DAT his mother every boy*  
“The kidnapper returned every child to his mother.”

(bound reading*)

b. El secuestrador lo devolvió a su madre a cada niño.

Example (5.69) exemplifies principle C effects. Both of the sentences in (5.69) sound unnatural to all readers, but there is a detectable difference between

---

10 In Northern Spain the clitic *le* is both accusative and dative.
(a) and (b). The indirect object strong pronoun cannot be co-referential with an R-expression in the direct object, unless the latter is doubled:

(5.69) CONTEXT: What did the kidnapper do?

a. El secuestrador le devolvió a ella misma
the kidnapper Cl.dat returned to her self
el hijo de María
the son of Maria
‘The kidnapper returned Maria’s son to her.’ (bound reading *)

b. El secuestrador se lo devolvió a ella misma al hijo de María.

Thus, the clitic-doubled object seems to be hierarchically higher—although the obligatory presence of accusative A makes this fact less revealing.

Additionally, a doubled object does not c-command a pre-verbal subject or a post-verbal one. I show this in (5.70) with the help of principle B of binding theory. In (5.70a) and (5.70b), binding el mismo with Juan gives rise to a classical principle B violation. In (5.70c) we see that a p-moved CLDed object does c-command the post-verbal subject, but as we know this behavior is common to p-movement generally:

(5.70) a. El mismo lo/le reconoció al hijo de Juan. (bound reading *) [RP]
‘He himself recognized Juan’s son.’

b. Lo reconoció él mismo al hijo de Juan. (bound reading *)

c. Lo reconoció al hijo de Juan él mismo. (bound reading ok)

On the face of it, it looks like the syntax and interpretation of CLD is identical to that of accusative A. But there is one difference: CLDed constituents are obligatorily interpreted as specific (typologically, when specificity is marked on the verb morphology, specificity becomes obligatory, see Lyons’ 1999 survey). Thus, I conclude with Suñer (1988) that the doubling clitic bears an inherent [specific] feature.

I would like to finish this section with a brief discussion of CLD in Albanian and Greek. Their feature combination is not the same as that of Rioplatense, as pointed out by Anagnostopoulou (1999) and Kallulli (1999). As a matter of fact, they are more like CLRD, since they have to be [+a] (Kallulli 1999). Unlike CLD in Rioplatense, CLD in these languages cannot answer a wh-question:

(5.71) CONTEXT: What did Ana read?

a. #Ana e lexoi librín
Ana Cl read the book
(Kallulli 1999: 26–7)
Instead, (5.71a, 5.71b) above would answer a question like “what did Ana do to the book?”

As for the feature [+spec], Anagnostopoulou (1999) argues that it is not relevant for CLD in Greek—instead, the DP must be a referential definite (although this conclusion is contested by Kalluli 1999).

I will not try to make a contribution to our understanding of CLD in these languages. Instead, I simply point out once again that surface similarity does not correlate to similarity in syntax and interpretation.

5.5 The syntax of specificity

In order to articulate a syntax for specific objects and discourse anaphors, we have to take the following descriptive observations into consideration:

A. Constituents in Spec,v are [+a]. They may or may not be doubled by a clitic.
B. Constituents in Spec,V may or may not be [+spec]. If doubled by the clitic [I] they must be [+spec].
C. In Catalan there are clitics that double APs and PPs, CPs as well as indefinite non-specific DPs. In this language, clitic doubling leads to displacement to Spec,v, [+a], and dislocation.
D. In general Spanish clitic doubling leads to displacement to Spec,v, [+a] interpretation, and dislocation. But there is displacement to Spec,v without apparent clitic (p-movement) and dislocation without (overt) clitic for locative arguments and non-specific indefinites.
E. In Rioplatense (and other Spanish dialects) clitic doubling does not lead to dislocation. CLD is interpreted as [+spec]. There is displacement to Spec,v with or without clitic.

The first question that needs to be asked is: What motivates displacement? There are three possibilities: displacement for prosodic reasons, for semantic reasons, or for \( C_{\text{HL}} \) internal reasons (i.e. feature checking/valuation and creation of syntactic dependencies based on these features). We have already seen (Section 5.2.4) that prosodic requirements do not seem to be involved in p-movement. Can it be argued that semantics/pragmatics triggers movement?

Diesing (1992, 1996), Diesing and Jelinek (1995) argue that German scrambling and Icelandic object shift take place for semantic reasons. In particular, Diesing and Jelinek argue that DPs are semantically ambiguous between the entity <e> and the generalized quantifier type <<e,t>,t>. Lexical transitive

---

11 I use the expression “clitic [I]” to refer to the various Romance accusative clitics that include [I] in their base form (el in Catalan, lo in Spanish).
verbs are uniformly \(<e,\lt,\gt,\gt\) that is, they take entities and yield predicates. When a DP is a generalized quantifier it cannot combine with a lexical verb, which only takes DPs of type \(<e>\) as complements. Thus, the generalized quantifier must raise to a higher position out of the VP where it can combine with a predicate (of type \(<\lt,\gt\>)\).

Since Heim (1982) it has been assumed that quantifiers split their scope into a restrictor or restrictive clause and a nuclear scope. Diesing further claims that this partition has a strict structural correlate: the nuclear scope is the VP and the restrictor is the IP area above the VP:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Operator} & \text{Restrictor} & \text{Nuclear scope} \\
\text{Every } x & x \text{ a cat} & x \text{ is lazy}
\end{array}
\]

Thus, object raising, triggered by the inability to combine with a verb, places the DP in the restrictor.

Accusative A leads us to extricate movement from interpretation. A constituent can bear this particle, be displaced and still not be interpreted as [+spec]. As I have shown above, accusative A only forces the object to move, as a consequence of this movement additional interpretations become possible but displacement does not force them.

Given that prosodic and semantic motivations do not agree with the data, I conclude that p-movement, CLD, and accusative A involve movement triggered by feature-checking/valuation. I assume this feature is Case in CLD and accusative A because these constructions go only with DPs. Movement to Spec,v (CLRD or p-movement) can affect any XP. Thus, I suggest that the trigger for this movement is a feature similar to Case but broader in scope (as in Section 3.2.2).

Notice that the appearance of the clitic does not lead to a particular type of displacement or interpretation: in Catalan, the clitic correlates with movement to Spec,v and [+a] interpretation, in Porteño Spanish it co-occurs with movement to Spec,V and [+spec] interpretation. There is no easy correlation between surface appearance and structure and pragmatics. Actual syntax is revealed by c-command tests, pragmatics by placing sentences in context. Given this lack of correlation, I will assume that the properties of the clitic in CLD languages are not the same as in non-CLD language. Additionally, the features that trigger movement will have to be of a fairly abstract nature.

So, let’s get on with the analysis. The starting point is the realization, already suggested above, that there are two types of movement/dependencies

---

12 I take the liberty of translating IP into TP and VP into vP, in order to maintain consistency with the structural assumptions in this work.
at play. First, a type of movement that takes a DP to Spec,V: this is what is involved in CLD and accusative A. Second, a type of movement that takes any XP to Spec,v—what we see in CLRD and p-movement. Under the assumption that movement is formal-feature-triggered, I conclude that there are two types of features at play. The first type of movement, which only affects DPs, we can take to be Case-driven. The second must be triggered by another feature, call it \([f]\), I would hypothesize \([f]\) is akin to Case, since it gives rise to A-dependencies (see Section 3.2).\(^\text{13}\)

Take \(v\) to be merged in the derivation with both \([\text{acc}]\) and \([f]\). An object DP is merged with two unvalued features, \([\text{uCase}]\) and \([\text{uf}]\) and a complement PP or AP only with \([\text{uf}]\). Further, I incorporate the assumptions extensively argued for in López (2007). In this work, it is argued that the Agree(p,g) operation is strictly local: a probe can agree with its complement or with the spec of its complement. Movement is triggered by an unvalued feature of the goal. Movement is purely reactive and, consequently, strictly local: it goes spec-to-spec as new heads are merged. Movement only stops when the moving item establishes a dependency with another constituent bearing an appropriate valued feature (see Chapter 1 for more detailed discussion).

We will start with Case valuation and the feature \([+\text{spec}]\). The tree in (5.73) represents agreement between \(v\) and the object with the result that accusative case is assigned:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Agree} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{v[acc]} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Obj[uC]} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{t(Obj)}
\end{array}
\]

The object in Compl,V is too far from \(v\) to be probed by it, if my assumption of strict locality holds. The unvalued Case feature of the object makes it move and it does so to Spec,V. In that position \(v\) can probe it and assign it Case. Assuming V-to-v, this approach accounts for the adjacency between direct objects and the verb in English as well as the adjacency of the verb and the CLDed object pointed out by Franco and Mejías-Bikandi.

\(^\text{13}\) For instance, a p-moved constituent does not intervene in A’-movement:

(i) ¿Dónde dice Juan que María le entregó el libro a Susana / a Susana el libro?

‘Where does Juan say that Maria gave the book to Susana?’
As we have known since Baker (1988), an alternative way for an object to satisfy its Case requirement is by means of incorporation. Incorporation is apparent in only a few languages, but van Geenhoven (1996) has argued that what she calls semantic incorporation is more widespread and found in German and English. Let us then assume that Spanish also has incorporation of objects. Incorporation gives rise to the configuration in (5.74):

Assuming that incorporation is widespread in the languages of the world as Geenhoven’s proposals entail, it is certainly more abstract than Greenlandic or Mohawk incorporation since, for example, the object is never required to be adjacent to the verb and the object seems to be able to excorporate. It is possible that incorporation only involves some features of D; alternatively, it could be interpreted only as licensing/Case assignment of the object in situ (see Mahajan 1990, among others that propose two alternative configurations for Case checking with interpretive consequences). We then simply assume that what we call incorporation involves a tight relationship between a lexical verb and a D such that the Case feature of the latter is valued.

We can assume that nominal phrases can be merged as DPs or as KPs:

In case (5.75a), D incorporates into V. In case (5.75b), K prevents this incorporation—likely because of the effect of the Head Movement Constraint. It becomes necessary for the KP to raise and be assigned Case in Spec,V. If K combines with the feature [animate], it spells out as accusative A.

It is often pointed out that the existential verb haber as well as tener in its relational sense reject accusative A:14

14 tener, just like English “have”, has other meanings in addition to the relational meaning: it can mean “hold” or even “consider”. With these meanings, accusative A is possible:

(i) Tengo a tu hijo en brazos.
   ‘I have A your son in my arms.’
(ii) Tengo a Juan en gran estima.
    ‘I have A Juan in great esteem.’
(5.76)  

a. Aquí hay *a un enfermero. 
   ‘Here there is A a nurse.’

b. Juan tiene *a un enfermero. 
   ‘Juan has A a nurse.’

This has always been understood to be a puzzle because, as shown above, accusative A is compatible with non-specific readings. Interestingly, van Geenhoven (1996: 31–4) shows that the equivalent of existential haber and relational tener in West Greenlandic are inherently incorporating verbs. The Spanish puzzle ceases to be so if we extend this property of the West Greenlandic verbs to Spanish: existential haber and relational tener are inherently incorporating, a requirement that cannot be satisfied if accusative A is present.

Because of the role that some verbs have in triggering obligatory incorporation, Cohen and Erteschik-Shir (2002: 52) claim that incorporation depends on the semantic ambiguity of the verb. Although certain types of verbs do force incorporation as we have just seen, the internal structure and the configuration of the nominal also play a role in deciding if incorporation is possible or not. First, accusative A shows that incorporation of the nominal is possible only if the nominal has a certain internal structure. Second, datives never show specificity effects (see for instance Lyons’s 1999 survey). This can be accounted for if datives, as Baker (1988) shows, cannot incorporate due to their position in the tree (not properly governed, in 1980s parlance). Since they cannot incorporate, they are always free to be interpreted as specific or not. Thus, the fact that datives cannot incorporate shows that the position of the nominal is also crucial.

Thus, KPs move to Spec,V and enter an Agree relationship with v. DPs do not. However, DPs—non-specific nominals—do make it to Spec,v, as shown above with dislocation and p-movement data. Moreover, non-specific nominals can move to the left periphery. Thus, becoming specific or generic is not simply a question of being “higher” in the tree, as in Diesing’s sort of analysis. I take it that what is crucial is entering a dependency with v with the outcome of Case assignment (somewhat along the lines of de Hoop 1992).

Further, recall that accusative A does not force a specific reading on the KP, it only makes it possible. Thus, I suggest that getting Case from v makes the object visible to anchors (in the sense of von Heusinger 2002), and visible also to the generic operator. Being available for anchoring does not mean obligatory anchoring, so a constituent in Spec,V can still be interpreted as non-specific. An incorporated object is, so to speak, invisible to these higher operators. This invisibility gives rise to obligatory non-specific readings.
I turn now to the feature [f], the position Spec,v and the [+a] feature. In the following, I borrow heavily from Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. Let us assume that v is brought into the derivation with a valued [f] feature, together with [acc], while complement XPs are brought in with [uf]. Further, I take it that the feature matrix X, adjoined to v, takes up this [f] feature in Catalan and general Spanish. If that is the case, XP in Spec,V cannot value its own [uf] and must raise to Spec,v.

The XP in Spec,v has an unvalued [uf]. Every unvalued feature can be a probe, so the XP probes and finds the conglomerate [v, v+X], which has a valued [f]. If XP and v form a dependency based on feature sharing, then XP is a dependency with a valued [f]. This suffices to fully license the XP:

\[
(5.77) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{XP*[uf]} \\
\text{Subj} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{X} \\
\text{v} \\
t(\text{XP}) \text{ ... V ...}
\end{array}
\]

In Catalan, X always spells out as a clitic. In general Spanish it does so only sometimes. As mentioned above, spelling out of X as a clitic leads to obligatory dislocation (which in my analysis is a consequence of the ranking of Align-(R,[+a])).

We still have to account for CLD in Porteño and Basque Spanish. In these languages, the clitic does not trigger movement to Spec,v or dislocation and does not entail the [+a] feature. Instead, the doubled KP must be interpreted as specific. I take it that in these languages the clitic has grammaticalized further and has become an agreement suffix on v. As an agreement suffix, it does not take up the [f] feature, which can therefore be assigned to the KP in Spec,V. In other words, the clitic in CLD is not a spell out of X. If p-movement or CLRD happen in these languages, the [f] feature must have been taken up by an invisible representative of X.

The difference between the Spec,V and Spec,v positions gives us an interesting insight into the nature of phases and how the computational system interfaces with the interpretive systems. At the start of this monograph I stated the hypothesis that C_HL interfaces with the interpretive systems each time a phase culminates and that these interpretive systems are sensitive to
whether a constituent is in the edge of the phase, or indoors (Chomsky 2001a and much later work by him and others) and whether this constituent is in a dependency with a feature in the head of the phase or not. At this point, interpretive rules apply, making constituents [±a]. However, Spec,V is not the edge of a phase. The prediction is that no interpretive rules apply to Spec,V. This turns out to be the case: there is no interface rule that assigns an interpretation to Spec,V. But moving to Spec,V and being assigned Case by v is not without consequences: it makes the KP accessible to higher sentential operators or “anchors”.

5.6 Scrambling and object shift

There are numerous debates concerning the nature of scrambling in the Germanic languages. Among them, the subtle differences among the different languages stand out: German allows for scrambling of an argument over another argument and for scrambling of an object over the subject, both of which are forbidden in Dutch, which only allows for scrambling over an adverb. Here I will not try to make a substantial contribution to those debates, which would require a much finer-grained analysis that I am doing in this work. Rather, I will limit myself to (i) finding out what the information structure of these constructions is; (ii) what, if any, correlation with syntactic position this information value has; and (iii) compare/contrast these constructions with the Romance ones discussed above.

The data seem to indicate that non-specific indefinites do not scramble (unless they are contrastive focus, see Dayal 2002). This makes scrambling similar to CLD, as pointed out by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1997)—and less so to accusative A, since the latter can always have a non-specific interpretation. Additionally this interdiction lends credence to Diesing’s (1992) and de Hoop’s (1992) analyses, which take it as a departure point to argue that the defining feature of scrambling is [+spec].

But scrambling is also like dislocation or p-movement, since the scrambled constituent must also be [+a], as pointed out by Reinhart (1995), Meinunger (2000), Neeleman and Reinhart (1997), and Molnárfi (2002) (on the similarities between Portuguese p-movement and Dutch scrambling, see Costa 2004). In other words, it is the feature combination [+a, +spec] that leads to scrambling.

Let us look at the facts.

Both definites and indefinites can scramble, provided they are [+a]. The following pair of examples shows this with definite DPs (examples are in German unless otherwise indicated):
(5.78) **CONTEXT:** What happened to the book?  
- Ich habe das Buch gestern verkauft.  
  I have the book yesterday sold  
  ‘I sold the book yesterday.’  
  -# Ich habe gestern das Buch verkauft.

(5.79) **CONTEXT:** What did you sell yesterday?  
-# Ich habe das Buch gestern verkauft.  
- Ich habe gestern das Buch verkauft.  
  (Inspired by Dutch examples in Molnárfi 2002: 1122)

In (5.78), *das Buch* is anaphoric with respect to an antecedent in the previous discourse. As we can see, *das Buch* must appear to the left of the adverb. This has always been taken to indicate that it has moved to the left (or is base-generated there, see Fanselow 2001; Neeleman and Reinhart 1998). In (5.79) *das Buch* is part of the rheme and stays in situ. This is consistent with my analyses of Romance phenomena, where we also see that [+a] constituents move upward.

The following sentences exemplify scrambling of indefinite DPs:

(5.80) **CONTEXT:** Did you meet a general director yesterday?  
- Ja, Ich habe einen Generaldirektor gestern kennengelernt.  
  yes I have a general director yesterday met  
  ‘Yes, I met a general director yesterday.’  
  -# Ja, Ich habe gestern einen Generaldirektor kennengelernt.

As we see in this example, a [+a] indefinite is scrambled. Notice, however, that the DP *einen Generaldirektor* is both [+a] and [+spec]. One needs to extricate which of these features triggers scrambling. As a matter of fact, both are necessary. A specific [−a] indefinite does not scramble:

(5.81) Hans möchte heute jemanden einen Artikel zeigen  
  Hans wants today someone an article show  
  (und zwar seinen ersten in Phonologie)  
  namely his first in Phonology  
  ‘Hans would like to show someone an article today (namely, his first article of phonology.)’  
  (Frey 2001: 139)

This is expected within the framework developed in this work. However, as it turns out, a non-specific [+a] indefinite does not scramble either. This is shown in the following examples:
In (5.82), the bare plural *Tomaten* is [+a], while in (5.83) it is [−a]. However, in either case the unscrambled sentence is preferred.15

In Section 5.3 we saw that the complements of the verbs *haber* and *tener* “have” do not accept accusative A (in Spanish) and they are inherently incorporating predicates (in West Greenlandic). I concluded that these verbs force obligatory incorporation and henceforth prevent raising to Spec, V. It is interesting to note that the same verbs in German and Dutch do not allow for scrambling (as noted by Reinhart 1995):

(5.84) *omdat ik een kan altijd heb.* [Dutch]

because I a cat always have

Reinhart (1995) attributes this fact to focus structure since these verbs are light in meaning and therefore not easily focused. Is this the case? In Catalan there is no problem with dislocating the complement of “have” leaving the light verb in focus:

(5.85) *Jo sempre n’ he tingut, de gats.*

I always Cl.part’ have.1st had of cats

‘I have always had cats.’

Example (5.85) suggests that focusing on “have” presents no problem. Moreover, recall that the accusative A construction is related to specificity, not to focus/presupposition. Thus, assuming a unified analysis for the phenomena, the ungrammaticality of (5.84) does not seem to have anything to do with focus structure. Rather, it is linked to the impossibility of these verbs accepting incorporated objects.

My framework predicts that scrambling objects raise to Spec,v, the only place where the feature [+a] is assigned. We can test if an object has reached this position by leaving the subject in situ, thus creating a VOS order. Diesing

15 I thank Ingo Feldhausen and Edmund Pohl for grammaticality judgments. Tonjes Veenstra confirms the same judgments in Dutch.
claims that subjects may stay in situ in German, an assumption that seems to hold (Werner Frey p.c.). If so, the same test that we use for Spanish can be applied on German scrambling. We find that when we have the OS order the object c-commands the subject. A bound variable reading is available in the following sentence:

(5.86) a. . . weil dort jedem Mann seine Frau folgt.
    because there every.DAT Man his.NOM wife follows
    ‘. . . because his wife follows every man.’
    (Frey p.c.)

b. weil dort jedem Mann \( [vP/v \) seine Frau folgt]

So, if the object is higher than the in situ subject, where is it? Further, Diesing proposes an adverb test to pin-point the position of the object: an object to the left of an adverb like immer “always” has been scrambled:

(5.87) a. . . dass Otto immer Bücher über Wombats liest.
    that Otto always books about Wombats reads
    b. . . dass Otto Bücher über Wombats immer liest.
    (Diesing 1992: 107)

Bobalijk and Jonas (1996) test the object position in an even more precise fashion, by using transitive expletive construction. Consider the following example:

(5.88) Es essen ja doch brave Kinder grüne Äpfel immer sorgfältig.
The there ate ‘indeed’ well-behaved children green apples always carefully

(Bobalijk and Jonas 1996: 219)

Bobalijk and Jonas take the expletive to be in Spec,AgrS while the subject must be in Spec,T. The object has scrambled, since it appears to the left of the adverb. They claim that the position of the object is Spec,AgrO. In a model without agreement phrases, one can plausibly claim that the position between the subject in Spec,T and the adverb is Spec,v:

(5.89) Es essen ja doch \( [vP \) brave kinder T \( [vP \) grüne Äpfel \( [v \) immer v sorgfältig]]\]

Icelandic object shift fits the same pattern as the German data. As has often been mentioned, shifted objects must be specific. This explains why shifting bare plurals results in ungrammatical sentences (Diesing 1996):
(5.90)  a. Jón keypti bókina ekki. [Ice]
        ‘Jon didn’t read the book.’

        b. ?*Hann las baekur ekki.

        (Diesing 1996: 67)

It is customary to take the negative word ekki to be a landmark that indicates
if object shift has taken place. In these sentences, the DP has shifted, since it
appears to the left of ekki. Bobalijk and Jonas (1996) use the same test that we
saw above for German to pin-point the exact position of the shifted object:

(5.91) það lauk einhver verkefninu alveg. [Ice]
        There finished someone the.assignment completely

        (Bobalijk and Jonas 1996: 213)

Again, the subject and the adverb delimit a fairly precise zone, which within
my assumptions must be Spec,v. Thus, one must conclude that bare plurals
cannot reach Spec,v.

Specificity or definiteness is not sufficient to license object shift. If the DP is
focused, it cannot be shifted, even if specific:16

(5.92) Hvað las Jón ekki? [Ice]
        what read Jón not
        ‘What did Jon not read?’

        -Hann las ekki bækurnar
        he read not books.the
        ‘He didn’t read the books.’

        -#Hann las bækurnar ekki.
        he read books.the not

A shifted object has to be discourse anaphoric, as shown in the following
example:

(5.93) Context: Jón went into town a month ago and bought things
        for 20000 kroner: books, clothes, CDs. When he came home, he
        listened to all of the CDs that he bought right away and he has
        worn the same clothes since then but …

        … hann las bækurnar ekki fyrir en miklu
        he read books.the not before than much
        seinna. [Ice]
        later.

16 I thank Gunnar Hrafnbjargarson for help with examples and judgments.
Thus, a felicitous object shift in Icelandic, like German scrambling, requires both [+a] and [+specific].

Why are non-specific [+a] constituents not moved? One possible approach is to assume that they are moved but covertly. Unfortunately, this hypothesis cannot be tested using variable binding or reflexives because [−spec] DPs are bare plurals. Alternatively, we can assume that non-specific indefinites really do not move in the Germanic languages. If so, this kind of constituent is never anaphoric: if a non-specific indefinite is related to a discourse referent this relationship is always accidental co-reference, appearances notwithstanding (see my discussion at the conclusion of Chapter 2 regarding the difference between Greek and Romance dislocation). Unlike in Romance, in Germanic there seems to be the following implication:

\[(5.94) \quad [+a] \rightarrow [+spec]\]

That is, nothing can be discourse anaphoric if it is not specific.

I do not think it is surprising that this would happen. An informal analysis of a Catalan text reveals that the combinations [+a,−spec] and [−a,+spec] are less common in discourse. Moreover, in some languages they need to be marked with a special morpheme. In Afrikaans, the combination [−a, +spec] is marked with a special preposition, as described by Molnár (2002). In this language, definite objects may be introduced by the preposition vir, etymologically related to Dutch voor and German für. Molnár defines vir as a rheme marker (2002: 1128) and tells us that it surfaces when the DP does not scramble. Consider the following two examples:

\[(5.95)\]

\[a. \quad \text{dat ek die meisie gister gesoen het.} \quad \text{[Afr]} \]

that I the girl yesterday kissed have.

\[b. \quad \text{dat ek gister vir die meisie gesoen.} \]

As shown in these examples, when vir is merged, the object must remain in situ. Example (5.95b) is a good answer to the question “who did you kiss yesterday?”, which tells us that vir die meisie is rheme. Example (5.95a), with the scrambled DP, is a good answer to the question “what did you say about that girl?”, which tells us that die meisie is [+a].

In Catalan, [+a,−spec] constituents are marked with the “preposition” de, of unclear function:

\[(5.96) \quad \text{Context: Did you buy books?} \]

\[-Sí que n’ he comprat, de llibres. \]

yes that Cl.part’ have.1st bought of books ‘Yes I have indeed bought books.’
Thus, given the apparent markedness of the feature combination \([+a, -\text{spec}]\), it is not surprising that the Germanic languages have not grammaticalized it.

Let us now briefly consider the trigger of scrambling and object shift. As with p-movement, there are three choices. The first choice is to take it to be prosodically motivated, as in the adaptation of Zubizarreta’s framework by Reinhart (1995) and Neeleman and Reinhart (1997). The second choice is to take the Diesing route discussed above. The third choice is to take it to be feature-driven, in the way we sketched above for the Romance data.

In order to test if scrambling is a form of prosodically motivated movement, I will try out the same test that I applied before for the p-movement cases. The idea is to construct an example with three complements and see if scrambling is possible among the two complements that do not get stress according to the NSR or FPR. As a matter of fact, it is possible:

\[(5.97) \text{Ich habe meiner Schwester den Kuchen für meine Mutter mitgegeben.} \]

\[\text{I have my sister the cake for my mother.} \]

The benefactive \(\text{für meine Mutter}\) gets prominence according to the FPR and the NSR. If scrambling is driven by a conflict between these two rules, it is unclear why the two constituents that do not get prominence according to either rule should scramble.

As far as I can tell, Diesing’s proposal for semantically motivated movement fares impeccably with the German and Icelandic data. However, since we are interested in analyses that are as general as possible, consideration of the difficulties that semantically motivated movement has to deal with the Spanish accusative A leads me to conclude that we should try a different tack.

Thus, I suggest extending the approach sketched in Section 5.5 to account for this range of phenomena, that is that the interpretations of constituents are derived from position and dependency. The new datum that needs to be taken into consideration is the implication in (5.94) above.

In Section 5.5 I assumed that agreement with v and assignment of \([\text{acc}]\) leads to specificity while agreement with X (cl) and assignment of \([f]\) leads to discourse anaphoricity. We will assume that there is no X in Germanic. The

\[17 \text{ I thank Andre Meinunger for help with the example and grammaticality judgments.}\]
two features, \[\text{[acc]}\] and \[\text{[f]}\] form a hierarchical structure within \(v\) such that \[\text{[f]}\] is embedded in \[\text{[acc]}\]:

\[
\text{(5.99)} \quad \text{[acc]}
\]

\[
\downarrow \quad \text{[f]} \quad \text{[acc]}
\]

Further, let us assume that, being embedded, \[\text{[f]}\] cannot be reached unless \[\text{[acc]}\] is checked and deleted. It follows that a constituent that has checked \[\text{[f]}\] must have checked \[\text{[acc]}\] before. Such a constituent will have to be both \[\text{[+spec]}\] and \[\text{[+a]}\].

### 5.7 Conclusions

In this chapter I have discussed the following structures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[\pm\text{a}]</th>
<th>[\pm\text{spec}]</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-movement</td>
<td>[\pm\text{a}]</td>
<td>[\pm\text{spec}]</td>
<td>Spec,(v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative A</td>
<td>[\pm\text{a}]</td>
<td>[\pm\text{spec}]</td>
<td>Spec,(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>[\pm\text{a}]</td>
<td>[+\text{spec}]</td>
<td>Spec,(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrambling</td>
<td>[+\text{a}]</td>
<td>[+\text{spec}]</td>
<td>Spec,(v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object shift</td>
<td>[+\text{a}]</td>
<td>[+\text{spec}]</td>
<td>Spec,(v)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the data I have discussed in this chapter we can conclude that:

A. There is no prosodically motivated movement.
B. There is no semantically/pragmatically motivated movement (if we consider the full range of data, including accusative A).
C. By elimination of alternatives, I have argued that the types of short displacement discussed in this chapter must be triggered by syntactic dependencies based on the checking/valuation of features.
D. We confirm that the correlation between position and interpretation is mediated by a feature sharing dependency.
E. The correlation between Spec,v position and [+a] interpretation, initially posited only for Catalan CLRD, is confirmed in a variety of languages and superficially different construction types (p-movement, object shift, scrambling).

F. The position Spec,V is usually associated with the feature [+spec], but not necessarily (accusative A). Spec,V is necessarily [+spec] only if there is object agreement in v. This leads to the conclusion that only the edge of the vP phase is subject to an interpretation rule, phase-internal positions are visible positions, where constituents can be available for anchoring or binding. This goes against the line of research pioneered by Diesing (1992) and De Hoop (1992) according to which there are structural positions where a specific or generic interpretation is obligatory.
Dislocation debates

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter I pick up some loose threads from Chapter 3. The purpose is to examine the assumptions that ground my syntactic analysis of CLLD and CLRD and make sure that they stand on solid ground.

In Section 6.2 I examine the properties of dislocated constituents to decide whether these constructions are derived by movement or whether they are base-generated in the left/right periphery. I then present the evidence that CLLD and CLRD—as opposed to HTLD—are moved from a sentence-internal position; I examine the arguments presented by Cinque (1990), Iatridou (1995), Anagnostopoulou (1997), Frascarelli (2000, 2004), and Suner (2006) that CLLD is not moved. Then I consider Boeckx’s (2003) and Boeckx and Grohmann’s (2005) arguments that HTLD is also moved. I conclude that the assumptions presented in Chapter 3 are stronger than any alternatives.

Once the movement nature of CLLD and CLRD is established, I devote Section 6.3 to what triggers this displacement and how it comes about. Recall that empirical evidence shows that the trigger of movement cannot be a semantic or a prosodic condition (see Chapter 5). Consequently, I continue to assume that CLLD and CLRD are triggered by feature valuation. I start the section by showing that the attract/pied-piping approach to movement is ill-suited to dealing with subextraction—instead, I assume that movement is triggered by a feature in the moving item, as in López (2007).

Even if we agree that movement is triggered by a feature in the moving item, we still have two hypotheses to consider:

(i) Movement to the left periphery is triggered by independent criteria—Focus Criterion, Wh Criterion, Topic Criterion, etc. Consequently there is no coherent sense in which one can talk about “A’-dependencies”, because wh-movement, FF, CLLD, etc. are all triggered by different features. This is explicitly argued for by Rizzi (2004a).
(ii) All movement to the left periphery is triggered by the same formal feature. Empirical evidence from subextraction and intervention is
brought to bear on this issue. I show that the criterial approach leads to unresolvable paradoxes in cases of subextraction. Further, against Rizzi (2004a) I present evidence that CLLD intervenes in wh-movement and FF (CLRD, on the other hand, has A-movement properties, as shown in Section 3.2).

In Section 6.4 I discuss the position of CLRD. In Chapter 3 I argued, partially incorporating the findings in Cecchetto (1999) and Villalba (1996, 2000), that CLRD is located in the middle-field (Spec,v, within my structural assumptions). However, Cardinaletti (2002) and Samek-Lodovici (2006) launch a thorough critique of Cecchetto’s arguments. They also propose their own structures: CLRD is very high according to Samek-Lodovici (and Frascarelli 2000) and very low although outside the clause structure proper according to Cardinaletti. I argue that, although some of their criticisms of Cecchetto’s article are fair, there are still some good reasons to maintain the mid-field hypothesis. Additionally, I show that the alternatives present substantial empirical problems.

I close the chapter with a discussion of the structure of Romance pronominal clitics, casting some doubt on the recently popular “Big DP” hypothesis.

6.2 Movement or base-generation of dislocates

It has sometimes been argued that the dependency between CLLD and the clitic is based on movement, with the CLLDed constituent initially merged in a sentence-internal position and then raised to the CP area (Cinque 1977; Rizzi 1997; Villalba 2000; Grohmann 2003; etc.). Sometimes it has been argued that CLLD is initially merged in the CP area and its connection to the clitic set up by means of a base-generated chain (which Cinque refers to as a binding chain) or by movement of a clitic or some other operator (Cinque 1990; Iatridou 1995; Anagnostopoulou 1997; Frascarelli 2000; Suñer 2006; etc.).

What is the real difference between the two approaches, in terms of our current understanding of syntax? In minimalism, it is generally assumed that a trace is a copy of its antecedent, although how this is implemented technically has varied. For instance, Collins (1997) posits a Copy mechanism that is immediately followed by Merge. If the copied item is located in the lexicon, we have an ordinary merge into a θ-position (or modifier position). If the copied item is located in $C_{HH}$ we have what appears to our eyes as displacement. Alternatively, “Move” can be simply understood as Remerge, as in Chomsky (2005): exactly the same item has been merged again within the same structure.
In any case, what every contemporary approach to syntactic movement has in common is that if an item $\alpha$ “has moved” from A to B, some copy of $\alpha$ is present in A that should be detectable: reconstruction effects and binding effects straightforwardly test if there is indeed a fully-fledged constituent in A. On the other side, a base-generated approach entails that there is no such copy in A:

(6.1) a. $\alpha \ldots \text{Cl} t(\alpha) \rightarrow$ movement
    b. $\alpha \ldots \text{Cl} \rightarrow$ base generation

Another common test is islands: Ross (1967) argued that movement chains respect islands while base-generated—resumptive—chains do not. Cinque’s (1990) distinction between weak and strong islands adds one more datum to take into consideration: it has become received opinion that some resumptive chains are sensitive to strong islands (CLLD) while others are not sensitive to any islands (HTLD). This chapter challenges this distinction. Once confounding variables are controlled for, it is easy to show that CLLD is sensitive to all islands.

Finally, Weak Cross Over (WCO) has also been used as a test for movement. It is commonly assumed that movement chains are sensitive to WCO while resumptive chains are not. However, a full review of the facts like the one undertaken by Boeckx (2003) shows that there are instances of clear movement chains that are not sensitive to WCO and instances of resumptive chains that are sensitive to WCO. I conclude WCO is not a good test for movement.

The base-generation approach to CLLD could come in two versions. Cinque (1990) explicitly argues that the link between CLLD and the clitic is a syntactic chain. Therefore syntactic chains come in two varieties: movement chains (wh-movement, FF) and base-generated chains (CLLD). Thus, adopting Cinque’s framework entails adding a considerable complication to our theory: we end up with two types of syntactic chains plus discourse chains for HTLD. In the second version of the base-generated approach, the connection between CLLD and the clitic is a discourse phenomenon and CLLD is identical to HTLD. This solution adds nothing new to our theory of grammar, since discourse dependencies must exist anyway—a welcome result. What is at stake for linguists interested in understanding the language faculty is whether there are three types of dependencies or only two. If we agree that there are two types of dependencies, the second question is whether CLLD belongs to one or the other.

Thus, this section is oriented in three directions: (i) the theoretical problem of trying to understand what kinds of dependencies $C_{\text{HL}}$ allows for; (ii) the
I will start this section by presenting arguments that CLLD and CLRD do involve movement while HTLD does not. Further, I argue that HTLD and clitic are in a discourse-anaphoric relationship similar to that between a pronoun and a co-referent R-expression in a previous sentence. Thus, C_{HL} proper allows only for movement dependencies, other types of (apparent) dependencies take place in discourse. Shaer and Frey (2005) have put forth an analysis of HTLD in English and German according to which we would be dealing with “orphans”, as described by Haegeman (1991). They are constituents not integrated into the clausal structure but only adjoined to it at the discourse level. That is, C_{HL} constructs not only sentences but also other types of phrases that are not integrated into sentences. The computational system that builds discourses is able to string together sentences—giving rise to structures of the form S_1+S_2+...+S_n—but also is able to integrate “orphans” so that we may obtain structures of the form S_1+XP+S_2+YP+...+S_n.

In Sections 6.2.2–6.2.4 I address the arguments that have been presented to the effect that CLLD does not involve movement as well as Anagnostopoulou’s proposal that we have operator (clitic) movement rather than movement of the displaced element. Finally, in Section 6.2.5 I discuss Boeckx’s (2003) arguments that resumption always involves movement, even if strong islands appear to be violated. I take Boeckx’s theory to entail that HTLD is also displaced since HTLD, as I show, is a resumptive (and not intrusive, see Sells 1984) construction. I show that Boeckx’s theory is internally incoherent and unable to provide insights on the nature of Romance dislocations.

6.2.1 CLLD and CLRD move, HTLD does not

The strategy in this section is as follows. I compare/contrast the properties of FF, CLLD/CLRD, and HTLD with respect to some well-known tests. I show that, with respect to every test, CLLD pairs up with FF and not with HTLD. Some of these tests have been used before in one way or another; the novelty in the following discussion is to be found in the explicit contrasts of the three constructions presented here and the discussion of the examples. Additionally, I depart from tradition by showing that CLLD is sensitive to both weak and strong islands.
1. **Case and agreement.** As indicated in Chapter 1, the only visible feature that teases HTLD and CLLD apart is case morphology (see Cinque 1983/1997; Escobar 1995; Villalba 2000; among others). While the former appears in an invariable nominative form, the second’s case morphology agrees with that of the sentence internal double. This external flag only shows up in some cases in the Romance family. In Spanish, we see the particle *a* that indicates dative in (6.2a), which contrasts with (6.2b). In (6.2b), although the dislocated constituent *María* is linked to a dative clitic and an indirect object position, it shows up in a default nominative. Sentence (6.2c) shows the homophonous accusative *A* that shows up when we CLLD a human, specific direct object. Example (6.2c) is contrasted with (6.2d):

(6.2) a. *A María no le enviaré ningún paquete.*
   DAT Maria NEG Cl.dat send.fut.1st no package
   ‘I will send Maria no packages.’
   ➔CLLD [Sp]

b. *María, no le enviaré ningún paquete.*
   ➔HTLD

c. *A María, hace tiempo que no la veo.*
   A María does time that no la veo.
   ➔CLLD

   ‘I haven’t seen Maria in a while.’

d. *María, hace tiempo que no la veo.*
   ➔HTLD

In Catalan, a CLLDed non-specific indefinite is introduced by the “preposition” *de*. The HTLD version is not introduced by anything:

(6.3) a. *De farina, no n’he comprat encara.*
   ➔CLLD [Cat]

b. *Farina, no n’he comprat encara.*
   ➔HTLD

   ‘Flour, I haven’t yet bought any.’

The presence or absence of case morphology, an apparently minute detail, correlates with a host of other properties, as we shall see. Moreover, dislocation of APs, PPs, and CPs pairs up with (6.2a), (6.2c), and (6.3a), indicating that while any category can be CLLDed, HTLD involves only specific DPs. In this paragraph I discuss the analytical consequences of this difference and in subsequent paragraphs I study the properties that correlate with it.

---

1 Outside Romance, see Grohmann (2003: 133–78) for much illuminating discussion on this matter with regards to Contrastive Left Dislocation in German and CLLD in Greek.
For a start, consider an instance of discourse anaphora such as the following English sentence:

(6.4) John is a very tall guy. It is impossible not to see him.

Take “him” to refer to “John”. Notice that the two DPs agree in person, number, and gender. However, they do not agree in case—“him” is a direct object in accusative case while “John” is a nominative subject. Discourse agreement is the product of cross-sentential anaphora. It involves $\phi$-feature sharing in a non-local relationship but does not involve case morphology. The latter depends on the intra-sentential relations of the constituents.

Grammatical agreement is a strictly local relationship, involving items within the same sentence (or a smaller domain, a phase as in Chomsky 2000 or the cycle of López 2007). Grammatical agreement affects not only the $\phi$-features but also the case morphology of the constituents involved. This can be seen in the following Basque sentence:

(6.5) Jonek Mireni Getxoko ogia bidali
Jon.erg Miren.dat Getxo.from bread.abs sent
dio [Ba]
aux.3rd.3rd.3rd.

‘Jon sent Miren bread from Getxo.’

(Uriagereka 2002: 86)

The agreement morphology collected in the Basque auxiliary includes three bundles of $\phi$-features, one for each argument of the verb. Each of these feature bundles is marked as “ergative”, “absolutive”, and “dative” and each of the agreeing arguments is likewise case-marked. Thus, grammatical agreement between arguments and auxiliary includes the case morphology.

Now we are ready to return to CLLD and HTLD. If we can detect case agreement between the dislocated constituent and the clitic, then we can, with some certainty, conclude that what we are dealing with is grammatical agreement and a local relationship between clitic and dislocate (at some point in the derivation). If there is no case agreement then we have discourse agreement. As already mentioned, HTLD and clitic share $\phi$-features but HTLD appears always in (default) nominative. In example (6.6a), the doubling clitic is accusative. The case mismatch between the dislocated constituent and the clitic resembles the discourse connection between antecedent and pronoun. That is, the connection between Juan and lo in (6.6a) is the same as that in (6.6b).
6.6 a. Juan, no lo quiero ni ver.  [Sp]
   Juan NEG Cl.acc want.1st NEG see.inf
   ‘Juan, I don’t even want to see him.’

   b. Juan es un mal tipo. No lo quiero ni ver.
   Juan is a bad guy NEG Cl.acc want.1st NEG see.inf
   ‘Juan is a bad guy. I don’t even want to see him.’

CLLD obligatorily shares the same case morphology as the clitic, which tells us that at some point CLLD and the clitic were in a local configuration:

6.7 A Juan no lo quiero ni ver.  [Sp]
   ACC Cl.acc

This fact lends support to the thesis that CLLD originated within the clause and was later raised while HTLD is base-generated outside the clause. The relationship between clitic and CLLD is one of grammatical agreement while HTLD and clitic instantiate only a discourse dependency, not dissimilar to the connection between pronoun and DP in two separate sentences (Cinque 1983/1997; Shaer and Frey 2005).

2. The resumptive. As has been noted many times (see Villalba 2000 for a summary), the invariant dislocate can be resumed by a strong pronoun or an epithet while the dislocate with case morphology can only be resumed by a clitic (except for those dialects that have clitic doubling, more on this below):

6.8 a. Juan, hace tiempo que no veo a ese tipo.  [Sp]
   Juan does time that NEG see.1st A that guy

   b. ??A Juan hace tiempo que no veo a ese tipo.
   ‘John, I haven’t seen the guy in a long time.’

This reinforces the conclusion that CLLD is connected to a sentence internal position (which in (6.8b) is taken by another constituent), while HTLD is floating free.

3. Strong cross-over (principle C violation) (see Anagnostopoulou 1997: 155 for discussion of some of these facts in Greek, as well as Cinque 1983/1997, 1990 for Italian and Lahne 2005 for Occitan). In the following examples, I compare the behavior of CLLD with FF and HTLD:

6.9 a. *A MARÍA₁ pro₁ no (se₁) quiere para nada.  [Sp]
   ACC María NEG REFL.3rd loves for nothing
   (Intended meaning: María does not love herself at all).
b. A SI MISMA, pro, no se, quiere para nada.
   ‘She does not love herself at all.’

c. *A María, pro, no (se,) quiere para nada.

d. María, pro, no se, quiere para nada.

e. María, pro, ella, no se, quiere para nada.

f. María, no se, quiere, a sí misma.

g. *pro, no se, quiere, a María.

Example (6.9a) exemplifies FF. The ungrammaticality of (6.9a) can be accounted for as a strong cross-over/principle C violation: the focused constituent started off as a complement of the verb, where it is bound by pro, leading to a principle C violation. If FF were base generated in the left periphery, the ungrammaticality of (6.9a) would be mysterious. Notice that (6.9a) is ungrammatical whether the reflexive SE is present or not.

Example (6.9b) shows that it is possible to FF a reflexive, leading to a grammatical sentence. This suggests that principle A can be satisfied in situ or by a copy of the displaced constituent. Thus, FF is as clear an instance of movement as we are likely to find.

Sentence (6.9c), with displacement of a CLLD constituent, could simply be accounted for using the same movement analysis: a copy of a María is c-commanded by pro. Example (6.9d) shows that there is no incompatibility between CLLD and reflexivity, again naturally leading to the conclusion that there is a copy of the dislocated constituent within the clause. Notice that under a base-generation approach the presence of the reflexive DP in Spec,C with no c-commanding antecedent would require some complex analysis.

The contrast between (6.9c) and (6.9e) is revealing. In (6.9e), the HTLD constituent is an R-expression and can be coreferent with the subject and with the reflexive morpheme SE without giving rise to ungrammaticality. This can easily be accounted for if HTLD is base-generated in the left periphery and hence is never c-commanded by the subject pronoun.

Sentences (6.9f) and (6.9g) show that CLRD behaves like CLLD in this respect. A subject can bind a reflexive CLRD, showing that at some point CLRD is c-commanded by the subject. Example (6.9g) shows that a dislocated referential expression cannot be bound by a pronoun in subject position.

Further strong-crossover effects that tease CLLD and HTLD apart can be noticed in the following examples, involving an epithet in subject position. The sentence in (6.10a) exemplifies CLLD, as shown by the accusative A prefix. Coindexation between the CLLDed constituent and the epithet yields
stark ungrammaticality. The same is true of (6.10b), with CLRD. Example (6.10c), without accusative A, can only be HTLD and the sentence is fully acceptable.

(6.10) a. *Al arbitro, el muy tonto dice que el jugador no lo vio.  
    A.the referee the very silly says that the player NEG Cl.acc saw
    [Sp]

b. *El muy tonto dice que el jugador no lo vio, al árbitro.

c. El árbitro, el muy tonto dice que el jugador no lo vio.
   ‘The referee, that idiot, says that the player didn’t see him.’

Co-reference between the CLLD or CLRD constituent and the epithet, subject of the matrix clause, is ungrammatical. This entails that at some point the epithet c-commanded the dislocated constituent and principle C was violated. The grammaticality of (6.10c) tells us that the opposite conclusion should be reached with respect to HTLD.

To conclude: CLLD and CLRD pair up with FF with respect to binding properties and not with HTLD. In particular, the evidence points out clearly that CLLD and CLRD have a copy within the sentence.

4. Variable binding. A pronoun embedded in a CLLD constituent can be bound by a quantifier in subject position (Anagnostopoulou 1997; Zubizarreta 1998; Villalba 2000). This leads to the conclusion that CLLDed constituents are at some point c-commanded by the subject. A pronoun in HTLD position is not bound by a subject quantifier, which should lead to the conclusion that a subject never c-commands into a HTLD—I claim, because HTLD has no copy within the sentence that can be c-commanded:

(6.11) a. A su hijo, ninguna madre lo quiere castigar.  
   A her son no mother Cl.acc wants punish.inf  
   (bound reading ✓) [Sp]  
   ‘Her son no mother wants to punish.’

b. Su hijo, ninguna madre lo quiere castigar. (bound reading *)

5. Subextraction. Consider the following examples:

(6.12) a. D’històries, quines n’has sentit?  
   Of stories which.pl.fem Cl.part have.2nd heard
   ‘Which stories have you heard?’

b. Quines n’has sentit, d’històries?
c. Quines has dit que, d’històries, n’has sentit.
d. Quines has dit que n’has sentit, d’històries.

Under a movement analysis of CLLD and CLRD, we can conclude that *quines històries* started off as a constituent, from which the dislocated constituent is extracted—notice the appearance of the partitive clitic. Later raising of *quines* and *històries* proceeds independently:

\[(\text{6.13})\]
1. \[\text{[vP pro sentit [DP quines històries]]}\]
2. \[\text{[vP històries pro sentit [DP quines t]]}\]

That is, it is possible to extract a CLLD or CLRD constituent out of a wh-phrase, provided that the wh-phrase is D-linking (see Section 4.2).

Assume instead that the CLLD is base-generated in the left periphery. If so, then there is no extraction of *d’històries* from the wh-DP. In order to account for the fact that *d’històries* is interpreted as the restrictor of *quines* in (6.12) and there is number and gender agreement between them, there must be some coindexation mechanism that links a *pro* within the wh-DP and the dislocated constituent:

\[(\text{6.14})\] D’històries, [DP quines pro] …

Compare now the datum above with HTLD:

\[(\text{6.15})\] Històries, n’he sentit moltes. [Cat] stories Clpart’have.\text{1}\text{st} heard many ‘Stories, I’ve heard many.’

\[(\text{6.16})\] *Històries, quines n’ has sentit? Stories which.pl.fem Clpart’ have.\text{2}\text{nd} heard

\[(\text{6.17})\] *Històries, quines has sentit?

\[(\text{6.18})\] *Quines has dit que, històries, (n’) has sentit? Which have.\text{2}\text{nd} said that stories (Cl.part’) have.\text{2}\text{nd} heard

The ungrammaticality of (6.16), (6.17), and (6.18) contrasts with the grammaticality of the examples in (6.12). Now, the question is, if there exists something like the coindexation mechanism exemplified in (6.14), why is it not operative in cases of HTLD?

I suggest that the grammar does not provide coindexation mechanisms like the one in (6.14), and the connection between operator and restrictor is always that of c-command. Consequently, CLLD and CLRD are base-generated in the DP headed by the wh-D and raised from that position, as represented in (6.13).
6. Islands. As was already noted in Cinque (1977), CLLD is sensitive to islands while HTLD is not. Here are some Catalan examples of CLLD (from Villalba 2000: 255):

(6.19) *Al Pere, conec només dues persones que
DAT.the Pere know.1st only two people that
li saluden. [Cat]
Cl.dat say hello

(6.20) *Ric, suposo que ser-ho ajuda a ser feliç.
Rich think.1st that be.inf-Cl helps to be.inf happy

(6.21) *Ric, aniré al dentista quan ho sigui.
Rich go.fut.1st to.the dentist when Cl be.1st

Example (6.19) exemplifies a relative clause island, (6.20) exemplifies a subject island and (6.21) an adjunct island. HTLD, on the other hand, is not sensitive to any of them:

(6.22) El Pere, conec només dues persones que li saluden. [Cat]
‘Pere, I know only two people who say hello to him.’

(6.23) El famós professor, m’imagino que invitar-lo serà difícil.
‘The famous professor, I imagine that inviting him will be difficult.’

(6.24) La Maria, aniré jo al dentista quan ella hagi tornat.
‘Mary, I will go to the dentist when she is back.’

If we take islandhood to be a property of movement, then the examples in (6.19), (6.20), and (6.21) would be evidence that CLLD is derived by movement. Moreover, when we consider the HTLD examples, an account in terms of movement/non-movement becomes irresistible. However, Boeckx (2003) argues that islandhood is not a symptom of movement—I discuss this in a minute.

On the other hand, it is often mentioned that CLLD is not sensitive to weak islands (Cinque 1990; Escobar 1995; Anagnostopoulou 1997; Villalba 2000). The sentence in (6.25) exemplifies the wh-island while that in (6.26) exemplifies a factive island:

(6.25) Els llibres, em pregunto quan els llegirem. [Cat]
‘The books, I wonder when we will read them.’

(6.26) Aquest llibre, em penedeixo d’haver-lo llegit.
‘This book I regret having read it.’
Weak islands, however, are a delicate matter and the choice of examples may determine the analysis. In examples (6.25) and (6.26) I have chosen a definite DP direct object dislocate—in (6.26), additionally, the subordinate clause is non-finite. This gives rise to the smoothest extraction pavement possible. As a matter of fact, these examples do not sound better or worse than (6.27) and (6.28), with a D-linked direct object wh-phrase, which suggests that the “specialness” of CLLD in skipping weak islands is a myth:

(6.27) Quins llibres et preguntes quan llegirem? [Cat]
which books Cl.dat ask.2nd when read.fut.1st.pl

(6.28) Quins llibres et penedeixes d’aver llegit?
which books Cl.dat regret of’have.inf read.ptc

Thus, what we need to do is find examples of dislocates that are not specific direct objects. The following exemplify a CLLDed copula complement. While (6.29) shows that copula complements can be CLLDed, (6.30) and (6.31) sound marginal. Example (6.30) crosses over a wh-island while (6.31) crosses over a factive island. I take these contrasts to be evidence that CLLD is sensitive to weak islands after all:

(6.29) Bon estudiant, el Joan diu que el Carles ho pot ser. [Cat]
Good student the Joan says that the Carles Cl can be.inf

(6.30) ??Bon estudiant, em pregunto quan ho sera.
Good student, REFL ask.1st when Cl be.fut.1st.

(6.31) ??Bon estudiant, em penedeixo d’haver-ho estat.
Good student REFL regret.1st of have.inf-Cl been

The following examples make the same point with a non-specific direct object:

(6.32) D’històries, el Joan n’explicarà el diumenge. [Cat]
Of stories the Joan Cl.part’tell.fut.1st the Sunday

(6.33) ??D’històries, em pregunto com n’explicarà el diumenge.
ask.1st how

(6.34) ??D’històries, m’avergonyo de que n’hagis explicat el diumenge.
Cl.acc’shame.1st of that Cl’have.2nd told el diumenge.
the Sunday
‘*Stories, I am ashamed that you told on Sunday.’
I believe these data suffice to show that CLLD is sensitive to both weak and strong islands.

As for CLRD, it is even more strict, since it is clause-bound, as argued by Villalba (1996) and Cecchetto (1999)—in effect, it obeys Ross’s (1967) Right Roof Constraint. I discuss this in Section 6.4.1.

7. Floating quantifiers. They reveal A-movement (or control, assuming that the latter is not reducible to the former).

(6.35) a. A los hombres, los veremos a todos pronto. [Sp] A the men Cl see.fut.1st.pl A all soon
b. ??Los hombres, los veremos a todos pronto.

Example (6.35) shows that CLLD involves a “first stage” of A-movement—which coheres perfectly with the analysis presented in Chapter 3, which involves a first stage of movement to Spec,v and assignment of [+a].

Thus, I have shown seven pieces of independent evidence—some old, some new—converging on an analysis of CLLD (and CLRD) that includes movement while HTLD does not.

6.2.2 CLLD does not move: Part I

Cinque (1990), recanting from his earlier conclusion (Cinque 1977), argues that CLLDed constituents surface where they are generated. The connection with the clitic is established by means of a binding chain. This approach is later taken up by Frascarelli (2000 and later work) and, in a different form, by Anagnostopoulou (1997). Iatridou (1995) additionally argues that CLLD is generated in Spec,C as a clause-mate of the clitic; unlike Cinque, she additionally argues that long distance dislocation is the result of COMP-to-COMP movement. Finally, Suñer (2006) updates the mechanics of Cinque’s approach arguing that the connection between the dislocated constituent and the clitic is one that involves the operation Agree, as in Chomsky (2000).

Cinque (1990) starts out chapter 2 of his monograph acknowledging that CLLD has two properties that would seem to suggest a movement generation of CLLD: its sensitivity to strong islands and binding theory connectivity. However, he goes on to claim that these properties should be ascribed to chains in general and not to movement chains in particular. His theory of A’-dependencies entails that there are two types of syntactic chains: base-generated chains (such as those linking a CLLD with a clitic) and movement chains (created by wh-movement). What leads him to this new complication of the theory?
Cinque argues that there are several pieces of evidence that CLLD does not involve wh-movement—in his framework, A’-movement is necessarily wh-movement. Here I discuss the two that seem most challenging: CLLD does not license parasitic gaps and does not respect subjacency.2

First, Cinque argues that CLLD—unlike wh-movement—does not license parasitic gaps. Consider the following example:

(6.36) *Gianni l’ ho cercato per mesi sensa trovare.  
Gianni Cl.acc’ have.1st looked for for months without find.inf  
[It]

The translation of this sentence into Catalan or Spanish is also ungrammatical. However, if we replace the dislocated constituent for a FFed or a wh-phrase, the sentence remains equally ungrammatical:

(6.37) a. *A Juan lo he buscado durante meses sin encontrar.  
A Juan Cl.acc have.1st looked for for months without find.inf  
[Sp]

b. *A JUAN he buscado durante meses sin encontrar.

c. *¿A quién has buscado durante meses sin encontrar?

The choice of lexical verb in the adjunct clause can alter the acceptability of a parasitic gap—in particular, if the verb can be used intransitively, the sentence improves. Example (6.38a) does not sound to my ear worse than a parasitic gap with a wh-phrase, as in (6.38b):3

(6.38) a. Los libros los ha guardado sin leer.  
The books Cl has put-away without read.inf  
‘The books I put away without reading.’

2 The other arguments can be summarized as follows: (a) CLLD does not allow for successive cyclic movement, (b) CLLD does not allow for ne cliticization, (c) optionality of clitics. Points (a) and (b) are demonstrably mistaken, while point (c) has been challenged by Cardinaletti (2002). Example (i) shows that a CLLDed constituent in a matrix clause can be interpreted as belonging in the subordinate clause, a hallmark of successive cyclic movement. And (ii) shows that en cliticization is possible:

(i) Intel.ligent, crec que no ho és.  
‘Intelligent I don’t think he is.’  
[Cat]

(ii) De cadires, en tinc quatre.  
Of chairs Cl have.1st four

3 Escobar (1995: 139) also reports examples in which parasitic gaps can be licensed with CLLD in Spanish.
Thus, we would need a full analysis of the properties of parasitic gaps that accounts for the difference in acceptability between (6.37) and (6.38). This undertaking goes beyond the limits of the present work. In the meantime, I find Cinque’s discussion insufficient to counter the arguments for movement presented in the previous section. Second, Cinque claims that CLLDed constituents do not respect subjacency (1990: 63) (and see above for my remarks on weak islands):

(6.39) Loro, _il libro_ , _credo_ que a Carlo sia sicuro che non glielo daranno mai. 

Cinque’s argument seems to be that _loro_ has had to cross two CPs, which are subjacency barriers in Italian (according to Rizzi 1982):

(6.40) _loro_ [CP _il libro credo_ [CP _que a Carlo…t t t]]

However, since CLLDed constituents can be stacked, it is not clear how strong this example is: _loro_ and _il libro_ can be two separate specs of C (or Fin). Complex NP extraction yields regular subjacency effects:

(6.41) a. ??De llibres, no crec la promesa de que el Joan en porti. 

b. ??Intelligent, no crec la promesa de que el candidat ho serà.

Thus, subjacency actually supports the movement analysis of CLLD.

Additionally, notice that base-generated chains and movement chains would be more different from one another than Cinque noticed. Villalba (2000) points out that “binding chains” are not related to any notion of binding that we are familiar with: they do not correspond to binding as in Chomsky’s (1981) Binding Theory or to quantifier-binding relations (which are impervious to even strong islands). Thus, in spite of their label, binding chains are really a new species of animal, supposedly standing together with movement chains as a second, distinct type of syntactic dependency.

Iatridou (1995) adds two more reasons to have CLLD base generated in Spec,C. The first one is the absence of Weak Crossover Effects (WCO):
(6.42) a. A Carlos, su madre lo quiere mucho.  
A Carlos his mother Cl.acc loves much

b. A CARLOS quiere mucho su madre.

While the FFed constituent gives rise to a classic WCO effect, the CLLDed constituent does not. I argue that this does not really constitute a good enough reason to abandon the movement analysis of CLLD—although mostly for a negative reason, namely, a lack of understanding of the phenomenon.

Sells (1984) and McCloskey (1990) show that in Hebrew and Irish (respectively), both languages in which resumptive pronouns are optional, the presence of the resumptive pronoun makes the resulting chain insensitive to WCO. The following are Hebrew examples (from Demirdache 1991: 51–2, Safir 2004: 115):

(6.43) a. ha-is se ?im-o ?ohevet oto.  
the-man that mother.his loves him 
‘The man that his mother loves.’

b. *ha-?is se ?im-o ?ohevet

Even more interestingly, the resumptive pronoun in Hebrew can raise and, when it does, the resulting chain is sensitive to WCO (Demirdache 1991, Safir 2004: 116):

(6.44) *ha-?is se oto xana ?amra se ?im-o
the man that him Xana said that mother-his 
?ohevet.  
loves

Thus, one could reach the conclusion that WCO is a property of movement chains while base-generated chains, for some reason, would be immune to it (this is the conclusion in Safir 2004, for instance) (but both types of chains are sensitive to Strong Cross Over). This conclusion would be rash. First, resumptive chains in Vata are sensitive to WCO, as shown by Koopman and Sportiche (1986):

(6.45) *ÀlÓ n’ nyla’nyni nà Ò dl’ mÊ la.  
Who you wonder C he cut it wh

Second, as pointed out by Lasnik and Stowell (1991), topicalization in English does not give rise to WCO effects:

(6.46) That man, his mother likes.
Likewise, relative pronouns in non-restrictive clauses do not give rise to WCO effects either:

(6.47)  Vicente, a quien su madre protege demasiado, nunca tiene la culpa de nada.  
‘Vicente, who his mother protects too much, is never guilty of anything.’

Thus, the best available data at the moment indicate that resumptive chains may or may not be sensitive to WCO and that non-resumptive chains may also be, or not, sensitive to WCO (see Richards 2001 on the role that IP/CP absorption plays on WCO). Pending further research (see Boeckx 2003: 152–5 for some speculative ideas), I submit that WCO cannot be taken as an argument for or against a movement analysis.

The second argument presented by Iatridou to argue that CLLD is not the result of movement comes from CLD (Clitic Doubling, see Chapter 5). Iatridou assumes that the movement analysis of CLLD entails that CLD is the source of CLLD (the connection between dislocation and CLD is detailed in Chapter 5 of this monograph). She argues that the fact that some languages have CLLD but not CLD is a problem for the analysis. The following is a Catalan example:

(6.48)  a. *Jo el vaig veure el gos.  
       b. El gos, jo el vaig veure.  
       ‘The dog I saw.’

However, the fact that (6.49a) is ungrammatical was never seen as a problem for a raising analysis of passives. It simply indicates that the movement operation is obligatory:

(6.49) a. *was discovered the treasure.  
       b. The treasure was discovered.

Along the same lines, Iatridou shows that the set of DPs that can be CLDed is a subset of those that can be CLLDed—for instance, in Rioplatense Spanish CLD has an additional animacy requirement. Again, this only suggests that with certain types of DPs an operation is obligatory while with others it is not. Nothing else can be concluded.

Finally, note that the idea that CLD is the input to CLLD if the latter is moved from its θ-position is not true. The different derivational histories of CLD and CLLD, detailed in Chapter 5, show that the feature structures that shape up the constituents of either construction are different.
One final argument against the movement analysis of CLLD is due to Frascarelli (2004). She argues that CLLD involves anti-reconstruction effects that are unexpected under a movement analysis of CLLD. In the following example, Leo and lui can be co-referential, which suggests that *la mia foto con Leo* has never been in a clause-internal position.

\[(6.50) \text{La mia foto con Leo, lui non l'ha ancora vista.} \quad \text{[It]} \]

‘My picture with Leo, he hasn’t seen it yet.’

However, this example shows nothing, since it is ambiguous between a CLLD and a HTLD structure. We need to find examples that are unambiguously CLLD or HTLD in order to truly evaluate the claim. The presence of accusative A makes (6.51a) a CLLD while its absence makes (6.51b) HTLD. The grammaticality judgment is that only the HTLD allows for the co-referential reading indicated by the sub-indices:

\[(6.51) \text{a. } *A \text{ la hermana de María, ella aún no la ha visto.} \quad \text{[Sp]} \]

‘Maria’s sister, she hasn’t seen her yet.’

\[(6.51) \text{b. La hermana de María, ella aún no la ha visto.} \]

‘Maria’s sister, she hasn’t seen her yet.’

6.2.3 **CLLD does not move, Part II: epithets**

Suñer (2006) revives the notion that CLLD are base-generated in the left periphery with a new empirical observation. She notices that in her Rioplatense dialect of Spanish one can find an epithet in what would be the base position of the dislocate:

\[(6.52) \text{En el trabajo, a su hermano, Mara me dijo que no lo aguantan a ese tarugo.} \quad \text{[RP]} \]

‘At work, her brother, Mara told me that they can’t stand that jackass.’

(Suñer 2006: 129)

She argues that CLLD could not be derived by movement from its θ-position because this position is already taken by the epithet. Hence, the CLLDed constituent is base-generated in the left periphery, in the spec of a TopP, identifiable with Rizzi (1997). The connection between dislocate and clitic
should be carried out by Chomsky’s operation of Agree, which replaces Cinque’s binding chain: “Within the MP, the most natural way to obtain connectivity is by means of long distance agreement . . . the valued features of CL (gender, number, human/animate, Acc Case, etc.) establish a long distance link with the base-generated LD constituent” (150–1). This agreement link would also account for the reconstruction effects discussed above.

Unfortunately, Suñer does not provide any details as to how this link between dislocate and clitic would be established. In spite of her invoking Chomsky’s approach to agreement, the connection between clitic and dislocate cannot be based on the mechanism that Chomsky proposes. In Chomsky’s Agree, there is a probing head with unvalued \( \phi \)-features that seeks a constituent within its c-command domain with valued \( \phi \)-features to satisfy its own. However, the dislocated constituent has valued \( \phi \)-features and it is not a head but a full XP. It is not discussed in Suñer’s article what feature triggers probing and whether a maximal projection can probe.

Moreover, as Suñer herself discusses, the dislocate can be found very far from the clitic:

\[(6.53)\quad [\text{CP } \text{a Juan dice Pedro [CP que Susana piensa [CP que no lo despiden]]}]\]

‘Peter says that Susana thinks that they are not going to fire Juan.’

Chomsky’s Agree is fairly local, since it cannot go beyond a phase boundary. How exactly will \text{a Juan} connect with the clitic across so many phase boundaries? Again, this is not discussed in Suñer’s article.

Moreover, the epithet datum can be approached from a movement perspective without much difficulty. The starting point is that an epithet is a predicate of the DP it is linked to. Thus, the structure of the sentence above before movement is as follows:

\[(6.54)\quad \text{En el trabajo, Mara me dijo que no lo aguantan} \quad \text{In the work Mara Cl said, that NEG Cl.acc put-up-with.}\]

\[\text{ese tarugo su hermano}.\quad \text{that jackass her brother}\]

Thus the epithet and the DP form a SC substantially similar to the SC clause complement of a verb like “consider” [i.e. I consider your brother a jackass].
This SC could spell-out in different ways, according to what features participate in the derivation:

(6.55)  

a. Mara me dijo que no aguantan a [SC ese tarugo de su hermano].
‘Mara told me that they can’t put up with that jackass of her brother.’

b. Considero [SC un tarugo a su hermano].
‘I consider her brother a jackass.’

c. Su hermano es [SC un tarugo t].
‘Her brother is a jackass.’

d. A su hermano, no sé cómo lo aguantan [SC a ese tarugo t].
‘Her brother, I don’t know how they put up with that jackass.’

If su hermano stays in situ in (6.55a), then a preposition de is inserted, probably for Case reasons or to express the predication relation. If the SC is selected by “consider” then there are no changes (except maybe word order)—notice however that in this case the deictic would sound somewhat infelicitous). If the SC is selected by “be” then su hermano raises to Spec,T. Finally, we have the option of dislocating su hermano as in Suñer’s example. Thus, there is no problem with epithets and a movement analysis of dislocations.

6.2.4 LF movement of the clitic (as an operator)

Anagnostopoulou (1997) argues that a CLLDed constituent is base-generated where it surfaces. She argues that the clitic raises (covertly) out of its clause and adjoins to the same category that houses the dislocated constituent, resulting in the following configuration:

\[
(6.56) \quad [\text{CP/IP CLLD } [\text{CP/IP Cl ... t}]]
\]

(Anagnostopoulou 1997: 158)

The analysis proposed by Anagnostopoulou overlaps empirically with the simpler one according to which the CLLDed constituent is the one that moves: islands, for instance, do not allow us to tease apart one from the other. The one argument that she presents that there is covert/LF movement of the clitic rather than overt movement of the dislocated constituent is based on Reinhart’s (1991) demonstration that LF movement is insensitive to weak islands (actually, the wh-island, the only one that she discusses). However,

4 Anagnostopoulou’s proposal of clitic movement is inspired by Demirdache’s (1991) analyses of resumptive dependencies in Hebrew, a language in which you actually see the resumptive pronoun moving overtly.
I have already discussed the weak islands issue and shown that CLLD is sensitive to them. Anagnostopoulou rejects a movement analysis of the dislocated constituent on the grounds that CLLD and CLD are asymmetric, repeating Iatridou’s argument just mentioned.

Finally, Anagnostopoulou’s proposal (or Cinque’s, or Iatridou’s, for that matter) does not provide an immediate analysis for the Binding Theory reconstruction and Strong Cross Over effects discussed above. In effect, in her analysis what we have inside the clause is not a copy of the dislocated constituent but only of the clitic. In order to circumvent this problem, she claims (1997: 183) that using Barss’s (1986) approach in terms of chains without reconstruction or without a copy of the dislocated constituent in situ could give us the desired results. Fair enough, but she neglects to tell us how exactly Barss’s system would give us connectivity for CLLD while avoiding it for HTLD.

6.2.5 Everything moves

Boeckx (2003) develops a theory of A’-dependencies in which all chains involving a resumptive pronoun are taken to be the result of movement. Since in some languages resumptive chains can violate even strong islands, an immediate consequence of his approach is that movement can generally overcome islands, including strong ones, given the right conditions. More precisely, Boeckx argues that there is no coherent notion of “island”, and movement is always unbounded. Apparent islands turn out to be restrictions on Agree—intuitively, the idea is that a probe cannot agree with a goal across, for example, an adjunct node. However, if movement can be made dependent on Match but independent from Agree, then movement can escape an adjunct. Resumption is the tool that allows for this separation of Move and Agree. Arguably, the seeming lack of coherence of the island notion has been replaced by an equally incoherent notion of “boundary for Agree” plus an arbitrary distinction between Match and Agree (for a critique of the latter distinction, see López 2007).

Boeckx’s approach does not agree with my own results, since I maintain the (somewhat more traditional) approach that HTLD is base-generated while CLLD involves movement—see the arguments presented in Section 6.2.1. Although Boeckx does not discuss dislocations in any detail—only a section on CLLD and nothing on HTLD—it is important to check if his results carry over to my own database, under the reasonable assumption that dislocations are a form of resumption. I conclude that Boeckx’s approach is not applicable, as I show.

5 Boeckx and Grohmann (2005) do discuss dislocations in German.
Before I start, let me ground my assumption that HTLD does exemplify resumption and not intrusion (a distinction already made by Sells 1984). Intrusives appear only in island contexts as repair mechanisms. However, HTLD is not so restricted:

(6.57)  Juan, hace tiempo que no lo veo.  
   ‘Juan, I haven’t seen him in a long time.’  [Sp]

Example (6.57) must be HTLD—a CLLD example would include the accusative A. No island separates the dislocate from the clitic. Thus, HTLD must be a resumptive construction and falls squarely under the purview of Boeckx’s approach.

Boeckx’s theory involves a theory of resumption (including CLLD) and a theory of A' movement. I discuss both of them in turn.

6.2.5.1  Resumption  According to Boeckx, all forms of resumption involve a structure in which the resumptive (a D) takes the displaced constituent as a complement:

\[
(6.58) \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{D}_{[\text{def}]} \quad \text{NP} \\
\mid \quad | \\
\text{ResPron} \quad \text{Wh/Op}
\]

In parenthesis, notice that this goes against a long tradition that takes wh-words to be determiners, not NPs. As a matter of fact, what the syntactic category of [wh] is is left unanalyzed, see Boeckx (2003: 29, ex 33). The problem that arises is that if [wh] is not D, a lot of interesting generalizations are lost, for instance: determiners, pronouns, and wh-words in German show the same nominative, accusative, dative, and genitive case morphology while nouns only show genitive morphology. We can establish a generalization for German according to which D shows case morphology in all four cases, but this generalization can be formulated only if [wh] is D.

Taking the structure in (6.58) to be the initial one, the wh/Op phrase raises, stranding the definite determiner as a resumptive pronoun. Movement must go through Spec,D as an escape hatch:

\[
(6.59) \quad \text{wh} \ldots [\text{DP} \ t(\text{wh})] [\text{D} \ t(\text{wh})]
\]

The questions that this analysis raises are obvious: why does not it violate the Left Branch Condition? Why is there no definiteness barrier?
Boeckx’s answer for these two questions is essentially as follows: whether one can or cannot extract from the spec of a category depends on the feature composition of that category. In particular, if D agrees with the extracted constituent, extraction is not possible.

I have nothing to add to Boeckx’s discussion of resumption in, for example, Irish, but his extension of the idea to clitic doubling (which should probably include CLR/LD) is clearly problematic. He cites two examples of clitic doubling with non-agreement between clitic and double: Sicilian (from Ledgeway 2000) and Spanish datives. Consider the Spanish dative, which he cites from Gutiérrez-Rexach (2000):

(6.60) No le tiene miedo a las balas. [Sp]
     NEG Cl.dat.sg has fear DAT the bullets
     ‘He’s not afraid of bullets.’

In this example it seems as if number agreement between clitic (le) and double (a las balas) were momentarily (and optionally) canceled. But there are no grounds for claiming there is no agreement between the dative clitic and the double. First, if the clitic is plural, the double must be plural:

(6.61) *No les tiene miedo a la bala. [Sp]
      Cl.dat.pl DAT the bullet

So, what we have in (6.60) seems to be that the form le has become unspecified for number (just like its sibling se). Second, there is [person] agreement: if we have a strong first or second person pronoun, the clitic must have the same [person] feature. Finally, in the first and second persons, number agreement is also obligatory:

(6.62) a. No te tengo miedo a ti. [Sp]
      neg Cl.2\textsuperscript{nd}.sg have.1\textsuperscript{st} fear DAT you
      ‘I am not afraid of you.’

b. *No le tengo miedo a ti.

Cl.3\textsuperscript{rd} DAT you

c. *No te tengo miedo a vosotros.

Cl.2\textsuperscript{nd}.sg DAT you.pl

Moreover, when we have an accusative clitic, we also have obligatory agreement between clitic and double, without any impoverished forms. Thus, Spanish is an argument against Boeckx’s proposals, not in favor of them.

Even more confusing is Boeckx’s assertion that Spanish “accusative A” supports his proposal:
(6.63) Lo he visto a Juan. [Sp]
   Cl.acc have.1st seen A Juan
   ‘I have seen Juan.’

He claims that the presence of the preposition “a” gives the double a sort of ϕ-inertness. This assertion is mysterious—there is, as a matter of fact, ordinary agreement between clitic and double, as can be seen in the following examples:

(6.64) a. Los he visto a los muchachos. [Sp]
   Cl.pl have.1st seen A the boys
   ‘I have seen the boys.’

b. *Lo he visto a los muchachos.
   Cl.sg

As far as I can tell, Boeckx’s proposals that (i) clitic doubling (and dislocation) involves the structure in (6.58) and (ii) apparent violations of LBC are permissible because there is no agreement between clitic and double have no empirical ground to stand on and plenty against it (at least within the database that I am using).

6.2.5.2 Islands and the Principle of Unambiguous Chains Let us now move onto Boeckx’s theory of movement, islandhood, and the role of resumptives in overcoming islands. He takes the following Principle of Unambiguous Chains as a point of departure:

(6.65) Principle of Unambiguous Chains (PUC): Chains cannot include more than one strong OCC/EPP position.

The PUC successfully rules out cases of Superraising:

(6.66) *John seems t is intelligent.

The ungrammaticality of this example comes about because the chain (John, t) includes two strong OCC/EPP positions (OCC is short for occurrence, see Chomsky 2000), corresponding to the two instances of Spec,T.

However, a subject wh-phrase should in principle create a problem, since there are two strong OCC positions: Spec,T and Spec,C. Boeckx proposes two ways that a language can go to overcome this difficulty. The first way is to have T and C agree, by means of which they become a single unit. Then we do not have two strong OCC for one chain, but only one OCC for each chain.

The other way is by means of resumption. The trick here consists of splitting the constituent in two blocks, one of which is involved in the downstairs
A-dependency (the resumptive pronoun) so the other one is free to enter the A’-dependency (the wh-phrase or the dislocate). Thus, there are now two chains, not one, and the PUC is respected. Resumption is a consequence of PUC.

The second leg of his argument involves the trigger of movement. Recall that Chomsky (2000) distinguishes between Match and Agree. If a probe finds features in a goal of the same type as those in the probe, then we can say that they Match. If, additionally, there is a transfer of features from goal to probe, then we have Agree (Chomsky 2000: 122, Boeckx 2003: 2). Chomsky claims that Agree may trigger movement if the probe has an additional EPP feature. Instead, Boeckx proposes that Match suffices to provoke movement.

Match takes place without limits. In particular, Match can target an adjunct, which has inert \( \phi \)-features, and even probe inside it (let me mention, in passing, that this predicts that adjuncts should create intervention effects for arguments). Agree, however, is more strict, since it can only involve a goal with active \( \phi \)-features (2003: 99–100).

Now we are ready to tackle the problem of islandhood and resumption. We first discuss Hebrew, a language in which resumptive chains are sensitive to no islands whatsoever:

\[ \text{(6.67) } \text{Ra?iti \?et ha-yeled \?aser/se-ha-cayad harag \?et saw.1\text{st} \text{ACC the child C-the-hunter killed ACC} } \]
\[ \text{ha-arie \?aser/se-radaf \?exarav. the lion C-that after him} \]
\[ \text{‘I saw the child that the hunter killed the lion that chased him.’} \]  

(Boeckx 2003: 20)

According to Boeckx, a probe can enter an adjunct and Match its features against a goal. If the goal includes a resumptive pronoun, the Wh/Op does not need to satisfy any Case/Agreement requirements, Agree between Wh/Op and probe is not necessary. Since Match is all that is required for movement, it can take place. (Another “in passing” aside: if an adjunct can match the probe, how can the probe go inside the adjunct without violating the A-over-A condition, which he assumes (compare Boeckx 2003 p. 66 with p. 100)?)

What about Greek, a language in which resumptive chains are sensitive to strong islands only (likewise Scottish Gaelic and Romanian)?

\[ \text{(6.68) } \text{Gnorisa mja gineka pu den ksero pjos tin met a woman C NEG know.1\text{st} who Cl} \]
\[ \text{pndreftike. married.3\text{rd}} \]
\[ \text{‘I met a woman that I don’t know who married.’} \]
Boeckx’s solution is that Agree must be involved. His analysis of this type of example is detailed as following (2003: 112):

(6.70) 1. Agr (in T or v) enters an A-dependency with the resumptive element.
2. The resumptive moves (cliticizes, or some such).
4. Wh/Op is extracted.

Since extraction in this type of example involves Agree, it is subject to the type of restrictions that Agree is subject to: in particular, Agree cannot penetrate adjuncts, with the direct consequence that extraction out of adjuncts is not possible. As evidence, Boeckx claims that the presence of a relative pronoun indicates the (abstract) presence of an agreeing complementizer.

However, it seems to me that this solution undermines Boeckx’s enterprise. The main idea he puts forth throughout the book is that resumption is a last resort operation, with the result that one chain that would include two strong OCC positions would become two chains with one strong OCC each. But in the Greek example we have a clitic that does not prevent the A’-dependency to require Agree—what is the role of the clitic then?

Let us further scrutinize Boeckx’s analysis of Greek resumption. Recall that the PUC for subject extraction can be satisfied either by having T agree with C or by means of resumption—resumption liberates the Wh/Op from any φ-feature requirements. The probe in (6.69) must be the complementizer pu. According to Boeckx, pu has unvalued φ-features and can (must) agree with Wh/Op in Greek even in the presence of a resumptive. The question is why can’t C agree with the T that it selects? If the φ-features of C are thus satisfied, it should be able to simply Match with the goal and overcome the island.

As for why resumption is not sensitive to weak islands in Gaelic while regular chains are, Boeckx claims that this is a consequence of the D-linking property of resumptive chains—as has been noted in the literature, D-linked chains can more easily overcome weak islands.
There is a final group of languages (Vata, Serbo-Croatian) that are sensitive to all islands. Boeckx deals with this group by arguing that complement clauses in these languages are actually relative clauses in disguise.

This is Boeckx’s theory of islands and resumptives in a nutshell. The question is whether the database that I am working on provides evidence for or against it. Recall that the Romance languages include HTLD as well as CLLD:

\[(6.71)\]

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \(\text{Juan, hace tiempo que no lo veo.}\) HTLD [Sp]
\item b. \(\text{A Juan, hace tiempo que no lo veo.}\) CLLD
\end{enumerate}

‘I have not seen John in a long time.’

Among the properties that tease them apart are, as listed above, (i) connectivity effects in case/prepositional complements, (ii) reconstruction effects, and (iii) islandhood.

Boeckx would be forced to claim that both HTLD and CLLD are the result of the application of movement rules. This would leave unaccounted why, as discussed above, HTLD does not give rise to SCO violations, etc., while CLLD does.

An additional problem is that Boeckx’s approach entails that the Romance languages should have two types of complementizers: an agreeing one (for CLLD, which respects islands) and a non-agreeing one (for HTLD, which does not respect islands). There is however no evidence that agreeing complementizers exist or have ever existed in Romance side by side with non-agreeing ones.

Finally, the structure of CLLD or HTLD in Romance cannot be as in treelet (6.58) because the dislocated constituent is not an NP but a fully-fledged DP. Thus, we have to assume that a DP is complement of another DP (as Cecchetto 1999 does):

\[(6.72)\]

```
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{ResPron}
\end{array}
```

\text{DP} \ 	ext{DP}
But now, we have an additional difficulty for Boeckx’s approach. Recall that he argues that if the resumptive takes care of the Agreement/Case part of the dependency, the Wh/Op could take care of the A’-dependency. This is crucial for the PUC. However, if we have two DPs, this assumption is harder to make, since each DP should presumably have its own independent Case requirement (for instance, possessor DPs are not licensed by the same Case feature that licenses their containing DP). (More on BigDPs in Section 6.6.)

Finally, evidence presented in López (2007) shows that movement takes place when Agree fails (see Chapter 1).

To sum up, it does not seem that incorporating Boeckx’s framework is going to give us new insight into Romance dislocations. Additionally, Boeckx’s analysis includes quite a number of empirical problems and its internal logic is incoherent. Thus, I maintain the idea that HTLD is base-generated in the left periphery while CLLD involves movement.

Let me now summarize Section 6.2. I have argued that HTLD is base-generated in a sentence-external position. It is only at the discourse level that it is linked to its resumptive constituent—thus, it cannot be argued that all resumptive chains are the outcome of movement as Boeckx (2003) argues. I have also argued that CLLD and CLRD are moved from a sentence-internal position, which leads to the further conclusion that C_HL does not include syntactic base-generated “binding chains”, as argued by Cinque (1990).

### 6.3 What triggers movement?

Having concluded that CLLD and CLRD are derived by movement, we need to clarify what triggers this movement. It is useful to start the discussion on this issue by distinguishing ultimate from proximate causes. As for the first, it is fair to say that, at least within the minimalist program, a certain agreement has been reached: movement exists in C_HL in relation to the satisfaction of interpretive/interface requirements (see for instance the exposition in Chomsky 2000). The debate begins with the proximate causes or, in other words, the mechanisms that are built in C_HL to attain displacement. I see three points of controversy.

The first point of controversy is whether all movement is triggered by checking feature/valuation, following the model provided by Case Theory or whether interface requirements are sufficient, without morphosyntactic features, to trigger this displacement. Prominent in the second approach is Diesing (1992, 1996; Diesing and Jelinek 1995), who argues that German strong DPs scramble because they cannot be interpreted in their θ-position. On the other side of the grammar, Reinhart (1995), Neeleman and Reinhart (1997),
and Zubizarreta (1998) have argued that scrambling or p-movement take place to satisfy conflicting stress rules, while Szendrői (2001) argues that focus movement takes place in order to place a constituent in stress. Both the Diesing–Jelinek and the Reinhart–Zubizarreta approaches are discussed in Chapter 5 and shown to have empirical problems.

As for dislocation, nobody, that I know of, has proposed a semantic or prosodic theory to account for it, but there is an influential approach according to which pragmatic features such as “focus” or “topic” trigger displacement. Within the approach to A’-movement inspired by Rizzi’s (1996) Criteria framework, it has often been assumed that the features that need to satisfy the criteria are the ones that trigger movement. For example, if an XP moves to Spec,Foc to satisfy a Focus Criterion, then the feature that triggers movement of XP must be a [focus] feature, presumably assigned to a lexical item as it is drawn from the lexicon. Rizzi (2004b) points out that the Criteria approach is not incompatible with the possibility of having formal features. He briefly considers this possibility and, after stating that the issue might be of little consequence, he explicitly assumes that A’-movement is triggered by features such as [focus], [topic], [wh], etc.

Notice that the approach presented in Chapters 3 and 4 is not compatible with Rizzi’s assumption, since XPs are not base-generated with such features. Thus, the first item in the agenda is to show that [focus] and [topic] do not trigger movement: using sub-extraction data, I conclude that all movement must be feature driven.

Another important consequence of the Criteria approach is that A’-dependencies disappear from the theory of grammar: if there are a bunch of different features that trigger displacement to the left periphery, we must conclude that there is no coherent notion of “A’-dependency”. Rizzi (2004a) claims that this is the case and argues that CLLD and wh-movement do not intervene for one another. As we have seen a couple of times throughout this chapter, empirical claims in this realm are often an artifact of the examples used. We are going to see this once again: if we control for distracting variables, we find that CLLD and wh-movement do create minimality effects for one another. I conclude that only one feature triggers all movement to the left periphery, which I have been referring to simply as [f’].

The second point of controversy concerns whether the feature that triggers displacement is to be found in the target of movement or in the dart. Up until Chomsky (1995) it was widely assumed that it was in the dart. Chomsky (1995) proposed that Move is Attract and displacement became akin to magnetism. However, López (2007) has argued, on the basis of A-dependencies, that the Move to Attract shift was not a good idea and that the original idea that a
constituent moves if something in its feature structure forces it was correct (see my brief remarks in Chapter 1). Instead of repeating the arguments in López (2007), I show how sub-extraction (a crucial component of my analyses, see Chapter 4) cannot be accounted for if movement is triggered by probes.

I start by discussing whether movement is triggered by a feature of the probe or by a feature of the goal. In Section 6.3.2 I argue against the Criterion approach and finally in Section 6.3.3 I argue that A’-dependencies do in fact exist.

6.3.1 Attract/Pied-pipe or Move?
Let us consider the Attract Feature/Agree (probe,goal) system of Chomsky (1995, 2000 and subsequent work), developed for A-dependencies. According to this approach, a head H with unvalued features of some kind probes in its c-command domain until it finds a constituent—a goal—with a matching feature. Given appropriate conditions (if the goal is not “frozen”, that is, the goal must have an uninterpretable feature of its own), the two features can agree. If the probe has an additional feature—EPP—the goal may be attracted and merged with H.

The question now is how locality is defined in this system. The idea is that the probe attracts the closest matching feature. But, what does closest mean? Chomsky (2000) gives us a definition:

(6.73) “D(Probe) is the c-command domain of Probe, and a matching feature G is closest to Probe if there is no G’ in D(Probe) matching P such that G is in D(G’).”

The following diagram shows the implications of this definition of closest:

(6.74)

```
  W
  / \  
P  X
  /   
G   Z
  / 
Y   G''
   / 
     G'
```

In tree (6.74) assume there are three features that match P: G, G’ and G’’. The definition of closest ensures that G is closer to P than G’, since G c-commands

6 Different versions of the same idea can be found in earlier papers. See for instance the following, from Chomsky (1995: 297, 356):

(i) K attracts F if F is the closest feature that can enter a checking relation with a sublabel of K.
   If β c-commands α and τ is the target of raising, then
   β is closer to K than α unless β is in the same minimal domain as (a) τ or (b) α.
G'. However, it does not establish any such relation between G and G'', since no c-command relation can be established between them. Thus, G, G'', and any other G''' contained within G would be equally close to P. Is this reasonable? I think not. Consider a DP included within another DP in Spec,T:

\[(6.75) \quad [\text{TP } [\text{DP the book of [DP my brother]]} \ldots] \]

If G is not closer to P than G'', then it should be as likely for “my brother” to get nominative/accusative case as for “the book of my brother”. However, this is not the case, the bigger DP always gets the relevant Case and the smaller DP always gets some DP-internal Case. Thus, I conclude that the definition of closest should ensure that G is closer to P than G''. This is as a matter of fact the tack that Fukui (1997) and Boeckx (2003: 66) take.

This conclusion has a consequence for our debate: if we take G to be closer to P than G'', then when G “freezes” a new probe cannot reach G''—in effect, G becomes an opaque domain. But this leaves sub-extraction out of the loop. Consider again a couple of examples of the type discussed in Chapter 4 (Rizzi 2004b discusses an Italian version of (6.77)):

\[(6.76) \quad \text{Del seu avi, la Maria diu que les histories les coneix la Susanna. [Cat] 'Maria says that Susana knows the stories of her grandfather.'} \]

\[(6.77) \quad \text{¿De qué autor te preguntas cuántos libros han sido censurados? [Sp] 'Of which author do you wonder how many books have been censored?'} \]

These two examples exhibit exactly the configuration represented above—in (6.77) for instance, the matrix [Q] is P, the wh-phrase “how many books by which author” is G and “by what authors” is G''. The bigger wh-phrase is “frozen”, since it has already satisfied a [Q] complementizer. Consequently, the matrix [Q] should not be able to penetrate it so it could reach the smaller wh-phrase:

\[(6.78) \quad [Q \text{ te preguntas } [\text{ForceP } [Q [\text{FinP cuántos libros [de qué autor]]} \ldots] \]]\]
Notice that no problem arises in these examples if the feature triggering movement is in the moving phrase and not in the C-domain. Take the wh-phrase example again. The formal feature—\([f']\), as before—of \(cual\) is satisfied in the subordinate Spec,C. Assume \(qué\) has another \([f']\) feature that is not satisfied in that position. Thus, \(qué\) must move to the matrix Spec,C. If \(qué\) has no \([f']\), it will simply stay as the complement of \(libros\), yielding the grammatical (6.79):\(^7\)

(6.79)   Me pregunto cuántos libros de qué autor han sido censurados.  [Sp]
          “I wonder how many books of which author have been censored.”

6.3.2  Formal or interpretive features?

The “Criterion” approach to A’-movement is stated as a filter that forces certain types of constituents (negative phrases, foci, topics, wh-phrases) to stand in a spec-head relationship with heads that have a corresponding feature (see Brody 1990 for the focus criterion, Rizzi 1996 for wh-criterion, and Haegeman and Zanuttini 1991 for the Neg-criterion, among many others). This filter would hold of either S-structure or LF representations—thus giving rise to the potential of parametric variation. A typical criterion filter can be stated thus:

(6.80)  Wh-Criterion (Rizzi 1996: 64)
        a. A wh-operator must be in a Spec-head configuration with a \(X₀^{[+\text{wh}]}\).
        b. An \(X₀^{[+\text{wh}]}\) must be in a Spec-head configuration with a wh-operator.

In order to evaluate the Wh-Criterion, I use sub-extraction again.

(6.81)  \(\alpha\) De qué autor te preguntas \(\beta\) cuántos libros t(\(α\))
        han sido censurados?  [Sp]
        ‘Of which author do you wonder how many books have been censored?’

(6.82)  Me pregunto cuántos libros de qué autor han sido censurados.  [Sp]
        ‘I wonder how many books of which author have been censored.’

\(^7\) If wh-determiners can be introduced into \(C_{hil}\) without a \([f']\), one should ask why (i) is ungrammatical:

(i)  *John bought which book?

I assume that (i) is ungrammatical because a D spelled out as wh must be \([+\text{c}]\), and the \([+\text{c}]\) feature can only be acquired in the left periphery.
Consider (6.81). The question is whether movement of $\alpha$ to the matrix clause can be accounted for in terms of the Wh-Criterion. Since $\alpha$ can stay included in $\beta$, as we can see in (6.82), we know that the Wh-Criterion does not force $\alpha$ to raise. Let me discuss this step by step.

If $\alpha$ stays included in $\beta$, clause (6.80a) of the Wh-Criterion is satisfied because de qué autor is in the spec of the lower $X_0^{+[wh]}$. The question is what forces $\alpha$ to raise in (6.81). The way the Wh-Criterion is set up, movement of $\alpha$ has to be forced by the first or by the second clause. $\alpha$, as a constituent of $\beta$, already satisfies the first clause of the Wh-Criterion in the subordinate clause. Thus, $\alpha$ does not raise to the matrix clause to be in a Spec-Head relationship with a Focus head.

Raising of $\alpha$ to the matrix clause can only be justified to satisfy the second clause of the Wh-Criterion: that is, to satisfy a need of the target rather than the dart. This entails that movement must be triggered by the probe, as in Chomsky’s (2000) system. But this leads to two problems. The first is that this sort of displacement can only be brought about by means of Attract/Agree which, as shown in Section 6.3.1, does not quite work in sub-extraction contexts: the probe would have to penetrate $\beta$ in order to reach $\alpha$, which should be banned. Second, even if we adopt an Attract/Agree approach, there has to be some unvalued/unchecked feature in $\alpha$ that makes it sensitive to a probe—an A’-equivalent of unvalued Case. This feature cannot be a [wh] feature because this feature is already satisfied downstairs, again following clause (6.80a) of the wh-criterion. I conclude that whatever triggers movement of $\alpha$ beyond $\beta$ cannot be [wh]. We can implement the same reasoning for sub-extraction of CLLD and FF (see the numerous examples of sub-extraction in Chapter 4). Whatever it is that triggers these displacements cannot be a [topic] or a [focus] feature.

The most plausible assumption to make at this point is that movement is triggered by unvalued formal features that are assigned to constituents optionally as they enter $C_{HL}$. Thus, notice that if we separate the interpretation (focus, topic, etc.) from the trigger of movement, subextraction becomes possible. In the case that $\alpha$ stays within $\beta$, as in (6.82), we can simply say that the smaller constituent does not have the formal feature—[$f’$]—that triggers movement. When $\alpha$ moves, then $\alpha$ does have this feature.

Contrary to what is generally assumed, evidence indicates that the feature that triggers wh-movement is not [wh]. This evidence is based on massive pied-piping phenomena such as the following:

(6.83) ...la generación de la guerra, [FinP [DP al último de cuyos miembros] C pro vimos t recientemente en un acto official... ] [Sp]
'...the war generation, the last of whose members we saw in an official event recently...'

This sentence is grammatical, although the wh-word *cuyos* "whose" is arguably too far embedded in the DP to check any features with the embedded C (Fin, if my assumptions are correct). Let us assume instead that what triggers movement is the [{\it f'\]} feature mentioned above, a feature that can be associated with any functional head and not just wh-D. If so, then it is the determiner *al* (*a+el* -> *al*) that bears this feature and the one that is involved in feature checking/valuation. *Cuyos* ends up in Spec, Fin as a free rider.

6.3.3 Intervention

In the framework developed in Chapter 3, and in Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 of this chapter, all A'-movement is triggered by one feature, which I called [{\it f'\}]. This involves a clear prediction: CLLD, FF, and wh-phrases should all create Relativized Minimality effects for one another, with mild ungrammaticality for complement extraction and strong ungrammaticality—ECP style—for adjunct extraction (see Rizzi 1990). On the other hand, the Criteria approach should make exactly the opposite prediction: since wh-phrases and FF on the one hand and CLLD on the other are triggered by different features. Thus, intervention gives us an excellent testing ground for both theories.

As a matter of fact, Rizzi (2004a) argues that CLLD is invisible to wh-extraction. Here are his examples:

(6.84) a. ?Non so a chi pensi che, tuo fratello, lo potremmo affidare. [It] 'I don’t know who you think that, your brother, we can entrust.'

b. ?Non so come pensi che, tuo fratello, lo potremmo convincere.' 'I don’t know how you think that, your brother, we can convince.'

(Rizzi 2004a: 245)

These judgments come as a surprise. As a matter of fact, the literature on CLLD and wh-movement had, until this point, agreed that CLLD created minimality effects for wh-phrases. Examples (6.85a and 6.85b) are taken from Rochemont (1989: 154, 155) and (6.85c) from Belletti (1990: 64): 8

---

8 Borer (1995) and Aoun and Benjamoun (1998) have argued that CLLD in Hebrew and Lebanese Arabic create intervention effects for wh-movement. Likewise, English Topicalization also creates intervention effects, down to the complement/adjunct distinction:
In view of this, let us take a closer look at Rizzi’s examples. As explained in Chapter 1, a dislocated constituent can be analyzed as a CLLD or a HTLD if (i) the resumptive element is a clitic, (ii) the dislocate is a DP, (iii) no island separates the dislocate and the resumptive clitic. The two constructions can only be teased apart when the resumptive element is not a clitic, the dislocate is not a DP constituent or when placing an island between dislocate and gap. Moreover, we also showed that a HTLD in a subordinate clause can be ungrammatical to mildly marginal or even fully acceptable in some cases (Lahne 2005 provides some Occitan examples). Finally, I concluded (following a long line of researchers, from Cinque 1983/1997 to Shaer and Frey 2005) that HTLD are not present in syntactic structure but are added as discourses are assembled.

With this in mind, notice that Rizzi’s sentences in (6.84) could exemplify CLLD or HTLD, which confounds the conclusion. In particular, if the reader analyzes the dislocate in (6.84) as a HTLD, extraction of the wh-phrase would have taken place successive cyclically without any obstacles and the mild ungrammaticality would be due to placing a HTLD in a subordinate clause. In this light, compare (6.84) with (6.85a, 6.85b): in the latter pair of examples, the dislocate is necessarily an instance of CLLD, since it is introduced by a dative case morpheme. As a matter of fact, Aoun and Benmamoun (1998)

(i)  a. *How do you think that Mary, Bill told t that John solved the problem t?
    b. ??Which problem do you think that Mary, Bill told t that John solved t?

(Lasnik and Saito 1992: 97–8)

So, from a Criterial perspective, Hebrew and Lebanese Arabic CLLD and English topicalization are triggered by the same feature that triggers wh-movement, while in Italian there is a different feature in charge of dislocations. However, this is an unhappy result. From a Universal Grammar perspective, it is awkward to reach the conclusion that every language consists of a set of constructions with arbitrarily distinct properties. Rochemont (1989), as a matter of fact, argues that there is a fundamental similarity between Italian CLLD and English topicalization.
argue extensively that in Lebanese Arabic movement dislocates create minimality effects for wh-movement while base-generated dislocates do not.

Thus, we need to construct examples that are unambiguously CLLD. In the following Catalan examples, the dislocated constituent is an AP or a PP (see Villalba 2000 for similar examples) or a non-specific DP. Thus, these sentences exemplify CLLD unambiguously. Notice that the sentences are ungrammatical and that the PP examples and the non-specific DP examples exhibit the classic adjunct/argument asymmetry:

(6.86) *No sé perquè₁ penses que inteligent₂, no ho és t₂ t₁. [Cat]
‘I don’t know why you think that he is not intelligent.’

(6.87) a. ??No sé qué₁ penses que a Barcelona₂ hi vol enviar t₂ t₁. [Cat]
‘I don’t know what you think that s/he wants to send it to Barcelona.’

b. *No sé com₁ penses que a Barcelona₂ hi vols enviar el paquet t₂ t₁.
‘I don’t know how you think that s/he wants to send the package to Barcelona.’

(6.88) a. ??A qui₁ dius que d’històries₂ el Joan DAT who say₂ say.2nd that of-stories the Joan explicarà t₁ molties t₂. [Cat]
‘tell.3rd many’

b. *Com₁ dius que d’històries₂ el Joan explicarà how say₂ say.2nd that of-stories the Joan tell.3rd molties t₂ t₁.
‘many’

I conclude that CLLD does create relativized minimality effects for wh-movement. This conclusion supports the hypothesis that all A’-movement is triggered by the same formal feature, which here I have called [f’].

To conclude this section: I exploited the sub-extraction data that I introduced in Chapter 4 in order to provide empirical evidence that (i) A’-movement must also be triggered by a feature of the moving item and (ii) this feature must be of a purely formal nature. Further, intervention effects tell us that CLLD and wh-movement are triggered by the same formal feature.

6.4 Right dislocation

In Chapter 3 I presented and briefly argued for an analysis of CLRD in which the dislocated constituent sat in a position in the middle field (following
Further, I claimed that this position is Spec,v, mostly on two grounds: (i) that CLRD instantiates A-movement and, (ii) as must be clear to the reader by now, on the basis of a general rejection of deriving the information structure of the clause by resorting to TopP and FocP. But this line of analysis is not the only one in the market. Cardinaletti (2002) presents an analysis of CLRD in which no movement is involved and the dislocated constituent occupies a low position—although outside the clause proper. Samek-Lodovici (2006) instead argues that CLRD is in a very high position (see also Frascarelli 2000, 2004). Thus, it becomes necessary to discuss all these alternative proposals in order to show that the mid-level analysis is correct.

Cardinaletti and Samek-Lodovici make a criticism of Cecchetto’s arguments as a starting point for their own analysis. We will see that, although they are correct that some of Cecchetto’s empirical evidence is not solid, the arguments that I presented in Chapter 3 remain untouched. Moreover, I will show that their argumentation includes a number of flaws.

This section is divided into three sub-sections. In Section 6.4.1 I briefly remind the reader of the arguments presented in Chapter 3 and I subject Cecchetto’s and Villalba’s arguments to scrutiny. Section 6.4.2 reviews Cardinaletti’s proposal and Section 6.4.3 Samek-Lodovici’s.

6.4.1 CLRD is in the middle field

6.4.1.1 Evidence in Chapter 3 Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1 presented some evidence that CLRD is in the middle field. To summarize, I argued that (i) when a complement is right dislocated, it c-commands the other complement; (ii) a right dislocated complement is lower than a pre-verbal subject but higher than a post-verbal subject. (i) and (ii) are exemplified in the following examples. Example (6.89) shows that a variable contained in a dislocated complement cannot be bound by a quantifier in the other complement. Example (6.90) shows that dislocating a complement allows it to extend its c-command domain. Example (6.91) shows that a right dislocated quantifier, unlike a left dislocated one, cannot bind a variable in the pre-verbal subject:

(6.89) a. No le entregué a ningún cliente su chaqueta. [Sp]

‘I gave no customer his jacket.’
b. No se la entregué a ningún cliente, su chaqueta.
\(\text{NEG CL.dat Cl.acc give.PAST.3^{rd}.sg DAT any customer his jacket}\)

(bound reading*)

\(\text{(6.90) a. Le entregué a su autor cada libro.}\)
\(\text{Cl.dat gave.1^{st} DAT her/his author each book}\)
\(\text{‘I gave her/his author each book.’}\)

\(\text{b. CONTEXT: Who did you give each book to?}\)
\(\text{Se lo entregué a su autor, cada libro.}\)
\(\text{Cl.dat Cl.acc gave.1^{st} DAT its author each book}\)
\(\text{‘I gave each book to its author.’}\)

\(\text{(6.91) CONTEXT: Who did his best friend give a book to?}\)
\(\text{a. El seu millor amic li va regalar un llibre a cada noi.}\)
\(\text{the his best friend Cl.dat PAST give.inf a book DAT each boy}\)
\(\text{‘His best friend gave a book to every child.’}\)

\(\text{(bound reading * )}\)

\(\text{b. El seu millor amic li va regalar un llibre, a cada noi}\)

\(\text{(bound reading * )}\)

\(\text{c. A cada noi, el seu millor amic li va regalar un llibre.}\)

I presented some additional evidence, based on Villalba (2000), that CLLD asymmetrically c-commands CLRD based on (i) extraction possibilities as well as (ii) quantifier-variable relations. Example (6.92) shows once again that it is possible to sub-extract and left dislocate a constituent contained within a CLRDed constituent while (6.93) shows that the symmetric operation is not possible. Example (6.94) exemplifies quantifier–variable relations:

\(\text{(6.92) Del meu avi, me les han explicat totes, [les histories t]}\)
\(\text{of.the my grandfather Cl.dat Cl.acc have.pl told all the stories}\)
\(\text{‘I have been told all of my grandfather’s stories.’}\)

\(\text{(6.93) *[Les histories t], me les han explicat totes, del meu avi.}\)
In the remainder of this section we will go over some other arguments for the middle field position presented by Cecchetto (1999) and Villalba (2000) and subject them to scrutiny. These are: (i) reconstruction and argument/adjunct asymmetries (Cecchetto and Villalba), (ii) NPI licensing (Villalba), (iii) ECP effects in French (Cecchetto), (iv) Aux-to-COMP in Italian (Cecchetto).

6.4.1.2 Reconstruction and argument-adjunct asymmetries Both Cecchetto and Villalba independently argued that R-expressions embedded in dislocated constituents co-referent with a pronominal subject give rise to the following grammaticality judgments: if the R-expression is embedded in a CLRDed constituent, co-reference with the pronominal subject is always ungrammatical. But if the R-expression is embedded within a CLLDed constituent, an argument/adjunct asymmetry becomes apparent. The examples in (6.95a, 6.95b, 6.95c) are from Villalba (2000: 190–1) and the judgments are his:

6.95  a. \[\text{pro}_1 \text{ va} \text{ dir} \text{ convenc´uda les mentides que la Maria} \text{ va inventar.} \]

b. Configuration: \[\text{pro}_1 \left[\text{CLRD} \left[\text{CP-compl/adj} \text{ DP}_1\right]\right]\]

c. Configuration: \[\text{CLLD} \left[\text{CP-adj} \text{ DP}_1\right]\text{ pro}_1\]

Les mentides que la Maria \text{ va} \text{ inventar pro}_1
the lies that the Maria \text{ PAST.1SG} invent

In the remainder of this section we will go over some other arguments for the middle field position presented by Cecchetto (1999) and Villalba (2000) and subject them to scrutiny. These are: (i) reconstruction and argument/adjunct asymmetries (Cecchetto and Villalba), (ii) NPI licensing (Villalba), (iii) ECP effects in French (Cecchetto), (iv) Aux-to-COMP in Italian (Cecchetto).
les va dir convencuda.

‘The lies that Maria, invented, she, truly believed.’

d. Configuration: \( \ast [_{CLLD} [_{CP-compl} DP_1]] pro_1 \)

\( * \)La mentida de que Maria, va fer

the lie of that Maria PAST do.inf

l’informe, pro_1 la va dir convencuda

the report Cl.acc PAST say.inf convinced

‘*The lie that Maria, made the report, she, truly believed.’

Their account of these data takes the following line. Take Lebeaux’s (1988) idea that adjuncts can be merged late in the derivation, after the constituent they adjoin to has moved from its original position. Further, assume that CLLD has moved above the subject. Then it is possible that the adjunct is adjoined to the CLLD constituent after it has moved above the subject and hence there is never a configuration that would give rise to a principle C violation:

\[
\begin{align*}
(6.96) & \quad 1. \text{pro}_1 \text{DP} & \rightarrow \text{movement of DP} \\
& \quad 2. \text{DP pro}_1 t & \rightarrow \text{merge of adjunct} \\
& \quad 3. \text{DP+}[_{CP adj} \ldots \text{DP}_1] \text{pro}_1 t
\end{align*}
\]

Complements, whose merging depends on the \( \theta \)-criterion, have to be merged with the DP from the beginning, and this results in the principle C violation:

\[
\begin{align*}
(6.97) & \quad 1. * \text{pro}_1 \text{DP+}[_{CP compl} \ldots \text{DP}_1]
\end{align*}
\]

In the case of CLRD, whether the dislocated constituent includes a complement or adjunct does not matter because dislocation does not remove the constituent from the c-command domain of the subject.

Samek-Lodovici questions this and carries out a survey of acceptability judgments with eighteen native Italian speakers, half of them linguists. He used only CLRDed sentences. Here is one example (judgments as in the original paper):

\[
\begin{align*}
(6.98) a. \text{pro}_1 \text{non le mantiene quasi mai, le promesse que Berlusconi,} \\
& \text{fa in campagna electorale.} \quad [\text{It}] \\
& \text{‘Berlusconi almost never keeps the promises that he} \\
& \text{makes during the electoral campaign.’}
\end{align*}
\]
b. *pro, non le mantiene quasi mai, le promesse che Berlusconi, sarà onesto.

‘Berlusconi almost never keeps the promises that he will be honest.’

The results are surprisingly variable, particularly among the non-linguists suggesting, to my mind, that at least the latter may have have found the sentences difficult to process—in this respect, it is worthwhile remarking that some of Samek-Lodovici’s examples are very long and the judgments were elicited orally.9 Length might also be a problem for two reasons. First, condition C effects become weaker the longer the distance between pronoun and R-expression (an effect that is particularly pronounced in VPE contexts, Fiengo and May 1994). Second, recall that CLRD are supposed to be anaphoric with respect to an antecedent. Anaphors do not tend to be long. A long dislocate like those in (6.98) is more likely to be interpreted as an afterthought (see Chapter 1 and Villalba’s discussion on this) than as a true CLRD, unless a context is provided. Another possible factor that might influence judgments, as Josep Quer (p.c.) points out, is that if we take the sentences to be literal quotes, they are all acceptable.

Finally, Samek-Lodovici only checked sentences with CLRD. But in order to make the point that there is no difference between CLRD and CLLD one needs to test both types of sentences with the same native speakers. Thus, much as I appreciate Samek-Lodovici’s desire to provide us with data more reliable than one’s own grammaticality judgments, I cannot take his results as final.

Be that as it may, Samek-Lodovici shows that, while the majority of his informants generally rejected all the sentences, they all found the ones with complement CPs to be worse. This would suggest that there are complement/adjunct asymmetries also with CLRD, thus undermining the claim that CLRD is in a middle position.

Under Samek-Lodovici’s inspiration I decided to conduct my own survey. I sent four Catalan linguists a battery of twenty-four sentences by e-mail, many of them distractors, and asked for their acceptability judgments. The sentences included contexts to help with interpretation. I decided to include also CLLD and wh-phrases so that results could be compared. Some of the crucial sentences are the following:

9 I have found in my own experience that the longer and more complex the dislocate the more variable the judgments. Sometimes, when I asked consultants to repeat back the sentence I had just given them they would return something similar but not the same (i.e. a coordination where there should have been subordination). See Schütze 1996 on issues concerning data elicitation).
The results were as indicated: to my surprise, the sentences were all unanimously rejected, the only one that was deemed slightly better involved deep embedding of the R-expression. These results lead to two conclusions: the first one is that both CLLD and CLRD must be at some point of the derivation c-commanded by the subject (as argued in detail in Section 6.2). The second one is that the adjunct was part of the displaced constituent from the beginning, in direct contradiction to Lebeaux’s analysis. In other words, argument/adjunct asymmetries must be a mirage (an illusion of which I was myself a victim). This accords well with the conclusions reached by some researchers on this topic, who have subjected the asymmetries to scrutiny (see Lasnik 2003 for a summary).
The final conclusion is that these condition C effects are not going to provide any evidence for the position of CLRD. Thus, Samek-Lodovici (2006) turns out to be partially right although in the direction opposite to the one he argued for.

6.4.1.3 NPI licensing  Villalba argues that NPIs in CLRD are licensed while NPIs in CLLD are not. He contrasts the following examples:

(6.102) La Maria no és responsable de ningú. [Cat]
the Maria NEG is responsible of anyone
‘Maria is not responsible for anyone.’

(6.103) *Responsable de ningú, la Maria no ho és. [Cat]

(6.104) La Maria no ho és, responsable de ningú. [Cat]
(Villalba 2000: 189)

Villalba presents this as evidence that CLRD must be c-commanded by negation while CLLD is not, further confirming the analysis that CLRD is in a middle position.

However, Samek-Lodovici (2006) instead argues that NPIs are not allowed in any dislocated constituent. He presents the following examples:

(6.105) a. Ne ho davvero voglia, di non vedere nessuno per qualche giorno.
‘I definitely DO wish not to see anybody for a few days.’

b. *Non ne ho voglia, di vedere nessuno per qualche giorno. 10
‘I definitely do not wish to see anybody for a few days.’
(Samek-Lodovici 2006: 845)

In (6.105b), the subordinate infinitive clause di vedere nessuno per qualche giorno “to see anybody for several days” is dislocated and resumed by the clitic ho. He attributes the ungrammaticality of (6.105b) to lack of c-command of nessuno “anyone” by the negative word non “not”. From this he concludes that CLRDed constituents must be located somewhere higher than negation. Again, notice that he does not compare these sentences with CLLD.

Given the discrepancy between Villalba’s and Samek-Lodovici’s judgments, I carried out an electronic survey of four linguists who are native speakers of Catalan. I tested sentences like the following, where the word

10 In example (6.105b), the original does not include davvero “definitely”; although the word “definitely” is included in the translation.
gaire “many” is an NPI (sentences inspired in examples taken from Villalba 2000):

(6.106) **CONTEXT:** Do you think Maria doesn’t listen to many people’s advice?

a. ?La Maria no hi confia, en els consells de gaire gent. [Cat]
   ‘Maria does not trust many people’s counsel.’

b. ??En els consells de gaire gent, la Maria no hi confia.

One of my consultants considered both (6.106a, 6.106b) ungrammatical (although it must be pointed out that he never used ?? in his judgments, in spite of the fact that the directions I gave suggested he could use them). The other three consultants saw (6.106a) as marginal while (6.106b) was consistently worse. This is the judgment that I represent in the examples.

At this point, it is unclear to me why (6.106a) is ungrammatical—it might simply be that these long CLRDs are awkward. The additional worsening of (6.106b) I attribute to lack of c-command between negation and the NPI. Thus, I conclude that NPIs do give us, after all, some evidence (admittedly delicate) that CLRD is c-commanded by negation and therefore located in a middle position.

6.4.1.4 **ECP effects in French** Rizzi (1997) has argued that CLLD in French gives rise to subject/object asymmetries in wh-extraction. Consider the following examples (I cite from Cecchetto 1999: 44, gloss/translation as in the original):

(6.107) ?Un homme à qui, ton livre, je pourrais le donner. [Fr]
   ‘A man to whom your book I could it give.’

(6.108) *?Un homme qui, ton livre, pourrait l’acheter. [Fr]
   ‘A man who your book could it buy.’

Rizzi claims that extraction of the subject relative pronoun is ungrammatical while extraction of the object relative pronoun is not. He analyses the contrast as the result of an ECP violation: the presence of a Top head intervenes between the trace and the wh word:

(6.109) a. qui C [CLLD Top [TP t T . . .]]

b. a qui C [CLLD Top [TP . . . V t]]
The presence of the head Top creates an intervention effect that prevents antecedent-government between the wh-phrase and its trace. This is not a problem for the object trace, as in (6.109b), because the trace can be head governed by the verb. However, lexical government is unavailable for the subject trace, hence the ungrammaticality of (6.108).

Cecchetto observes that CLRD does not give rise to ungrammatical subject extraction:

(6.110) ?Marie connaıˆt la personne qui lui a parlé comme ça, à Jean.

‘Mary knows the person who talked to Jean this way.’

This he takes as evidence that CLRD is not in the same position as CLLD and therefore against approaches to CLRD that place it in the left periphery. It is worth noticing that this tells us nothing about the actual position of CLRD—it could be in the middle field or in situ.

On the other hand, De Cat (2002) has challenged Rizzi’s original claim on two fronts. First, in a survey she conducted with native speakers she found that the contrast in (6.107) and (6.108) is either very weak or nonexistent. If CLLD does not give rise to ECP effects, then we do not really have the asymmetry between CLLD and CLRD that Cecchetto claims. Second, the evidence presented by De Cat strongly argues that French has no CLLD proper, all instances of dislocated topics being base-generated as HTLD. It seems that we must conclude that ECP effects provide us with no evidence for or against the proposal that CLLD and CLRD occupy a different structural position.

6.4.1.5 Aux-to-COMP in Italian In Italian and other Romance languages, one finds a type of clause with the following features: (i) it is headed by an auxiliary in the gerund form; (ii) it is adjunct to a regular clause; and (iii) the auxiliary appears to the left of the subject. Rizzi (1982) analyses the leftward movement of the auxiliary as head movement to C. The auxiliary assigns nominative Case to the subject in a government configuration:

(6.111) Avendo Gianni visto il film, non ci furono problemi.

‘Having Gianni seen the movie, there were no problems.’
Notice that under the assumption that subjects are merged in Spec,v, (6.111) is amenable to an alternative analysis: the subject is in situ and the gerund in T. This is important when evaluating Cecchetto’s proposal.

Cecchetto notices that you cannot have a CLLDed constituent between the auxiliary and the subject:

(6.112)  *Avendolo, il film, Gianni visto...

He proposes the analysis in (113) for this example:

(6.113)  [CP avendolo [TopP il film Top [IP Gianni visto...]]]

Cecchetto’s account of the ungrammaticality of (6.112) is based again on the intervening effect of Top. In this case, the extra structure gives us, as a result, that the auxiliary in COMP cannot govern the subject and the resulting structure violates the Case filter. In contrast, CLRD does not affect the grammaticality of the gerundive clause:

(6.114)  Avendolo Gianni visto, il film,...

This argument only follows if we assume Rizzi’s (1982) analysis of adjunct gerunds. Alternatively, if we assume that both the auxiliary and the subject are in situ, then (6.112) is ungrammatical because CLLD in the middle of the clause is always ungrammatical. Notice that the sentence improves if the CLLD appears before the auxiliary:

(6.115)  ??Il film, avendolo Gianni visto...

Thus, this argument for the distinct positions of CLLD and CLRD depends heavily on the analysis that we choose for this sort of construction.

6.4.1.6 Conclusions  So, to conclude this section, let me summarize the arguments presented for the mid position of CLRD:

(i) The c-command relations of the CLRDed constituent vis à vis other verbal complements show that CLRDed constituents are displaced.
(ii) The c-command relation of the CLRDed constituent with respect to the subject shows that it has moved to a mid position.
(iii) The relative hierarchy of CLLD and CLRD shows that the former c-commands the latter.
(iv) Argument/adjunct asymmetries do not provide any evidence one way or another.
(v) NPI licensing seems to provide further evidence that CLRD is not in a high position, although the fact that NPIs in CLRD are not perfect blurs the view somewhat.
(vi) ECP effects in French do not provide evidence for the position of CLLD and CLRD because these structures should probably be analyzed as base-generated dislocates.

(vii) Aux-to-COMP in Italian provides evidence that CLRD is not in the higher periphery only within the parameters of the analysis in Rizzi (1982).

It seems safe to construct the argument for the mid position of CLRD only on (i), (ii), and (iii), since they seem the most reliable pieces of data.

6.4.2 Right dislocation is very low

Cardinaletti (2002) mounts a fully-fledged challenge to Cecchetto’s analysis of CLRD and argues that it is in a very low position. Therefore it is necessary to carefully review her arguments against the mid-field approach, to see if they hold water and to find out if her own proposal withstands empirical scrutiny. My conclusion is that her analysis is inferior to the one defended in these pages.

Cardinaletti’s (2002) main theoretical point is that there are no optional clitics—generally speaking, she claims one should question the presence of optional elements in the sentence. Thus, she contrasts right dislocation with emarginazione (marginalization) and shows that it is not the case, as seems at first sight, that the latter is simply a version of the former without the clitic (as in Benincà 1988), but rather, that they are different constructions syntactically and prosodically. (As I showed in Chapter 5, I agree with her conclusions concerning the difference between emarginazione and CLRD.)

She claims that marginalized constituents are deaccented in situ. For CLRD, she proposes the following structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{X'}
\end{array}
\]

The category X is left undefined. Notice that CLRD is outside the TP structure and no c-command relationship can be established between CLRD and any constituent within TP, under a standard definition of c-command. Cardinaletti actually proposes using Kayne’s (1994) idea that a spec can c-command outside the XP that contains it—if so, then the subject in Spec,T can
c-command the CLRD. However, it is doubtful that this is such a good idea, in general. Compare (6.117a) and (6.117b), and (6.117c):

(6.117)  a. No one’s neighbor saw anything.
        b. *John’s mother saw himself.
        c. His, mother loves John.

The extension of c-command might be regarded as plausible for quantifier–variable relations (although alternative views are equally plausible, e.g. involving QR of the quantifier) but not for binding theory, since it predicts that (6.117b) should be good and (6.117c) bad. This will become important in the discussion.

Notice that the following contrast (see (6.90) above and Chapter 2) is unaccounted for within Cardinaletti’s analysis:

(6.118)  a. Le entregué a su autor cada libro  (bound reading??)  [Sp]
        ‘I gave her/his author each book.’
        b. CONTEXT: Who did you give each book to?
           Se lo entregué a su autor, cada libro.
           ‘I gave each book to its author.’

When we dislocate a direct object, we extend its c-command domain so it can bind a variable in the indirect object. This is not possible if CLRD is base-generated as a complement of X.

When we have multiple CLRDed constituents, Cardinaletti proposes the following structure:

(6.119)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{YP} \\
\text{XP} \\
\text{TP} \\
X \\
\text{CLRD}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Y'} \\
\text{Y} \\
\text{CLRD}
\end{array}
\]

This structure makes very precise predictions: there is no c-command relationship between the two CLRDed constituents. Moreover, even if it were accepted that the subject of TP could c-command the first CLRD within the extended c-command assumption, I doubt it could c-command the second:

(6.120)  *No one’s mother’s neighbor saw anything.
Both predictions can be falsified easily. Both the subject in Spec,T and the first CLRD c-command the second. The following sentence shows that a subject can bind the first or the second CLRDed complement:

(6.121) a. Juan no se lo entregó, a sí mismo,  
        Juan NEG. Cl.dat Cl.acc delivered DAT himself  
        el paquete.  
        the package  

b. Juan no se lo entregó, el paquete, a sí mismo.  
    ‘John did not deliver the package to himself.’

If a subject pronoun is made coreferent with an R-expression in a CLRDed constituent, the result is a principle C violation:

(6.122) a. pro₁ lo dijo, que Susana conocía a  
        Cl.acc said that Susana knew A  
        Javier₁.  
        Javier  
    ‘He said that Susana knew Javier.’

b. pro₁ se lo dijo, a María, que  
    Cl.dat Cl.acc said to Maria that  
    Susana conocía a Javier₁.  
    Susana knew A Javier  
    ‘He said to Maria that Susana knew Javier.’

This poses serious empirical challenges for the in situ structure proposed by Cardinaletti.

Moreover, binding relations can be established between different CLRDed constituents. This can be seen in the following examples:

(6.123) Creo que ya se lo entregó Juan, cada, libro, a su, dueño.  
       ‘I think that Juan already gave each book to its owner.’

(6.124) De un modo muy dramático, el sicoanalista se la presentó, a  
        Susana₁, a sí misma₁.  
        ‘In a dramatic fashion, the psychoanalyst introduced Susan to herself.’

(6.125) Ya lo sabe, él₁, que María votó a Juan₁ / que María lo, votó.  
       ‘He already knows that Maria voted for Juan / that Maria voted for him.’

These binding facts can hardly receive an account with the structure in (6.119). It seems, then, that Cardinaletti’s proposal fails the most basic constituency tests.
Cardinaletti devotes a good part of the article to discussing differences between CLRD and marginalization in Italian. Here, I would like to point out one of these differences as well as the analysis she proposes. She claims that it is possible to extract a wh-phrase from a marginalized constituent, as shown in (6.126a) but not from a CLRDed, as shown in (6.126b):

(6.126)  a. Che cosa ha detto, Gianni, che avrebbe fatto t?  [It]
         ‘What has Gianni said that he would do?’

         b. *Che cosa l’ha detto, Gianni, che avrebbe fatto t?

According to Cardinaletti, the possibility of extraction from a marginalized constituent can be derived from its being located in situ. As for the ungrammaticality of (6.126b), she limits herself to claiming that it is a consequence of its being in a clause external position (2002: 38). However, consider the following structure for a CP, proposed by Cardinaletti in a different context (2002: 42, ex. 33):

(6.127)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C} & \text{XP} \\
\text{TP} & \text{X’} \\
\text{X} & \text{CLRD}
\end{array}
\]

Notice that CLRD is in complement position, the canonical take-off position. Unless X is argued not to be a proper governor, I can see no syntactic reason why a wh-phrase could not move from here to Spec, C. Thus, (6.126b) should be grammatical. Additionally, notice that the marginalized constituent is in TP and the latter is the subject of X. Since extraction out of subjects is ungrammatical, extraction out of the marginalized constituent should be strongly ungrammatical. Thus, Cardinaletti’s proposal makes exactly the opposite predictions of what she claims.

Additionally, having C select for X rather than T brings up two questions: (i) how are we to make sure that, for example, T and C agree in finiteness? (ii) CLRD can co-occur with T-to-C in Italian: interrogative sentences, gerundive adjuncts, etc. How is T-to-C to take place within this structure?

Within my assumptions, the ungrammaticality of (6.126b) is a problem with PFC (Principle of Feature Conservation, see Chapter 4). As I showed, it is possible to left dislocate or to extract a D-linked wh-phrase out of CLRD:
That is because that CLRD is [+a], so any element extracted from CLRD must also be [+a]. Under the assumption that marginalization is [−a], the possibility of extracting a [−a] wh-phrase follows (see Chapter 4).

Cardinaletti argues that binding patterns also support her analysis. She notes that a post-verbal subject cannot bind into a CLRDed constituent, but it can into a marginalized one. This is most clearly seen with a negative quantifier:

\[(6.129)\quad a. \text{Non ha detto nessuno, } che \text{ pro, avrebbe fatto queste cose.} \quad \text{[It]} \\
 b. \text{Non l’ha detto nessuno, } che \text{ pro}, \text{ avrebbe fatto queste cose.} \\
\text{‘Nobody would have said that s/he would do these things.’}\]

This follows from her structural assumptions. A post-verbal subject does not c-command into the complement of X but it does c-command within its own TP. However, the impossibility of variable binding in (6.129b) follows from any analysis that raises the CLRD to a position higher than the base position of the subject. Example (6.129b) is compatible with an analysis that moves the CLRDed constituent to a position in the middle field.

Interestingly, a pre-verbal subject does bind a pronoun in a CLRDed constituent (Villalba 2000):

\[(6.130)\quad \text{Ningú, ho va admetre, que pro, hagués trencat el gerro.} \quad \text{[Cat]} \\
\text{‘Nobody admitted to have broken the jar.’}\]

This can be accounted for by Cardinaletti assuming that specs can c-command out of their functional categories (and it is also compatible with the position that CLRD is in a middle position). Beyond the doubts expressed above about extending c-command, we also find that if we have two dislocates the situation becomes more difficult:
In (6.131), pro can be bound by the subject ningú or by the indirect object cada. Thus, both the pre-verbal subject and the dislocated indirect object can c-command the second dislocate. However, the configuration proposed by Cardinaletti for multiple dislocates does not allow for this:

One can see that neither ningú nor cada noia c-commands pro.

Cardinaletti also makes an interesting observation concerning the information structure of marginalization and CLRD worth discussing. She presents the following contrast, taken from Frascarelli (2000):

On the basis of this example, she concludes that the constituent adjacent to the marginalized constituent must bear contrastive focus. In (6.134b), la macchina is an answer to a wh-question, so it must be information, not contrastive focus. This, she argues, accounts for the ungrammaticality of (6.134b). Her explanation is as follows: the most embedded constituent in the clause is the marginalized complement. According to the default stress rule, the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR),
it should carry the main stress of the sentence. Since it does not, then stress must have been assigned by the alternative, the Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule (E/CSR) (see Zubizarreta 1998). Hence the obligatory contrastive reading for the subject in marginalization.

Correspondingly, turning (6.134) into a CLRD construction yields a grammatical sentence;

(6.135)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Qui porterà la macchina?} & \text{[It]} \\
& \text{‘Who will drive the car?’} \\
b. & \text{La porterà Mara, la macchina.} \\
& \text{‘Mara will drive the car.’}
\end{align*}

A CLRDed constituent is not the lowest one of the clause—it is the complement of X, outside the clause—so stress on the adjacent constituent can be assigned by the NSR and it does not need to be contrastive.

She further claims that Cecchetto’s framework cannot account for this phenomenon. In effect, Cecchetto moves all constituents past the right dislocated one, so he leaves the CLRDed as the lowest constituent of the clause. In that configuration, the accent on the adjacent constituent has to be assigned by the E/CSR, wrongly predicting that it should be a contrastive focus.

However, it is not clear to me that this argument follows, since Cardinaletti does not take into consideration the issue of metrical invisibility, central in Zubizarreta’s framework. Zubizarreta shows that in German, English, and French anaphoric material are invisible for the application of the NSR. Although she argues that this is not the case for Spanish, in her argumentation in chapter 2 of her monograph she does not consider marginalization or CLRD. It could be argued that—at least in the latter case—the CLRD constituent is metrically invisible: it is, after all, dislocated, and it forms its own intonational phrase (see Chapter 3 of this monograph as well as Zubizarreta 1998 and Frascarelli 2000). If this sort of constituent is metrically invisible then CLRD can stay within the main clause, the adjacent constituent can get its accent following the NSR and Cardinaletti’s argument against Cecchetto’s approach does not hold.

To be on the safe side, notice that my own proposal is compatible with the data and analyses presented by Cardinaletti even if we do not involve metrical invisibility. Since I have the CLRDed constituent adjoined to vP and do not posit any syntactic displacement of the other vP constituents, the NSR is free to apply, predicting the grammaticality of (6.135b).

Finally, her proposal depends on Mara bearing contrastive focus in (6.135b). However, I showed in Section 2.3.5 that it is not the case that the constituent adjacent to the dislocation needs to be contrastive focus.
With this I conclude my review of Cardinaletti (2002) (which should not be considered exhaustive). I have shown that the analysis she proposes does not properly account for the structural relations that hold between a right dislocated constituent and the other constituents in the clause.

6.4.3 Right dislocation is very high

Samek-Lodovici (2006) makes two related claims. The first claim involves CLRD and the gist of it is that Cecchetto and Cardinaletti are both wrong because CLRD is really in a high, TP-external, position (he does not mention the proposals in Villalba 2000 or López 2003). The second claim is about focus; this time it is Rizzi (1997) and his followers who are wrong when they claim that there is focus movement to the left periphery because focus, in Samek-Lodovici’s view, is always in situ. Here I discuss only his arguments for a high position of CLRD.

Samek-Lodovici argues that the derivation of CLRD involves the following steps (an analysis attributed to unpublished lectures by Richard Kayne):

(6.136) a. The dislocated constituent starts out in situ. The verb carries strong accent.

L’ho VISTO Gianni

b. Gianni is displaced to Spec,Top. Top selects IP

[TopP Gianni Top [TP l’ho VISTO t]]

c. TP raises to the spec of an unnamed functional category

[XP [TP l’ho visto t(Gianni)] X [TopP Gianni Top t(TP)]]

Example (6.137) shows the structure in (6.136c) in tree format:

(6.137)

```
  XP
   /\  \
  TP X'
      /\  \
     X TopP
        /\  \\n       spec Top'
          /\    \
         Top    \\
            /\  \
           t_2 Gianni_1 [L’ho visto t_1]_2
```
Samek-Lodovici claims that this analysis has the advantage that it partially unifies CLRD and CLLD, since both of them raise to the same TP-external Spec;Top. Presumably, the reason why one of them shows up to the right of the sentence while the other one shows up to the left is that the CLLD does not involve remnant movement of TP. However, equalizing CLRD and CLLD is not a good idea: (i), as detailed in Villalba (2000) and in Chapter 2 of this monograph, there are important interpretive differences between the two; (ii) there are structural data, involving binding relations and sub-extraction possibilities (again already discussed in Villalba 2000) that show that CLLD asymmetrically c-commands CLRD.

Additionally, notice that CLLD and CLRD can be present in the same sentence:

(6.138) A Maria, l’hi vaig enviar, el paquet. [Cat]
       to Maria Cl.acc’Cl.dat PAST.1st send.inf the package
       ‘I sent Maria the package.’

Samek-Lodovici does not address this problem (unfortunately, he does not discuss multiple dislocations at all), but Frascarelli (2000: 139) does. She argues that the dislocates are base-generated as specs of Top and the complement of Top, TP, is remnant-moving to an even higher position. CLRD is a constituent in Spec;Top that gets stranded when TP moves, a CLLD constituent is dragged (so the remnant constituent is in this case Top’ and not TP). Example (6.139.1) shows the initial position of the constituents, (6.139.2) shows the Top’ displaced to the left, dragging the lower topic a Maria along but stranding the higher topic el paquet to the right:

(6.139) 1. [TopT-el paquet [TopT’-a Maria Top [l’hi vaig enviar]]]
       2. [TopT’-[a Maria Top l’hi vaig enviar]] [TopT-el paquet t]

Note that this analysis entails that CLRD is hierarchically higher than CLLD, just the opposite of what the empirical facts indicate.

Samek-Lodovici presents three pieces of empirical evidence for his external topicalization analysis of CLRD: they are based on agreement in the dialect of Ancona (Central Italy), on binding and on NPI licensing. His points on binding and NPI licensing I discussed above so here I limit myself to his point concerning the Ancona dialect.

Using data from Cardinaletti (2001), Samek-Lodovici shows that in Ancona post-verbal subjects in the VSO order allow for a default, non-agreeing, 3rd person singular form of verbal inflection. This is not grammatical if the subject is pre-verbal:
This drawing Cl.acc has made those children.

‘Those children made this drawing.’

Interestingly, a CLRD subject does not allow for this default form. Instead, it triggers obligatory agreement:

\[
(6.141) \quad \text{L’ hanno fatto / * ha fatto ieri, il disegno, quei bambini li.} \\
\text{Cl.ac have.3rd.pl made / has made yesterday the drawing, those children there.}
\]

Samek-Lodovici concludes that the default inflection is a property of post-verbal subjects in this dialect and that, if CLRDed subjects were in post-verbal position, as argued by Cecchetto, they should allow for default inflection.

The datum is interesting but it is subject to alternative interpretations. Under one alternative interpretation the default form of T is triggered by narrow focus on the subject. As far as I can tell, the data presented in Cardinaletti (2001) are consistent with this hypothesis and it would explain why a right dislocated subject cannot trigger default. Or maybe, what is crucial for this phenomenon is whether the post-verbal subject is in situ or not—only if it is in situ can the default form appear. One could then argue that right dislocated subjects have moved, even if string-vacuously.

To conclude Section 6.4, Cardinaletti (2002) and Samek-Lodovici’s (2006) articles are valuable because they have brought to the fore an amount of interesting data and have forced a deeper consideration of the issues surrounding CLRD. However, it seems clear that the empirical evidence, resting mostly on traditional c-command tests, supports the middle field analysis of CLRD.

### 6.5 Remarks on the syntax of clitics

Ever since Kayne (1975) and Strozer (1976) the syntax of Romance pronominal clitics has been on the agenda of generative researchers. One of the questions that has often been asked is: how exactly does this apparently pronominal element end up attached to the left of the verb (with some well-known exceptions that I discuss in a minute)? There have been since then (at least) three lines of analyses.
The first line of analysis is the movement approach, as argued by Kayne (1975). The crucial datum for this approach is that in French (and Italian, Catalan) a clitic and a fully-fledged argument are mutually incompatible unless the argument is dislocated:

(6.142)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{J'ai vu Marie.} \\
& \quad \text{`I have seen Marie.'} \\
b. & \quad \text{Je l'ai vue.} \\
& \quad \text{`I have seen her.'} \\
c. & \quad *\text{Je l'ai vue Marie.} \\
d. & \quad \text{Je l'ai vue, Marie.}
\end{align*}

An account of this incompatibility is straightforward under the assumption that the clitic is indeed a pronoun, an argument of the verb base generated in complement position and then adjoined to the verbal complex. This approach to the syntax of clitics is obviously incompatible with my own proposals, since I have the double base generated in a $\theta$-position.

A second line of analysis, usually identified with Borer (1984) and Suñer (1988) is to regard clitics as verbal affixes, akin to agreement morphemes. The datum that leads to this conclusion is that in some varieties of Spanish the clitic and the argument are compatible within the same clause (and in all varieties the clitic is obligatory with a strong pronoun). This phenomenon is referred to as Clitic Doubling (CLD), discussed in Chapter 5:

(6.143)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Yo la he visto a Maria.} \\
\text{`I have seen Maria.'}
\end{align*}

This is, of course, the line that I have taken in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Romanic linguists could, at this point, have taken the easy way out and simply claim that there are two types of clitics. This would not be a surprising result, we know since Givón (1976) that pronouns become agreement markers over time, so French and Rioplatense Spanish would instantiate different stages of grammaticalization. However, generative linguists usually abhor dividing solutions and always prefer to claim that if two things look alike, they must be alike.11

11 In Chapter 5 I have, as a matter of fact, argued that the feature structure of Rioplatense clitics is slightly different from clitics in non-doubling varieties. In the non-doubling varieties, the clitic is a feature structure with a category label, since it bears a [uf]. It is a former weak pronoun that has grammaticalized enough to be considered an agreement morpheme, but retaining of its former self the feature [uf]. In clitic-doubling varieties, the clitic is a plain agreement morpheme, without a [uf].
Are the two solutions symmetrical? That is, do they really stand in perfect equilibrium in terms of empirical coverage as well as empirical inadequacy? I would like to point out that while (6.143) is a direct counterexample to the movement hypothesis, the French examples do not per se make the agreement solution impossible. It would not be impossible to see the French clitic as a verbal morpheme that triggers obligatory dislocation of the associated argument, maybe because it is a D that takes up the case of the verb, as in Jaeggli (1982) or because it is a sort of EPP in Chomsky’s (2000) system. Thus, the affix analysis of clitics is compatible with the French, Catalan, and Italian facts, while Kayne’s (1975) is incompatible with CLD.

Moreover, I would like to propose here a novel (to my knowledge) argument in favor of seeing clitics of contemporary Romance languages as agreement morphemes. This argument is based on the surface position of the clitic. The position of clitics in Romance follows these two generalizations pretty closely:12

(6.144)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item If the verb is finite, the clitic attaches to the left.
\item If the verb is non-finite (including imperatives) the clitic attaches to the right (Spanish, Catalan, Italian) or to the left (French, except imperatives, which use a strong pronoun).
\end{enumerate}

It does not seem to me that a movement approach can provide a satisfactory analysis of these generalizations (although it has not been for lack of trying, as in Kayne (1989) and many others after him). Let us see how the agreement approach can handle them.

Assume that in the history of the Romance languages weak pronominals became object agreement morphemes. In this process, two principles would be at work:

(6.145)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item A universal template: Verb root+AgrO+AgrS (Baker 1996)
\item A language particular (or parametric) constraint: inflectional affixes attach to the right of the root.
\end{enumerate}

In a finite verb, both (6.145a) and (6.145b) cannot be satisfied unless the structure of the verbal complex is fully altered—as indeed happened occasionally in Portuguese:

(6.146)  
\begin{verbatim}
Falar-lhe-emos. [Po]  
Speak.inf-Cl.dat-fut.1st.pl  
'We will speak to him.'
\end{verbatim}

12 I am putting aside clitics that obey the Wackernagel/Tabler-Mussafia law, apparent in contemporary Portuguese as well as older varieties of other Romance languages. Barbosa (2000) convincingly argues that clitic positioning in Portuguese depends on prosodic factors.
I do not think it is chance that this example instantiates a future form constructed from the infinitive+auxiliary, which is a Romance innovation. That is, creating the V+AgrO+T+Agrs string would not involve remaking an old structure, but would simply be a step in the making of a new one.

But in the general case, unless the clitic is inserted, obeying (6.145b) would lead to the structure Verb root+AgrS+AgrO, in violation of (6.145a). One solution is to attach the clitic to the left of the verb, respecting (6.145a) but violating (6.145b). I surmise that the language particular/parametric condition is more easily violable and this accounts for the position of the clitics vis à vis the verb. With non-finite verbs, which have no AgrS, AgrO can attach to the verbal root respecting Baker’s universal template. In French, clitics attach to the left even on non-finite forms: I suggest this is an analogic development.

Let us now discuss the third line of analysis, the BigDP hypothesis. It has been put forward in published form by Uriagereka (1995) (although some unpublished versions circulated earlier), who attributes the idea to Ester Torrego. Their idea is that in CLD constructions the clitic is a determiner that takes the other DP as a spec. There is also an empty pronominal in the structure, whose *raison d’être* I discuss in a minute:

\[
(6.147) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{DP(double)} \\
\text{D(\text{Cl})} \\
\text{pro}
\end{array}
\]

From that position, the clitic adjoins to a high position that in Uriagereka’s article is F, a high functional category connected with information structure. Later movements of T and the subject give rise to the familiar word order:

\[
(6.148) \quad \text{Yo la he visto a María} \\
\text{I Cl have,1st seen A María} \\
\text{‘I have seen Maria.’}
\]

1. \( \text{[TP yo he [VP visto [DP María [D' la pro]]]]} \)
2. \( \text{[FP la [TP yo he visto a María t pro]]} \)
3. \( \text{yo [FP la he [TP t t visto a María t pro]]} \)

The presence of *accusative* A is crucial for this analysis. Since the clitic takes up the accusative Case assigned by the verb, A must be in the structure to assign Case to the DP *María*. This connection between CLD and the presence of an independent accusative case assigner is referred to as *Kayne’s generalization,*
and holds in Spanish and Rumanian (but not in Greek (Anagnostopoulou 1994) or Albanian (Kallulli 1999)).

Later, Cecchetto (1999, 2000) proposes to extend the same idea to dislocations in Italian. That is, a dislocation construction would involve the same steps as above, followed by dislocation of the double.

(6.149) 1. \[TP\ y\ o\ he\ [VP\ visto\ [DP_a\ María\ [DY\ la\ pro]]]\]
2. \[FP\ la\ [TP\ y\ o\ he\ visto\ a\ María\ t\ pro]]\]
3. \[y-o\ [FP\ la\ he\ [TP\ t\ t\ visto\ a\ María\ t\ pro]]\]
4. \[TopP\ a\ María\ y-o\ [FP\ la\ he\ [TP\ t\ t\ visto\ t\ t\ pro]]\]

However, Italian has no accusative A, so we do not know how the doubled DP gets Case. Cecchetto does not address this problem.

The Big DP hypothesis has become very popular and various researchers have adapted it to their analyses and extended it in interesting ways (see Bleam 1999; Belletti 1999; Boeckx 2003; Suñer 2006; for examples). It is also perfectly compatible with my own proposals in Chapter 3. Thus, I should probably leave it alone. However, I can’t stop myself from pointing out some of the problems with this approach and suggest that, as a matter of fact, it should be abandoned.

One thing that may surprise the reader is the dearth of empirical argumentation in favor of this hypothesis. Since it involves an eccentric structure in which a D selects for another D and the selected D is not introduced by the usual DP-internal case marker (\textit{de} or any other language-specific equivalent of “of”), one would think that there should be abundant empirical argumentation for it.

Uriagereka (1995) simply states that, since contemporaneous 3rd person clitics and definite determiners derive historically from the same set of Latin demonstratives, then they should receive the same analysis. 1st and 2nd person clitics, which have a different history, should have a different analysis (left unspecified in Uriagereka’s article). But whether A and B should have the same analysis should be decided on the basis of their synchronic behavior, not on events that happened more than a thousand years ago. And the fact of the matter is that 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person clitics all behave alike concerning, for example, their position with respect to the verb and the phenomenon of clitic climbing. Moreover, at least the plural first and second person clitics can be doubled by a full DP:

(6.150) a. Nos vieron a los profesores en el mercado. [Sp]
\text{Cl.1\textsuperscript{st}.pl saw.pl A the teachers in the market}
‘The saw us teachers in the market.’
b. Os vieron a los profesores en el mercado.
   ‘They saw you teachers in the market.’

The clitics nos and os are not historically associated with Latin demonstratives, but they do participate in doubling. Thus, it seems that there is no connection between historical linguistics and contemporary CLD. I suggest that first, second, and third person clitics should get the same analysis because they behave alike.

Even if we adopt the BigDP hypothesis, we can only use it in a small sub-set of cases, that is, when the doubled DP is a third-person direct object, according to Uriagereka. Dative CLD should get a different analysis (see in particular Blem 1999, who argues against BigDPs for dative CLD). Likewise, we have clitics that do not correspond to any argumental position, as the se clitic in the following examples:

(6.151) a. Se lo comió todo.  
   ‘S/He ate it all up.’

b. Se arrepintió de sus pecados.  
   ‘S/He regretted his/her sins.’

Since these clitics could not move from somewhere else, they must have been base-generated as affixes to the verb.

Finally, Catalan also has clitics that double APs and PPs, as mentioned above. The following are a couple of examples:

   ‘He is not intelligent.’

b. A Barcelona, no hi va anar.  
   ‘S/He didn’t go to Barcelona.’

Would ho and hi also be considered determiners? Or should they be considered a Deg and a P respectively? But there is no sense in which they could be considered such, that is, ho does not express any notion of degree.

Thus, it seems that most cases of clitics have to be analyzed as stems of verbal morphology and BigDP has very little empirical applicability. Surely, a basic application of Occam’s Razor should lead us to explore the possibility of a unified analysis of pronominal clitics, particularly since the bifurcated approach has so little empirical support.

It is sometimes mentioned that by assuming that clitics are determiners, we can account for the specificity effects triggered by the former and that this is an advantage over agreement approaches (see for instance Uriagereka 1995: 87,
Uriagereka’s account of specificity consists of positing an empty pronominal *pro* as part of the structure (see above). *Pro* naturally forces the need for a discourse antecedent. But notice that Uriagereka is conflating the features [+spec] and [+a] which, as argued repeatedly in this thesis, should be kept separate.

Moreover, determiners in the Romance languages are valued as definite or indefinite, not specific/non-specific. The two notions are clearly distinct as argued by von Heusinger (2002): both definite and indefinite DPs can be specific or non-specific (see Chapter 1):

\[(6.153)\] John is looking for the dean . . .
\[\ldots\text{whoever it might be. } \rightarrow \text{non-referential (non-specific)}\]
\[\ldots\text{namely for Smith, who happens to be the dean. } \rightarrow \text{referential (specific)}\]

\[(6.154)\] John is looking for a pretty girl . . .
\[\ldots\text{whoever he will meet, he will take her to the movies. } \rightarrow \text{non-specific}\]
\[\ldots\text{namely for Mary. } \rightarrow \text{specific}\]

Thus, the fact that clitics are divided along the lines of the \(+\text{spec}\) distinction while regular determiners are divided as \(+\text{definite}\) should count as an argument against putting them all together in the same bag.

Finally, well-known object agreement markers such as those of Hindi (see Mahajan 1990) and Swahili (see Carstens 1991) also have specific values. The case of Swahili is particularly interesting because in this language there are no overt determiners at all, thus an analysis along the lines of BigDP is even more implausible.

I would like to finish this section with a strong argument against movement analyses of clitics that I borrow in part from Miller and Monachesi (2003). Italian, Catalan, and Spanish can have the bare verb in a left-detached position with a normally conjugated verb in its normal position:

\[(6.155)\] Correr, no he corrido. [Sp]
\[\text{Run.inf NEG have.1}\text{st run.ptc}\]
\[I \text{have not run.}\]

This left-detached verb should probably be considered base-generated in that position. Interestingly, the detached verb cannot be accompanied by complements or modifiers and auxiliaries and negation are out:

\[13\] Although when talking about definite DPs, the terms referential/non-referential are used (Quine 1960).
(6.156) a. *Comer patatas, no he comido patatas.  [Sp]
   Eat.inf potatoes NEG have.1st eaten potatoes
b. *Venir con su hermana, Juan nunca viene
   come-inf with his sister Juan never comes
   con su hermana
   with his sister
c. *Haber llegado, no ha llegado.
   Have.inf arrived NEG has arrived
d. *No comer, no he comido.
   NEG eat.inf NEG has eaten

Therefore what we have in this construction is a bare V or v, no VP, TP, etc.
But this left detached verb can support pronominal clitics:

(6.157) Traérselas, no se las ha traído.  [Sp]
   Bring.inf.Cl.dat.Cl.acc NEG Cl.dat Cl.acc have.1st
   brought
   ‘I have not brought them to her/him.’

This example presents a paradox for the BigDP hypothesis. If the detached verb cannot hold any complements or adjuncts, why can it hold clitic pronouns which, presumably, head their own complement DPs? This sort of datum, however, is to be expected if clitics are simply base-generated as part of the verbal morphology.

Moreover, this datum presents an additional problem for Uriagereka’s (1995) particular development of the proposal. The detached unit in (6.157) is only the verb, no higher functional categories are permissible. Thus, clitics must be attached to the verb, not to a high functional category, as Uriagereka claims (see 6.148).

6.6 Conclusions

This chapter has been devoted to making a contribution to the current debates concerning the syntactic nature of dislocations. I have argued that the empirical evidence available to us indicates clearly that CLLD and CLRD move from (have a copy of themselves in) a sentence-internal position, while HTLD is not integrated into sentence structure. As a consequence, we have only one type of syntactic dependency, contra Cinque (1990). I have argued that a formal feature in the moving item triggers displacement of CLLD, FF,
and wh-phrases to the left periphery, and this feature is always the same, as can be seen in intervention effects. From a more theoretical perspective, I have shown that the probe/goal system to movement does not fare well with sub-extraction. I have also argued that CLRD moves to the middle-field and have presented arguments against alternatives. Finally, I have presented some problems to the BigDP approach to Romance clitics and claimed that Romance clitics are verbal affixes.
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