Topicalization, CLLD and the left periphery*

Haegeman
UMR 8258 Silex du CNRS

Abstract

Starting from a brief consideration of the internal make-up of adverbial clauses this paper will show that the widespread assumption that fronted arguments in English and CLLD constituents in Romance occupy the same position leads to a number of problems. I will conclude that the position occupied by English topicalized arguments differs from that of the CLLD topics in Romance and that English topics occupy a higher position in the left periphery. The final part of the paper compares a number of views on the lower topic position in Romance.

1   Topicalization in the left periphery

In much recent literature on the left periphery inspired by Rizzi's seminal paper (1997), one point that has often gone relatively unquestioned is that cross-linguistically fronted topics occupy a designated position, the specifier of TopP. While admitting that there are differences in the way the topic is related to the host clause, Rizzi (1997) for instance, basically assumes that CL(itic)L(eft)D topics in Romance as well as fronted topics in English occupy Spec,TopP (also for instance Grewendorf (2002), Grohmann (2003); Platzack (2004), but see among others Benincà (2001), Benincà and Poletto (2001), Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2003), Lopez (2003) and Pereltsvaig (2004) for different views). Implicit in some proposals is also an assumption that the interpretation of fronted topics in English is not significantly different form that of fronted CLLD elements in the relevant languages. Delfitto (2002: 61) says: 'topics are interpreted in essentially the same way in English topicalization and Italian CLLD'. The conflation of the two types of fronted arguments arises probably because in many of the relevant papers authors either mainly look at English type topicalization or concentrate on CLLD and the two are not often systematically confronted. In this paper I want to highlight some differences in position between English topicalized arguments and CLLD arguments in Romance. The paper is organised as follows: Section 1 introduces the idea that English topicalization is a root phenomenon, section 2 discusses the syntax of adverbial clauses, concentrating on central adverbial clauses. Sections 3 and 4 show how embedded clauses may differ with respect to the composition of their left periphery: notably it is proposed that the CP of central adverbial clauses, factive complements, subject clauses and infinitival clauses is structurally reduced and lacks the projections that licence topicalization. Section 5 deals with CLLD in Romance and shows that it has a wider distribution than topicalization in English, occurring precisely in the domains associated with a reduced CP. Section 6 postulates that there is a lower position in the left periphery which can host CLLD constituents in

Romance. The section examines a number of proposals for locating this position in the left periphery. Section 7 discusses a complication with respect to conditional clauses containing CLLD constituents in Romance. Section 8 is a summary of the paper.

1.1. Root phenomena

In a rich literature, going back to the 1970s, it has been acknowledged that there exists a range of syntactic phenomena whose application is restricted to root clauses and embedded clauses with root properties. English topicalization is taken to be one of these phenomena (Emonds 1970, 2004, Rutherford 1970, Hooper & Thompson 1973, Andersson 1975, Green 1976, Davison 1979, Heycock 2002, Haegeman 1984a,b, 1991, 2001, Maki et al 1999). With respect to defining the domain of application of topicalization and other main clause phenomena, Hooper and Thompson (1973) argue that such phenomena are apparently related to 'asserted clauses'. They also point out that the relevant restriction cannot be syntactically represented, or if it could, that such syntactic representation would not be explanatory:

> As a positive environment we can say that [root] transformations operate only on Ss that are *asserted*. …some transformations are sensitive to more than just syntactic configurations. *It does not seem possible to define the domain of an RT in terms of syntactic structures in any general way*. However, …, even if it were possible to define in syntactic terms the conditions under which RTs can apply, … the question of why these transformations can apply in certain syntactic environments and not others would still be unanswered (Hooper & Thompson 1973: 495, italics mine)

1.2. Accounting for the restriction

It may be true that at the time that Hooper and Thompson were writing, no syntactic account for the restricted distribution of main clause phenomena was available, but note that the authors themselves do give a clear indication as to what the syntactic distinction should rest on when they say:

> Though RTs may apply in some complements that are full sentences introduced by the complementiser *that*, they may never apply in any complements that are reduced clauses. By reduced clauses we mean infinitives, gerunds, and subjunctive clauses, i.e. those complement types which have uninflected verbs. (Hooper and Thompson 1973: 484-5, italics mine).[1]

At an intuitive level, we can reinterpret this to mean that root phenomena are licensed in domains with somewhat 'more functional structure', and that domains lacking that particular layer of structure will not allow root phenomena. A similar intuition is expressed for instance in Larson and Sawada (2005: 5) and by McCloskey (2004). In the first part of the paper I try to make this hypothesis more precise, using a modified version of Rizzi's split CP. I will start by examining argument fronting in adverbial clauses.

2   Adverbial clauses and root phenomena

2.1   Topicalization in adverbial clauses

2.1.1   English

In English, we need to distinguish argument fronting from local adjunct fronting (Haegeman 2003a), a contrast which is not always explicitly addressed. While fronted arguments are typically restricted to root clauses or embedded clauses with root properties, fronted adjuncts are not subject to this a restriction.[2]

(1) a *If these exams you don't pass you won't get the degree.

   b If next week you cannot get hold of me, try again later.

(2) a *While her book Mary was writing this time last year, her children were staying with her mother.

   b While around this time last year Mary was writing her book, her children were staying with her mother.

(3) a *When her regular column she began to write for the Times, I thought she would be OK.

[1]   cf. Emonds (2000: 8).

[2]   As pointed out by McCloskey (2004) not all temporal clauses allow adjunct fronting.

b   When last month she began to write a regular column for the Times, I
            thought she would be OK.

These differences between argument fronting and adjunct fronting in adverbial
clauses are not immediately compatible with the analysis offered by Rizzi (1997), in
which fronted arguments move to the specifier of TopP and fronted adjuncts are
TopP adjoined. If both types of fronting involve the same projection TopP, then it is
not clear how one can be ruled out while the other is grammatical. Haegeman
(2001a,b) proposes that, as suggested by Rizzi himself (1997: see his footnotes 26,
30 and 32), some fronted adjuncts need not be adjoined to TopP. Specifically
temporal adverbs may also be somewhat lower in the left periphery..

    However, argument fronting is (marginally) possible in adverbial clauses with
root like properties. (4) provides some examples: (4a) is from the literature, (4b-e)
are attested examples, (4f-g) are constructed examples

(4)   a   His face not many admired, while <u>his character</u> still fewer felt they could
            praise. (Quirk et al 1985: 1378)

      b   His face not many admired, <u>while</u> <u>his character</u> still fewer felt they could
            praise. (Quirk et al 1378)

      c   I think we have more or less solved the problem for donkeys here,[3]
            <u>because</u> <u>those we haven't got</u>, we know about. (*Guardian*, G2, 18.2.3,
            page 3, col 2).

      d   We don't look to his paintings for common place truths, <u>though</u> <u>truths</u> they
            contain none the less (*Guardian*, G2, 18.02.3, page 8, col 1)

      e   Professor Head (Letters July 28) suggests the oath of allegiance implies
            commitment to monarchy as a system of government. It doesn't, <u>though</u>
            <u>whether this will mollify him,</u> I don't know.(*Guardian*, 29.7.3, page 17,
            col 5, letters to the editor, Rev. Steve Parish. Warrington)

      f   Naturally, my carrots, peas, beans, potatoes, lettuces and tomatoes have a
            taste beyond compare , <u>although</u> whether it is because they are organic or
            just mine I am not sure. (*Guardian* 6.11.3? page 2, col 1)

      g   If <u>these problems</u> we cannot solve, there are many others that we can
            tackle immediately.

      h   If <u>aphids</u> we did not worry about, snails we did.

      i   If <u>anemonies</u> you don't like, why not plant roses instead?

I have proposed (Haegeman 2002a, 2003a, 2003b) that adverbial clauses that do not
allow for fronted arguments are fully integrated in the host clause and are interpreted
as modifying the event expressed in the associated clause. For instance, conditional
clauses introduced by *if* refer to events/states of affairs that would be a sufficient
cause for the event/state of affairs in the main clause to be realised; temporal clauses
expressed by *while* express events/states of affairs that are the temporal frame for the

---

[3]   Concerns problem of caring for donkeys and the role of the people at the Donkey Sanctuary.

event/state of affairs expressed in the main clause etc. I will label such adverbial clauses ' central adverbial clauses'.

On the other hand, 'peripheral' adverbial clauses do allow (to some extent) for argument fronting; they are less tightly connected to the host clause (see Haegeman (2002a, 2003b) for arguments) and serve to provide the discourse frame against which the proposition expressed in the host clause is evaluated. Adverbial *while* clauses of this type are contrastive and express a proposition which provides the privileged background that will enhance the relevance of the associated matrix clause; conditional *if* clauses express a premise which is entertained by the speaker and which serves as the privileged context for the processing of the main clause. In sum, the relevant adverbial clauses provide discourse backgrounds that serve as restrictors for processing, against such backgrounds the matrix clause yields particular contextual implicatures (see Haegeman 2002a, 2003b).

2.1.2 Comparative data

The contrast in argument fronting between the two types of adverbial clauses is not confined to English. The contrast is also found in Japanese, in Korean (see Whitman 1989), in Gungbe, which I will illustrate below, and it has been reported for Chinese (Lu Peng 2003: 232-34).[4]

In Japanese[5], *wa* topicalization is not possible in central conditional clauses (Maki *et al* 1999) but it is licit in peripheral conditional clauses expressing a premise for the processing of the host clause.

(5)   a   *Mosi sono yoona zassi-wa, (anata-ga) yome-<u>ba</u>,

if that like magazine-top (you-nom) read (CONDITIONAL)-if

(anata-wa) yasai-ga sukini narimasu.

(you-top) vegetable-nom like become

'If these magazines, you read, you will come to like vegetables'

b   Mosi sono yoona zassi –wa (anata-ga) sukide-nai (CONCLUSIVE)-<u>naraba</u>,

if that like magazine-top (you-nom) like-not-if

naze (anata-wa) (sorera-o) kai-tuzukerunodesu ka?

why (you-top) (them-acc) buy-continue, Q

'If such magazines, you don't like, why do you keep buying them?'

Observe that *ba* in the central conditional clause is replaced by *nara ba* in the peripheral conditional clause. With respect to *nara* Kuno says:

---

4   Lu Peng distinguishes an external topic from an internal one. The latter appears to the right of the subject and is arguably IP internal. It can occur in all types of adverbial clauses. The external topic is restricted to what would be peripheral adverbial clauses.

5   Thanks to Hideki Maki (pc) for the Japanese data. See also Sawada and Larson (2004: section 1.2)

Concerning the conditional sentence pattern[S1 *nara*] S2:'It is usually said that this pattern has a strong degree of assertion about the statement represented by S1'. (Kuno 1973: 168)

Korean shows a similar contrast between central conditionals, which do not allow topicalization, and peripheral ones, which do (see Whitman 1989)

(6)   a *i <u>chayk-un</u> (ku-ka) ilk-<u>umyen</u>/ilk-ess-<u>umyen</u>   (Korean[6])

this <u>book-Top</u> (he-Nom)read-if / read-Past-if

ku-nun ama ku yenghwa-lul poko siphe hal kes-i-<u>ta</u>

he-Top probably that movie-Acc see want will-Dec

'If this book, he reads/read, he will probably want to see that movie.'

('central adverbial')

b <u>ku chayk-un</u> (ney-ka) cohaha-n-<u>ta-myen</u> way kukes-ul ca-ci anh-ni?

that book-Top (you-Nom) like-Pres-Dec-if why that-Acc buy-NMZ not do-Q

'If that book, you like, why don't you buy it?' (peripheral adverbial)

The contrast is also found in Gungbe (Aboh pc): only *ni* conditionals with echoic reading allow *ya* topicalization. (7) 'implies that speaker and hearer are not at the Procure, but in another bookshop where they have found a book that the hearer had seen at Procure <u>and told the speaker about'</u> (Aboh, pc)[7]

(7) (*) Ni <u>wema ehe lo ya</u>, a mon e to Procure, xo e na mi.

if book this Det Top 2sg see 3sg at Procure buy 3sg for me

2.2   The internal structure of adverbial clauses

In addition to differing with respect to the possibility of argument fronting, central and peripheral adverbial clauses display a number of other differences which can be reduced to one essential contrast: peripheral adverbial clauses allow for the encoding of illocutionary force, central adverbial clauses don't. As a result, peripheral adverbial clauses will manifest a range of phenomena that involve anchoring to the speaker, these are absent from central adverbial clauses. I briefly go over some examples here.

2.2.1   Speaker oriented epistemic modals and adverbial clauses

Peripheral adverbial clauses can, and central adverbial clauses cannot, contain expressions of epistemic modality:

---

[6]   I thank Shin Sook Kim for the judgements .

[7]   The resumptive pronoun *e* (3sg) is somewhere between a weak pronoun and a clitic (for discussion see Aboh 2004)

(8) a *Mary accepted the invitation without hesitation after John <u>may</u> have accepted it (based on Verstraete 2001: 149)

      b ??John works best while his children are <u>probably/might be</u> asleep.

      c The ferry will be fairly cheap, while/whereas the plane may/ will <u>probably</u> be too expensive.

      d If Le Pen will probably win, Jospin must be disappointed. [8]

Epistemic modality is by definition anchored to the speaker-related: it expresses the speaker's stance concerning the likelihood of the state of affairs/event, which is anchored to speech time. Tenny (2000: 319) underlines the need for anchoring to speaker in relation to the highest adverbs in the Cinque (1999) hierarchy:

> We cannot have a point of view without a sentient being to hold it. A speech act, of course, necesssarily involves the speaker as a participant, En evaluative expression, at the sentence level, reflects the point of view of the speaker. Evidentiality involves the speaker as a sentient perceiver, a proposition that is *apparently* true or false must be so to someone. Finally, epistemic modality, which addresses a state of knowledge of something, must involve a sentient mind that is in the state of knowing; at the sentential level it is the speaker who is represented as holding that knowledge. (Tenny 2000: 319)

Verstraete points out, for instance, that even if 'epistemic modals can be morphologically associated with a past tense, ... *this morphological marking does not express the speaker's past judgement.* Either it is used for tentativeness,… or it occurs in a context of indirect or free indirect speech' (Verstraete 2001: 152, italics mine).

2.2.2 Illocutionary force

The availability of epistemic modality in peripheral adverbial clauses and its absence in central adverbial clauses suggest that peripheral clauses can be anchored to the speaker in a way that central adverbial clauses cannot. This distinction is confirmed by the observation that peripheral adverbial clauses may be associated with indicators of illocutionary force, a point signalled by Declerck and Reed (2001) for

---

[8] The distinction between the two types of adverbial clauses is not always made, leading to a failure to identify the restrictions on the distribution of epistemic adverbials. For instance, in his discussion of the distribution of sentential adverbials Nilsen (2004) points out that 'speaker oriented adverbs, such as evaluatives (*fortunately*), evidentials (*evidently*), and some modals (*possibly*) are degraded… in antecedents of conditionals (2004:811). In a footnote he then says:
One can also find occurrences of *probably* in antecedents of conditionals which aren ot that bad.
[i] If Le Pen will probably win, Jospin must be disappointed.
I take the slipperiness of some these [sic] intuitions to be comparable to that found with relative adverb ordering. Consequently I will try to stick to phenomena for which intuitoins are sharper. (2004:811, note 5)

Failure to distinguish the two types of adverbial clauses seems to be at the basis of the 'slippery intuitions'. Nilsen's problematic (i) is my (8d). It contains an instance of a peripheral conditional: the natural interpretation of which is that the conditional echoes a previous statement or proposition that is contextually salient. The fact that epistemic adverbials are licit in (i)/(8d) is then not unexpected. Such epistemic adverbials remain unacceptable in central adverbials.

conditional clauses. Central adverbial clauses do not have this illocutionary potential and are integrated in the speech act conveyed by the associated clause.

> When the Present Perspective System is used in the sub-clause [i.e. central conditional, lh], the speaker makes a single (but complex) prediction: *she presents the contents of the two clauses as forming a unit*. (Declerck and Reed 2001: 131, italics lh)

> when the Future Perspective System [peripheral conditional lh] is used in both clauses [conditional and associated clause, lh], the *speaker makes two independent predictions*: there are, as it were*, two illocutionary speech acts*. (Declerck and Reed 2001: 131, italics lh)

There are a number of empirical data illustrating this opposition.

2.2.2.1   *Echoic effect in conditional clauses*

Declerck and Reed (2001) signal that peripheral conditional clauses are echoic:

> closed P-clauses [≈ peripheral conditional clauses lh] are always echoic in one sense or another. They can echo straightforward statements about the actual world, or they can echo Q-propositions about a nonfactual world. However, the claim that closed P-propositions are echoic need not mean that they have to be echoes of actual utterances. They may also be echoes of an internal or mental proposition (thought) such as the interpretation of an experience, perception etc. (Declerck and Reed 2001:83)

Being 'echoic' implies a relation to the discourse, and one that is mediated by the speaker who 'echoes' a previous utterance/thought.

2.2.2.2   *Tags (H&T 1973: 471.)*

Further evidence for the availability of illocutionary force in peripheral adverbial clauses and its absence in central adverbial clauses comes from the observation that the former may and that the latter may not have their own question tags associated with them. In (9a) the tag *didn't she* is related to the matrix clause; a tag *hadn't they*, which would have to be related to the adverbial clause, is not possible, as seen in (9b). Temporal *while* clauses show the same restrictions (10).

(9)   a   Mary went back to college <u>after/before</u> her children had finished school, <u>didn't she</u>?

b   *Mary went back to college <u>after/before</u> her children had finished school, <u>hadn't they</u>?

(10)   a   Bill took a degree at Oxford while his children were still very young, <u>didn't he</u>?

b   *Bill took a degree at Oxford while his children were still very young, <u>weren't they</u>?

The situation is different in peripheral adverbial clauses. Sentence-final contrastive *while* clauses will not normally be followed by a tag relating to the host clause. Such

a tag would have to precede the contrastive *while* clause (12a,b). On the other hand, a contrastive *while* clause may have its own tag (12c):

(11) a *Bill took a degree at Oxford, while his daughter is studying at UCL, <u>didn't he?</u>

b Bill took a degree at Oxford, <u>didn't he,</u> while his daughter is studying at UCL.

c Bill took a degree at Oxford, while his daughter is studying at UCL, <u>isn't she?</u>

(12) is an attested example with a question tag associated with a peripheral *because* clause:

(12) Henry III, or example, ruled for 56 years but his golden jubilee was flop. 'Henry III?' they said, 'Erm, now which one's that then? '<u>Cos </u>Henry V is Agincourt, <u>isn't he</u>…(*Guardian*, 2.2.2., page 8, col 2)

2.2.2.3   *Speech act adverbials*

Peripheral adverbial clauses may also contain adjuncts relating to the speech act, as illustrated by the following example:

(13) '[A referendum on a united Ireland]…will be a 'good thing, because <u>frankly</u> they need to be taken down a peg and come down to earth and be a little bit more sober in their approach to things.'(*Guardian*, 22.7.2, page 4, col 4))

2.2.2.4   *(Rhetorical) questions*

Among peripheral clauses, *because* clauses and *although* clauses are found to contain rhetorical questions.

(14) a No one would have been too upset about her bad behaviour, because <u>wasn't that what writers were put on earth to do</u>? (*Observer*, 20.8.2000 page 27, col 8)

b News about the anti-American demonstrations which had begun to appear in Berlin and other parts of Germany in the fortnight since the summit hadn't exactly helped sell what was supposed to be Michelle's greatest success. Although w<u>hat did the mid-west care about Berlin? (</u>BNC, Verstraete 2002: 147)

The status of such examples may be debatable (cf. Newmeyer 2003: 692) and one might consider them as a matter of usage rather than being grammatical in the strict sense. Still, the fact that such rhetorical questions are found at all with these adverbial clauses and that they are not used in the central ones, suggests that *although* clauses and *because* can be associated by speakers with the type of illocutionary force typical of unembedded root clauses.

2.2.2.5   *Imperatives (Verstraete 2002: 146)*

Verstraete (2002: 146) signals that some peripheral adverbial clauses may also have imperative force markers. I refer to his work for discussion.

(15) a The students should have enough money, although remember we are
          expecting a drop in the department funding.

      b The fees should bring in more money, because remember we are expecting
          a drop in the department funding.

      c ??The students should have enough money, while remember we are
          expecting a drop in the department funding.

3   RT/MCP and the internal make-up of CP

3.1   'Structural Reduction'

My proposal to account for the difference between central and peripheral adverbial clauses is inspired by Hooper and Thompson's own observation concerning the restricted distribution of root phenomena, which I have reproduced in the preceding section. They point out that root phenomena are generally excluded from structurally 'reduced' clauses. I propose that central adverbial clauses are reduced clauses, they are structurally deficient, while peripheral adverbial clauses can display the full clausal structure available in root clauses. More specifically, I locate this difference in the left periphery of the clause. I proposes that the CP-domain of central adverbial clauses lacks the functional projection that guarantees anchoring to the speaker and which is projected in root clauses (and in clauses embedded under speech act verbs or propositional attitude verbs). The speaker-related projection, I contend, can be available in peripheral adverbial clauses. The proposed structural distinction is semantically motivated. Central adverbial clauses are part of and modify the proposition with which they are associated, peripheral adverbial clauses express independent propositions, associated with illocutionary force, that serve as the immediate discourse background to the associated clause.

3.2   RT/MCP and the internal make-up of CP

3.2.1   'Reduction' and speaker related projections

The structural distinction between the two types of adverbial clauses proposed here is analogous to that postulated elsewhere to differentiate between complement clauses. Citing work by Benincà and Poletto (2001), for instance, Grewendorf (2003: 53) refers to 'the idea that embedded clause vary as to which portions of the CP-layer may be projected, and that this has to do with the selectional properties of the matrix verb… it may be a property of non-bridge verbs that their complement does not

project the whole CP-layer while bridge verbs select a complete CP-layer with all projections of the left periphery available.' (see also, among others, McCloskey 2004, Meinunger 2004, for similar ideas). My proposal is that the dual selectional behaviour of conjunctions is not restricted to those introducing complement clauses but extends to other subordinating conjunctions. For instance, *while* selects a different type of projection depending on its interpretation: temporal *while* selects a reduced variant of CP, contrastive *while* selects the full CP. In order to make this idea more precise I will explore Rizzi's (1997) split CP.

3.2.2   The periphery of the clause: the split CP (Rizzi 1997)

3.2.2.1   *Force vs Sub*

Various authors have proposed that the unitary CP-layer be replaced by a hierarchy of functional projections. (16a) is from Rizzi (1997).

(16) aForce > Topic > Focus > Fin[9]

Following Bhatt and Yoon (1992), Bennis (2000), Rizzi (1997: note 6), Roussou (2000) and others, I propose to decompose the head labelled Force. Subordinating conjunctions are inserted in the position 'Sub'; Sub serves to subordinate the clause, to 'make it available for (categorial) selection independently of its force' (Rizzi 1997). A specific head, which I will label Force, guarantees anchoring to the speaker and is implicated in the licensing of, among other things, illocutionary force and epistemic modality. Roussou (2000) implements the idea that Rizzi's original functional head Force be split into two heads on the basis of data from Modern Greek.

> For present purposes let us take the highest C, realised by *pu* in [17a], to have the properties of a subordinator: it connects the clause to some element of the higher clause (so that the former depends on the latter). [note omitted] Given its connecting properties we will simply refer to this head as C. …
>
> According to [17a] there are three basic C positions each specified for different features. The higher C gives us 'subordination', the middle C clause-typing, and the lower C modality.…Focus/Topic is situated between the two higher [heads] (Roussou 2000: 79)

(17)   a $[_C$ *pu* [Topic/ Focus $[_{COp}$ *oti/na/as* $[_{Neg}$ $[_{CM}$ *θa*/ $t_{na/as}$ $[_I$ cl+V…]]]]]][10]

In terms of my own labelling, Roussou's C-position corresponds to 'Sub' ,COp corresponds to 'Force' and CM corresponds to Fin.

(17)   b $[_{Sub}$ *pu* [Topic/ Focus $[_{Force}$ *oti/ na/as* $[_{Neg}$ $[_{Fin}$ *θa*/ $t_{na/as}$ $[_I$ cl+V…]]]]]]

Both central adverbial clauses and peripheral adverbial clauses contain the position Sub, which hosts the subordinating conjunction,. Only peripheral adverbial clauses

---

9   Mainly on the basis of Romance data, Rizzi (1997) introduces a lower topic position to the right of Focus. This position is probably restricted to Romance (see section 5).

[10]   *Pu*: factive complements, *oti* : non factives. I have simplified Roussou's structures somewhat.

can contain Force. Root clauses obviously also contain the head Force. Central adverbial clauses refer to events / states of affairs, and lack manifestations of illocutionary force. We end up with the following functional hierarchies in the left periphery of finite clauses

(16) b Central adverbial clause: Sub   Fin

     c Peripheral adverbial clause: Sub   ForceTop Focus Fin

     d Root clause: ForceTop Focus Fin

In anchoring the clause to the speaker, Force also anchors it to speech time. The independent encoding of temporal relations in a syntactic domain depends on anchoring to Speech time.[11] Epistemic modality, which I take to be licensed by anchoring to speaker /speech time, similarly is licensed through the presence of the head Force. For a similar proposal relating epistemic modality and illocutionary Force I also refer to recent work by Bayer (2001: 14-15). [12]

3.2.2.2   *Topicalization and Force*

In a discussion of Bavarian emphatic topicalization, Bayer (2001) postulates a link between the presence of illocutionary Force and the availability of topicalization:

> *... this form of topicalization is the grammar's reflex of the speech act to be performed* and is as such on a par with German constructions involving modal particles like *aber, denn, doch, ja* etc. *Modal particles* supply features which interact with other features such as [WH] yielding a wide range of *illocutionary forces*. Bayer 2001: 14-15)

> *. ...if emphatic topicalization belongs to the class of grammatical means of force projection in the sense of Rizzi (1997), its root clause property* and strict left peripherality [in Bavarian] are not surprising. ' (Bayer 2001: 14-15)

Putting things very roughly, (18a) with a fronted topic, would have the reading (18b): the speaker relates the topic to the clause that is predicated of this topic. In other words, topicalization is a kind of 'speech act'.

(18) a   This book, I don't like.

---

[11] Conceivably, the dependency can also be stated the other way, in which case anchoring to speaker depends on Speech time. What is distinctive in peripheral adverbial clauses and what licences MCP would then be the syntactic encoding of Speech Time, with 'force' perhaps relabelled 'S'. Such a position would entail the reworking of the claims made below but is not incompatible with the main argumentation of this paper. For instance, epistemic modality might be argued to depend on S. I hope to look into different alternative formulations in future work. See also Bianchi (2003), who proposes that the C domain encodes a logophoric center. Following Tenny's (2000) classification of adverbial adjuncts one may also see Force as the encoding of Speaker deixis.
Regardless of the exact choice of a label to designate and identify the relevant head it will be able to link up to Speech time, speaker deixis, speaker point of view.
[12] In work on root phenomena in Embedded clauses Meinunger (2004) proposes that embedded clauses displaying Verb Second in German are characterised by the presence of an assertion operator in the CP domain. This proposal is obviously compatible with postulating a Force projection in CP.

b   About this book, the speaker asserts that the speaker does not like it.[13]

I assume that English topicalization depends on the presence of Force and that the language does not have any alternative way of relating a fronted topic to the associated clause. That topicalization is not available in central adverbial clauses in English is then a consequence of the absence of the projection associated with Force.[14] As we will see below, other languages may have alternative mechanisms for licensing fronted arguments in the left periphery.

The differentiation between two types of adverbial clauses in English is to be related to the more general distinction between clauses that express mere 'events/states of affairs' and those that are assertions associated directly with a speaker. In the next sections I review other embedded domains that can also be characterised in terms of a reduced CP-structure (see Hooper and Thompson 1973).

3.3   Factive complements

Melvold (1991) proposes to distinguish factive complements from non-factive complements in that the former are (definite) descriptions of individual events while the latter are assertions, associated with truth value. In terms of the analysis proposed here, non-factive complements encode Force while factive complements lack Force (and TopP and FocP, the projections which are, by hypothesis, licensed by Force.)

(19) a   Non-factive complements: *that* (Top)(Focus)'Force' Mod*Fin

b   Factive complements   *that*   Mod* Fin

Hence factive complements are expected to resist topicalization, while non-factive complements admit it:

(20) a   The inspector explained that <u>each part</u> he had examined very carefully.
(Hooper and Thompson, 1973: 474, their (48))

b   (%)*John regrets that <u>this book</u> Mary read. [15] (Maki *et al* 1999: 3, their (2c))

---

[13] Though this needs to be worked out, I would like to explore the idea that topicalization structures like that in (18a) are the root/abstract counterparts to embedded patterns illustrated in (18c), in which a DP (*Mr Bush)* is related to the complement clause via a speech act verb (*say*) and the preposition *of.*
[i] Britany Clayton, …said of Mr. Bush: 'He makes me nervous'.*(New York Times*, 9.11.2, A16, col 5)
Speculating on this for a moment: if the topic is like an argument of an abstract speech act verb, then the predication is that it will be unique. This prediction is borne out (see section 5.2.3)
[14] Whitman (1989) postulates a link between topicalization and the availability of modal markers. If epistemic modality depends on Force (as suggested above), and if topicalization also depends on Force, this is expected.
The restrictions could also be restated in terms of the alternative proposal briefly introduced in note 10: if topicalization depends on epistemic modality and if the latter is anchored to speech time, we predict topicalization will be excluded from non-root environments.
[15]   On factive verbs and semifactives see Hooper and Thompson 1973: 480 ff. For discussion of variable judgements on topicalization in factive complements I refer to Maki et al (1999).

In my analysis, 'assertion' involves an extra layer of functional structure in the CP (see also Meinunger 2004), while presupposed complements lack that layer of the structure. My analysis contrasts rather sharply with Zubizaretta (2001) who says:

> It is likely that factive predicates, which presuppose the truth of their propositional complement, contain an Ass(ertion) operator in its [sic, lh] CP. This operator is lexicalised by the complementizer, which explains why it must be obligatorily present [cf. *John regrets *(that) Mary is bald*]. Complements of propositional attitude verbs lack an Ass operator, therefore, their complementizer may be absent in some languages [cf. *John thinks (that) Mary is bald*]. (Zubizaretta 2001: 201*).*

Note that my analysis does not exclude that factive complements involve additional structure, but if they do, then it would be in terms of, for instance, being selected by a D-head, rather than there being additional CP-internal structure.

3.4   'Sentential subjects '(Koster 1978, Davies & Dubinsky 1999, 2001, Miller 2001).

The observation that subject clauses resist topicalization (Hooper and Thompson 1973: 476) can be interpreted as a consequence of their reduced structure:

(21) a. *That this book, Mary read thoroughly is true (Authier 1992: 332, his (17b))

    b It is true that this book, he read thoroughly (Authier 1992: 333, his (18b))

This hypothesis would reconcile the claims that sentential subjects do not exist at all (Koster 1978) with those that have argued that they do exist (Davies and Dubinsky 1999, 2001, Miller 2001). To the extent that sentential subjects can occupy the canonical subject position, my proposal is that they have a reduced CP (without Force). Sentential subjects with a full CP (with Force) could then be argued to occupy a peripheral position (Koster 1978, cf. Meinunger 2004). I hope to elaborate this conjecture in later work.

4   CLLD is not a root phenomenon

In the preceding sections, I interpret the non occurrence of topicalization in English in specific clause types in terms of the impoverished structure of their CP-domain. If CLLD were interpretively and structurally identical to English topicalization (cf. Rizzi 1997, Delfitto 2001), we would predict that CLLD should be disallowed in the contexts disallowing topicalization in English, namely in central adverbial clauses, factive complements, sentential subjects and infinitival clauses.[16] This prediction is not borne out at all. I first provide a survey of these contexts.

---

[16]   For a survey of the movement vs base-generation debate and an analysis of CLLD in terms of the Big DP analysis see Cecchetto (2000).

4.1 Central adverbial clauses

In (22-26), CLLD is apparently licensed in central adverbial clauses. It would appear that these clauses also refer to events/states of affairs and cannot be plausibly argued to differ interpretively from their English counterparts. [17]

(22) a.It   Se <u>gli esami finali</u> non <u>li </u>superi, non otterrai il diploma.

      if the final exams not them pass-2sg, non obtain-FUT-2sg the diploma

    'If you don't pass the final exams, you won't get the diploma.'

  b   Se <u>queste cose</u> non <u>le</u> sai,   non supererai l'esame.

    If these things not them know-2sg, not pass-FUT-2sg the exam

    'If these things you don't know, you won't pass the exam'

(23) a.Ca. Si <u>aquest examen</u> no <u>l'</u>aproves amb un cinc, perdràs el curs sencer.

      If this exam non it pass with a five, lose-FUT-2sg the course entire

     'If this exam you don't pass with a 5, you'll miss the whole year.'

  b   Quan <u>aquesta cançó</u> <u>la </u>vaig tornar a sentir al cap dels anys, em vaig emocionar molt.

    when that song it returned to hear after some years, I was very emotional

     'When I heard this song again after some years, I got really emotional'

(24)Sp   Si <u>este examen</u> no <u>lo</u> apruebas con un cinco, perderás el curso entero. [18]

---

[17]   The data are complex, though. Carlo Cecchetto signals that though CLLD is possible in central adverbial clauses, it certainly is not as good as it would be in peripheral adverbial clauses. He gives the following, in which the (a) examples are peipheral adverbial clauses and the (b) examples contain central ones. The example of a temporal central adverbial clause with CLLD in (iiib) is particularly degraded.

    (i)   a   Se il dolce non lo porti, porta almeno il vino
            if the sweet non it bring, bring at least the wine
            If you are not bringing the sweet, then bring at leqst the wine
        b   Se il dolce non lo porti, penseranno che sei maleducato
            If the sweet non it bring, they will think that be-2sg badly educated
            If you don't bring the sweet, they will think that you are not well educated
    (ii)   a   Se la pasta non la sai fare, è inutile che ci provi
            If the pasta non it can do, is useless that it try
            'If you cannot cook pasta, there's no point in trying.'
        b   ? Se la pasta non la sai fare, penseranno che sei un cattivo cuoco
            if the pasta non it can make, they will think that you are a bad cook
            'if you cannot cook pasta, they will think you're a bad cook;'
    (iii)   a   Mentre il pesce lo mangia, rifiuta di mangiare la carne
            while the fish it eats-3SG, refuses-3SG to eat meat
            'While he eats fish, he refuses to eat meat.'
        b   ?? Mentre il pesce lo mangia, beve vino rosso
            While the fish it eat-3SG, drink-3SG wine red
'   While he is eating fish he is drinking red wine'.
[18]   Judgements Catalan and Spanish : Josep Quer (pc). However judgments seem to vary:

If this exam not it finish with a five, lose-FUT-2sg the course entire

'If this exam you don't pass with a 5, you'll miss the whole year.'

(25)Fr   %Si <u>ce livre</u>-<u>là</u> tu <u>le</u> trouve à la Fnac, achète-le. [19]

if this book there you it find at the Fnac, buy it.

'If this book here you it find at the FNAC, buy it'

(26) MGAn <u>afto to vivlio</u> <u>to</u> vris   stin dhimotiki vivliothiki, [20]
if   this the book it find-2s in-the local library
boris na to paraggilis stin kentriki vilviothiki
could-2s prt it order-2s in-the central library

'If you find this book at the local library, then you can order it in the central library.'

4.2   CLLD in factive complements [21]

Factive complements resist topicalization in English (and in Japanese, cf. Maki et al 1999); they allow CLLD in Romance:

(27)   a.It E' strano che <u>questo problema</u> gli studenti non <u>l</u>'abbiano potuto risolvere.[22]

is strange that this question the students non it have been able to resolve

bIt Mi dispiace che <u>questo problema</u> gli studenti non <u>l</u>'abbiano potuto risolvere

me displeases that this problem the students non it have been able to resolve

c Cat Lamento que <u>aquesta pregunta</u> els meus estudiants no <u>l</u>'hagin contestat orrectament

---

'For Spanish, left-dislocated phrases with CLLD cannot appear embedded with subjunctive mood which otherwise seem to facilitate the most clear cases of embedding in Spanish:

[i]   ??/*Ella prefiere que a Luis, el médico lo examine
         She prefers the that Acc Luis acc-cl the doctor examines
         …we may conclude that CLLD is a root phenomenon. (Escobar 1997: 248, italics mine)
Luis Lopez (pc) signals that to him (i) sounds perfect with a postverbal subject:
         (ii)   Ella prefiere que a Luis lo examine el medico (no el enfermero)
                   she prefers that Acc Luis CL examine-SUBJ the doctor (not the nurse)

19 See also Ashby (1988), Barnes (1985), Lambrecht (1981). There is considerable variation among informants
20   Thanks to Anna Roussou for the MG data.
21   . Factive complements are often subjunctive in Romance.
           In English such complements also resist topicalization.
           (i)*It 's important that <u>the book</u> he study carefully (H&T 1973, 485, their (166))
           For French subjunctives: see among others Hirschbuhler 1997.
22   CLLD is slightly more marked there wrt bridge verb complements, comparable to CLLD with infinitives: (Luigi Rizzi, pc).

regret-1sg that this problem the my students not it have answered
correctly

d Cat És estrany que <u>aquesta pregunta</u> els meus estudiants no <u>l'</u>hagin
  contestat correctament
  is strange that this question my students not it have answered correctly

e Fr c'est bizarre que <u>ce texte-là</u> personne ne <u>le </u>connaisse

  it is strange that that text-there no one it knows

f Fr   J'ai beaucoup regretté que <u>ce texte-là</u> ils n' <u>l'</u>aient pas discuté
  I have much regretted that that text there they it not have discussed

g MG[23]Lipithike pu <u>tin diatrivi tu</u> dhen <u>tin</u> ixan paraggili sti vivliothiki
  resented-3s that the thesis his not it had-3p ordered in-the librar

h MG   Ine parakseno pu<u> afto to vivlio</u> <u>dhen</u> to exoun sti vivliothiki.
  is strange that this the book not it have-3p in-the library

4.3   Sentential subjects

In Italian, sentential subjects also do not pose any particular problems for the
licensing of CLLD.

(28)   a.It Che questo problema, i professori non l'abbiano potuto risolvere[24]

  That this problem, the professors not it have been able to solve
  mi sembra improbabile.

   me seems unlikely

b It.Che questo problema, il governo non lo voglia discutere

  that this problem, the government non it wants discuss

  mi sembra probabile.

  me seems unlikely

For Catalan and Spanish, the judgements are less clear: sentential subjects are
marginal and more so with CLLD. But the informant I consulted did not consider
them to be ungrammatical:[25]

(29) a.Sp: ?Que los profesores no hayan podido resolver este problema me parece
  improbable .

that the professors not it have been able to solve this problem me seems unlikely

b Sp: ??Que este problema los profesores no lo hayan podido resolver me
  parece improbable .

---

that this problem the professors not it have been able to solve me seems unlikely

   c. Sp: Que el gobierno no quiera discutir este problema me parece probable

    that the govenment not it wants discuss this problem me seems likely

   d.Sp Que este problema el gobierno no lo quiera discutir me parece probable

    that this problem the govenment not it wants discuss me seems likely

(30) a Cat: Que els professors no hagin pogut resoldre aquest problema em sembla improbable

     that the professors not have been-able to solve this problem me

  seems unlikely

   b.Cat. Que aquest problema els professors no l'hagin pogut resoldre em sembla improbable

    that this problem the proffessors no it have been ablto to solve me seems unlikely

c Cat: Que el govern no vulgui discutir aquest problema em sembla probable.

That the governmnent not wants discuss this problem me seems likely

   d.Cat Que aquest problema el govern no el vulgui discutir em sembla probable.

    That this problem the government not it wants discuss me seems likely

Though this suggests cross linguistic differences which one would like to further explore, I will assume, based on the Italian data above, that CLLD is at least more easily available in sentential subjects in Romance than topicalization would be in English, again showing it is not subject to the same licensing requirements.

4.4 CLLD in infinitival complements

That CLLD has a wider distribution than topicalization and that it occurs in what Hooper and Thomson referred to as 'reduced' structures is also clear when we consider their 'reduced' contexts. Infinitival control complements resist topicalization in English:

(31) a *My friends tend <u>the more liberal candidates</u> to support (H&T 1973: 485, their (160))

   b * I have decided <u>your book</u> to read

On the other hand CLLD is (at least marginally) possible in Romance infinitival control clauses as shown by the following data from the literature.

(32) a Gianni pensa, <u>il tuo libro</u>, [$_{Fin}$ di] conoscer<u>lo</u> bene. (Rizzi, 1997: 309)

    Gianni thinks, the your book, di know-it well

a' *Gianni pensa, [Fin di] <u>il tuo libro,</u> conoscer<u>lo</u> bene. (Rizzi, 1997: 309)

b   Mi sembra, <u>il tuo libro,</u> [Fin di] conoscerlo bene. (Rizzi, 1997: 309)

me seems, the your book, di know-it well

c   Gianni sostiene, <u>il tuo libro,</u> [Fin di] conoscerlo bene.

Gianni maintains, the your book, di know it well (Bianchi 2001: 29, her (69c))

Significantly, though, raising complements disallow CLLD. I return to this presently.

(33)   *?Gianni sembra<u>, il tuo libro,</u> conoscer<u>lo</u> bene.

Gianni seems the your book know –it well

With respect to French, there is speaker variation. Tellier gives the contrast in (34):

(34)   a   Je cherche, <u>ton livre</u>, à l'acheter d'occasion. (Tellier 2001: 356-7)

I seek-for your book à it buy second hand

b   *Je cherche à, <u>ton livre</u>, l'acheter d'occasion.

I seek-for à your book it buy second hand

Rizzi comments: 'Speakers of French are reluctant to accept CLLD with infinitives. Nevertheless, a detectable contrast exists between control and raising (Ch. Laenzlinger p.c.):

(34)   c   ??Je pense, <u>ton livre</u>, pouvoir le comprendre.

I think, your book, to be able it to understand.'

d   *Marie semble, <u>ton livre</u>, pouvoir le comprendre.

Marie seems, your book, to be able it understand (Rizzi 1997:331,n 24)

Spanish is more restrictive than Italian:[26] Observe that there is no overt spell out of Fin here, which might suggest that there is less structure than in Italian or French.

(35)   a   *Juan piensa, tu libro, conocerlo bien

Juan thinks, your book, know –it well

b   * Me parece, tu libro, conocerlo bien

Me seems, your book, know-it well

c * Juan sostiene tu libro conocerlo bien

Juan maintains your book know-it well

---

[26]   Judgement from Enriqueta Perez Vazquez. See also not 17. There may be variation among speakers.

4.5   CLLD in French complex inversion

Further evidence to distinguish CLLD from topicalization is that in spoken French CLLD constituents may intervene between the constituent that triggers inversion and the inverted verb or auxiliary as discussed by Laenzlinger and Musolino (1995):

(36)   a   Où ce livre (Jean) l'a -t-il acheté? (Laenzlinger & Musolino 1995: 83)

where this book John it has -he bought?

b   Où Jean ce livre l'a -t-il acheté? (Laenzlinger & Musolino 1995: 83)

where John this book it has he bought

Once again, fronted arguments cannot intervene between the trigger for inversion and the inverted auxiliary in English (see Haegeman 2000):

(36)   c   Many of these proposals not only do I agree with, but they were included in the text.

d   *Not only do many of these things I agree with.

4.6   Preliminary conclusion

The data discussed above suggest quite clearly that the CLLD constituent in the left periphery is to be found in environments that resist topicalization in English. In particular while topicalization in English can be related to the availability of anchoring to speaker (which I locate in the functional head 'Force'), this is not a property of CLLD, which has a significantly wider distribution.

These findings cast doubt on the assumption that topicalized arguments as well as CLLD constituents invariably target Spec,TopP. Some authors have indeed signalled that CLLD has a wider distribution than English topics. Cinque (1990) for instance says :

> [the] left-dislocated' phrase of CLLD [in Italian,lh] can occur at the front of virtually any subordinate clause type. Here again CLLD contrasts with LD , which typically occurs in root contexts and (to different degrees of marginality) in the complements of only a few classes of propositional attitude verbs (Cinque 1990: 58)

See also Hirschbuhler (1997: 62) for French.

In the next section I will speculate on the difference between the English-type topicalization and CLLD.

5   A lower topic position in the left periphery

5.1   CLLD topic is higher than preverbal subject :

To account for the wider distribution of CLLD, one might propose that the dislocated DPs are IP-adjoined or even IP internal. Zubizaretta (1998), for instance, suggests that CLLD constituents may actually occupy Spec IP:

> The topic in CLLD …may be adjoined to a root clause or an embedded clause. (Zubizaretta 1998: 187)

> Spanish to some extent resembles some of the Germanic languages – specifically, Yiddish and Icelandic (references omitted)…. Languages with a generalised TP may be said to allow a certain amount of feature syncretism. More precisely, in these languages a discourse-based functional feature, such as 'topic', 'focus', or 'emphasis', may combine with the feature T(ense), giving rise to the syncretic categories T/'topic', T/'focus', T/'emphasis'. A topic, focused, or emphatic phrase may therefore be moved to [Spec,T] for feature-checking purposes … This of course is possible only to the extent that the nominative subject can be licensed in these languages in some way other than via specifier-head agreement with T. (Zubizaretta 1998: 100)

In work on German, Frey (2000) proposes that topics may be licensed in a medial position in the IP domain and Meinunger (2000) interprets Germanic scrambling as IP-internal topicalization. One might try to generalise their proposals to CLLD.

However, though there may be fronted arguments with a topic reading in the IP domain, this analysis cannot extend to the left-dislocated DP in CLLD. Observe, for instance, that the CLLD constituent in central adverbial clauses precedes the subject:

(37)   a.It Se <u>queste cose</u> <u>Maria</u> non le sa, non supererà l'esame

  if these things Maria non them knows, non will pass the exam

  b.Cat Si <u>aquest examen</u> <u>el Josep</u> no l'aprova amb un cinc, perdrà el> curs sencer.

• *if this exam Josep doesn't pass with a 5, he'll miss the whole year*

c.Sp Si <u>este examen</u> <u>Juan</u> no lo aprueba con un cinco, perderá el curso entero.

• *if this exam Juan doesn't pass with a 5, you'll miss the whole > year*

Moreover, in Italian control infinitives (cf. (32)), the dislocated DP constituent precedes *di* which Rizzi associated with the lowest head Fin of the CP domain. The dislocated constituent cannot follow *di*:

(38)   *Mi sembra, [Fin di] <u>il tuo libro</u>,   conoscer<u>lo</u> bene. (Rizzi, 1997: 309)

  me seems   di   the your book know –it well

5.2   A lower TopP in the periphery

The discussion above leads to the conclusion that CLLD constituents are IP external and that they do not depend on the presence of Force. One way of interpreting this is to propose that in addition to the higher topic position licensed by Force, there is a lower position for CLLD constituents. Various proposals have been elaborated along these lines. I will discuss three of them here.

5.2.1   Rizzi 2001.

In order to accommodate the distribution of left dislocated constituents and adjuncts in Italian, Rizzi (2001) postulates a recursive topic position below the Focus position, which can be preceded by fronted adverbial adjuncts. I refer to his paper for details.

(39)   Rapidamente, i libri, li hanno rimessi a posto. (Rizzi 2001, his (49)

quickly, the books, they put them to place

This leads him to propose the more articulated periphery in (40).

(40)   Force Top* Int Top* Focus Mod* Top* Fin   IP (Rizzi 2001)(on recursion of Top cf. below)[27]

Observe that lower topic is located immediately above Fin and it is lower than Mod, the position for locally fronted adjuncts. I assume that Mod is available in central adverbial clauses, since these allow adjunct fronting (Haegeman 2003a). The reduced structures thus allow for the projection of the position Mod. Hence, we expect the lower topic position to be available in reduced structures. In particular, we predict that CLLD is licit in control structures, which are arguably 'reduced CP's with Fin still available, but that they will not be available in Raising structures which are arguable CP-less structures, lacking Fin altogether. The prediction is borne out as shown by Italian (33) and French (35b).

While CLLD is licit in central adverbial clauses, focalization is not possible. This suggests that the reduced CP-structure is indeed truncated above Mod.

(41) a. *Se GLI ESAMI FINALI non superi, non otterrai il diploma.[28]

If THE EXAMS FINAL not pass, not you-will obtain the degree

b. *Se QUESTE COSE non sai, non supererai l'esame.

if THESE THINGS not you-know, you will not pass the exam.

As expected, focalization also leads to a degradation in sentential subjects, where CLLD is possible (cf (28)).[29]

---

[27]   For the projection Int see discussion in his paper.
[28]   The judgements are no different if the adverbial clauses occur sentence finally:
(i)   a. *Non otterrai il diploma, se GLI ESAMI FINALI non superi.
                    b. *Non supererai l'esame, se QUESTE COSE non sai.
             Thanks to Nicola Munaro for judgements on these examples.
[29]   As expected, the degradation is far less when the clause is extraposed. (cf (21) in the text).

(42) a. ?(?)Che QUESTO PROBLEMA i professori non abbiano potuto risolvere mi sembra improbabile.

that THIS PROBLEM the professors should not have been able to solve seems unlikely.

b. ?(?)Che QUESTO PROBLEMA il governo non voglia discutere mi sembra probabile.

that THIS PROBLEM the government should not want to discuss seems unlikely.

Similarly, focalization leads to strong degradation in control complements:[30]

(43) a. ?(?)Gianni pensa IL TUO LIBRO di conoscere bene, non il suo.

Gianni thinks YOUR BOOK to know well, not his

b. *Mi sembra IL TUO LIBRO di conoscere bene, non il suo.

seems to me YOUR BOOK to know well, not his

If we postulate a lower position for licensing CLLD constituents in Romance, dominating FinP, and if we also assume that this position is not available in English, we can relate the difference in distribution in the different clause types to the structural proposals elaborated above concerning the CP structure. English topicalization is a type of speech act and depends on the availability of the head Force; similarly Focus in the CP domain is anchored to Force. In Romance CLLD can be licensed by an alternative mechanism. This suggestion entails that there should be some further interpretive differences between the two types of topics. I return to this point presently.

One prediction of Rizzi's hierarchy in (40) is that the 'lower topic' or the fronted adverbial adjunct should be able to follow a focalized constituent or an interrogative *wh*-constituent (assumed to occupy SpecFocP). This prediction is not borne out. Concerning this problem Rizzi (2001:16) says the following:

Preposed adverbials can't naturally occur in a position lower than the *Wh* element either, a property plausibly related to the obligatory adjacency between the *Wh* element and the inflected verb, whatever its ultimate theoretical status …:

[44] * Che cosa, rapidamente, hanno fatto?

'What, rapidly, did they do?'

A particularly clear indication of the peculiar distributional properties of preposed adverbs emerges with *Wh* elements not requiring inversion, such as *perché* in Italian …): the preposed adverb can follow but cannot precede *perché,* while a topic can occur in both positions:

[45] a   Perché, improvvisamente, Gianni è tornato a casa?

(i)   a. ? Mi sembra improbabile che QUESTO PROBLEMA i professori non abbiano potuto risolvere.
          b. ? Mi sembra probabile che QUESTO PROBLEMA il governo non voglia discutere
[30]   Thanks to Nicola Munaro for judgements. The apparently neat distinction between the two types of clauses remains unaccounted for.

'Why, suddenly, Gianni went home?

b * Improvvisamente, perché Gianni è tornato a casa?

'Suddenly, why Gianni went home?

[46] a   Perché, il mio libro, Gianni lo ha portato via?

'Why, my book, Gianni took it away?'

b Il mio libro, perché Gianni lo ha portato via?

'My book, why Gianni took it away?'

5.2.2   Benincà and Poletto (2001)

An alternative proposal postulating a lower topic position is that elaborated by Benincà (2000) and Benincà and Poletto (2001), who propose that the left periphery be decomposed as in (47):[31]

(47) a ForceP… Hanging topic… Left Dislocated Topic…Focus FinP

This hierarchy allows for a distinction between a higher topic position and a lower one. There is only one Hanging Topic per clause, while there may be multiple Left Dislocated elements. Multiple dislocated constituents are indeed possible in Romance (48) (see Delfitto 2001) :

(48) aIl libro, a Gianni, glielo daro senz'altro. (Rizzi 1997: 290, his (21))

the book, to Gianni him-it give-FUT-1sg without doubt

Observe that multiple fronted arguments are also possible in central adverbial clauses:[32]

 (48) b Se a Gianni questo libro non glielo mostro, sarà molto deluso

if to Gianni this book non him-it show, be fut –3sg very disappointed

c Se a Maria di questo problema non gliene parleremo, non potrà aiutarci

if to Maria of this problem non her-of it speak-fut-1pl, non be able-fut-3sg to help us

---

[31]   I have adjusted their hierarchy to enable easier comparison with Rizzi's hierarchy.

[32]   Thanks to Nicola Munaro for the data. Observe that multiple topicalisation is also possible in temporal adverbials:

(i)   a   Quando a Gianni questo libro gliel'ho mostrato, ne è rimasto molto deluso

when to Gianni this book him it have shown, of it he has remained very disappointed

b   Quando a Maria di questo problema gliene ho parlato, mi ha capita perfettamente.

When to Maria of this problem to her –of it have –1sg talked, me has-3sg understood perfectly

Larson and Sawada (2004) point out that in some temporal adverbial clauses only one CLLD constituent is possible. This suggests that some temporal adverbial clauses impose some additional restriction. See also McCloskey (2004).

As there tends to be only one topic per clause in English (see Rizzi 1997), we could equate Benincà and Poletto's HT position with the high TopP . Their LD topic position could then arguably be taken to correspond to the lower position associated with dislocated constituents in CLLD.

This analysis correctly predicts that LD topics will not occur to the right of focalized constituents. However, if we adopt a truncation analysis to account for the properties of central adverbial clauses, sentential subjects, and infinitival clauses, then in order to allow for LD topics to occur in such 'reduced structures' would have to be truncated just under the hanging topic:

(47) b   reduced structure

Left Dislocated Topic…Focus FinP

c   full structure

ForceP… Hanging topic…Left Dislocated Topic…Focus FinP

This does not seem to give the correct predictions since we have seen that focalized constituents lead to ungrammaticality in reduced structures.

5.2.3   Frascarelli and Hinterholzl (2003)

In work on the interpretive and prosodic properties of topics, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2003) distinguish three types of topics, two of which are immediately relevant to our concerns.

•The ABOUTNESS TOPIC occupies the highest Topic position in the left periphery. Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl say: "it is cognitively speaking important for such Topics to occur at the beginning of the sentence." cf. Lambrecht 1994:194). ABOUTNESS Topics are located in a *higher position with respect to WH/Focus* constituents.

The FAMILIARITY TOPIC occupies the lowest TopP projection. FAMILIAR Topics are located lower than WH/Focus constituents and they can be realized in either peripheries.[33]

The structure these authors propose for the left periphery is the following:

(49)   a   [AboutP [ContrP [FocP   [FamP   [IP

In terms of the analysis elaborated here, the ABOUTNESS topic would be that associated with an 'illocutionary act' licensed by Speech act/ Force in terms of Bayer's (2001) analysis. The FAMILIARITY topic is not dependent on Force and is licensed in a lower position.

ABOUTNESS topics are unique:

---

[33]   CONTRASTIVE topics, are located between ABOUTNESS and FAMILIARITY.
        Lopez (2003) points out that Catalan CLLD arguments are contrastively stressed. Italian or Spanish CLLD arguments do not have to be contrastively stressed, on the other hand.

A sentence can only contain *one* ABOUTNESS Topic, while multiple FAMILIAR Topics are allowed (different elements can be part of background information). (Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2003, handout p 6, their (7))

The hierarchy postulated here is similar to that proposed by Rizzi (2001): the lower FAMILIARITY topic follows the focalized constituent. Again, assuming truncation above FamP we would predict that the reduced clause types will allow familiarity topics though not focalized constituents nor ABOUTNESS topics. The fact that multiple topics are possible (48c,d) is also expected:

(49) b   Reduced structures   Sub   [FamP [IP

     c   Full embedded structures Sub   [AboutP [ContrP [FocP [FamP [IP

Again, multiple (familiarty) topics are expected to be possible in the reduced structures. Again the non-occurrence of a FAMILIARITY topic with a higher focalized constituent remains to be accounted for. Perhaps one can invoke the adjacency constraint referred to by Rizzi (5.2.1)

5.3   The role of Fin

5.3.1   Fin and CLLD

The three proposals discussed above all serve to distinguish at least two topic positions, one of which is low enough so as to survive in truncated clauses. This would be the position that can be targeted by CLLD topics in Romance. The implication of the analysis is that this lower position is not available for topics in English.

The analysis raises the immediate question why the lower topic position is not available to English (and similar languages).[34] I would speculate that the low topic position is licensed by virtue of the clitic involved in CLLD. Specifically, the clitic, which matches the IP external DP in *phi* features, is IP-internal and is incorporated to a functional head of the I domain. Fin selects IP, and there is a matching of features between the two heads (in terms of agreement, finiteness, maybe mood). Let us assume that Fin licenses the lower topic (cf. Lopez 2003, Grewendorf 2003 for a slightly different view on the role of Fin in topic licensing) provided I is complex and has the relevant *phi* features associated with it[35]. Inspired by Delfitto (2001), I propose that the relation between the CLLD constituent in the left periphery and the clitic in the IP domain is one of agreement and that it does not require feature checking. Delfitto (2001) proposes that the fact that no feature checking is involved is at the basis of the absence of intervention effects, hence multiple topics are

---

[34]   Note that the topic position postulated for small clauses (Basilico 2003) would have to be interpreted differently. Perhaps in terms of the 'subject of predication' of Cardinaletti (1997, 2000) and of Haegeman (2002b).

[35]   Thanks to Kleanthes Grohmann for this suggestion.

possible in the case of CLLD (cf. (48)). In addition to Fin, Familiarity CLLD topics may also be licensed by alternative mechanisms and thus can also show up IP internally (Meinunger 2000, Frey 2000, Belletti 2001)

5.3.2   Speculations on Fin

The analysis proposed here gives a more prominent role to Fin in the left periphery. Additional interpretive aspects of Fin that could be explored could be that it encodes Reference time (Reichenbach (1947), Hornstein (1990)). In contrast, Speech time could be related to 'Force'. Proposals that are similar to this are that Fin encodes the 'Perspective point' (Bianch, Bertinetto and Squartini (1995), Bianchi and Bertinetto (1996)). For a similar proposal see also Boeckx (1998, 2001:50), who links FinP and point of view. Adapting proposals by Bianchi (2003) one might also relate the CP domain strongly to the logophoric centre of the clause and propose that while Fin encodes the 'Internal logophoric centre' (Bianchi 2003), Force encodes the External logophoric centre in 'Force' (pace Bianchi 2003).

6   A problem: Pied piping and adverbial clauses (Munaro 2004)

There is one remaining problem for the account of CLLD elaborated here. As it stands the occurrence of CLLD is dependent on Fin and should not give rise to any of the illocutionary effects which I associate with the presence of Force. However, this does not seem quite correct. In a discussion of CLLD in conditional clauses in Italian, Munaro (2004) says:

> The topicalization internal to the conditional antecedent is subject to restrictions; a constituent can be felicitously topicalized inside a conditional <u>only when the *if*-clause precedes the main clause, that is, when it is itself a topic.</u> (Munaro 2004)

The generalisation also applies to the other Romance languages examined here. The relevant data are given in (50):

(50) a It   *Non supererai l'esame se <u>queste cose</u> non le sai (Munaro 2004)
            not pass-2sg-FUT the exam if these things not them know
      b Ca   *Perdràs el curs sencer, si <u>aquest examen</u> no l'aproves amb un cinc
            lose-2sg-FUT the course entire if this exam not it pass-2sg with a 5
      c Sp   *Perderás el curso entero, si <u>este examen</u> no lo apruebas con un cinco
            lose-2sg-FUT the complete course if this exam not it pass-2sg with a 5
      d Fr   *Achète-le si <u>ce livre</u>-là tu le trouves à la Fnac. (French **%**)
            buy it if this book there you it find at the Fnac

One way of reconciling this observation with the account above is to propose (following Munaro 2004) the following:

1. Romance CLLD 'familiar' topic may target a lower landing site in the CP domain.

2. However, familiarity topics still require anchoring to the discourse. The position the topic attains in the central adverbial clause is inadequate to license the topic in central adverbial clause because central adverbial clause lack the projections to ensure anchoring to the discourse.

3. 'Pied piping' of adverbial clause to the topic projection of matrix CP makes up for internal deficiency of central adverbial CP and guarantees licensing of (lower) topic.

A similar pied piping analysis has been proposed to account for emphatic topicalization in central adverbial clauses in Bavarian (Bayer 2001) and for the licensing of verb second patterns in complement clauses in German (Meinunger 2004). I hope to return to this issue in future work.

7   Summary

In this paper I examine some of the differences between English topicalization and Romance (and modern Greek) CLLD. English topicalization is essentially a root phenomenon: it is excluded from central adverbial clauses, factive complements, subject clauses and infinitival complements. CLLD is not subject to this restriction. I propose that in English topicalization is to be related to assertive illocutionary force as represented by the functional head Force in the left periphery. Whenever the left periphery is reduced, Force is not projected and topicalization is illicit. CLLD does not depend on Force but is licensed through Fin-I agreement. In contexts in which Force is not projected but in which Fin is projected, CLLD remains licit. The fact that focalization, unlike CLLD, is not available in the reduced structures suggests that this too depends on Force. The data suggest that the position occupied by CLLD complements is lower than FocP.

References

Aboh, E. 2004. *The Morphosyntax of Complement-Head Sequences. Clause Structure and Word Order Patterns in Kwa*. OUP, New York.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1997. "Clitic Left Dislocation and Contrastive Left Dislocation." In Elena. Anagnostopoulou, Henk. van Riemsdijk & Frans Zwarts, eds., *Materials on Left Dislocation,* John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 151-192.

Andersson, Lars-Gunnar. 1975. *Form and Function of Subordinate Clauses.* Gothenburg Monographs on Linguistics, 1, University of Göteborg, Department of Linguistics.

Authier, J.-M. 1992. "Iterated CPs and Embedded Topicalisation." *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 329-336.

Basilico, David. 2003. "On the Topic of Small Clauses." *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 1-36.

Bayer, Josef. 2001. "Asymmetry in Emphatic Topicalization." In Caroline Féry and Wolfgang Sternefeld, eds., *Audiatur Vox Sapientiae, Studia Grammatica* 52: 15-47.

Belletti, Adriana. 2001. Aspects of the Low IP Area." Ms. University of Siena

Benincà, Paola. 2001. "The Position of Topic and Focus in the Left Periphery." In Guglielmo Cinque & Giorgio Salvi, eds., *Current Studies in Italian Linguistics Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 39-64.

Benincà, Paola, /Poletto, Cecilia. 2001. "Topic, Focus and V2: Defining the CP Sublayers." Ms. University of Padova. Talk presented at the *Siena Workshop on Cartography.*

Bennis, Hans. 2000. "On the Interpretation of Functional Categories." In Hans Bennis, Maarten Everaert, & Eric Reuland eds., *Interface Strategies*, KNAW publications.

Bhatt R, and J. Yoon. 1992. "On the Composition of Comp and Parameters of V-2." In D. Bates, ed. *Proceedings of WCCFL*, Stanford CSLI, 10: 41-53.

Bianchi, Valentina. 2001. *On Person Agreement.* Ms. University of Pisa. .

Bianchi, Valentina, PierMarco Bertinetto and Maria Squartini. 1995. *Perspective Point and Textual Dynamics.* In Pier Marco Bertineto, Valentina Bianchi, Mario. Squartini and James Higginbotham, eds. *Temporal Reference: Aspect and Actionality,* Vol 1. *Semantic and Syntactic perspective.* Turin/ Rosenberg and Tellier, pp. 309-324.

Bianchi, Valentina. and PierMarco. Bertinetto. 1996. "Temporal Adverbs and the Notion of Perspective Point." In Violetta Koseska-Toszewa and Danut Rytel-Kuc, eds., *Semantyka a Konfrontacja Jezykowa.* Warszawa Polska Akademia, Nauk, pp. 11-21.

Boeckx, Cedric. 1998. Raising in Romance. Ms, University of Connecticut. Available at : http://mitpress.mit.edu/celebration

Boeckx, Cedric (2001) 'On the co-occurrence of expletives and definite subjects in Germanic;' In Abraham, Werner and Jan-Wouter Zwart (eds.), *Issues in Formal German(ic) Typology.* Amsterdam and New York: John Benjamins. pp. 45-64.

Bowers, John. 1993. "The Syntax of Predication." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591-65.

Cardinaletti, Anna. 1997. "Subjects and Clause Structure" in Haegeman, Liliane, ed., *The New Comparative Syntax.* Longman, London, pp. 33-63.

Cardinaletti, Anna. 2000. "Towards a Cartography of Subject Positions." Ms, University of Venice, SSLMIT University of Bologna.

Cecchetto, Carlo 2000. "Doubling Structures and Reconstruction" *Probus* 12, 1-34.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-dependencies.* Cambridge, MIT Press

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads.* Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.

Davison, Alice. 1979. "Some Mysteries of Subordination.", *Studies in the .L.inguistic Sciences*, 9, 105-128.

Declerck, Renaat & Susan Reed. 2001. *Conditionals: a Comprehensive Empirical Analysis.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Doherty, Monica. 1985. *Epistemische Bedeuting.* Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.

Emonds, Joseph. 1970. "Root and Structure-preserving Transformations." Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Emonds, Joseph. 2004. "Unspecified Categories as the Key to Root constructions" In David Adger, Cécile de Cat and George Tsoulas, eds., *Peripheries.* Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 75-120.

Escobar, L. 1997. "Clitic Left Dislocation and other Relatives." In Elena Anagnostopolou, Henk van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwarts, eds., *Materials on Left Dislocation,* John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 233-274.

Frascarelli, Maria. 2000. *The Syntax Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian.* Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Frascarelli, Maria & Roland Hinterhölzl. 2003. "Types of Topics in German and Italian." Workshop on Information Structure and the Architecture of Grammar: A Typological Perspective, February 1-2, 2004.

Frey, Werner. 2000. "A Medial Topic Position for German." *Linguistische Berichte.*

Green, Georgia. 1976. "Main Clause phenomena in Subordinate Clauses.", *Language*, 52, 382-97.

Grewendorf, Günther. 2002. "Left Dislocation as Movement." In Simon Mauck and Jenny Mittelstaedt, eds., *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics.* Volume 2, Fall 2002, pp. 31-81.

Grohmann, Kleanthes. 2003. *Prolific Domains.* John Benjamins., Amsterdam.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1991. "Parenthetical Adverbials: the Radical Orphanage Approach." In Shuji Chiba, Akira Ogawa, Yasuaki Fuiwara, Norio Yamada, Osamu Koma & TakaoYagi, eds.., *Aspects of Modern English Linguistics: Papers Presented to Masatomo Ukaji on His 60th Birthday.* Kaitakusha, Tokyo, pp. 232-53.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2000. "Inversion, Non-adjacent inversion and Adjuncts in CP." In Paul Rowlett, ed., *Transactions of the Philological Society, Special Number: Papers from the Salford Negation Conference*. Vol 98, 1, 121-160

Haegeman, Liliane. 2002a. "Anchoring to Speaker, Adverbial Clauses and the Structure of CP." In Simon Mauck and Jenny Mittelstaedt, eds., *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics*. Volume 2, Fall 2002, pp. 117-180.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2002b. "Sentence-Medial NP-adjuncts in English." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 25: 79-108.

Haegeman, Liliane 2003a."Notes on Long Adverbial Fronting in English and the Left Periphery." *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 640-649.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003b. "Speculations on Adverbial Fronting and the Left Periphery." In Jacqueline Guéron and Liliane Tasmowski, eds., *Temps et Point de Vue/ Tense and Point of View*. Publidix: Parix X; pp. 329-365

Heycock, Caroline. 2002. "Embedded Root Phenomena." Ms. University of Edinburgh.

Hirschbuhler, Paul. 1997. "On the Source of Lefthand NPs in French." In Elena Anagnostopoulou, Henk van Riemsdijk & Frans Zwarts eds., *Materials on Left Dislocation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 55-66.

Hooper, John, and Sandra. Thompson. 1973. "On the Applicability of Root Transformations." *Linguistic Inquiry 4*: 465-97.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1990. *As Time Goes By*. MIT Press: Cambridge.

Iatridou, Sabine and Tony Kroch 1992. "The Licensing of CP Recursion and its Relevance to the Germanic Verb-Second Phenomenon." *Working papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 50: 1-24.

Kuno, Susumo. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Larson, Richard. K. and Miyuki. Sawada. 2004. *Presupposition & Root Transforms in Adjunct Clauses*. NELS 34

Lopez, Luis. 2002. "Toward a Grammar without TopP and FocP. In Simon Mauck and Jenny Mittelstaedt , eds., *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics*, Volume 2, Fall 2002, 181-209.

Lopez, Luis. 2003. "Steps for a Well-adjusted Dislocation." *Studia Linguistica* 57: 193-232.

Lu, Peng. 2003. *La Subordination Adverbiale en Chinois Contemporain*. Ph.D. thesis: Paris 7.

Maki, Hideki, Lizanne Kaiser, and Masao Ochi. 1999. "Embedded Topicalization in English and Japanese." *Lingua* 109: 1-14.

McCloskey, Jim. 2004. "Questions in a Local English." Paper presented at Georgetown University Round Table.

Melvold, J. 1991. "Factivity and Definiteness." *More Papers on wh-movement*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Meinunger, Andre. 2000. *Syntactic Aspects of Topic and Comment*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Meinunger, Andre. 2004. "Verb Second in German(ic) and Mood Selection in Romance." Paper presented at the Workshop on Clause Typing and the left periphery. Georgetown University Round Table.

Munaro, Nicola. 2004. ."Computational puzzles of conditional clause preposing" in Delmonte, R. & Di Sciullo, A.M, eds., *UG and External Systems*, John Benjamins - Amsterdam/Philadelphia

Newmeyer, Frederick. 2003. "Grammar is Grammar and Usage is Usage." *Language* 79: 682-707.

Nilsen, ∅ysten. 2004. 'Domains for adverbs', in Artemis Alexiadou, ed., *Adverbs across frameworks*, *Lingua* 114, 809-847.

Paul, Ileane 2002. "The Syntactic Encoding of Topic and Focus." In Simon Mauck and Jenny Mittelstaedt , eds., *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistic*s. Volume 2, Fall 2002, pp. 247-261.

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2004. "Topic and Focus as Linear Notions: Evidence from Italian and Russian." *Lingua*, Special issue: Focus and the Interaction between Syntax and Pragmatics. Guest edited by Dirk Bury, Karen Froud, Richard Horsey and Kriszta Szendroï, 114: 325-344.

Platzack, Christer. (2004) "Cross-linguistic Word Order Variation at the Left Periphery: the Case of Object First Main Clauses." In David Adger, Cécile de Cat and George Tsoulas. *Peripheries*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 191-210.

Quirk, Randolph, Joseph Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman, London.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. Free Press, New York.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery." In Liliane Haegeman, ed, *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281-337.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. "Locality and Left Periphery." Ms. University of Siena.

Roussou, Anna. 1994. *The Syntax of Complementisers*. UCL Diss.

Roussou, Anna. 2000. "On the Left Periphery. Modal Particles and Complementisers." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1: 65-94.

Rutherford, William. 1970. "Some Observations Concerning Subordinate Clauses in English." *Language* 46: 97-115.

Shaer, Benjamin. 1996. *Making Sense of Tense: Tense, Time reference, and Linking Theory*. Ph.D. diss. McGill University, Montreal.

Shaer, Benjamin and Werner Frey. 2003. Toward an Account of English and German Left-Peripheral Elements. Talk presented at the LAGB Oxford, Somerville College.

Speas, Margaret 2004. "Evidentiality, Logophoricity and the Syntactic Representation of Pragmatic Features." *Lingua* 114: 255-277.

Tellier, Christine. 2001. "On some distinctive properties of parasitic gaps in French." In Peter Culicover & Paul Postal, eds, *Parasitic Gaps*. Cambridge, Mass: the MIT Press, pp. 341-367.

Tenny, Carol. 2000. "Core events and adverbial modification', In *Events as Grammatical Objects,* C. Tenny et James Pustejovsky, éds. CSLI Publications, 285-334.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 1998. "A Semiotic Model for the Description of Levels in Conjunction/ External, Internal –Modal, and Internal-Speech Functional." *Functions of Language* 5: 179-211.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2003. *Interpersonal Grammar and Clause Combining in English*. Ph.D. diss, University of Leuven.

Whitman, John. 1989. "Topic, Modality, and IP Structure." In Susumo Kuno *et al* (eds*.).Proceedings of the Third Harvard Workshop on Korean Linguistics*. Seoul: Hanshin

Zubizaretta, Maria Luisa 2001. "Preverbal Subjects in Romance Interrogatives." In Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock, eds., *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*. Oxford University Press., New York, pp. 183-204.

Liliane Haegeman
07/04/04