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I. Background: the problem at hand

A. The cartographic approach to the left periphery

1. the evolution of proposals on the fine structure of the left periphery

Rizzi (1997)
(1) \[\text{ForceP} \ [\text{TopP} \ [\text{FocP} \ [\text{TopP} \ [\text{FinP} \ TP]]]]] \] (where TopP can iterate)

Wh-phrases assumed to move to/through Spec, FocP (incompatibility of wh and Focus)
relative operators in Spec,ForceP (before Top and/or Foc)

Benincà (2001)
(2) \[\text{DiscP} \ \text{Hanging Topic} \ [\text{Disc} (\text{che}) \ [\text{ForceP} (\text{excl wh-}) \ [\text{Force} (\text{che}) \ [\text{TopP} \ (\text{CLLD}) \ Top \ [\text{Top} (\text{che}) \ [\text{FocP} \ [\text{Foc} (\text{wh-/Foc} (\text{Foc} (\text{Foc (\text{FinP} \ (\text{che}) \ TP)]})])])])]]]

hanging topic: doubled by strong pronoun

context: What are we doing with our products?
La frutta la regaliamo, la verdera la vendiamo.
‘The fruit we give away, the vegetables we sell’

Rizzi (2006)
(4) \[\text{ForceP} \ [\text{TopP} \ [\text{FocP} \ [\text{FinP} \ TP]]]]

The operation of the criterial heads in a minimalist-style derivation: The criterial head bears an uninterpretable feature which is valued and deleted by the corresponding interpretable feature, and an edge feature which triggers Move of the constituent bearing that interpretable feature
2. criticisms of the cartographic approach

Emonds (2004): proposing a certain order of criterial heads in terms of the label of the head amounts to an ad-hoc distributional statement

Reinhart (2006): features like [topic] or [focus] are not features on a lexical item LI which enters into the numeration, but rather properties of an entire constituent, as this relates to the informational content of the entire sentence—this is information that cannot be present in the numeration

López (forthcoming): notions such as topic or focus, however these are defined, make no predictions about the syntactic behavior of constituents labelled as such [and hence, features such as [topic] or [focus], are equally useless, in terms of the syntactic derivation, P.K.]

(cf. Casielles-Suárez 1999, 2004 on terminological confusion and overlap with respect to TOPIC and FOCUS)

B. alternatives to the cartographic approach

1. proposals of minimal structure in the left periphery

Emonds (2004): a-categorial movement to Discourse Shells, where these are created by displacement to the edge of a Discourse Projection

Discourse Projections: matrix clauses and a subset of subordinate clauses which allow “root” transformations, which may vary by language [the Discourse Projection Parameter]

the head of a Discourse Shell: a null head realized as “comma intonation” in the prosody

(5) That guy, after the play, according to Sue, he wept

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{ZP that guy } & \text{YP after the play } & \text{XP according to Sue } & \text{TP he wept }\\
[z \emptyset] & [y \emptyset] & [x \emptyset] & [\emptyset]
\end{array}
\]

\begin{tabular}{c|c|c|c}
Discourse Shell & Discourse Shell & Discourse Shell & Discourse Projection
\end{tabular}

(Emonds 2004)

López (forthcoming): displacement to (multiple) Specs of FinP

(6) Su manuscrito a NADIE se lo devolvió María. (example from Zubizarreta 1998)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{FinP su manuscrito } & \text{Fin a NADIE } & \text{TP se lo devolvió María }\\
[Fin' su manuscrito ] & [Fin' a NADIE ] & [TP se lo devolvió María ]
\end{array}
\]

CLLD: first movement to (outer) Spec,vP, triggered by an unvalued feature which is spelled out as the CL, then movement to Spec,FinP

(7) el coche [TP lo compré] [vP <el coche>] [v' [pro] [v' <lo compré>] [vP <el coche> <compré> ]]]]]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{FinP el coche } & \text{TP lo compré } & \text{vP <el coche>} & \text{v' [pro] [v' <lo compré>] [vP <el coche> <compré> ]]]]
\end{array}
\]
the informational properties of CLLD and focus-fronted (FF) constituents:

FF: $a$ (discourse anaphoric), $c$ (contrastive)

CLLD: $+a$, $+c$

at the vP phase, the pragmatics component assigns $+a$ to constituents at the edge
at the FinP phase, the pragmatics component assigns $+c$ to constituents at the edge

2. Problems for minimal approaches

A. when both topic (in the form of CLLD), and FF, CLLD $>$ FF, $^*$FF $>$ CLLD
(exception: “echo contexts”, López forthcoming, see below)

(8) a. Su manuscrito a NADIE se lo devolvió.
b. $^*$A NADIE su manuscrito se lo devolvió

B. Cross linguistic differences
in Romance, in general, multiply-fronted constituents possible
in English, multiple-fronted constituents possible only with marked comma intonation
and resumptive pronouns (Emonds 2004)

(9) a. $^*[\text{What a stupid campaign}], [\text{that whole weekend}], \text{Mary spent } \underline{\_} \underline{\_} \text{ on } \underline{\_} \underline{\_}$
b. $^*[\text{Bill}], [\text{that house}], \text{she took } \underline{\_} \underline{\_} \text{ to } \underline{\_} \underline{\_} \text{ for the weekend}$
c. $^*[\text{His manuscript}], [\text{to NOBODY}], \text{did the editor return } \underline{\_} \underline{\_} \underline{\_} \underline{\_}$

C. Intralinguistic distinctions, topic vs. focus
Spanish: in (some) indicative subordinate clauses, both CLLD and FF possible
in subjunctive clauses, CLLD possible, but not FF

(10) a. Ha dicho que a NADIE devolvieron su manuscrito.
‘S/he has said that to NO ONE they returned their manuscript’
b. Ha dicho que su manuscrito se lo devolvieron ayer.
‘S/he said that his manuscript they returned it to him yesterday’
c. Ha dicho que su manuscrito a NADIE se lo devolvieron.
‘S/he said that his manuscript to NO ONE they returned it’

(11) a. $^*\text{El editor quiere que a NADIE devuelvan su manuscrito.}$
‘The editor wants that to NO ONE they return (SUBJ) his manuscript’
b. El editor quiere que su manuscrito se lo devuelvan ahora mismo.
‘The editor wants that his manuscript they return (SUBJ) it to him right now’
c. $^*\text{El editor quiere que su manuscrito a NADIE se lo devuelvan.}$
‘The editor wants that his manuscript to NO ONE they return (SUBJ) it’
II. Proposal

1. general outlines
   A. Two crucial heads in the left periphery: Force and Fin
      Force: Hosts a world operator \( \omega \) which represents the model of evaluation of
      the propositional content of the clause (Kempchinsky 2006)
      Fin: Links to the center of deixis (main clauses) or to the model of evaluation
      specified by Force (cf. Bianchi 2001)
   B. Fronting operations in Romance
      (i) Focus fronting (FF): movement to Spec,FinP
      (ii) CLLD topicalization: movement to an a-categorial projection, after movement
           to Spec,vP (López)
           pause prosody not needed because of resumptive clitic
      (iii) hanging topics: movement to an outer Discourse Shell, whose head is realized with
            pause prosody (Emonds 2004)

2. fronting operations: matrix clauses
   A. Focus fronting: movement to Spec,Fin
      discourse effect of focus fronting: to “correct” previous information in the discourse
      (12) Person A: Elena publicó su primer libro en España.
                    ‘Elena published her first book in Spain’
      Person B:   (No), el SEGUNDO LIBRO publicó en España (no el primero)
                    ‘(No), the SECOND BOOK (she) published in Spain (not the first one)’
      focus fronting reflects the point of view of the speaker (Uriagereka 1995), even in the
      presence of a matrix subject:
      (13) Person A: Juan dice que Elena publicó su primer libro en España.
                    ‘Juan says that Elena published her first book in Spain’
      Person B:  No, dice que el SEGUNDO LIBRO publicó en España (no el primero)
                    ‘No, (he) says that the SECOND BOOK (she) published in Spain (not the first
                    one)’
      Fin links to discourse context; material in Spec,Fin is readily accessible to that context:
      (14) \([\text{ForceP} \ [\text{FinP} \ \text{el SEGUNDO LIBRO} \ [\text{Fin} \ \text{TP} \ [\text{pro} \ \text{publicó <el segundo libro> en España}]\]]\]
      B. Topicalization (CLLD): movement to an a-categorial shell above FinP (adaptation of
         Emonds 2004)
      discourse properties of a CLLD constituent: discourse anaphoric and contrastive (López,
         forthcoming)
(15) El coche de Juan típicamente lo usamos sólo para los viajes cortos.  
‘Juan’s car we typically use only for short trips’

(16) \[[\text{ForceP} \quad \alpha \text{P el coche de Juan} \quad \text{FinP} \text{ Fin \quad \text{TP típicamente lo usamos <el coche> ... }}]]\]

multiple topicalization: multiple a-categorial shells

(17) a. A nuestra hija el coche de Juan se lo dejamos los fines de semana.  
‘To our daughter Juan’s care we leave for weekends’

b. El coche de Juan a nuestra hija se lo dejamos los fines de semana.

c. Los fines de semana, el coche de Juan a nuestra hija se lo dejamos.

d. Los fines de semana, a nuestra hija el coche de Juan se lo dejamos.

e. A nuestra hija los fines de semana el coche de Juan se lo dejamos.

C. hanging topics: adjoined to ForceP (alternatively, Spec of Discourse Proj)

(18) (En cuanto a) Juan, el coche se lo deja a su hija los fines de semana.

(19) \[[\text{ForceP} \quad \text{en cuanto a Juan,} \quad \text{ForceP} \quad \alpha \text{P el coche} \quad \text{FinP} \text{ Fin \quad \text{TP} \quad \text{pro} \text{ si se lo deja <el coche> a su hija los fines de semana }}]]\]

3. Intermediate consequences and (potential) problems

A. Topic > Focus because a-categorial shells are above FinP

(20) a. A nuestra hija el COCHE DE JUAN le dejamos los fines de semana (no el mío)

b. *El COCHE DE JUAN a nuestra hija le dejamos los fines de semana (no el mío)

(21) \[[\text{ForceP} \quad \alpha \text{P a nuestra hija} \quad \text{FinP} \text{ el COCHE DE JUAN} \quad \text{Fin' Fin \quad \text{TP le dejamos <el coche> <a nuestra hija> los fines de semana }}]]\]

B. multiple Topics but one Focus because Focus targets a unique position, Spec,Fin

(22) *El COCHE DE JUAN(,) A SU HIJA le deja los fines de semana.

C. counterexample to both of the above claims: examples such as (22) and (23) below

(22) A GIORGIO, questo libro, devi dare  (Benincà & Poletto 2004)  
‘TO GIORGIO this book you must give’

(23) a CHICAGO aquests llibres els va enviar el Carles  (López forthcoming)  
‘To CHICAGO these books sent Carlos’

Benincà & Poletto: *questo libro* has informational focus
informational focus may front when there is also contrastive focus
López: (22) is actually like (23), FOCUS > CLLD – possible only in echo contexts
(24) context for (23):
Aquests llibres els va enviar el Carles a Nova York.
‘These books sent Carlos to New York’

two possible analyses:
(i) movement to multiple Specs of FinP, with constituent in outer Spec interpreted as
contrastive: at the edge of the phrase, receives stress accent

Note that English, which strongly disallows multiple fronting without comma intonation,
marginally permits sentences such as (25):

(25) context: Which of these books do you think I should give to Jane?
I don’t know, but to MARY this book you should give

(ii) echo context = iteration of ForceP

(26) [ForceP [FinP a CHICAGO [Fin' Fin [ForceP aquests llibres [FinP els va
enviar el Carles]]]]]

4. fronting operations: subordinate clauses

A. a range of fronting operations available to subordinate clauses, according to the matrix
predicate

(i) Vs of reporting: hanging topics > CLLD > Focus

(27) Elena dice que en cuanto a Juan, el coche con SU HIJA lo deja los fines de semana.
‘Elena says that with respect to Juan, the car with HIS DAUGHTER he leaves on weekends’

(ii) epistemic Vs
    indicative: hanging topics > CLLD > Focus
    subjunctive: *hanging topics > CLLD > Focus

(28) Elena cree que en cuanto a Juan, el coche con SU HIJA lo deja los fines de semana.
‘Elena believes that with respect to Juan, the car with HIS DAUGHTER he leaves on
weekends’

(29) Elena no cree que (*en cuanto a Juan,) el coche con SU HIJA lo deje los fines de semana.
‘Elena doesn’t believe that (*with respect to Juan,) the car with HIS DAUGHTER he
leaves (SUBJ) on weekends’

(iii) volitional Vs: *hanging topics > CLLD > *Focus

(30) a. Elena prefiere que el coche lo dejen con su hija los fines de semana.
‘Elena prefers that the car they leave(SUBJ) with their daughter on weekends’

b. *Elena prefiere que el coche CON SU HIJA lo dejen los fines de semana
‘Elena prefers that the car WITH THEIR DAUGHTER they leave(SUBJ) on weekends’
c. *Elena prefiere que CON SU HIJA dejen el coche los fines de semana
   ‘Elena prefers that WITH THEIR DAUGHTER they leave(SUBJ) the car on weekends’

d. *Elena prefiere que en cuanto a Juan, el coche lo deja con su hija los fines de semana.
   ‘Elena prefers that with respect to Juan, the car he leave(SUBJ) with their daughter on
   weekends’

B. the general approach: the closer the identity between the default world of evaluation
   (the speaker’s epistemic model of the actual world, cf. Quer 2001) and the world of
   evaluation of the subordinate clause, the greater the range of left peripheral operations
   allowed

C. a closer look at the interaction of Force and Fin

**matrix clause:** default world \( w \) = speaker’s epistemic model of the actual world (cf. (Quer 2001)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \phi\text{-feature inheritance} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} [\text{ForceP} \text{Force}_w \text{[FinP} \text{Fin} \text{[TP DP \text{T}_{[w]}} \text{... [<DP_{[\phi]>} ... ]]} \text{Agree (valuation and deletion)}]
\end{array}
\]

**subordinate clause, \( V \) of reporting** (inheritance of \( \phi \)-features by \( T \) not shown)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \phi\text{-feature inheritance} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} [\text{ForceP} \text{Force}_w \text{[FinP} \text{Fin} \text{[TP DP \text{T}_{[w]} \text{say}_w [\text{ForceP} \text{that}_{w} \text{[FinP} \text{Fin} \text{[TP DP \text{T}_{[w]} \text{... [<DP_{[\phi]>} ... ]]} \text{Agree (valuation and deletion)}]
\end{array}
\]

\text{Fin in the subordinate clause links directly to C center of deixis}

\text{note in English/Spanish-type languages, person values of subordinate subject still dependent}

\text{on speech context:}

(31) \text{Juan dice que yo tengo que hacerlo.} \quad \text{yo = speaker,} \neq \text{Juan}
   ‘Juan says that I have to do it’

**subordinate clause, volitional predicate** (inheritance of \( \phi \)-features by \( T \) not shown)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \phi\text{-feature inheritance} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \text{complement clause selection} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} \\
\phantom{C} [\text{ForceP} \text{Force}_w \text{[FinP} \text{Fin} \text{[TP DP \text{T}_{[w]} \text{want}_w [\text{ForceP} \text{that}_{w} \text{[FinP} \text{Fin} \text{[TP DP \text{T}_{[w]} \text{... [<DP_{[\phi]>} ... ]]} \text{Agree (valuation and deletion)}]
\end{array}
\]

\text{complement clause selection}
Fin in the subordinate clause inherits person specifications indirectly from C, to then pass them on to T in the subordinate clause (person values still dependent on speech context):

(32) **Juan quiere que yo lo haga.**  
‘Juan wants that I do it’

Topics (CLLD) possible: CLLD constituents are discourse anaphoric, thus referents already established

Focus not possible: Fin within the subjunctive clause is in the domain of the buletic model of the speaker (lexically entailed by the matrix predicate), hence can’t access discourse context

D. the more problematic cases

(i) subordinate clauses to negated epistemics: model of evaluation is epistemic model of the world of the matrix subject

focus fronting allowed: correction of the discourse context as perceived by matrix subject

(i) subordinate clauses to factive-emotives: focus fronting allowed

(33) Lamento que LAS ESPINACAS no le gustan a Pedro (y no las papas) (Zubizarreta 1998)  
‘I regret that SPINACH Pedro doesn’t like (and not potatoes)’

factive-emotive complements have a complex model of evaluation: a buletic intensional model anchored to the matrix subject (cf. Villalta 2001, Kempchinsky 2007) and the epistemic model of the matrix subject (thus, like negated epistemics)

generalization: focus fronting requires that Fin be in the domain of Force with a world operator \( W \) which links to some realistic modal base

the discourse context within the epistemic model of evaluation of the matrix subject: (inheritance of \( \phi \)-features by T not shown)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C} \\
[\text{Force}_P \text{Force}_w \text{Fin}_P \text{TP DP } T_{[\nu \eta]} \text{ V}_w \text{[that}_w \text{[Fin}_P \text{that}_w \text{TP DP } T_{[\nu \eta]} \text{ Fin } \text{TP DP } T_{[\nu \eta]} ... [<\text{DP[\nu]}> ... ]]]]
\end{array}
\]

5. a note on English vs. Spanish

Spanish multiple fronting (i.e., CLLD): movement to an a-categorial phrase possible because the constituent has already checked a feature in (outer) Spec,vP, hosted in the clitic (López, forthcoming)

English: only one fronting operation allowed without comma intonation and resumptive pronoun: to Spec,Fin

other fronting operations are iterations of hanging topics
6. a general view of subordination

The classic distinction between “root” and “non-root” operations, or more recent approaches of true subordination and quasi-subordination is not a binary opposition, but a range of subordination directly related to the role of Force and Fin in the syntax and at the syntax/semantics (syntax/pragmatics?) interface.
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