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Greek has a pattern of creating new object experiencer predicates (NOE) (corresponding to the Belletti & Rizzi’s Class II ‘worry’ predicates) that involves several sources. Two of these will be discussed in this talk:

Source I includes verbs of spatial configuration/assuming a position (Levin 1993, SCVs, Mavriogiorgos 2007):

(1) a. O Janis gonatise
    the John-nom kneeled-3sg
    John kneeled

b. Ta pola eksoda %(ton) gonatisan ton Manoli. NOE
    The many expenses-nom (him-cl) kneeled-3sg the Manoli-acc
    Manolis suffered under the bulk of the expenses

Source II: EO readings are possible also with certain externally caused predicates, (e.g. the tear-apart class, see also Martin 2007 for French; in general, across languages the recruitment of NOEs comes from this class):

(2) a. O Janis dielise to aftokinito
    the John-nom tore apart the car-acc
    John tore the car apart

b. I zoi %(ti) dielise ti Maria
    Life cl tore apart the Mary-acc
    lit. Life tore Mary apart

These predicates share the following properties:
1) there is a restriction on the thematic role of the subject: the subject bears the **causer role**
2) the object is animate, and it is interpreted as an **experiencer**
3) there is a strong preference for the animate object to be clitic-doubled
4) they do not undergo passivization

A similar effect of clitic doubling has been observed with class II psychological object experiencer predicates (EO) in Greek in Anagnostopoulou (1999), when the subject is a non-volitional causer:

(3) a. ta nea *?(ton) stenahorisan to Jani
    the news cl got upset the John-acc
    The news got John upset

b. i simberifora su *?(tin) provlimatise ti Maria
    the behavior yours cl puzzled the Mary-acc
    Your behavior puzzled Mary

---

1 This is based on joint work with Elena Anagnostopoulou (University of Crete).
I will address the following questions: i) How similar are these verbs to EO predicates? ii) Do these predicates constitute subcases of the causative alternation? iii) How does the EO reading of non-psych predicates come about? and finally iv) What is the role of clitic doubling?

It will be argued that NOEs are based on a causative structure. When the undergoer is an animate argument, it behaves like an experiencer argument. This can be accounted for by assuming that the experiencer is associated with an applicative head. Thus these strings show an animacy, differential object marking (DOM)-like effect. In turn this suggests that clitic doubling is sensitive to animacy as well as aspectual restrictions. As will be shown, the clitic doubling observed in EOs and NOEs differs from clitic doubling in other domains (related to familiarity). This supports the view that clitic-doubling and DOM are related but very different phenomena (see Leonetti 2008 for discussion). A DOM effect arises in these strings, suggesting that experiencers are marked as prominent objects, Leonetti (2008).
Discourse markers at the interface between syntax and prosody: The case of guarda te in regional Italian of Veneto.

Linda Badan
Ghent University

In this paper, we deal with the verb-based discourse marker guarda te, formed by the combination of the 2nd-person singular imperative of the verb ‘look’ and the accusative 2nd-person singular pronoun ‘you’, in regional Italian of Veneto (North-east Italy, Padua-Este area). By analyzing its interpretive, syntactic and prosodic properties, we argue in favor of the representation of discourse-related items in a dedicated domain in the left periphery of the clause (Rizzi 1997, Speas & Tenny 2003, Hill 2007, Haegeman & Hill 2013, Munaro & Poletto 2009, Coniglio & Zegrean 2012 a.o.), where functional projections encode not only syntactic and interpretative features, but also prosodic ones.

General properties. Guarda te can have either (i) a mirative interpretation, selecting only exclamatives or other type of sentences expressing a sense of surprise (see (1)); or (ii) an evidential reading, expressing an obvious confirmation with authority and sense of superiority, as in (2).

1) a. Guarda te (che) è andato al ristorante senza dircelo! Surprise
   ‘Guarda te (that) he’s gone to the restaurant without saying a word!’
   b. *Guarda te è andato al ristorante. Non surprise
   ‘Guarda te he’s gone to the restaurant.’

2) Context: The weather is horrible, the sky is black and all the weather forecasts for today are very bad.
   A: Che dici, dovrei prendere l’ombrello?
   ‘What do you think, should I bring the umbrella?’
   B: Guarda te (*che) mi pare evidente.
   ‘Guarda te, that’s obvious.’

Syntactically, both mirative and evidential guarda te occupy only sentence initial positions (3), cannot be embedded (4), and can appear in isolation (5).

3) a. *Non vedi guarda te come piove?
   ‘Don’t you see guarda te how much it rains?’
   b. *Non vedi come piove guarda te?
   ‘Don’t you see how much it rains guarda te?’

4) Lui sapeva che guarda te bisognava prendere l’ombrello.
   ‘He knew that guarda te it was necessary to bring the umbrella.’

5) A: Devo portare l’ombrello?
   ‘Should I bring the umbrella?’
   B: (Eh) Guarda te. (=That’s obvious)

What is guarda te? We show that (i) guarda te is distinct from guarda ‘look’, analyzed by Cardinaletti (2015). Guarda has a very different interpretation: its main function is attracting attention (6a). Morphologically, guarda not only occurs in the 2nd-person singular, but can also be in the 2nd-person plural guardate and in the polite from guardi. Syntactically, guarda can appear in sentence initial, internal, and final position (6b).

6) a. Guarda (*te) che se non la smetti ti picchio
   ‘Look that if you don’t stop it I beat you.’
   b. Io non so più cosa dirti guarda (*te).
   ‘I don’t know what to tell you any more look’.

(ii) Guarda te is not a real verb; for instance, it does not allow clitics *guardalo/ci te. It is not a head either. In fact, guarda te is not completely grammaticalized: in appropriate contexts it can be substituted by guarda tu/ tu guarda (tu is the 2nd-person singular pronoun in the Nominative). Furthermore, it can be modified, although only by un po’ ‘a bit’. It is notable that in this case, and only in this case, the 2nd-person plural form is allowed (guardate un po’ voi).

(iii) On the basis of Cardinaletti’s (cit.) analysis of guarda, we argue that guarda te is a weak
adverb. Similarly to sentential adverbs, guarda te is in the left periphery and has a specific meaning and prosody. However, it cannot be analyzed as a real adverb since (a) the mirative guarda te cannot be substituted by a corresponding adverb like sorprendentemente ‘surprisingly’, (b) it cannot be focalized, and (c) its lexical meaning of looking is bleached. We propose that guarda te, being a weak adverb, is a XP that occupies a specifier position of either a mirative or evidential functional projection (à la Cinque 1999) in the left periphery of the sentence, in a speech-act domain that encodes the relation between context, speaker’s/hearer’s attitude and selected clause (Speas & Tenny 2003, Hill 2007 & sub., Haegeman 2014 a.o.). To further support our proposal, we also show that guarda te can co-occur with other verb-based discourse markers with different functions and that their relative order is restricted in a way that corresponds to Cinque’s (1999) hierarchy for adverbs: Evaluative (mirative) > Evidential > Epistemic > Obligation.

The tight link between prosody and meaning. The two guarda te (mirative and evidential) have two different prosodic properties: (i) The prosodic contour of the mirative guarda te is rising, while that one of the evaluative guarda te is falling; (ii) the mirative guarda te can be followed by a complementizer che ‘that’, but if che is absent guarda te must be followed by a pause. Differently, the evidential guarda te cannot be followed by the complementizer che and it is always followed by a pause (cf. (1) with (2)). These observations show that the interpretive properties of guarda te are strongly tied to their prosodic contour, which, together with the context of use, is fundamental to distinguish the mirative from the evidential reading. On the basis of these observations, we propose that a single level of syntactic representation encodes both semantic and prosodic properties, in the spirit of the cartographic approach (Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999, Giorgi 2014), but also inspired by the work of Frascarelli (2012), Frascarelli & Jiménez-Fernández (2016) and Wiltshko (2014). Accordingly, I argue that the functional projections occupied by discourse markers such as guarda te are the specifiers of a non lexical head H that mediates between syntax and prosody (in spirit of Giorgi cit., who proposed the head K for the analysis of parentheticals). The head H is the syntactic realization of the pause between guarda te and the sentence that follows, or it can be overtly encoded by the complementizer che ‘that’:

7) Speaker field in LP
   [HP[Spec, MF guarda te [MIR]10/che ...sentence]

The proposal accounts for a number of facts. The linearization requirement between the guarda te and the selected sentence is satisfied. The head H encodes the syntax, semantics, and prosody of the discourse marker and constitutes le trait d’union between context, speaker, and sentence. Finally, our proposal further supports Cinque’s (2008) program of encoding discourse within syntax.

Null prepositions and light nouns in Germanic and Romance
Laura R. Bailey
University of Kent
l.r.bailey@kent.ac.uk

Where a relatively ‘light’ preposition (one with little semantic content and a more functional role) is required in standard varieties, we find variant constructions where it may be omitted:

(1) Does this train go (to) Canterbury West?
   (Southeast British English, my example)

(2) Gehst du heute auch (zum) viktoriapark?
   Go you today also (to.the)Viktoriapark
   ‘Will you also go to the Viktoriapark today?’
   (Kiezdeutsch, Wiese 2009: 792)

(3) pao (ston) kinimatografo
   I.go (to.the.ACC) cinema.ACC
   ‘I am going to the movies.’
   (Greek, Ioannidou & den Dikken 2006: 1)

(4) Te ve (a) mèsa
    scl go to mass
   ‘You go to mass’
   (Bellinzonese, Cattaneo 2009: 287)

This phenomenon occurs in many contact varieties (Multicultural London English, Kiezdeutsch, Rinkebysvenska, Straattaal) where it is reasonable to think that it is a null variant of the preposition, probably functioning purely as a Case marker. Compare the MLE example in (5), where the omitted element is of, frequently assumed to be Case (Rooryck 1996, Zwart 2005, Svenonius 2010, among others):

(5) A set (of) shelfs [sic]
    (Bermondsey, British Library C900/05078, Johnnie Robinson, p.c.)

However, prepositions are also omitted in varieties that are not obviously contact varieties in the relevant sense: the areas of England where examples like (1) are found do not correlate with areas of high immigration, for instance.

The constructions all seem to have the following properties in common:
   a) The argument is a goal and the verb directional (although Cattaneo (2009) notes that Bellinzonese also exhibits the construction with locatives)
   b) The verb is semantically bleached (Wiese 2009); most often, it is GO or COME (the variety found in Ormskirk can occur with other motion verbs, although this is very degraded in Kent, and Cattaneo (2009) gives laura ‘work’ as requiring a preposition)
   c) The class of nouns that can occur is restricted: in Standard German, just to the names of public transport stops (Wiese 2009), in Bellinzonese to some city
names and six other familiar locations (Cattaneo 2009), and a slightly more productive group of familiar locations and place names in English and Greek

d) The goal is usually adjacent to the verb (and the word order in Kiezdeutsch appears to alter from that of Standard German to accommodate this, although cf. (2))

e) The article must also be absent; anything more than a bare N is very degraded in all the varieties where this phenomenon occurs (with the exception of the Ormskirk type).

The varieties to be discussed here are those of Kent, Leicester and Manchester in England, and the type found in Greek and Italian dialects. The Ormskirk type of null preposition, while superficially similar, exhibits crucial differences that show that it is a different phenomenon (occurrence with other motion verbs, compatibility with ditransitive alternations).

I analyse the bare nouns in this construction as light locative nouns that incorporate into D and PLACE (following Collins 2007). Furthermore, PATH conflates with v, as argued for verb-framed languages by Acedo-Matellán & Mateu (2013).

(6) [vP go [PathP [PlaceP pub [DP pub]]]]

These non-standard constructions can be analysed by reference to the cartographic nature of the PP, and importantly, vary along typological lines rather than being the result of the spread outwards of a regional feature. This is illustrated by the patterning of Manchester with Kent and Leicester and the Greek/Romance type, rather than with its geographical neighbours Ormskirk and Liverpool (Biggs 2013).
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This paper aims at providing an explanation for the main changes undergone by Old Romance imperative configurations concerning information structure distribution. According to Rivero and Terzi (1995), natural languages may accommodate to two different patterns regarding the syntax of imperatives: 1) languages the imperatives of which display a distinctive syntax, and 2) languages in which main clauses and imperative constructions follow the same syntactic requirements.

As is well known, Old Romance languages follow the second pattern, whereas most Modern Romance variants exhibit the first one. In Old Romance main clauses, clitic pronouns are preverbal whenever there is a triggerer of proclisis – that is, focused constituents and certain adverbs, among others (Batllori, Iglésias and Martins 2005). Old Romance imperative structures are subject to the same requirement (see Keniston 1937 for Old Spanish, Martins 1994 for Old Portuguese, Wanner 1987 for Old Italian, and Foulet 1923 for Old French, for instance). In fact, enclisis in main and imperative V1 clauses relates to the fact that in Old Romance POL has a strong feature which triggers the movement of the verb to this position (see Rodríguez Molina 2014, for more arguments in favour of Old Spanish having a strong POL feature). However, as illustrated by the following examples, this movement is blocked when there is fronting of another element.

(1) y aquello le encargad vos [CORDE: 1482 – 1492. Garci Gómez de Montalvo, Amadís de Gaula, libros I y II] Old Spanish
(2) Ora me dizede o que i faça. [CIPM: Séc. XV. Demanda do Santo Graal, Título 180, fol. 65b] Old Portuguese
(3) E di questo mi date sicuranza, [C.OVI.IA.sec. XIII s. m. (fiorentino) Chiaro Davanzati, Rime, son. 72, v. 12, 293.12] Old Italian
(4) So toi, si te repose un peu [Courtois d’Arras: 479, apud Foulet (1923: 112, § 154)] Old French

Moreover, as the Old Portuguese example in (5) shows, the imperative follows the affirmative emphatic polarity particle bem, which in accordance with Batllori and Hernanz (2013) is generated in POL and moves to FOCUS so as to be licensed.

(5) ca bem seede certos que ante de muytos dias seeredes e~ tam grande coyta que averedes mester siso e esforço [CIPM: Séc. XIV. Crónica Geral de Espanha, Título 353, fol. 133c]

As for Old Romance, then, the previous data could be taken as evidence in favour of considering imperatives to be generated in Cinque’s (1999) SpeechActMod and undergo movement to POL whenever there is not any other fronting movement that blocks it, as other main clause inflected verbs do. Concerning Modern Romance and bearing in mind the data given in (1) to (4) would be ungrammatical, it is obvious that imperative configurations accommodate to the second pattern posed by Rivero and Terzi.
Terzi (1995) and it could be argued that there has been a syntactization of the imperative mood which has led to its dependence on an imperative operator in Fin (see Frascarelli and Jiménez-Fernández 2016, for the licensing of imperatives by a Fin operator).
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1. **Focus Fronting and the optionality problem.** In Italian corrective replies, a contrastively focused constituent can, but need not, be fronted to a left-peripheral position, see (1B–B’).

(1) A: Hanno invitato Marina. (Bianchi & Boci 2012)  
B: GIULIA hanno invitato (non Marina).  
B’: Hanno invitato GIULIA (non Marina).  

Bocci (2013), Bianchi *et al.* (2015) provide experimental evidence showing that, independently of its surface syntactic position, the focus element in (1B–B’) is systematically marked by an L+H* pitch accent, differing from the default pitch accent of declaratives (H+L*). This shows that despite the apparent syntactic difference, the prosodic component “sees” the focus as essentially the same in the two cases. We therefore conclude that movement of the focus-marked constituent is apparently optional, contrary to the obligatory movement of wh-constituents in indirect and direct (non-echo) questions.

2. **Optimal spellout.** Following Bianchi & Boci (2012), corrective focus always moves to the left periphery in order to generate focus alternatives (or a focus-background partition) at the propositional level. From this perspective, (1B–B’) are alternative spellouts of the chain in (2):

(2) [FP Giulia [TP pro hanno [vP Giulia [invitato Giulia ]]]]

Bobaljik & Wurmbrandt (2012) propose that the PF representation of a sentence must be the optimal spellout of its LF: specifically, in the case of a movement chain, an ordered set of constraints determines which chain link is the optimal spellout option.  

In order to derive the two options (1B–B’), I assume the following spellout principles:  

I. **Recoverability:** Spell out exactly one link in a movement chain.  

II. **Scope Transparency:** Spell out an A'-moved operator in its scope position.  

III. **Rightmostness:** Spell out a [focus/Q]-marked element in the rightmost position available.  

(II) can be seen as a faithfulness principle on the LF-PF pairing; (III) expresses the preference for the metrical head to be aligned with the right boundary of the intonational phrase (since the [focus]-marked element must be spelled out with main prosodic prominence). I assume the following ranking in Italian: Recoverability >> Scope Transparency >> Rightmostness.  

Consider now the possible spellouts of the chain in (2). (a) Spelling out the focal constituent in the highest position satisfies Scope Transparency but violate Rightmostness; (b) vice versa, spelling out the lowest chain link satisfies Rightmostness but violates Scope Transparency (the *in situ* position is not the one that identifies the domain of focus). As the two principles are equally ranked, neither LF-PF pairing wins over the other, and optionality obtains. (c) On the other hand, spelling out any intermediate chain link (e.g. in the edge of vP) yields a PF that satisfies neither Scope Transparency nor Rightmostness, so this option is ruled out. Finally, the prosodic component assigns the pitch accent L+H* to the whole chain; its prosodic realization, however, will fall on the chain link that is selected for spellout.

3. **Spelling out wh-chains.** If we assume the wh-chain (3), with a focus-like Q feature on the wh-phrase, principles (I–III) predict optional spellout of the wh-phrase either in the left periphery or in situ; in the second case, the wh-phrase should bear main prominence.

(3) [CP ChiQ [TP pro hanno [vP ChiQ [invitato ChiQ ]]]]
This might perhaps appropriately describe contemporary colloquial French, but it is inadequate for standard Italian, where the wh-phrase is always spelled out in the highest chain position (I return below the echo questions). Moreover, experimental evidence presented in Bocci et al. (2017) shows that, in the case of a bare wh-element (except for perché ‘why’), the main sentence prominence actually falls on the lexical verb that is adjacent to the External Merge position of the wh-phrase. In (4a), the wh-phrase undergoes short-distance movement in the matrix clause, and main prominence falls on the lexical verb, as indicated by the accent. In (4b), where the wh-phrase undergoes long-distance movement from the embedded clause, main prominence falls (mostly) on the embedded verb.

(4) a. \([\text{CP} \ A \ chi \ hai \ [\text{VP} \ detto \ t \ [\text{CP} \ che \ ti \ hanno \ [\text{VP} \ rubato \ la \ macchina]]]]\)?
   to who have.2SG said that YOU.DAT have.3PL stolen the car?
   ‘To whom did you tell to that your car was stolen?’

   b. \([\text{CP} \ A \ chi \ ti \ ha \ [\text{VP} \ detto \ [\text{CP} \ che \ hanno \ [\text{VP} \ rubato \ t \ la \ macchina]]]]\)?
   to who YOU.DAT have.3SG said that have.3PL stolen the car?
   ‘From whom did s/he tell you they stole the car?’

The impossibility of spelling out the lowest chain link leads me to conclude that, despite appearances, this link does not contain a [Q] feature in Italian. I therefore propose the revised wh-chain in (5), where a vP-level Θ head endows the wh-phrase with existential import (cf. Beghelli & Stowell 1997, Sportiche 1996, Kayne 1998 on quantificational heads); the wh-phrase acquires the Q feature and moves successively-cyclically to its scope position in CP.

(5) \([\text{CP} \ Chi_0 \ [\text{TP pro} \ hanno \ [\text{VP chi}_0 \ [\exists_0 \ [\text{invitato chi}]]]]]\)

In configuration (5), the satisfaction of principles (II) and (III) is divorced. As for the chi-chain, (I)+(II) determine the spellout of the highest chain link: in fact, the lower links do not satisfy (II), and they cannot alternatively satisfy the equally ranked principle (III), because (a) the intermediate link is not the rightmost element bearing the [Q] feature, and (b) the lowest link is not endowed with this feature at all. On the other hand, the Θ head is incorporated to the lexical verb, so principle (III) assigns the main sentence prominence to the latter. An exception to this general pattern is perché ‘why’, an operator which is directly generated in a left-peripheral scope position (Rizzi 2001), so that spellout in that position satisfies (I), (II) and (III) at the same time. Time permitting, I will also discuss chains headed by lexically restricted wh-phrases, and I will suggest that they may involve a resumptive A’-dependency.

4. Echo questions. In Italian, echo questions differ systematically from information-seeking wh-questions in that the bare wh-phrase is spelled out in a clause-final position and bears the main sentence prominence (e.g. Hai invitato chi? ‘You invited whom?’) I will tentatively explore a possible approach, based on the idea that in echo questions the wh-phrase does not receive an existential/inquisitive import, because it does not receive the [Q] feature. The lack of existential import also explains (a) the fact that there can be no indirect echo questions (echo interrogatives would not have the question denotation required by the selecting predicates), and (b) the fact that in echo questions the wh-phrase do not scopally interact with any operator in the sentence, e.g. a universal quantifier.

Goal: the goal of the presentation is to analyse word order and syntactic structure of ditransitive constructions in European Portuguese (EP). In order to limit the discussion, the issue of heavy DO will be the focus of the presentation; we will argue in favor of the proposal that, as other DO constituents, a heavy DO is base-generated as complement of a low verbal category; the difference is that a heavy constituent does not need to move to any intermediate categories, what makes discursive functional categories such that topic and focus unnecessary in the syntactic structure.

Some considerations on information structure in ditransitive constructions: EP, as Spanish and Italian, belongs to the group of languages where the given information (the topic) is normally presented at the first place and the informational focus at the final and most embedded position of the clause (Cinque 1993, Duarte 1987, Costa 1998, 2009). As for contrastive focus, it is either left in situ, bearing prosodic prominence, or moves to the left periphery. If there is movement, prosodic prominence also obtains (Martins 2012).

Costa (1998, 2009) has shown that ditransitive constructions obey to this general framework. In fact, the unmarked order in EP is V DO IO: only (2) would be an adequate (redundant) answer to a wh question like (1), with the IO as the informational focus:

(1) A quem é que a Maria deu um livro? (to whom is that Mary gave a book)
‘To whom did Mary give a book?’

(2) A Maria deu um livro ao João. (the Mary gave a book to the John)
‘Mary gave a book to John’

Also regarding “What happened?” questions (3), the adequate answer is (2), not (4): (Costa 2009: 95-6):

(3) O que aconteceu? ‘What happened?’
(4) #A Maria deu ao João um livro. (the Mary gave to the John a book)
‘Mary gave John a book’

This last order is ok as a contrastive focus, as it is confirmed by (5):

(5) A Maria deu ao João um livro, à Maria um CD (the Mary gave to the John a book, to the Mary a CD)
‘Mary gave John a book and she gave Mary a CD.’

When the DO is a heavy constituent, it occupies the last position, as in (6) and (7) (Duarte 2003):

(6) O João disse à Maria que vai sair. (the John said to the Mary that will leave)
‘John said to Mary that he will leave’

(7) O João deu à Maria o dinheiro que herdou da avó. (the John gave to the Mary the money that inherited from the grandmother)
‘John gave to Mary the money that he inherited from his grandmother’

When we have a question with focus on the IO and a heavy DO: being the heavy DO a topic and the IO a focus, we would expect the order V DO IO, but the order V IO DO is the most natural, as in (8b) and (9b).

(8)(a) A quem disse o João que ia sair? (to whom said the John that went leave)
‘To whom did John said that he was leaving?’

(b) O João disse à Maria que ia sair. (the John said to the Mary that will leave)
‘John said to Mary that he will leave’

(9)(a) A quem deu o João o dinheiro que herdou da avó? (to whom gave the John the money that inherited from the grandmother)
‘To whom did John give the money that he inherited from his grandmother?’

(9)(b) O João deu à Maria o dinheiro que herdou da avó. (the John gave to the Mary the money that inherited from the grandmother)
‘John gave to Mary the money that he inherited from his grandmother’

Again an alternative word order, with the IO in the final position seems possible, but only if the IO is a contrastive focus, prosodically marked (8c), (9c):
(8) (c) O João disse que ia sair à Maria, e não à Luisa.
(9) (c) O João deu o dinheiro que herdou da avó à Maria e não à Luisa.

**Analysis:** How to analyse these phenomena? We know since Kayne (1994) that no rightward movement is possible. Jiménez Fernández (2009), for Spanish, accepts that at the left periphery of the verbal domain (vP) there is place for discursive functional categories, like TopP, FocP; according to the different status of the DO and the IO they would move and occupy different positions. As for heavy constituents, the author considers that they are focus and the light constituent is a topic:

(10) Angela le dio a Juan el dinero que envió el año pasado.

One of the arguments in favor of Jiménez Fernández’ proposal is the behavior of low adverbs as *en secreto*, that the author analyses as spec of a low functional category. In fact, the best answer to (11) in Spanish is (12):

(11) ¿ A quién le dio Ángela el dinero?
(12) Ángela le dio el dinero a papa en secreto.

If *en secreto* belongs to the question and is a topic (cf. ¿ A quien le dio Ángela el dinero en secreto?), its final position is rather marginal (13), because it occupies the final position after the informational focus of the sentence, the IO:

(13) ?? Ángela le dio el dinero a papa en secreto (ex. 23, Jiménez Fernández 2009, p. 194).

But if we have a heavy DO, the situation is different and the adverb could occupy different positions, being (14) one of them, showing that in (10) and in (14) the heavy DO moves:

(14) Ángela le devolvió a Juan el dinero que me envió el año pasado en secreto.

All this justifies the authors’ proposal according to which in Spanish DOC (following Demonte 1995) the DO and the IO move to a low periphery of vP to value discourse features.

**European Portuguese and Spanish exhibit here some differences:**

1- In the Spanish DOC, the dative clitic *le* occurs before the full IO (Demonte 1995: 20): this one is therefore announced by the clitic *le*, and in this way it is given information. In EP, as the clitic is not obligatorily used, we can maintain the view that the IO still belongs to the informational focus of the clause, even in sentences with a heavy DO at the final position of the clause, as it is the case of (8b) and (9b).

2- In EP, manner adverbs may occupy different positions (15, 16, 17), some ones being marked with a stress (Costa 1998, chap. 1):

(15) O João deu à Maria o dinheiro que herdou da avó em segredo. (the John gave to the Mary the money that inherited from the grandmother in secret)

‘John gave to Mary the money that he inherited from his grandmother in secret.’

(16) O João deu, em segredo, à Maria, o dinheiro que herdou da avó.

(17) O João deu à Maria, em segredo, o dinheiro que herdou da avó.

**Some conclusions:** we may conclude that in EP the order V DO IO is the unmarked order; the final order of the DO is reserved for a complex, heavy constituent, and the IO, which still may belong to the focus part of the sentence, occupies, in these circumstances, a pre-DO position. The position of adverbs and the inexistence of an obligatory clitic in the so called DOC do not favor an analysis where the DO and the IO may move to a low periphery of vP to value discourse features.

The question to be discussed is if word order V IO DO is due to movement of the IO over the DO, or if there is a syntactic structure where the IO is projected in a higher position over the DO. This issue has justified a lot of controversy. Costa (1998, 2009) argues, based on some binding, scope, fronting and ellipsis phenomena, that there are two base-generated structures for ditransitive constructions in Portuguese. Torres Morais & Lima Salles (2010) argued in favour of two different constructions, a DOC and a prepositional construction, based on differences in meaning and on the nature of the preposition. Brito (2010) and more recently Gonçalves (2016, p. 151) have proposed that the IO is projected in the spec and the DO in a complement position of a low verbal category. It seems that it is case with heavy DOs: they are projected in a low position: if it is a CP, it does not need case and doesn’t move; if it is a Complex DP it may have case by a long distance agreement.
References:
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Wh-Movement in Echo Questions and Crosslinguistic Variation
Ekaterina Chernova

Centre de Lingüística Teòrica, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

1. Introduction. Traditionally, it is assumed that echo wh-questions (henceforth wh-EQs) necessarily exhibit wh-in-situ (e.g., Sobin 2010; a.o.). This paper argues against such view and presents a novel evidence in favor of existence of overt wh-movement in request-for-repition EQs. It is argued that, just as in true questions, echo wh-movement proceeds successive cyclically, through a particular syntactic structure underlying EQs; namely, one with two CP levels (Escandell 2012; Sobin 2010). So, the legitimacy of echo wh-extraction is subject to parametric variation and crucially depends on whether a particular language has an additional escape hatch.

2. Data. The English wh-EQ in (1b), which echoes a previous wh-interrogative utterance (Uwh) in (1a), presents a number of striking features that apparently violate rules of question formation in languages with obligatory wh-movement: wh-in-situ; Superiority violation; widest scope for the echo wh-phrase (notice that only who requests for an answer). Unlike an ordinary wh-word (in italics), the echo wh-item (in bold) acts as a discourse anaphora, referring back to an entity already introduced in the immediately previous utterance, but unheard by the speaker:

(1) (a) Uwh: What did (mumble) buy? (ENG) (b) EQ: What did who buy? (ENG)  
(c) EQ: *Who bought what? (ENG)

In English, echo wh-movement is blocked in EQs as (1), but allowed in (2), when the stimulus is a declarative (Udcl). However, consider the Russian wh-EQ in (3). Multiple wh-fronting languages (MWF), in addition to the standard wh-in-situ, (3b), do allow echo wh-movement: either to an immediately preverbal position, (3c), or to the leftmost one, above the U’s what, (3c). Curiously, in Spanish, a language that can exhibit MWF under certain restricted contexts (Gallego 2014), an echo wh-word also has more options than in English. Consider (4), where EQs repeat a previous yes/no question:

(3) (a) Uwh: Čto kupil (mumble)? (RU) (b) Uyn: ¿Ha leído Pedro (mumble)? (SP)  
(c) EQ: Čto kupil kto? has read Pedro (mumble)?  
(d) EQ: *kto skazal? (RU) ¿(Que) si (Pedro) ha leído (Pedro) qué?

c. EQ: ¿kto skazal? that whether Pedro has read Pedro what

d. EQ: *¿kto skazal? ¿(Que) qué si ha leído Pedro?

The data in (1-4) suggest that echo wh-movement exists and depends on two main factors: (i) the clause-type of the utterance being echoed; (ii) general pattern of wh-movement in true multiple questions of a particular language.

3. Proposal. 3.1. Extending Cable’s (2010) Q-theory to wh-EQs, I argue that the derivation of EQs involves three crucial elements: (i) an anaphoric echo wh-phrase (WhP), merged at its argument position; (ii) a phonetically null discourse-bound Question-particle (Q), merged anywhere in the tree where it c-commands WhP; (iii) interrogative echo C head (C_e) projecting its own CP_e-level. 3.2. All three elements bear some instance of the interrogative Q-feature, [Q_e], different from [Q] in true wh-questions (Cable 2010).

3.2. Adopting Sobin’s (2010) insight, I assume that the derivation of wh-EQs, unlike the one of true questions, contains two A-projections: (i) CP_e of the same clause-type as of the utterance being echoed; (ii) a discourse-bound interrogative CP_e that selects its sister CP_e as a complement,
I argue that Spanish EQs, as in (4), show evidence in favor of the double-CP structure: *si* ‘whether’ is an interrogative operator of the echoed yes/no utterance, hosted at Spec,CP<sub>_o_</sub> (this operator being null in true questions, (4a), and phonetically realized in embedded contexts). 3.3. With Cable (2010), I argue that all instances of wh-movement (including the echo-movement) arise as a secondary effect of Q-movement. That is, echo wh-movement is a result of *Q*-projection, as shown in (5): *Q*<sub>e</sub> merges with the echo-inserted WhP<sub>e</sub> at its base position and projects QP<sub>_e_</sub>, which immediately dominates both *Q* and its sister. Consequently, movement of QP<sub>_e_</sub> into Spec,CP<sub>_e_</sub> (in order to get scope) will pied-pipe WhP<sub>e</sub> (no wh-feature-percolation being necessary).

4. **Echo wh-movement.** I argue that echo-movement proceeds successive cyclically, through available escape hatches on its way up to CP<sub>_e_</sub>, (5). Given the double-CP structure of EQs, it is plausible that one of such escape hatches would be the edge of CP<sub>_o_</sub>. If it is available as an intermediate landing site, echo wh-movement is allowed; otherwise, it is blocked. This is the reason why the clause-type of the echoed utterance plays a so important role for overt echo wh-extraction. Now, the echo-puzzle in (1-4) follows straightforwardly. 4.1. **Echoing a declarative.** The wh-EQ in (2c) is derived along the lines in (5). Since the echoed utterance is a declarative, a declarative CP is projected in the derivation of a corresponding EQ, its specifier being unfilled. Spec,CP<sub>_o_</sub> can be used as an intermediate landing-site for the fronted wh-word on its way to CP<sub>_e_</sub>. 4.2. **Echoing a question.** However, when the previous utterance is interrogative, Spec,CP<sub>_o_</sub> is occupied either by a wh-word, (1,3), or a question operator, (4). I standardly assume that languages with MWF in true questions resort to multiple Spec,CPs (Rudin 1988; Pesetsky 2000; Richards 2001), unlike languages of the English type, which make use of a single Spec,CP. The proposed analysis correctly predicts the grammaticality of (3d) in contrast with (1c): in Slavic, an echo wh-word moves into CP<sub>_e_</sub> through the additional, inner Spec,CP<sub>_o_</sub>, which is unavailable in English. Similarly to the latter, Spanish neither allows multiple Spec,CPs; hence, the ungrammaticality of (4d) is expected. 4.3. **Partial movement.** Finally, Russian, (3c), and, marginally, Spanish, (4c), also admit a kind of *partial* movement of the echo wh-word to some structurally lower position. As standardly assumed, the immediately preverbal position for WhP<sub>e</sub> is a result of Ā-movement to a position below CP (for Slavic, FocusP in Bošković 2002; IP in Richards 2001; AspP in Chernova 2015, a.o.; for Romance, FP in Uriagereka 1985; TP in Gallego 2010: a.o.). Here the availability of the edge of certain projections (AspP in Slavic; TP in Romance) as a landing site for an extracted wh-item is considered in terms of vP’s phase-extension (den Dikken 2007; Gallego 2010), assuming that points of Spell-out are subject to parameterization. 4.4. The options exposed in 4.2 and 4.3 (ex-situ and partial wh-fronting) are excluded from English, where the only possibility for the echo wh-phrase is to remain in-situ, (1b) (also legitimate in Russian, (3b), and Spanish, (4b)). The successive-cyclic nature of echo wh-movement is schematically represented below in (6):

\[
[\text{CP}_o (\text{WhP}_e)] [\text{CP}_e \quad \text{wh}_B] [\text{CP}_e \quad \text{TP}(\text{WhP}_e) [\text{AspP}(\text{WhP}_e) \quad [\text{AspP}(\text{WhP}_e) [\text{AspP}(\text{WhP}_e) [\ldots (\text{WhP}_e)]]]]]]
\]

The shadowed zones stand for the additional escape hatches and/or host positions for the fronted echo wh-word, being absent from English. The dark ones correspond to Spanish, where an echo wh-element can appear at the edge of vP and TP respectively, (4c). The clear zones stand for Russian: the edge of AspP may host an echo wh-word, (3c); movement into Spec,CP<sub>_o_</sub>, (3d), proceeds through an additional escape hatch available only in Slavic languages: Spec,CP<sub>_o_</sub>. Finally, all three languages allow for the wh-in-situ option.

5. In sum, the paper presents a novel facts regarding overt wh-movement in EQs. This Q-based approach uniformly captures the puzzling echo-properties, which are left otherwise unexplained.
NULL AND POST-VERBAL SUBJECTS IN SPANISH L1 SPEAKERS. AN INTERFACE INVESTIGATION ON ACQUISITIONAL DATA AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.

María Cornejo Núñez
University of Seville; University of Rome Tre

The main focus of this study is the interaction between word order and information structure. As is known, the unmarked order in English, Italian and Spanish is SVO (Zubizarreta 1998). However, in Spanish and Italian this order can be modified depending on discourse requirements (Fernández Soriano 1993). In particular, the subject can be realised in postverbal position (e.g., *Lo ha dicho Juan* ‘Juan told that’, *È arrivato papà* ‘Dad has arrived’).

Our long-term goal is to check whether the association between context(s) and word order variation is part of the competence of an English learner of Spanish or Italian L2, and to check possible difficulties in order to have a better understanding of language acquisition and improve methods in the field of second language learning and teaching.

The hypothesis is that the realization of postverbal subjects might be sensitive to specific focus types. We have conducted some experimental tests. Every test took into consideration the influence of two factors in the realization of postverbal subjects: focus type (information, corrective and broad focus) (Jiménez-Fernández 2015 a,b) and verb type (transitive [+animate or –animate object], unaccusative [progressive or result change; motion] and unergative [monovalent or bivalent] verbs). These tests are intended for adults and children:

a) Control groups Spanish and Italian L1: adults and children.

We started by testing a control group composed of 124 Spanish native-speakers (adults). The test consists of a series of sentences/dialogues set in different contexts, and a final part (generally a question) with four options proposing different word orders to complete the relevant micro-text. For each option the student should provide a judgement from 0 to 4 (where 0= very bad and 4 = the best option). All options are grammatical. We are interested to know which word order option the learner would choose for that specific context. This test is distributed online, it is anonymous and it takes about 20 minutes.

(1) *Esta mañana había un gato en el jardín, pero ya no está ¿Quién lo ha cogido?*

_This morning there was a cat in the garden and now I can’t see it anymore. Who took the cat?_ (information focus question type).

After that, the test was taken as the model for the “Smurfs Test” used for children, where we tested language production of postverbal subjects depending on different situational contexts (107 children). We created a one-to-one question-(free) answer test with The Smurfs characters for the syntax-prosody analysis of Postverbal Subjects in L1 children. The test consists of a series of sentences/dialogues set in different audiovisual contexts and a final part (question) that motivates the child’s answer. The test was distributed as a power point presentation in two different sessions (2 weeks distance).
Since the acquisitional process of postverbal subjects in L1 children and L2 speakers might be related to the Null Subject parameter (Frascarelli 2007), we also tested this linguistic phenomenon by conducting a null subject test for children, the “Peppa Pig” test (107 children).

Summary of preliminary results:

**Information focus.** *Adults:* SVO is the preferred order for all verb types. OVS (associated with left-dislocation) is a very frequent order in Spanish. VOS (associated with in situ object) shows different values depending on the verb type. VSO shows very low values in general: right dislocation is not a real option in Spanish. *Children:* VOS and OVS are more frequent in children from 8 to 10 with all 3 types of verbs (trans,inac,inerg). SVO is the preferred order from 5 to 8 with all verbs.

**Corrective focus.** *Adults:* OVS order is in general associated with this type of focus; however, VOS is preferred in some cases. SVO is a preferred option with all verb types. VSO is not an option in this case. *Children:* OVS, there is a progression from 63% to 95% in all children (from 5) for trans.-[an] verbs. VOS is used by children from 8 to 10 for inac.[result change] verbs and SVO is used by children from 5 to 8 in the same case.

**Broad focus.** *Adults:* SVO is the preferred order for all verb types. Relevance of the VOS order in this case, which is the second option. VSO and OVS show very different values depending on the verb type. *Children:* There is a progression from 53% to 77% (Primary School with inac.[result change] verbs and SVO is the preferred order for trans.-[an] and inerg.[mo] verbs.

b) English-speakers students of Spanish L2/Italian L2.

This experimental test is still in progress. The Postverbal Subject Online Test for English-speakers students of Spanish L2 is being conducted at present.

**References**

The Left Periphery of nominal phrases and the argument-adjective asymmetry

This presentation investigates the interaction of formal morpho-syntactic mechanisms, like the licensing of agreement and empty categories, with discourse-related functions (unselective quantification and information structure), focusing on the internal syntax of DPs.

The left periphery and informational structure in nominal phrases have been less investigated and appear to be much more reduced with respect to the sentential ones. In this paper we want to suggest: 1) that in fact nominals may have an informationally relevant left peripheral position (see Alexiadou et al. 2007); 2) that they may use it both per se and as an escape hatch to feed the left periphery of the sentence; 3) that some of the limitations observed in this domain are motivated by an independent universal constraint on adjective movement that languages with arguments introduced by null determiners are able to circumvent.

Under certain conditions, languages display fronting (with or without further extraction from the DP) both of (inflectional or prepositional) argument phrases, as in (1), and of Adjective Phrases (APs), as in (2). In some languages, these formal structures can come to interact with (parametrically activated/available) information-related functions. There are languages, however, that admit the former but not the latter type of movement, for apparently purely formal reasons, see (3):

(1) a. Nauk-oj uwięczenie u nego bylo vsegda. Russian
   ‘He has always been interested in science.’
   b. wiste he geornor þæt his aldres wæs ende gegonæn. Old English
   knew the more-surely that his life was end come (cobeowul, 27.818.702)
   ‘[he] knew more surely that his life’s end had come’

(2) a. Novujo prodal Piotr [t mašinu]. Russian
   New sold Peter car ‘Peter sold a/the new car.’
   b. Ne seah ic ælfþeodigæ þæs manige men modiglicran. Old English
   NEG saw I foreign so many men brave (cobeowul, 12.336.276)
   ‘I have never seen so many brave foreign men’

(3) a. ho letto DI HUME il libro (non di Kant) Italian
   have read of Hume the book (not of Kant) ‘I read Hume’s book, not Kant’s’
   b. *ho letto NUOVO il libro (non vecchio)
   have read new the book (not old) ‘I read the new book, (not the old one)’

Languages that allow for fronting or extraction of adnominal APs are Slavic languages (except Bulgarian/Macedonian), Latin, the earliest stages of Old English. In the other group, i.e. languages that only allow for the fronting or extraction of genitives but not of APs, one finds Bulgarian/Macedonian, later Old English (Crisma 2011), modern Germanic languages, Romance languages. This partly recalls a typological generalization pointed out by Bošković (2005 and following work), namely that Left Branch Extraction is possible in languages without articles.

The key to understanding this peculiar crosslinguistic distribution of these phenomena is the pattern displayed by Greek: within Greek definite DPs, APs come in two varieties, with or without a definite article of their own, duplicating the one of the whole phrase (polydefiniteness). Indefinites do not show reduplication. In definite DPs, the reduplication of the article is without a definite article of their own, duplicating the one of the whole phrase (polydefiniteness). Patterns following work)
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We argue that the two conditions in (5) are not disjunctive but are instantiations of the same mechanism of satisfying the agreement requirements of frontable XPs. The possibility in (a) suggests that in such XPs, APs headed by agreeing adjectives use the XP-internal D immediately selecting them to check their uninterpretable φ-features, independently of the D heading the overall DP. Likewise, in languages of type (b) such agreement requirements are satisfied more abstractly, through a null D category independently introducing - arguably - bare argument nominals in such languages. In this perspective, (5) can be rephrased as in (6), which also captures the difference between APs and elements which are frontable in languages not meeting the conditions in (5) a or b, such as prepositional genitives in Romance, cf. (3):

(6) Fronting (and extraction, Giorgi & Longobardi 1991, ch.2) is only possible for NP-internal XPs that satisfy φ-agreement locally, that is, within the limits of the fronted phrase itself.

In our proposal, then, agreement requirements cannot be satisfied through reconstruction.

The Slavic language family presents a suggestive articulation: the availability of adjectival movement correlates with the presence/absence of overt articles in these languages, thus splitting the family into Bulgarian/Macedonian vs. the rest of Slavic:

(7) *Nova-ta prodade Petko [ t kola].

BULGARIAN

new-DEF sold Peter car ‘Peter sold the new car’ (Bošković 2005: 3)

Interestingly, the availability of AP extraction in the Slavic languages without overt articles crucially depends on whether adjectives are marked for φ-features: Serbo-Croatian has several non-agreeing adjectives and these are the only adjectives that cannot undergo extraction:

(8) Đok smed-ja / *braon / *bež je on kupio [ t kola] SERBO-CROATIAN

brown-FEM.SG / brown / beige AUX he bought car.FEM.SG

‘He bought a/the brown/beige car’ (adapted from Bošković 2012)

The difference observed in (8) can be explained by the proposal in (6), if one accepts that null determiners are necessarily licensed through agreement with an overt number feature on the head of their complement XP. This would follow from Delfitto and Schroten’s (1992) independent treatment of the lack of bare nominal arguments in languages without number marking on N.

The Slavic languages allowing AP movement are not uniform with respect to whether they only allow AP extraction or also DP-internal fronting of adjectives: Serbo-Croatian does not allow the latter at all, Polish has a restricted set of fronting contexts, while Russian allows them more freely, though not completely. The variation of this property across Slavic calls for another parametric cut, namely, some languages cannot use the escape hatch position for discourse related functions, whereas others can. Interestingly, Polish and Russian share another property: both languages have a postnominal position for (a more or less restricted class of) adjectives, preceding genitives, while Serbo-Croatian does not. Thus, there is a correlation between the unavailability of another marked position for APs and DP-internal fronting of adjectives: the left-peripheral position is used for information-structure purposes only if the language has the independent option of variable AP positions NP-internally, otherwise it can only be used as an escape hatch from the DP. In other words, the left-peripheral position is present in both types of languages, but only one type activates discourse-related positions within DPs.

We conclude that DPs may have a peripheral position left of D, well visible e.g. in Greek, usable for discourse-related functions and/or further movement outside the nominal phrase. Bošković’s proposed generalization about lack of articles and freer extraction of AP modifiers from NP is corroborated beyond the domain of Slavic languages. A deep analysis of these constructions suggests that languages without overt articles do not lack a functional head like D, but rather provide evidence for a structural realization of a set of unpronounced formal features in a D-like position, subject to the generalization of otherwise attested licensing conditions. It also suggests that, on a par with its parametric exploitation for discourse related functions, the quantificational interpretation of this null bundle of features as definite/indefinite is outside Narrow Syntax, while in languages with articles the position is only licensed via valuation of its content through phonologically overt specification.
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dimitris.michelioudakis@york.ac.uk nina.radkevich@york.ac.uk
**Discourse-Pragmatics Beyond Force: \nContrastiveness in North-Eastern Italian Dialects (NEIDs)**

In Lamonat and Sovramontino, the NEIDs under investigation, contrastive elements, be they topics or foci, are limited to one occurrence per sentence and must be sentence-initial. The paper aims to (i) attempt a unitary syntactic analysis of contrastive foci and contrastive topics in Lamonat and Sovramontino and (ii) shed more light on the relationship between contrastiveness and the discourse-pragmatic function of the XP projection above Force.

Traditionally, an element is contrastive when it specifically refers to an information unit that is contrary to the corresponding interlocutor’s presuppositions (Kiss 1998). A contrastive element can also involve an explicit choice among a finite set of alternatives where the presupposed contrasting information unit has not been previously mentioned in the discourse. Contrastiveness is generally considered as a property of foci, more specifically a subtype of narrow focus. It is nonetheless also a well-attested feature of topics (Lopez 2009, Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010). Typologically, the common syntactic-pragmatic properties of contrastive foci and contrastive topics are discussed by Erteschik-Shir (2007), who notes that, in many languages (i) sentence initial topics represent so-called contrastive or switch topics and consist of a specific type of topic that has some focus properties; and (ii) sentence initial foci represent restrictive or contrastive foci consisting of a specific type of focus that has some topic-like properties. Lamonat and Sovramontino obey this typological trend and exhibit a sharp distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive elements.

In Lamonat and Sovramontino, all contrastive constituents must surface at the leftmost position of the sentence regardless of whether they constitute foci or topics. As for contrastive topics, we mean a piece of topical information that, explicitly or implicitly, is in a contrastive relation with another piece of topical information. As far as contrastive foci are concerned, unlike in standard Italian, they can never be realised in-situ, but must appear at the left edge of the utterance, as in (1):

1) **CONTEXT: Did you give a T-shirt to the winner? (Lamonat & Sovramontino)**

   a. No. NA MEDAJA ge on dat al vinñitor NEG a medal DAT.CL have.1PL given to-the-winner  "No. We gave a medal to the winner"

   b. #No. Ge on dat NA MEDAJA al vinñitor NEG DAT.CL have.1PL given a medal to-the-winner  "No. We gave a medal to the winner"

Note that such position is not available for non-contrastive constituents in narrow focus, as only focal and topical elements bearing a contrastive reading can occupy it. For instance, new-information focus fronting is not available in these NEIDs, as shown in (2):

2) **CONTEXT: What did you give to the winner? (Lamonat & Sovramontino)**

   a. Ge on dat NA MEDAJA b. #NA MEDAJA ge on dat DAT.CL have.1PL given a medal a medal DAT.CL have.1PL given 'We gave him a medal' 'We gave him a medal'

   Despite the virtually identical surface positions of contrastive foci and contrastive topics, the two exhibit clear morpho-syntactic differences, as exemplified in (3) and (4):

3) a. **TO PARE è vedù ier an tel bosk [no to mare!]** (Lamonat) your father have.1SG seen yesterday in-the woods  'It was your father that I saw in the woods, not your mother'  

   b. *TO PARE ier è vedù an tel bosk [no to mare!]

4) To pare ier l è vedù an tel bosk, [to mare l era fora kasa] your father yesterday OCL have.1SG seen in-the woods  'As for you father, I saw him in the woods yesterday, while your mother was at home'
In (3), the focal constituent *to pare* contrasts with *to mare*; similarly, in (4), the topic *to pare* is in contrast with *to mare* and sets the frame of the utterance. In (4), the left dislocated contrastive topic must be resumed by an object clitic in the matrix clause, which indicates topicalization; ii) in (3), the contrastive focal element requires adjacency to the verb and receives main sentence stress: nothing can intervene between the focal constituent and the verb as the insertion of any adverbial or topical phrase would yield ungrammaticality (see (3b)). The NEIDs in question strictly require that any constituent bearing a contrastive reading appear in the left-edge of the sentence, irrespective of its status as topic or focus.

By adopting Rizzi's (1997) split-CP model, I investigate which left peripheral position contrastive elements occupy in these two varieties; most importantly, I critically evaluate whether or not this position can be regarded as the same for contrastive topics and contrastive foci. To this end, I look at root interrogatives, D-linked *wh*-elements and high adverbs. I propose that in Lamonat and Sovramontino both contrastive foci and topics target the same leftmost position in the left periphery. This position is above ForceP, as shown in (5):

(5) \[\text{XP [ForceP [TopicP [FocP [FinP [TP]]]]]]\]

XP dominates ForceP as (i) contrastiveness is only licensed at the sentence leftmost position; and (ii) despite being topic-like, contrastive elements are not recursive. The other empirical piece of evidence that suggests that contrastive elements occupy a syntactic position higher than Force is that they are found in complementary distribution with aboutness topics (in the sense of Frascarelli and Bianchi 2010) and frame-setters. Both types of elements are not affected by sentence type or mood (Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007; Greco and Haegeman 2017). XP therefore closely resembles FrameP: Poletto (2000, 2002) and Benincà & Poletto (2004) argue that this 'scene setting position' is indeed located structurally higher than Force. The discourse-pragmatics of 'frame setting' elements is compatible with that of contrastive elements as speakers pick a specific element that, implicitly or explicitly, contrasts with the other elements that they could have picked as frame-setters. This has lead us to the claim that, in these varieties, the discourse-pragmatics of contrastive elements, frame-setters and aboutness topics have merged in a position which is structurally higher than Force. Furthermore, the complementary distribution between contrastive elements and a-topics (as well as frame–setters) can be explained in light of this functional-pragmatics merge: both types of elements have the function of limiting the applicability of the main predication to a certain restricted domain. In other words, such elements require a following utterance to predicate the validity of them, anchoring the main predication to a specific domain.

To conclude, contrastiveness seems to have the ability of superseding topic or focus status; our research goes towards a unitary treatment of this syntactic-pragmatic aspect of language in the Romance varieties under investigation. Our data also suggest that such reanalysis of contrastive elements has led to the collapse of several discourse-pragmatics functions in a single projection above Force.

**Selected References:**

The interaction of morphophonological requirements of focus with verb-initial word orders in root/non-root clauses
Arantzazu Elordieta (UPV/EHU) (with Bill Haddican (CUNY, Queens College))
arantzazu.elordieta@ehu.eus bill.haddican@gmail.com

In this paper we study three different strategies available in Basque dialects to focalize the finite verb: (i) verb doubling, (ii) ba-insertion and (iii) V1 strategy. We argue that the three constructions reflect different ways of complying with morphophonological requirements of foci, including the requirement that foci be capable of bearing sentence stress. In particular, we argue that these strategies reflect selective deletion of material in Focus (PF repair operations) that would otherwise violate these constraints (Bošković and Nunes 2007).

Tense-bearing verbs are banned from occurring in sentence initial position in standard Basque, discounting topics (Elordieta and Jouitteau 2010; Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina 2003; Euskaltzaindia 1985; Ortiz de Urbina 1989, 1994; Uriagereka 1999). We illustrate this constraint, which we will refer to as "*T1" in (1). In (1a), the tense-bearing verb sits in sentence initial position and the result is bad. (1b,c) show word orders where the verb is shielded from the left edge of the sentence by foci or by a non-finite verb form. (1d) shows that topics, which are obligatorily separated from material to their right by an intonational break, do not count as first position elements.

(1) a. *Dator Mikel come.3sg Mikel ‘Mikel is coming’
   b. MIKEL/Nor dator/? Mikel/who come.3sg ‘MIKEL/who is coming?’
   c. Etorri da Mikel come-inf be.3sg Mikel ‘Mikel HAS come’
   d. *Mikel, dator Mikel come.3sg ‘As for Mikel, he is coming’

*T1 is violable, however, in some embedded clause types, as in the temporal adjunct clause and the embedded yes/no questions in (2) and (3) respectively (Ortiz de Urbina 1994; Elordieta and Haddican 2014).

(2) Jon ikusi-ko dut [datorr-en-ean] Jon-abs see-fut aux come.3sg- Comp-loc ‘I will see Jon when he comes’
(3) Ez daki-t [datorr-en] ala ez neg know-1sg come.3sg-Comp or not ‘I don’t know if (s)he’s coming or not’

It has been suggested that the above pattern is akin to V2, in light of the fact that V2 effects in Germanic languages do not apply in some kinds of embeddings (Holmberg 2015; Jouitteau 2008; Julien 2009; Roberts 2004 for Germanic/Celtic and Ortiz de Urbina 1989, 1994; Uriagereka 1999 for Basque). However, we describe a set of word order facts which are problematic for this approach and argue instead that the tensed verb does not raise to the same C-head that attracts XP-movement. We link the root/non-root asymmetry in (1a) vs. (2)-(3) to a structural deficiency of certain embedded clauses.

Two (standard) assumptions are crucial to our analysis: a) finite verbs in Basque do not bear main stress (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, 1994; Elordieta 2001), and b) focus must contain an element bearing main stress. Thus, a focalised finite verb clashes with the latter requirement.
We propose that when the tensed verb is focalised, Basque resorts to three different repair strategies: (i) verb doubling (see (4)), (ii) *ba*-insertion (see (5)) and (iii) V1 strategy (see (6)), which reflect a PF repair by partial or total spell out of multiple and/or lower copies in a way that accommodates these conflicting needs (Nunes 2004; Bošković and Nunes 2007).

(4) a. Ibil-i dabil beti kale-a-n
    walk-inf walk.3sg always street-det-loc
    ‘She is always WALKING in the street’/
    ‘She IS always WALKING in the street’

(5) a. *dator Mikel b. Ba-dator Mikel
    ba-come.3sg Mikel ba-come.3sg Mikel
    ‘Mikel is coming’  ‘Mikel is coming’

(6) Eros-i du Jon-ek egunkari-a
    buy-inf aux Jon-erg newspaper-det
    ‘Jon HAS bought the newspaper’ (general verum focus reading across dialects)
    ‘/Jon has BOUGHT the newspaper’ (also verb focus in eastern dialects)

REFERENCES:
Datives, theticity and information structure
Antonio Fábregas (University of Tromsø), Ángel L. Jiménez Fernández (University of Seville) & Mercedes Tubino (Western Michigan University)

THE PROBLEM. Dative experiencer (DE) psychological predicates have an unmarked, thetic ordering Dative-Verb-Nominative (1):

(1) ¿Qué pasa?
What’s up?
  a. Que a María le gusta Juan.
      that to María her.DAT likes Juan
  b. #Que Juan le gusta a María.
      that Juan her.DAT likes to María

Note that there are arguments that the DE is not in subject position (Gutiérrez-Bravo 2006, Tubino 2008) in these cases. In accusative eventive predicates, in contrast, the thetic ordering is with the nominative in preverbal position.

(2) ¿Qué pasa?
What’s up?
  a. Que Juan ha atacado a María.
      that Juan has attacked ACC María
  b. #Que a María la ha atacado Juan.
      that ACC María her.ACC has attacked Juan

There are even minimal pairs with the same verb in the two construals (Campos 1999):

(3) ¿Qué pasa?
What’s up?
  a. Que a María le molesta Juan.
      [stative, DE]
      that to María her.DAT bothers Juan
  a’. #Que Juan le molesta a María.
  b. Que Juan molesta a María.
      [eventive, acc.]
      that Juan bothers ACC María
  b’. #Que a María la molesta Juan.

The problem is the following: why is the thetic ordering of these verbs radically different with DE stative construals and with accusative eventive construals?

DEFECTIVE INTERVENTION AND LABELING. We motivate the order in (4) as the base structure for a DE verb (1). Following Chomsky’s (2000: 123) Defective Intervention, the dative blocks the checking relation between T and the subject, preventing agreement and thus creating a non-convergent configuration.

(4) *[T... [DatDP VP NomDP]]

From (4), the alternative configuration in which Dat internally merges above T is convergent, as it no longer is an intervenor. We assume that the landing site of Dat in (5) is a functional head immediately dominating T (Uriagereka 1995).
In the case of an accusative eventive verb, the configuration is (6).

(6)  *[T   [NomDP  vP [VP  AccDP]]

This derivation is non-convergent: the nominative DP is a phrase merged with another phrase (vP), without agreement between them. This precludes labeling of the set formed by them (Chomsky 2013); the solution is to internally merge DP with TP, with subsequent agreement that solves the labeling problem.

(7)  [[NomDP  T  [____ vP [VP  AccDP]]

INFORMATION STRUCTURE. The question is, then, why the movement of the DE in (5) and that of the nominative in (7) do not break the thetic ordering of the clause. Following the spirit of Reinhart (2007), we propose that movement is only interpreted as having an impact on information structure if there is an alternative derivation which does not involve this particular movement and which is also convergent. In the case of (4)-(5), movement of DE is not informationally relevant because the alternative without movement is non-convergent. In the case of (6)-(7), the same happens.

The configuration in (1b) is not thetic because there is an alternative derivation not involving movement that is also convergent, so movement of Nom has information structure consequences:

(8)  COMPARE:  a. [DatDP  T  [____ VP NomDP]
       b. [NomDP ... DatDP  T  [____ VP  ____]]

The configuration in (2b) involves, with respect to (7), movement of AccDP above TP, so it will also have information structure repercussions.

CONSEQUENCES FOR INFORMATION STRUCTURE. This account suggests that information structure does not need to be built by endowing syntactic constituents with specialised features (topic, focus...) that trigger movement to designated positions. Its effects can be obtained as an epiphenomenon from internal merge operations that are allowed by the system (cf. Chomsky 2013, Epstein, Kitahara & Seely 2014) but are not required in order to obtain convergent derivations.
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In this paper, we shed new light on the question of how neutral and contrastive focus is realized in Central-Peninsular Spanish and propose a stochastic optimality-theoretic approach (SOT, Boersma & Hayes 2001) to account for the attested variation. At the same time, we propose that existing discrepancies between claims made in theoretical work on the one hand and in empirical work on the other can be reduced to diatopic differences. By considering data collected through a production experiment based on semi-spontaneous speech including transitive and intransitive verbs, this study reveals five main findings:

(a) Neutral and contrastive focus can each be realized by different strategies (cf. (1), (2), and (3)), but stress shift is not a relevant option (see section No stress shift);
(b) Cleft constructions are used for both focus types even though there are certain preferences: (inverted) pseudo-clefts are favored for neutral focus, while simple clefts are preferred for contrastive focus (see section Cleft and focus type);
(c) Subject/object asymmetry in clefts: Subjects typically prefer simple clefts both in neutral and contrastive focus, whereas objects prefer inverted pseudo-clefts for neutral focus, while they allow for both pseudo-clefts and simple clefts for contrastive focus;
(d) Focus does not have to bear always sentential stress: in clefts, prosodic alignment can be a sufficient correlate of focus (see section Focus without sentential stress);
(e) Direct and indirect objects differ with respect to the strategy speaker choose to realize focus: P-movement and clefts are favored for neutral focus on direct objects, while the neutral word order and clefts are favored for neutral focus in indirect objects. As for contrastive focus there is no difference in the strategy but in the frequency of the strategy (see Table 1).

No stress shift: There is an ongoing discussion on how focus is realized in Spanish. Theoretical work (such as Zubizarreta 1998, 1999 or Gutiérrez-Bravo 2002) argues that neutrally focused elements must be located in sentence-final position (via \textit{p-movement}, (1b)) in order to receive main stress by means of the Nuclear Stress Rule. Empirical studies, in turn, show that neutrally focused elements actually can be realized \textit{in situ} (1a) and that this option reflects the predominant strategy for focus realization (e.g. Gabriel, Feldhausen & Pešková 2009, Gabriel 2010 for Argentinean Spanish; Muntendam 2013 for Andean Spanish; Hoot 2012 for Mexican Spanish; Vanrell & Fernández-Soriano 2013 for Canarian Spanish). Our empirical results show that stress shift is not an option in Central-Peninsular Spanish and suggest that dialectal variation must be taken into account as a decisive factor involved in the variation of focus realization strategies.

Cleft and focus type: While the cleft constituent (such as \textit{Juan} in (3)) is generally considered to be the contrastively focused element in Spanish (see, e.g., Zubizarreta 1999, Morales 2005, van den Steen 2005), Moreno Cabrera (1999: 429ff.) states that simple clefts on the one hand and (inverted) pseudo-clefts on the other hand have different information structural properties. Our study – as far as we know – represents the first empirical verification of this claim and confirms it; see Table 2.

Focus without sentential stress: It is generally accepted that focus in Spanish bears sentential stress (see, e.g., Ortiz-Lira 1994, Zubizarreta 1998 among many others). However, contrary to what has been claimed in the past, our results show the contrastively focused constituent in clefts such as (4a) does not always bear sentential stress – independently of the
grammatical function of the clefted element. This corroborates the claim made by Moreno Cabrera (1999: 4298f.) who says that simple clefts in Spanish do not need a special intonational marking of the contrastive focus. This is also reminiscent of the hypothesis put forth in Féry (2013), stating that the prosodic correlate of focus is rather prosodic alignment than prosodic prominence in terms of sentential stress.

**Theoretical account:** The results are accounted for by means of a SOT approach using established constraints from work on intonational phrasing, focus marking and cleft constructions (such as ALIGN-FOCUS-i-R and HEAD-i-R from Féry 2013, SUBJECT from Grimshaw & Samek-Lodovici 1998, or FOCUSCLEFT from Destruel 2013). The proposed model offers clear advantages over the approaches proposed by Gutiérrez-Bravo (2002) and Gabriel (2010), since it accounts for both the variation attested in the data and the use of clefts.

(1) a. [F Los aLUMnos] se enfrentaron con la policía. (*Europ.Sp / LatinAmSp.)
   ‘The students confronted the police’.

   b. Se enfrentaron con la policía [F los aLUMnos].
   (Europ.Sp / okLatinAmSp.)

(2) [cF ManZAnas] compró Pedro (y no peras).
   ‘Pedro eats apples (and not pears).’

(3) a. Es Juan el que viene.
   ‘It is Juan who comes.’

   b. El que viene es Juan.
   Clefts

   c. Juan es el que viene.
   Pseudo-clefts

   Inverted pseudo-clefts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral focus</th>
<th>Contrastive focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[S]</td>
<td>[cS]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clefting 71.1%</td>
<td>Clefting 61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-movement 14.5%</td>
<td>Focus fronting 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O_m]</td>
<td>[cO_m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-movement 47.9%</td>
<td>Clefting 61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral WO 43.6%</td>
<td>Focus fronting 23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O_a]</td>
<td>[cO_a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clefting 23.3%</td>
<td>Clefting 41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral WO 43.6%</td>
<td>Focus fronting 23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Types and frequency of focus marking strategies in neutral focus (left panel) and contrastive focus (right panel) declaratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral focus</th>
<th>Clefts 44.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-clefts 13.4%</td>
<td>Clefts 70.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted pseudo-clefts 41.5%</td>
<td>Pseudo-clefts 23.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contrastive focus | Inverted pseudo-clefts 5.4% |

Table 2: Types and frequency of cleft constructions attested in neutral and contrastive focus declaratives.

Discourse Categories in Imperatives
Mara Frascarelli and Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández
University of Roma Tre; University of Seville

1. Introduction and goal. A number of recent works have examined the internal composition and extent of the phrasal hierarchies in the left periphery of different clause types, mainly concentrating on the distinction between root, ‘root-like’ subordinates and (diverse) embedded clauses (cf., among others, Haegeman 2002; Heycock 2006). Some works have also focused on the projection of discourse categories, leading to a clause-related distinction for (different types of) Foci, Contrast and Topics, also based on semantic and prosodic interface considerations (cf. Ámbar 1999, Haegeman 2004, 2012; Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010; Bianchi 2012; Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007; Jiménez-Fernández 2015a,b; Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa 2014). The data examined generally concern declarative or interrogative clauses, while no such study was ever proposed for imperative clauses.

This paper intends to address this issue for imperative clauses, assuming as diagnostics conversational dynamics and the type of discourse categories that are admitted in their C-domain, through a systematic comparative interface investigation in three languages (English, Italian and Spanish). A novel perspective is thus proposed to shed new light on the syntax-semantic mapping and the interface (syntax-prosody) properties of imperative clauses, embedding the relevant proposal in a cartographic framework of analysis.

2. Describing the picture: The association of Topics and Foci with imperatives. Assuming Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl’s (2007) interface distinction between Aboutness-Shift (A-)Topics, Contrastive (C-)Topics and Familiar/Given (G-)Topics, it appears that the semantic and discourse properties of A-Topics can hardly associate with the imperative mood, as shown by examples (1a-b) from Italian, where (1b) involves an A-Topic in the left periphery:

(1) a. Basta giocare: vai subito a finire i compiti!
   ‘Stop playing: go and finish your homework immediately!’
   b. *Basta giocare: i compiti, vai subito a finirli!
   ‘Stop playing: your homework, go and finish it immediately!’

As argued in Bianchi & Frascarelli (2010), an A-Topic constitutes a speech act on its own (an ‘initiating speech act’, cf. Krifka 2001), introduced by a dedicated speech act operator and (possibly) conjoined to the speech act expressed by the following sentence. Hence, though they might in principle be associated with an imperative, a sentence like (1b) cannot be interpreted because two instructions cannot be successfully managed in the same complex speech act. On the other hand, C-Topics (2B) and G-Topics (3) seem to be allowed (both in Italian and Spanish), showing that they can be interpreted in the scope of operators:

(2) A. Dove posso mettere questi fiori? (*Where can I put these flowers?’)
   B. a. Le rose, mettile nel vaso, il girasole lascialo sul tavolo.
   b. Las rosas ponlas en el jarrón, el girasol déjalo sobre la mesa.
   (lit. the roses put-them in the vase, the sunflower leave-it on the table)
(3) a. La palla tirala./ Tirala, la palla.
   b. La pelota tirala./ Tirala, la pelota. (lit. the ball throw-it/throw-it the ball)

In this respect, English appears to provide some cross-linguistic differences. Cormany (2013) argues that non-contrastive topics are not allowed in English and, in general, left-peripheral arguments are often unacceptable (from Jensen 2007):


However, this is not absolute. Sentences (5a–c), from Haegeman (2012:120), obtain acceptable results, and the context clearly induces a C-Topic interpretation for the fronted constituents. Thus C-Topics (though not G-Topics) are fronted in imperatives:
(5) a. The tie give to Bob, the aftershave give to Don.
   b. Anything you don’t eat put back in the fridge.

This is expected given Bianchi & Frascarelli’s suggestion that in English G-Topics are realized through destressing.

As for foci, a Mirative Focus (MF) totally ‘clashes’ with the imperative mood (compare declarative (6a) with (6b) from Italian), while Contrastive Focus (CF) is unproblematic as long as the focused element remains in situ, as in (7). The crucial observation is that MF is argued to be connected with a root ‘evaluative’ force (a “proposal to negotiate a shared evaluation”, cf. Bianchi 2012). So, what about Correction? How can we account for the dichotomy between the fronted and the in situ realization?

(6) a. Wow! DUE BOTTIGLIE abbiamo bevuto! (Wow: TWO BOTTLES OF WINE we drank!)
   b. *Wow! DUE BOTTIGLIE bevi immediatamente! (Wow: TWO BOTTLES drink now!)

(7) a. Bevi L’ACQUA, non il vino! / ¡Bébete EL AGUA, no el vino! (Drink WATER, not wine!)
   b. *L’ACQUA bevi, non il vino! / *¡EL AGUA bébete, no el vino! (*WATER drink, not wine!)

3. The proposal. Cormany (2013) proposes that in imperatives V raises to Fin and the ‘subject’ to spec-FinP. Jensen (2007), on the other hand, concludes that imperatives lack a CP domain altogether. We think that the data examined lead toward a different solution.

Based on the results provided by an interface investigation of elicited data and original interpretive questionnaires, it is thus argued that imperatives qualify as non-assertive matrix propositions, dominated by a Speech Act Phrase, which includes the Speaker and the Addressee as co-arguments (thus implementing previous proposals by Speas & Tenny 2003, Haegeman & Hill 2010, and Miyagawa 2012). The imperative feature is therefore not connected with Force, but interpreted via an Agree relation between a Modality projection (in the split-IP zone) and the [+DIR]ective feature encoded in the C-domain. In this picture Agreement properties can find a novel explanation (puttin in force Miyagawa’s notion of “allocutive” agreement) and cross-linguistic asymmetries are comprehensively taken into account in the light of independent syntactic and interface requirements.

The inactivation of an independent Force can explain why imperatives block the realization of A-Topics and MF, still allowing for C-Topics. As for the ban on fronted CF, this can be independently attributed to an intervention effect: syntax blocks the movement of discourse-related categories that interfere with the allocutive probe in Fin°.
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CRITICAL POSITIONS WITHOUT FEATURES
CONSEQUENCES FOR LABELING AND CARTOGRAPHY
Angélique Gallego (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

1. MAIN IDEA. This paper argues that left periphery interpretations (topic, focus, relative, modifier, etc.) should be analyzed in configurational terms (like theta roles). Adopting ideas of the l-syntax framework of Hale & Keyser’s (1993) and the label-free system of Chomsky (2008, 2013, 2015), we put forward an approach to left periphery interpretations that dispenses with both feature checking and purely templatic-based mechanisms (cf. Rizzi 1997, 2004).

2. BACKGROUND. Cartographic studies have been at the forefront of generative linguistics at least for the last fifteen years. Although various attempts have been made to recast cartographic analyses (Abels 2012, Bobaljik 2000, Ernst 2002, Lopez 2009, Nilsen 2003, among others), no agreed-upon alternative has succeeded. Nevertheless, cartographic approaches have been shown to be problematic on both conceptual and empirical grounds. On the conceptual side, there are three salient objections. First, if UG contained the functional sequence postulated by cartographers (ca. 400 functional heads; cf. Cinque & Rizzi 2008), it would be too complex—implausible on acquisition and evolution grounds (Chomsky 2011). Second, the machinery assumed by cartographers includes: movement-driven Spec-Hº feature checking (which requires postulation of labels and movement) and the postulation of redundant features (e.g., a Top head is endowed with a Top feature). Finally, a key working hypothesis of cartography is that notions like “Topic” are lexical items, which is not obvious on paradigmatic grounds; instead, “Topics” (alternatively, “Subjects,” “Objects,” etc.; cf. Chomsky 1965) are likely to be syntagmatic entities, since they emerge in the syntax—through a configuration.

On the empirical side, various potential loopholes have also been noted. First, the order of adverbs and certain verbal heads (auxiliaries) has been shown to be more intricate than predicted by the cartographic templates (Bobaljik 2000), at least for Italian. Second, Rizzi (1997) accounts for certain ordering restrictions (e.g., two contrastive foci in Romance), suggesting that they violate the functional sequence. However, Lopez (2009) convincingly counters that most such cases cannot be reduced to a templatic explanation, involving a pragmatic clash instead. Taking contrastive focus to involve a correction interpretation, Lopez argues that “it is odd to have two corrections simultaneously” (p.123). As this author shows, the same clash remains even if one focus stays in situ (see (1b)), which is unexpected if all that matters is the functional sequence (in the CP).

(1) Context: John gave the CDs to Chris
a. #THE BOOKS, TO MARY he gave
b. #THE BOOKS, he gave TO MARY

Third, it is unclear why feature checking is needed for left periphery interpretations to arise, given the evidence showing that Probe-Goal agreement does not require movement (it can take operate ‘at a distance;’ cf. Boecx 2008). Finally, Rizzi (2004) draws evidence from different languages that seem to spell-out the left periphery heads postulated by cartographic studies. Relevant examples are Gungbe yà or Japanese wa. Be this as it may, it is somewhat intriguing that the languages at hand are head-final, which could be taken to indicate that these particles are the spell-out of an affix attached to the moved phrase, and not a left periphery head—just like the particle a in Spanish is attached to DPs in DOM scenarios (Ana via a Carlos – Eng. ‘Ana saw Carlos’). Evidence supporting this possibility is found in Tlingit (Cable 2010). (This head-final) language features the particle sá adjacent to wh-phrases moved to the left periphery, as (2) shows:

(2) Waa sá sh tudinookw I éesh? (Tlingit)
how Q feels your father

“How is your father feeling?”

One could take (2) to reinforce Rizzi’s (2004) view, sá heading a dedicated projection in the CP layer. However, Cable (2010) provides evidence that sá heads a Q projection merged with the wh-phrase.

3. THE PROPOSAL. Chomsky’s (1965) observation about syntactic functions being derivative is, at the relevant level of abstraction, the one Hale & Keyser (1993) make in their approach to theta-roles, which are also treated like relational entities. Assuming this, this paper explores (3):

(3) The Configurational Thesis: Criterial interpretations (topic, focus, etc.) are analogous to thematic interpretations (agent, theme, etc.)—emergent properties of configurations

The gist of Hale & Keyser’s project was that thematic roles (and lexical categories) are few in number because, quite simply, phrase structure relations are few in number. If correct, the same should hold for left periphery interpretations (pace Cinque & Rizzi 2008). Therefore, both criterial and thematic interpretations should be limited, and subject to two interface-oriented principles: (i) Unambiguous Projection and (ii) Full Interpretation.

4. THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS. Chomsky’s (1986) Full Interpretation is a fairly standard notion, but phrase structure has been subject to much recent debate (cf. Collins 2002, Hornstein 2009, Narita 2011, Ott 2011). Here we would like to adopt the framework outlined in Chomsky (2013, 2015). Details aside, we assume two components of Chomsky’s proposal. This first one is the idea that labels determine the interpretation of a syntactic object. The second one is a Labeling Algorithm (see (4), where H stands for head):

(4) Labeling Algorithm: In H, cα, H an LI, H is the label

As noted by Chomsky (2003, 2015), the algorithm in (4) is inoperative with (YP, XP) structures. In those cases, the label cannot be determined and movement acts as a repair-strategy (in a way reminiscent of Moro 2000). Empirical evidence that some element must move in (YP, XP) configurations abounds in the literature (Moro 1997, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2007, Richards 2010, etc.). In the same breath, Chomsky (2013, 2015) suggests that the same
problem emerges in movement scenarios, which he takes to account for successive cyclic movement without the need to postulate ad hoc features. This is key, for criterial interpretations precisely involve movement to a Spec position, thus the creation of a (YP, XP) configuration. Given that XPs that move to the left periphery stay there (they do not ‘keep moving,’ successively cyclically), in violation of (4), Chomsky (2013, 2015) argues that there is a feature-matching process that ‘stabilizes’ them. In particular, Chomsky assumes that when a, say, wh-phrase (containing a Q feature; cf. Cable 2010)) and the C head (which also contains a Q feature; cf. Rizzi 2004) merge, the resulting label is obtained through the feature that is shared by both:

\[
\{\{Q, \text{WhP}\}, \{C, \{t_{Q, \text{whP}}\}\}\} \rightarrow Q \text{ feature shared by } C \text{ and } \text{WhP}
\]

(5) is dubious, since it either reintroduces Spec-Hä agreement (and feature-percolation, m-command) or else entails a new, Match-based, conception of Agree. Worse yet, it also jeopardizes the standard structural dependencies established between Probes and Goals—whatever feature X and Y share in the {YP, XP} configuration, it cannot be the case that one c-commands the other, as in standard Agree dependencies (Chomsky 2001).

5. TW O TYPES OF LEFT PERIPHERY DEPENDENTS. Adopting the basics of Chomsky (2008, 2013, 2014), we claim that there are three outcomes of movement, schematically depicted in (6).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \{\{C, \text{XP}\}, \{t_{\text{XP}}\}\} & \text{CLAUSE TYPING} \\
\text{b. } & \langle \text{XP}, \{C, \{t_{\text{XP}}\}\}\rangle & \text{NON CLAUSE TYPING} \\
\text{c. } & \{\{\text{XP}, \{C, \{t_{\text{XP}}\}\}\}\} & \text{SUCCESSIVE CYCLIC MOVEMENT}
\end{align*}
\]

Since (6c) is irrelevant for our purposes, we are left with (6a) and (6b), which fits with Hale & Keyser’s (1993) claim that Unambiguous Projection and Full Interpretation construe the number of theta roles to two per domain/phase (agent-theme and theme-goal in transitive and intransitive VPs respectively; putting aside the introduction of additional, applicative, heads). (6a) and (6b) illustrate movements that have or have not clause-typing effects. We argue that (6b) covers topicalization, which we take to arise through adjunction. Empirically, adjuncts and topics behave on a par on several grounds: they can appear in different positions and in an interated fashion (Cinque 1999, Rizzi 2004). Moreover, given that adjunction involves no labeling (it replicates the already existing label; Chomsky 2004), it creates no locality problem (selection, extraction, etc.), which captures the observation that topicalization lacks typing effects—no verb selects for “clauses with a topic.” (6a) covers phenomena like focalization, wh-movement or relativization, which do involve typing (there are relative/interrogative/exclamative clauses) and trigger island effects (Cinque 1990). We take this to indicate that, structurally, (6b) and (6a) are different. Importantly, as (6a) shows, we claim that the relevant left periphery dependent moves to C and becomes its first-Merge dependent (a ‘complement,’ in X-bar theoretic terms). This has different advantages. First, it adheres to the simplest formulation of (4). Second, if the moved XP becomes the complement of C, then TP in turn becomes a non-complement: a specifier. Now, if specifiers are opaque (Huang 1982, Uriagereka 1999), we can account for the wh-island constraint, which is illustrated in (7):

\[
\text{“How do you wonder } \left[ CP \left[ C \left[ \text{ who} \right] \rightarrow \text{t will fix the car} \right] \right] \text{” ?}
\]

Given that TP becomes a specifier after movement of wh-phrases, it follows that no further wh-phrase can move from the interior of the TP, as it will not be in the search space of C—this domain will be restricted to who. A second empirical prediction made by (6a) concerns so-called “freezing effects.” As noted in the literature (Lasnik & Saito 1992), wh-phrases cannot abandon their checking position, which Rizzi (2006) relates to freezing: once the Q-feature is checked, wh-phrases are “frozen” (see (6a,b)), much like DPs are when they check their Case.

\[
\text{a. Bill wonders } [\text{which book}, \{C, \left[ \text{ she read} \right] \}] \text{ b. } \text{“Which book} \text{,” does Bill wonder } [\{t, \text{C } \left[ \text{ she read} \right] \}]
\]

Though appealing, freezing is hard to accommodate in A-bar terms, for A-bar (i.e. semantic) features (focus, Q, topic, etc.) do not render their bearers [ -active], unlike structural Case. (6a) offers a more promising way to account for (8). If we assume the Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky 2001), whereby the complement of a phase head is transferred to PF and LF at the phase level (and becomes inaccessible), then it is which book (not the TP) that is transferred in (8). This explains why the wh-phrase cannot move after it merges with C.

6. SUMMARY. This paper argues that left periphery interpretations should be treated like theta-roles—that is, derivative or relational (not featural) notions that emerge from the configuration (Hale & Keyser 1993). This sets a different scenario to understand not only the nature of topics (foci, etc.), but also the impressive empirical findings of the cartographic project and the very nature of UG (labels, the “functional sequence,” etc.).

Focus affinity and the argument-adjunct distinction

Steffen Heidinger
University of Graz

Introduction & Research questions. Although almost every part of a sentence can be focus, different syntactic functions do not have the same affinity to focus. For example, objects are considered better candidates for focus than subjects (Lambrecht 1994, Drubig 2003, Dufter & Gabriel 2016, Du Bois 2003). The main goal of this paper is to shed light on the relation between focus affinity (Some syntactic functions are more often focus than others!) on the one hand and the distinction between arguments and adjuncts on the other. Although the argument-adjunct distinction is fundamental both in descriptive and theoretical linguistics, so far no in-depth analysis of its impact on the focus affinity of syntactic functions exists. In this paper we will therefore address the following two questions on the relation between focus affinity and the argument-adjunct distinction.

(1) Research Question 1: How are arguments and adjuncts ranked with respect to focus affinity?
Research Question 2: How can one account for the ranking?

Data source. The language under study is Spanish. The syntactic functions we consider are direct object (dO), subject-oriented depictive (DEP), instrumental adjunct (INST) and locative adjunct (LOC). The respective argument-adjunct comparisons are given in (2).

(2) dO vs. DEP; dO vs. LOC; dO vs. INST

To determine which syntactic function of the pairs in (2) has a stronger affinity to focus, we conducted a forced-choice experiment with written stimuli (36 participants; monolingual speakers of Peninsular Spanish). We presented sentences of the type Subject-NOM-Verb-A-B (where A and B are postverbal syntactic functions as in (2)) and asked participants to choose between two paraphrases. The paraphrases differed w.r.t. the explicitly negated element (A or B). The choice between the paraphrases indicates whether A or B is interpreted as the narrow focus. The method relies on the close relation between focus of negation and information structural focus (cf. Jackendoff 1972, Huddleston & Pullum 2002, Beaver & Clark 2008).

Answer to Research Question 1. The results of the pairwise comparisons are given in (3). It holds for all three pairs that the adjunct has a higher degree of focus affinity than the argument.

(3) DEP > dO; LOC > dO; INST > dO

Table 1 gives additional information on how often the members of each pair were interpreted as focus and on the statistical significance of the observed differences. The table reads as follows: Subject-oriented depictives have a higher degree of focus affinity than direct objects because in a sentence with a depictive and a direct object, the depictive is interpreted more often as focus than the direct object (69,44% > 30,56%); the observed difference is statistically significant on the ,001-level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic functions</th>
<th>Frequency of interpretation as focus</th>
<th>Significance (Binomial; exact, two sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEP &gt; dO</td>
<td>69,44% &gt; 30,56%</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC &gt; dO</td>
<td>77,78% &gt; 22,22%</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST &gt; dO</td>
<td>84,72% &gt; 15,28%</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Pairwise comparisons of arguments and adjuncts
**Answer to Research Question 2.** Our account of the rankings in (3) is based on Grice's (1975) Maxim of Quantity (MoQ) in (4).

(4) Maxim of Quantity: Do not give more information than necessary!

In the face of the MoQ, the presence of a given syntactic function in an utterance must be legitimated. Being focus is one mechanism to legitimate the presence of a given syntactic function in an utterance, being part of a verb's argument structure is another one. In the case of the argument-adjunct distinction, these two mechanisms interact in the following way. While the presence of an argument in a sentence is typically legitimated by its grammatical status of being required by the verb, the presence of an adjunct is not legitimated by the verb. The second mechanism, namely focalization, can in principle legitimate the presence of both arguments and adjuncts. But since the presence of arguments can be legitimated independently of focus, it follows that focalization will be used to legitimate the presence of adjuncts. Hence adjuncts rely heavily on the legitimating power of focus, while arguments (here: the direct object) do not. This asymmetry can be represented in a 'non-harmonic scale' as in (5) (Prince & Smolensky (1993: 149) on harmony scales).

(5) Violation of MoQ
   a. DEP/Background > dO/Background
   b. LOC/Background > dO/Background
   c. INST/Background > dO/Background

A non-focus adjunct violates the MoQ to a higher degree than a non-focus argument, because an argument can be legitimated independently of the focus-background partition. In order to avoid/minimize the violation of the MoQ, it's the adjunct and not the argument that is interpreted as focus (as we have observed in our experimental data, cf. (3)).

**References**


What are subjects good for?
Roland Hinterhölzl
Università Ca'Foscari, Venice
rolanh@unive.it

In this paper, I address the question of what is on the basis of the fundamental relation between subject and predicate in language. I will argue that the subject has the function to situationally anchor the predicate in the clause. This implies in turn that clauses cannot have a (semantically) expletive subject and leads to a reanalysis of the fundamental role of so-called expletive elements in the grammar.

It is generally assumed that the subject predicate relation constitutes a core notion of human grammar. The introduction and the wide-spread acceptance of the vP-internal subject hypothesis leads to the question of why a particular argument of the verb should enter into a specific agreement relation with the tensed verb or into a Spec-head relation with T. One can either stipulate the subject predicate relation as a purely syntactic necessity in the grammar (cf. EPP) or investigate the question whether the relation between the subject and the finite verb / Tense has a semantic or pragmatic role to play.

To appreciate better the question at issue, let us look at the interpretation of a simple case like (1). In event semantics, the interpretation of (1a) can be specified as in (1b), that is, the sentence represents the claim of the speaker that there is an event of visiting in the past (at a time before the speech event) in which a certain individual, named John, figured as the agent of this event and the individual's mother figured as the theme of the event.

(1)  a.  John visited his mother  
    b.  \( \exists e \) visiting(e) & past (e) & agent (e, John) & theme (e, his mother)

From a semantic point of view, one may want to ask what does it buy us to know that the individual John figures also as the subject of the clause? A possible answer to this question is the observation that it is normally not sufficient to temporally anchor the clause to the speech event alone, as is indicated in (2). Anaphorically linking she to his mother in (2a), the meaning of (2b) amounts to the claim that there is an event of sickness in the past whose theme is John's mother. This rendition is incomplete since speakers typically interpret (2b) as a claim about John's mother being sick at the time of his visit.

(2)  a.  John visited his mother.  
    b.  She was sick  
    c.  She was sick one week before/earlier

It is often claimed that this specification in meaning is due to a pragmatic mechanism that instantiates the non-specified discourse relation between (2a) and (2b): the utterance in (2b) is relevant in the context of the utterance of (2a) only if the speaker intends to say that there was a temporal overlap between John's visit and his mother's sickness. Note that this will not do, since there are linguistic expressions that explicitly refer to the time of John's visit as a reference point, as is indicated in (2c).

The proposal that I would like to make is that the reference time in (2c) is not determined by verbal categories like Tense and Mood directly but mediated by the subject. The anaphoric subject in (2b) and (2c) refers to a discourse antecedent that has been established in a previous event in the context, namely the event of John's visit, and it is this event with respect to which the predicate is (temporally) situated in (2b) and (2c).

There are various possibilities conceivable of achieving this temporal anaphoric link. One way, advocated for in this paper, is the assumption that nominal expressions are individuated with respect to an event (cf. Carnap 1928, Elbourne 2005). This is immediately evident with deictic nominal expressions of the type this man (here) or that woman (there) which designate an
individual with respect to (a location of) the speech event, but can be extended to all kinds of nominal expressions. In this approach, the meaning of the definite description the man (a DP in syntactic terms) is the unique individual that has the property of being a man in a given situation or event. The crucial point of this approach is that this event, depending on the DP's interpretation and syntactic position in the clause, can be identified with the event denoted by the verb or can be identified with an event in the context (as is the case with discourse anaphoric DPs).

We are now in a position to explain why subjects in [Spec,TP] serve to anchor the predicate denoted by the verb (phrase). It is T - by establishing a relation between speech time and reference time - that, next to the verb - introduces two further event arguments. According to Reichenbach (1947), Tense establishes a link between speech time and reference time and Aspect then anchors the event time (the event denoted by the verb) to the established reference time, with imperfective aspect specifying that the event time contains the reference time and with perfective aspect specifying that the event time immediately follows the reference time. As is illustrated in (3), past tense establishes that the reference time precedes the speech time. I propose that the Spec-head relation between the subject and T is interpreted as the identification of the event arguments of the subject and T. In other words, the reference time of T (and henceforth of the verb) is identified with the event with respect to which the subject is evaluated in the discourse. Value assignment to the event argument is then constrained by the subject in the following way: the individual mapped from this event must be identical with the discourse antecedent of the subject.

(3) a. $\lambda e. \lambda e. _s. e < e_s$ (interpretation of a past morpheme in T)
   b. $\lambda e. \lambda x. \text{the unique man } (x,e)$ (interpretation of the subject in Spec,T)
   c. event identification (Kratzer 1996: 122): $\lambda e_1. \lambda x. \text{the unique man } (x,e_1) \& \lambda e_s. e_1 < e_s$

Not all subjects qualify as anchors for the main predicate. In particular, indefinite DPs are not evaluated with respect to a pre-established event in the context. In this case, the event argument of the indefinite DP is identified with the event argument of the verb and the predicate has to be anchored in an alternative way. In English, the adverbial there is inserted in Spec,TP in this case. I will argue that there is not an expletive but serves as an alternative anchor in the clause, as is illustrated in (4ab).

(4) a. John visited his mother
   b. There was a child crying in the garden
   c. I went to the local bar last night. Into the room walked a man with a green hat ...

In the present account, there is a function that maps an event onto its location and referring back to the event of John's visit provides the event with respect to which the predicate was a child crying in the garden is temporally and locally evaluated.

In conclusion, subject-verb agreement probably results from the grammaticalisation of this important relation between subject and Tense, but what is crucial is that a referentially anchored expression enters into a Spec-head relation with T, allowing for the temporal location of the event denoted by the predicate. That is why PPs, by denoting the resultant location of a predicate expressing a change of state (location) can serve as subject / anchor in cases of locative inversion, as illustrated in (4c).
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What, if anything, does a language in which all dative objects, local (1st/2nd person) direct object (DO) pronouns, and non-local [+given] DOs are almost invariably clitic doubled tell us about the relation between argument structure, Case, agreement, and information structure in natural language? And what does the partial suspension, or mitigation of such a constraint in configurations that would otherwise yield a person-case constraint (PCC) effect tell us about these relations and about the PCC itself? Taking my cue primarily from clitic constructions in Albanian, a generally strong PCC language where the facts presupposed in these two questions hold, I argue that: (i) the PCC is a misnomer, as Case in particular is irrelevant; (ii) there is a causal relation between the PCC and differential object marking (DOM); (iii) clitic doubling is DOM; (iv) PCC effects arise due to competition for topic-prominence.

1. Background: A prominent line of syntactic approaches to the PCC involves feature-checking with the same functional head (Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005, Béjar & Rezac 2003, 2009, Adger & Harbour 2007, Nevins 2007, 2011). According to Anagnostopoulou (2003), dative and accusative object clitics (unlike full pronouns) compete for agreement with $v_0$, which involves the cyclic checking of person and number features assumed to be distributed as in (1). In strong PCC languages first the dative, and then the accusative object clitic checks its features with $v_0$; the derivation converges if the dative clitic checks the person feature of $v_0$, and the accusative clitic its number feature. If the accusative object clitic is 1st/2nd person, the person feature of $v_0$ cannot be checked and the derivation crashes because only $\phi$-complete checking results in structural Case checking. Weak PCC languages have Multiple Agree, i.e. person is checked simultaneously against both object clitics, which can only occur under non-conflicting feature specifications of the elements partaking in the Agree relation.

(1) 1,2, ACC: +person, number 1,2, DAT: +person 3 ACC: number 3 DAT: -person

2. Two problems for Case-based approaches: First, while languages manifest so-called “anti-agreement” repair strategies to obviate PCC effects – see e.g. the radical Albanian case in (3a) where the (otherwise) obligatory direct object doubling clitic has been omitted to avoid a PCC violation – a fact that Anagnostopoulou’s (2003) approach is indeed designed to capture since the absence of a clitic is taken to indicate lack of agreement between $v_0$ and the full pronoun (FP) in situ, Albanian also exhibits another strategy, namely reversing the otherwise rigidly fixed DAT > ACC order within the cluster (see (2)), yielding the (otherwise ungrammatical) order ACC > DAT instead; see (3b). Both (3a) and (3b) while slightly marked stand in stark opposition to the fully ungrammatical (3c), which violates the (strong) PCC. Note that the checking order DAT > ACC is crucial for Anagnostopoulou, thus failing to account for (3b).

(2a) Kush na e bëri dhuratë këtë njeri? ⇒ normal order of clitics: DAT > ACC
who $u_{\text{cl}}$ 3 $s_{\text{cl,acc}}$ made present this person
‘Who brought us this guy (as a present)?’

b. *Kush e na bëri dhuratë këtë njeri? ⇒ *ACC > DAT
who $s_{\text{cl,acc}}$ us $s_{\text{cl}}$ made present this person

(3a) ?Kush na bëri dhuratë ty?
who $u_{\text{cl}}$ made present you.$s_{\text{fp}}$
⇒ radical anti-agreement: ACC dropped

b. ?Kush të na bëri dhuratë (ty)? ⇒ order reversal possible: ACC > DAT
who you.$u_{\text{cl}}$ us $u_{\text{cl}}$ made present you.$s_{\text{fp}}$
(Intended) ‘Who brought you to us as a present?’

c. *Kush na të bëri dhuratë (ty)? 
⇒ normal order *DAT > ACC impossible
who us $u_{\text{cl}}$ you.$u_{\text{cl}}$ made present you.$s_{\text{fp}}$
(=> PCC)

A second problem for Anagnostopoulou’s Case-based approach involves the fact that in Albanian two dative clitics may co-occur in a clitic cluster, (4), the first (invariably 1st/2nd person) an ethical dative, and the second (invariably 3rd person) doubling a goal DP (‘the/my family’).
… imagine what they can inflict (me) on my family’

3. A fuller picture: The fact that all dative objects and DOs instantiated by local pronouns are with the exception of the anti-agreement pattern in (3a) invariably clitic doubled in Albanian points to clitic doubling as a DOM strategy. Furthermore, a doubled non-local DO functions as a topic, cf. the complementarity between the minimal pairs in (5B)/(6B) vs. (7B)/(8B):

(5) A: What did Ana do?      B: Ana (*e) lexoi  librin.  (Albanian) I Ana (*to) dhiavase to vivlio. (Greek) 
(6) A: What did Ana read?      B: Ana (*e) lexoi librin.  (Albanian) I Ana (*to) dhiavase to vivlio. (Greek) 
(7) A: Who read the book?      B: Ana *(e) lexoi librin.  (Albanian) I Ana ?(to) dhiavase to vivlio. (Greek) 
(8) A: What did Ana do to/with the book? B: Ana *(e) lexoi librin.  (Albanian) I Ana ?(to) dhiavase to vivlio. (Greek)

It then stands to reason that focused objects cannot be doubled, (9). In contrast, the object of a subject question, being part of the presupposition, must be/is strongly preferred doubled, (10):


The link to presupposition is further highlighted in (11): even for a non-factive verb factivity can be triggered by clitic doubling, i.e. factivity is the correlate of givenness/topichood in the propositional domain). Crucially, no contradiction obtains in the absence of the clitic.

(11) E besova se Beni shkoi (*por në fakt ai nuk shkoi).  (Albanian) CL,ACC,3S believed.I that Ben left (but in fact he not left) ‘I believed (it/the fact) that Ben left (*but in fact he didn’t).’

Since datives and local DOs in Albanian are except for (3b) invariably clitic doubled, clitics here seem to behave like agreement markers. But if the nature of agreement and topic markers is indeed substantially different, why are clitics employed as a means for fulfilling both functions? I contend that clitic doubling is always agreement with a “topic-worthy”, or “individuated” DP, which also explains why unlike DOs, dative objects cannot be instantiated by bare singulars since these lack a D-projection, thus directly relating to the “D-hierarchy”.

4. A novel account: Building on a re-interpretation of the “D-hierarchy” by Kiparsky (2008), who posits that it “involves neither ‘animacy’ nor ‘agentivity’”, but that “[a] category related to definiteness, such as ‘individuation’ or ‘topic-worthiness’ is a more likely candidate”, I take “topic-worthiness”/“individuation” to be an interpretable feature on the head of ApplP, in the specifier of which datives are licensed. I follow Pancheva & Zubizarreta (2017) in that: (i) ApplP is a phase; (ii) there is only one individuation feature per phase; (iii) if there is more than one DP that can agree with the interpretable individuation feature on the head of the phase, and one DP is marked [+author] while the other [-author], the DP [+author] is the one that agrees; (iv) the domain of application of the constraint can be different: Appl\(^0\), \(v^0\), \(T^0\); (v) variation arises from different specifications of the value of the interpretable individuation feature. Finally, the data in (3b) can be accommodated by assuming that whenever this order reversal happens, the accusative clitic has expanded the relevant agreement domain by moving upwards, possibly introducing a new phase with a new interpretable ‘topic’ feature.
Brazilian Portuguese (BP) has been undergoing changes in its core grammars since the beginning of the 19th century, among them the loss of referential null subjects (exs 1a-c) (Duarte 1995 a.o). Some Caribbean varieties of Spanish underwent similar changes regarding overt referential subjects (2a-c), in the case of Dominican Spanish (DS) acquiring the lexical expletive *ello* (3a-b) (cf. Toribio 1996).

BP, on the other hand, retained the null expletive as in (4), but developed unusual raising structures, called *topic subjects* (cf. 5), which are unavailable in DS.

Most Brazilian linguists connect the existence of these *topic subject* constructions to the fact that BP has been claimed to be a Topic prominent language and to the changes in null subjects (Pontes 1988; Galves 1987; Negrão and Viotti 2000). According to Kato and Duarte (2012) BP is a partial NS language that satisfies the EPP through either the external merge of a null expletive (cf ex.4) or the internal merge of a sub-constituent from the sentence (exs. in (5)). DS, on the other hand can satisfy EPP by external merge of a lexical expletive (cf. ex (3)) and lacks the constructions in (5) as shown in (6). Therefore, the assumption has been that the raising of topics in Topic constructions are permitted in BP because the Spec TP is empty and no overt expletive is available to be placed there so permitting the output in (5).

In this talk we take quite a different view about the origin of topic subject constructions in (5) in BP. We attribute the appearance of topic constructions, not to the changes in the NS parameter and availability of null expletives, but to the disappearance of overt third person clitics in BP (Cyrino 1993). We propose that third person clitics have been replaced by null ones in BP. We base our conclusion on the striking parallelism between the topic constructions in BP in (7a) (8a) and the dative topic construction in DS in (7b) (8b). The crucial difference with Dominican Spanish is that unlike BP it has maintained its overt third person clitics. We therefore proposing that BP constructions are topic-like constructions with an empty third person clitic parallel to dative constructions in Dominican and other varieties of Spanish. We take advantage of this parallelism and propose a common derivation in (9) to (11). Under our proposal both DP’s *meu time/mi equipo* start in an internal position in the bigger DP as in (9) in BP and DS. In DS, this DP *mi equipo* can be extracted from its matrix DP *suerte* because its applicative head is filled by the overt dative clitic and the insertion of the preposition *a* in (10a) (Cuervo 2003). Finally the dative DP in Spanish moves to the left periphery in (11a). We propose a similar derivation for BP in (9b). There is movement to an intermediate Applicative head where the empty clitic CL licenses the DP (10b) and finally there is movement to the left periphery (11b). Crucially the possibility of agreement with the topic in BP is due to the fact that the empty clitic does not produce any intervention effects, contrary to the overt one in Spanish and DS. We follow Miyagawa’s (2016) approach on how this topic might agree in BP. This analysis therefore captures a crucial parallelism between Topic Constructions in BP and dative topic constructions in Spanish and explains why DS has not developed the exact constructions in 6, i.e., because DS maintained overt third person dative clitics. Thus our approach captures that two languages similar in their properties of null subject properties as BP and DS nevertheless differ in these topic constructions possibilities.

Considering the change from a functional view, we realize that both dative topic construction in Spanish and the Topic Subject constructions are categorical sentences, while the impersonal constructions with null or lexical expletives are thetic sentences in...
Kuroda’s (1972) sense. Thus, while DS maintained the categorical CLLD construction while acquiring lexical expletives in thetic impersonal sentences, BP changed the categorical type of sentences into TopicSubject sentences, while maintaining the null subject in thetic sentences.

1. (a) Eu falo bem espanhol. Lit.: I speak Spanish well.
   b. Você fala bem espanhol. You speak Spanish well.
   c. Ele fala bem espanhol. He speaks Spanish well.

2. (a) Yo hablo español.
   b. tú hablas español.
   c. él habla español.

3. a. Ello hay muchos mangos este año. Lit.: There are many mangoes this year.
   b. Ello parece que no hay azúcar. It seems that there is no sugar.

4. (a) 0 chove em São Paulo, 0 faz sol no Rio. Lit.: São Paulo rains, Rio makes sun.
   b. 0 está entrando água por esses janelas. It is leaking water through these…
   c. 0 parece que os meninos dormiram. It seems that the boys slept.

   b. Essas janelas, estão entrando água t, BP Water is getting into these windows.

   b. *Esas ventanas están entrando agua DS. These windows are leaking water.

7. (a). Minhas pernas racharam a pele BP Lit.: My legs cracked the skin.
   b. A Mis piernas se les desgarraró la piel DS. To my legs it lacked luck.

   b. A mi equipo le faltó suerte. DS. B: to my team it lacked luck.

   b. [TopP [Øexpl [VP faltou [sorte [meu time ]DP] BP
   lacked luck my team

10. a. [TopP [Øexpl [Appl P [a mi equipo ]le ] [VP faltó [suerte t, DP]
   b. [TopP [Øexpl [Appl P [meu time ]CL] [VP faltou [sorte t DP]
   my team lacked luck

11. a. [TopP [a mi equipo ] [Øexpl [Appl P Le ] [VP faltó [suerte t, DP]
   b. [TopP[meu time ] [Øexpl [Appl P CL ] [VP faltou [sorte t, DP]
   My team lacked luck.
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DOM AS A SYNTAX-PRAGMATICS INTERFACE MARKER: EVIDENCE FROM CATALAN

Marta Khouja
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (CLT)

1. GOALS

This study explores the interface between syntax and Information Structure concerning Differential Object Marking (DOM) and partitive constructions (*de*) in topicalised objects within Romance languages. We provide data from Catalan for a treatment of case marking related to discourse properties. We propose an analysis for DOM under Kayne’s (1994) system (a.o.) of prepositions as functional categories (K), which permits to explain why in CLLD & CLRD configurations accusative and partitive DOs are systematically marked.

2. INTRODUCTION & DATA

It has been widely claimed that the reasons why DOs are overtly marked are related to the animacy and definiteness scales. Nevertheless, if we analyze thoroughly the syntactic conditions in which DOM can or, more interestingly, must be activated, this generalization cannot be assumed anymore. Although topicality is argued to be a relevant trigger for the DOM to appear, it seems that not any kind of topic allows for the accusative marking (cf. Hanging Topics), but rather CLD configurations turn out to be the dedicated locus for DOM objects and therefore we assume a to be a left periphery phenomenon.

Unlike Spanish, the data from Balearic Catalan (Escandell-Vidal 2007, 2009, a.o.) shows that DOs can be marked even if they encode properties not generally associated with object marking, such as being non-human or indefinite:

(1) a. *No la conec, a la Marta* (Balearic Catalan)
   not cl.acc meet, ACC the Marta
   'I don't know her, Marta'

   b. *No el necessito, a(n) aquest llibre*
   not cl.acc need, ACC this book
   'I don't need it, this book'

Crucially, the same distribution of DOM is not grammatical when the DO remains in situ (*No conec (*a) na Marta; No necessito (*a) aquest llibre*), regardless of their semantic properties. In this case, standard Catalan and Balearic behave alike (i.e., only marked with personal and relative pronouns): The same occurs if there is no presence of a clitic (cf. focus configurations: *LA MARTA, he vist (no la Maria)*). Additionally, as some authors have noted (Berretta 1989, Jones 1995, Imemmolo 2010, Belletti & Manetti 2016, a.o.), other Romance varieties such as some Italian dialects (2) seem to exhibit a similar pattern in DOM configurations:

(2) a.*Non mi convince a me questo* (Sicilian)
   'That doesn't convince me'

b. A me, non mi convince questo

3. THE ANALYSIS

The data above suggests that Catalan DOM cannot be accounted for by a theory of DOM that only appeals to animacy and definiteness, which are neither sufficient nor exclusive features. Instead, they could be taken to provide further support for an account of DOM as a
functional preposition which is the spell-out of a functional Case projection (K) (Kayne 1994; López 2012). As we pointed out, the clitic seems to be key for the configuration, so that Kayne’s Generalization must be revisited. The clitic checks its accusative case in its base position in vP; as a result, the doubled DP has to move out from its in situ position to a projection above vP in order to license case. Thus, DOM would be a mechanism of long-distance case assignment between v* and the DO.

As further support, this analysis may be extended to other case marking constructions such as the partitive de for Quantifier NPs (3), bare NPs (4), possessives (5) or demonstratives (6):

(3) No en tinc cap, de problema
    'I have no problem'
(4) No en tinc, de llibres
    'I do not have any book'

(5) M’agradaria veure la teva, de casa(*es)
    'I would like to see you house'
(6) Aquest si que m’agrada, de cotxe(*s)
    'This car I do like it'

However, we will show some asymmetries between CLLD and CLRD that allow us to argue for different configurations. As a matter of fact, G-Topics (Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007) can be iterated on the right-hand in Catalan or Italian [Sempre en fan, de congressos (DO), els de la UAB (Subj.)], but they cannot be generated in Spanish. We will provide some tests in terms of syntax and interpretation to prove that CLRD are placed in a position below TP (López 2009, Villalba 2000). An analysis relying on the hypothesis that some topics are Hanging Topics and receive default case would explain why accusative and partitive case exhibit different behavior depending on the area where they move.

4. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of Catalan DOM and other case marking data, we argue that DOM and other case markers are related to discourse processes such as CLD, and thus the preposition is the morphological realization of a projection (KP) responsible for case assignment to the dislocated DO. The analysis of CLLD & CLRD should reflect the asymmetries shown in the markedness of topics in Catalan, due to the distinct positions for DOs involved in IS. Moreover, we have shown that data from Balearic Catalan may rethink the parameters of DOM generally established in terms of semantic scales.
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Towards a unified analysis of verum focus in German, English and Spanish
Anna Kocher (anna.kocher@univie.ac.at) University of Vienna

This paper contributes a comparative study on verum focus, which is defined by Höhle (1992) as emphasizing the expression of truth of a proposition. By contrasting different strategies from Romance and Germanic languages, the goal is to determine the underlying syntactic structure of verum focus. The analysis is modeled in a cartographic framework, thereby adopting the idea that the left periphery is split in a number of hierarchically ordered functional projections (cf. Rizzi 1997 ff.).

Claims This contribution will motivate the following claims:
C 1: Verum focus is stress on sentence mood (cf. also Lohnstein 2015).
C 2: There is a projection in the lower section of the left periphery dedicated to sentence mood.
C 3: The superficially different strategies in the different languages result from the (in)ability of finite verbs to move to or be inserted in the left periphery.

The phenomenon The empirical focus resides on the strategies in German, English and Spanish exemplified in (1).

   H. comes
c. Sp. Juan s ı́ (que) viene.
   J.  PRT QUE comes

In German declaratives verum is marked through stress on the finite verb (Höhle 1992, Lohnstein 2015). In English, in the absence of an auxiliary verb – which is stressed otherwise – do is inserted and stressed (Lohnstein 2015). In the relevant Spanish strategy, the particle sí, sometimes followed by the complementizer que\(^1\), is inserted (Batllori & Hernanz 2008, Escandell-Vidal & Leonetti 2009a, 2009b, Escandell-Vidal 2011, Kocher in press).

C 1: The sentence mood theory of verum focus This paper brings in further support for Lohnstein’s (2015) sentence mood theory of verum focus. This theory was proposed to account for verum focus in German. In the present paper I extend the analysis to the English and Spanish strategies exemplified in (1). In this theory, the verum interpretation results from focus on sentence mood. Verum focus is perceived of as a regular type of focus that introduces alternative (Krifka 2008). Depending on the type of sentence mood, different alternatives are active. In declaratives the relevant focus alternatives are believe p and not believe p. From reducing the alternatives the verum interpretation as an emphasis on the truth of the proposition results.

C 2: Syntactic structure of verum focus In line with Lohnstein (2007), I adopt the idea that there is a division of labor between illocutionary force concerned with pragmatics and sentence mood that mediates between clause typing and illocutionary force. I assume that this division of labor is also present in syntax. ForceP, the highest projection in the left periphery, is associated with illocutionary force whereas sentence mood is anchored to MoodP, located in the lower section of the left periphery. In light of this, I propose to expand Rizzi’s split CP and adopt the following fully projected structure of the left periphery.\(^2\)

\[
\text{(2) } [ \text{ForceP [ TopP [ IntP [ TopP [ FocP [ ModP [ TopP [ MoodP [ TopP [ FinP [ IP ]]]]]]]]]]]
\]

\(^1\) See Kocher 2017, in press for an analysis of the structure and functions of que in these contexts.
\(^2\) The precise position of MoodP within the functional field will be demonstrated empirically (cf. Kocher 2017, in press).
C 3: Relation to verb movement The main idea of this contribution is that all the strategies exemplified in (1) have the same underlying structure given in (3). The superficial differences result from independent grammatical properties that restrict verb movement in these languages.

(3)

German, contrary to English and Spanish, is a verb second language. The empirical facts that follow from this property indicate that the finite verb in declaratives reaches a position in the left periphery. In line with Lohnstein (2015), in the present paper this projection is identified as MoodP. Consequently, the [+focus] feature in Mood° is expressed as prosodic stress on the finite verb. In English, lexical verbs must remain IP internal. In order to satisfy the [+focus] feature, auxiliaries are moved to Mood°, or in their absence, do is inserted. In Spanish declarative, verb movement to the left periphery is ungrammatical. Therefore, the particle sí is inserted in the specifier of MoodP.

Further extension of the analysis The analysis is furthermore extended to account for verum focus in other clause types. While German and English permit verum focus across the board, Spanish sí (que) is restricted to declaratives. I will show that this results from the fact that in Spanish interrogatives and imperatives, MoodP is occupied by the finite verb, leaving no projection empty to host the particle. Finally, by discussing verum focus in embedded declaratives, I will shed further light on some contrasting properties of the left peripheries of the different languages investigated presently. In German and English, in embedded declaratives the complementizer rather than the finite verb is stressed. Assuming that also here verum focus is associated to MoodP suggests that the embedding complementizer is merged in the lower section of the left periphery (cf. Lohnstein 2015). Contrarily, in Spanish sí (que) follows the embedding complementizer. This indicates first, that in the Spanish left periphery there are multiple projections accessible to complemenizers and second, that in this language the embedding complementizer must be merged higher than in German and English.
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Information-structural prominence and argument realization

Anja Latrouite (HHU Düsseldorf)

Information-structural considerations are known to influence the selection of voice and construction types. Passive, for example, is generally characterized as a construction used for backgrounding the actor argument and foregrounding the undergoer argument. As has been noted by Watanabe (2000) and others, the foregrounding of the undergoer argument may also be achieved in active sentences via topicalization. This kind of foregrounding usually results in a contrastive topic reading of the undergoer. However, there are more restrictions for object topicalization than for the use of the passive construction. It is the goal of this paper to lay out the similarities and differences with respect to those restrictions in Japanese and Philippine languages like Kalanguya and Tagalog and put forward a possible explanation as to how and why undergoer fronting in order to achieve information-structural prominence of this argument, may be restricted.

The example in (1a) shows one of Watanabe’s examples of undergoer fronting from Japanese. Note that the actor argument is not overtly realized and is thus understood to be a very salient participant from the immediate common ground, i.e. the speaker. If the actor argument is overt in the sentence and a true agent argument, but the undergoer is indefinite or animate, undergoer topicalization is not accepted by native speakers, as exemplified in (1b) and (1c). Actor topicalization, on the other hand, is not limited in the same way (1d).

(1) Japanese (Watanabe p.339ff)

a. Tegami wa kakushi-ta ‘The letter (I) hid.’
   Letter TOP hide-PST

b. #Ittuu-no tegami wa hisyo ga kakushi-ta. ‘A letter, the secretary hid (it).’
   One-GEN letter TOP secretary NOM hide.PST  (intended)

c. ?Taroo wa hisyo ga kakushi-ta. ‘As for Taro, the secretary hid (him).’
   Taro TOP secretary NOM hide-PST         (intended)

d. Hisyo wa ittuu-no tegami wo kakushi-ta. ‘As for the secretary, she hid a letter.’
   Secretary TOP one-GEN letter AKK hide-PST

For the sentences in (1b) and (1c) passive voice would be preferred as a means to foreground the undergoer and background the actor. The data show that a default setting for the undergoer in terms of ‘discourse new’ and ‘not yet given’ is not enough to license undergoer topicalization in the presence of a focal and foregrounded actor argument marked by ga. (1c) makes clear that it is not the lack of definiteness alone that makes undergoer topicalization less acceptable. A definite, but animate undergoer is also considered awkward in an undergoer topicalization construction unless a very specific context is provided, as we will show. The examples in (1) illustrate that three levels are considered in the evaluation of the respective prominence of an argument and thus its eligibility to appear in a contrastive topic position: (i) the reference phrase level, i.e. the relative semantic properties of the referents such as animacy and referentiality, (ii) the verb phrase level, i.e. the overt syntactic transitivity (and specific meaning aspects of verbs), and (iii) the level of information-structural prominence, i.e. the at-issueness of a referent with respect to a given explicit or implicit question under discussion. Our corpus study provides evidence for the fact that it is the third level that outranks considerations on the other two levels, if we follow Riester et al. (2017) in assuming that at-issueness of arguments can be detected via implicit questions under discussion that are congruent with both the pragmatic and the morphosyntactic context.

Interestingly, similar but not identical restrictions on undergoer topicalization can be observed in Philippine languages like Kalanguya and Tagalog (Santiago 2015, Latrouite 2015). Despite having a very different grammar and a different kind of voice system, undergoer topicalization is also more restricted than actor topicalization, as the comparison of (2a) and (2b) shows. So there seems to be a more systematic pattern in languages that require an explanation.

(2) Tagalog

a. #Ang liham ay sumulat ang babae. ‘The letter, the woman wrote (it).’
   NOM letter TOP AV.write NOM woman       (intended)
b. Ang babae ay sinulat ang liham. ‘As for the woman, she wrote the letter.’
NOM woman TOP UV.write NOM letter

The data in (2) are more complex than the Japanese data as there are two phenomena: voice selection and ay-inversion, both of which mirror different aspects of the relative information-structural salience of the arguments, as we will argue. It has to be noted that the nominative marker in Tagalog and Kalanguya - in contrast to the Japanese nominative marker - is considered a marker of topicality/givenness, at least when it comes to undergoer marking. The feature (+topical) is a marked information-structural feature for undergoers and is known to have morphosyntactic reflexes in many languages (cf. Güldemann et al. 2015). Latrouite (2015) argues that the information-structural prominence (IS) of the topical undergoer heavily influences voice selection. However, topicality is not a marked feature for actors, so topical actors are in no way divergent from the norm or somehow information-structurally especially salient. Rather, it is the feature (+focal) that is marked for actors and has morphosyntactic reflexes in many languages (cf. Güldemann). Based on our corpus data, we can show that there are indeed cases in which the focal actor leads to a preference of actor voice over undergoer voice in Tagalog. Now it is obvious, that both features can co-occur in a sentence, i.e. the undergoer can be topical and the actor focal. The data in (2a) make clear that focality of the actor may not be sufficient in the face of a topical undergoer that has one more information-structurally salient feature due to ay-inversion, i.e. contrastivity. On the other hand a contrastive, topical actor may be ay-inverted without influencing voice selection. It is noteworthy that there is a second pattern. While in the sentences given in (2) the voice on the verb corresponds to the postverbal argument, in (3), the voice form of the verb corresponds to the fronted element. In this case, where both ay-inversion and voice choice identify the same argument as prominent, object foregrounding is acceptable and unproblematic much like in the passive constructions in Japanese. There are also no restrictions with respect to actor topicalization, as (3b) exemplifies.

(3) a. Ang liham ay sinulat ng babae. ‘The letter, the woman wrote (it)’
NOM letter TOP UV.write GEN woman
b. Ang babae ay sumulat ng liham. ‘The woman, she wrote the letter.’
NOM woman TOP AV. write GEN letter

Based on examples from our corpus for all of these constructions, the different competing prominence considerations will be laid out and a constraint- and QUD-based approach to the interaction of information structure, voice selection and construction choice be presented.
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The aim of this presentation is to offer new data for the idea that the ability to display a focus/background articulation is not an inherent property of syntactic structures per se, but of asserted content (cf. Roberts 1996; Simons et al. 2010, 2016). To this end, we will examine the different behaviour of integrated and appositive relative clauses (hereinafter, IRC and ARC) with respect to focus structure—an issue that, to the best of our knowledge, had not been dealt with in the previous literature.

Whether integrated or appositive, relative clauses can be assumed to have the same internal syntactic structure—the fact that they are attached at different levels of syntactic structure being not relevant to their internal configuration. As for their contribution to discourse, the two types are usually supposed to contribute non-at-issue content (Potts 2005, 2015; Simons et al. 2010; Tonhauser et al. 2013): both IRCs and ARCs pass the usual tests for projective meaning, and neither of them can address the question under discussion directly, so the content of a relative is not a good candidate for a direct answer to an explicit question (which does not necessarily mean that they never can: see Simons et al 2010).

Now, as for information structure, it is known that in Romance languages, VOS word order licenses the narrow focus reading of the postverbal subject (Cf. Zubizarreta 1999; Leonetti, in press for a recent overview). This is illustrated in (1) for Spanish:

(1)  
Había alquilado el apartamento Ernesto.  
Have.PST.3SG rent.PP the apartment Ernesto.  
‘ErNESto rented the apartment.’ (It was Ernesto who rented the apartment).

Consider now the example in (2), with an IRC:

(2)  
Nos quedamos en el apartamento [que había alquilado Ernesto].  
We.OBL stay.PST.1PL in the apartment that have.PST.3SG rent.PP Ernesto.  
‘We stayed at the apartment that Ernesto rented.

Here, the word order pattern in the relative clause is VOS—subject inversion with a transitive predicate—and nevertheless the postverbal subject cannot receive a narrow focus interpretation. A plausible hypothesis about the contrast between (1) and (2) is that focus structure is a root phenomenon, so only main clauses like (1), but not embedded clauses like the relative in (2), can have a focus/background articulation (cf. Hooper & Thompson 1973; Matić et al. 2014). The situation changes again with ARCs, as shown in (3):

(3)  
La policía entró en el apartamento, [que había alquilado Ernesto] y le detuvo.  
The police enter.PST.1PL in the apartment, [which have.PST.3SG rent.PP Ernesto] and he.ACC arrest PST.3SG  
‘The Police entered the apartment, which Ernesto rented, and arrested him.’
In (3) the postverbal subject can indeed receive a narrow focus interpretation. If the word order is the same in (2) and (3), the question that arises is why the focus structure is not the same in IRCs and ARCs.

Our proposal is that the information structure of relative clauses depends on their contribution to discourse. IRCs act as predicates that intersect with the head noun and thus contribute to establishing the reference of the whole DP; the content they convey is presented as backgrounded. ARCs, in contrast, express an independent, supplementary assertion about the antecedent, which has to be referentially autonomous; ARCs typically add new information and provide supporting content, designed to contextualize the at-issue content (Asher 2000; Potts 2005, 2015; see also Bach 1999 for a different approach). The generalization that emerges is, thus, that focus/background articulation obtains with assertions only: only ARCs can have focus/background articulation because they assert new information, whereas IRC lack information structure as a natural consequence of conveying presupposed content (cf. the Interface Root Restriction in Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010 for a related proposal).

The underlying generalization happens to be relevant for other constructions as well, to the extent that they work as assertions in the discourse context. For instance, even complement clauses of factive verbs, despite being the central case of presupposed subordinate clauses, can have a focus/background articulation when they address the current QUD and therefore carry the main assertion (cf. Simons et al 2016). Suppose A asks how the Euro2016 championship was and B gives the answer in (4):

(4) Me sorprendió mucho que ganara la copa Portugal.

‘It surprised me a lot that Portugal won the cup.’

Here the VOS pattern is again associated to a narrow focus reading for the subject, which shows that embedded clauses can develop their own information structure when they are asserted. We believe that the data examined here have relevant theoretical consequences:

a. they clearly favour a view of information structure as a component of grammar that is not strictly encoded in syntax, against cartographic approaches: syntactic configurations do not establish information structure in a blind, automatic way; rather they introduce constraints on possible informational articulations. Information structure is highly sensitive to the kind of contribution made by an utterance to the ongoing discourse: only assertions, either at-issue or not, can have a focus/background partition.

b. they provide new evidence for the study of asymmetries concerning information structure between main clauses and subordinate clauses, and for investigating the nature of root phenomena on the basis of facts that do not belong to the domain of movement and fronting operations.

Discourse Processes, doi = 10.1080/0163853X.2016.1150660. • Tonhauser, J. et al. (2013): Towards
funciones informativas: tema y foco”, in I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds.), Gramática
Topics and null subjects

In the recent literature on null subjects it is usually assumed, at least for consistent null subject languages like Spanish and Italian, that referent identification in referential null subjects is topic-oriented, i.e. it depends on a matching relation between pro and a topic (cf. Grimshaw and Samek-Lodovici 1998, Frascarelli 2007, forthcoming, Sigurðsson 2011, Camacho 2013). In Frascarelli’s proposal, Rizzi’s (1982) double requirement of licensing and identification of pro is claimed to rest on an information-structural strategy, as a referential pro must be identified by an Aboutness Topic that is merged in the C-domain. According to this perspective, not only the licensing of null subjects, but also their interpretation, is determined by strictly grammatical principles, such as Frascarelli’s Topic Criterion.

This paper aims at presenting a critical review of this alleged connection between reference assignment to null subjects and information structure. Although a connection along these lines can be observed in consistent null subject languages, my claim is that it depends on general pragmatic principles, and not on syntactic conditions.

A preference for topic antecedents is in fact noticeable in well-known contrasts in Italian like (1)-(2), from Grimshaw and Samek-Lodovici (1998: 198).

(1) Questa mattina, la mostra è stata visitata da Gianni. Più tardi, pro*ì ha visitato l’ università.
   ‘This morning, the exhibition was visited by John. Later on, he visited the university.’
(2) Questa mattina, Giannì ha visitato la mostra. Più tardi, pro; ha visitato l’ università.
   ‘This morning, John visited the exhibition. Later, he visited the university.’

In (1), the DP Gianni is inside a by-phrase and cannot be the antecedent of the null subject in the second clause, whereas the same DP provides an adequate antecedent for the null subject in (2), where it appears as the subject of the first clause. As preverbal subjects are naturally interpreted as topics, and by-phrases are not, we can conclude that the availability of a topic antecedent is a crucial condition for the licensing of null subjects in languages like Italian. The relevant question is whether this is enough to turn identification by a topic into a grammatical condition like the Topic Criterion.

The preference for topic antecedents could in fact be explained as an effect of the need for highly accessible antecedents –topics are discourse-prominent, and thus easily accessible as antecedents-, which is in turn a consequence of the competition and the division of labour between null subjects and strong, overt pronouns. Under this alternative view, the link between null subjects and topics depends on interpretive principles that lie outside of the grammatical system.

I believe that there are strong reasons to prefer this last approach:

1. The contrast in (1)-(2) is not due to a syntactic constraint. If the context is modified, a DP inside a by-phrase can make an adequate antecedent for a null subject (cf. A: - Il guasto è stato riparato da Gianni. B: - pro; è proprio bravo, eh? ‘A: - The damage was repaired by
John. B: - He is really good, isn’t he?’). The same happens with other basic data that apparently support the role of topic antecedents.

2. The presence of a topic antecedent is particularly relevant when more than one potential antecedent is available in the context, and the more salient one –usually the topic- is selected. However, no grammatical constraint is operating here. It is pragmatic inference that leads speakers to choose the relevant antecedent. The interpretation represented in (1) gives rise to an interpretive anomaly, rather than to ungrammaticality.

3. In Frascarelli’s account, it is necessary to assume that silent topics are merged to build topic chains and ensure topic continuity across sentences. When a null subject is linked to an antecedent occurring in a focal position (for instance, in Vorrei presentarti Leo, pro, è il mio migliore amico ‘I’d like to introduce Leo to you. He is my best friend’, from Frascarelli forthcoming), a silent topic should be posited in the C-domain in the main clause to identify pro. The crucial problem is that there is no clear evidence in favour of such silent topics. It is true that the DP Leo introduces a discourse referent that can become the topic of a subsequent predication, but that does not imply that a dislocated topic has to be merged in the syntax; it rather shows that null subjects may be linked to non-topical antecedents, if they are salient enough.

4. The very idea of having silent copies of left dislocated topics as antecedents is difficult to accept. Dislocation is a marked strategy for introducing topics (i.e. it is the strategy needed for expressions that otherwise would not be interpreted as topics): as such, it is typically associated with topic shift and contrast –just the functions that a null subject cannot have. Thus, there should not be null dislocated topics. Dislocation must always be overt. And it should not be simply equated with the introduction of topics into the discourse.

5. A syntactic approach to the preference for topic antecedents is merely stipulative, whereas a pragmatic account offers a motivated explanation for the facts and for their context-dependent nature. The pragmatic view provides also a natural way to connect the data with the results of recent research on processing of null subjects (Filiaci 2011), as well as a justification of the Avoid Pronoun Principle as a non-grammatical principle, based on the inferential resolution of the competition between grammatical options. Finally, it represents a simpler, less costly solution that resorts to independently motivated notions.
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DISCOURSE MARKERS AND INFORMATION STRUCTURE IN GERMAN
LANGUAGE EXCHANGE SETTINGS

Javier Martos/Bettina Kaminski
Universidad de Sevilla

The primarily grammatical interest on discourse markers promoted the investigation of their possible syntactic positions, their function as cohesive devices and ultimately their relation to issues of information structure (Blühdorn/ Foolen/ Loureda 2017). Moreover, research on this topic have shown how relevant syntax is, since two of the three kinds of discourse markers in German described by Imo (2016) focus on words with a highly rigid syntax such as coordinate and subordinate conjunctions (Günthner/Imo 2003), adverbs and particles. Its use in oral settings has led to a more flexible syntax use and distribution despite the lack of flexibility in German syntax.

While much research on discourse markers has concentrated exclusively on the language by native speakers, this paper aims at examining and analyzing the production of discourse markers by speakers of German as second language in language exchange settings based on an online learning e-tandem program. Much of the FLT in German focuses on different features about language learning such as vocabulary and grammar rules, but hasn’t payed too much attention to information structure. Nevertheless native speakers and learners have to face same tasks in terms of speech acts in their communication in German, but these tasks can be very challenging and demanding for learners when they take part in a conversation, as our collected data reveal (Martos/Kaminski 2016). Actually useful information structure markers (Zorraquino/Portolés 1999:4080) are quite hard to find in spontaneous learners speech. Consequently their native speaking tandem partners provide us with evidence for an important linguistic effort taking on more responsibilities on common ground management to promote the information flow. Learners with competence levels between A2- B1 make use of these elements with a significant lack or over-use that prevents a complete development of the discourse topic and framework. This leads us to the conclusion that the meaning and use of discourse markers has to be learned since their acquisition can be important for communicative success (Fox Tree 2010).
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CORE INTENTIONAL FEATURES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON WORD ORDER
AND LINGUISTIC VARIATION

Ana Ojea
Universidad de Oviedo
aojea@uniovi.es

GOAL. To explore the empirical power of a subset of informational features which I term core intentional features (cf. Ojea 2017)

PRELIMINARIES. Core intentional features are edge features which sit in the relevant phases (CP and v*P) and are subject to parametric variation. They are assumed to drive the derivation of the sentence so that it constitutes an intentionally-adequate object (i.e. a categorical or a thetic statement; cf. Sasse 1987) even in the absence of a particular communicative situation. Core intentional features are part of our grammatical competence and, as such, they are obligatory, occupy a fixed landing site in the structure and are truth-conditionally relevant. They are thus different from standard pragmatic features such as topic or focus, which are part of our pragmatic competence and therefore optionally found in different landing sites where they give rise to different interpretative effects.

PROPOSAL. I specifically focus here on one of these features, [DI] (discourse intention), and on its effects on word order in a discourse-prominent language such as Spanish. In this language [DI] is inherited by TP and probes either a constituent that names an entity or a constituent that frames the event in place or time. In the former case, a categorical statement follows whereas in the latter a thetic statement is obtained. Assuming a preliminary distinction between sentences that inaugurate the discourse (d-sentences) and sentences which are integrated in a particular context (context-dependent sentences), I explore:

a) The position of the subject in Spanish: It is argued that the SV/VS order in Spanish follows from the conditions of valuation of [DI]. In d-sentences it will be a matter of structural and semantic prominence, thus predicting why it is preverbal in some cases (1) but obligatory (2) or optionally (3) postverbal in others:

(1) Los representantes sindicales abandonaron la reunión
The representatives union abandon-PAST.PERFECTIVE.3PL the meeting
'The union representatives abandoned the meeting'

(2) A Juan le preocupa tu salud
At John him worry-PRESENT.3SING your health

‘Your health worries John’

(3) a. La guerra civil española estalló en 1936.

The war civil Spanish break-PAST PARTICIPLE in 1936

b. En 1936 estalla la guerra civil española.

In 1936 break-PAST PARTICIPLE the war civil Spanish

‘The Spanish civil war broke in 1936’

As for context-dependent sentences, valuation of [DI] will depend here on pragmatic prominence. To exemplify this, the paper explores the properties of the so called Locative Inversion in Spanish (as in 3b above), discussing some of the standard assumptions on the topic (cf. among others, Bresnan 1994, Levin and Rappaport 1995, Mendikoetxea 2006).

b) Parametric variation: The paper also addresses a number of significant contrasts between English and Spanish which are said to follow from the different locus of valuation of [DI] in both languages. In doing so it contributes to the debate on the nature of the EPP principle and its role on language variation.

In sum, the proposal advocated here in terms of the core intentional feature [DI] makes explicit the role of information structure as an integral part of the grammar, with no need to resort to a discourse-based articulation of the sentence (i.e. the focus structure in Erteschik-Shir 1997 or Breul 2014), or to pragmatic features such as (the different types of) topic or focus, which clearly pertain to performance. It thus allows to maintain the programmatic distinction between grammatical and pragmatic competence even when dealing with the intentional articulation of the sentence.
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The (Information) Structure of Marked Copular Constructions: a multi-layered interface approach to *it-* and *there-*sentences
Francesca Ramaglia (francesca.ramaglia@uniroma3.it)
University of Roma Tre

**Keywords:** Information Structure, Interface analysis, existential sentences, locative constructions, presentational structures, (pseudo)clefts

In the literature, scholars concerned with copular constructions have often examined the possibility for the two relevant constituents to appear in the reversed order. Roughly speaking, there seems to be a crucial difference between (1), which does not allow for inversion, and (2-3), which are acceptable in both versions and seem to have ‘the same meaning’:

(1) a. *John is tall/a doctor*
   
   *Tall/a doctor is John*

(2) a. *The cause of the scandal is a photo*
   
   *A photo is the cause of the scandal*

(3) a. *John is that man*
   
   *That man is John*

The present paper aims to make a contribution to this debate by proposing an interface analysis of two (macro)-types of information-structurally (IS) marked copular constructions:

(4) a. *It is a book that I read* [cleft]
   
   *What I read is a book* [pseudocleft]
   
   *A book is what I read* [inverted pseudocleft]

(5) a. *There is a man in the garden* [existential]
   
   *A man is in the garden* [locative]
   
   *In the garden is a man* [inverted locative]

Though the two sets of constructions in (4-5) present a number of common properties (not only concerning word order but also, for instance, specific TAM restrictions, as is shown in Den Dikken et al. 2000), they are generally analyzed independently from one another.

On the other hand, a unified explanation is proposed in this paper, as the relevant structures will be shown to represent a set of IS-oriented copular constructions with a number of common properties, but different derivations, thus yielding specific IS interpretations. Since the comparison between *it-* and *there-*sentences (and related structures) can be carried out at different levels of analysis, each of which can shed light on different aspects of the relevant constructions, this work aims at proposing a multi-layered interface approach, in which morphosyntactic, semantic, discourse and prosodic properties of the relevant IS-marked copular sentences are taken into account. This approach will be shown to be crucial to explain both the similarities and the asymmetries that the relevant constructions present.

Based on Frascarelli & Ramaglia’s (2013, 2014) analysis of (pseudo)cleft constructions, syntactic diagnostics (mainly concerning extraction effects; cf. Moro 1997, Den Dikken 2006) will be used to investigate the role of the two copular constituents, showing that the post-copular phrase constitutes the predicate in all the constructions in (4-5). Furthermore, semantic analysis will reveal that, while *it*-clefts represent specificational copular structures, existential *there*-sentences are predicational constructions, and this will be claimed to determine specific well-known restrictions imposed on the post-copular constituent (e.g., the
fact that some phrases such as NPIs, non-referential QPs and certain types of AdvPs cannot be clefted (6), or else the Definiteness Effect associated with existential *there*-sentences in languages like English (7) as opposed to Italian (8):

(6) a. *It is nobody that will come  
    b. *It is someone that I met  
    c. *It is always that he is late
(7) There is a/*that book on the table
(8) C’ è Gianni in giardino  (Italian)  
    There is John in garden  
    ‘*There is John in the garden’

While morphosyntactic asymmetries between *it*-clefts and existential *there*-sentences will be shown to be associated with specific semantic properties, intonational analysis will confirm that both constructions share the same discourse function. In particular, it will be proposed that the post-copular phrase is the Focus of the sentence, whereas the following element (i.e., the locative PP of existential sentences and the *that*-clause of clefts) constitutes a dislocated constituent (i.e., a right-hand Topic).

The multi-layered approach we propose will thus prove to be an effective means to explore micro-variation in IS-marked copular constructions, from a cross-linguistic perspective. Comparative interface analysis will also be crucial to explain the asymmetry shown in (7-8) concerning the Definiteness Effect, which seems to affect existential *there*-sentences in some languages (7) and to be somehow ‘relaxed’ in others (8): the present paper will present a corpus-based study providing semantic, discourse and intonational evidence that grammatical structures like (8) are not to be analyzed as existential sentences proper but rather constitute presentational *there*-constructions. In particular, it will be shown that in a language like Italian the particle *ci* ‘there’ followed by the copula can be used as an illocutionary marker (originally connected with the story-telling formula *c’era una volta* ‘once upon a time’, lit. ‘there was a time’) introducing presentational constructions with a Topic-Comment articulation.

References
Background:
In order to facilitate communication and convey an utterance appropriately, speakers have the option to choose between diverse syntactic alternatives (e.g. Myachykov 2010: 53). The first picture in Figure 1, for instance, can be described by formulating a German active sentence like Der Pilot misst den Clown (The pilot measures the clown), but it is also possible to produce a passive sentence such as Der Clown wird vom Piloten gemessen (The clown is measured by the pilot) or a topicalization like Den Piloten misst der Clown (The clown [ACC], the pilot [NOM] measures) to describe the scenario adequately. This choice between syntactic alternatives does not only depend on the pragmatic context, but also on other factors such as visual information or animacy of the referents (e.g. Tomlin 1995, 1997; Myachykov & Tomlin 2008).

For instance, studies have shown that concepts which are placed higher on the animacy hierarchy scale are preferably chosen as sentential subjects or realized in an earlier clause position leading to the production of non-canonical passive sentences or object topicalizations (Prat Sala & Branigan 2000; Van Nice & Dietrich 2003). At the same time, people canonically seem to represent actions in a left to right directionality, with agents located on the left and patients on the right (e.g. Chatterjee et al. 1999).

Aim of Study:
We sought to determine how patient animacy and the position of the patient determine the selection of syntactic structure in – to this date under-researched – German sentence production. Since both voice alternations and object topicalizations are feasible options in German, the study also offers the possibility to disentangle whether animacy and visual position preferably affect grammatical function assignment (McDonald et al. 1993) or word order (Prat Sala & Branigan 2000).

Method:
We conducted a sentence production experiment with 60 monolingual adult German participants who were asked to describe simple black-and-white drawings depicting diverse interactions in a single sentence. The different conditions are depicted in Figure 1. All stimuli were controlled for size of agents and patients, word length and word form frequency of their referents and depicted action verbs that require a direct accusative object and were matched in frequencies for passive voice.
Results:
A two-way repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of patient animacy ($F(1, 59) = 7.05, p = .010$) and patient position ($F(1, 59) = 5.36, p = .024$) on the production of passive sentences. In addition, we yielded a significant interaction between both factors regarding the number of passive sentences ($F(1, 59) = 5.36, p = .024$). Pictures with animate and left-positioned patients lead to a significantly higher number of passives compared to sentences with an inanimate or right-positioned patient. Thus, our experiment confirmed the assumption that animacy and position of the patient affect information structure (i.e. the choice of non-canonical sentences).

Discussion:
In conclusion, our experiment shows that visual and conceptual factors determine syntactic structures. Atypical stimuli with animate and left-positioned patients lead to a higher number of non-canonical structures compared to more typical pictures with an inanimate or right-positioned patient. Since throughout the experiment no topicalizations occurred at all, the results of our study also suggest that the animacy status and position of the patient determine syntactic function assignment rather than word order.
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Challenging the Existence of Dedicated Focus Projections in the Left Periphery of Italian

Vieri Samek-Lodovici (v.samek-lodovici@ucl.ac.uk)

University College London

This talk identifies some major challenges to current analyses of the left-periphery of Italian, arguing against the presence of a contrastive focus projection and proposing a solution.

Ever since Rizzi’s (1997) seminal research on split CPs, contrastive focus has been assumed to occur in a fixed, dedicated projection ‘FocP’ above TP, with its exact position varying slightly across distinct analyses (Rizzi 2004, Frascarelli&Hinterhölzl 2007, Rizzi&Cinque 2016, Poletto&Bocci 2016). As I will show, several observations challenge this assumption.

A first problem concerns the claim that in root clauses wh-phrases and contrastive foci both fill the specifier of FocP. This is an important part of Rizzi’s original analysis because if true, then the considerable evidence supporting the existence of a left-peripheral projection for wh-phrases can be reclustered in support of a similar projection for contrastive foci (indeed the same projection). Contrastive foci, however, easily co-occur with wh-phrases in root interrogative clauses, see (1) (‘F’ marks focus. Stress is in capitals. The focalizing context is in parentheses). Under Rizzi’s analysis this should be impossible because the focused object must eventually covertly move to SpecFocP, but SpecFocP is already filled by the wh-phrase ‘chi’. Positing FocP thus incorrectly predicts (1) to be ungrammatical. In my talk, I will provide several additional examples, including cases where wh-phrases co-occur with left-peripheral foci. I will also show that Rizzi’s original 1997 data on this matter do not provide support for positing FocP either.

(1) (Tutti conoscevano la vittima). Ma chi conosceva l’ASSASSINO\textsubscript{F}?
   `(Everybody knew the victim). But who knew the murderer?’

A second problem concerns contrastively focused interrogative sentences. Consider (2), where a lecturer mentions first A1 and then A2 as potential research questions to her students. Under most definitions of contrastive focus, e.g. Krifka (2008) or Neeleman & Vermeulen (2012), the entire sentence A2 is contrastively focused due to its contrast with - and replacing of - A1.

(2) A1: Quale potenze straniere hanno interferito nelle elezioni americane?
   Which foreign powers have interfered in-the elections American
   ‘Which foreign powers interfered with the American elections?’

   A2: Anzi. [Cosa hanno fatto gli USA per difendersi dalle interferenze russe\textsubscript{F}]
   Rather. What have done the US to to-defend-themselves from-the intereferences Russian?
   ‘Or rather. What did the US do to prevent the Russian interferences?’

Under Rizzi’s analysis, sentence A2, like any other contrastive focus, must eventually move to SpecFocP. But this is impossible because A2 contains FocP: it would literally have to move into itself. As (3) illustrates, the root of the sentence, which either coincides with FocP as in (3) or contains FocP, would have to move into either its own specifier as in (3) or a specifier it contains. A2 is thus predicted to be ungrammatical; instead it is perfectly fine.
A third problem concerns focused heads. If specifier positions only allow for phrasal constituents, as standardly assumed, then the focused verbal head in (4B) cannot covertly move to the specifier of FocP. Movement to FocP’s head is also barred, due to the intervening head of the topic projection hosting ‘domani’ (for the intervention effects of lower topics see Rizzi 1997:299). Since there is no way to move the verb to FocP, (4) is incorrectly predicted to be ungrammatical. The same problem applies to any other similar sentences.

(4) A: Domani Gianni incontrerà Marco.  B: No. Domani, Gianni CHIAMERÀF Marco.  ‘Tomorrow John will meet Mark.’  ‘No. Tomorrow, John will CALL Mark.’

These and many similar data show that positing FocP as the final destination of all contrastive foci leads to severely incorrect predictions for large classes of sentences. In the second part of my talk I will show how the same data are instead accounted for under Samek-Lodovici (2006, 2015), where contrastive foci occur in-situ except when generated inside a phrase targeted by right-dislocation, in which case they left-adjoin the containing phrase before its right-dislocation. Since right-dislocation is absent in (1)-(4), focus occurs in-situ in all these cases. It follows that in (1) the wh-phrase and the focused object no longer compete for SpecFocP, accounting for the grammaticality of this class of sentences. In (2), the focused sentence no longer needs to move to a position within itself, again accounting for its grammaticality. In (4), the verb is focused in-situ and need not move anywhere, dissolving the problem.

Finally, I will consider cases involving the right-dislocation of sub-sentential constituents containing a focus, such as the VP in (5) (where ‘R’ marks right dislocation). This case is interesting because focus occurs between the auxiliary in T and the right-dislocated VP that originally contained it. Focus thus is neither in-situ nor in Rizzi’s left-periphery. Under Samek-Lodovici’s analysis, these patterns are expected because foci left-adjoin – and thus immediately precede – the right-dislocated phrases that contained them, here the VP. Indeed, the VP can be shown to have the typical properties of right-dislocated phrases. The same patterns become highly problematic if focus is assumed to be left-peripheral. For example, interpreting (5) as partial movement on the way to FocP requires unwelcome assumptions about the position attained by focus and the factors driving its movement.

(5) Abbiamo [a MARCOF], [raccontato tutto]R. (Non a Gianni.)  ‘We told everything to MAR. (Not to John).’

Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) argue that, while an F-topic is a “given, d-linked” (p.87) constituent, a C-topic “induces alternatives” (p.87) and “creates oppositional pairs” (p.87). The authors propose that these two different types of topics are produced with two different pitch accents.

I test their claim in an experimental setting using Spanish clitic-doubled left dislocation (CLLD), since this construction can fulfill both a familiarity and a contrastive discursive function (Bianchi and Frascarelli, 2010). CLLD involves the left dislocation of a constituent, and a clitic-doubling pronoun. Example (1) is an F-type CLLD, since a tus amigos is d-linked, while example (2) is a C-type CLLD, since A Pedro and a Mario create a contrast within the given set a tus amigos. Based on Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl’s (2007) model, the CLLD constituent in (1) is produced with a pitch accent different than the CLLD constituent in (2).

(1) - ¿Dónde ves [\text{ANTECEDENT} a tus amigos]? (F-type CLLD)
   \text{Where do you see your friends?}
   - [\text{CLLD} A \text{ mis amigos} ] [\text{clitic los}] veo en Madrid.
   A my friends Cl see.1st.sg in Madrid
   My friends, I see then in Madrid.

(2) - ¿Dónde ves [\text{ANTECEDENT} a tus amigos]? (C-type CLLD)
   - [\text{CLLD} A Pedro ] [\text{clitic lo}] veo en Madrid, pero [\text{CLLD} a Mario ] [\text{clitic lo}] veo en Barcelona.
   A Pedro Cl see.1st.sg in Madrid, but A Mario Cl see in Barcelona
   Pedro, I see him in Madrid but, Mario, I see him in Barcelona.

I am not aware of any published effort at testing F&H’s hypotheses using CLLD as a test case. The prosody of this construction has been studied in some detail (Feldhausen, 2016), finding a consistent CLLD pitch accent on 83-85% of the utterances. However, Feldhausen only tested F-type CLLD and did not attempt to find out if F-type and C-type dislocations are prosodically distinct. Stavropoulou and Spiliotopoulos (2011) did compare F-topics and C-topics, finding almost exact pitch accents in both conditions. However, no dislocations were tested. Additionally, both Feldhausen and Stavropoulou and Spiliotopoulos used scripted production, which may provide different results than more naturalistic speech (Rao, 2009).

In order to correct the limitations from Feldhausen (2016) and Stavropoulou and Spiliotopoulos (2011) as testing cases for Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl’s (2007) model, I propose an elicited production task to test F-type and C-type CLLD. 10 native speakers of Spanish were given a context and a question, and were asked to produce a response with a given constituent (see example 3 for a C-topic stimulus). This constituent was [+human] and included a DOM a, as a way to force a left dislocation. The data set includes a total of 55 C-type CLLD and 60 F-type CLLD.
Results show 1) no consistent pitch accent for F-topics, 2) no consistent pitch accent for C-topics, and 3) a significant difference between F-topics and C-topics (see figure 1). Despite the difference in 3), two thirds of the utterances (L+H* and L+>H*) are almost identical for both F- and C-topics.

Figure 1: Percentage of the different types of pitch accent (M*, L*, H*, L*+H, L+>H*, L+H*) performed by the participants in the two different types of topics (familiarity vs. contrastive).

These results, in line with those findings by Stavropoulou and Spiliotopoulos (2011), run against the prosodic predictions made by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007). Both studies challenge the idea that different topic types are produced with different prosodic patterns; an idea broadly extended within the cartographic approaches to information structure (Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010; Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007; Rizzi & Bocci, 2015).
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A look at some aspects of the syntax-pragmatics interface in Spanish

Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (UPV/EHU)

Since Zanuttini’s (1997) seminal work on negation it has been assumed that we need to distinguish (at least) 4 different types of negation, associated with different structural positions/semantic interpretations. Some Romance varieties make these differences evident, with a distinct morphophonological spell out for each negative marker (Zanuttini op.cit., de Clercq 2013); further, the relative word order between these negative markers and adverbs/aspects/the rich set of clitics displayed by some of these varieties allows us to distinguish them from each other and to pinpoint their specific structural position. The classical approach to Spanish negation, however, assumes the existence of a single NegP, dominating TP (Laka 1990). In this paper we analyze the interaction between syntax and pragmatics on the basis of the study of negative questions-answers in Spanish; this allows us to approach the study of polarity markers from a new perspective, taking advantage of recent works on this question (Holmberg 2016, Krifka 2013,2015). It is argued that, just as in other Germanic and Romance varieties, there is evidence to propose the existence of different types of polarity markers also in Spanish (see Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2016). We discuss how this can be incorporated within an approach to the syntax-pragmatics interface where the higher part of the semantic skeleton is dedicated to the encoding of Speech Acts (Wittscho 2015, Wittscho & Heim 2016).

- **Question-answers in English.**

English presents two different negative markers: *n’t* and *not*. In addition to their different phonological matrix, they also present different syntactic properties, a.o.: i) only *n’t* can attach to tensed auxiliaries, ii) only *n’t* can surface in Comp. Negative questions involving *n’t* and *not* present different properties, as illustrated in (1-2) (Holmberg 2012/2015, Krifka 2013/2015, a.o.) We will refer to examples like (1) as involving a *low* negation (*L*-neg), and examples like (2) as involving a *high* negation (*H*-neg). While negative declaratives and questions with *L*-neg admit four different answers, questions with *H*-neg only admit two. Note that in addition to *n’t* and *not*, we find a third type of negative marker in these answers: *no*.

(1) Did John *not* steal the cookies? a. Yes, he did. b. No, he didn’t c. Yes, he didn’t d. No, he did.
(2) Didn’t John steal the cookies? a. Yes, he did. b. No, he didn’t c. *Yes, he didn’t* d. *No, he didn’t*.

A negative sentence like (3) introduces two propositional discourse referents (DR): i) d for the proposition 2+2=5, and d’ for its negation, ¬[2+2=5]. That in (3a) picks up d’ as its DR, whereas it picks up d in (3b).

(3) Two plus two isn’t five a. everyone knows that b. That would be a contradiction
\[ \text{[N} \text{EGP} 2+2 \text{ is-} n’t \text{[TP } t_{2+2} \text{ t}_5 \text{][]} \uparrow \text{d’} \rightarrow [-2+2=5] \uparrow \text{d } [2+2=5] \]

In a speech act like an assertion, a speaker takes on responsibility for the truth of a proposition. Krifka (2013) assumes that this corresponds to a distinct syntactic layer in syntax, which he calls ActP. He defends that particles like *yes* and *no* are anaphoric elements that pick up propositional discourse referents (DRs) that are introduced by preceding sentences, and assert them or assert their negation.

(4) a. Interpretation of *Yes*: \([\text{AcTP } \text{Yes }]\) requires salient discourse referent \( d_{\text{PROP}} \) interpreted as ASSERT (d).
   b. Interpretation of *No*: \([\text{AcTP } \text{No }]\) requires salient discourse referent \( d_{\text{PROP}} \) interpreted as ASSERT (¬d).

Since negative sentences (like (3) above or (5) below) introduce two propositional DRs (d and d’), the response particles *yes* and *no* can pick up either d or d’, which results in 4 possible different answers (6).

(5) He didn’t steal the cookies \([\text{AcTP } \text{ASSERT } \text{[N} \text{EGP he did-n’t } \text{[TP } t_{\text{HE}} \text{ t}_{\text{DID steal the cookies}} \text{][]} \uparrow \text{d’} \rightarrow [-2+2=5] \uparrow \text{d } [2+2=5] \]

(6) a. *Yes. ASSERT (d)* Yes, he did. (Rejecting accent & clause) b. *Yes. ASSERT (d’)* Yes, he didn’t (natural accent & clause) c. *No. ASSERT (¬d)* No, he didn’t. (natural acc., clause optional) d. *No. ASSERT (¬d’)* No, he did (rejecting & clause)

An interrogative question like (1) would have the underlying structure in (7), and as shown above, allows 4 different answers (1a-d). These possibilities would be accounted for along the lines of the explanation proposed for (5): they follow from the different possibilities that the anaphoric elements *yes* and *not* have to pick up their discourse referents, d and d’ in (7).

(7) \([\text{AcTP } \text{did-QUESTION } \text{[N} \text{EGP he not } \text{[TP } t_{\text{HE}} \text{ steal the cookies}} \text{][]} \uparrow \text{d’} \rightarrow [-2+2=5] \uparrow \text{d } [2+2=5] \]
Finally, the reason why interrogatives like (2) only allows the answers in (2a-b) follows from the fact that in questions with H-neg only one proDR is introduced: Neg is interpreted as a Speech Act operator: Speaker 1 requests from S2 to negate the assertion that Ede stole some cookies.

\[
(7) \quad [_{\text{ACTP}} \text{did-REQUEST} \quad [_{\text{NEGP}} \text{not} \quad [_{\text{ACTP}} \text{he assert} \quad [_{\text{TP}} \text{the he steal the cookies}]])]
\]

- **A new look at questions-answers in Spanish**

i) **Two different types of negative questions.** While, as discussed above, English has at least 3 different negative markers (*n’t, not, no*), Spanish only has the negative marker *no*. The question then arises as to whether we have any difference similar to that illustrated by the English pair in (1-2). The analysis of the syntax-pragmatics interface of negative questions-answers in Spanish reveals that we also need to distinguish different types of questions in this language.

\[(8) \text{Juan no ha venido?} \quad (\text{Lit. ‘Juan not has come’?})\]

   a. Sí, sí ha venido.  
   b. Sí, no ha venido.  
   c. No, (no ha venido).  
   d. No (*reject accent*), sí ha venido.

\[(9) \text{No ha venido Juan?}\]

   a. Sí, sí ha venido.  
   b. *Sí, no ha venido.  
   c. No, (no ha venido).  
   d. *No (*reject accent*), sí ha venido.

All the speakers we have consulted report a sharp contrast in the type of answers licensed by (8) and (9): (9) only licenses the two answers in (9a) and (9c). The facts are very similar to the ones observed in (1-2), and are amenable to the same type of account proposed by Krifka.

ii) **We need to distinguish different polarity markers.**

   a. If we follow an analysis along the lines of Krifka (2013) for the constrasts in (8a-d) vs. (9a-d), we are bound to conclude that we also have to distinguish different polarity markers in Spanish, with different semantic/pragmatic roles associated to them. There is additional evidence to support this conclusion:

   b. While it is true that the phonological form (*sí and no*) associated with the polarity markers does not change in the answers in (8)- (9), there are big differences in the way in which these forms can be pronounced (affecting stress and tone, lengthening of vowels, reduplication, etc.). This is illustrated in (10a). Notice that these forms are not always interchanchable; interchanchability is severy restricted, as shown in (10b).

\[(10) \text{i. Juan no ha venido?} \quad \text{a. Sí, sí ha venido.} \quad \text{b. Sí-sí, sí ha venido.} \quad \text{c. Síííí, sí ha venido.}\]

   ii. Juan no ha venido?  
   a. *Sí, sííí ha venido;  
   b. *Sí, sí-sí ha venido.

   c. Polarity markers can be replaced by other lexical units with similar interpretation (like *in efecto*, lit. ‘in effect’). But, again, interchanchability is very restricted, and is conditioned by the semantic/pragmatic role of the polarity marker.

\[(11) \text{Juan no ha venido?}\]

   i. a. No, (no ha venido)  
   b. *En efecto, no ha venido.

   ii. a. Sí, sí ha venido  
   b. *En efecto, sí ha venido.

iii. **The syntax-pragmatics interface of question-answers.**

We discuss whether these differences can be captured syntactically, and if so, how. We will adopt the proposal in Wiltschko (2015) & Wiltschko & Heim (2016) in their analysis of confirmational and assume that there is a correlation between the complexity of speech acts and their structural representation. Following these authors, there are two different layers of functional structure dominating the propositional structure (CP): the first one corresponds to the grounding layer (GroundP), dedicated to encode speaker’s and addresse’s propositional attitude towards *p*, and higher functional layer, ResponseP, associated with a Call on Addresse (what the speaker wants the addressee to do). We extend Wiltschko’s analysis and argue that the different types of answers licensed in each case follows from the different ways in which the underlying structure of the sentence and the polarity markers are mapped onto these functional layers.

<myriam.uribe-etxebarria@ehu.eus>
Optional and obligatory Comp reduplication with non-root dislocations in Spanish

Julio Villa-García, University of Manchester

Grohmann & Etxepare (2003), Rodríguez-Ramalle (2005), and González i Planas (2011) observe that, in Spanish, embedded hanging topics (HTs) require reduplicative/recomplementation que (cf. (1a) vs. (1b)), unlike embedded clitic-left dislocations (CLLDs), which can optionally be followed by que (cf. (2a) vs. (2b)). Based on Villa-García’s (2015) claim that recomplementation que in Spanish creates an island whose effect can be ameliorated by PF-deletion of the offending complementizer after movement crosses it (see also Cerrudo-Aguilar & Gallego, in preparation, and Radford 2017), I argue that the obligatoriness of recomplementation que with embedded HTs reduces to the lack of movement of the HT. The seeming optionality of the low que with embedded CLLDs, for its part, reduces to two underlying derivations, one where the sandwiched CLLD is directly merged (i.e., base-generated) in between ques (i.e., the overt-que option, analogous to the HT derivation, with a pause) and one where the CLLD moves (internally merges) (i.e., the deleted/null-que option).

Villa-García (2015) shows that in recomplementation-que configurations in Spanish (cf. (3)), movement across recomplementation que creates a locality problem (cf. (4a)), which vanishes in the absence of que (cf. (4b)) (see also the data in (5), which show that reconstruction of the sandwiched CLLD is only available without recomplementation que). The author proposes two mechanisms for the deletion of the low que. First, the data support the Rescue-by-PF deletion analysis of the mitigating effect of ellipsis/deletion on island violations, illustrated for English in (6) (Ross 1969, Merchant 1999 et seq., Lasnik 2001, Boeckx & Lasnik 2006, Bošković 2011, i.a.). The upshot of this account is that when movement crosses recomplementation que, que is *-marked (cf. (7a)). If que* remains in PF, a violation occurs (cf. (4a)), since the presence of a * in PF is illicit; however, if que* is deleted in PF (cf. (7b)), the derivation is salvaged (cf. (4b)). (See also (8) for the derivation of (5b), which involves movement of the CLLD to the specifier of recomplementation que). Second, Villa-García suggests that secondary que can be deleted in examples like (3) via an optional PF-deletion operation, much like optional that is deleted in English under Chomsky and Lasnik’s (1977) that-deletion analysis of the alternation in (9), wherein that has been deleted when it does not surface (cf. (9b)). A theoretical question posed by such an account is how to handle the non-trivial issue of optionality in language. In this paper, I put forth the hypothesis that deletion of recomplementation que is not optional but induced by movement across it, á la Rescue-by-PF Deletion (see, e.g., Pesetsky & Torrego 2001 for an attempt to motivate the presence vs. absence of that in English in examples like (9)).

On the by-now standard assumption that HTs are directly merged in their surface position and are accompanied by a pause (Casíelles-Suárez 1997, López 2009, i.a.), I submit that recomplementation que is obligatory in examples like (1a) with HTs because no movement operation crosses it (cf. (10a)); hence que cannot be deleted, on the assumption that que deletion is last resort. Put differently, removing que when no movement crosses it violates last resort, as in (1b), whose derivation is furnished in (10b). In cases of CLLD (cf. (2)/(3)), however, there are two legitimate derivations, namely direct merge, as in (10c), or movement, as in (10d) (Martín-González 2002). If the CLLD is directly merged in between ques, then que is not deleted (cf. (2a)/(5a)/(10c)), since no movement operation crosses it, much like with HTs (cf. (1a)/(10a)). Not surprisingly, with recomplementation que, no reconstruction effects are observed, as indicated by the unavailability of the bound reading in (5a). Similarly, such sandwiched dislocates are followed by a pause, which correlates with base-generation (Bošković 2001). By contrast, if the CLLD moves to the position in between ques, then recomplementation que is *-marked and deleted in the PF component as part of Rescue-by-PF deletion, as shown in (8)/(10d). As expected, the relevant dislocates exhibit reconstruction effects (cf. (5b)) and no (obligatory) pause. I therefore conclude that the apparent optionality of recomplementation que with embedded CLLD is due to the availability of two different underlying derivations for CLLD –Merge or Move. (11) provides the different derivations.

Now, under the Rescue-by-PF-Deletion account, long-distance extraction across recomplementation que also leads to its *-marking and subsequent deletion in PF (cf. (4b)/(7)). This implies that the dislocate a tu madre in (4) may have been derived by Merge or Move. With HTs, which can only be directly merged in their surface position, it would also be theoretically possible to delete recomplementation que in PF for independent reasons, i.e., if a long-distance moving element crosses it (cf. (12a)). Yet, HTs themselves display island-creating properties (Cinque 1990, Cinque & Rizzi 2011), which means that removing que in such cases does not improve the status of the sentence, as shown in (12b), where the island el fútbol remains. Put another way, the island violation is non-rescuable in this case.

Overall, I argue that the obligatoriness of recomplementation que with embedded HTs in Spanish stems from the unavailability of the movement derivation for the HT dislocate, thus preventing
recomplementation-que deletion, which is now recast as a last-resort operation effected only when movement crosses que. Recomplementation que is optional with CLLDs, since such constituents can be derived by Merge or Move.

(1) a. Dice que el fútbol, que ese deporte le gusta /b. *Dice que el fútbol, ese deporte le gusta

 says that the soccer that that sport cl. likes

 ‘As for soccer, s/he likes that sport.’

 → Mandatory recomplementation que with embedded HTLD

(2) a. Dice que de fútbol, que no hablan nunca / b. Dice que de fútbol, no hablan nunca

 says that of soccer that not talk ever

 ‘S/he says that they never talk about soccer.’

 → Optional recomplementation que with embedded CLLD

(3) a. Dijo que cuando lleguen, que me llaman / b. Me dijo que a mi prima, (que) la echaron

 said that when arrive that cl. call cl. said that my cousin that cl. threw

 ‘S/he told me they’ll call me when they arrive.’

 ‘S/he said my cousin was fired.’

(4) a.*Quién me dijiste que a tu madre, que la iba a ___ llamar?

 who cl. said that your mother that cl. was to call

 ‘Who did you say was going to call your mom?’

 b. Quién me dijiste que a tu madre la iba ___ a llamar?

 (5) a. Me contaron que a su perro, que todo el mundo, lo tiene que dejar fuera del teatro

 cl. told that his dog that all the world cl. has that leave out the theater

 ‘They told me that everybody has to leave his/their dog outside of the theater.’

 (X bound reading)

 b. Me contaron que a su perro todo el mundo, lo tiene que dejar fuera del teatro

 (√ bound reading)

(6) a.*That he will hire someone is possible, but I will not divulge who that he will hire is possible

 b. That he will hire someone is possible, but I will not divulge who that he will hire is possible

(7) a. Quién...dijiste [CP que [...[que*... <quién>]]]  (movement across que → *-marking)

 b. Quién...dijiste [CP que [...[que]... <quién>]]  (que* removed in PF → violation circumvented)

(8) a. ...[CP que [...a su perro [que*... <a su perro>]]]  (movement across que → *-marking)

 b. ...[CP que [...a su perro [que]... <a su perro>]]  (que* removed in PF → violation circumvented)

(9) a. I think that Seville rocks

 b. I think that Seville rocks

(10) a. ...[CP que [... el fútbol [que ... ]]]  (cf. (1a); directly merged HT: no que deletion)

 b. *[...][CP que [... el fútbol [que ... ]]]  (cf. (*1b); no movement: illicit que deletion)

 c. [...][CP que [... de fútbol [que ... ]]]  (cf. (2a); directly merged CLLD: no que deletion)

 d. [...][CP que [... de fútbol [que*... <de fútbol>]]]  (cf. (2b); moved CLLD: que* deletion)

(11) Embedded HT (direct merge)

 ...que HT que

 Embedded CLLD (direct merge (i) or move (ii))

 (i) ...que CLLD que

 (ii) ...que CLLD que=/$ <CLLD>

(12) a.*A quién me dijiste que el fútbol, que ese deporte le gusta?

 who cl. said that the soccer that that sport cl. likes

 Intended meaning: ‘As for soccer, who did you say likes it?’

 b. *A quién me dijiste que el fútbol, que ese deporte le gusta?
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Infinitival wh-relatives in Romance: Consequences for the truncation vs. intervention debate
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Introduction Infinitival wh-relatives (IR) are widely attested across the Romance landscape:

(1) a. Sto cercando una persona con cui discutere questa proposta. (It.)
    am seeking a.F person with which discuss.INF this.F proposal
b. Busca un amigo en quien/en el que confiar. (Sp.)
    seeks a friend in whom/in the that rely.INF

Our interest in this presentation will be the inavailability of CLLD (G-Topics for [4]) in these constructions (2) and the consequences for the commonly assumed left periphery of sentence since [9] (3).

(2) a. *Busco una persona amb qui d’aquest tema parlar-ne. (Cat.)
    seek.1SG a.F person with who of-this subject talk.INF-of.it
b. la persona amb qui d’aquest tema en vaig parlar
    the.F person with who of-this subject of.it past.1SG talk
(3) [TopicP [FocusP [TopicP [FinitenessP ]]]]

I will show that neither the truncation ([6, 7]) nor the intervention analysis ([2, 8]) can deal with these facts, so that we must rethink our current assumptions on the structure of infinitival sentences.

Truncation The contrast between finite and non-finite relatives in (2) may suggest that we are dealing with an impoverished left periphery (truncation), just as happens with infinitive clauses in general ([7]; cf. [5]):

(4) *Juan niega [a María haberle dado el premio].
    John denies to Mary have.INF-to.her given the prize

Yet, this solution cannot extend to interrogatives:

(5) No sé, d’aquest pernil, on comprar-ne. (Cat. [10])
    not know.1SG of-this ham where buy.INF-of.it
If we assume, with [9], that interrogative words move to FocP, and relative words, to ForceP, the truncation analysis must make the ad hoc assumption that only movement to FocP, but not to ForceP, allows the projection of TopP.

Moreover, we also have clear intervention facts in wh-relatives that are insensitive to finiteness. As [3] remark, high emphatic polarity items, which are typically found in FocP, are incompatible with restrictive relatives, regardless of finiteness:

\[(6) \ a. \ *El \ aria \ que \ bien \ ha \ cantado \ la \ soprano \ es \ muy \ bonita. \ (Sp.) \]
\[
\text{the aria that well has sung \ the soprano is very nice}
\]

\[b. \ *Hay \ un \ aria \ que \ bien \ cantar. \ (Sp.) \]
\[
\text{has.\there \ an \ aria \ that \ well \ sing.\text{INF}}
\]

Again, the truncation analysis cannot explain this fact.

**Intervention** An alternative to the cartographic plus truncation analysis is deriving the restrictions on CLLD from intervention effects ([1, 2, 8]). In Romance, wh-relatives and wh-interrogatives pattern differently:

\[(7) \ a. \ Questo \ è \ l'\uomo, \ a \ cui \ tu \ pensi \ che, \ il \ premio \ Nobel, \ lo \ daranno \ this \ is \ the-man \ to \ who \ you \ think \ that \ the \ prize \ Nobel \ it \ will\give \ without\other \ (It. \ [1]) \]

\[b. \ Mi \ domando, \ il \ premio \ Nobel, \ a \ chi \ lo \ potrebbero \ dare. \ (It. \ [9]) \]
\[
\text{to-me \ ask \ the \ prize \ Nobel \ to \ who \ it \ could \ give}
\]

However, this intervention pattern breaks down with IRs, which are wrongly predicted to allow CLLD, as seen in (2).

To sum up, I have shown that IRs are a hard bullet to bite both for truncation and intervention analyses of the left periphery of sentence (time permitting, I will show that parenthetical analyses like [5] do not fare better). Hence, IRs are not only a major empirical for Romance syntax, but also a crucial playground for testing our hypothesis on the on the articulation of the left periphery of sentence and the interaction of different kinds of movements.
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Is topicalised Topic more prominent than left-dislocated Topic? Evidence from structural priming experiments in Mandarin Chinese
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In conversation, speakers often highlight prominent information to which they intend to draw their conversational partners’ attention. For example, utterance (1) ‘it was Beckham whom Obama kicked’ or (2) ‘Beckham, Obama kicked him’ highlights the Patient (Beckham; Focus in (1) and Topic in (2)). Previous research showed that speakers tended to assign prominence to the Patient (encoding the Patient as the sentence-initial subject of a passive sentence) after hearing their interlocutors highlight the Patient as Focus in previous utterances [1]. Do speakers also tend to assign prominence to the Patient after hearing their interlocutors highlight it as sentence Topic? Furthermore, do distinct types of sentence Topic (e.g. topicalized and left-dislocated) influence speakers’ prominence encoding differently? To investigate these questions, we tested 87 Mandarin speakers in two psycholinguistic experiments, focusing on the priming effects of prominence that is associated with topicality.

Mandarin is described as a topic-prominent language [2] where both topicalisation (e.g. (3)) and left-dislocation (e.g. (4)) are frequently used. In both (3) and (4), the Patient (Beckham) is prominent. In Mandarin, the Patient is also encoded as prominent entity in Bei-construction (e.g. (5)) and Ba-construction (e.g. (6)). In all four non-canonical constructions ((3)-(6)), the Patient bears different grammatical functions (Topic in (3)-(4), Subject in (5) and Object in (6)) but is always encoded earlier in the sentence than in the canonical SVO order (7).

(3). Topicalisation (TOP): Beikehanmu, Aobama ti-dao le. ‘Beckham, Obama kick-fall ASP’
(4). Left-dislocation (LDT): Beikehanmu, Aobama ti-dao le ta. ‘Beckham, Obama kick-fall ASP him’
(5). Bei-structure (BEI): Beikehanmu bei Aobama ti-dao le. ‘Beckham BEI Obama kick-fall ASP’
(6). Ba-structure (BA): Aobama ba Beikehanmu ti-dao le. ‘Obama BA Beckham kick-fall ASP’
(7). Canonical SVO: Aobama ti-dao le Beikehanmu. ‘Obama kick-fall ASP Beckham’

Methods. We conducted two confederate-scripted priming experiments. In Experiment 1 (N=48), a participant and a confederate took turns to describe pictures to each other. The confederate, who pretended to be a naïve participant, actually read the scripted description of each picture as a prime using either a TOP, LDT, SVO, or intransitive baseline structure. Participants’ responses were coded as patient-prominent (TOP, LDT, BEI, BA), non-patient-prominent (SVO), and Other. In Experiment 2 (N=39), all aspects of the set-up were the same as Experiment 1 except that in each trial the participant and the confederate asked each other a scripted question about the to-be-described picture. For example, the participant asked ‘Beckham, who kick-fall him?’ (a question-versioned prime) before the confederate uttering the scripted prime ‘Beckham, Obama kick-fall him.’ Likewise, the confederate asked the participant ‘that table, who kick-fall?’ (a question-versioned topicalisation) before the participant produced a description. We hypothesised that a TOP prime or a LDT prime would lead to more patient-prominent responses than a SVO prime would because in a TOP prime or LDT prime the Patient is prominent whilst in a SVO prime it is not.

Results. As hypothesised, in both experiments participants were more likely to produce patient-prominent responses after hearing a TOP or LDT prime (25.5% and 20.4% in Experiment 1, 22.2% and 16.3% in Experiment 2) than after the canonical SVO prime (12.0% in Experiment 1; 13.4% in Experiment 2). A linear-mixed effects model with random intercepts indicated that these differences were statistically significant (p < .001 in Experiment 1; p < .01 in Experiment 2). Moreover, the tendency to produce patient-prominent responses was significantly higher after exposure to a TOP prime than after an
LDT prime in Experiment 1 ($p < .05$). In experiment 2, numerically TOP prime did lead to a higher proportion of patient-prominent responses (22.2%) than LDT prime did (16.3%) but the difference did not show statistical significance. This might be due to confederate always asking participants a topicalised question, which could have interfered with the prime. In fact, under the LDT condition, participants had exposure to both a question-versioned topicalisation structure and the left-dislocation prime before producing a response.

**Discussion.** Taken together, our study shows that participants were more likely to produce a patient-prominent response after exposure to a TOP or LDT prime than after exposure to an SVO prime and that such a tendency was stronger after a TOP prime than a LDT prime, at least in Experiment 1. Our finding is consistent with linguistic theories that make distinctions between topicalisation and left-dislocation. At surface level, the two differ in that a left-dislocated Topic has an overt co-referential pronoun in the comment expression (e.g. 'ta ‘him’ in (4)) but a topicalised Topic does not. Thus it has been suggested that syntactically topicalised Topic is moved to sentence-initial position from its original post-verbal position whilst left-dislocated Topic is base-generated [3]. Although our study does not address the syntactic derivation of Topic, it demonstrates that distinct types of Topic show different priming effects, suggesting that the distinction between different types of Topic has psychological basis.

Our study suggests that topicalised Topic and left-dislocated Topic may have different information status in interlocutors’ discourse model. As functional linguistics suggests, left-dislocated Topic is a “new topic” introduced into a discourse whilst topicalised Topic is a “continuing topic” that has already been introduced into the discourse [4], [5]. If this account is correct, topicalised Topic is not only prominent in the current utterance it occurs in but also rendered salient by the previous discourse. By contrast, left-dislocated Topic is only assigned prominence in the current utterance. Furthermore, it has been suggested that different forms of referent expressions correspond to the accessibility of referents in interlocutors’ mental representations, with the most reduced expression (i.e. no pronoun or “zero” pronoun) often being used to refer to the most accessible (i.e. prominent) entity in people’s mental model [6], [7]. Given that left-dislocated Topic has an overt co-referential pronoun (less reduced referent expression) in the comment expression and that topicalised Topic has no co-referential pronoun (the most reduced expression) in the comment expression, it is possible that topicalised Topic is conceptually more prominent than left-dislocated Topic.

**Conclusion.** The results of our empirical research suggest that speakers persist in assigning prominence to particular thematic roles after exposure to utterances that highlight the same thematic role as sentence Topic. Moreover, distinct types of sentence Topic influence such persistence differently, i.e., topicalised Topic has a larger priming effect than left-dislocated Topic does. These results suggest that conceptually topicalised Topic might be more prominent than left-dislocated Topic.