<div align="center">**The syntax of fronting phenomena**</div>

The Split CP

<u>**BESE: Other fronting movements (pp. 270-276)**</u>
1 Topicalisation: *Biggs$_1$, I remember seeing t$_1$ on the train./On the train$_1$, I saw Biggs t$_1$.*
pronounced with a pause, unlike wh-elements
no inversion, no complementary distribution: This man, where have I seen before?
multiple topics: recursive adjunction to CP

embedded sentences: the topic follows the spec/head in CP: *I asked where, [in this town]$_1$, we could hide* t$_1$.

Two topic positions: CP-adjunction in main clauses, IP-adjunction in embedded clauses (partial resemblance with conditionals).

2 Focus fronting: *[An Arsenal supporter]$_1$ I wouldn't trust t$_1$.*
no comma intonation, information structure different from topicalisation (old-new vs. new-old in focus)
Position: complementary distribution with *wh*-words, but CP,Spec excluded, ok with topics as well in restricted order:

*MEN$_1$ who would trust t$_1$

I said that MEN$_1$ I wouldn't trust t$_1$

I said that, in this room$_2$, POTATOES$_1$ I wouldn't store t$_1$ t$_2$.

3 Negative fronting: *(I said that) Never in my life$_1$ have I been so embarrassed t$_1$.*
no CP,Spec either, though very similar to questions due to inversion. If the auxiliary is not in C, there must be another XP between CP and IP with a head in the structure for the auxiliary to move to. CP selects IP/iP.
iP: [+F, -N], this is where foci and fronted negatives appear (complementary distribution).

All fronted elements accounted for: *wh*-words, topics, foci, fronted negatives, inverted auxiliaries.

General word of advice: do not forget about traces/copies.

<u>**RADFORD (2004)**</u>, *Minimalist Syntax: Exploring the Structure of English*, Cambridge: CUP):
Split Projections (pp. 327-336, based on Rizzi (1997, The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery In L. Haegeman. (ed.), Elements of Grammar. Dordrecht: Kluwer))

The CP-layer: **Force Phrase >> Topic Phrase >> Focus Phrase >> Finiteness Phrase**
(locality considerations rethought in terms of a notion of extended projections)

Which position does Wh-movement target?

a) relative operators: highest specifier position, in ForceP: *Syntax is the kind of subject which only very rarely will students enjoy.*

b) interrogative wh-operators:

- Spec,FocP in main questions (complementary distribution, only one wh-word!)

Yes-no questions: SAI = movement to Foc → no Focus or Topic after the auxiliary

Will never again things be the same?
Can that kind of behaviour we tolerate in a civilised society?

- Spec,ForceP in complement clause questions

Lee wonders why under no circumstances at all would Robin volunteer.

c) exclamative wh-expressions

In how many countries of the world, such behaviour, under no circumstances would autocratic leaders tolerate!

The FinP:

Gianni pensa, il tuo libro, di PRO conoscerlo bene.
g. thinks   the your book of PRO know.it well

Present-day English: no overt counterpart of infinitival particles like *di* in control clauses. Middle English *for*?

Al were it good [no womman for to touche] (Chaucer, *Wife of Bath's Tale,* line 85)
Although it would be good to touch no woman.

A: What was the advice given by the police to the general public?
B: (i) *Under no circumstances for anyone to approach the escaped convicts.*
          (ii) *That under no circumstances should anyone approach…*
          (iii) *Under no circumstances to approach the escaped convicts.*

Returning to the status of topicalised constituents: adjunction or TopP?

What features are involved? Is there a topic/focus feature driving the constructions in question?

Contrastive focus vs. information focus (data from (Lopez, 2009, *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*, OUP; examples mainly from Catalan)

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

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

(3) Context: You gave the winner a T-shirt.
Una MEDAGLIA abbiamo dato al vincitore

Answers to a wh-question:

(4) 'What did Pere read? // Which newspaper did Pere read?
a. -Va llegir l'Avui.
PAST.3rd.sg read.inf l'Avui
'He read l'Avui.'
b. -#L'AVUI va llegir

Unlike Romance FF, Hungarian fronted focus can answer a wh-question:

(5) Context: Who did they call up?
Jánost hívták fel [Hu]
John.ACC called.3rd.pl up
'They called up John.'
(Horvath 2005: 18)

Hungarian also has an in-situ focus:

(6) Context: Where could I find out about the train schedule?
Megtudhatod az interneten.
Perf.prt.know.can.2nd.sg the internet.on
'You could find out in the internet.'
(Horvath 2005: 14)

A further condition for preverbal focus:

(7) *A nap sütött ki a felhők mögül.
The sun shone out the clouds from.behind
b. A nap ki-sütött a felhők mögül.
'The sun is shining through the clouds.'
(Kenesei 2006)

exhaustive focus + opening up a complementary quantification set: [+c]

(8) -What did John eat, the cake or the ice-cream?
-He ate the cake.

(9) Context: What did John eat, the cake or the ice-cream?
-Es va menjar el pastı´s.
Cl PAST eat.inf the cake
'He ate the cake.'

(10) Context: What are we going to do with the cake?
-El pots menjar, el pastı´s.
Cl.acc can.2nd eat.inf the cake
'You can eat the cake.'

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

(12) Context: What did John eat, the cake or the ice-cream?
-Es va menjar el pernil.
'He ate the ham.'
-No va menjar res.
'He ate nothing.'

Topic/Focus: not grammatical primitives, only "a particular amalgam of features that may surface in the grammars of some languages", more elemental features can be identified.

Reading for next class:
Lasnik, Howard, Juan Uriagereka and Cedric Boeckx,. 2004. *A Course in Minimalist Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell: LF Processes. Why We (Don't?) Need Them and What They Might Be, pp. 180-222.