Issues in the left and right periphery

Given the evidence for Fine structure of the Left periphery (Rizzi, 1997, (Koopman, 1996, .. .)

•what is the hierarchy in the left periphery?
•what are the structural building blocks?
•Comparative syntax/ language variation
  •language internal variation: (questions versus imperatives versus root clauses vs embedded clauses)

How do right dislocation and left dislocation fit into the structure; (no right adjunction, following Kayne, 1994);
•what, if any, is the connection between right and left dislocation;

•problem of general architecture: how are the different “regions” that make up a clause combined?VP, TP, CP)
Overview

Discuss some general issues, and the questions they raise;
Lay out the “general rules of the game”: what particular assumptions do I make?

Discuss Rizzi’s paper Left periphery
--> Topics in mperatives

--> verb second
Variation in the left periphery..

Crosslinguistic language variation (Celtic languages vs Hungarian vs Dutch)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{RefP*} \\
\text{DistP} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\text{FP} \\
\text{AgrP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Vf} \\
\text{[Vf .........................] (..Irish-like)} \\
\text{XP [Vf ..................] (Verb second-like)}
\end{array}
\]

(Hungarian, K&Sz, 2000, p 8)
Variation language internally..

Root clauses:
    XP Vf …
Non-root:
    dat….. Vf
Yes-no questions:
    Vf Su…
Imperatives:
    V(imp) …

But why are non-root not C second? (* I think yesterday that John left)
(dat does not have a EPP topic feature: --> a stipulation)
Why don’t embedded clauses allow initial topics in Dutch: dat TOP C
+ variability in Germanic, and crosslinguistic
Why are yes no questions and imperatives verb first:
    Op V (stipulation: why is the declarative operator not sufficient)
Right and left dislocation

Dutch (imperatives)
Right-peripheral objects are possible in Dutch imperatives. (Den Dikken 1992)

Leg neer dat boekje!
Put down that book
‘Put that book down!’

But not in Dedaratives and interrogatives
(1)  .  *Ik leg nu neer dat boekje
      I put now down that book
b.  *Nu leg ik neer dat boekje
    Now put I down that book
c.  *wie legt neer dat boekje?
    who puts down a that book

Mystery: Dutch does not have “heavy NP shift” (i.e. DPs to the right finite verb)
Dat …….DP…..V  CP/Inf/Adv/PPs/*DP
Right and left dislocation

- contrary to appearances, the occurrence of right-peripheral objects is not a construction-specific property.
- Rightperipheral objects arise in a modular fashion, (rightdislocation, related to leftdislocation, ‘(itself related to topicalization, and Topic drop (V-second)

Rightdislocation:
(1) dat heb ik even neergelegd, dat boekje that have I adv downput that book
‘I just put down that book’

Leftdislocation:
(2) Dat boekje dat heb ik even neergelegd that book that have I adv downput
‘That book I just put it down’

Topic drop: (D-pronoun drop)
(3) dat heb ik even neergelegd, dat boekje that have I adv downput that book
‘Did I just put down that book’

- Can all cases of rightperipheral objects be brought back to this type of analysis. (yes: but some problems remain, with restrictions on Topic drop)
Topics...

2. If rightperipheral DPs are backgrounded Topics, why then are overt leftperipheral topics excluded in Dutch imperatives (2a),

(1) a. *Dat boekje leg even neer!
     that book  put adv  down

Topic drop is fine, showing imperatives do allow for leftperipheral Topis in principle:

(2)    leg maar even neer
       put adv adv down

An intriguing contrast between Dutch and German:
Leftperipheral topics are allowed in German imperatives: (Reis and Rosengren, ..)

(3)    das Buch gib mal zurück
       that book give adv  back
How is syntactic structure partitioned? (atoms and “partitions”, Sportiche 1999)
The “discrete” view

Standard view...

CP region; Cs, subordinators, Q, wh, focus, topic

IP/TP region; Case/tense/negation

VP region; lexical category; argument structure, c-selection

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>IP/TP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>vP</td>
<td>v’/vP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How is it put on the shelf?
or interleaving.. ?

Where is accusative Case assigned (AgrO is somehow related to v Burzio’s generalization)?
or CP reiteration: minimal syntactic structure: C Agr Pred V (Sportiche, Hallman, K&Sz)
Cinque (1999): Adverbs and functional heads
A Crosslinguistic Perspective. Oxford University Press,

Domain (politically) (11,13)

1 Mood, Speech act (frankly) (12,33,84)

2 Mood – Evaluative (fortunately) (11,18,33,84)

3 Mood – Evidential (allegedly, evidently) (85)

4 Mod – Epistemic (probably) (18, 84, 86)

5 Tense (past) (once) (87)

6 Tense (Fut) then (87)

7 Mood – Irrealis (perhaps) (55,66,73,78,88)

8 Mod – necessity (necessarily, must)

9 Mod – Possibility (possibly, can)

10 Asp – Habitual (usually, used to)

11 Asp – Predispositional tend
Basic assumptions: structure and movement

large structures: each atom projects
   atoms are features, not words (morphosyntax is syntactic)

forms:  Projection Theory --> X-bar schema
   unidirectional (no variability in directionality)
   Head complements/ Spec head (agreement) (no Agree)

movement: of overt material.( probably cyclic spell-out)
   No silent movement/feature movement/
   (overt vs covert movement): projections must be associated with
   overt lexical material in the course of the derivations)
   XP (remnant) movement;
      very limited head movement
   doubly filled C filter

   no economy principles

Interfaces are direct: phonological constituency is syntactic constituency;
   interpretation is read off the syntax
An important configuration…
(Kayne, overt versus covert movement, 1977)

High merger: (only spells out head of onlyP): only with John; only John, * with only John
Low merger + movement:

Low merger: with only one student

How do you determine if some element is merged low and moved high, or if it starts out high? (distribution: determiners, negation, demonstratives, subordinators/complementizers, Ps etc)
Part 2: Rizzi
The fine structure of the left periphery

Some history

1981 (LGB)

\[ \text{Comp} \rightarrow \text{XP} \]

\{ \{ \text{[±WH]} \} \}

\text{for}

\text{XP} \quad \text{that}

\text{Op} \quad \text{for/0}

\text{wh/rel pro}

problems:

-- c-command

-- cooccurrence restrictions

\text{H- that-tenseTP}

\text{H- for-infinitivalTP}

\text{H- if- tense TP}

\text{H- 0- infinitival/gerund (PRO)}

-- crosslinguistic variation

C’s: complementizers, yes/no question particles, subordinators, declarative markers,..
Focused constituents, topics, wh-constituents, DP versus other categories..
Positional evidence...

Diagram:
- Force
  - TopP*
    - IntP
      - Question, declarative, imperative, exclamative, (relative, comparative, adverbial of certain kind)
    - FocP
      - TopP*
        - FinP
          - Di (Italian) /for (English)
  - TopP*
    - IP
General considerations

• no need for a theory of adjunction (topicalization is adjunction, you may not adjoin to arguments (CP)). This is a good result given Kayne’s (1994) proposal
• provides for transparent interface with phonology and semantics
• creates necessary framework to address comparative syntax.
Positional evidence-1: Italian

a. V che to John V-cl-(61a)

b. V to John di V-cl (62a)
Positional evidence continued-2 Italian

c. V che toJ THIS tomorrow cl-V(37a)
Positional evidence continued- 2a Evidence for Int

c. V Top si/perche Foc V (1977)
Positional evidence-3 Italian

- Force
- A cui
- TopP*
- theN
- theN
- theN
- A cui
- IntP
- FocP
- A cui
- TopP*
- theN
- FinP
- ?theN
- FinP
- V

d. NP to who, the Nobel price, .. (12a).

e. (root Q) * to who, the Nobel price, .. (13a).

f. V <the Nobel price> to who <? the Nobel price> (14).
Accounting for general cooccurrence restrictions: root wh.

- RootQs: Top wh/*wh Top IP
- Why *e (=14a?) T to C (T carries wh) (V to Foc.: precludes presence of lower Top) (*T to Top)
Adjacency and Case

(52b) * For, tomorrow, John to leave
(51b) that-tomorrow, John will leave

*For spells out Fin; DPs depends on for for Case
but why not Top for .. ..? (Top di OK in Italian

This might be related

a. to the fact that for assigns structural Case to the subject (the subject is outside TP, inside the projection of the PP;
b. to the fact that *di* is also involved in nominals (as a D),

[the book *di* Gianni]
Some general questions...

- But what about subordinators? --> Hungarian
- What about mood?
- Are there other elements that can occur where Int occurs (decl/imp?)
- How do Force and Fin talk to each other?
- How do Fin and IP talk to each other? (T to C..)
- If wh is lower than Force, how does locality of selection work?
- What is up with the recursion?
- Can higher Top be distinguished from lower Top?
- Do arguments and adjuncts behave the same way for topicalization?
- Why don’t we find Force markers etc all over the place?
- How to express verb second? Verb first in this framework?
- How is scrambling related to this (Topics Focus)
Some proposals...

How do Fin and TP talk to each other?
How do Force and Fin talk to each other?
If wh is lower than Force, how does locality of selection work?

--> Spec head

Fin attracts TP
Decl Force attracts Fin/DeclP;

FinP can cause pied-piping of a containing XP

Language variation due to the size of pied-piping-
--> complexity filters
A striking similarity between embedded and root clauses
(quite similar to Hallman, 2001)
Force and clause type

\[ \text{Q} \]

- Force
  - TopP*
    - IntP
      - Decl
      - FocP
        - TopP*
          - FinP
            - IP