1 Introduction

The present paper aims at presenting an analysis of the left periphery of Spanish and Catalan. The left periphery refers to the pre-IP domain, i.e. the CP, where the syntax interfaces with the pragmatics. It is the area reserved for elements that move there as a consequence of the information structure of the sentence, such as topic and focus, but it also encompasses different types of CP elements, such as wh- and relative operators, or subordinating complementizers. Following Pollock’s (1989) split of the IP, an attempt was made to identify all the functional categories in the IP, which culminated with Cinque’s (1999) influential work. This trend was soon extended to the CP, thus, current analyses of the left periphery fall mainly within the cartographic approach.

The result of the efforts of researchers entrenched within this research program is a map of the CP (cf. Rizzi 1997, 2001, Poletto 2000, Benincà 1996, 2001, Poletto and Pollock 2004a,b, Benincà and Poletto 2004, among others). The cartography of the CP includes a number of functional projections hosting either a lexical element base-generated in its head, as is the case of exclamative wh-words, or a strong feature that attracts a constituent of the IP to its head (V to C movement) or its Spec (Focused constituents). This approach considers the orderings of these different constituents when they co-occur in order to map them to specific functional projections. The main assumption within this line of research is the rejection of a CP with a single projection based on the co-occurrence of different constituents traditionally attributed to the CP. This argument is widely accepted. Notwithstanding the overall appeal of the approach, extant proposals suffer from shortcomings that require attention. The present paper presents the main advancements and limitations in the cartography of the CP, and proposes a means of redressing its limitations. Referencing new and published data from Spanish and Catalan, the paper aims to provide a uniform, simplified map of the left periphery.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to presenting the main ideas that emerge from the literature on the left periphery. Section 3 proposes a structure of the left periphery that can account for data in Spanish and Catalan. In light of the conclusions reached from the data analysis a uniform structure of the left periphery is proposed. Section 4 offers a conclusion as well directions for future research.

2 The Cartographic Approach

2.1 Overview

This section is devoted to discussing the main concepts that surface from the cartographic approach to the study of the CP. The pursuit of this proposal is to map the left periphery constituents to a complex structure of the pre-IP field. As stated above, the cornerstone of this work is the fact that there are several functional projections within the CP, as proven by their co-occurrence, that present a fixed word order, which is taken to indicate the ordering of these functional projections. Unfortunately this approach has not reached a unified complex structure. This work encompasses structures involving the information structure of the sentence, i.e. preposed foci and topics, and other sentence type phenomena, i.e. question formation, relativization, etc. As a consequence of this diversity, the initial effort of works such as Rizzi (1997, 2001)
has yielded more specific works in the same general framework. Rizzi (1997, 2001) compares topics and foci and decides on the order of the functional projections in the CP by presenting examples of foci and topics in relation to other left-peripheral constituents such as wh-words and complementizers. Nevertheless, this project is limited in that it does not take into account the specifics of topics, foci, and question formation, among other peripheral phenomena. Benincà (1996, 2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2004) give further attention to the different types of topics, which leads them to conclude that there is only one topic projection and that HT (hanging topics) appear in a higher projection. Poletto (2000) and Poletto and Pollock (2004a, b) focus on question formation and the structure of the left periphery involved in the structure, leaving aside the bigger picture of other left peripheral constituents, such as topics and foci. In what follows, a brief account of each of these works is presented.

### 2.2 Main proposals

Rizzi (1997, 2001) proposes the following structure of the left periphery based on the word order attested when topics, foci, questions and relative operators co-occur:

(1) Rizzi (2001: 289)

```
Force (Topic*) Interrogative (Topic*) Focus (Topic*) Finite IP
```

He explains that the CP falls in between the previous discourse and the IP, thus, the extremes of the CP must be connected with each. Force hosts constituents that make reference to the preceding context, whereas Fin is connected to the IP, as evidenced by the English requirement that ‘that’ appear with a tensed clause and ‘for’ with an untensed clause. In between these two extremes, topics and foci are at play. FocusP is not recursive, since there can only be one focused phrase per clause, whereas TopicP is:

(2) Il libro, a Gianni, domain, glielo darò

the book to Gianni tomorrow cl. give fut.1sg.

```
senz’altro.
certainly
```

“I’ll give the book to Gianni tomorrow for sure.”

Regarding the word order, TopicP can either precede or follow foci (3-4), thus, its multiple projection in (1).

(3) A Gianni, QUESTO, domain, gli dovete dire.

to Gianni this tomorrow cl. should 2sg. say

“Tomorrow you should tell THIS to Gianni.”

(4) QUESTO, a Gianni, domain, gli dovete dire.

this to Gianni tomorrow cl. should 2sg. say

“Tomorrow you should tell THIS to Gianni.”

---

1 Not all the examples offered a gloss and an idiomatic translation in the original. In these cases, I added the gloss and made the translation idiomatic. The translation, thus, may not exhibit the word order or pragmatic force exemplified in the source language.
TopicP can also precede Int(errogative) (Rizzi 2001). Int hosts elements like se ‘if’ or perché ‘why’ in Italian.

(5) a. Non so se, a Gianni, avrebbero potuto dirgli la verità.
   neg know 1sg if to Gianni have cond.3pl can pp saycl the truth.
   “I don’t know if, to Gianni, they could have told the truth.”

b. Non so, a Gianni, se avrebbero potuto dirgli la verità.
   neg know 1sg to Gianni if have cond.3pl can pp saycl the truth.
   “I don’t know if, to Gianni, they could have told the truth.”

Other wh-operators are assumed to move to FocP, as attested by their inability to co-occur with focused constituents:

(6) a. *A GIANNI che cosa hai detto to Gianni what thing say pres.pft.2sg (, non a Piero) ?
   neg to Piero
   “TO GIANNI what did you tell (, not to Piero)?.”

b. *Che cosa A GIANNI hai detto (, non a Piero) ?
   what thing TO GIANNIsay pres.pft 2sg. neg to Piero
   “What TO GIANNI did you tell (, not to Piero)?.”

While the differences between these two groups of wh-operators are contemplated in Rizzi’s structure, subsequent work better accounts for these contrasts.

Regarding the multiple topics, Benincà (2001) offers the structure in (7), which simplifies the structure of topics:

(7) DiscourseP
   Hanging Disc’
   Topic
   C subord
   ForceP
   che excl Force’
   wh-
   C subord che
   Left Dislocated Top’
She distinguishes topics from hanging topics (HTs), which are located higher in the structure. The difference is observed in the appearance of a strong pronoun in HT versus a clitic, if available in the language, in topics (clitic left dislocation, henceforth CLLD):

(8)  a.  En esa ciudad nunca he estado.
    in that town never have.1sg. be.pp
    “In that city I have never been.”

b.  Esa ciudad, nunca he estado allí.
    that town never have.1sg. be.pp there
    “That town, I have never been there.”

(8a) is an example of CLLD; the clitic is absent because Spanish lacks a locative clitic. Notice that Catalan, French or Italian would have a clitic in the translations of this sentence. (8b), on the other hand, is an example of HT since a strong element, allí, doubles it in the IP (Casielles-Suárez 2004). Benincà (2001) considers that the differences between hanging topics and CLLD are the presence of the clitic and the phrase type. Notice that HTs are not case-marked, i.e. a DP in (8b), while CLLD are, thus (8a) requires a PP. In case of an animate accusative fronted phrase, CLLD requires a personal a, whereas, HT does not.

Regarding questions, the main addition made by Poletto (2000) and Poletto and Pollock (2004a, b) is considering the position of the verb, among other constituents that are located within the CP in Northern Italian Dialects (NIDs). Among these elements are two types of subject clitics (SCLs): invariable and deictic SCLs. Poletto (2000) postulates that the following structure represents the CP involved in questions:

(9)  [CP che[CP2 a[CP3/AgrCP SCL [CP4 [Spec C4 pa] [C0 ch/lo]]]]]

She offers numerous pieces of evidence in favor of such a complex structure. Here we offer a summary of these:

First, in questions, different heads occupy distinct positions. She proves that SCI corresponds to verb movement into the CP layer and that the focus particle pa is located in the CP layer. With respect to SCI, she presents three arguments, namely, that, (i) in certain dialects, the SCI crosses the particle pa, (ii) some varieties exhibit a
type of do-support very similar to English, which is assumed to be V to C movement, and (iii) some dialects display coordinated interrogatives where the SCI is coordinated with a CP. Regarding the focus particle *pa*, Poletto claims that it is in the CP based on its distribution. *Pa* co-occurs with a preceding SCI but never co-occurs with a complementizer. These facts can be accounted for by saying that *pa* and the complementizer cannot co-occur because they occupy the same phrase; *pa* is in the Spec and the complementizer is the head. When the complementizer is produced, *pa* cannot take place due to the minimalist ban on two elements in the same phrase realizing the same strong feature, contemplated under the Doubly Filled Comp. Placing *pa* in the Spec of the lowest projection in CP also explains why SCI can co-occur with *pa* and not with the complementizer. The verb cannot move through the head of the CP4 since the complementizer is realized and blocks it. As a consequence of the fact that both SCI and *pa* are located in the CP and both can co-occur, she posits the complex structure of the CP sketched in (54).

Second, wh-items can occupy different Spec positions. She presents data exhibiting different wh-items behaving differently with respect to SCL. As way of an example, *do*, the short form of 'where', is incompatible with deictic clitics and cannot occur when a complementizer is realized. These facts can only be explained by considering it a clitic element that has to procliticized to the AgrCº head where the verb occurs. A different group of wh-elements are weak elements that need to occupy a position where they can undergo a Spec-head agreement with a head, as opposed to strong elements which occupy the Spec of projections without a head. These groupings explain the differences found between different types of wh-elements: D-linked vs non D-linked wh-words or argumental vs. non argumental ones. In sum, the distinction between weak and strong wh-words argued for based on their distribution with SCL stems in the fact that weak elements need to occur in a Spec-head relation whereas strong wh-words require an empty head. This constitutes evidence in favor of arguing for different Spec positions within the CP, hence, the complex structure presented in (54).

Third, the position of the wh-item in a specific Spec position yields certain interpretative consequences. After discussing data from different dialects displaying different interpretations depending on what CP level is projected, she concludes that every projection carries a different interpretation. “The lowest CP conveys the meaning of a rhetorical question, the CP containing a deictic SCL is a request for more information, and CP1 corresponds to a modal interpretation” (Poletto 2000: 71).

Fourth, the complementizer is proven to merge in a low position but can move up from head to head to the highest head position in the CP. This fact is justified based on the main-embedded asymmetry. In embedded clauses the complementizer merges low in the CP and, thus bans V to C movement. The fact that it moves to higher Cº positions is demonstrated by the clustering of the complementizer with vocalic clitics, which occur higher in the structure.

Thus, the CP involved in questions hosts Subject Clitic Inversion (SCLI), where the verb moves as predicted by the ordering with the subject clitic:

(10) \[ \text{Cossa fa lo?} \]
    \[ \text{what do 3s. SCL.} \]
    \[ \text{“What is he doing?”} \]

The differences observed between two types of wh-operators are captured by two positions; non-D(iscourse)-linked, argumental, monosyllabic wh-words are projected lower than D(iscourse)-linked, non-argumental, polysyllabic wh-words. The difference between D-linked and non-D linked is exemplified in (11). (11a) is a D-linked wh-word,
i.e., it subcategorizes for a noun. The split between argumental and non-argumental refers to the function of the wh-phrase. The following example captures the fact that the lower operators (11b) do not allow the verb to move to C, and, as a consequence, post-verbal subjects are not allowed. Since post-verbal subjects are not allowed, they have to be right dislocated doubling the pro that is in the IP.

(11)  
\[ a. \text{Quale libro ha letto Gianni?} \]  
what book read pres.pft.3sg. Gianni  
“Which book did Gianni read?”  
\[ b. \text{Cossa pro ha fatto, Gianni?} \]  
what pro do pres. Pft.3sg. Gianni  
“What has Gianni done?”

In sum, the CP involved in questions hosts SCL, the verb, and two operator projections (Poletto 2000). Looking at doubling questions in Bellunese (12), Poletto and Pollock (2004a) offer further evidence in favor of two operator positions in the left periphery:

(12)  
\[ \text{Cossa ha-lo fat que?} \]  
what have.3sg-he do pp. what  
“What did he do?”

They propose the following structure based on the claim that several elements can appear in between these two operators, thus, other projections are necessary:

(13)  
\[ \text{[Op2P Op2º [ForceP Forceº][GroundP Groundº [TopP Topº [Op1P Op1º IP]]]]} \]

Verbs move to Force to check off the [+question] feature, Ground hosts the subject clitics, and Top the subject DP. However, other possibilities are observed.

The interaction between different types of questions (D-linked vs. non-D-linked operators in Italian) and the availability of stylistic inversion (SI) or subject clitic inversion (SCLI) is used to justify these projections. The authors argue that some operators (non-D-linked operators in Italian and defective operators such as pourquoi in French) are defective in that they cannot check the [+question] feature in Force. These defective operators appear with SCLI or in embedded contexts since Remnant IP movement in SCLI and the selecting verb in the main clause can check off this feature in Force. Thus non-D-linked operators can appear with SI in embedded clauses but in main clauses they must appear with SCLI. The difference between SI and SCLI stems in the availability of a pause before the postverbal subject, represented here by a comma, since Italian is a null subject language:

(14)  
\[ \text{Italian SI} \]  
\[ Quale libro ha letto Gianni? \]  
what book read pres.pft.3sg. Gianni  
“Which book did Gianni read?”

(15)  
\[ \text{Italian SCLI} \]  
\[ Cossa ha fatto, Gianni? \]  
what pro do pres. Pft.3sg. Gianni  
“What has Gianni done?”
The interplay between these two types of inversion and the type of wh-operator becomes clearer in the following examples:

(16) Italian D-linked operator with SI

a. Quale libro ha letto Gianni?
what book read pres.pft.3sg. Gianni

“What book did Gianni read?”

b. Mi hanno chiesto quale libro ha letto Gianni.
cl. ask pres.pft.3pl. what book read pres.pft.3sg. Gianni

“They have asked me what book Gianni read.”

(17) Italian non-D-linked operator with SCLI

Cossa ha fatto, Gianni?
what pro do pres.Pft.3sg. Gianni

“What has Gianni done?”

(18) Italian non-D-linked operator with SI

a. *Cossa ha fatto Gianni?
What do pres. Pft.3sg. Gianni

“What has Gianni done?”

b. Mi hanno chiesto cosa ha fatto Gianni.
cl. ask pres.pft.3pl. what done pres.pft.3sg. Gianni

“They have asked me what Gianni did.”

The examples (16-18) display this interplay; Italian D-linked operators can appear with SI whereas non-D-linked operators cannot in main clauses. Poletto and Pollock (2004a) explain that non-D-linked operators are defective and, as such, they cannot check off the [+question] features in Force. Thus, Remnant IP movement checks this feature yielding the word order observed in (17). SI can appear with these defective operators in embedded clauses because the selecting verb in the main clause checks off the strong [+question] features in Force. The use of the projection Force is, then, required in order to account for the alternation between SI and SCLI observed in Italian D-linked vs. non-D-linked operators. Regarding the projection TopP, the Topic feature can be checked by a DP subject in SI sentences or by AspP in SCLI. This is due to the fact that clitics are [+ground] and not [+topic] and, therefore, they cannot check off the topic feature in TopP. The feature in GroundP can also be checked by several elements: remnant IP movement, D-linked wh- words, or by subject clitics. The left periphery for questions proposed by Poletto and Pollock (2004a) is based on the comparison of questions in Bellunese, French and Italian, which yields this split CP. This structure explains the availability of doubling questions in Bellunese but it also accounts for the position of post-verbal subjects in questions by distinguishing between SI and SCLI. Nonetheless, this complex structure can be expanded, since topics, for instance, can precede questions. More research needs to focus on how this structure translates into the structure proposed by Poletto (2000), the general structure proposed by Rizzi (1997), or that put forth by Benincà (2001).
In this section we have presented the main proposals with respect to the cartography of the left periphery. However, we cannot provide a complete structure combining these proposals since they are not easily translatable. That is, the proliferation of projections renders comparisons difficult. In the following section, we summarize the generalizations that emerge from these studies with the aim of preparing the background for a more austere proposal of the structure of the left periphery.

2.3 Generalizations

The main generalization that emerges from the cartographic approach is that the CP is a field consisting of a number of functional projections. There is a boundary between the CP and the IP, although it is not clear where to draw the line. Some issues like the position of pre-verbal subjects make this boundary blurry. Some authors argue that preverbal subjects are topics, and, as such, they occupy the TopicP (Ordóñez 2000, Ordóñez and Treviño 1999, Camacho 2006), whereas others argue that they occupy the highest specifier position within the IP (Goodall 1992, Suñer 2003, Casielles-Suárez 2004, Gutiérrez Bravo 2002). Post-verbal subjects in questions are placed within the CP, more specifically in TopP, too, according to Poletto and Pollock (2004a). However, since the verb moves to V, it is difficult to decide whether the subject remains in IP or moves to the left periphery too.

Not only is it not clear where the boundary between the CP and the IP is but the semantic differences between the CP and the IP remain unexplored. The left periphery, being the syntax interface with pragmatics, is very heterogeneous, hosting constituents related to the information structure of the sentence and other constituents that refer to the sentence type. Although Rizzi (1997) recognizes this split, it is not reflected in the structures proposed. His structures present different functional projections based on the assumption that if the elements can co-occur, they occur in different projections. While this assumption may be valid, this approach takes it to the extreme, advocating for almost one projection per word. A much simpler structure is in order. Supporting a simpler structure can be achieved by abandoning some of the more basic assumptions. One cannot argue that the CP only has one layer, but including the notion of adjunction can help. Rizzi (1997) rejected the idea of adjunction to explain the asymmetry between topics and foci based on his faulty assumption that topics precede and follow foci. It seems that differentiating between the constituents that belong in the CP and those that are adjoined to it can simplify the complex structure of the left periphery. Another generalization that emerges from these proposals is that topic is a doubling structure. We propose abandoning such a claim since direct object doubling is disallowed in most dialects of Spanish. Still, left dislocated direct objects present a clitic in the IP in these dialects:

(19) Spanish dialects disallowing direct object clitic doubling:
   a. *La vi a la chica.
      cl.acc. see pret. 1sg. anim. the girl
      “I saw the girl”
   b. A la chica la vi.
      anim. the girl cl.acc. see pret. 1sg.
      “I saw the girl.”

(19) indicates that CLLD should not be seen as a doubling structure where the DP is moved to the left periphery.
The preceding discussion has presented the generalizations that will be followed or rejected in the analysis. The next section offers new and published data to motivate a uniform structure of the left periphery proposed for Spanish and Catalan.

3 New proposal

3.1 Are topics adjoined?

The cartographic approach assumes that (i) there is one recursive topic (Rizzi 1997) or two types of topics (Benincà and Poletto 2004, Benincà 2001) and (ii) topics are moved from the IP. In Spanish and Catalan, we can distinguish three types of topics: hanging topics (HT), topics (Casielles-Suárez Background topics), and sentence topic (STop, the position for pre-verbal subjects). First, STop is part of the IP, as argued in Casielles-Suárez. Note that STop cannot host a bare plural:

(20) a. Jugaban niños en el parque.
   “Children were playing in the park.”

b. Dinero tengo yo.
   “Money I have.”

c. Langostas destruyeron las cosechas.
   “LOCUSTS destroyed the crops.”

d. *Niños jugaban en el parque.
   “Children were playing in the park

(20d) is banned because the subject is in the IP. In (14a) the subject is within the VP and in (20b) and (20c) the bare nominals are in CP.

Second, background topics appear in CLLD structures (cf. Cecchetto 2000 for clitic right dislocation, henceforth CLRD) both in Catalan and Spanish:

(21) Spanish CLLD:
    A la chica la vi.
    “I saw the girl.”

Lastly, hanging topics occur with a strong pronoun in the IP. Compare the following examples (example 8 above):

(22) a. En esa ciudad nunca he estado.
    “In that town I have never been.”

b. Esa ciudad, nunca he estado allí.
    “That town, I have never been there.”
CLLD structures (22a) are characterized by the presence of a clitic, if it is available in the language (Vallduví 1998), whereas HTs appear with a strong element. In (22a) no clitic is present since Spanish lacks a locative clitic. Comparison with the Catalan translation (23a) proves that when the clitic is available in the language, as is the case of Catalan, it is produced:

(23)  
\begin{align*} 
\text{a. } & \text{En aquella ciutat no he estat mai.} \\
& \text{in that town neg. cl. have.1sg. be.pp never} \\
& \text{“In that town I have never been.”} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Aquella ciutat, no he estat allí mai.} \\
& \text{that town neg. have.1sg. be.pp there never} \\
& \text{“That town, I have never been there.”} 
\end{align*}

As pointed out above, the cartographic approach rejects adjunction based on assumptions that have already been abandoned. Rizzi’s (1997) rejection of adjunction was based on his faulty assumption that topics precede and follow foci. Benincà (2001) proves that there is a fixed word order of topics and foci. However, a closer look at these structures displays evidence for and against treating CLLD as movement. In favor of adjunction, consider the following example:

(24)  
\begin{align*} 
\text{a. } & \text{A la chica la vi en el parque.} \\
& \text{to the girl cl see.pret.1sg. in the park} \\
& \text{“I saw the girl in the park.”} \\
\text{b. } & \text{*La vi a la chica en el parque.} \\
& \text{cl see.pret.1sg. to the girl in the park} \\
& \text{“I saw the girl in the park.”} 
\end{align*}

If CLLD (24a) is considered to be derived by movement, before the movement was applied, there would be a doubling structure where the direct object is doubled by a clitic. (24b) proves that this is not the case in most varieties of Spanish. Thus, positing that the direct object DP has moved from the IP is at odds with the fact that Spanish does not allow for direct object clitic doubling. Considering CLLD a case of adjunction avoids this problem. In addition, it also accounts for the differences observed between topics and foci with respect to Weak Crossover (WCO) effects pointed out by Cinque (1999) for Italian:

(25)  
\begin{align*} 
\text{a. } & \text{Gianni, sua madre lo ha sempre apprezzato.} \\
& \text{Gianni his mother cl aux always appreciate ppt.} \\
& \text{“Gianni, his mother always appreciated him.”} \\
\text{b. } & \text{?GIANNI, sua madre ha sempre apprezzato t (non Piero).} \\
& \text{Gianni his mother aux always appreciate ppt (non Piero).} 
\end{align*}
appreciate ppt.  (not Piero)

“Gianni, his mother always appreciated, not Piero.”

Since the CLLD object (25a) is adjoined it can be coindexed with the possessive
determiner, whereas the focused object (25b) cannot be coindexed because it has been
moved from the IP and in doing so causes WCO effects.

Regarding HTs, considering that they are adjoined to the CP explains the
presence of a strong pronoun in the IP coindexed with it.

(26)  Julia, nunca he hablado con ella.

Julia never speak pres.pft.1sg with her.

“Julia, I have never talked to her.”

In fact, under a movement analysis, Julia would move from within the IP and
coindexation with the pronoun would incur a Principle B violation. Since coindexation is
allowed, the movement analysis must be abandoned. Moreover, this structure cannot
be the result of movement since there is no place in the IP for the HT Julia. There is a
difference, though, between topics and HTs: whereas HTs can be omitted without ill
effect, the omission of a CLLD element results in ungrammaticality:

(27)  a. *(En la mesa) no he puesto el libro.

on the table neg put pres.pft1sg. the book

“I haven’t put the book on the table.”

b. (La mesa,) no he puesto el libro allí.

the table neg put pres.pft1sg. the book there

“I haven’t put the book there, on the table.”

Notice, however, that this is easily explained by the fact that there is not a locative
clitic in Spanish. We could posit that there is a null clitic that is only licensed by co-
indexation with an element in the clause. The omission of the licensing element, as in
(27a) results in ungrammaticality. The same sentence with an accusative clitic is
grammatical (28). Actually, the Catalan equivalent of (27), (29), admits elision due to
the availability of the locative clitic. Thus, there is no need to posit a movement
analysis for either structure.

(28)  (A Silvia) no la he visto.

to Silvia neg cl. see pres.pft. 1sg.

“I haven’t seen Silvia.”

(29)  (A la taula) no hi he posat el llibre.

on the table neg cl. put pres.pft1sg. the book

“I haven’t put the book on the table.”

This section has presented evidence in favor of distinguishing three types of
topics. It also presents evidence in favor of considering topics and HT to be adjuncts.
The difference between HTs and CLLD has not been addressed. In the paragraphs to
follow this difference is attributed to distinct adjunction sites. In order to reach this
conclusion, a comparison between their behaviours with respect to questions and foci
is needed. In the following section, questions and preposed foci are argued to result
from movement, as posited by the cartographic studies.
3.2 Questions and preposed foci are moved

As opposed to CLLD phrases, preposed foci do not exhibit an accusative clitic when the moved phrase is the direct object. In fact, if the preposed focus is omitted the sentence is ungrammatical (30). Notice that the indirect object admits doubling in Spanish (31), thus, the clitic may appear with preposed indirect objects although it is not necessary (32).

(30) *(A SILVIA) no he visto.
     to Silvia neg see pres.pft. 1sg.
     "I haven’t seen Silvia.”

(31) No le he dicho eso a Susana.
     to Susana neg cl. say.pre.pft.1sg. that
     “I haven’t said that to Susana.”

(32) a. A SUSANA no le he dicho eso.
     to Susana neg cl. say.pre.pft.1sg. that
     “I haven’t said that to Susana.”
     b. *(A SUSANA) no he dicho eso.
     to Susana neg. say.pre.pft.1sg. that
     “I haven’t said that to Susana.”

When the clitic appears, as in (33a), the preposed indirect object is omissible. This contrasts with the sentence without the clitic (33b), which would be ungrammatical if the focused indirect object is omitted:

(33) a. (A SUSANA) no le he dicho eso.
     to Susana neg cl. say.pre.pft.1sg. that
     “I haven’t said that to Susana.”
     b. *(A SUSANA) no he dicho eso.
     to Susana neg. say.pre.pft.1sg. that
     “I haven’t said that to Susana.”

Thus, the preposed foci are moved from within the IP, leaving a trace behind. Movement can also explain why WCO effects occur when the preposed foci are co-indexed with a possessive determiner in the subject.

All the evidence presented here and in previous work indicates that preposed foci are phrases within the IP that have been moved to the CP to check off the [+focus] feature. The case of question operators is very similar, although they are attracted to the CP to check off the strong [+question] feature. As in the case of preposed foci, when a question is formed, there is a trace left behind where the question operator is base-generated. This position is illustrated in wh- in-situ questions:

(34) a. ¿Qué te ha dicho María?
     what cl. say.pres.pft.3sg. María
     “What did María tell you?”
     b. ¿María te ha dicho qué?
Poletto and Pollock (2004a) argue that in situ questions in Italian are the result of movement of the wh-operator and subsequent movement of the IP to achieve the observed word order. This claim is based on the fact that, in in-situ questions in some Northern Italian Dialects (NIDs), there is subject clitic inversion (SCLI), argued to result from movement to C:

(35) Ha-lo fat que?
    has-he do pp. what
    “What did he do?”

Spanish and Catalan do not exhibit this type of clitics, thus, it is impossible to confirm that there is movement to C. (34a) demonstrates that subjects are post-verbal in questions, however, in (34b) the subject can be pre-verbal. This fact only indicates that the verb has not moved to C, therefore, we cannot confirm or reject Poletto and Pollock’s claim.\(^2\) The fact that there is a wh- trace in the IP is confirmed by the answer to the question in (34a), where eso ‘that’ corresponds with the position where the wh-operator is base-generated (36). In addition, omission of the wh-operator results in ungrammaticality (37). Thus, we can claim that there is no doubt that there is movement in question formation.

(36) María me ha dicho eso.
    María cl. say.pres.pft.3sg. that
    “María told me that.”

(37) *¿Te ha dicho María?
    cl. say.pres.pft.3sg. María
    “Did María tell you?”

We may wonder, though, whether there is movement in yes-no questions where the complementizer is null in Spanish. Evidence from the position of the subject indicates that there is V to C movement:

(38) ¿Va María a la playa?
    go 3sg. María to the beach
    “Is María going to the beach?”

In contrast with Spanish, Catalan uses a question marker in yes-no questions. There is V to C movement. However, movement of the question marker from the IP cannot be posited since there is no gap in the IP.

(39) Que anirà en Joan a la platja?
    Wh-operator go fut3sg. the Joan to the beach
    “Is María going to the beach?”

\(^2\) The fact that sentences like (i) are grammatical may indicate that the subject is not moved to C. Nevertheless, further research should indicate what the position of the object is, if the subject remains in the Spec of vP.

(i) ¿Por qué te ha dicho eso María?
    why cl. say.pres.pft.3sg that María?
    “Why did María tell you that?”
Other facts related to question formation are far more intriguing: the ban on pre-verbal subjects and the two asymmetries related to this fact. It is well known that there is an asymmetry between main and embedded clauses regarding the ban on preverbal SCL in Italian. In Spanish and Catalan there are no SCL, and the position of the subjects does not reveal an asymmetry:

(40)  a. ¿Qué trajo su amiga?  
what bring pret.3sg. his friend  
“What did his friend bring?”
   b. *¿Qué su amiga trajo?  
what his friend bring  
“What did his friend bring?”
   c. Juan me preguntó qué trajo su amiga.  
Juan cl. ask pret.3sg. what bring pret.3sg. his friend  
“Juan asked what his friend brought.”
   d. *Juan me preguntó qué su amiga trajo.  
Juan cl. ask pret.3sg. what his friend bring pret.3sg.  
“Juan asked what his friend brought.”

(41)  a. Què ha portat la seva amiga?  
what bring pret.3sg. the his friend  
“What did his friend bring?”
   b. *Què la seva amiga ha portat?  
what his friend bring  
“What did his friend bring?”
   c. En Joan em va preguntar què va portar  
the Joan cl. ask pret.3sg. what bring pret.3sg. la seva amiga.  
The his friend  
“Juan asked what his friend brought.”
   d. *En Joan em va preguntar quina cosa la seva amiga va portar  
the Joan cl. ask pret.3sg. what thing the his friend bring pret.3sg.  
“Juan asked what his friend brought.”

It has been noted that some wh-operators allow for pre-verbal subjects whereas others don’t. The split has been argued to be between D-linked and non-D-linked or
between argumental and non-argumental (Goodall 1992, Suñer 2003, etc.). The following examples show that an argumental D-linked wh-word bans pre-verbal subjects (42a) and (43a), whereas a non-argumental non-D-linked wh-word does not (42b), and (43b):

(42) a. *¿Qué libro Javi ha leído?  
   what book Javi read pres.pft.3sg.  
   “What book has Javi read?”

b. ¿Por qué Luis se fue a casa tan pronto?  
   why Luis go pret.3sg. to home so early  
   “Why did Luis go home so early?”

(43) a. *Qué la seva amiga ha portat?  
   what his friend bring  
   “What did his friend bring?”

b. Per què la Carme no ve?  
   why the Carme neg go 3sg.  
   “Why isn’t Carme going?”

The examples in (42-43) appear to indicate that the split in Spanish and Catalan is between argumental and non-argumental wh-operators. However, the following examples indicate that such a split does not exist in Spanish although it does in Catalan. In (44a) the locative wh-operator is an argument of the verb, whereas in (44b) it is not. Yet, both sentences are ungrammatical with a pre-verbal subject in Spanish. In Catalan (45), the preferred word order is with a post-verbal subject. Nevertheless, the pre-verbal subject is not banned (45b).

(44) a. *¿Dónde Juan ha puesto sus apuntes?  
   where Juan put pres.pft 3sg. his classnotes  
   “Where did Juan put his classnotes?”

b. *¿Dónde Juan ha comprado su moto?  
   where Juan buy. pres.peft. 3sg. his motorbike  
   “Where did Juan buy his motorbike?”

(45) a. *On en Joan ha posat el seus apunts?  
   where the Joan put pres.pft 3sg. the his classnotes  
   “Where did Juan put his classnotes?”

b. *On en Joan ha comprat la seva moto?  
   where th Joan buy. pres.peft. 3sg. the his motorbike  
   “Where did Juan buy his motorbike?”

There may be some cross-linguistic or cross-dialectal variation regarding this split. Some languages follow a syntactic cue in the classification of wh-operators that require V to C movement (the argumental vs. non-argumental, like Catalan) whereas some others may follow a prosodic or “weight” cue, classifying the groups according to the number of syllables (por qué ‘why’ and D-linked wh-words, like Spanish). The ban on pre-verbal subjects is the result of V to C movement. Those wh-operators that require
post-verbal subjects need to be in a Spec-Head relationship with the verb in order to check off the strong [+question] feature in C. Those wh-operators that do not have this requirement do not need the verb to move although the verb can move. In sum, D-linked non-argumental wh-operators optionally attract the V to C to check off the strong features, whereas non-D-linked argumental wh-operators attract V to C. The split between these two types of wh-operators is language/dialect specific.

Ordóñez and Olarrea (2006) argue that the data from Caribbean Spanish can only be explained by movement of an entire IP to a split CP.

(46) a. ¿Qué tú comes?
   what you eat.2sg.
   “What do you eat?”

b. *¿Qué comes tú?
   what eat.2sg you
   “What do you eat?”

They argue that the preverbal pronoun in (46a) must move to Spec, AgrsP due to its nature as a weak pronoun. The whole AgrSP subsequently moves to the CP. In the case of postverbal subjects, they argue, in line with Poletto and Pollock (2004a), that post-verbal subjects move to GroundP. Nevertheless, these data can be explained without arguing for the movement of the entire IP. Notice that the distinction between weak pronouns and clitics is based on the fact that weak pronouns constitute phrases whereas clitics constitute heads (Cardinaletti and Starke 1996). Ordóñez and Olarrea (2006) compare these with Spanish accusative and dative clitics. It is not so well-established that accusative and dative clitics are not phrases. Thus, this should not be considered sufficiently strong evidence to claim that preverbal subjects as in (46a) are weak pronouns or clitics. Whatever their nature might be, the verb can be argued to pick them up on its way up to the CP.

In addition, their claim that the post-verbal subject moves to a different projection in C (GroundP) is not well sustained. The difference between pre-verbal and post-verbal subjects can be captured before movement to CP applies. These pre-verbal subjects are weak or cliticlike and need to attach to the verb. Furthermore, the evidence against V to C discussed in Ordóñez and Olarrea is inconclusive. The comparison with V2 languages reveals discrepancies that may be due to other reasons. For instance, the fact that there is not a main versus embedded asymmetry in Spanish can be explained otherwise. The selecting verb can check the [+question] feature. Another discrepancy pointed out in Ordóñez and Olarrea is the fact that, in Germanic languages, the subject can appear in between the auxiliary and the past participle. Spanish compound verb forms can never be split as opposed to other Romance languages such as French and Italian. Thus, the fact that the subject cannot split Spanish compound verbal forms can be explained by independent reasons. Other evidence against V to C in Spanish is related to clitics. For instance, they argue that enclisis should surface if there is movement to C. However, this argument is based on work claiming that imperatives move to C, and, as a consequence, they display enclisis. This argument is far from obvious, thus, it cannot be fully considered as counter-evidence of V to C. In sum, this paper rejects Ordóñez and Olarrea’s
arguments against V to C movement in Spanish. Moreover, V to C can account for the data by claiming that the weak pronoun attaches to V on its way to C³.

An alternative to this analysis is considering that wh-words and foci in Spanish and Catalan move to the Spec of IP. The subject remains in situ. This has been argued for Catalan (Vallduví 1992, and Bonet 1990) and Spanish (Kempchinsky 2001). Despite the attractiveness of such analysis in accounting for the ban on pre-verbal subjects in these contexts without positing the controversial V to C movement, this analysis needs to posit that the wh-words that allow for pre-verbal subjects do indeed move to C. The details as for why only some wh-words move to C would need more work. Nevertheless, at this point, both analyses seem equally plausible. More research is needed in order to be able to argue for one of these two analyses. Notice that in either case the structure of the left periphery would be the same as stated above. The difference would be in the unavailability of V to C movement and the availability of Spec IP as a landing site for preposed foci as well as the wh-words that require post verbal subjects. Other work pertinent to this discussion is Ordóñez and Treviño's (1999) who claim that pre-verbal subjects behave like pre-verbal objects, presenting evidence from ellipsis, quantifier extraction, and the scope of quantifiers. They, however, claim that objects and subjects are in a Top position. This does not account for the distribution of bare nominals presented in Casielles-Suárez (2004). Ordóñez and Treviño's (1999) evidence argues for a common position for preverbal subjects and objects. Since pre-verbal subjects are in Spec, IP, as evidenced by the ban on bare nominals, pre-verbal objects occupy the same position. Thus, combining the ideas present in Vallduví (1992), Bonet (1990), and Kempchinsky (2001) with that the evidence in Ordóñez and Treviño (1999) results in a Spec of IP hosting wh-words, foci, preverbal subjects and objects. At this point, both analysis, i.e. considering V-to-C movement or movement of the wh-word or the focus fronted phrase to the higher Spec in the IP, are plausible and I do not take a stand on this issue here.

To summarize, the preceding paragraphs have presented evidence in favor of a movement analysis of preposed foci and wh-words. In both cases, the movement is motivated by the checking of strong features [+foc] in the case of preposed foci and [+question] in the case of questions. Contra Poletto and Pollock (2004a) and Ordóñez and Olarrea (2006), we consider that the subject remains in the IP. The fact that foci and wh-operators cannot co-occur is further developed in the following section.

3.3 Preposed foci and wh-operators cannot co-occur

An interesting fact pointed out in the literature is the fact that preposed foci and wh-operators cannot co-occur:

(47)  a. *A chi IL PREMIO NOBEL doverebbero
dare?
to whom the Prize Nobel should.1pl. give

“Who should they give the Nobel prize to?” Rizzi (1997: 298)

b. *IL PREMIO NOBEL a chi doverebbero
dare?
the Prize Nobel to whom should.

1pl. give

³ The fact that the phenomenon is generalizing to other types of subjects, i.e. DPs, may argue against V to C in these varieties. It could be the case that these varieties are losing V to C. Since V to C only occurs in main clauses and only with a group of wh-words, it does not seem unconceivable that Caribbean Spanish generalize the maintenance of V in IP; that is, C does not attract V to check off the [+question] feature.
“Who should they give the Nobel prize to?” Rizzi (1997: 298).

Note that the same is true for yes-no questions, which include a null operator. This fact is argued to be the result of a competition for the same projection. As explained in the previous section, both preposed foci and wh-operators land in a Spec position in the CP, one to check off the [+foc] feature in the head and the other the [+question] feature.

Another shared trait is the ban on pre-verbal subjects: preverbal subjects cannot co-occur with wh-operators or foci.

(48) **Spanish: questions**
   a. ¿Qué quiere María?
      what want 3sg. María
      “What does María want?”
   b. *¿Qué María quiere?
      what María want 3sg.
      “What does María want?”

(49) **Catalan: questions**
   a. Què vol la María?
      what want 3sg. the María
      “What does María want?”
   b. *Què la María vol?
      what la María want 3sg.
      “What does María want?”

(50) **Spanish: Fronted Foci**
   a. LOS CUADERNOS quiere María (y no los libros).
      the notebooks want 3sg. María (and not the books)
      “María wants THE NOTEBOOKS (and not the books).
   b. *LOS CUADERNOS María quiere (y no los libros).
      the notebooks María want 3sg. (and not the books)
      “María wants THE NOTEBOOKS (and not the books).

(51) **Catalan: Fronted Foci**
   a. ELS QUADERNS vol la María (i no els)

---

4 Notice that here we are considering that the common landing site is in the CP but it would still be the same if it was Spec, IP.

5 Rizzi (1997: 298) points out that in Italian it is possible to have pre-verbal subjects with preposed foci. The ban on pre-verbal subjects with preposed foci in Spanish has been pointed out in the literature (Torrego 1984, Piera 1987 y Hernanz and Brucart 1987 y Teresa María Rodríguez Tamalle 2002). It may be the case that there is variation as in the case of questions operators explained in the previous section. More research is needed to explain the V-to-C requirement.
The notebooks want 3sg. the María (and not the books).

"María wants THE NOTEBOOKS (and not the books).

b. *ELS QUADERNS la María vol (i no e l s

the notebooks the María want 3sg. (and not the books)

"María wants THE NOTEBOOKS (and not the books).

The data can be explained with V to C movement or with movement of the focus fronted phrase or wh-word to Spec, IP in both cases. In V to C movement theory, when C has a strong feature, it requires both the Spec and the head to be filled. Following the second theory, this can also be explained: if we consider that the focus fronted phrase and the wh-word have moved to the Spec, IP, there is no room for the preverbal subject. However, there seems to be variation with respect to this requirement, i.e. some wh-operators allow preverbal subjects, whereas others do not. Also, variation among languages is attested regarding this requirement. In Italian, unlike in Spanish, pre-verbal subjects are allowed with preposed foci. This variation could be argued to be a lexical requirement. Some wh-words require V-to-C movement, or cannot move to C, following Vallduví (1992), Bonet (1990), and Kempchinsky (2001). As a consequence, preverbal subjects do not surface. Then, preverbal subjects occur with wh-words that do not require V-to-C, or move to C, following the second theory. However, a more detailed study of these cases is necessary and future research should aim to delimit the cases when V to C is obligatory, or when wh-movement to C is banned. For now, we point out that the split between wh-words that allow for pre-verbal subjects and those that do not seems to follow different patterns in Spanish, where there seems to be a weight cue (D-linked vs non-D-linked wh-words), and Catalan, where there seems to be a syntactic cue (argumental vs. non argumental wh-words). D-linked wh-words, in the case of Spanish, non argumental wh-words, in the case of Catalan, and focus fronting, in the case of Italian allow for preverbal subjects. This can be explained by the flexibility in the V to C movement requirement or by their movement to C. Non-D-linked wh-words in Spanish, argumental wh-words in Catalan, and focus fronting in Spanish ban preverbal subjects. In these cases, V to C movement is obligatory, or there is a ban in moving focus fronted phrases or wh-words to C.

As a conclusion to this section, (52) offers a representation for (48a- 51a). The wh-operator in (52a) and (52b) and the preposed foci in (52c) and (52d) move to Spec, CP. The verb is moved to the head and the subject remains within the IP.

(52)  a. **Spanish question**

    \[\text{CP} \text{qué} \ [\text{c quiere}] [\text{IP} \text{María} [i \ t]...t]\]

b. **Catalan question**

    \[\text{CP} \text{qué} \ [\text{c voli}] [\text{IP} \text{la María} [i \ t]...t]\]

c. **Spanish preposed focus**

\[\text{CP} \text{la María vol} (i no e l s\]

\[\text{CP} \text{la María quer} (i no e l s\]

\[\text{CP} \text{la María vol} (i no e l s\]
Notice that, contra Poletto (2000) and Poletto and Pollock (2004a,b), I do not consider that the subject moves to the CP. There is no evidence of such movement in Spanish or in Catalan; thus, the structure of the CP is simplified. Under Poletto and Pollock’s (2004a) structure (13 above, repeated here in 53), (52) would have all the lexical items landing in three different projections in the CP: Op1, Ground and Topic. The simpler structure in (52) assumes that the operator and the verb share a projection and that the subject remains in the IP, explaining the sanctioned word order.

(53) \[ \text{[Op2P Op2}^0 \text{[ForceP Force}^0]\text{[GroundP Ground}^0 \text{[TopP Top}^0 \text{[Op1P Op1}^0 \text{IP}]]] \]

The cases where the verb does not move to C are represented as follows:

(54) a. ¿Por qué Carmen no viene?
   why Carmen neg. come3sg.
   “Why isn’t Carmen coming?”

b. [CP Por qué [C Ø][IP Carmen [i: no viene]...\(t_j\)]

In this section, we have proposed a common analysis of preposed foci and question formation exemplified in (52). The fact that they cannot co-occur together with the distribution with pre-verbal subjects requires a common analysis\(^6\).

3.4 **The co-occurrence of topics, questions and preposed foci**

In the preceding sections, we have presented an analysis for topics, questions and preposed foci. Both HTs and CLLD constructions have been argued to be the result of adjunction whereas preposed foci and questions are the result of movement. Questions cannot co-occur with foci but both questions and foci can co-occur with both types of topics (HTs and CLLD). Since topics are adjoined, a single layer CP could be posited. I present evidence here that this is not the case, as the complementizer *que* ‘that’ requires a different projection within the CP. Thus two layers are proposed: CP1 and CP2.

The co-occurrence between topics and questions is attested in the following examples. Notice that the topic projection is adjoined to the CP:

(55) **María, ¿qué quiere?**  
   (Spanish)
   María what want 3sg.
   “María, what does she want?”
   [TopP María][CP qué [C quiere][IP[i: \(t_1\)...\(t_j\)]]

(56) **La María, què vol?**  
   (Catalan)
   the María what want 3sg.
   “María, what does she want?”
   [TopP La María][CP què [C vol][IP[i: \(t_1\)...\(t_j\)]]

\(^6\) The ban on their co-occurrence can also be explained semantically. Since focus is used to repair the hearer’s misconception, it does not make sense to ask for information to an interlocutor that does not have the facts right. This semantic reason cannot, nevertheless, capture the fact that they disallow preverbal subjects.
Questions and preposed foci have the same structure, as defended above. The wh-operator and the preposed focus move out of the IP into the Spec of the CP. The verb is attracted to C and the subject remains in the IP, yielding the required word order. The topic preceding C is adjoined to the CP.

(58) **Spanish: Focus Preposing**

\[ \text{EL LIBRO quiere } \text{María (y no el cuaderno).} \]

```
[CP el libro] [C quiere] [IP María [i t₁] ...tⱼ]
```

(59) **Catalan: Focus Preposing**

\[ \text{ELS QUADERNS vol } \text{la María (i no els llibres).} \]

```
[CP els quaderns] [C vol] [IP la María [i t₁] ...tⱼ]
```

(60) **Spanish: A topic co-occurring with Focus Preposing**

\[ \text{María, EL LIBRO quiere (y no el cuaderno).} \]

```
[TopP María][CP el libro] [C quiere] [IP [i t₁] ...tⱼ]
```

(61) **Catalan: A topic co-occurring with Focus Preposing**

\[ \text{La María, EL LLIBRE vol (i no el quadern).} \]

```
[TopP La María][CP el llibre] [C vol] [IP [i t₁] ...tⱼ]
```

These examples show topics co-occurring with foci and questions without distinguishing between topics and HT. Next we offer some examples that distinguish topics from HT although they behave the same with respect to focus preposing and questions:

\[ \text{Catalan que in yes-no questions is base generated in Spec, C. There is no gap in the IP so it is not treated as a wh-operator but a question marker.} \]
Spanish: HT co-occurring with Focus Preposing

Julia, AYER POR LA MAÑANA hablé
with her (not by the afternoon)

“I talked to Julia yesterday morning (not afternoon).”

Catalan: HT co-occurring with Focus Preposing

La Julia, AHIR PEL MATÍ vaig parlar
with her (not by the afternoon)

“I talked to Julia yesterday morning (not afternoon).”

Spanish: Topic co-occurring with Focus Preposing

Con Julia, AYER POR LA MAÑANA hablé
with her (not by the afternoon)

“I talked to Julia yesterday morning (not afternoon).”

Catalan: Topic co-occurring with Focus Preposing

Amb la Julia, AHIR PEL MATÍ vaig parlar
with her (not by the afternoon)

“I talked to Julia yesterday morning (not afternoon).”

Spanish: HT co-occurring with a question

Julia, ¿cuándo hablaste
with her

“Julia, when did you talk to her?”
Catalan: HT co-occurring with a question

La Julia, quan vas parlar
with Julia when talk.pret.2sg.
amb ella?

"Julia, when did you talk to her?"

\[\text{[TopP } \text{La Julia]}][\text{CP quan} ][\text{C vas parlar]}][\text{IP } [i t]] [\text{AdvP amb ella}]...t\]

Spanish: Topic co-occurring with a question

Con Julia, ¿cuándo hablaste?
with Julia when talk.pret.2sg.

"When did you talk to Julia?"

\[\text{[TopP con Julia]}][\text{CP cuándo} ][\text{C hablaste}]][\text{IP } [i t]...t]\n
Catalan: Topic co-occurring with a question

Amb la Julia, quan vas parlar?
with the Julia when talk.pret.2sg.

"When did you talk to Julia?"

\[\text{[TopP amb la Julia]}][\text{CP quan} ][\text{C vas parlar}]][\text{IP } [i t]...t]\n
According to the analysis put forth so far, the CP contains only one layer and topics are left-adjoined to the CP. The next section introduces the complementizers que ‘that’ and, as a consequence, a more refined structure of the CP is needed.

Questions and foci can be preceded by the complementizer que ‘that’. Notice that this que is always referring to a previous context and cannot occur in an out-of-the-blue context. In front of a focused phrase or a question, some material is elided (Me preguntaba ‘I was wondering’ or Decía ‘I was saying’):

Spanish: Que + Preposed Focus

¡Que EL LIBRO quiere María!

That the book want 3sg. María

"María wants THE BOOK (and not the notebook)."

\[\text{[cp que[CP el libro]}][\text{C quiere}]][\text{IP María } [i t]...t]\]

Catalan: Que + Preposed Focus

Que EL LLIBRE vol la María!

That the book want 3sg. the María

"María wants THE BOOK (and not the notebook)."

\[\text{[cp que[CP el llibre]}][\text{C voli}]][\text{IP la María } [i t]...t]\]

Spanish: Que + Question

¿qué quiere María?

that what want 3sg. María

"What does María want?"
According to Rizzi’s (1997) nomenclature, this que is base generated in Forceº. We can distinguish two projections; ForceP (or CP1), where the connection with the previous context is established by base-generating a complementizers there, and FocP (or CP2), where elements from IP are moved. For ease of exposition, this paper uses the nomenclature CP1 and CP2. Once these two projections are established we can consider their interaction with topics. First, we consider the co-occurrence of the complementizer que and a preposed focus with the two different types of topics:

(74)

a. Spanish: Que + Topic + Focus

Que en Madrid MARÍA no ha estado
that in Madrid María neg be pres.pft.3sg.

(Luis sí).

Luis yes

“María has not been to Madrid (Luis has).”

b. Spanish: HT + Que + Focus

Madrid, que MARÍA no ha estado allí
Madrid that María neg be pres.pft.3sg there

(Luis sí).

Luis yes

“María has not been to Madrid (Luis has).”

(75)

a. Catalan: Que + Topic + Focus

Que a Madrid la MARÍA no hi ha estat
that in Madrid the María neg cl. be pres.pft.3sg.

(en Lluís sí).

the Lluís yes

“María has not been to Madrid (Lluís has).”

b. Catalan: HT + Que + Focus

Madrid, que la MARÍA no ha estat
Madrid that the María neg be pres.pft.3sg

allà (en Lluís sí).
there the Lluís yes
“María has not been to Madrid (Lluís has).”

[HT Madrid][CP1 que [CP2 la Maríaj [C no ha estatj][IP tij [I tj][AdvP allà]]]]

The HT precedes que, whereas the topic follows it. Based on this word order, we can claim that HT is adjoined to CP1 whereas topic is adjoined to CP2. This is borne out by the data involving the complementizer que, HTs, Topics and questions.

(76) a. **Spanish: Que + Topic + Question**

Que en Madrid ¿qué compró Paz?
that in Madrid what buy pret.3sg. Paz

“What did Paz buy in Madrid?”

[CP1 que [TopP en Madrid][CP2 quéj [C comprój][IP Pazj [I tij]]]]

b. **Spanish: HT + Que + Question**

Madrid, que ¿qué compró Paz allí?
Madrid that what buy pret.3sg. Paz there

“What did Paz buy in Madrid?”

[HT Madrid][CP1 que [CP2 quéj [C comprój][IP Pazj [I tij]][AdvP allí]]]

(77) a. **Catalan: Que + Topic + Question**

Que a Madrid què va comprar la Pau?
that in Madrid what buy pret.3sg. la Pau

“What did Paz buy in Madrid?”

[CP1 que [TopP a Madrid][CP2 quèj [C va comprarj][IP la Pauj [I tij]]]]

b. **Catalan: HT + Que + Question**

Madrid, que què va comprar la Pau allà?
Madrid that what buy pret.3sg. the Pau there

“What did Paz buy in Madrid?”

[HT Madrid][CP1 que [CP2 quèj [C va comprarj][IP la Pauj [I tij]]][AdvP allà]]]

Thus, the following structure can account for the data of co-occurring HTs or Topics with the complementizer que and foci or questions.

(78) [HT...][CP1 que[TopP...][CP2 wh-/foc]j [C vij][IP Subj. [I tij]]]

This structure shows that the CP layer has two levels; CP1 and CP2. It is possible to adjoin the topic (CLLD) to CP2 and HT to CP1. Thus, the difference between Topic (or CLLD) and HT is in the adjunction site. So far I have only considered main clauses, although in the case of que, a preceding main clause seems to be elided. The next section aims at elucidating whether relative que and other subordinating complementizer are base-generated in CP1. This would indicate that CP1 is where elements are base-generated and CP2 where elements are moved.

### 3.5 Embedded contexts

The examples above are repeated here including the elided material. Notice that, in the sentence with the topic, the only difference is the presence of the main
verb. The sentence with the HT is ungrammatical. Thus, it is impossible to adjoin to CP1 in embedded clauses.

(79) a. **Spanish: Que + Topic + Focus**

_Digo_ que en Madrid MARÍA no ha estado

Luis yes

“I am saying that María has not been to Madrid (Luis has).”

(80) a. **Catalan: Que + Topic + Focus**

_Dic_ que a Madrid la MARÍA no hi ha estat (en Lluis sí).

Luis yes

“I am saying that María has not been to Madrid (Luis has).”

(81) a. **Spanish: Que + Topic + Question**

Me preguntaba que en Madrid

Cl. wonder impf.1sg. that in Madrid

qué compró Paz
what buy pret.3sg. Paz
“I was wondering what Paz bought in Madrid?”

\[[IP Me preguntaba[CP1 que [TopP en Madrid][CP2 qué [CP Compró][IP Paz [I t]]]]\]

b. Spanish: HT + Que + Question

*Me preguntaba Madrid, que
cl. wonder impf.1sg. Madrid that
qué compró Paz allí.
what buy pret.3sg. Paz there
“I was wondering what Paz bought in Madrid?”

\*[[IP Me preguntaba [HT Madrid][CP1 que [CP2 qué [CP Compró][IP Paz [I t] [AdvP allí]]]]]

(82)

a. Catalan: Que + Topic + Question

Em preguntava que a Madrid
cl. wonder impf.1sg. that in Madrid
qué va comprar la Pau
what buy pret.3sg. the Pau
“I was wondering what Paz bought in Madrid?”

\[[IP Em preguntava[CP1 que [TopP a Madrid][CP2 qué [CP Compró][IP la Pau [I t]]]]\]

b. Catalan: HT + Que + Question

*Em preguntava Madrid, que
cl. wonder impf.1sg. Madrid that
qué va comprar la Pau allà
what buy pret.3sg. the Pau there
“I was wondering what Paz bought in Madrid?”

\*[[IP Em preguntava [HT Madrid][CP1 que [CP2 qué [CP va compar][IP la Pau [I t] [AdvP allà]]]]]

These examples indicate that adjunction to CP1 is banned and, thus, HTs cannot occur in embedded clauses. This having been established, we can turn to relative clauses in order to elucidate whether relative operators occupy the same position as wh-operators, i.e. CP2 or the same as the complementizer que, i.e. CP1. Since topics precede CP2 and follow CP1, the word order with respect to topics can answer this question:

(83)

Spanish: Relative clause + topic

Vi a la chica que, con Marta, habló
see pret. 1sg. to the girl who with Marta talk pret.3sg.
ayer (y no la semana pasada).
yesterday (and not the week past)
"I saw the girl that talked to Marta yesterday (not last week)."

[IP Vi a la chica[CP1 que [TopP con Marta][IP va parlar ayer]]]

(Catalan: Relative clause + topic)

Vaig veure a la noia que, amb la Marta,
see pret. 1sg. to the girl who with the Marta
va parlar ahir (y no la setmana passada).
talk pret.3sg. yesterday (and not the week past)

"I saw the girl that talked to Marta yesterday (not last week)."

[IP Vaig veure a la noia[CP1 que [TopP amb Marta][IP va parlar ayer]]]

(Spanish: Topic + Relative clause)

*Vi a la chica con Marta que habló
see pret. 1sg. to the girl with Marta who talk pret.3sg.
ayer (y no la semana pasada).
yesterday (and not the week past)

"I saw the girl that talked to Marta yesterday (not last week)."

(Catalan: Topic + Relative clause)

*Vaig veure a la noia amb la Marta que
see pret. 1sg. to the girl with la Marta who
va parlar ahir (y no la setmana passada).
talk pret.3sg. yesterday (and not the week past)

"I saw the girl that talked to Marta yesterday (not last week)."

In the example, the relative que precedes the topic and cannot follow it, thus, the relative que is located in CP1. The fact that it is located in CP1 predicts (i) that it cannot co-occur with the subordinating que and (ii) that it can co-occur with focused constituents:

(Spanish: Relative clause + Fronted Focus)

Vi a la chica que CON MARTA habló
see pret. 1sg. to the girl who with Marta talk pret.3sg.
ayer (y no con Elsa).
yesterday (and not with Elsa)

"I saw the girl that talked to MARTA yesterday (not to Elsa)."

[IP Vi a la chica[CP1 que [CP2 con Marta][IP habló ayer]]]

(Catalan: Relative clause + Fronted Focus)

Vaig veure a la noia que AMB LA MARTA
see pret. 1sg. to the girl who with the Marta
va parlar ahir (y no amb la Elsa).
talk pret.3sg. yesterday (and not with the Elsa)
“I saw the girl that talked to MARTA yesterday (not to Elsa).”

(89) **Spanish: Subordinating que + Relative clause**

*Vi a la chica digo que que

see pret. 1sg. to the girl say 1sg. that who

habló con Marta ayer.
talk pret.3sg. with Marta yesterday

“I saw the girl that talked to Marta yesterday.”

(90) **Catalan: Subordinating que + Relative clause**

*Vaig veure a la noia dic que que

see pret. 1sg. to the girl say 1sg. that who

va parlar amb la Marta ahir.
talk pret.3sg. with the Marta yesterday

“I saw the girl that talked to Marta yesterday.”

According to these data, the subordinating and the relative *que* are in CP1, whereas moved elements such as fronted foci and wh-operators are in CP2. It would be tempting to say that the CP1 is only for base generated elements, whereas the CP2 is the landing site for moved elements, but relativization has been long argued to involve wh-movement (Chomsky 1977 inter alia). Moreover, the yes-no question wh-word in Catalan, *que*, cannot be argued to be due to movement. As a consequence, this generalization cannot be made.

In this section we have argued that in embedded clauses, HTs are banned because adjunction to CP1 is not permitted. Also, relative *que* has been argued to be in CP1. Thus, the structure for embedded clauses is the following:

(91) **[IP ]**[CP1 que[TopP...]] [CP2 wh-/foc] [C V i ] [IP Subj. [t t t]]

4 **Conclusion**

This paper has briefly reviewed the previous literature on the structure of the left periphery in order to adopt and reject some of the generalizations made. The existing literature reviewed is that belonging in the cartographic approach, whereby a split of the CP is necessary. This split is argued in evidence of co-occurring left peripheral elements. The ordering of the multiple functional projections in the CP is derived from the word-order observed. Rizzi (1997, 2001) proposes a structure comparing topics, preposed foci, interrogative and relative operators. This structure is modified by Benincà (2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2004) by presenting a more exhaustive analysis of topics. The study of interrogative sentences yields a structure with multiple layers ignoring how these relate to other peripheral constituents (Poletto 2000 and Poletto and Pollock 2004a, b). These structures cannot be combined into a single general structure of the CP. As a consequence, the present study offers a simplified single general structure of the CP taking into account the structures considered in the cartographic approach: topics, foci, questions and relative clauses. This approach benefits from the classification of topics offered in Casielles-Suárez (2004). The distinction of the three topics, i.e. sentence topic (STop), background topic (CLLD) and HT, is essential to the analysis presented above. STops are projected in the Spec of IP. HTs and Topics are adjoined to CP1 and CP2 respectively. In this respect,
we depart from the cartographic approach. Fronted Foci and questions, however, are
derived by movement, as in the cartographic approach. The analysis considers that
there is V to C movement, as the other studies do, although the movement is to the
head of CP, not an independent projection, as argued in Poletto and Pollock (2004a).

There are some unresolved issues regarding interrogative sentences and
fronted foci, namely, the obligatoriness of V to C movement only with certain wh-
operators and only in certain languages. Leaving this question for future research, the
word order observed when questions or fronted foci co-occur with topics lead to the
conclusion that HTs and topics are attached to CP. Further comparison with the
complementizer *que* ‘that’ indicates that there is another layer within the left
periphery, i.e. CP1. HTs are discussed to differ from topics in the adjunction site, HTs
adjoin to CP1, whereas topics adjoin to CP2. The analysis of embedded contexts
concluded that adjunction to CP1 is banned and that relative operators move from the
IP into CP1. As a consequence, CP1 cannot be argued to be the site for unmoved
constituents, as opposed to CP2. CP2 displays unmoved constituents (the Catalan yes-
no wh-operator *que*) and CP1 hosts moved constituents: the relative operator. The
resulting structure is presented in (92):

(92) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{HT} \\
\text{HT} \\
\text{CP1} \\
\text{C1} \\
\text{TopP} \\
\text{Top} \\
\text{CP2} \\
\text{Wh-/foc} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C2} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{V_i} \\
\end{array}
\]

This structure is simpler than those previously proposed in several respects.
The total number of functional projections within the left periphery is reduced to two:
CP1 and CP2. The differential behaviour of the left peripheral constituents emerges
from the analysis of topics as adjuncts. Although more research is needed to
substantiate this claim, this analysis can account for inter and intra-linguistic
differences by means of lexical requirements. Different languages/ dialects behave
differently regarding V to C (or movement of the wh-word or focus fronted phrase to
C). More specifically, some wh-operators require such movement whereas others do
not. The split between these two groups does not coincide in all languages. This
problem can be solved by claiming that in a language a wh-operator is marked in the
lexicon as requiring V to C movement when it falls within category A, whereas those in
category B optionally move V to C. Further research should try to extend this left
peripheral structure to other languages by accounting for the differences observed
between the languages as encoded in the lexical entry of the operators or the
functional heads. Moreover, future research should account for the bilingual left
periphery in cases where the two languages differ in the structure of the left periphery.
I have proposed a common structure of the left periphery that can account for differences among languages as due to lexical requirements. In Catalan, argumental wh-words, for instance, require V to C movement. In Spanish, however, it is non-D-linked wh-words which require V to C movement. When these lexical requirements are not shared in the two languages, the following questions arise: what is the structure that emerges? Is it one belonging to a language or a third one that combines both?

In conclusion, the present paper presents an analysis of the left periphery of Spanish and Catalan that shares some traits with that proposed in the cartographic studies but that aims at a simpler structure. This simplification, however, needs further elaboration to account for other left peripheral phenomena, such as subject clitic inversion in Northern Italian dialects.
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