Advanced Syntax

1. Fronting movements

a. Wh-movement: *Who did you seen on the train t_1?/I wonder who you saw on the train.*

b. Topicalisation: *Biggs$_1$, I remember seeing* t_1 *on the train.*
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).

c. 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 topic 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, POTATOES$_1$ I wouldn't store t_1.

d. Negative fronting: (*I said that) Never in my life have I been so embarrassed.*
no CP,Spec either, though very similar to questions due to inversion. If the auxiliary is not in C, there must be another XP bw 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.

2. Main Clause Phenomena (MCP)
Haegeman (2010): English temporal and conditional clauses resist argument fronting + cross-linguistically adverbial clauses resist MCP.
Smaller structure or intervention effect?

(1) a *While this paper I was revising last week, I thought of another analysis.
   b *When her regular column she began to write again, I thought she would be OK.
   c *If these exams you don't pass, you won't get the degree.

Hooper and Thompson (1973) offer a semantic/pragmatic account: MCP such as argument fronting depend on assertion. It does not seem possible to define the domain of a root transformation in terms of syntactic structures in any general way.

Expressions of epistemic modality are not compatible with temporal or conditional adverbial clauses:

(2) a *??John works best while his children are probably/may be asleep.
b *John will do it when/if he may/must have time.
c *We met John before he must have tampered with the tapes.

Speech act adverbials are incompatible with temporal and conditional adverbial clauses:

(4) ??*When/if frankly he is unable to cope, we 'll have to replace him.

Evaluative adverbs are also not easily compatible with temporal and conditional adverbial clauses:

(5) *If they luckily arrived on time, we will be saved.

Proposal 1: Speaker oriented meanings in a(n Illocutionary) ForceP. missing from these clauses.

Problems: adjuncts can be fronted:

(9) If on Monday we haven't found him, we'll call the RSPCA.

Imperatives, which would presumably be said to be associated with illocutionary force, do not allow topicalisation in English.

(12) a Your essay, leave *(it) in my pigeon hole this afternoon.
b That book about shrimp, did you actually read *(it)?
c That book about shrimp, when did you read *(it)?
d That book about shrimp, how much we all enjoyed *(it)!

More refined condition: assertive/declarative force? Topicalisation and the appearance of the speaker related adverbs is dependent on the feature composition of Force. But: Gerundive clauses tolerant of topicalisation:

(13) That solution Robin having already explored t and rejected t, she decided to see if she could mate in six moves with just the rook and the two pawns.

In English small clause complements of with, speaker-related evaluative, evidential and epistemic modals are available:

(14) a With John unfortunately/apparently/probably unable to cope with the situation, we decided to turn to Mary.

Proposal 2: a movement analysis based on parallel restrictions
As shown in (16a–c) wh-arguments cannot be extracted across fronted arguments: subject extraction leads to ungrammaticality (16a), the extraction of to whom is degraded (16b). Arguments can, however, be extracted across adjuncts (16c and d):

(16) a *This is a man who$_i$ liberty$_j$ t$_i$ would never grant t$_j$ to us.
b ??The student to whom$_i$, your book$_j$, I will give t$_i$ t$_j$ tomorrow.

c John Prescott is the person who in future t will be in charge of major negotiations with the firefighters.
d The student to whom, tomorrow, I will give your book t.

Pursuing the observation that arguments do and adjuncts do not interfere with movement
→ adverbial clauses are derived by movement of an operator to their left periphery. (18a) is a schematic representation. In such contexts argument fronting will give rise to an intervention effect (18b).

(18) a John left [CP when [IP Sheila left the office ~~when~~.]]
b *John left [CP when the office [IP Sheila left ~~the office~~ ~~when~~]]

Support for the proposal:

In many languages subordinating conjunctions are formally identical to sentence-initial interrogative or relative constituents:

(23) a When did he arrive?
b I wonder when he arrived.
c When he arrived, the place was in darkness.
d French: quand, Italian: quando, Catalan quan, Dutch: wanneer

Island effects similar to wh-movement:

(21) I saw Mary in New York when [IP she claimed [CP that [IP she would leave.]]]
(i) high construal: at the time that she made that claim
(ii) low construal: at the time of her presumed departure

(22) I saw Mary in New York
when [IP she made [DP the claim [CP that [IP she would leave.]]]]
(i) high construal: at the time that she made that claim
(ii) low construal: *at the time of her presumed departure

Cf. When did you claim that you would leave?/When did you make the claim that you would leave?