Main point: Just as there was evidence to split IP up into several projections (TP, AgrSP, etc.), there is also evidence that CP likewise needs to be split:
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The story begins: What is the role of the complementizer anyway?

It is a kind of interface between some kind of propositional content of a sentence (IP) and higher structure, either a higher sentence or the discourse level itself. So, it has properties “from the outside” as well as “from the inside.”

From the outside, one of the relevant bits of information that the complementizer carries is the clausal type. This is sometimes morphologically realized. We’ll call this Force.

From the inside, complementizers are also sensitive to the finiteness of the embedded clause; e.g., *for* vs. *that* in English.

So, there are two kinds of features we might attribute to “C” each “looking” a different direction: **Force** and **Finiteness**.

The “left periphery” of the clause is where complementizers are, and also where topicalized and focused things seem to show up:
Your book, you should give it to Paul (not to Bill) [topic, old]

YOUR BOOK you should give it to Paul (not mine) [focus, new]

These look kind of the same in English, but they’re different in Italian.

Il tuo libro, lo ho letto.  
‘Your book, I have read it.’

IL TUO LIBRO ho letto (, non il suo)  
‘Your book I read, not his.’
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**Brief side note on topic and focus**: What *topic* and *focus* are exactly is a complex issue, and one which has generated a great deal of literature. Some approximations:

**Topic**: What the sentence is “about”. Sometimes paraphrasable with *As for…*

As for your book, you should give it to Paul (not to Bill).  
Topic is generally *old information*, known from preceding discourse.

**Focus**: What is *new* in the sentence. One place focus can be found is in the answer to a *wh*-question, where the *wh*-word was in the question:

Q: What did Pat buy?  
A: Pat bought [F stamps].

Focus is also very often used contrastively, as in:

Well [I passed the test].  
(contrasts *me* and *others*, who we deduce did *not* pass the test).

These seem to be up somewhere in the CP area as well. Presumably, it would be *between* the “outward looking” Force features and the “inward looking” Finiteness features.

… Force … (Topic) … (Focus) … Fin IP

So, let’s begin. First, observe that *che* and *di* behave differently with respect to where the topic goes:
(12)  a.  Credo che loro apprezzerebbero molto il tuo libro
     ‘I believe that they would appreciate your book very much.’

     b.  Credo di apprezzare molto il tuo libro
     ‘I believe “of” to appreciate your book very much.’

(13)  a.  Credo che il tuo libro, loro lo apprezzerebbero molto
     ‘I believe that your book, they would appreciate it a lot.’

     b.  *Credo, il tuo libro, che loro lo apprezzerebbero molto
     ‘I believe, your book, that they would appreciate it a lot.’

(14)  a.  *Credo di il tuo libro, apprezzarlo molto
     ‘I believe “of” your book to appreciate it a lot.’

     b.  Credo, il tuo libro, di apprezzarlo molto
     ‘I believe, your book, “of” to appreciate it a lot.’

(15)  ... (che) ... (topic) ... (di) ...

Topic and focus are different in a number of respects:
• Clitic resumptive pronoun appears with topic, not with focus.
• Topics don’t show WCO effects.
• Bare quantifiers can’t be topicalized, can be focused.
• Clauses can only have one focus, but can have any number of topics.
• Topics are compatible with wh-words, Focus isn’t.

It seems that there can be any number of topics either above or below the focus, though.

(16)  a.  Credo che a Gianni, QUESTO, domani, gli dovremmo dire
     ‘I believe that to Gianni, THIS, tomorrow we should say.’

     b.  Credo che domani, QUESTO, a Gianni, gli dovremmo dire
     ‘I believe that tomorrow, THIS, to Gianni, we should say.’

     c.  Credo che domani, a Giani, QUESTO gli dovremmo dire
     ‘I believe that tomorrow, to Gianni, THIS, we should say.’

     d.  Credo che a Gianni, domani, QUESTO gli dovremmo dire
     ‘I believe that to Gianni, tomorrow, THIS we should say.’
e. Credo che QUESTO, a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire
‘I believe that THIS, to Gianni, tomorrow, we should say.’

f. Credo che QUESTO, domani, a Gianni, gli dovremmo dire
‘I believe that THIS, tomorrow, to Gianni, we should say.’

(17) … Force (Top*) (Foc) (Top*) …

Questions and relative operators:

(18)  a. Un uomo a cui, il premio Nobel, lo daranno senz’altro
‘A man to whom, the Nobel Prize, they will give it undoubtedly.’

    b. *Un uomo, il premio Nobel, a cui lo daranno senz’altro
‘A man, the Nobel Prize, to whom they will give it undoubtedly.’

(19)  a. *A chi, il premio Nobel, lo daranno ?
‘To whom, the Nobel Prize, will they give it?’

    b. Il premio Nobel, a chi lo daranno ?
‘the Nobel Prize, to whom will they give it?’

(20) a. Ecco un uomo a cui IL PREMIO NOBEL dovrebbero dare (non il premio X)
‘Here is a man to whom THE NOBEL PRIZE they should give (not prize X).’

    b. *Ecco un uomo IL PREMIO NOBEL a cui dovrebbero dare (non il premio X)
‘Here is a man THE NOBEL PRIZE to whom they should give (not prize X).’

(21) a. *A chi IL PREMIO NOBEL dovrebbero dare?
‘To whom THE NOBEL PRIZE should they give?’

    b. *IL PREMIO NOBEL a chi dovrebbero dare?
‘THE NOBEL PRIZE to whom should they give?’

(22) … relative operator … (topic) … (focus)
(23) … (focus/wh-word) … (topic) …

Proposal: Relative operators are in SpecForceP, *wh*-words are in SpecFocusP.
Earlier evidence for focus and topic phrases...

Word order (syntax) encodes information status in **Hungarian**. (24) shows word orders for szereti ‘loves’, János ‘John’, Marit ‘Mary-ACC’ (from É. Kiss 1981)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>topic</td>
<td>focus</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main stress (bold) falls on the first element after topic.

Kiss (1998, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 45) adds that adverbs like loudly can only be found somewhere in Region II.

**Focus is quantificational, topic is not.**

**A'-movement.** Movement which adjoins somewhere (like to IP for QR) or movement into any “CP”-type specifier is A'-movement—and is generally assumed to create this kind of **operator–variable** relation between the moved thing and its trace. The moved thing is responsible for assigning values (referents) to the trace.

(25) **What** did you buy?
For each (relevant) thing x, did you buy x?

**Weak Crossover.** In an A'-chain (a chain formed by A'-movement), where the operator must check values from a set of values to check truth, there is a restriction on the area of
the tree crossed over by the A’-movement: It can’t contain a pronoun which is interpreted as coreferential with the trace.

(26) \( \text{Who}_i \text{ did her}_i \text{ father scold } t_i \)?
(27) \( \text{Who}_i \text{ did Mary persuade his}_i \text{ father to scold } t_i \)?

(28) \( \text{Who}_i \ t_i \text{ scolded her}_i \text{ father } \)?
(29) \( \text{Who}_i \text{ did Mary persuaded } t_i \text{ to scold his}_i \text{ father} \)?

(30) a. \( \text{His}_i \text{ father scolded } [\text{every boy}]_i \).
    b. \( [\text{every boy}]_i \text{ His}_i \text{ father scolded } t_i \). \quad \text{LF}

(31) a. \( [\text{Every boy}]_i \text{ scolded his}_i \text{ father}. \)
    b. \( [\text{every boy}]_i \ t_i \text{ scolded his}_i \text{ father}. \quad \text{LF}

Whatever the reason for this effect, people have used this to diagnose A’-movement (particularly when you can’t see it). Notice:

(32) Today was a good day with respect to people being scolded by parents.
    His\(i\) father only scolded MARK\(i\).

(33) Today was a good day with respect to parents being scolded.
    Only MARK\(i\) scolded his\(i\) father.

(Contrastive) focus of this kind patterns like every boy. Why?

(34) [of the relevant boys, true for x=Mark, false otherwise] [x’s father scolded x].
(35) [of the relevant boys, true for x=Mark, false otherwise] [x scolded x’s father].

(36) \( [\text{only MARK}]_i \text{ his}_i \text{ father scolded } t_i \). \quad \text{LF}
(37) \( [\text{only MARK}]_i \ t_i \text{ scolded his}_i \text{ father}. \quad \text{LF}

(Still true without only—we assume that even without only we have to make reference to the set of relevant boys and the truth of the IP with respect to each)

It was observed, however, that WCO seems to disappear in certain cases where we’d otherwise expect it. Lasnik & Stowell (1991) [essentially] tied this to a property of the binder—A’ chains involving true quantification show WCO effects; other A’ chains (where the referent of the bottom element doesn’t vary) don’t.
Topics...(Culicover again, my attempts to improve the examples)

(38) Who was the luckiest boy on his birthday this year?
    Why, it was Robin!
    To Robin, his mother gave lots of presents.

(39) I am the greatest salesman ever. Nobody ever returns my merchandise.
    I can only think of one counterexample—
    [THAT RED SNOWBLOWER], its owner returned it to me.
    But you can be sure it’ll be sold again tomorrow.

(40) That Mary, she never returns anything she borrows.
    Look at her yard, littered with other people’s stuff.
    I can only think of one counterexample—
    [THAT RED SNOWBLOWER], Mary returned it to its owner last week…
    But now it’s back in her yard again.

Well, ok, the data’s not that strong, because fronting (both focus-type and topic-type) isn’t all that good in English.

For our (Rizzi’s) purposes we mainly care that there are two kinds of A’-movements, the kind that causes WCO (“quantificational”) and the kind that doesn’t (“not”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantification:</th>
<th>A quantificational structure has an operator and a variable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The variable is generally in argument position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The operator takes a set of possible values and evaluates the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(part of the) sentence (in its scope) for those values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Every student]… [IP] passed the test]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretation goes as follows: To find the truth of this sentence, we go through each value provided by the operator, and check truth of the IP for each of the values in its range.

- student A passed the test. T/F?
- student B passed the test. T/F?
  ...
- student Z passed the test. T/F?

For every student, the whole thing is true if every value checked is True.
For some student, the whole thing is true if at least one value checked is True.
For most students, the whole thing is true if most of the values checked are True.
...and so forth.
Comment. The purported inability to have two focus phrases is controversial. É. Kiss (1998) argues that you can have two focus phrases in Hungarian, and even the English example: *No, it is false that John gave the book to Mary—BILL gave THE RECORD to Mary* seems to have two contrastive foci (neither seems to be a contrastive topic).

In this connection, it might be relevant to consider this: Rizzi tells us that focus and *wh-*words cannot co-occur, and the two foci cannot co-occur. But it is also true of Italian that two *wh-*words cannot co-occur—you cannot ask *Who bought what?* in Italian (in that way). Of course, many languages do allow multiple *wh-*questions, including English. Perhaps this points to some Italian-specific restriction that is involved both in constraining *wh-*words and foci to one?