Readings for next time:
Rizzi, Luigi (1997).   The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman. (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. **Read through section 6 (ends top of p. 299).**
Rizzi, Luigi (1999). On the position Int(errogative) in the left periphery of the clause. Ms., Università di Seina. (Later published in 2001, I don't have the official copy).

Benincà (2001): More on Italian topics and foci

Rizzi (1997) uses the following examples to argue that there can be any number of TopicP projections above FocusP, and any number of TopicP projections below FocusP.

(1)   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
       c.   Credo che domani, a Gianni, QUESTO gli dovremmo dire
       d.   Credo che a Gianni, domani, QUESTO gli dovremmo dire
       e.   Credo che QUESTO, a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire
       f.   Credo che QUESTO, domani, a Gianni, gli dovremmo dire

The idea is that in (1) the intonation on QUESTO 'this' tells us where the focus is, and we can identify topics by the fact that they've been moved away from where they'd normally be. It appears that all of the possible positions for two fronted topics, relative to the position of the focus, are available. This is illustrated in (2) below, where "Top*" means "any number of Topic phrases."

(2)   … (Top*) (Foc) (Top*) …

It turns out that there are a couple of issues with this argument, however. We will look at them, in order to see whether the assumptions that underlie the argument were secure. To see the first issue, we turn to Paduan, an Italian dialect. Here are some facts about it. In a sentence with a regular subject, like (3), the clitic pronoun *l* is optional.

(3)   Mario (l) compra na casa.
        Mario (he) buys a house.

Notice that this clitic pronoun is "redundant" in a certain sense; it seems that (if it is there), both *Mario* and *l* are getting the external θ-role of *compra* 'buys'. For this reason, these constructions are often referred to as "clitic doubling" constructions.

We don't care for now why it is possible to do this kind of clitic doubling, though you can do it in standard Italian and all kinds of other languages. The important thing is that the clitic double appears exactly when the subject is a topic. So, to say that the clitic in (3) is optional is in fact kind of misleading: When *l* is there, *Mario* is a topic, and when *l* is there, *Mario* is just a regular subject.

We can see this by examining what happens when we have another topic between *Mario* and the verb. In (4a), the clitic *l* is required, not optional. *Na casa* is clearly topicalized (it is fronted, and it is doubled by the clitic *la*), and so *Mario* must also be topicalized, and so must be doubled by the clitic *l*. In (4b), we see the same thing.
>   (Recall that * before parentheses means that the element in the parentheses is obligatory; so, "no*(l)" means that *nol* is grammatical, and *no* without the *l* is ungrammatical.)

(4)   a.   Mario, na casa, no*(l) la compra.
               Mario, a house, not (he) it will buy

        b.   Mario, de so sorela, *(el) ghe ne parla sempre.
               Mario, of his sister, (he) ofher speaks always

However, in the sentence in (5), the clitic again appears to be optional (as it was in (3)).

(5)   Mario doman (l) compra na casa.
        Mario tomorrow (he) buys a house.

☞ **Question 1**. What does (5) tell us about *doman* in Paduan? Assume that the reason that the clitic *l* is optional in (5) is the same as the reason that it is optional in (3).
>   *Hint*: Don't overthink this, basically what I'm trying to get you to observe is that *doman* is different from *na casa* in (4a). Why does *na casa* force *l* to be there in (4a)? This must not be happening with *doman* in (5).

☞ **Question 2**. Now, go back and look at the standard Italian examples in (1). In light of what we just learned about Paduan *doman*, and assuming that *domani* works the same way in standard Italian, what does (1) *really* seem to be telling us about the organization of Topic and Focus in the "left periphery" of the clause? (It's not as much as Rizzi thought…) Specifically, do we have evidence of a topic phrase below the focus phrase? Multiple topic phrases below the focus phrase?

Ok, here's something just as bad. The idea that Rizzi's (1) is based on is that Italian shows the same kind of "clitic doubling" that we saw above in Paduan for topics. That is, when something is a topic, there is a clitic doubling it (at least when the topic in question is an argument of the verb).

However, it seems that with *dative* arguments (e.g., *to John* in *I gave the book to John*), it seems to be possible to have a clitic double in more situations. Specifically, in (6), the dative argument *a Gianni* 'to Gianni' clearly hasn't moved to topic position (it's still after the verb), but yet it's still possible to have the clitic double *gli* 'to him'.

(6)   Gliel'ho detto a Gianni
        To.him-it'have told to Gianni
        'I told this to Gianni'

☞ **Question 3**. Ok, in light of this new information about *gli* 'to him', *now* what does (1) seem to be telling us about the organization of Topic and Focus in the "left periphery" of the clause? (It's nowhere *near* as much as Rizzi thought.) Specifically, what do we *really* know about *a Gianni* in (1)?

Now, here's an observation about Italian that we can take to be a bit more informative on this issue. In (7), *A GIANNI* is the focus, and *un libro di poesie* is unambiguously a topic because it is doubled by the clitic *lo*.

(7)   a. * A GIANNI, un libro di poesie, lo regalerete.
               'TO GIANNI, a book of poems you will give it.'

        b.   un libro di poesie A GIANNI, lo regalerete.
              'You will give a book of poems to Gianni.'

☞ **Question 4**. Revise Rizzi's schema from (2) in a way that can account for the fact in (7).
        Note: this will involve removing things from (2), not adding anything.

The Weak Crossover (WCO) effect was reviewed on the handout from class, but the short version suitable for our purposes is this: You can't move a focus past a pronoun that is coindexed with it. The same thing holds of *wh*-phrases. Topics don't have this restriction.

As a reminder, the cases with *wh*-movement are like these:

(8)   * Who$_i$ did her$_i$ father scold t_i ?
(9)   Who$_i$ t_i scolded her$_i$ father ?

Here, in (8), *her* is coindexed with *who*, meaning that *her* must refer to whoever *who* does. But (8) can't mean that: It can't mean 'Who was scolded by her father?'—it can only mean something like 'Who did Mary's father scold?'. The question in (9) is fine, though, on the coindexed interpretation. WCO is what makes (8) ungrammatical; *who* moved past *her*, so *who* and *her* are prevented from sharing the same index.

Focus also seems to show WCO effects; you can't move a focused phrase (even covertly) over a coindexed pronoun.

(10)   Today was a good day with respect to people being scolded by parents.
       *His$_i$ father only scolded MARK$_i$.

(11)   * [only MARK]$_i$ his$_i$ father scolded t_i .   LF

(12)   Today was a good day with respect to parents being scolded.
       Only MARK$_i$ scolded his$_i$ father.

 (13)   [only MARK]$_i$ t_i scolded his$_i$ father.   LF

Topics *don't* show WCO effects, though—for whatever reason, they just don't.

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

Ok, so we have a test. If something is moved to the left, it will show WCO effects if it is a focus, and it won't show WCO effects if it is a topic. A demonstration is in (15): (15a) is a topic construction, and coreference is possible, (15b) is a focus construction, and coreference is impossible.

(15)   a.   Gianni$_1$, suo$_1$ padre l$_1$'ha licenziato.
            Gianni$_1$ his$_1$ father him$_1$'has fired.
            'Gianni has been fired by his own father.'

       b. *GIANNI, suo$_1$ padre ha licenziato.
            GIANNI$_1$ his$_1$ father has fired him$_1$.
            'Gianni has been fired by his own father.'

☞ **Question 5**. With this test in hand, with your revised schema from Question 4, how can we explain the fact that both (16a) and (16b) are ungrammatical? How can we explain the fact that it is ungrammatical to double *Giorgio* in (17) with a clitic?

(16) a. * A MARIA, Giorgio$_1$, sua$_1$ madre presenterà.
       to Maria Giorgio his mother will introduce
       'His mother will introduce Giorgio to Maria.'

     b. * A MARIA$_1$, Giorgio, sua$_1$ madre presenterà.
       to Maria Giorgio her mother will introduce
       'Her mother will introduce Giorgio to Maria.'

(17) * A MARIA, Giorgio, sua madre **lo** presenterà.
       to Maria Giorgio his mother will him introduce

Background/notes…

The "Wh-criterion" is something like a precursor/alternative to the "feature checking" requirement that we often think drives *wh*-movement. What Rizzi proposed (in his 1996 paper) is that there is a [wh] feature on T and a [wh] feature on *wh*-words, and that there is a requirement ("the Wh-criterion") that these features arrange themselves such that one is in the specifier of a head with the other. For object *wh*-questions, then, T moves to C, carrying along its [wh] feature, and then the *wh*-word has to move to SpecCP so that the Wh-criterion can be satisfied.