The left periphery of adverbial clauses

Liliane Haegeman

Department of English – University of Ghent

1. The data


(1) a Fr. Quand cette chanson je l’ai entendue,
   When this song I it-have-1SG heard-PART-FEM,
   j’ai pensé à toi.
   I have-1SG think-PART of you.

b *When this song I heard, I thought of you.

(ii) Stylistic inversion is licensed (at least for some speakers) in French temporal clauses (2a) (Lahousse 2003), while locative inversion is ungrammatical in English temporal clauses (2b):

(2) a Fr. %Quand avait débuté le salon Sainte-Euverte…
   when have-PAST-3SG start-PART the salon Sainte Euverte (Lahousse 2003)

b *Helen and Jack had dinner before into the kitchen trooped the children.
   (Hooper and Thompson 1973: 496 (their (251))

(3) a preposing around be
   *The deputies could extort with impunity, as long as no less corrupt was
   the ward boss. (Emonds 1976: 35, his (36))

b VP preposing
   * When passed these exams you have, you’ll get the degree.

English argument fronting & locative inversion: ‘Main Clause Phenomena’/’Root phenomena’: restricted to (finite) main clauses and a subset of embedded clauses:

Though RTs may apply in some complements that are full sentences introduced by the complementiser that, they may never apply in any complements that are reduced clauses. By reduced clauses we mean infinitives, gerunds, and subjunctive clauses, i.e. those complement types which have uninflected verbs. (Hooper&Thompson 1973: 484-5, italics mine)

As a positive environment we can say that [root] transformations operate only on Ss that are asserted. …some transformations are sensitive to more than just syntactic configurations. It does not seem possible to define the domain of an RT in terms of syntactic structures in any general way. However, …, even if it were possible to define in syntactic terms the conditions under which RTs can apply, … the question of why these transformations can apply in certain syntactic environments and not others would still be unanswered (Hooper &Thompson 1973: 495, italics lh)


Structural difference between French (Romance) and English adverbial clauses:

French dislocated elements are only allowed to appear at the edge of Discourse Projections. I follow Emonds (2004) in assuming that only root and root-like clauses contain a Discourse Projection… the set of embedded clause with root properties varies cross-linguistically… The group of embedded clauses allowing a left-dislocated topic in Spoken French is wider than that which is commonly included in the ‘embedded root clauses’ category…
As a preliminary conclusion, French embedded root clauses do not have exactly the characteristics of embedded root clauses as they have been defined in the literature. However, this might be due to the fact that embedded root phenomena have been mainly studied with respect to Germanic languages. Further research is clearly necessary to determine the extent of cross linguistics variation as to which embedded clauses can be endowed with root properties (De Cat 2008: 522).

Objections: French & English adverbial clauses make the same semantic contribution to the clause and they share other properties:

(i) French and English temporal adverbial clauses are similar in that both allow circumstantial adjuncts in their left periphery:

\[(4) \quad \begin{align*}
 & a \text{ Fr} \quad \text{Quand la semaine dernière elle s'est mise à la rédaction, …} \\
 & \quad \text{when last week she herself –be-3SG put-FEM to the writing,}
 & b \quad \text{When last month she began to write,….}
\end{align*}\]


\[(5) \quad \begin{align*}
 & a \text{ Fr} \quad * \text{Quand probablement il fera plus chaud, nous n'aurons pas besoin de chauffage.} \\
 & \quad \text{when probably it make-FUT more warm, we ne have-FUT not need for heating}
 & b \quad * \text{When probably it will be warmer, we won't need the heating any more.}
\end{align*}\]

**Hypothesis II**: the difference between (1a) and (1b) follows from the syntactic differences between CLLD and argument fronting in English.

⇒ We cannot simply assume that the syntax of topically constituents in the left periphery is identical for English and French. We have to augment Rizzi’s split CP hypothesis with additional mechanisms.

3. **English argument fronting, adjuncts and clitic left dislocation (Lecture 1, section 3)**

3.1. **Starting point: English argument fronting, adjunct fronting, Romance CLLD**

\[(6) \quad \begin{align*}
 & a \quad \text{When last year she began to write her regular column again, I thought she would be OK.}
 & b \quad *\text{When her regular column she began to write again last year, I thought she would be OK.}
 & c \quad \text{Quand cette chanson je l’ai entendue, je me suis souvenue de mon premier amour.}
 & \quad \text{When this song I it-have heard, I me am reminded of my first love}
 & \quad \text{‘When I heard this song, I remembered my first love.’}
\end{align*}\]

3.2. **Broadening the picture: Wh-Movement, topicalisation and CLLD**

3.2.1. **Embedded interrogatives: English argument fronting vs CLLD**

\[(7) \quad \begin{align*}
 & a \quad *\text{Robin knows where , the birdseed, you are going to put. (Culicover 1991: 5 (6c)}
 & b \quad *\text{I wonder who, this book, would buy around Christmas. (Rizzi 1997:307, (76a))}
 & c \quad *\text{I don’t know when your text we will be able to discuss.}
\end{align*}\]
(8) a J’aimerais savoir à qui ton texte, tu comptes le montrer d’abord.
   I like-COND-1SG know to whom your texte you count-2SG it show first
   ‘I would like to know to whom you are thinking of showing your text first.’
   b Je ne sais pas quand, ton texte, on pourra le discuter.
   I ne know not when, your texte, one can-FUT-3SG it discuss
   ‘I don’t know when we will be able to discuss your text.’

(9) a Eng *wh-int-constituent- topic…
   b Rom \(\text{\check{\emptyset} wh}_{\text{int}}\)-constituent- CLLD…

3.2.2. Embedded interrogatives: English argument/adjunct asymmetry

(10) a Lee forgot which dishes, under normal circumstances, you would put on the table. (Culícover 1991: 9, (17d))
   b Eng *wh-int-constituent- adjunct…

3.2.3. Relative clauses: argument fronting vs CLLD

(11) a *a student to whom, your book, I will recommend
   b ??He is a man from whom money we could never take. (Bianchi 1999: 188, her (76))
   c ‘Io studente a cui, il tuo libro, lo darò domani
the student to whom, the you book, it give-FUT-1SG tomorrow
   d Voici l’étudiant à qui ton livre je le donnerai.
this is the student to whom your book I will give

(12) a Eng *wh_{rel}-constituent- topic…
   b Rom \(\check{\emptyset} wh_{rel}\)-constituent- CLLD…

3.2.4. Relative clauses: argument / adjunct asymmetry in English:

(13) a *I met the author who, this new column, began to write last year.
   b I met the author who, last year, began to write this new column.
   c Eng \(\check{\emptyset} wh_{rel}\)-constituent - adjunct

3.2.5. Topic islands: English argument fronting (14) vs. Romance CLLD (15)² & adjunct fronting (16).

(14) a *Who did you say that to Sue Bill introduced? (Boeckx and Jeong 2004: (3))
   b *On which table did Lee say that these books she will put? (Koizumi 1995: 140)
   c *How do you think that, this problem, we can solve?
   d *These are the patients to whom Mary suggested that the cooked vegetables we should give in the present circumstances.

(15) a ??Chi credi che Maria la voterebbe?
   Who think-2SG that Maria her vote-COND-3SG (Alexopoulou et al 2004: 350: (64))
   b ? Non so a chi pensi che, tuo fratello, lo potremmo affidare. (Rizzi 2002: his (64a))
   non know-1SG to whom think-2SG that your brother him can-COND-1PL entrust
   ‘I don’t know to whom you think that, your brother, we could entrust’
   c ??Non so a chi pensi che, queste cose, le dovremmo dire.
   Non know-1SG to whom think-2SG these things them must-COND-1PL say
'I don’t know to whom you think we should say these things.' (Rizzi 2004: 232, his (27b))

d) ? Non so come pensi che, tuo fratello, lo potremmo convincere. (Rizzi 2002: his 64b)

‘I don’t know how you think that, your brother, we could convince him’

e) ?Non so come pensi che, a Gianni, gli dovremmo parlare.

Non know-1SG how think-2SG that to Gianni him must-cond-1PL TALK

(16) a) These are the patients to whom Marty suggested that in the present circumstances we should give the cooked vegetables.

b) ?How did they say that two weeks ago John had travelled to France?

(17) a) Eng *wh_IN/REL-constituent ………..topic…

b) Rom \wh_IN/REL-constituent ………..CLLD…

c) Eng \wh_IN/REL-constituent ………..adjunct…

3.2.6. Multiple topics


b) *Bill, that house, she took to for the weekend. (Emonds 2004: 95 (27b))

c) It. Il libro, a Gianni, glielo daro senz’altro.

d Fr. A Jean, ton livre, il ne faut pas le lui montrer.

To John, your book, it ne must not it him show-INF

(19) a) Eng *arg topic – argument topic…

b) Eng \C CLLD – CLLD…

c) Eng \adjunct –adjunct…

3.2.7. Summary:

Fronted arguments in English: interveners for XP movement:

(20) a) *This book Lee says that, to Robin, I gave (Culicover 1991: (37), his (120))

b) Ce texte Pierre dit que à Jean il ne faut pas le lui montrer.

This text Pierre says that to Jean it NEG should not it him show

‘This texte, Pierre says you should not show it to Jean.’

c) These patients Marty suggested that in the present circumstances we should not give any cooked vegetables.

(21) a) Eng *arg topic … argument topic…

b) Eng \C CLLD … CLLD…

c) Eng arg topic … -adjunct…

3.2.7. Summary:

Fronted arguments in English: interveners for XP movement:
CLLD in Romance: not interveners for XP-movement:

(23) a  Rom \( \hat{\text{wh}}_{\text{INTERL}} \)-constituent - CLLD…
    b  Rom \( \hat{\text{wh}}_{\text{INTERL}} \)-constituent …………. CLLD…
    c  Rom CLLD - CLLD
    d  Rom CLLD …………. CLLD

‘Intervention’ effects:

Fronted arguments are said to lead to intervention effects. Fronted arguments in English block the fronting of wh-constituents and of arguments, they create ‘islands’ for movement (‘topic islands’). Fronted circumstantial adjuncts do not lead to intervention effects. CLLD constituents in Italian and French do not lead to intervention effects.

4. Hypothesis II: The movement analysis of temporal clauses

4.1. The proposal: (null) operator movement in temporal clauses

(24)(=6)a  When last year she began to write her regular column again, I thought she would be OK.
    b  *When her regular column she began to write again last year, I thought she would be OK.
    c  Quand cette chanson je l’ai entendue, je me suis souvenue de mon premier amour.
       When this song I it-have heard, I me am reminded of my first love
       ‘When I heard this song, I remembered my first love.’

The argument adjunct asymmetry in English temporal clauses (24) can also be ascribed to an intervention effect if such clauses are derived by the movement of a (temporal) operator to their left periphery.

In the literature such proposals have been made by, among others, Geis 1975, Enç 1987: 655, Larson 1987, 1990, Dubinsky & Williams 1995, Declerck 1997, Zribi-Hertz & Diagne 1999, Citko 2000, Demirdache & Uribe-Etchebarria 2004; Stephens 2007, Lecarme 2008. The proposal comes down to saying that temporal clauses are free relatives. In (25b) the fronted argument blocks the movement of when:

(25) a  When I heard this song, …
       \[ \text{CP when} \ [\text{IP I … [VP heard this song] when] } \]
    b  *When this song I heard, I remembered my first love.
       \[ \text{CP when} \ [\text{TopP this song [IP I … [VP heard this song] when] } \]

4.2. Arguments for the movement analysis of temporal clauses

Relative when clause with overt antecedent:

(26) a  At a time when women still struggle for pay parity in the American workplace, a group of female entrepreneurs has proved that ... \( (\text{New York Times 27.7.8 p. 7 col 1 in Observer}) \) (Restrictive relative)
    b  By 2050, when the world population will have risen to 9.2 billion, the sustainable population will be a third that, due to increasing per capita consumption. (based on Guardian 26.07.08 pag 44 col 2) (non-restrictive relative)
By 2050, when the UN predicts the world population will have risen to 9.2 billion, the sustainable population will be a third that, due to increasing per capita consumption. (*Guardian* 26.07.08 page 44 col 2) (non-restrictive relative)

The UN predicts the world population will have risen to 9.2 billion *at that time*.

By 2050, *when* the UN predicts

\[ [TP \text{ the world population will have risen to 9.2 billion } \text{when } ] \]

‘long movement’

We know now that Oliver must have died shortly after eight, *when* you say you were testing the launch. (PD James, *The lighthouse*, Faber&Faber 2005, Penguin 2006: 358)

**Adverbial clauses: Long construal as a result of long movement**

(27) I saw Mary in New York when \[[IP \text{ she claimed } \text{CP that } [IP \text{ she would leave.}]]\]

(i) high construal: 'I saw her at the time that she made that claim.'

\[ \text{I saw Mary in New York } \text{CP when, [IP she claimed } \text{CP that [IP she would leave]]t}]] \]

(ii) low construal 'I saw her at the time of her presumed departure.'

\[ \text{I saw Mary in New York } \text{CP when, [IP she claimed } \text{CP that[IP she would leave t]]} ] \]

**Blocking long movement**

(28) I saw Mary in New York when \[[IP \text{ she made } \text{DP the claim } \text{CP that } [IP \text{ she would leave.}]]\]

(i) high construal: 'I saw her at the time that she made that claim.'

\[ \text{I saw Mary in New York } \text{CP when, [IP she made } \text{DP the claim } \text{CP that [IP she would leave.]]t}]] \]

(ii) low construal: *'I saw her at the time of her presumed departure.' *CNPC

\[ \text{I saw Mary in New York } \text{CP when, [IP she made } \text{DP the claim } \text{CP that [IP she would leave t.]]} ] \]

The contrast between (28a) and (28b) can be assimilated to that between (29a) and (29b): a relative pronoun (*which*) can be extracted from a complement clause (*CP*) to the verb *claim* but it cannot be extracted from a complement clause to the noun *claim*:

(29) a This is the text \[[CP which [IP she claimed [CP that [IP she wrote which]]]]\]

b *This is the text \[[CP which [TP she made [the claim [CP that [IP she wrote which]]]]\]

**Note:**

In English high/low construal is also available with *before/after, until, (temporal) since* (Geis 1970, Larson 1987, 1990)

(i) a I saw Mary in New York before/after John said that she left. (Larson 1987:261:(45a))

b I encountered Alice after she swore that she had left. (Larson 1990: 170: (2a))

c I can’t leave until John says I can leave (based on Larson 1990: 170: (2b))

d I haven’t been there since I told you I was there (Larson 1990: 170: (2d))

Low construal is unavailable with temporal *while*:

(i) c I didn’t see Mary in New York while she said she was there. (Geis 1970, Stump 1985, Larson 1990: 174, (11a))

For contrasts in high/low construal cf. also Norwegian (*når* (high construal) vs *da* (no high construal)) (see Stephens 2006), Hungarian (see Lipták 2005, see below), German (Larson 1988, Lipták 2005), Serbian (Lipták 2005: 171), Hindi (Bhatt & Lipták 2005).
4.3. Cross-linguistic support for movement analysis of temporal adverbial clauses


Temporal adverbs doubling up as ‘temporal conjunctions’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Phrase Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Hij kwam toen aan.</td>
<td><em>Toen hij aankwam was hij moe.</em> when (=‘then’) he arrived was he tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>Da var det lettere</td>
<td><em>Da jeg var korrespondent</em> ‘he was correspondent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>then was it easier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Norwegian, Stephens 2006)

Hungarian: ‘the *a*-marker is a morpheme that adorns relative wh-phrases in Hungarian’ (Lipták 2005: 139)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Phrase Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>A nap [amikor Anna megjött]</td>
<td><em>The day when Anna arrived</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The day <em>REL</em> what-at Anna arrived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The day when Anna arrived’ (Lipták 2005: 142)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lipták (2005): Hungarian temporal clauses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Phrase Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>[(A)mikor Peter ninces otthon]</td>
<td>*When Peter is not at home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>REL</em>-what-at Peter is not home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>[(A)mőta ismeri Annát]</td>
<td><em>Since he knows Anna</em>’ (Lipták 2005:138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>REL</em>-what-since knows Anna-ACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relativization strategy for Polish temporal adjunct clauses: Citko (2000), for an LFG based implementation for Norwegian *når* Stephens (2006a), Hindi (Bhatt & Lipták 2005), Basque (Lipták 2005: 176), Scottish Gaelic (David Adger p.c) etc.

Zribi-Hertz and Diagne 1999: 23: on temporal clauses in Wolof:

L'ensemble de données présenté ci-dessus conduit à conclure que les syntagmes étiquetés plus haut 'circonstancielles de temps' ne sont autres que ce qu'on a pu appeler ailleurs des 'relatives indépendantes adverbiales', c'est-à-dire des DP incluant un circonstant relativisé dépourvu de contenu lexical.

The data presented her lead to the conclusion that the constituents labelled 'temporal adverbiaal clauses' are no other than what are also labelled 'independent adverbiaal relatives', that is to say, DPs with a non-lexicalised relativised adverbiaal adjunct’. (Tr. LH)

Hengeveld & Wanders (2007: 3-4)

In the examples from Mokilese, the temporal adjuncts are actually noun phrases with a temporal noun as their head. These noun phrases furthermore contain a subordinate clause expressing the event with respect to which the main clause event is situated in time. In [i] the subordinate clause is a relative clause modifier of the temporal head noun *anjoau* 'time', and in [ii] it is the second argument of the relational noun *mwoh* 'front'. Strictly speaking, these are not cases of adverbial subordination, since the subordinate clause either modifies or is an argument of a noun. However, this type of construction is often the diachronic source of true conjunctions, …

[i] Ngoah suh-oang John *anjoau*-o ma ngoah in-la sidow-a.
I meet-ALL John time-REM REL I go-DIR store-DEF
't I met John when I went to the store.'
't I met John the time at which I went to the store.'

[ii] Ih dupukk-oang ngoahi *mwoh*-n oai japahl-do Mwoakilloa.
he pay-ALL I front-POSS my return-DIR Mokil
'He paid me front of my returning to Mokil.'
'Mokilese (Harrison 1976: 260)

4.4. **CLLD in Romance adverbial clauses**

CLLD in adverbial clauses in French:

(33) a Fr. Dès que ton texte je l’aurai lu, je t’appellerai.
As soon as your text I it have-FUT-1SG read, I you call-FUT-1SG

b Fr. Alors quand ce salaud je l’ai surpris un soir en train d’ouvrir l’ordinateur du
when that bastard I him have discovered one evening switching on my computer,
secrétariat, j’ai immédiatement téléphoné à la police.
I have immediately called the police.

c Fr. Quand ça je l’ai appris, j’ai immédiatement téléphoné à la police.

(34) a *I don’t know when your text we can discuss.

b Je ne sais pas quand, ton texte, on pourra le discuter.
I know not when your text we can it discuss

CLLD: reduced intervention effects (cf. Cinque (1990: 58), Oshima (2001), De Cat (2008),
Alexopoulou et al (2004)). For French CLLD see also DeCat (2007)

(35) a It. Non so a chi pensi che, queste cose, le dovremmo dire.

b Fr. *Est venue Marie?
when be-3SG come Marie

(36) a Fr. Quand est venue Marie? (Barbosa: 2001: 42, her (77))

b Fr. *Est venue Marie?

(37) a Fr. Jean a parlé de quoi?
John has talked of what

b Fr. *A parlé Jean de quoi?

(38) a Fr. **? Jean a parlé pourquoi?
Jean has talked why

b Fr. *Pourquoi a parlé Jean?

Pourquoi cannot occur in the clause (TP); it is always in the left periphery. Hypothesis: pourquoi it is not moved to the left periphery from within the clause. Because it is not moved, it does not license SI.
Sentence initial temporal adjuncts may license SI:
(39)  
  a Fr. Là se nouaient des relations…
  b Fr. et soudain surgirent six hommes noirs
  c Fr. Derrière la maison se trouve le jardin.
      behind the house itself finds the garden  
      (Lahousse 2003a,b)

4.5.2. SI in adverbial clauses (Lahousse 2003a,b)
If temporal adverbial clauses are derived by the leftward movement of a temporal
operator then we predict that this movement will also license SI. The prediction is
correct.
(40)  
  a Fr. Quand avait débuté le salon Sainte-Euverte…
      when had started the salon Sainte Euverte
  b Fr. Il souffre comme souffriraient ses bêtes.
      he suffers like suffer-COND-3PL his animals  
      (Dorgelès, Le Bidois 1952:329)
  c Fr. %Je voulais partir quand sont arrivés les enfants.
      I wanted to leave when be-3PL arrive-PART the children
      (Lahousse 2003 : 280, her (1))
  d Fr. %Dès que retentit la sonnerie, je me précipita dans l’allée.
      as soon as ring-PAS-3SG the bell, I me hurry-PAS-1SG into the aisle

5. A brief excursion: ‘Peripheral’ adverbial clauses (Haegeman 2003a)
(41)  
  a According to Smith, a group of Arkansas state troopers who worked for Clinton
      while he was governor wanted to go public with tales of Clinton’s womanising.
      (Guardian, G2, 12.3.2, page 3, col 2-3)  
      (‘during the time that’)
  b While [Dr Williams’] support for women priests and gay partnerships might
      label him as liberal, this would be a misleading way of depicting his
      uncompromisingly orthodox espousal of Christian belief. (Guardian, 2.3.2, page
      9, col 1-2)  
      (‘whereas’)
  c While [the lawsuit challenging the legitimacy of lethal injections] probably
      won’t stop the use of lethal injection altogether, it will certainly delay its use
      while the supreme court decides what to do. (Guardian G2, 12.12..3, page 4, c 4)

      There is a secondary conjunctive interpretation that all these connectives (as, while, when)
      shade into. They get an interpretation similar to and in these contexts. And is not a temporal
      connective, and these conjunctive interpretations do not tell against the theory [of temporal
      subordination and complex tense structures] (Hornstein (1993: 206: note 19) )

Haegeman (2003): ‘Central adverbial clauses’ contribute to the proposition expressed in the
associated/main clause, ‘peripheral adverbial clauses’ do not modify the event/state of affairs
expressed in the associated IP, they provide a background assumption for the main assertion.

Temporal while (42a) vs. contrastive while (42b):
(42)  
  a I will listen to the news while I’m/will be having breakfast.
  a’ It was while I was having breakfast that he called me.
  b I am going to study in Ghent, while my sister is going to study in Leuven.
  b’ *It is while my sister is going to study in Leuven that I am going to study in Ghent.
Temporal since vs causal since:

(43)  
- a. I haven't seen him since he moved to France.
- b. Since he's moving next week, he won't be coming to the talk.

Hypothesis: Peripheral adverbial clauses do not involve movement of an operator from IP to CP. Prediction: peripheral adverbial clauses compatible with argument fronting:

(44)  
- a. His face not many admired, while his character still fewer felt they could praise.
  (Quirk et al 1985: 1378)
- b. It is amazing how this view could have spread about someone who changed the image of causes like Aids and landmines, and in doing so showed a possible new role for the royals. It is particularly ironic since so much of what Diana did for her fellow humans she did with no concern for publicity whatsoever. (Guardian, G2, 31.8.4 page 9 col 2)
- c. We don't look to his paintings for common place truths, though truths they contain none the less (Guardian, G2, 18.02.3, page 8, col 1)
- d. I think we have more or less solved the problem for donkeys here, because those we haven't got, we know about. (Guardian, G2, 18.2.3, page 3, col 2).


6.1. Conditional clauses incompatible with main clause phenomena

(45)  
- a. *If these exams you don't pass, you won't get the degree.
- b. If on Monday the share price is still at the current level then clearly their defence doesn't hold much water. (Observer, 11.7.4, business, p. 22 col 5)
- c. *If present at the party are under age children, they won't be able to show the X-rated films.
- d. *If passed these exams you had, you would have had the degree.

6.2. The movement derivation of conditional clauses

Bhatt and Pancheva (2002, 2006) ‘Our proposal that [conditional clauses] are interpreted as free relatives amounts to the claim that they are definite descriptions of possible worlds.’ (Bhatt and Pancheva 2006: 655). (46a) would be derived by the leftward movement of a World operator, as shown in representation (46b):

(46)  
- a. If John arrives late
- b. [CP OP w C° [John arrives late in w]]

6.2.1. Temporal adverbial clauses and conditional clauses: both introduced by wenn in German

(47)  
Wenn Steffi gewinnt, wird gefeiert.  
German
  if Steffi wins AUX-PASSIVE celebrate-PART
  ‘If Steffi wins, there is a celebration.’

Bhatt and Pancheva (2006: 657): ‘There seems to be no evidence suggesting that the syntactic behavior of wenn is different in conditional and in temporal clauses, i.e., it does undergo A'-movement in both cases. (Bhatt and Pancheva 2006: 657).

6.2.2. An operator in the left periphery of conditionals

Conditional clauses: // yes/no questions
(48) a I asked him if he had said that he would leave
   b If he had said that he would leave…
   c Had he said that he would leave?
   d Had he said that he would leave….

The null operator in V2 languages:
(49) a Morgen komt hij naar huis.
   Tomorrow comes he home
   b Naar huis komt hij morgen
   c Hij komt morgen naar huis
   d XP- finite verb

(50) a Had hij gezegd dat hij zou vertrekken?
   had he said that he would leave
   b [CP OP [Vfin had ] [TP Subject … t\_op ]]
   c Had hij gezegd dat hij zou vertrekken, ik zou teruggebeld hebben.
   Had he said that he would leave, I would back-called have
   ‘Had he told me he was leaving, I would have called him back.’
   d XP- finite verb

(50) a I wonder if he said he would leave
   b [CP Op if [he said he would leave t\_op ] ]

conditionals as the relative variant of yes/no questions: Arsenijević (2006: abstract)


(51) a I will leave if you say you will leave. high/*low
   High: ‘the condition for my leaving is your saying that you will leave’;
   Low: ‘the circumstances in I will leave are the same conditions in which you say that you
   will leave’.
   b Had he said he would leave, I would have left. high/*low
   (cf. Bhatt & Pancheva 2002: 13, a-b based on their (50a,c), (51e), 2006: 655-6:
   based on their (47a,c, their (48b))

(52) a I don’t recall if he said he was leaving. High/*low
   b I don’t recall when he said he was leaving. High/low

6.4. Modal markers in conditional clauses

6.4.1. THE DATA

(53) a ??*If frankly he's unable to cope, we'll have to replace him. Speech act
   b * If they luckily /fortunately arrived on time, we will be saved. Evaluative
   (Ernst 2007: 1027, Nilsen 2004).
   c *If George probably comes, the party will be a disaster. Epistemic
   d *If the students apparently can’t follow the discussion in the third chapter, we’ll
do the second chapter. Evidential
   e * John will do it if he may/must have time. (Declerck & Depreterere (1995: 278)

Lahousse (2008: 22) and Ernst (2008:10) for French; Ernst (2008: 10) for Dutch and Chinese.
Tomasczewiz (to appear) for Polish.
(54) The articulated TP (Lecture 1. 4.1.)

\[ \text{MoodP} \text{speech act} \rightarrow \text{MoodP} \text{evaluative} \rightarrow \text{MoodP} \text{evidential} \rightarrow \text{ModP} \text{epistemic} \rightarrow \text{TP (Past)} \rightarrow \text{TP (Future)} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{MoodP} \text{alethic} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{habitual} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{epistemic} \rightarrow \text{ModP} \text{modal} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{cognitive} \rightarrow \text{TP (Anterior)} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{seminal} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{continuous} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{perspective} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{progressive} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{durative} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{general} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{progressive} \rightarrow \text{ModP} \text{obligation} \rightarrow \text{ModP} \text{permission/ability} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{comitative} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{VoiceP} \text{alethic} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{epistemic} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \text{frequentative} \rightarrow \text{TP} \]

(55) a Hij is helaas waarschijnlijk ziek (Koster 1978: 205-209)

\[ \text{MoodP} \text{evaluative} \rightarrow \text{ModP} \text{epistemic} \]

he is unfortunately probably ill

b *Hij is waarschijnlijk helaas ziek

*\[ \text{ModP} \text{epistemic} \rightarrow \text{MoodP} \text{evaluative} \]

c Helaas is hij waarschijnlijk ziek...

\[ \text{MoodP} \text{evaluative} \rightarrow \text{ModP} \text{epistemic} \]

d *Waarschijnlijk is hij helaas ziek

*\[ \text{ModP} \text{epistemic} \rightarrow \text{MoodP} \text{evaluative} \]

e (=d)

\[ \text{MoodP} \text{evaluative} \rightarrow \text{ModP} \text{epistemic} \rightarrow \text{TP (Past)} \rightarrow \text{TP (Future)} \]

(56) a Hij is (vandaag) helaas (vandaag) waarschijnlijk (vandaag) ziek.

He is (today) unfortunately (today) probably (today) sick

b Waarschijnlijk/Helaas is hij vandaag ziek.

6.4.3. ABSENCE OF HIGH MODALS IN CONDITIONAL CLAUSES

‘F –Spec account [such as Cinque’s account outlined above, LH] has nothing to say about why SpOAs are usually bad in …the antecedents of conditionals.’ (Ernst 2008: 7). ‘Such facts may be treated as a purely semantic matter (…) but for the F-Spec approach a semantic explanation must be an add-on to the basic syntactic account’ (Ernst 2008: 7).


(Haegeman 2007 ; Tomaszewicz (to appear) for an application to Polish, Willmot(2007) and Lahousse (2008:23) on the relevance of the realis/irrealis mood for conditionals).

The Irrealis operator belongs to the class of high modal markers in Cinque’s approach, and hence that it shares crucial features with these high modal markers.

(56) [ MoodP speech act \rightarrow MoodP evaluative \rightarrow MoodP evidential \rightarrow ModP epistemic ]

\[ \rightarrow \text{TP (Past)} \rightarrow \text{TP (Future)} \rightarrow \text{MoodP irrealis} \]

Circumstantial adjuncts:
- typically realised as PP or DP;
- do not lead to intervention effects wrt to high adverbs (57);
- can be clefted (58);
- can be focus of wh-question (59)

If AdvPs proper occupy the specifier position of distinct functional projections above the VP…it seems natural not to assume the same for circumstantial phrases. This is particularly natural if the rigid ordering of AdvPs is a consequence of the rigid ordering of the respective functional heads. (Cinque 1999: 29, also: pp. 15-16 and 28-30.)

(57) a Hij is (vandaag) helaas (vandaag) waarschijnlijk (vandaag) ziek.

He is (today) unfortunately (today) probably (today) sick

b Waarschijnlijk/Helaas is hij vandaag ziek.
Probably/unfortunately he today sick

(58) a *It is probably/obviously/without any doubt that he left.
b It was yesterday/only recently that they discovered he had left.

(59) a *How luckily has he won?
b *How probably will he arrive late? (‘How probable is it that…’)  
c How recently have you done an energy audit of your site? (www.chemical
processing.com/articles/2008/131.html - 59k)

6.4.4. CONDITIONALS LACK LOW CONSTRUAL

I assume that B&P’s World operator originates in the specifier of Mood\textsuperscript{realis} Given the observed intervention effects, the Irrealis operator shares relevant features with the higher modal expressions in the Cinque hierarchy. In general the higher modal adverbs cannot undergo long movement (see Cinque 1999: 18 for discussion).

(60) a Frankly, I do not understand that he wants to leave. High/*low  
b Probably he thinks that Mary will come. High/*low  
c Obviously he thinks that Mary will come. High/*low  
d Fortunately, he thinks that Mary will come. High/*low


(61) a By tomorrow I think the situation will be clear.
b. Next year the President believes that there will be a definite improvement in the functioning of the financial system.

6.5. Echoic conditionals (and peripheral adverbials in general) allow high modals:

(62) [a] If Le Pen will probably win, Jospin must be disappointed. (Nilsen 2004: 811: note 5)  
(if = given that, if you say that, if it is true that, …)
b Data plays an important part in the story as usual while surprisingly a lot of characters fall to the background more than usual (internet review)  
c While obviously fiction has qualities distinct from political prose, novelists do clearly respond to the political world of which they are part. .(based on MIT OpenCourseWare » Literature » 21L.471 Major English Novels: Reading Romantic Fiction, Spring 2002)

closed P-clauses [= peripheral conditional clauses, lh] are always echoic in one sense or another. They can echo straightforward statements about the actual world, or they can echo Q-propositions about a nonfactual world. However, the claim that closed P-propositions are echoic need not mean that they have to be echoes of actual utterances. They may also be echoes of an internal or mental proposition (thought) such as the interpretation of an experience, perception etc. (Declerck and Reed, 2001:83)

Proposal: no operator movement (see section 5) in peripheral adverbial clauses.
(63) If some precautions they have indeed taken, many other possible measures they have continued to neglect.

7. Emphatic polarity as an MCP

7.1. Emphatic polarity bien/si in the Spanish left periphery (Hernanz 2007a,b)

(64) a. Bien me gustaría ayudarte, pero non puedo. (Hernanz 2007b: 113 (17b))
   ‘I would really like to help you, but I can’t.’

b. Como Julià (*bien) fuma, siempre se está quejando. (2007b: 130 : (51a))
   Since Julià (*well) smokes, she is always complaining

c. Cuando Pepe (*bien) trabaja, ve la televisión. (2007b : 130 : (51b))
   When Pepe (*well) works, he watches television

d. Si Pepe (*bien) acaba a tiempo su tesis, ya te lo haré saber.¹⁰
   If Pepe (*well) finishes the thesis on time, I’ll let you know

Incompatibility with ‘central’ adverbial clauses: due to intervention effect.

7.2.Emphatic polarity igenis in Hungarian (Lipták 2003)

(65) a. Anna nem ment el moziba.
   Anna not went PART cinema.to
   ‘Anna didn’t go to the cinema.’
   Anna igenis elment moziba. (Lipták 2003: (38a))
   Anna yes-also PART went cinema.to
   ‘Yes, she did.’

b. Anna elment moziba.
   Anna PART+went moziba.
   ‘Anna went to the cinema.’
   Anna igenis nem ment el moziba. (Lipták 2003: (38b))
   Anna yes-also not went Part cinema.to
   ‘No she didn’t.’

c. [VFocP igenis [FocP el [Foc’ ment [moziba]]]]

(66) a. Úgy gondolom, nem fognak panaszkodni a diákok,
   I think not will-3PL complain-INF the students
   de ha (*igenis) panaszkodnak, majd megnézzük, mit tehetünk.
   but if (*igenis) complain-3PL then see-1PL what do-potential-1PL
   ‘I think the students will not complain, but if they do, we will see what we can do.’

b. János mindig csendes volt,
   János always quiet was
   de amikor (*igenis) megszólalt, furcsa dolgokat mondott.
   but when (*igenis) begin.to.speak-3SG strange things-ACC said-3SG
   ‘János was always quiet, but when he began to speak, he said strange things’

7.3. Sentence final emphatic negation in the Pavese dialect (Zanuttini 1997, Poletto 2008)

(67) a. No ghe so ndà NO. (Poletto 2007)
   ‘I did not go there’

b. Dovrebbe finire il lavoro per stasera. *Se non lo finisce NO, lo faccio io.
   Must-COND-3SG finish the work for tonight. If not finish-3SG NO it do-1SG I
To account for the final position of NO in (67a) (her (9)), Poletto adopts the functional hierarchy in (67c) with four distinct projections to host expressions of sentential negation, each located at a different layer of the clause. The ‘emphatic’ negative marker NO is merged in the highest negative projection, NegP4. The sentence-final position of NO in (67a) is the result of leftward movement of the clause to SpecFocP. (67d) = (Poletto’s (11)).

(67) c  [CPNegP=NegP4 NO] [IP [PolP=NegP1 non [TP1 [Presupp=NegP2 mia [ TP2 [NegPol=NegP3 nen [ Asp perf. [Aspgen/progr. [VP [DP=ExistP ]]]]]]]]]

Once again the ungrammaticality of NO in the conditional clause can be ascribed to an intervention effect.

7.4. Sentence final ni in Nupe (Kandybowicz 2007, to appear)

The semantic contribution of ni: ‘to reinforce the polarity of the clause/add emphasis to the asserted truth or falsity of the sentence.’ (to appear: chapter 2:33)

Analysis: ni: is the expression of the left peripheral head Foc0, which attracts □P to its specifier.

(68) a Musa ba nakàn ni:. (Kandybowicz 2008 : chapter 2 : (22))
Musa cut meat ni
‘Musa actually cut the meat.’

b Musa ba nakàn å ni:. (Kandybowicz 2008 : chapter 2 : (23))
Musa cut meat NEG ni
‘Musa did not actually cut the meat.’

c [FocP [CP Musa ba nakàn [hå ] [Foc, ni:] [p...

d *Musa gå ba nakàn ni:, Gana å du u: 12 Musa COND cut meat FOC Gana FUT cook 3RD.SG
‘If Musa DID cut the meat, then Gana will cook it.’

Note: not all cases of emphatic polarity are MCP. See Breitharth & Haegeman (2008)

Distinction: emphasis on polarity/event vs. emphasis on assertion.

(69) a Oa’t NIE en regent, moe-j de blommen woater geven
if it NOT en rains, must you the flowers water give (Breitharth &Haegeman 2008)

b If it DOES rain, you should water the flower bed.

References (non exhaustive)


Notes


(i) It. *A Carlo, ti parlerò solo delle persone che gli piacciono.*

To Carlo, to you talk-FUT-1SG only about the people that him please

(Alexopoulou et al 2004: 342)

4. Rizzi (2004 : 245) says: Wh extraction across a topic is slightly degraded in Italian (more severely in other languages), but with no manifestation of the argument/adjunct asymmetry which we have taken to be the earmark of RM effects.

5. SI is also triggered by the subjunctive: See Kayne and Pollock (2001) for one account. (i) Fr. Je voudrais que soient invités tous les étudiants de première année.

I would-like that be-SUBJ invited-PL all the students of the first year

6. Not all speakers accept SI in adverbial clauses, perhaps because of its literary flavour. Speaker variation is perhaps also to be related to the fact that (among other things) quand is not a relative operator in French. I have nothing more to say about this.

7. The proposal can be implemented in at least 3 ways: (i) there is NO operator in the Left periphery of peripheral adverbial clauses, (ii) an operator is inserted directly in a high position, (iii) an operator moves from position that is higher than the landing site of fronted constituents.


9. Low construal is available with conditionals formed by relativization:

(i) I will leave in any circumstance in which you say you’ll leave. high/low

(Bhatt & Pancheva 2002: 13, a-e their (50), d,e: their (51); 2006: 655-6: their (47))

I assume that such conditionals are genuine relative clauses.

10. Thanks to M. Lluisa Hernanz for help on the data.

11. Thanks to Aniko Lipták and Barbara Úrögdí for judgements on Hungarian.

12. Thanks to Jason Kandybowicz for the data.