Chapter 2
An Apparent
\textit{Wh}-Construction: Clitic Left
Dislocation in Romance

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will consider in detail certain aspects of a construction peculiar to Romance that bears in interesting ways on the analysis developed in chapter 1. I will refer to it as clitic left dislocation (CLLD) (see Van Haaften, Smits, and Vat 1983), since the generally optional pronoun matching the left-peripheral phrase can only be a clitic, not a tonic, pronoun.

The properties of this construction will turn out to have nontrivial implications for a number of central theoretical issues. For one thing, it will appear that, even though the construction exhibits two properties that are normally considered diagnostic of a (\textit{Wh}-)Movement construction (namely, sensitivity to strong islands and Connectivity), it cannot be so analyzed within the current theory. See section 2.3 for a detailed justification of this claim, which will be supported and highlighted by a systematic comparison with topicalization, a construction that differs minimally from CLLD (in fact forming a syntactic minimal pair with it). A significant number of differences between the two will be reviewed, and seen to reduce to the single fact that topicalization, though not CLLD, involves \textit{Wh}-Movement.

If the evidence is correctly interpreted, then, sensitivity to strong islands and Connectivity will have to be dissociated from \textit{Wh}-Movement and be made dependent on some more abstract property that both \textit{Wh}-Movement constructions and CLLD share. I will suggest that this property is the possibility of entering binding chains (in the sense of chapter 1), which must be able to arise in either of two ways: via movement or base generation.
If binding chains are sensitive to strong islands, irrespective of their origin, the principle of bounding theory that derives strong islands must be a condition on representation rather than one on movement. Thus, CLLD turns out to provide some genuine empirical evidence to determine an issue that has primarily been discussed from a conceptual point of view (Chomsky 1980b).

Given that (antecedent) government chains are also characterized by (1) sensitivity to strong islands and (2) Connectivity, why do we say that CLLD enters only into binding chains? As we will see in section 2.3.4, the answer is that, under ordinary conditions, CLLD shows only properties of long Wh-Movement, and none of successive cyclic Wh-Movement. In other words, phrases that can enter only into a successive cyclic derivation will appear not to be able to be dislocated in CLLD—whence the conclusion that the construction enters only into binding chains.

The observation that unbounded (“base-generated”) dependencies that correspond to long Wh-Movement can be found separated from successive cyclic Wh-Movement, as in CLLD, thus constitutes an interesting argument for the dissociation of binding, and its locality conditions, from (antecedent) government, and its locality conditions. CLLD is, in a certain sense, a pure representation of binding.

Its properties are interestingly more complex, however, and in fact point to a rather far-reaching conclusion: that the Wh-Movement/non-Wh-Movement dichotomy is reducible to another dichotomy: presence or absence of (nonreferential) operators. We will return to this issue in section 2.6.

Before turning to the arguments for the non-Wh-Movement nature of CLLD, within the current theory, we must carefully distinguish CLLD from the construction discussed by Ross (1967), Chomsky (1977), and others under the name of left dislocation (LD), whose analogue is also present in Romance.¹

2.2 LD and CLLD

That LD and CLLD are two distinct constructions becomes apparent if we compare some of their most obvious properties.

The “left-dislocated” phrase of CLLD can be any maximal phrase:

(1) a. [PP Al mare], ci siamo già stati.

to the seaside there-(we)-have already been
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[AP Bella], non lo è mai stata.
beautiful not-it-(she) ever was

[VP Messo da parte], non lo è mai stato.
got out of the way not-it-(he) ever was

[QP Tutti], non li ho visti ancora.
all not-them-(I) have seen yet

[CP Che bevi], lo dicono tutti.
That (you) drink it says everybody

This contrasts with LD, which essentially allows for "left-dislocated" NPs only (compare, for example, *To John, I have already spoken to him). The "left-dislocated" phrase of CLLD can occur at the front of virtually any subordinate clause type:

(1) b. L'unica persona che a Gianni, non gli ha mai fatto
the only person which to Gianni not-to-him-has ever done
un favore, ...
a favor
Non so proprio chi, questo libro, potrebbe recensirlo
I don't know who this book could review it
per domani.
for tomorrow
Da quando, al mercato, ci va lui,
since when to the market he goes there
non mangiano più bene.
they don't eat well anymore

Here again CLLD contrasts with LD, which typically occurs in root contexts and (to different degrees of marginality) in the complement of only a few classes of propositional attitude verbs (see, among others, Ross 1967, 424, Emonds 1970, 19–20, Postal 1971, 136, fn. 18, Gundel 1975, Baltin 1982).

In CLLD there is no (theoretical) limit to the number of "left-dislocated" phrases. See, for example, (1c):

(1) c. Di vestiti, a me, Gianni, in quel negozio,
clothes to me Gianni in that shop
non mi ce ne ha mai comprati.
(he) not-to-me-there-of-them ever bought

On the contrary, LD allows no more than one "left-dislocated" phrase (see Postal 1971, 136, fn. 17, where the impossibility of such sentences as *Mary, John, she likes him is noted).
In CLLD the IP-internal resumptive element, if present, can be a *clitic pronoun only:
(1) d. In quella città, non ci sono mai stato.
    in that town not-there-(I)-have ever been
*In quella città, non sono mai stato là.
    in that town not (I) have ever been there

No such requirement holds of LD (Quella città, non sono mai stato là ‘That town, I’ve never been there’).

In CLLD there is obligatory Connectivity between the “left-dislocated” phrase and the IP-internal position (whether or not the latter is bound by a clitic). One case is Connectivity with respect to the binding theory:
(1) e. A lei/*se stessa, Maria dice che non ci pensiamo mai.
    of her/herself Maria says that (we) not-there-think ever
A *?lei/se stessa, Maria non ci pensa.
    of her/herself Maria not-there-thinks

See Cinque 1977, 1983c, and Van Haaften, Smits, and Vat 1983 for more detailed discussion of this and other types of Connectivity in CLLD.

As is well known, LD shows no kind of Connectivity between the “left-dislocated” phrase and the IP-internal resumptive pronoun (for evidence to this effect, see the works just cited).

The relation between the “left-dislocated” phrase and the resumptive element in CLLD is sensitive to island constraints:
(1) f. *[pp A Carlo], ti parlerò solo del
to Carlo I will talk to you only about
[ np le persone [cp che gli piacciono]].
the people that to him appeal
*Se [ap ricco], credi che [ip [cp esserlo stato]
if rich you think that to have been it
non gli giovino], ti sbagli.
does not help him you are wrong
*[pp A voi], Mario corre più di [cp quanto non vi sembri].
to you Mario runs more than it to you seems
*[pp A casa], lo abbiamo incontrato [pp prima che
home we met him before that
ci andasse].
he there went
The first example contains a complex NP, the second a sentential subject, the third a comparative clause not reducible to a complex NP (see Bracco 1980), the fourth an adverbial clause.

As is well known, LD shows no such property (Chomsky 1977).

2.3 CLLD: Arguments for Its Non-Wh-Movement Nature

2.3.1 The Resumptive Clitic and the Licensing of Parasitic Gaps

The properties of CLLD, and especially properties (1e–f) (Connectivity and sensitivity to islands), seem to invite the conclusion that this construction differs from LD precisely in involving Wh-Movement. Matters are not that simple, however.

One important question that a Wh-Movement analysis of CLLD must address is the cooccurrence of Wh-Movement with a clitic pronoun that matches in features the putatively moved phrase. Essentially two possibilities suggest themselves, both of which have in fact been proposed in the recent literature. The first consists in regarding the construction as an instantiation of the clitic-doubling phenomenon familiar from other languages, the second in regarding the clitic pronoun as an overt spelling out of the pronominal features left on the (wh-)trace. Neither proposal is without problems, however. I will examine each one briefly, concluding that neither is a viable account of the phenomenon.

Various considerations render a clitic-doubling analysis of CLLD unlikely (at least for Italian). In clitic-doubling languages it is ordinarily the case that whenever a clitic may “double” a moved phrase in some Wh-Movement construction, it may do so in all other constructions displaying the properties of Wh-Movement, and it may also double a corresponding unmoved phrase (see Steriade 1980, Jaeggli 1982, Borer 1984a, and Dobrovie-Sorin 1987, 1990). Neither of these properties, however, is found in Italian. Clitics cannot “double” a moved phrase in ordinary wh-constructions, nor can they “double” a corresponding unmoved phrase:  

(2) a. *(A) chi lo conoscete?  
   who him-(do-you)-know  

b. *Lo conosciamo (a) Gianni. 
   him-(we)-know Gianni

This simply amounts to the conclusion that Italian is apparently not a clitic-doubling language. It could still be claimed that, for some reason, clitic doubling is limited in Italian to just CLLD structures, as in (3):
(3) a. Gianni, lo conosciamo.
   Gianni we know him
b. Di questa faccenda, non ne voglio parlare.
of this matter not-(I)-of-it want to talk

But even this weaker (and unenlightening) conclusion meets with problems. CLLD, for example, does not conform to what is sometimes referred to as “Kayne’s generalization” (see Chomsky 1981, 227, and the references cited above concerning the clitic-doubling phenomenon). Kayne observed that it is systematically the case that a clitic-doubled direct object in clitic-doubling languages cannot be “bare.” It must be introduced by a preposition. But this is clearly not the case in CLLD:5

(4) Non so se il vino, lo volete adesso o dopo.
   I don’t know if wine you want it now or later

The prospects of assimilating the clitic in CLLD to the independent phenomenon of clitic doubling thus look unrewarding, to say the least.6

The alternative of regarding the clitic as the overt “spelling out” of a wh-trace (and CLLD as a “Move α” construction) does not look promising either. One piece of evidence against this analysis may be provided by the inability of the clitic to license a parasitic gap. Chomsky (1982) discusses the apparent inability of clitics to license parasitic gaps in (Spanish) relative clauses employing the resumptive pronoun strategy. He suggests that a principled account can be given if, in essence, the relevant Ā-binder (either an abstract operator base-generated in Spec CP or the head of the relative clause) can be coindexed with the parasitic gap (and the “resumptive” pronoun) at LF only. This will entail a violation at S-Structure, where the parasitic gap fails to qualify as any one of the possible types of empty categories (Chomsky 1982, 58ff.). It cannot be a well-formed PRO, because it is governed; it cannot be a well-formed pro, because it is not identified; it cannot be a well-formed NP-trace, because it is free in its governing category. Finally, it is not a well-formed variable, because it is not Ā-bound at S-Structure. Under these assumptions, it thus follows that (ordinary) resumptive (clitic) pronouns will never be able to license a parasitic gap. The ungrammaticality of (5a) thus contrasts with the grammaticality of (5b), where syntactic movement creates an operator in Spec CP coindexed with the parasitic gap at S-Structure, thus authorizing it as a variable:7

(5) a. *El reloj de que me hablaste, que lo han conseguido arreglar
   the clock you spoke to me about which they got to fix (it)
sin mover e, ha quedado muy bien.
   without moving now works very well
b. El reloj de que me hablaste, el cual han conseguido arreglar t sin mover e, ha quedado muy bien.

Now, it is clear that this account of (5a) cannot carry over to the inability of the clitic in CLLD to license a parasitic gap, under the analysis in which the former is the spelling out of a wh-trace. In such a case, there is a syntactically moved operator in Spec CP coindexed with the clitic and the parasitic gap at S-Structure, just as in (5b) (alternatively, there is a real gap chain with which the parasitic gap chain can form a composed chain). If anything, the licensing of a parasitic gap here would be expected.\(^8\)

If we assume that the (clitic) resumptive pronoun of CLLD is not the spelling out of a wh-trace (because CLLD does not involve Wh-Movement), the impossibility of parasitic gaps with CLLD follows directly:

(6) *Gianni, l’ho cercato per mesi, senza trovare e.

Gianni I have looked for months without finding

This, of course, is not to say that pronouns may never be the (S-Structure) spelling out of (wh-)traces. Apparently that possibility is realized in some languages. Swedish, for instance, systematically allows resumptive pronouns in wh-constructions just where a corresponding gap would violate the ECP (typically, the subject position of tensed clauses introduced by a filled Comp; see the discussion in Engdahl 1985, sec. 2, which is the source of (7) and (8), and Sells 1984):\(^9\)

(7) Vilket ord visste ingen hur [ Ip det/*t stavas]

which word knew no one how it is spelled

As Engdahl suggests, a case can be made that such resumptive pronouns in Swedish are the spelling out of a wh-trace, for they act like A-bound variables in the relevant respects (p. 14). Not only can they occur in all wh-constructions and behave like gaps in across-the-board contexts, they are also found to license parasitic gaps, as illustrated in (8):

(8) Vilken fange var det lakarna inte kunde avgora om

which prisoner was it the-doctors not could decide if

han verklingen var sjuk utan att tale med ___ personligen?

he really was ill-SG without to talk with in person

"Which prisoner was it the doctors couldn’t determine if really was ill without talking to in person?"

The resumptive clitic in Italian CLLD shares none of these properties. It cannot occur in ordinary wh-constructions. It does not behave like a gap in across-the-board contexts. And, what is perhaps more telling, it does
not license parasitic gaps. The systematic contrast with the Swedish case makes it plausible not to regard the resumptive pronoun in Italian CLLD as the spelling out of a wh-trace.

In turn, the implausibility of analyzing the CLLD resumptive pronoun as either an instance of clitic doubling or the spelling out of a wh-trace is itself indirect evidence that CLLD does not involve Wh-Movement. That rule is, in fact, ordinarily incompatible (in Italian) with the presence of a clitic locally binding the wh-trace (see (2a)).10 Interestingly, topicalization, which is a regular (nonovert) wh-construction, consistently excludes resumptive pronouns:11

(9) *GIANNI, l'ho cercato, non Piero.
Gianni (focus) I looked for not Piero

Note that except for the obligatory absence of resumptive clitics and the impossibility of topicalizing more than one constituent (properties to which we will return), topicalization is identical to CLLD with respect to the properties of (1). Virtually all of the differences to be observed below between the two constructions will be seen to reduce to a single difference: presence, in topicalization, versus absence, in CLLD, of Wh-Movement.

2.3.2 CLLD and Subjacency
If Wh-Movement is constrained by Subjacency as (re)formulated by Chomsky (1986b), then we have a separate reason not to take CLLD to involve Wh-Movement. There appear to be perfectly grammatical CLLD structures that Subjacency would exclude if they were derived by Wh-Movement.

Consider, for example, a case such as (10),

(10) Loro, il libro, credo che Carlo sia sicuro
them the book I think that to Carlo it is certain
che non glielo daranno mai.
that they will never give it to him

where three different constituents are separately left-dislocated from the most deeply embedded clause. Whatever derivation is chosen, a violation of Subjacency as interpreted by Chomsky (1986b) (or of the strict cycle) will ensue. In that system, whenever Spec CP is filled, extraction of a constituent out of that CP will cross a barrier, CP itself, which inherits barrierhood from IP (no matter whether CP is L-marked or not). So, for example, in the Italian sentence (11)
(11) Anna, a cui, non ricordo [CP quando
Anna to whom I don't remember when
[IP hanno dato il premio ti],... they gave the prize
the *wh-phrase a cui will cross a single barrier, CP (given that tensed IP is not a barrier in this language).

If the crossing of two consecutive *wh-islands, as in (12), yields a more degraded sentence in Italian than the crossing of a single *wh-island,
(12) *Gianni, a cui, non so [CP quando si saprà
Gianni to whom I don't know when one will know
[IP cosa daranno ti],... what they will give
then the two separate crossings of a single barrier (CP) shown in (12) must cumulate to yield a full Subjacency violation. Otherwise, a well-formed derivation would be associated with (12), which would be expected to be on a par with (11), contrary to fact (see Chomsky 1986b, 31–42, and, for a somewhat different approach, section 1.9 above).

However, if repeated crossings of a single barrier by the same constituent cumulate, counting as a Subjacency violation, then a Wh-Movement derivation of such multiple CLLD structures as (10) should be expected to yield a Subjacency violation. Consider, for example, the (simplified) derivation shown in Figure 2.1. Here, at least one constituent crosses a single barrier of type CP twice, violating Subjacency. So the derivation in figure 2.1 should be as ill formed as (12), which it is not.

Topicalization, on the other hand, allows only one topicalized constituent per sentence (for independent reasons), thus behaving like ordinary wh-constructions.

2.3.3 Successive Cyclicity and Aux-to-Comp
Another property suggesting that CLLD does not involve Wh-Movement is that, unlike ordinary wh-constructions, it apparently cannot avail itself of successive cyclic derivations. If we consider adjuncts, which can only move successive cyclically, we detect a clear contrast between ordinary Wh-Movement constructions and CLLD. For example:
(13) a. PER QUESTA RAGIONE, ha detto che se ne andrà ti.
for this reason (focus) he said that he will leave
b. Per quale ragione, ha detto che se ne andrà ti?
for what reason did he say that he will leave
c. La ragione per la quale, ha detto che se ne andrà \( t_i \).
the reason why he said that he will leave

(14) *Per questa ragione\(_i\), ha detto che se ne andrà \( t_i \).
for this reason he said that he will leave

(15) a. IN MODO DEFINITIVO\(_i\), ha detto che l’aggiusterà \( t_i \).
in a definitive way (focus) he said that he will fix it

b. In che modo ha detto che l’aggiusterà \( t_i \)?
which way did he say that he will fix it

c. Il modo in cui, ha detto che l’aggiusterà \( t_i \).
the way in which he said that he will fix it

(16) *In modo definitivo\(_i\), ha detto che l’aggiusterà \( t_i \), prima o poi.
in a definitive way he said that he will fix it sooner or later

Why is the construal of the “fronted” adjunct possible in (13a–c) and (15a–c) but not in the corresponding CLLD cases (14) and (16)? (Note again the minimal contrast between CLLD and topicalization: (13a) versus (14) and (15a) versus (16).)

If CLLD does not involve any form of movement (hence does not involve any successive cyclic movement), the contrast follows directly. \( t \) is antecedent-governed in (13) and (15), due to the presence of a trace of successive cyclic movement in the VP-adjoined position (or the specifier position of the embedded CP), but it is not in (14) and (16), for lack of such an intermediate trace:

(17) a. \([_{\text{Top}} \text{Per questa ragione}_i] [_{\text{CP}} \text{ha detto}_{\text{CP}} \text{che } [_{\text{CP}} \text{se ne andrà } t_i]]\]

b. \([_{\text{Top}} \text{PER QUESTA RAGIONE}_i] [_{\text{CP}} O_i\ldots [_{\text{CP}} t_i \text{ che } [_{\text{IP}} [_{\text{VP}} t_i [_{\text{VP}} \text{se ne andrà } t_i]]]]\]

In fact, the contrast is detectable in “short” movement cases as well. (18a) differs in interpretation from (18b):

(18) a. Per questa ragione, hanno arrestato Mario.
because of this reason they have arrested Mario

b. Hanno arrestato Mario per questa ragione.
they have arrested Mario for this reason

The fact that (18a) does not share the meaning of (18b) suggests that *per questa ragione* cannot be reconstructed into the IP-internal position that it occupies in (18b). This is what we expect, in fact, if CLLD does not involve *Wh*-Movement. The IP-internal empty category will thus fail to be antecedent-governed, since its antecedent is too far away. A barrier, CP, intervenes between them:

(19) \([_{\text{Top}} \text{Per questa ragione}_i] [_{\text{CP}} [_{\text{IP}} \text{NP VP } t_i]]\)
As expected, the corresponding topicalization case (20) differs from CLLD in displaying only the interpretation of (18b), which suggests that reconstruction into (hence movement from) the IP-internal adjunct position is required in this case (see below for discussion):

(20) PER QUESTA RAGIONE, hanno arrestato Mario.\textsuperscript{14}

Successive cyclic movement also appears to be necessary to account for the contrast between (21) on one hand and (22) on the other, in which the subject of the infinitive has been Wh-Moved under relativization and question formation:

(21)  *Riteniamo Gianni essere intelligente.
       we consider Gianni to be intelligent

(22)  a. Gianni, che riteniamo essere intelligente, .
       Gianni who we consider to be intelligent
   
   b. Chi ritenevate essere intelligente?
       who did you consider to be intelligent


(23)  *Riteniamo [\textsubscript{cp}\textsubscript{ip} Gianni essere intelligente]].

(24)  a. Gianni, O\textsubscript{i} che [\textsubscript{ip} riteniamo [\textsubscript{cp} t\textsubscript{i}\textsubscript{ip} t\textsubscript{i} essere intelligente]]... 
   
   b. Chi\textsubscript{i} ritenevate [\textsubscript{cp} t\textsubscript{i}\textsubscript{ip} t\textsubscript{i} essere intelligente]]?

If CLLD involved Wh-Movement, we might expect it to be possible to dislocate the subject of an infinitival sentence in the same successive cyclic fashion. Apparently, however, it is not possible. See (25a), with the putative derivation (25b):

(25)  a. (Consideriamo Anna stupida.) *?Gianni, invece,
       (We consider Anna stupid.) Gianni on the contrary
       riteniamo essere intelligente.
       we consider to be intelligent
   
   b. . . . Gianni O\textsubscript{i}(. . . .) riteniamo [\textsubscript{cp} t\textsubscript{i}\textsubscript{ip} t\textsubscript{i} essere intelligente]].

The ill-formedness of (25a) contrasts again rather clearly with the essential well-formedness of the corresponding topicalization case (at the appropriate stylistic level):

(26) GIANN\textsubscript{i}, riteniamo [\textsubscript{cp} t\textsubscript{i}\textsubscript{ip} t\textsubscript{i} essere intelligente]],
    Gianni (focus) we consider to be intelligent
    non Carlo.
    not Carlo
Alongside the successive cyclic derivation, another Wh-Movement derivation is potentially open to (22) and (25a)—one dependent on the previous application of the Aux-to-Comp rule (Rizzi 1981, 1982, chap. 3) in the infinitival clause, as shown in (27)–(28):

(27) a. Gianni, O_i che riteniamo [CP essere_k[IP t_i t_k intelligente t_i]], ...  
    b. Chi_i ritenevate [CP essere_k[IP t_i t_k intelligente t_i]]?

(28) Gianni, O_i invece riteniamo [CP essere_k[IP t_i t_k intelligente t_i]], ...

In the present case a successive cyclic movement of the subject of the infinitive is no longer needed. The preverbal subject position of the infinitive receives (nominative) Case in situ as a function of the Aux-to-Comp rule (again see Rizzi 1982, chap. 3).

At any rate, the ill-formedness of (25a) indicates that even this movement derivation is unavailable (due, I suggest, to the non-Wh-Movement nature of CLLD).\textsuperscript{15}

Note that the EC in (25a) is not locally bound by a clitic. One might suggest that this, rather than lack of Wh-Movement, is the cause of its ungrammaticality. However, a clitic "resuming" the left-dislocated constituent is normally optional, except for object clitics (to which we will return). In particular, where no clitic form exists that corresponds to a certain (left-dislocated) constituent, none is required (Da Gianni, non è stato salutato ‘By Gianni, he was not greeted’; Per Mario, non ho mai lavorato ‘For Mario, I never worked’).

Although personal Agr(eement) might rightly be taken to function as a kind of clitic in tensed clauses, no clitic or Agr appears to be available to the subject of infinitival clauses. So none should be required.

In any event, what is relevant is that, under a Wh-Movement analysis of CLLD, there would be no obvious reason why a clitic should be obligatorily present (thus explaining on independent grounds the ill-formedness of (25a)). As we will see, quite the opposite situation obtains under a non-Wh-Movement analysis of CLLD.

2.3.4 The Ne-Cliticization Test
Additional evidence that CLLD should not be analyzed as involving movement is provided by its behavior with respect to a more subtle diagnostic criterion for Wh-Movement in Italian. This is based on a peculiarity of the pronominalization of the $\bar{N}$ associated with an indefinite quantifier as analyzed by Belletti and Rizzi (1981) and by Rizzi (1982, chap. 4). Such an $\bar{N}$ is obligatorily pronominalized with the clitic ne (lit. ‘of-it/them’).
whenever the quantifier NP is in the object position of the VP, a properly
governed position (that is, whenever it is the direct object or the inverted
subject of a passive or ergative verb). It is obligatorily a zero pronoun
(PRO, Belletti and Rizzi suggest, following Kayne (1979, app.)) whenever
the quantified NP is in (preverbal) subject or left-dislocated position (both,
arguably, ungoverned positions). The relevant paradigm is given in
(29)–(30):

(29) a. *(Ne_i) ho smarrite [NP quattro t_i] (di quelle lettere).
of-them (I) lost four (of those letters)
b. *(Ne_i) sono andate smarrite [NP quattro t_i].
of-them have gone lost four

(30) a. [NP Quattro t_i] (*ne_i) sono andate smarrite (non distrutte).
four of-them have gone lost (not destroyed)
b. [NP Quattro t_i], credo che (*ne_i) siano andate smarrite
four I think that of-them have gone lost
(non distrutte).
(not destroyed)

(For more careful discussion, see Pollock 1986 and the references cited in
note 16.)

What is relevant to present concerns is that the obligatoriness of *ne is
preserved under Wh-Movement, as shown by the following paradigm,
discussed by Rizzi (1982, 150):

(31) a. Quante pietre hai preso?
how many stones have you taken
b. *Quante hai preso?
how many have you taken
(Compare *Ho preso tre ‘I have taken three.’)
c. Quante ne hai prese?
how many of-them have you taken
(Compare Ne ho prese tre ‘I have taken three of-them.’)

Given that Wh-Movement can only take place from properly governed
positions (because of the ECP), we expect that extraction of the subject of
a tensed IP introduced by a complementizer will take place from the
postverbal position, which is the only properly governed one of the pre-
verbal and postverbal subject positions. This in turn predicts that extrac-
tion of a pronominalized quantified subject of a passive or ergative V
necessarily involves the ne option, since this is obligatory when the NP is
in the (properly) governed object position. That is indeed the case, as Rizzi
notes:17
(32) a. Quante pietre hai detto che sono cadute?
how many stones did you say that fell down
b. Quante hai detto che *(ne) sono cadute?[^18]
how many did you say that of-them-fell down

The "fronting" of a subject quantifier of an ergative V (whose N is pronominalized) would thus seem to constitute a test to establish whether a certain left-peripheral construction involves Wh-Movement or not. In this context, the contrast between the CLLD case (30b) and the corresponding topicalization case (33) is instructive:

(30) b. \([\text{NP Quattro } t_i]\) creo che *(ne) siano andate smarrite
four I think that of-them have gone lost

(non distrutte).
not destroyed

(33) Speaker A: Sono arrivate dieci lettere.
have arrived ten letters
'Ten letters have arrived.'

Speaker B: No, QUATTRO pare che *(ne) siano arrivate,
no four it appears that of-them have arrived
NON DIECI.
not ten

Topicalization, but not CLLD, behaves like a Wh-Movement construction. (30b) in fact raises two separate questions: (1) Why is ne not obligatory (as in regular Wh-Movement constructions)? (2) Why is it actually impossible?

The answer to the first question is that the EC in (30b), unlike that in (33), need not be in the (properly) head-governed object position. It can instead be in the preverbal subject position locally bound by Agr, which acts in this case like a subject resumptive clitic (see (34)) parallel to the object case in (35):[^19]

(34) \([\text{NP Quattro PRO}]_i\) creo che \([\text{IP } e_i \text{ Agr}_i]\) siano andate smarrite.
four I think that have gone lost

(35) \([\text{NP Quattro PRO}]_i\) creo che \([\text{IP } le_i]\) abbiano smarrite \(e_i\).
four I think that they have lost them

As for why ne is actually impossible in (30b), suggesting that the postverbal properly head-governed subject position is unavailable to CLLD, we may note that independent principles rule out all possible derivations from such a position. Consider (36):
Clitic Left Dislocation in Romance

(36) a. \([\text{NP Quattro } t_k]\) \ldots \text{ Agr ne}_k \text{ siano andate } [\text{VP smarrite } t_i]

b. \([\text{NP Quattro PRO}]_i \ldots \text{ Agr ne}_k \text{ siano andate } [\text{VP smarrite } t_i]

c. \([\text{OP Quattro}]_i \ldots \text{ Agr ne}_k \text{ siano andate } [\text{VP smarrite } t_i t_k]

(36c) is ruled out because the phrase in Top, not being referential, cannot enter into a binding chain with its trace; nor can it enter into a government chain, since the construction does not involve movement of a null operator (see the next section for more evidence to this effect). (36b) is excluded because ne has no source (or EC to be construed with under Reconstruction). Finally, (36a) is excluded (in addition perhaps to the reasons that exclude (36c) by the fact that \(t_i\) cannot qualify as any of the possible empty NP types. It cannot be PRO or NP-trace; it cannot be a variable (because there is no operator to bind it); and it cannot be pro, because Agr fails to identify it in [NP, VP], for minimality reasons.

2.3.5 The Complex Distribution of the Resumptive Clitic

Yet another argument for the non-\(Wh\)-Movement status of CLLD comes from a basic property of the construction: the fact that resumptive clitics in CLLD are all optional except for object clitics (\(lo, la, li, le\), and so on):

(37) a. A casa, non (ci) sono stato ancora.
    home not (there) have (I) been yet

b. Di questa faccenda, non (ne) voglio più parlare.
    of this matter not (of-it) (I) want to speak anymore

c. Bella, pare che non (lo) sia mai stata.
    beautiful it seems that not (it) (she) ever was

d. Influenzato dalla pittura fiamminga, non (lo) è stato.
    influenced by Flemish painting not (it) he was

e. Gianni, *(lo) vedrò domani.
    Gianni (him) (I) will see tomorrow

Why should the object be singled out as obligatorily requiring a clitic to bind it? Interestingly enough, such incoherence in the paradigm can be made to follow from independent principles of the theory if we again assume that CLLD does not involve \(Wh\)-Movement. One obvious difference between (37e) and all the other cases for which the clitic appears optional is that the EC is an NP in the former case and some category distinct from NP in the latter cases: a PP in (37a–b), an AP in (37c), and a VP in (37d).

Let us consider the consequences of taking this to be the relevant factor in the asymmetry shown in (37). NPs seem to have a special status among the various categories. They are the only category that is systematically
partitioned, in both the overt and empty variants, into the four distinct classes \([-\text{pronominal, } +\text{anaphor}],[+\text{pronominal, } +\text{anaphor}],[+\text{pronominal, } -\text{anaphor}],[-\text{pronominal, } -\text{anaphor}]\) (see Chomsky 1982), and consequently the only natural class of elements subject to the binding theory.

Granting the essential correctness of this characterization, let us go back to paradigm (37) and consider the structure of (37e) as opposed to the structure of (37a), which we may regard as representative of all the non-NP cases:

\[(38) \text{[[}_\text{PF A casa} \text{]} \text{CP C[}_\text{IP NP non (ci) sono stato])]}.\]
\[(39) \text{[[}_\text{NP Gianni} \text{]} \text{CP C[}_\text{IP NP (lo) vedrò domani])]}.\]

We will further assume that the presence of the resumptive clitic is entirely optional throughout the construction, as indicated by the large majority of the cases (the null hypothesis, in any event). How are we to account, then, for the apparent obligatoriness of the resumptive clitic in (37e), the NP case? The logic of the answer will be as follows: whereas nothing excludes either option (presence or absence of the clitic) when the EC is a non-NP, a number of general principles converge, when the EC is an NP, to exclude the option with no clitic.

To see this, we may consider whether the theory associates any well-formed derivation to the variant of (37e) without the clitic. I adopt here the intrinsic definition of ECs discussed by Chomsky (1982), though a comparable result could be obtained under the contextual definition (for arguments that the former definition should be preferred to the latter, see Chomsky 1982, 1986a, Safir 1982, and Brody 1984).

Let us consider the various possibilities in turn. If the EC is assigned the combination of features \([+\text{pronominal, } +\text{anaphor}] (= \text{PRO})\), the structure is excluded by the binding theory in the familiar manner. If the EC is \([-\text{pronominal, } +\text{anaphor}] (= \text{NP-trace})\), the structure is again excluded by Principle A of the binding theory since the anaphor is A-free in its governing category. If it is \([+\text{pronominal, } -\text{anaphor}] (= \text{pro})\), the structure is similarly excluded because pro is not properly identified (see Chomsky 1982 and chapter 3).

This leaves us with one last possibility: that the EC is \([-\text{pronominal, } -\text{anaphor}]\), that is, a variable. A general, and minimal, requirement on variables is that they be locally A-bound (and operator-bound). This requirement may in fact be enforced by a general (contextual) definition of variable such as that in (40):²⁰
(40) Variable =_{def} [NP e] in A-position locally Ā-bound and operator-bound.

If, following Chomsky (1981, 102), we further assume (41) as a tentative definition of "operator,"

(41) Operator =_{def} bare quantifiers, wh-phrases, and null NPs in Spec CP.

then the NP Gianni in (37e) will not qualify as an operator (it is neither a quantifier nor a wh-phrase, nor is it in Spec CP—if nonnull NPs are impossible there; see Kayne 1984, chap. 10) and thus cannot identify an EC in IP as a variable.²¹ So, if we assume that CLLD does not involve Wh-Movement, which would create an empty NP in Spec CP (an operator) binding the EC in IP, even the last possibility left for the variant of (37e) without the clitic is excluded on general grounds, by the principle barring free variables.²²

In sum, it appears that no well-formed derivation can be associated with the cliticless variant of (37e)—a desirable result, since it directly explains why resumptive clitics happen to be obligatory in the object case. (If a clitic is present, no problems arise, the resulting configuration being a normal clitic-"trace" configuration, subject to antecedent government; recall chapter 1).²³

If non-NP ECs are not required to qualify as either PRO, pro, NP-trace, or variable (because they are not partitioned by the features [± pronominal, ± anaphor], then no comparable restriction is placed on such cases—whence the optionality of the resumptive clitic. The PP EC of (37a), for example, falls neither under the binding theory nor under the requirement, holding of variables only, that an operator Ā-bind the EC.

Thus, a simple and independently motivated account of the curious asymmetry found in paradigm (37) is possible if we assume crucially that CLLD does not involve Wh-Movement.²⁴

Topicalization, which does involve Wh-Movement as standardly assumed, again differs minimally from CLLD in the expected way, since no clitic is required (or is in fact possible) in a structure corresponding to (37e). Following Chomsky (1977), the EC there is Ā-bound by a null NP in Spec CP:

(42) [GIANNI_{i}cip NP_{i}vedrò e_{i} domani]].

(41), the notion of operator assumed in the account of the obligatoriness of the clitic in the object case, in interaction with the nonmovement hypothesis for CLLD suggested here, makes one straightforward prediction. Should there be an object bare quantifier in place of a name in the
left-dislocated position, a resumptive clitic would no longer be required, since the object EC would come to be A-bound by a proper operator (a bare quantifier in an A-position external to IP). This expectation is fulfilled, as shown by the following examples, originally pointed out to me by Paola Benincà as exceptions to the otherwise obligatory presence of object clitics in CLLD:  

\[(43)\]  
a. Qualcosa, farò (non preoccuparti).
   something (or other) I will do (don’t worry)  
b. Qualcuno, troverò di sicuro per questo compito.
   someone (or other) I will find surely for this task

The grammaticality of \((43a–b)\) contrasts with the ungrammaticality of the cliticless variants of \((44a–d)\), which contain quantified NPs instead of (bare) quantifiers in the left-dislocated position:

\[(44)\]  
a. Qualche sbaglio, ogni tanto,
   \{*fa anche Gianni \}
   \{lo fa anche Gianni\}
   some mistake every now and then makes (it) even Gianni  
b. Tuti i tuoi errori, prima o poi,
   \{*pagherai \}
   \{li pagherai\}
   all your errors sooner or later you will pay (them)  
c. Alcune cartoline,
   \{*ho ricevuto anch’io \}
   \{le ho ricevute anch’io\}
   some postcards have received (them) even I  
d. Molte lettere
   \{*mi hanno spedito in ufficio \}
   \{me le hanno spedito in ufficio\}
   many letters to-me-(them) have sent to my office

I take this contrast to support Chomsky’s notion of operator, \((41)\), figuring in the definition of variable given in \((40)\). The reason why the clitic appears obligatory again in \((44)\) is that the NP in left-dislocated position fails to qualify as an operator and is thus unable to identify the IP-internal EC as a variable.

As far as the linguistic concept of “operator” at issue here is concerned, it seems that quantified NPs behave more like names than quantifiers.

Such a difference between bare quantifiers and quantified NPs may in fact correlate with a structural difference, if bare quantifiers are instantiations of the maximal N projection (\(\tilde{N}\)) rather than of the specifier node, as indicated in \((45)\).  

\[(45)\]  
a. Bare quantifiers: \([\text{NP}_{\text{QP}} \text{Q}]\)
   b. Quantified NPs: \([\text{NP}_{\text{QP}} \text{Q}] [\text{N} \text{N}]\)
Going back to (43), we may ask whether a resumptive clitic, though not required, is at all possible in these contexts. As (46)–(47) show, a resumptive clitic is apparently optional in such cases:

(46) Qualcosa, (la) vedo anch’io.
    something (it) I see as well

(47) Qualcuno, (l’) ho trovato, non preoccuparti.
    someone (him) I’ve found don’t worry

However, it turns out that this optionality is indeed only apparent, arising from the fact that left-dislocated bare quantifiers are systematically ambiguous between one use as (bare) quantifiers (in which the clitic is impossible) and one use as quantified NPs (in which the clitic is as obligatory as in (44)).

One relevant observation is that the presence versus absence of the clitic in (46)–(47) correlates systematically with a property of the interpretation of the NP: whether it is referential (specific) or nonreferential, respectively. When a specific referential interpretation is clearly forced by the context, the clitic appears to become obligatory again:

(48) Speaker A: Li conosci, quelli?
    ‘Do you know them, those people?’

Speaker B: Sì, qualcuno, *(l’) ho già conosciuto.
    yes someone (him) I already know

(49) Qualcosa, su cui avevo fatto incidere le sue iniziali,
    something on which I had his initials engraved
    \{ glie’ho appena data \}
    \{ *gli ho appena dato/a \}.
    I just gave (it) to him

This may suggest that the “pure” quantifier use of an NP is incompatible with a specific referential interpretation of the NP. When the referential reading is forced, only the name-like quantified-NP use is possible (which requires the presence of a resumptive clitic).

A particularly clear indication that the optionality of the clitic is only apparent in (46)–(47) is provided by a peculiarity of qualcosa. For many speakers qualcosa changes gender according to whether it is used as a (bare) quantifier or a quantified NP, being masculine (the unmarked gender, in Italian) when used as a (bare) quantifier, but feminine when used as a quantified NP (similarly to qualche cosa).

This can be seen by selecting two different contexts, one forcing the nonreferential use of qualcosa (which correlates with the (bare) quantifier
use), the other the referential use (which correlates with the quantified-NP use):

(50) a. E’ successo qualcosa, mentre ero via?
did something happen (+ masc) while I was away

b. *E’ successa qualcosa, mentre ero via?
did something happen (+ fem) while I was away

(51) a. Qualcosa mi era caduta in testa
something (+ fem) fell on my head
ma non ho fatto in tempo a vederla.
but I had no time to see it (+ fem)

b. *Qualcosa mi era caduto in testa
something (+ masc) fell on my head
ma non ho fatto in tempo a vederlo.
but I had no time to see it (+ masc)

The contrast in (50) shows that qualcosa, as a quantifier, has only masculine gender. The contrast in (51) indicates that qualcosa, as a quantified NP, is (preferably) feminine.

Now consider the contrast in the following CLLD context:

(52) a. Qualcosa, prima o poi la farò.
something sooner or later it (+ fem) I will do

b. *Qualcosa, prima o poi lo farò.
something sooner or later it (+ masc) I will do
(Compare Qualcosa, prima o poi farò.)

The clitic can only be feminine. This shows that qualcosa as a quantifier is incompatible with a clitic.

These observations about left-dislocated quantifiers thus indicate that bare quantifiers (used nonreferentially), but not quantified NPs, can act as operators. They also suggest that, in general, (nonderivative) variables cannot be A-bound both by an operator and by a clitic (something that appears to be true for the clear cases of Wh-Movement constructions). Finally, they constitute indirect confirmation for the non-Wh-Movement nature of CLLD. The complex pattern of obligatory, optional, and impossible resumptive clitics, though entirely natural under a non-Wh-Movement analysis of CLLD in interaction with Chomsky’s notion of operator, would hardly be comprehensible under the opposite analysis.

The account proposed for paradigm (37) draws the crucial distinction not between object ECs and all other ECs (which would be a curious bifurcation, in any event) but between NP ECs and non-NP ECs. In other
words, it does not single out object ECs as something special. Rather, it predicts that subject ECs should behave alike, being excluded in the variant without a resumptive clitic.

At first sight, that prediction would seem to be unverifiable, given the pro-drop nature of Italian. In such sentences as (53)

(53) Gianni, credo che ___ sia già arrivato.

Gianni I believe that (he) has already arrived

it is impossible to distinguish the derivation in which the subject EC is not locally bound (which is predicted to be ill formed just like the corresponding object case) from the derivation, always available in a pro-drop language, in which the subject EC is locally bound by Agr (which would act, in this respect, very much like a resumptive clitic). Given that at least one well-formed derivation can always be associated with any sentence like (53), there would seem to be no way to test the empirical prediction of the analysis for the ordinary case.

One case in which the prediction could be checked in a standard pro-drop language would be one in which the subject NP position receives Case but no pronominal Agr is available that could locally bind the NP position. Exactly one such case appears to exist in Italian: in the Aux-to-Comp constructions discussed by Rizzi (1981, and 1982, chaps. 3 and 4). Limiting ourselves for convenience to one of these constructions, we may characterize the features relevant to our discussion in the following way: In the infinitival complement to a restricted class of verbs (largely verbs of opinion) lexical subjects are permitted (at a more marked stylistic level) when the auxiliary is preposed to Comp, but not when it follows the subject:

(54) a. Ritenevano non esser io disposto ad aiutarli.

they believed not-to-be I willing to help them

b. *Ritenevano io non esser disposto ad aiutarli.

The contrast can be interpreted as an effect of the creation in (54a) of a special context of (structural) nominative Case assignment dependent on the preposing of the auxiliary to C.

The construction differs from tensed structures (the ordinary context of nominative Case assignment), however, in that the pro-drop properties of the former are only a subset of those available to the latter. In essence, a pronominal subject can be dropped in the Aux-to-Comp construction only if its interpretation is that of a pleonastic pronoun, not that of a personal pronoun:
(55) a. *Maria li ha aiutati benché ritenessimo
    Maria helped them though we believed
    non essere e disposta a farlo.
    she was not willing to
    Compare:
    Ritenevamo non esser lei disposta a farlo.
    we believed not-to-be she willing to

    b. Ritenevamo non essere e necessario partire immediatamente.
    we believed not-to-be necessary to leave immediately
    Compare:
    è necessario partire immediatamente.
    pro (pleon.) is necessary to leave immediately

This contrast can be straightforwardly accounted for if it is assumed that
the Aux-to-Comp construction (unlike the ordinary tensed sentence case)
contains no Agr with nominal features of number, person (or gender)
capable of rendering the personal interpretation possible (see Rizzi 1982,
chaps. 3 and 4). This conclusion is supported by the fact that no such
feature is realized on the overt inflection of the verb (which is an infinitival
form).

The construction thus appears to provide the abstract context suggested
above in which the prediction made by the proposed analysis can be
checked. Indeed, if the subject NP of the Aux-to-Comp construction is a
(nominative) Case marked position that is not locally bound by a nominal
criticlike Agr, we expect no CLLD of that subject NP to be possible, for
exactly the same reasons that ruled out CLLD of the object NP in the
cliticless variant of (37e). This expectation appears to be fulfilled:

(56) (Consideriamo Ava stupida.)*? Gianni, al contrario,
    we consider Ava stupid Gianni on the contrary
    riteniamo essere intelligente.
    we consider to be intelligent

    Topicalization again turns out to contrast minimally with CLLD in that
it is apparently possible (at the appropriate stylistic level) to topicalize the
subject NP in the Aux-to-Comp construction. Compare (56) with (57):

(57) Solo LEI, ritenevamo essere adatta a quel compito.
    only her we believed to be suitable for that task

The (relative) contrast can once again be explained if topicalization, unlike
CLLD, does involve Wh-Movement. (57) is thus entirely parallel to (58),
in which the subject has been extracted through an overt instance of
Wh-Movement:
(58) Quante persone ritenevate essere adatte a quel compito?
how many people did you believe to be suitable for that task

2.4 A Surprising Behavior under Negation

The conclusion that successive cyclic movement is not available to CLLD is apparently contradicted by a well-defined class of cases.

The ungrammatical examples (59a–d) all become grammatical if a negation precedes the EC with which the CLLD phrase is construed, as in (60a–d):

(59) a. *Per questa ragione, ha detto che se ne andrà e i.
for this reason he said that he will leave
b. *In modo definitivo, ha detto che l’aggiusterà e i,
in a definitive manner he said that he will fix it
sooner or later
(= (16))
c. *Per un’altra ragione, Carlo è morto e i.
for another reason Carlo died
d. *In modo scortese, Carlo di solito si comporta e i.
in a rude manner Carlo usually behaves

(60) a. Per questa ragione, ha detto che non se ne andrà e i.
for this reason he said that he will not leave
b. In modo definitivo, ha detto che non l’aggiusterà e i.
in a definitive manner he said that he will not fix it

c. Per un’altra ragione, Carlo non è morto e i.
for another reason Carlo did not die
d. In modo scortese, Carlo di solito non si comporta e i.
in a rude manner Carlo usually does not behave

This state of affairs is doubly puzzling. First, it is not immediately obvious why the presence of a negation should affect the construction’s normal incompatibility with successive cyclic movement, apparently turning a non-Wh-Movement into a Wh-Movement construction (at least, in this particular circumstance). Second, the grammaticality of (60a–d) raises another, more serious puzzle. Adverbials, which (unlike complements) can only move via successive cyclic movement, are known not to be extractable from a negation island (see Ross’s (1984) original discussion of “inner islands” and Rizzi’s (1990, chap. 1) reduction of negation islands to Relativized Minimality). This is illustrated by the systematic contrast between (61a–c), all containing phrases that can undergo long Wh-Movement, and
the ungrammatical (62a–c), which contain phrases that can only be moved successive cyclically:

(61) a. Bill is here, which they don’t know.
    b. It is this car that I think that John didn’t fix e in that way.
    c. Which book did you not receive?

(62) a. *Bill is here, as they don’t know.
    b. *It is in this way that I think that John didn’t fix his car.
    c. *How angry wasn’t he?

If anything, one should expect the presence of the negation to block, not to “unblock,” the CLLD of adverbials in (60a–d).

However, there is an interpretation of this apparent anomaly that is compatible with, and in fact supports, the conclusion that CLLD does not involve movement of an empty operator, explaining both puzzles simultaneously.

In the preceding sections we have seen that many systematic contrasts between topicalization and CLLD can be explained by analyzing the former, but not the latter, as a Wh-Movement construction. Given the formal near-identity of the two constructions, in particular the fact that the “fronted” constituent appears to be operatorlike in neither, we have assumed that the difference lies in the fact that topicalization, but not CLLD, involves the movement of an empty operator to the Spec CP adjacent to the constituent in Top.

Suppose, now, that this is not an accidental difference between the two constructions, and that the presence of an empty operator in topicalization is tied to the quantificational force of the construction, which involves the “fronting” of a focused element, in Italian. Put differently, it is the presence of quantificational force in topicalization, and its absence in CLLD, that renders the employment of an empty operator possible in the former and impossible in the latter. In fact, we have already seen that where such a quantificational force becomes available to CLLD (in the case of (certain) left-dislocated bare quantifiers) this construction too acquires Wh-Movement properties (no obligatoriness of a clitic for objects, licensing of parasitic gaps, and so on).

Suppose, now, that another option exists for contributing quantificational force to a phrase (hence, for “licensing” an empty operator moving to Spec CP): amalgamation with a negation, whose quantificational character is hardly disputable.

This notion of amalgamation needs to be made more precise. It is well known that a quantifier in the scope of a negation can amalgamate with
it. See, for example, (63), where the quantifier *molti* ‘many’ is in the scope of the sentential negation *non* ‘not’, and the amalgamated reading ‘not + many’ = ‘few’ is accordingly possible (see Klima 1964):

(63) Franco non ha visto molti film di Forman.
Franco has not seen many films by Forman.

For a quantifier to be in the scope of the negation, it is necessary (though not sufficient) that the quantifier be c-commanded by the negation in the same simple clause at S-Structure. Notoriously, if the c-command requirement fails at S-Structure, as in the passive counterpart of (60) (*Molti film di Forman non sono stati visti da Franco* ‘Many films by Forman have not been seen by Franco’), the quantifier cannot be interpreted in the scope of (hence cannot amalgamate with) the negation, and the only available reading is ‘For many \(x, x = \ldots, \text{not} (\ldots x \ldots)\). That being c-commanded by a negation in the same simple clause is not sufficient for being in its scope is shown by such cases as (64), where the explicit contrast apparently forces another c-commanded constituent to be in the scope of the negation:

(64) Franco non ha visto molti film di Forman con Maria,
Franco has not seen many films by Forman with Maria
ma con Carla.
but with Carla

Here, *molti* is not in the scope of *non* and consequently cannot amalgamate with it to yield the reading ‘not + many’ = ‘few’. Apparently, no more than one constituent may be in the scope of negation.

We can express the scope of negation explicitly via the following scope convention:

(65) In the structure \([\ldots \text{neg} \ldots X(P)\ldots]\), where \(\text{neg}\) is a clausal negation c-commanding \(X(P)\) in the same simple clause at S-Structure, coindex \(\text{neg}\) and \(X(P)\) (with superscripts).

We will further assume that the convention cannot apply more than once. (65) will then yield representations such as (66) and (67) from (63) and (64), respectively:

(66) Franco *non* ha visto \([_Q \text{ molti}]_t^i\) film di Forman.
(67) Franco *non* ha visto molti film di Forman \([_P P \text{ con Maria}]_t^i\), ma con Carla.

On the basis of (65), we may then define the following amalgamation convention (see Rizzi 1982, 123):

(68) In the structure \([\ldots \text{neg}^t \ldots Q^t \ldots]\), where \(Q\) is a quantifier belonging to a certain class,\(^{28}\) \(Q^t\) amalgamates with \(\text{neg}^t\) at LF.
In a Quantifier Raising (QR) framework, this would assign (66) the LF representation (69):

(69) Not + many (= few) x, x = films by Forman, Franco saw x

In the same framework, the other reading of (63) follows from a different application of the scope convention, whereby the verb, rather than molti, is coindexed with the negation (Franco non ha visto molti film di Forman). If so, the amalgamation convention cannot affect neg and molti, since only phrases coindexed with the negation (that is, in its scope) can amalgamate with it.

Let us now return to the suggestion that “amalgamation” with a negation (now interpreted as a function of superscript coindexing) is a way of acquiring quantificational force, hence of licensing an empty operator where one is not otherwise licensed, as in CLLD.

If we adopt this hypothesis, which is based on the independent notion of scope (of clausal negation), both puzzles noted above dissolve at the same time.

Recall that (14) is ungrammatical because no null operator is available in CLLD (so that eᵢ ultimately fails to be related to its antecedent via a chain of antecedent government relations):

(14) *Per questa ragione, ha detto che se ne andrà eᵢ.

for this reason he said that he will leave

This is so because the CLLD phrase has no inherent quantificational force (contains no bare quantifier of the appropriate kind), nor is the semantics of the construction capable of contributing such quantificational force, unlike in topicalization. Since adjuncts, unlike (certain) complements, cannot enter a long-distance binding chain either, no well-formed derivation will be available to (14).

Under the amalgamation hypothesis, the presence of a negation taking the EC in its scope radically changes the situation. Here, a null operator O is licensed because, being in the exclusive scope of non, with which it can amalgamate (at LF), it receives from it the required quantificational force:

(70) Per questa ragione, Oᵢ credo che non se ne andrà eᵢ.

Given the identity of (superscript) coindexing between O and the phrase in Top, which here expresses the fact that the former is essentially a “placeholder” for the latter (see Chomsky 1977), the phrase in Top itself will be under the scope of the negation and will thus ultimately amalgamate with non to give an LF representation of the form (71):²⁹

(71) Non + per questa ragione, [credo che se ne andrà eᵢ]
This amalgamation hypothesis in fact receives independent support. It makes a number of predictions that turn out to be correct, allowing us at the same time to account for some otherwise curious properties of the construction.

If being in the scope of clausal negation may license a null operator via amalgamation (a process that therefore turns a non-*Wh*-Movement construction into a *Wh*-Movement construction), it is predicted that when an object is in the exclusive scope of negation and can amalgamate with it, then it will no longer need to be locally bound by a clitic, since it may function as a variable bound by the null operator.

We have seen that quantified NPs, as opposed to (certain) bare quantifiers, cannot function as inherent operators binding a variable and therefore need to be resumed by a clitic because of the non-*Wh*-Movement status of CLLD. See, for example, the contrast between (72) and (73):

(72) a. Qualcosa, farò.
   something I will do
   b. Qualcuno, troverò di sicuro che mi aiuti.
      someone I’ll surely find who will help me

(73) a. *Pochi soldi, di sicuro guadagna.
   little money he surely earns
   b. *Molti amici, ha invitato, che io sappia.
      many friends he has invited as far as I know

Interestingly, if the IP-internal EC is in the scope of clausal negation, the ungrammatical (73a–b) become grammatical (as originally pointed out to me by Mauro Scorretti):

(74) a. Pochi soldi, di sicuro non guadagna.
   little money surely he does not earn
   b. Molti amici, non ha invitato, che io sappia.
      many friends he has not invited as far as I know

Even certain classes of nonquantified NPs, which also require a resumptive clitic when clitic left dislocated, are less than totally unacceptable if in the scope of a clausal negation:

(75) a. *Questo, Gianni non farà mai.
   this Gianni will never do
   (versus
   *Questo, Gianni farà sempre.
   this Gianni will always do)
b. ??Gianni, credevo che non vedessi.
   Gianni I thought that you did not see
   (versus
   *Gianni, credevo che vedessi.
   Gianni I thought that you saw)

c. ??Il suo libro, non leggerò.
   his book, I will not read
   (versus
   *Il suo libro, leggerò.
   his book I will read)

We may interpret their marginality as a consequence of the marginal capacity “names” have to amalgamate with a negation at LF.

The amalgamation hypothesis also crucially predicts that all those constituents that may be clitic left dislocated only in the presence of clausal negation can be interpreted only under the scope of this negation. That is indeed what we find, although this state of affairs is in no way logically necessary.

Take for example (74b). Alongside ‘The friends that he has invited are not many’, one might well expect it to have a reading such as ‘The friends that he has not invited are many’. But this is not so. Only the former reading is possible, with the quantifier molti ‘many’ under the scope of non. This is all the more surprising, a priori, as the sentence acquires such a reading when a clitic locally binds the object EC:

(76) Molti amici, non li ha invitati, che io sappia.
    many friends he them-hasn’t invited as far as I know

All this is of course expected if a prerequisite for the absence of the object clitic is that the object EC be in the exclusive scope of the negation so that a null operator may be licensed, as the amalgamation hypothesis predicts.

The same holds for non-NPs. Consider the contrast between (77) and (78). In (78) the fronted phrase is necessarily understood in the scope of the negation:

(77) a. *In modo diverso, Carlo si comporterà.
   in another way Carlo will behave
   b. *Andato a casa, Gianni è.
   gone home Gianni has (lit. is)
   c. *Fredda, Ivo l’ha mangiata.
   cold Ivo has eaten it

(78) a. In modo diverso, Carlo non si comporterà.
   in another way Carlo will not behave
b. Andato a casa, Gianni non è.
gone home Gianni has (lit. is) not
c. Fredda, Ivo non l'ha mangiata.
cold Ivo has not eaten it

We also expect that, whenever some other phrase is in the scope of clausal negation, CLLD of the constituents in (74) and (78) will be impossible—once again, a correct prediction. See (79), where the overt contrasts show that a phrase other than the EC is under the scope of the negation:

(79) a. *Molti amici, non ha invitato e, per lettera, ma per telefono.
many friends he has not invited by letter but by phone
b. *In un modo diverso, non si è comportato alla festa e, in another manner he did not behave at the party ma per strada.
but in the street
c. *Andato a casa, non è e, in macchina, ma a piedi.
gone home he has not by car but by foot

A related case is (80):

(80) *In un modo diverso, non ho promesso
in another manner I did not promise
che mi sarei comportato e
that I would behave

Here, although the EC associated with the fronted phrase is c-commanded by the negation, it is not in its scope. This is because the negation belongs to a superordinate clause, and the scope of the negation is clause-bound in the general case (that is, abstracting from limited cases of "Neg-raising," as in In un modo diverso, non credo che si comporterà e, 'In another manner, I don't think that he will behave').

Consider, now, how the amalgamation hypothesis dissolves the second puzzle: the fact that adverbial adjuncts appear to be extractable from Ross's negation island, in apparent violation of Rizzi's (1990) Relativized Minimality account of it, whereby in a structure like (81), e fails to be antecedent-governed by in che modo, owing to the intervention of the potential A-antecedent non:

(81) *[CP[PP In che modo]i, [IP NP [non si comporterà e]]?]
in which manner will he not behave

Consider, now, the corresponding well-formed CLLD case:

(82) *[CP[PP In un modo diverso], [IP NP [non si comporterà e]]].
in another manner he will not behave
In this case, even if the null operator moving from $e_i$ is directly extracted from the government domain of non, Relativized Minimality will not be violated. Non does not qualify here as an intervening potential $\overline{\text{A}}$-antecedent preventing $e_i$ from being antecedent-governed by the fronted operator. Since the two are coindexed, non is the closest antecedent governor of $e$.

One may ask, incidentally, what prohibits coindexing non with the adverbial operators in ordinary Wh-Movement constructions, thus voiding the effect of Relativized Minimality on negation islands altogether. My tentative answer is that overt wh-operators and the focus operators of the cleft and topicalization constructions are semantically incapable of amalgamating with a negation. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that even such quantifiers as molti ‘many’ and tutti ‘all’, which can normally amalgamate with a clausal negation, do not when they are focused (heavily stressed) in situ. For example:

\begin{flalign*}
(83) & \text{Franco non ha colpito } & \{ \text{MOLTI BERSAGLI} \} \{ \text{TUTTI I BERSAGLI} \} \\
& \text{Franco did not hit } & \{ \text{many (focus) targets} \} \{ \text{all (focus) targets} \}
\end{flalign*}

(83) can only mean that ‘The targets that he did not hit (which he missed) were many/all’. Note also that the negation in How many targets didn't you hit? has the verb, not the interrogative quantifier, in its scope ( = How many targets did you miss (= not hit)?).

Thus, far from constituting a problem, the apparently surprising behavior of CLLD phrases under negation turns out to provide interesting confirmation for the idea that the construction per se is not endowed, unlike topicalization, with a null operator moving to Spec CP.

2.5 Two Additional Constructions: Resumptive Preposing and Adverb Preposing

The claim that CLLD does not involve Wh-Movement except in the presence of (certain) bare quantifiers, or clausal negation, is prima facie contradicted by the unexpected well-formedness of two other classes of cases:

\begin{flalign*}
(84) & \text{a. Allo stesso modo, si comportò suo figlio.} & \text{in the same manner behaved his son} \\
& & \\
& \text{b. Arrestati per ubriachezza, sono stati anche loro.} & \text{arrested for drunkenness were they too}
\end{flalign*}
c. Fredda, credo che l'abbia mangiata solo lui.  
cold I think that only he ate it

(85) a. Domani, mi ha promesso che verrà.  
tomorrow he promised me that he will come
b. Ad Aiaccio, credo che sia nato Napoleone.  
in Aiaccio I think that Napoleon was born

c. Per divertirsi, mi chiedo  
to amuse themselves I wonder
se siano andati a Coney Island.  
whether they went to Coney Island

(84a–c) contain left-dislocated constituents construed with ECs that can only enter chains of antecedent government relations. If such sentences were instances of CLLD, their well-formedness would be problematic, since the ECs could only be antecedent-governed if the successive cyclic movement of a null operator were involved. But CLLD does not involve any such movement, except under the special circumstances noted above, and not verified here.

There is, however, evidence that these cases are instances not of CLLD but of a separate (Wh-Movement) construction, subject to somewhat different contextual conditions. The need to recognize the existence of such a construction alongside CLLD is in fact pointed out in Cinque 1978b, fn. 71 and 1983c, fn. 25 and is more amply motivated in Benincà 1988.

The first piece of evidence is that, despite their formal (and intonational) similarity with CLLD sentences, (84a–c) are felt to belong to a more literary, or recherché, style.

Second, the pragmatic conditions under which (84a–c) are well formed are different and much more restricted than those governing CLLD. The fronted phrase must either directly resume an identical phrase in the immediately preceding discourse or be inferentially linked to such a phrase (much as in the English VP-Preposing construction: ...and kill himself he did). For some unclear reason, such preposing in Italian is almost obligatorily accompanied by inversion of the subject.30 For example, (84a–c) become totally unacceptable if the subject is preverbal, in striking contrast to CLLD structures, for which no such condition holds:

(86) a. *Allo stesso modo, suo figlio si comportò.  
in the same manner his son behaved

b. *Arrestati per ubriachezza, anche loro sono stati.  
arrested for drunkenness they too were
c. *Fredda, credo che lui l'abbia mangiata.
   I think that he ate it

Of particular relevance here is the fact that such constructions show every diagnostic of Wh-Movement, in systematic contrast to CLLD. For example, under the peculiar pragmatic and formal restrictions just noted, it is possible for an object not to be resumed by a clitic (87) and to license parasitic gaps (88). Moreover, the construction is (again unlike CLLD, and like topicalization) incompatible with another Wh-Movement construction (89). Compare (89a–b) with (90), in which CLLD can unproblematically cooccur with a wh-interrogative construction. These are all expected properties, if Wh-Movement of a null operator is indeed involved.31

(87) . . . e questo disse anche il Sottosegretario.
and this said the Vice Minister too

(88) La stessa cosa negò senza commentare il suo avvocato.
the same thing denied without commenting his lawyer

(89) a. . . e la stessa cosa, a chi disse suo figlio?
   and the same thing to whom said his son
   b. *QUESTO, a chi disse suo figlio?
   this (focus) to whom said his son

(90) Questo, a chi l'ha detto suo figlio?
this to whom it said his son

We may also note that the only apparent exceptions to Belletti and Rizzi's (1981) and Rizzi's (1982, chap. 4) observation that a preverbal subject N associated with an indefinite specifier cannot be pronominalized with ne appear to obey the peculiar pragmatic conditions of this construction. For example:

(91) a. . . e una ne cadde anche il giorno dopo.
   and one of-them-fell the day after too
   b. . . e molti ne furono pubblicati anche l'anno seguente.
   and many of-them-were published the year after too

We can thus interpret them as well-behaved cases of successive cyclic Wh-Movement of a QP from a postverbal position (92), rather than as ill-behaved cases of Clitic Movement from a preverbal subject (93):

(92) . . . [[QP una]k [CP [IP pro nei cadde tk t1 . . .]]
(93) . . . [[IP [NP una ti] [fi [nei cadde] [vP . . .]]

This conclusion is supported by the structure's sensitivity to weak islands, which would be unexpected if (93) rather than (92) were the appropriate
analysis of (91a). See (94), which contains a negative island:

(94) *... e una non ne cadde neanche il giorno dopo.
and one not of-them-fell the day after either

Finally, consider the dislocation of idiom chunks. Benincà (1988, 151) observes that this is in general possible only when the idiom chunk resumes an idiom mentioned in the (immediately) preceding discourse. See (95a–b)

(= Benincà's (133a–b)):

(95) a. Quando gli hai detto che saresti partito,
when you told her that you would have left
Maria è cascata dalle nuvo-le,
Maria (lit.) fell from the clouds (showed ignorance of the fact)
e dalle nuvo-le è cascata anche sua madre,
and from the clouds fell her mother too
che pure doveva saperlo.
who should have known

b. Tutti a quel punto sono rimasti di sasso,
everybody at that point was left (lit.) of stone (staggered)
ma di sasso è rimasto soprattutto Giorgio.
but of stone was left above all Giorgio

This appears to suggest that idiom chunks, which ordinarily cannot enter binding chains because of their general nonreferential character, cannot be clitic left dislocated either. When they appear to be, as in (95a–b), they are instead examples of distinct Wh-Movement constructions such as Resumptive Preposing.32

Being in the scope of a negation licenses a null operator in CLLD, and in fact this is another means to dislocate an idiom chunk. See (96), which may well be uttered ex abrupto, thus failing to qualify as a case of Resumptive Preposing.33

(96) Nel pallone, non ci vai mai, tu?
(lit.) in the balloon not there you ever go
‘Don’t you ever get confused?’

If so, (84a–c) cease to be problematic for the non-Wh-Movement analysis of CLLD and are in fact entirely natural given the evidence for the Wh-Movement nature of Resumptive Preposing.

Let us turn now to the second class of potentially problematic cases, (85a–c), repeated here:

(85) a. Domani, mi ha promesso che verrà.
tomorrow he promised me that he will come
b. Ad Aiaccio, credo che sia nato Napoleone.  
    in Aiaccio I think that Napoleon was born  
c. Per divertirsi, mi chiedo  
    to amuse themselves I wonder  
    se siano andati a Coney Island.  
    whether they went to Coney Island

All of these sentences involve a fronted adverbial that is construed with
the embedded, not the matrix, clause, thus suggesting the presence of
*Wh*-Movement from the embedded clause to the Spec CP of the matrix
clause.

If these were instances of CLLD, they would represent an anomaly for
the non-*Wh*-Movement analysis of the construction. But there is some
indication that they too belong to a distinct construction. This indication
comes from a peculiar restriction to which all such cases are subject: unlike
what happens in ordinary *Wh*-Movement constructions, the fronting of
the adverbial preserves only an embedded IP-initial interpretation of the
adverbial, not the VP-internal interpretation.

Before we discuss this restriction, a brief digression is in order concerning
the fundamental syntactic distribution of temporal, locative, and reason
adverbials. Characteristically, these adverbials occupy either an IP-initial
or an IP-final position.\(^{34}\) Often, depending on which of the two positions
the adverbial occupies, the sentence differs in meaning (that is, in the scope
properties of the adverbial), even though this may not always be easy to
express with precision. Consider, for example, such pairs as these:

(97) a. In 1821, Napoleon died.  
    b. Napoleon died in 1821.

(98) a. At the restaurant, please eat!  
    b. Please eat at the restaurant.

(99) a. To amuse myself, I went to Coney Island.  
    b. I went to Coney Island to amuse myself.

The two sentences of each pair differ systematically in meaning. For
example, as pointed out by Kuno (1975), (97a) says something about the
year 1821. It says that something notable happened—namely, Napoleon’s
death. (97b), on the other hand, says something about Napoleon—namely,
that his death occurred in 1821. The same is true for (98a–b), as observed
by Geis (1986b). The force of the request conveyed by *please* affects only
the verb in (98a) and only the adverbial in (98b).\(^{35}\) Finally, (99a) says that,
to amuse myself, I did something (namely, go to Coney Island), rather than
stay home and listen to music, whereas (99b) says that the reason I went
to Coney Island was to amuse myself, rather than to visit relatives. Such differences are all a function of the different scopes of the adverbial, which modifies the entire IP in the (a) cases and only the VP in the (b) cases.  

There are essentially two ways of accounting for (97)—(99). One is to relate the IP-initial position and IP-final (VP-adjointed) position via Wh-Movement, in the same vein as the Adverb Preposing analysis of the sixties (see Ross 1986, 179ff.). In this case the different scope properties of the adverbials would presumably be a function of the different structural positions that they occupy at S-Structure. The other way to account for (97)—(99) is simply to base-generate the adverbial independently in either IP-initial or IP-final position (in the latter case, either adjoined to VP or directly under IP). The difference in scope between the adverbials would again follow from the different structural positions that they occupy (now, at all levels of representation).

There are reasons to favor the base-generation over the movement analysis. The first has to do with the inability of the adverbial in IP-initial position to preserve the scope that the adverbial has in IP-final (VP-adjointed) position: a property that is entirely unprecedented for ordinary Wh-Movement constructions. As (100a–c) demonstrate, a topicalized, questioned, or clefted adverbial may generally retain the scope of the VP-internal trace. (In fact, ordinarily it must, as we will see.)

(100) a. NEL 1821, è morto Napoleone!
in 1821 (focus) Napoleon died
b. In quale anno è morto Napoleone?
in which year did Napoleon die
c. E' nel 1821 che Napoleone è morto.
it is in 1821 that Napoleon died

This property can be made more visible by having two quantifiers interact with each other. Compare (101a–c) with (102), the Adverb Preposing case:

(101) a. In quale città del sud ognuno di loro è nato?
in which southern city was every one of them born
b. IN UNA CITTA' DEL SUD, ognuno di loro è nato. 
in a southern city (focus) every one of them was born
c. E' in una città del sud che ognuno di loro è nato.
it's in a southern city that every one of them was born

(102) *In una città del sud, ognuno di loro è nato.
in a southern city every one of them was born

In (101a–c) the fronted indefinite phrase can be in the scope of the universal distributive quantifier ognuno di loro, so that the southern city may well be
different for each of the persons involved. For example, one might answer (101a) with “Pasquale was born in Naples, Nicola in Bari, and Letterio in Messina.” In (102), on the other hand, in a southern city is not under the scope of the universal quantifier. There is just one city involved for everybody, whence the strangeness of the sentence with the distributive quantifier in subject position distributing over no set.

Given that the same scope relations are preserved under embedding (In quale città del sud credi che ognuno di loro sia nato? ‘In which southern city do you think that every one of them was born?’), the possibility of having the fronted indefinite phrase under the scope of the embedded IP subject must be due to its VP-internal trace being under the scope (c-command domain) of the subject. The absence of such scope interaction in (102) in turn indicates that no VP-internal trace is available in Adverb Preposing cases (we will shortly consider a possible reason for this).

A second reason to favor a base-generation over a movement analysis of the IP-initial/IP-final adverbial pairs is provided by the observation that, at least in some cases, base generation is the only option. If so, unless a movement analysis is needed to account for other things (which it is not), it becomes redundant.

What are the adverbial cases that can only be base-generated in IP-initial position? One example is provided by a particular reason adverbial in Italian, the conjunction siccome followed by a clause. This adverbial is found only in IP-initial, never in IP-final, position, so that here there is no question of an IP-final source for the adverbial. In this connection, it is interesting to compare the distribution of siccome (+ CP) with two other causal conjunctions in Italian, perché and poiché (see Gruppo di Padova 1974):

\[
(103) \begin{align*}
\text{a. Me ne vado} & \quad \{ \begin{align*}
& \text{siccome} \\
& \text{perché} \\
& \text{poiché}
\end{align*} \} \quad \text{ho sonno.} \\
& \text{I leave} \\
& \text{because I am sleepy}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \{ \begin{align*}
& \text{Siccome} \\
& *\text{Perché} \\
& \text{Poiché}
\end{align*} \} \quad \text{ho sonno, me ne vado.} \\
& \text{because I am sleepy} \\
& \text{I leave}
\end{align*}
\]

(103a) shows that perché and poiché, but not siccome, may appear in IP-final position; (103b) shows that perché may not appear in IP-initial position (which is again problematic for a movement (but not a base-generation) analysis of the construction).\(^{37}\)
A quite different argument that certain adverbials must be able to originate in IP-initial position rather than being moved there from an IP-final position is provided by Longobardi (1983). Longobardi notes that if such strong and weak crossover cases as (104a–b)

(104) a. *[Di parlar[e a [che ragazzo]]_i_[IP pro] vi ha chiesto t_k]?  
   to speak to which boy did he ask you

   b. *?[Di parlar[e a [che ragazzo]]_i_[IP vi ha chiesto t_k sua madre]]?  
   to speak to which boy did his mother ask you

are a function of the obligatory presence of a trace within the associated IP, the fact that no strong or weak crossover effects are found with the apparent fronting of adverbial adjuncts as in (105a–b) suggests that no IP-internal trace should be postulated in such cases:

(105) a. Dopo aver presentato Maria a che ragazzo_i,  
   after presenting Maria to which boy 
   lui, vi si è dimostrato riconoscente?  
   he was grateful to you

   b. Dopo aver presentato Maria a che ragazzo_i,  
   after presenting Maria to which boy 
   sua madre vi si è dimostrata riconoscente?  
   his mother was grateful to you

Rather, Longobardi concludes, the adverbial adjunct must have moved from an IP-initial position, where it was base-generated.38

On the basis of this evidence I conclude that no actual grounds exist for the classical analysis of Adverb Preposing. On the contrary, reasons exist for base-generating the adverbials directly in IP-initial position (possibly, Top) and in (at least) two distinct IP-final positions, one under VP and one outside VP, with the ensuing differences concerning their semantic scope.

After this digression, we may return to the peculiar restriction to which all of the cases in (85), repeated here, appear to be subject:

(85) a. Domani, mi ha promesso che verrà.  
   tomorrow he promised me that he will come

   b. Ad Aiaccio, credo che sia nato Napoleone.  
   in Aiaccio I think that Napoleon was born

   c. Per divertirsi, mi chiedo  
   to amuse themselves I wonder
   se siano andati a Coney Island.
   whether they went to Coney Island
Although the fronted adverbial must be construed with the embedded clause, the only possible interpretation is the one that corresponds to the embedded IP- (or CP-) initial scope, never the one corresponding to the embedded VP scope. Thus, (85a–c) are synonymous with (106a–c), not with (107a–c) (in the reading with no pause before the IP-final adverbial):

(106) a. Mi ha promesso, domani, che verrà.
   he promised me tomorrow that he will come
b. Credo, ad Aiaccio, che sia nato Napoleone.
   I think in Aiaccio that Napoleon was born
c. Mi chiedo, per divertirsi,
   I wonder to amuse themselves
   se siano andati a Coney Island.
   whether they went to Coney Island

(107) a. Mi ha promesso che verrà domani.
   he promised me that he will come tomorrow
b. Credo che Napoleone sia nato ad Aiaccio.
   I think that Napoleon was born in Aiaccio
c. Mi chiedo se siano andati a Coney Island
   I wonder whether they went to Coney Island
   per divertirsi.
   to amuse themselves

This contrasts with what we find in ordinary Wh-Movement constructions, including Resumptive Preposing and the limited Wh-Movement instances of CLLD when the dislocated phrase is in the scope of negation or is itself a bare quantifier. For all of these the scope of the fronted adverbial can be (in fact, must be) the VP-internal one. Consider (108a–c), the fronted adverbials of which share the scope of (107a–c), not that of (106a–c):

(108) a. DOMANI, mi ha promesso che verrà.
   tomorrow (focus) he promised me that he will come
b. AD AIACCIO, si dice che Napoleone sia nato.
   in Aiaccio (focus) they say that Napoleon was born
c. *PER DIVERTIRSI, mi chiedo
   to amuse themselves (focus) I wonder
   se siano andati a Coney Island.
   whether they went to Coney Island

This suggests, then, that we are confronted with a quite special, construction-specific, instance of Wh-Movement, which only affects IP-initial adverbials. I will call it Adverb Preposing, modifying in part the original usage of the term.
2.6 Implications for an Analysis of Wh-Movement

To recapitulate the point of the discussion so far, it appears that, factoring out certain only apparent instances of CLLD, a substantial number of rather subtle and seemingly unrelated properties of the CLLD construction can be tied together and simply viewed as different manifestations of a single, abstract property: the absence of Wh-Movement. That conclusion appears to be strengthened by the systematic and coherent contrast observed for each such property between CLLD and topicalization, a construction that differs minimally from CLLD precisely in having Wh-Movement.

If correct, this conclusion has some nontrivial implications for a number of general issues. First, given that CLLD displays Connectivity, in the sense illustrated above, it follows that Connectivity cannot be made to depend on, or correlate with, Move α. Second, given that CLLD is sensitive to (strong) islands, it seems that this property can no longer be interpreted as a diagnostic criterion for Wh-Movement but can instead be interpreted as a property of chains, whether these are created by movement, as in standard Wh-Movement constructions, or base generation, as in CLLD.

The properties of the construction in fact suggest a more abstract way of looking at Wh-Movement, since certain instances of CLLD were seen above to involve Wh-Movement—at first sight a rather paradoxical situation. We observed that the construction appears to acquire the properties of successive cyclic Wh-Movement (the ability to enter into government chains) only under particular conditions: when some nonreferential operator is involved (either a dislocated bare quantifier, which necessarily enters into government chains, or a negation taking scope over the dislocated phrase).

A more accurate characterization of CLLD would then seem to be that the construction is not endowed with a (null) operator; hence, it lacks the properties that go with it (the ability to enter into government chains).

In a more general vein, the observed properties of CLLD make it tempting to interpret Wh-Movement as an epiphenomenon, in that, as CLLD shows in a particularly clear way, its defining properties are not always found together, do not single out a homogeneous class of constructions, and in fact may lead separate lives, as it were.

(109) Defining properties of Wh-Movement (see Chomsky 1977)
   a. It obligatorily leaves a gap.
   b. It is subject to long movement, under certain conditions.
c. It is subject to successive cyclic movement, under certain other conditions.

d. It obeys strong islands.

e. It obeys weak islands (when it applies successive cyclically).

It appears that property (109a) is found only when an operator is involved (whether overt or null, whether referential or nonreferential). Since CLLD (as opposed to topicalization) is not endowed with a (null) operator of either kind, it will lack property (109a), though it shows properties (109b) and (109d) (unless the dislocated phrase is itself an operator intrinsically):

(110) a. Gianni, *(lo) incontro domani.
Gianni (him) I meet tomorrow

b. Mario, non so perché lo abbiano invitato.
Mario I don’t know why they invited him

c. *A Franco, non concluderai nulla
to Franco you will conclude nothing
senza parlargli.
without speaking to him

Properties (109b) and (109d) thus lead an independent life from the others (though I have suggested they are associated with binding chains). When an intrinsic operator is dislocated, the construction acquires property (109a), and given that non-\(w\)h intrinsic operators are apparently only of the nonreferential type, it further acquires the linked properties (109c) and (109e), binding being unavailable:

(111) a. Qualcosa, credo che *(lo) farà. (see section 2.2.2)
something I think that (s)he will do (it)

b. *Qualcosa, mi chiedo chi potrà fare.
something I wonder who will be able to do

c. *Qualcosa, se ne è andato senza fare.
something he left without doing

Topicalization may instead show the clustering (109a), (109b), (109d), because it contains a (null) operator that (as a function of its ultimate antecedent in Top) may qualify as a referential operator and thus enter into a binding chain (see (112)), although it may show the previous clustering (again depending on the ultimate antecedent of the null operator; see (113)):

(112) a. QUESTO, mi chiedo se *(lo) desiderino.
this (focus) I wonder if they want
b. *FRANCO, credo che, invitando, facciano
Franco (focus) I think that inviting they commit
il più grave errore della loro vita.
the worst error of their life

(113) a. NESSUNO, credo che (*lo) abbiano visto.
nobody (focus) I think that they saw (him)
b. *NESSUNO, mi chiedo
nobody (focus) I wonder
perché abbia visto. (see section 1.4.1)
why he saw
c. *NESSUNO, se ne è andato per invitare.
nobody (focus) he left to invite

Under a conception of Wh-Movement as a primitive and monolithic cluster of properties, it would be hard to make sense of the different arrangements that the properties in (109) may assume, and in particular of the character of CLLD, which would sometimes qualify as a Wh-Movement construction and sometimes as a non-Wh-Movement construction. The defining properties of Wh-Movement are thus better seen as separate defining properties of the two types of operators isolated in chapter 1, or of the absence of an operator.