
1.1. Central adverbial clauses (temporal, conditional) & argument fronting:

a. her regular column, she began to write in 1959.

b. "...when she began to write her regular column in 1959, I thought she would be OK.

2.6. Extending the account (i): Conditional clauses (Haegeman 2010)

a. She would put Len between two women who would have to bear his halitosis, while killing the buried mal table among the also-rans. (Saffranus Fain, A week in December, London: Vintage 2010, page 59)

b. I still want (I don't think so). Whereas Waters you never have to get tired of, because you don't like him, you can't be close to him forever. (Frankenz, Jonathan, Freedom, 2010, Fourth Estate paperback 2011: 182)

2.2.3. Italian

Rizzi (2001): root vs movement targets SpecPc (cf. (9a)): complementary distribution wh-movement & focus movement:

a. *chi QUESTO hanno detto (non qualcosa’altro)?

2.2.2. Ghaghe

a. We were instructed to say that on no account could we show any of the material we brought with us as evidence.

b. Tony is the person for whom [wh for whom [wh exist a positive impact]]. I remember to buy [buy(3)]. (Colletz 1946: 46f, (17))

d. *Lo [wh for whom [wh exist a positive impact]] non voglio. (Colletz 2001: 2004, page 6, col. 5)

2.4.1. Problems for the unique CP (with English)

2.2.1. The structure of the clause (i): the articulated CP

(7)

Spec

that

they

should

then

read

this
text

a. Which text should they all read? This text.

b. Which text should they all read? This text.

c. Which text should they all read? This text.

d. Which text should they all read? This text.

e. Which text should they all read? This text.

2.3. Restrictions on root transformations in English

5.

...
3. Central adverbial clauses have a left periphery

3.1. Left peripheral adjuncts

(24) a. When last month she began to write her regular column again, I thought she would be OK.
    b. I thought she would be OK when last month she began to write her regular column again.

(25) a. Pr. Quand sanzio démeure, j’ais m’soin.
    b. Pr. Quand sanzio demeure, j’ai m’soin.

(26) a. Si tu veux, tu peux aller à Paris.
    b. Si tu veux, tu vas à Paris.

(27) a. Cela serait une triste nouvelle.
    b. Cela serait une triste nouvelle.

2.3. Central adverbial clauses in Romance

CLLD - allowed in adverbial clauses in French, Italian, Spanish, Catalan and Modern Greek (Hageman 2006, see among others Bocci 2007, Cardinalli 2009).

(25P) a. Dit que n’est pas vrai, je lui ai dit que c’était vrai.
    b. Dit que n’est pas vrai, je lui ai dit que c’était vrai.

(26P) a. Si tu veux, tu peux aller à Paris.
    b. Si tu veux, tu vas à Paris.

(27P) a. Cela serait une triste nouvelle.
    b. Cela serait une triste nouvelle.

2.3.1. Finiteness restriction

(28) [A warning that flights to Chicago travellers should avoid] will soon be posted. (Emonds 2004: 77)

(29) a. If you don’t talk to the boss, you cannot understand the problem. (Garzonio 2008: 7)
    b. If you don’t talk to the boss, you cannot understand the problem. (Garzonio 2008: 7)

2.3.2. Some finite domains are also incompatible with CCP

(i) central adverbial clauses (cf. (3))

(a) *Mary used another company [instead/instead] to flights Chicago they could avoid.
    b. *Mary used another company to flights Chicago they could avoid.


(a) Avendo(la) la stessa proposta fatta il partito di maggioranza, …
    b. *Avendo(la) la stessa proposta fatta il partito di maggioranza, …

(b) If you don’t talk to the boss, you cannot understand the problem. (Garzonio 2008: 7)

3.3. Restrictions in Romance adverbial clauses

(i) Focusing is unavailable in unmarked Italian adverbial clauses.

(30) Se chella sapeva un segreto, annullare passato si guasta.
    d. if that one knows the secret, the past is cancelled
    e. if that one knows the secret, the past is cancelled

The double-subject construction typically proves licentious in contexts where it serves to announce a new stage or a start of another paragraph or to report a phenomenon transparently betrayed in the structural combination of a pronoun with a coindexed lexical DP (Ledgeway 2010: 264).

Adopting the airtight left periphery developed by Bocci and Pietrova (2006), Ledgeway (2010) concludes that the doubling phenomenon occupies a designated subject position in the left periphery (Subj), (28) which is higher than FocP. (The doubling lexical DP subject (Subj) may occupy a number of different positions as the left periphery or in TP)

(iii) that one # sells
    a. the buckle has broken. (Ledgeway 2010: 239, fn (19))
    b. the buckle has broken.

The difference between English argument focusing and CLLD due to "paratactic variation" (however expressed, eg amount structure, presence/absence of edge feature) in the 'size' of the LP of the adverbial clause, with Romance LP being 'larger' than the English LP. Not all LP phenomena are available in Romance adverbial clauses, in particular LP movements that seem to pattern with English (and lack resumptive clitics) are also unavailable:

3.3. Restrictions in Romance adverbial clauses

(i) Focusing is unavailable in unmarked Italian adverbial clauses.

(31) Se la stessa proposta fa anche l’altro candidato,
    a. *Se la stessa proposta fa anche l’altro candidato,
    b. *Se la stessa proposta fa anche l’altro candidato,

French has non-embedded argument focusing (Le chocolat, j’adore; huit ans je devais avoir (Abeille, GIRLEAST & Bache 1997), but does not have desubject (Abeille, GIRLEAST & Bache 1997), it will not discuss these patterns here.

Endnotes

1 For relative clauses with MFC see also HKT (1973: 400-1), Gross (1998), Ogie (1981) and Braune (1999).

2.3. Restrictions on root transformations in English

(16) a. [Se la stessa proposta  fa anche l’altro candidato] (Ghule 2007: 15, (32))
    b. [Se la stessa proposta  fa anche l’altro candidato] (Ghule 2007: 15, (32))
It tells us how much in 20 years books have become such a welcome part of TV culture and

4. The double asymmetry

Table 1: The double asymmetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLLD (Romance)</th>
<th>Bare Argument fronting (English, Romance)</th>
<th>Initial adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject position</td>
<td>Subject position</td>
<td>Subject position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative position</td>
<td>Predicative position</td>
<td>Predicative position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td>Wh-question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Relative clauses

a. *These are the students to whom, your book, you would recommend your book.

b. These are the students to whom you would recommend your book.

c. When did you say that she began to write her regular column?

4.3. Long interrogative sub-movement


b. This book to Robin I gave.

c. *When did you say that she began to write her regular column?

4.4. Long relative sub-movement

a. *Those patients, when did John plant?

b. Those patients, when did John plant?

c. This is a simplification: Authier 2011 shows that the fronting affects TP. See his paper for discussion.
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For more instances of the double asymmetry see Hagoort (2012: Chapters 2 and 3).

5. The movement derivation of temporal adverbial clauses

5.1. The proposal

According to a tradition started by Geis (published as Geis 1970, 1975, cited in Ross 1987: 211) and continued in work by Reuland (1979), Larson (1993, 1997, 1999), Reuland (2000), Demontcaille and Urbano-Echabarrain (2004), Steedman (2006), Reuland (2007), Zaenen (2009, 2011) and many others, temporal adverbial clauses are derived by movement of an TP-internal operator to the left periphery. Like the sub-phase headed by other free relative clauses (48b), when in English temporal clauses can be expanded to sentences (48c), with ever having the interpretation it has in free relatives (see De Clercq 1997: 46/7 for discussion and references).

a. *This was the time when she began to write her regular column.

b. I'll buy what you want to sell.

c. *Wherever I am I am working on this book. (see De Clercq 1997: 46/7)

5.2. Evidence from locality (left and low centered) and island effects

a. I saw Mary in New York when she claimed that she would leave.

b. *I saw Mary in New York when she claimed that she would leave.

c. *I saw Mary in New York when she claimed that she would leave.

5.3. Evidence from locality (right and high centered)

a. I saw Mary in New York when she claimed that she would leave.

b. *I saw Mary in New York when she claimed that she would leave.

c. *I saw Mary in New York when she claimed that she would leave.

5.4. Evidence from locality (left) and low centered in temporal clause

a. I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

b. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

6. Summary

Table 2: The double asymmetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLLD (Romance)</th>
<th>Argument fronting</th>
<th>Initial adjunct</th>
<th>e.g.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject position</td>
<td>Subject position</td>
<td>Subject position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative position</td>
<td>Predicative position</td>
<td>Predicative position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Most general accounts for (b-e) have been cast in terms of locality conditions on movement: fronted arguments in English create islands for movement, LP adjuncts and CLLD do not. See Reuland (2000).

6. Summary

Table 2: The double asymmetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLLD (Romance)</th>
<th>Argument fronting</th>
<th>Initial adjunct</th>
<th>e.g.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject position</td>
<td>Subject position</td>
<td>Subject position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative position</td>
<td>Predicative position</td>
<td>Predicative position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
<td>Long relative clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
<td>Multiple fronting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1. Control and evidentiality

(iii) control (CLLD–d-): e.g. raising complements (CLLD–d):

(37) a. Mi sembra, [tutti i] [tutto il] [il libro che] [conosciamo] bene.

(38) b. *Quando ci sono, [tutti i] [tutto il] [il libro che] [conosciamo] bene.

Gianluca says the reference book knows it well.

6.2. Evidence from locality (left)

a. I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

b. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

c. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

6.3. Evidence from locality (right)

a. I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

b. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

c. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

6.4. Evidence from locality (center)

a. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

b. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

c. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

6.5. Evidence from locality (right)

a. I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

b. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.

c. *I don't know whether I will stay or whether I will leave.
c. Alors que chantait Marie, une bombe a éclaté.

When (that) the minister stayed on was the country dismayed
b. Toen (dat) de minister aanbleef was het land verslagen
c. De student weet niet wanneer (dat) de beslissing zal zijn bekend.

When (that) the decision is known can we leave
b. Wanneer (dat) de beslissing is bekend kunnen we vertrekken.

c. If also interesting are the Picasso paintings, we'll stay on.

If interesting are the Picasso paintings, we'll stay on. (Heycock et Kroch, 1997: 81).

6.2. Conditional clauses are derived by movement

5.4.1. The subordinating conjunction

(i) High construal: Event time > Reference time > LEAVE

(ii) Low construal: Reference time > Event time > LEAVE

(iii) Temporal adjunct at 3 PM. Event time: Reference time > Event time > LEAVE

5.4.2. Dutch (Reuland 1979: 167)

Dutch interrogatives function both as temporal adverbial (58a) and as a conjunction introducing an adverbial clause (58b). On the movement derivation sentence initial in (58b) would be moved from a clause-interna-tional position.

In adverbial clauses introduced by conjunctions such as *foran* (dat), *wanneer* (wan), etc., the presence of the complementizer *dat* (that) is marked in Standard Dutch. In Flemish varieties of Dutch it is more easily admitted. Temporal adverbial clauses show the same variation in presence of *dat* it is marked in Dutch and omitted in Flemish (Reuland 1979: 166). On a movement analysis of temporal clauses introduced by *wan*, *wanneer* etc., the regional variation in distribution of the complementizer *dat* follows from whatever determines the regional variation in its distribution in interrogative and relative clauses. (Reuland 1979: 166). Reuland (1979: 164-5) extends the argument also to Flemish.

b. *Se la stessa proposta fa anche l'altro candidato,

c. Se, anche l'altro candidato, non supera, quel posto non è tuo*

6. Crosslinguistic support

(i) High construal: Event time > Reference time > LEAVE

(ii) Low construal: Reference time > Event time > LEAVE

(iii) Temporal adjunct at 3 PM. Event time: Reference time > Event time > LEAVE

6.1. Conditional clauses: the double asymmetry

6.2. Conditional clauses are derived by movement


One proposal that [conditional clauses] are interpreted as free relatives amounts to the claim that they are definite descriptions of possible worlds. (Blatt & Pinceva 2006: 65).

6.3. Conditional clauses are derived by movement


One proposal that [conditional clauses] are interpreted as free relatives amounts to the claim that they are definite descriptions of possible worlds. (Blatt & Pinceva 2006: 65).

(57a) TP x E v T

(57b) TP x E v T

Table 3: Stylistic inversion in French adverbial clauses (from Laborde 2003a)

Native speakers consulted accepted (61) and relate the markedness of the examples to the fact that SI belongs to the more formal register.
Hypothesis: The modal adverb is in the specifier of WorldP and either competes with the World or is in the VP.

(68) [in opposition inspired by Da/EUE 2012]

6.4. Complementing support

(70) Gm. Wenn Steffi gewinnt, wird gefeiert. (B& P 2006: 657)


