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0 The problem

(1) a. *Gianni, si chiede, [chi ha comprato il ritratto di [se stesso]], Gianni
refl ask.3SG, who aux.3SG buy.PPT [the picture of refl same.mscg
‘John, wonders, [who bought the picture of himself].’

b. *Gianni, si chiede, [chi, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], lo ha comprato],
Gianni refl ask.3SG, who, the picture of refl same.mscg, cl aux.3SG buy.PPT
‘John, wonders, [who, the picture of himself, bought].’

c. Gianni, si chiede, [chi, [il ritratto di Maria], lo ha comprato],
Gianni refl ask.3SG, who, the picture of Mary, cl aux.3SG buy.PPT
‘John, wonders, [who, the picture of Mary, bought].’

d. Gianni, si chiede, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], chi lo ha comprato,
Gianni refl ask.3SG, the picture of refl same.mscg, who cl aux.3SG buy.PPT
‘John, wonders, [the picture of himself, who bought].’

• In this talk, I show that:
1. the full cartographic CP structure may not always be projected;
2. only the outmost edge of a phase is accessible for binding (Bošković, 2016a).

• Outline of the talk
1. Brief theoretical overview
   a. cartography of CP
   b. phase-driven A-binding
2. Data discussion
   a. anaphor-containing D-linked wh-phrases
   b. indirect Y/N-questions
   c. anaphor-containing topic + argumental wh-item
3. Concluding theoretical remarks

* I am indebted to Zeljko Bošković for the continued support and invaluable contribution to this topic. Many thanks also to the audience of the 1st SynCart workshop (Tuscany, Italy; July 2016) and Luigi Rizzi for sharing their thoughts about the data with me. All errors remain mine.

1 Theoretical background

(2) ForceP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>TopP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FocP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FinP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rizzi, 1997)

(3) a. Force selects clausal type
b. TopP may be recursive (as indicated by *), FocP may not
c. IntP is where se ‘if’, perché ‘why’ are positioned (Rizzi, 2001)
d. Fin selects clausal finiteness

(4) The highest clausal projection is a phase (Bošković, 2014; Bošković, 2015).

(5) Bošković (2016a): if a phase has more than one edge, only the outmost one is accessible for movement and binding. In (6), Bošković argues that there are multiple edges of the same phase (i.e., NP), Serbo-Croatian missing DP. Here I assume that they are multiple Specs, freely ordered:

(6) a. [NP omiljena Jovanova kola] favorite Jovan GEN car
    ‘John’s favorite car’

b. [NP omiljena Jovanova kola] Jovan GEN favorite car
    ‘John’s favorite car’

(7) However, adjectival extraction (8) and extraction of complements of modifying adjectives (9) are disallowed when the adjective is preceded by a possessor.

(8) a. Omiljena, je kupio [NP t] [NP Jovanova [NP kola]].
    favorite aux.3SG buy.PPT Jovan GEN car
    ‘He bought Jovan’s favorite car’

b. Cija je kupio [NP t] [NP omiljena [NP kola]]?
    whose aux.3SG buy.PPT favorite car
    ‘Whose favorite car did he buy?’

(9) a. [Na tebe], sam vidio [NP [ponosnog t] [NP oca]].
    of.p you aux.1SG see.PPT proud father
    ‘I have seen John’s father proud of you’

b. *Na tebe], sam vidio [NP Jovanovog [NP [ponosnog t] [NP oca]].
    of.p you aux.1SG see.PPT Jovan GEN proud father
    ‘I saw John’s father who is proud of you’
Likewise, an anaphor must be at the leftmost edge of the NP phase, otherwise the whole sentence becomes bad:

a. Marija, je prodala [NP svoju, omiljenu knjigu].
   Marija AUX.M.3SG sell.PPT her favorite book
   ‘Mary sold her favorite book.’

b. *Marija, je prodala [NP omiljenu svoju, knjigu].
   Marija AUX.M.3SG sell.PPT favorite her book
   ‘Mary sold her favorite book.’

The binding domain for Condition A can be stated in terms of phases (Bošković, 2016a; Canac-Gianni, 2016b; Crucially, it’s the anaphor inside the fronted phrase that is responsible for the effects in (14a) and (14b):

a. *Gianni knows where how many/what kind of pictures of himself were bought.

b. Gianni knows where how many/what kind of pictures of herself were bought.

An anaphor may be bound outside of its minimal phase only if it is located at the edge of the phase.

2 Cross-clausal A-binding in Italian

A. ANAPHOR-CONTAINING D-LINKED wh-PHRASES

a. ??Gianni, si chiede [quale ritratto di [se stesso]], Maria ha comprato. Gianni REFL ask.3SG which picture of REFL same.MSG Maria AUX.3SG buy.PPT
   ‘Gianni wonders which picture of himself Mary bought.’

b. *Gianni, si chiede, Maria, [quale ritratto di [se stesso]], ha comprato. Gianni REFL ask.3SG Maria which picture of REFL same.MSG AUX.3SG buy.PPT
   ‘Gianni wonders, Mary, [which picture of himself], she bought.’

Crucially, it’s the anaphor inside the fronted phrase that is responsible for the effects in (14a) and (14b):

a. Gianni si chiede [quale ritratto di Luigi] Maria ha comprato. Gianni REFL ask.3SG which picture of Luigi Maria AUX.3SG buy.PPT
   ‘Gianni wonders [which picture of Luigi] Mary bought.’

b. Gianni si chiede, Maria, [quale ritratto di Luigi], ha comprato. Gianni REFL ask.3SG Maria which picture of Luigi AUX.3SG buy.PPT
   ‘Gianni wonders, Maria, [which picture of Luigi] she bought.’

Keep in mind that focus is structurally incompatible with wh-phrases (Rizzi, 1997), regardless of the presence of the anaphor:

a. *Gianni, si chiede, MARIA, [quale ritratto di [se stesso]], ha comprato (non Marco) Gianni REFL ask.3SG, MARIA, [which picture of REFL same.MSG] AUX.3SG buy.PPT (not Marco)
   Intended: ‘Gianni wonders, MARIA, [which picture of himself] bought (not Marco).’

b. ??Gianni si chiede, MARIA, [quale ritratto di Luigi] ha comprato (non Marco) Gianni REFL ask.3SG, MARIA, [which picture of Luigi] AUX.3SG buy.PPT (not Marco)
   ‘Gianni wonders, MARIA, [which picture of Luigi] bought (not Marco).’

The data above challenge the idea of the full cartographic structure being always projected.

if the full CP structure were always projected, ForceP would be always a phase.
Therefore, the anaphor in [Spec, TopP] would not be able to be bound cross-phasally
and (14) should be ungrammatical.
B. INDIRECT Y/N QUESTIONS

(17) *Gianni, si chiede se Maria ha comprato [il ritratto di [se stesso]]. [baseline]
Gianni REFL ask.3SG whether Maria AUX.3SG buy.PPT the picture of REFL same.MSG
'John wonders whether Mary has bought the picture of [himself].'

(18) a. Gianni, si chiede, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], se Maria lo ha
Gianni REFL ask.3SG, the picture of REFL same.MSG, whether Mary CL AUX.3SG
comprato t\textsubscript{j}.

b. ??Gianni, si chiede se, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], Maria lo ha
Gianni REFL ask.3SG whether, the picture of REFL same.MSG, Mary CL AUX.3SG
comprato t\textsubscript{j}.

c. ??Gianni, si chiede se, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], Maria ha
Gianni REFL ask.3SG whether, the picture of REFL same.MSG, Mary AUX.3SG
comprato (non quello di Marco).

Again, it's the anaphor that is responsible for the spectrum of judgments in (18), as anaphor-less sentences are all okay:

(19) a. Gianni si chiede se Maria ha comprato [il ritratto di Luigi].
Gianni REFL ask.3SG whether Maria AUX.3SGMSG buy.PPT the picture of Luigi.

b. Gianni si chiede se, [il ritratto di Luigi], Maria lo ha comprato t\textsubscript{j}.
Gianni REFL ask.3SG whether, the picture of Luigi, Maria CL AUX.3SG buy.PPT

c. Gianni si chiede, [il ritratto di Luigi], se Maria lo ha comprato t\textsubscript{j}.
Gianni REFL ask.3SG, the picture of Luigi, whether Maria CL AUX.3SG buy.PPT

(20) Gianni, si chiede, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], chi lo ha comprato t\textsubscript{j}.
Gianni REFL ask.3SG, the picture of REFL same.MSG, who CL AUX.3SG buy.PPT.

'John wonders, who the picture of himself, bought.'

(21)

C. ANAPHOR-CONTAINING TOPIC + ARGUMENTAL wh-ITEMS

(20) Gianni, si chiede, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], chi lo ha comprato t\textsubscript{j}.
Gianni REFL ask.3SG, the picture of REFL same.MSG, who CL AUX.3SG buy.PPT.

'John wonders, the picture of himself, who bought.'

(22) *Gianni, si chiede, chi, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], lo ha comprato t\textsubscript{j}.
Gianni REFL ask.3SG, who, the picture of REFL same.MSG, CL AUX.3SG buy.PPT.

'John wonders, who, the picture of himself, bought.'

(23) If the full structure were always present, all cases where the anaphor is not in [Spec, ForceP] should be bad.

(24) A-binding is allowed across clauses if and only if the anaphor is inside of the outmost phasal edge of the embedded clause, in compliance with Bosković (2016a).

\textsuperscript{1}Noteworthily, judgments are maintained if the subject is post-verbal:

(i) a. ??Gianni, si chiede se, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], lo ha comprato t\textsubscript{j}.
Gianni REFL ask.3SG if, the picture of REFL same.MSG, CL AUX.3SG buy.PPT.

b. Gianni, si chiede, [il ritratto di [se stesso]], se lo ha comprato t\textsubscript{j}.
Gianni REFL ask.3SG, the picture of REFL same.MSG, if CL AUX.3SG buy.PPT.
3 (Apparent) issues

3.1 Edgy adverbial topics don’t block cross-phrasal A-binding

The sentence below, involving an adjunct, is grammatical:

(25) Gianni, si chiede, ieri, [il ritratto di se stesso] j, chi lo ha comprato.

Gianni REFL ask.3SG, yesterday, [the picture of refl same.MSG], who CL AUX.3SG buy.PPT t j.

'John wonders, yesterday, the picture of himself, who bought.'

(26)

CP

Gianni si chiede

TopP

ieri

TopP

[il ritratto di se stesso] j

Top 0

FocP

chi

Foc 0

FinP

lo ha comprato t j

Adjunct topics like *ieri* are adjoined - and adjunction can take place acyclically (Lebeaux, 1988; Stepanov, 2001).

a. *Which argument that John is a genius did he believe?
b. Which argument that John made did he believe?
c. *He believed the argument that John is a genius.
d. *He believed the argument that John made.

Assuming a derivational approach to Condition A (Belletti and Rizzi, 1988), anaphor licensing occurs before introducing adjuncts. On the other hand, in double object constructions4:

(30) *Gianni, si chiede, [a Maria], [il ritratto di se stesso] j, chi gli-e-lo comprato.

Gianni REFL ask.3SG to Maria, [the picture of refl same.MSG], who CL.DAT – CL.ACC ha dato t k t j 3.

AUX.3SG give.PPT

'John wonders, to Mary, [the picture of himself], who gave.'

3For another case where adjunct and non-adjunct topics behave differently, see Bošković (2011) and Browning (1996).

4This example (30) may involve either multiple Specs of the same TopP or multiple TopPs.

3.2 Is se stesso always local?

Regarding (30), speakers vary in their judgements here. However, this may due to the fact that for speakers who judge (30) to be good, the following sentences are good too:

(31) a. Gianni si chiede chi ha comprato il ritratto di se stesso.
   Gianni REFL ask.3SG who AUX.3SG buy.PPT the picture of refl same.MSG
   'John wonders who bought the picture of himself.'

b. Gianni si chiede se Maria ha comprato il ritratto di se stesso.
   Gianni REFL ask.3SG whether Maria AUX.3SG buy.PPT the picture of refl same.MSG
   'John wonders whether Mary bought the picture of himself.'

I assume that these speakers allow the logophoric use of *se stesso* in such contexts. Giorgi (2007) shows that *se stesso* is usually not logophoric, as opposed to *proprio/a ‘his/her own’; for example:

(32) *Gianni disse a Maria che la foto di se stesso, con lei, a Roma provava che la foto di se stesso, con lui, a Napoli era un falso.
   John told Mary that the photo of himself with her in Rome proved that the photo of herself with him in Naples was a fake. (Pollard and Sag, 1992, p. 275)

But actually *se stesso* may be used logophorically in some cases:

(33) Gianni pensò che niente avrebbe potuto rendere una foto di se stesso, adeguata per Maria.
   John thought that nothing could make the picture of himself acceptable to Mary. (ib., 272)

4 Conclusions

(34) According to the contextual structural needs, the left periphery may not be always entirely projected, as also suggested by Rizzi (1997), Bošković (2016b), and Erlewine (2016, among others).

(35) Cross-clausal A-binding is possible only when the anaphor is inside the outmost phasal edge.
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