It is well known that certain left peripheral phenomena are restricted to root or root-like clauses (Emonds 1970, Hooper and Thompson 1973). This has perhaps been documented most extensively for English where, for instance, argument fronting in adverbial clauses, whether it be as topicalization of as focalization, is unacceptable for the majority of speakers. Attempts have been made to relate the absence of argument fronting (and similar root phenomena) to the idea that the certain clauses are more ‘compact’, function as one unit of information and lack an articulated internal information structure (IS) (Hooper and Thompson 2013, van der Wal 2013, Guldemann 1996).

However, it is not the case that the relevant clause types cannot encode IS: for instance, English adverbial clauses are compatible with clefting and with in situ focusing, two devices that encode IS. In addition, languages that encode topicalization through clitic left dislocation (CLLD), such as French and Italian, allow this pattern also in adverbial clauses. Such languages thus seem to be more liberal in allowing CLLD in the domains that block argument fronting in English.

It has been proposed that in English clause types with restrictions on argument fronting, such as adverbial clauses, are somehow structurally defective in that the relevant layers of the left periphery that would host fronted arguments are truncated (Kuroda 1992, Haegeman 2006). To capture the more liberal distribution of CLLD, it could then be argued that in languages with CLLD the relevant clauses have a ‘larger’ left periphery, thus allowing for the pattern, or alternatively, that the relevant clauses are also truncated, like their English counterparts, but that CLLD differs structurally from argument fronting in English in targeting a lower layer of the left periphery which survives even in cases of truncation (Haegeman 2006). With its articulated left peripheral structure, a cartographic approach (Rizzi 1997, Cinque and 2010) lends itself fairly easily to the implementation of structural truncation. The absence of specific left peripheral projections can then be related to a reduced potential for encoding IS and for the absence of assertion (cf. Hooper and Thompson 1973, Haegeman 2006).

In the presentation, I will show that the ‘truncation’ of clauses incompatible root phenomena need not be ‘stated’ as such, and that the restricted availability of the left periphery in certain clause types is a by- product of their derivation, more in particular such clause types are argued to be derived by movement of a TP-internal operator to the left periphery. Only left peripheral material that is independently known not to block operator movement will survive in such environments, CLLD being a prime example.

It will also be shown that, the movement account can also capture the restricted distribution of certain types of adverbial modifiers, in particular (i) one implementation of the movement account of conditional clauses will account for the unavailability of high modals in such clauses and (ii) a specific implementation of the movement account of finite temporal clauses captures the non-availability of adjuncts modifying the reference time (see Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 2012).
In the final part of the presentation it will be shown that while CLLD does not block operator movement and thus remains available in adverbial clauses, other types of left peripheral fronting in languages displaying CLLD are also subject to the restrictions found for English argument fronting. Illustrations will be provided from Italian Focus fronting (Bocci 2009) and Resumptive preposing (Cardinaletti 2010) and from French PP preposing (Authier and Haegeman to appear) and VP preposing (Authier 2011).