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Abstract: Under the basic tenet that syntactic derivation offers an optimal solution to both phonological realization and semantic interpretation of linguistic expression, the recent minimalist framework of syntactic theory claims that the basic unit for the derivation is equivalent to a syntactic propositional element, which is called a phase. In this analysis, syntactic derivation is assumed to proceed at phasal projections that include Complementizer Phrases (CP). However, there have been pointed out some empirical problems with respect to the failure of multiple occurrences of discourse-related elements in the CP domain. This problem can be easily overcome if the alternative approach in the recent minimalist perspective, which is called Cartographic CP analysis, is adopted, but this may raise a theoretical issue about the tension between phasality and four kinds of functional projections assumed in this analysis (Force Phrase (ForceP), Finite Phrase (FinP), Topic Phrase (TopP) and Focus Phrase (FocP)). This paper argues that a hybrid analysis with these two influential approaches can be proposed by claiming a reasonable assumption that syntactically requisite projections (i.e., ForceP and FinP) are phases and independently constitute a phasehood with relevant heads in the derivation. This then enables us to capture various syntactic properties of the Topicalization construction in English. Our proposed analysis, coupled with some additional assumptions and observations in recent minimalist studies, can be extended to incorporate peculiar properties in temporal/conditional adverbials and imperatives.
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Introduction

In English, one argument Determiner Phrase (DP), whose discourse meaning is equivalent to “established” information in one conversational context among the participants, can optionally raise from its underlying position to the left periphery of the clause, as shown in (1).*1 This type of operation (and the construction itself) is traditionally called Topicalization.*2

(1) a. This book, I really like _. [1]
   b. I believe that this book, you should read _. [2]

In the case of Topicalization in the root clause, as in (1a), the topic element appears in the sentence-initial position, while in embedded Topicalization, as in (1b), it appears between a complementizer (that) of the clause and the subject phrase.

In the framework of the Phase Theory, Topicalization can be analyzed as an instance of an Internal Merger (IM) to the edge of a phasal Complementizer Phrase (CP) with the help of the Edge Feature (EF) of its head [3].*3 Under the premise that phase heads are the central locus for syntactic derivations, this theory assumes that only the head of the CP is responsible for
the merger-agreement property in the clausal periphery. This idea, however, cannot appropriately handle the grammaticality in (2) and (3), where more than one discourse-related element appears in the sentence-initial position.

(2) a. ?? [That book], [to John], Mary handed _i _j. [4]  
    b. ?? [To John], [that book], Mary handed _i _j. [4]  

(3) a. [This book], [to ROBIN], I gave _i _j. [5]  
    b. * [To ROBIN], [this book], I gave _i _j. [5]  

The degraded grammaticality in (2) is clearly derived from the circumstance where more than one topic element appears in the sentence-initial position. The contrast in (3) shows that topic elements can precede focus elements, but not vice versa.** The Phase Theory cannot give a plausible explanation for the grammaticality of these.

Rizzi’s cartographic CP analysis can explain the grammaticality for such multiple discourse-related constructions as (2) and (3) [6, 7]. This analysis assumes that the CP, which is inherently composed of two kinds of syntactic unit (i.e., ForceP-Fin(ite)P and Top(ic)P-Foc(us)P), is split whenever discourse-related elements are merged in the clausal periphery. The resultant configuration is illustrated in (4).**

(4) [FocP Force [TopP Top [FocP YP Foc [FinP Fin [TP T […]]]]]]

This analysis, however, in which these four projections are supposed to be inherently endowed with a movement-agreement property, should be assessed under the minimalist concept of a maximally simplified language ability. To put it simply, each projection in (4) should be circumstantially asked whether it can behave as a central locus for the derivation like a phase.

The aim of this paper is to show the theoretical validity of a hybrid analysis between Phase Theory and Cartographic CP analysis. These analyses can be successfully blended if we consider that ForceP and FinP are phases, and that their heads independently constitute a phase-based relation with the relevant heads in each domain; more specifically, Fin establishes a Case/φ-based relation (i.e., A rgument)-relation with the head of Tense Phrase (TP), whereas Force makes a discourse-based relation (i.e., A´ (non-argument)-relation) with the head of the TopP/FocP. We will show the details of our analysis in the next section, and show that it can successfully overcome the empirical and theoretical problems found in previous studies, as well as capture the basic properties of Topicalization. Moreover, our proposed analysis can explain some peculiar behaviors of Topicalization within temporal/conditional adverbial clauses and imperative sentences. Finally, we will conclude this paper.

**Basic assumptions: phase-based cartographic perspective**

In the framework of the Phase Theory, it is assumed that C, as a phase head, intrinsically equips with merger-agreement property, and transmits this to T through the Feature Inheritance (FI) operation [3]. For example, in the derivation of the subject Wh-Question in (5a), the FI operation of an Agreement Feature (AF) and EF from C to T in (5b) causes the Wh-phrase (who) to agree with T and internally merge to the Spec(ifier)-TP. At the same time, an inherent EF in C drives who to raise to the Spec-CP. This simultaneous IM of who is shown in (5c) [8].

(5) a. Who arrived?  
    b. [CP C [TP T [AF]/[EF] [v P v [VP arrived who]]]]  
    c. [CP who C [EF] [TP who T [AF]/[EF] [v P v [VP arrived who]]]]

After these IMs, only the hierarchically topmost copy of who, the one appearing in the Spec-CP, is phonetically realized in the phonological component, leading to the surface output of (5a).

Next, let’s move on to consider the essence of the Cartographic CP analysis [6, 7]. The basic CP structure assumed in this analysis is illustrated in (6).

(6) [FocP Force [TopP XP Top [FocP YP Foc [FinP Fin [TP T […]]]]]]

Among these four kinds of functional projections, both TopP and FocP function as a locus for providing the discourse-related property of one lexical element in its Spec-positions to phonological and semantic interfaces.
Here, let us look at the phasehood of these projections in (6). At first, following previous studies [6, 7, 9–10, 11], this paper assumes that ForceP constitutes a phasehood, and its head establishes a close relationship with Top and Foc via the FI operation. The force property in the finite clause is necessary for determining illocutionary force [6, 7], and, if necessary, motivating merger operations to the edge of the clausal periphery [9, 11]. In fact, it can be argued that the existence/absence of ForceP differentiates the grammaticality between (7) and (8) below.

(7)  
   b. I believe that **this book**, you should read _ . [2]

(8)  
   a. *My friends tend the more liberal candidates to support _ . (raising) [12]  
   b. *I have decided your book to read _ . (control) [13]  
   c. *I disapprove of such books your reading _ . (gerund) [12]  
   d. *Police believe the London area the suspect to have left _ . (ECM) [13]

In the finite examples of (7), where the declarative force property is necessarily realized in the CP domain, Topicalization is successfully applied. In contrast, Topicalization cannot be applied in all the nonfinite examples shown in (8) without any force property in the embedded periphery. In the current line of discussion, this contrast is simply ascribable to the existence of the ForceP (or Force property in C) in the clausal periphery [14].

In the next place, this paper assumes that FinP is also a phase, and its head creates a relationship with T. Intuitively, this seems to be the case because its central function is to handle the finiteness which is necessary to be manifested in every clausal structure. In the current line of discussion, this contrast is simply ascribable to the existence of the ForceP (or Force property in C) in the clausal periphery [14].

In the next place, this paper assumes that FinP is also a phase, and its head creates a relationship with T. Intuitively, this seems to be the case because its central function is to handle the finiteness which is necessary to be manifested in every clausal structure. In this point, it is noteworthy that the nonfinite clausal marker *to* has been assumed to be in T in the generative tradition. Moreover, Pesetsky and Torrego argue that the finite complementizer “that is not C, but a particular realization of T moved to C [15].” As a related argument, Holmberg and Platzack claims a close relationship between C’s finite property and its nominative Case licensing for subjects in Spec-TP in V2 languages [16]. A similar fact is observed in English, too, as in (9).

(9)  
   a. Mary believes [TP him/*he to be late].  
   b. Mary believes [CP he/*him is late].

The contrast with respect to the surface form of the embedded subject can be explained in terms of a difference of the maximal projection of the embedded clause: in the nonfinite (9a), it projects TP, while in the finite (9b), it forms a full CP structure. This differentiates the Case realization of the embedded subject DP. First, in (9a), whose periphery lacks a CP, its subject realizes Accusative Case as a reflex that the matrix verb (believe) ‘exceptionally’ licenses it as an Accusative. Next, in (9b) with a complete CP, it can be argued that its subject gains a Nominative Case as a result of the collaboration with Fin (or its property) in the CP and embedded T, as will be shown soon below.

Taking into consideration the essence of these analyses that advocate a close relationship between finiteness and T, it is reasonable to assume that Fin, as a phase head, is responsible for the Case/φ-based A-relation by way of the conventional FI operation to T [3, 8], as in the derivation of (5b) above. Moreover, if we follow the current line of argument, it can also be assumed that Force is responsible for the discourse-based A´-relation with Top and Foc via the force-/topic-related FI operation. Our argument can be summarized in (10).

Here we consider some important points about the derivation in (10). First, the A-relation between Fin and T is independently established with the A´-relation between Force and Top/Foc. Therefore, the inertness of Force does not entail the failure of A-relation.

Next, the status of TopP and FocP is crucially dependent on the appearance of ForceP; therefore, their agreement-merger properties are directly transmitted by way of the FI operation from Force. This implies that these two functional projections do not always
emerge in the cartographic CP structure: their appearances are necessarily accompanied by ForceP [17]. In fact, Topicalization cannot be applied to the structures without ForceP, as we will show later.

Finally, we mention the theoretical validity of our analysis. In the conceptual perspective, the hybrid analysis proposed here may cause a tension between the Phase Theory without TopP/FocP in the CP domain and the Cartographic CP analysis which considers these projections to be one of the central loci for computations. These seemingly conflicting notions can be reconciled if only computationally requisite projections (i.e., ForceP and FinP) constitute a phase. This enables us to assume that TopP and FocP are nonphases for their optional status, and their computational properties are derivationally succeeded from Force through the FI operation [18].

Analysis: basic properties of topicalization

As shown in the preceding section, Topicalization can be applied in any clause with a root property, as repeated in (11).

    b. I believe **that this book**, you should read _.  [2]

This root-embedded applicability is also seen in the case of Wh-Movement, as in (12).

(12) a. **What** did John see _?
    b. I wondered **what** John saw _.

Grammatical similarities between Topicalization and Wh-Movement can be observed in other respects. First, they manifest syntactic island phenomena. Their applications are prohibited from within Complex DP Island as in (13a) and (14a), and Wh-Island as in (13b) and (14b), respectively.

(13) a. **This book**, I accept the argument that John should read _.  [1]
    b. **This book**, I wonder who read _.  [1]

(14) a. **Which book** did John meet a child who read _?  [19]
    b. **Who** did you ask where John saw _?  [20]

Second, both types of operation are not applicable to the element embedded in the inside of the previously A’-moved element, as in (15) and (16) [21–23].

(15) ?? [Vowel harmony], I think that [articles about _], you should read _.  [23]

(16) *Why, do you wonder [how likely to fix the car _],
    John is _?  [23]

Third, these moved elements can formally license a parasitic gap (PG) in the sentence. Given that the PG licensing requires an A’-moved element in the sentence [24], the well-formedness of (17) and (18) is derived from the appropriate licensing of PG of the topialized phrase (these papers) and the fronted Wh-phrase (which articles), respectively.

(17) **These papers** I filed _ [without reading pg].  [25]

(18) **Which articles** did John file _ [without reading pg]?  [23]

These data shown in (11), (13), (15) and (17) are sufficient for us to postulate that the Topicalization operation is such an instance of syntactic A’-movement to the CP periphery as Wh-Movement.

Our phase-based cartographic analysis can straightforwardly capture these properties. First, under a general assumption that the complementizer that occupies a Force position in the cartographic CP [26], the linear orders among clause-initial elements in (11) can be straightforwardly explained. Next, given that the topic phrase internally merges with the Spec-TopP, which is conventionally analyzed to be equivalent to the A’-movement of the Wh-phrase to the Spec-CP (or Spec-FocP [6]) in the case of Wh-Questions, we can argue that the grammaticality in (13), (15) and (17) is a direct consequence of the A’-nature of Topicalization. (For a detailed analysis of examples of Wh-Movement examples, see Tanaka [27, 28] and references cited therein.)

Moreover, our analysis can successfully incorporate the contrast with respect to the clausal (non)finiteness of the Topicalization application. The relevant paradigms are repeated below.*?

    b. I believe **that this book**, you should read _.  [2]
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(20)  a. *I have decided your book to read _. (control) [13]
b. *I disapprove of such books your reading _. (gerund) [12]

In our phase-based cartographic analysis, it can be explained that the contrast between the finite paradigms in (19) and nonfinite ones in (20) is derived from the existence of the ForceP in the CP field. In (19), with ForceP (or Force property), its head successfully inherits both EF and AF to the Top, and then the DP can be fronted from its underlying position, resulting in the well-formed Topicalization configuration. In contrast, in (20), without ForceP, the EF, as a driving force of Topicalization, cannot be supplied from Force to Top via the FI operation. Therefore, the output in (20) itself cannot be derived in our current line of analysis.

As a related fact to the ill-formed paradigms in (20), it is well known that Topicalization is strictly prohibited in clauses in which the nonfinite complementizer for appears, as below.

(21)  a. *I propose [FinP these books, for John to read _]. [14]
b. *I propose [true, for, these books, John to read _]. [14]

Given Rizzi’s claim that nonfinite complementizer for occupies the Fin head, the maximal projection of the embedded clause in (21) is supposed to be FinP at most [29]. This implies that the ForceP in (21) is missing in the CP field. It can then be argued that Topicalization cannot be motivated in the inside of the embedded clause of (21).

These empirical facts shown in (19)–(21) cannot be appropriately explained by the simple Cartographic CP analysis proposed in Rizzi [6]. This analysis assumes that TopP independently projects (or its property remains) into any CP fields, and its head can freely motivate Topicalization without any help from other functional projections. This means that it wrongly predicts (20) and (21) to be well-formed, contrary to fact. On the other hand, our analysis can directly ascribe the grammaticality in (19)–(21) to the existence of ForceP: in a finite case like (19) equipped with ForceP in CP, Topicalization can be applied as a result of the FI-based collaboration between Force and Top. In contrast, it cannot be applied in nonfinite cases like (20) and (21), because ForceP is completely missing in CP. This consequence strongly supports our central claim that Topicalization is crucially dependent on the existence of the phasal ForceP in CP. At the same time, this suggests that our analysis has an empirical advantage, compared to Rizzi’s Cartographic CP analysis.*8

Finally, our approach can appropriately explain the grammaticality in the case of multiple discourse-related elements in the left peripheral position, as repeated in (22) and (23).

(22)  a. ??[That book], [to John], Mary handed _i _j. [4]
b. ??[to John], [that book], Mary handed _i _j. [4]
(23)  a. [This book], [to ROBIN], I gave _i _j. [5]
b. *[to ROBIN], [this book], I gave _i _j. [5]

First, given the basic notion on the discourse-related agreement, a DP and a head must be built in a one-to-one relation. This then means that in (22), neither of the topic phrases can appear in the Spec-TopP, and therefore these examples can never be derived from our analysis. Next, TopP occupies a higher position than FocP. This positional relation between them readily accommodates the topic-focus order in (23a) but not the reverse one in (23b).

To sum up this section, we have demonstrated that our analysis can give an appropriate explanation of various properties of Topicalization, and it can be empirically supported.

Conditional/temporal adverbials

As explained in the previous section, Topicalization is basically applicable to root clauses. However, this operation is prohibited within the conditional/temporal adverbial clause, which seemingly obtains a root property [9]. Relevant examples are shown below.

(24)  a. *If these exams you don’t pass _, you won’t get the degree. [30]
b. *While her book Mary was writing _ this time last year, her children were staying with her mother. [30]
However, Topicalization is not always prohibited in the inside of such adverbials. Haegeman introduces some well-form examples, as in (25) [9].

(25) a. If these problems we cannot solve _, there are many others that we can tackle immediately. [31]

b. If anemones you don’t like _, why not plant roses instead? [31]

c. His face not many admired, while his character still fewer felt they could praise _. [31]

For the functional difference between ill-formed (24) and well-formed (25), Haegeman states that “adverbial clauses that do not allow for fronted arguments are fully integrated in the host clause and are interpreted as modifying the event expressed in the associated clause. […] On the other hand, ‘peripheral’ adverbial clauses do allow (to some extent) for argument fronting: they are less tightly connected to the host clause […] and serve to provide the discourse frame against which the proposition expressed in the host clauses is evaluated [32].” This statement implies that adverbial clauses whose function is to simply modify the proposition manifested in the host clause do not permit Topicalization in their clauses, as in (24). In contrast, adverbials which build up a discourse condition prerequisite for the proposition manifested in the host clause can tolerate the application of Topicalization in their clauses, as in (24). In this respect, we can find a different situation in the case of PAC. When this type of adverbial follows host clauses in the sentence, tags associated with the hosts must emerge right behind their clauses as in (30a), but not in the sentence-final position as in (30b).

(30) a. Bill took a degree at Oxford, didn’t he, while his daughter is studying at UCL. [34]

b. *Bill took a degree at Oxford, while his daughter is studying at UCL, didn’t he? [34]

However, PAC can have their own tags in the sentence-final position, as in (31).

(31) Bill took a degree at Oxford, while his daughter is studying at UCL, isn’t she? [34]

For the grammaticality in (27)–(31), CAC, in which ForceP is missing in CP, cannot license modal elements, while PAC, whose CP structure is complete, definitely can. Thus, the structural difference regarding ForceP between CAC and PAC is a direct factor in the grammaticality between (27) and (28), and (29b) and (31).

Returning to the main discussion, the presence/absence of ForceP in these two types of adverbials can
be straightforwardly extended to give an account of the difference with regard to (24) and (25). First, CAC without ForceP clearly fail to constitute the A’-relation between Force and topic elements, resulting in the ill-formedness in (24) in our analysis. In contrast to this, in the case of PAC, Force can successfully motivate the Topicalization operation to the Spec-TopP. This naturally accounts for the well-formedness in (25). *

To summarize this section, we have shown that the existence/absence of phasal ForceP in the cartographic CP determines the grammaticality with regard to the Topicalization application in two types of conditional/temporal adverbial clause.

**Imperatives**

In preceding sections, we argued that ForceP, as a phase, plays a crucial role in the application of Topicalization. This argument naturally leads us to expect its operation to be applicable in any clause with an illocutionary force. For example, it has been generally assumed that imperative sentences uniquely have an illocutionary force as an imperative, which is associated with an addresser’s command/request to addressees in the discourse. In the generative tradition, this property has been analyzed to be formally licensed at the clausal periphery in the course of the derivation [35-38]. More specifically, a phonetically null element tied to an addresser’s “command/request” implicature is formally licensed in the CP domain. In the current line of discussion, the locus for the null element should be ForceP. Therefore, it can be expected that Topicalization could be successfully applied in the imperative sentence. This expectation, however, is not the case, as shown in (32).

    b. *This book, leave _ on the table! [40]
    c. *The book, buy _! [41]

Interestingly enough, however, the sentence becomes rather acceptable if the fronted argument gains contrastively focal interpretation, as below.

(33) a. (You can have raisins for a snack.) CHOCOLATE, don’t even think about _! [37]
    b. The TIE give _ to Bob, the AFTERSHAVE give _ to Don! [42]
    c. THESE stocks, buy _ immediately! (Those avoid _ at all costs!) [41]

In this paper, we argue that the contrast between (32) and (33) lies in the featural content of the null element in the imperatives. Following previous studies [36-38], we assume that this is equivalent to a null imperative operator (henceforth, Op), which contains a set of morphosyntactic features associated with a directive for encoding an addressor’s command/request to addressees and as a result is dedicated to identifying the relevant sentence as an imperative. Moreover, this Op contributes to establishing the discourse background which is relevant for the use of imperative sentences, by delimiting the context as an irrealis where a certain state is not realized at the stage of the utterance of the sentence [37]. Moreover, we assume that the Op’s feature (temporarily, call it [imperative (IMP)] feature) is obligatorily licensed at ForceP [36, 37]. Given this, the Op, whose underlying position is the inside of TP [43], undergoes IM with the Spec-ForceP, and engages with its head through the agreement of each [IMP] feature. *10

In terms of the inherent properties of Op, Haegeman [43] implies that this operator has enriched featural contents. One of the features is an operator feature which corresponds to the [IMP] feature above. The other is a discourse-related feature, and its role is to set a discourse context relevant for imperatives, namely, to identify the addressee as a discourse participant [35, 44], or to establish an irrealis context. Given this, we can assume that the Op inherently gains a [Top] feature, as well as an [IMP] feature, and in the course of the derivation, it stops by Spec-TopP for its checking before moving on to the Spec-ForceP. Its successive IMs are illustrated in (34).

(34) [ForceP Op[IMP] [TopP [Top]] [Foc P [Foc P Fin [TP . . .]]] [Foc P [Foc P Fin [TP . . .]]]]
This derivation successfully captures the contrast between (32) and (33). First, it can be explained that the ungrammaticality in (32) derives from the multiple appearance of the Op and the overt topic element in one Spec-TopP. This is the same explanation as the one in (22) in the previous discussion. In contrast, the IM of the null Op never interferes with the focused element in the Spec-FocP, resulting in the well-formedness of (33). To recap, our proposed derivation shown in (34) can successfully explain the grammatical contrast of the discourse-related element (topic vs. focus) in imperative sentences.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have demonstrated the legitimacy of a hybrid approach to the phase-theoretic derivation and cartographic CP structure. The main claim is crucially related to the phasehood in the cartographic CP structure: Force and Fin as a phase head independently constitute a syntactic relation with relevant heads. Our proposed derivation, coupled with some additional assumptions in the recent minimalist framework, can felicitously capture various intriguing properties of English Topicalization constructions.
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Notes

*1. In the perspective of information structure, Topicalization dedicates to constituting topic-comment order, where the topic phrase is “old” information which is already provided by a discourse participant, and the comment phrase is “new” information.

*2. This paper adopts boldface notations for moved elements, and underline ones for their base positions.

*3. Chomsky argues that movement operations are restated as IM operations [3]. For convenience, this paper often uses the term “movement” in the case of IM operation.

*4. As shown in (3), this paper uses capital letters for focused elements.

*5. Rizzi originally assumes that there are two TopPs in the clausal periphery, as in (4) [6]. In the following discussion, we omit this lower TopP for the reason that this projection is mainly used for discourse-related phenomena in Romance languages [45]. Moreover, this paper assumes that whenever the activation of CP does not take place, the single CP projects and its head handles entire syntactic operations related to it [46]. This is the case in the derivation of (1).

*6. We assume that the discourse-related AFs from Force to Top/Foc are optional features that are assigned to relevant lexical items in the Lexical Subarray [47]. For the interpretability of AFs, the ones in Top/Foc are interpretable, while the ones in XP/YP are uninterpretable [48]. As for EF, phase heads optionally bear it, which is a driving force for discourse-related movements and is associated with interpretive effects on outcome [3].

*7. The maximal projection of the embedded clause in raising and ECM is generally assumed to be TP, not CP. Therefore, we deliberately focus on the relevant paradigms in (20) from the original ones shown in (8).

*8. We thank an anonymous reviewer for clarifying this point.

*9. This paper assumes that in the split CP configuration, ForceP contains a conditional if or temporal when/while in its head position. Therefore, in the ill-formed examples of (24), there are no suitable positions for these subordinators, unlike in the well-formed ones of (25).

*10. Tentatively, this paper assumes the [IMP] feature of the Op is uninterpretable, while the one of the Force head is interpretable, following the agreement system proposed in this paper (see footnote 6 for the related argument.). The idiosyncratic nature of [IMP] feature may be supported by the peculiar status of English imperatives: nonovert subjects, obligatory appearances of do in negative imperatives, and consistently non-inflectional verbal forms. We will leave the details of [IMP] feature for the future study.
References


英語話題化構文のミニマリスト分析：フェイズとカートグラフィック的観点から
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要　旨：統語派生が言語表現の音声具現化と意味解釈への最適解を提供するという基本理念のもとで, 近年のミニマリスト統語派生理論では, その派生単位がフェイズと呼ばれる統語的命題要素であると主張されている。この分析では, 補文標識句 (Complementizer Phrase: CP) を含むフェイズ投射をもとに統語派生が進むが, CP 領域内で複数の談話関連要素が生起可能な事実を説明できない問題が指摘されている。この問題は, 近年のミニマリスト統語論においても一つの影響力のある分析であるカートグラフィック CP 分析を採用することによって克服されるが, 文タイプ・発話効力関連句 (Force Phrase: ForceP), 定性関連句 (Finite Phrase: FinP), 話題句 (Topic Phrase: TopP), 焦点句 (Focus Phrase: FocP) という 4 種の機能投射とそのフェイズ性に関する理論的問題を呈する可能性がある。本論文では, 統語派生上必要不可欠な ForceP と FinP がフェイズとしてそれぞれに関連した主要部とフェイズ関係を形成する融合分析を提案する。この結果, 英語の話題化構文の基本特性が説明される。また, 近年の他のミニマリスト研究における観察と仮定を踏まえることにより, 時・条件の副詞節中や命令文中における話題化構文の固有特性を説明できることも示す。

キーワード：話題化, フェイズ, カートグラフィック CP 姿造, 時・条件の副詞節, 命令文。