Extraction from Clausal Adjuncts in Czech
Petr Biskup and Radek Šimík

Background: It is often assumed that extraction out of adjunct is impossible (dubbed as Adjunct Condition; see e.g. Huang 1982, Uriagereka 1999, Stepanov 2007). Some authors show that there are exceptions to this condition; e.g. according to Cinque (1990) and Manzini (1992), extraction from non-finite adjuncts is possible in contrast to finite adjuncts; according to Truswell (2011), A-bar movement from an adjunct is possible if the adjunct and the matrix clause describe a single event; according to Demonte (1988), Borgonovo & Neeleman (2000) and Miyamoto (2012), extraction is possible from object-oriented secondary predicates with the status of an adjunct; and according to Bošković (to appear), the ban on extraction from adjunct is voided for elements base generated at the edge of the adjunct.

Claim: We present novel empirical evidence from Czech demonstrating that extraction is also possible from finite adjuncts, such as a conditional adjunct (1), a purpose adjunct (2), or a correlative adjunct (3).

(1) Potkal jsem [$_{NP}$ člověka, [$_{CP2}$ **kterému**$_1$ [$_{CP1}$ když to dáš t$_1$], tak tě tam *pro*$_{1/2}$ pustí]].
    met AUX.1SG man.ACC which.DAT when it give.2SG so you.ACC there let.in.3
    'I met a man for whom it holds that he/she/they will let you in if you give it to him.'

(2) To je [$_{NP}$ řečník, [$_{CP2}$ **kterého**$_1$ [$_{CP1}$ abychom mohli pozvat t$_1$], musíme mít spoustu peněz]].
    it is speaker which.ACC so.that could.1PL invite must.1PL have a.lot.of money
    'This is a speaker for whom it holds that we need a lot of money for inviting him.'

(3) To je ten [$_{NP}$ chlap, [$_{CP2}$ **kterému**$_1$ [$_{CP1}$ co(koliv) dáš t$_1$], to *pro*$_1$ promrhá]].
    it is the man which.DAT what(ever) give.2SG it dawdles.away.3SG
    'This is a man for whom it holds that he will dawdle away whatever you give him.'

Since these examples contain finite adjuncts with events different from the event of the matrix clause and include movement of the object argument, they cannot be subsumed under any of the analysis mentioned above. We also argue that richness of the structure of the clausal adjunct determines whether or not extraction is possible: For it to be possible, the adjunct clause must not contain a D/N projection. Hence, (at least some cases of) adjunct islands can be reduced to complex NP islands.

Arguments for extraction: There are many arguments (i) that extraction takes place and (ii) that it targets SpecCP$_2$ rather than just SpecCP$_1$. First, (1)–(3) display case-connectivity – the *wh*P bears the case assigned within the adjunct. Second, the gap in the adjunct is not "parasitic" on an gap in the main clause: even though there might be a coindexed *pro*/variable in the main clause (1)/(3), this is not necessary (1)/(2). Third, in order for the relative to be able to combine with its head (by predicate modification), the relative operator *kter-* must move to the edge of CP$_2$, not just CP$_1$. Fourth, (4) shows that the extracted *wh*P can move from the preposed adjunct to an even higher position.

(4) **Komu**$_1$ Marie říkala, že když zavolám t$_1$, tak dostanu potvrzeni o účasti?
    who.DAT Marie told that when I.call so I.get confirmation about participation
    'For whom does it hold that M. told that I would get the confirmation of participation if I call him?'

Finally, Czech does not allow doubly filled COMP in relatives (5) in contrast to Bavarian, which also tells against the SpecCP$_1$ position of the moved *wh*P in cases like (1)–(3) (cf. Grewendorf 2015).

(5) * To je ten člověk, **který** **že** / **co** přišel.
    it is the man which.NOM DECL.COMP REL.COMP came

Extraction out of CP vs. DP: (1)–(3) contrast with the ungrammatical (6) and (7), where the adjunct is headed by a DP: the conjunctions are composed of a preposition, **demonstrative**, and a complementizer (*pro-to-že* 'for-this-DECL.COMP' = 'because', *po-té co* 'after-this REL.COMP' = 'after').

(6) * To je ta [NP knížka, [CP2 **kterou**₁ [CP1 **poté co** koupil t₁], potkal Chomského]].
    it is the book which.ACC after what he.bought he.met Chomsky

(7) * To je ta [NP knížka, [CP2 **kterou**₁ [CP1 **protože** koupil t₁], už nemá peníze]].
    it is the book which.ACC because he.bought already does.not.have money

Consider further (our analysis of) the pattern in (8). (8a), repeated from (3), involves extraction out of a CP, which crucially follows the movement of the adjunct to the left periphery of the main clause, upon which the demonstrative element *to* gets stranded. (8b) shows that if the demonstrative element gets pied-piped, the adjunct is not transparent for extraction (akin to (6)/(7)). Extraction without previous adjunct movement is not possible (8c/d), suggesting that these adjuncts are DPs, whether covertly ((8c) – a light-headed relative; Citko 2004) or overtly ((8d) – a free relative, standardly analyzed as a DP; Caponigro 2002).

(8) a.   chlap, [CP2 **kterému**₁ [CP1 co(koliv) dáš t₁], [DP to tCP1] promrhá]
         man which.DAT what(ever) give.2SG it dawdles.away.3SG

    b. * chlap, [CP2 **kterému**₁ [DP **to** [CP1 co dáš t₁], promrhá tDP]
         man which.DAT that what give.2SG dawdles.away.3SG

    c. * chlap, [CP2 **kterému**₁ promrhá [DP [CP1 co(koliv) dáš t₁]]
         man which.DAT dawdles.away.3SG what(ever) give.2SG

    d. * chlap, [CP2 **kterému**₁ promrhá [DP **to** [CP1 co dáš t₁]]
         man which.DAT dawdles.away.3SG that what give.2SG

The pattern in (8) – based on (3) – generalizes to (1) and (2), yielding a strong argument in favor of treating right-peripheral clausal adjuncts as DPs (or PPs). A subpart of the pattern is showed in (9).

(9) a.   člověk, [CP2 **kterému**₁ [CP1 když to dáš t₁], [DP tak tCP1] tě tam pustí].
         man which.DAT when it give.2SG so you.ACC there let.in.3

    b. * člověk, [CP2 **kterému**₁ tě tam pustí [DP [CP1 když to dáš t₁]]].
         man which.DAT you.ACC there let.in.3 when it give.2SG

Note that the contrast between (9a) and (9b) cannot be explained by different directions of the adjunct merger and connectedness (Kayne 1983) because Czech is an SVO language and extraction from adjuncts merged to the right (supposed for (9b)) should be grammatical. The unacceptability of (9b) cannot be based on distance (memory) either, as demonstrated by (10).

(10) To je ten člověk, **kterého**₁ když mu dáme dost peněz, naši nepřátelé nenajdou t₁.
     it is the man which.ACC when him give.1PL enough money our enemies NEG.find.3PL
     'This is the man, who our enemies will not find if we give him enough money.'

As to the difference in possibility of extraction from NP between the clausal adjunct and the *wh*P contained in the clausal adjunct, we follow Bošković's (2015) conception of the PIC according to which only the immediate domain of the phase head is accessible to operations outside of the phase. Thus, while movement of the adjunct CP itself out of NP (DP) is allowed, as in (1)-(3), (8a) and (9a), movement of the *wh*P from SpecCP of the adjunct clause to SpecNP violates Antilocality independently of whether the whole piece of structure is fronted, as in (8b), (6) and (7), or is not, as in (8c-d) and (9b). This problem, however, does not arise when the adjunct clause is fronted and the dominating NP (DP) stranded, as in (1)-(3), (8a) and (9a) (the exact landing position of the fronted adjunct (CP₁) in the decomposed structure of the left periphery of the matrix clause (CP₂) – which is important for the locality of the extraction movement of the *wh*P – will be discussed in the talk).