

In Werner Abraham, ed. 2005. *Focus on Germanic Typology*.
Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 131-144.

Cedric Boeckx (HARVARD) & Kleantes K. Grohmann (CYPRUS)

Left dislocation in Germanic

Abstract

Left dislocation constructions seem to come in very different shapes with very different properties across languages. We concentrate on the shapes occurring in Germanic and argue for a unified movement analysis which distinguishes contrastive left dislocation from hanging topic left dislocation in that only the former involves Agree on top of Match between the left dislocate and the resuming pronominal. Under such an approach, the variety in shapes and properties observed breaks down to a tight similarity from which the diverging patterns fall out in a straightforward fashion.

1. The phenomenon of left dislocation

While the well-known phenomenon of *clitic left dislocation* has received considerable attention in the generative literature (see among many others CINQUE 1977, 1990: ch. 2 for Italian and AOUN & BENMAMOUN 1998 for Lebanese Arabic), non-clitic, *contrastive left dislocation* of the type as it appears in Germanic has not enjoyed the same theoretical success, though there are recent attempts of resuscitation of some of the issues involved. GROHMANN (1997, 2000, 2003), on whose studies this contribution heavily relies, partly fills this gap by contrasting the properties of two types of left-dislocation constructions in German, also addressing some pertinent concerns in other Germanic dialects.¹

The aim of this paper is to account for essentially the following paradigm:

- (1) a. Diesen Frosch, den hat die Prinzessin gestern geküßt.
this.ACC frog RP.ACC has the princess yesterday kissed
'This frog, the princess kissed (it) yesterday.'

¹ See GROHMANN (2003: 174-175) for comprehensive references as well as ALTMANN (1981) for early, FREY (2004) for more recent discussion of the German phenomenon, and the collection of papers old and new in ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, VAN RIEMSDIJK & ZWARTS (1997), including ample references cited.

- b. Dieser Frosch, den hat die Prinzessin gestern geküßt.
this.NOM frog RP.ACC has the princess yesterday kissed
 ‘This frog, the princess kissed it yesterday.’

The construction in (1a) is traditionally known as contrastive left dislocation (henceforth, CLD):² an XP is LDed to the left periphery of the clause and co-indexed with a pronominal element; in German, this element is a d(emonstrative)-pronoun, which is homomorphous with the determiner. The d-pronoun is standardly taken to be a resumptive pronoun (RP). (1a) stands in direct contrast with the construction in (1b), where the LDed element and RP do not match in Case (glancing over apparent preferences for the RPs’ position). (1b) is known as *nominativus pendens*, *Freies Thema*, or, the term we employ, Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD). The aim of this paper is to provide an adequate analysis of both CLD and HTLD, with special emphasis on their respective derivational histories. On a theoretical level, we argue for a unified movement analysis which differs in its ancillary operations of Agree and Match. Typologically, this enables us to account for the phenomenon of left dislocation across the Germanic languages collectively.

It should be noted that we focus on German examples for two reasons. First, German is the only Germanic language with a fully functioning paradigm of morphological case (save Icelandic); as such, the crucial difference in case distinctions can be seen most clearly in this representative of the Germania. Second, and with this provocative comment we hope to spark further research, we believe that at this point there is not much of interest to be gained from looking at German’s siblings and cousins (but see below); with a bit of luck, we will be proven wrong before long by fruitful research in this domain.

Naturally, this does not mean that other dialects don’t have left dislocation — they do. Let us illustrate. Noted as early as VAN RIEMSDIJK & ZWARTS (1997), a seminal paper which initiated some interest in the mid to late Seventies, left dislocation structures do, of course, exist in Dutch. They concentrate on the difference between (2a) and (2b):

² The term “contrastive (left) dislocation” was arguably first used by THRÁINSSON (1979) and has recently come under criticism for German from FREY (2004), who simply calls it “German left dislocation.”

- (2) a. De Hollanders, die zijn te flegmatiek.
the Dutch they are to phlegmatic
 ‘The Dutch (, they) are too phlegmatic.’
- b. Dat portret, ik geloof niet dat hij het nog heeft.
that portrait I believe not that he it still has
 ‘That portrait, I don’t think that he still has it.’

In Dutch, too, we can observe two different pronominal forms resuming the left dislocate: (2a) contains a d-pronoun, (2b) a p(ersonal)-pronoun analogous to German. However, in the absence of case distinctions, we cannot observe the same distributional patterns as in German. As a matter of fact, the d-pronoun is restricted to a “high” occurrence, while the p-pronoun appears in a “low” position. In topological field theory, prevalent in much of the German grammatical tradition, *high* occurrence equals the *Vorfeld*, the position in the ‘prefield’ roughly correlating to CP; it is the constituent that immediately precedes V2, the verb in second position. The *low* position is some structural position within the *Mittelfeld*, the ‘middlefield’ (roughly, between V2 and the sentence-final non-finite verb form, in more modern terms some position between C and V).

In fact, one might be tempted to descriptively correlate the low occurrence of a resuming personal pronominal form (p-pronoun) with the above-mentioned hanging topic construction (HTLD) and the high occurrence of a d-pronoun with contrastive dislocation (CLD); this is essentially the Dutch pattern and that found in many other dialects (such as Frisian or West Flemish). Other varieties of Germanic, however, don’t seem to show this morphological distinction in RPs. Consider Icelandic, from ZAENEN (1997):

- (3) a. fiessi hringur, Ólafur hefur lofað Maríu honum.
this.NOM ring.NOM Olaf has promised Mary.DAT it.DAT
- b. fiessum hring, honum hefur Ólafur lofað Maríu.
this.DAT ring.DAT it.DAT has Olaf promised Mary.DAT
 ‘This ring, Olaf promised (it) to Mary.’

In this case, the RP is in both cases identical to the p-pronoun; there is no resuming d-form in Icelandic. As the examples so far show, all patterns are found across the Germanic languages: (i) CLD and HTLD with (ii) low and high resumptives of (iii) both the d- and p-pronominal variety as well as (iv) with Case-matching and without.³ As the reader can already deduce from the translations offered above (where we adopt the convention of (3) in the following), English, too, makes a distinction between (HT) left dislocation and a structurally as well as derivationally quite different type of preposing structure, topicalization: when English employs an RP, it resembles in all relevant aspects HTLD of the other Germanic dialects, and when it doesn't use an RP at all, it acts, looks and feels like CLD — or in other words, there is a striking similarity between topicalization and CLD distinct from HTLD, and English simply lacks the formal way of marking CLD.

Terminology aside, GROHMANN pursues and refines this descriptive state of affairs extensively in his work. It can easily be observed that only German employs all options in (nearly) all possible ways. This shall serve as ample justification to focus on German in the remainder of our Germanic discussion, with the analysis lending itself naturally to cross-Germanic extension. We will focus on the *nearly*-property of all possible ways and suggest theoretical means to capture the differences and missing patterns.

2. Two kinds of CLLD

Because the aforementioned construction known as clitic left dislocation (CLLD), which does not occur at all in the Germanic languages and dialects, has been subject to intensive scrutiny over the years, we find it useful to note some properties of CLLD that will be instrumental for an analysis of CLD. We illustrate with AOUN & BENMAMOUN

³ For an extension to left dislocation inside nominals in Dutch, West Flemish and (dialects of) Norwegian, see GROHMANN & HAEGEMAN (2003), elaborated and extended to German in GROHMANN (2003: ch. 6). The Dutch construction in (i) illustrates the type of structure we have in mind:

- (i) Jan_i, die_i z' n_i late vertrek
Jan that his late departure
 'Jan's late departure'

(1998), who examine in detail patterns of CLLD in Lebanese Arabic. In particular, they focus on how CLLD interacts with other A-bar processes such as topicalization and Wh-movement. (The latter is traditionally considered the operation that subsumes the former.)

As in many languages, CLLD is characterized by the fronting of an NP to the beginning of the clause and the presence of an argumental clitic related to (i.e. resuming) the fronted NP. (4) illustrates CLLD in Lebanese Arabic:

- (4) Naadya jeef-a Kariim mbeerih.
Nadia saw.3SG.M-her Karim yesterday
 ‘Nadia, Karim saw her yesterday.’

As in other contexts of resumption in Lebanese Arabic, the weak RP related to the LDed NP, the dislocate, is insensitive to islands::

- (5) Sməʕt ʔanno Naadya rəht [mən duun ma təhke maʕ-a].
heard.1SG that Nadia left.2SG.M without C talking.2SG with-her
 ‘I heard that Nadia, you left without talking to her.’

Wh-movement and topicalization (when not accompanied by an RP) behave much as they do in English and are sensitive to islands. Both Wh-movement and topicalization are possible across a left dislocate, as in (6)-(7).

- (6) fu Naadya (sməʕte ʔanno) xabbaruw-a?
what Nadia heard.2SG.M that told.3PL-her
 ‘What, Nadia, did (you hear that) they tell(/told) her?’
- (7) Nəkte Naadya (sməʕte ʔanno) xabbaruw-a.
joke Nadia heard.2SG.M that told.3PL-her
 ‘A joke, Nadia, did (you hear that) they tell(/told) her.’

However, AOUN & BENMAMOUN observe that Wh-movement (and topicalization) across a left dislocate is ungrammatical if the dislocate is separated from the RP by an island. Witness (8), where Wh-movement is involved:

- (8) **ʃu Naadya xabbaro Kariim [ʔabl ma ʃeef-a] ʔanno*
what Nadia told.3PL Karim before C saw.3SG.M-her that
l-mʕallme ʔaalit?
the-teacher.F said.3SG.F
 ‘What, Nadia, did they tell Karim before he saw her that the teacher said?’

AOUN & BENMAMOUN show that a similar contrast obtains in the case of long distance Wh-movement/topicalization. If the CLLDed element is not separated from the RP by an island, the long-distance operation is fine (9). If, however, the dislocate is separated from the RP by an island, Wh-movement/topicalization across it gives rise to deviance (10).

- (9) *ʃu sməʕte ʔanno Naadya xabbaruw-a*
what heard.2SG.M that Nadia told.3PL-her
 ‘What did you hear that Nadia, they told her?’
- (10) **ʃu sməʕt ʔanno Naadya xabbaro Kariim [ʔabl ma ʃeef-a]*
what heard.2SG.M that Nadia told.3PL Karim before C saw.3SG.M-her
ʔanno l-mʕallme ʔaalit?
that the-teacher.F said.3SG.F
 ‘What did you hear that Nadia they told Karim before he saw her that the teacher said?’

Summing up, an A-bar dependency can be created across CLLD as long as the dislocate is not separated from the RP it is related to by an island. AOUN & BENMAMOUN’s interpretation of this generalization is that CLLD may be a case of either base-generation or movement. In island contexts, the movement option is unavailable, hence the patterns of interacting A-bar dependencies above. AOUN & BENMAMOUN further justify their dual analysis of CLLD by noting that reconstruction effects with resumption are found only in non-island contexts (see also AOUN, CHOUEIRI & HORNSTEIN 2001, AOUN & LI 2003), that is, in contexts where movement can take place, opening the possibility of reconstruction by leaving a copy of the moving element behind. Consider (11) vs. (12):

- (11) Təlmiiz_j-a_i l-kəsleen ma baddna nxabbir [wala m^ʕallme]_j ʔənno
student-her the-bad NEG want.1PL told.1PL no teacher that
 ha-l-maʔzduub_j za^ʕbar b-l-faħS.
3PL-the-idiot cheated.3SM in-the-exam
 ‘Her bad student, we didn’t tell any teacher that this idiot cheated on the exam.’
- (12) *Təlmiiz_j-a_i l-kəsleen ma ħkiina maz [wala m^ʕallme]_j [ʔabl-ma
student-her the-bad NEG talked.1PL with no teacher before
 ha-l-malzduub_j yuuSal].
the-idiot arrive
 ‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before the idiot arrived.’

Let’s now turn back to German(ic) and revisit the types of left dislocation noted above.

3. Two kinds of Germanic LD

GROHMANN (1997, 2000, 2003) essentially entertains the same dual analysis for Germanic as AOUN & BENMAMOUN, with CLD being the movement and HTLD the base-generation structure. Before examining some of the tests GROHMANN brings to bear on the issue, let us note a distinction between CLD and HTLD that will be relevant shortly.

Consider the somewhat fuller paradigm in (13)-(15), where the a-examples extend the basic paradigm of (1) above and the b-examples contain the weak pronominal *es* which is independently known not to occur in the *Vorfeld*:

- (13) a. [Diesen Frosch], den/*ihn hat [TP die Prinzessin geküßt].
this.ACC frog RP.ACC/him has the princess kissed
 ‘This frog, the princess kissed (it).’
- b. [Dieses Buch], das/*es sollten [TP wir Martin geben].
this.ACC book RP.ACC/it should we Martin give
 ‘This book, we should give (it) to Martin.’

- (14) a. [Dieser Frosch], den/*ihn hat [_{TP} die Prinzessin geküßt].
this.NOM frog RP.ACC/him has the princess kissed
 ‘This frog, the princess kissed him.’
- b. [Dieses Buch], das/*es sollten [_{TP} wir Martin geben].
this.NOM book RP.ACC/it should we Martin give
 ‘This book, we should give it to Martin.’
- (15) a. [Diese-r/-n Frosch], [_{TP} die Prinzessin hat den/ihn geküßt].
- b. [Dieses Buch], [_{TP} wir sollten das/es Martin geben].

As already noted above, in some cases dislocate and RP agree in Case, in others they don't. Of special interest here is that in the structures (13), where both do agree, the RP is outside TP if we take the subject position to demarcate the boundary between ‘C-domain’ and ‘T-domain’ (see GROHMANN 2003 for discussion). We can observe that in situations where Case-matching fails, a p-pronoun may be used in addition to a d-pronoun, and that the RP may be either high (above TP) or low (inside TP). The high occurrence of an RP is often equated with a topic position, giving rise to the verb-second structure observed in the clause following the dislocate.⁴ When the RP is low, Case-matching may be available. For reasons discussed in detail in GROHMANN (2000, 2003), we take both Case-identity and position of RP to be indicators of LD-type. In particular, we claim that low RP signals HTLD. High RPs are compatible with HTLD only in situations of Case-mismatch. In other words, (13) exemplifies CLD, (14) and (15) HTLD.

GROHMANN argues further that CLD is the result of movement (like topicalization), whereas HTLD arises from base-generation. Two core facts which he substantiates his claim with are reconstruction asymmetries and island asymmetries.⁵

⁴ FREY (2004) makes the case for a TP-internal topic position for RPs that in some instances may appear in an apparently low position, yet behave in all respects like a pronominal resuming a CLDed element. We take FREY's research as an indicator of well-motivated revived interest in the topic matter and hope for fruitful results in this area, including further discussion of such topic position(s).

⁵ See GROHMANN's work for additional tests. The tests illustrated here were chosen to highlight the parallelism between German and Lebanese Arabic presented in section 2.

3.1. Reconstruction asymmetries

The examples in this subsection show that CLD exhibits reconstruction effects for Binding Condition C, whereas HTLD does not. When dislocate and RP agree in Case, coreference of the R-expression inside and a subject pronoun is impossible, but when there is no Case-agreement, coreference is fine. As the translation shows, the same applies to English topicalization. (Intended coreference is indicated with underlining.)

- (16) a. **[Der Freundin, die Martin geholfen hat], der gab er einen Kuß.*
the.DAT friend who Martin helped has RP.DAT gave he a kiss
 ‘*The friend who helped Martin, he gave a kiss.’
- b. *[Die Freundin, die Martin geholfen hat], der gab er einen Kuß.*
the.NOM friend who Martin helped has RP.DAT gave he a kiss
 ‘The friend who helped Martin, he gave her a kiss.’

Given that CLD involves movement of the dislocate from a lower position within the clause, there would be a Condition C violation if the CLDed element could reconstruct in (16a). The R-expression in base-generated HTLD may freely be coreferent with the lower pronoun as it would never be in its domain.

The same can be witnessed in cases of long-distance LD for Case-agreement or absence thereof as well as high and low RPs (italicized).

- (17) a. **[Der Frau, die Martin geholfen hat], *der* sagte sein*
the.DAT woman who Martin helped has RP.DAT said his
Bruder, gab er einen Kuß.
brother gave he a kiss
 ‘*The woman who helped Martin_i, her said his_i brother he_i gave a kiss.’
- b. *[Die Frau, die Martin geholfen hat], *der* sagte sein*
the.NOM woman who Martin helped has RP.DAT said his
Bruder, gab er einen Kuß.
brother gave he a kiss

- c. [Die Frau, die Martin geholfen hat], sein Bruder sagte, er
the.NOM woman who Martin helped has his brother said he
 gab *ihr* einen Kuß.
gave her a kiss
 ‘The woman who helped Martin_i, his_i brother said he_i gave her a kiss.’

These data suggest that both properties play a role, Case-matching between dislocate and RP on the one hand (17a-b) and high vs. low position of the RP on the other (17c). Further connectedness effects are discussed in GROHMANN (2003: ch. 4, sect. 3.2).

3.2. Island asymmetries

German LD allows violation of a Wh-island (18), and of the adjunct island (19), but crucially only if the RP is low.

- (18) a. [Diesem Frosch], was hat die Prinzessin dem gegeben?
this.DAT frog what has the princess RP.DAT given
 ‘This frog, what did the princess give to *(him)?’
- b. [Diesen Frosch], wer glaubt der Bauer, hat den geküßt?
this.ACC frog who believes the farmer has RP.ACC kissed
 ‘This frog, who does the farmer believe kissed *(him)?’
- (19) a. [Der schöne Mann], Martin haßt die Tatsache, dass den
the.NOM handsome man Martin hates the fact that RP.ACC
 die Frau geküßt hat.
the woman kissed hat
- b. [Der schöne Mann], Martin haßt die Tatsache, dass die Frau
the.NOM handsome man Martin hates the fact that the woman
 ihn geküßt hat.
him kissed hat
 ‘The handsome man, Martin hates the fact that the woman kissed *(him).’

The data fall out as expected if HTLD (the only LD-type compatible with a low RP) is an instance of base-generation, akin to the English translations indicated (which only has movement-derived topicalization or base-generated HTLD). Contrast this state of affairs with the CLD examples in (20)-(21).

- (20) a. *[Diesem Frosch], <dem> was <dem> hat die Prinzessin gegeben?
 ‘*This frog, what did the princess give to?’
 b. *[Diesen Frosch], <den> wer <den> glaubt der Bauer hat geküßt?
 ‘*This frog, who does the farmer believe kissed?’
- (21) *[Den schönen Mann], den haßt Martin die Tatsache, dass die
the.ACC handsome man RP.ACC hates Martin the fact that the
 Frau geküßt hat.
woman kissed hat
 ‘*The handsome man, Martin hates the fact that the woman kissed.’

If the hanging topic is base-generated, island effects will certainly fall out immediately.

4. Against base-generation

BOECKX (2003a) argues that despite conflicting evidence emerging from locality conditions, a unified approach to resumption is warranted. Although the fact that some RPs, but not others, are sensitive to islands suggests that some RPs relate to their antecedents by movement, while other RPs favor a base-generation analysis, BOECKX catalogs a series of facts that directly argue against a hybrid theory of resumption. In particular, irrespective of their behavior in island contexts, RPs are subject to some solid cross-linguistic generalizations (see BOECKX’s work for illustration).

For instance, irrespective of island (in)sensitivity, RPs appear to trigger a specific reading on the antecedent and seem to be compatible with discourse-linked interrogatives only (see also BOECKX & GROHMANN 2003). A second important generalization about

RPs is that many properties of resumption can be shown to depend on the complementizer system of the language, and not on properties of the pronouns themselves. Third, a vast majority of the languages that make use of RPs isolate the subject position, either by restricting RPs to that position (like Vata, for example) or by banning them from that position (as e.g. Irish and Hebrew do).

On the whole, we think that the importance of the island data has been overestimated. As BOECKX shows in detail, a unified theory of resumption is attainable. Such a theory should be movement-based (for further motivation see HORNSTEIN 2001 or the rigorous pursuit of minimalist desiderata presented in GROHMANN 2003: ch. 2, for example). To make it work, BOECKX takes as its starting point CHOMSKY's (2000: 122) *Probe-Goal* model of syntactic relations, summarized in (22).

- (22) a. Features *Match*
 ⇒ ex.: ϕ -features on a subject NP match those on finite T^0
- b. (Properties of) Features trigger *Agree*
 ⇒ ex.: the value(s) of the ϕ -features of the subject NP are transmitted to T^0
- c. (Properties of) Features trigger *Move*
 ⇒ ex.: the subject NP raises to SpecTP

Following CHOMSKY (2001: 5), we take *Match* to be a relation holding of two items sharing a feature. To illustrate, there is a [Wh]-feature on C that matches the [Wh]-feature on the Wh-word that ultimately raises (e.g. in a question like *What did John buy?*). *Agree* is a potentially long-distance agreement relation holding between two elements (which CHOMSKY calls *Probe* and *Goal*) that have matching features. *Move* is a function of the ill-understood EPP-property of a probe that demands that a goal be remerged into its specifier. Taken together, *Match*, *Agree* and *Move* characterize displacement phenomena in natural languages. The presence of uninterpretable features on an element turns it into a *Probe*. *Match* determines what kind of category the *Probe* seeks (one with a matching feature F). *Agree* establishes the feature checking relation between *Probe* and *Goal* (F on

the Goal values F on the Probe). The EPP property determines whether the Probe offers a (specifier) position for Move.

In various works (BOECKX 2003a, 2003b, in press, BOECKX & JEONG 2002), BOECKX has argued for the need to depart from CHOMSKY's assumptions just stated. In particular, he argues that Agree cannot take place in the absence of Match, which seems uncontroversial. He also assumes that Match is a prerequisite for EPP-satisfaction (recall that the EPP is not an independent feature, but a property of a feature). But unlike CHOMSKY, BOECKX does not take Agree to be a prerequisite for Move (see also BOBALJK & WURMBRAND 2003 for keeping Move and Agree as distinct operations, not parasitic upon one another). In particular, he provides extensive arguments in favor of allowing Move to take place solely under Match.

To mention just a few exemplary instances, across languages the distinction between Match and Agree is responsible for the distribution of inflected and uninflected complementizers, Case-(mis)matching between an RP and its antecedent, distinct locality effects (in particular, apparent island-violations), and possibly (anti-)reconstruction effects (BOECKX & HORNSTEIN 2004). We will not detail the differences that result from forming chains via pure Match vs. Match + Agree.

Rather, we would like to suggest that HTLD is the result of movement of the LDed antecedent away from its RP-associate (in effect, a case of stranding), as depicted in (23), where angled brackets indicate the lower trace/copy of the moved element.

(23) NP_i ... [TP ... [DP RP [<NP_i>]] ...]

Movement of NP in (23) takes place under Match only, i.e. without Agree. As a result (for reasons detailed in BOECKX's work), it evades island effects, and does not license reconstruction (understood as the interpretation of the lower copy of NP). In addition, for the movement to be licit, no agreement between the NP and the RP is allowed to take place — hence, the Case-mismatch between the RP and the hanging topic NP; the NP receives default Case (nominative in German).

CLD proceeds differently. In particular, we assume that Agree is involved in such cases, hence the presence of islands effects and reconstruction, but also Case-identity between dislocate and RP. For present purposes, we follow GROHMANN (1997, 2000, 2003) in taking the RP in such cases to be a (minimal) spell-out of the lower copy of the moving NP, as sketched in (24). (For a slightly different implementation that maintains a stricter parallelism between (23) and (24), see BOECKX 2003a: ch. 4, sect. 4.4.1.)

(24) $NP_i (\dots) [\langle NP_i \rangle \Rightarrow RP] \dots [TP \dots \langle NP_i \rangle \dots]$

The *Copy Spell Out* analysis of CLD captures the fact that for all intents and purposes, the RP acts as a copy of the NP. Because Copy Spell Out is licensed only in cases where movement is too local (see GROHMANN 2000, 2003 for detail), it limits the strategy in (24) to those cases where the RP is a high pronoun (within an articulated Comp or CP).

The main point of this section is that we do not need to resort to a dual, base-generation vs. movement analysis to capture the differences between HTLD and CLD. The independently motivated distinction between Match and Agree suffices to do so, while it allows us to maintain a unified, movement-based analysis of left dislocation in Germanic. As a result of the technical details of this analysis, our analysis of HTLD will also counter FREY'S (2004) quibbles with GREWENDORF'S (2002) "Big DP"-approach, of which the current proposal is a refinement (see also KAYNE 2002). The parallelism between HTLD and CLD as suggested by GREWENDORF is too simplistic and overgenerates, a problem the present proposals circumvents. We take this conjecture to be a further ingredient of our attempt to revitalize deeper research — empirically as well as theoretically — on the issue of left dislocation in Germanic.

To conclude this section we would like to point out that the movement analysis of HTLD accounts for an important, and to our knowledge novel, observation made in GROHMANN (2003). He notes that in instances of multiple HTLD (with the right intonation certainly possible, unlike CLD; cf. fn. 6 below), the order of RPs mirrors that of full noun phrases in German if they show up in their d-form, and that of pronouns if in p-form.

It is well known among Germanicists that pronouns occurring in the *Mittelfeld* are subject to a strict ordering pattern in form of a pronominal hierarchy (cf. LENERZ 1977, 2001). Thus in the unmarked case, when no additional effects come into play (such as intonation/stress, topic/focus, theme/rheme structure etc.), the ordering among personal pronouns is subject >> direct object >> indirect object (or NOM >> ACC >> DAT in the canonical case). We're not interested in pinpointing specific positions in the clause structure. Rather we take the *Mittelfeld* to correlate with the rough structure of TP in (23)-(24) above, below V2 which sits somewhere within CP.

(26) illustrates with an embedded clause, where V2 does not have any effects. This stands in opposition to full (definite argument) phrases, as (25) shows; marked orders are signaled by the hash mark '!'.

- (25) a. ... weil die Mutter dem Alex den Wagen geschenkt hat.
 since the.NOM mother the.DAT Alex the.ACC car given has
 '... since the mother gave the car to Alex.'
- b. !... weil die Mutter den Wagen dem Alex geschenkt hat.
 c. !... weil dem Alex die Mutter den Wagen geschenkt hat.
 d. !... weil dem Alex den Wagen die Mutter geschenkt hat.
 e. !... weil den Wagen die Mutter dem Alex geschenkt hat.
 f. !... weil den Wagen dem Alex die Mutter geschenkt hat.
- (26) a. ... weil sie ihn ihm geschenkt hat.
 since she.NOM him[it].ACC him.DAT given has
 '... since she gave it to him.'
- b. !... weil sie ihm ihn geschenkt hat.
 c. !... weil ihn sie ihm geschenkt hat.
 d. !... weil ihn ihm sie geschenkt hat.
 e. !... weil ihm sie ihn geschenkt hat.
 f. !... weil ihm ihn sie geschenkt hat.

Observe now that resuming d-pronouns adhere to the unmarked order of full phrases, as (25), regardless of the order of hanging topics if there is more than one:⁶

- (27) [Der Alex]_i, [der Wagen]_j, [seine Mutter]_k,
the.NOM Alex the.NOM car the.NOM mother
- a. gestern hat die_k dem_i den_j geschenkt.
yesterday has RP.NOM RP.DAT RP.ACC given
 ‘Alex, the car, the mother, yesterday, she gave it to him.’
- b. *gestern hat die_k den_j dem_i geschenkt.
- c. *gestern hat dem_i die_k den_j geschenkt.
- d. *gestern hat dem_i den_j die_k geschenkt.
- e. *gestern hat dem_i die_k den_j geschenkt.
- f. *gestern hat dem_i den_j die_k geschenkt.

The data in (27) are puzzling if RPs are treated as pronouns linked to their antecedent in a non-movement fashion. However, they fall out straightforwardly from the analysis above, which treats HTLD as a movement process. Recall from (23) that at some point, the antecedent NP and its RP associate form a full DP structure. It is at that point that the ordering restrictions noted in (27) are determined, prior to movement of the LDed NP.

Now, one might hold that what these data show is that hanging topics simply do not properly belong to the clause they occur with, that they are outside the clausal domain. We do not want to specify the position of the dislocates in this article (GROHMANN 2000, 2003 assumes the dislocate to sit in a specifier within the C-domain in CLD and in an adjoined position in HTLD), but we do want to address the issue of belonging. If the hanging topic did not belong to the clause, one would expect the pronominal ordering without further ado, since we know that d-pronouns are heavier and more tonal than the weak p-pronouns.

However, as BOECKX’s work on resumption shows an integrated account is warranted even in contexts that have traditionally been assumed to be void of any (movement)

⁶ WERNER ABRAHAM (p.c.) calls such multiple hanging topics *themata pendencia in extremo*, a fitting term since multiple HTLD calls for special contextual licensing. We address their relevance presently.

dependencies. Methodologically, this is a desired result, since we do not have to evoke additional assumptions (such as linking rules) or unwanted entities (such as specific, grammar-internal constructs; see also HORNSTEIN 2001, GROHMANN 2003). In particular, BOECKX (2003c) applies the Match-Agree approach to donkey anaphora and thus demonstrates how apparently clause-external relationships can be integrated into a general theory of grammar conforming to independently motivated operations.

5. Final remarks

Types of LD, as first studied by ROSS (1967), are interesting for a variety of reasons. For one, they seem to express the same semantic, i.e. truth-conditional relation that topicalization does, thus are formally similar to the latter construction. But unlike topicalization, LD involves resuming the LDed element somewhere lower in the clause. This strategy presumably accounts for the pragmatic, functional differences observed between the two phenomena (as BIRNER & WARD 1998 show).

With regard to resumption, languages either express this with a clitic (such as Romance languages and Arabic) or with a different pronominal element which is specially marked; in German, this is canonically the demonstrative form. Aside from the form of resumption, the position of the resumptive element varies. In German, the language of our main focus, the resumptive is either in a high position or in a low position. We identified the high position with a topic position and the low position with the canonical argument position.

However, apart from these descriptive facts, types of LD also pose a real problem: there seem to be different strategies of LDing elements, not only cross-linguistically but also within a given language, so how can we distinguish the two? And if it turns out that we can, what does this show us?

We have argued in favor of a unified movement-based analysis of HTLD and CLD in German, and showed how the differences between the two strategies fall out from

independently motivated processes, such as movement under pure Match or Copy Spell Out. In so doing, we have incorporated Germanic LD into the rich landscape of resumption detailed in BOECKX (2003a) and GROHMANN (2003).

Beyond the rhetoric espoused throughout, we hope to have empirically supported our provocative introductory remarks. In light of the theoretical proposal presented in section 4, it now remains to be seen whether one can revisit the corresponding structures in German's numerous relatives. Just as we relied on a comparison with CLLD found in Lebanese Arabic (but also closer to home, such as the Romance languages or Greek), it might be instrumental to scrutinize the arising patterns not only from a pan-, but also from a per-Germanic comparison. We have in mind such interesting facts such as the following from mainland Scandinavian. As Marit Julien (p.c.) remarks, a subject or a left dislocate can be resumed in the right periphery of the clause. (28) illustrates with Norwegian.

- (28) a. Jeg har sett den filmen, jeg.
I have seen the film.DEF I
- b. *Jeg har sett den filmen, den.
I have seen the film.DEF the
 'I have seen the film.'
- (29) a. Den filmen, den har jeg sett, jeg.
the film.DEF this have I seen I
- b. Den filmen, den har jeg sett, den.
the film.DEF this have I seen the
 'The film, I have seen.'

We leave further interpretation as food for thought. It strikes us, however, that here we might have to integrate considerations not only pertaining to left, but also to right dislocation, another phenomenon (more widely) found in Romance languages, for example (see VILLALBA 2000 for a recent in-depth empirical treatment of right dislocation in Romance and beyond, and a theoretical comparison with left dislocation).

References

ACC	accusative	LD	left dislocation
C	complementizer	M	masculine
CLD	contrastive left dislocation	NEG	negation
CLLD	clitic left dislocation	NOM	nominative
DAT	dative	NP	Noun Phrase
DEF	definite	PL	plural
DP	Determiner Phrase	RP/RP	resumptive pronoun
F	feminine	SG	singular
HTLD	hanging topic left dislocation	TP	Tense Phrase

References

- ALTMANN, HANS (1981). *Formen der "Herausstellung" im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, Freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, ELENA; VAN RIEMSDIJK, HENK & ZWARTS, FRANS (eds.) (1997): *Materials on left dislocation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- AOUN, JOSEPH & BENMAMOUN, ELABBAS (1998): Minimality, reconstruction and PF-movement, in: *Linguistic Inquiry* 29.4, 569-597.
- AOUN, JOSEPH; CHOUËIRI, LINA & HORNSTEIN, NORBERT (2001): Resumption, movement and derivational economy, in: *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.3, 371-403.
- AOUN, JOSEPH & LI, YEN-HUI AUDREY (2003): *Essays on the representational and derivational nature of grammar: The diversity of Wh-constructions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- BIRNER, BETTY J. & WARD, GREGORY (1998): *Information status and noncanonical word order*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- BOBALJK, JONATHAN DAVID & WURMBRAND, SUSANNE (2003): Relativized phases. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- BOECKX, CEDRIC (2003a): *Islands and chains*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- BOECKX, CEDRIC (2003b): Symmetries and asymmetries in multiple checking, in: BOECKX, CEDRIC & GROHMANN, KLEANTHES K. (eds.), *Multiple Wh-fronting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17-26.
- BOECKX, CEDRIC (2003c): (In)direct binding, in: *Syntax* 6.3, 213-236.
- BOECKX, CEDRIC (in press): Case matters and minimalist concerns, in: HORNSTEIN, NORBERT & URIAGEREKA, JUAN (eds.), *The minimalist fact*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- BOECKX, CEDRIC & GROHMANN, KLEANTHES K. (2003): Introduction, in: BOECKX, CEDRIC & GROHMANN, KLEANTHES K. (eds.), *Multiple Wh-fronting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-15.
- BOECKX, CEDRIC & HORNSTEIN, NORBERT (2004): Superiority, reconstruction, and islands. Ms., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. & University of Maryland, College Park.
- BOECKX, CEDRIC & JEONG, YOUNGMI (2002): The fine structure of syntactic intervention. Ms., University of Maryland, College Park.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (2000): Minimalist inquiries: The framework, in: MARTIN, ROGER; MICHAELS, DAVID & URIAGEREKA, JUAN (eds.), *Step by step. Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 89-155.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (2001): Derivation by phase, in: KENSTOWICZ, MICHAEL (ed.), *Ken Hale. A life in language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1-52.
- CINQUE, GUGLIELMO (1977): The movement nature of left dislocation, in: *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.2, 397-411.

- CINQUE, GUGLIELMO (1990): *Types of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- FREY, WERNER (2004): Notes on the syntax and the pragmatics of German left dislocation, in: LOHNSTEIN, HORST & TRISSLER, SUSANNE (eds.), *The syntax and semantics of the left periphery*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 203-233.
- GREWENDORF, GÜNTHER (2002): Left dislocation as movement, in: *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics* 2, 31–81.
- GROHMANN, KLEANTHES K. (1997): On left dislocation, in: *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 40, 1-33.
- GROHMANN, KLEANTHES K. (2000): A movement approach to contrastive left dislocation, in: *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 25, 3–65.
- GROHMANN, KLEANTHES K. (2003): *Prolific domains. On the anti-locality of movement dependencies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- GROHMANN, KLEANTHES K. & HAEGEMAN, LILIANE (2003): Resuming reflexives, in: *Nordlyd* 31.1, 46-62.
- HORNSTEIN, NORBERT (2001): *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- KAYNE, RICHARD S. (2002): Pronouns and their antecedents, in: EPSTEIN, SAMUEL DAVID & SEELY, T. DANIEL (eds.), *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*. Oxford: Blackwell, 133-166.
- LENERZ, JÜRGEN (1977): *Zur Abfolge nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- LENERZ, JÜRGEN (2001): Word order variation: Competition or co-operation, in: MÜLLER, GEREON & STERNEFELD, WOLFGANG (eds.), *Competition in syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 246-281.
- ROSS, JOHN R. (1967): Constraints on variables in syntax. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.
- VAN RIEMSDIJK, HENK & ZWARTS, FRANS (1997): Left dislocation in Dutch and status of copying rules, in: ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, VAN RIEMSDIJK & ZWARTS (eds), 119-148. [original manuscript from 1974]
- THRÁINSSON, HÖSKULDUR (1979): *On complementation in Icelandic*. New York: Garland.
- VILLALBA NICOLÁS, F. XAVIER (2000): The syntax of sentence periphery. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- ZAENEN, ANNE (1997): Contrastive dislocation in Dutch and Icelandic, in: ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, VAN RIEMSDIJK & ZWARTS (eds), 119-148. [original manuscript from the early 1980s]