

Copy Left Dislocation

Kleanthes K. Grohmann

University of Maryland, College Park

1. CLD vs. HTLD: A Difference in Derivations?

German has two types of left dislocation (LD), commonly referred to as *Contrastive Left Dislocation* (CLD) and *Hanging Topic Left Dislocation* (HTLD).¹ Independent of a syntactic framework, the following should show conclusively that the two are different in their syntactic nature; leaving aside framework-specific metaphors for displacement, it further suggests that CLD must be derived by movement of the LDed XP, while HTLD is not. In particular, I propose that the specific resumptive pronoun (RP) found in CLD is the spelled out copy of the LDed XP itself; spelling out of copies is needed as a repair strategy for an otherwise illegitimate movement. As such, LD structures across languages should be split into two types, whether they are derived by movement or whether they are base-generated. In this paper, I lay out the main properties in which CLD and HTLD differ; I also present a view on clause structure that incorporates spelling out of copies, suggesting *Copy Left Dislocation* as a more appropriate term for CLD. Lastly, I point to possible future avenues for the general picture developed.

CLD is characterized by obligatory Case-matching between the LDed XP and the RP; moreover, the RP occurs exclusively in high position (the ‘topic’ position, as we will see) and necessarily comes in the guise of a *d(emonstrative)*-pronoun. In contrast, Case-matching between LDed XP and RP in HTLD is not obligatory, and the hanging topic actually occurs preferably in nominative Case (hence the traditional term *nominativus pendens*); it may appear in high, mid or low position (like any other argument) and show up in the form of a *d-* or a *p(personal)*-pronoun.

(1) illustrates CLD, (2) and (3) HTLD; for reasons of space, I cannot discuss argument-PPs, adjuncts in LDed position or other strategies. (The LDed XP and the RP are indicated in italics and the RP is put in boldface.)

* I would like to thank the audiences in LA and elsewhere, as well as particularly Joseph Aoun, Norbert Hornstein and Dominique Sportiche. I received financial support from NSF-grant SBR9601559. All errors are mine and mine only.

1. I leave out further discussion of these labels and related issues. The classic literature on this topic, in which some of the properties presented here have been reported first in one form or another, includes Gundel (1974), van Riemsdijk and Zwarts (1974), Cinque (1977), Thráinsson (1979), Zaenen (1980), Vat (1981), van Haaften et al. (1983); see also the papers in Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997) for some recent perspectives and Grohmann (1997, 2000a) for longer precursors of this paper.

- (1) *Diesen Satz, den mag ich besonders.*
 this.ACC sentence RP.ACC like I especially
 ‘This sentence, [it,] I like especially.’
- (2) *Dieser Satz, # den mag ich besonders.*
 this.NOM sentence RP.ACC like I especially
 ‘This sentence, it, I like especially.’
- (3) *Dieser Satz, # ich mag ihn besonders.*
 this.NOM sentence I like him especially
 ‘This sentence, I like it especially.’

Another striking difference, which will simply be presupposed here and not further discussed, is an intonational break (‘#’) after the LDed XP in HTLD, while the “regular” verb second matrix structure connects without such in CLD. (Altmann 1981, for example, discusses this property in more detail.) For simplicity, I restrict myself to the discussion of the two varieties of HTLD depicted in (2) and (3); others are possible in some circumstances. The *d*-pronoun is glossed throughout as RP, the *p*-pronoun with its English counterpart. The structural difference between (2) and (3) is reflected in the translation, indicating that the RP is in topic position, as it is in (1) also (to be further addressed below). The bracketed pronoun in the translation of (1) will be left out completely in the remainder of the paper, suggesting the close relationship between CLD and topicalization. In other words, we will see that not only do German CLD and topicalization correspond to some extent, German CLD also finds its closest English counterpart in topicalized structures, while German HTLD arguably mirrors English LD structures.

The structure of this paper is as follows. The fact that CLD comes with obligatory Case-matching and shows clear connectedness effects related to this property point to a close relation between LDed XP, RP and original merging site: in the case of arguments, the VP-internal position (section 2). This hypothesis is further supported by other movement diagnostics, such as islands or idiom chunks (section 3). A natural final representation can be assigned to both CLD and HTLD, differing mainly in the position of the LDed XP: specifier vs. adjunct (section 4.) A natural movement analysis in terms of copy spell-out falls out from other desirable views on clause structure and derivation, as does the more articulated structure (section 5). I will conclude with some pointers to further research, tying in the current analysis with other LD-strategies across languages (section 6).

In a nutshell, I propose the following structures for data like (1) to (3), respectively, illustrating a derivational analysis of the relation between the CLDed XP and the RP; copies left behind by movement are struck through:

- (4) a. $[_{CP} \mathbf{XP} C^0 [_{TopP} \mathbf{XP} \Rightarrow \mathbf{RP} V [_{TP} \dots \mathbf{XP} \dots [_{VP} \dots \mathbf{XP} \dots]]]]$
 b. $[_{CP} \mathbf{XP} [_{CP} C^0 [_{TopP} \mathbf{RP} V [_{TP} \dots \mathbf{RP} \dots [_{VP} \dots \mathbf{RP} \dots]]]]]]$
 c. $[_{CP} \mathbf{XP} [_{CP} C^0 [_{TP} \text{subj} V \dots \mathbf{RP} \dots [_{VP} \dots \mathbf{RP} \dots]]]]]]$

2. Reconstruction Effects

One type of connectedness effects in CLD which might be the result of the difference in Case-matching between the two strategies comes from reconstruction, which in and of itself strongly suggests movement (see Fox 1999 and references). For earlier discussion of connectivity in Dutch LD structures (with mentioning of German in passing), see van Riemsdijk and Zwarts 1974, Vat 1981, van Haaften et al. 1983, or Anagnostopoulou 1997.

2.1. Weak Crossover

CLD allows bound variable readings of pronouns, in particular in a potential Weak Crossover (WCO) configuration arising from a quantificational element in the matrix clause and a pronominal element inside the LDed XP, illustrated here with a strong quantifier in subject position. In other words, CLD does not give rise to a WCO effect, strongly suggesting that the LDed XP may reconstruct at LF to a position from where it is c-commanded by the quantifier. This is shown in (5a); (5b) shows that this behaviour mirrors topicalization, well-known to obviate WCO effects in German (intended binding relations are indicated by underlining).

- (5) a. Seinen Vorgarten, **den** mag jeder Herforder Bürger.
 b. Seinen Vorgarten mag jeder Herforder Bürger.
 his front-lawn likes every Herfordian dweller
 ‘His front lawn, every Herfordian likes.’

HTLD, regardless of the nature and position of the RP, does not allow the bound variable reading; as this is the only reading of interest, we can ignore the fact that the structures in (6) are well-formed, just in case the pronoun inside the LDed XP refers to a specific person.

- (6) a. #Sein Vorgarten, **den** mag jeder Herforder Bürger.
 b. #Sein Vorgarten, jeder Herforder Bürger mag ihn.
 #‘His front lawn, every Herfordian likes it.’

This observation also holds across clauses, where the relevant element is extracted and must be interpreted inside the embedded clause:

- (7) a. Seinen Vorgarten, **den** glaubt jeder, kann er schön halten.
 b. Seinen Vorgarten glaubt jeder kann er schön halten.
 his front-lawn believes every can he pretty keep
 ‘His front lawn, everyone believes he can keep pretty.’

Moreover, it does not matter whether the RP in HTLD is also extracted (8a) or occurs in the embedded topic position (8a’):

- (8) a. *Sein Vorgarten, **den** glaubt jeder, kann er schön halten.
 a'. *Sein Vorgarten, jeder glaubt, **den** kann er schön halten.
 b. *Sein Vorgarten, jeder glaubt, er kann **ihn** schön halten.
 *‘His front lawn, everyone believes he can keep it pretty.’

The absence of WCO effects in these contexts can be captured if it is the LDed XP itself that undergoes movement from lower down in the structure in CLD, but not in HTLD, pointing to a derivational difference between CLDed XPs and hanging topics as well as the relevant RPs. Given the hypothesized structures in (4), we can see immediately that a moved XP may reconstruct into a position low enough to be bound by the quantifier in subject position; reconstruction of the RP in HTLD does not help.

2.2. Condition A

Similarly, only an anaphor inside a CLDed XP may be coreferent with a lower pronoun and/or an R-expression. Thus, the absence of Condition A effects further points to movement of the CLDed XP, as opposed to the hanging topic, on the same grounds (i.e. reconstruction). This can best be shown with the reciprocal *einander* ‘each other’; (9) illustrates for CLD and topicalization, and the minimal pair in (10) for HTLD:

- (9) a. *Freunden von einander, **denen** erzählen Herforder selten Lügen.*
 b. *Freunden von einander, erzählen Herforder selten Lügen.*
 friends of each-other tell Herfordians rarely lies
 ‘Friends of each other, Herfordians rarely tell lies (to).’
- (10) a. **Freunde von einander, **denen** erzählen Herforder selten Lügen.*
 b. **Freunde von einander, Herforder erzählen **ihnen** selten Lügen.*
 *‘Friends of each other, Herfordians rarely tell them lies.’

2.3. Condition C

If WCO and Condition A effects can be obviated by movement of the CLDed XP, we would now expect that an R-expression inside the LDed XP coreferent with a lower pronoun leads to ungrammaticality in CLD, but not in HTLD. Indeed, we can observe a Condition C effect only in CLD:

- (11) a. **Der Tatsache, daß Alex arm ist, **der** mißt er keine Bedeutung bei.*
 b. **Der Tatsache, daß Alex arm ist mißt er keine Bedeutung bei.*
 the fact that Alex poor is measures he no meaning PRT
 *‘The fact that Alex is poor, he doesn’t attach importance to.’

In HTLD, on the other hand, we find well-formedness on all levels; the absence of Condition C effects suggests base-generation of the HTLDed XP in its surface position and any relevant movement of the RP only.

- (12) a. *Die Tatsache, daß Alex arm ist, **der** mißt er keine Bedeutung bei.*
 b. *Die Tatsache, daß Alex arm ist, er mißt **ihr** keine Bedeutung bei.*
 ‘The fact that Alex is poor, he doesn’t attach importance to it.’

This section has shown that the structures in (4) bear some empirical merit. Given that LF-reconstruction can only occur to a position where a copy has been left behind by previous movement, we have our first piece of evidence that connectivity in LD constructions depends on the status of the LDed XP itself, whether it has moved to or is base-generated in its left-peripheral surface position.

3. Classic Movement Diagnostics

Now that we have gone through the analysis and seen initial empirical motivation for it, let us turn to other diagnostics for movement that hold for CLD but not for HTLD, suggesting movement of the LDed XP only in one.

3.1. Sensitivity to Islands

A classic argument for movement is island sensitivity (Ross 1967). Under traditional conception, it is unlikely that a dependency is the result of movement if it may span across an island; in turn, if it shows island sensitivity, it may have arisen from movement—especially if we find minimal pairs where one structure obeys islands and the other one does not. CLD constructions are indeed sensitive to islands, illustrated with a strong island, the complex noun phrase constraint (marked in boldface):

- (13) a. ****Seinen Vorgarten, den** haßt Maria **die Tatsache**, daß jeder mag.*
 b. ****Seinen Vorgarten,** haßt Maria **die Tatsache**, daß jeder mag.*
 his front-lawn hates Maria the fact that every likes
 *‘His front lawn, Maria hates the fact that everyone likes.’
- (14) a. ****Sein Vorgarten, den** haßt Maria **die Tatsache**, daß jeder mag.*
 a'. *#**Sein Vorgarten,** Maria haßt **die Tatsache**, daß **den** jeder mag.*
 b. *#**Sein Vorgarten,** Maria haßt **die Tatsache**, daß jeder **ihn** mag.*
 #‘His front lawn, Maria hates the fact that everyone likes it.’

The CLD structure in (13a) is strictly ungrammatical, as is (not surprisingly) the attempted topic extraction in (13b); the corresponding HTLD structures in (14a',b) are not—these simply do not allow for a bound variable reading, as already established previously (extending further to other cases from above). (14a) shows that in HTLD, the only element undergoing movement is the RP, which may not be extracted out of the island (viz. the contrast with (14a')). Under the hash-marked, deictic reading of the pronoun inside the LDed XP, the relation between XP and RP may cross an island, but not via movement.

3.2. Displacement of Idiom Chunks

Another classic argument strongly suggesting that it really is the LDed XP that moves in CLD comes from displacing idiomatic chunks; as shown by Marantz (1984) and many others, these must be the result of movement, where the idiomatic interpretation is yielded by a strictly local (base-generated) configuration.

- (15) Der Alex hat der Maria gestern den Kopf verdreht.
 the Alex has the Maria yesterday the head twisted
 ‘Alex turned Maria’s head yesterday.’

The idiom in (15) may be manipulated structurally with retaining of its interpretation, including the relevant chunk *den Kopf* ‘the head’. (This may not hold for the English equivalent, but for the purpose of illustration, I gloss over this; see Schenk 1995, for instance, for discussion of syntactic properties of English idioms, and corresponding well-formed reordering.) In (16), various parts of the clause are topicalized, in (17) the idiomatic chunk is CLDed and topicalized, respectively; (18) illustrates attempted HTLDing of the relevant chunk.

- (16) a. Der Maria hat der Alex gestern den Kopf verdreht.
 b. Gestern hat der Alex der Maria den Kopf verdreht.
- (17) a. *Den Kopf, den* hat der Alex der Maria gestern ~~*den Kopf*~~ verdreht.
 b. Den Kopf hat der Alex der Maria gestern verdreht.
 ‘Maria’s head, Alex turned yesterday.’
- (18) a. **Der Kopf, den* hat der Alex der Maria gestern ~~*den Kopf*~~ verdreht.
 b. **Der Kopf, der Alex hat ihn* gestern der Maria verdreht.
 *‘Maria’s head, Alex turned it yesterday.’

As it turns out, those speakers that judge (16) grammatical, especially (16b), also accept (17a), CLDing the idiomatic chunk, but not (18). Again, under an analysis where the CLDed XP is derived by movement, as laid out above (see also (4)), the result as evidenced here is nothing but expected. Let us next turn to finer differences in derivation and structure.

4. Specifier vs. Adjunct

Now that we have seen empirical support to derive Case-matching between CLDed XP and RP by them being one and the same element with two different copies (addressed in detail in the next section), or in a weaker version, that the CLDed XP is derived by movement, unlike the HTLDed XP, let us consider whether we can make out structural differences in the final position of CLDed and HTLDed XPs.

4.1. (Im)possibility of Embedding

Interestingly, only the CLDed XP may be embedded; this can only be shown in the context of so-called “bridge verbs” which allow for a verb second clause as their complement (as LD is contingent on a matrix, verb second environment). This suggests that only one is a root phenomenon (cf. Emonds 1970, Chomsky 1977). We might want to express this difference by analysing the CLDed XP to target SpecCP, while the base-generated HTLDed XP is adjoined to CP (already hinted at in (4) above).

- (19) a. Ich glaube, *diesen Satz*, **den** haben wir nun alle satt.
 b. Ich glaube, *diesen Satz*, haben wir nun alle satt.
I believe this sentence have we now all enough
 ‘I believe this sentence, we’ve all had enough of by now.’
- (20) a. *Ich glaube, *dieser Satz*, **den** haben wir nun alle satt.
 b. *Ich glaube, *dieser Satz*, wir haben **ihn** nun alle satt.
 *‘I believe this sentence, we’ve all had enough of it by now.’

By assigning a different phrase-structural status to the LDed XPs we not only get an angle on emeddability or merely achieve an overall surgical nicety, we also make a rather strict prediction which we test next.

4.2. Multiple and Co-Occurrence

The hypothesis that one LDed element is an adjunct, while the other one is a specifier can be tested further. Assuming a phrase-structural version of X-bar theory which allows for multiple adjunction but requires unique specifiers, this hypothesis can be tested and verified as follows.²

First of all, CLDed XPs are restricted to one occurrence only, in contrast to HTLDed XPs (for relevance to LD, see e.g. Cinque 1977, 1990). Secondly, the two may co-occur, but only if the hanging topic precedes the CLDed XP. Admittedly, the good structures below are far from perfect, but the contrasts are clear. (Here only the intended CLDed XP is boldfaced.)

- (21) a. *Alex_i, der Wagen_j, die Mutter_k*, gestern hat *sie_k ihm_i den_j* geschenkt.
 b. *Alex_i, Mutter_k, den Wagen_j, den_j* hat *sie_k ihm_i* gestern geschenkt.
 Alex mother the car RP has she him yesterday given
 ‘Alex, the mother, the car, yesterday she gave (it) to him.’

2. I acknowledge that this traditional view (cf. Jackendoff 1977 and many others) has lately come under attack, either on grounds of linearizability (Kayne 1994) or through some version of bare phrase structure and other developments (Chomsky 1995, 1998, 1999 and much related work). For present purposes, I do not see anything wrong with either track, though the current (more traditional) one seems to bear fruitful results (see also Grohmann 2000c for more).

- (22) a. **Der Alex_i, den Wagen_j, die Mutter_k, den_j* hat *sie_k ihm_i* geschenkt.
 b. ****Dem Alex_i, der Wagen_j, die Mutter_k, dem_i*** hat *sie_k ihn_j* geschenkt.
- (23) a. ****Dem Alex_i, den Wagen_j, die Mutter_k, dem_i*** hat *den_j sie_k* geschenkt.
 b. **Die Mutter_k, dem Alex_i, den Wagen_j, dem_i* hat *den_j sie_k* geschenkt.

We can now express these restrictions, given that specifiers, but not adjuncts, are unique as follows (where the CLDed XP is italicized):

- (24) [_{CP} der Alex [_{CP} die Mutter [_{CP} *den Wagen* C⁰ [_{TopP} *den* hat ...]]]]

To sum up so far, we have seen evidence in favour of movement of the CLDed XP and base-generation of the HTLDed XP, on the basis of connectedness effects (reconstruction and other movement diagnostics); we also have good evidence for (24), or the more complete representations in (4), where the CLDed XP sits in SpecCP, while any number of HTLDed XPs are adjoined to that position. What is unsolved, and shall remain so here, is how the HTLDed XP and the RP are connected, and how optional Case-marking on the XP is derived; what is also unclear yet, and shall be resolved in the next section, is how the RP is derived in CLD.

5. Prolific Domains and Copy Spell-Outs

It is now time to motivate what has been mentioned in passing already: not only does the CLDed XP move to SpecCP from its base-generated argument position, the RP is introduced derivationally, that is not as part of the numeration, but as a spelled out copy of the LDed XP. In order to do so, I present a framework that splits clause structure into three prolific domains and discuss some preliminary consequences.³

5.1. Tripartite Clause Structure

One aspect of the vast proliferation of functional projections over the past decade or so is a blur of an intuition regarding clause structure and its connection to interpretation that was present in earlier structures. If we compare (25a) and (25b), we can sense a tripartition of clausal structure in one case, which is not so obvious in the other; rather, whatever the exact array of projections, we can assign a certain “function” to each one, while it is not so easy to group them together in a coherent way. Or is it?

- (25) a. COMP > INFL > VP
 b. CP > TopP > FocP > FP > TP > NegP > ModP > AspP > vP > VP

3. This section is a very much condensed version of Grohmann (2000b), further elaborated in Grohmann (2000c). I hope this summary is clear enough for present purposes, predominantly the derivation of CLD in the context of prolific domains.

The intuition pursued here, and in concurrent work, is that the idea behind (25a) can be recreated with a larger arsenal of functional projections along a tripartition: there is a part of the clause concerned with thematic licensing (viz. VP, call this the V-domain), another part deals with grammatical issues such as agreement, Case etc. (viz. INFL, here the T-domain), and the third layer addresses discursal issues, creation of operator-positions and other clause-peripheral effects (viz. COMP, or the C-domain).

We can make the cut along the following lines (bearing in mind that the list, and possibly hierarchy, of projections need not be exhaustive):

- (26) a. V-domain: $vP > VP$
 b. T-domain: $TP > NegP > ModP > AspP$
 c. C-domain: $CP > TopP > FocP > TopP > FP$

I refer to each of these layers as a “prolific domain;” ‘domain’ in the obvious sense that it spans a certain homogenous part of the derivation and ‘prolific’ in that we can refine the basic structure of (25a) with something like (26), namely that each domain contains more articulate structure.

We can already see how this tripartition might help us for cases of LD. Both the LDed XP and the high occurrence of the RP are arguably part of the C-domain. The lower occurrence of the RP in German sits somewhere in the T-domain, while the RP in English LD is *in situ*.⁴

In other work, I focus more on some consequences of such a view of clause structure, such as mapping syntactic computation to the LF- and PF-interfaces in a quite dynamic manner (Grohmann 2000b, 2000c; cf. Uriagereka 1998, 1999, Uriagereka and Martin 1999 for background). In the following, I shall explore some other consequences of this approach, namely a natural condition on prolific domains barring movement within.

5.2. Domain-Internal Movement Constraints

If we take the three prolific domains of a clause to look roughly as sketched in (26), one observation falls out immediately, with a minimal set of background assumptions: maximal phrases tend to occur only once in each of these domains; in other words, XPs do not move from one position within a given prolific domain to another position within the same domain, but all movement obligatorily crosses domains.

4. Without further ado, I assume that German is a head-initial language throughout, and all arguments evacuate the V-domain in the overt syntax (cf. Zwart 1993 and related work). Likewise, I go with the traditional view that English objects raise at LF, not overtly (but see Lasnik 1995 and others), though neither assumption has any bearings on the current issue as far as I can see. Given that the RP counts as the “first constituent” of a verb second structure and need not be a subject, we can safely assume that it is inside the C-domain (TopP). Likewise, if the LDed XP belongs formally to the clause, it too must be in the C-domain (CP); cf. (4) and below.

The best testing device is the V-domain, where positions are limited in number and function, given (26a). Following much recent work which goes back to at least Boskovic (1994), nothing in principle rules out movement into theta positions.⁵ As such, it is not so clear why (27a) cannot be interpreted as (27a'), given the derivation in (27b), shown in its relevant parts:

- (27) a. *John likes.
 a'. John likes himself.
 b. [_{VP} **John** [_V likes [_{VP} [_V ~~likes~~ **John**]]]]

From (27) we might conclude that movement from one theta position to another is ruled out categorically, regardless of whether this move would change interpretation (see Grohmann 2000b, 2000c for more). In other words, it seems as if we cannot create reflexive interpretation in the course of the derivation. However, derivational approaches to reflexivization do exist—starting with the original proposal of a transformational rule of pronominalization by Less and Klima (1963) up to more recent approaches, such as Lidz and Idsardi (1998) or Hornstein (2000); I will briefly consider the latter here, simply because it seems to fit easiest.

To put it very crudely, Hornstein's analysis generates the antecedent DP, with the reflexive morpheme *self* adjoined to it, in the thematic object position. It then moves to the thematic subject position, Spec_vP by convention, to check another theta-feature (cf. fn. 5). The copy left behind needs to be PF-visible, though, under the assumption that *self* carries the necessary information to check (accusative) Case. For this purpose, the copy spells out as a "default element," in this case, a pronoun, as shown in (29).

Within a domain-driven framework, the derivation may look identical, namely (29); what differs is the motivation for spelling out the lower copy. Turning locality upside down, the program suggests that movement within a prolific domain is ruled out, unless the lower copy spells out, as a repair strategy, so to speak (contra Chomsky's 1998, 1999 conception of 'phases'; see Grohmann 2000c for more cases and details). We can thus capture this:

(28) *Condition on Domain-Exclusivity (CDE)*

No maximal phrase XP may have more than one address identification AI per prolific domain $\Pi\Delta$, unless it has a drastic effect on the output, i.e. the relevant copy of XP has a different PF-matrix (=copy spell-out).

- (29) [_{VP} **John** [_V likes [_{VP} [_V ~~likes~~ **John** \rightarrow **him**-[self]]]]]

There might be some advantages of this approach over Hornstein's, apart from being more general; see the works cited for thorough discussion.

5. Space does not allow deeper discussion, especially intricate issues having to do with the Theta Criterion, remnants of D-structure in Minimalism and more. For more detailed treatment, see Boeckx (2000), Grohmann (2000c), Hornstein (2000).

5.3. Copy Left Dislocation, Then

Obviously, (29) looks very similar to (4a), and not by sheer accident. Given the CDE and the approach sketched above for reflexivization, we now have a quite natural explanation for (i) how the CLDed XP may be the result of movement, (ii) why the CLDed XP and the RP must match in Case, (iii) how and why the RP is introduced, and to some extent (iv) why the RP comes in a unique morphological form.⁶

Point (i) is arguably the least problematic, given the first part of this paper and the overwhelming evidence pointing to the XP itself as being subject to movement conditions and constraints (reconstruction, islands etc.). In the totality of these issues, however, we now have a way to go about it, and also account for (ii) and (iii) in one fell swoop: analogously to instances of spelling out lower copies in reflexive constructions as the CDE-driven repair strategy of an otherwise illicit movement, the RP is the copy spell-out of the CLDed XP. As such, it is expected to match in Case, given that we want to keep as many identical features as possible for this process. Thus (iv) receives a relatively adequate answer in that the “default element” that fills the PF-matrix is in a sense predetermined: it is a personal pronoun in English reflexivization, while it is a demonstrative pronoun in German CLD—which now receives a straightforward name, “Copy Left Dislocation” (see also the next section on some further musings). It is not unreasonable to have more than one element play the filler role in copy spell-out, after all the copies involved are very different from each other across constructions (and even languages). Thus, the copy left behind by reflexivization in a simple example like (29) has only its thematic features checked, while the copy spelled out in CLD has already satisfied its thematic, grammatical (e.g. Case) and partly discoursal features checked.

Regarding the latter, at the point of spelling out the copy, the XP in question has arguably checked a topic-feature; the move from SpecTopP to SpecCP (cf. (4) above and (30) below) must be motivated on further discoursal grounds, with topic being one property and whatever feature is responsible for LD the other. This is not an unreasonable assumption given that on the one hand, topicalization and LD are similar in a number of ways, yet on the other, differing in some as well (cf. Birner and Ward 1998, Prince 1998 and many others on the pragmatic properties of the two).

Let us thus assume the following derivational steps for CLD (cf. (1)):

- (30) a. V-domain: [_{vP} ich [_v mag [_{VP} [_v ~~mag~~ **diesen Satz**]]]]
- b. T-domain: [_{TP} ich mag [_{ϕP} **diesen Satz** ~~mag~~ [besonders [vP]]]]
- c. C-domain I: [_{TopP} **diesen Satz** mag [TP]]
- c'. C-domain II: [_{CP} **diesen Satz** [_{TopP} ~~diesen Satz~~ **den** mag [TP]]]

6. Needless to say, this “naturalness” comes with a twist—in this essay, it is more a stipulation given that the research program laid out elsewhere has any validity.

The derivation up to (30c) is standard (under a Zwartian approach, regardless of details, such as the status of ϕ P/AgrP or adverbials): thematic properties are licensed inside the V-domain, grammatical properties inside the T-domain (Case, agreement etc.). If the derivation stops at the point of (30b), we get a subject-initial matrix clause; if it proceeds up to (30c), the result is topicalization. (The same, by the way, holds for English with the difference of verb movement in both.) The last step portrayed in (30c') is the crucial step: the topic moves from one position to another within the same prolific domain, ruled out (on hopefully independent grounds, if the CDE can be derived from something deeper)—here the repair strategy kicks in, spelling out the topic-copy as a *d*-pronoun.

The final result is CLD where we not only clearly see the tight relation between topicalization and LD, but also an explanation for all the properties seen in sections 2 to 4: the CLDed XP is expected to be able to reconstruct, to obey island boundaries, to be unique—and to leave room for base-generated material to its left. Here the two background assumptions mentioned in the beginning of section 5 play out: without further discussion, I take specifiers to be unique and formally different from adjuncts, which in the least case are not unique and must precede specifiers. If not motivated by anything else, at least this set of assumptions gives us some mileage and a rather natural account for an otherwise strange construction.⁷

6. Some Final Remarks

One interesting result of the study of German LD presented here ties in neatly with other recent work on such constructions across languages. In the light of the present paper, work on Italian clitic left dislocation (CLLD) by Cechetto and Chierchia (1998), and Aoun and Benmamoun's (1998) intriguing investigation of two types of CLLD in Arabic dialects, it seems to emerge that Cinque's original intuition behind LD constructions across languages in which he distinguishes movement-derived from base-generated LD structures was on the right track after all (Cinque 1977), rather than trying to capture the movement properties somehow else (Cinque 1990).

If we want to evaluate movement variants of CLD and CLLD on a par, we might expect the resumptive elements in both to be of the same nature, especially if Cinque is right in identifying a specific pronominal element employed for resumption as a characteristic of the movement variant; in his case, this concerns the clitic in CLLD. We now have an additional, yet still specific, resumptive element in German CLD as well, the *d*-pronoun. If the latter is the result of spelling out a copy left behind by (an otherwise illicit) movement, we might try to show the same to be at work in CLLD. I leave this discussion open, but it might turn out to yield interesting results.

7. Needless to say, I do not feel that this is all there is to it. A formal system is laid out in more detail in Grohmann (2000c).

Such an approach invariably runs into trouble were we to look for evidence in the C-domain; languages that employ CLLD typically express resumption lower down in the clause, arguably inside the T-domain (e.g. Italian, Greek, Arabic). If it turns out that this clitic can be analysed as a spelled out copy of a phrase that otherwise would have moved within a prolific domain, we would not only be able to express the Cinque/Aoun and Benmamoun cut in a straightforward fashion, but also support the framework sketched here briefly with evidence for the CDE in a further domain.

References

- Altmann, Hans. 1981. *Formen der "Herausstellung" im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, Freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1997. Clitic Left Dislocation and Contrastive Left Dislocation. In Anagnostopoulou et al. 1997, 151-192.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena, Henk van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwarts, eds. 1997. *Materials on Left Dislocation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aoun, Joseph and Elabbas Benmamoun. 1998. Minimality, Reconstruction and PF-Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29, 569-597.
- Birner, Betty J. and Gregory Ward. 1998. *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2000. Notes on Missing Object Constructions. Ms, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Boskovic, Zeljko. 1994. D-Structure, Theta Criterion and Movement into Theta Positions. *Linguistic Analysis* 24, 247-286.
- Cechetto, Carlo and Gennaro Chierchia. 1998. Reconstruction in Dislocation Constructions and the Syntax/Semantics Interface. In Kimary N. Shahin, Susan Blake and Eun-Sook Kim, eds. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 132-146.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On Wh-Movement. In Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow and Adrian Akmajian, eds. *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 71-132.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1998. Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 15. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1999. Derivation by Phase. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 18. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1977. The Movement Nature of Left Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 397-411.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Emonds, Joseph P. 1970. *Root and Structure-Preserving Transformations*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.
- Fox, Danny. 1999. Reconstruction, Binding Theory and the Interpretation of Chains. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 157-196.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 1997. On Left Dislocation. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 40, 1-33.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2000a. A Movement Approach to Contrastive Left Dislocation. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 25.

- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2000b. Prolific Domains. In Maximiliano Guimaraes, Luisa Meroni, Cilene Rodrigues and Itziar San Martin, eds. *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 9, 41-70.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2000c. *Prolific Peripheries: A Radical View from the Left*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. 1974. *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- van Haften, Ton, Rik Smits and Jan Vat. 1983. Left Dislocation, Connectedness and Reconstruction. In Werner Abraham, ed. *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 133-154.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2000. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. *X-bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1995. A Note on Pseudogapping. In Rob Pensalfini and Hiroyuki Ura, eds. *Papers on Minimalist Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL, 143-163.
- Lees, Robert and Edward Klima. 1963. Rules for English Pronominalization. *Language* 39, 17-28.
- Lidz, Jeff and William J. Idsardi. 1998. Chains and Phono-Logical Form. In Alexis Dimitriadis, Hikyong Lee, Christine Moisset and Alexander Williams, eds. *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 6, 109-125.
- Marantz, Alec. 1984. *The Nature of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Prince, Ellen. 1998. On the Limits of Syntax, with Reference to Left-Dislocation and Topicalization. In Peter Culicover and Louise McNally, eds. *The Limits of Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 281-302.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk and Frans Zwarts. 1974. Left Dislocation in Dutch and Status of Copying Rules. Ms., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, and University of Amsterdam. [Published in Anagnostopoulou et al 1997, 13-29.]
- Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge. [Published 1986 as *Infinite Syntax!* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.]
- Schenk, André. 1995. The Syntactic Behaviour of Idioms. In Martin Everaert, Erik-Jan van der Linden, André Schenk and Rob Schreuder, eds. *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 253-271.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1979. *On Complementation in Icelandic*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge and New York: Garland Publishers.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1998. *Rhyme and Reason*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1999. Multiple Spell Out. In Samuel D. Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, eds. *Working Minimalism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 251-282.
- Uriagereka, Juan and Roger Martin. 1999. Lectures on Dynamic Syntax. Ms., University of Maryland, College Park and Kanda International University.
- Vat, Jan. 1981. Left Dislocation, Connectedness and Reconstruction. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 20, 80-103.
- Zaenen, Annie. 1980. *Extraction Rules in Icelandic*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 1993. *Dutch Syntax. A Minimalist Approach*. Doctoral dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.