Dislocation without Movement*

Cécile De Cat
University of Leeds
C.DeCat@leeds.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper argues that French Left-Dislocation is a unified phenomenon whether it is resumed by a clitic or a non-clitic element. The syntactic component is shown to play a minimal role in its derivation: all that is required is that the dislocated element be merged by adjunction to a Discourse Projection (generally a finite TP with root properties). No agreement or checking of a topic feature is necessary, hence no syntactic movement of any sort need be postulated. The so-called resumptive element is argued to be a full-fledged pronoun rather than a true syntactic resumptive.

1 Introduction: On Movement

For decades, the postulation of syntactic movement has been at the heart of the endeavour to explain ungrammaticality in natural languages. In the derivational, incremental approach to grammar proposed by Chomsky (1995; 2000; 2001) among others, a series of constraints has been defined to restrict the output of the computational system to grammatical structures while minimising rule-specific restrictions. This paper focusses on derivational constraints (i.e. those applying to syntactic operations), and more specifically on the movement versus base-generation opposition in current theory. The empirical field of investigation is that of French dislocation, and in particular Clitic Left Dislocation, a construction that has been argued to display characteristics of both base-generated and movement-derived configurations.

It is standardly assumed that syntactic movement plays a part in the relationship between two elements if that relationship cannot hold across (strong)

*This research was funded by a grant from the Economic and Social Research Council (grant #041R00433), which is gratefully acknowledged. I wish to thank the following people for comments and/or discussion: David Adger, Cedric Boeckx, João Costa, Jenny Doetjes, Joe Emonds, Hans-Martin Gärtner, Liliane Haegeman, Ruth Kempson, Eric Mathieu, Fritz Newmeyer, Bernadette Plunkett, Paul Postal, Ben Shaer, Nicolas Sobin, George Tsoulas as well as the audience at the ZAS workshop on dislocated elements (Berlin, November 2003) and the York Staff & Student Seminar. Comments welcome at C.DeCat@leeds.ac.uk

syntactic islands (originally defined by Ross 1967). This diagnostic has been granted precedence over other diagnostics for movement (such as weak cross-over effects and the licensing of parasitic gaps) in the abundant literature on Clitic Left Dislocation.

Against the standard view, it has recently been proposed that insensitivity to islands is in fact not a satisfactory diagnostic for absence of syntactic movement. Postal (1998), for instance, argues that NP 'extraction' is much freer than other types of extraction and that its insensitivity to islands is not *per se* a sign of base-generation. Postal advocates a reinstatement of Ross's (1967) theory according to which only chopping rules (i.e. those involving a gap) are bounded, while copying rules (i.e. those involving a resumptive pronoun) are not. Boeckx (2003) makes a somewhat similar point and argues that islands only block Agree, not movement. He proposes that chains are formed either by Match or by Match+Agree. Chains formed by Match alone contain a (stranded) resumptive pronoun and are not sensitive to islands; chains formed by Match+Agree are sensitive to islands. Both proposals advocate that whenever we find a (true) resumptive pronoun (as might be the case in Clitic Left Dislocation), insensitivity to islands does not necessarily indicate absence of movement.

In this paper, I would like to draw attention to a series of facts regarding French Clitic Left Dislocation that suggest that a movement analysis is not appropriate, even if we adopt the proposals of Postal (1998) or Boeckx (2003). As we will see, a better understanding of the information structure phenomena associated with that construction is essential when testing its syntactic limits. On the basis of this initial exploration of the data, I develop a comprehensive analysis of French Left-Dislocation, arguing that syntax only plays a minimal role in its derivation. The proposed analysis is predicted to extend straightforwardly to any 'base-generated' dislocated topic, cross-linguistically, including any case of so-called Hanging Topic Left Dislocation.

The organisation is as follows: Section 2 demonstrates that French dislocation is a unified phenomenon (involving left- and right-dislocation, whether the resumptive element is a clitic or not) and that it is not generated by movement. This leads to a discussion of the status of the resumptive element and of the possibility of an analysis of Left Dislocation in terms of Hanging Topic. Section 3 presents the proposed analysis and outlines its predictions. Section 4 concludes the paper with a discussion of the theoretical consequences of the proposed analysis.

2 French Dislocation is Not Generated by Movement

2.1 French LD: A Unified Phenomenon

The most widely studied type of left dislocation is so-called Clitic Left Dislocation (ClLD). In ClLD, a left-peripheral XP (as bolded in (1)) is coindexed with a resumptive clitic within the clause. This construction has been attested in many languages (e.g. Italian: Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997; Greek: Anagnostopoulou 1997, Iatridou 1990; Lebanese Arabic: Aoun and Benmamoun 1998).

(1) **Les malotrus**$_i$, on ne les$_i$ invite pas.
the louts one NEG them invites not
'We don't invite louts.'

Traditionally, ClLD has essentially been exemplified with dislocated objects, but this appears to be due to the fact that most of the languages in which ClLD has been discussed are PRO-drop. French not being a PRO-drop language (at least in its most widely spoken varieties, as I have demonstrated in De Cat in press), it offers a prime source of examples of ClLDed subjects:

(2) **Les clitiques**$_i$, ils$_i$ comptent pas pour du beurre.
the clitics they count not for some butter
'Clitics do count.'

It is widely acknowledged that dislocated elements are interpreted as topics (e.g. Iatridou 1990; Rizzi 1997). The topic is generally understood to be what the sentence is about (Reinhart 1981), or more precisely the discourse referent with respect to which the sentence is evaluated (Erteschik-Shir 1997, Strawson 1964, Reinhart 1981).

In French, Left Dislocated elements can be resumed by elements that are not clitics. Such LDs are thus by definition not ClLD. Yet, there is no principled reason to distinguish ClLD from other types of LD in spoken French: the nature of the resumptive element does not affect the syntactic or interpretive properties of LDs in that language, as demonstrated below.[1] Examples of non-clitic LDs are given in (3).

(3) a. **Claas**$_i$, ses$_i$ chaussettes ont disparu.
Claas his socks have disappeared
'Claas's socks have disappeared.'
b. **Kambi**$_i$, je n'ai plus jamais entendu parler de lui$_i$.
Kambi I NEG-have not ever heard to-talk of him
'I never heard anything about Kambi again.'

[1]There are no intrinsic prosodic differences either between LDs that are resumed by a clitic element and those that are not. Demonstrating this would go beyond the scope of this paper.

c. **Le lait**$_i$, j'adore ça$_i$.
the milk I-adore that
'I'm mad about milk.'

Resumption by an epithet is also possible (see Hirschbühler 1975), though rarely used in spontaneous speech.

(4) **Plastic Bertrand**$_i$, j'ai tous les disques de ce farfelu$_i$.
Plastic Bertrand I-have all the records of this weirdo
'I have all of Plastic Bertrand's records.'

In (3) and (4), the dislocated element expresses the topic of the sentence just as it does in ClLD: the sentence is interpreted as being *about* the referent of the dislocated element and is evaluated with respect to that referent.

The examples below show that non-clitic LDs behave similarly to ClLD.[2] First, observe that non-clitic LDs are not sensitive to islands (ClLD's insensitivity to islands will be demonstrated in section 2.2).

(5) a. **Class**$_i$, j'ai pris [une photo [de ses$_i$ chaussettes]].
Claas I-have taken a photo of his socks
'I've taken a picture of Claas's socks.'
b. **Kambi**$_i$, je me souviens [du banc [où je m'asseyais
Kambi I REFL. remember of-the bench where I REFL.-sat
avec lui$_i$]].
with him
'I remember the bench where I sat with Kambi.'
c. **Le lait**$_i$, il vaut mieux avoir [un frigo [pour conserver ça$_i$
the milk it is-worth better to-have a fridge to conserve that
en été]].
in summer
'It's best to have a fridge to keep milk in summer.'

Second, like ClLD, multiple instances of non-clitic LD are allowed:

(6) a. **Claas**$_i$, **du contre-plaqué**$_j$, tu verrais jamais ça$_j$ dans sa$_i$
Claas some plywood you would-see never that in his
maison.
house
'You'd never see plywood in Claas's house.'
b. **Kambi**$_i$, **l'école**$_j$, ça$_j$ ne lui$_i$ allait pas trop.
Kambi the-school it NEG to-him went not too-much
'Kambi couldn't stand school very well.'

[2] I will not illustrate the relevant properties with ClLD examples, as this has been done for many a language in the literature (on French, see e.g. Larsson 1979).

c. **Le lait**$_i$, **Steph**$_j$, ça$_i$ ne va pas avec son$_j$ estomac.
the milk Steph it NEG goes not with his stomach
'Milk doesn't go well with Steph's stomach.'

Third, like ClLD, non-clitic RD has a right-hand counterpart:

(7) a. Ses$_i$ chaussettes ont disparu, **à Claas**$_i$.
his socks have disappeared to Claas
'Claas's socks have disappeared.'
b. Je n'ai plus jamais entendu parler de lui$_i$, **Kambi**$_i$.
I NEG-have not ever heard talk of him Kambi
'I never heard anything about Kambi again.'
c. J'adore ça$_i$, **le lait**$_i$.
I-adore that the milk
'I'm mad about milk.'

Fourth, like ClLD, non-clitic LD can appear in embedded contexts.

(8) a. Je veux pas que **Claas**$_i$, on cache ses$_i$ chaussettes.
I want not that Claas one hides his socks
'I don't want us to hide Claas's socks.'
b. Tu te souviens que **Kambi**$_i$, tout le monde voulait
you REFL. remember that Kambi all the people wanted
toujours danser avec lui$_i$?
always to-dance with him
'Do you remember how everybody always wanted to dance with Kambi?'
c. Je pense pas que **la bière**$_i$, ça$_i$ soit très bon pour le foie.
I think not that the beer it be very good for the liver
'I don't think beer is very good for the liver.'

I conclude that French LD is a unified phenomenon, in that the nature of the resumptive element does not alter its essential properties. In all cases, the LDed element expresses the topic of the sentence; it can be resumed by an element inside an island; it can appear in embedded clauses; and it is recursive.

2.2 French LD is Not Sensitive to Islands

It has frequently been claimed that Clitic Left Dislocation shares with constructions involving XP movement the property of being sensitive to (strong) islands. This has been argued to be the case in e.g. Italian (Rizzi 1997), Greek (Iatridou 1990) and Spanish (Escobar 1997). However, this is not verified in all languages. Lebanese Arabic has been argued to be an exception (Aoun and Benmamoun 1998), and as I will argue below, the same is true of

spoken French.[3]

In order to test the sensitivity of (Cl)LD to strong islands, a judgment elicitation task was designed and presented to 31 native speakers of French from Belgium, Canada, France and Switzerland. For each sentence, a short context was provided to ensure that the dislocated element was a likely topic for the test sentence. Informants were presented with descriptions four levels of acceptability, the English translations of which are given in (9). If an informant failed to choose anything from the pull-down menu a 'no choice' value was printed and the token was discarded.

(9) a. I could say that sentence.
b. I could say that sentence but in another context.
c. I could never say a sentence like that, but I know that other French speakers could.
d. That sentence is too weird. No French speaker talks like that.

The context for each test sentence was given in a written form, prior to the informant clicking on a link to hear the test sentence (which was not transcribed). Example test sentences are given in (10). The level of acceptability of each sentence is given in parentheses: the first rating (in bold) reflects acceptability (i.e. the proportion of informants who rejected the sentence), the second rating reflects markedness.

(10) a. **Les autres**$_i$, je vais attendre [avant de les$_i$ relire].
the other-ones I will wait before to them to-re-read
(**0%** - 6%)

b. Mais **le juge**$_j$, ça$_i$ a surpris tout le monde, [qu'elle l'$_j$ ait invité]$_i$.
but the judge it has surprised all the people that-she him has invited
(**0%**- 19%)

c. **Aux petits**$_i$, je sais pas [ce [qu'elle leur$_i$ lit]].
to-the little-ones I know not that that-she to-them reads
(**0%** - 25%)

[3]To be more precise, Aoun and Benmamoun (1998) argue that Lebanese Arabic displays two types of ClLD: one insensitive to islands (which they analyse as base-generated) and one sensitive to islands (which they say involves syntactic movement). Alexopoulou et al. (in press) argue that the latter only is genuine ClLD and that the former is in fact a Broad Subject construction. French ClLD is not amenable to a Broad Subject analysis given that Broad Subjects are not obligatorily interpreted as topics.

d. **Ta mère**$_i$, je ferai tout pour être parti [quand elle$_i$ viendra].
your mother I will-do all to be gone when she will-come
(**3%** - 28%)

e. **Aux autres**$_i$, on va attendre [avant de leur$_i$ parler].
to-the other-ones one will wait before to to-them to-speak
(**13%** - 31%)

The overall picture reveals that for this randomly selected group of speakers, the relation between the dislocated element and the coreferential clitic holds across (and in spite of) the following types of islands: adjuncts, as in (10a), (10d), (10e); moved XPs, as in (10b), and complex NPs, as in (10c).

Compare the acceptability ratings of the examples above with those for *wh*-extraction across an island:[4]

(11) À qui est-ce que tu ne sais pas [ce [qu'elle lit]]?
to whom is-it that you NEG know not that that-she reads
(**41%** - 19%)

I conclude that French (Clitic) Left Dislocation is insensitive to strong islands. But is this sufficient to justify a base-generation analysis?

2.3 To What Extent are Islands a Diagnostic for Movement?

Ross (1967) originally identified islands as a constraint on *Chop*, not on *Copy*. Both were conceived as rules of syntactic movement. What distinguished them was that Chop left a gap in the moved element's original position, while Copy left a resumptive pronoun behind. Islands were thus originally not a diagnostic for movement *per se* but a diagnostic for *types* of movement.[5]

This idea has recently been revived and reinterpreted by Boeckx (2003), who argues that islands preclude agreement relations but not movement. Building on Cecchetto (2000), Boeckx postulates that resumptive pronouns head a big-DP and that the moved XP is first-Merged as the object of the resumptive

[4]Note that this sentence was given in a context favouring a D-linked interpretation, which is supposed to alleviate island effects. In spite of this, the unacceptability rating is still fairly high, and in any case significantly higher than any of the unacceptability ratings for the dislocated constructions tested.

[5]I will leave aside Cinque's (1990) proposal to view islands as a representational constraint on binding chains rather than a derivational constraint on syntactic movement. On that view, the (in)sensitivity of French ClLD to islands would not be an indication of whether movement is involved and consequently, only the diagnostics to be discussed in section 2.5 would be relevant in that respect. Delais-Roussarie et al. (2003) analyse French left-dislocation along the lines of Cinque (1990), arguing that left-dislocated PPs are the only clear cases of ClLD in that language, all other cases being ambiguous between ClLD and Hanging Topic Left Dislocation. The possibility of distinguishing the two configurations in French will be discussed in section 2.6.

element. Boeckx proposes that chains induced by A′-movement can be the product of two kinds of operations: either Match+Agree or Match alone. In the former case (illustrated in (12)), the φ requirements of the moved XP have to be satisfied by an agreeing complementiser. In the latter case (illustrated in (13)), such requirements are fulfilled by the resumptive pronoun.

(12) An fear aL bhuail tú (Irish)
the man C-agr. struck you
'The man that you struck'

(13) An fear aN bhuail tú é
the man C-non-agr. struck you him
'The man that you struck'

In French subject relatives and clefts (14a), no resumptive pronoun is left in the extraction site. That the complementiser (*qui*) should be marked for agreement (as argued by Rizzi 1990) is exactly what is predicted by Boeckx (2003). In left-dislocated sentences such as (14b), in contrast, the presence of a resumptive element (*il* 'he') bleeds the requirement for an agreeing complementiser. Chains like that in (14a) are (correctly) predicted to be sensitive to islands, while chains like that in (14b) are (correctly) predicted not to be.

(14) a. C'est cet homme-là qui a mangé le raisin vert.
it-is that man-there who has eaten the grapes green
'It's that man who's eaten the green grapes.'
b. **Cet homme-là**, il a mangé le raisin vert.
that man-there he has eaten the grapes green
'That man has eaten the green grapes.'

What is not predicted is that in French, agreeing complementisers are only possible in subject extraction contexts, not in object extraction contexts (which are equally sensitive to islands). A way out might be to postulate that *qui* is not an agreeing complementiser after all (*contra* Rizzi 1990) and that agreement is invisible on French complementisers.

(15) C'est [le raisin vert]$_i$ **que** ton père a mangé t$_i$.
it-is the grape green that your father has eaten
'It's the green grape that your father has eaten.'

Boeckx's theory predicts that ClLD is insensitive to islands if the resumptive clitic is a true resumptive pronoun, which for him requires that it should head a big-DP structure in which its 'antecedent' is the first-merge complement of the resumptive. Evidence for a big-DP lies in the presence of a resumptive pronoun and the only evidence that Match alone has applied is that the resulting configuration is insensitive to islands. This renders Boeckx's proposal untestable on the basis of French (because of circularity). What it suggests nonetheless

is that French ClLD is not derived by Match+Agree (because it is insensitive to islands). Whether it is derived by Match alone or base-generated will depend on other diagnostics for movement-induced configurations, which will be examined in section 2.5.

Postal (1998) gives another reinterpretation of Ross's (1967) original proposal. Like Ross, he argues that resumptive pronouns (henceforth RPs) are associated with peripheral elements as a result of Copy rather than Chop. But unlike Ross (and unlike Boeckx) he argues that sensitivity to islands is not obviated simply by the presence of an RP. He proposes to distinguish two types of RPs, with different syntactic behaviour. Only what he labels *non-controlled* RPs appear in configurations insensitive to islands. *Controlled* RPs, on the other hand, have to extract, usually to become sister to the clause-peripheral element which they resume and by which they must be controlled. Controlled RPs are typically invisible, and they are banned in *wide antipronominal* contexts, i.e. in contexts where (phonologically) weak definite pronouns are impossible. An example of a wide antipronominal context is given in (16).

(16) a. There are **such apples** on the table.
b. *There are **them** on the table.
c. *[Such apples]$_i$, there are **t**$_i$ on the table.

Postal also defines two types of islands: locked versus unlocked (or selective) islands. Locked islands do not permit RP extraction and hence preclude control of such RPs. Such islands include e.g. English non-restrictive relative clauses, as illustrated in (17)

(17) a. *Tim$_i$, I believe you invited Joan, who fancies t$_i$.
b. *Tim$_i$, I believe you invited Joan, who fancies him$_i$.

An example of unlocked/selective island is irrealis *if* clauses, as illustrated in (18) (from Postal 1998:43). Selective islands allow object extraction (18a) but not adjunct extraction (18b).

(18) a. [Which car]$_i$ would you prefer it if I fixed t$_i$?
b. *[How rapidly]$_i$ would you prefer it if I fixed the car t$_i$?

How do these considerations apply to French? The RPs involved in French dislocation are in most cases visible (and obligatory). Invisible RPs are allowed in certain cases (illustrated in (19)). Taking sensitivity to locked islands as a diagnostic for whether those RPs are of the controlled type of not, it seems that French invisible RPs are not of the controlled type when generic (19a) or when they correspond to a gap in the paradigm (19b), i.e. when there is no pronominal element available in the language in question to resume a particular type of peripheral element (such as a locative pronoun that could be modified by a preposition, as would be required in (19b)).

(19) a. [La crème Budwick]$_i$, je connais [quelqu'un [qui aime bien e$_i$]].
the cream Budwick I know somebody who likes well
'I know somebody who likes Budwick cream.'

b. [Ce mur-là]$_i$, on devrait aider [les gens [qui sont embusqués
that wall-there one should help the people that are ambushed
derrière e$_i$]].
behind
'That wall, we should help the people who are ambushed behind it.'

Given their insensitivity to locked islands, French's visible RPs might either be non-controlled RPs or not 'genuine' RPs. In the former case, dislocated structures resumed by such RPs might be derived by Copy (a form of movement). In the latter, they would have to be base-generated.

According to Postal, all RPs are weak definite pronouns (Postal 1998:42). The reverse is not necessarily the case. To evaluate whether French RPs are 'true' RPs in the sense of Postal (1998), I propose to examine cases of RPs that do not readily fit Postal's definition: the clitic *en* 'of it' and the pronoun *ça* 'that' in (20). *En*, being a partitive, is clearly not definite and *ça* is not necessarily weak.[6]

Consider the sentences in (20). Example (20a) shows that *ça* cannot be a controlled RP, given its acceptability inside a locked island. The English counterpart of (20b) is given in (21) (from Postal 1998:26).

(20) a. [La crème Budwick]$_i$, je connais [personne [qui aime ça$_i$]].
the cream Budwick I know nobody that likes that
'I don't know anybody who likes Budwick cream.'

b. [Des produits comme ça]$_i$, il savait qu'il y en$_i$ avait t$_i$
some products like that he knew that-it there of-it were
dans la bouteille.
in the bottle
'He knew that there were chemicals like that in the bottle.'

(21) *[Such chemicals]$_i$, he knew that there were [t$_i$/them$_i$] in the bottle.

The impossibility of a weak definite pronoun in (21) indicates a wide an-

[6] *ça* can be dislocated and it can be selected by a preposition. Both patterns are impossible for weak pronouns.

(i) a. Ça/*Le, c' est bon.
that/it it is nice
'That's nice.'

b. Mange avec ça/*le.
eat with that/it
'Eat with this.'

tipronominal context, i.e. one in which a controlled RP is expected. Postal argues that topic NPs cannot be extracted from such contexts. By contrast, the French counterpart to (21) clearly allows 'extraction' of a topic NP, as illustrated in (20b), in spite of the fact that weak definite pronouns are banned in such contexts (just as they are in English):

(22) *Il l'y a dans la bouteille.
it it-DEF has in the bottle

One possibility is that so-called resumptive elements that do not readily fit Postal's definition (such as *en* and *ça*) are non-controlled RPs (triggered by Copy). The requirement that RPs be weak definite pronouns would therefore have to be lifted, which would leave the ungrammaticality of (21) unexplained. Alternatively, if 'true' RPs are indeed restricted to weak definite pronouns (in accordance with Postal 1998), pronouns that are not weak and definite would not be true RPs. Consequently, they should be free to occur inside locked islands (hence ruling out Chop) without being the product of Copy. In other words: dislocated elements resumed by *en* or *ça* would be base-generated in their peripheral position and the 'resumptive' element would in fact be an argument of the verb. In the next subsection, I argue that this is indeed the most adequate analysis, not only for *en* and *ça*, but for all the 'RPs' involved in French dislocation.

2.4 On the Status of the 'Resumptive' Pronoun

A core property of true resumptive pronouns (RPs), as defined by Sells (1984), is that they are interpreted as bound variables (and that this binding is not simply anaphoric).This is illustrated below with a Swedish relative clause (from Sells 1984:56).

(23) Det finns mycket$_i$ som man önskar att **det**$_i$ skulle vara annorlunda.
there is much that one wishes that it should be different

According to Sells (1984), English does not have true RPs but what he calls *intrusive pronouns*. Such pronouns appear mainly where they can alleviate island violations and they are not interpreted as true variables. This is illustrated by the contrast in (24). A gap in the extraction position inside the relative clause can be interpreted as a variable (24a). In contrast, when a pronoun occupies the extraction position (24b), it is interpreted as referring to one particular individual.

(24) a. [Which of the linguists]$_i$ do you think that if Mary marries **t**$_i$ then everyone will be happy?

b. [Which of the linguists]$_i$ do you think that if Mary marries **him**$_i$ then everyone will be happy?

Aside from the availability of true RPs in a given language, Sells argues that a variable interpretation can only be obtained where there is a binder with operator-like properties (such as a quantifier or a *wh*-element). If the resumptive element of (clitic) left-dislocation is a true RP, we should expect it to receive a variable interpretation whenever the dislocated element has operator-like properties. Topics *per se* do not have quantificational properties (Rizzi 1997). There is nonetheless the possibility that a topic might act as an operator due to the inherent properties of the type of XP that instantiates it. However, as is well known, quantifiers, non-generic indefinites and *wh*-elements (which are standardly regarded as operators) cannot be topics (and hence cannot be dislocated): they do not meet the requirement that topic referents be readily identifiable in the context. This requirement is illustrated in (25).

(25) a. *__Tout homme__, il est mortel.
any/every man he is mortal
b. *__Chaque potager__, il a son robinet.
each allotment it has its tap

The only exception to this rule is what Erteschik-Shir (1997) calls *subordinate update*, which consists in identifying the main topic of the sentence out of a pre-established set available in the discourse context. In (26), for instance, the dislocated element summons the set of exceptionally gifted individuals known to the speaker and identifies one individual in that group. That individual then becomes the topic of the sentence and the indefinite referring to it can be dislocated.

(26) [Un qui est surdoué]$_i$, **c'**$_i$ est le fils Fiorini.
one who is over-gifted it is the son Fiorini
'One who's gifted is Fiorini's son.'

Crucially, even in instances where the dislocated element has quantifier-like properties, the resumptive pronoun is attributed a fixed reference. The relation between the resumptive and its antecedent is merely anaphoric and is no different to what it would be if the antecedent was omitted.

Omission of a left-dislocated element does not indeed alter the interpretation of the sentence significantly, as illustrated in (27) — provided the referent of *les Racts* is salient enough in the context.

(27) a. **Les Racts**, c'étaient les monstres de mon frère.
the Racts it-were the monsters of my brother
'The Racts were my brother's monsters.'

b. C'étaient les monstres de mon frère.
it-were the monsters of my brother
'They were my brother's monsters.'

There is in fact no *syntactic* requirement for a dislocated element to be (overtly) present. The 'resumptive' element does not need to be licensed syntactically by its 'antecedent'. Not only can the dislocated element be omitted, in certain cases it is even banned from appearing at the periphery of the clause containing its 'resumptive' element.

(28) a. **Les tartes**$_i$, elle a oublié d'acheter des oeufs pour les$_i$
the pies she has forgotten to-buy some eggs to them
faire.
make
'She's forgotten to buy eggs to make the pies.'
b. *Elle a oublié d'acheter des oeufs pour **les tartes**$_i$, les$_i$
she has forgotten to-buy some eggs to the pies them
faire.[7]
to-make

(29) a. [**La vieille MG jaune**]$_i$, j'ai pas envie de la$_i$ vendre.
the old MG yellow I-have not desire to it sell
'I don't feel like selling the old yellow MG.'
b. *J'ai pas envie de, [**la vieille MG jaune**]$_i$, la$_i$ vendre.
I-have no desire to the old MG yellow it to-sell

The label 'resumptive' is therefore misleading in the case of (French) LD. I would like to argue that the clitic involved in French LD has the same pronominal status as it would have in a sentence not involving a coreferential dislocated element. In other words, the pronoun *il* 'he' is fundamentally the same in sentences (30a) and (30b).

(30) a. C'est pour Kester$_i$. Il$_i$ aime bien les poissons.
that-is for Kester he loves well the fish
'That's for Kester. He loves the fish.'
b. **Kester**$_i$, il$_i$ aime bien les poissons.
Kester he loves well the fish
'Kester loves the fish.'

I conclude that the 'resumptive' element in French left dislocation is not a true resumptive but a full-fledged pronoun (with deficient characteristics in the case of clitics; see De Cat in press). This construction can therefore not be

[7]The same judgment would obtain if the left-dislocated element preceded the non-finite complementiser in (28b).

derived by movement (whether Chop or Copy). Corroborating evidence against a movement analysis is provided in the next section.

2.5 Corroborating Evidence for a Base-Generation Analysis of French Dislocation

Diagnostics for movement traditionally include weak cross-over effects, the licensing of parasitic gaps, relativised minimality effects and reconstruction effects. All these indicate that movement is *not* involved in the derivation of French dislocation.

2.5.1 French LD Does Not Yield WCO Effects

It is well known that, cross-linguistically, ClLD configurations do not induce weak cross-over effects: as shown in (31), a pronoun can freely intervene between its A′-binder (here *Abélard*) and the element at the foot of the 'chain' (here the resumptive element *l'* 'him').

(31) **Abélard**$_i$, sa$_i$ mère l'$_i$ aimait trop.
Abelard his mother him loved too-much
'Abelard's mother loved him too much.'

The same is true when the resumptive element is not a clitic:

(32) **Abélard**$_i$, on sait que son$_i$ élève passait des heures délicieuses
Abelard one knows that his pupil spent some hours delicious
avec lui$_i$.
with him
'It's well known that Abelard's pupil spent delicious hours with him.'

Absence of WCO effects is exactly what is expected on a base-generation analysis of dislocation.[8]

2.5.2 French LD Does Not License Parasitic Gaps

French is more restrictive than English with respect to the configurations in which parasitic gaps can be licensed (Tellier 2001). Examples of the parasitic gap construction in French are given in (33) (all examples from Tellier 2001). The most deeply embedded verb is obligatorily interpreted as transitive in sentences (33a) and (33c). Following Tellier, I take *t* to be the real gap and *e* to be the parasitic gap.

[8]Rizzi (1997) argues that the absence of WCO effects in ClLD can be accounted for in terms of non-operator A′-movement. I will consider that no movement (even of that type) applies in the case of French ClLD, given the bulk of the evidence discussed in section 2.

(33) a. Voilà les livres que tu as déchirés *t* au lieu de
PRESENTATIVE the books that you have torn in place of
consulter *e*.
consult
'These are the books that you tore up instead of consulting.'
b. Un homme dont l'honnêteté *t* se voit dans les yeux *e*.
a man of-who the-honesty REFL. sees in the eyes
'A man whose honesty shows in his eyes.'
c. C'est le genre de plat que tu dois cuire *t* avant de
it-is the kind of dish that you must cook before of
consommer *e*.
eat
'It's the kind of dish that you have to cook before eating.'

The left-dislocated constructions below are comparable to the examples above. Yet parasitic gaps are not possible:

(34) a. **Les livres**$_i$, tu les$_i$ as déchirés au lieu de *(les$_i$) consulter.
the books you them have torn in place of (them) to-consult
b. [**Un homme comme ça**]$_i$, son honnêteté se voit dans
a man like that his honesty REFL. sees in
[ses$_i$/*les] yeux.
[his/the] eyes
c. [**Ce genre de plat**]$_i$, tu dois le$_i$ cuire avant de *(le$_i$)
this kind of dish you must it cook before to (it)
consommer.
eat

Again, this would be entirely unexpected under a movement analysis of French dislocation.

2.5.3 No Relativised Minimality Effects

If movement is involved in the derivation of left-dislocated elements, relativised minimality effects should arise when a dislocated XP intervenes between another dislocated XP and its resumptive element. The examples in (35) illustrate that dislocated subjects and objects do not disrupt each other's chains.

(35) a. **La pluie**$_i$, **ta salade**$_j$, elle$_i$ lui$_j$ fera du bien.
the rain your lettuce it to-it will-do some good
'The rain will do your lettuce some good.'
b. **Cette toile**$_j$, **Julia**$_i$, elle$_i$ ne l'$_j$ a pas vendue.
that canvas Julia she NEG it has not sold
'Julia didn't sell that picture.'

It is even possible to 'intertwine' two topic chains associated with the same grammatical role. The interpretation of (36) indicated by the indexing is perfectly acceptable in a context where the hearer knows for instance that Rosi's mother has a big garden:

(36) **Rosi**$_i$, **sa mère**$_j$, elle$_i$ m'a dit qu'elle$_j$ adorait jardiner.
Rosi her mother she to-me-has said that-she loved gardening
'Rosi told me her mother loved gardening.'

I conclude that there are no minimality effects on topic chains, which corroborates a base-generation analysis.

2.5.4 No Reconstruction Effects in the Interpretation of French LD

One of the main arguments for a movement analysis of ClLD in various languages (aside from sensitivity to islands) has been reconstruction effects in the interpretation of dislocated elements (see e.g. Cecchetto 1999; Frascarelli 2000). Support for a movement analysis is found when dislocated elements are interpreted as if they occupied the argument position with which they are associated.

A series of facts suggest that in French, the dislocated element is not interpreted in its reconstructed position: (i) a dislocated element cannot be bound by a quantifier in subject position; (ii) no Condition C effects are observed; (iii) dislocated elements obligatorily take wide scope with respect to clausal negation; and (iv) when a dislocated element contains a variable, native speakers will by default search for a binder in the context rather than in the sentence.

A variable in a LDed XP cannot be bound by a clause-mate QP Consider the sentence in (37). The variable contained (in the possessive determiner) in the object can be bound by the universal quantifier in the subject position. A distributive interpretation of this sentence is therefore possible.

(37) [Chaque maître]$_i$ a renvoyé un de ses$_i$ disciples.
each master has dismissed one of his disciples
'Each master dismissed one of his (own) disciples.'

If the object is dislocated, as illustrated in (38), the distributive reading is lost. The only possible interpretation of this sentence is one in which the possessor corresponds to a referent identified in the discourse context (represented below by the index *x*), and not to the subject of the sentence.

(38) [Un de ses$_{x/*i}$ disciples]$_j$, [chaque maître]$_i$ l'$_j$ a renvoyé.
one of his disciples each master him has dismissed
'Each master dismissed one of his (somebody else's) disciples.'

This contrast indicates that the left-dislocated element is not interpreted in its reconstructed position (and presumably that QR targets a position that is lower than the dislocated element).

Absence of Condition C effects If dislocated elements are interpreted in their reconstructed position, one might expect Condition C effects to arise in cases like (39), which would be reconstructed as in (40).

(39) a. **Tes sales petites remarques sur Léon**$_i$, il$_i$ ne les
your dirty little remarks on Leon he NEG *them*
apprécierait surement pas.
would-appreciate surely not
'Leon would surely not appreciate your dirty little remarks about him.'

b. **Le dernier livre que j'ai prêté à Marie-Hélène**$_i$, elle$_i$ l'a
the last book that I-have lent to Marie-Helene she it-has
lu en une nuit.
read in one night
'The last book I lent her, Marie-Helene read in one night.'

(40) a. *Il n' apprécierait surement pas tes sales petites
he NEG *would-appreciate surely not your dirty little*
remarques sur Léon.
remarks on Leon

b. *Elle$_i$ a lu en une nuit le dernier livre que j'ai prêté ?
she has read in one night the last book that I-have lent to
Marie-Hélène$_i$.
Marie-Helene

The contrast between (39) and (40) shows that reconstruction is not obligatory in French. While it is not *per se* sufficient to show that a reconstruction interpretation of dislocated elements is impossible in French, I believe that it contributes significantly to the current discussion when considered together with the other pieces of evidence proposed.

Wide scope with respect to negation. If dislocated elements are (or can be) interpreted in their reconstructed position, it should be possible for them to get a narrow-scope reading with respect to sentential negation. This, however, is not possible with French dislocated elements, as illustrated in (41).

(41) **Toutes ces toiles**$_i$, Julia, elle ne les$_i$ a pas vendues.
all those canvases Julia she NEG *them has not sold*
'Julia didn't sell any of (all) those pictures.'
'Julia didn't sell some of those pictures.'

This sentence is false in a context where Julia sold some but not all of the pictures under discussion. The dislocated quantified phrase can thus not be interpreted in a reconstructed position which would allow it to enter the scope of the sentential negation.

Interpretation of variables. When presented with a sentence containing a potential binder for a variable contained inside a dislocated element, native speakers overwhelmingly tend to choose to associate the variable with a referent in the discourse context rather than with the sentence-internal binder.

91% of my informants (i.e. 28/31 speakers from Belgium, Canada, France and Switzerland) interpret *sa fille* 'his daughter'[9] as the daughter of a person other than the man mentioned in the following sentences (which were presented to them out of context to maximise the chances of sentence-internal binding):

(42) **Sa fille**, je connais l'homme qui l'$_i$a emmenée.
his daughter I know the-man who her-has taken-away
'I know the man who took his daughter away.'

This clear preference is unexpected if *sa fille* is interpreted in the object position — in which case the sentence would be entirely ambiguous as to whether it is that man's daughter or somebody else's (as confirmed by native speaker judgements).

The facts discussed above indicate that French LD cannot be derived by Copy. If it were the case, reconstruction effects would arise (because the dislocated element and its resumptive would in effect be a single constituent with two manifestations in the sentence). Yet, we have seen that they did not. I conclude, together with Hirschbühler (1975), that French LD is not derived by movement, be it (today's version of) Copy or Chop.

2.6 Are These in fact Hanging Topics?

In the wake of Hirschbühler (1975) and other articles arguing for a base-generation analysis of LD, a distinction was introduced (to my knowledge by Vat 1981) to distinguish between movement-generated LD and base-generated LD. Instances of the former are standardly considered to include ClLD and (Germanic) Contrastive Left Dislocation (which I will not consider here). Instances of the latter are mainly considered to be Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD). The question that arises is: is French (Cl)LD actually HTLD?

The distinction between ClLD and HTLD is not exactly clear-cut. It was originally established to distinguish 'non-connected' Left Dislocation (HTLD)

[9]The possessor in *sa fille* could equally be translated as 'her' but I have ignored this in the text so as to highlight the possibility of interpreting it as the daughter of the man mentioned in the sentences under scrutiny.

from its connected counterpart (ClLD) (see, e.g., Cinque 1983; Vat 1981). A dislocated element was considered to be connected when it bore marks of dependency from a sentence-internal element. This connectedness was argued to manifest itself essentially in terms of case matching between the dislocated element and its resumptive.

Four other properties traditionally distinguish HTLD from ClLD. First, HTLD is not recursive but ClLD is (i.e. more than one dislocated element is allowed). Second, HTLD is a strictly root phenomenon while ClLD can occur in (certain) embedded clauses.[10] Third, HTLD tends not to be resumed by a clitic — though authors diverge as to whether HTLD can be resumed by a clitic at all. Cinque (1983), for instance, argues that the reason why (43) is grammatical is that this example does not involve ClLD but HTLD in spite of featuring a resumptive clitic. Others argue that HTLD involves by definition a non-clitic resumptive (e.g. Grohmann 2000).

(43) **Giorgio**$_i$**,** non conosco [la ragazza [che lui$_i$ vuole sposare]].
Giorgio not I-know the girl that him wants to-marry
'I don't know the girl who wants to marry Giorgio.' (Cinque 1983:97)

Fourth, ClLD has a right-hand counterpart but HTLD does not.

In spite of these differences, no clear interpretive differences have to my knowledge been identified that would distinguish HTLD from ClLD: in both cases, the dislocated element is interpreted as the topic.

The following facts suggest that French left-dislocated DPs resumed by a clitic, as those in (10), are not instances of hanging topics: (i) more than one such dislocated element is allowed (44); (ii) the dislocated XP can appear in an embedded clause (45); (iii) and left-dislocated elements can just as well appear in the right periphery of the clause (46). Yet, in none of the examples (44)-(46) does the dislocated element show overt marks of connectedness.

(44) a. **Les autres**$_i$, **Alice**$_j$, elle$_j$ les$_i$ a déjà lus.
the other-ones Alice she them has already read
'Alice has already read the other ones.'

b. **Camille**$_i$, **le juge**$_j$, elle$_i$ a décidé de l'$_j$ inviter quand même.
Camille the judge she has decided to him invite nonetheless
'Camille decided to invite the judge nonetheless.'

[10] I come back to this point in section 3.3.

(45) a. Je ne savais pas que **les cochons**$_i$, ils$_i$ avaient des salles de
I NEG knew not that the pigs they had some rooms of
bain.
bath
'I didn't know pigs had bathrooms.'

b. J'ai peur que **Jonas**$_i$, il$_i$ les prenne.
I-have read that Jonas he them takes
'I fear Jonas might take them.'

(46) a. Elle les$_i$ a déjà lus, **les autres**$_i$.
the them has already read the other-ones
'She's already read the other ones.'

b. Elle a décidé de l'$_i$ inviter quand même, **le juge**$_i$.
she has decided to him invite nonetheless the judge
'She decided to invite the judge nonetheless.'

Let us take a closer look at the issue of connectedness. French does not exhibit morphological case marking on DPs, and dislocated pronominals obligatorily appear in the strong form (e.g. *moi* 'me' rather than *me* 'I') irrespective of the grammatical function of their resumptive element. The tightness of the connection between the dislocated element and the rest of the sentence can therefore not be measured straightforwardly. However, it has been argued that in languages like French, indirect case is marked on DPs by means of a preposition (e.g. Kayne 1975; Vergnaud 1974). Though prepositions are not all case markers: Zaring (1991) argues that only dative and non-dative *à* + NP (as in (47)) and *de* + NP (as in (48)) are case-marked NPs (and not true PPs) in French.

(47) a. J' ai écrit à Marie-Hélène.
I have written to Marie-Helene
'I've written to Marie-Helene.'

b. Je pensais à Montréal.
I was-thinking to Montreal
'I was thinking about Montreal.'

(48) a. Elle parlait de Solène.
she was-talking of Solene
'She was talking about Solene.'

b. Elle a envie de soleil.
she has desire of sun
'She wants some sun.'

Consequently, the PPs in (47) and (48) are case-marked DPs, but those in (49) are true PPs.

(49) a. J' irai boire un verre avec Shaun.
I will-go to-drink a glass with Shaun
'I'll go for a drink with Shaun.'
b. Ils viendront chez nous.
they will-come at us
'They'll come to our house.'

To the extent that such PPs are genuine case-marked DPs, they would provide the only uncontroversial basis for a distinction between connected and non-connected dislocation in French. If a PP has to be stripped of its P to become acceptable in a dislocated position, this would indicate that the resulting configuration is an instance of HTLD rather than ClLD. Pushing this line further, one could argue that the obligatory stripping of a preposition from PPs whose resumptive element is situated inside a strong island would be a clear indication that French ClLD is in fact impossible in such configurations and that whenever the resumptive element of a dislocated DP is situated inside a strong island, the configuration is that of HTLD and not ClLD.

The facts, however, are far from being that clear (as I explain below). What I believe is crucial for the present purpose is that native speakers do accept dislocated PPs resumed by an element inside a strong island at least some of the time. To the extent that (i) the preposition is an indicator of the connectedness between the dislocated element and the rest of the sentence and that (ii) HTLD does not display such signs of connectedness, I take these cases to indicate clearly that French ClLD (or whatever one decides to call these cases of 'connected' dislocation) is not constrained syntactically by strong islands.

There is however a noticeable degree of variability across speakers and across test sentences, for which an explanation is needed.[11] Importantly, I have not found any sign of inter-individual or dialectal variation as to the sensitivity of dislocated elements to islands. Judgments of markedness or unacceptability were randomly distributed across informants and across dialects: it is not the case that certain speakers categorically disallow an island boundary to intervene between the dislocated element and its resumptive.

What I have found is that left-dislocated PPs (whether they are genuine PPs or case-marked DPs) tend to be viewed as marked by most informants (and are extremely rare in corpora of spontaneous production),[12] but this is true whether the resumptive element is situated within an island or not.

The DP counterpart to left-dislocated PPs is almost always preferred, as indicated by the contrast between (50) and (51).

[11] Thanks to Jenny Doetjes for discussion of this issue.

[12] Out of a sample of 4030 clauses produced by adults, extracted from the York and Cat corpora of spontaneous production, I did not find a single instance of a left-dislocated object PP (see De Cat (2002) for details). A similar observation has been made for other French corpora of spontaneous production by Barnes (1985) and Lambrecht (1981; 1986).

(50) a. ??**De ce projet**$_i$, il en$_i$ a beaucoup parlé.
of this project he of-it has a-lot talked
b. ??**A ce travail-là**, **je** ne saurai jamais m'y$_i$ faire.
to that job-there I NEG will-know never me-to-it do
c. ??**Au confort**$_i$, on s'y$_i$ habitue très vite.
to-the comfort one REFL-to-it gets-used very quickly

(51) a. **Ce projet**$_i$, il en$_i$ a beaucoup parlé.
that project he of-it has a-lot talked
'He talked a lot about that project.'
b. **Ce travail**$_i$**-là**, je ne saurai jamais m'y$_i$ faire.
that job-there I NEG will-know never me-to-it do
'I'll never get used to that job.'
c. **Le confort**$_i$, on s'y$_i$ habitue très vite.
the comfort one REFL-to-it gets-used very quickly
'One gets used to comfort very quickly.'

The 'stripping' of dependency markers from left-dislocated elements is not obligatory (as suggested by the fact that the examples in (51) are marked rather than ungrammatical), but it is preferred. This might indicate that the requirement that left-dislocated topics be bare DPs is not syntactic in nature. If that requirement is not met, the resulting sentence is marked rather than ungrammatical.[13]

I would conclude that French LD is not HTLD to the extent that it displays the following properties: (i) it is recursive; (ii) it is allowed in certain embedded contexts (though, as we will see in section 3.3, these have to be root-like); (iii) it can be resumed by a clitic; and (iv) it can (though marginally) bear marks of connectivity (to the extent that these are visible in spoken French).

This conclusion needs qualifying, though. If, cross-linguistically, the difference between connected and non-connected LD (i.e. between ClLD and HTLD) translates categorically into different syntactic configurations which are arrived at via different syntactic derivations or mechanisms, an analysis of French LD as involving HTLD in all cases might be more desirable so as to fit in with the general picture. If this was the case, a revision of the core characteristics of HTLD would be called for on the basis of the French data: HTLD would after all be recursive, be allowed in certain embedded contexts and display dependency markers in a limited way.

[13] A possibility which I hope to explore in further research is that the marginality of left-dislocated PPs might be due to increased demands on processing/parsing. Indeed, until a resumptive element (or a trace) is identified, the hearer does not know whether to interpret the sentence as involving topicalisation (which involves movement) or left-dislocation (which I argue does not).

2.7 Conclusion

The evidence discussed so far unambiguously points towards a base-generation analysis of French dislocated elements. It has been argued that syntactic boundaries freely intervene between the dislocated element and its resumptive and that there are no notable *syntactic* discrepancies between dislocated elements resumed by a clitic and those resumed by a non-clitic.

3 A First-Merge Adjunction Analysis of French Dislocation

3.1 The Analysis

The analysis I will argue for is summarised in (52). It involves neither movement of the dislocated element nor (covertly) of its resumptive and no requirement for a dedicated functional projection (such as TopicP).[14]

(52) Dislocated elements are adjoined by first-merge to a maximal projection with root properties.

The main points of this proposal are spelled out in (53).

(53) a. Dislocated elements appear at the edge of Discourse Projections (following Emonds 2004). Discourse Projections are finite root(-like) clauses.
b. The numeration is organised into D-subarrays. A D-subarray is a phase (in the sense of Chomsky 2000; 2001) containing a T endowed with a discourse feature.
c. When the remaining items of a D-subarray are not visible to Merge, Adjunction applies as a last-resort operation to exhaust the numeration.
d. Topics are licensed and interpreted by a rule of Predication.

Point (53a): The structural and interpretive reflexes of information structure tend to be absent from embedded clauses, except in what some have characterised as embedded quotations (see e.g. Tomioka 2000) or more generally embedded clauses with root properties (Hooper and Thompson 1973).[15] Emonds

[14]This analysis does not apply to Topicalised structures (in which a (generally contrastive) left-peripheral element appears without a resumptive element and the sentence would be ungrammatical if the peripheral XP is removed), which are best accounted for by syntactic movement (De Cat 2002). However it is not necessary to postulate the existence of a TopicP even in such structures, as argued by Lasnik and Saito (1992).

[15]See Heycock (to appear) for a comprehensive review of the literature on embedded root phenomena.

(2004) argues that clauses with root properties are essentially finite IPs. He proposes that what counts as a Discourse Projection (other than IP) is parameterised and that so-called *embedded root phenomena* involve root-like indirect discourse embedding ('RIDE'). Emonds further argues that Discourse Projections are dominated by categorially unspecified Discourse Shells (equivalent to CP when their head is filled by a complementiser) that enable root transformations.

I propose that dislocated elements, which, being topics, have a clear discourse import, are adjoined to Discourse Projections. This correctly predicts the distribution of dislocated topics, as argued in detail in De Cat 2002.

The concept of Discourse Projection could be implemented in minimalist fashion by endowing T with a discourse feature. At this point, I see three possibilities worth considering: [anchoring], [assertive] or [performative]. (i) The choice of an [anchoring] feature could be motivated by the work of Haegeman (2002; 2003), who argues that to have root properties, a clause needs to be interpreted relative to a context, which requires reference to speaker and hearer. This feature would force the event expressed by the verb in T to be interpreted relative to the topic of the sentence, whose default values correspond to the time and place of utterance (Erteschik-Shir 1997; Gundel 1975) and to the speaker. (ii) Alternatively, the choice of an [assertive] feature could be justified by the need to account for the fact that root-like clauses are typically embedded under attitude verbs, which have been argued to introduce 'quotations' (Hooper and Thompson 1973). However, this would fail to capture the fact that topics are possible with imperatives and questions. (iii) Opting for a [performative] feature might fare better in capturing the inherent properties of root clauses (see e.g. De Cat 2002). I leave the issue of the exact nature of the discourse feature on T for further research.

What is crucial at this point is that the discourse feature on T should not be specifically a [topic] feature. It is also important to note that this discourse feature does not need checking in the overt syntax of French: it does not participate in an Agreement relation and hence cannot trigger movement (of e.g. a topic XP). In spoken French, an XP in [spec,TP] cannot be interpreted as the topic of the sentence (as argued extensively in De Cat in press). This would be unexpected if T bore a [topic] feature which required checking by an XP topic.

The main effect of this discourse feature on T is to force Spell-out of the phase containing it, which becomes inaccessible/opaque to further (discourse) operations. For instance, as shown by Haegeman (2003), a focus operator in the associated clause of a cleft can range over an adverbial clause only if that clause has root properties (which she demonstrates is true of so-called peripheral adverbial clauses, like the one in (54a), but not so-called central adverbial clauses, like the one in (54b).

(54) a. It is after I left that I realised he was my former teacher. (Haegeman's (11-a))
b. *It is while my mother was a housewife that my father used to work in a brickyard. (Haegeman's (11-c))

A similar effect can be observed with negation facts. An adverbial clause may only fall within the scope of main clause negation if it lacks root properties (Haegeman 2003):

(55) a. He doesn't drink while he's driving. (Haegeman's (10a))
b. My husband doesn't smoke cigarettes, while he does occasionally smoke a cigar. (Haegeman's (10c))

The negation can only range over a complex event encompassing a central adverbial clause (drinking and driving) (55a), not a peripheral one (smoking cigarettes and smoking cigars) (55b).

These facts can be accounted for by the fact that peripheral adverbial clauses (but not central adverbial clauses) have root properties (as demonstrated by Haegeman 2003), which I argue renders them opaque.

Point (53b): Peripheral topics (i.e. dislocated elements) can appear either at the edge of the clause containing their resumptive element (which requires this clause to be a Discourse Projection) or they can appear higher, as in (5b), (5c), (10), (19), (30b), (32), and (42), in which case the higher clause (but not the lower one) is a Discourse Projection. This must be determined on the basis of which D-subarray the dislocated element belongs to. The underlying assumption is that the numeration is selected in an information structure-sensitive fashion. This, I believe, is necessary under any analysis to account for the choice of, for example, pronominals instead of R-expressions in a context where the referent in question is salient. It is what gives the appropriate numeration to utter (56a) rather than (56b) as a follow-up to (56), a choice driven by a combination of information structure and economy considerations.

(56) My friend has two children.
a. She feeds them every day.
b. My friend feeds her children every day.

Under current assumptions, the grammar does not include a rule of pronominalisation. Yielding (56a) rather than (56b) as an output therefore depends entirely on what the numeration contains. I believe similar conclusions would have to be drawn under a cartographic approach à la Rizzi (1997).[16] The concept of D-subarray captures the information-structure-sensitive nature of lexical selection in the building of the numeration.

[16]I am not aware of any work within the cartographic approach addressing these issues explicitly.

Point (53c): Adjunction is the only operation that can be performed blindly by the syntactic computational system, as it does not obligatorily involve agreement (see Hoekstra 1991).[17] This blindness is exactly what allows syntax to be freed from the burden of information structure, which is necessary to account for the French dislocation data, as will be shown below.[18] The Extension Condition (Chomsky, 1993; 1995) is met by the fact that adjunction can only exhaust the numeration within a D-subarray, which in effect corresponds to a root projection. The theoretical implications of the base-generated adjunction analysis of French dislocation will be discussed in section 3.4.

Point (53d) finds justification in the work of Chomsky (1977), Iatridou (1990), É.Kiss (1995), Rizzi (1997), Erteschik-Shir (1997), and Barbosa (2000), among others. The rule of Predication is what evaluates the dislocated structure. Following Erteschik-Shir (1997), I assume that this rule operates in the interpretive component. Recast in the terms of the present analysis, this rule interprets the Discourse Projection as the predicate and the adjoined topic as the subject of predication. The latter is understood as what the predication is about — more precisely, as the referent with respect to which the truth value of the sentence is evaluated — following Reinhart (1981). If the dislocated element cannot be interpreted as the topic, the combination of what the rule of Predication interprets as the 'subject' and the 'predicate' is anomalous: it gets rejected on interpretive (discourse) grounds.

As an illustration of the proposed analysis, consider the following sentence:

(57) Elle$_i$ coule de source, **cette analyse**$_i$.
she flows from spring this analysis
'This analysis is straightforward.'

The derivation starts out with the subarray in (58), and proceeds from the bottomup in standard fashion until TP is reached.

(58) v, T$_{[performative]}$, elle, coule, de, source, cette, analyse

After the discourse projection TP has been merged, we are left with two items in the numeration: *cette* and *analyse*, which I will assume are built into a DP. Adjunction applies as a last-resort operation to exhaust the numeration: the remaining DP is adjoined to the top of the structure, yielding a TP (on top of which a CP can project).

[17] A syntactic crash would result if the topic is merged in argument position because the required resumptive clitic would then be adjoined as last-resort but would not have an adequate host on which to cliticise.

[18] Freeing syntax from information structure features should also apply to Focus for consistency. See Szendröi (2001, 2003) for an analysis eschewing syntactic focus features.

3.2 Predictions of the Adjunction Analysis

The adjunction analysis predicts that French dislocated elements can appear at the edge of any Discourse Projection and that there is no *syntactic* constraint on the number of topics allowed nor on whether they appear in root or embedded clauses.[19] Different predictions are made under an analysis *à la* Rizzi (1997), which constrains the distribution of left-peripheral topics by licensing them only at the edge of designated topic phrases (TopPs). Such TopPs can only be projected if they do not give rise to minimality or adjacency effects. Due to space restrictions, I cannot show that such an analysis cannot account for the distribution of French left-dislocation. I refer the reader to De Cat 2002. For arguments against the postulation of FocP and TopP, see Newmeyer (2004).

3.3 French Embedded Discourse Projections

The extent to which dislocated elements are allowed at the edge of embedded clauses has, to my knowledge, never been fully investigated in the literature. While an in-depth investigation would be beyond the scope of this paper, I would like to make a few observations to pave the way for subsequent research.

Under the present analysis, French dislocated elements are only allowed to appear at the edge of Discourse Projections. I follow Emonds (2004) in assuming that only root and root-like clauses contain a Discourse Projection (corresponding to TP). The set of embedded clauses with root properties varies cross-linguistically (a point to which I come back below). He notes that such projections are finite and that they are usually complements rather than adjuncts and governed by V or A (rather than N or P), with some argument of the governing V being animate.

In what follows, I make a first sketch of what counts as embedded root in spoken French, on the basis of the dislocation data.

A number of conditions have been identified in the literature for an embedded clause to qualify as root-like. Hooper and Thompson (1973) argue that so-called *root transformations* (i.e. transformations that can only take place in root clauses, following Emonds 1970) are only possible in embedded clauses to the extent that such clauses can be asserted. Typically, 'embedded root clauses' are indicative clauses selected by a verb of saying or a factive verb (see Heycock to appear, to appear for a review of the literature on the subject).

The group of embedded clauses allowing a left-dislocated topic in spoken French is wider than what is commonly included in the 'embedded root clause' category. Left-dislocated topics appear in (i) certain subjunctive clauses, as in (59a), (45b), (8a); (ii) restrictive relative clauses, as in (59b); (iii) clauses selected by a negated verb, as in (59c); and (iv) clauses that are not assertive, as in

[19]This is not to say that constraints of another type do not play a role in restricting the distribution of topics in embedded clauses. This issue is addressed in section 3.3.

(59d), all of which fall outside off the traditional classification of embedded root clauses. All the examples in (59) come from the York corpus of spontaneous production.

(59) a. Tu veux que **moi**, je le dessine?
you want that me I it draw
'Do you want me to draw it?'
b. Elle enregistre ce que **toi**, tu dis.
she records that that you you say
'It records what you're saying.'
c. Je savais pas que **les cochons**, ils avaient des salles de bain, moi.
I knew not that the pigs they had some bathrooms me
'I didn't know pigs had bathrooms.'
d. Et si **moi**, je viens et que je casse tous tes jouets, tu seras contente?
and if me I come and that I break all your toys you will-be happy
'And if I come and break all your toys, will you be happy?'

However, dislocated topics are banned from embedded, non-finite clauses, as predicted by Emonds' definition of Discourse Projections as inherently finite.[20]

(60) a. *J'ai dit de, les haricots, les équeuter.
I-have said to the beans them tail
b. *J'ai peur de, moi, me couper.
I-have fear to me REFL cut

The matrix clause also has an impact on whether the embedded clause can take a dislocated element. In general, an embedded clause tends to have root properties when it conveys indirect discourse, i.e. when the embedding verb introduces reported speech.[21] Emonds' generalisation is that an embedded clause will have root properties if the governing verb has an animate argument serving as a subject of consciousness.

[20]The dislocated elements in (60) can only appear at the edge of the matrix clause (a Discourse Projection):

(i) a. **Les haricots**$_i$, j'ai dit de les$_i$ équeuter.
the beans I-have said to them tail
b. **Moi**, j'ai peur de me couper.
me I-have fear to REFL cut

[21]It is not sufficient for an embedded clause to be selected by a verb like *say* for it to qualify as embedded root: it also has to be finite, as illustrated by (60a).

(61) a. #Il faut empêcher que les myrtilles, ils les cueillent toutes
it must impede that the bilberries they them pick all
aujourd'hui.
today

b. Ils ont dit que les myrtilles, ils les avaient toutes
they have said that the bilberries they them had all
cueillies aujourd'hui.
picked today
'They said they had picked all the bilberries today.'

Incidentally, note that a Rizzian analysis offers no principled explanation of the unacceptability of (61a), given that the presence of a TopP in the embedded clause does not yield adjacency effects of any sort.

Non-object clauses can also be endowed with root properties. This is true of e.g. conditional clauses (59d) and relative clauses. Ease of identification of the topic's referent facilitates its presence in a relative clause: dislocated elements referring to speaker or hearer are allowed more readily than third person referents in general (see De Cat 2002 for details). It may well be the case that relevance-theoretic considerations have an impact on the acceptability of topics in such clauses.

To offer a preliminary conclusion: French embedded root clauses do not have exactly the characteristics of embedded root clauses as they have been defined in the literature. However, this might be due to the fact that embedded root phenomena have been studied mainly with respect to Germanic languages. Further research is clearly necessary to determine the extent of cross-linguistic variation as to which embedded clauses can be endowed with root properties.

3.4 Theoretical Consequences

Over the past two decades, a variety of phenomena have been taken to motivate the assumption that syntactic movement could take place via intermediate adjoined positions (for a comprehensive review of the relevant literature, see Sabel 2002). Postulating the existence of intermediate traces in VP-adjoined positions was shown to explain a variety of phenomena (such as reconstruction effects, locality effects and the absence of weak cross-over effects) in certain configurations involving *wh*-movement and scrambling. Adjunction to VP could not, however, be left unconstrained. It was established (among others by Chomsky 1986) that adjuncts could not be adjoined to adjuncts or to any XP requiring L-marking and that, more generally, movement was ruled out from [spec,CP] to an adjoined position.

Sabel (2002) argues that these restrictions do not follow from strictly minimalist assumptions and that they give rise to a number of empirical problems. He defends the idea that *movement may not proceed via intermediate adjunc-*

tion and that successive-cyclic movement only targets specifier positions.

I have presented clear evidence to the effect that French dislocated elements are adjoined to Discourse Projections and that this type of adjunction does not involve syntactic movement. This has the following consequences:

(62) a. The ban on adjunction to adjuncts and to object clauses is a *derivational* constraint, not a *representational* one.
b. XP-adjuncts need to be distinguished from specifiers: only the latter involve Agreement.

French dislocation has been shown to be possible at the edge of object and adjunct clauses. This, in the light of Sabel 2002, suggests that the ban on adjunction to such clauses is not representational in nature.

The present analysis also provides further empirical support for Hoekstra's (1991) arguments in favour of maintaining a distinction between XP-adjuncts and specifiers, based on the fact that only the latter involve syntactic agreement.

Finally, the possibility of left- and right-adjunction of dislocated elements does not contravene the Head Parameter (which Saito and Fukui (1998) argue applies to adjuncts too) if the distinction between adjunction by movement and base-generated adjunction is maintained: only the former but not the latter need incorporate the effects of that parameter.

4 Conclusion

French dislocation has been shown to be a syntactically uniform phenomenon, irrespective of the nature of the resumptive element. This phenomenon is uniform in the sense that the following characteristics are maintained in all cases: (i) the dislocated element expresses the topic of the sentence; (ii) the 'resumptive' element can be situated inside an island or inside another clause to that hosting the dislocated element; and (iii) dislocated constructions do not display the key properties of movement configurations: they do not license parasitic gaps, do not give rise to weak cross-over or minimality effects, and are not interpreted via reconstruction.

The term 'resumptive' has been argued to be something of a misnomer in this case, given that the clause-internal element coreferential with the dislocated XP is not interpreted as a genuine resumptive pronoun (in the sense of Sells 1984), does not manifest the properties advocated in Postal (1998), and does not behave as predicted by Boeckx (2003). Indeed, there is no syntactic requirement for the dislocated element to be present: any sentence containing a dislocated element is equally acceptable if that dislocated element is deleted. The so-called resumptive element is best analysed as a full-fledged (though possibly deficient) pronoun interpreted as a discourse-level anaphor.

The analysis proposed is that French dislocated elements are base-generated by adjunction to maximal projections with discourse properties (which requires them to be root or root-like). The distribution of dislocated elements is determined by their own discourse properties and those of the clausal projection with which they combine into a Predication (in the sense of Chomsky 1977). While issues concerning root-like embedded clauses are still some way from being resolved, an analysis of French dislocation as an essentially root phenomenon seems to be on the right track. Such an approach offers a more principled way of accounting for the distribution of peripheral topics than one which assumes that TopicPs can be projected at the edge of any clause unless they violate syntactic requirements (such as adjacency).

One of the advantages of the proposed analysis is that it makes it possible to free syntax from the burden of information structure. This is highly desirable on the face of the influence of factors such as the ease of identification of the corresponding discourse referents on the distribution of dislocated elements. On such an analysis, it is possible to postulate highly specialised components of the language faculty, thus maximising economy and allowing full exploitation of the potential of the interfaces between these components. In particular, a direct interaction between information structure and the lexicon is desirable — and perhaps indispensable, if one is to take the Inclusiveness condition seriously.

References

Alexopoulou, Theodora, Doron, Edit, and Heycock, Caroline. In press. Broad Subjects and Clitic Left Dislocation. In Adger, David, De Cat, Cécile, and Tsoulas, George, eds., *Peripheries. Syntactic Edges and Their Effect*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 329–358.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1997. Clitic Left Dislocation and Contrastive Left Dislocation. In Anagnostopoulou, Elena, van Riemsdijk, Henk, and Zwarts, Franz, eds., *Materials on Left Dislocation*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 151–192.

Aoun, Joseph and Benmamoun, Elabbas. 1998. Minimality, reconstruction, and PF movement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29(4):569–597.

Barbosa, Pilar. 2000. Clitics. a window into the null subject property. In Costa, João., ed., *Portuguese Syntax. New Comparative Studies*. OUP, Oxford, pp. 31–92.

Barnes, Betsy. 1985. *The Pragmatics of Left Detachment in Spoken Standard French*, volume VI:3 of *Pragmatics & Beyond*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. *Islands and Chains: Resumption as Derivational Residue*. Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 63. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Cecchetto, Carlo. 1999. A comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica*, 53(1):40–67.

Cecchetto, Carlo. 2000. Doubling Structures and Reconstruction. *Probus*, 12(1):93–126.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On *WH*-movement. In Culicover, Peter, Wasow, Thomas, and Akmajian, Adrian, eds., *Formal Syntax*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 71–132.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In Hale, Kenneth and Keyser, Samuel Jay, eds., *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 1–52.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In Martin, Roger, Michaels, David, and Uriagereka, Juan, eds., *Step by Step*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by hase. In Kenstowicz, Michael, ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1983. 'Topic' Constructions in Some European Languages and 'Connectedness'. In Ehlich, Konrad and van Riemsdijk, Henk, eds., *Connectedness in Sentence Text and Discourse*, volume 4 of *Tilburg Studies in Language and Literature*. KBU, Tilburg, pp. 7–42.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A′ Dependencies*, volume 17 of Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

De Cat, Cécile. 2002. *French Dislocation*. PhD diss., University of York.

De Cat, Cécile. In press. French subject clitics are not agreement morphemes. *Lingua*.

Delais-Roussarie, Elisabeth, Doetjes, Jenny, Marandin, Jean-Marie, and Sleeman, Petra. 2003. Left Dislocation and Topicalisation in French. Talk presented at the ZAS Workshop on Dislocated Elements in Discourse, Berlin. PhD diss.

Emonds, Joseph. 1970. *Root and structure-preserving transformations*. PhD diss., MIT.

Emonds, Joseph. 2004. Unspecified categories as the key to root constructions. In Adger, David, De Cat, Cécile, and Tsoulas, George, eds., *Peripheries. Syntactic edges and their effects*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 75–120.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Escobar, Linda. 1997. Clitic Left Dislocation and Other Relatives. In Anagnostopoulou, Elena, van Riemsdijk, Henk, and Zwarts, Franz, eds., *Materials on Left Dislocation, Linguistik Aktuell 14*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, pp. 233–274.

Frascarelli, Maria. 2000. *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 50. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Grohmann, Kleanthes. 2000. *Prolific Peripheries. A Radical View from the Left*. PhD diss., University of Maryland.

Gundel, Jeannette. 1975. Left Dislocation and the Role of Topic-Comment Structures in Linguistic Theory. *OSU WPL*, 18:72–131.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2002. Anchoring to Speaker, Adverbial Clauses and the Structure of CP. *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics*, 2:117–180.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. The Syntax of Adverbial Clauses and Its Consequences for Topicalisation. Ms, Université Charles de Gaulle - Lille III.

Heycock, Caroline. To appear. Embedded Root Phenomena. In van Riemsdijk, Henk and Everaert, Martin, eds., *The Syntax Companion: An Electronic Encyclopaedia of Case Studies*. The LingComp Foundation.

Hirschbühler, Paul. 1975. On the Source of Lefthand NPs in French. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 6:155–165.

Hoekstra, Eric. 1991. *Licensing Conditions on Phrase Structure*. Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics (GroDiL), Groningen.

Hooper, Joan and Thompson, Sandra. 1973. On the Applicability of Root Transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 4(4):465–497.

Iatridou, Sabine. 1990. *Clitics and Islands Effects*. Ms, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French Syntax*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
É. Kiss, Katalin. 1995. Introduction. In É.Kiss, Katalin, ed., *Discourse Configurational Languages*. OUP, Oxford, pp. 3–28.
Lambrecht, Knud. 1981. *Topic, Antitopic and Verb Agreement in Non-Standard French*, volume II:6 of *Pragmatics & Beyond*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
Lambrecht, Knud. 1986. *Topic, Focus, and the Grammar of Spoken French*. PhD diss., University of California.
Larsson, Eva. 1979. *La dislocation en français : Étude de syntaxe générative*. CZK Gleerup, Lund.
Lasnik, Howard and Saito, Mamoru. 1992. *Move alpha*. Current Studies in Linguistics. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
Newmeyer, Frederick. 2004. On Split-CPs, Uninterpretable Features, and the 'Perfectness' of Language. This volume.
Postal, Paul. 1998. *Three Investigations of Extraction*. Current Studies in Linguistics 29. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. *Philosophica*, 27:53–93.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativised Minimality*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar. A handbook of Generative Syntax*.. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281–337.
Ross, John. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. PhD diss., MIT, Cambridge, MA.
Sabel, Joachim. 2002. Intermediate Traces, Reconstruction and Locality Effects. In Artemis Alexiadou, ed., *Theoretical Approaches to Universals*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 259–313.
Saito, Mamoru and Fukui, Naoki. 1998. Order in Phrase Structure and Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29(3):439–474.
Sells, Peter. 1984. *Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns*. GSLA, Amherst.
Sportiche, Dominique. 1988. A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and Its Corollaries for Constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19(3):425–449.
Strawson, Peter. 1964. Identifying Reference and Truth Values. *Theoria*, 30.
Szendröi, Kriszta. 2001. *Focus and the Syntax-Phonology Interface*. PhD diss., UCL, London.
Szendröi, Kriszta. 2003. A Stress-Based Approach to the Syntax of Hungarian Focus. *The Linguistic Review*, 20:37–78.
Tellier, Christine. 2001. On Some Distinctive Properties of Parasitic gaps in French. In Culicover, Peter and Postal, Paul, eds., *Parasitic Gaps*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
Tomioka, Satoshi. 2000. Information Structure and Disambiguation in Japanese. In Megerdoomian, K. and Bar-ell, L., eds., *WCCFL*, volume 20, Somerville, MA. Cascadilla Press, pp. 101–114.
Vat, Jan. 1981. Left Dislocation, connectedness and reconstruction. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik (GAGL)*, 20:80–103.
Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 1974. *French Relative Clauses*. PhD diss., MIT, Cambridge, MA.
Zaring, Laurie. 1991. On Prepositions and Case-Marking in French. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics / Revue canadienne de Linguistique*, 36(4):363–377.