

Notes on the syntax and the pragmatics of German Left Dislocation

Werner Frey

Abstract

Both *German Left Dislocation* (GLD) as well as so called *Hanging Topic Left Dislocation* (HTLD) are commonly considered to be topic marking constructions. This paper demonstrates that while this is in fact true for the former construction, it is not for the latter. Contra the standard assumption it will be shown that the resumptive pronoun (RP) of GLD may be positioned in the middle field of a German clause. However, it cannot appear anywhere in the middle field, but only in the designated topic position. Thus, the RP necessarily has the status of a sentence topic. As regards discourse properties, it is shown that GLD has to respect the condition of recoverability, and that it is a sentence topic promotion device, which, however, maintains the current discourse topic. GLD differs crucially from the HTLD construction and standard V-second clauses with regard to these properties.

In addition, the syntax of GLD is considered. After a critical discussion of two recent movement analyses of the dislocated phrase, it is argued that an analysis which base generates the dislocated phrase at the left periphery of the clause containing the RP is more adequate. The paper ends with some reflections about the relationship between the syntactic structure of GLD and its discourse properties.

1. Introduction

In German, a typical declarative main clause is a V-second clause, i.e. a clause in which a single maximal projection occupies the position preceding the finite verb called the ‘prefield’. Besides this standard case there exist a group of constructions which show at least two maximal phrases in front of the finite verb. This group includes German Left Dislocation, Hanging Topic Left Dislocation, and constructions which have a speech act adverbial clause or a conditional of irrelevance (cf. D’Avis this volume) in front of the prefield.

Although this paper primarily addresses German Left Dislocation, it also contains some reflections on similarities and differences between German Left Dislocation, V-second clauses, and Hanging Topic Left Dislocation. It is organized as follows: In section 2, the construction to be primarily considered is characterized. It is shown that binding effects provide the right means to identify the construction unambiguously. Section 3 demonstrates that there is a designated position in the German clause which is reserved for topics. This insight will be used in section 4 to determine whether or not German Left Dislocation is necessarily a topic marking construction. In section 5, further information-structural properties of German Left Dislocation are investigated and compared with the properties of V-second clauses and the Hanging Topic construction. Finally, section 6 discusses the syntactic analysis of the construction. It is argued that base generation of the dislocated element is superior to a movement account.

2. Left Dislocation in German, Left Dislocation in English

In the literature on German syntax, the term *Linksversetzung* (which is the translation of the term *Left Dislocation*) is used to refer to the following construction:

- (1) *den Hans, → den mag jeder*
(Linksversetzung, German Left Dislocation)
the-acc H., RP-acc likes everyone

This construction is sometimes called *Contrastive Left Dislocation*. Since this construction does not have to be contrastive, I will employ the term

German Left Dislocation (GLD). A construction with formal properties very similar to (1) is also found in Dutch.

In his influential study, Altmann (1981) lists the following main characteristics of GLD: (i) progradient intonation on the dislocated phrase (= ‘GLDed phrase’ in the following), no pause between it and the rest of the clause (indicated by ‘→’ in (1)); (ii) the resumptive pronoun (RP) that appears in the construction is a weak *d*-pronoun, for example, if the GLDed phrase is an NP, the RP is a pronoun such as *der*, *die*, *das* if nominative or the case-inflected variants thereof; (iii) the RP occurs in the prefield of the clause; (iv) if the dislocated phrase is an NP, it has the same case as the RP. GLD has to be differentiated from the construction in (2), which is referred to as *freies Thema* (free theme) or *Hanging Topic Left Dislocation* (HTLD) in the literature (the latter term will be used in this paper):

- (2) *den Hans*, ↓ *jeder mag ihn* (HTLD)
the-acc H., everyone likes him

Altmann (1981) notes the following main characteristics of HTLD: (i) there is a pause between the ‘hanging topic’ phrase and the rest of the clause (indicated by ‘↓’ in (2)); (ii) the resumptive element shows up in the form of a personal pronoun, a *d*-pronoun (which does not have to be weak) or even a superordinate term; (iii) the resumptive element may appear in the prefield or in a low position, i.e. in the middle field of the clause; (iv) if the dislocated phrase is an NP, it is in the nominative or it is in the same case as the resumptive element.

It is immediately clear that, given these characteristics, in written language the analysis of an example as GLD is not definite, it could also be analysed as HTLD. Further, even for the spoken language, the categorization as GLD is not clear. Altmann (1981, 148) notes in passing that the progradient intonation is not a sufficient condition for GLD.

It is therefore necessary to find a better criterion to distinguish the two constructions in a clear way. This criterion is offered by binding phenomena (cf. e.g. Vat 1981, Anagnostopoulou 1997, Zaenen 1997, Grohmann 2000):

- (3) Operator binding
- a. *Seinen₁ Doktorvater, → den verehrt jeder Linguist₁*
(GLD)
his supervisor-acc RP-acc admires every linguist
- b. **Seinen₁ Doktorvater, jeder Linguist₁ verehrt ihn*
(HTLD)
- (4) Principle-C-effects
- a. **Den neuen Artikel von Peter₁, → den will er₁ in LI*
the new article by Peter-acc RP-acc wants he in LI
veröffentlichen (GLD)
(to) publish
- b. *Den neuen Artikel von Peter₁, er₁ will ihn in LI*
veröffentlichen (HTLD)

As demonstrated by (3) and (4), GLD shows binding effects, HTLD does not. (3a) demonstrates that, in GLD, an operator may bind a pronoun inside the dislocated phrase. As (3b) shows, this is not possible in a construction which is clearly a HTLD construction. Principle C effects may be induced by an R-expression inside the dislocated phrase of a GLD structure, cf. (4a), but not by an R-expression inside the dislocated phrase of a clear HTLD-construction, cf. (4b). Note that progradient intonation is necessary to get binding effects. If sentences like (3a) and (4a) are spoken with a pause between the preceding phrase and the rest of the clause, the binding effects disappear. Thus, the progradient intonation is a necessary condition for GLD.

When binding facts are taken into account, it can be shown that it is wrong to treat an example like (5a) as a case of GLD as, for instance, Wiltshko (1997) does:

- (5) a. *Marias Doktorvater, diesen Mann verehrt Hans*
Mary's supervisor this man admires Hans-nom
- b. **Seinen₁ Doktorvater, diesen Mann verehrt jeder*
his supervisor-acc this man-acc admires every
Linguist₁
linguist

The parallel example (5b) shows that, in contrast to GLD, binding is not possible if the resumptive element is a full noun phrase. Furthermore, the binding criterion proves that Altmann (1981) was right in restricting the RP of a GLD structure to *d*-pronouns which are weak:

- (6) **Seinen₁ Doktorvater, diesen verehrt jeder Linguist₁*
 his supervisor-acc RP-acc (strong) admires every linguist

If, as in (6), the RP is a strong *d*-pronoun, the binding option disappears. In the following I will use the binding option as the crucial criterion to differentiate between GLD and HTLD¹:

- (7) The construction under consideration is an instance of GLD if, and only if, it allows a binding relation between an element of the clause and an element inside the dislocated phrase.

Let us now look at the English constructions which are referred to as *Left Dislocation* and *Topicalization*:

- (8) a. *Mary, Peter admires her very much*
 b. *Mary Peter admires very much*

A construction like (8a) is called *Left Dislocation* (LD) and a construction like (8b) is called *Topicalization*. If we apply the ‘binding criterion’ we find:

- (9) a. *The new article by Peter₁ he₁ wants to publish it in LI* (LD)
 b. **The new article by Peter₁ he₁ wants to publish in LI* (Topicalization)

(9a) shows that, with respect to binding, English LD corresponds to the German HTLD-construction (cf. (4b)) rather than to GLD. (9b) shows that English topicalization has the same binding properties as GLD (cf. (4a)). It is therefore highly misleading that English LD and GLD are often referred to by the same term, namely *Left Dislocation*.²

The examples in (4) and (9) suggest the following correspondences (cf. e.g. Anagnostopoulou (1997)):

- (10) GLD ~ English Topicalization
 German HTLD ~ English Left Dislocation (LD)

Note that these correspondences also hold with regard to intonation. In English, a left-dislocated element is intonationally separate from the remainder of the utterance whereas a topicalized phrase is not. As mentioned above, the same is true for the corresponding German constructions.³

3. The medial topic position in German

In German as a V-second language, an independent declarative clause has the finite verb in second position following the so called prefield. In c-structure terms, the prefield is usually reconstructed as the Spec-position of CP. In a finite clause introduced by a complementizer or in a non-finite clause, all verbal elements occur at the end of the clause. There are good reasons to take the position of the finite verb in a V-second clause and the position of a complementizer in a V-final clause as one and the same (commonly this is the C-position). The part of the clause which is between the position of the finite verb/complementizer and the verbal elements at the end is called the ‘middle field’.

- (11) a. *den Hans* *wird* *Maria morgen* *treffen*
 the Hans-acc will Mary tomorrow meet
prefield **V_{fin}** **middle field** **verbal complex**
 ‘Tomorrow Mary will meet Hans’
- b. *dass* *Maria morgen den Hans* *treffen wird*
C **middle field** **verbal complex**
 ‘that tomorrow Mary will meet Hans’

Most syntacticians working on topics in German assume that topics have to be placed in the prefield of a German clause (e.g. Müller & Sternefeld (1993), Vallduví & Engdahl (1996), Molnár (1998), Jacobs (2001)). However, this assumption is not so much argued for but, rather, it is simply adopted since, cross-linguistically topics frequently appear to be clause-

initial.⁴ On the other hand, no one denies that phrases of other informational status can also be positioned into the prefield. Therefore, it seems that there is no position in German which is exclusively reserved for topics, Lambrecht (1994), Vallduví & Engdahl (1996), Molnár (1998).

Whereas according to the standard view there is no special position for topics in German, Frey (2000) argues that one comes to the opposite conclusion if one considers the middle field. The following thesis is argued for:

- (12) In the middle field of the German clause, directly above the base position of sentential adverbials (SADVs), there is a designated structural position for topics (in the *aboutness*-sense): all topical phrases in the middle field, and only these, are located in this position.

In (12) the category of SADVs figures prominently. The term ‘SADV’ refers to adverbials which express the speaker's estimation of the eventuality, e.g. *luckily*, *apparently*, *certainly*. Thus, for example, temporal or locative adjuncts are not among the SADVs. The base position of sentence adverbials is higher than the base position of any other element in the German clause, cf. e.g. Frey (2003). In this paper, SADVs are only relevant in their neutral use as sentence adverbials, in which they modify the whole proposition. These items may also have a focus inducing use. In this case, they relate to one narrowly focussed constituent of the clause, the rest of the clause being presupposed. As focus inducers they have special properties; in particular, their distribution is very different to that of their neutral (proposition-modifying) use.⁵ In what follows, the reader is asked to disregard any focus inducing readings of SADVs which might be possible by narrowly focussing an accompanying constituent.

As is well known, there are different notions of topicality. In Frey (2000) it is argued that what is encoded in the syntax of German as described in (12) are aboutness topics.⁶ The notion of an ‘aboutness topic’ stems from the famous characterization by Hockett (1958:201):

- (13) “the most general characteristic of predicative constructions is suggested by the terms ‘topic’ and ‘comment’ for their ICs: the speaker announces a topic and then says something about it”

Reinhart (1981) proposes an analogy to illustrate the concept. During the discourse, a context set is constructed which contains the set of propositions accepted to be true at this point. According to Reinhart, the propositions in the context set are not stored there in an unordered way but according to ordering principles. One of these principles relates the propositions to the discourse referents which are designated by the sentence topics. This ordering principle is similar to the ordering system of a subject catalogue in a library. In accordance with this analogy, a sentence topic functions like an entry of a subject catalogue under which information is stored.

Three of the different phenomena which support the claim in (12) are the following (see Frey (2000) for more):

- (14) the context forces aboutness
Da wir gerade von Hans sprechen.
 Since we right now of H. speak 'Speaking about Hans'
- a. *Nächstes Jahr wird den Hans erfreulicherweise eine*
 Next year will the-acc H. fortunately a
vornehme Dame heiraten
 fine lady marry
- b. *#Nächstes Jahr wird erfreulicherweise den Hans eine vor-*
nehme Dame heiraten
- (15) non-referential expressions
- a. **Während des Vortrags haben mindestens drei Teilnehmer*
 during the lecture have at least three participants
leider geschlafen
 unfortunately slept
- b. **Heute hat fast jeder erstaunlicherweise*
 today has almost everyone surprisingly
gearbeitet
 worked

- (16) cataphoric pronouns
- a. *Sein₁ Vater wird dem Otto₁ wahrscheinlich das Auto
 His father will the-dat O. probably the car
 ausleihen
 lend
 'Probably, Otto's father will lend him the car'*
- b. **Sein₁ Vater wird wahrscheinlich dem Otto₁ das Auto aus-
 leihen*

The context in (14) demands that *Hans* has to be an aboutness topic in the following sentence. (14a, b) show that, under such circumstances, if the item in question occurs in the middle field, it has to precede a sentence adverbial. The examples in (15) contain quantificational phrases. These cannot be topics, cf. e.g. Reinhart (1981). As (15) shows, these phrases cannot appear in front of a SADV in the middle field. The sentences in (16) contain cataphoric pronouns. According to Kuno (1972) and Reinhart (1995), cataphoric pronouns can only co-refer with topics. Under this assumption, (16a, b) also show that a topic in the middle field has to be positioned in front of a sentential adverbial.

4. GLD and topicality

GLD and HTLD are both thought to mark a topic. Usually, it is the dislocated phrase which is seen as the topic. These claims, however, are basically made on an intuitive basis. Scheutz (1997), for example, observes that it has not been proven that GLD marks a topic. Therefore, the question arises of whether it is possible to verify these claims.

As mentioned in section 1, Altmann (1981) assumed that the RP of a GLD structure has to appear in the prefield of a German clause. This assumption is adopted in most studies on GLD, cf. e.g. Vat (1981), Cinque (1983), Grohmann (2000), an exception is Grewendorf (2002). However, the following examples demonstrate that it should be given up:

- (17) a. *Seinem₁ Doktorvater, jeder Linguist₁ wird dem zum Glück*
 his supervisor-dat every linguist will RP luckily
Geld ausleihen
 money lend
- b. *Seinem₁ Doktorvater, würde dem wenigstens ein*
 his supervisor-dat would RP at least one
Linguist₁ Geld ausleihen?
 linguist money lend

(17) shows that there are examples which have the RP inside the middle field and which nevertheless contain an operator phrase binding a pronoun inside the dislocated phrase. In section 1, it was shown that it is a characteristic of GLD, in contrast to HTLD, to allow such a binding relation. Thus, the sentences in (17) demonstrate that there are GLD examples which have the RP in the middle field. However, not all sentences with the RP in the middle field allow an operator binding relation between a phrase inside the core of the sentence and an element in the dislocated phrase:

- (18) a. *??Seinem₁ Doktorvater, jeder Linguist₁ wird zum Glück*
 his supervisor every linguist will luckily
dem Geld ausleihen
 RP money lend
- b. *??Seinem₁ Doktorvater, würde wenigstens ein Linguist₁*
 his supervisor would at least one linguist
dem Geld ausleihen?
 RP money lend

The same is true for the principle C effect. There are examples with the RP in the middle field which show the effect, and there are examples which do not:

- (19) a. **Den neuen Artikel von Peter₁, → er₁ will den*
 the new article by Peter he wants RP
anscheinend in LI veröffentlichen
 apparently in LI (to) publish
- b. *Den neuen Artikel von Peter₁, er₁ will anscheinend den in*
LI veröffentlichen

What is the difference between the sentences that show binding effects and the ones that do not? The answer becomes clear if we look at the positions the RP occupies. Compare e.g. (17a) with (18a). In (17a) the RP precedes the SADV, in (18a) the RP follows the SADV. That is, in (17a), which allows binding, the RP is positioned in the designated topic position characterized in (12). The RP is topical. In contrast, in (18a), which does not allow binding, the RP does not occur in the topic position. It is not a sentence topic.

This kind of reasoning also explains the difference between (17b) and (18b). These sentences do not contain a SADV, thus the topic position is not unambiguously marked in these sentences. Nevertheless, there is an important difference between them. For (17b) there exists an analysis in which the RP is positioned in the topic position. This is not the case for (18b). The quantified subject of (18b) is not a possible topic. It cannot occur in the topic position (cf. (15) in section 3). Thus, the following RP cannot either. In sum, the RP in (17b) can be analysed as a topic, the RP in (18b) cannot.⁷

The same observation explains the examples in (19). In (19a), in which a principle C violation arises, the RP occurs in the topic position. In contrast, in the well-formed (19b), the RP is not in the topic position.

In section 1, it was shown that the possibility of a binding relation is characteristic of a GLD structure. Thus, the data in (17)-(19) show that in a GLD structure, the RP may appear in the middle field only if it occurs in the topic position characterized in (12). As demonstrated in section 3, in German, a topic may appear in the prefield or in the middle field. However, topics are marked in a definite way only in the middle field. Thus, in the environment where topics are unambiguously marked, we see that the RP in GLD has to be a topic. It is fair to generalize that the RP in GLD is also a topic if the RP occurs in the prefield. We therefore arrive at the following claim:

(20) In GLD, the RP is a sentence topic.

According to (20), the widely held opinion that GLD is a topic marking construction is correct. By using the diagnostic of the designated topic position in the middle field, we have been able to prove this claim. As stated in (20) the RP is the topic of GLD. However, because of the relationship between the dislocated phrase and the RP (cf. section 6), the same is true for the dislocated phrase; it is also the topic.⁸

Let us now see whether HTLD is also necessarily a topic marking construction. The following sentence shows that it is not:

- (21) *Den/Der Hans, laut Maria wird anscheinend keiner ihn unterstützen*
the-acc/nom H., according to M. will apparently no one him support

The RP of (21) follows the SADV. Thus, according to (12), it does not occur in the topic position in the middle field, i.e. it is not a sentence topic. The same can be observed in (19b). Since the RP of HTLD certainly can be a sentence topic, cf.:

- (22) *Den/Der Hans, laut Maria wird ihn anscheinend keiner unterstützen*

we arrive at the following claim:

- (23) In HTLD, the resumptive element does not have to be sentence topic.

From (23), we can safely conclude that the dislocated phrase does not have to be a sentence topic either. Thus, HTLD is not a topic marking construction per se.⁹ The widely held opinion that HTLD necessarily marks a topic is not correct.

5. Some more information-structural properties of GLD

5.1. GLD and focus

It is sometimes claimed that a GLD structure is not possible as an answer to a wh-question (e.g. Anagnostopoulou (1994, 157) on the Dutch equivalent). However, the following sentence casts doubt on this claim:

- (24) Q: *Wen hat Maria dem Präsidenten vorgestellt?*
 Whom has M. (to) the president introduced
 A: *Den Karl, den hat Maria dem Präsidenten vorgestellt*
 the-acc K. RP has M. (to) the president introduced

The GLD sentence constitutes a natural answer to the question.¹⁰ (24) shows that it is possible that the RP in a GLD structure constitutes the narrow focussed element of the clause. Note that there is a contrastive flavour to the answer if it is given by means of a GLD structure like in (24).

Although we saw above that the RP can in principle occur in the middle field, we find an interesting restriction when the RP is focussed. In this case, the RP cannot remain in the middle field, cf. (25a):

- (25) *Wen hat Maria dem Präsidenten vorgestellt?*
 a. **Den Karl, Maria hat (den) dem Präsidenten (den) vorgestellt*
 b. *Maria hat heute dem Präsidenten Karl vorgestellt*

(25b) illustrates that in principle the item which corresponds to the wh-phrase (*Karl* in this example) may be placed in the middle field.

There is a well known constraint which can help to explain (25a): focussed phrases are not allowed to scramble in the German middle field, Lenerz (1977). However, according to (20), in a GLD structure, a RP which occurs in the middle field has to be positioned in the topic position, i.e. it has to be scrambled to the left periphery of the middle field. Obviously these two conditions impose contradicting demands on the focussed and topical RP of (25a). Thus, this sentence is ungrammatical.

In German, a focussed element may be positioned in the prefield. The same is true for a topical element. Thus, in the grammatical answer in (24) the RP can fulfill both demands put on it, i.e. it is focussed and it is topical. The consequence is that the RP plays the role of a contrastive topic in this example.

5.2. Recoverability

The following sentences exemplify an interesting functional difference between the dislocated phrase of a GLD structure and the phrase in the prefield of a standard V-second clause:

- (26) *Die Kinder hatten ihren ersten Ferientag*
 The children had their first day of vacation
- a. *Der Otto, der wollte Fußball spielen*
 the-nom O. RP wanted soccer play
 - b. *Der Otto wollte Fußball spielen*
 - c. *Den Otto, den hatte Maria abgeholt*
 the-acc O., RP had M. picked up
 - d. *Den Otto hatte Maria abgeholt*

(26a, c) are GLD structures, (26b, d) are V-second clauses. In the given context, the GLD structures are interpreted such that *Otto* refers to a member of the set of children. The V-second clauses are not necessarily interpreted this way, i.e. the referent of *Otto* does not have to be one of the children. This means that the GLDed phrase picks out a referent which is already available in the discourse. In contrast, a phrase in the prefield of a V-second clause may introduce a new referent.¹¹

The following examples show that this property of GLD is not just a consequence of the topical status of the GLDed phrase:

- (27) a. *Heute wird ein amerikanischer Linguist erfreulicherweise*
 Today will an American linguist fortunately
Autogramme geben
 autographs sign
- b. *Ein amerikanischer Linguist wird heute Autogramme geben*
 - c. **Ein amerikanischer Linguist, der wird heute Autogramme geben*
 - d. *Linguisten verschiedener Länder sind in unserem Dorf.*
 Linguists from different countries are in our village
Ein amerikanischer Linguist, der wird heute Autogramme geben

An existentially interpreted indefinite may be a sentence topic as shown by (27a). In this case, it has a specific reading. This shows that a topic does not have to be familiar to the hearer. An existentially interpreted specific indefinite may also occur in the prefield of a V-second clause, cf. (27b). However, an indefinite, even if it is specific, cannot constitute the dislocated phrase of a GLD structure in an out of the blue context, cf. (27c). The sentence becomes grammatical only if the GLD occurs in a context which

allows one to relate the referent of the indefinite to an already established discourse referent, cf. (27d).¹²

This observation about GLD is reminiscent of a condition which Prince (1998) formulates for English Topicalization:

- (28) Topicalization triggers an inference on the part of the hearer that the entity represented by the initial NP stands in a salient partially ordered set relation to some entity or entities already evoked in the discourse-model; Prince (1998, 293).

A partially ordered set relation is any relation which is either reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric, or irreflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric. I do not want to discuss whether this is the right constraint for the relation in question because this depends heavily on semantic decisions. Therefore, I will just formulate the following condition:

- (29) The referent of the GLDed phrase has been introduced in previous discourse or stands in a cognitive salient relation to an already introduced discourse referent.

The notion of saliency is supposed to distinguish examples like the following:

- (30) a. *Otto ist gestern geflogen. Das Flugzeug, das hatte O. is yesterday flown. The aircraft, RP has allerdings Verspätung.*
though delay
b. *#Otto aß gestern in einem feinen Lokal. Die Gabel, die war O. ate yesterday in a fancy restaurant. The fork, RP was allerdings verbogen.*
though bent.

The reference to an event of flying makes it salient that an aircraft is involved. However, the reference to an event of eating in a restaurant does not make it salient that a fork is involved.¹³

5.3. Topic promotion

In section 4, it was shown that the RP of GLD, and thus also the GLDed phrase, is a sentence topic. The following examples demonstrate that the GLDed phrase has to be a new sentence topic, i.e. the GLDed phrase cannot refer to a referent which was referred to by a topical expression in the preceding sentence:

- (31) a. **Heute hat [Peter₁]^{Top} erfreulicherweise einen Auftrag bekommen. Dieser begabte Architekt₁, der hat das wirklich verdient*
Today has P. fortunately a commission got. This talented architect RP has it really deserved
- b. *Heute hat erfreulicherweise Peter₁ einen Auftrag bekommen. Dieser begabte Architekt₁, der hat das wirklich verdient*

In (31a), the topic of the first sentence and the GLDed phrase of the second sentence have the same reference. The text is not well-formed. In contrast, in the well-formed (31b) the referent of the GLDed phrase of the second sentence is denoted by a non-topic in the first sentence. This observation leads to the following claim:

- (32) GLD is a topic-promoting device, i.e. a non-topic acquires the status of a topic

HTLD behaves differently. The dislocated phrase may very well pick up a referent which was designated by a topic in the preceding sentence:

- (33) *Heute hat [Peter₁]^{Top} erfreulicherweise einen Auftrag bekommen. Dieser begabte Architekt₁, er hat das wirklich verdient*

The same is true for a standard V-second clause. The expression in its pre-field might pick up a referent which was previously referred to by a topic expression:

- (34) *Heute hat [Peter₁]^{Top} erfreulicherweise einen Auftrag bekommen.
Dieser begabte Architekt₁ hat das wirklich verdient*

Thus, the promotion function expressed in (32) constitutes a genuine property of GLD.

5.4. GLD and discourse topics

According to (32), GLD changes the informational status of an expression: a non-topic promotes to a topic ('topic' referring to 'sentence topic'). We should also ask how GLD behaves with respect to the discourse topic. This notion is used here in a purely intuitive sense, just referring to the main theme of a section of a text.

The following sequence of two sentences illustrates that a GLD structure is not the appropriate construction to change the discourse topic:

- (35) i. *Maria wird morgen mit Hans nach Paris fahren.*
M. will tomorrow with H. to Paris go
ii. *#Der Hans, → der ist sehr zerstreut in letzter Zeit*
the H. RP is very absent-minded lately

Out of the blue, it is hard to find a common theme for the sentences (35i) and (35ii). Therefore, (35ii) is understood as introducing a new discourse topic. However, (35ii) as a GLD structure is felt to be inappropriate for doing so.

The situation is different with HTLD:

- (36) i. *Maria wird morgen mit Hans nach Paris fahren.*
ii. *Der Hans, er ist sehr zerstreut in letzter Zeit*
the H. he is very absent-minded lately

The sentences in (36) are again understood as contributing to two different discourse topics. Therefore, the well-formedness of (36) shows that HTLD is a suitable device for moving to a new theme.

Thus, GLD and HTLD differ in their effects on the current discourse topic. In 5.3, it was shown that they also differ significantly with respect to

the sentence topics of previous sentences. (37) summarizes these observations:

- (37) GLD signals a shift of sentence topic but maintains the discourse topic.
In contrast, HTLD does not signal a shift of sentence topic but signals a shift of discourse topic.

6. On the syntactic analysis of GLD

6.1. Island sensitivity

A standard assumption is that GLD is island sensitive, i.e., it is assumed that, depending on the analysis, no island node may intervene between the position of the dislocated phrase and its base position, or between the RP and its base position. However, recently Grewendorf (2002, 43) has claimed that GLD does not exhibit island sensitivity. Grewendorf gives examples like the following:

- (38) a *Den Studenten, Hans kennt das Mädchen, das den*
 the student-acc H. knows the girl who RP
 geheiratet hat
 married has
 b. *Den Studenten, nachdem Maria den geheiratet hat, wurde*
 the student-acc, after M. RP married has become
 sie depressiv
 she depressive

Grewendorf argues for a movement analysis of the GLDed phrase which might leave the RP behind at different places. Thus, according to Grewendorf, the GLDed phrase in (38a) is moved out of a relative clause, and in (38b) it is moved out of an adverbial clause.

With respect to Grewendorf's analysis, I would first like to point out that examples like (38) are likely not to be instances of GLD:

- (39) a. **Ihren₁ Doktorvater, Hans kennt jede Linguistin₁, die den*
 Her supervisor H. knows every linguist who RP
geheiratet hat
 married has
- b. **Ihren₁ Doktorvater, nachdem den jede Linguistin₁*
 Her supervisor after RP every linguist
geheiratet hat, war Otto traurig
 married has was O. sad

According to my judgement, these examples do not allow binding of an element in the GLDed phrase, as shown in (39). Since this binding possibility is characteristic of GLD, we may conclude that the examples in (38) are not instances of GLD, but rather of HTLD.

The island sensitivity of GLD is also shown by the following examples:

- (40) a. **Seinen₁ Doktorvater, jeder Linguist₁ geht in die Kirche,*
 his supervisor every linguist goes to the church
bevor er den trifft
 before he RP meets
- b. **Seinen₁ Doktorvater, den geht jeder Linguist₁ in die Kir-*
che, bevor er trifft
- c. **Seinem₁ Doktorvater, Maria hasst das Gerücht, dass dem*
 his supervisor M. hates the rumour that RP
jeder Linguist₁ hilft
 every linguist helps
- d. **Seinem₁ Doktorvater, dem hasst Maria das Gerücht, dass*
jeder Linguist₁ hilft

In (40a, b), the dislocated phrase is related to a source position inside an adverbial clause, and in (40c, d) to a source position inside the complement clause of a noun. As the impossibility of binding shows, these constructions cannot be interpreted as examples of GLD. In (40b, d), the RP has left the islands thereby causing strong ungrammaticality in addition to the failure of binding.

If the island conditions are respected, the GLD may be ‘long distant’. This applies to the distance between the GLDed phrase and the source position and to the relation between the RP and the source position:

- (41) a. *Seinem₁ Doktorvater, Maria glaubt, dass dem jeder*
his supervisor M. believes that RP every
Linguist₁ Geld ausleihen wird
linguist money lend will
- b. *Seinem₁ Doktorvater, dem glaubt Maria, dass jeder Lingu-*
ist₁ Geld ausleihen wird

Given our observations in section 4 and in view of examples like (41b), it is clear that the RP has to move at least to the local topic position and may then subsequently move to a higher Spec,CP-position. Another question is whether the GLDed phrase is moved or whether it may be base generated in its surface position. There are two recent approaches which argue for the movement of the GLDed phrase.

6.2. On two recent movement analyses of the GLDed phrase

The first movement analysis might be called the ‘big XP’ approach (cf. Vat 1981, Grewendorf 2002 for German, Cecchetto & Chierchia 1999 for clitic left dislocation with a DP in Italian). According to this approach, the preposed phrase and the RP are initially found in a Spec-Head configuration in a ‘big XP’. Grewendorf (2002) adopts the split-CP framework of Rizzi (1997) for German. In this framework, what was formerly the CP-projection is replaced by a cascade of different functional projections: ForceP, TopicP, FocusP, FinP. Grewendorf proposes a derivation like the following for a GLD structure with a preposed DP. The ‘big XP’ is moved to Spec,FinP. There it is broken and the GLDed phrase moves to Spec,TopicP:

- (42) a. $[_{TopP} [_{FinP} \dots [_{IP} Maria [_{VP} [_{DP} den\ Hans [_{D} den]] getroffen] hat]]]$
- b. $[_{TopP} [_{FinP} [_{DP} den\ Hans [_{D} den]]_1 [_{Fin}^0 [_{IP} Maria [_{VP} t_1 getroffen] hat]]]]]$
- c. $[_{TopP} den\ Hans_2 [_{FinP} [_{DP} t_2 [_{D} den]]_1 [_{Fin}^0 [_{IP} Maria [_{VP} t_1 getroffen] hat]]]]]$

In my view, this approach encounters some problems. In (42), the ‘big XP’ containing the RP as its head checks the EPP-feature in FinP. The phrase in

Spec checks its topic-feature in TopicP. However, as we have seen, the RP may stay in the middle field (as Grewendorf also assumes), and, as was shown in section 4, if it does, the RP has to move to the topic position of the middle field (a position which is not made available in Rizzi's framework), i.e. the RP is a topic. Nevertheless, it has to be guaranteed that the 'big XP' splits there; it cannot stay together in the surface structure. It is not clear how this can be achieved if the GLDed phrase carries a topic-feature: this feature could be checked in this position, and so there would be no motivation to split. On the other hand, the other remaining feature, the force-feature, does not seem to be appropriate for the GLDed constituent.

Another problem with the 'big DP' approach is that movement out of an adjunct island must be allowed:

- (43) *Am seinem₁ Geburtstag, an dem arbeitet wahrscheinlich*
 On his birthday, on RP works probably
jeder Linguist₁
 every linguist

The examples in (39) and (40) above show that GLD is island sensitive. (43) is a GLD structure with a temporal adverbial. In the 'big XP'-approach, the GLDed constituent has to move out of this adverbial. However, for indisputable cases of movement, adverbials are strong islands in German.

Furthermore, given that GLD is island sensitive, the assumption that a phrase sitting in the prefield is open for extraction (cf. the movement which derives (42c)) is not innocent. For standard cases of extraction, such a constituent is an island:

- (44) **[Über wen]₁ glaubt Hans [[ein Buch t₁] hat Maria heute gelesen]*
 About who believes H. a book has M. today read

Note that extraction out of a 'big XP' sitting in the prefield, i.e. in the C-domain, would not only be necessary to target a position inside the same split CP as in (42), but also to target a higher one as in example (45). The resulting structure would be very similar to the structure of the ill-formed (44).

- (45) *Seinem₁ Doktorvater, Maria glaubt, dem wird jeder Linguist₁*
 his supervisor M. believes RP will every linguist
Geld ausleihen
 money lend

Finally, it is not immediately clear how in this approach it is guaranteed that in a standard V-second clause like (11a) the finite Verb is in fact in second position and not in the third or any other more deeply embedded position.

Let us now consider a second proposal for a movement analysis of the GLDed phrase, which may be called the ‘spelling out’ approach, cf. Grohmann 2000, who also uses a split-CP framework. The idea is that the GLDed constituent is the originally selected argument, it undergoes movement to Spec,TopicP in the C-domain and moves further inside the C-domain. The RP is the spell out of the movement trace in Spec,TopicP. The spell out of the trace is supposed to be necessary because the movement targets two positions in the same C-domain.

The main problem with this approach is that the RP should not be possible in the middle field. However, we have seen that the RP of GLD can stay in the topic position of the middle field. Note that it can be shown that this topic position does not belong to the C-domain. For example, in contrast to a position in the C-domain, it cannot be the target of long movement (cf. Frey 2000). So, it is in principle excluded to consider the prefield and the upper part of the middle field which contains the topic position as belonging to one and the same structural domain which is just separated by the surface position of the verb.

Another problem with the ‘spelling out’ approach is that even if it could be modified such that movement is via the topic position in the middle field and such that the trace could be spelled out there as an RP, it faces the problem that there are examples of GLD whose RPs can occur in a position in which the GLDed constituent is not possible, e.g.:

- (46) a. *Stolz auf sich₁, Hans₁ ist das anscheinend immer gewesen*
 proud of himself H. has RP apparently always been
 b. **Hans₁ ist stolz auf sich₁ anscheinend immer gewesen*

Whatever the reason for the contrast between (46a) and (46b), these data make it unlikely that the RP is just the spell out of a trace of the moved GLDed constituent.

Grohmann (2000) assumes that the GLDed phrase moves to a position in the split C-domain which is above TopicP. It is not immediately clear which position this could be. ForceP is not appropriate because the GLDed phrase is not related to clause typing. Clauses of various different types are compatible with GLD (cf. n. 7). Therefore one would have to postulate an additional functional projection in the split C-domain which could be the target of the GLDed phrase.

Note also that the ‘spelling out’ approach, like the ‘big XP’ approach, faces the problem of how to regulate the position of the finite verb in a standard V-second clause.

Below, I will point to a further problem for the ‘big XP’ approach and the ‘spelling out’ approach.

6.3. A base generation analysis of the GLDed phrase

I would like to propose a more conservative analysis of GLD which assumes base generation of the GLDed phrase (and a non-split C-domain). The proposal is the following: The GLDed constituent is base generated in a CP-adjoined position.¹⁴ This can be any CP which dominates the base position of the RP and which allows adjunction. From its base position the GLDed phrase may move to higher CP-adjoined positions. The RP originates in a theta-position. The RP has to check its topic feature in the topic position in the middle field or in the local prefield and may be moved further by A-bar movement to a higher Spec,CP-position. The chains of the GLDed phrase and of the RP undergo the formation of an A-bar-CHAIN. A CHAIN is simply defined as follows:

- (47) A CHAIN $\langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \rangle$ is a sequence of nodes sharing the same θ -role such that for any i , $1 \leq i < n$, α_i c-commands and is coindexed with α_{i+1} (cf. Cecchetto & Chierchia 1999)

The resulting CHAIN has to fulfill the condition that the head of the chain of the GLDed phrase c-commands the head of the chain of the RP. The

formation of a CHAIN with the GLDed constituent and the RP is possible because there is only one theta-role involved. Furthermore, we may assume that a CHAIN carries at most one case-feature which is spelled out on the lexical members of the CHAIN.

In a well-formed CHAIN, every pair of adjacent members has to respect the island conditions, i.e. for any i , $1 \leq i < n$, there is no island node between α_i and α_{i+1} . For the following discussion it is sufficient to recall that embedded V-second clauses, complement clauses of non-bridge verbs, adjunct clauses, and clauses inside of an NP constitute islands in German. Adjunction voids islandhood, i.e. if α_i is adjoined to an island node K , K does not count as a island node between α_i and α_{i+1} or between α_i and α_{i-1} .

As was shown by Barss (1986), Binding Theory can be formulated relative to chains thereby avoiding the need for literal reconstruction of moved phrases for the checking of the binding conditions (cf. also Frey 1993). This approach can be straightforwardly extended to CHAINS (cf. Cecchetto & Chierchia 1999). In such a formulation of the binding theory, it follows, for example, that an operator phrase in the clause may bind a pronoun inside the GLDed constituent if the highest A-position of the operator phrase c-commands a member of the CHAIN of the GLDed constituent. In a similar way, the binding principles A, B, and C can be formulated with respect to CHAINS. Thus, binding effects exhibited by GLD examples can be captured by principles formulated in this way.

Let us now consider some examples. The examples in (39) and (40) involve island violations, the islands being adjunct clauses, and clauses inside NPs. In (40b, d), the RP has been moved out of an island. In the other examples, there is an island node between the surface position of the GLDed phrase and the surface position of the RP in the embedded clause. Note that in these examples it is not possible to base generate the GLDed phrase adjoined to the clause containing the source position. A GLD structure, being a root phenomenon (cf. n. 14), is not possible in these embedded structures.

Consider now the following sentence which constitutes a further problem for the movement accounts. The possibility of binding shows that it is a well-formed GLD-structure:

(48) *Seinem] Doktorvater, Maria glaubt, jeder Linguist] wird dem Geld ausleihen*

(48) causes a severe problem for the ‘big XP’ approach as well as for the ‘spelling out’ approach because to derive (48), the GLDed would have to

move out of a V-second clause.¹⁵ However, indisputable instances of movement are clearly impossible out of a V-second clause:

(49) **Wem₁ glaubt Maria [CP jeder Linguist wird t₁ Geld ausleihen]*

The following sentence in which the RP has been moved also demonstrates that it is not possible to move a phrase from within a V-second clause:

(50) **Seinem₁ Doktorvater, dem glaubt Maria, jeder Linguist₁ wird Geld ausleihen*

We can explain the grammaticality of (48) as follows. The bridge verb *glauben* allows the embedding of a GLD structure constructed with a V-second clause, cf. n. 14. Therefore, underlying (48) we have (51):

(51) *Maria glaubt [CP seinem₁ Doktorvater [CP jeder Linguist₁ wird dem Geld ausleihen]]*

From this structure, (48) is derived by movement of the GLDed phrase to the matrix clause. The resulting CHAIN containing the GLDed phrase and the RP does not violate the island conditions. Note that to account for (48), the assumption that the GLDed phrase may be base generated in a position adjoined to the CP containing the base position of the RP is crucial. If the GLDed phrase had to be base generated in its surface position (as e.g. Anagnostopoulou 1997 proposes), (48) would involve an island violation. The pair in the CHAIN which consists of the GLDed phrase and the surface position of the RP would violate the island condition for CHAINS.

(50) obviously violates the condition for well-formed CHAINS because an island intervenes between the surface position of the RP and the adjacent lower member of the CHAIN (which is the position of the RP in the topic position in the embedded clause).

Let us now consider the GLD structures in (41) and (45). In (41a, b) the complement clause of the bridge verb *glauben* is introduced by *dass* and therefore does not constitute an island. The underlying structure of (45) is (52):

(52) *Maria glaubt [CP seinem₁ Doktorvater [CP dem wird jeder Linguist₁ Geld ausleihen]]*

In (45), the GLDed phrase is again adjoined to the matrix CP. No island node intervenes between any adjacent members of the CHAIN.

Note also the difference between (41a) and (53):

- (53) **Seinem₁ Doktorvater, M. bezweifelt, dass dem jeder Linguist₁*
his supervisor M. doubts that RP every linguist
Geld ausleihen wird
money lend will

A non-bridge verb like *bezweifeln* does not allow the embedding of GLD as shown in (54) (cf. n. 14), :

- (54) **Maria bezweifelt, [_{CP} seinem₁ Doktorvater [_{CP} dass [_{IP} jeder Lin-*
guist₁ dem Geld ausleihen wird]]]

Thus, (54) cannot be the underlying structure of (53). Furthermore, it is clear that the complement clause of *bezweifeln* constitutes an island:

- (55) **Wem hat Maria bezweifelt dass jeder Linguist Geld ausleihen*
wird

Therefore, it is not possible to construct a CHAIN for (53) which respects the island conditions.

Let us also shortly comment on the assumption that GLD cannot be iterated (cf. e.g. Zaenen 1997, Grohmann 2000). The following example casts doubt on this assumption:

- (56) [*Ihrem₁ Doktorvater*]_i, [*ihr₁ Auto*]_j, *jede Studentin₁ hat dem_i das_j*
heute gezeigt

Our proposal to base generate the GLDed constituent in an adjunction position leads us somehow to expect sentences like (56).¹⁶

I would like to end this section with a short remark on a statement by Prince concerning the syntax-pragmatic interface. Prince (1998, 282) states: “In fact, I believe that a careful study of the correlations between syntactic form and discourse function leads us to conclude that ... the relation be-

tween syntactic form and discourse function is no less arbitrary than, say, the relation between phonological form and lexical meaning.” From the, admittedly rather narrow, perspective of our investigations it is not so clear whether one should subscribe to this viewpoint. For GLD, there seems to be a certain correspondence between syntactic form and discourse function. In (29) of section 5.2, a recoverability condition for the GLDed phrase was formulated. That such a condition should hold makes some sense if we assume that every lexically realized contentful element needs ‘contentful licensing’. The GLDed constituent does not ‘check’ a sentence internal feature. Therefore, it has to be ‘licensed’ through a contentful relation to an already established discourse referent. Furthermore, in (20) of section 4, the topic condition for the RP was stated. So we might ask whether it is arbitrary that such a condition should hold, that is, whether there could exist a construction which is identical to GLD except that its RP stays in its base position having no special information structural status. This is unlikely if we assume that an A-bar chain is only possible if a non-L-related feature is checked. If this holds for A-bar chains, it holds for A-bar CHAINS in particular. Therefore the RP of a construction like GLD has to move to a position to check a semantically or pragmatically contentful feature. In the German GLD construction this is fulfilled because the RP moves at least to the topic position of the middle field. Finally, the checking of the topic feature has to contribute information to the CHAIN which is not already encoded. Therefore, the discourse licensing of the GLDed phrase is managed by a non-topic. This results in the topic-promoting function of GLD.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, functional and syntactic properties of GLD were studied. It was shown that GLD is always a topic marking construction. It holds, that the phrase which is designated as a topic by GLD cannot be a sentence topic in a preceding sentence. Furthermore, GLD demands that its designated topical phrase be linked to the preceding text. With regard to discourse topics, it was argued that GLD can only be used to continue a given discourse topic, it cannot be used to embark on a new one. The collection of properties we assigned to GLD is unique to GLD. It was shown that V-second clauses and HTLD show a different pattern.

With respect to the syntax of GLD, some arguments against a movement analysis of the preposed phrase were presented. It was argued that an ap-

proach which base generates the preposed phrase in a position adjoined to a CP-node dominating the base position of the RP is superior. The preposed phrase, as well as the RP, may undergo further movement.

Notes

1. The binding criterion can be used to establish whether or not certain controversial cases should be classed as GLD-constructions, e.g.:

- a. *Wenn seine₁ Großmutter glücklich ist, dann ist jeder₁ Linguist glücklich*
If his grandmother happy is, then is every linguist happy
- b. **Wenn seine₁ Großmutter glücklich ist, so ist jeder₁ Linguist glücklich*
- c. *Mit seinem₁ Doktorvater, mit dem spricht jeder Linguist₁ auch über Fußball*
With his supervisor with RP talks every linguist also about soccer
- d. **Ob sein₁ Doktorvater erscheint oder nicht, so wird doch jeder Linguist₁ kommen*
whether his supervisor appears or not so will after all every linguist come

a., b. show that a ‘wenn-dann’ conditional is a GLD structure but not a ‘wenn – so’ conditional. c. shows, contra Cinque (1983, n. 30), that a prepositional object may constitute the dislocated phrase of a GLD-construction. d. is an example of what D’Avis (this volume) calls an ‘irrelevance conditional’. The impossibility of binding demonstrates that irrelevance conditionals are not possible in a GLD-construction. This confirms the supposition of D’Avis (this volume).

2. This terminological confusion leads to severe problems, as can be seen in, for example, Zwart (1998) where English LD is equated with GLD and its Dutch equivalent without any discussion.
3. With regard to binding and intonation a German V-second clause behaves like GLD, i.e. the phrase in the prefield of a V-second clause exhibits binding effects and belongs to the same intonational contour as the rest of the clause.

The most obvious distributional difference between a V-second clause and GLD is that a wider range of constituents can be positioned in the prefield than can be dislocated in GLD. For example, quantifiers, weak indefinites and reflexives can appear in the prefield but cannot constitute the GLDed phrase. I think this difference can be explained by the information-structural differences discussed in the following.

4. This assumption has a long tradition. Halliday (1967) defined sentence topics as the first expression in a clause. However, Reinhart (1981) rejected this claim as inappropriate for English.
5. For Example, as a focus inducer, a SADV might even be positioned in the prefield together with the focused constituent it relates to:

a. Dem Otto anscheinend/anscheindend dem Otto hat sich Maria anvertraut

The- DatO. Apparently has REFL M. confided (in)

Note that according to standard assumptions, only one constituent may appear in the prefield. A SADV which occurs in the prefield together with another constituent can only have the focus inducing reading.

6. The main reasons are that (specific) indefinites may be situated in the designated topic position and that first sentences of discourses or discourse segments may make use of this position.
7. A GLD structure may also occur with a wh-question:

a. *Seinen₁ Wagen, welcher Linguist₁ hat den erfreulicherweise heute geputzt?*
 his car which linguist has RP fortunately today cleaned

b. **Seinen₁ Wagen, welcher Linguist₁ hat erfreulicherweise den heute geputzt?*

The difference between a. and b. shows again that, in the middle field, the RP of a GLD structure has to occur in the topic position.

A GLD structure seems also to be possible as an imperative, cf.:

c. *Seinen₁ Computer, jeder₁ starte den jetzt!*
 his computer everyone start-IMP RP now

8. This means that an expression like *seinen Doktorvater* can be a topic in the reading in which it is dependent on a quantified phrase. In this reading *seinen Doktorvater* is not really referential, so one might wonder why it can be a topic. Note, however, that once the referent of the noun of the quantified phrase is fixed (during the process of the interpretation of the quantified phrase) the referent of *seinen Doktorvater* is simultaneously fixed. So, the dependent *seinen Doktorvater* is referentially anchored to another expression. Thus, in a border sense, the dependent phrase exhibits a form of referentiality and is therefore suitable as an aboutness topic. (See e.g. Heusinger (2002) for a similar broader notion of specificity of indefinites.)

9. This is confirmed by the fact that a non-specific indefinite may be preposed in HTLD:

a. Irgendeinen teuren Tisch, heute will anscheinend
 Some expensive table (or other) today wants apparently
 Karl ihn endlich kaufen
 K. it finally buy

A non-specific indefinite is not possible as a sentence topic (cf. e.g. Reinhart (1981)).

10. That the answer is in fact a GLD structure is shown by the possibility of binding:

Q: *Wen verehrt jeder Linguist?*

‘Whom does every linguist admire’

A: *Seinen₁ Doktorvater, den verehrt jeder Linguist₁*
 his supervisor RP admires every linguist

11. In this respect, HTLD behaves like V-second clauses:

a. *Die Kinder hatten ihren ersten Ferientag*
Der Otto, er wollte Fußball spielen

In a., the referent of *Otto* does not have to be one of the children.

12. Whereas a sentence like a. can already be ruled out by the topic condition for GLD, the deviance of a sentence like b. in an out of the blue context, even with the specific reading of the GLDed phrase, again follows from the need to link a GLDed phrase to the preceding discourse:

- a. *Keinen Linguisten, den mag Otto
 no linguist RP likes O.
 b. *Viele Linguisten, die mag Otto.
 many linguists RP likes O.

13. See Ward & Prince (1991) for the discussion of some English examples submitted to the condition (28).

14. GLD is a root phenomenon. For a proposal of how to derive this fact from the assumption that the GLDed phrase is adjoined to CP, see Anagnostopoulou (1997). The root character of GLD is shown by the fact that it only occurs in root contexts and in initial position of the complement of very few verbs, the so called bridge verbs, which also allow embedded V2 clauses. Bridge verbs tolerate an embedded GLD structure which is constructed with a V-second clause or, marginally, an embedded GLD structure which is constructed with a *dass*-clause:

- a. Maria glaubt, den Hans, den mag jeder
 M. believes the-acc H RP likes everyone
 b. (?)Maria glaubt, den Hans, dass den jeder mag
 M. believes the-acc H that RP everyone likes

15. The same criticism applies to the LFG analysis proposed by Zaenen (1997), which mirrors a movement analysis.

16. The following example containing a conditional also demonstrates that GLD may be iterated:

- a. *Seinen₁ Wagen, wenn es schneit, dann stellt den jeder Linguist₁ in*
 his car if it snows then puts RP every linguist in
 die Garage
 the garage

a. is an iterated GLD construction because the *wenn-dann* conditional is already a GLD structure (cf. n. 1).

References

- Altmann, H.
1981 Formen der „Herausstellung“ im Deutschen. Tübingen. Niemeyer.
- Anagnostopoulou, E.
1997 Clitic Left Dislocation and Contrastive Left Dislocation. In: Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 151-192.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. et al.
1997 (eds.): Materials on Left Dislocation. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Barss, A.
1986 Chains and Anaphoric Dependencies. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Cecchetto, C. & G. Chierchia
1999 Reconstruction in Dislocation Constructions and the Syntax/Semantics Interface. In: S. Blake et al. (eds.): WCCFL XVII Proceedings. CSLI publications, Stanford University, 132-146.
- Cinque, G.
1983 ‘Topic’ Constructions in some European Languages and ‘Connectedness’. Reprinted in: Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 93-118.
- D’Avis, F.-J.
2003 In front of the forefield – inside or outside the clause. In: diesem Band.
- Frey, W.
1993 Syntaktische Bedingungen für die semantische Interpretation. Berlin: Akademie Verlag (studia grammatica 35).
- Frey, W.
2000 Über die syntaktische Position der Satztopiks im Deutschen. In: Schwabe, K. et al. (eds.): Issues on Topics. ZAS Papers in Linguistics 20. 137-172.
- Frey, W.
2003 Syntactic Conditions on Adjunct Classes. In: C. Fabricius-Hansen. et al. (eds.): Approaching the Grammar of Adjuncts. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 163-209.
- Grewendorf, G.
2002 Left Dislocation as Movement. In: S. Mauck & J. Mittelstaedt (eds.): Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics, Vol. 2, 31-81.

- Grohmann K.
 2000 Prolific Peripheries: A Radical View from the Left. Dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Halliday, M.A.K.
 1967 Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English, II. In: *Journal of Linguistics*, 3, 199-244.
- von Heusinger, K.
 2002 Cross-linguistic Implementation of Specificity. In: K. Jaszczolt & K. Turner (eds.): *Meaning through Language Contrast*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins. 404-421.
- Jacobs, J.
 2001 The Dimensions of Topic-Comment. *Linguistics* 39/4, 641-681.
- Kuno, S.
 1972 Functional Sentence Perspective: A Case Study from Japanese and English. *LI* 3, 269-336.
- Lambrecht, K.
 1994 *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lenerz, J.
 1977 *Zur Abfolge nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 5).
- Molnár, V.
 1998 Topic in Focus. On the Syntax, Phonology, Semantics and Pragmatics of the So-Called "Contrastive Topic" in Hungarian and German. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 45.1-2, 89-166.
- Müller, G.&W. Sternefeld
 1993 Improper Movement & Unambiguous Binding. *LI* 24,461-507.
- Prince, E.
 1998 On the Limits of Syntax, with Reference to Left-Dislocation and Topicalization. In: P. Culicover & L. McNally (eds.): *The Limits of Syntax*. *Syntax and Semantics* 29, New York: Academic Press, 281-302.
- Reinhart, T.
 1981 Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. *Philosophica* 27, 53- 94.
- Reinhart, T.
 1995 *Interface Strategies*. OTS Working Papers, Utrecht University.
- Scheutz, H.
 1997 Satzinitiale Voranstellungen im gesprochenen Deutsch als Mittel der Themensteuerung und Referenzkonstitution. In: P. Schlobinski (ed.): *Syntax des gesprochenen Deutsch*. Opladen: Westdt. Verlag, 27-54.

- Vat, J.
 1981 Left Dislocation, Connectedness and Reconstruction. Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik 20, 80-103. [Reprinted in: Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 67-92.]
- Vallduvi, E. & Engdahl, E.
 1996 The Linguistic Realization of Information Packaging. Linguistics 34, 459-519.
- Ward, G.L. & E F. Prince
 1991 On the Topicalization of Indefinite NPs. Journal of Pragmatics 15.8, 167-178.
- Wiltschko, M.
 1997 Parasitic Operators in German Left-Dislocation. In: Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 307-339.
- Zaenen, A.
 1997 Contrastive Dislocation In Dutch and Icelandic. In: Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 119- 148.
- Zwart, J.-W.
 1998 Where Is Syntax? Syntactic Aspects of Left Dislocation in Dutch and English. In: P. Culicover & L. McNally (eds.): The Limits of Syntax. Syntax and Semantics 29, New York: Academic Press, 365-393.