

Werner Frey, ZAS Berlin

Pragmatic properties of certain German and English left peripheral constructions*

Abstract

The paper discusses various left peripheral constructions in German and English which are often considered to be topic constructions. The paper demonstrates, however, that only one of the constructions under review obligatorily marks a topic in the “aboutness”-sense. It also discusses how the constructions behave with respect to some discourse properties which are often related to topicality: referential linking to the preceding discourse, promotion of a non-topic to a topic, thematic continuity. The paper describes which constructions exhibit which discourse properties and shows that quite similar constructions behave rather differently with respect to these properties. The paper’s findings also cast serious doubt on certain common assumptions about how left peripheral constructions in the two languages correspond to each other.

Introduction

In the recent syntactic literature a great deal of attention has been devoted to the left periphery of the clause, the part of the clause often called the “C-domain.”¹ According to e.g. Rizzi (1997) and Platzack (2001) the C-domain contains, among other things, information that links the propositional content of the clause to the discourse. Rizzi (1997: 283) states that the C-domain is “the interface between a propositional content (expressed by the IP) and the superordinate structure (a higher clause or, possibly, the articulation of discourse, if we consider a root clause).” Rizzi assumes that elements in the C-domain express sentence type, express a specification of finiteness, and make explicit the pragmatic systems “topic-comment” and “focus-presupposition.”

In what follows, I will be investigating some left periphery constructions in German and English that are generally identified as “topic constructions.” These constructions all involve the C-domain. However, the investigation will not concentrate on the syntax but on some pragmatic properties of the constructions. I will investigate whether these “topic constructions” in fact encode the topic-comment distinction and I will examine the constructions with regard to three discourse sensitive properties. Thus, the following discussion is an attempt to determine properties which often are alluded to but are not made explicit in the syntactic literature.

1. The constructions considered

The subject of this paper is left peripheral constructions in German and English which are often claimed to be connected with topicality. This section gives an overview of the constructions which will be investigated.

Before we do so, the notions “prefield” and “middle field,” standardly used in the description of German syntax and also used in this paper, have to be introduced. German as a V-second language requires that, in a regular independent declarative clause, the finite verb appears in second position. The position preceding the finite verb in a V-second clause is called “prefield.” A finite clause introduced by a complementizer or a non-finite clause does not have a prefield. In these clauses, all verbal elements occur at the end. It is

standard to assume that the position of the finite verb in a V-second clause and the position of a complementizer in a V-end clause are one and the same (the C^0 -position in many frameworks). The notion “middle field” is used to refer to the part of the clause between the position of the finite verb/complementizer and the verbal elements at the end of the clause.²

The following German constructions will be considered in this paper:

- The German preposing construction (PREPOS-Ger)

As is well-known, in principle any maximal constituent may be moved to the prefield of a German V-second clause. In example (1), an object has been moved there.³

- (1) Den Hans₁ wird Maria morgen t₁ treffen
the-ACC H. will Mary tomorrow meet
‘Tomorrow Mary will meet Hans’

Movement to the prefield is often called “topicalization” (cf. e.g. Müller & Sternefeld 1993). However, since it is not only topics that may be positioned in the prefield (cf. Section 2), in what follows I will use the neutral term “German preposing construction” (PREPOS-Ger) for a sentence like (1).

- Left-dislocation of German (LD-Ger)

In the German literature, the term “Linksversetzung” (‘Left Dislocation’) is used to refer to the following construction:

- (2) Den Hans, → den₁ mag jeder t₁
the-ACC H. RP-ACC likes everyone

Sometimes this construction is also called “Contrastive Left Dislocation.” However, since this construction does not have to be contrastive, I will call it “Left Dislocation of German” (LD-Ger). A construction with formal properties very similar to (2) is also found in Dutch.

Many authors assume that the primary function of this construction is to mark a sentence topic (e.g. Altmann 1981, Jacobs 2001, Grohmann 2003).

In his influential study, Altmann (1981) lists the following main characteristics of LD-Ger: (i) progradient intonation on the left peripheral phrase and no pause between it and the rest of the clause (indicated by “→” in (2)); (ii) the resumptive pronoun (RP) that appears in the construction is a weak d-pronoun (for example, the weak d-pronoun which figures as the RP of a left peripheral DP is the pronoun which if it, for instance, bears nominative case, has the following forms *der*, *die*, *das* depending on the gender); (iii) the RP occurs in the prefield of the clause; (iv) if the left peripheral phrase is a DP, it agrees with the RP in case.

- The Hanging Topic construction in German (HT-Ger)

LD-Ger has to be differentiated from the construction in (3), which is often referred to as the “Konstruktion mit freiem Thema” (‘construction with a free theme’) or “Hanging Topic construction.” In this paper, the term “Hanging Topic construction in German” (HT-Ger) will be used:

- (3) Hans, ↓ jeder mag ihn
H. everyone likes him

Many authors assume that, like for LD-Ger, it also holds for HT-Ger that its primary function is to mark a sentence topic (e.g. Altmann 1981, Jacobs 2001, Grohmann 2003).

Following Altmann (1981), we may note the following main characteristics of HT-Ger: (i) there is a pause between the left peripheral phrase and the rest of the clause (indicated by “↓” in (3)); (ii) the resumptive element shows up in the form of a personal pronoun, a d-pronoun (which can, but does not have to, be weak), a definite description, or an epithet; (iii) the resumptive element may appear either in the prefield or in the middle field of the clause; (iv) if the left peripheral phrase is a DP, it is in the nominative or in the same case as the resumptive element (or as a previously mentioned coreferring DP (cf. fn. 8)).

It is immediately clear that, given these characteristics, the analysis of an example as LD-Ger is not conclusive in written language; it could also be analysed as HT-Ger. Therefore, it is necessary to find a better criterion to distinguish in a clear way the two constructions. This criterion is offered by binding phenomena (cf. e.g. Vat 1981, Zaenen 1997, Grohmann 2003):

Operator binding:

- (4) a. Seinen₁ Doktorvater, → den verehrt jeder Linguist₁ (LD-Ger)
his-ACC supervisor RP-ACC admires every linguist
b. *Sein₁ / *Seinen₁ Doktorvater, jeder Linguist₁ verehrt ihn (HT-Ger)
his-NOM / his-ACC supervisor every linguist admires him

Principle C-effects:

- (5) a. *Den neuen Artikel von Peter₁, → den will er₁ in LI
the-ACC new article by Peter RP-ACC wants he in LI
veröffentlichen (LD-Ger)
(to) publish
b. Der neue / Den neuen Artikel von Peter₁, er₁ will ihn
the new NOM / the new ACC article by P. he wants it
in LI veröffentlichen (HT-Ger)
in LI (to) publish

As demonstrated by (4) and (5), LD-Ger shows binding effects, HT-Ger does not. (4a) demonstrates that, in LD-Ger, an operator may bind a pronoun inside the left peripheral phrase. As (4b) shows, this is not possible in a construction which is clearly an HT-Ger construction. Principle C-effects may be induced for an R-expression inside the left peripheral phrase of an LD-Ger structure, cf. (5a), but not for an R-expression inside the left peripheral phrase of a clear HT-construction, cf. (5b). Note that to get binding effects it is necessary that there is no pause between the dislocated element and the rest of the clause. If sentences like (4a) and (5a) are spoken with a pause between the preceding phrase and the rest, the binding effects disappear. Thus, the progradient intonation without a pause is a necessary condition for LD-Ger.

The binding criterion proves that Altmann (1981) was right in restricting the RP of an LD-Ger structure to d-pronouns which are weak:

- (6) *Seinen₁ Doktorvater, diesen / diesen Mann verehrt
his-ACC supervisor d-PRON-ACC (strong) this man admires
jeder Linguist₁
every linguist

If, as in (6), the RP is a strong d-pronoun or a definite description (or any other expression different from a weak d-pronoun, for that matter), the binding option disappears.

These data show that the binding criterion allows LD-Ger and HT-Ger to be unambiguously differentiated:

- if the construction under consideration allows a binding relation between an element of the clause and an element inside the left peripheral phrase, it is an instance of LD-Ger; if it does not allow such a binding relation, it is an instance of HT-Ger.

Let us now look at the English constructions which are to be considered in this paper.

- Topicalization (TOP-Eng) and Left Dislocation (LD-Eng)

The formal difference between the constructions in (7) is the absence of a RP in (7a) and the presence of a RP in (7b):

- (7) a. Mary₁ Peter admires very much t₁
b. Mary, Peter admires her very much

A construction like (7a) is called “Topicalization” (in the following “TOP-Eng”). In TOP-Eng, focus stays in its regular, clause-final position.⁴ A construction like (7b) is called “Left Dislocation” (in the following “LD-Eng”). TOP-Eng (cf. e.g. Reinhart 1981, Lambrecht 1994) as well as LD-Eng (cf. e.g. Reinhart 1981, Gundel 1988, Lambrecht 2001) are often considered to necessarily mark a topic.

The two constructions differ with respect to whether a constituent inside the clause may bind a constituent inside the left peripheral phrase:

- (8) a. His₁ mother every boy₁ likes (TOP-Eng)
b. *The new article by Peter₁ he₁ wants to publish in LI (TOP-Eng)
c. *His₁ mother, every boy₁ likes her (LD-Eng)
d. The new article by Peter₁, he₁ wants to publish it in LI (LD-Eng)

Let us compare the data in (8) with the ones in (4) and (5). (8a, b) show that TOP-Eng has the same binding properties as LD-Ger (cf. (4a), (5a)). (8c, d) show that LD-Eng has the same binding properties as HT-Ger (cf. (4b), (5b)). Thus, with respect to binding, LD-Eng corresponds to HT-Ger and not to LD-Ger.

These correspondences also hold with regard to intonation. In English, a topicalized phrase usually forms an intonational unit with the rest of the clause, whereas a left-dislocated element is intonationally separated. Again, TOP-Eng patterns with LD-Ger and LD-Eng with HT-Ger, and not with LD-Ger. The fact that LD-Eng and LD-Ger are usually referred to by the same term ‘Left Dislocation’ is therefore misleading.⁵

Furthermore, as is well-known, in PREPOS-Ger the preposed constituent shows binding effects, and it forms an intonational unit with the rest of the clause. Therefore we can state the following correspondences with regard to binding effects and intonation:⁶

- (9) PREPOS-Ger, LD-Ger ~ TOP-Eng
HT-Ger ~ LD-Eng

Existing syntactic analyses of the constructions reflect these rough correspondences. In the generative literature, there is agreement that PREPOS-Ger, LD-Ger and TOP-Eng involve A-bar-dependencies. In TOP-Eng, according to one type of analysis (e.g. Lasnik & Saito 1992, Müller 1995), and in PREPOS-Ger the left peripheral phrase is moved to its surface position with a trace left in the base position of the moved constituent. For the analysis of LD-Ger, there are two main approaches. The first assumes that the dislocated element is moved to its surface position from its base position inside IP (cf. e.g. Vat 1981, Grohmann 2003). The presence of the RP is accounted for by extra assumptions. The other argues that the dislocated element is base generated in its surface position and enters into an A-bar-chain relation with the RP and the trace in the base position of the RP (cf. e.g. Cinque 1983, also Frey 2004). This approach is similar to the alternative analysis of TOP-Eng. This analysis assumes that the left peripheral element of TOP-Eng is base generated and enters into an A-bar-chain relation with a clause-internal empty operator which is moved to a position in the C-domain below the position of the left peripheral element (e.g. Rizzi 1997).

It is obvious that in all these accounts of PREPOS-Ger, LD-Ger or TOP-Eng, the left peripheral element belongs to the same syntactic structure as the rest of the construction. The binding and island effects of the constructions result because the left peripheral element forms an A-bar-chain with a trace inside the clause.⁷

The analyses of LD-Eng and HT-Ger are different. In both constructions, the element in the left periphery, which is base generated in its surface position, does not form a syntactic object with the resumptive phrase. The connection of the left peripheral element with the resumptive element is established by rules of discourse grammar. I regard it as an open question where the left peripheral element is generated. In the generative literature, it is usually assumed that it is generated in a position belonging to the structure of the sentence which contains the resumptive element (cf. e.g. Chomsky 1977, Lasnik & Saito 1992, Grohmann 2003). However, a plausible alternative is that the left peripheral element is generated sentence externally, i.e. that it is generated in a position that is not structurally related to the sentence which contains the resumptive element but is part of an independent discourse unit (cf. Altmann 1981, Cinque 1983). Whatever the right answer is, it is likely to be the same for LD-Eng and HT-Ger.⁸

In Sections 3 and 4, the different left peripheral constructions introduced above will be investigated with respect to certain pragmatic properties. For each of the constructions and for each of the properties, it will be determined whether or not the construction has the property in question. Given correspondences between the constructions of the two languages as depicted in (9), it will be interesting to see whether such correspondences can be found in the pragmatic properties as well.

2. Topics and their clause internal positions in German and English

The famous characterization of the notion “topic” by Hockett (1958: 201) reads as follows:

- (10) “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.”

This understanding of topicality forms the base for the so called “aboutness concept” of topic. A well-known early advocate of the aboutness concept is Reinhart (1981):

- (11) A topic is an expression whose referent the sentence is about. The concept “topic” is a category of pragmatic aboutness.

Reinhart proposes an analogy to illustrate this 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 (1981), 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 their sentence topics. That ordering principle is similar to the ordering principle of a subject catalogue of a library. A topic functions like an entry of a subject catalogue under which information is stored. In a similar vein, Jacobs (2001) states that an aboutness topic is an address which marks the point in the speaker-hearer knowledge where the information carried by the comment has to be stored.

The aboutness concept of topic is adopted by many linguists working on information structure. In the following, it will also be assumed. A controversial point is whether an aboutness topic has to be already given in the preceding context (as e.g. assumed by Gundel 1988, Lambrecht 1994, Vallduví & Engdahl 1996, Erteschik-Shir 1997, Rizzi 1997) or whether it can denote a new referent (as e.g. argued for by Reinhart 1981, 1995, Molnár 1991, and also by Frey to appear). This controversy will be touched on below.

According to some authors, pragmatic aboutness is only one of several different dimensions of the notion “topic” (e.g. Chafe 1976, Jacobs 2001). For Chafe (1976) and Jacobs (2001), another type of topic has a frame function, i.e. this type of topic provides “the frame within which the sentence holds” (Chafe 1976: 51).⁹ However, since aboutness is felt by many linguists to constitute the core of topicality and because many linguists who formulate claims about constructions considered in this paper refer to the aboutness concept (e.g. Gundel 1988, Reinhart 1981, Lambrecht 1994, 2001, Rizzi 1997), I feel justified to base the following investigations solely on this particular understanding of the notion “topic”.

Let us now look at the position of a topic in a regular clause in German and in English. Most syntacticians working on topics in German assume that a sentence internal topic has to be moved to the prefield of a verb-second clause (e.g. Molnár 1991, 1998, Müller & Sternefeld 1993, Vallduví & Engdahl 1996, Jacobs 2001). Thus, it is assumed that the standard assumption that topics have to occur at the beginning of a clause also holds for German:¹⁰

- (12) /PEter mag diesen \FILM
P. likes this movie

The indicated intonation in (12) (“/”: rise, “\”: fall) strongly suggests to construe *Peter* as the aboutness topic of the clause.

It is clear that in PREPOS-Ger, phrases of other informational status can also be moved to the prefield:

- (13) a. Keiner mag diesen Film
no one likes this movie
b. Leider hat Paul verschlafen
unfortunately has P. verschlafen
c. Wer hat Maria heute gesehen?
who has M. today seen

The elements in the prefields of (13) are elements which, by their nature, cannot be topics: a quantified DP in (13a), a sentential adverbial in (13b), and a question word in (13c). These phrases, being non-referential, do not yield good addresses for the storage of information.

Given the assumption that topics have to be moved to the prefield and given the fact that non-topics may also be moved to the prefield, the standard view is that in a German regular clause there is no position which is exclusively reserved for topics (cf. Lambrecht 1994, Vallduví & Engdahl 1996, Molnár 1991, 1998). However, Frey (to appear) argues that one comes to a different conclusion if one considers the middle field. The following thesis is argued for:

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

In (14), the category of SADVs figures prominently. The term “SADV” refers to adverbials which express the speaker’s estimation of the eventuality, e.g. *zum Glück* (‘luckily’), *anscheinend* (‘apparently’), *wahrscheinlich* (‘probably’). Thus, for example, temporal or locative adjuncts are not among the SADVs. The base position of SADVs is higher than the base position of any other element in the German clause (cf. e.g. Frey 2003). (14) refers to SADVs in their neutral use, in which they modify the whole proposition. SADVs may also have a focus inducing use. In this use, the SADV relates to one narrowly focussed constituent of the clause, the rest of the clause being presupposed. As focus inducers, SADVs have special properties. In particular, their distribution is very different to that of their neutral appearance (cf. fn. 13). In the following, the focus inducing use of SADVs is not relevant and the reader is asked to disregard any such readings of SADVs which might be possible by narrowly focussing an accompanying constituent.

Three kinds of evidence for (14) are given in the following (for further evidence, see Frey to appear):

- the context forces aboutness

(15) Ich erzähle dir etwas über Hans
I tell you something about H.

- a. Nächstes Jahr wird den Hans zum Glück eine vornehme Dame heiraten
next year will the-ACC H. luckily a fine lady marry
b. #Nächstes Jahr wird zum Glück den Hans eine vornehme Dame heiraten

- non-referential expressions

- (16) a. *Während des Vortrags haben mindestens zwei leider einen
during the lecture have at least two unfortunately an
Apfel gegessen
apple eaten
b. Während des Vortrags haben leider mindestens zwei einen Apfel gegessen
c. *Heute hat fast jeder erfreulicherweise gearbeitet
today has almost everyone fortunately worked
d. Heute hat erstaunlicherweise fast jeder gearbeitet

- cataphoric pronouns
- (17) a. Sein₁ Vater wird dem Otto₁ wahrscheinlich das Auto leihen
his father will the-DAT O. probably the car lend
'Probably, Otto's father will lend him the car'
- b. *Sein₁ Vater wird wahrscheinlich dem Otto₁ das Auto leihen

The context in (15) states that the next sentence will be about Hans. Thus, it requires that if *Hans* occurs in the following sentence, it has to be an aboutness topic.¹¹ *Hans* may occur in the prefield or in the middle field. The sentences (15a, b) demonstrate that if *Hans* occurs in the middle field, it has to precede a SADV. Thus, the sentences (15) confirm one part of (14): There is a position above the position of SADVs which, in the middle field, an aboutness topic has to occupy. Conversely, the examples (16a, c) confirm the other part of (14). According to e.g. Reinhart (1981) and Jacobs (2001), quantificational phrases cannot be aboutness topics. The sentences (16a, c) show that in the middle field quantificational phrases, i.e., non-topics, cannot appear in front of a SADV (for a qualification with respect to contrastively focussed quantified expressions, see fn. 12). Finally, the sentences in (17) confirm both parts of (14). They contain cataphoric pronouns. According to Reinhart (1981), based on Kuno (1972), a phrase can license a cataphoric pronoun if and only if the phrase is an aboutness topic. So, (17a) shows that a non-topical phrase in the middle field has to occur below a SADV, and (17b) shows that a topic in the middle field has to occur in a position above the SADV. To sum up, we can say that the examples in (15)-(17) provide strong evidence for the claim formulated in (14). When they occur in the middle field, elements whose topical status is determined independent of position, behave as predicted by (14): namely, if topics, they occupy precisely that position identified in (14) and if non-topics, they must occur elsewhere.¹²

From (14), several consequences can be drawn (cf. Frey to appear). One, which will play a certain role in the present paper, is that an indefinite DP may be a topic:

- (18) Heute hat ein Student leider während der Vorlesung geschlafen
today has a student unfortunately during the lecture slept

In (18), the indefinite is located in the topic position characterized in (14). Given the example in (17a), we expect that a topical indefinite may license a cataphoric pronoun. This is confirmed:

- (19) Weil er₁ müde war, hat ein Student₁ leider geschlafen
since he tired was has a student unfortunately slept

Note that the indefinites in (18) and (19) have a specific interpretation, i.e. in order to use these sentences properly, the speaker has to have a certain referent in mind. Thus, our findings confirm a conclusion which was already arrived at by Reinhart (1981) and which is stated in (20):

- (20) An indefinite DP may be an aboutness topic. If so, it has a specific interpretation.

Another consequence which can be drawn from (14) is:

- (21) A German clause can have more than one topic.

More than one non-focussed phrase may precede a SADV in the middle field. According to (14), all these phrases are topics. This is confirmed by cataphoric pronouns:

- (22) Da sie₁ ihn₂ mag, wird Maria₁ Hans₂ wahrscheinlich helfen
since she him likes will M. H. probably help

Since only a topic can be coreferential with a cataphoric pronoun, it follows that the main clause in (22) contains two topics.

As mentioned above, the prefield of a German clause is not reserved for topics but it is a good position for topics. That topics can be positioned in the prefield can be easily demonstrated:

- (23) a. Ich erzähle dir etwas über Hans.
I tell you something about H.
Den Hans wird nächstes Jahr eine vornehme Dame heiraten
the-ACC H. will next year a fine lady marry
b. Er₁ hat gut trainiert. Otto₁ wird daher morgen spielen
he has well trained O. will therefore tomorrow play

Note that because a sentence may contain several topics, nothing speaks against having one topic in the prefield and another one in the topic position of the middle field.

To establish (20) and (21) the claim in (14) was used. The fact that German has a designated topic position, and that a topic can therefore be objectively identified as such, will also be of importance for the investigations of the German left peripheral constructions in the following.¹³ What about English? Does it also have a sentence internal designated topic position? Most linguists would answer “no.” Although there is a preference to interpret the grammatical subject of a clause as its topic, there are clauses with other constituents playing this role (cf. e.g. Reinhart 1981). Thus, in contrast to German, in a regular clause English does not provide a means to force the topic status or the non-topic status of a constituent just by placing it in a special position.

3. LD-Ger, HT-Ger, TOP-Eng, LD-Eng, and topicality

In the literature, it is assumed that LD-Ger, HT-Ger, TOP-Eng and LD-Eng are all topic-marking constructions. These claims are, however, often made on an intuitive basis. Is it possible to check these claims? In Frey (2004) it is argued that this is possible for the German constructions LD-Ger and HT-Ger in the way indicated in the following.

As mentioned in Section 1, Altmann (1981) assumed that the RP of an LD-Ger structure has to appear in the prefield of a German clause. This assumption is adopted in most studies on LD-Ger (cf. e.g. Vat 1981, Cinque 1983, Grohmann 2003). However, the following examples demonstrate that this assumption should be given up:

- (24) a. Seinem₁ Doktorvater, jeder Linguist₁ wird dem zum Glück Geld leihen
his supervisor every linguist will RP luckily money lend
b. Seinen₁ Wagen, welcher Linguist₁ hat den erfreulicherweise heute geputzt?
his car which linguist has RP fortunately today cleaned

(24) 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 left peripheral phrase. In Section 1, it was shown that, in contrast to HT-Ger, LD-Ger does allow such a binding relation. Thus, the sentences in (24) demonstrate that there are examples of LD-Ger 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 left peripheral phrase:

- (25) a. *Seinem_i Doktorvater, jeder Linguist_i wird zum Glück dem Geld leihen
b. *Seinen_i Wagen, welcher Linguist_i hat erfreulicherweise den heute geputzt?

Similarly, not all sentences with the RP in the middle field give rise to Principle C-violations. Some sentences with the RP in the middle field do display this violation, while others do not:

- (26) a. *Den neuen Artikel von Peter_i, → er_i will den anscheinend
the new article by Peter he wants RP apparently
in LI veröffentlichen
in LI (to) publish
b. Den neuen Artikel von Peter_i, er_i 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. (24) with (25). In the sentences in (24), the RPs precede the SADV; in (25), the RPs follow the SADV. That is, in the sentences in (24), which show binding, the RPs are positioned in the designated topic position characterized in (14). These RPs are topics. In contrast, in the sentences in (25), which do not allow binding, the RPs do not occur in the topic position. They are not topics.

The same observation explains the examples in (26). In (26a), in which a Principle C-violation arises, the RP occurs in the topic position. In contrast, in the well-formed (26b), the RP is not in the topic position.

In Section 1, it was shown that the possibility of a binding relation is characteristic of an LD-Ger structure. Thus, the data in (24)-(26) show that in an LD-Ger structure, the RP may appear in the middle field only if it occurs in the topic position characterized in (14).

In German, a topic may appear in the middle field or in the prefield. 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 LD-Ger has to be a topic. It is fair to generalize that the RP in LD-Ger is also a topic when it occurs in the prefield. We therefore arrive at the following claim:

- (27) In LD-Ger, the RP is a topic.

In LD-Ger, the left peripheral phrase and the RP form one syntactic object. So, the RP and the left peripheral phrase together constitute a topic. Thus, according to (27), the widely held view that LD-Ger is a topic marking construction is correct.¹⁴

Let us now see whether the assumption that HT-Ger likewise is necessarily a topic marking construction is also correct. The first piece of evidence that it is not is given by the following sentence:

- (28) Den/Der Hans, heute will anscheinend keiner ihn unterstützen
the-ACC/NOM H. today wants apparently no one him (to) support

The RP of (28) follows the SADV. Thus, according to (14), it occurs outside of the topic position in the middle field, i.e. it is not a topic. Since the RP of HT-Ger certainly can be a topic, cf.:

(29) Den/Der Hans, heute will ihn anscheinend keiner unterstützen

we arrive at the following claim:

(30) In HT-Ger, the resumptive element does not have to be a topic.

What about the topical status of the left peripheral phrase in HT-Ger? Since the left peripheral element and the resumptive element are not syntactically identified, nothing about the status of the left peripheral element as topic or as non-topic can be immediately concluded just from the status of the resumptive element. However, examples like the following show that the left peripheral element of an HT-Ger construction does not have to be understood as a topic of the construction:

(31) Einen netten jungen Mann, im Internet möchte Petra ihn kennenlernen
A nice young man, on the internet wants P. him meet

In (31), the left peripheral phrase is a non-specific indefinite. As mentioned in Section 2, Reinhart (1981) argues that indefinites can be topics, however, in this case they have to have a specific interpretation. The reason is that an aboutness topic needs to have a definite reference because the aboutness-relation can only apply between a proposition and a designated, identifiable referent (Reinhart 1981, Lambrecht 1994, Jacobs 2001). Therefore, a non-specific indefinite, having no definite reference, cannot be an aboutness topic. The German data in (18) and (19) confirmed the view that an indefinite can be an aboutness topic, but only if it has specific interpretation, cf. (20).

Thus, (31) shows that the left peripheral phrase in HT-Ger does not have to be an aboutness topic. This observation yields the second piece of evidence for the claim that, if we take “topic” to mean “aboutness topic,” the widely held view that HT-Ger necessarily marks a topic is not correct.

On the other hand, as shown above, LD-Ger necessarily marks an aboutness topic. Thus, we expect that in LD-Ger the dislocated element cannot be a non-specific indefinite. This is confirmed by (32a):

(32) Eva und Karl machten in diesem Sommer eine Menge Ausflüge
E. and K. took in this summer a lot of trips
ins Brandenburgische.
to Brandenburg
a. *Irgendeine schöne Reise, → die haben sie mit dem
some beautiful trip (or other) RP have they by
Rad unternommen
bike made
b. Eine bestimmte Reise, → die haben sie mit dem Rad unternommen
a specific trip RP have they by bike made

(32b) demonstrates that LD-Ger with a specific indefinite is fine.

To summarize our observations so far, we can formulate the following claim:

(33) LD-Ger necessarily marks a topic and HT-GER does not necessarily do so.

Let us now look at TOP-Eng and LD-Eng. In seeking to establish whether or not the English constructions necessarily mark a topic, we cannot use the position of a RP, as we

did in the case of LD-Ger and HT-Ger. TOP-Eng does not have a RP, and, since English does not have a designated topic position in the simple clause, the position of the RP in LD-Eng does not help us either. However, we established above that the interpretation of an indefinite in the left peripheral position provides a good means for deciding whether or not LD-Ger or HT-Ger is necessarily a topic marking construction. Therefore, we should check the behaviour of indefinites in TOP-Eng and LD-Eng. As observed e.g. by Ward & Prince (1991), TOP-Eng is possible with a non-specific indefinite. This is illustrated by the following examples:

- (34) a. (... In principle, he is now capable of carrying out or determining the accuracy of any computation.)
Some computations he may not be able to carry out in his head (from Birner & Ward 1998: 80)
- b. One or the other of them someone will buy

Note, that the left peripheral constructions in (34) have the primary stress inside the clause and therefore are true instances of TOP-Eng (cf. fn. 4). Thus, data like (34) show that TOP-Eng does not necessarily mark a topic.¹⁵

Non-specific indefinites are also possible as the left peripheral constituent of LD-Eng (contra Gundel 1988: 213):

- (35) a. The world is falling apart. So many people, they don't know what to do
- b. A man without an attitude, Mary is still looking for him

Thus, (35) demonstrates that the left peripheral phrase of LD-Eng does not have to be a topic. Further, since the pronouns in (35) are semantically identified with the left peripheral non-specific indefinites, the same can be said about the pronouns.

We can summarize the previous discussion in terms of the following claim:¹⁶

- (36) TOP-Eng and LD-Eng do not necessarily mark a topic.

4. Context sensitive properties

4.1 Linking

The following sentences exemplify an interesting functional difference between LD-Ger on the one hand and PREPOS-Ger and HT-Ger on the other:

- (37) Die Kinder hatten ihren ersten Ferientag
the children had their first day of vacation
- a. Der Otto, der wollte Fußball spielen (LD-Ger)
the-NOM O. RP wanted soccer play
- b. Den Otto, den hatte Maria abgeholt (LD-Ger)
the-ACC O. RP had M. picked up
- c. Der Otto wollte Fußball spielen (PREPOS-Ger)
- d. Den Otto hatte Maria abgeholt (PREPOS-Ger)
- e. Der Otto, er wollte Fußball spielen (HT-Ger)
- f. Den Otto, ihn hatte Maria abgeholt (HT-Ger)

The first sentence in (37) provides the context with respect to which each of the following sentences should be evaluated. (37a) and (b) are LDs-Ger with a left peripheral subject

and a left peripheral object, respectively. (37c) and (d) are instances of PREPOS-Ger, with a preposed subject and a preposed object, respectively. Finally (37e) and (f) are instances of HT-Ger with a left peripheral subject and a left peripheral object, respectively.

In the given context, the LD-Ger structures are necessarily interpreted such that *Otto* refers to a member of the set of children introduced by *die Kinder* in the preceding sentence. This means that the left peripheral phrase of LD-Ger has to pick out a referent which is linked to an already available discourse referent.

Things are different in the other two constructions. PREPOS-Ger and HT-Ger are not necessarily interpreted this way, i.e. (37c-f) also have a reading according to which the referent of *Otto* does not belong to the children. This holds even if in (37c-f) *Otto* is understood intuitively as a topic. Thus, the phrase in the prefield of a V2-clause and the left peripheral phrase of HT-Ger may introduce a completely new, non-linked referent. It is worth emphasizing that, as (37d) and (f) show, this also holds when an object figures in PREPOS-Ger or HT-Ger.

The following examples also show that the linking property of LD-Ger is not just a consequence of the topical status of its left peripheral phrase:

- (38) Die Kinder hatten ihren ersten Ferientag
- a. Am Mittag wollte Otto selbstverständlich Fußball spielen
in the afternoon wanted O. naturally soccer (to) play
 - b. Maria hatte den Otto erfreulicherweise abgeholt
M. has the-ACC O. fortunately picked up

In Section 2, it was shown that only topical elements may occur in the middle field in front of a SADV (subject to the qualification in fn. 12). Thus, in (38a) the subject *Otto* is a topic, and in (38b) the object *den Otto* is. In the given context, both sentences have an interpretation according to which the referent of *Otto* does not have to belong to the set of children. Therefore, the topichood of a phrase does not impose the requirement to link its referent to an already established discourse referent. Rather, the linking requirement which we find for the referent of the left peripheral phrase of LD-Ger is due to this very construction. That the linking requirement is not due to the topical status of a phrase could also be seen from an example like (18). This sentence containing a topical indefinite is fine in an “out of the blue” context.

The observation about the interpretations of the LD-Ger constructions in (37a, b) is reminiscent of a condition which Prince (1998) formulates for English Topicalization:

- (39) 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 asymmetric. I do not want to discuss whether this is the right constraint for the relation because this depends heavily on semantic considerations and decisions. Therefore, I will just formulate the following condition:

- (40) The referent of the left peripheral phrase of LD-Ger has been introduced in previous discourse or stands in a cognitive salient relation to an already introduced discourse referent.

There is no such requirement for the referent of the phrase which undergoes PREPOS-Ger or HT-Ger.

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

- (41) a. Max flog gestern mit einer teuren Fluglinie. Das Flugzeug,
M. flew yesterday with an expensive airline the aircraft
das war allerdings alt
RP was though old
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
however 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.¹⁷

Let us now look at the English constructions. The following example of TOP-Eng illustrates why Prince (1998) formulates a condition like (39):

- (42) I was looking out of the window. #Mary I saw

However, there are elements which do not have to fulfil any linking requirement if they are positioned in the left periphery of an English clause. The following interesting examples are due to Chris Wilder (p.c.):

- (43) a. A man came in. Carefully he lit a pipe
b. A man came in. With a hammer he broke the window
c. A man came in. #With a hammer I think he broke the window

In (43a) and (b) adverbials are positioned in the left periphery of the second clause. These adverbials are not related to any element of the first clause. Nevertheless the sentences are fine. However a non-linked adverbial is only possible at the beginning of its own clause. (43c) shows that long dislocation of a non-linked adverbial by TOP-Eng is not possible. Therefore, the dislocation of the adverbials in (43a) and (b) is unlikely to be an instance of TOP-Eng. Rather it seems that English has a kind of local scrambling of adverbials. To my knowledge, this phenomenon has hardly been investigated yet.¹⁸ But it seems fair to put this kind of sentence to the side and to stick to Prince's generalization that TOP-Eng induces a linking requirement for the left peripheral phrase.

LD-Eng behaves differently. It does not impose a linking requirement on the referent of the left peripheral constituent. This is shown by sentences like (44):

- (44) The children had their first day of vacation. Max, he wanted to play soccer

The left peripheral phrase in (44) may have an interpretation according to which the referent of *Max* does not belong to the set of children.

The following statement summarizes the findings of this section:

- (45) In LD-Ger and TOP-Eng, the referent of the left peripheral phrase has to be linked to a referent already established in the discourse. This does not hold for PREPOS-Ger, HT-Ger, and LD-Eng.

According to (45), only a subset of the left peripheral constructions considered induces an anaphoric relationship between the left peripheral phrase and the preceding discourse. Note

that it would be wrong to assume that the constructions which induce the linking requirement are exactly the ones which involve movement of the left peripheral constituent. PREPOS-Ger certainly involves movement but it does not impose a linking requirement on the referent of the preposed element. Thus, the claim of Birner & Ward (1998: 32), which is formulated with regard to English, does not fully hold for German, namely that: “Felicitous preposing requires that the referent or denotation of the preposed constituent be anaphorically linked to the preceding discourse.”

4.2 Topic promoting

In Section 3, it was shown that LD-Ger designates a topic. We may now ask the question of whether LD-Ger can be used to indicate continuity of a topic, i.e., of whether the left peripheral element of LD-Ger can be coreferential with a topic of the preceding sentence. The following examples show that the answer is “no”:

- (46) a. Einen großen Auftrag hat [Max₁]^{Topic} erfreulicherweise
 a big commission has M. fortunately
 gestern bekommen.
 yesterday got
 #Der talentierte Architekt₁, → der machte sich sofort an die Arbeit
 the talented architect RP got REFL immediately down to work
- b. Einen großen Auftrag hat erfreulicherweise Max₁ gestern bekommen.
 Der talentierte Architekt₁, → der machte sich sofort an die Arbeit
- c. [Löwen₁]^{Topic} hat Otto viele fotografiert.
 lions has O. many photographed
 ‘As for lions, Otto has many photographed’
 #(Denn) Löwen₁, → die sind einfach faszinierend
 because lions RP are simply fascinating
- d. Otto hat viele [Löwen₁] fotografiert.
 O. has many lions photographed
 (Denn) Löwen₁, → die sind einfach faszinierend

If the second sentences in (46a-d) are read with one intonational contour, i.e. if they are understood as LDs-Ger, one finds a difference in acceptability between the texts in (46a) and (46c) on the one hand and the texts in (46b) and (46d) on the other. Let us start with (46a) and (46b). In (46a), the left peripheral phrase of the second sentence refers to the same referent as the phrase in the first sentence that is situated in a position which, according to (14), can only host topics. This text is less good than the one in (46b), in which the referent picked up by the left peripheral phrase of the second sentence is not referred to by a topical expression of the first clause but is part of the first clause’s comment. Thus, the difference between these two texts indicates that the left peripheral phrase of LD-Ger has to be a new topic, i.e. the left peripheral phrase cannot refer to the referent of a topical expression in the preceding sentence. This is confirmed by the examples in (46c) and (46d). The first sentence in (46c) exhibits the so called “DP split”-construction. In this construction, a subpart of the DP, which has to contain the noun, is positioned to the left of the rest of the DP. It is a standard assumption that this is a topic marking construction, i.e., that the noun containing part of a DP split always marks a topic. The second sentence in (46c) is an LD-Ger construction whose left peripheral phrase is coreferential with the topical part of the DP split in the first sentence. The LD-Ger construction is not felt to be really appropriate under these circumstances. Consider (46d) now. Here, there is no DP split in the first sentence. The left peripheral phrase of the second sentence is coreferential with a phrase which can very well be interpreted as a non-

topic. The text in (46d) is fine. Thus, (46c) and (46d) also demonstrate that the left peripheral phrase of LD-Ger does not want to be coreferential with a phrase which marks a topic in the preceding sentence.

Let us see how PREPOS-Ger and HT-Ger behave in this respect:

- (47) a. Einen großen Auftrag hat [Max₁]^{Topic} erfreulicherweise
gestern bekommen.
Der talentierte Architekt₁ machte sich sofort an die Arbeit
the talented architect got REFL immediately down to work
- b. Einen großen Auftrag hat erfreulicherweise Max₁ gestern bekommen.
Der talentierte Architekt₁ machte sich sofort an die Arbeit
- c. [Löwen₁]^{Topic} hat Otto viele fotografiert.
(Denn) Löwen₁ sind einfach faszinierend
because lions are simply fascinating
- d. Otto hat viele [Löwen₁] fotografiert.
(Denn) Löwen₁ sind einfach faszinierend
- (48) a. Einen großen Auftrag hat [Max₁]^{Topic} erfreulicherweise
gestern bekommen.
Dieser begabte Architekt₁, er hat erst vor kurzem
This talented architect he has only recently
das Studium abgeschlossen
the studies finished
- b. Einen großen Auftrag hat erfreulicherweise Max₁ gestern bekommen.
Dieser begabte Architekt₁, er hat erst vor kurzem das Studium abgeschlossen
- c. [Löwen₁]^{Topic} hat Otto viele fotografiert.
Löwen₁, sie sind beliebte Motive der Tierfotographie
lions they are popular subjects of animal photography
- d. Otto hat viele [Löwen₁] fotografiert.
Löwen₁, sie sind beliebte Motive der Tierfotographie

The second sentences in (47a)-(47d) contain instances of PREPOS-Ger. Although PREPOS-Ger does not always mark a topic it is reasonable to assume that it does so in the examples in (47). The well-formedness of the examples shows that even under these circumstances PREPOS-Ger does not care whether the referent of its preposed phrase was already referred to by a topic or by a non-topic. The same claim can be made about HT-Ger, as the examples in (48) show: The left peripheral phrase in HT-Ger can be coreferential with a topic or with a non-topic of the preceding sentence.

Our observations can be summarized as follows:

- (49) The left peripheral constituent of LD-Ger cannot be coreferential with a topic of the preceding sentence.

In contrast, the referent of the left peripheral element of PREPOS-Ger or of HT-Ger may be referred to by a topic or by a non-topic of the preceding sentence.

Thus, it is a genuine property of LD-Ger that it always functions as a topic-promoting device: According to (33), its left peripheral constituent is a topic. According to (45), the referent of the left peripheral constituent has to be linked to the preceding discourse. According to (49), the left peripheral constituent cannot be coreferential with a topic of the preceding sentence.

This is different with PREPOS-Ger and HT-Ger. First, the left peripheral phrase of PREPOS-Ger or of HT-Ger does not have to be topical. In the case of PREPOS-Ger, this is obvious (cf. Section 2) and in the case of HT-Ger, this was argued for in Section 3, cf. (33). Furthermore, according to (45), the referent of the left peripheral phrase of PREPOS-Ger or of HT-Ger does not have to be linked to the preceding discourse. Finally, according to (49), even if the left peripheral element is coreferential with a phrase in the preceding sentence, the topical status of this preceding phrase is irrelevant. This also holds in case PREPOS-Ger or HT-Ger marks a topic. These constructions are not necessarily topic promoting devices.

Note by the way that a topic in the middle field might be coreferential with a preceding topic:

- (50) Heute hat [Max₁]^{Topic} erfreulicherweise einen Auftrag bekommen. Darauf
today has M. fortunately a commission got for that
hat [dieser begabte Architekt₁]^{Topic} leider lange warten müssen
has this talented architect unfortunately a long time (to) wait (to) have

The sentences in (50) both contain a topic in the middle field and these two topics are coreferential.

Let us look at the English constructions. Like PREPOS-Ger and HT-Ger, TOP-Eng and LD-Eng do not necessarily mark a topic (cf. (36)). Given our observations about PREPOS-Ger and HT-Ger, we expect that TOP-Eng and LD-Eng do not care whether their left peripheral phrase is coreferential with a topic in the preceding sentence. This expectation seems to be fulfilled:

- (51) As far as Peter is concerned, he just cooked a wonderful dinner.
a. That guy I really like
b. That guy, I really like him

We may assume that the phrase *as far as X is concerned* forces a term in the immediately following clause which is coreferential with *X* to be a topic.¹⁹ This means that in (51) the pronoun *he* is topical. Thus, the fact that both (51a, b) are well-formed in the given context leads us to the following claim:

- (52) The left peripheral phrase of TOP-Eng or of LD-Eng may pick up a referent which was already referred to by a topical phrase in the preceding sentence.

Although TOP-Eng and LD-Eng do not always mark a topic it is reasonable to assume that in (51) they do so. Even under these circumstances, (52) holds. TOP-Eng and LD-Eng, like PREPOS-Ger and HT-Ger, are not necessarily topic-promoting devices.

4.3 Discourse structuring

Discourses are organized and structured. A discourse unit is followed by a break which is again followed by a discourse unit and so forth. A discourse unit is felt to have some kind of thematic continuity or, as some authors call it, topical coherence thereby constituting a discourse topic. Thematic continuity should be distinguished from referential continuity. Referential continuity of a discourse chunk requires that each of its sentences refer back to entities in the immediately preceding sentence. It can be shown that the thematic units into which a discourse is divided do not coincide with chunks of referential continuity (cf. e.g. Goutsos 1997).

The division of a discourse into units is not just inherent in the discourse, nor is it just dictated by some pre-discourse necessity. “Rather,” as Levinson (1983: 315) writes: “topical coherence is something constructed across turns by the collaboration of participants”; and Goutsos (1997: 35) notes along the same lines that “discourse topic is not defined and identified as an a priori unit but is seen as the outcome of the marking of boundaries by a text producer and the decoding of boundaries by the text receiver.” Thus, the speaker or writer decides how the discourse should be structured. To structure a discourse, the speaker/writer has formal means at his/her disposal to indicate continuation of a discourse unit or break of continuation. According to Goutsos (1997), these are for example: discourse markers like *now, then, of course*; metadiscourse items like *at this point, so far so good*; special sentence structures like presentative constructions or sentences with certain initial adjuncts; orthographic markers in written discourse; intonation.

In Section 4.1, we investigated whether the left peripheral elements of the constructions considered in this paper necessarily contribute to referential continuity. Now, in this section, the behaviour of the constructions with respect to thematic continuity will be examined, i.e., it will be investigated whether the different constructions have different consequences for the structuring of a discourse.

Let us start with the following examples:

- (53) a. Hans wird diese Woche zwei Konzerte geben. Das erste, das ist
H. will this week two concerts give the first RP is
am Montag in Bochum. Das zweite, das ist am Mittwoch
on Monday in B. the second RP is on Wednesday
in Hamburg (LD-Ger)
in H.
- b. #Hans wird diese Woche zwei Konzerte geben. Das erste, es ist
am Montag in Bochum. Das zweite, es ist am Mittwoch
in Hamburg (HT-Ger)

The first text sounds much more natural than the second one. The formal difference between these examples is that in (53a) the second and the third sentence involve LD-Ger constructions whereas, in (53b), the second and the third sentence involve HT-Ger constructions.

These texts exhibit the discourse relation which is often called “elaboration.” The first sentence states something which is worked out in more detail in the following sentences. In using an elaboration the speaker/writer intends the sentence which is elaborated and the elaborating sentences to be understood as part of one discourse unit. Thus, the fact that (53a) is well-formed may give rise to the supposition that LD-Ger is well-suited for the purpose of continuation of a discourse unit. On the other hand, the deviance of (53b) might indicate that HT-Ger is used as a signal to shift to a new discourse unit.

Let us look at another example of a sequence of sentences which naturally belong to one discourse unit: the sequence of a wh-question and its answer. We find a sharp difference in acceptability between LD-Ger and HT-Ger:

- (54) Wen hat Maria in Berlin getroffen?
who has M. in B. met
- a. Maria, die hat in Berlin den Hans getroffen (LD-Ger)
M. RP has in B. the-ACC H. met
- b. Den Hans, den hat sie in Berlin getroffen (LD-Ger)

- c. #Maria, sie hat in Berlin den Hans getroffen (HT-Ger)
- d. #Den Hans, ihn hat sie in Berlin getroffen (HT-Ger)

(54a, b) show that LD-Ger may be used as the answer to a wh-question. It can continue the discourse unit of the question. (54b) shows that the left peripheral element may even yield the requested value for the wh-phrase (Frey 2004). This fact is of interest in its own right. In (54b), the linking requirement of LD-Ger is fulfilled because the question makes the set of possible values for the wh-phrase salient. Furthermore, we note that in (54b), the focus is on *den Hans*. Thus, there seems to be a division of labour between the various elements of the A-bar chain in (54b). Whereas the left peripheral element constitutes the focus of the answer, the RP is the topic. Together this results in a contrastive topic represented by the A-bar chain, which accounts for the contrastive reading of (54b) (Kamp et al. 2003, Frey 2004).

(54c, d) demonstrate that HT-Ger is not possible as an answer to a wh-question, regardless of whether the left peripheral element is the focus or not. This fact finds a straightforward explanation if HT-Ger is not appropriate to continue a discourse unit, but is used to shift to a new discourse unit.

Let us next consider a discourse exhibiting a narration. A narration like in (55) reports a sequence of events which are ordered in time. There is a tendency for a discourse participant to put the different sentences of such a narration into one discourse unit together. Again we find a difference between LD-Ger and HT-Ger, although not as sharp as that in (53) and (54):

- (55) a. Hans hat den Max gestoßen. Der Max, der fiel hin. Hans hat
H. has the-ACC M. pushed the M. RP fell down H. has
sich sofort entschuldigt
REFL right away excused
- b. #Hans hat den Max gestoßen. Der Max, er fiel hin. Hans hat
sich sofort entschuldigt

The two texts are identical except that in (55a), the second sentence is an LD-Ger construction and in (55b), the second sentence is an HT-Ger construction. (55a) is fine. The linking requirement as well as the topic-promoting requirement posed by LD-Ger are fulfilled.

(55b) is not as good as (55a). The HT-Ger construction is not fully appropriate in this environment. One has the feeling that the HT-Ger construction in the second sentence signals a shift of perspective which does not really fit into the given context. Note that the unnaturalness of (55b) cannot be reduced to the fact that, in its most likely interpretation, (55b) involves changing the topic *Hans* in the first clause to the topic *Max* in the second and back to *Hans* in the third clause. The well-formed (55a) contains the same changes of topics. Rather, it is the effect of HT-Ger on the more global structure of the text that makes (55b) deviant.

Similar observations can be made with regard to the following examples:

- (56) Ich habe etwas in der Zeitung über Hans gelesen.
I have something in the newspaper about H. read
- a. Den Hans, den will der Minister zum Botschafter
the-ACC H. RP wants the minister to ambassador
ernennen (LD-Ger)
(to) appoint
- b. #Hans, der Minister will ihn zum Botschafter ernennen (HT-Ger)
H. the minister wants him to ambassador (to) appoint

In (56), the second sentence explicates the first sentence. Furthermore, the first sentence has the effect that *Hans* will figure as a topic in the next sentence. Note that this requirement can be fulfilled by HT-Ger. Thus, in (56b), *Hans* can be understood as a topic. However, it would be natural for the first sentence of (56) and the following explicating sentence to be part of one discourse unit. So, the impossibility of (56b) in the given context must again be related to the fact the HT-Ger is not the right means to continue a discourse unit.

The deviant examples of (53)-(56) led to the conjecture that these examples are bad because HT-Ger signals a break in the discourse and establishes a new point of departure. Therefore, we now should consider a discourse which favours such a break and check how HT-Ger fits in:

- (57) Hans ist ein richtiger Fan der Berliner U-Bahn. Deshalb reist er oft nach Berlin. Die Berliner U-Bahn, sie nahm 1902 ihren Betrieb auf. Sie startete auf einem Ostteil der heutigen Linie U1 ...
'H. is a real fan of the Berlin Underground. That's why he travels to Berlin so often. The Berlin Underground, it started operating in 1902. It began on an eastern stretch of the current Line U1 ...'

In (57), whereas the first two sentences are about Hans' enthusiasm for the Berlin underground, the third sentence switches to the new theme "history of the Berlin underground." So, it very natural that the writer/speaker wants to mark a break at this point. Thus, the fact that the HT-Ger construction in the third sentence sounds quite appropriate confirms the supposition that HT-Ger signals a break in the development of a discourse.

Note that if we replace HT-Ger in the third sentence with LD-Ger the text sounds awkward, as expected:

- (58) Hans ist ein richtiger Fan der Berliner U-Bahn. Deshalb reist er oft nach Berlin. #Die Berliner U-Bahn, → die nahm 1902 ihren Betrieb auf. Sie startete auf einem Ostteil der heutigen Linie U1 ...

Let us now summarize our observations about sequencing and segmenting with LD-Ger and HT-Ger. We can state the following claims:

- (59) An LD-Ger construction continues the current discourse unit.
An HT-Ger construction signals a break in continuity and starts a new discourse unit.

The organization of a discourse affects the form of coreferring expressions. The form may signal continuity, or a break in continuity (Smith 2003). Anaphoric expressions convey continuity; full coreferring DPs signal the existence of a new discourse unit (Vonk et al.

1992). Let us therefore check whether (59) is confirmed by the choice of the form of a coreferring DP:

- (60) a. Maria₁ freut sich auf Weihnachten. Der Weihnachtsmann, M. looks forward REFL to Christmas Father Christmas, der wird hoffentlich viele Geschenke bringen. Sie₁ hat sich unter RP will hopefully many presents bring she has REFL amongst anderem einen Motorroller gewünscht other things (for) a scooter asked
- b. Maria₁ freut sich auf Weihnachten. Der Weihnachtsmann, er wird hoffentlich viele Geschenke bringen. *Sie₁/Maria₁ hat sich unter anderem einen Motorroller gewünscht

(60b) shows that it is hardly possible for a pronoun to be coreferent with a DP which is separated from the pronoun by an HT-Ger construction. This is explained by (59). Since HT-Ger signals a discourse break, in (60b) the pronoun and the coindexed DP *Maria* do not belong to the same discourse unit. However, a pronoun wants to be in the same discourse unit as its antecedent. Therefore, in (60b) *Maria* is not a possible antecedent for the pronoun.

Compare (60a). It shows that a pronoun can be coreferent with a DP separated from the pronoun by an LD-Ger construction. This again confirms (59). LD-Ger continues the current discourse unit. Thus, in (60a) the pronoun and the coindexed DP belong to the same discourse unit, which makes coreference of the two expressions possible.

Let us now turn to PREPOS-Ger and look whether it also has particular effects on discourse structure. First, it can be observed, and this is hardly surprising, that PREPOS-Ger is a good means to continue the current discourse unit. If, in any of the examples (53)-(56), the LD-Ger construction is replaced by PREPOS-Ger the example is still fine. We may illustrate this with the first example:

- (61) Hans wird diese Woche zwei Konzerte geben. Das erste ist am Montag in Bochum. Das zweite ist am Mittwoch in Hamburg

Next, let us consider the well-formed text (57), whose content favours a break between the second and the third sentence. In (57), the third sentence consists of an HT-Ger construction. Now, what happens if we replace the HT-Ger construction with PREPOS-Ger?

- (62) Hans ist ein richtiger Fan der Berliner U-Bahn. Deshalb reist er oft nach Berlin. Die Berliner U-Bahn nahm 1902 ihren Betrieb auf. Sie startete auf einem Ostteil der heutigen Linie U1 ...

(62) is well-formed. Certainly, in this text, there is a tendency to have a pause between the second and the third sentence, or, in written form, to begin a new paragraph with the third sentence. However, for our considerations it is important that PREPOS-Ger can constitute the third sentence. It follows that PREPOS-Ger can be used at a point where the discourse starts a new discourse unit.

Thus, our findings indicate that PREPOS-Ger does not have special properties with respect to the continuation or beginning of a discourse unit:

- (63) PREPOS-Ger may be used to continue a discourse unit or to start a new one.

Incidentally, we can also note that the option of continuing a discourse unit or of starting a new one is also available should there be a topic designated in the middle field. Since this is essentially self-evident, it does not have to be illustrated.

Let us now consider TOP-Eng and LD-Eng. The following examples each contain a sequence of sentences which are normally understood as belonging to the same discourse unit:

- (64) a. I heard some news about John. John Mary kissed (#him)
b. Mary took the kids to the shops. She bought dolls for the girls.
For Jonny, she bought a teddy bear / #Jonny, she bought a teddy bear for him

In (64a), the first sentence has the effect that in the next sentence *John* will figure as a topic. Furthermore, the second sentence explicates the first sentence. It is natural to group the two sentences into one discourse unit. The impossibility of LD-Eng in the second sentence of (64a) therefore shows that LD-Eng is not the right means to continue a discourse unit (cf. for this claim also Enç 1986).

In (64b), the first sentence is elaborated by the following sentences. There is a strong tendency to put all these sentences together into one discourse unit. Thus, the impossibility of LD-Eng as an elaborating sentence again indicates that LD-Eng is not used to continue a discourse unit.

In both (64a, b), TOP-Eng is fine. Thus, TOP-Eng can be used as an explicating sentence and as an elaborating sentence, respectively. This shows that TOP-Eng is well-suited for the purpose of continuation of a discourse unit.

We expect that LD-Eng signals a shift to a new discourse unit. The following example, which is cited in Prince (1998: 284), seems to confirm this:

- (65) ... there won't be any dead up there. There'll just be tombstones setting there. Because the coal is under the graves. An old preacher down there, they augered under the grave where his wife was buried. And he's nearly blind and he prayed and everything.

With the fourth sentence, which is an LD-Eng construction, a new discourse unit seems to start.

The following example is constructed similar to the German example (57):

- (66) Hans is just crazy about Berlin. That's why he is always here. (Now) Berlin, it's a real old city. It was founded in 1237 ...

In (66), the first two sentences are about the relation of Hans to Berlin. The third sentence starts a new discourse unit which is about the history of Berlin. The fact that the third sentence in (66) is realized with an LD-Eng construction confirms the expectation that LD-Eng is used to signal a break in the development of a discourse.

In the examples in (60) above, we used the form of a coreferring expression as an indicator of discourse structure. Anaphoric expressions convey continuity, whereas full coreferring DPs signal that a new discourse unit has been set up. In the following example, this test is used in a discourse containing LD-Eng:

- (67) Mary₁ has just written a letter to Santa Claus. (Now) Santa Claus, he always brings lots of presents at Christmas time. *She₁/Mary₁ has asked him for a bicycle.

As shown by (67), a pronoun cannot be coreferent with a DP separated from the pronoun by an intervening LD-Eng construction. If the pronoun and the coindexed DP do not belong to the same discourse unit, it is clear why *Mary* is not a possible antecedent for the pronoun. Thus, (67) constitutes another confirmation that LD-Eng signals a discourse break.

The examples in (64) above show that TOP-Eng can be used to continue a discourse unit. We now have to examine whether TOP-Eng can also be used to start a new discourse unit. The following example indicates that it can:

- (68) Hans is just crazy about Berlin. That's why he is always here. (Now) Berlin, you can get to very easily these days. Many cheap airlines have a connection to the capital of Germany. It has three airports ...

In (68), the first two sentences are again about the relation of Hans to Berlin. The third sentence starts a new discourse unit which is about getting to Berlin. The fact that in (66) the third sentence is realized with a TOP-Eng construction shows that TOP-Eng can be used at the start of a new discourse unit.

For the English constructions considered in this paper we can therefore state:

- (69) TOP-Eng may be used to continue a discourse unit or to shift to a new one.
LD-Eng signals a break in continuity and starts a new discourse unit.

In this section, we have investigated how the constructions considered in this paper behave with respect to discourse continuity and break in continuity. We have seen that HT-Ger and LD-Eng signal a break, that LD-Ger is used to continue a discourse unit, and that PREPOS-Ger and TOP-Eng may be used to continue a discourse unit or to start a new one. What about starting a new discourse? Which construction can be used discourse-initially? Of the considered constructions only PREPOS-Ger can be used to begin a discourse. This fact can be explained with the properties we have already ascribed to the constructions. HT-Ger and LD-Eng signal a break in continuity of a discourse. Since at the beginning of a discourse the indication of a break in continuity makes no sense, HT-Ger and LD-Eng cannot be used here. According to (45), the referents of the left peripheral elements of LD-Ger and TOP-Eng have to be linked to referents already established in the discourse. Obviously, this requirement cannot be fulfilled discourse-initially. Finally, PREPOS-Ger does not impose a linking requirement for its left peripheral phrase nor does it signal a break in discourse continuity. Therefore, this construction can be used as the first sentence of a discourse.

5. Conclusions

In this final section, I would like to draw some conclusions from our findings. The following table lists the results of the investigation (“✓” means that the construction in question necessarily has, “*/✓” that it can but need not have, and “*” that it never has the property in question):

Table 1. *Summary of results*

	MF-TOPIC	PREPOS-Ger	LD-Ger	HT-Ger	TOP-Eng	LD-Eng
marks an aboutness-topic	✓	*/✓	✓	*/✓	*/✓	*/✓
designated element is linked	*/✓	*/✓	✓	*/✓	✓	*/✓
is a topic promoting device	*/✓	*/✓	✓	*/✓	*/✓	*/✓
is a discourse discontinuity device	*/✓	*/✓	*	✓	*/✓	✓

The table includes a column named “MF-TOPIC.” This term is supposed to refer to sentences which designate a topic in the middle field according to (14). Above, it was discussed in passing whether this topic designation goes together with any of the other pragmatic properties discussed in this paper. The answer was always “no.” The purpose of listing the properties of MF-TOPIC in Table 1 is to make clear that the discourse relevant properties of constructions with a topical left peripheral element are not just due to the topical status of the left peripheral element but are properties of the constructions. Thus, the fact that e.g. the referent of the left peripheral constituent of LD-Ger has to be linked to an already introduced discourse referent is not because the left peripheral constituent is a topic but because it is the left peripheral phrase of LD-Ger. The same reasoning holds for the topic-promoting property of LD-Ger. Finally, the impossibility of starting a new discourse unit with LD-Ger also has nothing to do with the fact that LD-Ger marks a topic.

With regard to the properties considered in this paper, PREPOS-Ger is pretty unspectacular. The prefield of a V2-clause may host a topic or a non-topic, the referent of the constituent in the prefield may, but need not, be linked to a referent introduced in the preceding text. If there is a topic in the prefield it may be a new one or it may be the same as in the preceding sentence. Finally, a V2-clause may continue a discourse unit or start a new one. However, that PREPOS-Ger does not induce a linking requirement is of interest because it is sometimes assumed in the literature (e.g. Lötscher 1984) that non-focussed phrases in the prefield, especially non-focussed non-subjects, have an anaphoric function.

The table shows that LD-Ger and HT-Ger differ not only with respect to binding possibilities and intonation (as was shown in Section 1) but also with respect to all the pragmatic properties considered in this paper. Thus, these constructions need to be differentiated from one another. This is still not always done in the literature (cf. e.g. Lambrecht 2001).

Let us now compare the German and the English constructions. The difference between PREPOS-Ger and TOP-Eng is interesting. These constructions are often treated as equivalent (cf. e.g. Gundel 1988, Lambrecht 2001). Yet, Table 1 shows that this is not justified. PREPOS-Ger and TOP-Eng differ with respect to the important linking property listed in the second row. Given this observation, we expect that e.g. a German sentence with a topic in its prefield will very often correspond to a regular English clause and not to TOP-Eng. This is clear if the German sentence has a topical subject in its prefield because a subject cannot undergo TOP-Eng. But it should also hold if the German clause contains a topical object in its prefield whose referent is not linked to an already introduced referent. The corresponding English sentences will have a topical subject as default (one of the

reasons for the higher frequency of passives in English) or a topical object marked by intonation.

The difference between LD-Ger and TOP-Eng is of equal interest. Some authors treat LD-Ger and TOP-Eng as equivalent (e.g. Rizzi 1997). Table 1 shows that this is not correct either. Only for one of the investigated properties (namely for the linking property) do the two constructions have the same entry.

Thus, we see that there is no equivalence between TOP-Eng and PREPOS-Ger, nor between TOP-Eng and LD-Ger. Rather, what Table 1 shows is that with regard to the pragmatic properties considered in this paper, LD-Ger is more specified than TOP-Eng, and TOP-Eng is more specified than PREPOS-GER. Therefore, an LD-Ger construction with a non-subject as the left peripheral element might be translated with TOP-Eng without any risk that one of the properties will be wrongly valued. On the other hand, TOP-Eng cannot always be translated with LD-Ger since LD-Ger is specified with regard to all the considered properties, whereas TOP-Eng is specified with regard to only one. Concerning TOP-Eng and PREPOS-Ger, Table 1 shows that with respect to the properties investigated here TOP-ENG can always be translated by PREPOS-Ger without any risk of a wrongly valued property. This is not possible the other way round because PREPOS-Ger is completely unspecified.

Note also that with regard to syntax neither PREPOS-Ger nor LD-Ger is equivalent to TOP-ENG. Since German is a V2 language and English is not, PREPOS-Ger cannot have a direct counterpart in English in syntactic terms. With regard to LD-Ger, it was shown in Section 1 that the construction involves a weak d-pronoun. In English, there is no element corresponding to the weak d-pronoun of German. Thus, we do not find an English construction which corresponds formally to LD-Ger. Therefore, the fact that, functionally too, TOP-Eng stands in full correspondence to neither PREPOS-Ger nor LD-Ger might be thought of as being connected to these syntactic facts.

Note by the way that according to Table 1 there does not exist any relationship of the kind considered above between HT-Ger and TOP-Eng nor between MF-TOPIC and TOP-Eng.

Let us now consider HT-Ger and LD-Eng. In Section 1, it was noted that with respect to binding properties and intonation, LD-Eng corresponds to HT-Ger and not to LD-Ger. Table 1 also shows that with respect to the pragmatic properties considered here, LD-Eng shares every property with HT-Ger and none with LD-Ger. Therefore, it is very problematic that many authors (e.g. Zwart 1998, Lambrecht 2001) treat LD-Eng and LD-Ger on a par.

The equivalence between LD-Eng and HT-Ger with respect to the properties listed in Table 1 also makes sense from a syntactic point of view. As noted in Section 1, it is reasonable to assume that, in the relevant parts, the syntactic analyses of the two constructions are very similar.

Let us now consider the first row of Table 1. According to our findings, HT-Ger, TOP-Eng and LD-Eng are not necessarily topic marking constructions. However, in the literature they are often considered to be such. Furthermore, many general claims about topics are justified by considering constructions of these types. For example, Lambrecht (2001) claims that topics must be definite expressions or be capable of a generic interpretation and that topics must be a centre of the present concern and have a degree of salience. As empirical evidence for these claims, Lambrecht only considers dislocation constructions. Given our findings, these claims do not hold for topics *per se*. For example, the familiarity requirement for topics, which is postulated by Lambrecht and other authors (e.g. Gundel 1988) might arise just because a construction like TOP-Eng forces the linking of the referent of its left peripheral phrase. Lambrecht's other claim that topics must be a centre of the present concern is explained by him with an LD-Eng construction:

(70) #Hi John. Guess what. Your sister, I saw her last night

However, given the properties in Table 1, we would explain the ill-formedness of (70) rather differently. LD-Eng has to start a new discourse unit, and this is not possible in the context given in (70).

Let me finally make a short comment about the practice now standard in the syntactic literature of analysing LD-GER and TOP-Eng (and often also HT-Ger and LD-Eng) as involving just some feature TOPIC which is checked during the syntactic derivation. It is clear that our findings cast doubt on the validity of such approaches. It is hard to imagine a contentful notion of topichood which could do justice to the different constructions given their differences as listed in Table 1. Further, analyses of the constructions that assign similar syntactic structures to them (cf. Section 1) and employ some general feature TOPIC do not constitute a suitable basis for an explanation of the pragmatic differences between the constructions.

Table 1 suggests that finer distinctions between the construction have to be made. For example, the crucial property which LD-Ger and TOP-Eng share is that the left peripheral element needs linking. So we might say that the left peripheral element of LD-Ger and TOP-Eng has to check a LINKING feature. In addition, in LD-Ger, and only in LD-Ger, a TOPIC feature is always checked during the derivation. It remains to be seen whether these two properties allow one to deduce the other two properties of LD-Ger listed in Table 1. With regard to HT-Ger and LD-Eng, Table 1 suggests that none of the pragmatically motivated features used in syntax is an inherent part of their analysis. Rather, the status of the left peripheral element of HT-Ger and LD-Eng as non-integrated into the following clause is likely to be responsible for the crucial property of HT-Ger and LD-Eng indicated in the last row of Table 1.

References

- Altmann, Hans (1981). *Formen der "Herausstellung" im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Baltin, Mark (1982). A Landing Site Theory of Movement Rules. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 329-336.
- Birner, Betty J. & Gregory Ward (1998). *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order in English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Brand, Margareta, Marga Reis, Inger Rosengren & Ilse Zimmermann (1992). Satztyp, Satzmodus und Illokution. In *Satz und Illokution*, Bd. 1, Inger Rosengren (ed.), 1-90. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Chafe, Wallace (1976): Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View. In *Subject and Topic*, Charles N. Li (ed.), 25-55. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1977). On Wh-Movement. In *Formal Syntax*, Peter Culicover et al. (eds.), 71-132. New York: Academic Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1983). 'Topic' Constructions in some European Languages and 'Connectedness'. Reprinted in *Materials on Left Dislocation*, Elena Anagnostopoulou et al. (eds.), 93-118. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Enç, Mürvet (1986). Topic Switching and Pronominal Subjects in Turkish. In *Studies in Turkish linguistics*, Dan I. Slobin & Karl Zimmer (eds.), 195-208. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi (1997): *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Frey, Werner (2003). Syntactic Conditions on Adjunct Classes. In *Modifying Adjuncts*, Ewald Lang et al. (eds.), 163-209. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Frey, Werner (to appear). A Medial Topic Position for German. *Linguistische Berichte*.
- Frey, Werner (2004). Notes on the Syntax and the Pragmatics of German Left Dislocation. In *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Sentence Periphery*, Horst Lohnstein & Susanne Trissler (eds.), 203-233. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Goutsos, Dionysis (1997). *Modeling Discourse Topic: Sequential Relations and Strategies in Expository Text*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes (2003). *Prolific Domains: On the Anti-Locality of Movement Dependencies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Grosz, Barbara, Aravind Joshi & Scott Weinstein (1995). Centering: A Framework for Modelling the Local Coherence of Discourse. *Computational Linguistics* 21(2), 203-225.
- Gundel, Jeanette (1988). Universals of Topic-Comment Structure. In *Studies in Syntactic Typology*, Michael Hammond et al. (eds.), 209-239. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Haegeman, Liliane (2002). Anchoring to Speaker, Adverbial Clauses and the Structure of CP. Manuscript.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. (1967). Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English, II. *Journal of Linguistics* 3, 199-244.
- Hockett, Charles F. (1958): *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: McMillan.
- Jacobs, Joachim (2001). The Dimensions of Topic-Comment. *Linguistics* 39(4), 641-681.
- Kamp, Hans, Ágnes Bende-Farkas & Arndt Riester (2003). Fortsetzungsantrag zum DFG-Projekt "Logik-unterstützte Verzahnung von Semantik und Pragmatik". University of Stuttgart.
- Kuno, Susumo (1972). Functional Sentence Perspective: A Case Study from Japanese and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 269-336.
- Lambrecht, Knud (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lambrecht, Knud (2001). Dislocation. In *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*, Vol. 2, Martin Haspelmath et al. (eds.), 1050-1078. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lasnik, Howard & Mamoru Saito (1992). *Move α : Conditions on Its Application and Output*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lötscher, Andreas (1984). Satzgliedstellung und funktionale Satzperspektive. In *Pragmatik in der Grammatik*. Jahrbuch 1983 des Instituts für deutsche Sprache, Gerhard Stickel (ed.), 118-151. Düsseldorf: Schwann.
- Molnár, Valéria (1991). *Das TOPIK im Deutschen und Ungarischen*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International (=Lunder germanistische Forschungen 58).
- Molnár, Valéria (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, Gereon & Wolfgang Sternefeld (1993). Improper Movement and Unambiguous Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 461-507.
- Müller, Gereon (1995). *A-bar Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Platzack, Christer (2001). Multiple Interfaces. In *Cognitive Interfaces. Constraints on Linking Cognitive Information*, Urpo Nikanne & Emile van der Zee (eds.), 21-53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prince, Ellen (1998). On the Limits of Syntax, with Reference to Left-Dislocation and Topicalization. In *The Limits of Syntax*. Syntax and Semantics 29, Peter W. Culicover & Louise McNally (eds.), 281-302. New York: Academic Press.
- Prince, Ellen (1999). How Not to Mark Topics: 'Topicalization' in English and Yiddish. In: *Texas Linguistics Forum*, Chapter 8. Austin: University of Texas.
- Reinhart, Tanya (1981). Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. *Philosophica* 27, 53-94.
- Reinhart, Tanya (1995). *Interface Strategies*. OTS Working Papers. Utrecht University.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar. Handbook in Generative Syntax*, Liliane Haegeman (ed.), 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Smith, Carlota S. (2003). *Modes of Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vallduví, Enric & Elisabet Engdahl (1996). The Linguistic Realization of Information Packaging. *Linguistics* 34(3), 459-519.
- Vat, Jan (1981). Left Dislocation, Connectedness and Reconstruction. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 20, 80-103. [Reprinted in *Materials on Left Dislocation*, Elena Anagnostopoulou et al. (eds.), 67-92. Amsterdam: Benjamins.]
- Vonk, Wietske, Letticia Hustinx & Wim Simons (1992). The Use of Referential Expressions in Structuring Discourse. *Language & Cognitive Processes* 7, 302-333.
- Ward, Gregory & Ellen Prince (1991). On the Topicalization of Indefinite NPs. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15(8), 167-178
- Zaenen, Annie (1997). Contrastive Dislocation In Dutch and Icelandic. In *Materials on Left Dislocation*, Elena Anagnostopoulou et al. (eds.), 119-148. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1998). Where Is Syntax? Syntactic Aspects of Left Dislocation in Dutch and English. In *The Limits of Syntax*. Syntax and Semantics 29, Peter W. Culicover & Louise McNally (eds.), 365-393. New York: Academic Press.

* I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers very much for their helpful critical remarks, comments and suggestions. All errors are my own.

¹ The terminology is used because until recently this part of the clause was structurally represented by the functional head C^0 and the specifier positions and possible adjunction positions of its projection. Rizzi (1997) argues that the single C-projection should be replaced by a cascade of different functional projections.

² (i) illustrates the use of the notions “prefield” and “middle field”:

- (i) a. Maria wird morgen Hans treffen
M. will tomorrow H. meet
prefield vfin middle field verbal complex
‘Tomorrow Mary will meet Hans’
b. dass Maria morgen Hans treffen wird
comp middle field verbal complex
‘that tomorrow Mary will meet Hans’

³ In the examples in this paper, I sometimes use proper names with case-marked articles in order to make their grammatical functions more visible. Proper names with articles, though not common in written language, are perfectly fine in colloquial German.

⁴ I am aware of the fact that there are dialectal variations in acceptability of TOP-Eng. TOP-Eng is rather uncommon in British English. In the following, judgements are based on a dialect in which TOP-Eng is a regular construction.

There is a construction, called the “Focus Movement-construction,” which has the same surface structure as TOP-Eng, but shows a different intonation:

- (i) They just bought a dog. FIDO they named it

Whereas in TOP-Eng focus stays in clause-final position, in a Focus Movement-construction, illustrated in the second clause of (i), the dislocated constituent carries the only focus accent of the clause. In the following, Focus Movement will not be considered.

⁵ As becomes obvious in Zwart (1998), this terminological practice can lead to severe problems. Without any discussion, Zwart equates LD-Eng with LD-Ger and its Dutch equivalent.

⁶ Another well-known property could be added with regard to which these two correspondences hold: PREPOS-Ger, LD-Ger and TOP-Eng are sensitive to island constraints, whereas HT-Ger and LD-Eng are not (cf. e.g. Cinque 1983).

⁷ Of course, PREPOS-Ger, LD-Ger and TOP-Eng also show syntactic differences. To name a few: PREPOS-Ger occurs with verb-second, TOP-Eng does not; PREPOS-Ger and LD-Ger cannot occur right below a complementizer, TOP-Eng can; PREPOS-Ger and LD-Ger cannot occur inside a relative clause, TOP-Eng can.

According to one standard account, the positions of the left peripheral elements in PREPOS-GER, LD-Ger and TOP-Eng are all different: In TOP-Eng, the moved constituent is adjoined to IP (e.g. Baltin 1982, Lasnik & Saito 1992), whereas in PREPOS-Ger, the moved constituent is positioned in SpecCP (with the finite verb being located in C), in LD-Ger, the left peripheral element is obviously positioned even higher. According to another account, the left peripheral elements in LD-Ger and TOP-Eng are in the same structural position, but in German and English, complementizers as well as relative pronouns would have to occupy different positions (cf. Rizzi 1997, Grohmann 2003).

⁸ If the position of the left peripheral elements of HT-Ger and LD-Eng is analysed as belonging to the structure of the following sentence, this position has to be different to the position of the left peripheral element in TOP-Eng and in LD-Ger because the distribution of the constructions is different. TOP-Eng, like LD-Ger, may (marginally) be embedded under bridge verbs (cf. e.g. Lasnik & Saito 1992, Frey 2004), whereas HT-Ger can never be embedded and LD-Eng only in very few cases.

Note that an argument in favour of generating the left peripheral element outside the structure of the following sentence is provided by case matching facts in German. If there is a coreferential DP in the preceding sentence, and if there is case matching of the left peripheral element in HT-GER, i.e. if the left peripheral element does not have the default nominative case, this matching can actually be with the DP in the preceding sentence (Altmann 1981):

- (i) A: Maria hat dem Hans finanziell geholfen.
M. has the-DAT H. financially helped
B: ?dem Hans / ??Den Hans, ich würde ihn nicht unterstützen.
the-DAT H. / the-ACC H. I would him-ACC not support

The main verb of the first sentence subcategorizes for a dative object, the main verb of the following HT-Ger construction subcategorizes for an accusative object. Under these circumstances, the case matching with the preceding DP sounds better. A perfect result, however, would only be achieved if both verbs subcategorized for the same object case.

⁹ Jacobs (2001) even differentiates four dimensions of the notion “topic”: aboutness, frame-setting, informational separation and predication.

¹⁰ This assumption has a long tradition. Halliday (1967) even defined sentence topics as the first expression in a clause. However, Reinhart (1981) rejected this claim as inappropriate for English.

¹¹ To phrase it in the library metaphor of Reinhart’s (1981): The given context demands that the information of the following sentence should be stored under the entry “Hans.” Thus, if the following sentence contains the item *Hans*, i.e. the item which points to the entry under which the information of the sentence has to be stored, *Hans* necessarily is topical.

¹² According to Frey (to appear), there is a position between C⁰ and the topic position characterized in (14) which is not reserved for topics. This becomes clear by considering the following examples:

- (i) a. da mindestens √EIN Bild Otto zum Glück heute fast √Edem verkaufte
since at least one picture O. fortunately today nearly everyone sold
b. obwohl ver√LIEren₁ Otto anscheinend nie und √NIMmer glaubte, jemals t₁
although lose O. apparently never believed ever
lernen zu müssen
learn to have
'although Otto never believed that he would ever have to learn to lose'

Only contrastively focussed elements, like elements with a fall-rise intonation (in (ia) and (ib) indicated by √), may occupy this position between C⁰ and the topic position.

In (i), the contrastively focussed elements occurring right after the complementizers are not in the topic position. In (ia), the element under discussion is a quantified expression, which cannot occur in topic position (cf. (16)). In (ib), it is a verbal projection, which has even undergone long movement (Brand et al. 1992). As shown in Frey (to appear), the topic position can only be the target of short movement. Note that if such a non-topic occurs to the right of a topic and to the left of a SADV the sentence becomes ungrammatical, thereby confirming that the topic position is in fact directly above the base position of the SADVs, as stated in (14):

- (ii) a. ??da Otto mindestens √EIN Bild zum Glück heute fast √Edem verkaufte
b. *obwohl Otto ver√LIEren₁ anscheinend nie und √NIMmer glaubte, jemals t₁ lernen zu müssen

¹³ A reviewer refutes the existence of a designated topic position in German by pointing to examples like:

- (i) Maria hat den OTto erfreulicherweise abgeholt
M. has the-ACC O. fortunately picked up

Since the reviewer assumes that the nuclear focus of a clause cannot be a topic (cf. Molnar 1991, 1998), example (i) is supposed to falsify the thesis (14).

Note, however, that irrespective of whether or not we accept the premise about the nuclear focus of the clause, (i) does not falsify (14). (i) has two analyses compatible with (14). The first analysis makes use of the position which is discussed in fn. 12, i.e., according to this analysis of (i), the focussed element is situated in the position between C⁰ and the topic position which is reserved for contrastively focussed constituents.

The other possible analysis treats the SADV *erfreulicherweise* as a focus inducing operator which relates to the focussed constituent. As such an operator, a SADV has a very free distribution and does not mark the topic-comment boundary. For example, in this use, a SADV might even be positioned in the prefield together with the focussed constituent it relates to. Note, that under standard assumptions, only one constituent may appear in the prefield.

- (ii) Dem OTto anscheinend / anscheinend dem OTto hat sich Maria anvertraut
the-DAT O. apparently has REFL M. confided (in)

¹⁴ This means that an expression like *seinen Doktorvater* in (24a) is a topic in the reading in which it is dependent on a quantified phrase. In this reading *seinen Doktorvater* is not referential in a strict sense, so one might wonder why it can be a topic. Note, however, that when 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 broader sense, the dependent phrase exhibits a form of referentiality.

¹⁵ Prince (1999) arrived at the same conclusion by very different means. Prince shows that the left peripheral phrase in TOP-Eng is typically not the Backward-looking Center (Cb) or the Preferred Center (Cp) in the sense of Centering Theory (Grosz, Joshi & Weinstein 1995). Since Prince assumes that the Cb or the Cp are two reasonable candidates for “aboutness topic,” she claims to have shown that TOP-Eng does not mark a topic. Note, however, that it is not obvious that Cb or Cp corresponds to “aboutness topic.” Cb is supposed to be the most salient entity already under discussion, and Cp the most likely candidate for the most salient entity in the following utterance. Thus, Prince’s understanding of “topic” presupposes sentence-external effects of topics. However, it is not part of the aboutness concept of topic that a topic has sentence-external effects.

¹⁶ In Reinhart (1981), where it is claimed that TOP-Eng and LD-Eng are obligatory topic-marking constructions, data like (34) and (35) are not considered.

¹⁷ See Ward & Prince (1991) for the discussion of some English examples submitted to the condition (39).

¹⁸ However, Haegeman (2002) discusses a phenomenon which might be related. According to Haegeman, in an adverbial clause the long dislocation of an adverbial is not possible but the short dislocation is. Haegeman suggests (i) that long and short dislocations of adverbials target different positions (long dislocation targets a TOP-position, short dislocation a MOD-position in a split CP system like that of Rizzi (1997), cf. fn. 1), and (ii) that adverbial clauses have a truncated structure in the left periphery.

¹⁹ I do not have a decisive test showing that this is in fact the case. However, the German equivalent seems to induce the topichood of such a coreferential phrase:

- (i) a. ??Was Peter betrifft, laut Maria will leider keiner ihm helfen
What P. concerns, according-to M. wants unfortunately no one him help
b. Was Peter betrifft, laut Maria will ihm leider keiner helfen
c. Peter, laut Maria will leider keiner ihm helfen

(ia) and (ib) show that the coreferential pronoun should occur in the topic position. Compare (ia) with (ic), which is fine. (ic) is an instance of HT-Ger, which according to (33) does not have to mark a topic.

The reason why in the “Was X betrifft”-construction the phrase coreferential with *X* has to be a topic is the following: Like the aboutness context *Ich erzähle dir etwas über X* used in example (15), the phrase *Was X betrifft* requires that the information of the following sentence be stored under the entry “X.” Thus, if the following sentence contains the item *X*, it necessarily is topical (cf. fn. 11).