

# French dislocation without movement.

**Abstract.** This paper argues that French Dislocation is a unified phenomenon involving both Left- and Right-Dislocation, irrespective of whether it is resumed by a clitic or a non-clitic element. Narrow syntax is shown to play a minimal role in its derivation: all that is required is that the dislocated element be merged by adjunction to a Discourse Projection (defined as a phase with root properties). No agreement or checking of a designated (e.g. topic) feature is necessary, hence no syntactic movement of any sort need be postulated. The so-called resumptive element is argued to be a full-fledged pronoun rather than a true syntactic resumptive. The relation between the dislocated element and its resumptive is captured in terms of discourse coreference.

The core syntax and interpretive properties of left- and right-dislocation are shown to be identical; differences between the two configurations are shown to derive straightforwardly from the properties of the two sides of the clause periphery.

## 1. Introduction

For decades, the postulation of syntactic movement has been at the heart of the endeavour to explain ungrammaticality in natural languages. In the derivational, incremental approach to grammar proposed by Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001) a.o., a series of constraints have been defined to restrict the output of the computational system to grammatical structures while minimising rule-specific restrictions. This paper focusses on derivational constraints (i.e. those applying to syntactic operations), and more specifically on the movement vs. “base”-generation opposition in the current theory, to the extent that it is relevant to the understanding of French dislocation. The main focus here is on Clitic Left Dislocation, a construction that has been argued to display characteristics of both “base”-generated and movement-derived configurations (Cinque, 1990).

In the Minimalist Program, the general consensus is that dependency relations have to be captured in terms of syntactic movement (see e.g. various contributions to Epstein and Seely, 2002), i.e. that they are essentially derivational in nature. Under such an approach, a difference between representational vs. derivational chains (as in Cinque, 1990) is no longer possible.

In this paper, I draw attention to a series of facts regarding French Clitic Left Dislocation that suggest that a movement account is not appropriate, even under new, radical analyses of

resumptive elements, as in e.g. Boeckx (2003), and that the theory has to allow for non-derivational dependencies.

As we will see, a better understanding of the Information Structure phenomena associated with Clitic Left Dislocation is essential when determining its syntactic properties.<sup>1</sup> On the basis of an in-depth exploration of the data, I develop a comprehensive analysis of (spoken) French left- and right-dislocation in terms of first-merge adjunction without recourse to syntactic projections dedicated to the encoding of discourse functions. The proposed analysis is predicted to extend straightforwardly to any “base-generated” dislocated topic, cross-linguistically, including any case of so-called Hanging Topic Left Dislocation.

The organisation is as follows: section 2 demonstrates that French dislocation is a unified phenomenon (involving left- and right-dislocation, whether the resumptive element is a clitic or not). Section 3 demonstrates that CLLD is not generated by movement in spoken French. All the standard diagnostics for movement are considered, with special attention to the island facts (on the basis of a judgement elicitation task involving a large number of native speakers). The absence of movement-induced effects leads to a discussion of the status of the resumptive element and of the possibility of an analysis of Left Dislocation in terms of Hanging Topic. French Right Dislocation is then shown not to be amenable to an analysis involving Left Dislocation (whether at LF or in the syntactic component). The existence of cases in which a right-dislocated element appears out of the clause containing its resumptive element is argued to point to an analysis in terms of first-merge adjunction, as in Left Dislocation. Section 4 presents the proposed analysis and outlines its predictions (especially those related to the distribution of dislocated elements, and in particular to the root properties of dislocated constructions). The differences between left- and right-dislocation are shown to derive straightforwardly from the properties of the two sides of the clause periphery. The theoretical consequences of the proposed analysis are discussed in section 4.5.

---

<sup>1</sup> I take Information Structure to be what determines the form of utterances, relative to their context.

## 2. French LD: a unified phenomenon

The most widely studied type of left-dislocation is so-called Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD).<sup>2</sup> In CLLD, a left-peripheral XP (as bolded in (1)) is coindexed with a resumptive clitic within the clause. This construction has been attested in many languages (e.g. Italian: Cinque 1977, 1990, Rizzi, 1997; Greek: Iatridou, 1995, Anagnostopoulou, 1997; Lebanese Arabic: Aoun and Benmamoun, 1998).

- (1) **Les malotrus<sub>i</sub>**, on ne les<sub>i</sub> invite pas.  
the louts one NEG them invites not  
'We don't invite louts.'

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

- (2) **Les clittiques<sub>i</sub>**, ils<sub>i</sub> comptent pas pour du beurre.  
the clitics they count not for some butter  
'Clitics do count.'

It is widely acknowledged that dislocated elements are interpreted as topics (e.g. Gundel, 1974, Reinhart, 1981, Rizzi, 1997). I will assume that the same holds for dislocated elements in Spoken French (see Lambrecht, 1994 and XXX for extensive argumentation to that effect). *Topic* here is taken to correspond to what the sentence (or clause) is about (Reinhart, 1981), or more precisely the discourse referent with respect to which the predication is evaluated (Strawson, 1964, Reinhart, 1981, Erteschik-Shir, 1997).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The data discussed will be exclusively from Spoken French, due to space limitations. Similarly, an extensive review of the extremely prolific literature on dislocation could not possibly be included. Key proposals will be discussed in the text where relevant.

<sup>3</sup> As originally pointed out by Strawson (1964), the existence of the topic referent is presupposed and necessary to compute the truth value assessment of the sentence. Unless the hearer can identify a referent for *the king of France*, (s)he will be unable to tell whether the sentence in (i) is true or false. *Le roi de France* 'the king of France' is therefore not a possible topic in the current political reality.

In French, Left Dislocated elements can be resumed by elements that are not clitics. Such LDs are thus by definition not CLLD. Yet, there is no principled reason to distinguish CLLD from other types of LD in Spoken French: the nature of the resumptive element does not affect the syntactic or interpretive properties of LDs in that language, as shown below.<sup>4</sup> Examples of non-clitic LDs are given in (3).

- (3) a. **Claas<sub>i</sub>**, ses<sub>i</sub> chaussettes ont disparu.  
 Claas his socks have disappeared  
 ‘Claas’ socks have disappeared.’
- b. **Kambi<sub>i</sub>**, je n’ai plus jamais entendu parler de lui<sub>i</sub>.  
 Kambi I NEG-have not ever heard to-talk of him  
 ‘I never heard anything about Kambi again.’
- c. **Le lait<sub>i</sub>**, j’adore ça<sub>i</sub>.  
 the milk I-adore that  
 ‘I’m mad on milk.’

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

- (4) **Plastic Bertrand<sub>i</sub>**, j’ai tous les disques de ce farfelu<sub>i</sub>.  
 Plastic Bertrand I-have all the records of this weirdo  
 ‘I have all of Plastic Bertrand’s records.’

- 
- (i) Le roi de France, il est chauve.  
 the king of France he is bald  
 ‘The king of France is bald.’

By contrast, if a DP without reference appears in a non-topic position, the truth value of the sentence can be computed. If there is no king of France, the sentence in (ii) is false.

- (ii) Elle a invité le roi de France.  
 she has invited the king of France  
 ‘She’s invited the king of France.’

<sup>4</sup> There are no intrinsic prosodic differences either between LDs that are resumed by a clitic element and those that are not. Demonstrating this would go beyond the scope of this paper.

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

The examples below show that non-clitic LDs behave similarly to CLLD. First, observe that non-clitic LDs are not sensitive to islands, as seen in (5) (see § 3.4.3 for a detailed argumentation to that effect); the insensitivity of LD to islands is shown in (6).

- (5) a. **Les autres<sub>i</sub>**, je vais attendre [avant de les<sub>i</sub> relire].  
the other-ones I will wait before to them to-re-read
- b. **Aux autres<sub>i</sub>**, on va attendre [avant de leur<sub>i</sub> parler].  
to-the other-ones one will wait before to to-them to-speak
- (6) a. **Claas<sub>i</sub>**, j'ai pris [une photo [de ses<sub>i</sub> chaussettes]].  
Claas I-have taken a photo of his socks  
'I've taken a picture of Claas' socks.'
- b. **Kambi<sub>i</sub>**, je me souviens [du banc [où je m'asseyais avec lui<sub>i</sub>]].  
Kambi I REFL. remember of-the bench where I REFL.-sat with him  
'I remember the bench where I sat with Kambi.'
- c. **Le lait<sub>i</sub>**, il vaut mieux avoir [un frigo [pour conserver ça<sub>i</sub> en été]].  
the milk it is-worth better to-have a fridge to conserve that in summer  
'It's best to have a fridge to keep milk in summer.'

Second, like CLLD, multiple instances of non-clitic LD are allowed. The CLLD examples are in (7) and the LD ones in (8).

- (7) a. **Celui-là<sub>i</sub>**, **des vers<sub>j</sub>**, il<sub>i</sub> en<sub>j</sub> produisait cinq tous les matins.  
that-one-there INDEF verses he of-them produced fi ve all the mornings  
'That guy produced fi ve verses a day.'
- b. **Le savon<sub>i</sub>**, **Ponge<sub>j</sub>**, il<sub>j</sub> en<sub>i</sub> a fait un poème mousseux.  
the soap Ponge he of-it has made a poem foamy  
'Ponge wrote a foamy poem about soap.'
- (8) a. **Claas<sub>i</sub>**, **du contre-plaqué<sub>j</sub>**, tu verrais jamais ça<sub>j</sub> dans sa<sub>i</sub> maison.  
Claas some plywood you would-see never that in his house  
'You'd never see plywood in Claas' house.'
- b. **Kambi<sub>i</sub>**, **l'école<sub>j</sub>**, ça<sub>j</sub> ne lui<sub>i</sub> allait pas trop.  
Kambi the-school it NEG to-him went not too-much  
'Kambi couldn't stand school very well.'

- c. **Le lait**<sub>i</sub>, **Steph**<sub>j</sub>, ça<sub>i</sub> ne va pas avec son<sub>j</sub> estomac.  
 the milk Steph it NEG goes not with his stomach  
 ‘Milk doesn’t go well with Steph’s stomach.’

Third, LD can always have a right-hand counterpart, whether it is resumed by a clitic or by a non-clitic.<sup>5</sup> CLRD examples are given in (9), and RD ones in (10).

- (9) a. Tu ne lui parles plus, **à ta poupée**?  
 you NEG to-her talks no-more to your doll  
 ‘You don’t talk to your doll anymore?’  
 b. Il y en a plein dans le jardin, **des guêpes**.  
 there are lots in the garden of wasps  
 ‘There are lots of wasps in the garden.’  
 (10) a. Ses<sub>i</sub> chaussettes ont disparu, **à Claas**<sub>i</sub>.  
 his socks have disappeared to Claas  
 ‘Class’ socks have disappeared.’  
 b. Je n’ai plus jamais entendu parler de lui<sub>i</sub>, **Kambi**<sub>i</sub>.  
 I NEG-have not ever heard talk of him Kambi  
 ‘I never heard anything about Kambi again.’  
 c. J’adore ça<sub>i</sub>, **le lait**<sub>i</sub>.  
 I-adore that the milk  
 ‘I’m mad on milk.’

Fourth, CLLD (see (11)) and LD (see (12)) can appear in embedded contexts.

- (11) a. Je ne savais pas que **les cochons**<sub>i</sub>, ils<sub>i</sub> avaient des salles de bain.  
 I NEG knew not that the pigs they had INDEF bathrooms  
 ‘I didn’t know pigs had bathrooms.’  
 b. Elle pensait que **des magasins**<sub>i</sub>, elle en<sub>i</sub> trouverait à chaque coin de  
 she thought that INDEF shops she of-them would-fi ndat each corner of  
 rue.  
 street  
 ‘She thought she’d fi nd shops anywhere.’  
 (12) a. Il paraît<sup>6</sup> que **Claas**<sub>i</sub>, on a caché ses<sub>i</sub> chaussettes.  
 it appears that Claas one has hidden his socks  
 ‘It appears that Claas’ socks have been hidden.’  
 b. Tu te souviens que **Kambi**<sub>i</sub>, tout le monde voulait toujours danser avec  
 you REFL. remember that Kambi all the people wanted always to-dance with  
 lui<sub>i</sub>?  
 him

<sup>5</sup> Right-dislocation will be discussed in detail in § 3.7.

‘Do you remember how everybody always wanted to dance with Kambi?’

- c. Je pense pas que **la bière**<sub>i</sub>, ça<sub>i</sub> soit très bon pour le foie.  
I think not that the beer it be very good for the liver  
‘I don’t think beer is very good for the liver.’

I conclude that French LD is a unified phenomenon, in that the nature of the resumptive element does not alter its essential properties. In all cases, the LDed element expresses the topic of the sentence, it can be resumed by an element inside an island, it can appear in embedded clauses, and is recursive. It is also preferably stripped of dependency markers (such as prepositions), something I come back to in section 4.4.<sup>7</sup>

In the remainder of the paper, most of the examples will be of Clitic Left/Right Dislocation, but the discussion is assumed to extend to non-clitic dislocation throughout.

### 3. French dislocation is not generated by movement

Diagnostics for movement traditionally considered relevant to CLLD include Weak Cross-Over effects, the licensing of parasitic gaps, Relativised Minimality effects, reconstruction effects and sensitivity to (strong) islands. In the following subsections, these diagnostics are applied in turn to the spoken French data, and shown to indicate consistently that movement is *not* involved in the derivation of French dislocation. Island sensitivity is discussed in more detail in section 3.5, as it is the most controversial.

#### 3.1. FRENCH LD DOES NOT YIELD WCO EFFECTS

Examples of the type illustrated in (13) have been used in the literature to argue that CLLD configurations do not induce Weak-Cross-Over effects (see e.g. Iatridou, 1995). The argument goes

---

<sup>6</sup> I have adopted the reform of French spelling, following recommendations of the Conseil supérieur de la langue française. See <http://jupiter.fltr.ucl.ac.be/FLTR/ROM/ess.html> for details.

<sup>7</sup> Which syntactic categories are possible topics (and hence ‘dislocatable’, whether to the left or to the right) will not be explored here in detail, as it would require an in-depth discussion of the interpretive properties of (dislocated) topics, something that cannot be done within the scope of this paper. The interested reader is referred to XXX and XXX.

that, in such configurations, a pronoun can freely intervene between its A'-binder (here *Abélard*) and the element at the foot of the “chain” (here the resumptive element *l'* ‘him’).<sup>8</sup>

- (13) **Abélard**<sub>*i*</sub>, sa<sub>*i*</sub> mère l'<sub>*i*</sub> aimait trop.  
 Abelard his mother him loved too-much  
 ‘Abelard’s mother loved him too much.’

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

- (14) **Abélard**<sub>*i*</sub>, on sait que son<sub>*i*</sub> élève passait des heures délicieuses avec lui<sub>*i*</sub>.  
 Abelard one knows that his pupil spent some hours delicious with him  
 ‘It’s well known that Abelard’s pupil spent delicious hours with him.’

On that analysis, absence of WCO effects is exactly what is expected on a direct-generation analysis of dislocation.

However, WCO effects are only expected to arise in configurations involving the binding of a variable by a quantifier (Lasnik and Stowell, 1991).<sup>9</sup> Given the intrinsically non-quantificational nature of dislocated topics (pointed out e.g. in Rizzi, 1997), the absence of WCO in dislocated constructions does not constitute independent evidence for the absence of movement. Indeed, the existence of sentences like (15-a) indicates that the coindexing of the so-called resumptive and the topic does not entail that the ‘resumptive’ be syntactically bound by its antecedent: such coindexing is equally possible across sentences, as shown in (15-b).

---

<sup>8</sup> Contrary to what Zubizarreta (1998) observed for Spanish, even long-distance CLLD does not yield WCO effects in Spoken French. A topic in the matrix clause can be associated with a resumptive in an embedded clause and nonetheless bind a pronominal element in the matrix clause:

- (i) **Abélard**<sub>*i*</sub>, sa<sub>*i*</sub> femme savait qu’Eloïse passait des heures délicieuses avec lui<sub>*i*</sub>.  
 Abelard his wife knew that-Eloise spent some hours delicious with him  
 ‘Abelard’s wife knew that Eloise spent delicious hours with him.’
- (ii) **Abélard**<sub>*i*</sub>, sa<sub>*i*</sub> m`ere savait bien qu’Eloïse l'<sub>*i*</sub> adorait.  
 Abelard his mother knew well that-Eloise him adored  
 ‘Abelard’s mother knew full well that Eloise adored him.’

<sup>9</sup> Thanks to Kyle Johnson and to an anonymous reviewer for pointing out this issue to me. Credit for example (15-a) goes to that reviewer.



- (15) a. Abélard<sub>i</sub>, sa<sub>i</sub> mère était une sainte.  
 Abelard his mother was a saint  
 ‘Abelard’s mother was a saint.’
- b. J’ai bien connu Abélard<sub>i</sub>. Sa<sub>i</sub> mère était une sainte.  
 I-have well known Abelard his mother was a saint  
 ‘I knew Abelard well. His mother was a saint.’

Rizzi (1997) argues that the absence of WCO effects in CLLD can be accounted for in terms of non-operator A-bar movement (where a null constant is bound by an anaphoric operator). On the basis of the evidence presented below, which uniformly points out to the absence of movement effects from dislocated configurations in spoken French, I will consider that no movement (even of that type) applies in the case of French CLLD. In particular, it will be shown in section 3.4.2 that Strong Cross-Over effects are not attested either, which rules out A-bar movement altogether.

### 3.2. FRENCH LD DOES NOT LICENSE PARASITIC GAPS

French is more restrictive than English with respect to the configurations in which parasitic gaps can be licensed (Tellier, 2001). Examples of the parasitic gap construction in French are given in (16) (all examples from Tellier, 2001). The most deeply embedded verb is obligatorily interpreted as transitive in sentences (16-a) and (16-c). Following Tellier, the *t* is the real gap and *e* is the parasitic gap. The sentences below would be ungrammatical if the parasitic gap was replaced with an overt resumptive pronoun.

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

The left-dislocated constructions below are comparable to the examples above. Yet parasitic gaps are not possible: the presence of a resumptive pronoun in the location of the would-be parasitic gap is obligatory.

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

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

### 3.3. NO RELATIVISED MINIMALITY EFFECTS

If movement is involved in the derivation of left-dislocated elements, Relativised Minimality effects should arise when a dislocated XP intervenes between another dislocated XP and its resumptive element. The examples in (18) illustrate that dislocated subjects and objects do not disrupt each other's chains.

- (18) a. **La pluie**<sub>i</sub>, **ta salade**<sub>j</sub>, elle<sub>i</sub> lui<sub>j</sub> fera du bien.  
the rain your lettuce it to-it will-do some good  
'The rain will do your lettuce some good.'
- b. **Cette toile**<sub>j</sub>, je pense que **Julia**<sub>i</sub>, elle<sub>i</sub> ne l'<sub>j</sub> a pas vendue.  
that canvas I think that Julia she NEG it has not sold  
'I think Julia didn't sell that picture.'

It is even possible to "intertwine" two topic chains associated with the same grammatical role:

- (19) **Rosi**<sub>i</sub>, **mon père**<sub>j</sub>, elle<sub>i</sub> m'a dit qu'il<sub>j</sub> était charmant.  
Rosi my father she to-me-has said that-he was charming  
'Rosi told me my father is charming.'

I conclude that there are no Minimality effects on topic chains, which corroborates a base-generation analysis.<sup>10</sup>

### 3.4. NO RECONSTRUCTION EFFECTS IN THE INTERPRETATION OF FRENCH LD

One of the main arguments for a movement analysis of CLLD in various languages (aside from sensitivity to islands) has been reconstruction effects in the interpretation of dislocated elements (see e.g. Zubizarreta, 1998, Cecchetto, 1999, Frascarelli, 2000, Villalba, 2000). Support for a movement analysis is found when dislocated elements are interpreted as if they occupied the argument position with which they are associated.

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

#### 3.4.1. *A variable in a LDed XP cannot be bound by a clause-mate QP*

Consider the sentence in (20). The variable contained (in the possessive determiner) in the object can be bound by the universal quantifier in the subject position. A distributive interpretation of this sentence is therefore possible.

- (20) [Chaque maître<sup>6</sup>]<sub>i</sub> a renvoyé un de ses<sub>i/x</sub> disciples.  
 each master has dismissed one of his disciples  
 ‘Each master dismissed one of his (own) disciples.’

If the object is dislocated, as illustrated in (21), the distributive reading is lost. The only possible interpretation of this sentence is one in which the possessor corresponds to a referent identified in the discourse context (represented below by the index *x*), and not to the subject of the sentence.

---

<sup>10</sup> Strictly speaking there is no ‘base’ anymore, under current assumptions of the Minimalist Programme. I will however retain the label ‘base-generation’ so as not to confuse the reader with the introduction of non-standard terminology.

- (21) [Un de ses<sub>x/\*i</sub> disciples]<sub>j</sub>, [chaque maitre]<sub>i</sub> l'<sub>j</sub> a renvoyé.  
 one of his disciples each master him has dismissed  
 'Each master dismissed one of his (somebody else's) disciples.'

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

### 3.4.2. *Absence of Condition C effects*

If dislocated elements were interpreted in their reconstructed position, one might expect Condition C effects to arise in cases like (22), which would be reconstructed as in (23).

- (22) a. **Tes sales petites remarques sur Léon<sub>i</sub>**, il<sub>i</sub> ne les apprécierait  
 your dirty little remarks on Leon he NEG them would-appreciate  
 surement<sup>6</sup> pas.  
 surely not  
 'Leon would surely not appreciate your dirty little remarks about him.'
- b. **Le dernier livre que j'ai prêté à Marie-Hélène<sub>i</sub>**, elle<sub>i</sub> l'a lu en une nuit.  
 the last book that I-have lent to Marie-Helene she it-has read in one night  
 'The last book I lent her, Marie-Helene read in one night.'
- (23) a. \*Il n' apprécierait surement pas tes sales petites remarques sur Léon.  
 he NEG would-appreciate surely not your dirty little remarks on Leon
- b. \*Elle<sub>i</sub> a lu en une nuit le dernier livre que j'ai prêté à Marie-Hélène<sub>i</sub>.  
 she has read in one night the last book that I-have lent to Marie-Helene

The contrast between (22) and (23) shows that reconstruction is not obligatory in French. While it is not *per se* sufficient to show that a reconstruction interpretation of dislocated elements is impossible in French, I believe that it contributes significantly to the current discussion when considered together with the other pieces of evidence proposed.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> A reviewer objects that, if sentences like (i) are possible, we might have to conclude that *wh*-movement is also base-generated in French. However, contrary to what the reviewer suggests, (i) is uncontroversially ungrammatical, which confirms that CLLD clearly behaves differently to left-peripheral constructions involving movement.

(i) \*Quel livre que j'ai prêté à Marie-Hélène<sub>i</sub>, elle<sub>i</sub> l'a lu en une nuit?  
 which book that I-have lent to Marie-Helene she it-has read in one night

Condition C effects have been claimed to be at the source of Strong Cross-Over effects (see e.g. Rizzi, 1997), which are predicted to arise in configurations involving A-bar movement. The following contrast may seem to indicate that French CLLD manifests such effects:

- (24) #**A** *Elias<sub>i</sub>*, il<sub>i</sub> pense que tu n'as pas parlé avec lui<sub>i</sub>.  
to Elias he thinks that you NEG-have have not talked with him

However, the same level of unacceptability arises even when no coindexed pronoun intervenes between the dislocated element and its strong pronominal resumptive (whether or the dislocated element is an DP or a PP).

- (25) #Il<sub>i</sub> pense qu' (**à**) *Elias<sub>i</sub>*, tu n'as pas parlé avec lui<sub>i</sub>.  
he thinks that to Elias you NEG-have have not talked with him

This looks very much like a Principle C violation, contrary to what I claimed above. But consider (26), the last sentence of which is clearly as bad as (24) and (25), in spite of the fact that the offending R-expression *Elias* is not bound syntactically by a pronoun.

- (26) J'ai vu *Elias<sub>i</sub>*. Il<sub>i</sub> était de nouveau déprimé, et je lui<sub>i</sub> ai demandé pourquoi.  
I-have seen Elias he was again depressed and I to-him have asked why  
La réponse était: # tu n'avais pas parlé à *Elias<sub>i</sub>*.  
the answer was you NEG-had not talked to Elias

The last sentence of (26) is bad because an R-expression<sup>12</sup> is used to refer to the discourse topic *Elias*. The same effect would be observed if the R-expression had been *mon frère* 'my brother' or any other DP not yet used in the preceding context but coreferential with *Elias*). On the assumption that the response does not contain a full copy of the antecedent, it is reasonable to conclude that the unacceptability of (25) is a consequence of the discourse structure and not a syntactic effect.

The unacceptability of (24) and (25) is therefore due to the fact that an R-expression is introduced in the discourse topic 'chain'. The claim that French CLLD is not derived by movement still stands.

<sup>12</sup> This R-expression is crucially not an epithet, contrary to the classic cases of Hanging Topics where the dislocated element is resumed by a DP. See 3.6 for details.

### 3.4.3. *Wide scope with respect to negation*

If dislocated elements were (or could be) interpreted in their reconstructed position, it should be possible for them to get a narrow-scope reading with respect to sentential negation. This is however not possible with French dislocated elements, as illustrated in (27).

- (27) **Toutes ces toiles<sub>i</sub>-là,** elle ne les<sub>i</sub> a pas vendues.  
all those canvases-there she NEG them has not sold  
'She didn't sell any of (all) those pictures.'  
  
# 'She didn't sell some of those pictures.'

This sentence is false in a context where the woman in question sold some but not all of the pictures under discussion. The dislocated quantified phrase can thus not be interpreted in a reconstructed position which would allow it to enter the scope of the sentential negation.<sup>13</sup>

### 3.4.4. *Interpretation of variables*

When interpreting a sentence containing a potential binder for a variable contained inside a dislocated element, an overwhelming majority of native speakers choose to associate the variable with a referent in the discourse context rather than with the sentence-internal binder. This was tested on the basis of sentences like (28), presented to native speakers out of context to maximise the chances of sentence-internal binding:

- (28) **Sa fille<sub>i</sub>,** je connais l'homme qui l'<sub>i</sub>a emmenée.  
his daughter I know the-man who her-has taken-away  
'I know the man who took his daughter away.'

---

<sup>13</sup> A reviewer suggests that the impossibility of dislocating Negative Polarity Items would contribute uncontroversial evidence that French dislocated elements do not reconstruct. However, dislocated NPIs are independently ruled out on interpretive grounds, as they do not satisfy the referentiality requirement on topics (see XXX). The unacceptability of (i) can therefore not be attributed to the base-generation of the dislocated element alone.

- (i) \*[Le livre de personne]<sub>i</sub>, je ne l'<sub>i</sub> ai lu.  
the book of nobody I NEG it-have read

94% of my informants (i.e. 28/32 speakers from Belgium, Canada, France and Switzerland) interpret *sa fille* ‘his daughter’<sup>14</sup> as the daughter of a person other than the man mentioned in the sentence.

This clear preference is unexpected if *sa fille* is interpreted in the object position — in which case the sentence would be entirely ambiguous as to whether it is that man’s daughter or somebody else’s.

### 3.5. FRENCH LD IS NOT SENSITIVE TO ISLANDS

It is standardly assumed that syntactic movement plays a part in the relationship between two elements if that relationship cannot hold across (strong) syntactic islands (originally defined by Ross, 1967). This diagnostic has been granted precedence over other diagnostics for movement (such as those considered above) in the abundant literature on CLLD (see e.g. Delais-Roussarie et al., 2004 for French).

CLLD has been argued to be sensitive to strong islands in e.g. Italian (Rizzi, 1997), Greek (Iatridou, 1995), and Spanish (Escobar, 1997). However, this is not verified in all languages. Lebanese Arabic has been argued to be an exception (Aoun and Benmamoun, 1998), and as I will argue below, the same is true of Spoken French.<sup>15</sup> This is not a new claim (see e.g. (Hirschbühler, 1975; Zribi-Hertz, 1984)). What is new here is that the Information Structure requirements on topics are fully taken into account (see XXX, and that the key data were evaluated experimentally by a large number of native speakers.

---

<sup>14</sup> The possessor in *sa fille* could equally be translated as ‘her’ but I have ignored this in the text so as to highlight the possibility of interpreting it as the daughter of the man mentioned in the sentences under scrutiny.

<sup>15</sup> To be more precise, (Aoun and Benmamoun, 1998) argue that Lebanese Arabic displays two types of CLLD: one insensitive to islands (which they analyse as base-generated) and one sensitive to islands (which they say involves syntactic movement). Alexopoulou et al. (2004) argue that the latter only is genuine CLLD and that the former is in fact a Broad Subject construction. French CLLD is not amenable to a Broad Subject analysis given that Broad Subjects are not obligatorily interpreted as topics.

### 3.5.1. *Native speakers' judgements*

So as to test the sensitivity of (CI)LD to strong islands, a judgment elicitation task was designed and presented to 32 native speakers of French from Belgium, Canada, France and Switzerland. For each sentence, a short context was provided to ensure that the dislocated element was a likely topic for the test-sentence. Informants were presented with four levels of acceptability, the English translation of which is given in (29). If an informant failed to chose anything from the pull-down menu a “no choice” value was printed and the token was discarded.

- (29)
- a. I could say that sentence.
  - b. I could say that sentence but in another context.
  - c. I could never say a sentence like that, but I know that other French speakers could.
  - d. That sentence is too weird. No French speaker talks like that.

The context for each test-sentence was given in a written form, prior to the informant clicking on a link to hear the test-sentence (which was not transcribed, as the language of inquiry is *spoken* French).<sup>16</sup> Example test-sentences are given in (30). The level of acceptability of each sentence is given in parentheses: the first rating (in bold) reflects unacceptability (i.e. the proportion of informants who rejected the sentence), the second rating reflects markedness.

- (30)
- a. **Les autres<sub>i</sub>**, je vais attendre [avant de les<sub>i</sub> relire]. (0% - 6%)  
the other-ones I will wait before to them to-re-read
  - b. Mais **le juge<sub>j</sub>**, ça<sub>i</sub> a surpris tout le monde, [qu'elle l'<sub>j</sub> ait invité]<sub>i</sub>. (0% - 19%)  
but the judge it has surprised all the people that-she him has invited
  - c. **Aux petits<sub>i</sub>**, je sais pas [ce [qu'elle leur<sub>i</sub> lit]]. (0% - 25%)  
to-the little-ones I know not that that-she to-them reads
  - d. **Ta mère<sub>i</sub>**, je ferai tout pour être parti [quand elle<sub>i</sub> viendra]. (3% - 28%)  
your mother I will-do all to be gone when she will-come

<sup>16</sup> On the differences between spoken and written French with respect to the encoding of Information Structure, see e.g. Côté (2001), XXX and Lahousse (2003).



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

The overall picture reveals that for this randomly selected group of speakers, the relation between the dislocated element and the coreferential clitic holds across (and in spite of) the following types of islands: adjuncts (30-a), (30-d), (30-e), moved XPs (30-b), complex NPs (30-c).

Compare the acceptability ratings of the examples above with those for *wh*-extraction across an island:<sup>17</sup>

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

An anonymous reviewer suggests that different results might arise with subject islands and coordinate structures. Sentential subjects are marked in Spoken French for independent reasons (see XXX), which is why they were not included in the original experimental design. Since then, sentences like (32) have been presented informally to a large number of informants and widely accepted as unmarked. Incidentally, note that in (32), in addition to the fact that the left dislocated element is associated with the subject of the sentence (which, under a movement analysis, would violate the subject condition), its resumptive is also inside a complex NP (i.e. an extra island).

- (32) [Des/les] enfants, moi, toutes les photos que j'en ai vu étaient floues.  
 (of)-the children me all the pictures that I-of-them have seen were blurred  
 'All pictures of the children I've seen were blurred.'

Dislocated elements were also accepted when associated with coordinate structures, as exemplified below:

- (33) De son mari, elle s'en souvient bien mais elle en parle jamais.  
 of her husband she REFL-of-him remembers well but she of-him talks never

---

<sup>17</sup> Note that this sentence was given in a context favouring a D-linked interpretation, which is supposed to alleviate island effects. In spite of this, the unacceptability rating is still fairly high, and in any case significantly higher than any of the unacceptability ratings for the dislocated constructions tested.

- (34) A la deuxième, on lui reprochait tout et on lui demandait encore  
 to the second-one one to-her reproached everything and one to-her asked even  
 plus.  
 more

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

### 3.5.2. *To what extent are islands a diagnostic for movement?*

Ross (1967) originally identified islands as a constraint on *Chop*, not on *Copy*. Both were conceived as rules of syntactic movement. What distinguished them was that *Chop* left a gap in the moved element's original position, while *Copy* left a resumptive pronoun behind. Islands were thus originally not a diagnostic for movement *per se* but a diagnostic for *types* of movement.<sup>18</sup>

This idea has recently been revived and reinterpreted by Boeckx (2003), who argues that islands preclude agreement relations but not movement. Building on Cecchetto (2000), Boeckx postulates that resumptive pronouns head a big-DP and that the moved XP is first-Merged as the object of the resumptive element.<sup>19</sup> Boeckx proposes that chains induced by A'-movement can be the product

---

<sup>18</sup> I will leave aside Cinque's (1990) proposal to view islands as a representational constraint on binding chains rather than a derivational constraint on syntactic movement. On that view, the (in)sensitivity of French CLLD to islands would not be an indication of whether movement is involved and consequently, only the diagnostics to be discussed in sections 3.1-3.4 would be relevant in that respect. Delais-Roussarie et al. (2004) analyse French left-dislocation along the lines of Cinque (1990), arguing that left-dislocated PPs are the only clear cases of CLLD in that language, all other cases being ambiguous between CLLD and Hanging Topic Left Dislocation. The possibility of distinguishing the two configurations in French will be discussed in section 3.6.

<sup>19</sup> Boeckx (2003) notes that this big-DP structure is reminiscent of that proposed by Sportiche (1988) for floated quantifiers. Note however that direct evidence in support of a big-DP structure for floated quantifiers can be found in sentences like (i), where the quantifier and the DP surface adjacent to each other. To my knowledge, no such evidence is available to support the big-DP hypothesis for resumptive elements. See Boeckx's chapter 2 for discussion.

- (i) a. [Tous les révolutionnaires] ne sont pas des terroristes.  
 all the revolutionaries NEG are not INDEF terrorists  
 'Not all revolutionaries are terrorists.'
- b. Les révolutionnaires ne sont pas tous des terroristes.  
 the revolutionaries NEG are not all INDEF terrorists  
 'Revolutionaries are not all terrorists.'

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

- In French subject relatives and clefts (37-a), no resumptive pronoun is left in the extraction site. That the complementiser (*qui*) should be marked for agreement (as argued by Rizzi, 1990) is exactly what is predicted by Boeckx (2003). In (37-b), by contrast, the presence of a resumptive element (*il* ‘he’) bleeds the requirement for an agreeing complementiser. Chains like that in (37-a) are (correctly) predicted to be sensitive to islands, while chains like that in (37-b) are (correctly) predicted not to be.

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

- 19

Boeckx’ theory predicts that CLLD is insensitive to islands if the resumptive clitic is a true resumptive pronoun, which for him requires that it should head a big-DP structure in which its “antecedent” is the first-merge complement of the resumptive. Evidence for a big-DP lies in the presence of a resumptive pronoun and the only evidence that Match alone has applied is that the resulting configuration is insensitive to islands. This renders Boeckx’ proposal unfalsifiable as far as French data is concerned (because of circularity). What it suggests nonetheless is that French CLLD is not derived by Match+Agree (because it is insensitive to islands). The other diagnostics for movement-induced configurations, which have been examined in sections 3.1-3.4, suggest that it is not derived by Match alone either, but by first-merge adjunction.

### 3.5.3. *On the status of the “resumptive” pronoun*

A core property of true resumptive pronouns (RPs), as defined by Sells (1984), is that they are interpreted as bound variables (and that this binding is not simply anaphoric). This makes them syntactically dependent, in a way that I will show the so-called resumptive of CLLD is not.

The bound variable reading of “true” resumptive pronouns is illustrated below with a Swedish relative clause (from Sells, 1984:56).

- (39) Det finns mycket<sub>i</sub> som man önskar att **det**<sub>i</sub> skulle vara annorlunda.  
 there is much that one wishes that it should be different

Sells argues that a variable interpretation can only be obtained where there is a binder with operator-like properties (such as a quantifier or a *wh*-element). If the resumptive element of (Clitic) Left-Dislocation is a true RP, we should expect it to receive a variable interpretation whenever the dislocated element has operator-like properties. Topics *per se* do not have quantificational properties (Rizzi, 1997). There is nonetheless the possibility that a topic might act as an operator due to the inherent properties of the type of XP that instantiates it. However, as is well known, quantifiers, (non-generic) indefinites and *wh*-elements (which are standardly regarded as operators) cannot be topics (and hence cannot be dislocated): they do not meet the requirement that topic referents be readily identifiable in the context. This is illustrated in (40).

- (40) a. \***Tout** **homme**<sub>i</sub>, il<sub>i</sub> est mortel.  
 any/every man he is mortal

- b. \***Chaque potager**<sub>*i*</sub>, il<sub>*i*</sub> a son robinet.  
 each allotment it has its tap

A possible exception to this rule is what Erteschik-Shir, 1997 calls *subordinate update*, which consists in identifying the main topic of the sentence out of a preestablished set available in the discourse context.<sup>20</sup> In (41), for instance, the dislocated element summons the set of exceptionally gifted individuals known to the speaker and identifies one individual in that group. That individual then becomes the topic of the sentence.

- (41) [Un qui est surdoué]<sub>*i*</sub>, c'<sub>*i*</sub> est le fils Fiorini.  
 one who is over-gifted it-is the son Fiorini  
 'One who's gifted is the Fiorini's son.'

Crucially, even in instances where the dislocated element has quantifier-like properties, the resumptive pronoun is attributed a fixed reference. The relation between the resumptive and its antecedent is merely anaphoric. There is in fact no *syntactic* requirement for a dislocated element to be (overtly) present.<sup>21</sup>

The label “resumptive” is therefore misleading in the case of (French) LD. The clitic involved in French LD has the same pronominal status as it would have in a sentence not involving a coreferential dislocated element. In other words, the pronoun *il* ‘he’ is fundamentally the same in sentences (42-a) and (42-b).<sup>22</sup>

- (42) a. Kester<sub>*i*</sub> dit qu'il<sub>*i*</sub> aime bien les poissons.  
 Kester says that-he loves well the fish  
 'Kester says he loves the fish.'  
 b. **Kester**<sub>*i*</sub>, tu sais qu'il<sub>*i*</sub> aime bien les poissons.  
 Kester you know that-he loves well the fish

<sup>20</sup> *Subordinate update* satisfies the condition on identified by Prince (1981) and Ward and Prince (1991) which states that topics must be in a *partially ordered set* relation to a referent in the context (i.e. a referent will be a possible topic if it enters in a relation such as *is taller than*, *is part of*, *is a subtype of*, etc. with a referent in previous discourse). However, subordinate update cannot be equated with the poset (partially ordered set) requirement (see Erteschik-Shir, 1997 for details).

<sup>21</sup> An anonymous reviewer points out that dislocated elements are obligatory when contrastive. I do not dispute this, but this requirement is not syntactic in nature: it is due to Information Structure considerations.

<sup>22</sup> In XXX I demonstrate that, even if one analyses French subject clitics as agreement markers without argument status, the XP coindexed with a subject clitic is always dislocated in Spoken French.

I conclude that the “resumptive” element in French left dislocation is not a true resumptive but a full-fledged pronoun (with deficient characteristics in the case of clitics). This construction can therefore not be derived by movement (whether Chop or Copy).

#### 3.5.4. *Conclusion*

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

#### 3.6. ARE THESE IN FACT HANGING TOPICS?

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

The distinction between CLLD and HTLD, though advocated by many to be clear-cut,<sup>23</sup> has, to my knowledge, never been backed up by diagnostics robust enough to distinguish between the two constructions unambiguously in languages that lack morphological case marking on DPs. For instance, Benincà (2001) acknowledges that the dislocated element in a sentence like (43) can be analysed as either CLLD or HTLD.

- (43) **Mario**<sub>i</sub>, lo<sub>i</sub> rivedrò. (Benincà, 2001:44)  
Mario him I-will-see-again  
‘Mario, I’ll see him again.’

---

<sup>23</sup> See e.g. Cinque 1983, 1990, Villalba, 2000, Benincà, 2001, Delais-Roussarie et al., 2004.

In what follows, I show that there is in fact no empirical base for a distinction between HTLD and CLLD in spoken French.

Five properties traditionally distinguish HTLD from CLLD:

- (44) a. CLLD is syntactically “connected” to the rest of the sentence; HTLD is not (see e.g. Vat, 1981, Cinque, 1983). A dislocated phrase is “connected” when it bears marks of dependency from a sentence-internal element (e.g. via case assignment). Connectedness manifests itself essentially in terms of case matching between the dislocated element and its resumptive.
- b. HTLD is not recursive but CLLD is (i.e. more than one dislocated element is allowed — Cinque, 1990).
- c. HTLD is a root phenomenon while CLLD can occur in embedded clauses (Cinque, 1990).
- d. HTLD tends not to be resumed by a clitic — though authors diverge as to whether HTLD can at all be resumed by a clitic. Cinque (1983), for instance, argues that the reason why (44-d-i) is grammatical is that this example does not involve CLLD but HTLD in spite of featuring a resumptive clitic. Others argue that HTLD involves by definition a non-clitic resumptive (e.g. Grohmann, 2000).
- (i) **Giorgio<sub>i</sub>**, non conosco [la ragazza [che lui<sub>i</sub> vuole sposare]].  
 Giorgio not I-know the girl that him wants to-marry  
 ‘I don’t know the girl who wants to marry Giorgio.’ (Cinque, 1983:97)
- e. HTLD is insensitive to islands but CTLD is (Cinque, 1990).

However, as far as I am aware, no clear interpretive differences have been identified that would distinguish HTLD from CLLD: in both cases, the dislocated element is interpreted as the topic and one construction does not feel more marked than the other (e.g. as to level of or givenness).<sup>24</sup> I am not aware either of any analysis identifying prosodic differences between the two types of LD. In

---

<sup>24</sup> Some have suggested that interpretive differences did arise between the two constructions: Cinque (1983:95) claims HTLD encodes new or unexpected topics and Villalba (2000) claims that HTLD encodes discourse topics and not sentence topics. However, no diagnostic is provided to identify new/unexpected topics or discourse topics.

French, Delais-Roussarie et al. (2004) argue that there is no interpretive nor prosodic difference between HTLD and CLLD.

The stripping of dependency markers has been used as the only reliable diagnostic between HTLD and CLLD (Cinque, 1977, Larsson, 1979, Delais-Roussarie et al., 2004): (45) would be HTLD but (46) would be CLLD.

- (45) **Son photographe<sub>i</sub>**, elle lui<sub>i</sub> en a jamais parlé.  
her photographer she to-him of-it has never talked  
‘She never talked about it to her photographer.’
- (46) **A son photographe<sub>i</sub>**, elle lui<sub>i</sub> en a jamais parlé.  
to her photographer she to-him of-it has never talked  
‘She never talked about it to her photographer.’

In spoken French, however, such allegedly clear cases of HTLD do not behave as predicted by the generalisations in (44).

First, there can be more than one “HTLD”:

- (47) a. **La mer<sub>j</sub>, son photographe<sub>i</sub>**, elle lui<sub>i</sub> en<sub>j</sub> a jamais parlé. (HTLD)  
the sea her photographer she to-him of-it has never talked  
‘She never talked about the sea to her photographer.’
- b. **De la mer<sub>j</sub>, à son photographe<sub>i</sub>**, elle lui<sub>i</sub> en<sub>j</sub> a jamais parlé. (CTLD)  
of the sea to her photographer she to-him of-it has never talked  
‘She never talked about the sea to her photographer.’

Second, “HTLD” is allowed in embedded clauses:

- (48) a. Je pense que **son photographe<sub>i</sub>**, elle lui<sub>i</sub> en fait voir de toutes les couleurs.  
I think that her photographer she to-him of-it makes see of all the colours  
‘I think she gives her photographer a hard time.’ (HTLD)
- b. Je pense qu’**à son photographe<sub>i</sub>**, elle lui<sub>i</sub> en fait voir de toutes les  
I think that-to her photographer she to-him of-it makes see of all the  
couleurs. (CTLD)  
colours

Third, “HTLD” can be resumed by a clitic (as shown in the examples above).



In this context, how should one interpret the data in (30), which appear to indicate that CLLD is insensitive to strong islands in spoken French?

These data show that native speakers *can* accept dislocated PPs resumed by an element inside a strong island. To the extent that (i) such dislocated elements are connected to the core of the sentence by the preposition they contain and that (ii) HTLD does not display such signs of connectedness, I take these cases to indicate clearly that French CLLD is not constrained *syntactically* by strong islands: the syntax of spoken French clearly has to allow for that configuration.<sup>25</sup> In fact, no property of CLLD vanishes when the resumptive element is contained within an island — and this is true both in cases where “connectedness” is overt and in cases where it is not.

The relative marginality of PPs dislocated across an island boundary is not sufficient proof that syntactic movement is involved in French CLLD. It should at least be accompanied by interpretive effects (of the kind discussed in § 3). I do not dispute that it is possible to find cases of PPs dislocated across an island boundary which will be rejected by native speakers. However, this rejection will be due to (i) insufficient likelihood that the dislocated PP be interpreted as a topic (see the Appendix for an elaboration of this point) and (ii) the fact that left-dislocated PPs resumed by a pronoun or clitic tend to be viewed as marked by most informants (and are extremely rare in corpora of spontaneous production),<sup>26</sup> whether their resumptive element is situated within an island or not.

It can be concluded that French LD is not HTLD to the extent that it displays the following properties: (i) it is recursive; (ii) it is allowed in certain embedded contexts (though, as we will see in section 4.3, these have to be root-like); (iii) it can be resumed by a clitic; (iv) it can (though marginally) bear marks of connectivity (to the extent that these are visible in Spoken French).

This conclusion needs qualifying, though. If, cross-linguistically, the difference between connected and non-connected LD (i.e. between CLLD and HTLD) translates categorically into differ-

---

<sup>25</sup> I have not found any sign of inter-individual or dialectal variation as to the sensitivity of dislocated elements to islands. Judgements of markedness or unacceptability were randomly distributed across informants and across dialects: it is not the case that certain speakers categorically disallow an island boundary to intervene between the dislocated element and its resumptive.

<sup>26</sup> Out of a sample of 4030 clauses produced by adults, extracted from the XXX and XXX corpora of spontaneous production, I did not find a single instance of a left-dislocated object PP. A similar observation has been made for other French corpora of spontaneous production by Barnes (1985) and Lambrecht (1981, 1986).

ent syntactic configurations which are arrived at via different syntactic derivations or mechanisms, an analysis of French LD as involving HTLD in all cases might be more desirable. In other words, it could be that spoken French does not have CLLD.<sup>27</sup> And if this is found to be the case, a revision of the core characteristics HTLD would be called for (so that it could be recursive, be allowed in certain embedded contexts and display dependency markers in a limited way). Until further cross-linguistic research establishes whether CLLD can hold across strong islands in other languages, it may not be possible to choose between these two options.

### 3.7. WHAT ANALYSIS FOR FRENCH RD?

In the quest for general principles constraining syntactic derivations, the focus of attention has tended to be on left- rather than right-peripheral elements.<sup>28</sup> As a result, and because of standard assumptions ruling out rightward movement, phenomena involving the right periphery of the clause have tended to be forced into the mould of constraints designed to deal with left-peripheral “transformations”. In what follows, I will argue that French LD and RD can be accounted for using the *same* syntactic mechanisms without having to postulate that RD is in fact some kind of LD. The differences between LD and RD will be shown to derive straightforwardly from the theory proposed, and in particular from the properties of the two sides of the clause periphery (the same is done by Cann et al., 2004 in a different framework).

We have seen that in French, left-dislocated elements associated with an indirect object are preferably bare, in that they strongly tend to be DPs rather than PPs. By contrast, right-dislocated elements of this type are preferably not bare, as illustrated in (49).<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Spoken French is already set apart from other Romance languages by the fact that it is not pro-drop and that it does not use post-verbal subjects inthetic contexts. See Lahousse (2003) and XXX.

<sup>28</sup> One of the reasons invoked to explain the relative lack of attention to right-peripheral phenomena has been the assumption that these are less frequent than their left-hand counterpart. This is clearly not true of French RD, which occurs as frequently as LD in corpora of spontaneous production (see XXX). In questions, RDs are even more frequent than LD, as attested in the spontaneous speech of adults from the XXX and the XXX corpora: in *wh*-questions, 75% of dislocated elements are right-peripheral, and in yes-no questions, 58% of dislocated elements are.

<sup>29</sup> This is not to say that PPs can never be stripped of their P when right-dislocated: such examples are attested in corpora of spontaneous production (see for instance (101) later in the text).

- (49) a. Je dois encore lui<sub>i</sub> répondre, ??(à) **Jim**<sub>i</sub>.  
 I must still to-him reply (to) Jim  
 'I must still reply to Jim.'
- b. (?À) **Jim**<sub>i</sub>, je dois encore lui<sub>i</sub> répondre.  
 (to) Jim I must still to-him reply  
 'I must still reply to Jim.'

Under standard assumptions regarding connectivity, this suggests that RD is derived by movement. Four variants of the movement analysis of RD have been proposed in the literature. The “old” route assumes that rightward movement is part of grammar (as argued for instance by some of the contributors to Beerman et al., 1997). More recently, it has been proposed that the right-dislocated element is in fact in its argument position, with optional clitic doubling and optional dislocation intonation (see e.g. Kayne, 1994). Other proposals view RD as a special kind of LD: either RD is situated at the left periphery of an extended projection of V, and appears to be right-peripheral as an effect of the movement of all lexical items base-generated under ‘RD’ (see e.g. Villalba, 1998, Cecchetto, 1999, Belletti, 2001, López, 2003), or RD is in fact in the left periphery of the clause, but appears to be right-peripheral because of IP inversion (see e.g. Frascarelli 2000, 2004).

I will show that, whatever route one chooses, a movement analysis of French RD makes predictions that are not borne out and should therefore be rejected.

### 3.7.1. *French RD is not an LF/PF phenomenon*

Under Kayne’s assumptions, the only way left-dislocated phrases can be derived is by postulating the presence of a functional projection hosting the left-peripheral element in its specifier. He claims that “except for the necessary presence of an abstract X<sup>o</sup>, [his analysis] is not terribly different from, for example, Cinque’s (1990) treatment of what he calls clitic left-dislocation.” (Kayne, 1994:78-79).

Kayne further assumes that right-adjunction is prohibited by UG. He proposes that right-dislocation in Romance languages is a unified phenomenon, in which the right-dislocated element occupies the object position, with optional clitic doubling and optional dislocation intonation. This line of thought proceeds as follows: (i) Right-dislocation does not depend on the presence of a clitic doubling an object, as the clitic can sometimes be omitted; (ii) The doubling clitic does not depend on the right-dislocation intonation, contrary to what is standardly assumed, which is

equivalent to stating that all Romance languages displaying RD allow for clitic doubling. This latter point is argued for on the basis of examples like (50), which do not require a dislocation intonation of the indirect object *à elle* ‘to her’.

- (50) Jean lui a parlé à elle. (Kayne, 1994:80)  
 Jean to-her has talked to her  
 ‘Jean talked to her.’

Consequently, examples like (51) are to be treated on a par with the obligatory cases of dative clitic doubling in Spanish, as in (52). Kayne suggests that this justifies analysing right-dislocated phrases as occupying the object position.

- (51) Une pierre \*(lui) est tombée sur la tête, à Jean. (Kayne, 1994:80)  
 a stone to-him is fallen on the head to Jean  
 ‘A stone fell on Jean’s head.’

- (52) \*(Le) examinaron los dientes al caballo. (Kayne, 1994:80)  
 to-it they-examined the teeth to-the horse  
 ‘They examined the horse’s teeth.’

The final step of his reasoning is to claim that CLLD is derived by movement of the left-dislocated phrase from the object position, and that right-dislocation is an instance of CLLD at LF. The right-dislocation intonation is argued to be triggered by an optional feature in the “overt syntax” that would feed both LF (triggering movement) and PF (triggering dislocation intonation).

Kayne’s account of right-dislocation ignores a vast amount of data: it leaves aside (i) right-dislocated subjects (53), (ii) right-dislocated phrases that cannot be argued to occupy the object position (54), and (iii) right-dislocated phrases resumed by a non-clitic element (55).<sup>30</sup>

- (53) Elle<sub>i</sub> ignore les sujets disloqués, **son analyse**<sub>i</sub>.  
 she ignores the subjects dislocated his analysis  
 ‘His analysis ignores dislocated subjects.’

- (54) On va les<sub>i</sub> manger avec des pommes, [**ces petits enfants**]<sub>i</sub>.  
 one will them eat with some apples these little children

<sup>30</sup> Frascarelli (2004) also shows that in Italian, there is no fixed order of topics, contrary to what Kayne’s analysis predicts.

‘We’ll eat these little children with apples.’

- (55) Il aime ça<sub>i</sub>, [**la chair fraîche**]<sub>i</sub>.  
he loves that the flesh fresh  
‘He loves fresh flesh.’

In (53), the right-dislocated element is a subject. One might choose to assume that the right-dislocated subject is in the VP-internal position where the subject originates (Kayne, 1994:118,141, following Koopman and Sportiche, 1991), and that the object is in [spec,AgroP], thus creating the subject-last order displayed in (53). But such an analysis would not be tenable, at least on the grounds that Spoken French does not allow for clitic doubling of the subject, as argued in De Cat (2005). In (54) the object cannot be in the object position as it follows a VP adjunct. As for (55) I do not see how it can be accounted for in a way compatible with Kayne’s analysis of right-dislocation, given that the resumptive element is not a clitic, and that under no circumstances can an object be unambiguously doubled by *ça* ‘that’ (i.e. without dislocation intonation), even in Canadian French, where the use of *ça* is more pervasive than in European French:

- (56) \*On connaît ça les Wombles. (no dislocation intonation)  
one knows that the Wombles

Kayne’s claim that French allows for clitic doubling is itself controversial, given that it is only verified in cases where the doubled object is a strong pronoun (as in (50) but not in (57)) or in constructions expressing inalienable possession as in (51).

- (57) \*Jean lui a parlé à Gudule. (no dislocation intonation)  
Jean to-her has talked to Gudule

If the possession involved is not inalienable, doubling is not possible (58-a) and in that case, it has to be expressed by a possessive determiner (58-b).

- (58) a. \*Une pierre lui est tombée sur la brouette, à Jean.  
a stone to-him is fallen on the wheel-barrow to Jean  
b. Une pierre est tombée sur sa<sub>i</sub> brouette, à Jean<sub>i</sub>.  
a stone is fallen on his wheel-barrow to Jean  
‘A stone fell on Jean’s wheel-barrow.’

Note also that the French counterpart to the Spanish clitic doubling construction in (52) is ungrammatical:

- (59) \*On lui a examiné les dents au cheval. (no dislocation intonation)  
 one to-it has examined the teeth to-the horse

Furthermore, even in cases where the clitic is compulsory, as in (51), the alleged doubled object has to receive a dislocation intonation contour, as shown in (60). In the Spanish example in (52), the indirect object receives no such intonation.

- (60) \*Une pierre lui est tombée sur la tête à Jean. (no dislocation intonation)  
 a stone to-him is fallen on the head to Jean

A clitic doubling analysis of French right-dislocated object can thus only be proposed for cases like (61), to the extent that they can be derived from cases like (50). Note however that there is a significant difference between (50) and (61), in that the former but not the latter yields a contrastive reading of the indirect object (Ronat, 1979). A sentence like (50) can only be felicitous in a context where Jean has talked to a particular woman AS OPPOSED TO some other person.

- (61) Jean lui<sub>i</sub> a parlé, à elle<sub>i</sub>.  
 Jean to-her has talked to her  
 ‘Jean talked to her.’

Kayne’s (1994) analysis of right-dislocation as a PF phenomenon thus turns out to be untenable on the following grounds: (i) it wrongly predicts that right-dislocation of elements doubled by a clitic is optional in French (which is only verified in a very limited set of cases), (ii) it cannot be extended to right-dislocated subjects, to XPs that cannot be argued to occupy the object position, nor to XPs that are resumed by a non-clitic element.

### 3.7.2. French RD is not LD lower in the tree

An analysis of RD as LD in a lower Topic position (whether a dedicated TopicP, as in Villalba, 1998, Cecchetto, 1999, Belletti, 2001 or [spec,vP], as in López, 2003) faces a number problems, especially with respect to the spoken French data.

First, as pointed out by Frascarelli (2004), it requires *ad hoc* stipulations in order to derive the prosody (something I will not dwell upon here).

Second, situating right-dislocated elements at the periphery of vP predicts strict ordering restrictions which are contradicted by the facts. In (62-a), the conditional clause clearly modifies the whole sentence and not just the VP. This indicates that it appears at the periphery of the sentence, in which case the dislocated *moi* cannot be in the lower periphery of the clause (be it [spec,AgroP], [spec,vP], or a lower TopicP). In (62-b), the floated quantifier is traditionally considered to occupy the specifier of VP (or vP) and is thus lower than [spec,AgroP]: *la bonne* ‘the maid’ can thus not occupy [spec,AgroP].

- (62) a. [CP [TP J’irai demain], si tu veux, **moi**].  
          I-will-go tomorrow if you want me  
          ‘I’ll go tomorrow if you want.’  
      b. Elle les a [VP tous attrappés], **la bonne**.  
          she them has all caught the maid  
          ‘The maid has caught them all.’

Third, the above-mentioned analyses all postulate that RD gets to this lower periphery by syntactic movement. This in turn makes predictions that are not borne out by the Spoken French data, as discussed below.

### 3.7.3. French RD is not LD + IP-inversion

If RD is derived by movement via LD + IP-inversion, it should show at least some of the characteristics in (63).

- (63) a. Licensing of parasitic gaps in the IP  
      b. Weak Cross-Over effects  
      c. Relativised Minimality effects with other RD chains

- d. Reconstruction effects
- e. Sensitivity to islands

I will assume that the LD which would form the first step of RD (by movement) is driven by movement. Indeed, if the initial LD was base-generated, the connectivity explanation for the quasi-obligatoriness of P in RD would fall apart.

Examples (64)-(66) suggest that RD cannot be derived by LD-movement + IP-inversion. The initial LD does not license parasitic gaps (64), it does not yield Weak Cross-Over effects (65) and it does not show any sign of Relativised Minimality effects (66).

- (64) [Tu les<sub>i</sub> as déchirés au lieu de \*(les) consulter], les livres<sub>i</sub>, [IP t<sub>j</sub>].  
 you them have torn in place of (them) consult the books  
 ‘You’ve torn the books instead of consulting them.’
- (65) [Sa mère l’<sub>i</sub> aimait trop]<sub>j</sub>, Abélard<sub>i</sub>, [IP t<sub>j</sub>].  
 his mother him loved too-much Abelard  
 ‘Abelard’s mother loved him too much.’
- (66) [Il<sub>1</sub> l’<sub>2</sub> aimait trop]<sub>j</sub>, Abélard<sub>1</sub>, son élève<sub>2</sub>, [IP t<sub>j</sub>].  
 he him loved too-much Abelard his pupil  
 ‘Abelard loved his pupil too much.’

The impossibility of a narrow-scope interpretation of the right-dislocated element with respect to negation suggests that the dislocated element does not get interpreted in an IP-internal (reconstructed) position:<sup>31</sup>

- (67) Julia, elle ne les<sub>i</sub> a pas vendues, **toutes ces toiles**<sub>i</sub>.  
 Julia she NEG them has not sold all those canvases  
 ‘Julia didn’t sell any of (all) those pictures.’  
 # ‘Julia didn’t sell some of those pictures.’
- (68) #[Chaque maitre]<sub>i</sub> l’<sub>j</sub> a renvoyé, [un de ses<sub>i</sub> disciples]<sub>j</sub>.  
 each master him has dismissed one of his disciples

---

<sup>31</sup> Some of the evidence for the absence of reconstruction in LD cannot be adapted to show the absence of reconstruction in RD because it requires dislocated elements that introduce a new referent (out of a D-linked set), a function right-dislocated elements cannot perform given that they are introduced/processed after the core of the sentence.



Summing up, right-dislocated elements do appear to be interpreted in their peripheral position (rather than in a reconstructed position).

Turning now to the last diagnostic (63-e), French RD does not show any sign of being sensitive to islands in the course of its putative derivation, contrary to what should be expected under an analysis in terms of (movement-)LD.<sup>32</sup> This is illustrated in (69) and (70). In these examples, the right-dislocated element under discussion is preceded by a right-dislocated associated with the subject of the matrix clause, which indicates that *sa fille* ‘his daughter’ and *aux voleurs* ‘to the thieves’ are not attached to the embedded clause (i.e. we are really looking at instances of right-dislocated elements separated from their resumptive by an island boundary).

- (69) Je<sub>i</sub> connais l’homme qui l’<sub>i</sub>a emmenée, **moi<sub>i</sub>, sa fille<sub>i</sub>**.  
 I know the-man who her-has taken-away me his daughter  
 ‘I know the man who took his daughter away.’
- (70) [Je<sub>i</sub> suis partie [avant que tu ne leur<sub>j</sub> parles]], **moi<sub>i</sub>, aux voleurs<sub>j</sub>**.  
 I am left before that you NEG. to-them speak me to-the thieves  
 ‘I left before you spoke to the thieves.’

Let us take a closer look at the putative derivation of (70). The right-dislocated *aux voleurs* ‘to the thieves’ is attached to the matrix clause, as can be seen from the fact that it follows a right-dislocated element (*moi* ‘me’) coindexed with the subject of the matrix clause. The intermediate step of the derivation would be as in (71), where the resumptive of the left-dislocated *aux voleurs* ‘to the thieves’ appears inside an adjunct.

- (71) **Moi, aux voleurs<sub>i</sub>**, je suis partie [avant que tu ne leur<sub>i</sub> parles].  
 me to-the thieves I am left before that you NEG. to-them speak

On a movement analysis of LD, an intermediate step such as (71) is ruled out, as it violates the Adjunct Condition. *Aux voleurs* ‘to the thieves’ thus cannot have reached its right-dislocated position via movement.

Consider now example (72).

---

<sup>32</sup> Recall that standard analyses of CLLD postulated that syntactic movement had to be involved *because* of island sensitivity.

- (72) Mais **le juge**<sub>j</sub>, ça<sub>i</sub> a surpris tout le monde, [**qu'elle l'**<sub>j</sub>**-ait invité**]<sub>i</sub>.  
 but the judge it has surprised all the people that-she him-has invited  
 'But it surprised everybody that she'd invited the judge.'

The right-dislocated clause is associated with the subject position of the matrix clause. On a movement analysis, that clause thus originates in [spec,VP]. *Le juge* 'the judge' could only be extracted prior to the movement of that clause to [spec,IP] (to avoid violating a strong island). The EPP of the matrix I (or T) has to be satisfied as soon as I (or T) is merged, so the clause will need to raise to the subject position before any head can be projected to attract *le juge* 'the judge' out of it. We are thus forced to assume that *le juge* is base-generated in its left-dislocated position, in which case the derivation steps are as follows (after raising of the clause to the subject position).

- (73) **Le juge**<sub>i</sub>, qu'elle l'<sub>i</sub> ait invité a surpris tout le monde.  
 the judge that-she him has invited has surprised all the people

Next, the sentential subject is left-dislocated over *le juge*:

- (74) [**Qu'elle l'ait invité**]<sub>i</sub>, **le juge**, ça<sub>i</sub> a surpris tout le monde.  
 that-she him-has invited the judge it has surprised all the people

In the third step, the IP moves leftward, by so-called IP-remnant movement (which standardly targets the Focus position in the periphery of the clause). It is crucial that this position be higher than the positions hosting the dislocated clause and the dislocated DP, to make sure they appear right-dislocated.

- (75) [**Ça a surpris tout le monde**]<sub>i</sub>, **qu'elle l'ait invité** t<sub>i</sub>, **le juge**.  
 it has surprised all the people that-she him-has invited the judge

The last step required to obtain (72) is to move *le juge* to the sentence-initial position. It could not have moved together with the IP given that it is a topic and can thus not be focus-moved. Given that *le juge* is already in a left-peripheral, topic position, it is hard to imagine a principled reason why it should move further up within the same periphery. To my knowledge, no topic-to-topic movement has ever been attested within the periphery of the same clause.

Unless one is willing to allow *ad hoc* stipulations, a sentence like (72) cannot be derived in a principled way by a movement-via-LD analysis. In other words, such an analysis predicts that

sentences like (72) do not exist (or perhaps that they are strongly marked), contrary to fact. I conclude that a movement-via-LD analysis of RD is at best implausible.

#### 3.7.4. *Differences unexpected if RD = LD*

Aside from not being able to derive the data in a satisfactory fashion, the LD analysis of RD predicts that LD and RD are much more similar than they actually are. First, it predicts that the presence of dependency markers (such as prepositions) should be equally acceptable in either periphery. The contrast in (76) is therefore entirely unexpected.

- (76) a. (? A) Clélia, il ne lui écrivait plus.  
           to Clelia he NEG to-her wrote no-more  
           ‘He didn’t write to Clelia anymore.’
- b. Il ne lui écrivait plus, ??(à) Clélia.  
      he NEG to-her wrote no-more to Clelia  
      ‘He didn’t write to Clelia anymore.’

Second, it predicts that any element that can be left-dislocated can be right-dislocated. While this is true in most cases, it is not true (i) when the dislocated element is contrastive and/or emphatic, (ii) when it identifies a topic among a D-linked set. In all these cases only left-dislocation is possible. This is illustrated in (77) and (78). In example (77) the first line sets out a context for the (a) and (b) sentences.

- (77) Je ne vois presque jamais Alice.  
       ‘I hardly ever see Alice.’
- a. Mais **sa sœur**<sub>i</sub>, je la<sub>i</sub> vois souvent.  
      but her sister I her see often  
      ‘But I often see her sister.’
- b. #Mais je la<sub>i</sub> vois souvent, **sa sœur**<sub>i</sub>.  
      but I her see often her sister
- (78) a. **Tout ce que tu m’as dit là**, j’aimerais mieux l’oublier.  
      all that that you to-me-have said there I-would-like better it-to-forget  
      ‘I’d rather forget what you’ve told me.’
- b. #J’aimerais mieux l’oublier, **tout ce que tu m’as dit là**.  
      I-would-like better it-to-forget all that that you to-me have said there

If right-dislocated elements occupy a position in the left-periphery, these differences are unexpected. I will argue in subsection 4.4 that they can be derived straightforwardly from the properties of each of the sentence peripheries.

In the following subsection, I show that a rightward movement of French right-dislocation is impossible.

### 3.7.5. French RD is not subject to the Right-Roof constraint

If RD is derived by rightward movement, it is expected to be clause-bound (subject to by Ross's 1967 so-called Right-Roof constraint).

- (79) a. [Tu es partie [sans \*(lui<sub>i</sub>) parler]], **toi, à Dave<sub>i</sub>**.  
 you are left without to-him to-speak you to Dave  
 'You left without speaking to Dave.'
- b. [Tu m'avais dit [que tu \*(l'<sub>i</sub>) inviterais]], **à moi, ta mère<sub>i</sub>**.  
 you to-me-had said that you him would-invite to me your mother  
 'You told me you would invite your mother.'

The *toi* 'you' and *à moi* 'to me' intervening between the embedded VP and the right-dislocated DP in (79) are outside of the VP boundary. If this was not the case, such dislocated elements would be parentheticals, in which case they should be allowed to precede a VP-internal element such as an object complement. But this is impossible: if the resumptive element is omitted (as indicated by the parentheses above) and the VP-final stress is placed on the PP in (79-a) or the DP in (79-b), the sentence becomes ungrammatical. We can safely conclude that *à Dave* 'to Dave' and *ta mère* 'your mother' in (79) are right-dislocated outside of the clause containing their resumptive element, as indicated by the bracketing in (79). These examples thus show that French RD is not clause-bound, which suggests that it is not derived by rightward movement.

## 3.8. SUMMARY

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

LD and RD, nor between dislocated elements resumed by a clitic and those resumed by a non-clitic. Section 4.4 will show that the interpretive differences between LD and RD can be derived from the properties of the two sides of the periphery of the clause.

#### 4. A first-merge adjunction analysis of French dislocation

##### 4.1. THE ANALYSIS

French dislocation involves neither movement of the dislocated element<sup>33</sup> nor (covertly) of its resumptive<sup>34</sup> and it does not require a dedicated functional projection (such as TopicP).<sup>35</sup>

I propose that dislocated elements in spoken French are adjoined by first-merge to a maximal projection with root properties (see e.g. Hooper and Thompson, 1973). Root-like clauses are necessarily finite (as argued by Emonds, 2004) but finite clauses are not automatically root-like (as will be shown in § 4.3). Syntactically, this can be captured by endowing the finite T of root-like clauses with a [discourse] feature. This feature forces the event expressed by the verb in T to be interpreted relative to the discourse context and in particular the topic of the sentence, whose default values correspond to the time and place of utterance (Gundel, 1975, Erteschik-Shir, 1997) and to the speaker. Dislocated topics in spoken French are adjoined to the left- or right-periphery of clauses containing a  $T_{[+discourse]}$  (see § 4.4 for details). Encoding this discourse feature on T instead of a functional projection in its own right is motivated by economy considerations and by the fact that this head/feature does not *select* the topic nor attracts a ‘discourse-marked’ element to the left-periphery (contrary to what is done by the F position proposed by Uriagereka, 1995,

<sup>33</sup> Analyses arguing for movement of the topic phrase include Iatridou (1995), Zubizarreta (1998), Cecchetto (1999), Grohmann (2003), López (2003)... Some have proposed that the topic phrase moves at PF: see e.g. Kayne (1994), Aoun and Benmamoun (1998).

<sup>34</sup> LF-movement of the resumptive element has been argued for by e.g. Demirdache (1991), Anagnostopoulou (1997), Rizzi (1997).

<sup>35</sup> Analyses postulating the existence of a Topic projection include Rizzi (1997), Cecchetto (1999), Villalba (2000), Benincà (2001), Frascarelli (2002), Grohmann (2003), Delais-Roussarie et al. (2004)...

Many alternatives have been proposed that do away with a dedicated Topic Projection see e.g. Barbosa (2000), Newmeyer (2003), López (2003), Gill and Tsoulas (2004), Emonds (2004),...

for instance). This is particularly important in light of the existence of truly right-peripheral topics in spoken French. Crucially, the discourse feature on T is not a [topic] feature, and it does not require checking in the overt syntax of French: it does not participate in an Agreement relation and hence cannot trigger movement (of the topic XP or its resumptive). In Spoken French, an XP in [spec,TP] cannot be interpreted as the topic of the sentence (as argued by De Cat, 2005). This would be unexpected if T bore a [topic] feature which required checking by an XP topic.

This analysis correctly predicts that the dislocated element is not related syntactically to its resumptive element. As I have argued in § 3.5.3, this relation is one of discourse coreference, i.e. it is of the same nature as that which holds across sentences. There is no need for the resumptive to be a copy of the dislocated element: a subset relation can be sufficient, as illustrated in (80) (see e.g. Prince, 1981 and Ward and Prince, 1991).

- (80) **Comme poisson**, j’aime bien les sardines.  
as fish I-like well the sardines  
‘As for fish, I like sardines.’

## 4.2. PREDICTIONS OF THE FIRST-MERGE ADJUNCTION ANALYSIS

The adjunction analysis predicts that French dislocated elements can appear at the edge of any Discourse Projection and that there is no *syntactic* constraint as to the number of topics allowed nor as to whether they appear in root or embedded clauses.<sup>36</sup> Different predictions are made under an analysis *à la* Rizzi (1997), which I discuss below.

### 4.2.1. *Problematic predictions of the template approach*

Rizzi’s (1997) cartographic approach constrains the distribution of left-peripheral topics by licensing them only at the edge of designated topic phrases (TopPs).<sup>37</sup> He proposes that TopPs can be

---

<sup>36</sup> This is not to say that constraints of another type do not play a role in restricting the distribution of topics in embedded clauses. This issue is addressed in subsection 4.3.

<sup>37</sup> The default is for topics to appear in the specifier of TopP but Rizzi also allows adverbial topics (such as temporal modifiers) to be adjoined to (a possibly empty) TopP and still check their Topic feature.

projected exclusively on either side of a Focus projection, but that these TopPs are recursive. When the topic-focus field is activated, the map of the left-periphery is said to be as in (81).

- (81)  $[_{\text{ForceP}} \text{Force} [_{\text{TopP}} \text{Top}^\circ [_{\text{FocP}} \text{Foc}^\circ [_{\text{TopP}} \text{Top}^\circ [_{\text{FinP}} \text{Fin}^\circ [_{\text{IP}} \dots ]]]]]]$

This rigid structure does however not capture the distribution of left-peripheral French topics.<sup>38</sup>

Rizzi argues that ForceP is always the top projection of the clause: it encodes clausal type and has to be accessible to selection. He also claims that finite complementisers appear in Force<sup>°</sup> and non-finite ones in Fin<sup>°</sup>, to derive fact that TopPs cannot follow a non-finite complementiser.<sup>39</sup> This, however, predicts that attested sentences like (82) do not exist. In (82), the PP preceding the embedded clause receives a left-dislocated intonation and clearly modifies the embedded clause rather than the matrix clause.<sup>40</sup>

- (82) Je pense **sur son doigt**,  $[_{\text{ForceP}} \text{qu' il montrait où est ce que c' était sale}]$ .  
 I think on his finger that he pointed where it is that it was dirty  
 'I think he was pointing to where it was dirty on his finger.'

A solution may be to assume that embedded clauses can take two complementisers, one (covert) in Force<sup>°</sup> to encode the selectional and force features of the embedded clause, and the other (overt) in Fin<sup>°</sup>, below the topic-focus field. However, examples such as (83) suggest that postulating an empty C in Force<sup>°</sup> does not after all rescue Rizzi's proposed cartography of the left periphery.

- (83) Je sais pas, **les clients**,  $[_{\text{ForceP}} \text{ce qu'ils veulent}]$ .  
 I know not the clients that that-they want  
 'I don't know what the clients want.'

In (83), the DP *les clients* 'the clients' precedes the embedded object clause. It cannot simply be a parenthetical in the face of the unacceptability of (84) (which can be straightforwardly explained if *les clients* is dislocated, given that dislocated elements can only appear at the edge of Discourse Projections, which do not include non-propositional complements).

<sup>38</sup> The cartographic approach predicts that right-peripheral topics are in fact left-peripheral. This is discussed in § 3.7.

<sup>39</sup> An independent restriction would then need to be introduced to disallow topics after non-finite complementisers.

<sup>40</sup> This examples, along with similar ones, was found in the XXX corpus.

- (84) \*Ils<sub>i</sub> veulent, **les clients**<sub>i</sub>, des fi gues.  
 they want the clients some fi gs

The fact that examples like (83) are attested shows that topics must be allowed to be projected higher than ForceP: the dislocated element precedes the complementiser of relative clause, which Rizzi argues always sits in Force<sup>o</sup>. Under Rizzi's approach, dislocated topics require the projection of a Topic phrase but ForceP has to be the topmost projection of the clause for selection purposes.

A second problem with the cartographic approach is that it does not explain why certain topics cannot occur in the clause containing their resumptive element, as shown by the contrast in (85) and (86). In fact, it wrongly predicts that such "long-distance" cases do not exist, when the resumptive is situated inside an island (like the complex DP in (85-a)).

- (85) a. [**Les malotrus**]<sub>i</sub>, je connais pas grand-monde qui les<sub>i</sub> aime.  
 the louts I now not great-people who them likes  
 'I don't know many people who like louts.'
- b. [**La voiture jaune**]<sub>i</sub>, j'étais triste de la<sub>i</sub> vendre.  
 the car yellow I-was sad to it sell  
 'I was sad to sell the yellow car.'
- (86) a. \*Je connais pas grand-monde qui, [**les malotrus**]<sub>i</sub>, les<sub>i</sub> aime.  
 I now not great-people who the louts them likes
- b. \*J'étais triste de [**la voiture jaune**]<sub>i</sub>, la<sub>i</sub> vendre.  
 I-was sad to the car yellow it sell

A third problem for Rizzi's analysis is that it requires that dislocated structures be treated as an exceptional type of A-bar dependency, as it does not yield Relativised Minimality effects when interacting with other A-bar dependencies, including those arising from the left-dislocation of additional elements.<sup>41</sup>

#### 4.3. FRENCH EMBEDDED DISCOURSE PROJECTIONS

The extent to which dislocated elements are allowed at the edge of embedded clauses has, to my knowledge, never been fully investigated in the literature. While an in-depth investigation would

<sup>41</sup> In his original proposal, (Rizzi, 1997) claimed that adjacency effects did arise from the presence of Topic projections. However this was contradicted by the data (see e.g. XXX for the relevant French data) so the proposal was amended in (Rizzi, 2002).



be beyond the scope of this paper, I will make a few observations below to pave the way for subsequent research.

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

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

In the literature on embedded root phenomena, a number of conditions have been identified for an embedded clause to qualify as root-like. Hooper and Thompson (1973) argue that so-called *Root Transformations* (i.e. transformations that can only take place in root clauses, following Emonds, 1970) are only possible in embedded clauses to the extent that such clauses can be asserted. Typically, “embedded root clauses” are indicative clauses selected by a verb of saying or a factive verb (see Heycock, 2005 for a review of the literature on the subject).

The group of embedded clauses allowing a left-dislocated topic in Spoken French is wider than what is commonly included in the “embedded root clauses” category. Left-dislocated topics appear in (i) certain subjunctive clauses (87-a) (12-a), (ii) restrictive relative clauses, (87-b), (iii) clauses selected by a negated verb (87-c), (iv) clauses that are not assertive (87-d), all of which fall out of the traditional classification of embedded root clauses. All the examples in (87) come from the XXX corpus of spontaneous production.

- (87)
- a. Tu veux que **moi**, je le dessine?  
you want that me I it draw  
‘Do you want me to draw it?’
  - b. Elle enregistre ce que **toi**, tu dis.  
she records that that you you say  
‘It records what you’re saying.’
  - c. Je savais pas que **les cochons**, ils avaient des salles de bain, moi.  
I knew not that the pigs they had some bathrooms me

‘I didn’t know pigs had bathrooms.’

- d. Et si **moi**, je viens et que je casse tous tes jouets, tu seras contente?  
and if me I come and that I break all your toys you will-be happy  
‘And if I come and break all your toys, will you be happy?’

However, dislocated topics are banned from embedded, non-finite clauses, as predicted by Emonds’ definition of Discourse Projections as inherently finite.<sup>42</sup>

- (88) a. \*J’ai dit de, **les haricots**<sub>i</sub>, les<sub>i</sub> équeuter.  
I-have said to the beans them tail  
b. \*J’ai peur de, **moi**, me couper.  
I-have fear to me REFL cut

Given that both left- and right-dislocated elements are topics (as argued in XXX), it should be assumed that dislocated phrases are equally banned from the right-periphery of non-finite clauses. However, this is harder to confirm empirically, given the bare nature of the right-periphery: a right-dislocated phrase at the end of a non-finite clause could be actually adjoined to the matrix clause (89).

- (89) [CP ... [CP ... ] RD ]

To the extent that native speakers accept the sentence below without a dislocated element,<sup>43</sup> they also accept (90-b) but reject (90-a). The right-dislocated element follows the indirect object of the

---

<sup>42</sup> The dislocated elements in (88) can only appear at the edge of the matrix clause (a Discourse Projection):

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

<sup>43</sup> This requires them to accept that the non-finite object clause precedes the indirect object instead of being postponed to the right. Extraposition is the preferred option for all the informant consulted:

- (i) Elle a demandé à tout le monde de les équeuter.  
she has asked to all the people to them tail  
‘She asked everybody to tail them.’

matrix clause, and hence cannot be in the right-periphery of the non-finite clause (which contains its resumptive element).

- (90) a. #Elle a demandé de les<sub>i</sub> équeuter, **les haricots<sub>i</sub>**, à tout le monde.  
           she has asked to them tail the beans to all the people
- b. Elle a demandé de les<sub>i</sub> équeuter à tout le monde, **les haricots<sub>i</sub>**.  
           she has asked to them tail the beans to all the people  
           ‘She asked everybody to tail the beans.’

The matrix clause also has an impact on whether the embedded clause can take a dislocated element. In general, an embedded clause tends to have root properties when it conveys indirect discourse, i.e. when the embedding verb introduces reported speech.<sup>44</sup> Emonds’ generalisation is that an embedded clause will have root properties if the governing verb has an animate argument serving as a subject of consciousness.

- (91) a. #Il faut empêcher que **les myrtilles<sub>i</sub>**, ils les<sub>i</sub> cueillent toutes aujourd’hui.  
           it must impede that the bilberries they them pick all today
- b. Ils ont dit que **les myrtilles<sub>i</sub>**, ils les<sub>i</sub> avaient toutes cueillies aujourd’hui.  
           they have said that the bilberries they them had all picked today  
           ‘They said they had picked all the bilberries today.’

Incidentally, note that a Rizgian analysis offers no principled explanation as to the unacceptability of (91-a).

Non-object clauses can also be endowed with root properties. This is true of e.g. conditional clauses (87-d) and relative clauses. Ease of identification of the topic’s referent facilitates its presence in a relative clause: dislocated elements referring to speaker or hearer are allowed more readily than third person referents in general (see XXX for details). It may well be the case that relevance-theoretic considerations have an impact on the acceptability of topics in such clauses.

As a preliminary conclusion, French embedded root clauses do not have exactly the characteristics of embedded root clauses, as they have been defined in the literature. However, this might be due to the fact that embedded root phenomena have been mainly studied with respect to Ger-

---

<sup>44</sup> It is not sufficient for an embedded clause to be selected by a verb like *say* for it to qualify as embedded root: it also has to be finite, as illustrated by (88-a).

manic languages. Further research is clearly necessary to determine the extent of cross-linguistic variation as to which embedded clauses can be endowed with root properties.

The last remaining question is that as to how the proposed analysis accounts for which side of the clause periphery hosts which dislocated elements in Spoken French.

#### 4.4. DERIVING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LD AND RD FROM THE PROPERTIES OF THE PERIPHERIES

Right-peripheral topics are usually considered to have a slightly different status and function to their left-peripheral counterpart.<sup>45</sup> Lambrecht, on the basis of his work on Spoken French (Lambrecht, 1981, 1986), argues that there are two types of peripheral topics, depending on the side of the sentence they appear in. Right-peripheral topics, which he labels *antitopics*, are said to differ from left-peripheral topics in several ways. (i) They are higher on the presuppositional scale: either the *antitopic* is given, or it is easily recoverable, and in any case it is more so than left-peripheral topics; (ii) *Antitopics* can never have a contrastive or an emphatic function<sup>46</sup> and this is reflected in their lack of stress; (iii) They can have a stylistic function; (iv) They cannot be modified by adverbs like *aussi* ‘too’, *seulement* ‘only’, *même* ‘even’; (v) They do not have a topic-shifting or a topic-creating function.

---

<sup>45</sup> The one exception to the claim that left- and right-dislocation are a unified phenomenon in spoken French is illustrated in (i), which has no direct left-hand counterpart (as shown in XXX).

- (i) a. C’est la mienne, **de collection**.  
it-is the mine of collection  
‘It’s my collection.’
- b. \*[(**De**) **collection**], c’est la mienne.  
of collection it-is the mine

This type of right-dislocated element is obligatorily PPs headed by *de* ‘of’ and it entertains a local relation with their resumptive element, as shown by e.g. Milner (1978) and Emonds (2001). In XXX I show that such right-dislocated elements are not interpreted as topics and that the locality requirement which characterises them do not apply to right-dislocated topics.

<sup>46</sup> Not all contrastive elements are necessarily emphatic: a contrast can arise out of the implied comparison with other elements of a given set.

Ashby (1988) argues, against Lambrecht (1981), that all the functions characteristically associated with left-dislocated elements can also be associated with their right-dislocated counterparts. He suggests that right-dislocated elements do not instantiate a different type of topic to left-dislocated elements.<sup>47</sup>

I will follow Ashby (1988) in rejecting the notion of *antitopic*. However, the differences between left- and right-peripheral topics (listed in (i)-(v) above) need to be accounted for. These will be shown to derive directly from the prosodic and the syntactic characteristics of the configurations in which left- and right-dislocations occur.

#### 4.4.1. *Prosodic properties and their consequences*

Prosodically, left-dislocated elements are particularly salient. They are typically stressed, uttered on a high pitch, and clearly set off from the rest of the utterance (see XXX for a description and discussion of the relevant diagnostics). By contrast, right-dislocation prosody is characterised by the absence of “distinctiveness” of the pitch contour. In most cases, their melody is low and flat. The right-dislocated position is typically non-salient from a prosodic point of view (Ashby, 1994, Rossi, 1999, Mertens et al., 2001).

As a result, any dislocated element requiring prosodic salience will obligatorily appear at the left-periphery of the clause. The marking of contrast is one of the typical cases requiring prosodic salience. Contrast can be marked *in situ* by adding a stress to the word or syllable to emphasise. In the sentence in (92), contrast is achieved simply by emphasising the word *Laken*, as indicated by the capitals on its first syllable.

- (92) Mais non, c’est le brigadier Azewé à LAKen.  
       but no it-is the Brigadier Azewe at Laken  
       ‘No, it’s the Brigadier Azewe at LAKen.’

The sentences in (93) illustrate the obligatory left-dislocation of contrastive XP topics. These three sentences were uttered one after the other by a speaker of the XXX corpus. Their topics are

---

<sup>47</sup> An analysis *à la* Vallduví (1992) is therefore ruled out from the start for the Spoken French data. Vallduví (1992) postulates that the post-focal part of the ground, which he labels the *tail*, does not itself encode topics. Rather, *tails* provide information as to how the information related to the topic should be entered on the relevant card (corresponding to the discourse referent currently under discussion). See XXX for discussion.

part of a set defined in the discourse (here: a family). Being mentioned one after the other creates a “list” effect implying a contrast between the members of the set.

- (93) **Le grand frère**, c’ est Lucas. **L’ autre**, c’ est Maxime. Et **le petit dernier**, c’ est  
 the big brother it is Lucas the other it is Maxime and the little last it is  
 Matéo.  
 Mateo  
 ‘The oldest brother is Lucas. The other one is Maxime. And Mateo is the last one.’

Only the topic of the first sentence could appear as a right-dislocated element, provided that some big brother is salient in the context. The second and the third sentences obligatorily require left-dislocations.

- (94) C’ est Lucas, **le grand frère**. # C’ est Maxime, **l’ autre**. # C’ est Matéo, **le petit dernier**.  
 it is Lucas the big brother it is Maxime the other-one it is Mateo the little  
 last-one

Another instance of clear contrast is that arising from the use of modifiers like *aussi* ‘too’, *même* ‘even’. With one exception (see (97)), topics modified by such elements are obligatorily left-dislocated in Spoken French.

- (95) a. Et **ceux de Luc aussi**, ils sentent le fromage?  
 and those of Luc too they smell the cheese  
 ‘And those of Luc smell of cheese too?’  
 b. #Ils sentent le fromage, **ceux de Luc aussi**?  
 they smell the cheese those of Luc too

Right-dislocated elements can encode emphasis only to the extent that the contrast can be expressed without the need for prosodic emphasis. This can be done by using a right-dislocated pronoun coindexed with a DP inside the sentence:

- (96) a. Maman<sub>i</sub> est malade, **elle<sub>i</sub>**.  
 Mum is ill her  
 ‘MUM is ill.’  
 b. Minnie<sub>i</sub> ne s’ en va pas, **elle<sub>i</sub>**.  
 Minnie NEG REFL of-here goes not her  
 ‘MINNIE’s not going away.’

It is therefore to be expected that right-dislocated pronouns should be the only elements allowing modification by *aussi*:

- (97) a. **Crocro**<sub>i</sub>, il<sub>i</sub> veut une poire, **lui**<sub>i</sub> **aussi**.  
 crocro he wants a pear him too  
 ‘Crocro too wants a pear.’
- b. Ah tu sais ce que c’<sub>i</sub> est, **ça**<sub>i</sub> **aussi**.  
 ah you know that that it is that too  
 ‘You know that too.’
- (98) a. #Il<sub>i</sub> veut une poire, **crocro**<sub>i</sub> **aussi**.  
 he wants a pear crocro too
- b. #Ah tu sais ce que c’<sub>i</sub> est, **cette image**<sub>i</sub> **aussi**.  
 ah you know that that it is that image too

The direction dislocation is thus partly determined by the prosodic requirements of that element. Prosodically salient elements can only be hosted by the left-periphery, given that it is the only one allowing pitch and intensity prominence.

#### 4.4.2. *General salience and its consequences*

The prosodic characteristics of left-dislocated elements, coupled with the fact that they are uttered before the core of the sentence, render these elements particularly salient. As a consequence, left-dislocation will be the preferred repair strategy in situations where the speaker had originally misjudged the level of recoverability of a topic. This is illustrated in the attested exchange in (99).

- (99) Parent: Il est où, **le bébé**? Où il est?  
 he is where the baby where he is  
 ‘Where’s the baby? Where is he?’
- Child: Il est là, **(l)a tête**.  
 he is there the head  
 ‘The head’s there.’ (Picking up a bit of plasticine)
- Parent: **Le bébé de Maman**, il est où?  
 the baby of Mum he is where  
 ‘Where’s Mum’s baby?’

Left-dislocation will also be preferred for topics when the speaker judges that the referent of the topic they introduce is not easily recoverable or identifiable.

It is however not true that referents with a low level of salience in the context appear obligatorily in the left-periphery. Contrary to what is often assumed in the literature (e.g. Lambrecht, 1981, Grobet, 2000), new referents can be encoded directly as right-dislocated topics, as in (100), for instance, which was uttered in a context where no plane had yet been mentioned.

- (100) Tu sais où il allait, **l'avion que tu as vu qui décollait?**  
 you know where he went the-plane that you have seen that took-off  
 'Do you know where the plane you saw taking off was going?'

On the whole, the function of right-dislocated topics is vaguer than that of their left-hand counterparts. When presented with minimal pairs involving a left- and a right-dislocated topic, native speakers tend to report an impression of markedness associated with left-dislocated topics. This impression is reported to be particularly strong in *wh*-questions, which might contribute to explaining why right-dislocation is so prevalent in that utterance type.

#### 4.4.3. *Linear order and its consequences*

We have seen that French right-dislocated elements tend to require the presence of syntactic dependency markers but that this was not obligatorily so. Examples from spontaneous production containing a right-dislocated element without dependency marker are attested in the literature. Such examples are rare, but one has to bear in mind that right-dislocated elements bearing dependency markers are rare too (as shown in XXX).

- (101) a. Ça nous est égal, **nous**. (Ashby, 1988)  
 that to-us is equal us  
 'We don't mind.'
- b. On peut pas s'en servir, **le reste**. (Ashby, 1988)  
 one can not REFL-of-it serve the rest  
 'We can't use the rest.'

It can be concluded that the presence of dependency markers on right-dislocated elements is preferred, but not absolutely obligatory. The non-obligatory character of this constraint on right-peripheral topics can be interpreted as an indicator that it is discourse-based rather than syntactic in nature. The need for dependency markers on right-dislocated elements may arise from inter-



pretability conditions. It is widely acknowledged that, cross-linguistically, topics strongly tend to correspond to the grammatical subject of the sentence (Li and Thompson, 1976). Topics are thus expected by default to be coindexed with the subject of the sentence and not with the indirect object (i.e. the only argument possibly realised as a PP in French). It is thus to be expected that topics coindexed with e.g. indirect objects, which are typically low on the presuppositional scale (Lambrecht, 1994), require extra identification mechanisms when appearing in a typically non-salient position.

#### 4.5. THEORETICAL CONSEQUENCES

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

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

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

- (102) a. The ban on adjunction to adjuncts and to object clauses is a *derivational* constraint, not a *representational* one.

- b. XP-adjuncts need to be distinguished from specifiers: only the latter involves Agreement.

French dislocation has been shown to be possible at the edge of object and adjunct clauses. This, in the light of Sabel (2002), suggests that the ban on adjunction to such clauses is not representational in nature (102-a). The present analysis also provides further empirical support for Hoekstra's (1991) arguments in favour of maintaining a distinction between XP-adjuncts and specifiers, based on the fact that only the latter involve syntactic agreement (102-b).

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

## 5. Conclusion

French dislocation has been shown to be a syntactically uniform phenomenon encompassing both Left and Right Dislocation, and dislocations with a clitic or a non-clitic resumptive. This phenomenon is uniform in the sense that the following characteristics are maintained in all cases: (i) the dislocated element expresses the topic of the sentence, (ii) the "resumptive" element can be situated inside an island or inside another clause to that hosting the dislocated element, (iii) dislocated constructions do not display the key properties of movement configurations: they do not license parasitic gaps, do not give rise to Weak Cross-Over nor Minimality effects, can hold across strong islands and are not interpreted via reconstruction.

The term "resumptive" has been argued to be something of a misnomer in this case, given that the clause-internal element coreferential with the dislocated XP is not interpreted as a genuine resumptive pronoun (in the sense of Sells, 1984), and that it does not behave as expected following Boeckx (2003). Indeed, the so-called "resumptive" element is not syntactically dependent, in the sense that it does not require a syntactic antecedent. It is best analysed as a full-fledged (though possibly deficient) pronoun, interpreted as a discourse-level anaphor.

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

One of the advantages of the proposed analysis is that it makes it possible to free syntax from the burden of Information Structure. This is highly desirable on the face of the influence of factors such as the ease of identification of the corresponding discourse referents on the distribution of dislocated elements. On such an analysis, it is possible to postulate highly specialised components of the language faculty, thus maximising economy and allowing full exploitation of the potential of the interfaces between these components.

## **Appendix**

This appendix provides further detail regarding the methodology adopted to elicit native speaker judgements experimentally.

Three points are essential to elicit judgements on dislocation data.

First, it is important to bear in mind that dislocated elements encode the topic of the sentence, and that this requires the satisfaction of various felicity conditions (see XXX). Essentially, a context has to be provided to ensure that the referent in question is sufficiently salient. In this context, it has to make sense to say something *about* that referent. To avoid confusing informants as to what they had to judge, the context was provided in written form (as opposed to the test sentence, which was in audio format only and which informants accessed by clicking a button after reading the context).

Second, prosody is one of the key distinctive features of dislocated constructions. For this reason, using recorded test-sentences was of paramount importance to ensure that the prosody

was the same for all informants. This also delimited (as much as possible) whether informants could assign a contrastive interpretation to the dislocated element, given that this requires prosodic salience.

Third, one has to ensure that speakers provide judgements on *spoken* French, not *written* French. Dislocations are used consistently in spoken French to encode topics, as demonstrated in XXX. The encoding of Information Structure operates differently in written French — see (Lahousse, 2003).<sup>48</sup> In testing situations, native speakers tend to be influenced by written French, which is considered the “norm” (and is strongly promoted at school and in the media). To try and avoid this as much as possible, the data was presented in audio format only. Informants were told that there was no “correct” answer and that the study aimed to survey the way people really speak. They were invited to choose a judgement from a pull-down menu (originally set on “choose”, so any item skipped could be discarded from the analysis).

The options to choose from were as follows:

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

Options a and b were considered to indicate acceptability: the informant identified the sentence as something they could say themselves. Option c was taken to indicate markedness instead of unacceptability, because the informant accepted that this sentence is *possible in spoken French*. Option d was taken to indicate unacceptability. Justification for such an interpretation of the results is provided by the judgements of sentences predicted to be (i) acceptable and unmarked and (ii) strongly marked or ungrammatical. The unmarked sentence used as a base-line is given in (3-b), for which the context was (3-a):

- (3) a. Vous avez eu beaucoup de monde, à la fête ?

---

<sup>48</sup> Thetic sentences are encoded with postverbal subjects in written French but not in spoken French. In spoken French, the canonical subject position can only host subjects if they are in focus (whether in narrow focus or in a thetic structure). In written French, subjects in this position can receive a topic interpretation.

‘Did you get a lot of people at the party?’

- b. Non, il y a personne qui est venu.  
no it there has nobody who has come  
‘No, nobody came.’

97% of the 32 informants gave an *a* rating to this sentence and 3% gave it a *b* rating. This sentence does not violate any syntactic nor information structural requirement. *B* ratings should thus not be interpreted as a significant restriction on the acceptability of sentences. Note that *b* ratings were always significantly fewer than *a* ratings for any of the sentences tested.

The strongly marked sentence used as a base-line is given in (4-b), together with its context (4-a).

- (4) a. J’ai pas compris ce que t’as dit.  
‘I haven’t understood what you said.’  
b. À qui<sub>i</sub> est-ce que tu ne sais pas [ce [qu’elle lit t<sub>i</sub>]]?  
to whom is-it that you NEG know not that that-she reads

The ratings were as follows: a: 25%, b: 16%, c: 19%, d: 41%. As pointed out in § 3.5.1, this sentence was unfortunately given in a context favouring a D-linked interpretation, which is known to alleviate island effects. This is reflected in the acceptability ratings. However what is crucial here is that 41% of informants categorically rejected this sentence: this constitutes a significantly higher proportion than on any of the dislocated test-sentences (where the highest rejection rate was 19%).

The 7 sentences testing whether dislocated elements can be separated from their resumptive element by a strong island boundary are given below (in the b examples), preceded by their context (given in a). The acceptability ratings are given in Table I.

- (5) a. J’ai recommencé les Tintin d’avant 1960.  
‘I’ve started reading the pre-1960 Tintins again.’  
b. **Les autres**<sub>i</sub>, je vais attendre [avant de les<sub>i</sub> relire].  
the other-ones I will wait before to them to-re-read
- (6) a. On s’attendait à voir toutes sortes de gens saugrenus à la fête pour sa sortie de prison.  
‘We were expecting to see all kinds of weird people at her releasing party.’  
b. Mais **le juge**<sub>j</sub>, ça<sub>i</sub> a surpris tout le monde, [qu’elle l’<sub>j</sub> ait invité]<sub>i</sub>.  
but the judge it has surprised all the people that-she him has invited

- (7) a. Elle est en train de lire les Contes de Mille et Une Nuits aux plus grands.  
'At the moment, she's reading the 1001 Nights Tales to the big ones.'
- b. **Aux petits<sub>i</sub>**, je sais pas [ce [qu'elle leur<sub>i</sub> lit]].  
to-the little-ones I know not that that-she to-them reads
- (8) a. Je veux plus les voir. Plus jamais.  
'I never want to see them again. Ever.'
- b. **Ta mère<sub>i</sub>**, je ferai tout pour être parti [quand elle<sub>i</sub> viendra].  
your mother I will-do all to be gone when she will-come
- (9) a. On va d'abord interroger les témoins directs.  
'We'll first interrogate the immediate witnesses.'
- b. **Aux autres<sub>i</sub>**, on va attendre [avant de leur<sub>i</sub> parler].  
to-the other-ones one will wait before to to-them to-speak
- (10) a. Ça me dit rien d'aller au cinéma, ce soir.  
'I don't feel like going to the cinema tonight.'
- b. **Ce film-là<sub>i</sub>**, j'ai déjà vu [tous les extraits [qu'on en<sub>i</sub> montre]].  
that film-there I-have already seen all the extracts that-one of-it shows
- (11) a. Je sais pas ce que François a reçu.  
'I don't know what François got.'
- b. Mais **à Alice<sub>i</sub>**, je connais le livre qu'ils lui<sub>i</sub> ont donné.  
but to Alice I know the book that-they to-her have given

In the table below, the first two numbers indicate the proportion of informants who gave an *a* or a *b* rating respectively, indicating acceptability; the third number corresponds to the proportion of a *c* rating, indicating markedness; the second number corresponds to *d* ratings, indicating unacceptability. One informant omitted to provide a judgement for (9) so the proportions were calculated for 31 informants rather than 32 for that sentence.

Table I. Results of the internet judgement elicitation task

Sentence	Rating			
	a	b	c	d
(5)	91%	3%	6%	0%
(6)	75%	6%	19%	0%
(7)	66%	9%	25%	0%
(8)	56%	13%	28%	3%
(9)	45%	10%	32%	13%
(10)	34%	13%	47%	6%
(11)	16%	9%	56%	19%

The poor rating of (11), compared with (7) which is syntactically similar (i.e. both cases involve a dislocated PP coreferential with a cliticised indirect object inside a complex DP), suggests that

non-syntactic factors can have a significant effect on acceptability. It is likely that informants considered that the test sentence was not a likely follow-up to the context provided. To ascertain whether this could have been the case, a modified version (given in (12)) was presented to 6 native speakers (2 of whom had taken part in the original task). It received the following rating: 4 a, 1 b and 1 c.

- (12) a. Je sais pas ce qu' ils ont donné à François.  
'I don't know what they gave François.'
- b. Mais à **Alice<sub>i</sub>**, j'ai vu le livre qu'ils lui<sub>i</sub> ont acheté.  
but to Alice I-have seen the book that-they for-her have bought

There are two key differences between (11) and (12): first, the dislocated PP is contrasted with a PP in the preceding sentence; second, the predicate in the main clause is semantically closer to that in the context sentence in (12) than in (11), which seems to render the sentence in (b) a more plausible follow-up to (a). The poor rating of (11) should thus be attributed to information structural rather than syntactic restrictions.

## References

- Alexopoulou, T., E. Doron, and C. Heycock: 2004, 'Broad Subjects and Clitic Left Dislocation'. In: D. Adger, C. De Cat, and G. Tsoulas (eds.): *Peripheries. Syntactic edges and their effect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 329–358.
- Anagnostopoulou, E.: 1997, 'Clitic Left Dislocation and Contrastive Left Dislocation'. In: E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk, and F. Zwarts (eds.): *Materials on Left Dislocation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 151–192.
- Aoun, J. and E. Benmamoun: 1998, 'Minimality, reconstruction, and PF movement'. *Linguistic Inquiry* **29**(4), 569–597.
- Ashby, W.: 1988, 'The Syntax, Pragmatics, and Sociolinguistics of Left- and Right-Dislocations in French'. *Lingua* **75**(2-3), 203–229.
- Ashby, W. J.: 1994, 'An acoustic profile of right-dislocations in French'. *Journal of French Language Studies* **4**(2), 127–145.
- Barbosa, P.: 2000, 'Clitics. A Window into the Null Subject Property'. In: J. Costa (ed.): *Portuguese Syntax. New Comparative Studies*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 31–92.
- Barnes, B.: 1985, *The pragmatics of left detachment in spoken standard French*, Vol. VI:3 of *Pragmatics & Beyond*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Beerman, D., D. Leblanc, and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.): 1997, *Rightward movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Belletti, A.: 2001, 'Aspects of the low IP area'. In: L. Rizzi (ed.): *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structure*, Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beninc`a, P.: 2001, 'The position of topic and focus in the left periphery'. In: G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds.): *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 40–64.
- Boeckx, C.: 2003, 'Resumption and asymmetric derivation'. In: A.-M. d. Sciullo (ed.): *Asymmetry in Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 85–98.
- Cann, R., R. Kempson, L. Marten, M. Otsuka, and D. Swinburne: 2004, 'On the left and on the right'. In: D. Adger, C. De Cat, and G. Tsoulas (eds.): *Peripheries. Syntactic edges and their effects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Cecchetto, C.: 1999, 'A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance'. *Studia Linguistica* **53**(1), 40–67.
- Cecchetto, C.: 2000, 'Doubling Structures and Reconstruction'. *Probus* **12**(1), 93–126.
- Chomsky, N.: 1977, 'On wh-movement'. In: P. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian (eds.): *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 71–132.
- Chomsky, N.: 1986, *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, N.: 1995, *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N.: 2000, 'Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework'. In: R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds.): *Step by Step*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N.: 2001, 'Derivation by Phase'. In: M. Kenstowicz (ed.): *Ken Hale. A Life in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, G.: 1977, 'The movement Nature of Left Dislocation'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 397–412.
- Cinque, G.: 1983, 'Topic' constructions in some European languages and 'connectedness'. In: K. Ehlich and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.): *Connectedness in Sentence Text and Discourse*, Vol. 4 of *Tilburg Studies in Language and Literature*. Tilburg: KBU, pp. 7–42.
- Cinque, G.: 1990, *Types of A-bar dependencies*, Vol. 17 of *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Côté, M.-H.: 2001, 'On the status of the subject clitics in child French'. In: M. Almgren, A. Barreña, M.-J. Ezeizabarrena, I. Idiazabal, and B. Mac Whinney (eds.): *Proceedings of the 8th Conference of the IASCL*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 1314–1330.
- De Cat, C.: 2005, 'French subject clitics are not agreement morphemes'. *Lingua* 108, 1195–1219.
- Delais-Roussarie, E., J. Doetjes, and P. Sleeman: 2004, 'Dislocation'. In: F. Corblin and H. de Swart (eds.): *Handbook of French Semantics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, pp. 501–.
- Demirdache, H.: 1991, 'Resumptive chains in restrictive relatives, appositives and dislocation structures'. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Emonds, J.: 1970, 'Root and structure-preserving transformations'. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Emonds, J.: 2001, 'La relation entre la dislocation à droite et le clitique franco-italien en/ne'. *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* 119, 1–32.
- Emonds, J.: 2004, 'Unspecified categories as the key to root constructions'. In: D. Adger, C. De Cat, and G. Tsoulas (eds.): *Peripheries. Syntactic edges and their effects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 75–120.
- Epstein, S. D. and T. D. Seely (eds.): 2002, *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Erteschik-Shir, N.: 1997, *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Escobar, L.: 1997, 'Clitic Left Dislocation and other Relatives'. In: E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk, and F. Zwarts (eds.): *Materials on Left Dislocation*, Vol. 14 of *Linguistik Aktuell*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 233–274.
- Frascarelli, M.: 2000, *The syntax-phonology interface in focus and topic constructions in Italian*, Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 50. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Frascarelli, M.: 2002, 'Topicalization as Merge. A comparative analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Italian'. ms, Università degli Studi Roma Tre.
- Frascarelli, M.: 2004, 'Dislocation, clitic resumption and minimality'. In: R. Bok-Bennema, B. Hollebrandse, B. Kampers-Manhe, and P. Sleeman (eds.): *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2002*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 99–118.
- Gill, K.-H. and G. Tsoulas: 2004, 'Peripheral effects without peripheral syntax'. In: D. Adger, C. De Cat, and G. Tsoulas (eds.): *Peripheries. Syntactic edges and their effects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 121–141.
- Grobet, A.: 2000, 'L'identification des topiques dans les dialogues'. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Genève.
- Grohmann, K.: 2000, 'Copy Left Dislocation'. In: Billerey and Lillehaugen (eds.): *WCCFL 19 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 139–152.
- Grohmann, K. K.: 2003, *Prolific Domains: On the Anti-Locality of Movement Dependencies*, Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 66. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gundel, J.: 1974, 'The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory'. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas.
- Gundel, J.: 1975, 'Left dislocation and the role of topic-comment structures in linguistic theory'. *OSU WPL* 18, 72–131.
- Heycock, C.: 2005, 'Embedded Root Phenomena'. In: M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.): *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hirschbühler, P.: 1975, 'On the source of lefthand NPs in French'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 6, 155–165.
- Hoekstra, E.: 1991, *Licensing Conditions on Phrase Structure*. Groningen: Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics (GroDiL).
- Hooper, J. B. and S. A. Thompson: 1973, 'On the applicability of root transformations'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4(4), 465–497.
- Iatridou, S.: 1995, 'Clitics and Islands Effects'. In: R. Izvorski and V. Tredinnick (eds.): *U.Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 2.
- Kayne, R.: 1994, *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche: 1991, 'The position of subjects'. *Lingua* 85(211-258).
- Lahousse, K.: 2003, 'NP-Subject Inversion in French and (Preposed) Adverbs'. In: A. Pérez-Leroux and Y. Roberge (eds.): *Romance Linguistics: Theory and acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 181–196.
- Lambrecht, K.: 1981, *Topic, antitopic and verb agreement in non-standard French*, Vol. II:6 of *Pragmatics & Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lambrecht, K.: 1986, 'Topic, focus, and the grammar of spoken French'. Phd dissertation, University of California.



- Lambrecht, K.: 1994, *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Larsson, E.: 1979, *La dislocation en français : étude de syntaxe générative*. Lund: CZK Gleerup.
- Lasnik, H. and T. Stowell: 1991, 'Weakest Crossover'. *Linguistic Inquiry* **22**, 687–720.
- Li, C. N. and S. A. Thompson: 1976, 'Subject and topic: a new typology of language'. In: C. Li (ed.): *Subject and Topic*. New-York: Academic Press, pp. 457–489.
- López, L.: 2003, 'Steps for a well-adjusted dislocation'. *Studia Linguistica* **57**(3), 193–231.
- Mertens, P., J.-P. Goldmann, E. Wehrli, and A. Gaudinat: 2001, 'La synthèse de l'intonation à partir de structures syntaxiques riches'. *TAL (Traitement Automatique des Langues)* **42**(1), 142–195.
- Milner, J.-C.: 1978, *De la syntaxe à l'interprétation : quantités, insultes, exclamations*. Paris: Seuil.
- Newmeyer, F. J.: 2003, 'Against the split-CP hypothesis'. In: P. Banský and A. Przepiorkowski (eds.): *Proceedings of GLiP-5*. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences.
- Prince, E. F.: 1981, 'Topicalisation, focus-movement, and Yiddish-movement: A pragmatic differentiation'. In: D. Alford, K.-A. Hunold, M. Macaulay, J. Walter, C. Brugman, P. Chertok, I. Civkulis, and M. Tobey (eds.): *Seventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. pp. 249–264.
- Reinhart, T.: 1981, 'Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics'. *Philosophica* **27**(Special issue on Pragmatic Theory), 53–94.
- Rizzi, L.: 1990, *Relativised Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L.: 1997, 'The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery'. In: L. Haegeman (ed.): *Elements of grammar. A handbook of generative syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281–337.
- Rizzi, L.: 2002, 'Locality and Left Periphery'. In: A. Belletti (ed.): *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Vol. 3. Oxford: OUP, pp. 223–251.
- Ronat, M.: 1979, 'Pronoms topiques et pronoms distinctifs'. *Langue française* **44**, 105–127.
- Ross, J. R.: 1967, 'Constraints on Variables in Syntax'. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Rossi, M.: 1999, *L'intonation. Le système du français : description et modélisation*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Sabel, J.: 2002, 'Intermediate traces, reconstruction and locality effects'. In: A. Alexiadou (ed.): *Theoretical Approaches to Universals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 259–313.
- Saito, M. and N. Fukui: 1998, 'Order in Phrase Structure and Movement'. *Linguistic Inquiry* **29**(3), 439–474.
- Sells, P.: 1984, *Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns*. Amherst: GLSA.
- Sportiche, D.: 1988, 'A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure'. *Linguistic Inquiry* **19**(3), 425–449.
- Strawson, P. F.: 1964, 'Identifying reference and truth values'. *Theoria* **30**.
- Tellier, C.: 2001, 'On some distinctive properties of parasitic gaps in French'. In: P. Culicover and P. Postal (eds.): *Parasitic Gaps*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Uriagereka, J.: 1995, 'An F position in Western Romance'. In: K. É. Kiss (ed.): *Discourse configurational languages*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 153–175.
- Vallduví, E.: 1992, *The Informational Component*. New York: Garland.
- Vat, J.: 1981, 'Left dislocation, connectedness and reconstruction'. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik (GAGL)* **20**, 80–103.
- Villalba, X.: 1998, 'Right dislocation is not right dislocation'. In: O. Fullana and F. Roca (eds.): *Studies on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages*. Girona: Universitat de Girona, pp. 227–241.
- Villalba, X.: 2000, 'The Syntax of Sentence Periphery'. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Ward, G. and E. F. Prince: 1991, 'On the topicalisation of indefinite NPs'. *Journal of Pragmatics* **15**(8), 167–178.
- Zribi-Hertz, A.: 1984, 'Prépositions orphelines et pronoms nuls'. *Recherches Linguistiques* **12**, 46–91.
- Zubizarreta, M. L.: 1998, *Prosody, Focus and Word-Order*, Vol. 23 of *LI Monographs*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

