An Ellipsis Approach to Contrastive Left-dislocation*

Dennis Ott
University of Groningen
dennis.ott@post.harvard.edu

April 2012

Abstract

This paper proposes a novel analysis of Contrastive Left-dislocation (CLD), according to which the left-dislocated XP is a remnant of clausal ellipsis. This analysis makes sense of the otherwise paradoxical fact that the dislocated XP shows connectivity into the clause it precedes, while other properties betray its clause-external status. This paradox is resolved by analyzing CLD as a juxtaposition of two parallel clauses, the first of which is reduced by IP-ellipsis at PF. Akin to recent treatments of sluicing, fragment answers, split questions, and other phenomena, the analysis reduces CLD to an interplay of $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement and ellipsis, thereby removing constructional residue from the theory of UG.

Keywords: dislocation, ellipsis, movement, fragments, connectivity

1 Introduction

In this paper I propose a novel analysis of Contrastive Left-dislocation (CLD), a construction in which a left-peripheral XP precedes a complete clause containing a resuming element.

(1) Den Peter, den habe ich gestern gesehen.
the Peter him have I yesterday seen
'I saw Peter yesterday.' (German)

For convenience I will henceforth refer to the 'dislocated' XP (*den Peter* in (1)) as the *dXP*, to the resumptive element (*den* in (1)) as the *anchor*, and to the clause containing the anchor as the *host clause*.

*Acknowledgments to be added.

According to the analysis I will defend, the *d*XP is a remnant of clausal ellipsis. More specifically, my claim is that (1) derives from the following underlying biclausal structure:

(2) $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ [den Peter]$_i$ habe ich gestern t_i gesehen$]$ $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ den$_k$ habe ich gestern t_k gesehen$]$

In the mapping to phonetic form, CP_1 is reduced by ellipsis of the complement of the fronted XP, yielding (3), corresponding to the surface form in (1).

(3) $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ [den Peter]$_i$ ~~habe ich gestern t_i gesehen~~$]$ $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ den$_k$ habe ich gestern t_k gesehen$]$

The juxtaposed CP_1 and CP_2 are parallel, *modulo* the difference between *d*XP and anchor; as explained in section 3 below, this parallelism licenses ellipsis in CP_1.[1] As shown above, the *d*XP has $\overline{\text{A}}$-moved to the edge of CP_1, enabling constituent deletion of the remainder of the clause.

This type of clausal ellipsis, in the wake of Merchant 2001 commonly implemented as PF-deletion of IP/TP,[2] has been argued to figure in a range of elliptical constructions, such as sluicing, fragment answers, and split questions.

(4) *Sluicing* (Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001; van Craenenbroeck 2010b)

a. John bought something, but I don't know what.

b. ... but I don't know $[_{\text{CP}}$ what$_i$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ ~~John bought t_i~~$]]$

(5) *Fragment answers* (Merchant 2004a; Temmerman 2011)

a. A: Wie dacht Carl dat de wedstrijd zou winen? – B: Kim.
who thought Carl that the contest would win Kim
A: 'Who did Carl think would win the contest?' – B: 'Kim.'

b. $[_{\text{CP}}$ Kim$_i$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ ~~dacht Carl dat t_i de wedstrijd zou winen~~$]]$ (Dutch)

(6) *Split questions* (Arregi 2010; Ott 2012)

a. Qué árbol plant'o Juan, un roble?
what three planted Juan an oak
'What tree did Juan plant, an oak?'

b. $[_{\text{CP}}$ [qué árbol]$_i$ plant'o Juan $t_i]$ $[_{\text{CP}}$ [un roble]$_k$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ ~~plant'o Juan t_k~~$]]$ (Spanish)

[1] In closely related work (Ott 2012), I show that right-dislocation constructions can be analyzed in a directly parallel way, with ellipsis in CP_2; see footnote 31.

[2] I argue in Ott in progress that 'IP-ellipsis' is a misnomer, and that what undergoes deletion in all these cases is in fact the complement of the fronted operator, as also proposed in Thoms 2010. This captures Merchant's (2001) *Sluicing–COMP generalization*, according to which no non-operator material can surface in CP when IP is elided. Since space precludes a thorough discussion of this alternative implementation here, I will stick to traditional terminology and use the term IP-ellipsis, ignoring the problem of finite verbs in elliptical matrix clauses (which I will simply represent as being in IP).

If my proposal is on the right track, CLD belongs to this class of elliptical constructions.[3]

Existing approaches to CLD variously analyze the *d*XP as moved to or as base-generated in its surface position, but analyses of either ilk suffer from empirical and conceptual shortcomings. As I will show, the movement-and-ellipsis alternative avoids these problems and derives all core properties of CLD in a principled fashion, relying exclusively on the independently motivated operations of $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement and IP-ellipsis. In this way, the analysis eliminates a significant amount of constructional residue from the theory of UG.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I outline the central empirical properties of CLD and the theoretical challenge arising from them. I will then go on, in section 3, to outline the ellipsis-based approach. Section 4 shows how this account correctly predicts connectivity of the *d*XP into the host clause, despite its otherwise clause-external character. Various further predictions of the approach are shown to be borne out in section 5, and section 6 concludes.

2 Core Properties of CLD

This section summarizes the central empirical properties of CLD. The presentation will lead to the apparent paradox that the *d*XP is clause-external *and* clause-internal at the same time; this is the main problem to be solved by the analysis proposed in the following section.

The type of left-dislocation discussed in this paper is found in all non-English Germanic languages, generally as a root phenomenon.[4] Thráinsson (1979) introduced the term *Contrastive Left-dislocation* to distinguish it from English-type left-dislocation, which differs in crucial respects from CLD.[5] In this paper, I will focus exclusively on CLD, setting aside other

[3]See also van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006, Holmberg 2011, and Kluck 2011, among others, for recent analyses employing IP-ellipsis in other domains.

[4]This includes CLD in embedded contexts with root-like properties, as in the following examples:

(i) a. Jón segir að Þessum hring, honum hafi Ólafur lofað Maríu.
Jon says that this ring, it has Olaf promised Mari.
'Jon says that Olaf promised this ring to Mari.' (Icelandic; Thráinsson 2007)

b. Ich glaube den Hans, den kennt er kaum.
I believe the Hans him knows he barely
'I think he barely knows Hans.' (German; Bayer 2001)

Icelandic has generalized embedded V2 while German permits embedded root domains for a subset of bridge verbs; embedded CLD obeys the same constraints. I will set embedded CLD aside here as it poses no problem for the present analysis (beyond general questions concerning embedded root phenomena, see Heycock 2006), focusing on the core case.

[5]English left-dislocation as in *John, I like him* appears to pattern with what has been labeled *Hanging-topic Left-dislocation* (HTLD) in languages like Dutch and German (cf. van Riemsdijk 1997; Frey 2004b).

(i) Der Peter, ich kenne ihn nicht.
the.NOM *Peter I know him*.ACC *not*
'As for Peter, I don't know him.' (German)

types of left-dislocation. Most examples in this paper will be drawn from German, however the syntactic properties of CLD surveyed in what follows appear to be by and large invariant across the (non-English) Germania.

Turning now to the distinctive properties of CLD, let us first consider the *d*XP, which typically has the pragmatic function of a contrastive topic or a focus, marked by a corresponding rising or falling accent in German.[6] The *d*XP can be prosodically integrated into the host clause, but may alternatively be separated from it by an intonational break (signified by # below), or even by interjections (cf. Greenberg 1984).

(7) a. Den Peter {# / ja / genau / verdammt} den habe ich gestern gesehen.
the Peter yes exactly damn him have I yesterday seen
'Peter, {#/yeah/exactly/dammit}, I saw him yesterday.' (German)

b. Daunen boek, toch wel, daunen ei Marie wel gelezen.
that book PRT PRT *that has Mary* PRT *read*
'Yes, Mary read that book.' (Wambeek Dutch; van Craenenbroeck 2010b)

This suggests that the *d*XP bears a rather loose structural relation (if any) to the host clause. This impression is reinforced more generally by the fact that the *d*XP is always omissible, preceding a syntactically complete clause, in apparent violation of the otherwise robust V2 pattern. Semantically, too, it is essentially vacuous, having no truth-conditional effect on compositional interpretation.

As noted in Zaenen 1997 for Dutch and Icelandic, CLD is virtually unrestricted with respect to the category of the *d*XP.

(8) a. [$_{DP}$ Peysuna sína], hana finnur Ólafur hvergi.
sweater self's it finds Olaf nowhere
'Olaf can't find his sweater anywhere.' (Icelandic; Zaenen 1985)

b. [$_{AdvP}$ Gisteren], toen heeft Jan dat boek snel terug gebracht.
yesterday then has John that book quickly back brought
'John quickly returned the book yesterday.' (Dutch; Zwart 1998)

c. [$_{VP}$ Gemt den særligt godt], det tror jeg nu ikke de har.
hidden it very well that think I now not they have
'I don't think they have hidden it very well.' (Danish; Mikkelsen 2011)

d. [$_{CP}$ Dass Peter seine Freundin geküsst hat], das glaube ich nicht.
that Peter his girlfriend kissed has that believe I not
'I don't believe that Peter kissed his girlfriend.' (German)

Hanging topics are usually nominative DPs and do not show connectivity into the host clause (van Riemsdijk 1997; Frey 2004b; Grewendorf 2008). I will not attempt provide a full-fledged analysis of HTLD in this paper; but see footnote 22 for possible directions. It should be noted that HTLD constructions in German are rather contrived and rarely if ever occur in normal spoken speech; the same is noted for Dutch by Zwart (2011).

[6] On information-structural properties of CLD, see Altmann 1981; Frey 2004b; Shaer et al. 2009.

e. [$_{AP}$ Schön], das ist sie wirklich nicht.
beautiful that is she really not
'She really isn't beautiful.' (German)

As shown by the above examples, CLD is not restricted to referential *d*XPs (*pace* Grewendorf 2008); in section 3 we will see that categories that cannot be resumed by an anchor are excluded from CLD, at least in its standard form. My working assumption here will be that the category of the *d*XP is not restricted syntactically.

Turning now to the anchor within the host clause, it is typically realized as a weak *d*-pronoun (which I gloss as a personal pronoun for the sake of simplicity).[7] Leftward movement of this anchor out of an island induces deviance.

[7]Icelandic seems to productively employ personal pronouns as anchors in CLD (Zaenen 1997; Thráinsson 2007), a crosslinguistic difference I abstract away from in this paper. In German/Dutch, weak (unstressed) personal pronouns as anchors in CLD are marked but not impossible, a fact I take to reflect a pragmatic preference for *d*-pronouns when elements from preceding discourse are resumed. The same preference can be found (in spoken language, at least) across utterances (not that weak pronouns do not front).

(i) A: Hast du Peter gestern noch gesehen?
have you Peter yesterday still seen
'Did you get to see Peter yesterday?'
B: Ja, ich hab' {den / %ihn} gestern noch gesehen.
*yes I have d-him him.*WEAK *yesterday still seen*
'Yes, I did get to see him yesterday.' (German)

In naturally occurring speech, the use of a weak pronoun in such contexts is stilted but not impossible, especially when a reduced form is used. Where no *d*-pronoun is available, as with first person plural, personal pronouns are fully acceptable in German/Dutch CLD.

(ii) Du und ich, wir sollten uns mal unterhalten.
you and I we should us PRT *talk*
'You and I should have a chat at some point.' (German)

Alternatively, an epithet can be used to anchor the *d*XP.

(iii) a. Den Peter, den Idioten habe ich gestern noch gesehen.
the Peter that idiot have I yesterday still seen
'I saw that idiot Peter yesterday.' (German)
b. Maria, dat wijf vermoord ik nog eens.
Maria that bitch kill I one day
'I'm going to kill that bitch Mary some day.' (Dutch; van Riemsdijk and Zwarts 1997)
c. Ólaf, þetta fífl elskar hún ekki.
Olaf that idiot loves she not
'She doesn't love that idiot Olaf.' (Icelandic; Zaenen 1997)

I will only use examples with pronominal anchors in the remainder of this paper, since CLD with an epithetic anchor does not seem to behave differently in any relevant respect. Note, however, that epithetic anchors are lethal to Grohmann's (2003) 'copy spell-out' approach to CLD, since in this case the lexical content of the anchor is not a mere subset of the formal features of the *d*XP; hence, such cases could be handled only by assuming massive violations of Inclusiveness (Chomsky 1995).

(9) *Den Peter, den$_i$ kenne ich die Frau [die t_i zuletzt gesehen hat]
the Peter that know I the woman that last seen has
int.: 'I know the woman who was the last to Peter.' (German)

Customary claims to the contrary (e.g., in Altmann 1981 and Alexiadou 2006) notwithstanding, leftward movement of the anchor is in fact not obligatory, although typically the more natural option.[8] No decrease in acceptability can be detected particularly when some other operator (such as a *wh*-phrase or a null polar-interrogative operator) occupies the edge of the host clause, precluding fronting of the anchor.

(10) a. Seinem$_i$ Doktorvater, jeder Linguist$_i$ wird dem Geld ausleihen.
his advisor every linguist will him money lend
'Every linguist will lend money to his advisor.' (German; Frey 2004b)

b. Den Käse, (wann) hat die Maus den gegessen?
the cheese when has the mouse that eaten
'(When) Did the mouse eat the cheese?' (German; Haider 2010)

(11) a. Jan, waar heb je die gezien?
Jan where have you him seen
'Where did you see Jan?' (Dutch; Vat 1981)

b. Chomskys böcker, vem hatar dem?
Chomsky's books who hates them
'Who hates Chomsky's books?' (Swedish)

In situ occurrence of the anchor is at odds with analyses of CLD that crucially rely on this movement, such as those proposed in Wiltschko 1997 and Grohmann 2003 (which moreover suffer from most of the problems noted below).

The facts reviewed so far strongly suggest that the *d*XP is generated externally to the host clause: it precedes a syntactically complete (gapless) V2 clause, including its left periphery.

Independence of the *d*XP from the host clause is also brought out by *Infinitivus pro participio* (IPP) effects and the interpretation of modal verbs.[9] Consider the fact that the IPP is consistently judged to be more acceptable in (12a), a case of VP-fronting, than in (12b), a case of VP-dislocation.

(12) a. ?Griechisch lernen habe ich immer schon wollen.
*Greek learn have I always wanted.*INF

b. *Griechisch lernen, das habe ich immer schon wollen.
*Greek learn that have I always wanted.*INF
'I've always wanted to learn Greek.' (German)

[8]This is also noted (for German) by Eisenberg (2006: 398), Frey (2004b), and Grewendorf (2008). The last two authors demonstrate that the *d*XP exhibits connectivity of the kind discussed in section 4.4 below regardless of the position of the anchor.

[9]Thanks to Jason Merchant for drawing my attention to these empirical domains in the present context.

On the assumption that the dislocated VP originates in the host clause, (12b) ought to be as acceptable as (12a). By contrast, when it is syntactically external, the deviance of (12b) follows straightforwardly from the unacceptability of the host clause, owing to the fact that VP-proforms generally obviate the IPP (see, e.g., Lange 1981).

Similarly, it has been noted (e.g., in Drubig 2001) that VP-proforms block epistemic readings of modal verbs, as illustrated by the following examples:

(13) a. Maria muss die Aufgabe lösen können. [epistemic/deontic]
Maria must the task solve can
'Maria should/must be able to solve the task.'

b. Maria muss die Aufgabe lösen können, und Hans muss das auch. [deontic]
Maria must the task solve can and Hans must that too
'Maria must be able to solve the task, and Hans must be, too.' (German)

If host clause and *d*XP are independent of one another, we expect VP-dislocation to pattern with (13b) rather than with (13a). This prediction is borne out.

(14) a. Die Aufgabe lösen können muss auch Hans. [epistemic/deontic]
the task solve can must also Hans
'Hans should/must be able to solve the task, too.'

b. Die Aufgabe lösen können, das muss auch Hans. [deontic]
the task solve can that must also Hans
'Hans must be able to solve the task, too.' (German)

If (14b) were a direct transformational variant of (14a), as claimed by Grohmann's (2003) 'copy spell-out' approach as well as analyses seeking to equate CLD and topicalization (e.g. Zwart 1998), we would not expect the two cases to track the discrepancy witnessed in (13). As before, the facts are as expected once it is acknowledged that the *d*XP is not part of the host clause at any stage of the derivation.

The facts reviewed here thus strongly corroborate Zaenen's (1997) assumption that the *d*XP "is not in the same sentential domain as the rest of the sentence." However, despite these indications of the external, 'add-on' nature of the *d*XP, connectivity effects ostensibly betray a clause-*internal* base position.

(15) Seinen$_i$ besten Freund, den sollte jeder$_i$ gut behandeln.
*his.*ACC *best*ACC *friend him*ACC *should everyone well treat*
'Everyone should treat his best friend well.' (German; Grohmann 2003)

(15) illustrates two kinds of connectivity found in CLD (to be reviewed systematically in section 4 below): the *d*XP agrees in case with its anchor, and the pronoun it contains is bound by an element in the host clause (here, the quantified subject *jeder* 'everyone'). If,

as standardly assumed, such connectivity effects have a syntactic basis, then some sort of syntactic relation between *d*XP and host clause must obtain after all.

3 Movement and Ellipsis in CLD

The simultaneous occurrence of clause-external *and* clause-internal properties of the *d*XP has spawned a wealth of proposals variously locating CLD on either side of the *base-generation vs. movement* dichotomy (see van Riemsdijk 1997 and Alexiadou 2006 for overviews of the existing analyses).

Proponents of a base-generation approach to CLD, such as Frey (2004b), have argued that the *d*XP is base-generated as a left-peripheral adjunct to the host clause (see (16)). To account for connectivity, this analysis is then supplemented with a specially devised chain-formation mechanism, reproduced in (17).

(16) $[_{\text{CP}}\ d\text{XP}_i\ [_{\text{CP}}\ (\dots)\ \text{anchor}_i\ (\dots)\ ]]$

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

The effect of (17) is a movement-like dependency (a 'CHAIN') between *d*XP and anchor, crucially in the absence of actual movement; similar mechanisms have been proposed by Anagnostopoulou (1997), Zaenen (1997), and Wiltschko (1997), among others.[10]

It is evident that this kind of approach, whatever its descriptive merits, has little insight to offer: identity in θ-role between *d*XP and anchor and the resulting exceptional CHAIN formation is simply stipulated, in violation of the Theta Criterion (Chomsky 1981); and while (17) descriptively captures connectivity effects, it amounts to little more than a restatement of the facts. Even when these qualms are set aside, however, the problem of the exceptional V3 structure—which however must be blocked in other contexts to avoid a weakening of the V2 requirement—assigned to CLD by such an approach remains.

The V3 problem is inherited by monoclausal movement analyses of CLD, first proposed in Vat 1981.[11] In Grewendorf's (2008) updated implementation, *d*XP and anchor are originally composed in a 'big DP' (of which the *d*XP is the specifier and the anchor is the head), which is split up in the course of the derivation: the big DP raises to the left periphery, followed by subsequent very local $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement of the *d*XP to an even higher left-peripheral position. Grewendorf is thus forced to assume a movement-derived V3 structure, arising exclusively in

[10] Analyses of CLD in terms of (16) and (17) bear some resemblance to non-structural analyses of sluicing, such as that of Chung et al. (1995), which resort to similar stipulations to account for movement properties of the sluiced *wh*-phrase.

[11] For critical discussion of various versions of the movement approach to CLD, see Hoekstra 1999; Frey 2004b; Grewendorf 2008.

CLD. This is clearly an unwelcome consequence, and a chief advantage of the ellipsis approach will be its compliance with the strict V2 pattern of the relevant languages.[12]

Moreover, as pointed out by Frey (2004b), CLD of adjuncts is necessarily problematic for any analysis that derives CLD from a 'big XP.' Consider (8b), repeated below:

(18) Gisteren, toen heeft Jan dat boek snel terug gebracht.
yesterday then has John that book quickly back brought
'John quickly returned the book yesterday.' (Dutch; Zwart 1998)

In cases of this kind, extraction of the *d*XP from a phrase comprising it and the anchor in the base would invariably violate the Adjunct Condition.

The movement theory also runs into trouble in cases where there is a mismatch between the *d*XP and the clause-internal gap, as in the following example:[13]

(19) Naar zijn$_i$ promotie, daar$_k$ kijkt iedere taalkundige$_i$ naar t_k uit.
to his defense there looks every linguist to out
'Every linguist looks forward to his defense.' (Dutch; van Craenenbroeck 2004)

Here, the *d*XP is a PP, whereas the trace in the host clause is of category DP, the preposition having been stranded by movement of the R-pronoun *daar*. As van Craenenbroeck concludes, the *d*XP cannot originate in the gap position, leaving it mysterious how variable binding is computed in (19).

While space restrictions preclude a more comprehensive discussion of the literature on CLD, I think it is fair to say in light of the above observations that no hitherto proposed analysis manages to cut the Gordian Knot: both movement and base-generation approaches fail, as a matter of principle, to reconcile clause-internal and clause-external properties of the *d*XP. Worse yet, given the highly idiosyncratic mechanisms stipulated by these analyses, CLD squarely falls within the domain of *constructional residue*, the class of unexplained phenomena stipulated in UG, and as such remains as an obstacle on the route to an explanatorily adequate theory (Chomsky 1981, 1995).

Let us now turn to the ellipsis approach. Example (1) and its underlying structure is repeated in (20) below; (21) schematically represents the analysis of CLD proposed here.

[12] As far as I am aware, the only analysis of CLD that evades the V3 problem is that proposed in de Vries 2009, 2010. According to his analysis, the anchor is a parenthetical element whose structural relation to the *d*XP is mediated by a functional head; consequently, it does 'not count' for purposes of V2. This assumption is problematic in light of the fact that the anchor does not have the characteristic intonational properties of parenthetical material; it is also falsely predicted by this approach that the putative constituent composed of *d*XP and anchor can surface *in situ*. Furthermore, recall that *d*XP and anchor can be linearly separated (when the latter remains *in situ*); such syntactic separation of appositive DPs by leftward movement of either one is usually impossible, however.

[13] I thank Marika Lekakou for reminding me of these examples.

(20) a. Den Peter, den habe ich gestern gesehen.
the Peter him have I yesterday seen
'I saw Peter yesterday.' (German)

b. [$_{CP_1}$ den Peter$_i$ ~~habe ich gestern t_i gesehen~~] [$_{CP_2}$ den$_i$ habe ich gestern gesehen]

(21) [$_{CP_1}$ *d*XP$_i$ [~~$_{IP}$ … t_i … ~~]] [$_{CP_2}$ … anchor …]

As shown above, I analyze CLD as derived from a juxtaposition of two clauses, the linearly first of which is reduced by deletion of IP at PF, leaving only the fronted *d*XP.[14] Note that, as predicted by the analysis, non-elliptical counterparts of the reduced structure in (21) are generally acceptable, while expectedly exhibiting a high degree of redundancy.

(22) Den Peter habe ich gestern gesehen. Den habe ich gestern gesehen.
the Peter have I yesterday seen him have I yesterday seen
'I saw Peter yesterday. I saw him yesterday.' (German)

Ellipsis in CP_1 eliminates the perceived redundancy, cataphorically linking the clause to CP_2. Note that backward IP-ellipsis of this type is independently attested, e.g. in backward sluicing.[15]

(23) a. I don't know what, but John will have something. (Coppock 2001)

b. [$_{CP}$ what$_i$ [$_{IP}$ ~~John will have t_i~~]]

The most conspicuous advantage of the analysis is that it avoids the V3 problem: each of the two CPs is a standard V2 clause, and V3 order arises only superficially, as a result of PF-deletion in CP_1.[16] Therefore, the analysis does not imply any weakening of the structural V2 requirement.[17]

*d*XP and host clause being separate clausal domains, each subject to regular well-formedness

[14]The sole (remote) antecedent of this approach I have been able to track down in the literature is a passage in Flämig et al. 1981: chapter 4, section 4.2.6.1 (written by Brigitta Haftka), where it is suggested in passing that *d*XPs are equivalent to reduced clauses.

[15]Deletion analyses of Right-node Raising (e.g. Hartmann 2001) likewise rely on backward ellipsis.

[16]In fact, CLD can involve more than two clauses. Where multiple co-referent *d*XPs are resumed by an anchor, each *d*XP represents an elliptical clause, as shown below:

(i) a. Den Chef$_i$, den Peter$_i$, diesen Idioten$_i$, den habe ich gesehen.
the boss the Peter that idiot him have I seen
'I saw the boss, Peter, that idiot.' (German)

b. [$_{CP_1}$ den Chef ~~habe ich gesehen~~] [$_{CP_2}$ den Peter ~~habe ich gesehen~~] [$_{CP_3}$ diesen Idioten ~~habe ich gesehen~~] [$_{CP_4}$ den habe ich gesehen]

(Note that disjoint reference of the *d*XPs is excluded by (26).)

Frey (2004b) also deems cases of CLD acceptable in which different *d*XPs relate to different anchors in the host clause; however such cases are judged unacceptable by all speakers I consulted (myself included). I will set the issue aside here, pending further clarification of judgments.

[17]As Günther Grewendorf (pers. comm.) points out, verb-final subject clauses likewise permit dislocation, i.e. CP_2 need not be a V2 clause.

conditions, the analysis derives the facts noted in section 2 for IPP effects and modals. By the same token, it straightforwardly accomodates mismatches between *d*XP and the gap position in the host clause. The underlying structure of (19) is as follows:

(24) $[_{\mathrm{CP}_1}\ [_{\mathrm{PP}}$ naar zijn promotie$]_i$ ~~kijkt iedere taalkundige t_i uit~~$]$
$[_{\mathrm{CP}_2}$ daar$_k$ kijkt iedere taalkundige$_i$ naar t_k uit$]$ (= (19))

Thus, no real antecedent–trace mismatch arises, since the *d*XP antecedes its (PP-)trace in CP_1, whereas the R-pronoun has stranded its preposition in CP_2. We need not conclude—as van Craenenbroeck (2004) does—that the *d*XP is base-generated as an adjunct to the host clause; it has moved, but internally to the parallel elliptical clause.

I will here assume that backward IP-ellipsis is licensed in the same way as its forward counterpart. Specifically, I adopt Merchant's (2001) implementation of ellipsis licensing in terms of a Focus Condition (25), based on a notion of givenness as defined in (26).

(25) *Focus Condition on IP-ellipsis*
An IP α can be deleted only if α is e-GIVEN.

(26) *e*-GIVEN*ness* (Merchant to appear)
An expression X counts as e-GIVEN iff X has a salient antecedent A and, modulo $\exists$-type shifting,
a. A entails E-clo(X), and
b. X entails E-clo(A).

(27) The E-closure of α (E-clo(α)) is the result of replacing all E-marked subelements of α with variables of the appropriate type.

To adapt this approach to backward ellipsis it is necessary to construe the notion of 'antecedent' in (26) as including expressions that follow the ellipsis site in discourse. I take this move to be unproblematic, although space restrictions prevent a more detailed discussion of this matter here.[18]

In terms of the present analysis, and simplifying slightly, the Focus Condition requires

(i) Den Peter, dass sie den geheiratet hat verstehe ich nicht.
the Peter that she him married has understand I not
'I don't understand how she could marry Peter.' (German)

Given that embedded and matrix clauses are equivalent for purposes of ellipsis licensing (as evidenced by sluicing and fragment answers, see Merchant 2001, 2004a), this possibility is expected and unproblematic for the current analysis.

[18] Jason Merchant (pers. comm.) suggests that the notion of antecedent can be maintained on a quite literal interpretation when e-GIVENness is construed as a pragmatic (rather than narrowly semantic) notion, operating over discourse trees of the kind proposed in Büring 2003. I will leave an implementation of this idea to future work.

the elided IP in CP_1 and the overt IP in CP_2 to denote mutually entailing propositions. To illustrate, (29) cannot be the source of deletion in (28), as entailment from the elided IP to its antecedent fails; as a result, the deleted IP does not count as e-GIVEN according to the definition in (26), and ellipsis applies in violation of (25).

(28) Den Peter, $[_{CP_2}$ den $[_{IP_A}$ habe ich t einen Idioten genannt]]
the Peter him have I an idiot called
'I called Peter an idiot.' (German)

(29) $[_{CP_1}$ den Peter $[_{IP_E}$ habe ich t beleidigt]]
the Peter have I insulted
a. E-clo(IP_E): $\exists x$. I insulted x
b. E-clo(IP_A): $\exists x$. I called x an idiot
c. E-clo(IP_E) $\nrightarrow$ E-clo(IP_A)

The net effect of (25) is thus that CP_1 and CP_2 are always semantically—and hence, largely syntactically—parallel; otherwise, ellipsis could not apply felicitously. The reader is refered to Merchant 2001, to appear for further details of this conception of ellipsis parallelism.

What are the predictions of the ellipsis analysis concerning the interpretive relation between the *d*XP and its anchor? Since each is part of a separate clause,[19] the anaphoric link between the *d*XP and the anchor is equivalent to cross-sentential antecedent–pronoun dependencies (cf. Zaenen 1997). Thus, the *d*XP–anchor dependency in (20) is directly parallel to that in the non-elliptical (22).

Assuming this to be correct, we expect categories that fail to serve as antecedents for anchors to be excluded from CLD. Cases in point are QPs, nonspecific indefinites, and NPIs.

(30) a. *Ich habe [keinen Studenten]$_i$ gesehen. Den$_i$ habe ich gesehen.
I have no student seen him have I seen
'I saw no student. I saw him.'
b. *Ich habe [fast alle Studenten]$_i$ gesehen. Die$_i$ habe ich gesehen.
I have almost all students seen them have I seen
'I saw almost all students. I saw them.'
c. *Ich habe [irgendeinen Studenten]$_i$ gesehen. Den$_i$ habe ich gesehen.
I have some student seen him have I seen
'I saw some student. I saw him.'

[19] I will remain agnostic here about the option of a structural connection between the two clauses, for instance by means of adjunction of one to the other. CLD being a root phenomenon, there seems to be little evidence that *d*XP and host clause form a single-rooted syntactic object; compare Arregi's (2010) analysis of split questions in similar terms. Nothing substantial hinges on this detail, however. Note also that the anaphoric relation created by ellipsis in CP_1 renders the relation between the two clauses in CLD 'tighter' than that of two sequential non-elliptical clauses; this linkage by ellipsis explains why CLD, while underlyingly biclausal, is intuitively perceived by speakers as a 'single sentence.'

d. *Ich habe hier noch nie [auch nur irgendeinen Studenten]$_i$ gesehen. Den$_i$
I have here yet never any student seen him
habe ich hier noch nie gesehen.
have I here yet never seen
'I've never seen any student here. I've never seen him here.' (German)

As expected, the elliptical CLD variants of these examples are equally deviant.

(31) a. *Keinen Studenten, den habe ich gesehen.
no student him have I seen
intended: 'I saw no student.'

b. *Fast alle Studenten, die habe ich gesehen.
almost all students them have I seen
intended: 'I saw almost all students.'

c. *Irgendeinen Studenten, den habe ich gesehen.
some student him have I seen
intended: 'I saw some student.'

d. *Auch nur irgendeinen Studenten, den habe ich hier noch nie gesehen.
any student him have I here yet never seen
intended: 'I've never seen any student here.' (German)

Given this correspondence, we need not assume that CLD is inherently constrained to exclude these categories; CLD of QPs, nonspecific indefinites, and NPIs is deviant simply because no suitable antecedent is provided for the anchor. (In fact, we will see in section 5.3 below that such categories *can* appear as *d*XPs in CLD, just in case they are anaphorically related to the anchor.)

This logic carries over to *wh*-phrases, reflexives, and subparts of idioms, all of which are inherently unable to antecede pronouns[20] and consequently make bad *d*XPs.[21]

[20]Considerations of parallelism provide an additional reason for the unavailability of a idiomatic construal in CLD of idiom parts: since non-elliptical CP_2 permits only a compositional interpretation (it never contains the full idiom as a unit, the anchor taking the place of the *d*XP), semantic parallelism between CP_1 and CP_2 in effect dictates compositional interpretation of *both* CPs.

[21]Note that all of these categories can undergo $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement to the CP edge (*Vorfeld* movement) in monoclausal contexts. By contrast, NPIs generally resist such fronting (a fact which Merchant 2004a takes to explain their unacceptability as fragment answers; see den Dikken et al. 2000: 49f. on the generalization that NPIs must be licensed at S-structure). Witness:

(i) *Auch nur irgendeinen Studenten habe ich hier noch nie gesehen.
any student have I here yet never seen
intended: 'I've never seen any student here.' (German)

Recall from the schema in (21) that on the present analysis, the *d*XP is assumed to be topicalized, enabling constituent deletion of IP. CLD of NPIs, then, is thus doubly ruled out on this approach: NPIs cannot serve as antecedents (as shown in (30d)), and they resist topicalization movement.

Weak pronouns likewise resist topicalization and CLD:

(32) a. *Wen, den hat Peter gesehen?
who him has Peter seen
'Who did Peter see?' (German)

b. *Zichzelf, die heeft hij nog nooit overgeslagen.
himself him has he yet never passed over
'He hasn't ever passed himself over.' (Dutch; van Riemsdijk and Zwarts 1997)

c. *De spijker, die heeft Jan weer eens op de kop geslagen.
the nail that has Jan again once on the head hit
'Jan hit the nail on the head once again.' (Dutch; Zaenen 1997)

The present analysis thus has a number of non-trivial empirical and conceptual merits: it circumvents the V3 problem (detrimental to both base-generation and monoclausal movement appraoches); it solves the problem of apparent antecedent–trace mismatches in CLD; and it correctly accounts for the range of categories that can figure as *d*XPs.

4 Connectivity

As noted above, the main theoretical challenge posed by CLD is to reconcile the externality of the *d*XP relative to the host clause with concurrent indications that the *d*XP is actually an integral part of the host clause.[22] In this section, I will systematically discuss these indications and show how they are accounted for by the ellipsis approach.

(ii) *Ihn (den) habe ich gestern gesehen.
*him.*WEAK *him have I yesterday seen*
'I saw him yesterday.' (German)

Given their inability to undergo topicalization, then, the present approach correctly predicts that weak pronouns cannot figure as *d*XPs, just like they cannot occur as clausal fragments in general. Note, however, that in this case, too, there is a second reason for why weak pronouns are excluded from CLD: by definition, they are incompatible with the contrastive/focal import usually assigned to *d*XPs.

[22] As noted in footnote 5, connectivity differentiates CLD and HTLD, obtaining in the former but not in the latter (as amply documented by Grohmann 2003; Frey 2004b; Grewendorf 2008, a.o.).

(i) *Sein$_i$ Vorgarten, jeder$_i$ will ihn schönhalten.
*his.*NOM *front lawn everyone wants him.*ACC *pretty.keep*
*'As for his frontlawn, everyone wants to keep it pretty.' (German; Grohmann 2003)

The question of how to analyze HTLD hinges to a large extent on the question of whether nominative case is a true *nominativus pendens* (see Merchant 2004b for some discussion of 'default case') or must be assigned in some more or less standard way. If the latter, one might pursue an approach not unlike that adopted in this paper for CLD, but with a different underlying structure of the *d*XP. For instance, the hanging topic in (iia) could be the (nominative) subject of a reduced copular clause, as shown in (iib).

(ii) a. Der Peter, ich kenne ihn nicht.
*the.*NOM *Peter I know him.*ACC *not*
'As for Peter, I don't know him.' (German)

b. [$_{CP_1}$ der Peter$_i$ [~~ist es t_i~~]] [$_{CP_2}$ ich kenne ihn nicht]
the Peter is it I know him not

4.1 Case Agreement and θ-marking

Obligatory case agreement between *d*XP and anchor in CLD was first noted by Ross (1973); the following examples from German and Icelandic illustrate:

(33) a. Den Peter, den habe ich gesehen.
*the Peter.*ACC *him.*ACC *have I seen*
'I saw Peter yesterday.'

b. Dem Peter, dem habe ich gestern geholfen.
*the.*DAT *Peter him.*DAT *have I yesterday helped*
'I helped Peter yesterday.' (German)

(34) a. Peysuna sína, hana finnur Ólafur hvergi.
*sweater.*ACC REFL *it.*ACC *finds Olaf nowhere*
'Olaf can't find his sweater anywhere.'

b. Þessum hring, honum hefur Ólafur lofað Maríu.
*this.*DAT *ring it.*DAT *has Olaf promised Marí*
'Olaf promised this ring to Mari.' (Icelandic; Zaenen 1997)

Thus, despite the fact that the *d*XP does not seem to have moved from the interior of the host clause (for the reasons given above), its systematic covariance in case suggests that it is case-marked in some way by the host-clause predicate (Merchant 2001 refers to such correlations as *form-identity effects*).

Form identity in case is a straightforward consequence of the parallel structure of CP_1 and CP_2, enforced by the Focus Condition (25): the *d*XP and the anchor are case-marked by the same predicate. To illustrate, in (33b) *helfen* 'to help' assigns dative case to both *d*XP and anchor.

(35) $[_{CP_1}$ dem Peter$_i$ $[_{IP}$ ~~habe ich t_i geholfen~~$]]$
$[_{CP_2}$ dem$_k$ $[_{IP}$ habe ich t_k geholfen$]]$ (= (33b))

This explanation for case agreement is directly analogous to that proposed in Merchant 2001 for in sluicing, where the sluiced *wh*-phrase is case-marked in the parallel reduced clause (compare his *form-identity generalization I*).

(36) a. Peter hat jemandem geholfen, aber ich weiß nicht wem.
*Peter has someone.*DAT *helped but I know not who.*DAT
'Peter helped someone, but I don't know who.' (German)

b. $[_{CP}$ wem$_i$ ~~Peter t_i geholfen hat~~$]$

This analysis of hanging topics is akin to that proposed for discourse-initial fragments in Merchant 2004a. For purposes of the present article, I will leave it at this highly tentative suggestion.

By the same token, it follows that *d*XP and anchor bear the same θ-role. Recall that identity in θ-role was simply presupposed in (17), in violation of the θ-Criterion and as a prerequisite for exceptional CHAIN formation. No such θ-theoretic problem arises on the present approach, where *d*XP and anchor are in separate, but parallel clauses.

4.2 P-stranding

In his discussion of sluicing, Merchant (2001) establishes the following crosslinguistic generalization (his *form-identity generalization II*):

(37) A language L will allow preposition stranding under sluicing iff L allows preposition stranding under regular *wh*-movement.

This correlation is expected on an analysis of sluicing (like Merchant's) according to which the sluiced XP undergoes $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement prior to deletion of IP.[23] The following facts illustrate the difference between a non-P-stranding language like German and a P-stranding language like Norwegian described by (37):

(38) a. Sie hat mit jemandem gesprochen, aber ich weiß nicht *(mit) wem.
she has with someone spoken but I know not with who
'She talked to somebody, but I don't know who.' (German)

b. Per har snakket med noen, men jeg vet ikke (??med) hvem.
Per has talked with someone but I know not with who
'She talked to somebody, but I don't know who.' (Norwegian)

On a movement-*cum*-deletion analysis of sluicing, the difference follows from the (non-) availability of P-stranding: Norwegian, but not German, allows for the preposition to be stranded in the ellipsis site.

(39) a. aber ich weiss nicht [$_{\text{CP}}$ [mit wem]$_i$ ~~sie t_i gesprochen hat~~] (= (38a))

b. man jeg vet ikke [$_{\text{CP}}$ hvem$_i$ ~~Per hat snakked med t_i~~] (= (38b))

Mutatis mutandis, the analysis of CLD advanced here predicts the (im-)possibility of P-stranding in a given language to be reflected in these constructions as well, since the *d*XP is $\overline{\text{A}}$-moved prior to deletion. This prediction is borne out: pied-piping of P by the *d*XP is obligatory in German but degraded in Norwegian, Swedish, and Icelandic.[24]

[23] Several apparent counterexamples to (37) have been noted in the literature, but they do not seem to pose a credible threat to the validity of the generalization (see Rodrigues et al. 2009; van Craenenbroeck 2010a and references cited there).

[24] The facts in Dutch are somewhat less clear-cut than they are in German, not surprisingly given the variability in judgments reported in Merchant 2001: 95 for P-stranding under sluicing in this language. I attribute this fact to interference from HTLD (see footnote 5): Dutch not providing any overt indications of case-marking on the *d*XP, surface strings are potentially ambiguous between CLD and HTLD. In the German

(40) a. {*(Auf)} den Peter, auf den habe ich lange warten müssen.
for the Peter for him have I long wait must
'I had to wait for Peter for a long time.'

b. {*(Mit)} meiner Schwester, mit der habe ich mich oft gestritten.
with my sister with her have I REFL *often quarreled*
'I often quarreled with my sister.' (German)

(41) a. ([??]Med) søstera mi, ho krangla jeg ofte med.
with sister my her quarreled I often with
'I often quarreled with my sister.' (Norwegian)

b. ([??]Med) min syster, henne blev jag ofta osams med.
with my sister her became I often upset with
'I often got upset with my sister.' (Swedish)

c. ([??]Um) mömmu sína$_i$, hana talar hver einasti unglingur$_i$ illa um.
*about mother his.*ACC *her.*ACC *talks each single youngster badly about*
'Every youngster talks badly about his mother.' (Icelandic)

Exactly as in the sluicing cases, the observed differences follow from the different stranding respective options in the languages.

(42) a. [$_{\text{CP}_1}$ [mömmu sína]$_i$ ~~talar hver einasti unglingur illa um t_i~~]
[$_{\text{CP}_2}$ hana talar hver einasti unglingur illa um] (= (40b))

b. [$_{\text{CP}_1}$ [mit meiner Schwester]$_i$ ~~habe ich mich oft t_i gestritten~~]
[$_{\text{CP}_2}$ [$_{\text{PP}}$ mit der]$_k$ habe ich mich oft t_k gestritten] (= (41c))

4.3 Aux–V Relations

Mikkelsen (2011) observes that verbal morphology provides a further indication of connectivity in dislocation. Quite generally, auxiliaries control the form of the main verb they occur with; to illustrate, consider Danish *have*, which requires a participial main verb.

(43) Jeg tror nu ikke de **har** {**gem-t** / *gemm-e / *gemm-er /
*I think now not they have.*PRES *hide-*PPC *hide-*INF *hide-*PRES
*gem-te} den særligt godt.
*hide-*PAST *it very well*
'I don't think they have hidden it very well.' (Danish)

Mikkelsen observes that this Aux–V relation is preserved under both topicalization (44a) and CLD (44b) of VP.

examples used in the text, I include elements (specifically, determiners) that morphologically express case in the *d*XP to control for this factor.

(44) a. [$_{VP}$ {**Gem-t** / *Gemm-e / *Gemm-er / *Gem-te} den særligt godt]$_i$ tror
hide-PPC *hide*-INF *hide*-PRES *hide*-PAST *it very well think*
jeg nu ikke de **har** t_i
I now not they have.PRES

b. [$_{VP}$ {**Gem-t** / *Gemm-e / *Gemm-er / *Gem-te} den særligt godt] det$_i$
hide-PPC *hide*-INF *hide*-PRES *hide*-PAST *it very well that*
tror jeg nu ikke de **har** t_i
think I now not they have.PRES
'I don't think they have hidden it very well.' (Danish)

As indicated in the above representations, Mikkelsen assumes (in line with the base-generation approach to CLD) that VP itself has moved from its base position in the topicalization case, whereas this direct-movement option is not available in the CLD case (due to presence of the anchor). The conclusion she draws from (44b) is that verbal morphology is not computed in a strictly local fashion (as standardly assumed[25]), but can be determined at a distance—a conclusion would require a wholesale re-evaluation of Aux–V relations. Luckily, however, the traditional picture can be maintained on the ellipsis analysis of CLD proposed here, according to which the dislocated VP undergoes simple topicalization in CP_1; as a result, verbal morphology can be computed equally locally in (44a) and (44b).

(45) [$_{CP_1}$ [$_{VP}$ gem-t den særligt godt]$_i$ ~~tror jeg nu ikke de har t_i~~]
[$_{CP_2}$ det$_k$ tror jeg nu ikke de har t_k] (= (44b))

4.4 Reconstruction

Reconstruction of the *d*XP into the host clause for purposes of binding has been amply documented in the literature on CLD (van Riemsdijk and Zwarts 1997; Vat 1981; Zaenen 1997; Grohmann 2003; Frey 2004b; Alexiadou 2006; Grewendorf 2008), so I will confine myself to providing a concise summary of the core facts.

The following examples show binding of a pronominal variable under reconstruction; in addition, a control relation is reconstructed in (47):

(46) a. Seinen$_i$ besten Freund, den sollte jeder$_i$ gut behandeln.
his best friend him should everyone well treat
'Everyone should treat his best friend well.' (German; Grohmann 2003)

b. Zijn$_i$ eerste artikel, dat berokkent een linguïst$_i$ vaak schade.
his first paper that causes a linguist often harm
'A linguist's first article often harms him.' (Dutch; Vat 1981)

[25] See Chomsky 1957 for an early implementation, and Adger 2003 for an updated approach.

c. Sina$_i$ böcker, dem hatar varje student$_i$.
his books them hates every student
'Every student hates his books.' (Swedish)

(47) (PRO$_i$) sie$_k$ nicht zu vergessen, das hat Peter$_i$ jeder Frau$_k$ versprochen.
her not to forget that has Peter every woman promised
'Peter promised every woman not to forget her.' (German; Grewendorf 2008)

The following examples illustrate reconstruction for Conditions A and C:

(48) a. Mit sich$_i$ im Reinen, das war Peter$_i$ schon lange nicht mehr.
with himself in the pure that was Peter already long no more
'Peter hadn't been at peace with himself for a long time.' (German)

b. Stoltan afhor öðrum$_i$, það tel ég þa$_i$ ekki vera.
proud of each other that believe I them not to be
'I don't think they're proud of each other.' (Icelandic; Zaenen 1997)

(49) a. *Der Tatsache dass Alex$_i$ arm ist, der misst er$_i$ keine Bedeutung bei.
the fact that Alex poor is that attaches he no importance to
*'He$_i$ doesn't attach any importance to the fact that Alex$_i$ is poor.' (German)

b. *Anneke$_i$ d'r broer, die geloof ik dat ze$_i$ wel aardig vindt.
Anneke's brother him believe I that she sort of nice finds
*'I doubt that she$_i$'s fond of Anneke$_i$'s brother.' (Dutch; Vat 1981)

The following example illustrates optional scope reconstruction in CLD:

(50) Von drei Linguistikartikeln, da kriegt jeder Kopfschmerzen von. [$^{\checkmark}\forall > 3$]
of three linguistics articles there gets everyone headache of
'Reading three linguistics articles gives anyone a headache.' (German)

Note that material intervening between *d*XP and host clause does not block connectivity.

(51) a. Seine$_i$ Eltern, tja, die mag wohl kein Teenager$_i$.
his parents well them likes PRT *no teenager*
'I guess no teenager likes his/her parents.' (German)

b. Zijn$_i$ moeder, goh, die haat iedere puber$_i$.
his mother God her hates every teenager
'God, every teenager hates his mother.' (Dutch)

What we find, then, is that the *d*XP (seemingly) reconstructs into the host clause, despite the fact that the structural relation between *d*XP and host clause appears to be very indirect at most (as concluded in section 2). On the present approach, the paradox does not arise: reconstruction, just like form identity, is a direct consequence parallelism of the two clauses involved, as required by the Focus Condition (25). Hence, connectivity for binding arises as a result of ordinary reconstruction of the topicalized *d*XP internally to the elliptical CP_1.

(52) a. $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ [seinen$_i$ besten Freund]$_k$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ ~~sollte jeder$_i$ t_k gut behandeln~~]] (= (46a))
b. *$[_{\text{CP}_1}$ [Anneke$_i$ d'r broer]$_k$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ ~~beloof ik dat ze$_i$ t_k wel aardig vindt~~]] (= (49b))

This approach to connectivity in CLD is directly parallel to Merchant's (2004a) account of connectivity in fragment answers;[26] on his analysis, the fragment answer in (53) is derived in the exact same way as the *d*XP in (46a) (*viz.*, as shown in (52a)).

(53) A: Wen sollte jeder$_i$ gut behandeln? – B: Seinen$_i$ besten Freund.
who should everyone well treat his best friend
A: 'Who should everyone treat well?' – B: 'Their best friend.' (German)

4.5 Interim Summary: *d*XPs as Clausal Fragments

I have argued that a *d*XP in CLD is derived in the same way as a fragment answer (Merchant 2004a; Temmerman 2011),[27] the question tag in a split question (Arregi 2010), and the *wh*-remnant of sluicing (Ross 1969; Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001)—*viz.*, by movement to the clausal edge and subsequent ellipsis of the remainder of the clause. In all of these constructions, semantic parallelism of the underlying clauses enables ellipsis, as demanded by the Focus Condition (25). The interpretive link between *d*XP and anchor is established pragmatically, exactly like a corresponding intersentential antecedent–pronoun dependency.[28]

The analysis obviates the postulation of V3 structures in CLD, deriving the surface form from an underlying juxtaposition of V2 clauses. The paradox noted at the outset of this

[26] The same reasoning based on 'covert reconstruction' into ellipsis sites is used by den Dikken et al. (2000) and Kluck (2011) to account for connectivity effects in (certain types of) pseudoclefts and sentence amalgams, respectively.

[27] Merchant in fact assumes that fragment XPs move to the specifier of F(ocus)P, a minor detail I set aside here. Merchant's particular implementation is mainly based on certain assumptions about island sensitivity of fragment answers in English, an issue recently taken up—and shown to be more complicated than assumed by Merchant—by Griffiths and Lipták (2011).

[28] According to Koster's (1978) *satellite hypothesis*, sentential subjects invariably occur clause-externally.

(i) a. Dat hij komt is duidelijk.
the he comes is clear
'That he will come is clear.' (Dutch)
b. $[_{\text{CP}}$ dat hij komt$]_i$ $[_{\text{CP}}$ (dat$_i$/e_i) is duidelijk]

Assuming that Koster is right (see also Alrenga 2005 for recent arguments), what this means in terms of the present analysis is that sentential subjects are always clausal fragments; in the host clause, the anchor undergoes optional topic drop.

(ii) $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ $[_{\text{CP}}$ dat hij komt$]_i$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ ~~t_i is duidelijk~~]] $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ (dat) is duideljk]

Note, though, that the result is somewhat paradoxical: CP_1 in (ii) has exactly the structure that Koster argues does not exist, with a firmly clause-internal sentential subject. This suggests either that whatever grammatical constraint bans sentential subjects from occurring clause-internally is suspended under ellipsis, or that there is no such grammatical constraint at all, and sentential subjects are instead standardly 'expelled' to a peripheral position for performative reasons. I will leave a clarification of the issue to future work.

paper disappears: the *d*XP is external to the host clause because it is the surface remnant of a separate clause; since this separate clause and the host clause are underlyingly parallel, however, the fronted *d*XP behaves 'as if' it was an integral part of the latter.[29]

5 Predictions and Extensions

In this section, I will investigate further predictions of the ellipsis analysis of CLD and adduce substantial additional evidence supporting the approach.

5.1 Islandhood of the *d*XP

The ellipsis analysis of CLD predicts that the *d*XP cannot contain a trace related to an element in the host clause. This is so because the *d*XP is the remnant of a separate clause; thus any movement into the host clause would imply interclausal rightward movement.[30]

The relevant test cases involve CLD of VPs. First, however, consider the fact that VP-topicalization in German can strand arguments (Müller 1998).

(54) Zugegeben hat er nicht dass er falsch lag.
admitted has he not that he false laid
'He didn't admit that he had been mistaken.' (German)

[29] Although space restrictions preclude a thorough discussion of the matter here, it seems likely that the approach can be successfully extended to Clitic Left-dislocation (CLLD) of the Romance/Semitic variety, where the anchor is a clitic pronoun. As is well known, CLD and CLLD have many core properties in common (see Alexiadou 2006; Demirdache 1991; Anagnostopoulou 1997; for a comparison of Germanic CLD and Lebanese Arabic CLLD, see Boeckx and Grohmann 2004). *d*XPs in CLLD, just like their counterparts in CLD, show obligatory case agreement with the anchor and reconstruct (seemingly) into the host clause:

(i) a. Ton Jani den ton ksero.
*the.*ACC *John.*ACC NEG CL.ACC *know.1*SG
'I don't know John.' (Greek; Alexiadou 2006)
b. A {*?lei$_i$ / se stessa$_i$}, Maria$_i$ non ci pensa.
of her herself Mary not there thinks
'Mary doesn't think of herself.' (Italian; Cinque 1990)

As surveyed in Alexiadou 2006, there are serious problems for an assimilation of CLD to clitic-doubling constructions, such as the non-isomorphic typological distribution of clitic doubling and CLLD as well as specific constraints on doubling that do not hold for CLLD. Therefore, a unified ellipsis analysis of CLD and CLLD appears to be the more principled option. The *d*XP in CLLD is then taken to be the surface remnant of a separate, parallel clause.

(ii) [$_{CP_1}$ [a se stessa]$_i$ ~~Maria non t_i pensa~~] [$_{CP_2}$ Maria non ci pensa] (= (ib))

As shown in detail for CLD above, this analysis directly predicts the observed facts concerning case agreement and reconstruction. At the same time, by locating the *d*XP and its anchor in separate clauses, it avoids the problems arising for a clitic-doubling analysis. Therefore, an extension of the ellipsis approach to CLLD seems quite promising, although a fuller treatment of this issue must be left to another occasion.

[30] Note that the same conclusion follows if the two CPs are syntactically composed by adjunction of CP_1 to CP_2, in which case the former would likewise be opaque for extraction.

The CLD counterparts of these topicalizations are unacceptable; by contrast, no problem arises when the argument is pied-piped instead.

(55) a. *Zugegeben, das hat er nicht dass er falsch lag.
admitted that has he not that he wrong laid

b. Zugegeben dass er falsch lag, das hat er nicht.
admitted that he wrong laid that has he not
'He didn't admit that he had been mistaken.' (German)

There is no straightforward explanation for the deviance of (55a) on the assumption that CLD constructions are monoclausal structures, derived by movement of the *d*XP. If this were the correct analysis, stranding of the complement clause would be expected to as acceptable in (55a) as in (54).

By contrast, the observed discrepancy is directly predicted by the ellipsis approach: to derive (55a), the stranded argument would have to be extracted from the *d*XP; but such cross-clausal movement dependencies are generally impossible.

(56) $[_{\mathrm{CP}_1}\ [_{\mathrm{VP}}\ t_i$ zugegeben] ~~hat er nicht ...~~] $[_{\mathrm{CP}_2}\ \ldots\ [_{\mathrm{CP}}$ dass er falsch lag$]_i]$

Note that the host clause of (55a) by itself is unacceptable (**Das hat er nicht dass er falsch lag*) irrespective of context, the stranded complement clause being 'host-less.' Therefore, an alternative parse without movement from CP_1 into CP_2 is equally deviant.

5.2 Parallelism and Control Infinitivals

Infinitival control clauses provide additional evidence against a base-generation analysis of CLD, and for the ellipsis analysis; the argument is based on observations due to Truckenbrodt (forthcoming).[31] The relevant fact is that controlled *PRO*, unlike overt proforms, cannot serve as an anchor for a *d*XP.

(57) a. Peter hat angeordnet [*PRO* die Straße zu fegen]
Peter has ordered the street to sweep

[31] Truckenbrodt argues that right-dislocated XPs are remnants of ellipsis; in a very similar vein, I argue in Ott 2012 that the movement-*cum*-deletion approach derives right-dislocation as in (ia) in the same way as argued here for CLD, except that ellipsis occurs in CP_2 (ib).

(i) a. Ich habe ihn gestern noch gesehen, den Peter.
I have him yesterday still seen the Peter
'I saw Peter just yesterday.' (German)

b. $[_{\mathrm{CP}_1}$ ich habe ihn gestern noch gesehen$]$ $[_{\mathrm{CP}_2}$ [den Peter]$_i$ ~~habe ich gestern noch t_i gesehen~~]

The reader is referred to Ott 2012 for details of this approach.

b. *Die Arbeiter$_i$, Peter hat angeordnet [PRO_i die Straße zu fegen]
the workers Peter has ordered the street to sweep
'Peter ordered the street to be swept.' (German)

The deviance of (57b) contrasts with (58), where the embedded clause is finite.

(58) Die Arbeiter, Peter hat angeordnet dass die die Straße fegen sollen.
the workers Peter has ordered that they the street sweep should
'Peter ordered the workers to sweep the street.' (German)

Explaining the deviance of (57b) is no trivial task for proponents of a base-generation (adjunction) analysis relying on a CHAIN-formation mechanism like (17). By contrast, the present approach provides a principled explanation. For parallelism of CP_1 and CP_2 to be satisfied (and hence, for ellipsis in CP_1 to be licensed), *die Arbeiter* in (57b) would be required to have the following underlying pre-deletion structure:

(59) *[$_{CP_1}$ die Arbeiter$_i$ [$_{IP}$ hat Peter angeordnet [$_{CP}$ t_i die Straße zu fegen]]]

Such a structure is necessarily deviant, the fronted subject DP not having received case in the infinitival clause. Thus, subject *d*XPs anchored by *PRO* as in (57b) are impossible because infinitival clauses fail to license an overt subject; consequently, parallelism cannot be satisfied in these cases.[32] By contrast, no conflict between parallelism and subject licensing arises in finite (58).[33] Note that parallel facts obtain in sluicing, (60a) corresponding to (57b):

[32]Note that this conclusion presupposes a slightly stricter notion of parallelism than what is assumed in section 3 (Merchant's Focus Condition, based on e-GIVENness); that this is needed is shown independently by the sluice in (60a). Descriptively speaking, what appears to be needed is a condition requiring identical case assigners in antecedent and ellipsis site, as proposed in Chung 2006; see also Tanaka 2011 and sources cited there for arguments that ellipsis requires at least some morphosyntactic identity.

[33]It could be objected that the overt version of the *d*XP in (58) contains an illicit extraction inducing a *that*–trace effect, as shown below:

(i) *[$_{CP_1}$ die Arbeiter$_i$ hat Peter angeordnet [$_{CP}$ dass t_i die Straße fegen sollen]]
the workers has Peter ordered that the street sweep should

This objection can be countered in at least two ways. First, there is abundant evidence suggesting that *that*–trace violations are surface (PF) effects (see Kandybowicz 2006 and references therein), and Merchant (2001) shows that they are alleviated in sluicing (see also Bošković 2011).

(ii) It's probable that a certain senator will resign, but which$_i$ [$_{IP}$ ~~it's probable that t_i will resign~~] is still a secret

Repair by ellipsis is thus expected for (i) as well. A second possibility is to assume that the elliptical clause is in fact 'smaller' than (i); on this approach, only the embedded clause would antecede the elliptical CP_1, obviating long-distance movement:

(iii) [$_{CP_1}$ die Arbeiter$_i$ [$_{IP}$ sollen t_i die Straße fegen]]
the workers should the street sweep

(60) a. *Peter hat angeordnet die Straße zu fegen, aber ich weiß nicht wer.
Peter has ordered the street to sweep but I know not who
'Peter ordered someone to sweep the street, but I don't know who.' (German)

b. *[$_{CP_2}$ wer$_i$ [$_{IP}$ ~~Peter angeordnet hat [$_{CP}$ t_i die Straße zu fegen]~~]]

5.3 Forward Ellipsis in CLD

Thus far, the discussion focused on cases of CLD in which the directionality of ellipsis is *backward*: the antecedent (IP of CP_2) linearly follows the ellipsis site (IP of CP_1). The analysis leads us to expect that a reversal of ellipsis directionality ought to be possible, i.e. that similar constructions can be derived by means of *forward* ellipsis (as in regular sluicing and fragment answers).

This prediction is borne out. To see how, consider the following examples:

(61) a. Maria fragte sich, welche seiner Freunde Hans heute getroffen hatte. **Den Peter, das wusste sie ganz sicher.** Aber auch den Otto? (German)
Maria wondered which of his friends Hans today met had the Peter that knew she certainly but also the Otto
'Maria wondered which of his friends Hans had met today. Peter, that was clear. But Otto as well?'

b. Maria vroeg zich af wie Hans allemaal had ontmoet. **Peter, dat was duidelijk.** Maar ook Otto? (Dutch)
Maria asked herself PRT *who Hans all had met Peter that was clear but also Otto*
'Maria wondered who (all) Hans had met today. Peter, that was clear. But Otto as well?'

Let us focus on the German example in (61a) (the Dutch case is equivalent). Here, the IP of the embedded interrogative clause (*Hans heute (t) getroffen hatte*) acts as the antecedent for ellipsis in the following clause: *den Peter* is the surface remnant of the clause *den Peter hatte Hans heute getroffen* 'Hans had met Peter today;' it is this proposition that is subsequently resumed by the propositional proform *das*. Thus, the underlying structure of the boldface part of (61a) is as follows:

(62) a. [$_{CP_1}$ den Peter$_k$ hatte Hans t_k getroffen]$_i$ [$_{CP_2}$ das$_i$ wusste sie ganz sicher] →
b. [$_{CP_1}$ den Peter$_k$ ~~hatte Hans t_k getroffen~~]$_i$ [$_{CP_2}$ das$_i$ wusste sie ganz sicher]

This analysis accurately captures the meaning of the relevant part of (61a), satisfying the Focus Condition. The only difference to the cases previously discussed is that the elided IP's antecedent is located in *preceding* discourse, and that the anchor resumes (not the *d*XP

I will not attempt to decide between these two alternatives here, as either option appears to be unproblematic.

itself but) the entire proposition of which the *d*XP is the surface remnant. As expected, a non-elliptical counterpart to (62a) is acceptable (redundancy aside) and identical in meaning.

Within the present framework, cases like (61a) fall within the general purview of ellipsis-derived dislocation. Note that 'forward CLD' shows apparent 'backward reconstruction' into the antecedent clause, as in the following:[34]

(63) Wen mag jeder Mann$_i$? **Seine$_i$ Mutter, das ist klar.** Aber wen noch?
who likes every man his mother that is clear but who else
'Who does every man like? His mother, that's clear. But who else?' (German)

Binding of the pronoun inside the *d*XP is a standard reconstruction effect on the assumption that the underlying structure of the *d*XP in (63) is as shown in (64), corresponding directly to B's fragment response in (65).

(64) $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ [seine Mutter]$_i$ ~~mag jeder Mann t_i~~$]$

(65) A: Wen liebt jeder Mann$_i$? – B: Seine$_i$ Mutter.
who loves every man his mother
'Who does every man love?' – 'His mother.' (German)

Notice that in cases of 'forward CLD' the anchor resumes the entire CP_1 (more precisely, the proposition it denotes), rather than just the ellipsis remnant that is the *d*XP.[35] Recall now from section 3 that dislocated QPs, *wh*-phrases and anaphors are unacceptable. Consider again the case of illicit anaphor dislocation:

(66) *Zichzelf, die heeft hij nog nooit overgeslagen.
himself him has he yet never passed over
'He hasn't ever passed himself over.' (Dutch)

As expected, anaphors can figure as *d*XPs in cases of CLD in which the directionality of

[34]The same is true for the English translation, suggesting that the analysis applies here as well despite the fact that English lacks regular 'backward CLD.'

[35]If Holmberg's (2011) analysis of yes/no replies is on the right track, cases like B's response in (i) involve the same kind of forward ellipsis.

(i) A: Hat Peter die Maria geküsst? – B: Ja, (das) hat er.
has Peter the Maria kissed yes that has he
'Did Peter kiss Mary?' – 'Yes, he did.' (German)

Holmberg argues that yes/no replies are elliptical clauses, in which the affirmative/negative particle precedes an IP containing a polarity variable that is elided under parallelism. B's response in (i) would then have roughly the following, dislocation-like structure:

(ii) a. $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ ja$_i$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ t_i Peter hat die Maria geküsst$]]_k$ $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ das$_k$ hat er$]$ →
b. $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ ja$_i$ $[_{\text{IP}}$ ~~t_i Peter hat die Maria geküsst~~$]]_k$ $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ das$_k$ hat er$]$

Exploring these connections in more detail is evidently beyond the scope of the present paper.

ellipsis is forward (the same is true for QPs and *wh*-phrases; see below on the latter case):

(67) Van wie hield Peter eigenlijk? **Van zichzelf, dat hebben we gemerkt.** Maar
of who loved Peter actually of himself that have we noticed but
van wie nog meer?
of who else
'Who did Peter love, actually? Himself, that was clear enough. But who else?'
(Dutch)

The source of the discrepancy between (66) and (67) is evident: since the anchor's antecedent in (67) is the entire CP_1 rather than the *d*XP itself, the fact that anaphors cannot antecede pronouns is irrelevant in such cases.

'Forward CLD' of *wh-d*XPs brings out deeper parallels between dislocation constructions and sluicing. Consider the fact that Bavarian complementizer agreement is bled by sluicing (as first discussed in Lobeck 1995; data from Günther Grewendorf, pers. comm.):

(68) a. I woass net wo-ts ihr a Madl gseng hoabts.
*I know not where-2*PL *you.2*PL *a girl seen have*
'I don't know where you saw a girl.'

b. I woass dass-ts ihr a Madl gseng hoabts, owa I woass net wo(*-ts).
*I know that-2*PL *you.2*PL *a girl seen have but I know not where*
'I know that you saw a girl, but I don't know where.' (Bavarian)

Whatever the reason for this bleeding effect of ellipsis, its application in both (68b) and (69) suggests that the *wh*-fragment is derived by deletion in both cases.

(69) Irgandwann werd-ts (es) des vasteh. **Aber wann(*-ts), des wiss-ma net.**
*sometime will-2*PL *2*PL *that understand but when that know-we not*
'At some point you will understand this. But when, that we don't know.' (Bavarian)

Two further correlations point to the same conclusion. Dialectal Norwegian, like English, allows for inversion of the *wh*-remnant and a stranded preposition in sluicing, a phenomenon dubbed 'swiping' in Merchant 2002.

(70) Per gikk på kino men jeg veit ikke hvem med.
Per went to cinema but I know not who with
'Per went to the cinema, but I don't know who with.' (dial. Norwegian)

Dialects of Dutch allow for demonstrative pronouns to be stranded next to sluiced *wh*-phrases in certain contexts, a construction termed 'spading' in van Craenenbroeck 2010b.

(71) A: Jef ei gisteren iemand gezien. – B: Wou da?
Jef has yesterday someone seen who that
A: 'Jef saw someone yesterday. – B: 'Who?' (Wambeek Dutch)

I will not attempt to analyze swiping or spading; see the above references for discussion. What matters here is that both swiping and spading are strictly specific to sluicing/ellipsis environments. The fact that both phenomena can be found with dislocated *wh*-phrases in 'forward CLD' therefore supports the claim that these constructions have a similar derivational source (*viz.*, deletion).

(72) Marit visste at Per var gått på kino. **Men hvem med, det visste hun ikke.**
Marit knew that Per was gone on theater but who with that knew she not

'Marit knew Per had been to the theater. But who with, that she didn't know.'
(dial. Norwegian)

(73) Jef ei me Marie geklapt. **Mo wuiroem da, da weet ik nie.**
Jef has with Marie spoken but why that that know I not.
'Jef talked to Marie. But why, that I don't know.'
(Wambeek Dutch)

The syntactic unification of sluiced *wh*-phrases, *wh*-fragments and *wh-d*XPs entailed by the ellipsis approach to CLD thus receives substantial support.

5.4 Locality in CLD

As noted in section 2, CLD does not strictly require fronting of the anchor; the *d*XP shows connectivity regardless of this movement (recall (10a) above). Frey (2004b) observes that a *d*XP can be related to an *in situ* anchor inside an embedded V2 clause with a 'filled edge,' as in the following (note the reconstructed binding dependency):

(74) Seinem$_i$ Vater, Maria glaubt [$_{CP}$ jeder$_i$ wird dem Geld leihen]
*his.*ACC *father Maria thinks everyone will him.*ACC *money lend*
'Maria thinks that everyone will lend money to his father.' (German; Frey 2004b)

Such cases pose a serious problem for monoclausal movement analyses of CLD. If the *d*XP had moved from a clause-internal position (as indicated by the reconstructed binding relation), it would have moved from the embedded V2 clause into the matrix. However, such extraction from a topic island is generally sharply deviant.

(75) *Wem$_i$ glaubt Maria [$_{\text{CP}}$ jeder wird t_i Geld leihen]?
who thinks Maria everyone will money lend
int.: 'Who is such that Maria thinks everyone will lend money to him?' (German)

Evidently advocates of a direct-movement analysis of CLD are hard put to explain the discrepancy in acceptability between (74) and (75).

On the ellipsis analysis of CLD, the puzzle disappears. V2 and verb-final clauses are semantically parallel for purposes of e-GIVENness (26), as evidenced by standard cases of sluicing (Merchant 2001). Therefore, elliptical CP_1 can differ structurally from CP_2 such that the *d*XP undergoes long movement from within a verb-final complement clause, not crossing any island boundary.

(76) [$_{\text{CP}_1}$ [seinem$_i$ Vater]$_k$ ~~glaubt Maria t'_k dass jeder$_i$ t_k Geld leihen wird~~]
[$_{\text{CP}_2}$ Maria glaubt jeder wird dem Geld leihen] (= (74))

The extraction in CP_1 is licit; since the anchor remains *in situ* in CP_2, no movement violation arises.[36] By contrast, fronting of the anchor out of the V2 clause induces deviance on a par with (75), as expected.

(77) *Seinem Vater, dem$_k$ glaubt Maria, jeder wird t_k Geld leihen
*his.*ACC *father him.*ACC *thinks Maria everyone will money lend*
'Maria thinks everyone would lend money to his father.' (German)

Thus, non-locality in CLD is illusory, a consequence of Merchant's (2001) semantico-pragmatic approach to parallelism adopted here, which allows for slight structural differences between antecedent and ellipsis site.[37]

[36] An alternative solution could assume that the *d*XP moves via the embedded CP edge, the subject staying in IP; this underlying structure, too, is licensed by e-GIVENness.

(i) [$_{\text{CP}_1}$ [seinem$_i$ Vater]$_k$ ~~glaubt Maria [$_{\text{CP}}$ t'_k [$_{\text{IP}}$ jeder$_i$ wird t_k Geld leihen]]]~~
[$_{\text{CP}_2}$ Maria glaubt jeder wird dem Geld leihen] (= (74))

Since I do not see any predictive difference between the two explanations, I will not attempt to decide between them here.

[37] In the case just discussed, I argued that extraction of the *d*XP from an island is illusory: the elided structure permits extraction. Given that clausal ellipsis has been known to ameliorate island violations since Ross's (1969) seminal work (see Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001 on sluicing and Temmerman 2011; Griffiths and Lipták 2011 on fragment answers), one might expect to find further effects of this kind. Examples like the following, discussed in Grewendorf 2008, might be a case in point:

(i) ?Ihre^k Kinder$_i$, wenn die$_i$ keine Mutter^k mehr liebt geht die Gesellschaft unter.
her children when them no mother anymore loves goes the society under
'When no mother loves her children anymore, society will go under.' (German)

6 Conclusion: Dislocation Subdued

Is CLD derived by movement or base-generation of the *d*XP? This is the question that has dominated the literature so far, but neither option offered by this traditional dichotomy turns out to be adequate, owing to the fact that different properties of CLD simultaneously point in either direction. The novel analysis proposed in this paper allows us to have our cake and eat it, too: *d*XPs are *both* clause-external—in that they are fragments of a separate clause—*and* clause-internal—in that the reduced clause is underlyingly parallel to the host clause; the underlying biclausal structure of CLD is masked by PF-deletion, yielding a V3 pattern at the surface. The following summarizes the proposal schematically:

(78) $\overbrace{[_{\mathrm{CP}_1}\ d\mathrm{XP}_i\ \langle[_{\mathrm{IP}}\ \ldots\ \mathrm{t}_i\ \ldots\ ]\rangle]}^{\text{elliptical clause}}\ \underbrace{[_{\mathrm{CP}_2}\ \ldots\ \text{anchor}\ldots\ ]}_{\text{host clause}}$ (‘$\langle\ \ldots\ \rangle$’ = PF-deletion)

The *d*XP having undergone regular *Vorfeld* movement within CP_1, the analysis correctly predicts it to display the exact same grammatical properties it would have in the corresponding non-elliptical clause (θ-role, case, P-stranding, reconstruction), without having to resort to any special mechanisms. As I have shown, the analysis in (78) naturally extends to cases of CLD with forward deletion in CP_1, provides explanations for the apparent obviation of certain locality constraints and parallels with sluicing, and is likely to shed light on various related phenomena (see footnotes 29 and 31).

Here, the *d*XP appears to have moved out of an adjunct clause, as indicated by the reconstructed binding relation. Grewendorf (2008) speculates that such cases might be acceptable because of the presence of the anchor inside the island, acting as a resumptive pronoun. This explanation is implausible, however, in light of the fact that German generally lacks island-obviating resumption strategies of the English type; moreover, as pointed out by Jason Merchant (pers. comm.), it contradicts the crosslinguistic generalization that binders of resumptive pronouns must not be case-marked (see Merchant 2004b). An alternative option suggested by the ellipsis approach is to treat such cases as involving repair by ellipsis in CP_1. Similar consideration would then apply to apparent violations of the Coordinate-structure Constraint, as in the following examples:

(ii) a. ?Ihren$_i$ Doktorvater, jede Studentin$_i$ hat den und dessen Frau schon mal zum Essen
her advisor every student has him and his wife at some point for dinner
eingeladen.
invited
‘Every student invited her advisor and his wife for dinner at some point.’ (German)

b. ?Sina$_i$ böcker, jag vet inte var varje författare$_i$ går och köper dem.
his books I know not where every author goes and buys them
‘I don’t know where every author goes and buys his books.’ (Swedish)

Whatever the exact nature of ‘island amelioration’ under ellipsis—literal repair, as assumed in Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2008; Fox and Lasnik 2003, or circumvention, as suggested by Merchant (2001) and Abels (2011)—the fact that the phenomenon exists might provide us with a handle on the relative acceptability of the above examples. I cannot settle this matter conclusively here, however I hope to have shown with these preliminary remarks that island repair in CLD promises to be a fruitful avenue for future research.

Note that this ellipsis approach to CLD relies exclusively on the independently attested grammatical operations of $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement ('topicalization' of foci and contrastive topics[38]) and clausal (IP-)ellipsis. A grammar equipped with these operations is thus automatically predicted to generate the CLD pattern, given that clauses can be freely juxtaposed in discourse. Consequently, the *construction* labeled 'CLD' is eliminated from the theory of UG.[39]

References

Abels, Klaus. 2011. Don't repair that island! It ain't broke. Paper presented at *Islands in Contemporary Linguistic Theory*, University of the Basque Country.

Adger, David. 2003. *Core syntax: A minimalist approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2006. Left-dislocation (including CLLD). In Everaert and van Riemsdijk (2006), 668–699.

Alrenga, Peter. 2005. A sentential subject asymmetry in English and its implications for complement selection. *Syntax* 8:175–207.

Altmann, Hans. 1981. *Formen der 'Herausstellung' im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, Freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen*, volume 106 of *Linguistische Arbeiten*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1997. Clitic left-dislocation and contrastive left-dislocation. In Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 151–192.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena, Henk van Riemsdijk, and Frans Zwarts, ed. 1997. *Materials on left-dislocation*, volume 14 of *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Arregi, Karlos. 2010. Ellipsis in split questions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28:539–592.

[38] One could postulate assignment of corresponding information-structural features to the *d*XP, or stipulate that it moves to some kind of 'ContrastP,' similar to what is assumed in Frey 2004a for topicalization of non-subjects. Such moves amount to little more than a restatement of the observed facts, however; they provide no more insight than the assumption—tacitly adopted here—that pragmatic effects are functions of clausal edges (pragmatics only exploiting whatever options the syntax it presents it with), while additionally stipulating a descriptive feature, assigned in violation of the Inclusiveness Condition (Chomsky 1995).

[39] The ellipsis approach to dislocation suggests further interesting avenues for future research. The literature contains a wealth of discussion focusing on doubling-under-movement effects, e.g. VP-dislocation of the Spanish and Hungarian type as discussed in Lipták and Vicente 2009. It will be interesting to see if these constructions can be handled in a way analogous to what is suggested here for CLD. More generally, it is tempting to reappraise the mapping of the left periphery initiated in Rizzi 1997 from this perspective, raising the question to what extent left-peripheral constituents can be reanalyzed as sentence fragments. I hope to return to this topic in future work.

Bayer, Josef. 2001. Asymmetry in emphatic topicalization. In *Audiatur vox sapientiae: A Festschrift for Arnim von Stechow*, ed. Caroline Féry and Wolfgang Sternefeld, volume 52 of *Studia grammatica*, 15–47. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Boeckx, Cedric, and Kleanthes K. Grohmann. 2004. Left-dislocation in Germanic. In *Focus on Germanic typology*, ed. Werner Abraham, volume 6 of *Studia typologica*, 131–144. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Bošković, Željko. 2011. Rescue by PF-deletion, traces as (non-)interveners, and the *that*–trace effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42:1–44.

Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 26:511–545.

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding: The Pisa lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*, volume 28 of *Current Studies in Linguistics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chung, Sandra. 2006. Syntactic identity in sluicing: How much, and why. Ms., University of California, Santa Cruz.

Chung, Sandra, William A. Ladusaw, and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:239–282.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of* $\overline{\text{A}}$*-dependencies*, volume 17 of *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Coppock, Elizabeth. 2001. Gapping: In defense of deletion. In *Papers from the 37th meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society: The main session*, ed. Mary Andronis, Christopher Ball, Heidi Elston, and Sylvain Neuvel, 133–148. Chicago: CLS.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2004. Ellipsis in Dutch dialects. Doctoral Dissertation, Leiden University.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2010a. Invisible Last Resort: A note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. *Lingua* 120:1714–1726.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2010b. *The syntax of ellipsis: Evidence from Dutch dialects*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen, and Anikó Lipták. 2006. The crosslinguistic syntax of sluicing: Evidence from Hungarian relatives. *Syntax* 9:248–274.

Demirdache, Hamida. 1991. Resumptive chains in restrictive relatives, appositives, and dislocation structures. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

den Dikken, Marcel, André Meinunger, and Chris Wilder. 2000. Pseudoclefts and ellipsis. *Studia Linguistica* 54:41–89.

Drubig, Hans Bernhard. 2001. On the syntactic form of epistemic modality. Ms., University of Tübingen (`http://www.sfb441.uni-tuebingen.de/b2/papers/DrubigModality.pdf`).

Eisenberg, Peter. 2006. *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik*, volume 2. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.

Everaert, Martin, and Henk van Riemsdijk, ed. 2006. *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Flämig, Walter, Brigitta Haftka, Karl Erich Heidolph, Horst Isenberg, Fritz Jüttner, John Pheby, Renate Steinitz, and Wolfgang Ulrich Wurzel. 1981. *Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Fox, Danny, and Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive-cyclic movement and island-repair: The difference between sluicing and vp-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:143–154.

Frey, Werner. 2004a. A medial topic position for German. *Linguistische Berichte* 198:153–190.

Frey, Werner. 2004b. Notes on the syntax and the pragmatics of German left-dislocation. In *The syntax and semantics of the left periphery*, ed. Horst Lohnstein and Susanne Trissler, volume 9 of *Interface Explorations*, 203–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Greenberg, Gerald R. 1984. Left-dislocation, topicalization, and interjections. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2:283–287.

Grewendorf, Günther. 2008. The left clausal periphery: Clitic left-dislocation in Italian and left-dislocation in German. In *Dislocated elements in discourse: Syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives*, ed. Benjamin Shaer, Philippa Cook, Werner Frey, and Claudia Maienborn, volume 12 of *Routledge Studies in Germanic Linguistics*, 49–94. London: Routledge.

Griffiths, James, and Anikó Lipták. 2011. Contrast and island-sensitivity in fragments. Ms., University of Groningen and Leiden University (to appear in *Syntax*).

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2003. *Prolific domains. On the anti-locality of movement dependencies*, volume 66 of *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haider, Hubert. 2010. *The syntax of German*. Cambridge Syntax Guides. Cambridge University Press.

Hartmann, Katharina. 2001. *Right-node raising and gapping. Interface conditions on prosodic deletion*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heycock, Caroline. 2006. Embedded root phenomena. In Everaert and van Riemsdijk (2006), 174–209.

Hoekstra, Eric. 1999. On D-pronouns and the movement of topic features. *Folia Linguistica* 33:59–74.

Holmberg, Anders. 2011. On the syntax of *yes* and *no* in English. Ms., Newcastle University (to appear in *Lingua*).

Kandybowicz, Jason. 2006. COMP–trace effects explained away. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 25*, ed. Donald Baumer, David Montero, and Michael Scanlon, 220–228. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Kluck, Marlies. 2011. *Sentence amalgamation*, volume 285 of *LOT Dissertation Series*. Utrecht: LOT.

Koster, Jan. 1978. Why subject sentences don't exist. In *Recent transformational studies in European languages*, ed. Samuel Jay Keyser, volume 3 of *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*, 53–64. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lange, Klaus-Peter. 1981. Warum Ersatzinfinitiv? *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 19:62–81.

Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *Proceedings of NELS 31*, ed. Minjoo Kim and Uri Strauss, volume 2, 301–320. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Lipták, Anikó, and Luis Vicente. 2009. Pronominal doubling under VP-topicalization. *Lingua* 119:650–686.

Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing, and identification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence. Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*, volume 1 of *Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2002. Swiping in Germanic. In *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, ed. Jan-Wouter Zwart and Werner Abraham, volume 53 of *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*, 289–315. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Merchant, Jason. 2004a. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 27:661–738.

Merchant, Jason. 2004b. Resumptivity and non-movement. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 24:471–481.

Merchant, Jason. 2008. Variable island-repair under ellipsis. In *Topics in ellipsis*, ed. Kyle Johnson, 132–153. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Merchant, Jason. to appear. Ellipsis. In *Handbook of contemporary syntax*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Miriam Butt, and Tibor Kiss. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2^{nd} edition.

Mikkelsen, Line. 2011. Verbal inflection at a distance. In *Morphology at Santa Cruz: Papers in honor of Jorge Hankamer*, ed. Nick LaCara, Anie Thompson, and Matt A. Tucker, 85–96. Santa Cruz, CA: LRC Publications.

Müller, Gereon. 1998. *Incomplete category fronting. A derivational approach to remnant movement in German*, volume 42 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Ott, Dennis. 2012. Right-dislocation as deletion. Ms., University of Groningen.

Ott, Dennis. in progress. Generalized sluicing. Ms., University of Groningen.

van Riemsdijk, Henk. 1997. Left-dislocation. In Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 1–10.

van Riemsdijk, Henk, and Frans Zwarts. 1997. Left-dislocation in Dutch and the status of copying rules. In Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 13–29. Originally circulated in 1974 (Ms., MIT/University of Amsterdam).

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rodrigues, Cilene, Andrew Nevins, and Luis Vicente. 2009. Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and P-stranding. In *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2006*, ed. Danièle Torck and W. Leo Wetzels, volume 303 of *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 175–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the fifth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and Jerry L. Morgan, 252–286. Chicago: CLS.

Ross, John Robert. 1973. A fake NP squish. In *New ways of analyzing variation in English*, ed. Charles-James N. Bailey and Roger W. Shuy, 96–140. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Shaer, Benjamin, Philippa Cook, Werner Frey, and Claudia Maienborn. 2009. Introduction. Dislocation: concepts, questions, goals. In *Dislocated elements in discourse*, ed. Benjamin Shaer, Philippa Cook, Werner Frey, and Claudia Maienborn, volume 12 of *Routledge Studies in Germanic Linguistics*, 1–27. New York/London: Routledge.

Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2011. Syntactic identity and ellipsis. *The Linguistic Review* 28:79–110.

Temmerman, Tanja. 2011. The syntax of Dutch embedded fragment answers: On the PF-theory of islands and the WH/sluicing correlation. Ms., Leiden University and HU Brussels (to appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*).

Thoms, Gary. 2010. 'Verb floating' and VP-ellipsis. Towards a movement account of ellipsis licensing. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 10:252–297.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1979. *On complementation in Icelandic*. New York: Garland.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge Syntax Guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Truckenbrodt, Hubert. forthcoming. On the prosody and syntax of right dislocation, adjunct postposing, and sentential pro-forms in German. In *Inner-sentential propositional pro-forms* (working title), ed. Werner Frey, André Meinunger, and Kerstin Schwabe. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vat, Jan. 1981. Left dislocation, connectedness, and reconstruction. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 20:80–103.

de Vries, Mark. 2009. The left and right periphery in Dutch. *The Linguistic Review* 26:291–327.

de Vries, Mark. 2010. Empty subjects and empty objects. In *Structure preserved: Studies in syntax for Jan Koster*, ed. Jan-Wouter Zwart and Mark de Vries, volume 164 of *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*, 359–366. John Benjamins.

Wiltschko, Martina. 1997. Parasitic operators in German left-dislocations. In Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 307–339.

Zaenen, Annie. 1985. *Extraction rules in Icelandic*. Outstanding dissertations in linguistics. New York: Garland.

Zaenen, Annie. 1997. Contrastive dislocation in Dutch and Icelandic. In Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 119–148.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1998. Where is syntax? Syntactic aspects of left-dislocation in Dutch and English. In *The limits of syntax*, ed. Peter W. Culicover and Louise McNally, volume 29 of *Syntax and semantics*, 365–393. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2011. *The syntax of Dutch*. Cambridge Syntax Guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.