

**Workshop on**

**Dislocated Elements in Discourse: Syntactic,  
Semantic and Pragmatic Perspectives**

28-30 November 2003

Zentrum für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ZAS) Berlin

Organizers: Werner Frey, Claudia Maienborn, Benjamin Shaer

## Contents

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Talks</b> .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 2  |
| Olga Arnaudova (University of Ottawa) <i>Argument defocalization/saliency and clitic left dislocation in Bulgarian</i> .....                                                                                                                      | 2  |
| Betty Birner (Northern Illinois University) <i>Discourse Functions at the Periphery: Noncanonical Word Order in English</i> .....                                                                                                                 | 3  |
| Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion-University) <i>Fronted Quantificational Adverbs</i> .....                                                                                                                                                                 | 3  |
| Cécile de Cat (University of York) <i>For a base-generation analysis of French dislocation</i> .....                                                                                                                                              | 5  |
| Elisabeth Delais-Roussarie (Université de Toulouse) / Jenny Doetjes (Utrecht University / Leiden University) / Jean Marie Marandin (Paris 7) / Petra Sleeman (University of Amsterdam) <i>Left dislocation and topicalization in French</i> ..... | 7  |
| Gisbert Fanselow (Universität Potsdam) <i>Phonological and syntactic aspects of filling initial positions in German (and other languages)</i> .....                                                                                               | 8  |
| Judit Gervain (Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste) <i>The Syntax and Semantics of the Resumptive Dependency in Hungarian Focus-Raising</i> .....                                                                          | 8  |
| Günther Grewendorf (Universität Frankfurt) <i>Moving remnants to the left</i> .....                                                                                                                                                               | 10 |
| Beáta Gyuris (Hungarian Academy of Sciences) <i>A new approach to the scope of contrastive topics</i> .....                                                                                                                                       | 10 |
| Liliane Haegeman (Université Charles de Gaulle - Lille III- UMR 8258 Silex du CNRS) <i>Adverbial clauses, topicalisation and the left periphery</i> .....                                                                                         | 12 |
| Konstantina Haidou (University of London) <i>On the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface: Left, medial and right peripheral focus and topic in Greek</i> .....                                                                                             | 14 |
| Daniel Hole (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) <i>Why some LP constructions have strong interpretations, and others don't</i> .....                                                                                                         | 16 |
| Anke Holler (Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg) <i>How the left-periphery of a wh-relative clause determines its syntactic and semantic relationships</i> .....                                                                               | 18 |
| Hans Kamp (Universität Stuttgart) <i>Last one in, first one out. Interactions between Focus, Contrastive Topic and Quantification</i> .....                                                                                                       | 19 |
| Ruth Kempson / Ronnie Cann / Jieun Kiaer (University of Edinburgh / King's College London) <i>Topic and Focus Effects at the peripheries: The Dynamics of Tree Growth</i> .....                                                                   | 19 |
| Eric Mathieu (University College London) <i>French Topics</i> .....                                                                                                                                                                               | 21 |
| Nicola Munaro / Cecilia Poletto (University of Venice / Linguistica Università di Padova) <i>Ways of clausal typing</i> .....                                                                                                                     | 23 |
| Frederick J. Newmeyer (University of Washington and École Normale Supérieure) <i>On Split-CPs, Uninterpretable Features, and the 'Perfectness' of Language</i> .....                                                                              | 25 |
| Javier Perez-Guerra / David Tizón-Couto (Universidade de Vigo) <i>'These hands, they are apt enough to dislocate and tear thy flesh': On left-dislocation in the recent history of the English language</i> .....                                 | 25 |
| Nicholas Sobin (University of Texas at El Paso) <i>Echo Questions, Echo Negation, and Split CP</i> .....                                                                                                                                          | 26 |
| Augustin Speyer (University of Pennsylvania) <i>Vorfeldbesetzung and Centering Theory in German</i> .....                                                                                                                                         | 28 |
| Malte Zimmermann (Humboldt-Universität Berlin) <i>Discourse Particles in the Left Periphery</i> .....                                                                                                                                             | 30 |
| <b>Poster Session</b> .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 32 |
| Maria Alm (Lund University) <i>The functions and meanings of the German discourse particle "also" in the pre-front field- discussed on the basis of spoken German</i> .....                                                                       | 32 |
| Werner Frey / Benjamin Shaer (ZAS Berlin) <i>English and German Left-Peripheral Elements</i> .....                                                                                                                                                | 33 |
| Anikó Lipták (Leiden University) <i>How to deal with leftist relatives?</i> .....                                                                                                                                                                 | 35 |
| Yukiko Morimoto / Sam Mchombo (ZAS, Berlin / UC Berkeley) <i>Configuring Topic in the Left Periphery: A case of Chicheŵa Split NPs</i> .....                                                                                                      | 37 |
| Andreas Nolda (Humboldt - Universität Berlin) <i>'Split topicalization' and 'left dislocation' in German</i> .....                                                                                                                                | 39 |
| Thomas Weskott (Universität Leipzig) <i>Topicalization and the Dynamic Interpretation of Information Structural Markedness: Theoretical and Empirical Aspects</i> .....                                                                           | 40 |

## Talks

**Olga Arnaudova (University of Ottawa)**

*Argument defocalization/saliency and clitic left dislocation in Bulgarian*

The claim advanced in this paper is that the presence of pronominal clitics, ‘reflexive’ SE, and *pro*-drop in Bulgarian involves two predication domains and argument externalization (dislocation) in a higher predication domain. The analysis presented here expands ideas on Greek (Iatridou 1991) and Spanish (Zubizarreta 2000) and proposes that the phenomenon of ‘argument’-drop in Balkan languages uses a strategy well known from Iroquoian languages such as Mohawk (Baker 1996) where entities are either referentially salient or defocalized. In Part 1 of the paper, I observe that the domain of the lower predication can be realized either by DPs (1a), or by a combination of clitics and full pronouns (1b), on the condition that the full pronoun/noun is in a focus sensitive position (1c/d), or by clitics only, as in (1e), a situation, reminiscent of the Polysynthesis Parameter of Baker (1996), while the higher domain, can host only definite/specific or non-specific DPs/full pronouns as exemplified with the indefinite specific noun in (2). Non-specific indefinites are excluded from the higher predication domain. The structures in (1e) and (2) have in common the same interpretive component given that dislocated elements result as ‘removed’ from the domain of the focus projection and are referentially salient as in (1e) or provide an independent description of the referent, as in (2). Structures with nonnominative subjects containing SE bring further evidence to the proposal outlined above. For example, in constructions traditionally called ‘involuntary state’, ‘feel-like’, or ‘quirky subject’ constructions shown in (3), where there is a dative subject and a reflexive clitic. Rivero 2001 claims that, the reflexive clitic *se/si* indicates a null DP selected by the predicate, which has a human feature but no person and number features, so cannot be interpreted independently.

In Part 2, I present more evidence that the co-occurrence between clitics and DPs is not optional agreement marking, as argued in earlier studies on Bulgarian (Franks and King 2000 for example). I show that subjects and objects in the higher predication domain have a number of syntactic properties such as lack of reconstruction to a VP-internal position (4), lack of WCO effects, and minimality effects with foci (5) and *wh*-words, summarized in (6) similarly to the facts reported for Spanish by Zubizarreta 2000. They also need to be distinguished, both semantically and syntactically, from other left-periphery elements such as hanging topics (7), and contrastive foci (8).

In part 3, I argue that dislocated subjects are not in Spec, TP and the EPP feature on T is satisfied either by Merge of an element such as an adverbial, or by *pro* (as in (1a) rather than by the strong inflectional morphology, as argued in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998). Dislocated subjects are further contrasted with VP-internal subjects which stay in situ in the lower predication domain (when present) and check their Case by Agree (Chomsky 2001).

In Part 4, I claim that the analysis outlined in this paper explains in a natural way the formation of the clitic clusters: clitics which are base-generated within the VP in argument positions (as recently argued in Boscovic 2001 also for Bulgarian), move to the head position of T/AgrP to license discourse operators related to referentiality and hosting dislocated arguments.

I conclude by discussing the possibility that clitic left dislocation is an universal strategy used in many unrelated languages where the VP-internal predicate-argument relation can involve a number of clitic-like arguments such as reflexives, pronominal clitics (including subject clitics), and *pro* and is linked to referentially salient or defocalized elements found in a higher predication domain.

**Betty Birner (Northern Illinois University)**  
***Discourse Functions at the Periphery: Noncanonical Word Order in English***

Speakers have a wide range of noncanonical syntactic options that allow them to mark the information status of the various elements within the proposition. The correlation between a construction and the constraints on its information status, however, is not arbitrary; there are broad, consistent, and predictive generalizations that can be made about the information-packaging functions served by preposing, postposing, and argument-reversing constructions. Specifically, preposed constituents are constrained to represent discourse-old information, postposed constituents are constrained to represent information that is either discourse-new or hearer-new, and argument-reversing constructions require that the information represented by the preposed constituent be at least as familiar as that represented by the postposed constituent (Birner & Ward 1998). The status of inferrable information (Clark 1977, Prince 1981), however, is problematic; a study of corpus data shows that such information can be preposed in an inversion or a preposing (hence must be discourse-old), yet can also be postposed in constructions requiring hearer-new information (hence must be hearer-new). This information status – discourse-old yet hearer-new – was assumed by Prince (1992) to be non-occurring on the grounds that what has been evoked in the discourse should be known to the hearer. I resolve this difficulty by arguing for a reinterpretation of the term ‘discourse-old’ as applying to not only information that has been explicitly evoked in the prior discourse, but in fact any information that provides a salient link to the prior discourse via a relationship of either identity or inference. Extending Prince’s notion in this way allows us to account for the distribution of noncanonically positioned peripheral constituents in a principled and unified way.

**Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion-University)**  
***Fronted Quantificational Adverbs***

It is well known that fronting can affect logical form. For example, (1.a) is ambiguous between a reading where *officers* is mapped onto the restrictor (all officers accompany a ballerina) and a reading where *ballerinas* is (all ballerinas are accompanied by an officer).

In contrast, (1.b) and (1.c) are not ambiguous, and can only get the reading where the fronted element is in the restrictor. But what happens if the quantificational adverb itself is fronted, as in (1.d)? I will argue that, since nothing besides the adverb is fronted, the restrictor is empty, and all the rest of the sentence is mapped onto the nuclear scope.

Consider (2.a), and contrast it with (2.b), where the quantificational adverb is fronted. The difference between them is not merely stylistic - they have different truth conditions. Sentence (2.a) is ambiguous. It can get an *absolute* reading, saying that many politicians are crooked - false (hopefully). In addition, it has a reading, which considers the incidence of crookedness among politicians relative to the incidence of crookedness among people in general. Under this reading, (2.a) means: if we pick any person at random, there is some (low) probability  $P$  that this person is crooked; but if we pick a politician at random, the probability that we picked a crooked person is higher than  $P$ . Interpreted in this way, (2.a) is probably true. Appropriate context, e.g., (3), can help make the relative reading available. Note that the relative interpretation is not the one we get if we focus the subject: sentence (4) is bad (and even informants who accept it, assign it a different interpretation: many crooked people are politicians).

Note that (2.b) cannot have a relative reading, even with the help of context. It only receives the absolute reading, namely that many politicians are corrupt. Hence, fronting the quantificational adverb blocks the relative interpretation, and the question is: why?

Cohen (2001) demonstrates that the relative readings is a distinct reading (i.e. notmerely the vagueness of *often*).  $\text{often}_x[\psi(x)][\phi(x)]$  is evaluated with respect to a set of alternatives, A, defined in (5). Crucially, A contains alternatives to the restrictor as well as to the nuclear scope. The meaning of **often** is given in (6);  $\sqrt{A}$  is the disjunction of the elements in A, and  $P(\alpha|\beta)$  is the conditional probability of  $\alpha$  given  $\beta$ .

The logical form of (2.a) is (7). Suppose (2.a) is evaluated with respect to the alternatives in (8). Then  $\sqrt{A} = \text{person}$ . Under the absolute reading, (7) is true iff  $P(\text{crooked} | \text{politician} \wedge \text{person})$  is "large". Under the relative reading, it is true iff  $P(\text{crooked} | \text{politician} \wedge \text{person}) > P(\text{crooked} | \text{person})$ , as desired.

What about (2.b)? The unavailability of the relative reading is explained as follows. Since nothing besides the quantificational adverb is fronted, the restrictor is empty, so the logical form of (2.b) is (9). Having an empty restrictor is not, in itself, a problem - A will simply contain only alternatives to the nuclear scope. Because *crooked* is focused, the set of alternatives is (10), and  $\sqrt{A} = \text{politician}$ .

The absolute reading is still available:  $\text{often}_x[[\text{politician}(x) \wedge \text{crooked}(x)]]$  is true iff  $P(\text{politician} \wedge \text{crooked} | \text{politician})$  is "large". However, the story is different with the relative reading. It requires that  $P(\text{politician} \wedge \text{crooked} | \text{politician}) > P(\text{politician} \wedge \text{crooked} | \text{politician})$ . But since nothing is ever strictly greater than itself, this reading is necessarily false - the wrong interpretation.

The unavailability of the relative reading, then, provides evidence for the claim that fronting the quantificational adverb results in mapping the whole sentence onto the nuclear scope, leaving an empty restrictor. Because the domain of the quantificational adverb is always restricted by a set of alternatives, this usually has no effect on truth conditions; but the phenomenon of relative readings provides a test case which allows us to observe the effects of fronting the quantificational adverb on truth conditions.

### Examples:

- (1) a. Officers always accompany ballerinas. (Rooth 1985).  
 b. Officers, they always accompany ballerinas.  
 c. Ballerinas, they are always accompanied by officers.  
 d. Always, officers accompany ballerinas.

- (2) a. A politician is often [crooked]<sub>F</sub>.  
 b. Often, a politician is [crooked]<sub>F</sub>.

- (3) A: The main suspects are a politician, a physician, and a linguist. Who do you think did it?  
 B: Well, a politician is often [crooked]<sub>F</sub>.

- (4) ??[A politician]<sub>F</sub> is often crooked.

- (5)  $A = \{\psi \wedge \phi \mid \psi \in \text{ALT}(\psi) \ \& \ \phi \in \text{ALT}(\phi)\}$

- (6)  $\text{often}_x[\psi(x)][\phi(x)]$  is true iff  $P(\phi \mid \psi \wedge \sqrt{A}) > \rho$ , where:  
 1.  $\rho$  is "large" (absolute reading), or  
 2.  $\rho = P(\phi \mid \sqrt{A})$  (relative reading).

- (7)  $\text{often}_x[\text{politician}(x)][\text{crooked}(x)]$

(8)  $A = \{\text{politician} \wedge \text{crooked}, \text{politician} \wedge \text{honest},$   
 $\text{physician} \wedge \text{crooked}, \text{physician} \wedge \text{honest},$   
 $\text{linguist} \wedge \text{crooked}, \text{linguist} \wedge \text{honest},$   
 $\dots\}$

(9)  $\text{often}_x[\text{politician}(x) \wedge \text{crooked}(x)]$

(10)  $A = \{\text{politician} \wedge \text{crooked}, \text{politician} \wedge \text{honest}\}$

### References:

- Cohen, A. 2001. Relative readings of *Many*, *Often*, and generics. *Natural Language Semantics* 9.41 {67.  
Rooth, M. E. 1985. Association with Focus. University of Massachusetts at Amherst, dissertation.

### **Cécile de Cat (University of York)** *For a base-generation analysis of French dislocation*

This paper is based on a close investigation of the syntactic and information structural properties of (left- and right-)dislocated elements in spoken French. It argues that French dislocation is base-generated by adjunction to a clause-level maximal projection with performative properties (usually TP or CP) and that differences between left- and right-dislocation can be derived straightforwardly from the properties inherent to each side of the clause periphery. Both syntactic and interpretive arguments are presented in support of this analysis.

I present evidence from a judgement elicitation task (involving speakers from Belgium, Canada, France and Switzerland) to demonstrate that French left-dislocation is not sensitive to islands. However, this is not sufficient to rule out movement by Copy if ‘true’ resumptive pronouns are involved (Postal 1998, Boeckx 2003). In the case of French dislocation, the resumptive element, I argue, does not behave like a variable but like a full-fledged pronoun: it receives its interpretation independently from the dislocated element (with which it entertains a merely anaphoric relation). This, in conjunction with the arguments below, indicates that French dislocation does not involve (any kind of) syntactic movement.

As is well known, dislocated constructions do not induce Weak Cross-Over effects (as illustrated in (1)), nor do they license parasitic gaps (2). What has received less attention is that no reconstruction effects arise in the interpretation of French dislocated elements: (i) native speakers almost categorically reject a bound interpretation of dislocated elements containing an anaphor (such as *sa fille* ‘his daughter’ in (3)) and (ii) no condition C reconstruction effects are observed (where a dislocated element containing an R-expression would be illicitly bound by a coreferential pronoun if it were interpreted via reconstruction), as shown by the contrast in (4). These facts all point to a base-generation analysis of French left-dislocation.

The base-generation analysis also applies to right-dislocated elements, which I demonstrate not to be clause-bound (hence not subject to Ross’ (1967) Right-Roof constraint, as illustrated in (5)). I also show that an analysis of right-dislocation as left-dislocation + IP-remnant movement makes the wrong predictions for the French data.

An adjunction analysis of dislocated elements correctly predicts a freer distribution than does the so-called cartographic approach (Rizzi 1997), which relies on the existence of Topic projections in the left-periphery of the clause. Adjacency effects induced by topics at the left-periphery are shown to be similarly induced by parentheticals, which suggests that no functional projection needs be postulated to account for the (limited) restrictions on the distribution of topics.

Following common assumptions (e.g. Iatridou 1990; É.Kiss 1995), dislocated elements are taken to be licensed by a rule of Predication. However, restrictions as to which type of embedded clauses can host left-peripheral topics suggest a refinement of this rule: the maximal projection to which the topic is adjoined must have a performative function.

Differences between left- and right-peripheral topics are shown to derive from the properties of each side of the clause periphery: the left periphery precedes the predication and is inherently salient (by virtue of linearity and the possibility of prosodic prominence markings) while the reverse is true of the right periphery.

One of the advantages of the proposed analysis is that it makes it possible to free syntax from the burden of information structure, thereby providing a major argument in support of a disputed theoretical position. Postulating highly specialised components of the language faculty maximises economy and allows full exploitation of the potential of the interfaces between these components.

### Examples:

- (1) Abé<sub>i</sub>lard<sub>i</sub>, sa mère l'<sub>i</sub> aimait trop.  
 Abelard his mother him loved too-much  
 'Abelard's mother loved him too much.'
- (2) Ces livres<sub>i</sub>, tu les<sub>i</sub> as d'échirés au lieu de \*(les<sub>i</sub>) consulter.  
 these books you them have torn in place of (them) to-consult  
 'These books, you tore them instead of consulting \*(them).'
- (3) Sa<sub>j</sub> fille, je connais l'homme<sub>i/\*j</sub> qui l'a emmenée.  
 his daughter I know the-man who her-has taken-away  
 'I know the man who took his daughter away.'
- (4) a. Tes sales petits remarques sur Léon<sub>i</sub>, il<sub>i</sub> ne les apprécierait sûrement pas  
 your dirty little remarks on Leon he NEG them would-appreciate surely not  
 'Leon would certainly not appreciate your nasty little remarks about him.'  
 b. \*Il<sub>i</sub> n'apprécierait sûrement pas tes sales petits remarques sur Léon<sub>i</sub>.  
 he NEG would-appreciate surely not your dirty little remarks on Leon
- (5) [Tu est 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.'

### References:

- Boeckx, C. A. (2003). *Islands and Chains. Resumption as Derivational Residue*. Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Martin, R., Michaels, D., & Uriagereka, J. (eds.), *Step by Step*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Iatridou, S. (1990). *Clitics and Islands Effects*. Ms. MIT.
- É.Kiss, K. (1995). Introduction. In É.Kiss, K. (ed.), *Discourse configurational languages*. Oxford: OUP. 3–28.
- Postal, P. (1998). *Three Investigations of Extraction*. Current Studies in Linguistics 29. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, L. (ed.), *Elements of grammar. A handbook of generative syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 281–337.
- Ross, J. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation. MIT.

**Elisabeth Delais-Roussarie (Université de Toulouse) / Jenny Doetjes (Utrecht University / Leiden University) / Jean Marie Marandin (Paris 7) / Petra Sleeman (University of Amsterdam)**

***Left dislocation and topicalization in French***

In this paper we will discuss differences between hanging topic left dislocation, clitic left dislocation and topicalization in French, from 1) a syntactic, 2) a pragmatic and 3) a prosodic point of view.

1) From a syntactic point of view, topicalization is different from both types of left dislocation. In the case of topicalization there is a relation between the topicalized constituent and an empty position in the main clause. In dislocation, this position is either absent (so called ‘loose aboutness’), or filled by a (possibly empty) pronominal element or an epithet. Following Hirschbühler 1975 (and contra De Cat 2002), we argue that hanging topic left dislocation and clitic left dislocation in French can be distinguished from one another from a syntactic point of view. However, in most cases of LD, it is impossible to say whether we are dealing with CILD and HTLD. In this respect French differs from Italian, where the differences are much clearer (see Cinque 1977, 1983).

2) From a pragmatic point of view, there are not many differences between clitic left dislocation and hanging topic left dislocation in French. Again, French clearly differs from Italian (cf. Cinque 1983). Topicalization and Left Dislocation do differ significantly, however. We will discuss some data from Kerleroux & Marandin (2002), and we will show that these data can be reinterpreted in terms of Büring’s theory of Discourse Topics (Büring 1997). In the discourses in (1) and (2), there is a shift in the Discourse Topic: the second utterance is not a simple answer to the question: “What did Marie do with the children?”, which can be expected on the basis of *Marie a réuni les élèves*, but an answer to the more complex question: “What did Marie do with the girls and what did she do with the boys?”. In Büring’s terms, the second sentences in (1) and (2) reshape the Discourse Topic. Left Dislocation is never appropriate in utterances reshaping the Discourse Topic, whereas topicalisation typically occurs in such utterances. We will show that the data cannot be accounted for by simply referring to contrast: LD is not incompatible with contrastive readings. Moreover, we will show that LD shares this property with subject NP inversion.

3) Prosodically, there are again no clear differences between HTLD and CILD in French, but there are between left dislocation and topicalization. In all three constructions, we find a major phonological break at the end of the dislocated constituent. However, in the case of topicalization this has to be a Major Phrase boundary, which is marked by a continuation rise or H<sub>cont</sub> demarcative boundary tone. This realization is possible for LD as well, but we also find cases in which the right edge of the dislocated constituent is marked by a H(L)% tone, which indicates the presence of an Intonational Phrase boundary. This tone is used when the speaker wants to verify whether s/he and her/his interlocutors agree on the reference of the topic of the utterance. We will discuss the pragmatic differences between the two realizations for LD in detail, as well as the reasons for the absence of this realization for topicalization.

Quite in general, we can see that the differences between the two types of dislocation are minimal, and only play a role in syntax. In this respect there is a large difference with Italian, where the syntactic differences are much bigger, and where the two types of left dislocation have different pragmatic and prosodic properties. On the other hand, there are very clear pragmatic and prosodic differences between LD and topicalization: a) Topicalization is typically used in utterances that reshape the discourse topic, while LD is inappropriate in these contexts. b) LD has two distinct prosodic realizations that correlate with pragmatic properties while topicalization is always realized in the same way.

### Examples:

- (1) Marie a réuni les élèves. Aux filles, elle a donné des exercices d’algèbre. Aux garçons, elle a dicté un problème de géométrie.  
Mary gathered the students. To the girls, she gave algebra exercises. To the boys, she dictated a geometry problem.
- (2) #Marie a réuni les élèves. (Aux) filles, elle leur a donné des exercices d’algèbre. (Aux) garçons, elle leur a dicté un problème de géométrie.  
Mary gathered the students. To the girls, she gave them algebra exercises. To the boys, she dictated them a geometry problem.

### References:

- Büring, D. 1997. *The Meaning of Topic and Focus : The 59th Street Bridge Accent*. London: Routledge.
- De Cat, C. 2002. French Dislocation. Doctoral dissertation University of York.
- Cinque, G. 1977, The Movement Nature of Left Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 397-411.
- Cinque, G. 1983. Topic Constructions in some European Languages and Connectedness. *Tilburg Studies in Language and Literature* 4: 7-41. [Reprinted in: E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk and F. Zwarts (eds.). 1997. *Materials on Left Dislocation*. Amsterdam, Netherlands : Benjamins, 93-118.]
- Hirschbühler, P. 1975. On the Source of lefthand NPs in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 6: 155-165.
- Kerleroux, F. & J.-M. Marandin 2001. L’ordre des Mots. *Cahier Jean-Claude Milner*, ed. J.-M. Marandin, 277-302. Paris: Verdier.

### **Gisbert Fanselow (Universität Potsdam)**

#### ***Phonological and syntactic aspects of filling initial positions in German (and other languages).***

Second position effects have been claimed to be phonological in nature, or to at least involve phonological aspects. In this paper, I would like to present different kinds of evidence that support such a view. First, the identification of the element that can move to Spec,CP in verb second constructions may involve phonological aspects such as tone or accent. In particular, this is true in constructions in which what actually moves is only part of the category that is attracted. Second, we often observe that the factor triggering the preposing of an XP does not attract the phrase to Spec,CP, but to a position below that node. The movement to the very first position is untriggered from a syntactic point of view.

### **Judit Gervain (Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, Trieste)**

#### ***The Syntax and Semantics of the Resumptive Dependency in Hungarian Focus-Raising***

In a discourse-configurational language like Hungarian, the left periphery offers a particularly good testing ground to investigate processes operating at the interfaces of syntax, semantics and pragmatics.

One such process, focus-raising (FR) has recently received substantial theoretical attention. Earlier accounts (É. Kiss 1987; Kenesei 1994; Lipták 1998) all derive FR (1b) from subordinate constructions like the one in (1a) by assuming that the focused constituent of the embedded clause moved to the matrix focus position through the bridge verb of the main clause.

- (1) a *Azt mondtad, (hogy) GÁBOR siel jól.*  
 expl. acc said. 2st that Gábor. nom ski. 3swell  
 “You said Gábor could ski well.”  
 b *(\*Azt) GÁBORT<sub>i</sub> mondtad, hogy e jól siel.*  
 expl. acc Gábor. acc said. 2st that well ski. 3s

However, Gervain (forthcoming) has shown that FR is not a uniform construction among speakers. An experimental survey has revealed that at least two empirically distinguishable patterns exist (2). Whereas one of them, (2a) is indeed explicable in terms of movement, as previously assumed, the other, (2b) is incompatible with such an analysis. The plural agreement on the embedded verb, which is ruled out in simple clauses (3a), excludes the possibility that the focused DP starts out as the subject of the embedded verb. Note, however, that DPs of this type do have plural semantics (3b).

- (2) a *Az ÖSSZES LÁNY/LÁNYT mondtad, hogy jön/\*jönnek.*  
 the all girl. sg. nom girl. sg. acc said. 2st that come. 3s come. 3p  
 “You said that all the girls were coming.”  
 b *Az ÖSSZES \*LÁNY/LÁNYT mondtad, hogy jön/jönnek.*  
 the all girl. sg. nom girl. sg. acc said. 2st that come. 3s come. 3p
- (3) a *Az összes lány jön/\*jönnek.*  
 the all girl. sg. nom come. 3s come. 3p  
 “All the girls are coming.”  
 b *Két fiú érkezett. Üdvözöltem \*őt/őket.*  
 two boy. sg. nom arrive. past. 3sg greet. past. 1s **him them**  
 “Two boys arrived. I greeted them.”

Therefore, Gervain (forthcoming) has proposed to explain this latter pattern as an instance of resumption. Under this view, the focused DP is base-generated on the left periphery of the main clause and is linked to a phonologically null resumptive pronoun filling the embedded subject position (4). The ambiguity in the number feature of the pronoun, and thus of the embedded verb derives from the availability of both a singular and a plural number feature on the DP ((3a) and (3b)).

- (4) *Az [<sup>pl</sup>ÖSSZES<sub>i</sub> [<sup>sg</sup>LÁNYT<sub>m</sub>]] mondtad, hogy <sup>sg/pl</sup>pro<sub>i/mj</sub> jön/jönnek.*

The present paper investigates this resumptive dependency in more depth, with the aim of contributing to the long-lasting debate about the nature of resumptives. In a new experimental survey, diagnostic constructions such as parasitic gap licensing and cross-over effects were tested to decide whether the syntactic behavior of resumptives resembles that of pronouns or variables. It is concluded that the syntactic nature of resumptives is systematically ambiguous between the two options. It is proposed that vehicle change (Fiengo and May 1994, Safir 1999), the mechanism that allows traces to be treated as pronouns by interpretative mechanisms under certain circumstances, readily accounts for this syntactic ambiguity. Furthermore, it is shown that the ambiguity in syntactic behavior correlates with ambiguity in the semantic type of these elements.

## References:

- É. Kiss K. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 121-171.  
 Fiengo, R., May, R. 1994. *Indices and identity*. MIT Press: Cambridge.

- Gervain, J. forthcoming. "Two strategies of Focus-Raising: Movement and Resumption." In Pinon, Ch., Siptar P. (eds.): *Approaches to Hungarian VIII*.
- Kenesei I. 1994. "Subordinate Clauses". In: Kiefer, F. and E. Kiss, K. (eds): *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian. Syntax and Semantics 27*, 275-354. Academic Press, New York.
- Lipták A. 1998. "A magyar fókuszemelések egy minimalista elemzése". In Büky L., Maleczki M. (eds.): *Proceedings of "A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei III."* 23-24th April 1998, Szeged (Hungary), 93-115.
- Safir, K. 1999. „Vehicle Change and Reconstruction in A'-Chains". *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(4):587-620.

**Günther Grewendorf (Universität Frankfurt)**  
*Moving remnants to the left*

Evidence from various languages suggests that wh-in-situ constructions should be analyzed in terms of overt wh-movement to the left periphery of the clause (Poletto/Pollock 2000, Etxepare/Uribe-Etxebarria 2002, Simpson/Bhattacharya 2003). Such an analysis implies that the derivation of wh-in-situ questions has to make extensive use of remnant movement operations. Unfortunately, little is known about the general constraints to which remnant movement is subject to. Proceeding from crosslinguistic differences in the scrambling of remnant categories in Japanese and German I wish to suggest a new generalization which is intended to cover a broader range of remnant movement phenomena. Remnant movement is understood as movement of an element which contains a trace of a category moved out of that element and results in a configuration in which this trace is no longer bound. It is shown that Müller's (1996, 1998) generalization, according to which a remnant category XP cannot undergo a certain type of movement if the antecedent of the unbound trace has undergone the same type of movement, is too weak to rule out certain illicit cases of remnant movement. I therefore suggest a new approach to the problem of remnant movement which assumes a hierarchy of movement types and states that remnant movement is prohibited unless it is of a higher type than the movement which creates the remnant.

**Beáta Gyuris (Hungarian Academy of Sciences)**  
*A new approach to the scope of contrastive topics*

The paper proposes a new account of the scope of contrastive topic quantifiers in Hungarian, one of the major puzzles related to the semantic behaviour of these constituents cross-linguistically. As opposed to quantifiers in other preverbal operator positions in the Hungarian sentence, the scope of which corresponds to their linear order, certain contrastive topics appear to take narrow scope with respect to other preverbal operators in certain sentences (though usually not with respect to post-verbal ones), and wide scope in others. The paper enumerates the conditions which regulate the possible scopal interactions between contrastive topics and other preverbal operators.

Weaknesses of recent theoretical approaches to the problem, including those by Alberti and Medve 2000, and É. Kiss 2000, who claim that the narrow scope of contrastive topic expressions is due to the fact that they denote a set or a property of individuals are pointed out. It is shown that the approach proposed by Büring 1997, according to which all contrastive topics have the potential of taking both wide and narrow scope, and their actual scope is dependent on the availability of alterantive propositions, does not apply to Hungarian, since it would predict, that reading (a) is available for sentence (1) below.

One of the observations the theory relies on (which has also been made for several languages in the literature) is that contrastive topics necessarily have to be followed by a constituent

with an eradicating stress (cf., Kálmán 1985) which is situated in a preverbal position or is identical to the verb, to be referred to here as the *associate* of the contrastive topic. (In other accounts, i.e., in Büring 1997, it is referred to as the *focus*.) Associates are marked by the sign ‘’’ in the example sentences.

It is proposed in the paper that as regards their information structure, Hungarian sentences with contrastive topics fall into two basic categories:

1. The contrastive topic expression or the associate denotes a specific referent, and the rest of the sentence expresses a property of this referent. The constituent denoting a specific individual is perceived as having wide scope. The above state of affairs can manifest in two ways:
  - a) The contrastive topic is a referential expression. Compare (1), where the contrastive topic is not a referential expression and cannot take wide scope, to (2), where it can.
  - b) The associate refers to a specific individual. This can happen in two ways:
    - i) It is a lexical property of the associate expression that it can introduce a specific referent (compare (2b), where the universal DP can refer to a relevant sum individual in the context, to (3b), where its counterpart cannot refer).
    - ii) The associate expression acquires the property of being interpreted referentially by virtue of being placed into the preverbal focus position (compare (3b) and (4b), which differ only in the syntactic position of the associate).
2. The associate is a quantificational DP in focus position in which, semantically, it is the determiner which is focused (i.e., the truth of the whole sentence minus the determiner is presupposed), as in readings (1c) and (4c). (Note that (5), where it is the adjective which is focused semantically, does not allow the above reading.) In this case, the sentence expresses identification of the number/quantity of individuals/things having a particular property with the number/quantity specified by the focus determiner, and thus the contrastive topic and the associate expressions do not directly stand in each other’s scope.

It is proposed that all sentences with contrastive topics fall into one of the above classes as regards their information structure, which means that the scope of contrastive topics is derivable from their lexical properties and the lexical properties as well as the syntactic position of the associate without making any further assumptions.

### Examples

- (1) [CT ‘Legalább három diák] [FP ‘négy könyvet [VP olvasott el.]]  
 at least three student four book-ACC read pfx  
 a. #‘There are at least three students who read four books.’  
 b. ‘There are four books which were read by at least three student.’  
 c. ‘The number of books which were read by at least three students is four.’
- (2) [CT ‘Két könyvet] [QP ‘minden diák [VP elolvasott.]]  
 two book-acc every student pfx-read  
 a. ‘There are two books which were read by every student.’  
 b. ‘Every student has read at least two books.’
- (3) [CT ‘Két könyvet] [QP ‘több, mint öt diák [VP elolvasott.]]  
 two book-acc more than five student pfx-read  
 a. ‘There are two books which were read by more than five students.’  
 b. #‘There are more than five students who read two books.’  
 c. #‘The number of students who read two books is more than five.’

- (4) [CT 'Két könyvet] [FP 'több, mint öt diák [VP olvasott el.]]  
 two book-acc more than five student read pfx  
 a. 'There are two books which were read by more than five students.'  
 b. 'There are more than five students who read two books.'  
 c. 'The number of students who read two books is more than five.'
- (5) [CT 'Két könyvet] [FP több, mint öt 'okos diák [VP olvasott el.]]  
 two book-acc more than five clever student read pfx  
 a. 'There are two books which were read by more than five clever students.'  
 b. #'There are more than five clever students who read two books.'  
 c. #'The number of clever students who read two books is more than five.'

## References

- Alberti, Gábor and Anna Medve 2000. Focus constructions and the „scope-inversion puzzle” in Hungarian. In Alberti, G. and I. Kenesei (eds.) *The Structure of Hungarian VII*, 93–117. Szeged: JATEPReSS.
- Büring, Daniel. 1997. *The Meaning of Topic and Focus. The 59<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge Accent*. London, New York: Routledge.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 2000. A [+referáló] és [+specifikus] jegyek ellenőrzése a kontrasztív topik esetében. [The checking of the features [+referential] és [+specific] in the case of contrastive topic] In László Büky and Márta Maleczki (eds.). *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei IV. [New Methods in the Description of Hungarian IV]*, 85–96. Szeged: SZTE.
- Kálmán, László 1985. Word order in non-neutral sentences. In István Kenesei (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian I*. Szeged: JATE, 25-37.

## **Liliane Haegeman (Université Charles de Gaulle - Lille III- UMR 8258 Silex du CNRS)** ***Adverbial clauses, topicalisation and the left periphery***

### 1. Adverbial clauses

This paper will examine the structure and the interpretation of adverbial clauses in terms of their relation to the host clause. I will show that at least two types of adverbial clauses must be distinguished, these are illustrated by the conditional clauses in (1).

- (1)a. If it rains we will all get terribly wet and miserable.  
 b. If it is going to rain this afternoon, why don't we just stay at home and watch a video?

The conditional in (1a) expresses the cause of the main clause event, that in (1b) expresses a premise that warrants the conclusion expressed by the associated clause. The contrasts displayed by conditional clauses are also displayed by clauses introduced by other subordinating conjunctions such as *while*, *because*, *when*, *since*, *though* etc. Other subordinators tend to have only a temporal (event) reading (*before*, *after*).

### 2. External syntax:

Event conditionals (1a) and premise conditionals (1b) have a different relation with the host clause. (i) Event conditionals are construed within the scope of main clause operators such as tense, negation, question, focus (cleft), quantificational adverbs, etc. Premise conditionals are outside the scope of such operators. (ii) Binding possibilities (condition C effects, availability of bound pronouns) confirm the different scope relations. (iii) Parasitic Gaps can be licensed in event conditionals, with the licensing gap occurring in the main clause (see Nissenbaum 2000 for examples and discussion); PGs are not licensed in premise conditionals.

(iv) VP ellipsis or *do so* substitution of VP may affect event conditionals; it cannot affect the premise conditional. Etc.

I will label adverbial clauses of the type in (1a) **central adverbial clauses** and assume that they are syntactically integrated in the host clause (they may be, for instance, ‘adjoined to VP or to some other projection below the surface position of the subject’ (Nissenbaum 2000, cf. Thompson 1994a,b).

Premise conditionals (1b) are **peripheral adverbial clauses** and are syntactically more detached. Indeed, the question arises whether they are integrated to their host clause in the narrow syntax. One option is to propose that peripheral adverbial clauses are integrated to the host clause at the level of CP. In derivational terms, the difference between the two types of clauses can then be stated in terms of the level of the insertion of the conditional clause into the associated main clause. Central adverbial clauses are inserted at the level of vP or IP, peripheral adverbial clauses would be inserted at the level of CP. As a result the configurational relation between a peripheral adverbial clause and the host CP resembles that of a coordinated structure [<sub>CP1</sub> [<sub>CP<sub>a</sub></sub>] [<sub>CP1</sub>]]. In configurational terms, central adverbial clauses are c-commanded by the associated matrix I/C while peripheral adverbial clauses are not. I will also explore an alternative proposal (cf Haegeman 1991, Fabb 1990, Shaer and Frey 2003) according to which peripheral adverbial clauses are ‘orphan constituents’ which are not linked to their host in the narrow syntax. Whatever interactions are seen to exist between the orphan constituent and its host would then be of the same nature as interactions between two independent sentences in the discourse. Arguments for and against this proposal, which goes back to my earlier work, will be explored.

### 3. Internal syntax: truncation inside CP

The two types of adverbial clauses can be shown to differ in terms of their internal syntax, more specifically in terms of the functional structure of their CP domain, whose function is to link a proposition to the context (higher clause or discourse). For instance, the following contrasts are observed: (i) Central adverbial clauses resist argument topicalisation while peripheral adverbials allow it. (ii) Central adverbial clauses do not tolerate epistemic modals or epistemic adjuncts, while peripheral adverbial clauses do allow for them.

Early accounts for the restricted distribution of M(ain) C(lause) P(henomena) (Hooper and Thompson 1973) such as topicalisation, focused on the semantic/discourse function of the clause. Hooper and Thompson (1973) claim that MCP are restricted to ‘asserted’ clauses but they did not offer a precise syntactic formalisation. Given our current understanding of the functional structure of the clause it has become possible to interpret Hooper and Thompson’s (1973) analysis in structural terms. (See also Emonds (to appear) who introduces the concept of Discourse projection.)

In order to account for the internal syntax of adverbial clauses I will adapt a modified version of Rizzi’s (1997) Split CP proposal. I propose that central adverbial clauses lack some layer(s) of the internal structure of the CP domain. The interpretive differences between the two clause types as signalled in the 70s literature, suggest that they should actually be differentiated in terms of the presence (1b) vs. absence (1a) of ‘illocutionary force’. Typically, for instance, premise conditionals are echoic (1b) –suggesting they have Force. Following Bhatt and Yoon (1992) (cf also Bennis 2000), I distinguish the functional head that encodes force (clause type) from that which serves simply to subordinate the clause, to ‘make it available for (categorical) selection independently of its force’ (Rizzi 1997). ‘Sub’ introduces embedded clauses and hosts the conjunction. Central adverbial clauses then have the structural hierarchy in (2a), premise conditionals have the hierarchy in (2b) and root clauses are as in (2c).

|     |   |                      |     |       |      |       |            |
|-----|---|----------------------|-----|-------|------|-------|------------|
| (2) | a | central adverbial:   |     | Sub   | Mod  | Fin   | IP         |
|     | b | Peripheral adverbial | Sub | Force | Top* | Focus | Mod*Fin IP |
|     | c | Root clauses         |     | Force | Top* | Focus | Mod*Fin IP |

#### 4. Topicalisation

In the third part of the presentation I will return to the issue of argument fronting to the left periphery, and in particular to the observed restrictions on topicalisation in adverbial clauses. Rizzi (1997) seems to assume that English topicalisation and Romance CLLD target the same functional projection TopP. This assumption leads to problems. For instance, English argument fronting is a root phenomenon (Hooper and Thompson 1973, Maki, Kaiser and Ochi 1999), Romance CLLD is not. This difference raises the possibility that the functional projections available in the left periphery are not universal (cf Emonds to appear). The need arises for a non-stipulatory account for the observed cross-linguistic variation. Before this issue can be properly settled we will need to clarify the terms topic and TopP as syntactic concepts.

**Konstantina Haidou (University of London)**

***On the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface: Left, medial and right peripheral focus and topic in Greek***

**1. TOPIC.** It is a well known fact that intonational patterns influence pragmatic interpretations in several languages (Bolinger 1965, Halliday 1967, Jackendoff 1972, Lambrecht 1994, Ladd 1998, and Steedman 2000). Another well-known fact is that intonation can have an effect on semantic interpretation. For example, in German, different intonational patterns yield different scope readings (Féry 1993, Büring 1997, and Krifka 1998, among others). This paper discusses how pragmatic information, prosody, and semantic interpretation can be related in defining pragmatic notions such as focus and topic in Greek. Languages solve potential conflicts between focus, intonation and constituent order requirements either by sacrificing the canonical pattern of phonological phrasing, as in English  $S_FVO$  (cf. Truckenbrodt 1999) or by changing the canonical constituent order, as in Spanish  $VOS_F$  (cf. Zubizarreta 1998). We argue that Greek aims for the first option where the focus/topic/background partition is marked in the phonological component which interfaces with pragmatics.

**2. PROPOSAL.** We propose a model of the Syntax-Pragmatics (henceforth S-P) mapping which also captures a direct relation between pragmatics, which is expressed by a certain prosody, and semantics. All interactions between syntax and pragmatics are mediated by the prosodic component (Selkirk 1986, 1995; Hayes 1989; Nespor and Vogel 1986; Zec & Inkelas 1990). We follow Jackendoff's (1997) *Representational Modularity* (contra Chomsky 1995) that there can be no mixed representations that are partly phonological, partly syntactic, or partly semantic. Rather, all coordination among representations is encoded in mapping processes.

We argue that the representation of pragmatic notions (focus) in the grammar is mediated by the *Alignment* (A) or *Misalignment* (M) of the prosodic with the syntactic structure. The S-PA is responsible for the assignment of main stress in the unmarked order cases and the identification of the focus of the sentence (cf. 1). The focus constituent inserts a left  $\phi$ -boundary thus triggering rightward rephrasing of the string. The S-PM identifies positions other than clause final, e.g., medial and left peripheral (cf. 2, 3). In Greek, default prominence is rightmost. The focus constituent is the most prominent on the  $\phi$ - and  $-IP$  level. The S-PM mapping rules delete the accent on *post-focal* material, which count as *extrametrical* and semantically D-linked (cf.5).

*Topics* (cf. 4) are parsed into independent IPs which resist prosodic rephrasing due to the fact that prosody parses non-cyclic syntactic chunks (adjuncts) into independent  $\phi$ s or IPs. *Pre-focal given* material is accented and rephrases in accordance to binarity constraints (see also Baltazani 2002, Haidou 2002, 2003).

**3. PREDICTIONS.** (i) The current proposal is conceptually advantageous since it does not allow for phonologically-based movement into the syntax, to get a consistent set of mapping principles from syntax to pragmatics (contra Costa 1996; Choi 1996; Neeleman & Reinhart 1998; Szendrői 2001); (ii) Foci and Topics accents are expressed as semantic values at LF evoking alternatives (Rooth 1996; Büring 1999) or as a mapping to focus representation à la Williams (2000); (iii) As a result of the mapping, there is no predetermined Focus Phrase in Greek; (iv) The Focus-Stress correspondence allows for a direct prosody-semantics mapping without the mediation of syntax.; (v) Prosodic information is relevant in defining meaning in as much as it has an impact on semantic focus interpretation, scope interpretations (cf. 6) and on anchoring utterances within their context (*pragmatics*). Thus, PF material is delivered at conceptual structure along with syntax (cf. Reinhart 1995).

### Examples

#### *prosody - pragmatics interface and focus phrasing*

Right peripheral focus (information)

- (1). [i Maria kitakse]<sub>φ</sub> [ton YANI<sub>+F</sub>]<sub>φ</sub> focus phrasing  
 [i Maria]<sub>φ</sub> [kitakse ton Yani]<sub>φ</sub> unmarked phrasing  
 Maria-nom looked at-3sg the John-acc  
 ‘Mary looked at John’

Medial focus (contrastive)

- (2). [akubise sto {TRAPEZI<sub>+F</sub>}<sub>φ</sub> ta klidia ]<sub>φ</sub> IP focus phrasing  
 [akubise sto trapezi ta klidia]<sub>φ</sub> IP unmarked phrasing  
 put-3sg on the table the keys-acc  
 ‘He/She put the keys on the table’

Left peripheral focus (contrastive)

- (3). [{tha to PULISI<sub>+F</sub>}<sub>φ</sub> o Costas to aftokinito ]<sub>φ</sub> IP focus phrasing  
 [tha to pulisi o Costas ]<sub>φ</sub> [ to aftokinito ]<sub>φ</sub> IP unmarked phrasing  
 will it-cl sell-fut the Costas-nom the car-acc  
 ‘Costas will sell it, the car’

#### *topic phrasing*

Topic NP cl V

- (4). [<sub>NP-Topic</sub> tin mitera tu Vassili [<sub>IP</sub> i Maria tin latreui] [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>cl</sub>- t<sub>v</sub>]]]  
 /tin mitera tu Vassil<sub>i</sub> i Maria tin latreui/  
 [[tin mitera tu Vassili]<sub>φ</sub> φ [i Maria tin latreui]<sub>φ</sub>] IP  
 [[tin mitera tu Vassili]<sub>φ</sub>] IP [i Maria tin latreui]<sub>φ</sub>] IP  
 the mother-acc of Vassilis-gen, the Maria-nom cl-acc adore-3sg  
 ‘As for Vassilis mother, Mary loves her’

Medial topic cl V+ focus NP NP

- (5). [<sub>FP</sub> tus epiasan<sub>+F</sub> [ <sub>Topic</sub> tus kleftes [<sub>IP</sub> t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> i astinomi t<sub>v</sub>]]]]]  
 /tus epiasan<sub>i</sub> tus kleftes i astinomi/  
 [tus epiasan<sub>i</sub> dus kleftes i astinomi]  
 them-cl caught-3pl the thieves-acc the policement-nom.pl  
 ‘As for the thieves, the policemen caught them’

Note: Focused V deletes the Topic phrasing and de-accented *post-focal* material

*prosody – semantics interface*

- (5) Den            diavasan    polla vivlia                            Scopally ambiguous  
      not-neg    read-3pl    many books

*Focus intonation and disambiguation*

- a.    [DEN]<sub>F</sub> diavasan polla vivlia            [√NOT>MANY][\*MANY> NOT]  
b.    [Den diavasan]<sub>Topic</sub> [POLLA]<sub>F</sub> vivlia            [√MANY> NOT] [\*NOT>MANY]

**Daniel Hole (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)**

***Why some LP constructions have strong interpretations, and others don't***

The claim put forward in this talk is that competing constraints in the mapping of quantificational structures to sentence structure, plus inferencing, will sometimes lead to LP constructions with a special semantic-pragmatic function, whereas in other cases LP constructions are void of any semantic-pragmatic surplus. Defining LP constructions liberally, I will subsume phenomena at the left edge of sentences or clauses under this heading, irrespective of whether they are tightly integrated syntactically or not. In one case (4), I will even label an IP-LP construction as an LP construction. The first guiding idea is that hearers should, as soon as possible, know about the beginning of a quantificational structure, simply to avoid quantificational garden paths. This is why, e.g., the overt movement of relative pronouns makes perfect sense from the hearer perspective: The information about predicate abstraction is expressed at the beginning of the relative clause, no matter where the relative pronoun has initially been merged. Note that while restrictors form part of quantificational structures, they are typically totally unmarked as such. Therefore, starting a quantificational structure with the restrictor will usually mean not to mark the left edge of the structure at all. A typical kind of garden path resulting from restrictor-initial quantificational structures is provided by the contact clause example in (1) (note that contact clauses in English are subject to narrow restrictions).

(1) He gave the girl a cake had been given to another cake.

In short, hearer-friendly quantificational structures should start with the overtly marked quantifiers or nuclear scopes rather than with the restrictor. On the other hand, quantificational focus-background structures tend to have the quantifier, if there is any, and the nuclear scope in a right-peripheral position: Canonical utterances have their foci towards the end. In simple sentences with simple focus structures, this typically doesn't lead to garden paths: in an ideal discourse modelled along the lines of Buering (to appear) hearers know in advance that a focus-quantificational structure starts when an answer (to a possibly implicit question) begins, even if other quantifiers might potentially blur the picture. The idea now is to say that whenever the hearer is informed in advance about the kind of quantificational structure she's about to hear, and the speaker still chooses an LP construction with a focus and/or a quantifier in the periphery even though canonical word order would in principle be available, inferencing is invited. If conventionalized, this typically leads to strengthening phenomena of various sorts. Here are some examples.

(2) *Object preposing in English:*

- a. [APples]<sub>F</sub> I want to pick.  
b. I want to pick [APples]<sub>F</sub>.

(3) *Adverbial vs. ad-focus focusing in Mandarin:*

- a. Zhiyou [ZHE]F-zhong shu Lao Wang cai mai-guo.  
only this-CL:kind book Old Wang CAI buy-ASP  
'Old Wang has bought only [THIS]F kind of book before.'
- b. Lao Wang zhi mai-guo [ZHE]F-zhong shu.  
Old Wang ONLY buy-ASP this-CL:kind book  
'Old Wang has bought only [THIS]F kind of book before.'

In (2a), the exhaustivity interpretation is favoured or even enforced by the LP construction. Thus, (2a) is more informative than (2b), it is strengthened. The sentences in (3) are denotationally hard to distinguish, but (3a) has a much stronger evaluational component: Old Wang's buying of only THIS kind of book in (3a) is somehow scandalous, or at least very remarkable.

(4) *Strong vs. weak negative polarity in Mandarin*

- a. Lao Wang [SHENme]F dou mei mai.  
Old Wang anything DOU not.have buy  
'Old Wang hasn't bought ANYTHING AT ALL.'
- b. Lao Wang mei mai [SHENme]F.  
Old Wang not.have buy anything  
'Old Wang hasn't bought [anything SPECial]F.'

Again, the (IP-)LP construction in (4a) is more informative, and hence stronger, than the non-LP construction in (4b): If Old Wang hasn't bought anything special as in (3b), he may still have bought something insignificant, say, a chewing gum (cf. Krifka 1995). This is excluded in (4a). To sum up, I claim that the following two constraints are often at work in the course of choosing in favour of or against an LP construction:

- (5) a. \*QuantificationalGardenPath: Start a quantificational structure with the quantifier or the marked nuclear scope.  
b. Right-Align foci in focus-background structures.

These two constraints interact with a semantic-pragmatic strengthening mechanism, which may diachronically lead to conventionalized strengthened LP-constructions:

- (6) If the hearer is not in the danger of getting the quantificational structure wrong  
a. ...favour (4b);  
b. ...otherwise the hearer will draw strengthening inferences (i.e. if an LP construction is chosen).

In cases in which syntactic choices are not (generally) available, e.g. in relative clauses, LP constructions do not lead/have not led to strengthening phenomena.

### References:

- Buering, Daniel (to appear). 'On D-trees, Beans, and B-Accents'. *Linguistics & Philosophy*.  
Krifka, Manfred (1995). 'The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items'. *Linguistic Analysis* 25, 209-257.

**Anke Holler (Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg)**  
*How the left-periphery of a wh-relative clause determines its syntactic and semantic relationships*

This paper discusses aspects of the grammar of the wh-relative clauses (wh-RCs), also called “weiterführende Relativsätze”, which are syntactically peculiar as they show both root clause and subordinate clause properties. Semantically, wh-relatives relate to abstract entities of various kinds. From a pragmatic point of view, a wh-RC evokes coherence because of a symmetric discourse relation established between the wh-RC and its antecedent clause. The described grammatical behavior clearly can be attributed to the properties of the elements positioned at the left periphery of a wh-RC.

1. Three kinds of expressions are overtly realized on the left of a wh-relative: (i) the underspecified pronoun ‘was’ (‘which’), (ii) wh-adverbs such as ‘wofür’ (‘for which’), ‘wonach’ (‘after which’), ‘weswegen’ (‘why’), etc., and (iii) complex wh-expressions including an abstract noun. This is illustrated by (1a) to (1c), resp. The introductory expressions act syntactically either as complements (‘was’, complex wh-expressions) or as adjuncts (wh-adverbs) of the relative clause’s predicate. Semantically, they are anaphoric in that they establish a relationship to a preceding item.<sup>1</sup> It will be argued that the left-peripheral wh-anapher potentially can refer to abstract objects (cf. Asher 1993) of various semantic types such as event, event types, (projective) propositions and facts. Therefore, the assumption mostly stated in the philological literature (cf. Helbig 1980, and others) that wh-relatives are generally sentence-related or fact-related is incorrect. The antecedent of a wh-RC is sentential only in syntactic respect. Semantically, however, a wh-relative in principle can refer to any entity that can be abstracted from the preceding syntactic string. The semantic relationship is only restricted by the semantic type of the left-peripheral wh-anapher.

2. Due to the properties of its empty head, a wh-RC behaves like a non-restrictive relative clause. Moreover, a wh-RC is a typical non-integrated clause (Reis 1997) as indicated by its root properties, its independent focus domain and its final position in the complex sentence structure. Thus, a wh-RC is syntactically peculiar as it is dependent from the preceding clause without being licenced by a verb of this clause. In this aspect, it differs from so-called integrated clauses such as finite complements that are selected by the matrix verb. For these empirical insights, an HPSG-analysis is given which is based on a phonologically empty relativizer which serves as the head of a non-restrictive relative clause. The relativizer selects two complements: the dislocated wh-relative constituent and a functionally incomplete verbal projection. Driven by its head, a wh-relative clause is attached to the complete functional projection introduced by the preceding clause. In addition, two binary head features are defined,  $\alpha$  DEPENDENT and  $\alpha$  EMBEDDED, in order to distinguish dependent and independent clause types on the one hand and to account for integrated and non-integrated clause types on the other hand. Semantically, a wh-RC is interpreted as a proposition, and the left-peripheral wh-anapher has to be resolved by at least one appropriate semantic object abstracted from the matrix clause.

Examples:

- (1)a. Max spielt Orgel, was Anna überrascht.  
Max is playing organ, which surprises Anna.

---

<sup>1</sup> If the wh-anapher acts as an argument of the wh-predicate, it fulfills the selectional requirements of the respective verb. If the wh-anapher is expressed by a wh-adverb, the temporal, modal or causal meaning of this adverb is preserved.

- b. Hans hat sich sein Bein gebrochen, weswegen er jetzt im Krankenhaus liegt.  
Hans broke his leg, and that's why he is in hospital now
- c. Max bat Anna, einen Brief einzuwerfen, welcher Bitte sie nachkam.  
Max asked Maria to mail a letter, and she granted this request.

References:

- Asher, N. (1993). Reference to Abstract Objects in Discourse. Dordrecht: Kluwer.  
Brandt, M. (1990). Weiterführende Nebensätze. Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell International.  
Helbig, G. (1980). Was sind weiterführende Nebensätze. DaF 17, 13-23.  
Reis, M. (1997). Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verbzweitsätze. In C. Dürscheid, K.-H. Ramers und M. Schwarz (Eds.) Proceedings of the Germanic Roundtable at Berkeley, April 1998.

**Hans Kamp (Universität Stuttgart)**  
***Last one in, first one out. Interactions between Focus, Contrastive Topic and Quantification.***

This talk has two purposes. First, it will look at certain interactions between information structure and quantification. Secondly, and more generally, it will, in the context of the particular issues raised in connection with quantification and information structure, present (relevant parts of) a formalism that allows for transparent representations of information structure (in particular focus) as well as of nominal and adverbial quantification.

A substantial part of the talk will be devoted to the following puzzle:

In each of the sentences (1), (3) and (4) focal stress on the word "COOKS" can be interpreted as a signal that the focus constituent belongs to the nuclear scope of the quantifier (and not to its restrictor. But this is not so for sentence (2). Why?

- (1) Many COOKS applied.
- (2) Most COOKS applied.
- (3) Often COOKS applied.
- (4) Mostly/Usually COOKS applied.

I will also have something to say about the title of the talk.

**Ruth Kempson / Ronnie Cann / Jieun Kiaer (University of Edinburgh / King's College London)**

***Topic and Focus Effects at the peripheries: The Dynamics of Tree Growth***

This paper shows how the differing topic/focus effects and structural restrictions associated with left and right peripheral constituents, can be explained in terms of general principles determining growth of semantic structure. There is no stipulation of topic or focus positions (Rizzi 1997) or level of information structure (Vallduvi 1991). The framework adopted is Dynamic Syntax (DS: Kempson et al. 2001). Data include Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD), Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) (Greek, Spanish), extraposition, pronoun and (obligatory) clitic doubling (English, Spanish), and subject postposing (Spanish and Korean).

Like minimalism (Chomsky 1995), logical form as a tree is the only syntactic level in DS: syntactic explanations reside solely in the progressive projection of such structure. But DS trees are representations of semantic content built up over partial trees strictly following the left-right dynamics of processing. Early introduction and (subsequent) resolution of aspects of underspecification are central to syntactic explanations: eg anaphoric expressions project meta-variables substituted by (antecedent) logical terms, and long-distance dependency is expressed as introduction of an initially underspecified tree relation which is subsequently updated (replacing movement). Pairs of trees can then be “linked”, with one tree providing the context with which a subsequently introduced tree has to share a term.

The concepts of building linked trees and updating unfixed nodes form the basis of periphery effects, providing explanations for topic and focus. Topic is a structure relative to which a propositional structure is constructed, built as linked structures with essential anaphoric connection. Focus is an updating of an open propositional structure with a single term. HTLD (1) is analysed in terms of linked trees, hence the obligatory pronoun or other anaphoric expression without locality constraint (analogous to base generation – Agnastopoulou 1996) The left-peripheral expression in A' dependencies project an initially unfixed node whose update is resolved within a tree (analogous to A' movement). This update may be secured through construal of a pronoun (2) as long as the language allows the node decorated by the pronoun to be updated by arbitrarily complex structure, hence allowing case agreement (CLLD – Cinque 1990) (clitics may lexically induce and decorate a fixed node in the structure obviating the need for a full DP.) In subject pro-drop languages, we expect mixed topic/focus effects for explicit preposed subjects (3) (Belletti 1999). Introducing unfixed nodes or linked structures is used to different effect at the right-periphery, concepts of underspecification solving puzzles associated with rightward movement without positing additional focus projections (Mahajan 1997). A node introduced as unfixed at a late stage in the construction process will be dominated by the host from which it is built, licensing quantifying expressions and narrow scope effects (4). The right-branch constraint is expected as finally added structure within a tree can only provide a means to complete already constructed local structure (eg expletives (5)). The concept of linked trees underpins such phenomena as pronoun doubling (6) but with the pronoun preceding the full form in the linear sequence, it is the pronoun which is construed relative to the general context and the full form, given that linked structures must share a term, which is interpreted as identical to the pronoun, hence the background topic effect (Herring 1994). In pro-drop structures, either linked-structure or unfixed-node strategy is available, hence mixed focus/background-topic effects for postposed subjects (7)-(8). Pre-verbal clitics either provide input to later structural update (Spanish datives) (9) or are interpreted relative to context (10), with obligatory clitic doubling of strong pronouns (Spanish (11)-(12)) expressed as a lexical restriction on strong pronouns of only decorating linked structures or unfixed nodes (i.e. lexically associated with topic/focus effects) (Suner 1988). Thus parallels and differences between left/right peripheries and their associated topic/focus effects reduce to general tree-growth principles.

### Examples:

(1) That woman at the cash desk, she ignored me.

(2) Ti Maria (ti) sinantise xtes [GREEK]  
 the Maria, (her) I met yesterday  
 ‘Maria, I met her yesterday.’

(3) Maria compró un coche [SPANISH]  
 Maria bought a car  
 ‘Maria bought a car.’

- (4) cereal-ul mek-ess-ta taybwubwun-haksayng-i [KOREAN]  
 cereal-ACC eat-PST-DEC most student -NOM  
 'They ate cereal, in fact, most students.'
- (5) It is likely that I am wrong.
- (6) Lo conosco, Giovanni. [ITALIAN]  
 Him I know Giovanni  
 'I know him, Giovanni.'
- (7) Compró un coche, Maria [SPANISH]  
 bought a car, Maria  
 She bought a car, Maria.
- (8) cereal-ul mek-ess-ta Mary-ka [KOREAN]  
 cereal-ACC eat-PST-DEC Mary-NOM  
 'She ate cereal, Mary.'
- (9) (Les) ofrecieron queso y leche a families de pocos medios [SPANISH]  
 to them offer-3.ps.pl. cheese and milk to families of small means  
 'They offered cheese and milk to low-income families.'
- (10) (La) oían a Paca  
 (her) listened-3.ps.pl to Paca.  
 'They listened to Paca.'
- (11) La llamaron a ella  
 her call-3. ps.pl her  
 'They called her.'
- (12) \*Llamaron a ella  
 called-3.ps.pl her  
 'They called her.'

## References

- Anagnostopoulou, A. eds. 1996. *Materials on Left Dislocation*. Benjamins.
- Beerman, D et al eds. 1997. *Rightward Movement*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Belletti, A. 1999. Inversion as focalization and related questions. *Catalan WPL*. 9-45.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass:MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. 1990. *Types of A' Dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass:MIT Press.
- Herring, S. 1994. 'Afterthoughts, antitopics, and emphasis: the syntactization of postverbal position in Tamil' in Butt, M. et al (eds.) *Theoretical Perspectives on Word Order in South Asian Languages*, 119-152. CSLI.
- Kempson, R. et al 2001. *Dynamic Syntax: The Flow of Language Understanding*. Blackwell.
- Mahajan, A. 1997. Rightward scrambling. in Beerman, D. 1997.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegemann, L. (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer.
- Suñer, M. 1988. The role of AGreement in clitic doubled constructions' *NLLT* 6.
- Vallduvi, E. 1991. The informational Component. Ph.D. University of Pennsylvania.

**Eric Mathieu (University College London)**  
*French Topics*

The split-CP hypothesis put forward by Rizzi (1997), and further developed in Poletto (2000), Benincá (2001), Benincá & Poletto (forthcoming), has been very influential in recent years. It pertains to the view that the external area of IP is far richer than presumably thought. Very much in the spirit of Pollock (1989), who split IP in a series of distinct functional projections, the CP is now decomposed in several layers, one of which being a Focus projection. As for

Topics, Rizzi (1997) argues that they are folded around Focus and that they are recursive. On the other hand, Benincá & Poletto believe that there are dedicated positions for Topic(s) in the left periphery of the clause (e.g. a position for Hanging Topics, one for Left Dislocated topics, etc.). Another trend has recently flourished: Belletti (forthcoming) argues that the area immediately above VP also contains a Focus position surrounded by Topic positions (see also Belletti & Shlonsky 1995 and Cecchetto 1999). She claims that the internal Focus position is associated with a different interpretation from that of the external position (contrastive focus for the external position vs. informational focus for the internal position). On the other hand, she suggests that the topic interpretation is uniform in both peripheries and is assimilated to ‘given’, ‘known’, ‘non-focus’ interpretation.

The aim of the present paper is two-fold: first, concentrating on external focus and topic, a systematic comparison of Italian and French is provided. We find that there are subtle differences between the two languages, which indicate that the structure of the CP layer is not identical in the two languages. The French CP field appears to be ‘poorer’ than the Italian one. Second, we zoom on the area immediately dominating VP and consider whether this is an area as articulated as the external one. We argue *contra* Belletti that in most cases French (but also in Italian) internal topics are interpreted differently from the external ones. In order to achieve our second goal, we look at stranded nominals in split-DP constructions and at incorporated nouns in the first instance, and then we turn to Right Clitic Dislocation (RCD).

Following earlier work, the point of departure of the analysis presented here is that the nominals in the split-DP constructions in (1) are predicative indefinites, very much like incorporated nouns, bare plurals and attributive nominals in the sense of Van Geenhoven (1998) – semantic incorporation. In turn, the hypothesis that will be developed is that predicative indefinites are (non-prominent) new topics. They are like shifted topics (in the sense of Aissen, 1992), in that they are not given, but they are unlike shifted topics in that they are not what the sentence is about. They thus share with continuing topics (again in the sense of Aissen, 1992) the property of being minus ‘aboutness’ (Table 1 summarises the proposal). Following Sasse’s (1984) terminology, incorporated (and stranded) nominals will be referred as lower-order topics and non-incorporated (and raised) nominals as higher-order topics.

In sum, in a split-DP construction, although both the raised element and the stranded nominal are focused (in the sense that they introduce a new entity), they nevertheless constitute two different kinds of information. Stranded nominals represent background information while raised nominals denote foreground information (cf. 2). In other words, when the nominal is raised along with the WH operator, it is - given, + new, + about, when it appears in situ, it is - given, + new, - about. Whereas foregrounding highlights the most important information in the sentence (this notion is thus close to that of theme), background information means the less important information under discussion. It is not necessarily old or presupposed or given, and not necessarily unstressed. Stranded nominals in interrogatives receive main stress. Table 2 summarises the properties of autonomous versus incorporated/stranded nominals. The table is adapted from Sasse (1984). The novel idea here is that stranded nominals share with incorporated nominals all the properties in the right-hand column.

Whereas in previous work, we argued that stranded nominals were semantically incorporated, here we look at the possibility that stranded nominals actually raise to an internal discourse-related position. The evidence we provide suggest that there might be such a position available, but that it is not a topic position akin to the one present in the higher clause. Typically, topics appearing in the CP area are referential (or ‘given’ or ‘old’) or non-referential and what the sentence is ‘about’. The lower position we have in mind hosts *lower-order* topics. These topics share with focus the property of being ‘new’. This is not possible in the higher part of the clause (at least in French). The low-IP area appears to lack the shifted topic position (for instance, RCD elements cannot be non-referential while being what the sentence is ‘about’).

In conclusion, topics receive different interpretations depending on whether they are in the low-IP or the high-IP area. Having said that, lower-order topics are not necessarily internal topics (i.e. they do not have to appear in the low-IP area) and similarly, crosslinguistically (and even intra-linguistically – the case of French) we find that higher-order topics do not have to appear in the CP field. For example, split-topics in German are new topics, yet appear in the CP area (cf. van Geenhoven, 1998) and we will show that CRD elements can be lower-order topics as well in French. Finally, we show that informational focus is not restricted to the low-IP area in French contrary to what is often believed.

(1) Combien as-tu de livres?(2) Combien de livres as-tu lus?

|                   | <i>New</i> | <i>Old</i> | <i>Aboutness</i> |
|-------------------|------------|------------|------------------|
| Shifted topics    | +          | -          | +                |
| Continuing topics | -          | +          | -                |
| New topics        | +          | -          | -                |

Table 1

| <i>Autonomous Direct Object</i> | <i>Incorporated/Stranded Direct Object</i> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Specific                        | Non-specific                               |
| referential                     | non-referential                            |
| semantically dependent          | semantically dependent                     |
| pragmatically prominent         | pragmatically non-prominent                |

Table 2

### References:

- Benincà, P. (2001) Syntactic Focus and intonational Focus in the left periphery. In G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: North Holland. 39-64.
- Belletti, A. (forth.) Aspects of the low IP area. In *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. OUP.
- Belletti, A. & U. Shlonsky (1995). The Order of Verbal Complements. A Comparative Study. *NLLT* 13, 489-526.
- Benincà, P. & C. Poletto (forth.). Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. OUP.
- Cecchetto, C. (1999) A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53, 43-67.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer: 281-337.
- Sasse, H-J. (1984) The pragmatics of noun incorporation in Eastern Cushitic Languages. In F. Plank (ed.), *Objects: towards a theory of grammatical relations*, 243-268. London: Academic Press.
- van Geenhoven, V. (1998) *Semantic incorporation and indefinite descriptions: semantic and syntactic aspects of noun incorporation in West Greenlandic*. Stanford: CSLI.

### **Nicola Munaro / Cecilia Poletto (University of Venice / Linguistica Università di Padova)** *Ways of clausal typing*

In this work we analyze the syntactic distribution and the interpretive import of some particles which can occur in interrogative, imperative and exclamative clauses in various North-Eastern Italian dialects. A detailed study of these particles turns out to have theoretical relevance for a crosslinguistic theory of clausal typing on the one hand and for a deeper understanding of the role of left periphery elements in the syntax-pragmatics interface on the other.

The particles we analyze share the following common features: (a) they always occupy a peripheral position with respect to the clause they refer to; (b) they can occur exclusively in

main contexts; (c) when the particle is realized, the speaker takes a position with respect to an existing presupposition determined by the linguistic or situational context.

Some particles occur in sentence final position, while others occur in sentence initial position, as exemplified in (1) and (2) respectively; still others can occur in more than one position: sentence initially, sentence finally or immediately after the *wh*-item, like in (3). In order to account for these peculiar distributional properties, we propose that the particles are  $C^\circ$  elements and that their sentence final occurrence results from the fronting of the whole clause to the functional specifier corresponding to the head position of the CP field occupied by the particle. Although each particle is most likely located in a different head, we propose that the surface order is always derived as sketched in (4). This hypothesis enables us to assimilate sentence initial particles to the others, the only difference consisting in the fact that the clause may not front in some cases.

The movement hypothesis is supported by the following arguments:

- firstly, the particles can not occur in embedded contexts: this distributional constraint can be explained under the assumption that they are generated within the CP field, as the same kind of restriction affects other syntactic phenomena associated to this structural area;
- secondly, the interpretation triggered by the particles suggests that they encode modal semantic features, expressing the speaker's viewpoint or the perspective of presentation of the event, which are generally associated to the highest structural area of the sentence;
- thirdly, there are particles which can attract to their specifier either the whole clause or only the *wh*-constituent, stranding the rest of the clause, as exemplified with *po* in (3b-c); these cases witness that the particle can be located in the left-periphery of the clause, as it precedes the cluster formed by inflected verb and subject clitic pronoun; the movement hypothesis is therefore superior to the null hypothesis, according to which one should postulate the possibility for the particle to be generated in two different positions.

More generally, the proposed analysis supports Kayne's (1994) view that the relative order of head and complement is not a primitive parameter of language variation and that the complement-head order is derived by complement raising: if the clause is analyzed as a complement to the particle-head, then the sentence final position of the particle follows from clausal complement raising. As for the fact that the sentential particles we consider are not incompatible with *wh*-movement, this may be due to the fact that they are located in a CP projection higher than the one targeted by *wh*-movement, which takes place inside the clausal complement of the particle.

Finally, the semantic contribution of these particles witnesses that sentence typing is a more complex process than usually assumed: their interpretive import is not limited to marking the interrogative vs exclamative vs imperative nature of the clause, but includes finer distinctions concerning the speaker's attitude with respect to the background presupposition; moreover, the same particle can trigger different interpretations in different dialects. As a consequence, clausal typing should not be viewed as a process involving the activation of a single functional projection, but rather as the result of the interplay of different factors, including operator and clausal movement.

#### Examples:

(1)a. Quando sarali rivadi, *ti?* Pieve d'Alpago (Bl)

When be+fut+they come, prt.?

b. Quando eli rivadi, *mo?*

When are+they come, prt?

(2)E cos ch'l è mina vgnu fora! Taglio di Po (Ro)

Prt. what that it is not come out!

- (3)a. *Po*, quando eli rivadi? Pieve d'Alpago (Bl)  
 Prt. when are+they come?  
 b. Quando eli rivadi, *po*?  
 When are+they come prt.?  
 c. Quando, *po*, eli rivadi?  
 When prt. are+they come?

(4) [FP CP<sub>i</sub> [F° particle] [CP t<sub>i</sub>]]

## References

- Benincà, P. (2000) “La struttura della frase esclamativa alla luce del dialetto padovano” in N.Munaro (ed.) *Quaderni di Lavoro dell'ASIS 3*, CNR – Padova, pagg. 13-35  
 Munaro, N. & H.-G.Obenauer (1999) “On underspecified *wh*-elements in pseudo-interrogatives”, *Venice Working Papers in Linguistics 9*, pagg. 181-253  
 Obenauer, H.-G. (1994) *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Effets d'intervention et mouvements des quantifieurs*, thèse de doctorat d'état, Université de Paris VIII  
 Poletto, C. & R.Zanuttini (2003) “Making Imperatives”, in C.Tortora (ed.) *The Syntax of Italian Dialects – Studies in Honour of Paola Benincà*, Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York  
 Portner, P. & R.Zanuttini (1998) “The Force of Negation in *Wh*-Interrogatives and Exclamatives”, in P.Benincà & C.Poletto (edd.) *Quaderni di Lavoro dell'ASIS 2*, CNR - Padova, pagg. 13-37

### **Frederick J. Newmeyer (University of Washington and École Normale Supérieure) *On Split-CPs, Uninterpretable Features, and the 'Perfectness' of Language.***

This talk will discuss critically a number of developments at the heart of current syntactic theory. These include the postulation of a sequence of projections at the left periphery of the sentence, each encoding some aspect of the sentence's information structure; the idea that one can tie movement to the need to eliminate uninterpretable features; and, more globally, the idea put forward by Chomsky and others that advances in the past decade have made it reasonable to raise the question about whether language might be in some sense 'perfect'. In each case, I am going to argue for what one might call a 'conservative' position. That is, I see no strong arguments for a highly-articulated left-periphery; there seems to me to be no connection whatsoever between movement and uninterpretable features; and the idea that language might be perfect is at best incoherent. The picture that emerges is one that has much more in common with GB-era syntax than with one that has come out of current minimalist thinking.

### **Javier Perez-Guerra / David Tizón-Couto (Universidade de Vigo) *'These hands, they are apt enough to dislocate and tear thy flesh': On left-dislocation in the recent history of the English language***

As part of a major project on the syntactic organisation of written discourse in the recent history of the English language, this paper tackles the distribution of sentences comprising leftdislocated (LD) constituents in a corpus of eighteenth-century textual material (*Eighteenth-century Fiction*), which contains a selection of works in English prose from the period 1700-1780, by writers from the British Isles.

Once the phenomenon of LD at work has been defined (in the vein of (1) below), this investigation will concentrate on the analysis of the corpus in the following directions:

- (i) syntactic connection between the LD segments and the rest of the sentence –syntactic nature of the LD constituent, syntactic function of the referent in the clause, etc.–;
- (ii) grammatical complexity of the LD material and its association with end-weight;
- (iii) information conveyed by the LD material, that is, the discourse-based referentiality potential of the LD constituents in terms of recoverability, and its association with end-focus;
- and (iv) the influence of orality, genre and gender on LD.

(1) A sentence is said to contain a left-dislocated constituent if it satisfies (a) and either (b) or (c):

- (a) A non-vocative constituent other than the unmarked theme is in sentence-initial position, and a pause (comma, in writing) is ‘felt’ to occur between that segment and the rest of the clause. That sentence-initial constituent cannot fulfil a function in the sentence which it introduces. In other words, it cannot be inserted directly in the syntactic structure of the ensuing clause.
- (b) A syntactic relation holds between the preposed segment and another element fulfilling a basic function in the sentence. In other words, a copy (or a referent, in those cases showing backward pronominalisation) of the preposed segment occurs in the sentence.
- (c) A semantic relation holds between the preposed segment and another element fulfilling a basic function in the sentence, in such a way that both the preposed and its related elements share semantic features (‘coreference’). Alternatively, the element in the sentence may be, semantically speaking, ‘part’ of the preposed one, which thus functions, informatively speaking, as setting.

The results of this investigation will be connected with previous diachronic work on leftdislocation, especially Pérez-Guerra (1999) on the Early Modern English section of the *Helsinki Corpus* and a representative sample of the Present-day English *LOB Corpus*.

### Works cited

- Eighteenth-century Fiction*. CD-ROM produced by Chadwyck-Healey.  
 (The) *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. Compiled by the University of Helsinki (see Kytö 1996).  
 Kytö, Merja comp (1996) *Manual to the diachronic part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts. Coding conventions and lists of source texts*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki (Department of English).  
 Johansson, Stig (1978) *Manual of information to accompany the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English, for use with digital computers*. Oslo: University of Oslo (Department of English).  
 (The) *Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English*. Compiled by the Universities of Lancaster and Oslo and the Norwegian Centre for the Humanities at Bergen (see Johansson 1978).  
 Pérez-Guerra, Javier (1999) *Historical English syntax. A statistical corpus-based study on the organisation of Early Modern English sentences*. München: Lincom Europa.

### **Nicholas Sobin (University of Texas at El Paso)** ***Echo Questions, Echo Negation, and Split CP***

Rizzi (1997) splits CP into separate layers of “force” and “finiteness,” and places between these layers one “focus” and two (or more) “topic” layers, as in (1). However, adopting (1) for English complicates the analysis of another strongly CP-related phenomenon, namely echo questions (EQs). Basic facts about the formation of EQs support the classic CP analysis ([<sub>CP</sub> Spec [<sub>C</sub> C ...]]) over the analysis offered in (1).

“Syntactic” EQs in English (author 1990) are strongly tuned to the CP structure of the utterance (U) which they echo. For example, if an U has the CP structure of a Yes/No question, a simple [+Wh] C as in (2a), then so must its EQ, as in (2b-d). If the CP structure of

the U contains a wh phrase, then so must the EQ, even to the extent of apparently violating conditions on ordinary overt movement, as in (3). However, unlike the contents of CP proper, moved elements which are not in CP are not “frozen.” For example, it is possible to EQ a passive U with an active EQ, as in (4). Analyses which retain the classic CP layer (perhaps with other functional layers below CP, e.g., Puskas 1997 or Culicover 1992a; 1992b) allow a sharp characterization of the above CP-mimicing property of EQs: the EQ simply “freezes” the CP layer of U. However, nothing so simple can be said if CP is analyzed as in (1). Some of the EQ facts which disfavor the analysis in (1) are seen in (5) and (6). In (5), the fronted AvP by next year is a [Spec, TopP], that is For<sup>o</sup>, and the [c $\emptyset$ ] of (5c) is Fin<sup>o</sup>. (5b-c) show surprising vacillation in the CP elements of an EQ relative to the freezing of other elements. Further, wh phrases are claimed to move to [Spec, FocP], as are focus elements like HIS BOOK in (6). However, while the [Spec, FocP] element of (3) is “frozen in” in an EQ, the [Spec, FocP] element of (6) is not.

Another construction which has been claimed to strongly parallel the syntax of questions and which has been analyzed in terms of the split CP layer in (1), is Negative Inversion (NI), as in (7a) (Haegeman & Guéron 1999; Haegeman 2000). In such structures, the negative expression is claimed to occupy SpecFocP, as wh phrases are claimed to do, and the verb is claimed to move to Foc<sup>o</sup>, also as it is claimed to do in questions. Interestingly, there is the possibility of what I will term ‘echo negation’ (EN), as in (7b-c). When taking issue with the polarity of an utterance like (7a), it is possible to insert a second negative which would ordinarily be somewhat strange-sounding. Also, the inserted negative is stressed. These features make ENs superficially similar to EQs. If both questions and NI constructions shared the same CP positioning, we might expect ENs to also share the more abstract properties of EQs. However, they do not. First, whereas a newly introduced wh phrase in an EQ takes wide scope relative to any other wh phrase already present, a newly-introduced negative takes narrow scope relative to the already-present negative expression. Second, whereas an already-present wh phrase loses its interrogative force, the already-present negative expression retains its full semantic force in the EN. Third, where a wh phrase in the CP layer of U is “frozen” in the CP layer of its EQ (as in (3b-c)), the negative expression is not, as indicated by the EN possibility (7c). Thus, NI constructions and their ENs appear to behave contrary to their analysis as occupants of split CP and as question parallels, further suggesting that the classic CP analysis may be more appropriate.

### Examples:

(1)<sub>[ForP For<sup>o</sup> [TopP\* Top<sup>o</sup> [FocP Foc<sup>o</sup> [TopP\* Top<sup>o</sup> [FinP Fin<sup>o</sup> ...</sub>

(2)a. U:Did Mary like the chocolate worms?

b. EQ:Did Mary like WHAT?

c. EQ:\*WHAT did Mary like?

d. EQ:\*Mary liked WHAT?

(3)a. U:What did Mozart eat at the party?

b. EQ:What did WHO eat at the party?

c. EQ:\*WHO ate what at the party?

(4)a. U:(They said that) Mary was abducted by Martians.

b. EQ:(They said that) WHO abducted Mary?

(5)a. U:Bill said that by next year, Mary will be craving cigars.

b. EQ:Bill said that Mary will be craving WHAT by next year?

c. EQ:Bill said [c $\emptyset$ ] Mary will be craving WHAT by next year?

- (6)a. U:HIS BOOK they should give to Mozart (not mine)  
 b. EQ:??HIS BOOK they should give to WHO?  
 c. EQ:They should give his book to WHO?

- (7)a. U:Rarely does he order pizza with pineapple.  
 b. EN:Rarely DOESN'T he order pizza with pineapple!  
 c. EN:He rarely DOESN'T order pizza with pineapple!

### References:

- author. 1990. ----.
- Culicover, Peter W. 1992a. Polarity, inversion, and focus in English. In *ESCOL '91*, 46-68. Department of Linguistics, The Ohio State University, Columbus.
- . 1992b. Topicalization, inversion, and complementizers in English. In *Going Romance and beyond*, eds. Denis Delfitto, Martin Everaert, Arnold Evers, and Frits Stuurman. Utrecht: University of Utrecht.
- Haegeman, L. 2000. Inversion, non-adjacent inversion and adjuncts in CP. In *Transactions of the Philological Society*, ed. P. Rowlett, 121-160. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haegeman, L. & J. Guéron. 1999. English grammar. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Puskas, Genoveva. 1997. Focus and the CP domain. In *The new comparative syntax*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 145-164. London: Longman.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, 289-330. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

### **Augustin Speyer (University of Pennsylvania)** ***Vorfelddbesetzung and Centering Theory in German***

The German language, as is well known, is subject to the verb-second-constraint. This involves compulsory movement of the verb to C° and of some other constituent to SpecC, which in German literature is often referred to as *vorfeld* (ex. 1; Grewendorf, Hamm, Sternefeld 1987). Which constituent actually is moved to SpecC is not determined by syntax. It is consequently reasonable to suspect that movement to SpecC is governed by discourse requirements.

A first step is to examine English constructions which involve non-canonical word order. The focus lies on two constructions: Inversion (2) and Topicalization (3).

Inversion in English is subject to requirements of Centering Theory (as outlined by Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein 1995; Walker, Joshi and Prince 1998). As a simple starting hypothesis consider the observation made by Birner (1998) that in inverted English sentences the preposed element is always a C<sub>b</sub>. Since English inversion seems in some ways comparable to German *vorfelddbesetzung* (= movement to SpecC), it would be not surprising if the same were true for the German *vorfeld*.

Topicalization, as described by Prince (1999) is governed by completely different processes. The topicalized element must be in a salient partially-ordered set relationship to an element from the previous discourse. This is a subcase of *kontrast* in the sense of Vallduví and Vilkkuna (1998). Note that under this assumption it is not the C<sub>b</sub> that stands in the *vorfeld*. For topicalization the same claim can be made as for inversion, viz. that German *vorfelddbesetzung* seems to be comparable to English topicalization.

In my paper I examine whether *vorfelddbesetzung* is comparable to either or both of the English constructions mentioned above, and if both, which pragmatic model makes the better predictions for *vorfelddbesetzung*. I am using a corpus consisting of articles from the *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, selections from the "Neue Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft", and works by Günther Grass.

An analysis of sentences in the corpus reveals that the prediction according to which German *vorfeldbesetzung* is to be described by means of Centering Theory does not always obtain. It is true that often the  $C_b$  is in the *vorfeld*, but rather often it is not. The performance is improved if one makes certain additions to Centering Theory proper and allows for a) NPs which are embedded in other structures as centers, b) certain adverbial referential expressions, c) centers from not the immediately preceding sentence, but the sentence before that, d) evoking of concepts and easily inferable sister-concepts rather than lexical items (cf. Birner 1998: 318). But even so Centering Theory does not account for a large number of cases. It seems from the data as if Centering Theory is in principle at work and tries to put the  $C_b$  in the *vorfeld*-position, but can be overridden by other processes. The most important process seems to be *kontrast* in the sense of Vallduví and Vilkuna (1998), also important is the exposition of *brand-new information* (in the sense of Prince 1981), especially scene-setting elements. The *vorfeld*-position thus seems to be prespecified for kontrastive or brand-new elements. Only if there are no kontrastive or brand-new elements the  $C_b$  can be put into the *vorfeld*. It is interesting to note that even if the *vorfeld* is already occupied there is a tendency to put the  $C_b$  as far to the front as possible, so that it usually occupies the first place in the *mittelfeld* (i.e. the area between  $C^\circ$  and stranded  $V^\circ$ -elements; cf. Rambow 1993). If the  $C_b$  is the subject this position seems to be obligatory. Linking back to the original question one could say that German *vorfeldbesetzung* works similar to both English inversion and topicalization, but that in conflicting cases topicalization beats inversion.

Examples:

(1)

| vorfeld<br>(= SpecC) | linke Satzklammer<br>(= $C^\circ$ ) | mittelfeld                  | rechte<br>Satzklammer<br>(= stranded<br>elements in VP) | nachfeld |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| a. Der Hund          | ist                                 | über die Straße             | gelaufen.                                               |          |
| b. Gestern           | lief                                | der Hund über die Straße.   |                                                         |          |
| c. Den Hund          | habe                                | ich gestern über die Straße | laufen sehen.                                           |          |

(2) Tich made tea in a blackened billy and McPherson filled a telescopic cup he took from a pocket. Seated on a form, he helped himself to sugar [...]. [Seated opposite **him**] was Tich, waiting for Gossip, wondering, hoping.  
(from Birner 1998: 315)

(3)a. ‘We’ve got **Earl Grey**, Ceylon, Lemon Ginger, Raspberry, Rose hip. Which’d you like?’  
– ‘**Earl Grey** I’d like.’

b. Thanks to all who answered my note asking about gloves. I didn’t look at this bb for several days and was astounded that there were **11 answers**. **Some** I missed, darn.

(from Prince 1999: 1)

c. **The necklace** she got from a friend. **The ring** she bought for herself.

d. ‘And who you invited for this spontaneous orgy, you chump?’ – ‘Well, there’s **Charlie and Al and Liz and Pat and Tom and Shermey and Rick and John and Mary and Bill**. **All these guys** you’ll have to order pizza for, I’m afraid.’

References:

Birner, Betty J. (1998) ‘Recency effects in English inversion’ in Walker, Marilyn A., Aravind K. Joshi and Ellen F. Prince, eds. (1998a), 310-323.  
Grewendorf, Günther, Fritz Hamm and Wolfgang Sternefeld (1987) *Sprachliches Wissen*, Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

- Grosz, Barbara J., Aravind K. Joshi and Scott Weinstein (1995) "Centering: A Framework for modelling the local coherence of discourse," *Computational Linguistics* 21, 203-225.
- Prince, Ellen F. (1981) "Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information," in Cole, P., ed. *Radical Pragmatics*, New York: Academic Press, 223-255.
- Prince, Ellen F. (1999) "How Not to Mark Topics: 'Topicalization' in English and Yiddish," *Texas Linguistics Forum*, Austin: University of Texas, chapter 8.
- Rambow, Owen (1993) *Pragmatic Aspects of Scrambling and Topicalization in German: A Centering Approach*. Ms., University of Pennsylvania.
- Vallduví, Enric and Maria Vilkuna (1998) "On rheme and kontrast," in Culicover, P. and L. McNally, eds. *Syntax and semantics 29: The limits of syntax*, New York: Academic Press, 79-108.
- Walker, Marilyn A., Aravind K. Joshi and Ellen F. Prince (1998a) *Centering Theory in Discourse*. Oxford: OUP.
- Walker, Marilyn A., Aravind K. Joshi and Ellen F. Prince (1998b) "Centering in naturally occurring discourse: an overview," in idem eds. (1998a), 1-28.

**Malte Zimmermann (Humboldt-Universität Berlin)**  
***Discourse Particles in the Left Periphery***

This paper brings together the old problem of the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic analysis of discourse particles with recent approaches to the syntax and semantics of the left periphery. Based on semantic and on cross-linguistic evidence, I argue that the German discourse particle *wohl* 'presumably, possibly' acts as a modifier on force indicators (decl, inter) semantically, and is located in SpecForceP at LF.

Traditional analyses (Weydt 1969, Asbach-Schnitker 1977, Doherty 1985, Abraham 1991) treat *wohl* on a par with other elements, such as *ja* 'as you know', under the cover term 'modal/discourse particle'. Commonly observed properties of *wohl* are: (i.) it blocks the expression of absolute certainty (cf.1); (ii.) it can only occur in declarative and interrogative sentences (cf.1, 2ab).

In this paper, I present – at first sight – conflicting evidence concerning the semantic scope of *wohl*. On one hand, it can be shown that *wohl* does not make up part of the proposition expressed (the descriptive meaning), supporting its classification as a discourse particle. On the other hand, I show that *wohl* differs from presupposition-triggering elements (expressives, parentheticals) in that it does not take widest scope (at an independent semantic level).

First, the interpretation of *wohl* is sensitive to the type of sentence it occurs in: *Wohl* in declaratives expresses uncertainty on the part of the speaker (cf.3a), *wohl* in interrogatives allows for uncertainty on the part of the hearer. Consequently, *wohl* in questions is ruled out in contexts where the hearer can be assumed to be certain about the answer (cf.3b).

Second, the interpretation of *wohl* in questions shows that its meaning does not contribute to the proposition of a clause, but rather to its expressive content. Alternative questions are formed semantically by constructing a set containing the proposition expressed and its negation (cf.4) (Karttunen 1976, von Stechow 1991). The assumption that *wohl* contributes to the proposition would falsely predict (5a) to have the reading in (5b). The correct reading of (5a), with *wohl* taking scope over the negation, is shown in (5c).

Third, *wohl* differs from expressives and parentheticals in that it cannot scope out of embedded contexts (cf.6ab). This argues against locating the meaning of *wohl* at an independent semantic level of presuppositions with widest scope (Karttunen & Peters 1979)

The following assumptions resolve the apparent conflict in the scopal behavior of *wohl*:

- (i.) the sentence types 'decl' and 'inter' have basic meanings that can be paraphrased as 'commitment to proposition p' and 'request for commitment to proposition p' respectively;
- (ii.) the type (or force) of a clause is syntactically encoded in ForceP (Rizzi 1997);
- (iii.) *wohl* LF-moves to SpecForceP (cf.7) and operates on (the meaning of) sentence types, leading to a weakening in strength of commitment to the (requested) proposition. Presence of *wohl* indicates that the commitment is not assertive (i.e. absolute), but rather speculative in

nature (Green 2000). Locating *wohl* in the left periphery (at LF) is supported by the fact that its counterparts in other languages occur in the periphery of the clause overtly, e.g. in form of syntactic heads in the highest functional projection (Finnish, cf.8a), or in form of tags adjoined to the clause (English, cf.8b).

The proposed analysis allows for a compositional derivation of the meaning of interrogatives with *wohl* (cf.9). The analysis also accounts for the observed sensitivity between the targeted epistemic base (speaker knowledge, hearer knowledge) and the sentence type. Assuming that the choice of force (decl, inter) determines the epistemic base (cf. Dohert 1985), *wohl* inherits this information under Spec-Head-agreement. Furthermore, the analysis provides a straightforward account of certain illocutionary effects that show up with *wohl* (declaratives as questions, interrogatives as directives) in terms of pragmatic implicature.

In total, it was shown that at least some elements that are traditionally known as ‘discourse particles’ should be reanalyzed as modifiers in ForceP.

### Examples:

- (1) Hein ist wohl auf See.  
Hein is wohl at sea ‘I assume that Hein is at sea.’
- (2) a. Hat Hania wohl ihren Chef eingeladen? → interrogative  
has H. wohl her boss invited  
b. \*Lade wohl Deinen Chef ein! → imperative  
invite wohl your boss prt
- (3) a. A: Where is Hein? B: #Ich weiß genau, dass Hein wohl auf See ist.  
I know for sure that Hein wohl at sea is  
b. Passenger at the airport check-in: #Der Flug geht wohl um 5 Uhr?  
The flight leaves wohl at 5 o’clock?
- (4) Is Hein at sea? → ?{Hein is at sea, Hein is not at sea} (? = question operator)
- (5) a. Ist Hein wohl auf See? (Is Hein wohl at sea?)  
b. ?{‘assume’(hearer, Hein is at Sea), *not assume*’(hearer, Hein is at sea)}  
= Tell me: Do you assume that Hein is at sea, or *don’t* you *assume* that Hein is at sea?  
c. ?{‘assume’(hearer, Hein is at sea), *assume*’(hearer, Hein is *not* at sea)}  
= Tell me: Do you assume that Hein is at sea, or do you *assume* that Hein *isn’t* at sea?
- (6) a. President Bush has said that the *damned* Republicans deserve public support.  
<President B. has said that the \_ Republicans deserve public support, *speaker does not like the Republicans*>  
b. Kanzler Schröder hat gesagt, dass die SPD wohl Unterstützung verdient.  
Chancellor S. has said that the SPD wohl support deserves  
\* <Chancellor S. has said that the SPD \_ deserves public support, *speaker assumes that the SPD deserves public support*>
- (7) [ForceP wohl<sub>i</sub> [Force inter] [FinP ist [IP Hein [VP ti [VP auf See]]]]]?
- (8) a. On-ko-*han* Pekka kotona?  
ist-Q-wohl Pekka at home ‘Is Pekka wohl at home?’  
b. A: Where is Peter? B: He’s at home, *isn’t he?*

- (9) a.  $[[\text{inter}]] = \lambda p. \{p, \neg p\}$  (= proto-question formation)  
 b.  $[[\text{inter ist Hein auf See}]] = \{\text{Hein is at sea, Hein is not at sea}\}$   
 c.  $[[\text{wohl}]] = \lambda P. \{\text{assume}'(\text{hearer}, q) | q.P\}$   
 d.  $[[\text{wohl inter ist Hein auf See}]] = \{\text{assume}'(\text{hearer, Hein is at sea}), \text{assume}'(\text{hearer, Hein is not at sea})\}$

## References

- Abraham, W. (1991): Discourse particles in German: How does their illocutive force come about? In W. Abraham (Hg.), *Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 203-252.  
 Asbach-Schnitker, B. (1977): Die Satzpartikel „wohl“. In H. Weydt (Hg.), *Aspekte der Modalpartikeln*. Tübingen: Narr. 38- 62.  
 Doherty, M. (1985): *Epistemische Bedeutung*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.  
 Green, M. S. (2000): Illocutionary Force and Semantic Content. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2000. 435-473.  
 Karttunen, L. (1977): Syntax and Semantics of Questions  
 Karttunen, L./ Peters, S. (1979): Conventional Implicature. In Ch.-U. Oh & D. A. Dinneen (Hgg.), *Presupposition. Syntax and Semantics* 11. New York: Academic Press. 1-56.  
 Rizzi, L. (1997): The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Hg.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 281-337.  
 Stechow, A. von (1991): Focussing and backgrounding operators. In W. Abraham (Hg.), *Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. 37-84.  
 Weydt, H. (1969). *Abtönungspartikel*. Berlin, Zürich.

## Poster Session

**Maria Alm (Lund University)**

***The functions and meanings of the German discourse particle “also” in the pre-front field-discussed on the basis of spoken German***

The German word *also* can occur in different positions in the German sentence. It can occur as an adverb inside of the clause boundaries or in front of the sentence, outside the syntactic nucleus of the clause, in the so called *the pre-front field*.

According to Auer (1996), the pre-front field is a grammaticalization position, a structural meeting position for discourse and grammatical functions. Via this position dialogical structures can find their way into the core of the sentence, where they take on grammatical functions. Contrary, also elements from the syntactical core of the sentence can find their way out of the sentence into the interactional dimension of talk.

Auer presents *also* to be a typical example of an element leaving the syntactic core of the clause and taking on discourse functions. In becoming a discourse particle, *also* allegedly lost its adverbial meaning 'as a consequence of the previously said' and opened up for contextual determined meanings and for a variety of different pragmatic functions, most of which are discourse structuring functions (Auer 1996:317). Auer claims that to acquire these discourse functions, *also* „occurs in fixed and circumscribed sequential and/or syntactic environments.“ If this is so, it should be possible to examine the typical contexts of each function and that could explain how the listener knows what function is at task.

In this talk, the possible discourse functions of *also* in the pre-front field is made, using examples from an authentic conversation. The question whether it is possible to pin down the typical syntactic and sequential environments for the specific discourse particle functions is followed up. It is also discussed, exactly in what way the meaning of *also* has changing when moving from an adverb to a discourse particle use.

## References:

Auer, Peter (1996): „The pre-front field in spoken German and its relevance as a grammaticalization position.“  
*Pragmatics* 6:3, 295-322.

### **Werner Frey / Benjamin Shaer (ZAS Berlin)** ***English and German Left-Peripheral Elements***

It is standardly claimed that two distinguishable classes of left-dislocation structures – hanging topic left-dislocation (HTLD) and German ‘weak pronoun left dislocation’ (WPLD), illustrated in 1a and 1b, respectively – involve left-peripheral (LP) elements integrated into clause structure (see, e.g., Boeckx & Grohmann to appear for a strong version of this). In this paper, we outline an alternative, whereby only the latter construction – and its English counterpart, topicalization (Top), illustrated in 1c – involves LP elements generated within the clause. The LP element in the former we take to be an ‘orphan’ (e.g., Haegeman 1991), a distinct phrase marker bearing no syntactic relation to the following sentence. We show that this distinction is consistent with a range of syntactic differences between the two classes of left-dislocation constructions; with data related to ‘non-sentences’ (e.g., Stainton to appear); and with the respective discourse functions of LP elements in HTLD, on the one hand, and WPLD and Top, on the other. Significantly, our arguments for this distinction include a reinterpretation of attested facts about these constructions, as given in 2–4, which, though rarely seen in this light (but see, e.g., Cinque 1983), turn out to offer good support for it.

The contrast between German WPLD and HTLD is well documented and involves, for example, differences in the intonation, island, binding, and case patterns available to each. Analogous differences have also been found between English Top and HTLD. Relevant binding facts in each language include those illustrated in 2, which show that in WPLD and Top but not in HTLD, a quantifier phrase may bind a pronoun inside the dislocated phrase. Even more striking, we believe, are the German case patterns described by Altmann (1981), which offer strong evidence that LP elements in WPLD occupy positions high in the clause while those in HTLD represent syntactically independent orphans. The case facts hinge on mismatches, possible with HTLD but not WPLD, between the case of the LP element and that of the RP in the sentence, the former being (as a default) nominative or – more surprisingly – the same case as that of an NP in the previous sentence, as shown in 3a–b. A similar mismatch is also found in English, as shown in 3c, where the LD element is accusative and the RP nominative. Case data related to ‘non-sentences’ – XPs used to make assertions but not obviously constituents of any sentence – provide further support for an orphan analysis of HTLD, since here we find accusative case on English non-sentence NPs and nominative case on German ones, as shown in 4 – precisely the default case pattern just described for LP elements in HTLD.

Finally, the significant discourse/pragmatic differences associated with Top and WPLD, on the one hand, and HTLD, on the other, are compatible with our distinction between integrated and orphan LP elements. More specifically, the LP elements in both Top and WPLD must serve as ‘links’, connecting current to previous discourse in terms of a partially ordered set relation to an entity evoked in previous discourse (e.g., Birner & Ward 1998). In contrast, LP elements in HTLD (which may be thought of, consistent with their orphan status, as processing units distinct from the following sentence; see Prince 1998: 286) may or may not serve as links. This contrast is illustrated in 5, where the LP element *Otto* in the WPLD structure necessarily refers to a member of the set of children introduced by *die Kinder* in the preceding sentence, whereas *Otto* in the HTLD structure can refer to an individual who is not one of the children. An analogous contrast emerges between WPLD and HTLD with respect to

the marking of ‘aboutness-topics’ (A-topics), the entities that a sentence is ‘about’. In this case, the integrated LP element in the former construction obligatorily marks an A-topic (and is, more specifically, an A-topic-promoting device) whereas the orphan element in the latter construction may but need not do so.

### Examples

- (1) a. HTLD: Den Hans, jeder mag ihn .  
the-acc Hans everyone likes him  
a'. Hans, everyone likes him.  
c. Hans, everyone likes.
- b. WPLD: Den Hans, den mag jeder.  
the-acc Hans WP.him likes everyone  
Lit. ‘Hans, him everyone likes.’

### (2) OPERATOR BINDING

- a. HTLD: no binding possible between QP and pronoun  
\*Seinen<sub>i</sub> Doktorvater, [jeder Linguist]<sub>i</sub> verehrt ihn  
His supervisor-acc every linguist admires RP-acc  
a'. \*His<sub>i</sub> supervisor, [every linguist]<sub>i</sub> admires him.
- b. WPLD: binding between QP and pronoun  
Seinen<sub>i</sub> Doktorvater, den verehrt [jeder Linguist]<sub>i</sub>  
His supervisor-acc RP-acc admires every linguist  
b'. His<sub>i</sub> supervisor, [every linguist]<sub>i</sub> admires.

### (3) CASE MISMATCH

- a. Und dein Vater, wie geht's ihm?  
‘And your father, how is he?’
- b. A: Maria hat dem Hans finanziell geholfen.  
‘Mary has helped Hans financially.’  
B: Dem Hans/\*Den Hans! Ich würde ihn nicht unterstützen.  
‘Hans! I would not support him.’ (Altmann 1981)
- c. Me, I don't like beans.

### (4) NON-SENTENCES

- a. Ein schöner Abend, nicht?  
‘Nice evening, isn't it?’
- b. A: Who made this mess? B: Them!

### (5) LINKING REQUIREMENTS

- Die Kinder hatten ihren ersten Ferientag  
‘The children had their first day of vacation.’
- a. WPLD: Der Otto, der wollte Fußball spielen.  
‘Otto, he wanted to play football.’
- b. HTLD: Der Otto, er wollte Fußball spielen.  
‘Otto, he wanted to play football.’

### References.

- Altmann, H. 1981. *Formen der „Herausstellung“ im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Boeckx, C. & K. Grohmann. To appear. Left dislocation in Germanic. *Sprachforschung und Universalienforschung* 56.
- Birner, B. & G. Ward 1998. *Information status and noncanonical word order in English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Cinque, G. 1983. ‘Topic’ constructions in some European languages and ‘connectedness’. Reprinted in Anagnostopoulou et al., eds. *Materials on left dislocation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 93–118.
- Haegeman, L. 1991. Parenthetical adverbials: The radical orphan approach. In S. Chiba et al., eds. *Aspects of Modern English linguistics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha, 232–254.

- Prince, E. 1998. On the limits of syntax, with reference to left-dislocation and topicalization. In P. Culicover & L. McNally, eds. *The limits of syntax*. New York: Academic, 281–302.
- Stanton, R. To appear. The pragmatics of non-sentences. In L. Horn & G. Ward, eds. *Handbook of pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

**Anikó Lipták (Leiden University)**  
*How to deal with leftist relatives?*

**1. The topic**

Clauses are frequently peripheral elements in a sentence due to the fact they are ‘heavy’ constituents. Being on the left or being on the right periphery, however, does make a difference: left- and right-extraposed clauses often show different syntactic and semantic behaviour and they are often derived by different means.

My talk will take a look at clausal constituents where this is clearly the case: left and right occurrences of relative clauses in Hungarian. The basic difference between the two types of relative clauses lies in that relatives on the left, unlike relatives on the right, are *not* derived by movement from a lower adnominal position. Rather, they are base-generated in a left-peripheral position as *free relative* clauses, and being linked to a demonstrative resumptive pronominal in the main clause. This kind of left-peripheral relativization strategy, called *correlativization* has been attested in Hindi (1a,b) and some other exotic languages (Dasgupta 1980, Srivastav 1991, Wali & Koul 1997, Sahoo & Hellan 1998). I will show that correlativization also exists in Hungarian (and Slavic languages) and spell out the syntax of these clauses, which is very similar to the syntax of left dislocation.

**2. The correlative strategy in Hungarian**

That relative clauses on the left (2a) and relative clauses on the right (2b) differ from each other in many respects can be seen from the following pieces of data:

- (a) Relatives on the left are not adnominal, but *free* relatives: the relative pronoun *amely* “which”, for example, which is banned in free relatives (3a), cannot occur in relatives on the left (3b), but can occur in right-extraposed relatives (3c), arguing for a free relative status of relatives on the left.
- (b) Relatives with a complex relative phrase can be followed by the demonstrative *az* “that” (4a), but cannot be preceded by it (4b).
- (c) Quantifiers cannot occur with relatives on the left (5a), but can head relatives to the right (5b).
- (d) The demonstrative pronominal can be plural with coordinated relatives on the left (6a), but cannot be plural with relatives on the right (6b).

In all these properties, relatives on the right pattern with adnominal relatives immediately following their head (not illustrated here). This clearly suggests that relatives on the right are derived by rightward extraposition from a sentence-internal adnominal position, while relatives on the left are not related to adnominal relatives. They are base-generated on the left periphery and are linked to the main clause by means of resumptive demonstrative pronominals.

**3. Correlatives as left dislocated elements**

The syntactic relationship between the correlative clause and the correlative pronominal is like the relation between a left-dislocated constituent and a demonstrative following it. Correlative clauses in Hungarian pattern together with left dislocated constituents, as can be seen from the following:

- (a) both use the same pronominals (distal demonstratives)
- (b) the demonstrative pronominal can be both singular and plural after coordinated items with plural reference (6a,7)
- (c) the relation between the left-peripheral constituent and the demonstrative is constrained by subjacency (8a,b)
- (d) both left dislocates and correlatives can be preceded by topics (cf. 9a,b)

Drawing a parallel between left dislocation and correlativization, the present study about the distribution of clausal elements offers new insights into correlativization patterns and the structure of the left periphery.

Examples:

- (1)a. *vo laRkii [jo khaRii hai] shaayad lambii hai* ordinary relative clause  
 that girl REL standing is maybe tall is  
 ‘The girl who is standing may be tall.’  
 b. *[jo laRkii khaRii hai] shaayad vo lambii hai* correlative clause  
 REL girl standing is maybe that tall is  
 ‘Every girl who is standing may be tall.’ or ‘The girl who is standing may be tall.’
- (2)a. *[Aki nem kapott meghívót], az nem jöhet.*  
 who-NOM not get-PAST.3SG invitation-ACC that-NOM not come-POT.3SG  
 ‘Whoever did not get an invitation, cannot come.’  
 b. *Az nem jöhet [aki nem kapott meghívót].*  
 that-NOM not come-POT.3SG who-NOM not get-PAST.3SG invitation-ACC  
 ‘Whoever did not get an invitation, cannot come.’
- (3) a. *\*[Amelyet most vettem] nagyon érdekes.*  
 which-ACC now bought-1SG very interesting  
 b. *\*[Amelyet most vettem] az a könyv nagyon érdekes.*  
 which-ACC now bought-1SG that the book very interesting  
 c. *Az a könyv nagyon érdekes [amelyet most vettem].*  
 that the book very interesting which-ACC now bought-1SG  
 ‘The book I have bought now is very interesting.’
- (4) a. *[Amelyik lány ott áll] az magas.*  
 which girl there stands that tall  
 b. *\*Az magas [amelyik lány ott áll].*  
 that tall which girl there stands  
 ‘Which girls is standing there is tall.’
- (5) a. *\*[Aki korán kel] mindenki aranyat lel.*  
 who early rise-3SG everyone gold find-3SG  
 b. *Mindenki aranyat lel [aki korán kel].*  
 everyone gold find-3SG who early rise-3SG  
 ‘Everyone who rises early finds gold.’ (saying)
- (6) a. *[Aki most jött] és [aki már itt volt], az/azok időben érkezett/tek.*  
 who now arrived-3SG and who was here earlier that/those in time came-3SG/3PL  
 b. *Az/\*azok időben érkezett/tek [aki már itt volt] és [aki most jött].*  
 that/those in time came-3SG/3PL who arrived-3SG earlier and who arrived-3SG now  
 ‘Those who came now and who have been here already are in time.’

- (7) **Péter** és **Mari**, *az/azok* nem jött/jöttek el.  
 Peter and Mary that/those not came-3SG/3PL.  
 ‘Peter and Mary, they didn’t come.’
- (8) a.(?)**Pétert**, nem hallottam a hírt [hogy *azt* meghívtad]*LD* (*left dislocate*)  
 Peter-ACC not heard-1SG the news-ACC that that-ACC invited-2SG  
 ‘It is Peter that I didn’t hear the news that you invited.’  
 b.\*[**Akik ott állnak**] a hírt [hogy *azokat* meghívtad] nem hallottam.*correl.*  
 who-PL there stand-3PL the news-ACC that they-ACC invited-2SG not heard-1SG  
 ‘Who are standing there I didn’t hear the news that you invited.’
- (9) a. Tegnap **János**, *az* nem jött*LD*  
 yesterdayJohn-NOMthat-NOM not came-3SG  
 ‘John, he didn’t come yesterday.’  
 b. Péterrel [**aki korán jött**], *az* még találkozott.*correl.*  
 Peter-WITH who early came-3SGthat still met-3SG  
 ‘People who came early still met Peter.’

**Yukiko Morimoto / Sam Mchombo (ZAS, Berlin / UC Berkeley)**  
***Configuring Topic in the Left Periphery: A case of Chicheŵa Split NPs***

Bantu languages display mixed (non-)configurational properties such as the existence of VP on the one hand and discontinuous constituents (DCs) (1b-f) on the other (Mchombo 2002). Example (1a) shows the canonical NP structure and position for object in Chicheŵa. The examples in (1b-f) show various patterns of discontinuity of that NP (boldfaced). They all share the following characteristics: (i) DCs in Chicheŵa must occur clause-initially as seen in (1b-f); (ii) clause-initial DCs receive topic interpretation and require an anaphoric pronoun on the verb (underlined) corresponding to the whole NP; (iii) regardless of the position, the ordering of *contiguous* elements is fixed - H(ead) > D(emonstrative) > A(djective) - as shown by the contrast between (1) and (2).

The observation in (iii) is particularly problematic to any movement analysis, as it must be stipulated that independently moved elements (e.g. H and D in (1d)) retain the same ordering (H > D) between the base and derived position. As also noted by Sells (2001), this is a recurrent problem for the transformational approaches to phenomena like multiple *wh*-questions (e.g. Müller 2001) and object shift (e.g. Holmberg 1997, 1999, Kaiser 1997): the order of *who* > *what* is identical to the order of subject > object in SO languages; the order of IO > DO in object shift is constant across different structures. The structural and discourse characteristics of DCs observed in (i)–(ii) also have not been considered in previous derivational analyses of DCs (e.g. Jelinek 1984, Speas 1990 Baker 1996). In this paper, we argue that the based-generated approach to DCs in Chicheŵa within OT-LFG (Bresnan 2001) provides a simple, straightforward account of all the relevant facts that is fully consistent with the properties of Bantu phrase structure and its ‘discourse configurational’ nature (Morimoto 2000).

Based on the properties of DCs in (i) and (ii) above, we treat Chicheŵa DCs as instances of topicalization. This is consistent with the fact that every instance of DCs requires the object marker on the Verb, whose function is always topic-anaphoric (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987). Additional data also show that the ‘topicalizability’ is a pre-condition for DCs. Elements such as a demoted agent of a passive that lacks topic prominence (3) and a non-referential object of a verb-object idiom (4) thus cannot be DCs. In addition, we propose a structural analysis in

which each element of the clause-initial DCs adjoins to S and forms binary branching. The adjunction analysis is supported by the fact that the topicalized subject NP can appear between the discontinuous parts of the object NPs (5).

The OT alignment constraints and their ranking in (6) derive the basic clause structure and DCs in Chicheŵa. TOP-L and SUBJ-L (Seils 2001) both compete for clause-initial position. Their ranking as given ensures that TOPIC is clause-initial, whether it is subject or object. This accounts for the generalizations in (i) and (ii) above in terms of the structural position of DCs and their topic interpretation. Furthermore, given the way TOP-L is defined in (6a), the adjunction structure will be optimally binary, as in the proposed DC structure in (5): each TOPIC is leftmost in the S node that immediately dominates it. A flat structure would allow only one topical element to satisfy TOP-L.

Branching Uniformity (BrU) (Morimoto 2002) prefers fully left- or right-branching structure. Given the ordering Head-L (b) >> SUBJ-L (c) >> BrU (d), V<sup>0</sup> will be left, and the object will be right in VP (b >> c); the subject will be leftmost, and the co-head VP will be right in the root node S (c >> d). Thus, in the absence of TOPIC, these constraints ensure the canonical SVO structure. The constraints Dem-L (e) and Adj-L (f) force D(em) and A(dj) to align left within NP. The ranking e >> f ensures the ordering H-D-A (1a) rather than H-A-D; ranking Head-L above these constraints ensures the head-initial structure inside NP. These ordering constraints prefer the same ordering of contiguous elements wherever they are, as observed in (iii) above. Thus, under this output-oriented approach to constituent ordering, no additional mechanism is needed to ensure that the order of elements remains identical in the canonical and topicalized position. All we need is the set of Constraints that derive canonical structure and topicalization motivated independently of DCs in Chicheŵa.

Moreover, the general well-formedness constraints of LFG, completeness and coherence, ensure the presence of the topic-anaphoric pronoun(s) corresponding to the topicalized element(s) inside the minimal nuclear clause. Taking DCs in Chicheŵa as topicalized constituents that are outside the minimal clause thus naturally explains the obligatory co-occurrence of the anaphoric agreement.

#### Local Constraints on Chicheŵa Discontinuous Constituents

- (1) a. Njúchií izi                      zi-ná-lúm-a    **álenje**    **awa**                      **ópúsa....** [H D A]  
           10bees 10.PROX.DEM 10-PST-bite-FV 2hunter 2.PROX DEM 2-foolish  
           ,These bees bit these foolish hunters‘

- b. **awa** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **álenje** **ópúsa**.D ... [H A]  
 c. **álenje** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **awa** **ópúsa**.H ... [D A]  
 d. **álenje** **awa** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **ópúsa**. [H D] ... A  
 e. **awa** **ópúsa** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **álenje**. [D A] ... H  
 f. **álenje** **ópúsa** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **awa**. [H A] ... D

- (2) a. \*Njúchií izi zi-ná-lúm-á **awa** **álenje** **ópúsa**. \*... [D H A]  
 b. \***awa** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **ópúsa** **álenje**. \*D ... [A H]  
 c. \***álenje** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **ópúsa** **awa**. \*H ... [A D]  
 d. \***awa** **álenje** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **ópúsa**. \* [D H] ... A  
 e. \***ópúsa** **awa** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **álenje**. \* [A D] ... H  
 f. \***ópúsa** **álenje** njúchií izi zi-ná-wá-lúm-á **awa**. \* [A H] ... D

- (3) a. Mikángó i-na-ph-édw-á            ndí **alenja**    **awa**            **ó-dzí-kónd-a**.  
           4lion 4-PST-kill-PASS-FV by 2hunter 2these 2-REFL-love-FV  
           ,The lions were killed by these selfish (self-loving) hunters.‘  
 b. \* **ó-dzí-kónd-a** Mikángó i-na-ph-édw-á ndí **alenja** **awa**.  
 c. \***awa** Mikángó i-na-ph-édw-á ndí **alenja** **ó-dzí-kónd-a**.

(4)a. Nd-a-gwil-a **mwendo wáko**.  
 1SG-PERF-grab-FV 3leg 3your  
 ‚I have grabbed (your) leg‘ = I apologize

b. \***Wáko** nd-a-gwil-a **mwendo**.  
 c. \***mwendo** nd-a-gwil-a **Wáko**.

(5)**Yó-kálamb-a** anyaní **mikángo** a-na-í-gúl-il-á makású awa ó-búnth-a.  
 4-aged 2baboons 4lion 2-PST-4-buy-APPL-FV 6hoes 6these 6-blunt-FV  
 ‚The aged lions<sub>j</sub>, the baboons<sub>i</sub>, they<sub>i</sub> bought them<sub>j</sub> these blunt hoes‘  
 [S **Yó-kálamb-a** [S anyaní [S **mikángo** [ROOT.S [VP ... ]]]]DC structure

- (6)a. TOP-L(left): TOP aligns left in the projection that immediately dominates it.  
 b.Head-L: X<sup>0</sup> head aligns left in the projection that immediately dominates it.  
 c.SUBJ-L: SUBJ aligns left in the projection that immediately dominates it.  
 d. Branching Uniformity (BrU): Directionality of co-heads must be uniform.  
 e.Dem-L: Demonstrative aligns left in the projection that immediately dominates it.  
 f.Adj-L: Adjective aligns left in the projection that immediately dominates it.

**Ranking:** a >> b >> c >> d >> e >> f

**Andreas Nolda (Humboldt - Universität Berlin)**  
**‚Split topicalization‘ and ‚left dislocation‘ in German**

In this talk I shall relate German ‚split topicalization‘ to German ‚left dislocation‘. (1) is an example of the former construction:

(1) *Wein habe ich nur spanischen.*  
 wine have I only Spanish  
 ‚As for wine, I only have Spanish.‘

Following Fanselow (1988), Pafel (1998) and others, I shall argue that *Wein* and *spanischen* in (1) do not form a discontinuous constituent. Rather, only *spanischen* functions as the direct object of *habe*. It is anaphorically linked to *Wein*, with which it agrees in case, number, and gender. (2) exemplifies the latter construction (given a progradient intonation contour; cf. Altmann 1981 and Selting 1993):

(2) *Den Wein, den kaufe ich morgen.*  
 the wine this buy I tomorrow  
 ‚The wine, I shall buy (it) tomorrow.‘

According to common assumptions, *den Wein* is a ‚topic‘ constituent in (2), serving as the antecedent of the anaphoric object constituent *den* („this“), which agrees with the ‚topic‘ in the above mentioned categories.

Presupposing the formal framework of Integrational Syntax and Semantics (for an introduction cf. Lieb 1992, 1993), I shall suggest that - in spite of differences in word order and definiteness - (1) and (2) have an analogous syntactic structure and semantic interpretation (a similar case is made by Zifonun *et al.* 1997). For ‚dislocation‘ constructions, Integrational Syntax provides the syntactic function of (*grammatical*) *topic*, which relates *den Wein* in (2) to its co-constituent *den kaufe ich morgen*; another syntactic function, (*syntactic*) *antecedent*, relates it to the resumptive pronoun (cf. the presentation in Budde 2000).

According to my analysis of ‚split topicalization‘, these two functions also occur in (1): *Wein* is the topic of *habe ich nur spanischen* and the antecedent of *spanischen*. In both constructions the antecedent function is responsible for the number and gender agreement of the constituents related by it, while their agreement in case is a consequence of the occurrence of topic. Mirroring the syntactic structure, the propositions of these sentences are structured into a ‚topic‘ and a ‚comment‘ part; the interpretation of the antecedent occurrence relates the meanings of the agreeing constituents. Depending on the prosodic structure, the topic occurrence has in addition certain non-propositional semantic effects.

## References

- Altmann, Hans (1981). *Formen der ‚Herausstellung‘ im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen*. Linguistische Arbeiten 106. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Budde, Monika (2000). *Wortarten: Definition und Identifikation*. Ph.D. diss., Freie Universität Berlin.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (1988). Aufspaltung von NPn und das Problem der ‚freien‘ Wortstellung. *Linguistische Berichte* 114, 91-113.
- Lieb, Hans-Heinrich (1992). Integrational Semantics: An integrative view of linguistic meaning. In *Current Advances in Semantic Theory*, ed. by Maxim Stamenov, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 73, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 239-268.
- Lieb, Hans-Heinrich (1993). Integrational Linguistics. In *Syntax: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung/An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, ed. by Joachim Jacobs *et al.*, *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* 9, Berlin: de Gruyter, vol. 1, 430-468.
- Pafel, Jürgen (1998). *Skopus und logische Struktur: Studien zum Quantorenskopus im Deutschen*. Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340 127. Heidelberg: Universität Stuttgart.
- Selting, Margret (1993). Voranstellungen vor den Satz: Zur grammatischen Form und interaktiven Funktion von Linksversetzung und Freiem Thema im Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 21, 291-319.
- Zifonun, Gisela *et al.* (1997). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Schriften des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 7. Berlin: de Gruyter. Vol. 1.

**Thomas Weskott (Universität Leipzig)**

### ***Topicalization and the Dynamic Interpretation of Information Structural Markedness: Theoretical and Empirical Aspects***

Most accounts of dislocation implicitly or explicitly assume that there is a default ordering of elements in a sentence from which the dislocation construction deviates. The deviation gives rise to the markedness effect associated with constructions like e.g. the topicalization of direct objects in German transitive constructions (cf. (1.b)). This markedness is mirrored by psycholinguistic data showing a larger amount of processing cost for deviating than for canonical structures (s. Bader *et al.*, 1999, for an overview). But although the markedness of such constructions is widely acknowledged, it is not clear in which sense information-structural (IS) markedness could be made responsible for the peculiar interpretive behaviour of such constructions, as e.g. the more limited set of contexts of appearance (but s. Höhle, 1982; Reinhart, 1996).

In this talk, I will try to shed some light on this issue by proposing a scalar notion of IS-markedness which is based on three assumptions about the canonical realisation of transitive constructions:

- (I) the basic order of arguments is determined by the order of  $\lambda$ -prefixes in the lexical entry of the verb (Haider, 1993);
- (II) main stress is assigned to the most deeply embedded constituent (Cinque, 1993);
- (III) the complexity of the IS-bracketing reflects the degree of contextual restriction a sentence exhibits (Weskott, 2002).

Based on these default assumptions, the relative markedness of a construction will then be explicated in terms of deviation from the default case and the complexity of the IS-bracketings of a sentence. For example, the transitive construction in (1.a) will be less marked than the deviating topicalized construction (1.b) with a direct object in the left-peripheral position, because (I) is violated. Accordingly, (1.c) is marked when compared to (1.b) because it exhibits a non-canonical stress pattern violating (II). And finally, (2.b) is more marked than (2.a) because its IS-bracketing is more complex than that of (2.a), resulting in a more restricted set of contexts in which the sentence may be uttered felicitously. Going on to more complex cases like (3), in which these violations interact with each other, I show how a dynamic interpretation procedure which operates on the IS-bracketings explains the interaction between IS-markedness and the contextual restriction it effects (the amount of presupposed information being the crucial notion here; s. Asher & Lascardes, 1998).

The theoretical predictions developed in this framework have been tested empirically in a series of reading-time experiments, the results of which support the theoretical approach advocated here: they show that marked expressions in the left periphery are indeed more context-sensitive than unmarked ones. After a brief discussion of the results, the talk will be concluded by a sketch of how the proposed notion of markedness and its role in dynamic interpretation can be accounted for in a bi-directional OT framework.

Examples:

(1) (a) *Der Koch beleidigte den KELLner.*

Thenom cook insulted theacc. waiter.  
 `The cook insulted the waiter.'

(b) *Den Kellner beleidigte der KOCH.*

Theacc waiter insulted thenom cook.  
 `The waiter was insulted by the cook.'

(c) *Den KELLner beleidigte der Koch.*

Theacc waiter insulted thenom cook.  
 `It was the waiter who was insulted by the cook.'

(2) (a) *Der Koch      beleidigte den KELLNER.<sup>1</sup>*

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \{ \quad \quad \}^B \\ \{ \quad \quad \}^T \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \{ \quad \quad \}^F \\ \{ \quad \quad \}^C \end{array} \right]$$

(b) *Der Koch      beleidigte      den KELLNER.*

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \{ \quad \quad \}^T \\ \{ \quad \quad \} \end{array} \right]^B \left[ \begin{array}{c} \{ \quad \quad \}^F \\ \{ \quad \quad \}^C \end{array} \right]$$

(3) *Den ALten Kellner beleidigte der Koch.*

Theacc oldacc waiter insulted thenom cook.  
 `It was the old waiter that the cook insulted.'

---

<sup>1</sup> The subscripts `B' and `F' stand for Focus and Background; the superscripts `T' and `C' denote Topic and Comment, respectively. Small caps indicate main stress.

## References

- Asher, Nicholas & Alex Lascarides (1998b): The Semantics and Pragmatics of Presupposition. *Journal of Semantics* 15, 239-299.
- Bader, Markus & Michael Meng (1999): Subject-Object Ambiguities in German Embedded Clauses: An Across-The-Board Comparison. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 28(2), 121-143.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1993): A Null Theory of Phrase and Compound Stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 239-297.
- Haider, Hubert (1993): *Deutsche Syntax - generativ*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Höhle, Tilman N. (1982): Explikationen für "normale Betonung" und "normale Wortstellung". In: Werner Abraham, ed., *Satzglieder im Deutschen*, Tübingen: Narr, 75-153.
- Reinhart, Tanya (1996): Interface Economy: Focus and Markedness. In: Chris Wilder, Hans-Martin Gärtner & Manfred Bierwisch, eds., *The Role of Economy Principles in Linguistic Theory*, Berlin: Akademie, 146-169.
- Weskott, Thomas (2002): *Information Structure as a Processing Guide. The Left Periphery of German Verb-Second Sentences and Its Interpretation in Context*. University of Leipzig: PhD dissertation.