

The Movement Nature of Left Dislocation

Author(s): Guglielmo Cinque

Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Spring, 1977, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring, 1977), pp. 397-412

Published by: The MIT Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4177991>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Linguistic Inquiry*

JSTOR

Squibs and Discussion

THE MOVEMENT NATURE OF LEFT DISLOCATION*

Guglielmo Cinque,
Università di Padova

1. Introduction

Since Ross's first formulation of Left Dislocation (LD) as a movement rule (Ross (1967, ch. VI)), a number of people have challenged his analysis, proposing instead that the lefthand constituent be base-generated (Postal (1971); Hirschbühler (1974; 1975); Rodman (1974); Van Riemsdijk and Zwarts (1974); Gundel (1975)). Before briefly considering some of their arguments and alternative proposals, *which I will argue focus on a quite different construction*, I will present what I take to be rather strong evidence in favor of a movement analysis, for at least a large class of sentences in at least *some* languages.

All of the arguments I offer below have the following form:

- (1) There is some rule operating on NPs that ordinarily displays either a governor or a trigger or a controller *to the left* of the affected NP.
- (2) In our "LD" data the affected NP appears to the left of such a governor (or trigger, or controller) rather than to its right.
- (3) Were we not to posit a movement rule that applies (we must assume) *after* the relevant rule has operated on the NP, we would be compelled to state the same restrictions twice, as if they were independent ones, thus missing a basic regularity.^{1,2}

* I am grateful to Richard Kayne, Susumu Kuno, Andrew Radford, and Luigi Rizzi for very helpful criticism and for correcting me in a number of errors and infelicities contained in a previous version of this squib. I would also like to thank Elisabetta Folena, Jean Claude Maire-Vigueur, and Sorin Stati for lending me their native intuitions on the French and Rumanian sentences quoted below.

¹ Notice that a phrase-structure alternative to the facts to be reviewed below presents certain difficulties due to the potentially unbounded distance to the left of the "governed" element from the "governor", in surface structure, so that it would be at the very least extremely complex and cumbersome to state such interdependencies in the base.

² The above reasoning crucially assumes that LD operates on linearly ordered structures, but notice that it is noncommittal as to whether remote structures (or any stage before shallow structure, if

1.1. *Verb and Adjective Governed Prepositions in Italian and French*³

Consider the following examples:

(4) Non riesco a concentrarmi $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *di \\ su \\ *a \end{array} \right\}$ questo lavoro.

'I can't concentrate $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *of \\ on \\ *to \end{array} \right\}$ this work.'

(5) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *Di \\ Su \\ *A \end{array} \right\}$ questo lavoro, non riesco a concentrarmi.

' $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *Of \\ On \\ *To \end{array} \right\}$ this work, I can't concentrate-on-it.'

(6) Vado fiero $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *coi \\ dei \\ *ai \end{array} \right\}$ miei figli.

'I am proud $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *with \\ of \\ *to \end{array} \right\}$ my children.'

(7) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *Coi \\ Dei \\ *Ai \end{array} \right\}$ miei figli, ne vado fiero.

' $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *With \\ Of \\ *To \end{array} \right\}$ my children, I am proud-of-them.'

The prepositions in the lefthand PPs are clearly "governed" by the verb *concentrarsi* 'concentrate' and the adjective *fiero* 'proud'. Without assuming that the lefthand NPs are actually *reordered* with the consequent pied piping of the prepositions—a general and obligatory phenomenon in Italian—we would be hard put to account in a simple way for the selection of the correct preposition in front of the lefthand NP (see also fn. 1).

The same argument applies in French, where sentences like (8) pose the same problems for a non-movement analysis.

(8) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} De \\ *A \end{array} \right\}$ mes fils, j'en suis fier.

' $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Of \\ *To \end{array} \right\}$ my children, I am proud-of-them.'

It does not affect the argument that (8') is equally well formed.

(8') Mes fils, j'en suis fier.

LD is postcyclic) are so ordered. However, should such an assumption, which is not universally accepted anyway, turn out to be wrong, my facts would be evidence for merely a *copying* rather than a strict *movement* (by copying) analysis of LD.

³ Some of the arguments that follow are taken from Cinque (1974).

As we shall see in section 2 below, one can argue from their intonational, pragmatic, and syntactic characteristics that sentences like (8') are really instances of an entirely different construction.

1.2. Case Selection in German, Italian, and Rumanian

An analogous argument is offered by case selection in many languages. The first to present such an argument from German was Ross (1973).⁴ In languages like Italian and Rumanian a similar argument holds in the case selection of personal

⁴ He presents the following facts based on verbs governing particular cases:

(i) Sie lobten $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{den} \\ * \text{dem} \end{array} \right\}$ Professor.

'They praised $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{the (Acc.)} \\ \text{the *(Dat.)} \end{array} \right\}$ professor.'

(ii) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Den} \\ * \text{Dem} \end{array} \right\}$ Professor, sie lobten ihn.

(iii) Sie schmeichelten $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} * \text{den} \\ \text{dem} \end{array} \right\}$ Professor.

'They flattered the professor.'

(iv) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} * \text{Den} \\ \text{Dem} \end{array} \right\}$ Professor, sie schmeichelten ihm.

Van Riemsdijk and Zwarts (1974, fn. 4), discussing facts similar to Ross's agreement cases in German left-dislocated sentences, observe that case agreement between the lefthand NP and the "copy" is not always possible in German and cite such sentences as (v) and (vi) as evidence:

(v) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Die Anna} \\ * \text{Der Anna} \end{array} \right\}$, ich habe lange nicht mit ihr gesprochen.

'Anna $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(Nom.)} \\ * \text{(Dat.)} \end{array} \right\}$, I have a long time not with her (Dat.) spoken.'

(vi) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Der Hans} \\ * \text{Den Hans} \end{array} \right\}$, Anna behauptet dass ich ihn nicht beachten soll.

'Hans $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(Nom.)} \\ * \text{(Acc.)} \end{array} \right\}$, Anna claims that I to him (Acc.) not pay attention.'

Given this, they conclude it is "safe to assume that case-marking is neutral with respect to the choice between the transformational and the PSR [Phrase Structure] treatment of LD" (p. 17).

However, it should be observed that—as shown by Ebert (1973)—*dass* clauses are strict islands in German and so are PPs. In fact Van Riemsdijk and Zwarts themselves point out that corresponding to (v) and (vi) there are no well-formed sentences that have undergone Y-Movement. (The same, of course, holds for all the other extraction rules.) Now, given that *true copying rules do obey island constraints*, as shown below for Italian and French and as argued more extensively

pronouns,⁵ as we see from the following examples:

- (9) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Me} \\ * \text{Io} \end{array} \right\}$, ha detto che mi vede domani.
 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Pe mine} \\ * \text{Eu} \end{array} \right\}$, a spus că mă vede mâine.
 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Me} \\ * \text{I} \end{array} \right\}$, he/she said he/she will see me tomorrow.'
- (10) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Io} \\ * \text{Me} \end{array} \right\}$, sai che non l'ho più vista.
 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Eu} \\ * \text{Pe mine} \end{array} \right\}$, știi că n-am văzut-o.
 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{I} \\ * \text{Me} \end{array} \right\}$, you know that I haven't seen her.'

in Cinque (in preparation), Ross's facts and Van Riemsdijk and Zwarts's (v) and (vi) are *predicted* by a copying analysis of LD. The copying derivation (with consequent case agreement) being precluded out of PPs and *dass* clauses, the lefthand NPs in (v) and (vi) can only originate as hanging topics (see below), directly in the base in their lefthand position (hence no case agreement). The copying derivation, however, is available for Ross's cases, which involve no islands (hence the case agreement through copying), although this is not the only possibility, the hanging topic construction being permitted as well (with no case agreement, as expected). Consider:

(vii) Der Professor, sie lobten ihn. (compare (ii) above)

'The professor (Nom.), they praised him. (Acc.)

(viii) Der Professor, sie schmeichelten ihm. (compare (iv) above)

Furthermore, (ii) and (vii), (iv) and (viii) differ intonationally and pragmatically as indicated below in section 2, to which the reader is referred for a discussion of the *hanging topic* construction.

Thus, if something along these lines is correct, I believe that it can be maintained that Ross's original argument is not weakened by Van Riemsdijk and Zwarts's observation.

⁵ This argument is not valid for English, where lefthand personal pronouns must always be in the accusative:

(i) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} * \text{I} \\ \text{Me} \end{array} \right\}$, you know I haven't seen her since.

(ii) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} * \text{They} \\ \text{Them} \end{array} \right\}$, I think they'll never help us.

In fact such data have been taken—e.g. by Gundel (1975)—to support the nonmovement hypothesis, in that, under the movement hypothesis "a special lexical rule would be required to replace the non-objective pronouns by the corresponding objective forms" (p. 75). I think, however, that such facts are neutral with respect to the two hypotheses, since—as Andrew Radford has pointed out to me—they would follow from the independent general convention that in English only pronoun subjects of tensed Ss have the nominative form (*pace* the formal *It's I who proposed that*) (see Chomsky (1973, fn. 47)). However, from what I say later, it should become clear that these do not qualify as proper LD cases, but as instances of a different construction.

1.3. *Left-Dislocated Reflexive Adjectives in Italian*

The possessive adjective *proprio* in Italian obeys the same clause-mate restrictions typical of other reflexive pronouns. It can be used to “pronominalize” an *of+NP* possessive phrase only if the third person controller NP is “within the same simple sentence” and precedes the phrase *of+NP*.⁶ Otherwise *suo* must be employed. For example:

- (11) Piero_i ha perso la propria_i identità.
‘Piero_i has lost his_i identity.’
- (12) Carlo_i ha detto che non è disposto a rinunciare alla propria_i fede.
‘Carlo_i said that he_i is not willing to give up his_i faith.’
- (13) Furio_i ha detto che hanno ritrovato la $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *propria_i \\ sua_i \end{array} \right\}$ borsa.
‘Furio_i said that they have found his_i bag.’
- (14) Quando il $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *proprio_i \\ suo_i \end{array} \right\}$ capo entrò, Giorgio_i trasalì.
‘When his_i boss came in, Giorgio_i startled.’

Alongside (11)–(14), we find sentences in which *proprio* occurs in lefthand NPs and PPs that are indefinitely far away from, and precede, the controller NP:

- (15) Alla propria_i fede, Carlo_i ha detto che non è disposto a rinunciarci.
‘His_i faith, Carlo_i said that he is not willing to give it up.’

More interestingly, we find that the occurrence of *proprio* within a lefthand NP or PP is well formed just in case it is well formed in the corresponding non-left-dislocated sentences. That is, we find well-formed left-dislocated sentences (with *proprio* in the lefthand NP or PP) corresponding to (11) and (12) above and ill-formed left-dislocated sentences corresponding to (13) and (14). See (15) and the following sentences:

- (16) La propria_i identità, Piero_i non l’ha ancora persa.
‘His_i identity, Piero_i has not lost it yet.’

⁶ There appears to be a very limited class of exceptions to the “precedence constraint”. *Proprio* can precede the controller NP only in copulative sentences when the controller NP itself is indefinite. For example:

- (i) La propria_i fede è l’arma migliore (per PRO_i)
the his_i own faith is the weapon best (for PRO_i)
- (ii) *La propria_i fede è l’arma migliore per Giorgio_i.

This, however, does not seem to me to weaken the general observation made in the text.

- (17) *La propria_i borsa, Furio_i ha detto che l'hanno ritrovata.
 'His_i bag, Furio_i said that they have found it.'

Now it seems that a movement analysis of LD exactly predicts these two series of facts, whereas a phrase-structure solution would have to be implemented with two special mechanisms: one to account for the above correlation between left-dislocated sentences containing *proprio* in the lefthand constituent and the corresponding non-left-dislocated ones; the other to account for the fact that the reflexive adjective can occur in a position that can be indefinitely far from, and precede, the controller NP, whereas in general it *must* follow such a controller within the same simple sentence.

1.4. Idioms in Italian

An extremely strong argument for the movement analysis comes from the fact that we find lefthand NPs that are constituents of idioms. As is to be expected, these NPs are not autonomous in meaning, but together with the remaining part of the idiom they have a single meaning that cannot be predicted from that of its parts. Thus, such NPs will have to be inserted in a block with the entire idiom and only later moved away from it. This is particularly true of the following two Italian idioms *tirare le cuoia* (lit. 'to draw the leathers'='to die') and *tirare moccoli* (lit. 'to throw (?) or to draw (?) candles'='to swear'), where the NPs *le cuoia* and *moccoli* are obsolete words found only in these two idioms, and for which a phrase structure independent generation in their lefthand position would be very hard to maintain.

Now, we find perfectly well-formed sentences in which the object NP of such idioms shows up in a 'left-dislocated' position, under the appropriate pragmatic conditions:

- (18) *Le cuoia, le tirerai prima tu, bello mio!*
 (lit. 'The leathers, them-will-draw-you earlier you, beautiful mine!')
 'You will die earlier, my dear!'
- (19) *Moccoli, non ne ha più tirati da allora.*
 (lit. 'Candles (?), not of-them-has anymore thrown (?) since then.')
- 'He hasn't sworn anymore since that time.'

Clearly, no easy solution can be found for such cases out of the movement analysis.

1.5. Scope of Left-Dislocated Quantifiers in Italian and Rumanian

The last argument I will present has to do with the scope of quantifiers that have been left dislocated. Consider the follow-

ing identical discourse fragments in Italian and Rumanian:

- (20) Speaker A:
 a. Se ne sono andati tutti, eh!
 b. Toți au plecat!
 'Everybody left.'
- (21) Speaker B:
 a. Beh, tutti, non se ne sono andati.
 b. Chiar toți, n-au plecat.
 'Not everybody left.'

In (21) *tutti, toți* 'all' occur before a break and with a falling intonation typical of left-dislocated NPs. (21) means 'Not everybody left' (implying that (only) *some* did). It may not mean 'All did not leave' (i.e. everybody stayed).

Clearly, in the logical structure of (21) NEG must command the universal quantifier. Now this is consistent with the movement analysis that would derive (21) from the structures underlying (22),

- (22) a. Non tutti se ne sono andati.
 b. Nu toți au plecat.
 'Not everybody left.'

in which the negative precedes the quantifier in surface structure in accordance with Lakoff's derivational constraint.⁷

The fact that in (21) the universal quantifier, after the application of LD, ends up in surface structure to the left of the logically commanding NEG, in apparent violation of Lakoff's constraint, is something that needs to be accounted for.⁸

⁷ Notice that the facts are just the same if one left dislocates a quantifier from object position:

- (i) Tutti, non li devi leggere. (Solo alcuni, ti
 all not them you must read only some to you
 ho detto.)
 I-said
 'You don't have to read them all. (I only said *some* of them.)'

The only reading allowed here is with the universal quantifier in the scope of NEG (*not all*).

⁸ I had originally thought that such facts could be compared with Lakoff's claim (based on sentences like *Fond of many boys, Sarah Weinstein isn't*) that late rules such as Y-Movement are not sensitive to his derivational constraints, which he supposed to be operative only up to shallow structure. However, Susumu Kuno has pointed out to me that Lakoff's claim cannot be correct in the face of sentences like (i) and (ii), which are not synonymous with (iii) and (iv), respectively:

- (i) *Many* boys, Sarah Weinstein *isn't* fond of.
 (ii) *Many* boys, *every* girl is fond of.
 (iii) Sarah Weinstein *isn't* fond of *many* boys.
 (iv) *Every* girl is fond of *many* boys.

A. Radford, however, tells me that in some dialects of British English

However, within a movement analysis there is a straightforward way to account for facts like (21) and their interpretation: by positing that LD is not sensitive to Lakoff's derivational constraint (or its equivalent) (see fn. 8). Within the non-movement analysis, on the other hand, I do not see any simple way to account for the fact that whereas the quantifier is generated in a position that both commands and precedes NEG, the meaning indicates that NEG commands the quantifier.

2. Apparent Counterexamples to the Movement Analysis

Let us now look at the principal kind of evidence brought forth against a movement analysis of LD. Hirschbühler (1974; 1975) adduces examples of the following kind from French:

- (23) Paul, Pierre vient de se battre avec cet idiot.
'Paul, Pierre has just fought with that idiot.'

(i) and (ii) do allow for a reading synonymous to (iii) and (iv), this reading differing in intonation from the nonsynonymous reading. Furthermore, in both Italian and Rumanian Y-Movement *is* sensitive to Lakoff's constraints, since (v) and (vi) can only mean ($\forall x$ (NEG (x left)))).

(v) *Tutti*, non se ne sono andati. (italics indicate heavy stress)

(vi) *Toți*, n-au plecat.
'All, did not leave.'

These facts together may indicate that sensitiveness or insensitiveness to Lakoff's constraints might be tied up with the different derivation of the lefthand NP, either through Y-Movement or through LD.

With regard to the insensitiveness of LD to Lakoff's constraints, one might try to defend the following position: if we assume that LD is a copying rule (where the copy is later pronominalized if the constituent in question has a pro-form, otherwise kept in full form or just deleted if it has none—as independently supported by Italian, for which see Cinque (1974)), then a copy (*real or shadow*) still occupies the original position of the left dislocated constituent in surface structure so that no command/precedence relation would in fact be violated. Notice that a similar explanation is not available to the chopping rule of Y-Movement, which could be said to account for the fact just noted that the rule is indeed sensitive to Lakoff's constraints. As to Lakoff's original sentence, there are doubts that it is an instance of Y-Movement. Both intonationally and syntactically it behaves differently (see *Fond of many boys, *Sarah Weinstein isn't*, not *fond of many girls*). On the other hand, the insensitiveness of lefthand clauses to Lakoff's constraints is in all likelihood to be ascribed to a different principle such as that proposed in Kuno (1971, 360, fn. 32), since (vii) only allows a reading that is synonymous with (viii):

(vii) That *many* boys like her, *every* girl wants to believe.

(viii) *Every* girl wants to believe that *many* boys like her.

The principle reads: "If a quantifier A is in a matrix sentence, and quantifier B is in an embedded structure, . . . , the order of the quantifier interpretation is always that of 'A-B' regardless of whether A precedes B or not" (p. 361).

- (24) La chasse à l'étudiant, je pense que la police a toujours considéré cette activité comme un sport très agréable.

'Student hunting, I think the police have always considered that activity as a pleasant sport.'

Similar examples can be easily constructed for Italian and no doubt other languages too.⁹ They all show some kind of anaphoric element that is not a simple pronominal copy left behind to mark the original place of the dislocated NP. Rather, it represents a description that is coreferential with some NP in the previous context. Thus, the lefthand NP must be directly generated in the position where it appears in surface structure. And in fact Hirschbühler has suggested a revision of the phrase structure rules to include a rule like $S \rightarrow NP S$.¹⁰

Now, how are we to reconcile this evidence with arguments of the type I presented above? I want to argue that the phenomena shown in (8'), (23), (24), (i) and (ii) of fn. 5, and (i) of fn. 9 are of a very different nature from those shown in (4) through (21). The former are not cases of LD proper and I would agree in claiming—just as Hirschbühler, Rodman, and others do—that they should not be derived through a movement rule but should rather be generated, in the base, directly in their lefthand position, from whence they may control the pronominalization of the coreferential constituent to the right (if there is any).

Besides the intonational and pragmatic facts that will be hinted at below, I know of at least four syntactic phenomena that lend support to my interpretation of the facts by clearly

⁹ Rodman (1974) presents examples of a similar type from German, e.g. (i):

- (i) Fisch, ich esse Hering am liebsten.
'Fish, I (like to) eat herring the best.'

Here I will not go into the numerous other facts brought forth by the defendants of a phrase-structure solution to LD. It should become clear from the evidence and the discussion I present below that in most cases I am in accord with their observations and conclusions but also that I would regard such cases as instances of a construction different from LD. Thus, in my opinion, such facts do not really bear on the nature of the rule here referred to as LD.

¹⁰ Notice that an identical proposal is contained in Gruber (1967), where the phenomenon is labeled Topicalization. Also identical is Rodman's (1974) proposal, but for the inclusion of a variable X ($S \rightarrow (X) NP S$) that ranges over a number of constants such as *as for*, *speaking of*, *y'know about*, etc., since—as in Postal (1971, 136)—he considers sentences like (i) as equivalent to (ii)

- (i) Peter, I saw him with Clara yesterday.
(ii) $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{As for} \\ \text{Speaking of} \end{array} \right\}$ Peter, I saw him with Clara yesterday.

where the material in X can be optionally deleted.

differentiating the two constructions. I will choose examples from Italian and French, but I trust that a corresponding behavior can be easily detected as well in other languages that possess the two constructions.

2.1. *Subject Pronoun Drop in Italian*

Consider first the following sentence:

- (25) *Giorgio, sapevo che lui voleva andare a stare in campagna.*
 ‘Giorgio, I used to know that he wanted to go and live in the country.’

This sentence is well formed only under a particular intonation that is *not* the one typical of LD cases (sentences (4)–(21)). A much longer break intervenes between the lefthand NP and the rest of the sentence; besides, *Giorgio* has a contour somewhat similar to that of questioned NPs. If read with an LD intonation, (25) is ill formed. What makes it unacceptable, if we compare it with the perfectly well-formed LD version of it (26), is the presence of the subject pronoun “copy” *lui*.

- (26) *Giorgio, sapevo che voleva andare a stare in campagna.*

Subject pronouns in Italian are deleted everywhere but in contrastive environments (i.e. when they convey new information). A necessary condition for left dislocating an NP in Italian is that it be old information (see Cinque (1974)); hence the ill-formedness of (25) on the LD reading (furthermore, the copies of left dislocated NPs and PPs in Italian can only be clitics; compare fn. 12). The acceptable reading of (25) I will call the *hanging topic* reading, to borrow a term of A. Grosu, since it exemplifies a construction that mainly serves to promote an NP to topic status at a point in the discourse when it was not a topic.¹¹

Compare the following discourse fragments in Italian:

- (27) Speaker A: *Sai che Maria è andata a stare da Giorgio a Roma?* (Maria is topic)
 ‘You know that Maria has gone to live with Giorgio in Rome?’
 Speaker B: *Ah, Giorgio, sapevo che lui voleva andare a stare in campagna.*
 ‘Ah, Giorgio, I used to know that he wanted to go and live in the country.’

(26) read with the typical LD intonation is somewhat odd as a

¹¹ For a detailed pragmatic analysis of this construction see Keenan and Schieffelin (1976), although the authors refer to it as “left dislocation”.

response to Speaker A in (27). On the other hand, it is perfectly appropriate in a context where Giorgio is already a topic (hence old information for the following sentence). For example:

- (28) Speaker A: Sai che *tuo cugino* mi ha telefonato ieri per dirmi che ha trovato un bell'appartamento a Roma?
'Do you know that your cousin called me up yesterday to tell me that he found a nice apartment in Rome?'

Speaker B: Ma guarda. Giorgio, sapevo che voleva andare a stare in campagna, e invece. . . .

(25), instead, is ill formed in the context of Speaker A's utterance in (28).^{12,13}

2.2. Island Constraints in Italian and French

The second phenomenon that appears to discriminate between the two constructions is sensitivity to island constraints.

¹² Strictly speaking, these facts about Subject Pronoun Drop (SPD) and lefthand NPs are just a special case of a more general phenomenon: LD requires clitic copies.

Recall that SPD deletes only nontonic subject pronouns. Now it appears that tonic (i.e. nonclitic) "copies" are allowed only by lefthand hanging topics, *not* by real left-dislocated NPs and PPs which require nontonic *clitic* copies (hence, in the case of subjects, the clitic pronoun obligatorily deleted by SPD).

If we choose lefthand PPs to make sure that a movement has taken place and that we are facing a proper case of LD (otherwise, how could we account in a simple way for the correct selection of the "governed" preposition? See section 1.1 above) the contrast appears clear-cut:

- (i) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *A \text{ Giorgio} \\ \text{Giorgio} \end{array} \right\}$, sono sicuro che non ho mai scritto a lui.
'(*To) Giorgio, I am sure that I have never written to him (nonclitic).'
- (ii) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *Di \text{ Piero} \\ \text{Piero} \end{array} \right\}$, credo che non abbiano mai parlato di lui.
'(*Of) Piero, I think that they have never talked of him (nonclitic).'

Compare also the following identical facts from French:

- (iii) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *A \text{ Pierre} \\ \text{Pierre} \end{array} \right\}$, je pense toujours à lui.
'(*To) Pierre, I always think of him (nonclitic).'
- (iv) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *De \text{ mes fils} \\ \text{Mes fils} \end{array} \right\}$, je ne suis pas fier d'eux.
'(*Of) my children, I am not proud of them (nonclitic).'

¹³ Notice, also, the following facts—suggested to me by R.

Again, picking out lefthand PPs as true representatives of LD (see fn. 12), we observe that the copy left behind cannot be inside an island. For example:

- (29) *A Giorgio, ieri ho conosciuto la ragazza che *gli* ha scritto quelle insolenze.
'To Giorgio, yesterday I met the girl who wrote those insolent words to him.'
- (30) *A Giorgio, chi può credere alla calunnia che *gli* abbiano dato dei soldi?
'To Giorgio, who can believe the slander that they gave him money?'
- (31) *Di quel libro, mi son seduto in poltrona e *ne* ho letta una metà, ieri.
'Of that book, I sat in the armchair and read half of it yesterday.'
- (32) *A Giorgio, che tu *gli* abbia scritto vuol dire che sei ancora innamorata.
'To Giorgio, that you wrote to him means that you're still in love.'

On the other hand, "copies" of lefthand *NPs*, which display no governed prepositions (and thus may well be hanging topics), are not sensitive to island constraints, just as we would expect of ordinary pronominalization cases. For example:

- (33) Giorgio, ieri ho conosciuto la ragazza che *gli* ha scritto quelle insolenze.
- (34) Giorgio, non posso credere alla calunnia che *gli* abbiano dato dei soldi.

Kayne—about an interaction of the two constructions:

- (i) Ah, Giorgio, di libri, sapevo che lui voleva comprarne due.
'Giorgio, of books, I-knew that he wanted to buy two of them.'
- (ii) *Di libri, Giorgio, sapevo che lui voleva comprarne due.
'Of books, Giorgio, I-knew that he wanted to buy two of them.'

(to be compared with the perfect *Di libri, Giorgio, sapevo che voleva comprarne due* without the subject pronoun copy so that *Giorgio* too can qualify as a left-dislocated constituent like *di libri*). If, as assumed elsewhere here, lefthand PPs can only arise through a copying operation, whereas *NPs* that leave a nonclitic "copy" through a direct generation in the base as topics, it becomes apparent from examples such as (i) and (ii) above that only the sequence "hanging topic + left-dislocated constituent" is allowed, and not vice versa (owing presumably to the very nature of topics that in general occupy the first position in a sentence).

The contrast between (i) and (ii) would seem to provide a serious puzzle to the proponents of a unitary analysis for all lefthand *NPs* and PPs.

SQUIBS AND DISCUSSION

- (35) Quel libro, mi sono seduto in poltrona e *ne* ho letta una metà, ieri.
(36) Giorgio, che tu *gli* abbia scritto vuol dire che sei ancora innamorata.

Once again, the two series appear to differ in their respective prosody and pragmatics, as indicated in section 2.1 above.

The same situation, which clearly falsifies Ross's original characterization of copying rules, seems to obtain in French. In this way I interpret the contrast pointed out by Hirschbühler (1975, 161) between the ungrammatical (37), which is a case of LD proper (see the "governed" preposition), and the grammatical (38), which I would interpret as a case of hanging topic.

- (37) *A moi, le gars qui me fera peur n'est pas encore né.¹⁴
'To me, the guy who will frighten me hasn't been born yet.'
(38) Ce projet, ceux qui en parlent le plus sont ceux qui en savent le moins.
'This project, those who talk the most about it are those who know the least about it.'

In the same way I would interpret the following judgments of French native speakers:

- (39) a. *A Georges, j'ai connu la fille qui lui a écrit hier.
b. Georges, j'ai connu la fille qui lui a écrit hier.
'Georges, I met the girl who wrote to him yesterday.'
(40) a. *De ce livre, hier j'avais le temps et j'en ai lu la moitié.
b. Ce livre, hier j'avais le temps et j'en ai lu la moitié.
'This book, yesterday I had time and read half of it.'
(41) a. *A notre frère, le fait que tu n'y penses jamais, est absurde.
b. Notre frère, le fait que tu n'y penses jamais, est absurde.
'Our brother, the fact that you never think of him, is absurd.'

¹⁴ The oddness of constructions like (37), which some French speakers tend to judge to be less severely ungrammatical than does Hirschbühler, becomes clearer if we introduce a hedge just after the lefthand PP, as in (i):

- (i) *A moi, je crois que le gars qui me fera peur n'est pas encore né.
'To me, I believe that the guy who will frighten me hasn't been born yet.'

Thus it seems that sensitivity to island constraints is not merely characteristic of chopping, feature changing, and certain kinds of deletion rules but extends also to copying rules; it seems also that the original facts on which Ross based his claim about copying rules might eventually turn out to be cases of “hanging topics + pronominalization” (see Cinque (in preparation)).

2.3. *Embedded Lefthand NPs and PPs in Italian*

Another set of facts that clearly differentiates hanging topics from left-dislocated constituents is the possibility of the latter and the impossibility of the former in embedded structures.¹⁵ Again, taking PPs as representatives of LD and NPs with nonclitic “copies” (see section 2.1 and fn. 12) or with “copies” within islands (see section 2.2) as representatives of the hanging topic construction, we obtain the following pattern:

- (42) a. Ho paura che a Giorgio_i, Marco gli_i abbia già scritto.
 ‘I fear that to Giorgio_i, Marco has already written-to-him_i (clitic).’
 b. Ho sentito che di Piero_i, non ne_i parlano più.
 ‘I heard that of Piero_i, they don’t talk-of-him_i (clitic) anymore.’
- (43) a. *Sono sicuro che Mario_i, lui_i vuole andare al mare.
 ‘I am sure that Mario_i, he_i (nonclitic) wants to go to the sea.’
 b. *Ho l’impressione che Paolo_i, sappiate benissimo chi gli_i ha scritto.
 ‘I’ve got the impression that Paolo_i, you know very well who wrote to him_i.’

2.4. *Clefting in Italian and French*

The fourth phenomenon differentiating the two constructions is represented by the following contrast:

- (44) a. *A Giorgio, è a lui che ho scritto.
 b. *A Georges, c’est à lui que j’ai écrit.
 ‘To Georges, it’s to him that I wrote.’
 c. Giorgio, è a lui che ho scritto.
 d. Georges, c’est à lui que j’ai écrit.
 ‘Georges, it’s to him that I wrote.’

¹⁵ This last fact should hopefully descend from a general and independent analysis of topics in natural language.

- (45) a. *Di Maria, è di lei che hanno parlato.
 b. *De Marie, c'est d'elle qu'ils ont parlé.
 'Of Marie, it's of her that they have talked.'
 c. Maria, è di lei che hanno parlato.
 d. Marie, c'est d'elle qu'ils ont parlé.
 'Marie, it's of her that they have talked.'

This contrast may well be a particular case of the previously mentioned island facts. No left dislocation is allowed of clefted constituents, whereas "anaphors" of hanging topics can be freely clefted.

3. Summary

It has been argued above that in languages like Italian and French there is evidence that lefthand NPs enter into two quite distinct constructions, one of which is the result of a copying operation, while the other consists of a base-generated topic followed by the pronominalization of the coreferential NP to the right (if there is any). If this conclusion, and the proposed suggestion that other languages (such as English) possess just the hanging topic construction, prove correct—as the diagnostics used here would seem to indicate when applied to English—then languages will be shown to differ as to whether they allow both LD *and* the hanging topic construction, or just the latter.¹⁶

References

- Chomsky, N. (1973) "Conditions on Transformations," in S. R. Anderson and P. Kiparsky, eds., *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
 Cinque, G. (1974) "Left Dislocation in Italian: A Syntactic and Pragmatic Analysis," to appear in a special number of *Cahiers de Lexicologie*.
 Cinque, G. (in preparation) "Copying Rules and Island Constraints: A Reconsideration."
 Ebert, R. P. (1973) "On the Notion 'Subordinate Clause' in Standard German," in C. Corum et al., eds., *You Take the High Node and I'll Take the Low Node*, Chicago

¹⁶ Notice what this dichotomy predicts for a non-LD language: it will lack lefthand PPs, lefthand idiom chunks, lefthand reflexive pronouns and adjectives, and embedded lefthand NPs and PPs; it will not allow for more than one lefthand NP or PP; the resumptive pronoun will be able to appear within islands, etc. The reverse will be true in general for LD languages.

Further research is obviously needed to put this hypothesis to the test, though it seems to be confirmed so far by the data of the languages I have been looking at.

- Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- Gruber, J. (1967) "Topicalization in Child Language," *Foundations of Language* 3, 37-65.
- Gundel, J. K. (1975) "Left Dislocation and the Role of Topic-Comment Structure in Linguistic Theory," *Working Papers in Linguistics* 18, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Hirschbühler, P. (1974) "La dislocation à gauche comme construction basique en français," in C. Rohrer and N. Ruwet, eds., *Actes du Colloque Franco-Allemande de Grammaire Transformationnelle*, vol. 1, Tübingen.
- Hirschbühler, P. (1975) "On the Source of Lefthand NPs in French," *Linguistic Inquiry* 6, 155-165.
- Keenan, E. O. and B. B. Schieffelin (1976) "Foregrounding Referents: A Reconsideration of Left Dislocation in Discourse," in *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, Berkeley, California.
- Kuno, S. (1971) "The Position of Locatives in Existential Sentences," *Linguistic Inquiry* 2, 333-378.
- Postal, P. (1971) *Cross-over Phenomena*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Rodman, R. (1974) "On Left Dislocation," *Papers in Linguistics* 7, 437-466.
- Ross, J. R. (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Ross, J. R. (1973) "A Fake NP Squish," in C. J. Bailey and R. W. Shuy, eds., *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
- Van Riemsdijk, H. and F. Zwarts (1974) "Left Dislocation in Dutch and the Status of Copying Rules," unpublished manuscript, MIT and University of Amsterdam.

AGAINST THE UNIVERSAL
RELEVANCE OF THE
SHADOW PRONOUN
HYPOTHESIS*

Jaklin Kornfilt,
Harvard University

0. Introduction

Perlmutter (1972) claims that there are no chopping rules in the syntax of natural languages. He suggests that the processes that have been regarded as chopping processes should be analyzed as two-step operations: first, a copying rule creates

* This squib was written for an Advanced Syntax Workshop held at Harvard University during the Fall semester, 1975. I am grateful to Susumu Kuno for suggesting this topic to me, to Judith Aissen and Jorge Hankamer for criticizing the preliminary draft, and to Dorit Renov, Brachi Tilles, and Zvia Walden for native judgments of the Hebrew examples. The Turkish judgments are my own.