The Left and Right Periphery in Dutch

Mark de Vries, University of Groningen

To appear in *The Linguistic Review*, 2009

Abstract. This article discusses the information-structural status and the syntax of left and right dislocation constructions in Dutch. Four orthogonal information-structural features are proposed, and their distribution is systematically investigated. Furthermore, it is argued that hanging topic left dislocation, backgrounding right dislocation and afterthoughts are a particular kind of parenthesis. They do not involve movement, and do not show reconstruction effects. Contrastive left dislocation, on the other hand, behaves on a par with topicalization; both involve contrast, and show signs of A-bar movement. The demonstrative pronoun is analyzed as an apposition to the topicalized phrase. Finally, it is shown that right-dislocated constituents, like appositions, are parenthetical secondary predicates of an anchor in the host clause.

1. Introduction

The goal of this article is twofold.[1] First, it aims at clarifying the relation between peripheral syntactic positions and information-structural status in Dutch. Second, it seeks to describe and explain the syntactic properties of various dislocation constructions, and the similarities and differences between them.

Dutch has two properties that are convenient for a study in sentence periphery, namely verb second (V2) and verb final. At least superficially, Dutch is OV (but see Zwart 1994, 1997 for an important qualification that is in line with the universal spec-head-comp order argued for in Kayne 1994). This property is complemented by V2 positioning of the finite verb (possibly an auxiliary) in main clauses only.[2] As a consequence, simple, unmarked main clauses are SVO, but only those; more complex clauses are S-Aux-O-V*, where V* is an infinite verb, a past participle, or a verb cluster. The structural area between the two verbal poles, the *sentence brackets*, is traditionally called the *middle field*. In subordinate clauses, the V2 position is occupied by a complementizer, yielding C-S-O-V*, where V* now includes the finite verb (see Den Besten 1983, 1989). Importantly, the initial field is then inaccessible for lexical material (modulo relative operators in certain dialects). Thus, at first sight, we arrive at the picture in (1), illustrated in (2a/b) for main clauses and subordinate clauses, respectively. The relevant sentence brackets are underlined. In (2), the final field contains an extraposed PP.

(1)   initial field | <u>V2/C</u> | middle field | <u>V*</u> | final field

(2)   a.   *Ik <u>heb</u> gisteren   een   boek   <u>gelezen</u> over   taalkunde*
              I   have yesterday a   book   read   about linguistics
              'I read a book about linguistics yesterday.'

---

[2]   It is widely believed that the V2 position is a derived position. For this reason, the term V2 is also used for the *operation* that places the finite verb of a main clause in the second sentence position. An important argument in favor of this view is the fact that verbal particles are stranded in the supposed underlying position; see especially Koster (1975).

b.   *Ik zei [(*X) <u>dat</u> ik gisteren een boek <u>had gelezen</u> over taalkunde].*
      I   said   that I yesterday a book had read   about   linguistics
      'I said that I read a book about linguistics yesterday.'

In this article, the discussion will be confined to main clauses. Furthermore, I will remain agnostic as to whether first and second position is to be derived cartographically or dynamically; but see Koster (2003) and Zwart (2004) for discussion and references.

In unmarked sentences, the subject is positioned leftmost. However, depending on the intended information structure, every constituent can be moved to the first position instead, triggering inversion. This is called *topicalization* (see Salverda 2000 for an overview and further references). Two examples are given in (3):

(3)   a.   <u>*Die jongen*</u> *ken ik niet.*   (topicalization)
           that boy   know I   not
           'That boy, I don't know.'
   b.   <u>*Gisteren*</u> *ben ik naar de bioscoop geweest.*
           yesterday am I to   the cinema   been
           'Yesterday, I went to the movies.'

In (3a) the direct object is topicalized, and in (3b) an adverbial phrase.

The final field can be occupied by various constituents as well, for instance object clauses and optionally extraposed constituents, such as a relative clause:

(4)   a.   *Joop heeft gezegd <u>dat hij zou komen</u>.*   (obligatory extraposition)
           Joop has   said   that he would come
           'Joop said that he would come.'
   b.   *Ik heb een man gezien <u>die een rode hoed droeg</u>.*   (optional extraposition)
           I   have a   man seen   who a   red   hat   wore
           'I saw a man that was wearing a red hat.'

The initial constituents in (3), as well as the final constituents in (4), are clearly part of the clause (syntactically, semantically, and intonationally). The situation may be different, however, for so-called *dislocation* constructions. To which extent this is really the case is part of the discussion below. The sentences in (5) illustrate hanging topic left dislocation (HTLD) and backgrounding right dislocation (BRD).

(5)   a.   <u>*Die jongen*</u>*, ik ken <u>'m</u> niet.*   (HTLD)
           that boy   I   know him not
           'That boy, I don't know him.'
   b.   *Ik ken <u>'m</u> niet, <u>die jongen</u>.*   (BRD)
           I   know him not   that boy
           'I don't know him, that boy.'

In both (5a) and (5b) the clause contains an *in situ* correlate of the peripheral constituent, namely *'m* (underlined as well), a weak pronominal form meaning 'him'.

HTLD and BRD are not the only dislocation constructions. Two additional types have to be taken into account; these are contrastive left dislocation (CLD) to the left, and afterthoughts to

the right; see (6a/b), where again the pronoun or correlate as well as the peripheral constituent is underlined.

(6) a. <u>*Die jongen, die*</u> *ken ik niet.* (CLD)
           that boy   DEM know I   not
           'That boy, I don't know.'
   b. *Hij heeft* <u>*zijn zus*</u> *uigenodigd voor het feest,* <u>*Mieke.*</u> (afterthought)
           he has   his sister invited   for the party Mieke
           'He invited his sister for the party, Mieke.'

Afterthoughts can be phonologically distinguished from backgrounded constituents: they receive an independent pitch accent, whereas BRD leads to deaccenting. There is also a difference between HTLD and CLD: in the former construction, the dislocated constituent is clearly separated from the intonational contour of the clause; in the latter this is not the case.

The conclusion we can draw from all this is that (1) must be extended to (7), where the initial field is divided into two qualitatively different components, namely the prefield, which is an essential part of the clause, and the 'true' left periphery, which may contain a dislocated constituent; similarly, the final field is divided into the postfield and the 'true' right periphery.

(7) left periphery ‖ prefield | V2/C | middle field | V* | postfield ‖ right periphery

This is by now the traditional picture, which we find in reference grammars of Dutch (most importantly, Haeseryn et al. 1997). Although it is descriptively adequate to a fair extent, it leaves parenthesis (intercalation) out of the picture. On the one hand, this makes sense; on the other hand, this choice obscures the obvious similarities between peripheral constituents and sentence-internal parentheses. Interestingly, the latter can be anchored as well, that is, they relate to an expression in the host clause. To mention just a few examples, *Mieke* in (6b) can also be constructed as an apposition directly next to *zijn zus* 'his sister'; furthermore, both afterthoughts and backgrounded constituents can occur clause-internally; see (8a-c), for instance:

(8) a. *Ik heb* <u>*toen*</u> *gezegd,* <u>*gisteren,*</u> *dat hij weg moest gaan.*
           I   have then said   yesterday that he away should go
           'I then said, yesterday, that he should leave.'
   b. *Dat* <u>*hij*</u> *wegging,* <u>*Joop,*</u> *was afschuwelijk.*
           that he left   Joop   was terrible
           'It was terrible that he left, Joop'
   c. <u>*Joop is*</u> *vanmorgen –* <u>*nog steeds verdrietig*</u> *– vertrokken.*
           Joop is this.morning still   sad   left
           'Joop left this morning, still sad.'

For those reasons, I explore a more dynamic approach to parenthesis/dislocation in De Vries (2009). In the present article, however, let us limit the discussion to constructions involving the sentence periphery, bearing in mind that some of the conclusions may carry over to clause-medial parentheses.

In Section 3, I argue that CLD is crucially different from HTLD, building on a growing consensus in the literature since Cinque (1977) and Van Haaften, Smits and Vat (1983). I propose that CLD does not involve dislocation at the clause level; instead, the peripheral constituent is in the regular prefield. This raises the question where the additional pronoun comes

from. I will suggest that the demonstrative is appositively construed with respect to its anchor. Section 4 discusses BRD and afterthoughts. Like HTLD, I claim, these do not show reconstruction effects. Dislocation involves a particular syntactic configuration, namely embedding in a ParP (a parenthetical phrase), which can apply at different levels, yielding a variety of dislocation constructions. This is consistent with the suggestion above that (on some level of abstraction) we can generalize over peripheral dislocation constructions and non-peripheral ones, including parentheses and appositions. Furhermore, we will see that right-dislocated constituents, like appositions, are parenthetical secondary predicates of an anchor in the host clause. First, however, let us consider the potential link between information structure and the left and right periphery in Dutch; this is the topic of the next section. As we will see, there is no one-to-one correspondence between position and pragmatic or semantic function.

2. Dislocation and information structure

In Section 2.1, I propose four information-structural features. Section 2.2 investigates topicalization and CLD in Dutch from the perspective of this system. Section 2.3 examines HTLD, BRD and afterthoughts, and summarizes all the results.

2.1. Information-structural features

Many information-structural notions figure in the literature (for an impression, see Chafe 1976; Vallduví 1992; Lambrecht 1994; De Swart and De Hoop 1995; Büring 1997, 2003; Kruijff-Korbayová and Steedman 2003; Beyssade et al. 2004). Common distinctions are theme–rheme, topic–comment, topic–focus(–tail), focus–ground/background/presupposition, foreground–background(–intermediate ground), new–old/given information (or something in between, see Prince 1981). As for focus, we have the opposition narrow–wide, and the nontrivial relation between intonational and informational focus (see Keijsper 1984; Rochemont 1986; Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg 1990; Rooth 1992; Blok 1993; Zubizareta 1998). As for topics, we may distinguish shifting–continuing, and sentence–discourse; topics can be frame-setting, or express pragmatic aboutness or loose aboutness; there are regular topics and anti-topics (Chafe 1976; Herring 1994). Finally, there is the interfering notion of contrast, which can be associated with both topic and focus (see also the overview in Büring 2006).

The process of topicalization was illustrated in (3). Despite the name, it is usually not the case that a topicalized constituent is a canonical topic. Therefore, we must be careful not to automatically equate syntactic positions with information-structural notions, and avoid circular definitions such as "x is a syntactic position for αs; an α is a phrase that sits in (or moves to) x" (compare Neeleman and Van de Koot 2008 for a similar conclusion concerning scrambling). Here, I will try to evade loaded and possibly confusing terminology such as *topic* and *focus* as much as possible. Instead, I would like to propose a system of orthogonal semantic/pragmatic features (orthogonal in the sense that each carries an independent and meaningful aspect of the interpretation, such that they can be combined in principle). Then, I will show which feature combinations can be associated with the peripheral constructions under discussion.

Four features seem to be relevant. These are informally defined in (9), and briefly discussed in turn below.

(9)   *Information-structural features*:
      [about]   what the sentence is about;
      [new]   update information;
      [add]   additional information, not part of the main proposition;
      [contrast]   activated presupposition of alternatives, plus a choice.

The feature system presented here is privative. Of course it can be translated into a binary system by marking the absence of a feature as [-F], which is assumed to be the default.

The feature [about] refers to what Reinhart (1982) calls pragmatic aboutness, usually equated with the notion of sentence topic. The background idea is that each proposition can be associated with different pragmatic assertions, depending on which constituent is [about]. In an ongoing discourse, speaker and hearer build up a so-called *context set*, which, crucially, has an internal organization: each accepted proposition is stored as a presupposition associated with the constituent that it is about. Reinhart shows that the constituent that is [about] tends to be old information, but that this need not be the case; furthermore, it tends to be the subject, but this, too, is no requirement (some counterexamples are shown below). Essentially, aboutness is an intuitive, pragmatic notion. Therefore, it cannot be predicted from the syntax and semantics of a sentence which constituent is [about]. But the concept does come with a number of condions. Most importantly, what is [about] must be existentially presupposed (see also Gundel 1988). Consequently, non-specific indefinites are excluded from carrying this feature.

Reinhart points out that the sentence topic in a particular context may, but often does not coincide with the more general discourse topic. A rather obvious reason is that what can be a discourse topic does not need to be a literal constituent of the sentence. We also need to distinguish between pragmatic aboutness and what can be called *frame-setting*. Normally, only nominal phrases can be [about]. Preposed prepositional phrases, adverbs or other constituents may explicitly set the stage (for instance, set up a spatio-temporal frame), but they are usually not what the sentence is about, according to my intuition. It is, however, not absolutely impossible, and I will discuss some counterexamples below.

The feature [new] indicates that the phrase or element carrying it contains new information, that is, information not introduced previously into the discourse (or that is no longer active), for which the speaker presupposes that the proposition containing it it will update the knowledge of the hearer. Notice that a complex constituent may consist of both a [new] and a given part. This can be the case for both the constituent that is [about] and the remaining parts of the clause, since the two features are independent. Thus, the approach taken here is in one important respect compatible with Vallduví (1992) and Kruijff-Korbayová and Steedman (2003), who claim that the information structure has at least two dimensions to it (in their system, a theme-rheme axis and a background-contrast axis). In what follows, I will not unnecessarily complicate issues, and refrain from using information-structurally complex major constituents.

The feature [add] indicates whether a constituent provides additional information, that is, compositional-semantically non-restrictive material, which does not affect the truth value of the host clause. Generally, parenthetical material involves a secondary proposition next to the main proposition; see Corazza (2005), Potts (2007), and De Vries (2009), for instance. An example with an appositive relative clause is (10):

(10) a.   John, who was ill, did not come to the party.
      b.   (i)   John did not come to the party.
             (ii)   John was ill.

The primary message in (10a) is (10b.i); the secondary message is (10b.ii). In principle, both propositions can be true or false independently of each other. Clearly, the first takes priority over the second. Normally, a response by the hearer is a comment on the primary message. The secondary one functions like a presuppositional background. For instance, the possible response "*No, that is not true*" denies (10b.i), not (10b.ii). If one would want to deny (10b.ii), the way to do it is like this: "*Yes, I know that John did not come to the party, but note that he was not ill*".

In order to distinguish between primary and secondary information, I will simply assign the feature [add] to those parts of the sentence that are parenthetical. At least for now, this descriptive tool suffices (but obviously, a deeper analysis is required in the end). What must be assigned [add] includes non-restrictive, dislocated constituents. It will become clear that this involves HTLD, BRD and afterthoughts.

Finally, there is the feature [contrast], which indicates the activated presupposition of alternatives. This requires some discussion. What is usually meant by contrast is a combination of the above with a clear phonological pitch accent, and, possibly, with a spelled-out alternative in a subsequent sentence/clause, for instance in "*John bought a BOOK, but Peter bought a MAGAZINE*". Now consider the following *wh*-question context. The sentences in (11a) and (11b) illustrate two possible ways of answering:

(11) *Wat   heeft Joop gekocht?*
      what has   Joop bought
      'What did Joop buy?'
      a.   *Joop heeft een   boek   gekocht.*
      b.   *Joop heeft een   BOEK gekocht, (gek   genoeg, en   geen TIJDSCHRIFT).*
           Joop has   a   book bought   strange enough and   no   magazine
           'Joop bought a book, (curiously, and not a magazine).'

In both (11a) and (11b), the main sentence stress is on *boek* 'book'; in (11b) the pitch accent is exaggerated (what this means exactly in phonological terms does not concern us here, but an important aspect of it is that the pitch raises to a higher peak than it normally does). Because of the *wh*-context, both options involve the activated presupposition of alternatives. However, only in (11b) the particular choice – which is the same as in (11a) – is emphasized for some reason, and therefore possible alternative choices are explicitly excluded; this state of affairs is confirmed by the potential context between brackets. Thus, there are degrees of contrast. A weak contrast involves an open set of possible alternatives. As far as I can see, all the other types are phonologically marked as a strong contrast. These involve the explicit or implicit limitation of the set of alternatives in the context, and/or the exclusion of alternatives.

In (11), *boek* 'book' also happens to be [new]. However, it is important to see that being [new] is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for [contrast]; see also Kuno (1973), Rooth (1992), Büring (2003), and many others for discussion. First, a choice for one of several alternatives given in the preceding context leads to a situation where given information can be contrasted; this is often called *contrastive topic* (we will encounter some relevant examples below). Second, new information does not automatically imply an activated set of presupposed alternatives. Consider the following story: "*I saw Joop the other day. He bought a book*". The event *bought a book* is new information (the informational focus, some would say). Even though one may associatively think of possible worlds in which Joop did something else, I deny that in this sentence, there is an activated presupposition *Joop did something* with a variable ranging over events, which would make the event *bought a book* weakly contrastive in the way just defined. In the relevant sentence the subject *he* (=*Joop*) is [about], and hence existentially

presupposed. Of course, we know that an existent entity might be doing something, but it does not follow that this is part of the semantics of the clause. See also Gundel's (1988:40ff) effective critique of Chomsky's (1970) idea that the presupposition of a sentence is determined by replacing the focus with a variable.

Finally, let us briefly consider the grammatical status of the four features in (9). As we will see in more detail below, there is no fixed correlation between syntactic position and these features. At least in Dutch, they do not play any obvious role in the morphosyntax of the clause, with the exception of [add], to which I will return. But they are certainly important for the interpretation as well as the pronunciation. Regarding the latter, I assume that at least for the speaker, the distribution of aboutness, information status, restrictiveness, and contrasts across the clause are determinants of phonological stress assignment and the intonational contour (and not the other way around). Therefore, it seems that we need a joint interface C-I/A-P (a single output model). The relevant features, although essentially pragmatic in nature, are assigned (or at least licensed) at the interface, conditioned by constraints from various components of the grammar, and consequently have an effect on both the LF and PF side.

2.2. Information-structural features of topicalization and CLD in Dutch

The feature system proposed above makes it possible to characterize topicalization and CLD in Dutch, or at least some important aspects of these. Interestingly, in many cases topicalization can be turned into CLD and vice versa; compare (3a) and (6a), for instance (see Section 3 for some exceptions). As I do not see any essential difference in information-structural status in those cases, I will discuss Dutch topicalization and CLD simultaneously in this section. Section 3 contains a comparison between CLD and HTLD, and an argument concerning the status of the demonstrative pronoun in CLD.

Topicalized/CLD constituents are not necessarily [about] or [new], or the reverse of either. However, what we can say is this: every topicalized/CLD constituent has [contrast], be it weak or strong. For contrastive left dislocation, this is at least consistent with the name (and cross-linguistically not very controversial; most recently, see Sturgeon 2008 for Czech). For Dutch topicalization, the intuition is explicitly confirmed by Salverda (2000:101): "...It is this combination of [phonological, semantic, and syntactic] features in topicalized sentences which is used by the speaker to highlight or point to *an opposition of some kind*" (italics mine).

Since [new], [about], and [contrast] are orthogonal features, we now predict four possibilities: [contrast], [contrast, about], [contrast, new], and [contrast, about, new]. (As topicalized constituents are clearly part of the main proposition, the feature [add] does not apply; see also Section 3.) This is illustrated in (12) through (15). Here, emphasis is indicated by capitals, the topicalized/CLD constituent of interest is underlined, the demonstrative pronoun between brackets is needed for CLD, and A and B are different speakers. In each case, A provides some relevant context, and B produces the topicalization/CLD construction we are looking for.

(12) [contrast, about]
A: *Heb je   Joop nog   gesproken?*
    have you Joop yet   spoken
B: *Nee, JOOP (die)   is op vakantie, maar ik heb wel   met   PIET   overlegd.*
    no   Joop DEM   is on vacation but   I   have indeed with   Piet   consulted
    'A: Did you speak to Joop? B: No, Joop is on vacation, but I did consult with Piet.'

(13) [contrast]
A: *En   Henk?   Wat   heeft   Henk   aan   Mieke   en   Sofie   gegeven?*
   and   Henk   what   has   Henk   to   Mieke   and   Sofie   given
B: *Nou,   <u>MIEKE (die)</u> heeft hij een CD   gegeven   en   SOFIE   een BOEK.*
   well   Mieke   DEM has   he   a   CD   given   and   Sofie   a   book
   'A: And Henk, what did Henk give to Mieke and Sofie? B: Well, he gave Mieke a CD, and Sofie a book.'

In (13), speaker A introduces *Henk* explicitly as the participant that the answer by B must be about. Therefore, *hij* 'he' (=Henk) is [about] in the answer, and *Mieke* is not. *Mieke* is contrasted with *Sofie*; both are given in the preceding context, hence not [new].

(14) [contrast, about, new]
A: *Houd   je   van   watersport?*
   like   you   of   water.sports
B: *Tot op zekere hoogte.   <u>SURFEN (dat)</u> vind ik   bijvoorbeeld   leuk, maar ZEILEN niet.*
   till on certain height   surfing   DEM find I   for.instance   nice but sailing   not
   'A: Do you like water sports? B: To a certain extent. I like wind surfing, for instance, but I don't like sailing.'

In (14), *surfen* 'wind surfing' is new information. Being an example of water sports (probably the new discourse topic), it is also what the first clause is about.

(15) [contrast, new]
A: *En   Henk? Wat heeft Henk   ook   alweer gekocht?   Een   tijdschrift?*
   and   Henk   what has   Henk   also   again bought   a   magazine
B: *Nee, sukkel.   Een <u>BOEK (dat)</u>   heeft   hij gekocht, geen TIJDSCHRIFT.*
   no   dope   a   book   DEM   has   he bought   no   magazine
   'A: And Henk? What did Henk buy, again? A magazine? B: No, stupid. He bought a book, not a magazine.'

In (15), *Henk* (later *hij* 'he') is designated the [about] role by speaker A, so *een boek* 'a book' is not. Speaker B corrects A by contrasting the newly introduced book with the given magazine.

   A number of comments are in order. First, a topic/CLD position is by no means a requirement for acquiring contrast. We already saw an example of an *in situ* contrast in (13), where *een CD* 'a CD' is an explicit focus alternative of *een boek* 'a book'. For reasons of space, I will refrain from providing further examples.

   Second, we saw in (13) and (15) that the [about] feature is not necessarily associated with the first noun phrase of the sentence (see also Reinhart 1982). These findings differ from Frey's (2004) claims about German CLD, namely that it is topic marking and signals a shift in sentence topic. If the equivalents of (13) and (15) are considered acceptable in German (and according to my informants they are), Frey's generalization is too strong. I think the same point can be made with preposed non-nominal phrases.

   Third, so far I have shown that the topic/CLD position is compatible with a strong contrast. Now let me try to make plausible that it is also compatible with a weak contrast, and, more interestingly, that a contrast (weak or strong) is required. Consider the following minimal pairs:

8

(16) a.   *Ik heb <u>Joop</u> gezien.*   (unmarked order)
          I   have Joop seen
          'I saw Joop.'
     b.   <u>*Joop*</u> *heb ik gezien.*   (topicalization)
     c.   <u>*Joop, die*</u> *heb ik gezien.*   (CLD)

(17) a.   *Ik heb <u>gisteren</u> een boek gelezen.*   (unmarked order)
          I   have yesterday a   book read
          'I read a book, yesterday.'
     b.   <u>*Gisteren*</u> *heb ik een boek gelezen.*   (topicalization)
     c.   <u>*Gisteren, toen*</u> *heb ik een boek gelezen.*   (CLD)

The examples in (16a) and (17a) can be uttered out of the blue, with broad focus, no contrasts. According to my intuition, this is not the case for (16b/c) and (17b/c). These require a particular context, or else the hearer needs to accommodate. Apart from cases of explicit oppositions comparable to the situation in (12) through (15), a possible context is a *wh*-question such as *Who did you see?* for (16), and *When did you read a book* for (17). If so, we activate an open set of alternative choices, and consequently the relevant topicalized/CLD constituent is weakly contrastive. Another, particularly nice example is (18), taken from Bouma (2008:13):

(18) *Koning, keizer, admiraal, <u>Popla</u> kennen ze   allemaal!*
     king   emperor admiral   Popla know   they all
     'It doesn't matter whether they are king, emperor or admiral, they're all familiar with Popla.'

Apart from the HTLD construction, there is topicalization of *Popla*, which is a certain brand of toilet paper. An additional demonstrative turning topicalization into CLD is also acceptable. Why is this so? One factor, it seems to me, is that there is an obvious implicit contrast with other brands of toilet paper, which (this is the implication) are not nearly as good and famous as Popla. Even with idiom chunks we can build an implied contrast.

(19) *De klere (dat)   kan hij krijgen!*
     <idiom>   DEM   can he   <get>
     'Let him drop dead!'

Here, the marked word order stresses that the speaker wishes for the other person something bad rather than good. (The word *klere*, by the way, is etymologically derived from the disease *cholera*.)
     The idea that a topicalized phrase is contrastive is confirmed by the fact that an unstressable pronoun cannot be fronted:

(20) *Dat/*'t   weet ik niet, hoor!*
     that/it_weak know I   not   hear
     'That/*it, I don't know!'

In (20), the topicalized demonstrative is fine, but it cannot be replaced by the phonologically weak pronoun *'t* 'it'.

I should stress that [contrast] is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for topicalization/CLD. We already noticed that a contrast can be invoked *in situ*, so we cannot conclude that contrast alone triggers topicalization. Which constituent surfaces in the left periphery in Dutch is determined by an interplay of different factors, including the *given–new* distinction, which in turn is related to definiteness; see also Jansen (1981, 2002), Salverda (2000), and Bouma (2008) for discussion and references.

Is there no semantic or pragmatic difference between topicalization and CLD? This is unclear. The additional demonstrative in CLD seems to underline the contrastive aspect of the construction. However, both are acceptable in all contexts discussed so far. My hunch is that there could be a gradual difference in the sense that the stronger the contextually determined contrast, the more likely it is that CLD is used instead of simple topicalization. A second, interfering, factor is that CLD has a colloquial flavor.

There is one grammatical function, however, for which CLD appears to make a difference: this concerns the subject of a sentence. Sentence-initial subjects in Dutch are usually not contrastive (like any constituent, they *can* be, of course). This raises doubt on the idea that subjects are standardly raised into the topicalization position (say, SpecCP), which in turn can be taken as an argument for a dynamical approach to V2. In other words, because subjects are already sentence-initial in the canonical word order, they need not be associated with the properties of topicalized constituents. If this association is wanted nevertheless, the way to do it is to insert a demonstrative pronoun, which results in a CLD construction. Consider (21):

(21) a.   *Joop heeft een fiets gestolen.*
       Joop has a   bike stolen
       'Joop stole a bike.'
   b.   *Joop, die heeft een fiets gestolen.*

Example (21a) can be uttered out of the blue, but (21b) requires a particular context.

A somewhat related issue arises in English. Generally, English topicalization corresponds to Dutch CLD, and English left dislocation is comparable to Dutch HTLD; see Frey (2005) for more discussion. Topicalization of a subject, where the result would not be different from the canonical word order, is impossible in English: **John, _ saw a cow*. Depending on the context, LD is fine: *John, he saw a cow*. (See especially Prince 1998 for more details on English LD.) It is conceivable that subject LD takes over a possible contrastive function from topicalization in order to compensate for the gap in the paradigm. An example, taken from the internet, that I can interpret in this way, is the following: *Man, those Romans, they [k]new how to live! But [...] what have they done for us?* Clearly, this confuses the general picture, and it complicates the comparison between languages.

To conclude, topicalization and CLD in Dutch behave on a par to a considerable extent. All logical combinations of the three relevant information-structural features proposed in Section 2.1 are attested. The next subsection shows the results of applying the feature system to the other constructions under discussion. For now, I will confine the argument to nominal phrases.

2.3. Information-structural features of dislocation constructions in Dutch

Hanging topics, backgrounded phrases, and afterthoughts are dislocated from the host clause.[3] They provide additional information. Unlike contrastive preposed phrases, they do not show reconstruction effects (see the next sections). Therefore, they receive an [add] feature. As a consequence, they cannot be contrastive, since [contrast] directly relates to the interpretation of the primary proposition. Thus, there are four remaining possibilities: [add], [add, about], [add, new], and [add, about, new].

First, let us examine HTLD. It turns out that the dislocated constituent in HTLD (or its correlate in the host clause) is what the sentence is about. An illustration is (22):

(22) [add, about]
A: *Heb je   nog   gesurft?*
    have you yet   surfed?
B: *Nee.*
    no
A: *Waarom   niet?*
    why   not
B: *Och, surfen, ik ben er   niet zo dol op.*
    well surfing I am   there not so fond of
    'A: Have you been wind surfing? B: No. A: Why not? B: Ah well, wind surfing, I am not so fond of it.'

As we predicted, a contrast is infelicitous; see (23). Even if the second clause is turned into a CLD construction, the first remains unacceptable:

(23) [*Context:* Do you like wind surfing or sailing?]
    # *Nou, SURFEN, ik ben er   dol op. Maar ZEILEN, ik hou er   niet van.*
    well, surfing   I   am   there fond of but   sailing   I   like there not of
    Intended: 'Ah well, wind surfing, I am fond of it, but sailing, I don't like it.'

Furthermore, in a context where another phrase is designated the [about] feature, HTLD is infelicitous. Compare (24), where *hij* 'he' (=*Henk*) is [about], to (22):

(24) [*Context:* And what about Henk, does Henk like wind surfing?]
    # *Surfen, hij is er   niet zo dol op.*
    Surfing   he is there not so fond of
    Intended: 'Wind surfing, he is not so fond of it.'

HTLD appears to have a resuming function. The construction is reserved for phrases that repeat material mentioned earlier in the discourse. Therefore, the feature [new] is incompatible with it. An infelicitous attempt is (25):

---

3   A interesting special case is so-called *Loose Aboutness Left Dislocation*, as attested in French and Chinese, for instance; see Van Riemsdijk (1997) and Chafe (1976:50), respectively. It does not exist in Dutch. In this construction, the dislocated constituent is not pronominally represented in the host clause. This is different from the situation in HTLD. Therefore, a 'loose aboutness topic' is in fact a discourse topic, and not a sentence topic.

(25) [*Context:* Let's talk about sports. OK.]
    # *Tennis, ik ben er dol op.*
      tennis, I am there fond of
      Intended: 'Tennis, I am fond of it.'

Thus, if this impression is correct, there is only one type of HTLD: [add, about]. I should mention that Frey (2004) claims that German HTLD does not always involve the sentence topic. However, I cannot reproduce the crucial examples in Dutch.

    Next, consider BRD, which seems more or less the reverse of HTLD at first sight. BRD can be used to express [about] as well; see (26):

(26) [add, about]
A: *Heb je Joop nog gesproken?*
     have you Joop yet spoken?
B: *Vandaag bedoel je?*
     today mean you
A: *Hm-hm.*
     hm-hm
B: *Nee, ik heb 'm vandaag niet gezien, Joop.*
     no I have him today not seen Joop
     'A: Did you speak to Joop? B: You mean today? A: Hm-hm. B: No, I haven't seen him today, Joop.'

Here, the backgrounded constituent *Joop* is familiar; it serves as a kind of reminder.[4] Notably, BRD may also serve as a reminder in a context where it neither functions as the aboutness topic, nor as new information; this is illustrated in (27):

(27) [add]
A: *En Henk? Aan wie heeft Henk zijn kaartje gegeven?*
     and Henk to whom has Henk his ticket given
B: *Wie?*
     who
A: *Henk.*
B: *Oh, Henk heeft 't aan Mieke gegeven, z'n kaartje.*
     oh, Henk has it to Mieke given his ticket
     'A: And Henk? To whom did Henk give his ticket? B: Who? A: Henk. B: Oh, Henk gave it to Mieke, his ticket.'

Generally, BRD cannot involve new information. An infelicitous attempt is (28):

(28) [*Context:* Did you buy anything yesterday?]
    # *Ja, ik heb 't gekocht, het/een boek (over taalkunde).*
      yes I have it bought the/a book about linguistics
      Intended: 'Yes, I bought it, the/a book (about linguistics)'

---

[4] What is also interesting is that BRD can be combined with topic drop, for example *Heb ik gezien, die man* [have I seen, that man]. This is possible in imperative clauses, too: *Geef hier, die vaatdoek!* [give here, that dishcloth]; see Koopman (2007) for some discussion.

In (29), it is shown that BRD constructions cannot be contrastive, either:

(29) [*Context:* Did you speak to Joop or Mieke today?]
    # *Nee, ik heb 'm niet gezien, <u>JOOP</u>. Maar ik heb wel met 'r gesproken, <u>MIEKE</u>.*
    no I have him not seen Joop but I have yes with her spoken Mieke
    Intended: 'No, I haven't seen him, Joop. But I have spoken to her, Mieke.'

In short, BRD constructions are [add, about] or just [add].
    Finally, let us turn to afterthoughts. Per definition, these contain new information, albeit additional information, as do regular parentheses. An example is (30), where *Joop* specifies *een leuke man* 'a nice man':

(30) [add, new]
A: *Weet je nog iets over Mieke?*
    know you yet anything about Mieke
B: *Ja, ze heeft vandaag <u>een leuke man</u> ontmoet, <u>Joop</u>.*
    yes she has today a nice man met Joop
    'A: Do you know anything about Mieke? B: Yes, she has met a nice man today, Joop.'

Whether an afterthought (or its anchor) can also be [about] depends on the more general question if a newly introduced participant can be considered what a sentence is about. I think a presentative construction as in (31) is a good candidate, but I will not pursue the issue here.

(31) [add, new, ?about]
    <u>*Een grote, bebaarde man*</u> *stond op het marktplein, <u>Barbarossa</u>.*
    a big bearded man stood on the market.place Barbarossa
    'A big, bearded man was standing on the market place, Barbarossa.'

The findings so far are summarized in (32) and in Table 1, which is supplemented with what is known about constituents in their unmarked (*in situ*) position.

(32) CLD/topicalization   [contrast]; [contrast, about]; [contrast, new]; [contrast, about, new]
    HTLD   [add, about]
    BRD   [add]; [add, about]
    afterthoughts   [add, new]; ?[add, new, about]

Table 1. Information-structural feature combinations in relation to construction types.

	[about]	[new]	[contrast]	[add]
in situ	+	-	-	-
in situ, topicalization, CLD	+	-	+	-
in situ	+	+	-	-
in situ, topicalization, CLD	+	+	+	-
in situ	-	-	-	-
in situ, topicalization, CLD	-	-	+	-
in situ	-	+	-	-
in situ, topicalization, CLD	-	+	+	-
HTLD, BRD	+	-	-	+
?afterthoughts	+	+	-	+
BRD	-	-	-	+
afterthoughts, parenthesis	-	+	-	+
<impossible>			+	+

All feature combinations can be realized, except [add, contrast], as explained above. Every combination of [about], [new], and [contrast] is possible *in situ*. CLD/topicalization invokes [contrast], but is indifferent to [new] and [about]. HTLD, BRD, and afterthoughts are more specialized construction types.

3. CLD versus HTLD

3.1. On pronouns and categories

In CLD constructions, the peripheral constituent is accompanied by a distal demonstrative, taken from the paradigm in Table 2 in Dutch; see also Zwart (1998). An example is (33):

(33) *Joop, die/*deze   ken   ik niet.*
       Joop   DEM$_{dist}$/DEM$_{prox}$ know   I   not
       'Joop, I don't know.'

Table 2. Demonstratives in Dutch.

	proximate	distal
non-neuter argument	deze	die, (gene)
neuter PL argument	deze	die, (gene)
neuter SG argument	dit	dat
time	nu	dan [FUT]*, toen [PAST]
place	hier	daar
manner	(zus)	zo
proposition	dit	dat
event	dit	dat
predicate	dit	dat

* The future form *dan* is also used for conditionals.

In HTLD constructions, the correlate in the host clause is often a personal pronoun, with a preference for the weak form; see Table 3. In questions, however, there is a preference for a distal demonstrative. This is illustrated in (34):

(34) a. *Joop, ik ken 'm/?hem/??die/*deze niet.*
Joop I know him$_{weak}$/him$_{strong}$/DEM$_{dist}$/DEM$_{prox}$not
'Joop, I don't know him.'

b. *Joop, ken je die/?hem/??'m/*deze niet?*
Joop know you DEM$_{dist}$/him$_{strong}$/him$_{weak}$/DEM$_{prox}$not
'Joop, don't you know him?'

Table 3. Third person personal pronouns in Dutch.

	strong	weak
SG male, SU	hij	-ie
SG male, OB	hem	'm
SG female, SU	zij	ze
SG female, OB	haar	'r / d'r
SG neuter, SU/OB[*]	het	't
PL, SU	zij	ze
PL, OB	hun / hen	ze
expletive or location[**]		er

* The neuter form can also be used to refer to abstractions, events or propositions.
** *Er* combines pronominal and adverbial functions.

As we noted before, any stressable syntactic category with any function can be topicalized in Dutch, and accordingly, most of these can be enhanced to a CLD construction. Three examples of a non-nominal category are provided in (35). For more illustrations, see De Vries (2007a).

(35) a. *In de tuin, daar zaten ze.* (PP, place)
in the garden there sat they
'In the garden is where they were sitting.'

b. *Of hij komt, dat weet ik niet.* (CP, object clause)
if he comes that know I not
'Whether he will come, I don't know.'

c. *Knap, dat is hij zeker.* (AP, predicate)
handsome that is he certainly
'Handsome, he certainly is.'

Prepositional objects are an exception:[5]

(36) a. ?* *Over computers, daar(over) sprak hij (over).*
about computers, there(about) spoke he (about)
Intended: 'About computers, she talked (about).'

b. ?* *Aan haar fiets, daar(aan) dacht ze (aan)*
of her bike, there(of) thought she (of)
Intended: 'Of her bike, she was thinking (of).'

What is causing the problem here (whatever the formal explanation is), is that the preposition must be retained somehow, but this is not possible. Notice that if only the nominal phrase that is

---

[5] This is different from the situation in clitic left dislocation (CLLD) constructions (as in Romance languages), where PP dislocation is considered acceptable.

originally contained in the PP is contrastively dislocated, the sentence become perfect. Also, the simple topicalization variant of (36) is fine; see (37) and (38):

(37) a. *Computers, daar sprak hij over.*
computers there spoke he about
'Computers, he spoke about.'
b. *Haar fiets, daar dacht ze aan.*
her bike there thought she of
'Her bike, she was thinking of.'

(38) a. *Over computers sprak hij.*
about computers spoke he
'He spoke about computers.'
b. *Aan haar fiets dacht ze.*
of her bike thought she
'She was thinking of her bike.'

There is another difference between topicalization and CLD, namely, the peripheral constituent cannot be non-specific in the latter:

(39) *Niemand (*die) wilde een ijsje.*
Nobody DEM wanted an ice.cream
'Nobody wanted an ice cream.'

The reason is that the demonstrative must pick out a referent. In this case, such a referent is unavailable.

Let us turn to HTLD constructions again. For the same reason as in CLD constructions, the peripheral constituent must be specific: the pronoun must be able to refer; see (40):

(40) * *Een of andere prinses, ik wil d'r weleens ontmoeten.*
one or other princess I want her once meet
Intended: 'Some princess or other, I would like to meet her once.'

HTLD is much more limited than CLD (not only syntactically, but also in use, see also Jansen 1981, Zwart 2001). At first sight, acceptable examples always involve a nominal phrase; compare (35) to (41), for instance:

(41) a. * *In de bibliotheek, Joop heeft er gezeten.*
in the library Joop has there sat
Intended: 'In the library, Joop has been sitting there.'
b. * *Dat hij onschuldig was, hij heeft 't nooit beweerd.*
that he innocent was he has it never claimed
Intended: 'That he was innocent, he has never claimed it.'
c. * *Met een hamer, hij sloopt zo de stoel.*
with a hammer he demolishes so the chair
Intended: 'With a hammer, he demolishes the chair that way.'

This fact is related to the result obtained before, namely that HTLD always involves the feature [about], contrary to CLD. There is a strong tendency for pragmatic aboutness to be associated with nominal phrases (see also Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007 on shifting aboutness topics in German). However, this is not an absolute requirement. Consequently, to the extent that non-nominal phrases can be interpreted as what the sentence is about, HTLD constructions with such phrases are also acceptable (contrary to a widespread assumption in the literature). An illustration is the rhetorical question in (42), where the dislocated constituent is an AP:

(42) [*Context:* a conversation about being proud of publications in Tabu]
      Ja,   trots   op zijn papers in Tabu, wie is dat nou niet?
      yes   proud   of his   papers in Tabu who is that now not
      'Yes, proud of his Tabu papers, who is it not?'

Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to me.

So far, we discussed categories and the type of pronoun involved. A third issue is the possibility of connectivity effects between the peripheral constituent and the correlate in the relevant clause. I will briefly address this issue in a separate subsection.

3.2. Connectivity effects

There is a clear consensus in the literature that connectivity/reconstruction effects exist for CLD as well as topicalization, but not for HTLD. This concerns various Germanic and Slavic languages. See Van Haaften et al. (1983), Van Riemsdijk (1997), Grohmann (2003), Shaer and Frey (2004), Alexiadou (2006), De Vries (2007a), and Sturgeon (2008), among others. A similar distinction is made between Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) and HTLD in Romance and Greek, for instance; see Cinque (1977), Anagnostopoulou, Van Riemsdijk and Zwart, eds., (1997), Cecchetto (1999), and Delais-Roussarie, Doetjes and Sleeman (2004) for discussion. The conclusion of this argument is that CLD, topicalization, and CLLD are A-bar movement constructions, but HTLD is not.

Relevant effects are i) reconstruction for variable binding, anaphor binding, or the interpretation of idiom chunks, ii) obligatory Case matching between the peripheral constituent and the correlate, and iii) locality effects suggesting movement. For reasons of space, I cannot possibly repeat all the arguments here, so let me provide just a few interesting examples from Dutch.

Generally, extraction from an adverbial clause is unacceptable. The CLD construction in (43a) is as bad as the corresponding topicalization construction. The HTLD variant in (43b), however, is much better; in this case, there is no gap but a resumptive pronoun.

(43) a. * *Madame Bovary, dat zou   me zeer verbazen [als hij _ gelezen had].* (CLD)
           Madame Bovary that would me very surprise if   he   read   had
           Intended: 'Madame Bovary, it would surprise me very much if he had read.'
     b.   *Madame Bovary, het zou   me zeer verbazen [als hij 't gelezen had].* (HTLD)
           Madame Bovary it would me very surprise if   he   it read   had
           'Madame Bovary, it would surprise me very much if he had read it.'

Thus, there is a strong indication for A-bar movement in CLD, especially since successive cyclic movement from an object clause, as indicated in (44), is fine:

(44) *Madame Bovary, dat zei hij [_ dat hij _ gelezen had].*
     Madame Bovary that said he   that he   read   had
     'Madame Bovary, he said that he had read.'

From the previous examples we cannot tell what is moved in CLD constructions, just the demonstrative, or the anchor itself. The anaphor binding test in (45a) shows that it is the anchor that must be moved. The subject *Joop* binds the reflexive embedded in the preposed object. The demonstrative *die* is coreferent with the object as a whole; therefore, it is not a sufficient substitute of the anchor in order to explain the binding relationship.

(45) a. *[Pikante verhalen over   zichzelf$_i$]$_k$, die$_k$ hoort Joop$_i$ niet graag.*   (CLD)
         juicy   stories about REFL   those hears Joop   not   gladly
         'Juicy stories about himself, Joop doesn't like to hear.'
     b. * *[Pikante verhalen over   zichzelf$_i$]$_k$, Joop$_i$ hoort ze$_k$ niet graag.*   (HTLD)
         juicy   stories about REFL   Joop   hears them not   gladly
         Intended: 'Juicy stories about himself, Joop doesn't like to hear them.'

Again, in HTLD (45b) there is no sign of reconstruction. The example becomes fine if *zichzelf* is replaced by *hemzelf*, which is not a local anaphor in standard Dutch.
     The pattern in (45) can be confirmed by a split idiom test. In (46), we use the idiomatic expression *de klere krijgen* mentioned before in (19). As we observe, preposing of the idiom chunck *de klere* is only possible in the CLD construction.

(46) a. *De klere, dat kan hij krijgen!*   (CLD)
         <idiom>   that can he <get>
         'Let him drop dead!'
     b. * *De klere, hij kan 't krijgen!*   (HTLD)
         <idiom> he can it <get>
         Intended: 'Dead, let him drop it!'

In order to obtain the idiomatic interpretation of *de klere krijgen*, we have to reconstruct the preposed chunk *de klere*, on the assumption that idioms are drawn from the lexicon as a whole or must be interpreted as a combined whole. Vergnaud (1974), Kayne (1994), and others since, have used the idea of split idioms to argue for the raising analysis of relative clauses. Similarly, we may infer that the noun phrase itself (and not just the demonstrative) is A-bar moved in (46a).
     In short, there is proof for movement of the anchor in CLD, but not in HTLD. The next subsection contains a syntactic proposal for these constructions.

3.3. Syntactic analysis: parenthesis at different levels

The lack of connectivity effects in HTLD implies that it involves base-generated dislocation at the sentence level. Like parentheses, it involves additional material, not part of the primary proposition. Therefore, it seems to me, it is quite unlikely that a hanging topic would be generated in a high specifier position. Also, it is insufficient to assume that it is left-adjoined to the sentence, since then there would be no difference with regular left-peripheral adverbial material. Clearly, what we now need is a more general theory on parenthesis: how do we turn some XP into a parenthetical XP? Although the details are beyond the scope of this article, let me

summarize some ideas I have been developing in other work (see especially De Vries 2007b and 2009).

What is special about parenthesis is not so much the internal structure of either the parenthetical material or the host clause, but the connection between the two. The phrase or clause XP becomes parenthetical with respect to the host as the result of an operation that has an effect on the semantics, syntax, and phonology. Semantically, the XP is interpreted as a secondary message, outside of the host proposition (compare Potts's 2007 'comma operator'). Syntactically, there are several 'invisibility effects' such as the impossibility of movement between the parenthesis and the host, and the lack of binding relationships between them (see also Espinal 1991). Phonologically, parentheses are normally set off from the host by means of a discernable intonational pattern (see Dehé and Kavalova 2007 for discussion and further references). We can attribute these properties to a functional operator, call it Par, that is introduced as an (abstract) syntactic head. This head (like any head) is active in syntax, and has an effect on the interfaces, both LF and PF. Any XP selected as the complement of Par is then interpreted parenthetically; descriptively, this can be made explicit by the assignment of the feature [add] discussed before. By its very nature, there cannot be a designated position within the host for a parenthetical phrase; therefore, I will simply assume that parenthetical phrases are adjoined to a maximal projection of the host. I will come back to some of these issues below.

Given this background, let us assume that the left-peripheral XP in a HTLD construction (the hanging topic) is embedded in a parenthetical phrase ParP, which in turn is left-adjoined to the host clause:

(47) $[_{CP} [_{ParP}$ Par XP] $[_{CP}$ host clause]]   (HTLD)

More can be said about the internal structure of ParP (see also Section 4.2), but what is relevant here, is that several properties of HTLD follow from (47) straightforwardly. Being the complement of Par, XP is assigned the [add] feature. Phonologically, XP is set off from the host. There is no movement or ellipsis, so there cannot be connectivity effects. For the same reason, the host must be complete by itself, so there cannot be a gap corresponding to the hanging topic XP; instead a resumptive pronoun is required.

Next, let us turn to CLD constructions. The reconstruction data discussed in the previous subsection indicate that the left-peripheral XP is actually part of the host clause. At least at some level of representation, it is not dislocated at all. Therefore, suppose that XP is generated inside the clause, at the position of the gap, and subsequently moved to the left periphery. This insight is not new. As far as I know, it was proposed first in Van Haaften, Smits and Vat (1983). The basic idea is represented in (48):

(48) $[_{clause}$ XP_i V2 ... t_i ...]

CLD equals topicalization in this respect: both are A-bar movement constructions. The obvious question now is where the demonstrative comes from. The remainder of this section is an attempt to answer this question.

Van Haaften et al. argue that the relevant XP and the demonstrative pronoun are generated together in the clause-internal base position, in what we would now call a 'big XP'. The big XP is Vergnaud-raised to the COMP domain; subsequently, the 'small XP' is moved out of it, and left-dislocated to the sentence as a whole. There are a number of objections to this approach. It is unclear what licenses the additional dislocating movement. It is unclear what the internal structure of the big XP is. It is unclear what the function of the pronoun is. And finally, it is

unclear why, if XP is DP, there is Case matching between the pronoun and DP (especially since they compare the analysis to Vergnaud-raising in relative clause constructions, where in fact it is essential that the relative pronoun and the antecedent – to which is initially attached – may bear different Cases).

Grohmann (2003) proposes that the demonstrative in a CLD construction is a spelled-out trace. In order for this to work, there must be an additional movement of XP within the left periphery. Grohmann's theory, too, raises a lot of questions. Why is the trace spelled out as a demonstrative rather than something else? Can the additional movement be justified independently? Why is the trace not standardly spelled out in other A-bar movement constructions? Why is Dem obligatorily adjacent to XP, at least in Dutch?[6]

Therefore, let us try to develop an alternative analysis. What we have to retain, I think, is Van Haaften et al.'s idea that XP is moved, and forms a constituent with the demonstrative, as in (49):

(49) $[_{CP}$ [XP Dem]$_i$ V2 ... t$_i$ ...]

Let us simply discard any problematic additional movement, and instead focus on the internal structure of the constituent containing XP and Dem. It seems to me that the CLD construction is deceptive. The connectivity effects show that it is not XP that is dislocated. Rather, it is the demonstrative pronoun that is additional material, not at the sentence level but at the constituent level. My proposal is therefore that the demonstrative is attached as an apposition to XP. As an apposition is parenthetical, it is embedded in a ParP in accordance with the theory introduced above. Furthermore, appositions are always attached to the right of the anchor. Taken together, this yields the structure in (50):[7]

(50) $[_{CP}$ [XP $[_{ParP}$ Par Dem]]$_i$ V2 ... t$_i$ ...]   (CLD)

For more details and recent ideas concerning appositional constructions in general, I have to refer the reader to Heringa (2009), De Vries (2009), and Cardoso and De Vries (2008).[8] For reasons of space, I will focus on the specifics of the CLD construction, here. Thus, let us see if the basic idea in (50) makes sense, even though it might be counter-intuitive at first sight.

It seems to me that most properties of CLD (and indirectly the differences with HTLD) can be explained on the basis of (50). First, CLD is an A-bar movement construction, so there is a gap, there are reconstruction effects, there are locality constraints, but successive cyclic movement is possible. Second, if XP and Dem are a constituent together, both the apparent V3 order of the sentence and the obligatory adjacency of XP and Dem follow. Third, if XP is a DP, there is Case matching between DP and the demonstrative. This ties in with the fact that appositions generally show the same Case as the anchor in German and Czech for instance. By contrast, the XP in the HTLD construction (46) is not syntactically related to any DP in the host

---

[6]   However, Grohmann (2003) argues for the existence of an intermediate construction type in German, in which the demonstrative is in the middle field, as in HTLD, but which still shows properties of CLD.

[7]   An anonymous reviewer suggests an interesting alternative, namely an analysis along the lines of possessor doubling constructions: $[_{DP}$ DP $[_{D'}$ Dem]]. As this raises non-trivial questions about the semantics, and it seems to make the wrong predictions concerning Case, I will not pursue this option. Also notice that it can only be used for DPs, whereas any XP can be contrastively left-dislocated.

[8]   In addition to the effects of parenthesis, it seems that appositional constructions involve coordination between the anchor and the apposition; see also Kraak and Klooster (1968), Quirk et al. (1985), Koster (2000).

sentence, so matching is not expected in HTLD; and in fact, hanging topics show default Case, usually nominative.

Next, consider the intonation. In the HTLD construction (47), it is the XP that is parenthetical. Therefore, this XP receives an independent intonation contour, crucially involving a fall at the end: XP↓. In CLD constructions, this is not the case: XP→. Since XP is *not* the complement of Par in (50), this is exactly what we expect. Thus, the main distinction between HTLD and CLD is explained. But what about the demonstrative in CLD? A regular apposition receives an intonation contour of its own, set off from the contour of the host clause. This is not what we normally perceive for the demonstrative in CLD. However, it is convincingly shown by Dehé (2009) that the phonological behaviour of parentheticals does not always match the syntactic boundaries. In particular, weak/short parentheticals or first elements of longer parentheticals can be prosodically integrated with the surrounding material (an example is a parenthetical like *denk ik* 'I think'). I would like to suggest that this is what we encounter here.

It is also not immediately evident why a pronoun may function as an apposition. A personal pronoun, for instance, would normally add no information whatsoever to a full XP. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the pronoun in a CLD construction is a demonstrative. The reason, I think, is that demonstratives can be used as summary elements. Consider (51), where three items are coordinated, followed by a summarizing apposition:

(51) *mijn boeken, platen   en   CD's, {al die   dingen,   dat   alles}*
       my   books   records and CDs   all those things,   that   all
       'my books, records and CDs, {all those things, all that}'

As we see, both options between curly brackets involve a demonstrative pronoun. Notably, a distal demonstrative. According to my intuition, the summarizing/resuming function of demonstratives is what we encounter in CLD constructions as well.

Another way of combining a demonstrative with a full XP is as a means of disambiguation. In a context where Anna has more than one brother, and we are at a family gathering, we could say *Anna's broer, die* 'Anna's brother, that one', where the apposition *die* [DEM] is deictic and focused. Interestingly, this complex phrase can be used in a CLD construction, yielding (52), for instance:

(52) *Anna's broer,   die, die heeft   een   hond.*
       Anna's brother DEM DEM has   a   dog
       'Anna's brother, that one, DEM has a dog.'

Here, the first *die* is disambiguating, and the second *die*, signalling CLD, yields a contrast with respect to the predicate *heeft een hond*.

To conclude, I argued that HTLD and CLD involve parenthesis at different levels. In HTLD, the dislocated constituent itself is a left-peripheral parenthesis to the sentence as a whole. In CLD, the apparently dislocated constituent is not dislocated at all; instead, the demonstrative accompanying it is an apposition. We now predict that HTLD and CLD can be combined in one sentence, and that the former must precede the latter. This is indeed the case. An example is (18), with an additional *dat* [DEM] following *Popla*. Another example is (53):

(53) *(Wat betreft)   die jongen, GISTEREN, TOEN heb ik 'm   nog   gezien.*
        as concerns   that boy   yesterday   then have I   him still seen
       '(As for) that boy, yesterday I still saw him.'

Here, *gisteren* 'yesterday' is contrastive. It cannot be switched with *die jongen* 'that boy'.

4. Right dislocation

This section discusses the syntactic properties of right dislocation. Section 4.1 shows that right dislocation leads to separation from the host; Section 4.2 shows in which way right-dislocated phrases are related to the host after all.

4.1. Right-dislocated phrases are separated from the host

Superficially, BRD seems the mirror image of HTLD, but it is much more common in Dutch, and categorially more flexible. This is related to the fact that BRD is not necessarily [about]. Two examples of non-nominal BRD are given in (54):

(54) a.   *Ik ben er   weleens geweest,   in Groningen.*
           I   have there once   been   in Groningen
           'I have been there once, in Groningen.'
      b.   *Je   weet   nooit of je   't nog eens wordt,   depressief.*
           you know never if you it   yet once become depressed
           'You never know if you will get it some day, depressed.'

As for the pronoun in the host, it is usually a weak personal pronoun, but in questions a distal demonstrative is preferred:

(55) *Ben je   dat/??'t dan, depressief?*
      are   you that/it   then depressed
      'Is that what you are, depressed?'

This is similar to the situation in HTLD.
      Now let us see if there are any connectivity effects. Although the judgments are a bit difficult (as is typical for reconstruction data), the examples in (56) through (59) suggest that this is not the case. Compare (56) to (45). As in the HTLD construction, binding of the anaphor is illicit (but replacing it by *hemzelf* – not a local anaphor – is acceptable).

(56) * *Joop$_i$ hoort ze$_k$ niet graag, [pikante verhalen over   zichzelf$_i$]$_k$.*
      Joop   hears them not   gladly juicy   stories about REFL
      Intended: 'Joop doesn't like to hear them, juicy stories about himself.'

Example (57) is comparable to (46). As in the HTLD construction, the idiom cannot be split.

(57) * *Hij kan 't krijgen, de klere.*
      he can it \<get\>   \<idiom\>
      Intended: 'Let him drop it, dead.'

The example in (58) confirms the picture. Here, the attempt to bind a variable is unsuccessful.

(58) * [Elke taalkundige]$_i$ is er$_k$ trots op, [zijn$_i$ (eigen) Tabu-papers]$_k$.
     every linguist   is there proud of   his   own   Tabu-papers
          Intended: 'Every linguist is proud of them, his (own) Tabu papers.'

Furthermore, locality constraints do not seem to play a role. In (59), the relevant pronoun is inside an adjunct clause; compare (43). See also Zwart (2001) concerning violations of the Right Roof Constraint in BRD.

(59) *Het zou   me verbazen [als hij 't gelezen had], Madame Bovary.*
     it would me surprise if he it read   had Madame Bovary
          'It would surprise me if he had read it, Madame Bovary.'

Nevertheless, an anonymous reviewer points out that Principle C effects can be attested. This seems to be correct; see (60a). However, notice that (60b), with two subsequent sentences, is as bad as (60a).

(60) a. * *Ze$_i$ heeft hem$_k$ vandaag in de stad gezien, [de chef van Maria$_i$]$_k$.*
          she has him today   in the town seen   the boss of Maria
               Intended: 'She saw him in town, today, Maria's boss'
     b. * *Ze$_i$ heeft hem$_k$ vandaag in de stad gezien. [De chef van Maria$_i$]$_k$ leek   boos.*
          she has him today   in the town seen   the boss of Maria   seemed angry
               Intended: 'She saw him in town today. Maria's boss seemed angry.'

Whatever discourse principle takes care of (60b), it will also exclude (60a), which is therefore irrelevant for our purposes.

I conclude that there is no movement and no reconstruction in BRD constructions.[9] Thus, they can be analyzed roughly as in (61), which means that they involve a right-adjoined parenthetical phrase.

(61) [$_{CP}$ [$_{CP}$ host clause] [$_{ParP}$ Par XP]]   (Right Dislocation, first version)

The host clause must be complete; hence, there is no gap, and a pronominal correlate of XP is used.

Finally, let us briefly turn to afterthoughts. Phonologically, these are clearly separated from the host clause, and they receive an independent (sometimes exaggerated) pitch accent. As we discussed in Section 2, the main difference between BRD and afterthoughts is the information status: afterthoughts provide new information. Consequently, they often do not relate to a pronoun in the host, but rather to a full phrase, as if they are extraposed appositions or secondary predicates. (I will show another possibility in the next section.) An example with a non-nominal afterthought is (62):

(62) *Mijn buurvrouw   kwam langs, gekleed in haar trouwjurk.*
     my neighbor.FEM came along dressed in her wedding.gown
          'My neighbor came along, dressed in her wedding gown.'

---

[9]   Averintseva-Klisch (2008) claims that German BRD shows Case-matching, which is in conflict with the pattern resulting from the other data. At present, I have no explanation for this.

If BRD and an afterthought are combined in one sentence, the former normally precedes the latter; this is shown in (63):

(63) *Hij heeft* DE BUURVROUW *gezien, Joop* – GEKLEED IN HAAR TROUWJURK*!*
　　　he has　　the neighbor.FEM seen　Joop　dressed in　her　wedding.gown
　　　'He saw the neighbor, Joop – dressed in her wedding gown!'

The reverse order would be highly marked, if not unacceptable. This remains the same if *hij* 'he' and *de buurvrouw* 'the neighbor' switch subject and object roles. Thus, the effect is independent of mirror or crossing dependencies. The reason is probably the universal tendency to push new information to the right.

　　　Even though the discourse effect of an afterthought is quite different from BRD, I do not see any clear reasons to assume a different syntax; therefore, let us assume that (61) is appriopriate for afterthoughs as well.

4.2. Anchoring

In (10), we saw that parenthesis yields a secondary message. Another illustration is (64). The apposition gives rise to an implicit predication relation, which can be spelled out as in (64.ii).

(64) I saw Joop, my neighbor.
　　　(i)　　I saw Joop.
　　　(ii)　 Joop is my neighbor.

An apposition, therefore, can be viewed as a parenthetical secondary predicate (see Doron 1994, Heringa 2009, and De Vries 2009 for more discussion). What is relevant here, is that the same conclusions can be drawn concerning dislocation constructions. Consider the afterthought and BRD in (65) and (66), respectively:

(65) My neighbor came along, dressed in her wedding gown.
　　　(i)　　My neighbor came along.
　　　(ii)　 My neighbor was dressed in her wedding gown.

(66) I only met him yesterday, John.
　　　(i)　　I only met him yesterday.
　　　(ii)　 He is John. (him equals John)

In each case, there is an implicit predication, which is explicitly stated in (65.ii) and (66.ii).

　　　Notice that copular clauses can be predicative or specificational/identifying, as is well known. In the first case, a property is attributed to a subject; in the second case, the subject is identified with a certain referent, or some value is provided for it. As for the particular examples here, the secondary predication in (65) is predicative, in (66) specificational, and in (64) it is ambiguous.

　　　What distinguishes dislocation constructions from regular parentheses is that they are *anchored*: they always relate to an anchor in the host clause, such that this anchor is interpreted as the subject of an implicit predicative proposition, and the dislocated material as the predicate (whether specificational or predicative).

In the examples above, the anchor happens to be an overt constituent of the host clause. The situation is not always like this. The example in (67) shows that the representative of the anchor in the secondary proposition behaves as an E-type pronoun:

(67) I met a nice woman yesterday: Mary.
    (i)   I met a nice woman yesterday.
    (ii)   She (= the nice woman I met yesterday) is Mary.

Furthermore, a time adverbial can relate back to the time frame of the preceding clause or context; see the BRD in (68), and the afterthought in (69):

(68) *Henk heeft ook gezwommen, gisteren.*
    Henk has also swum yesterday
    'Henk has also been swimming, yesterday.'
    (i)   Henk has also been swimming.
    (ii)   This was yesterday.

(69) *Mieke komt bij ons op bezoek – morgen!*
    Mieke comes at us on visit tomorrow
    'Mieke will come visit us – tomorrow!'
    (i)   Mieke will come visit us.
    (ii)   This is tomorrow!

Similarly, locations can be specified:

(70) I saw John the other week – in London!
    (i)   I saw John the other week.
    (ii)   This was in London!

If we believe that the syntactic structure of a sentence should reflect its semantics as closely as possible, we have to adapt the structural proposal in (61) in the following way:

(71) $[_{CP} [_{CP}$ host clause$] [_{ParP}$ Par $[_{CP2nd}$ anchor = XP$]]]$ (BRD/afterthought)

Here, what is parenthetical is not just XP, but a secondary proposition CP^{2nd} containing a copular construction of the type *anchor = XP*, such that only XP is pronounced. Notice that the limited phonological realization of the secondary proposition, which might seem odd at first sight, can be compared to what happens in other, non-parenthetical, instances of secondary predication: just think of small clauses and PRO subjects. A relevant example is *John came home drunk*, where *drunk* is understood as a property of John.

    On a final note, I would like to suggest that the line of thinking in this section may provide a new perspective on other types of dislocation as well. If we stretch the notion of anchor to more abstract notions related to a sentence, such as HEARER or SENTENCE ABOUTNESS TOPIC, it is conceivable that parenthetical epithets, HTLD, and some other constructions, too, involve a secondary proposition of the type *anchor = XP*. I will leave this for future work.

5. Conclusion

The Dutch initial and final field, outside of the verbal poles (V2 and V*), must be divided into two parts on each side: the ones that are an integrated component of the clause, namely the topicalization position and the position for right-extraposed phrases, and the true left and right periphery in which we find dislocated constituents. On the right, we have backgrounding right dislocation (BRD), which is deaccented, and afterthoughts, which contain an additional pitch accent. On the left, only hanging topic left dislocation (HTLD) involves actual dislocation at the sentence level. Contrastive left dislocation (CLD), however, must be compared to topicalization; here, the left-peripheral constituent is part of the regular clause structure.

I proposed four orthogonal information-structural features, namely [about], [new], [add], and [contrast], and I illustrated all logically possible combinations (with the exception of [add, contrast], which cannot exist). I argued that CLD/topicalization constructions are always strongly or weakly contrastive, but dislocation constructions are not. HTLD always involves an pragmatic aboutness topic, which explains why it is normally a DP, but this is not necessarily the case for any of the other types: these are categorially free. Afterthoughts, like parentheses, provide new information; for CLD this is optional, but BRD and HTLD are not [new]. A backgrounded right-dislocated phrase is a reminder of information that is in fact old.

Only true dislocations involve additional information; this, then, is not the case for the peripheral phrase in a CLD construction. Consequently, CLD shows a variety of connectivity effects, contrary to the other types. I argued that CLD it deceptive: it is not the left-peripheral constituent that is dislocated at the sentence level; rather, it is the demonstrative pronoun that is dislocated at the constituent level, namely as an apposition to the leftmost phrase. The properties of the constructions under discussion are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Properties of CLD, HTLD and BRD.

	CLD	HTLD	BRD	afterthought
[contrast]	yes	no	no	no
[add]	no	yes	yes	yes
[about]	possibly	yes	possibly	?possibly
[new]	possibly	no	no	yes
category	any XP	DP, with some exceptions	any XP	any XP
connectivity effects	yes	no	no	no
pronominal correlate	distal demonstrative	usually (weak) personal pronoun; in questions a distal demonstrative	usually (weak) personal pronoun; in questions a demonstrative	<irrelevant>
XP	specific	specific	specific	predicate

Dislocation is a kind of parenthetical construal; it can operate at different levels, with different results for the information structure. I proposed that all dislocated material is embedded in a parenthetical phrase, where the head Par is an operator that turns its complement into a parenthesis, with consequenses for the syntax, semantics and phonology of the construction. Semantically, parentheses involve a secondary proposition. What distinguishes right-dislocated phrases (as well as appositions, and perhaps hanging topics and some other constructions) from regular parentheses, is that the secondary proposition is anchored: some constituent or more abstract aspect of the host clause serves as the subject of the secondary predicational proposition, in which the relevant dislocated phrase serves as the predicate.

References

Anagnostopoulou, Elena, Henk van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwart (eds.) (1997). *Materials on Left Dislocation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alexiadou, Artemis (2006). Left dislocation (including CLLD). In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Martin Everaert, Henk van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans and Bart Hollebrandse (eds.), chapter 37 in Volume II.

Averintseva-Klisch, Maria (2008). Rechte Satzperipherie im Diskurs: Die NP-Rechtsversetzung im Deutschen. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tübingen.

den Besten, Hans (1983). On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, Werner Abraham (ed.), 47-131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

den Besten, Hans (1989). *Studies in West Germanic Syntax.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Beyssade, Claire, Elisabeth Delais-Roussarie, Jenny Doetjes, Jean-Marie Marandin and Annie Rialland (2004). Prosodic, syntactic and pragmatic aspect of information structure – an introduction. In *Handbook of French Semantics*, Francis Corblin and Henriëtte de Swart (eds.), 455-475. Stanfort: CSLI Publications.

Blok, Peter (1993). The interpretation of focus. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Groningen.

Bouma, Gerlof (2008). Starting a sentence in Dutch: A corpus study of subject- and object-fronting. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Groningen.

Büring, Daniel (1997). *The Meaning of Topic and Focus -- The 59th Street Bridge Accent.* London: Routledge.

Büring, Daniel (2003). On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26, 511-545.

Büring, Daniel (2006). Intonation und informationsstruktur. In *Text – Verstehen: Grammatik und darüber hinaus*, Hardarik Blühdorn, Eva Breindl and Ulrich Wassner (eds.), 144-163. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cardoso, Adriana and Mark de Vries (2008). Internal and External Heads in Appositive Constructions. Manuscript, University of Lisbon and University of Groningen.

Cecchetto, Carlo (1999). A comparative analysis of left and right dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53, 40-67.

Chafe, Wallace (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In *Subject and Topic*, Charles Li (ed.), 25-55. New York: Academic Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1970). Remarks on nominalization. *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, Roderick Jacobs and Peter Rosenbaum (eds.), 184-221. Waltham, MA: Ginn.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1977). The movement nature of left dislocation. *Linguistics Inquiry* 8, 397-412.

Corazza, Eros (2005). On epithets qua attributive anaphors. *Journal of Linguistics* 41, 1-32.

Dehé, Nicole (2009). Clausal parentheticals, intonational phrasing, and prosodic theory. *Journal of Linguistics* 45.

Dehé, Nicole and Yordanka Kavalova (eds.) (2007). *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Delais-Roussarie, Elisabeth, Jenny Doetjes and Petra Sleeman (2004). Dislocation. In *Handbook of French Semantics*, Francis Corblin and Henriëtte de Swart (eds.), 501-528. Stanfort: CSLI Publications.

Doron, Edit (1994). The discourse function of appositives. *Proceedings of IATL* 9, 53-62. Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Espinal, M. Teresa (1991). The representation of disjunct constituents. *Language* 67, 726–762.

Frascarelli, Mara and Roland Hinterhölzl (2007). Types of topics in German and Italian. In *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*, Susanne Winkler and Kerstin Schwabe (eds.), 87-116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Frey, Werner (2004). Notes on the syntax and the pragmatics of German left dislocation. In *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, Horst Lohnstein and Susanne Trissler (eds.), 203-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Frey, Werner (2005). Pragmatic properties of certain German and English left peripheral constructions. *Linguistics* 43, 89–129.

Grohmann, Kleanthes (2003). *Prolific Domains*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gundel, Jeanette (1988). *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Garland.

van Haaften, Ton, Rik Smits and Jan Vat (1983). Left dislocation, connectedness, and reconstruction. In *On the formal syntax of the Westgermania*, Werner Abraham (ed.), 133-154. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [This is an improved version of a manuscript from 1981. The first version was reproduced in Anagnostopoulou, Van Riemsdijk and Zwart (eds.) (1997).]

Haeseryn, Walter, Karin Romijn, Guido Geerts, Jaap de Rooij and Maarten van den Toorn (eds.) (1997). *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.

Heringa, Herman (2009). A multidominance approach to appositions. Manuscript, University of Groningen.

Herring, Susan (1994). Afterthoughts, antitopics, and emphasis: The syntacticization of postverbal position in Tamil. In *Theoretical Perspectives on Word Order in South Asian Languages*, Miriam Butt, Tracy Holloway King and Gillian Ramchand (eds.), 119-152. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Jansen, Frank (1981). *Syntactische konstrukties in gesproken taal*. Amsterdam: Huis aan de drie grachten.

Jansen, Frank (2002). Preposed adverbial phrases in Dutch texts: Evidence for the left-right principle or for linear modification? *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 19, 97-106.

Kayne, Richard (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keijsper, Cornelia (1984). Vorm en betekenis in Nederlandse toonhoogtecontouren I and II. *Forum der Letteren* 25, 20-37 and 113-126.

Koopman, Hilda (2007). Topics in imperatives. In *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar*, Wim van der Wurff (ed.), 153-180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koster, Jan (1975). Dutch as an SOV language. *Linguistic Analysis* 1, 111-136.

Koster, Jan (2000). Extraposition as parallel construal. Manuscript, University of Groningen. <http://odur.let.rug.nl/~koster/papers/parallel.pdf>

Koster, Jan (2003). All languages are tense second. In *Germania et Alia: A Linguistic Webschrift for Hans den Besten*, Jan Koster and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), <http://www.let.rug.nl/~koster/DenBesten/contents.htm>.

Kraak, Remmert and Wim Klooster (1968). *Syntaxis*. Culemborg: Stam-Kemperman.

Kruijff-Korbayová, Ivana and Mark Steedman (2003). Discourse and information structure. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information* 12, 249-259.

Kuno, Susumu (1973). *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lambrecht, Knud (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neeleman, Ad and Hans van de Koot (2008). Dutch scrambling and the nature of discourse templates. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 11, 137-189.

Pierrehumbert, Janet and Julia Hirschberg (1990). The meaning of intonational contours in the interpretation of discourse. In *Intentions in Communication*, Philip Cohen, Jerry Morgan and Martha Pollack (eds.), 271-323. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Potts, Christopher (2007). Conventional implicatures, a distinguished class of meanings. In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, Gillian Ramchand and Charles Reiss (eds.), 475-501. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prince, Ellen (1981). Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In *Radical Pragmatics*, Peter Cole (ed.), 223-255. New York: Academic Press.

Prince, Ellen (1998). On the limits of syntax, with reference to left-dislocation and topicalization. In *The Limits of Syntax*, Peter Culicover and Louise McNally (eds.), 281-302. San Diego: Academic Press.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (eds.) (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Reinhart, Tanya (1982). *Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Riemsdijk, Henk van (1997). Left dislocation. In *Materials on Left Dislocation*, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Henk van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwart (eds.), 1-10. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rochemont, Michael (1986). *Focus in Generative Grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rooth, Mats (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75-116.

Salverda, Reinier (2000). On topicalization in Modern Dutch. In *The Berkeley Conference on Dutch Linguistics 1997*, Thomas Shannon and Johan Snapper (eds.), 93-111. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Shaer, Benjamin and Werner Frey (2004). 'Integrated' and 'non-integrated' left-peripheral elements in German and English. In *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop, ZAS Berlin, November 2003 (ZAS Papers in Linguistics 35)*, Benjamin Shaer, Werner Frey and Claudia Maienborn (eds.), 465-502. Berlin: ZAS.

Sturgeon, Anne (2008). *The Left Periphery: The interaction of syntax, pragmatics and prosody in Czech.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

de Swart, Henriëtte and Helen de Hoop (1995). Topic and focus. *Glot International* 1, 3-7.

Vallduví, Enric (1992). *The Informational Component.* New York: Garland.

Vergnaud, Jean-Roger (1974). French relative clauses. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

de Vries, Mark (2007a). Dislocation and backgrounding. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 24, 235-247.

de Vries, Mark (2007b). Invisible constituents? Parentheses as b-merged adverbial phrases. In *Parentheticals*, Nicole Dehé and Yordanka Kavalova (eds.), 203-234. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

de Vries, Mark (2009). Specifying coordination: An investigation into the syntax of dislocation, extraposition and parenthesis. In *Language and Linguistics: Emerging Trends*, Cynthia Dryer (ed.). New York: Nova.

Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa. (1998). *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1994). Dutch is head initial. *The Linguistic Review* 11, 377-406.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1997). *Morphosyntax of Verb Movement. A Minimalist Approach to the Syntax of Dutch.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1998). Where is syntax?Syntactic aspects of left dislocation in Dutch and English. In *The Limits of Syntax*, Peter Culicover and Louise McNally (eds.), 365-393. San Diego: Academic Press.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter (2001). Backgrounding ('right dislocation') in Dutch. Manuscript, University of Groningen. <http://www.let.rug.nl/~zwart/docs/backgr.pdf>

Zwart, Jan-Wouter (2004). Een dynamische structuur van de Nederlandse zin. Deel 1 en 2. *TABU* 33, 55-71 and 151-172.