

Left Dislocation in Dutch and the Status of Copying Rules

Henk van Riemsdijk & Frans Zwarts

MIT/University of Amsterdam

may 1974

Left dislocation in Dutch and the status of copying rules

1.

The problem set in this paper* is to account for the syntactic and some semantic characteristics of sentences like (1) in Dutch. The construction we find in (1) is usually called Left dislocation (henceforth LD).

(1)a. De Hollanders, die zijn te flegmatiek
The Dutch, they are too phlegmatic'

b. Dat portret, ik geloof niet dat hij het nog heeft
'That portrait, I don't think that he still has it'

Previous analyses of the English equivalents of sentences of this type have generally assumed that there exists an optional rule of LD that relates sentences such as those in (1) to their alleged sources in (2). (see, e.g., Ross 1957, Emonds 1970)

(2)a. De Hollanders zijn te flegmatiek
b. Ik geloof niet dat hia het portret nog heeft

This rule removes NP's from their original position in sentences, sets them off by commas, and substitutes pronouns for them. Emonds has convincingly shown that LD attaches NP's to the highest S-node and is therefore a root transformation in his terminology. This can be seen from the ungrammaticality of an example like (3).

(3) Wij dachten (dat¹) de post dat die allang gekomen was
'We thought (that) the mail that that long ago had come

In this respect Dutch LD sentences behave like the English ones, but apparently differ from their French equivalents (cf Hirschbuhler 1974). They also differ from the English ones in that the pronoun that is coreferential with the LDNP usually belongs to the class of d-words, i.e. pronouns that are also used as demonstratives and as relative pronouns. The d-word then undergoes, provided that the necessary conditions are met, preposing.

In the following section we will argue against a transformational derivation of LD sentences and in favor of the null hypothesis, i.e. the generation of these sentences in the base. In the final section we will venture some hypotheses about the consequences of our proposal for the promotion analysis of relative clauses and about the status of copying rules in general.

2.

The following observations suggest that Dutch LD sentences cannot be transformationally derived but must be generated in the base.

2.1. Epithets

Hirschbuhler (1974) has argued that French LD sentences should be generated in the base on the basis of epithets. An argument similar to his can be constructed for Dutch considering examples like (4).

- (4)a. Paul, ik geloof dat Piet net een partijtje heeft
`Paul, I think that Pete just a fight has

gevochten met die idioot
fought with that idiot'
- b. Paul, die slappeling heb ik onlangs nog in elkaar getimmerd
`Paul, that weakling have I only recently beaten up'
- c. Marie, dat wijf vermoord ik nog eens
`Mary, that shrew I will kill someday'

Such sentences differ from those in (1) in that the LDNP is not anaphorically related to a pronoun but to a full NP belonging to the class of epithets. One way to treat these examples transformationally would be to derive them from sentences with epithetical constructions like those in (5).

- (5)a. Ik geloof dat Piet net een partijtje heeft gevochten met die idioot van een Paul ('with that idiot of a P.')
- b. Die slappeling van een Paul heb ik onlangs nog in elkaar getimmerd
- c. Dat wijf van een Marie vermoord ik nog eens

Hirschbuhler argues extensively against such a derivation. It can be shown that neither topicalization nor the putative rule of LD could plausibly derive sentences like (4) from those in (5).

As for topicalization, there are two possibilities: it can be either the NP or the PP which is preposed. The second alternative is out because a) the preposition *van* never appears with LDNP's (no PP whatsoever can appear as an LD constituent) and b) there is no plausible rule of *van* deletion available. Under the first alternative, although there is a rule which could be used to delete *van* (the rule which deletes *van* in partitive constructions), we would be faced with a flagrant violation of the A over A principle to which topicalization is otherwise subject. Furthermore, there are many other contexts out of which topicalization is blocked but LD is possible (cf also Ross 1967):

- (6) Jan z'n tegenvoorbeeld, daar had ik niet aan gedacht
`John's counterexample, that I had not thought of'
- (7) Jan z'n tegenvoorbeeld had ik niet aan gedacht

(8) Dat tegenvoorbeeld, ik geloof dat dat net zo
 `That counterexample, I think that that just as
 min als Jan z'n andere bezwaar weggewerkt kan worden
 badly as John's other objection can be eliminated

(9) Dat tegenvoorbeeld geloof ik dat net zo min als Jan z'n andere bezwaar wegge werkt
 kan worden

In order to overcome these difficulties one might try to resort to the rule of LD itself. However we would then need a later rule to delete the sequence *van + (een) + pronoun*. But such a rule would seem to be highly implausible and ad hoc. Actually there are many epithetical constructions that do not have any LD counterpart at all. First of all, many of the epithetical constructions are idiomatized, e.g.

(10)a. Die boom van een kerel zit alweer op de strafbank
 `That tree of a guy sits again in the penalty box'
 b. Ik heb een schat van een kind ontmoet
 `I have a treasure of a child met'

The corresponding LD sentences are, however, all ungrammatical:

(11)a. Een kerel, die boom zit alweer op de strafbank
 b. Een kind, ik heb een schat ontmoet

Second, epithetical constructions can themselves take LD antecedents like in (12)

(12) Bobby Orr, die boom van een kerel heb ik al heel
 `Bobby Orr, that tree of a guy have I seen
 wat doelpunten zien scoren
 score quite a bit'

Epithetical constructions are not recursive, however, and cannot, therefore, provide a source for sentences like (12), witness

(13) *Die boom van een kerel van een Bobby Orr heb ik al heel wat doelpunten zien scoren

Finally, the second NP in epithetical constructions is defective in many other respects while LDNP's do not show a similar defectiveness².

(14) Mijn broer
 Jan z'n vader, die idioot is in de gracht gereden
 De bakker
 My brother

John's father, that idiot has driven into the canal
The baker

(15) Die idioot van mijn broer
 Jan z'n vader is in de gracht gereden
 de bakker

Hirschbuhler also states that epithets should not be transformationally inserted by any copying rule. In fact, such an insertion would seem to be indistinguishable from a process of lexical insertion by syntactic transformation. It has generally been assumed that the meaning of lexical items contributes to the semantic interpretation at the level of deep structure and there is no reason to assume that epithets differ in this respect.

These considerations seem to argue conclusively against any analysis that seeks to relate LDNP's and epithets transformationally. The last possibility that a transformationalist might want to resort to is deriving LDNP's from appositive NP's in these cases. Although (16) seems to be derivable that way, (17) through (19) show that such an analysis is untenable.

(16)a. Ik kan Jan, die idioot, niet uitstaan
 'I can John, that idiot, no longer stand

b. Jan, die idioot kan ik niet uitstaan

(17)a. Hij woont in Amsterdam, de hoofdstad van Nederland
 'He lives in Amsterdam, the capital of the Netherlands'

b. *Amsterdam, hij woont in de hoofdstad van Nederland

(18)a. Ik heb mijn vriend, de burgemeester van Amsterdam,
 'I have my friend, the mayor of Amsterdam

gisteren nog gesproken
only yesterday talked to'

b. Mijn vriend, ik heb de burgemeester van Amsterdam gisteren nog gesproken

(19)a. Men neemt Trager, een bekende Amerikaanse strukturalist,
 'one takes Trager, a well-known American structuralist,

in Nederland niet serieus
in Holland not seriously'

b. Trager, men neemt een bekende Amerikaanse strukturalist in Nederland niet serieus

2.2. *Reflexives and reciprocals*

Any transformational theory of LD entails that the class of LDNP's has to be identical to the class of NP's that occur in any position inside sentences unless specific restrictions are

placed on the rule. There are at least two classes of NP's, however, that cannot appear in LD position: reflexives and reciprocals.

- (20)a. *Zichzelf, die heeft hij nog nooit getraakteerd
 `Himself, him he has never treated
- b. Zichzelf, ik geloof niet dat hij hem ooit heeft overgeslagen
 `Himself, I do not think that he him ever has passed over
- (21)a. Elkaar, die houden ze wel altijd de hand boven het hoofd
 `Each other, them they always back up'
- b. Elkaar, ik geloof niet dat ze ze ooit
 `Each other, I don't think they give them ever
- een kadootje geven
 a present

(20) and (21) cannot be explained on general grounds by showing that there is a constraint against the fronting of reflexives and reciprocals, since their topicalized counterparts are grammatical.

- (22)a. Zichzelf heeft hij nog nooit getraakteerd
 b. Zichzelf geloof ik niet dat hij ooit heeft overgeslagen
- (23)a. Elkaar houden ze wel altijd de hand boven het hoofd
 b. Elkaar geloof ik niet dat ze ooit een kadootje geven

Ordering LD before reflexivization and the rule for reciprocals would not explain the ungrammaticality of (20) and (21) either, because in the b-sentences the rule has to have applied on the lower cycle.

The most plausible theory of reflexives and reciprocals seems to make use of rules which seek to relate anaphorically or otherwise, the reflexive or reciprocal NP's to an NP to their left. Such an approach can be found in Fiengo and Lasnik (1973) for reciprocals and seems adequate for Dutch reflexives too. Under the PSR hypothesis of LD, this theory of reflexives and reciprocals would automatically explain the facts in (20 - 23) because there is simply no NP to the left of the LDNP for a reflexive or reciprocal in LD position to be related to.

2.3. Idiomatic NP's

A similar argument can be constructed on the basis of idioms. In many instances the NP of an idiomatic expression can undergo movement rules like topicalization but cannot appear in LD position:

- (24)a. Hij kan de rambam krijgen

(= Let him choke)

- b. De rambam kan hij krijgen
 - c. *De rambam, dat/die kan hij krijgen³
- (25)a. Hij kan me het heen-en-weer krijgen (similarly)
- b. Het heen-en-weer kan hij me krijgen
 - c. Het heen-en-weer, dat kan hij me krijgen
- (26)a. Hij kan de kelere krijgen (similarly)
- b. De kelere kan hij krijgen
 - c. De kelere, dat/die kan hij krijgen
- (27)a. Hij heeft me de stuipen op het lijf gejaagd
'He has given me the creeps'
- b. De stuipen heeft hij me op het lijf gejaagd
 - c. *De stuipen, dat/die heeft hij me op het lijf gejaagd
- (28)a. Ik geloof er de ballen van
'I don't believe any of it'
- b. De ballen geloof ik er van
 - c. De ballen, dat/die geloof ik er van

Although there is no coherent theory of idioms, it seems likely that they are lexically inserted in an "en bloc" fashion. (Notice incidentally that the idiomatic NP's discussed here cannot appear as heads of relative clauses containing that idiom).

Under such a theory of idioms there is no way in which these idioms can be inserted under LDNP's that are generated in the base, while the transformational theory would need a special constraint on the rule of LD.

2.4. *Verb second*

It is a well-known fact that Dutch, like German, requires that the verb appear in second position in root sentences. In other words, any fronting of any constituent causes the verb to appear to the left of the subject (unless, of course, the constituent fronted is itself the subject).

- (29)a. Mijn zusje heeft gisteren haar paper ingeleverd
My sister has yesterday her paper given in

om met vakantie te kunnen
to be able to go on holidays'
- b. Gisteren heeft mijn zusje haar paper ingeleverd om met vakantie te kunnen

- c. Haar paper heeft mijn zusje gisteren ingeleverd om met vakantie te kunnen
 - d. Ingeleverd heeft mijn zusje haar paper gisteren om met vakantie te kunnen
 - e. Om met vakantie te kunnen heeft mijn zusje haar paper gisteren ingeleverd
- Consider now LD sentences:

(30)a. Mijn zusje, ik geloof niet dat ze haar paper al
 `My sister, I don't think that she her paper already
 heeft ingeleverd
 has given in'

- b. Haar paper, ik geloof niet dat mijn zusje het al heeft ingeleverd

Clearly LD violates the verb second principle. It is clear that this principle cannot be stated as a property of surface structure, since imperatives and direct yes-no questions have the verb in first position. That we want to say then is roughly that no movement can have the effect of producing the non-canonical order. Under this view LD cannot be a transformation.

Notice that it is not possible to say that LD applies after the stage of derivation at which the verb second rule applies, for this would mean that LD follows topicalization. But since LD would have to be formulated so as to introduce either demonstrative or non-demonstrative pronouns, a special constraint would be needed specifying that just in case LD applies to topicalized NP's the pronoun has to be demonstrative to prevent cases like

(31) *Die boeken, ze heb ik gisteren gekocht
 `Those books, them have I yesterday bought'

Compare this sentence with

(32) Die boeken, ik heb ze gisteren gekocht
 Die boeken, die heb ik gisteren gekocht

Rather, of course, the ungrammaticality of (31) is due to an independently needed constraint: unstressed pronouns cannot be topicalized. A rule of LD would therefore have to precede topicalization.

2.5. Imperatives and direct yes-no questions

As noted above, imperatives and direct yes-no questions have the verb in first position in surface structure. The following sentences show that fronting rules such as topicalization, adverb preposing, participle/adjective preposing cannot apply in imperatives (33) and yes-no questions (34):

(33)a. Ga de emmer even halen
 `Go get the bucket'

b. *De emmer ga even halen

b. Kom morgen maar'
'Come tomorrow rather'

*Morgen kom maar

c. Wees stil
'Be quiet'

*Stil wees!

(34)a. Ga je de emmer even halen?
'Go you get the bucket'

*De emmer ga je even halen?

b. Kom je morgen weer?
'Come you tomorrow again'

*Morgen kom je weer?

c. Heb je het paper al ingeleverd?
'Have you the paper given in already?'

*Ingeleverd heb je het paper al?

Compare now, however, LD in such cases:

(35)a. Dat boek over goniometrie, bel daar nog maar even over op!
'That book about goniometry, call up again about that'

b. De laatste stelling van dit boek, toont in 50 woorden
'The last thesis of this book, show in 50 words'

dat hij op een non sequitur berust!
that it is based on a non sequitur'

(36)a. Dat boek over goniometrie, heb je daar nog over opgebeld?

b. De laatste stelling van dit boek, toont die niet aan
'The last thesis of this book, doesn't it show'

dat we maar beter met linguïstiek kunnen stoppen?
that we had better stop doing linguistics'

If LD were a rule, it would be the only one to violate the constraint that no fronting may apply in imperatives and direct yes-no questions.

2.6. *The only one fronting per S constraint*

Emonds (1970) proposes a constraint to the effect that no more than one root fronting can apply in the derivation of any given sentence. Clearly, this constraint is independent of the verb second constraint. The following b-sentences are all bad, whether the verb is in second or in third position:

(37)a. Waar heb je Jan gezien?
'Where have you John seen'

Jan hebben wij gisteren nog ontmoet
'John have we only yesterday met'

Ingeleverd heeft zij het paper al gisteren
'Given in has she her paper only yesterday'

Dat hij gelijk heeft is ons niet duidelijk geworden
'That he is right has not become clear to us'

- b. *Waar heb Jan je gezien?
*Jan heb waar je gezien?
*Jan hebben gisteren wij nog ontmoet
*Gisteren hebben Jan wij nog ontmoet
*Ingeleverd heeft het paper zij al gisteren
*Het paper heeft ingeleverd zij al gisteren
*Dat hij gelijk heeft is duidelijk ons niet geworden
*Duidelijk is dat hij gelijk heeft ons niet geworden

(38)b. *Waar Jan heb je gezien?
*Jan waar heb je gezien?
*Jan gisteren hebben wij nog ontmoet
*Gisteren Jan hebben wij nog ontmoet
*Ingeleverd het paper heeft zij al gisteren
*Het paper ingeleverd heeft zij al gisteren
*Dat hij gelijk heeft duidelijk is ons niet geworden
*Duidelijk dat hij gelijk heeft is ons niet geworden

Again, LD would be the only rule to provide a counterexample to the otherwise perfectly general only one fronting per S constraint, witness

(39) Jan, waar heb je die voor 't laatst gezien?
'John, where have you seen him last'

Zijn broer, intrigerend is hij bepaald niet
'His brother, intriguing he is certainly not'

Haar paper, ingeleverd heeft zij het al gisteren
'Her paper, given in has she it already yesterday'

2.7. Conditions

In *Conditions on Transformations* (1973), Chomsky discusses a number of constraints on the applicability of transformations: the A over A principle, the tensed S constraint and the specified subject constraint. The following examples demonstrate that LD sentences violate all of these constraints.

(40)a. Equi NP deletie, ik heb gisteren nog een betoog
'Equi NP deletion, I have only yesterday an argument

ertegen gelezen
against it read'

b. Jansen, ze hebben hem nu eindelijk directeur ervan gemaakt
'Johnson, they have him now at last director of it made'

(41)a. De overheid, het lijkt mé onwaarschijnlijk dat die
'The authorities, it seems unlikely to me that they

er iets aan zullen doen
will do something about it'

b. De Exorcist, weet je dat die nog steeds niet draait
'The Exorcist, do you know that it is still not on

in Nederland
in the Netherlands'

(42)a. Equi NP deletie, ik vond Brame z'n argumenten
'Equi NP deletion, I found Brame's arguments

ertegen toch wel zeer overtuigend
against it all the same very convincing'

b. Dat dure boek, ik heb Jan gevraagd om het onmiddellijk
'That expensive book, I have asked John to immediately

op te halen
get it'

In a conception of grammar such as the one outlined in Conditions on Transformations, LD cannot, therefore, be a transformation.

2.8. *er*-insertion

Although LDNP's are defective in certain ways (see footnote 5), they can often be indefinite, e.g.

- (43) Een demonstratie, daar zou ik best zin in hebben
'A demonstration, that I would certainly feel like'

One of the properties of indefinite NP's is that they can participate in the Dutch equivalent of *there*-insertion: *er*-insertion.

- (44)a. *Een demonstratie staat voor morgen op het programma
'A demonstration is for tomorrow on the program
- b. Er staat voor morgen een demonstratie op het programma

Er-insertion can apply on lower cycles:

- (45) Men zegt dat er voor morgen een demonstratie op het programma staat
('They say that...')

Since LD applies indiscriminately to any NP, there is no reason why it shouldn't apply to *een demonstratie* in (45). Doing this, however, yields the ungrammatical

- (46) *Een demonstratie, men zegt dat er voor morgen dat op het programma staat

Similarly:

- (47) Goede linguïsten, het is duidelijk dat (*er) die
'Good linguists, it is clear that (there) they
niet op deze conferentie komen
do not come to this conference'

It seems clear that the ungrammaticality of (46) and (47) is due to the fact that they contain a demonstrative pronoun which is incompatible with *er*-insertion. Under the transformational

analysis of LD, there is no way, however, to block such sentences. On the PSR hypothesis the subject of the lower sentence is a demonstrative pronoun to start with, pronouns being inserted at deep structure level, so *er*-insertion can never apply. This prediction is in fact correct, given that the non *er*-inserted forms of (46) and (47) are grammatical, as shown in (47) and (48).

(48) Een demonstratie, men zegt dat dat voor morgen op het- programma staat

Basing ourselves on the assumption that the above arguments demonstrate sufficiently that LD sentences cannot be transformationally derived but have to be base-generated, we will now proceed to outline an analysis compatible with the PSR hypothesis⁴.

LDNP's are by no means the only constituents that can occur as sentence satellites. Other examples include vocatives, exclamations and OM-sentences.

(49) Moeder, ik heb mijn enkel verstuikt
 `Mother, I have wricked my ankle'

(50) Lieve help, wat is die jongen saai
 `Good grief, how dull that boy is'

(51) Nog een pilsje en ik ga er vandoor
 `One more beer and I'm leaving'

Like LDNP's, these constructions all have the property of not being embeddable, as the sentences (52) - (54) show.

(52) *Hij schreeuwde moeder dat hij zijn enkel verstuikt had
 `He shouted mother that he had wricked his ankle'

(53) Zij fluisterde lieve help dat zij haar portemonnee
 `She whispered good grief that she her purse
 vergeten was
 had forgotten'

(54) Ik geloof nog een pilsje en dat ik er maar vandoor ga
 `I think one more beer and that I am leaving'

Banfield (1973) has proposed to generate sentence satellites (together with non-sentential expressions) under an initial, non-recursive symbol E(xpression). We propose that LDNP's be added to the list of sentence satellites generated under E:

(55) [_E[_{NP} dat verhaal_{NP}] [_S dat interesseert me niet_S]_E]

Let us now briefly examine the relationship between a LDNP and its pronominal counterpart in a sentence. The important thing to notice is that there is an obligatory anaphoric relation

between the LDNP and the pronoun⁵. Dougherty (1969) has proposed that the set of sentences containing anaphoric pronouns is a subset of the set of sentences containing pronouns. He calls this the anaporn relation. This implies that there can be no obligatory anaphoric relations. However, as has been noted by Postal (1971), LD sentences violate the anaporn relation. Wasow (1972) observes that this anomaly of LD sentences can, along with a number of other exceptions to the anaporn relation such as right dislocation, tag question formation, reflexives, inherent reflexives, and reciprocals, be explained by analyzing every one of these cases as a copying rule. One more case where an anaphoric relation is obligatory is that of relative clauses. Vergnaud (1974) argues that here too a copying analysis is needed⁶. These analyses are in sharp contrast with the non-copying analysis that we propose for LD in this paper. However, although we can by no means come up with a full explanation for the obligatoriness of the anaphoric relation in LD sentences, the following fact suggests that the specific problem presented by the LD construction extends to cases where no plausible copying analysis is possible. Consider sentences like

- (56) Een theorie gebaseerd op globale regels, dat lijkt
 `A theory based on global rules, that seems
 me niet de ideaalste oplossing
 not the most ideal solution to me'

Notice that the pronoun (*dat*) is sloppy in that it doesn't agree in gender and definiteness with the LDNP. Similar situations can be found sentence-internally:

- (57) Hij presenteerde een theorie gebaseerd op globale regels
 `He presented a theory based on global rules
 hoewel dat hem niet de ideaalste oplossing leek
 although that didn't seem like the most ideal solution to him

The important thing here is that there is no way to interpret this sentence with the pronoun (*dat*) not entertaining an anaphoric relationship with the object of the matrix sentence. Of course no plausible analysis in which the pronoun is the result of a copying rule is available. This casts considerable doubt on the viability of Wasow's proposal. Any amendment of the theory of anaphora destined to accommodate cases like (57) would seem to be a good candidate to accommodate LD sentences as well.

Furthermore, it seems possible to speculate about the way one wants to formulate the condition of anaphoricity in LD sentences. Notice that unlike any other full, sentence-internal NP, LDNP's participate neither in grammatical relations, nor in selectional or subcategorizational relations. Still we want the grammar to characterize the notion 'possible LDNP', in order to exclude sentences like

- (58) *Zijn broer, Marie heeft me omarmd⁷
 `His brother, Mary has embraced me'

What we want to say then is that an N in the environment __ S⁸, for which it is neither the

case that it entertains a selectional relation with that S nor that the S and the N itself both entertain a selectional relation with the main verb, and which is not interpretable as a vocative or as an exclamation, is not interpretable unless an anaphoric relation is established between the N and the S. Notice that this formulation sets apart NP's with sentential complements from relative clauses and LD sentences, since NP's with sentential complements are subcategorized for the type of complementizer in their complements (cf. Bresnan 1972). The fact that this condition generalizes over LD and relative clauses seems quite desirable, since a) we no longer need the copying (i.e. promotion) analysis of relative clauses to express the obligatory anaphoric relation between the head and the relative pronoun, and b) we have a basis for the similarity of the pronouns that occur in both constructions⁹.

These remarks on LD and relative clauses suggest two things. First, that it may be possible or even necessary to account for certain counterexamples to the anaphoric relation without resorting to copying rules, and second, that it may be possible to either restrict or even abolish the class of copying transformations. With regard to the latter point, it is important to notice that the term copying rule has been used in the literature for two distinct types of transformations: A. rules that move an NP and leave a substantial, i.e. phonetically manifest copy behind, and B. rules that insert a substantial pronominal copy of an NP into another position. The latter type of copying rule may well turn out to be replaceable by a corresponding class of interpretive rules that establish, among other things, obligatory coreference between a pronoun and an antecedent. While the material presented in this paper has no bearing on this issue, we find the analysis of reciprocals presented in Fiengo and Lasnik (1973) and mentioned in 2.2. highly suggestive in this respect. The former category, that of type A copying rules, is characterized by the fact that the output of the rule is such that the relationship between the NP in its new position and the pronoun left behind is of the type that usually holds between pronouns and their antecedents. There are two things wrong with such rules. First, their movement part violates all the constraints that usually hold for movement rules (see, e.g., 2.7.). Second, the pronoun insertion part performs more than the insertion of a constant, purely grammatical morpheme and is at variance with the view that pronouns should be inserted at the deep structure level. Rather it often inserts material in a way that has certain semantic consequences. Take, e.g., the fact that a putative rule of LD would have the choice of inserting either a normal or a demonstrative pronoun (not to speak of epithets, cf. 2.1.). Such a task one would probably like to restrict to lexical insertion rules. Given these considerations, we would like to suggest that type A copying rules, and possibly type B copying rules too, should be disallowed by linguistic theory and that the only type of trace that NP movement rules are permitted to insert are non-substantial, i.e. phonetically null, traces.

Notes

The repetition of the complementizer (dat) yields a slightly improved sentence with a substandard flavor. Presumably it should rather be analyzed as a more general type of repetition structure, clearly not part of the grammar of competence.

Actually, the LDNP is also defective in certain ways (cf. footnote 5), but (14) and (15) show that the defectiveness is of a different kind.

Notice that there is a certain hesitation as to whether the pronoun should agree in gender with the idiomatic NP or whether the (presumably unmarked) neuter form should be used. For further remarks on the sloppy agreement of the pronouns in LD sentences see section 3).

One phenomenon that people might want to use to argue in favor of the transformational analysis of LD is case-marking. Dutch has no case-marking of any significance, so there is no problem for us there. In German, however, one might think that sentence like the following, in which the LDNP is accusative and dative, respectively, show that there has to be a transformation of LD that follows case-marking:

- (i) Den Hans, den habe ich lange nicht gesehen
 `John, him have I for a long time not seen'
- (ii) Der Anna, der möchte ich nicht mehr begegnen
 `Ann, her (dat.) want I long ermet'

Notice that the demonstrative pronoun is also marked for the same case. Consider now cases where the pronoun is case-marked, but cannot be topicalized.

- (iii)a. Ich habe lange nicht mit ihr/der gesprochen
 I have a long time not with her spoken
- b. *Ihr/der habe ich lange nicht mit gesprochen
 c. Die Anna/*Der Anna, ich habe lange nicht mit ihr gesprochen
- (iv)a. Anna behauptet, dass ich ihn/den nicht beachten soll
 `Anna claims that I him not should pay attention to'
- b. *Ihn/den behauptet Anna, dass ich nicht beachten soll
 c. Der Hans/*Den Hans, Anna behauptet, dass ich ihn nicht beachten soll

A preliminary survey of the data shows that the case-marking of the LDNP corresponds to the topicalizability of the pronoun. Whatever analysis one adopts to handle this fact, it seems safe to assume that case-marking is neutral with respect to the choice between the transformational and the PSR treatment of LD.

Sometimes the anaphoric relation seems optional, like in

- (i) Moeder, ik houd van haar
 `Mother, I love her'

But on the non-anaphoric reading such sentences receive a vocative interpretation, not an LD interpretation, as shown in sentences where the NP does not qualify as a proper vocative:

- (ii) *De tafel/zijn broer, ik houd van haar
 'The table/his brother, I love her'

Notice, however, that vocative NP's and LDNP's are similar in one respect: neither can take quantifiers:

- (iii) (*Alle) lieve mensen, ik heb jullie wat te zeggen
 '(All) dear people, I have something to tell you'

(*Sommige) onderofficieren, kom eens hier!
 '(Some) petty officers, come here'

- (iv) (*Alle) onderofficieren, die zijn wreed
 '(All) petty officers, they are cruel'

(*Sommige) boorse kondities, die zijn uiten boze
 '(Some) boolean conditions, they are odious'

Chomsky, (p.c.) has suggested that the promotion analysis of relative clauses can be formulated in such a way that none of the processes involved is a copying process. It is difficult to imagine, however, how this can be done without making use of an ad hoc mechanism such as the extraction of a subset of the features of an NP from that NP.

Hirschbühler (1974) claims that some sentences of that type are possible in French:

- (i) - Tu viens faire un tour à bicyclette?
 - Oh, tu sais, moi, la bicyclette, je n'aime pas me fatiguer.

The only condition on the acceptability of such sentences would then presumably be one of semantic connectedness. We find the Dutch equivalent quite ungrammatical:

- (ii) - Kom aan, pak de fiets en ga mee!
 - *Nou nee zeg, de fiets, ik houd er niet van me overmatig in te spannen

The number of bars associated with the N label has been left unspecified here.

More precisely, the set of pronouns occurring in LD is the class of d-words, and d-words are themselves a fairly large subset of the class of relative pronouns (which in addition includes w-words). Demonstrative pronouns are d-words too, but they differ from the d-words in both LD and relative clauses in that only demonstratives can be modified by *hier* (here) and *daar* (there).

- (i)a. Die (daar) heb ik nooit geproefd.
 'That one (there) have I never tasted'.

- b. De 1929er, die (daar) heb ik nooit geproefd
 'The 1929 one, ...'

- c. De jaargang die (*daar) ik nooit geproefd heb
 'The vintage that, ...'

Bibliography

- Banfield, A. (1973), Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech, in: *Foundations of Language* 10.
- Bresnan, J.W. (1972, ms), Theory of complementation in English, Ph.D. Diss. MIT.
- Chomsky, N. (1973), Conditions on transformations, in: Anderson & Riparsky (eds.) *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, N.Y.
- Dougherty, R.C. (1969), An interpretive theory of pronominal reference, in: *Foundations of Language* 5.
- Emonds, J.B. (1970, ms), Root and structure preserving transformations, Ph.D. Diss. MIT.
- Fiengo, R. & H. Lasnik (1973), The logical structure of reciprocal sentences in English, in: *Foundations of Language* 9.
- Haraguchi, S. (1973, ms), Remarks on dislocation in Japanese.
- Hirschbuhler, P. (1974, ms), On the source of left-hand NP's in French.
- Lasnik, H. (1974, ms), Remarks on coreference.
- Postal, P.M. (1971, ms), Some further limitations of interpretive theories of anaphora.
- Ross, J.R. (1967, ms), Constraints on variables in syntax, Ph.D. Diss. MIT.
- Vergnaud, J.-R. (1974, ms), French relative clauses, Ph.D. Diss. MIT.
- Wasow, T. (1972, ms), Anaphoric relations in English, Ph.D. Diss. MIT.