A. Outline  
This paper focuses on embedded left dislocation (ELD) in southern Dutch. I examine previously undiscussed data of ELD, d-HTLD (Hanging Topic Left Dislocation with a demonstrative) and CLD (Contrastive Left Dislocation) and present a unified account of these constructions in terms of operator movement (whereby the operator is a full copy of the dislocated XP). Intricate reconstruction facts provide the main support for the analysis.

B. The basic data  
Although it is generally assumed that all left dislocation (LD) except Romance/Greek Clitic Left Dislocation (CLD) is limited to root contexts (cf. e.g. Cinque 1990), the southern Dutch construction in (1) – first noted by van Craenenbroeck (2005) for Wambeek Dutch – provides evidence to the contrary.

C. The properties of ELD  
[a] A left peripheral constituent, coindexed with an IP-internal demonstrative, precedes both the complementizer and the fronted WH-phrase, cf. (1). [b] ELD is not limited to WH-contexts: it also occurs in embedded declaratives, selected both by bridge verbs and non-bridge verbs. [c] The ELDed XP can be of any category. [d] The ELDed XP is part of the complement clause, cf. (2): it follows all matrix material (any movement, e.g. scrambling, is ungrammatical) and the matrix subject cannot bind an anaphor or variable inside the ELDed XP. [e] ELD is not sensitive to islands: any island, weak or strong, can be violated, as is illustrated in (3) with a complex NP. [f] ELD reconstructs for Condition A, Condition B and Variable Binding, also in intermediate positions, cf. (4).

D. The analysis of ELD  
I propose that an operator, a full copy of the ELDed XP, is merged as the specifier of a big DP (a null operator would be problematic to handle the reconstruction facts, cf. [f]). The demonstrative (cf. [a]) is merged as the D-head of this big DP. This is shown in the tree structure in (5). The operator successively cyclically moves to [Spec, CP], while stranding the demonstrative: successive-cyclic movement handles reconstruction into intermediate positions, cf. [f]. The ELDed XP is merged as a CP-adjunct, as it is part of the complement clause, cf. [d]. The highest copy of the operator movement chain is deleted at PF under identity with the ELDed XP, and reconstructs at LF (cf. Munn 1994; Citko 2001 on relative clauses). Moreover, the IP-internal resumptive element (the demonstrative) alleviates locality violations (cf. Perlmutter 1972; Salzmann 2006), which explains the island insensitivity of ELD, cf. [e]. Furthermore, there is a second, lower C-head (filled by the complementizer), whose specifier hosts WH, cf. [a, b]. Only WH-phrases can fill this specifier position: Hoekstra & Zwart (1994) and Barbiers (2002) have pointed out independently that (varieties of) Dutch do(es) not allow for embedded topicalisation.

E. Support for the analysis: Condition C  
ELD shows an intricate pattern of reconstruction for Condition C: while Condition C effects arise in local contexts, they do not in non-local ones (an R-expression in the ELDed XP can be coreferential with the demonstrative in the embedded clause), cf. (6). I claim that this is due to Vehicle Change (Fiengo & May 1994), i.e. the lowest occurrence of an R-expression is replaced at LF by its ‘pronominal correlate’. As an R-expression is replaced by a pronoun, Condition B effects are expected to emerge, which is indeed the case, cf. (7). As such, Vehicle Change derives the correct results. An analysis in which the ELDed XP simply moves from its base position to [Spec, CP] cannot properly handle these observations, as it has been argued (cf. Fiengo & May 1994; Citko 2001) that Vehicle Change does not occur in constructions involving regular movement (e.g. WH-questions). However, in the context of operator movement, followed by PF-deletion, Vehicle Change is possible.

F. ELD is embedded d-HTLD  
When comparing ELD to several types of LD in the literature (cf. Anagnostopoulou, van Riemsdijk & Zwarts 1997; Alexiadou 2006 for an extensive overview), it seems that ELD is simply a new, as yet unobserved type of LD. However, I present new data for southern Dutch d-HTLD which show that this construction strongly resembles ELD (in its reconstruction behaviour, island insensitivity etc.), cf. Table 1 and (8). Consequently, I conclude that ELD is embedded d-HTLD.

G. The analysis of d-HTLD  
I assume that the analysis for d-HTLD is identical to the one for ELD, the only difference being that d-HTLD takes place in root clauses. As Dutch is a verb second (V2) language, it requires that the specifier of the C-position hosting the verb (in my analysis: the second, lower C) is filled. Not only WH-phrases, but also topics and subjects can fill this specifier position.

H. Extending the proposal to southern Dutch CLD  
New observations for CLD in southern Dutch show that it is identical to ELD and d-HTLD when it comes to the reconstruction facts. However, CLD differs from ELD and d-HTLD in that the demonstrative is fronted to the V2-position and that it is sensitive to islands, cf. (9) and Table 1. For CLD, I also propose an analysis similar to d-HTLD and ELD. However, in CLD, the operator first moves to the V2-position, pied-piping the demonstrative, and then moves on to the next specifier, stranding the demonstrative in the V2-position. This second movement step is motivated by the extra interpretational properties of CLD (cf. Grohmann 2003:155): unlike d-HTLD and ELD, CLD can be used to express contrastiveness. As the demonstrative has moved to the CP-domain and only low, IP-internal coreferring pronouns are real resumptive elements, locality violations can no longer be alleviated in CLD.
Examples

(1) Ik vraag ma af [den Bert], wa dat daan gekocht eit.
   I ask myself off the Bert what that DEM bought has

   'I wonder what Bert has bought.'

(2) * Elke taalkundige denkt [zijn, eerste artikel] dat ik dat niet goed vind.
   *Every linguist thinks his first article that I DEM not good find

   'Every linguist thinks that I do not like his first article.'

(3) Ik denk [Eva] dat ik het gerucht gehoord heb dat die in de gevangenis zit.
   I think Eva that I the rumour heard have that DEM in the prison sits

   'I think I heard the rumour that Eva is in prison.'

(4) Ik denk [die foto van zichzelf,] dat Peter, wil dat iedereen, die ziet.
   I think that picture of himself that Peter wants that everyone DEM sees

   'I think that Peter wants everyone to see that picture of him(self).'

(5) Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>CLD</th>
<th>$d$-HTLD</th>
<th>DEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>position resumpt. el.</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatible with wh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>island sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variable binding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) a. * Ik denk [boeken van Jan] dat hij, die verkoopt.
   I think books of John that he DEM sells

   * 'I think that he; sells books of John.'

   I think that John can lose that he DEM realizes

   'I think that John realizes that he might lose.'

   I think that he books of John him sells

   * 'I think that he; sells books of him.'

(8) a. * [Boeken van Jan], hij, heeft die verkocht.
   books of John he has DEM sold

   * He; sold books of John.

b. [Dat Jan, kan verliezen], hij, weet dat.
   that John can lose he knows DEM

   'John knows that he might lose.'

(9) * [Eva], die heb ik het gerucht gehoord dat in de gevangenis zit.
   Eva DEM have I the rumour heard that in the prison sits

   'I heard the rumour that Eva is in prison.'
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