

Ewelina Mokrosz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5241-5652>

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

The Puzzles of Topic Dislocations in Polish¹

Abstract

In this paper we show that there are different topic dislocations in Polish, each representing a specific type of a discourse function. With a battery of diagnostic tests we analyse each dislocation and propose their classification. As it turns out, constructions implementing a contrastive topic exhibit features of both A and A'-movement, which turns out problematic for a uniform analysis. We demonstrate that the movement in them is non-quantificational. The movement targeting TopP consists of at least two steps. An object undergoes A-movement and lands in the specifier of an Aboutness Phrase. Then it moves to SpecTopP where it checks a discourse feature.

Keywords

topic, left dislocations, crossover effects, aboutness, resumption

Abstrakt

Niniejszy artykuł analizuje konstrukcje, w których uwydatniona jest informacja dana. W pierwszej części artykułu dokonujemy klasyfikacji topików znajdujących się w analizowanych konstrukcjach. Ponieważ proces topikalizacji kojarzony jest zazwyczaj z przesunięciem w strukturze, wybrane testy pokazują czy rzeczywiście wszystkie badane konstrukcje wykazują cechy przesunięcia. Jak się okazuje, konstrukcje z topikiem kontrastywnym potrzebują analizy, która pogodzi ze sobą cechy przesunięcia do pozycji argumentu oraz do pozycji innej niż pozycja argumentu. Przedstawione dowody świadczą o tym, iż ruch dopełnienia w konstrukcjach o szyku dopełnienie-to-podmiot-orzeczenie jest ruchem niekwantyfikującym i wieloetapowym: najpierw do pozycji nad podmiotem aczkolwiek wykazującej cechy podmiotu, a następnie do pozycji okupowanej przez topiki.

Słowa kluczowe

topik, przesunięcia w lewą stronę, efekty skrzyżowania, cecha 'aboutness', wznowienie

¹ I am grateful to two SPL reviewers for their insightful and thought-provoking comments. All remaining errors are my own responsibility.

1. Introduction

This paper analyses different types of Polish topic dislocations that contain an object with a topic interpretation in the left periphery of a main clause (MC). Section 2 looks at a division of topics in Italian, German and English and their connection to any specific topic dislocation. Subsequently we investigate which topics common in the cartographic approach are attested in Polish and whether they are linked to any particular type of a dislocation or position in the left periphery. Section 3 probes into the nature of the movement usually assigned to discourse dislocations and discusses some puzzling inconsistencies that emerged in our study. To account for them we will turn to Witkoś (2008), who suggests that OSV word orders are derived by both A-movement and A'-movement.

2. Types of topics and topic dislocations in main clauses

2.1 Italian and German

The most common division of topics originally proposed for Italian is presented in (1). Each type of a topic is accompanied by its definition in the brackets.

- 1)
 - (a) shifting topic [+aboutness] (newly introduced/reintroduced);²
 - (b) contrastive topic (an element that induces alternatives which have no impact on the focus value and creates oppositional pairs with respect to other topics);
 - (c) familiar topic (a given or accessible constituent, typically destressed and realized in a pronominal form).

adopted from (Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007: 88)

The three topics are illustrated in the following example.

- 2) 'This is the situation: the teacher, as I told students, is pregnant, she's having a difficult pregnancy and she is now having benefit from a specific law that allows for an early maternity-leave. So far, I was given one month of teaching supply. I don't think she is coming back this year, however she told me not to tell students, because-well, she has her reasons. However, I think I will keep the class till the end of the year [...] anyway I did not tell this fact to students directly.'

² Shifting topics are also called sentence topics (Reinhart 1981) or Aboutness-shift topics (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010). In this paper, we will use the term Aboutness-shift topic (A-topic).

Questo, io ai ragazzi non l' ho detto direttamente.
 this I to.the boys not it(CL) have-1SG told directly
 'I did not tell that fact to my students directly.'

(Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007: 88)

In the example above *ai ragazzi* functions as a Familiar topic (F-topic), the subject *io* is a Contrastive topic (C-topic) and the direct object *questo* is an Aboutness-shift topic (A-topic).

In Italian, Aboutness-shift, Contrastive and Familiar topics are argued to be licensed in the left periphery above the TP (Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007; Frascarelli 2019). Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) propose the order of topics presented in (3) below. On the basis of prosodic evidence, they assume a similar order to be true in German.

3) [ShiftP [+aboutness] [ContrP [FocP [FamP* [IP

(Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007: 97)

In Italian, Aboutness-shift and Contrastive topics always precede the operator field occupied by foci and *wh*-phrases. A-topics and C-topics are clitic-resumed in Italian, which is why they are argued to be merged in the left periphery.³ Familiar topics may also be clitic-resumed. When they are, they are also merged in the left periphery (Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007). A construction in which dislocated elements are clitic resumed is called a Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) construction. Most importantly, in Italian different types of topics are linked to CLLD (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010). Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010), contra Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007), argue that English and Italian A-topics but not C-topics are clause external; they are not part of the left periphery. They provide three types of evidence: (i) A-topics co-occur with sentences with different illocutionary force, (ii) A-topic which is a product of Left Dislocation (LD) does not obey a Complex NP Constraint, and (iii) in Italian they precede a complementizer in embedded context (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010: 78). A-topics belong to Type I root phenomena that include LD and Focus Fronting, while C-topics to Type II root phenomena that encompass Topicalization (TOP) and V2 constructions (Frascarelli 2019).

A-topics in German, (4), in contrast to Italian A-topics, (5) below, are derived via movement as they show Principle C effects.

4) *Mein Bild von Leo_i hat er_i wahrscheinlich Maria nicht gezeigt.
 my picture of Leo has he probably Maria not shown
 'My picture of Leo_i, he_i has probably not shown to Maria.'

(Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007: 110)

³ For a movement analysis of a clitic-resumed construction in Italian see Cruschina (2021).

- 5) La mia foto con Leo, lui non l'ha ancora mostrata.
 the my picture with Leo he not it(cl) have-3SG still shown-FEM
 'My picture with Leo, he hasn't shown it yet.'

(Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl 2007: 98)

In Italian, but not in German, coindexation between a proper name that is part of an A-topic and the pronoun inside IP is felicitous, which shows that A-topics in Italian are merged in the left periphery. A possible reconstruction in German explains the lack of coindexation between the proper name *Leo* and the pronoun *er*.

2.2 English

Below we discuss A-topics and C-topics omitting Familiar topics, which are not limited to the position in the left periphery in English (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010).

- 6) *Aboutness-shift topic*

This book, leave *it* on the table!

Left Dislocation

(Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010: 77)

- 7) *Contrastive topic*

A: Tell me about Bill. Did he read the Selfish Gene?

Topicalization

B: Well, I don't know about Bill, but *Maxine* read The Selfish Gene. {Assert[Maxine read The Selfish Gene], Assert[Bill read the Selfish Gene], ...}

(Vermeulen 2010: 3)

In English, in contrast to Italian, different topics are associated with different constructions (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010: 61). The presence of a resumptive pronoun (*it* in (6)) is a distinguishing feature of LD and is linked to an A-topic (Frey 2005; Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010; Frascarelli 2019). Topicalization constructions, in turn, lack resumptive elements, see (7) (Ross 1967). They are argued to be an implementation of a C-topic (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010; Frascarelli 2019). Birner and Ward (2019) show that LD and TOP can co-occur in English.

- 8) [Scorpions]_{AT}, [those]_{CT} you have to look out for.

(Birner, Ward 2019: 1)

In English, only TOP, not LD, shows reconstruction and island effects (López 2016). They also lack an intonation break characteristic of LD constructions (Frey 2005).

Apart from LD and TOP, there is yet another construction that implements a topic, namely a Hanging Topic (HT) construction common in Germanic languages but also present in Slavic languages (Benincà, Poletto 2004;

Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010; Frascarelli 2000; Jasinskaja 2016; Krapova, Cinque 2008; López 2016).

- 9) That isn't the typical family anymore. [The typical family today]_{HT}, the husband and the wife both work.

(Lambrecht 1994: 193)

The presence of a resumptive element (*the husband and the wife*) makes HT constructions similar to LD constructions. These two constructions, however, differ. Shaer (2008) provides the following characteristic features of hanging topics:

- 10)
- a. HT are associated with a larger set of possible resumptive elements than other types of left-dislocating strategies;
 - b. HT structures do not require case-matching (the dislocate and the resumptive can differ in case);⁴
 - c. HT structures do not show connectivity effects; they are island-insensitive and they do not display reconstruction effects;
 - d. HT structures can only be embedded under special circumstances;
 - e. HT structures can be discourse-initial (they need not connect to previous discourse).

Polinsky and Potsdam (2014) remark that there is a general agreement that dislocation constructions differ syntactically and semantically across languages (see also Lipták 2011). The differences may be also observed even within a single language. Benincà and Poletto (2004) show clear differences between HT constructions and LD constructions, while Polinsky and Potsdam (2014) categorise HT constructions as a subtype of LD constructions. LD constructions for them include examples of English Topicalization, Italian CLLDs, Germanic Contrastive LD (with a fronted demonstrative), English Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD) or French LD with an epithet as an anaphoric expression (Polinsky, Potsdam 2014: 633). Only HTLD constructions in the presented list have a base generation analysis. López (2016), yet, provides a different classification. Dislocations are divided into Hanging Topic Left Dislocations (=Left Dislocations) (H-type dislocations) and Clitic Left/Right Dislocations or Contrastive Left Dislocations (D-type dislocations). The latter type of dislocations are based on a syntactic dependency between the dislocated constituent and a head in the main clause. Importantly, López concludes that English Topicalization is close to Romance CLLD (regardless the presence/absence of resumptive pronouns). López (2016) argues that H-type dislocations in Italian, Catalan, English and German have a particular discourse role, namely *Topic Promotion*, i.e. the introduction of a new

⁴ The term *dislocate* means the phrase is in the left periphery. It does not imply movement.

There is also a syntactic construction referred to by Andrason (2016) as ‘simple’ Left Dislocation. According to Andrason, all three examples below illustrate ‘simple’ LD. We have assigned topics to them.

13) *A-topic/C-topic*

Janek_i, to (on_i) wyjechał w zeszłym tygodniu ‘simple’ Left Dislocation
 John-NOM PART he left-3SG in last week
 ‘John, AS-FOR he left last week.’ (Duszak 1984: 57)

14) *A-topic*

Janek_i, to widziałem go_i wczoraj ‘simple’ Left Dislocation (?)
 John-NOM PART saw-1SG him yesterday
 ‘John, I saw him yesterday.’

15) *A-topic/C-topic* ‘simple’ Left Dislocation

Janka_i, tak to widziałem (go_i) wczoraj
 John-GEN yes PART saw-1SG him yesterday
 ‘John, I saw him yesterday.’

(Andrason 2016: 187)

They lack an introductory expression like *Co do ...*, ‘As for ...’, but they may have a resumptive pronoun which is obligatory when the dislocate bears the absolute case different from the case of the resumptive pronoun, see (14). When the dislocate is inflected, the resumptive element is.⁵ There is also a significant pause between the dislocate and the rest of the construction in all three examples above, which is absent in True Topicalization. Duszak (1984) and Andrason (2016: 195) argue that ‘simple’ LD and TT ‘form a gradient’ with regard to the presence/absence of a resumptive pronoun visible especially in the context where the dislocate corresponds to the subject in the main clause. The distinguishing feature of LD constructions are, thus, not resumptive pronouns because they may be optional there, but the pause after the dislocate, which, in fact, as Andrason (2016) concludes, may also be gradient. Example (14), in fact, represents a HT construction as the dislocate shows no case agreement with the head element inside the main clause, which is characteristic of HT constructions, see (10). What it implements is an A-topic.

⁵ Szczegielniak (2005) maintains that without embedding resumptive pronouns are ungrammatical in topicalization constructions.

(i) *[Ten komputer]_i Marek go_i kupił
 which computer Mark it bought
 ‘This computer Mark bought’
 (Szczegielniak 2005: 54)

The grammaticality judgement in (i) contradicts the one provided by Andrason (2016). We believe that example (i) could be marked as ungrammatical only if it is an instance of True Topicalization.

We believe that ‘simple’ LD may be associated with both a C-topic and an A-topic. On the one hand, the topic yielded by a ‘simple’ LD generates an oppositional pair, as shown in (16). On the other hand, like any other A-topic, it may introduce a new topic, see (17).

- 16) A: A co z Piotrem?
and what with Peter
‘And what about Peter?’
B: [Janka]_{CT}, to widziałem (go)_i wczoraj, a z Piotrem to nie
John-ACC PART saw-3SG him yesterday and with Peter PART not
wiem co się dzieje.
know-1SG what REFL happening
‘John, I saw him yesterday but I know nothing about Peter.’
- 17) Ewa lubi towarzystwo innych ludzi. Jada tylko na mieście i
Eve-NOM likes company-ACC other people eats-3SG only on town and
często spotyka się z przyjaciółmi. [Janka]_{AT}, na przykład, to
often meets REFL with friends John-ACC for example PART
widziała (go)_i nawet bardzo niedawno.
saw-3SG him even very recently
‘Eve likes meeting other people. She always eats out and very often meets with
her friends. John, for example, she has seen him quite recently.’

Both A-topics and C-topics can be followed in the left periphery by the discourse particle *to*, as shown in (11–17). Since the particle *to* can appear only in the left periphery, it is an important reference point in the discussion of the left periphery of Polish main clauses (see Cegłowski, Tajsner 2006).

2.4 The order of topics in the left periphery

The order of topics in the left periphery of a main clause may give us a clue as to whether they have a fixed position. This small-scale investigation is conducted within the frames of the cartographic approach under which the left periphery contains discourse dedicated functional projections with a constrained order (see (3) above).

In Italian and English an A-topic precedes a C-topic in the left periphery of a main clause (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010). In (18) and (19) we show that in Polish C-topics in TT constructions appear to either precede or follow A-topics that are part of ‘As-for’ LD constructions. The order of topics does not seem to be that flexible in clauses with HTs. In (20) and (21) we see that a HT has to precede a C-topic which is part of a TT construction.

'As for' LD > TT

- 18) Jeśli chodzi o [zabawki]_{AT}, to [Kamilowi]_{CT} to zabrał je
 if comes about toys-ACC PART Kamil-DAT PART took-3SG them
 Jan, a Piotrowi to nie wiem.⁶
 John-NOM and Peter-DAT PART not know-1SG
 'As for the toys, John took them from Kamil but I don't know who took them
 from Peter.'

TT > 'As for' LD

- 19) [Kamilowi]_{CT} to, jeśli chodzi o [zabawki]_{AT}, to zabrał je Jan,
 Kamil-DAT PART if comes about toys-ACC PART took them John
 a Piotrowi to nie wiem.
 and Peter-DAT PART not know-1SG

HT LD > TT

- 20) [Zielona zabawka]_{AT}? [Kamilowi]_{CT} to zabrał ją Jan,
 green toy-NOM Kamil-DAT PART took her John-NOM
 a Piotrowi to nie wiem.
 and Peter-DAT PART not know-1SG
 'The green toy? John took it from Kamil but I don't know who took it from Peter.'

**TT > HT LD*

- 21) *[Kamilowi]_{CT} to, [zielona zabawka]_{AT}, zabrał ją Jan, a Piotrowi
 Kamil-DAT PART green toy-NOM took it John-NOM and Peter-DAT
 to nie wiem.
 PART not know-1SG

Let us now examine 'simple' LD. As shown in (22) and (23) both C-topics and A-topics integral to 'simple' LD may either precede or follow a C-topic of TT.

'simple' LD (C-topic/A-topic) > TT

- 22) [Marii]_{CT}, *to [książki]_{CT} to Piotr (jej) dał a Ani
 Mary-DAT PART books-ACC PART Peter-NOM her gave-3SG and Ann-DAT
 kwiaty to nie wiem.⁷
 flowers-ACC PART not know-1SG
 'Peter gave Mary the books but I don't know who gave Ann the flowers.'
- 23) [Marii]_{AT}, *to [książki]_{CT} to Piotr (jej) dał a
 Mary-DAT PART books-ACC PART Peter-NOM her gave-3SG and
 kwiaty to nie wiem.
 flowers-ACC PART not know-1SG
 'Mary, Peter gave her the books but I know nothing about the flowers.'

⁶ The introductory phrase *Jeśli chodzi o ...*, 'As for', has the same function as *Co do ...*.

⁷ Krifka (1999) also demonstrates examples of multiple C-topics but see Sudhoff (2010: 114–115) for an alternative interpretation.

TT > ‘simple’ LD (C-topic/A-topic)

- 24) [Książki]_{CT} *to [Marii]_{CT}, to Piotr (jej)_i dał a Ani
 books-ACC PART Mary-DAT PART Peter-NOM her gave-3SG and Ann-DAT
 kwiaty to nie wiem.
 flowers-ACC PART not know-1SG
 ‘Peter gave Mary the books but I don’t know who gave Ann the flowers.’
- 25) [Książki]_{CT} *to [Marii]_{AT}, to Piotr (jej)_i dał a
 books-ACC PART Mary-DAT PART Peter-NOM her gave-3SG and
 kwiaty to nie wiem.
 flowers-ACC PART not know-1SG
 ‘Mary, Peter gave her the books but I know nothing about the flowers.’

A-topics do not seem to occupy any dedicated projection in the left periphery. Examples (18) and (19) show that the *Jeśli chodzi o ...* phrase may actually move around a C-topic produced by TT. ‘As for’ topics in Polish have more of an independent status close to the status of parenthetical expressions, hence their structural flexibility. Example (21) shows that HT constructions structurally do not overlap with ‘As for’ LDs even though they implement the same type of a topic, namely A-topic. The HT exhibits some kind of an extra sentential behaviour not being able to follow a C-topic. As reported by Benincà and Poletto (2004), the order of a HT and a left dislocate is also fixed in Italian in both main and embedded clauses, namely the former must precede the latter. In embedded contexts Italian HTs may precede even the complementizer ([HT [che [LD [LD ... [IP]]]]]). Sentences in (22–25) show that topics derived by ‘simple’ LD and C-topics of TT do not exclude each other; they do not seem to occupy the same discourse dedicated projection. What they share is the position preceding the particle *to*. It is likely that one of the topics moves to the SpecTopP, while the other topic adjoins to the SpecTopP. Since both constructions are compatible with each other, most probably they represent the same type of a movement. If this is true, we expect that a construction in which a C-topic produced by ‘simple’ LD precedes a HT be excluded.⁸

⁸ One of the reviewers suggests that examples with two fronted topics in the left periphery could be derived by VP-remnant fronting that includes evacuation movement of the verb followed by the movement of the remnant VP, as described, e.g., by Müller (2018).

A VP-remnant fronting with an evacuated head seems to be a controversial idea (Haider 2010; Takano 2000; Wurmbrand 2004). Takano (2000: 151) after Chomsky (1995) makes a generalization under which movement of the head out of the remnant bans the subsequent movement of the remnant, which is illustrated with the examples below from English and German.

- (i) *It’s [VP a book t_i to Mary]_j that John gave; t_j .
 (ii) *[Ihr ein Buch t_i]_j gab; Hans t_j .
 her a book gave Hans

‘Hans gave her a book.’

HTLD and 'simple' LD (C-topic)

- 26) [Ta książka]_{iAT}? [Kamilowi]_{jCT}, to Jan (mu)_i ja_i przeczyta
 this book-NOM Kamil-DAT PART John-NOM him her read-3SG.FUT
 a Piotrowi to nie wiem.
 and Peter-DAT PART not know
 'This book? John will read it to Kamil but I don't know who will read it to Peter.'

**'simple' LD (C-topic) and HTLD*

- 27) *[Kamilowi]_{jCT}, to [ta książka]_{iAT}, Jan przeczyta (mu)_i ja_i.
 Kamil-ACC PART this book-NOM John-NOM read-3SG.FUT him her

Examples (11–15) show that *to* is not associated with any particular type of a topic.⁹ Interestingly, the presence of both an A-topic and C-topic does not exclude the presence of two particles *to* at the same time, as shown in (18–19). Yet, the presence of two particles *to* is excluded when the topics arise of 'simple' LD and TT, regardless the order, see (22–25).

With VP-remnant fronting (VP headed by a trace), however, Müller (2018) reconciles a number of contradictory evidence in favour of single constituency approach and a multiple constituency approach to complex prefields in German by postulating two major operations at play, namely Merge and Remove. Certainly the idea is worth considering with regard to Polish dislocation constructions with multiple topics in the left periphery. For reasons of space we will mention only a couple of arguments for and against its implementation in Polish.

VP-remnant fronting would explain why in Polish complex sentences it is possible to front two expressions from the same clause (iv) but not from two different ones (iii).

- (iii) *[Piłkarzom]_i [podwyżkę]_j rząd powiedział t_i, że im da t_j.
 footballers-DAT rise-ACC government-NOM said that them give-FUT
- (iv) [Piłkarzom podwyżkę]_i rząd powiedział, że da t_i.
 footballers-DAT rise-ACC government-NOM said that give-FUT
 'The government said that it will give footballers a pay rise.'

We would be also able to account for the fact that two topics in the left periphery can be followed only by one particle *to* (see 22–25).

On the other hand, the aspect of Müller's (2018) analysis which makes it less convincing is the fact that the movement of the remnant VP is triggered by the feature V on C, which is not in any obvious way related to information structure. Furthermore, in the case of predicate fronting in Polish, which includes topicalization of vP, Bondaruk (2009) argues that the upper copy of the verb has to be spelled out to receive special intonation like any other topicalized expression. If we assume that topicalization movements include the movement of the VP, we expect the copies of the nominals as well as the copy of the evacuated verb inside VP to be spelled out.

⁹ Contra Krifka's (1999) Contrastive Topic Hypothesis, Sudhoff (2010: 113) shows that a stressed additive focus particle in German can be associated 'with more than one constituent'. In German the stressed *auch* may be associated with both an Aboutness-shift topic and a Contrastive topic. In Japanese the *wa*-marker can be associated with either an A-topic or a C-topic (Kuno 1973).

To conclude, the left periphery of main clauses in Polish seems to have at least one dedicated discourse projection for topics, namely the one preceding the particle *to* (see Cegłowski, Tajsner 2006). A-topics are part of ‘simple’ LDs, ‘As for’ LDs, and HT constructions, while C-topics can be realized either by ‘simple’ LD or by TT.

3 (Non)movement analysis of topic dislocation constructions

In this section we check whether all four topic dislocation constructions share a common (non)movement analysis. We will conduct well-known tests to see whether their derivation involves an A'-movement and discuss some paradoxes that arise from the application of the tests.

3.1 Resumption

As already reported, TT does not allow any resumptive pronouns while in HT constructions they appear to be obligatory. In ‘As for’ LDs, resumptive pronouns are obligatory only when they correspond to an object in the main clause. ‘Simple’ LD constructions feature optional resumptive pronouns, hence we can talk about resumptive ‘simple’ LD and non-resumptive ‘simple’ LD. Since resumptive pronouns are excluded only in TT constructions, it appears that only such constructions should involve movement. This assumption is based on the idea that resumptive pronouns and movement are incompatible (Chomsky 1977).

Concerning the form of the resumptive element (Benincà, Poletto 2004), in contrast to weak pronouns, epithets are argued to be clear indicators of the lack of movement.

28) *TT*

[Ewie]_i_{CT} to dał ??[ślicznotce]_i kwiaty a Marii
 Eve-DAT PART gave cutie-DAT flowers-ACC and Mary-DAT
 to nie wiem.
 PART not know-1SG
 ‘Eve. John gave that cutie flowers but I know nothing about Mary.’

29) *‘simple’ LD (C-topic)*

[Janka]_i_{CT} to widziałem ??[tego łobuza]_i wczoraj a z Piotrem
 John-ACC PART saw this rascal yesterday and with Peter
 to nie wiem co się dzieje.
 PART not know what REFL happening
 ‘John. I saw that rascal yesterday but I know nothing about Peter.’

30) 'simple' LD (A-topic)

Jak tak sobie pomyślę, (to) [Janka]_{iAT} to widziała
 how this myself think-1SG PART John-ACC PART saw-3SG
 [tego łobuza]_{ii} wczoraj.
 this rascal yesterday
 'Let me think. John. She saw that rascal yesterday.'

31) 'As for' LD

Jeśli chodzi o [tamten samochód]_{iAT}, to Jan
 if comes about that car PART John-NOM
 [tego grata]_i nigdy nie sprzeda.
 [that clunker] never not sells-FUT
 'As for that car, John will never sell that clunker.'

32) HT LD

[Janek]_{ATi}? Widziałem [tego łobuza]_i wczoraj.
 John-NOM saw-1SG that rascal yesterday
 'John? I saw that rascal yesterday.'

'As for' LD and HT constructions undoubtedly allow epithets. Epithets seem to be more acceptable in 'simple' LF than in TT. We believe that the judgments are strongly influenced by the length of the intonation break as is the case with resumptive pronouns.

3.2 Agreement

In Polish, a full agreement in person, number, gender and case between the dislocate and the corresponding element is observed only in 'simple' LD (see (13) and (15)). No case or number agreement is obligatory in 'As for' LD and HT constructions, as shown in (33a,b), as there is no grammatical relation between the topic bearing element and its corresponding item in the intra-sentential position. 'Simple' LD, see (33c), on the other hand, requires number agreement.

33) 'As for' LD

a. Jeśli chodzi o dziewczyny, to Maria otrzymała
 if comes about girls PART Mary-NOM received
 najwięcej nagród.
 most awards
 'As for the girls, Mary won the biggest number of awards.'

HT

b. A dziewczyny? Maria otrzymała trzy nagrody.
 and the girls-NOM Mary-NOM received three awards
 'What about the girls? Mary won three awards.'

'simple' LD

c. *Dziewczyny, to ona otrzymała trzy nagrody
 girls-NOM PART she received three awards

3.3 Anaphoric binding and Principle C effects

The felicitous co-reference between the reflexive and the proper name in TT and 'simple' LD in (34) and (35), respectively, can be ascribed to a reconstruction of the reflexive suggesting that both constructions feature movement.

34) TT

[Swoje_i zdjęcie] to Jan_i pokazał Marii, a
 self picture-NOM PART John-NOM showed Mary-DAT and
 zdjęcia Piotra to nie wiem.¹⁰
 picture-NOM Peter-GEN PART not know-1SG

'The picture of himself John showed to Mary but I know nothing about the picture of Peter.'

35) 'simple' LD

[Swoje_i zdjęcie]_j, to Jan_i pokazał (je)_j Marii, a
 selfpicture-NOM PART John-NOM showed it Mary-DAT and
 zdjęcie Piotra to nie wiem.
 picture-NOM Peter PART not know-1SG

'The picture of himself John showed it to Mary but I know nothing about the picture of Peter.'

Example (35) with a 'simple' LD may be slightly degraded for some native speakers due to the presence of the resumptive pronoun not accepted by everyone. Due to lack of space we omit here 'As for' and HT constructions. We assume, however, that their extra sentential nature would not allow for reflexive pronouns inside the dislocate.¹¹

¹⁰ Examples of felicitous binding in the TT constructions can be also found in Ceglowski and Tajsner (2006: 120).

¹¹ One of the reviewers provides examples in which a reflexive being a part of a topic in an 'As for' LD corefers with a proper name inside the main clause, which allegedly points to a movement analysis of this type of a construction.

- (i) Jeśli chodzi o [donosy na siebie]_j, to Jan_i napisał ich_j osiem.
 if comes about reports on self PART John wrote them eight
 'When it comes to reports about himself, John wrote eight of them.'
- (ii) Jeśli chodzi o donosy na swoich_i krewnych, to Jan_i napisał osiem.
 if comes about reports on self's relatives PART John wrote eight
 'When it comes to reports about his relatives, John wrote eight of these.'

Examples such as the one in (i) provide contradictory evidence. The reflexive is associated with a movement analysis while the resumptive pronoun suggests base generation of the top-

Violation of the binding Principle C is visible in (36) and (37) but not in (38) and (39), which gives us further evidence in favour of a movement analysis of TT and ‘simple’ LD and base-generation/adjunction analysis of ‘As for’ LD and HT construction.

36) *TT*

*[Mojego zdjęcia]_i z Janem_i to on_i mi jeszcze nie pokazał.
my picture with John PART he me still not showed-3SG

37) ‘simple’ LD

*[Mojego zdjęcia]_j z Janem_i to on_i mi (go)_j jeszcze nie pokazał.
my picture with John PART he me it still not showed-3SG

38) ‘As for’ LD

Jeśli chodzi o [moje zdjęcie z [Janem]_{i,j}], to on_i go_j
if comes about my picture with John PART he him
jeszcze nie pokazał.
still not showed
‘As for my picture with John, he hasn’t showed it to me yet.’

39) *HT LD*

[Moje zdjęcie]_j z Janem_i? On_i mi go_j jeszcze nie pokazał.
my picture with John he me it still not showed
‘My picture with John? He hasn’t showed it to me yet.’

ic. However, embedded reflexives may not necessarily constitute a reliable piece of evidence for A'-binding relations. The same has been observed by Pereltsvaig (2021: 3), who points to the existence in Russian of non-anaphoric types of reflexives. Below we provide examples of sentences with embedded reflexives in a subject position, which shows that Polish may also have non-anaphoric types of reflexives, which do not require an antecedent. The examples come from the Polish Web 2019 corpus.

(iii) Gniew na siebie był niepohamowany.
rage-NOM on self was unbridled
‘Rage on oneself was unbridled.’

(iv) Nauka na swoich błędach jest bardzo kosztowna.
learning on self’s mistakes is very expensive
‘Learning from your own mistakes is very expensive.’

Unembedded reflexives, however, are excluded as parts of topics in ‘As for’ LDs, which shows that such topic constructions cannot be derived by movement.

(v) *Jeśli chodzi o swoje trofea, to Jan zdobył ich sześć.
if comes about self’s trophies PART John won them six

The reviewer, however, makes an assumption according to which the complex nominal expressions in examples (iii–iv) contain a PRO subject that binds the reflexives in them but which does not require an obligatory control by any nominal expression allowing for an arbitrary interpretation dependent on a given context.

Topics derived via TT in (36) and ‘simple’ LD in (37) cannot have the same referent as the subject in the main clause. The noun *Janem* and the subject *on* do not co-refer. The noun *Janem* then must originate within the clause and undergo movement to the left periphery. Since *Janem* and *on* can be coindexed in (38) and (39), no violation of Principle C occurs, which means that there is no reconstruction and the dislocate most probably is merged in the left periphery.

3.4 Syntactic islands

Syntactic islands constitute another test for absence/presence of movement (Ross 1967). As it turns out, TT and ‘simple’ LD are sensitive to islands such as complex DPs presented below in (40) and (41). The movement out of an island in (40) and (41) leaves the sentences ungrammatical. Resumptive pronouns are argued to ameliorate island violations in English (Chomsky 1986; cf. Ackerman et al. 2018) and in some contexts in Polish (Szczegielniak 2005). In ‘simple’ LD, however, the resumptive pronoun is there even without an island. If the dislocate *Marii* were merged in the left periphery, no ungrammaticality should be observed contrary to what we see in (40).

40) *TT*

*Ten skuter, to nie znoszę faktu, że tak często używasz.
 this scooter-ACC PART not bear-1SG fact that so often use-2SG
 ‘This scooter, I can’t stand the fact that you use so often.’

(Cegłowski, Tajsner 2006: 119)

41) ‘simple’ *LD*

*Marii, to słyszałam taką plotkę, że Jan dał
 Mary-DAT PART heard-1SG such gossip-ACC that John-NOM gave
 (jej) pierścioneł.
 her ring-ACC

When it comes to ‘As for’ LD and HT dislocations, it is difficult to note any movement from an island as the resumptive pronoun appears there regardless the limitation imposed by a syntactic island.

3.5 Crossover effects

The presence of crossover effects is indicative of movement. Topicalization, in contrast to ‘As for’ LD in English, shows strong crossover effects (see Pan 2016: 52, 68). Weak crossover effects, however, are obviated in Topicalization and ‘As for’ LD constructions (Lasnik, Stowell 1991: 689; cf. Pan 2016: 53). This is in contrast to WCO effects exhibited by *wh*-questions. Cegłowski and Tajsner (2006) argue that TT in Polish involves movement as it shows SCO

effects. In (42) the pronoun *on* cannot co-refer with *Janka*. The noun *Janka* then must undergo a movement from within the main clause. The same can be observed with regard to ‘simple’ LD in (43). Even though ‘As for’ LD and HT dislocation also contain a resumptive pronoun, they do not induce SCO effects.

42) *TT*

**Janka_i kolegów to on_i szanuje.*
 Janek-GEN friends-ACC to he-NOM respects
 ‘Janek’s friends he respects.’

(Cegłowski, Tajsner 2006: 120)

43) ‘*simple*’ *LD*

*[*Janka_i kolegów_j*], to on_i (ich_j) na pewno szanuje.
 John’s friends-GEN PART he them certainly respects

44) ‘*As for*’ *LD*

Jeśli chodzi o Janka_i kolegów, to on_i ich na pewno szanuje.
 if comes about John’s friends-GEN PART he them certainly respects
 ‘As for John’s friends, he certainly respects them.’

45) *HT LD*

Koledzy Janka_i? On_i ich na pewno szanuje.
 friends-NOM John’s he them certainly respects
 ‘John’s friends? He certainly respects them.’

Below, we examine our four dislocation constructions with regard to WCO effects.

46) *TT*

Tomka_i to jego_i koledzy szanują.¹²
 Tomek-ACC to his_i friends-NOM respect
 ‘Tomek his friends respect.’

(Cegłowski, Tajsner 2006: 120)¹³

47) ‘*simple*’ *LD*

Tomka_i, to jego_i koledzy na pewno (go_i) szanują.
 Tomek-ACC PART his friends-NOM certainly him respect
 ‘Tomek, his friends certainly respect him.’

48) ‘*As for*’ *LD*

Jeśli chodzi o Tomka_i, to jego_i koledzy na pewno go_i szanują.
 if comes about Tomek PART his friends certainly him respect
 ‘As for Tomek, his friends certainly respect him.’

¹² See Wiland (2016: 138–139) who also shows amelioration of WCO in TT.

¹³ See also Orszulak (2011: 95).

49) *HT construction*

Tomek_i? Jego_i koledzy na pewno go_i szanują.
 Tomek-NOM his friends certainly him respect
 ‘Tomek? His friends certainly respect him.’

Grammaticality of examples (46) and (47) suggests a clash between the presence of reconstruction effects and the absence of WCO effects. Such a disagreement is, in fact, well-known in the literature (e.g., Grewendorf 2008; Cruschina 2021) and will be discussed in detail later on.

3.6 Parasitic gaps

Finally, we look at parasitic gaps in the four constructions in question. Example (50) presents a construction with two gaps, one being a real gap and the other a parasitic gap bound by an operator. As argued in literature, the existence of a parasitic gap depends on the presence of a real gap created by *wh*-movement (Engdahl 1983).

50) *TT*

Tamtą książkę to Jan przestudiował zanim zrecenzował
 that book-ACC PART John-NOM studied-3SG before reviewing
 a z tą to nie wiem co zrobił.
 and with that one PART not know-1SG what did
 ‘That book John studied before he reviewed it but I don’t know anything about this book.’

51) ‘*simple*’ *LD*

[Tamtą książkę]_i, to Jan (ja_i) przestudiował zanim zrecenzował.
 that book PART John-NOM her studied-3SG before reviewing
 ‘That book John studied it before he reviewed it.’

52) ‘*As for*’ *LD*

Jeśli chodzi o [tę książkę]_i, to Jan ja_i przestudiował
 if comes about this book PART John-NOM her studied
 zanim zrecenzował.
 before reviewing
 ‘As for this book, John studied it before he reviewed it.’

53) *HT*

Ta książka? Jan ją przestudiował zanim zrecenzował.
 this book-NOM John-NOM her studied before reviewing
 ‘This book? John studied it before he reviewed it.’

The licensing of the parasitic gaps in (50) and (51) is possible so the movement in TT and ‘simple’ LD has to be an A’-movement. Thus, the Engdahl (1983)’s condition is met. This observation appears to be valid also in ‘As for’ LD and HT dislocations.

3.7 Summary and conclusions

The relevant properties of the discussed constructions are summarized in the table below.

54)

	TT	'simple' LD	'As for' LD	HT LD
<i>Discourse functions</i>	C-topic	C-topic A-topic	A-topic	A-topic
<i>Resumptive elements</i>	absent	optional	obligatory with non subjects	obligatory with non subjects
<i>Agreement between the dislocate and the resumptive element</i>	n/a	person, number, gender, case	person, gender	person, gender
<i>Epithet as a resumptive element</i>	??	?	yes	yes
<i>Anaphoric binding</i>	yes	yes	no	no
<i>Principle C effects</i>	yes	yes	no	no
<i>Movement out of an island</i>	no	no	yes	yes
<i>SCO effects</i>	yes	yes	no	no
<i>WCO effects</i>	no	no	no	no
<i>Parasitic gaps</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Intonation break</i>	non existent	a gradient phenomenon		

Most of the criteria above divide topic dislocations into two groups. 'As for' LD and HT constructions pattern together and they show no features of movement. The dislocate is most probably base-generated in the left periphery, which accounts for a weakly constrained form of resumptive elements and the lack of reconstruction effects. In fact, it could be argued that what we see in HT and 'As for' LDs are not resumptive pronouns constrained by grammar but pronouns whose form is determined by discourse. In contrast, TT and 'simple' LD appear to share some features of movement, i.e. anaphoric binding, Principle C effects, lack of movement out of an island, and strong crossover effects. Despite those similarities, some of our observations seem to point to a non-movement nature of 'simple' LD. The very possibility of a resumptive pronoun in 'simple' LD could speak in favour of a base-generation analysis. In what follows we will try to account for the lack of WCO effects in TT and 'simple LD' as well as look at the nature of movement in TT and 'simple' LDs with optional resumptive pronouns.

4. Topicalization as non-quantificational movement

Topicalization has been argued to be a non-quantificational movement, hence the lack of WCO effects (Lasnik, Stowell 1991).¹⁴ In a non-quantificational relation the operator licensing a null epithet is dependent on an antecedent. The idea has been adopted by e.g., Safir (1996) and Pan (2016). The fact that we can use an epithet more or less successfully in all four dislocations under investigation gives us good grounds to support this standpoint.

Rizzi (1997) shows that focus movement is a quantificational movement in contrast to Topicalization. The features below go along with this division.

- 55) i. *Resumptive clitic* [typical of topics, impossible with foci]
 - ii. *Weak-Crossover* [foci give rise to WCO effects, topics do not]
 - iii. *Bare quantifiers* [they can be foci, but not topics]
 - iv. *Uniqueness* [there can be many topics, but only one focus per sentence]
 - v. *Compatibility with wh-phrases* [topics are compatible, foci are not]
- (Cruschina 2011: 54)

Below we compare TT with focus movement in Polish to see whether the two movements belong to two different types of dislocations.

- 56) *Resumption*
 ?*To JANOWI_i Maria sprzedała mu_i samochód. *Focus movement*
 PART John-DAT Mary-NOM sold him car
 ‘It was to John that Mary sold the car.’

- 57) *Weak-Crossover*
 ?*To Jana_i jego_i szef nagrodzi. *Focus movement*
 PART John-ACC his boss reward-3SG. FUT
 ‘It is John that his boss will reward.’

- 58) *Bare quantifiers*
 a. *Wszystko to Jan na pewno zje. *TT*
 all PART John-NOM certainly eat-FUT
 b. *To WSZYSTKO Jan zje. *Focus movement*
 PART everything John-NOM eat-FUT

- 59) *Uniqueness*
 a. see examples (22–25) *TT*
 b. A: Maria kupiła Piotrowi ciastka.
 Maria-NOM bought-3SG Peter-DAT biscuits
 ‘Mary bought Peter biscuits.’
 B: Nie. *To JANOWI TORT Maria kupiła. *Focus movement*
 No. PART John-DAT cake-ACC Mary-NOM bought

¹⁴ The quantificational accounts of Topicalization are not that uncommon, yet, they have not been widely discussed (see e.g., Sturgeon 2008: 33; Haegeman 2012: 133).

60) *Compatibility with wh-phrases*

- a. Jana_i to kiedy Maria zaprosiła? TT
 John-ACC PART when Mary-NOM invited-3SG
 'When did Mary invite John?'
 b. *Kiedy to JANA Maria zaprosiła? Focus movement
 when PART John-ACC Mary-NOM invited

The two types of movement differ. In focus constructions there are no resumptive elements and they do show WCO effects. The bare quantifier *wszyscy* 'all' is infelicitous in a TT and *to*-marked focus construction, yet, not exactly for the same reason. In both constructions the marker *to* requires a lexical item that is [+specific].¹⁵ Additionally, the focus marker *to* requires an exhaustive interpretation, which excludes *wszystko* 'all'. The focal *to* admits only one focus in contrast to the topical *to*, see (59). TT is compatible with a *wh*-movement at least on the surface. In (60a) the topic phrase co-occurs with the *wh*-phrase. Example (60b) with a focused phrase is no longer a real question. It resembles a corrective sentence. With this comparison we have shown that there are good grounds to adopt a non-quantificational view on topic movement.

The non-quantificational nature of topicalization is also observed in Hungarian (Lipták 2011). Topicalized items escape weaker islands and keep separate from quantificational elements like foci or *wh*-elements in the left periphery. Specifically, topics cannot occur between quantificational elements or be found below them. In (61) a topic between the focused phrase JANKOWI and the quantifier *każda* is ungrammatical. Both (61) and (62) show that neither a focused item nor a *wh*-item respectively can precede *to*-marked topics. Thus, topics seem to form a non-quantificational field of the left periphery.

- 61) *[JANKOWI]_F [tę książkę]_T to każda dziewczyna przeczytała dwukrotnie.
 John-DAT this book-ACC PART every girl-NOM read-3SG.PAST twice
 62) *[Kto] [Jankowi]_T to tę książkę przeczytał dwukrotnie?
 who John-DAT PART this book-ACC read-3SG.PAST twice

According to Grewendorf (2008), it is the nature of an empty category that stands behind the lack of WCO effects in both Italian CLLD and German LD as well as the non-quantificational nature of the topic movement. It also explains other differences between the two languages. The table below compares the distinctive features of Italian CLLD and German LD.

¹⁵ Bare quantifiers show no Discourse linking (Pesetsky 1987).

63) Italian CLLD vs. German LD

	<i>Movement properties</i>	<i>Non-movement properties</i>
<i>Italian CLLD</i>	Reconstruction effects Sensitivity to islands	No weak cross over No parasitic gaps
<i>German LD</i>	Reconstruction effects Parasitic gaps	No weak cross over No sensitivity to islands

(Grewendorf 2008)

If we compare the table in (63) with the table in (54), we can see that ‘simple’ LD in Polish shares more features with Italian CLLD than with German LD. That is, left dislocation in both languages is sensitive to islands and shows reconstruction effects but there are no weak cross effects. Yet, both German and Polish LD construction can license parasitic gaps. In Italian the Big DP first moves to the position below a verb. Then, the clitic attaches to the verb and the nominal phrase moves to a topic position (Cecchetto 2000). The trace of the clitic (an empty resumptive pronoun) is coindexed with the topicalized expression and intervenes between the parasitic gap and a gap left by the topicalized expression and no licensing of the parasitic gap is possible. In German, on the other hand, it is only the noun phrase that leaves the Big DP while the resumptive determiner stays inside the Big DP (Grewendorf 2008). Since no other empty category intervenes, it is possible for a non-operator gap of the moved DP to license the parasitic gap. Grewendorf’s proposal could also account also for the licensing of parasitic gaps in Polish. Let us propose that resumptive pronouns in Polish ‘simple’ LDs do not move out of the ‘Big DP’ as in German, which is why their trace does not intervene between the moved nominal phrase and the parasitic gap. The case-marked nominal phrase is their local binder. The weak acceptability of resumptives by some speakers may be connected with the observation made by Merchant (2001), who argues that resumptive-binding operators cannot be case-marked. Polish relative clauses seem to support that conclusion since resumptives can co-occur with the complementizer *co*, ‘that’, which is not case marked in contrast to the inflected *który*, ‘which’ (see Łęska 2016).

5. Aboutness phrase

Witkoś (2008) suggests that there must be a correlation between A-movement and the lack of WCO effects.¹⁶ Violations that result in weak crossover

¹⁶ The most recent support for A-movement type of explanation of the lack of WCO effects comes from Chierchia (2020) who maintains that their lack lies in the comparison of

effects are non-existent in the OVS word orders in Polish and are hardly ungrammatical in the OSV word orders (see also Wiland 2016). Since the movement in TT and ‘simple’ LD exhibits both A and A’ properties we propose that the object there must first move via some A-position before it reaches the SpecTopP. We believe that this A-position must be provided by Aboutness Phrase immediately dominating TP (for Russian see Wood, Livitz 2012). Postulating two A-positions does not seem to be new. Cardinaletti (2004) argues that there should be two subject positions; the higher one called SpecSubjP located below FinP and the lower one SpecAgrP. The former is a host of *the subject of predication* while the latter nests the *grammatical subject*. The head of SubjP carries a subject-of-predication feature, while the head of AgrP the EPP and φ -features. Witkoś (2008) maintains that the OSV word orders in Polish may have the so-called Generalized Inversion/Dislocation derivation. It includes A-movement of an object and the subject to the specifiers of TP. Both movements are possible due to the presence of [+multiple] EPP property on v and T. Subsequently the object moves to the SpecAgrP. In this way, the derivation of the OSV word order also includes extension of the binding domain. The moved object *Nowakom* can co-refer with *sobie*.

- 64) ?Nowakom₂ [nowe książki Kowalskich₁ o sobie_{1/2}] spodobały się
 Nowaks-DAT new-NOM books Kowalskis’ about each other liked
 już dawno.
 long time ago
 ‘The Nowaks got to like Kowalskis’ new books about themselves/each other long
 time ago.’

(Witkoś 2008: 304)

The object further undergoes A’-movement to some functional projection in the left periphery. A similar proposal has been made by Antonyuk (2021) for Russian OSV word orders. Since objects in the OSV orders in Russian bind reciprocals in the subject position they must first move to some ‘outer SpecTP’ position.

Citko, Germain, and Witkoś (2018) examine word orders with non-nominative items in apparent subject positions. The driving factor behind their analysis is the Labelling Algorithm (Chomsky 2015). They conclude that non-nominative items in the constructions in question lack subject properties and the constructions that contain them do not project SpecTP. None of the non-nominative items discussed by them moves via SpecTP as they do not show any typical subject properties, namely agreement with the verb, binding anaphors, raising to subject, controlling PRO, inverse scope and

topic heads with EPP heads. Topic heads as well as EPP heads share the semantic feature ‘aboutness’ and both introduce Discourse Referents. Since EPP heads (A-movement) obviate WCO effects Topic heads are expected to behave in the same way.

possible replacement by *pro*. Topics in TT and ‘simple’ LD do not seem to exhibit any of these features either.

We propose, after Rizzi (2018), that subjects and topics share the feature [aboutness]. Using the Calabrese test, Rizzi shows that *pro* may pick out the aboutness not only from subjects from the previous sentence but also from topics in a discourse. The two possibilities are presented below in Polish.¹⁷

65) Kiedy Jan_i uderzył Piotra_j *pro*_{i,j} był pijany.
 when John-NOM hit-3SG.PAST Peter-ACC was drunk
 ‘When John hit Peter, he was drunk.’

66) Piotr_i? Kiedy Jan go uderzył *pro*_i był pijany.
 Peter-NOM when John-NOM him hit-3SG.PAST was drunk
 ‘Peter? When John hit him, he was drunk.’

In (65) *pro* has the same referent as the subject in an adverbial clause, while in (66) *pro* may co-refer with the discourse topic.

The analysis that postulates A-movement of an object before it targets A'-position in TT and ‘simple’ LD seems to be supported by the observations made by Safir (1996) who proposes a consistency condition on A'-chains called A' Consistency, according to which, a binder can bind only identical expressions. Otherwise, WCO effects ensue. The chain should be either derivational, consisting of only copies (‘X dA-binds Y if X A-binds Y and Y is the trace’) or representational, consisting only of pronouns (‘X rA-binds Y if X A-binds Y and Y is not the trace of X’) (Safir 1996: 317). Importantly, movement of a non-quantificational element, which is the case with Topicalization leaves a *resumptive variable* and like other pronominal variables null resumptives are free from WCO effects. If we assume that an object in TT and ‘simple’ LD undergoes A-movement, the copy it leaves is not a true A'-copy. It is not a variable either.

67) X is a variable if X is locally A'-bound.

(Safir 1996: 317)

Thus, it can be argued to be a null resumptive. The uniformity of the chain is not broken and no WCO effects arise since the topicalized object binds representational items. The type of a resumptive that appears is not the one that requires A' binding. Reconstruction does not distinguish copies from resumptives so it is also possible with null pronouns (Safir 1996).

Let us now have a closer look at the [aboutness] feature. We propose that the head of the Aboutness Phrase is equipped with the following feature set: $\omega\phi$ -features, EPP feature and the [aboutness] feature. Why aboutness

¹⁷ Since, according to Rizzi (2018), all topics share the aboutness features we believe that the observation holds for other topics as well not only for a HT presented in (66).

feature? It is common in the literature to argue that one of the subject properties is aboutness (Rizzi 2005; Rizzi 2006; Rizzi, Shlonsky 2007; Rizzi 2018). According to Rizzi (2005, 2018), subjects share with topics the feature ‘aboutness’, which is also a motivation behind their movement to a subject position, thus subjects have the features [+aboutness, -D-linking], while topics are equipped with [+aboutness, +D-linking] because they are constrained by the discourse background. The aboutness properties of subjects should not be linked to information structure (Rizzi 2018). The negative bare quantifier can be found in a subject position, as in (68), which shows that subjects and topics should be kept separate.

- 68) A: Co się stało?
 what REFL happened
 B: Nikt (*to) nie przyszedł.
 nobody PART not came
 ‘No one has come.’

The topic interpretation of preverbal DPs refers to a common logical division of a sentence into a subject and a predicate, which is a discourse neutral context. Following Citko *et al.* we assume that due to Split Feature Inheritance in TT and ‘simple’ LDs the φ -features and the EPP feature are inherited by T while the feature [+aboutness] stays on the head of the Aboutness Phrase. The object equipped with the features [-aboutness, -D-linking] moves to the SpecAboutP to value the [-aboutness] feature.¹⁸ It moves further up to get anchored in the discourse. This is the case with the *OtoSV* word orders.¹⁹

As for the topicalized reflexives, they represent a reverse situation to the one where we have a topicalized noun and co-referring reflexives in the

¹⁸ In this paper we decide to call a discourse related feature [D-linking]. We do not commit ourselves to any specific analysis of discourse features here.

¹⁹ One of the reviewers remarks that sharing the [aboutness] feature by topics and subjects may lead to a violation of Relativized Minimality. The movement of a topic should be blocked by the subject that is equipped with the same feature. What we mean by sharing the [aboutness] feature between topics and subject is that both can carry it but not at the same time as there can be only one element over which the rest of the sentence predicates. In the presence of two nominal phrases in the vP, it is only one of them that receives this feature. If it is a nominal that eventually lands in the subject position, the other nominal will lack it. If it is a non-subject nominal that carries the [aboutness] feature, the subject nominal will not block a movement of an object as the [aboutness] feature has been already reserved for an object. The head of the Aboutness Phrase is equipped with φ -features, the EPP feature and the [aboutness] feature. The φ -features and the EPP feature are always lowered onto T, while the [aboutness] feature may either stay in the head of the Aboutness Phrase in the case of a topicalized object or be lowered to T (Split Feature Inheritance) in the absence of an object marked with the [aboutness] feature.

subject position. Apparently, the feature [aboutness] can belong to a set of features of nominal phrases excluding reflexives as they cannot function as subjects of predication. Thus, they undergo only an A'-movement.

6. (Non)resumptive 'simple' LD

Another question that arises is whether it is possible to unify a movement in TT and 'simple' LD constructions despite the presence of resumptive pronouns in the latter. Italian also has dislocation constructions with optional resumptive elements (dislocated dative object or locative) and those that lack resumptive pronouns (dislocated PP). Clitic-less constructions are instances of Simple Preposing (SP) (Cruschina 2021). Cruschina (2021) argues for a movement analysis of clitic and non-clitic dislocation constructions, both representing different types of A'-movement. The shared movement analysis follows from the lack of WCO effects and impossible licensing of parasitic gaps. They are sensitive to strong islands and display binding effects. Cruschina also brings to light three differences between them. Firstly, resumptive topics entail island effects (Rizzi 2004), while preposed adverbs and clitic-less PPs do not (Rizzi 2004). In the example of CLLDs from Rizzi (2004) a moved topic PP with a resumptive clitic appears to block the movement of a relative pronoun as the relative clause turns out to be infelicitous. A left dislocated adverbial and a plain PP without a resumptive pronoun do not yield any intervention effects. Therefore, CLLDs and SP must represent two different types of movements. Tomaszewicz (2012) argues that contrastive topics marked by *to* are incompatible with *if*-, *when*- and relative clauses, as shown in (69). The resumptive pronoun does not change grammaticality judgements, see (70).

69) TT

*Dzień, w którym listy to Maria wyśle Jankowi.
 day in which letters PART Mary send-3SG.FUT John-DAT
 'The day when Mary will send the letters to John.'

(Tomaszewicz 2012: 267)

70) 'simple' LD

*Dzień, w którym listy_i, to Maria wyśle (je) Jankowi.
 day in which letters PART Mary-NOM send-3SG. FUT them John-DAT

Secondly, Cruschina (2021) shows that long topicalization across two clause boundaries is illicit only for SP but not for CLLD. For Cegłowski and Tajsner (2006) fronting of an object in TT constructions out of an embedded clause is felicitous exactly like in 'simple' LD, see (71). In Polish

TT and ‘simple’ LD do not show much variation with regard to long topicalization.^{20, 21}

71) *TT*

Dziewczyny, to mówili, że spotkali w kinie.
 girls-ACC to said-3PL that met-3PL in cinema
 ‘As for the girls, they said they met them in the cinema.’

(Cegłowski, Tajsner 2006: 119)

72) ‘simple’ *LD*

[Ten komputer], to Marek podejrzewał, że Maria wie, że
 this computer PART Mark suspected that Mary-NOM knows that
 Jan chce (go) kupić
 Jan wants him buy

‘This computer Mark suspected that Mary knows that John wants to buy.’

example adopted from (Szczegielniak 2005: 53)

Thirdly, the dislocated topic can be omitted in CLLD but not in SP, which indicates that SP constructions in contrast to CLLD constructions have a gap and not a null clitic (a null resumptive element). TT devoid of any

²⁰ According to an anonymous reviewer, sentence (71) sounds better than sentence (72). It has been suggested that this may be due to the presence of *pro* subjects in the former and lexical subjects in the latter. We agree that (71) is slightly better than (72) but the exact reasons for that will have to remain the subject of a future investigation. Cegłowski and Tajsner (2006: 101) make a similar observation with regard to object fronting out of embedded clauses and argue that the difference is phonetic and not syntactic in nature.

²¹ One of the reviewers wonders how long-distance topic movement meets the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) formulated by Chomsky (2000, 2001). The condition requires that movement be strictly cyclic and proceed through the edges of phases such as vPs and CPs. In the paper it is argued that the *OtoSV* word order is derived via a complex movement of an object that first undergoes *A*-movement and then a discourse related *A'*-movement. To meet the PIC, the object first has to move to the edge of vP to be accessible to further operations. Since the object possesses an unvalued [aboutness] feature its movement to the edge of vP seems to be justified (cf. Bošković 2007) there is no feature checking in intermediate positions of successive-cyclic movement. However, as in the current approach and unlike in early minimalism, successive-cyclic movement starts before the final target of movement enters the structure, and Form Chain is eliminated. The locality of Move and the locality of Agree are shown to be radically different, Agree being free from several mechanisms that constrain Move, namely, phases and the Activation Condition. However, there is no need to take phases to define locality domains of syntax or to posit the Activation Condition as an independent principle. They still hold empirically for Move as theorems. The Generalized EPP (the “I need a Spec” property of attracting heads. Probes with their unvalued features have to c-command goals with matching valued features, hence further movement of the object to the specifier of the Aboutness Phrase. Agree is not blocked by PIC (Bošković 2007) so it could be argued that the [aboutness] feature is valued as result of a long-distance Agree. This scenario, however, would leave the object inside VP unable to undergo further movement due to PIC.

resumptive element disallows dropping of an object contrary to a resumptive ‘simple’ LD.

73) TT

?*(Janka to) widziałam wczoraj.
John-ACC PART saw-1SG yesterday

74) ‘simple’ LD

(Janka to) widziałam go wczoraj.
John-ACC PART saw-1SG him yesterday

Looking at the findings in table (54) and the sentences in (69-72) we can clearly see a strong similarity between TT and ‘simple’ LD. We would not reject completely the null resumptive analysis of TT. Given an elaborate context the sentence in (73) could be judged acceptable. The null resumptive analysis would explain the lack of WCO effects in TT in agreement with Saifir’s (1996) condition on the consistency of chains.

7. Conclusion

In this paper we discussed properties of four topic dislocations in Polish. Each dislocation was assigned by us a specific topic interpretation. We noted that TT and ‘simple’ LD are structurally similar and, most likely, should belong to the same category of dislocations. The second part of the paper tried to account for the lack of WCO effects in TT and ‘simple’ LD. We followed the proposal made by Witkoś (2008) and argued that an object first undergoes A-movement and then A’-movement. The biggest puzzle that we did not touch upon is the simultaneous existence of SCO effects and the lack of WCO effects. The puzzle, however, is not uncommon. Buring (2005: 173) shows that German displays SCO effects but no WCO effects in *wh*-questions and concludes that both types should be accounted for by different factors.

References

- ACKERMAN Lauren, FRAZIER Michael, YOSHIDA Masaya (2018). Resumptive pronouns can ameliorate illicit island extractions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49 (4), 847–859.
- ANDRASON Alexander. 2016. To resume or not to resume: Some remarks on “resumption” in left dislocation constructions in Polish, and its relevance for biblical Hebrew. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 50 (1), 185–199.
- ANTONYUK Svitlana. 2021. Russian OVS: Towards a better understanding of the construction’s properties and significance. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 29, 1–16.

- BENINCÀ Paola, POLETTO Cecilia (2004). Topic, focus and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In *The Structure of CP and IP, the Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Luigi Rizzi (ed.), 52–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BIANCHI Valentina, FRASCARELLI Mara (2010). Is topic a root phenomenon? *IBERIA: An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2, 43–88.
- BIRNER Betty J., WARD Gregory (2019). The interaction of topicalization and left-dislocation in English. *Anglophonia. French Journal of English Linguistics* 28 (December).
- BONDARUK Anna (2009). Constraints on predicate clefting in Polish. In *Studies in Formal Slavic Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantic and Information Structure*, Gerhild ZYBATOW, Uwe JUNGHANNS, Denisa LENERTOVÁ, Petr BISKUP (eds.), 65–79. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- BOŠKOVIĆ Željko (2007). On the locality and motivation of move and agree: An even more minimal theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38 (4), 589–644.
- BÜRING Daniel (2005). *Binding Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CARDINALETTI Anna (2004). Toward a cartography of subject positions. In *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Luigi Rizzi (ed.), 115–165. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CECCHETTO Carlo (2000). Clitic doubling and reconstruction. *Probus* 12 (1), 93–126.
- CEGŁOWSKI Piotr, TAJSNER Przemysław (2006). Topicalisation and object fronting in Polish. A view from a minimalist perspective. In *IFAtuation: A Life in IFA. A Festschrift for Professor Jacek Fisiak on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, Katarzyna DZIUBALSKA-KOŁACZYK (ed.), 99–131. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- CHIERCHIA Gennaro (2020). Origins of weak crossover: When dynamic semantics meets event semantics. *Natural Language Semantics* 28 (1), 23–76.
- CHOMSKY Noam (1977). On Wh-Movement. In *Formal Syntax*, Peter CULICOVER, Thomas WASOW, Adrian AKMAJIAN (eds.), 71–132. New York: Academic Press.
- CHOMSKY Noam (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- CHOMSKY Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY Noam (2000). Minimalist inquiries. In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, Richard MARTIN, David MICHAELS, Juan URIAGEREKA, Samuel J. KEYSER (eds.), 89–156. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY Noam (2001). Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, Michael KENSTOWICZ (ed.), 1–52. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY Noam (2015). Problems of Projection: Extensions. In *Structures, Strategies and Beyond: Studies in Honor of Adriana Belletti*, Elisa DI DOMENICO, Cornelia HAMANN, Simona MATTEINI (eds.), 1–16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CITKO Barbara, Allison GERMAIN, Jacek WITKOŚ (2018). If you cannot agree, move on! On labels and non-nominative subjects. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 3 (1).
- CRUSCHINA Silvio (2011). *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- CRUSCHINA Silvio (2021). Topicalization, dislocation and clitic resumption. *Studia Linguistica* 76 (2), 1–27.
- DUSZAK Anna (1984). Topical sentence positions in English and Polish. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 18, 55–70.
- ENGDAHL Elisabet (1983). Parasitic Gaps. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6 (1), 5–34.

- FRASCARELLI Mara (2000). *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- FRASCARELLI Mara (2019). Topics, conversational dynamics and the root/non-root distinction: Adverbial clauses at the discourse-syntax interface. In *Architecture of Topic*, Valéria MOLNÁR, Verner EGERLAND, Susanne WINKLER (eds.), 139–170. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- FRASCARELLI Mara, HINTERHÖLZL Roland (2007). Types of topics in German and Italian. In *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form: Generalizations across Languages*, Kerstin SCHWABE and Susanne WINKLER (eds.), 87–116. *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- FREY Werner (2005). Pragmatic properties of certain German and English left peripheral constructions. *Linguistics* 43 (1), 89–129.
- GREWENDORF Günther (2008). The left clausal periphery: Clitic left-dislocation in Italian and left-dislocation in German'. In *Dislocated Elements in Discourse Syntactic, Semantic, and Pragmatic Perspectives*, Benjamin SHAER, Philippa COOK, Werner FREY, Claudia MAIENBORN (eds.), 49–94. London: Routledge.
- HAEGEMAN Liliane (2012). *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and Composition of the Left Periphery: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 8*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- HAIDER Hubert (2010). *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- JASINSKAJA Katja (2016). Information structure in Slavic. In *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, Caroline FÉRY, Shinichiro ISHIHARA (eds.), 709–732. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KRAPOVA Iliyana, CINQUE Guglielmo (2008). Clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian. In *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, Dalina TASMOWSKI, Liliane TASMOWSKI (eds.), 257–88. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- KRIFKA Manfred (1999). Additive particles under stress. In *Proceedings of SALT 8*, Devon STROLOVITCH, Aaron LAWSON (eds.), 111–128. Cornell: CLC Publications.
- KUNO Susumo (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- LAMBRECHT Knud (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topics, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LASNIK Howard, STOWELL Tim (1991). Weakest crossover. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22 (4), 687–720.
- LIPTÁK Anikó (2011). The structure of the topic field in Hungarian. In *Mapping the Left Periphery*, Paola BENINCÀ, Nicola MUNARO (eds.), 163–198. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LÓPEZ Luis (2016). Dislocations and information structure. In *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, Caroline FÉRY, Shinichiro ISHIHARA (eds.), 402–421. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ŁĘSKA Paulina (2016). Agreement under case matching in Polish *co* and *który* relative clauses headed by numerically quantified nouns. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 24 (1), 113–136.
- MERCHANT Jason (2001). *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- MÜLLER Gereon (2018). Structure removal in complex prefields. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 36 (1), 219–264.
- ORSZULAK Marcin (2011). Focus and wh-movement in English and Polish: The cartographic approach. *Anglica Wratislaviensia* 49, 93–105.
- PAN Victor Junnan (2016). *Resumptivity in Mandarin Chinese: A Minimalist Account. Resumptivity in Mandarin Chinese*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- PERELTSVAIG Asya (2021). The OVS order in Russian: Where are the O and the V? *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 29 (FASL 28 extra issue), 1–15.
- PESETSKY David (1987). Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In *The Representation of (in)Definiteness*, Eric J. REULAND, Alice G. B. TER MEULEN (eds.), 98–129. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- POLINSKY Maria, POTSDAM Eric (2014). Left edge topics in Russian and the Processing of anaphoric dependencies. *Journal of Linguistics* 50, 629–669.
- REINHART Tanya (1981). Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27.
- RIZZI Luigi (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar: A Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Liliane HAEGEMAN (ed.), 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- RIZZI Luigi (2004). Locality and left periphery. In *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Adriana BELLETTI (ed.), 223–251. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- RIZZI Luigi (2005). On some properties of subjects and topics.’ In *Proceedings of the 30th Incontro Di Grammatica Generativa*, Laura BRUGE, Giuliana GIUSTI, Nicola MUNARO, Walter SCHWEIKERT, Giuseppina TURANO (eds.), 203–224. Venezia: Cafoscarina.
- RIZZI Luigi (2006). On the form of chains: Criterial positions and ECP effects. In *WH-Movement: Moving On*, Lisa LAI-SHEN CHENG, Norbert CORVER (eds.), 97–133. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- RIZZI Luigi (2018). Subjects, topics and the interpretation of Pro’. In *From Sounds to Structures: Beyond the Veil of Maya*, Roberto PETROSINO, Pietro CERRONE, Harry van der HULST (eds.), 510–529. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- RIZZI Luigi, SHLONSKY Ur (2007). Strategies of subject extraction. In *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky’s Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics*, Hans Martin GÄRTNER, Uli SAUERLAND (eds.), 115–160. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- ROSS Robert (1967). Constraints on Variabales in Syntax. PhD thesis, MIT.
- SAFIR Ken (1996). Derivation, representation, and resumption: The domain of weak crossover. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27 (2), 313–339.
- SHAER Benjamin (2008). German and English left-peripheral elements and the “Orphan” analysis of non-integration. In *Dislocated Elements in Discourse, Syntactic, Semantic and Pragmatic Perspective*, Benjamin SHAER, Philippa COOK, Werner FREY, Claudia MAIENBORN (eds.), 366–397. London: Routledge.
- STURGEON Anne (2008). *The Left Periphery. La.129*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- SUDHOFF Stefan (2010). *Focus Particles in German. La.151*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- SZCZEGIELNIAK Adam (2005). Relativization that you did. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics (Updated Version of a Harvard Doctoral Dissertation under the Title "Relativization and Ellipsis")* 24.
- TAKANO Yuji (2000). Illicit remnant movement: An argument for feature-driven movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31 (1), 141–156.
- TOMASZEWICZ Barbara (2012). The syntactic position of Polish by and main clause phenomena. In *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*, Albert AELBRECHT (ed.), 257–277. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- VERMEULEN Reiko (2010). *The Syntax of Topic, Contrast and Contrastive Topic*. Presented at the On Linguistics Interfaces II (OnLI II), The University of Ulster.
- WILAND Bartosz (2016). Le charme discret of remnant movement: Crossing and nesting in Polish OVS sentences. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 11 (3), 133–65.
- WITKOŚ Jacek (2008). On the correlation between A-type scrambling and lack of weak crossover effects'. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 44, 297–327.
- WOOD Jim, LIVITZ Inna (2012). *What Isn't an Oblique Subject in Icelandic and Russian?* University of Iceland.
- WURMBRAND Susi (2004). *No TP-Fronting Meets Nearly Headless Nick*. University of Connecticut.

Ewelina Mokrosz
ewelina.mokrosz(at)kul.pl
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Al. Raławickie 14
20-950 Lublin