Dennis Ott & Mark de Vries (University of Groningen) **Saturday 10:00**

Right-dislocation as deletion

The study of clausal peripheries, and in particular of the left periphery, has acquired a prominent role in syntactic theory. This talk aims to contribute to our understanding of the *right* periphery, focusing on right-dislocation (RD) constructions. In RD, a 'dislocated' XP (the *d*XP) appears at the outer right periphery of a host clause containing a correlative element. We argue that the *d*XP is the surface remnant of a separate clause, underlyingly parallel to the host clause, the rest of which is elided by a familiar type of clausal ellipsis. Our proposal has antecedents in work on Japanese/Korean (see Tanaka 2001 and Park & Kim 2009, among others), but has to our knowledge not been applied to other languages so far (but see remarks in Kayne 1994:78). Our goal is thus to extend and refine the ellipsis approach drawing on Germanic facts, and to firmly integrate RD into the typology of familiar elliptical constructions.

We address three subtypes of RD. In *backgrounding right-dislocation* (BRD), the *d*XP is deaccented and expresses discourse-old information:

(1) Ég þekki hana ekkert, *dóttur hans*. (Icelandic)
I know her:ACC nothing daughter his:ACC
'I don't know her at all, his daughter.'

In the afterthought (AT) construction, the *d*XP is a focus bearing an independent pitch accent. (2) is an example of a *specificational afterthought* (SAT), which specifies the denotation of the correlate:

(2) Ich habe heute einen Star getroffen, den John TraVOLta! (German)
I have today a:ACC star met the:ACC John Travolta
'I met a star today, John Travolta!'

A third type is the *predicative afterthought* (PAT), in which the *d*XP attributes a property to the referent of a clause-internal DP.

(3) Ich habe heute den John Travolta getroffen, ein berühmter STAR! (German)
I have today the:ACC John Travolta met a:NOM famous star
'I met John Travolta today, a famous star.'

BRD and SAT constructions display an intriguing and *prima facie* paradoxical array of properties. On the one hand, there is rather clear evidence that the *d*XP is not an integral constituent of the host clause. In terms of compositional semantics it is vacuous in BRD and 'added on' in ATs; prosodically, it does not affect the sentence accent of the host clause (unlike extraposition, which attracts the sentence accent); syntactically, it is vacuous, as evidenced by the fact that the host clause must always be syntactically complete by itself. Thus, we find a systematic contrast between RD of arguments and adjuncts, in that a clause-internal correlate is obligatory in the former but optional in the latter case (cf. Zwart 2001):

(4) a. Ik heb *('m) gezien, die man. b. Ik heb (toen) een man gezien, gisteren. (Dutch)
I have him seen that man I have then a man seen yesterday
'I saw *(him), that man.' 'I (then) saw a man, yesterday.'

Such facts are entirely unexpected on a rightward-movement analysis of RD; by contrast, they are expected if the *d*XP is external to the sentential domain defined by the host clause. The problem, however, is that a separate set of properties points in the opposite direction, betraying *connectivity* of the *d*XP into the clause. First, in case of argument dislocation the *d*XP bears the same θ-role as its correlate, and also covaries with it in case: see (1) and (2) above. Second, the *d*XP reconstructs for purposes of binding and scope. The following examples illustrate variable binding, satisfaction of Condition A, and violation of Condition C, respectively, in each case seemingly due to the presence of a binder in the host clause:

(5) a. Eines liebt jeder Lehrer$_i$: seine$_i$ Schüler. (German)
one thing loves every teacher his students
b. Dem kör han$_i$ ofta, sina$_i$ nya sportbilar. (Swedish)
them drives he often his.REFL new sportscars

c. *Ze$_i$ heeft hem gisteren nog gezien, Miekes$_i$ vriendje. (Dutch)
she has him yesterday still seen Mieke's boyfriend

We thus find a paradoxical constellation of properties that cannot be captured easily by either a base-generation or a movement analysis; RD squarely defies this traditional dichotomy. We therefore propose that the underlying representations are computed as biclausal structures, in which the linearly second clause is reduced by PF-deletion. That is, both BRD and SAT involve a juxtaposition of two clauses, underlyingly identical, *modulo* the difference between the *d*XP and its correlate. Semantic parallelism of the two clauses licenses ellipsis in the second, yielding the surface RD pattern:

(6) [$_{CP1}$ ich habe heute einen Star getroffen] [$_{CP2}$ den John TraVOLta [habe ich *t* getroffen]] → PF
[$_{CP1}$ ich habe heute einen Star getroffen] [$_{CP2}$ den John TraVOLta ~~[habe ich *t* getroffen]~~] (= (2))

The approach assimilates BRD/SAT to the class of constructions derived by clausal ellipsis, most notably sluicing (Merchant 2001), fragment answers (Merchant 2004), and split questions (Arregi 2010). Like the analyses just cited, ours has the advantage of deriving connectivity effects by attributing the relevant properties of the *d*XP to the grammatical relations it bears to elements (not in the host clause, but) inside the underlyingly parallel elliptical clause. Thus, matching θ-roles and case specifications of *d*XP and correlate are a straightforward consequence of both clauses containing the same case-assigning predicate (accusative *treffen* 'meet' in (6/2) above). Similarly, clausal parallelism as a precondition for ellipsis explains the observed reconstruction effects. In the examples in (5), the binder is not in fact a constituent of the host clause, but its counterpart within the parallel elliptical CP$_2$ c-commanding the *d*XP's trace:

(7) [$_{CP1}$ dem kör han ofta] [$_{CP2}$ sina$_i$ nya sportbilar ⟨ kör han$_i$ ofta *t* ⟩] (= (5b))

There is thus no direct reconstruction into the host clause, but rather ordinary reconstruction of the fronted XP within CP$_2$; this reasoning is directly analogous to Merchant's (2004) concerning connectivity in fragmentary responses (cf. *Who did John$_i$ see in the mirror? – Himself$_i$.*). In this way, the analysis allows us to have our cake and eat it, too: on the one hand, it correctly predicts connectivity effects (now understood to be a corollary of ellipsis parallelism); on the other, it explains the simultaneous signs of externality of the *d*XP, such as the syntactic independence of the host clause witnessed in (4).

We adduce further evidence for clausal structure underlying *d*XPs in BRD/SAT on the basis of right-dislocated PPs. Languages like German, which ban P-stranding under A-bar movement, require retention of a preposition in the *d*XP in such cases, whereas it is standardly omitted in P-stranding languages like Icelandic. Our analysis attributes this difference to leftward movement of the *d*XP within CP$_2$, analogously to Merchant's (2001, 2004) reasoning concerning parallel facts in sluicing/fragment answers.

The properties of PATs (as in (3)) suggest a slightly different analysis, however. Here we do not find case/binding connectivity into the host clause, as shown by the fact that the *d*XP in (3) bears nominative case. We propose that PATs are an instance of what Merchant (2004:725) terms *limited ellipsis*, i.e. ellipsis of the interior of a predicational copular clause, which does not require an explicit antecedent (compare *From Germany!*, which can be uttered out of the blue with a meaning like *This is from Germany!*).

(8) [$_{CP1}$ ich habe heute den John Travolta getroffen] [$_{CP2}$ ein berühmter Star [~~ist er *t*~~]] (= (3))
(cf. *Er ist ein:NOM berühmter Star.* 'He is a famous star.')

In sum, the ellipsis analysis of RD successfully derives the seemingly paradoxical constellation of properties thwarting monoclausal analyses that rely on either rightward movement or base-generation. More significantly, in doing so it relies exclusively on independently motivated grammatical computations (A-bar movement and PF-deletion), effectively eliminating RD as a construction.

References

Arregi, K. 2010. Ellipsis in split questions. *NLLT* 28. • Kayne, R. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MIT. • Merchant, J. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. OUP. • Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *L&P* 27. • Park, M.-K. & S.-W. Kim. 2009. The syntax of afterthoughts in Korean. *Ling Assoc Korea J* 17. • Tanaka, H. 2001. Right-dislocation as scrambling. *J Ling* 37. • Zwart, J.-W. 2001. Backgrounding ('right-dislocation') in Dutch. Ms., Groningen.