

# Italian Right Dislocation is Biclausal: An Argument from Binding

RoLinC 2021

Stefano Freyr Castiglione (UCL)

stefano.castiglione.20@ucl.ac.uk

Based on work done in collaboration with Ad Neeleman and Vieri Samek-Lodovici

# Overview

- Introduction and main claims
- Monoclausal analyses of Right Dislocation (RD) and the problem of variable binding
- An alternative: biclausal analyses
- Binding patterns with and without RD
- A connection with scope freezing?
- Conclusion

# Right Dislocation – main points

- A discourse-given constituent appears to the right edge of a clause;
- RD elements cannot receive contrastive interpretation;
- Cross-linguistically, RD elements are resumed by a clitic and do not leave a gap (Fernández-Sánchez & Ott 2020 for an overview);
- In Italian, cliticless RD is possible (Samek-Lodovici 2015);
  - Not to be confused with Marginalisation, i.e. de-stressing *in situ* of D-given elements.

# Main Claims

- Monoclausal analyses of RD cannot fully account for variable binding into right-dislocated categories;
- In a biclausal analysis of RD, variable binding can be easily explained;
- Two more assumptions are in order:
  - Clitics may be treated as *paycheck* pronouns (Elbourne 2008 a.o.);
  - Structures with a dative clitic (and, optionally, a RD IO) behave like Double Object Constructions (DOCs) and display scope freezing effects (Bruening 2001 a.o.).



# Monoclausal analyses of RD

(1)

|   | <i>Base-generation</i>                               | <i>A'-movement</i>                            |
|---|--|---|
| <i>Right-attachment</i>                       | (a) Cardinaletti 2002,<br>De Cat 2007                | (b) Vallduví 1992                             |
| <i>Left-attachment + individual movements</i> | -  | (c) Cecchetto 1999, Belletti 2004, Bocci 2013 |
| <i>Left-attachment + remnant TP movement</i>  | (d) Frascarelli 2004, Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007 | (e) Samek-Lodovici 2015                       |

# Right attachment with A'-movement (1b)

- Binding should be possible under reconstruction;
  - Grammaticality of binding into a RD category should parallel that of binding into a DP in its thematic position;
  - However, this is not always the case:
- (2) a. Ho presentato [ogni studente]<sub>i</sub> al suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> TUTOR.  
have.1SG introduced every student to.the his/his.own tutor  
'I introduced every student to their tutor.'
- b. \*Gli ho presentato [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>, al suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor.  
to-him have.1SG introduced every student, to.the his/his.own tutor

# Left attachment + individual movements (1c)

- RD is the result of movement to a low TopP (below TP), with, possibly, movement of other constituents across it;
  - These approaches may explain ungrammaticality in (2b) as the result of Weak Crossover (when crossing A'-movements are involved, e.g. with movement to a low FocP);
  - However, they would have to postulate a different kind of movement when subjects cross RD elements, as WCO effects do not arise:
- (3) a. [Ogni studente]<sub>i</sub> l'ha CONOSCIUTO, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor.  
every student him has met, the his/his.own tutor  
'Every student has met his/her tutor.'
- b. L'ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor.  
him has met every student, the his/his.own tutor

# Base-generation approaches

- No trace in of RD item in TP, so no reconstruction;
- Grammaticality of binding depends on the height of attachment of the binder;
- Preverbal subjects may bind into RD categories if they can c-command out of TP (e.g. Frascarelli 2004);
- But postverbal subjects can bind into RD categories, too (as in (3b)); this would be unexpected:

(3) a. [Ogni studente]<sub>i</sub> l'ha CONOSCIUTO, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor.  
every student him has met, the his/his.own tutor  
'Every student has met his/her tutor.'

b. L'ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor.  
him has met every student, the his/his.own tutor



# (A'-) Left attachment + remnant movement (1e)

- Samek-Lodovici (2015): clitic-resumed RD elements move from a “Big DP” (Cecchetto 1999 a.o.) whose head is the clitic, and should be able to reconstruct;
- This would explain why postverbal subjects can bind RD pronouns, as in (3b);
- But given a <DO IO> unmarked order, (2b) is still unaccounted for;
- In remnant movement configurations, Barss’ Generalisation (Barss 1986, Sauerland & Elbourne 2002, Heck & Assman 2014) applies:

## (4) *Barss’ Generalisation*

Reconstruction of  $\alpha$  is blocked when  $\alpha$  does not c-command its trace at surface level.

# More on Barss' Generalisation

- (5) a. [ $\exists$  Some young lady ] seems  $t'_{\exists}$  to be likely  $t_{\exists}$  to dance with [ $\forall$  every senator ].      $\exists > \forall; \forall > \exists$
- b. [ $_{\text{DegP}}$  How likely  $t_{\exists}$  to dance with [ $\forall$  every senator ] ] does [ $\exists$  some young lady ] seem to be  $t_{\text{DegP}}$ ?  
 $\exists > \forall; * \forall > \exists$

- Different analyses of Barss' Gen.:
  - Sauerland & Elbourne (2002): copy theory of reconstruction; subj. raising does not leave a copy;
  - Neeleman & van de Koot (2010): semantic computation based on feature percolation;
  - Heck & Assmann (2014): Lowering at LF and Strict Cycle Condition (Chomsky 1973).

# Monoclausal analyses – final remarks

- Because of Barss' Generalisation, the approach in (1e) makes the same predictions as the ones in (1d);
- Namely, that grammaticality of binding into RD categories ultimately depends on the binder's attachment height; reconstruction cannot be taken into account;
- In conclusion, none of the monoclausal approaches considered here can account for the data in (2-3);
- We turn to biclausal analyses to test whether they make the correct predictions.

# Biclausal Analyses of RD

- Ott & de Vries (2012, 2016) for Germanic, Fernández-Sánchez (2017) for Romance;
- Two clauses:
  - One (*host clause*) containing the *correlate* (clitic);
  - The other containing the dislocate; the rest of the second clause undergoes ellipsis;
- The two structures are in a coordination relation, established (in Ott & de Vries 2016) by an abstract colon head (Koster 2000).



# Biclausal Analyses of RD

(6) a. L'ho visto IERI, Gianni.

him have.1SG seen yesterday John

'I saw him yesterday, John.'

b. [<sub>P</sub> [<sub>S</sub> L'ho visto IERI] [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>S</sub> ~~ho visto Gianni ieri~~]]]

him have.1SG seen yesterday have.1SG seen John yesterday

# Binding into RD items

- There cannot be binding from one clause into the other, as there is no c-command;
- Rather, two independent binding relations must be established;
- This is easily accounted for in the second clause; but what about the first?

(7) [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>S</sub> L'ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>], [<sub>CP</sub> :° [<sub>S</sub> ~~ha conosciuto~~ il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor

him has met every student has met the his/his.own tutor

[~~ogni studente~~<sub>i</sub>]]]

every student

# Binding into a clitic

- In the first clause, no possessor is present;
- However, a pronoun may sometimes stand for an expression containing a bound variable: a “paycheck pronoun” (Karttunen 1969, Cooper 1979, Heim & Kratzer 1998, Elbourne 2000, 2008):

(8) The man who gave his paycheck to his wife is wiser than the man who gave **it** to his mistress.
- If clitics allow “paycheck” readings, binding in the first clause can be easily accounted for.

# Binding into a clitic

- With a paycheck reading, the clitic would have to be interpreted as a definite description (Cooper 1979, Elbourne 2000);
- The clitic in (9) stands for the definite description *il suo/proprio tutor*, this allows the distributive reading;
- Crucially, this reading is allowed regardless of the presence of a RD item:

(9) [Context: The department has assigned a tutor to each student]  
Oggi  $l_{[...i...]}$  'ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub> (, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).  
today him has met every student (the his/his.own tutor)  
'Today, every student met their tutor.'



# Binding into a clitic

- Thus, paycheck clitics explain covariance in the absence of c-command by the RD category (and in the absence of RD altogether);
- In sum, the biclausal analysis predicts that binding into a RD element is possible iff:
  - 1) In the first clause, the clitic can be construed as a paycheck pronoun;
  - 2) In the second clause, binding into the corresponding element is grammatical.
- This analysis will be shown to make the correct predictions for a wider set of data.

# Full grammaticality

- It is obtained when both clauses in the biclausal structure are fully grammatical:

(10) [Context: The department has assigned a tutor to each student]

- a. Oggi, [ogni studente]<sub>i</sub> l<sub>[...i...]</sub>'ha CONOSCIUTO (, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).  
today every student him has met (the his/his.own tutor)
- b. Oggi [ogni studente]<sub>i</sub> ha conosciuto il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> TUTOR.  
today every student has met the his/his.own tutor  
'Today, every student met their tutor.'

# Full grammaticality

- (11) a. [Nessuno studente]<sub>i</sub> l<sub>[...i...]</sub>'ha ancora CONOSCIUTO (, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).  
no student him has yet met (the his/his.own tutor)
- b. Nessuno studente ha ancora conosciuto il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> TUTOR.  
no student has yet met the his/his.own tutor  
'No student has met their tutor yet.'

# Full grammaticality

- (12) a. Oggi  $l_{[...i...]}$  ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub> (, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).  
today him has met every student (the his/his.own tutor)
- b. Oggi ha conosciuto il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>.  
today has met the his/his.own tutor every student  
'Today, every student met their tutor.'



# Full grammaticality

- (13) a. Non  $l_{[...i...]}$ 'ha ancora conosciuto [nessuno STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub> (, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).

NEG him has yet met no student (the his/his.own tutor)

- b. Non ha ancora conosciuto il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor [nessuno STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>.

NEG has yet met the his/his.own tutor no student

'No student has met them yet (their tutor).'

# Ungrammaticality in two clauses

- When both clauses are ungrammatical, the whole sentence is predicted to be ungrammatical:

(14) a. \*Oggi, *pro*<sub>[...i...]</sub> gli ha presentato [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>, a Gianni (, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).

today to-him has introduced every student to John (the his/his.own tutor)

b. \*Oggi, il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor gli ha presentato [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>, a Gianni.

today the his/his.own tutor to-him has introduced every student to John

Intended: 'Today, every student's tutor introduced that student to John.'

# Ungrammaticality in one clause

- Second clause is grammatical, first clause is ungrammatical;
- Example with DO quantifier and dative clitic;
- A direct object cannot bind into a dative clitic, whether the RD item is present or not;
- The baseline clauses without clitics are grammatical.

# Ungrammaticality in one clause

- (15) a. \*Oggi gli<sub>[...i...]</sub> ho presentato [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub> (, al suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).  
today to-him have.1SG introduced every student (to.the his/his.own tutor)
- b. Oggi ho presentato [ogni studente]<sub>i</sub> al suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> TUTOR.  
today have.1SG introduced every student to-the his/his.own tutor  
'Today, I introduced every student to their tutor.'
- (16) a. \*Non gli<sub>[...i...]</sub> ho ancora presentato [nessuno STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub> (, al suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).  
NEG to-him have.1SG yet introduced no student (to.the his/his.own tutor)
- b. Non ho ancora presentato [nessuno studente]<sub>i</sub> al suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> TUTOR.  
NEG have.1SG yet introduced no student to.the his/his.own tutor  
'I haven't introduced any student to their tutor yet.'



# Ungrammaticality in one clause

- (17) [Context: Several authors have sent me one of their articles]
- a. \*Questa settimana ci ho discusso [ogni ARTICOLO]<sub>i</sub> (, col suo<sub>i</sub> autore).  
this week with-him have.1SG discussed every article (with-the its author)
- b. Questa settimana ho discusso [ogni articolo]<sub>i</sub> col suo<sub>i</sub> AUTORE.  
this week have.1SG discussed every article with-the its author  
'This week, I discussed every article with its author.'
- (18) a. \*Non ci ho ancora discusso [nessun ARTICOLO]<sub>i</sub> (, col suo<sub>i</sub> autore).  
NEG with-him have.1SG yet discussed no article (with-the its author)
- b. Non ho ancora discusso [nessun articolo]<sub>i</sub> col suo<sub>i</sub> AUTORE.  
NEG have.1SG yet discussed no article with-the its author  
'I haven't discussed any article with its author yet.'

# Ungrammaticality in one clause – pt. 2

- The first clause is grammatical, the second clause is not;
- When the RD category is absent, the sentences are grammatical;
- When it is present, there is variation among speakers' judgments.

# Ungrammaticality in one clause – pt. 2

- (19) [Context: The department has assigned a tutor to each student]
- a. Oggi  $l_{[...i...]}$ 'ho presentato ad [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub> (, il %suo<sub>i</sub>/%proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor).  
today him have.1SG introduced to every student (the his/his.own tutor)  
'Today, I introduced to every student their tutor.'
- b. Ho presentato il ?suo<sub>i</sub>/??proprio<sub>i</sub> tutor ad [ogni STUDENTE]<sub>i</sub>.  
have.1SG introduced the his/his.own tutor to every student
- c. Ho presentato ad [ogni studente]<sub>i</sub> il suo<sub>i</sub>/proprio<sub>i</sub> TUTOR.  
have.1SG introduced to every student the his/his.own tutor

# Ungrammaticality in one clause – pt. 2

- (20) a. Non  $l_{[...i...]}$ 'ho ancora presentato a  $[\text{nessuno STUDENTE}]_i$  (, il  $\%suo_i/\%proprio_i$  tutor).  
NEG him have.1SG yet introduced to no student (the his/his.own tutor)  
'I haven't introduced them to any student yet (their tutor).'
- b. Non ho ancora presentato il  $?suo_i/??proprio_i$  tutor a  $[\text{nessuno STUDENTE}]_i$ .  
NEG have.1SG yet introduced the his/his.own tutor to no student
- c. Non ho ancora presentato a  $[\text{nessuno studente}]_i$  il  $suo_i/proprio_i$  TUTOR.  
NEG have.1SG yet introduced to no student the his/his.own tutor



# Binding by DO quantifier phrases

- (15-18) seem to show a peculiar property of ditransitive structures;
- Binding by a DO quantifier into an IO is possible when the clitic is absent, but impossible when the clitic is present;
- The same happens with the clitic *ci*;
- The judgments given follow from the biclausal analysis, but raise a question:
- Why are DOs unable to bind into dative and locative (paycheck) clitics?

# A connection with scope freezing?

- This behaviour may be explained in terms of scope freezing (Barss & Lasnik 1986, Larsson 1988, Bruening 2001 a.o.);
- In a configuration in which the Goal c-commands the Theme, scope is frozen, with the Goal outscoping the Theme (Williams 2006):

(21) a. Mary gave every toy to a child. b. \*Mary gave a child every toy.  $\forall > \exists$   
c. Mary gave a toy to every child. d. Mary gave every child a toy.

# A connection with scope freezing?

- Frozen scope has been shown to affect binding patterns, too (Barss & Lasnik 1986, Bruening 2001);
- In Double Object Constructions (DOCs), the Theme cannot take scope over a c-commanding Goal/Recipient;
- The relevant cases observed for Italian (with a dative clitic, or with *ci*) may be analysed as an instance of DOCs.

# DOCs in Italian

- Argued for by other authors;
- Holmberg et al. (2017) show Italian may have DOCs with an inanimate causer subject;
- In Italian, the Recipient cannot be passivised, although for independent reasons;
- Pineda (2020) argues for DOCs in Romance (mainly Spanish and Catalan, but also Italian).



# Concluding remarks

- Monoclausal analyses of RD run into problems when accounting for variable binding into RD categories;
- A biclausal analysis may explain the whole range of data by assuming two independent, parallel binding relations;
- In the first clause, the clitic may be treated as a paycheck pronoun;
- This explains why absence of a RD item does not affect binding;

# Concluding remarks

- When both clauses are grammatical, the whole sentence will be grammatical;
- When both clauses are ungrammatical, the whole sentence will be ungrammatical;
- The same will happen even if only one clause is ungrammatical;
- Ungrammaticality of binding by a DO into a dative may be explained in terms of scope freezing.

# Plans for future research

- The internal structure of the elided sentence;
  - Does the RD element remain *in situ* (Fernández-Sánchez, 2017) or does it undergo movement (Ott & de Vries, 2016)?
  - Evidence from (lack of) NPIs?
- Interaction between clitic-resumed RD and cliticless RD (Samek-Lodovici 2015), especially in the case of multiple dislocations.

# References

- Barss, A. (1986). Chains and anaphoric dependence [PhD dissertation]. MIT.
- Barss, A., & Lasnik, H. (1986). A note on anaphora and double objects. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 17, 347–354.
- Belletti, A. (2004). Aspects of the Low IP Area. In L. Rizzi (Ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures* (Vol. 2, pp. 16–51). Oxford University Press.
- Bocci, G. (2013). *The Syntax–Prosody Interface: A cartographic perspective with evidence from Italian* (Vol. 204). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bruening, B. (2001). QR obeys Superiority: Frozen scope and ACD. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 33(2), 233–273.
- Cardinaletti, A. (2002). Against Optional and null clitics. Right dislocation vs. Marginalization. *Studia Linguistica*, 56(1), 29–57.
- Cecchetto, C. (1999). A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica*, 53(1), 40–67.
- Cooper, R. (1979). The Interpretation of Pronouns. In F. Heny & H. Schnelle (Eds.), *Selections from the Third Groningen Round Table* (Vol. 10). Academic Press.
- De Cat, C. (2007). French dislocation without movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 25(3), 485–534.
- Elbourne, P. D. (2008). The Interpretation of Pronouns. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(1), 119–150.
- Fernández-Sánchez, J. (2017). Right dislocation as a biclausal phenomenon [PhD dissertation]. UAB.
- Fernández-Sánchez, J., & Ott, D. (2020). Dislocations. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 14(9), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12391>
- Frascarelli, M. (2004). Dislocation, Clitic Resumption and Minimality. A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Topic Constructions in Italian. In R. Bok-Bennema, B. Hollebrandse, B. Kampers-Manhe, & P. Sleeman (Eds.), *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* (Vol. 256, pp. 99–118). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.256.07fra>
- Frascarelli, M., & Hinterhölzl, R. (2007). Types of topics in German and Italian. In K. Schwabe & S. Winkler (Eds.), *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today* (Vol. 100, pp. 87–116). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.100.07fra>



# References

- Heck, F., & Assmann, A. (2014). Barss' Generalization and the strict cycle at LF. In A. Assmann, S. Bank, D. Georgi, T. Klein, P. Weisser, & E. Zimmermann (Eds.), *Topics at InfL (Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 92)* (pp. 527–560). Universität Leipzig.
- Heim, I., & Kratzer, A. (1998). *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Blackwell.
- Holmberg, A., Sheehan, M., & van der Wal, J. (2019). Movement from the Double Object Construction Is Not Fully Symmetrical. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 50(4), 677–722. [https://doi.org/10.1162/ling\\_a\\_00322](https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00322)
- Karttunen, L. (1969). Pronouns and Variables. In R. Binnick et al. (Eds.), *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (Vol. 5, pp. 108–116). Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.
- Koster, J. (2000). Extraposition as parallel construal. Ms., University of Groningen.
- Ott, D., & de Vries, M. (2012). Thinking in the right direction: An ellipsis analysis of right-dislocation. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 29, 123–134.
- Ott, D., & de Vries, M. (2016). Right-dislocation as deletion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 34(2), 641–690.
- Pineda, A. (2020). Double-Object Constructions in Romance: The Common Denominator. *Syntax*, 23(3), 203–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/synt.12193>
- Neeleman, A., & Van De Koot, H. (2010). A local encoding of syntactic dependencies and its consequences for the theory of movement. *Syntax*, 13(4), 331–372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2010.00143.x>
- Samek-Lodovici, V. (2015). *The interaction of focus, givenness, and prosody: A study of Italian clause structure* (First edition). Oxford University Press.
- Sauerland, U., & Elbourne, P. (2002). Total Reconstruction, PF Movement, and Derivational Order. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 33(2), 283–319.
- Vallduví, E. (1992). *The Informational Component*. New York: Garland.
- Williams, E. (2006). Circumstantial Evidence for Dative Shift. In H. Broekhuis et al. (Eds.), *Organizing Grammar: Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk* (pp. 661–668). Berlin: Mouton.

Thank you!