Right-dislocation as deletion*

Dennis Ott
Humboldt University of Berlin
dennis.ott@post.harvard.edu

Mark de Vries
University of Groningen
mark.de.vries@rug.nl

October 27, 2014

Abstract

While the left clausal periphery has been in the center of attention of syntactic theory since the 1970s, the right periphery remains comparatively ill-understood. The goal of this paper is to rectify this situation. We argue that Germanic right-dislocation constructions are composed of two juxtaposed clauses, the dislocated peripheral XP being a remnant of ellipsis in the second clause. This analysis explains the extra-sentential status of right-dislocated constituents while simultaneously accounting for signs of syntactic connectivity. These two seemingly conflicting facets are reconciled in a manner familiar from deletion-based accounts of sluicing and fragment answers, i.e. by attributing the relevant (apparent) grammatical interactions to parallel but silent clausal structure. We show that this analysis successfully derives the core properties of both backgrounded and focused ('afterthought') phrases at the right periphery, whereas monosentential movement or base-generation accounts necessarily fall short of accounting for the observed facts. The analysis not only eliminates a putative case of rightward movement, but shows that right-dislocation can be fully understood in terms of independently motivated computations, thereby removing constructional residue from the theory of Universal Grammar.

Keywords: right-dislocation; ellipsis; backgrounding; afterthoughts

*For comments and discussions we thank Noam Chomsky, Anika Dewald, Marcel den Dikken, Javi Fernández, James Griffiths, Erich Groat, Andreas Haida, Marlies Kluck, Clemens Mayr, Jason Merchant, Hubert Truckenbrodt, Jan-Wouter Zwart, three anonymous *NLLT* reviewers, as well as audiences at *Syntax Lab* (University of Leiden), *Ling-Lunch* (MIT), *Syntax Interface Lectures* (University of Utrecht), the workshop *Non-sentential constituents at the right periphery* (Humboldt University of Berlin), *GGS 38* (University of Freiburg), the 2012 and 2013 *TiN Dag* (University of Utrecht), *TABU Dag 2012* (University of Groningen), *NELS 43* (CUNY, New York), and the *87th Annual Meeting of the LSA* (Boston). For assistance with the data, we are indebted to Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (Icelandic), Sverre Stausland Johnsen (Norwegian), and Christer Platzack and Eric Lander (Swedish). This research was financially supported by the European Research Council.

1 Introduction

This paper proposes an analysis of right-dislocation constructions in Germanic according to which right-dislocated XPs are remnants of clausal ellipsis. That is, right-dislocation constructions are underlyingly bisentential, the linearly second sentence reduced up to a remnant XP that surfaces in juxtaposition to the unreduced left-hand clause. To keep the discussion within manageable proportions, most of our examples will be drawn from German and Dutch; however, since similar proposals have been advanced for parallel constructions in unrelated languages (see section 3), the analysis aspires to crosslinguistic validity.

Before delving into the details of our proposal, a clarification of the term 'right-dislocation,' and hence of the scope of our analysis, is in order; this is the purpose of section 2. In section 3, we explicate and develop our ellipsis-based analysis in detail, showing that it ties in neatly with related proposals and effectively eliminates right-dislocation as a construction. Section 4 is devoted to demonstrating how the ellipsis analysis captures the central properties of right-dislocation; in the course of the discussion, we also show that alternative analyses face significant conceptual and empirical problems, eschewed by our approach. Section 5 discusses various constraints on right-dislocation and shows these to follow either directly from the analysis or else from extraneous factors. Section 6 deals with predicative afterthoughts, a specific type of right-dislocation which we set aside in the preceding sections, and show to be amenable to a similar analysis. Section 7 concludes.

2 Background and empirical scope

Let us first outline some basic assumptions concerning terminology and scope of our proposal. We will here be using 'right-dislocation' (henceforth, RD) as a cover term for various phenomena that are sometimes terminologically distinguished, but which we believe (and intend to show in what follows) ought to be considered a unitary syntactic phenomenon. All of these phenomena have the following basic syntactic format:

(1) $\overbrace{[_{\text{CP}} \ldots \text{ correlate}_i \ldots]}^{\text{host clause}}\ d\text{XP}_i$

Descriptively speaking, RD constructions involve a *host clause* that is linearly followed by the dislocated XP, *d*XP for short. The *correlate* is a (potentially covert) element of the host clause that is cataphorically linked to the *d*XP. We assume that various phenomena are based on this kind of syntactic representation (to be refined in what follows), while differing at the level of information structure.[1]

[1] On discourse-functional aspects of RD, see Altmann 1981; Lambrecht 2001; Averintseva-Klisch 2009; Truckenbrodt 2013, in press; Dewald 2012.

One instance of (1), and hence a subtype of RD, is *backgrounding* (sometimes just called 'right-dislocation'). In this construction type a host-internal pronoun[2] resumes a discourse topic, and a coreferent deaccented XP occurs at the right periphery (here and throughout, low and level intonation is indicated by small italics):

(2) A: Kennst du den Peter? – B: Ja, den kenne ich, *den Peter*.
know you the Peter yes him know I the Peter
A: 'Do you know Peter?' – 'Yes, I know him, Peter.' (German)

(3) Tasman heeft ze gezien, *die Maori's*.
Tasman has them seen those Maoris
'Tasman saw them, those Maoris.' (Dutch; Zwart 2011, 78)

Note that while a backgrounded *d*XP is discourse-given, it nevertheless is, and must be, descriptively richer than its correlate; we return to this fact in section 3.

In the *afterthought* (AT) variety of RD, the *d*XP expresses discourse-new information about the referent of its correlate and is consequently realized with focal stress (coarsely represented throughout by small capitals on the entire phrase):[3]

(4) a. Ich habe heute einen Star getroffen: DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA!
I have today a star met the John Travolta
'I met a star today: John Travolta!' (German)

b. Jan heeft iets moois gebouwd: EEN GOUDEN IGLO.
Jan has something beautiful built a golden igloo
'Jan built something beautiful: a golden igloo.' (Dutch)

The choice of correlates in backgrounding and AT constructions is appropriate to their respectively discursive roles. In backgrounding, the correlate resumes a discourse topic, hence is typically a pro-form (or epithet; cf. footnote 2), and the focus within the host clause falls elsewhere. By contrast, the correlate of an AT introduces a new referent, to be specified by the *d*XP, and is consequently typically realized as a focused indefinite DP.[4]

[2]While typically pronominal, the correlate of a backgrounded XP can also be epithetic, as shown in the following (based on an example in Averintseva-Klisch 2009, 22):

(i) Und da hat die Tussi auch noch geheult, *die dumme Kuh*.
and then has the broad even still blubbered the stupid cow
'And then the broad started blubbering, the stupid cow.' (German)

We set this case aside here, since it does not appear to differ relevantly from RD with pronominal correlates.

[3]ATs but not backgrounded *d*XPs can be preceded by focus-sensitive particles such as *namely*. Interesting questions arise about the nature of these particles and their distribution (see, e.g., Onea and Volodina 2009), but the matter is beyond the scope of the present article.

[4]In the absence of an overt correlate (see below), some other constituent bears focus.

The examples in (4) feature *specificational* ATs: the *d*XP specifies the meaning of the correlate.[5] This case must be distinguished from *predicative* ATs:

(5) a. Ich habe heute den John Travolta getroffen, EIN BERÜHMTER STAR!
I have today the John Travolta met a famous star
'I met John Travolta today, a famous star!' (German)

b. Hij kwam binnen, DOODSBLEEK.
he came inside pale white
'He came in, pale white.' (Dutch)

There is reason to believe that specificational and predicative ATs have slightly different underlying structures. In what follows, we will largely focus on backgrounding and specificational ATs, deferring the analysis of predicative ATs to section 6.

It is furthermore necessary to distinguish RD from extraposition; given that the set of categories that can undergo extraposition (CP and PP) is a subset of the categories that can be dislocated (see section 5.1), surface strings are potentially ambiguous. In these cases intonation serves as a means of distinguishing between the different readings. Therefore, let us briefly highlight the prosodic differences between backgrounding and ATs, and compare these to extraposition. The examples in (6) illustrate the three types; small caps indicate sentence accents, slash and backslash a major rise or fall in pitch, and small italics low and level intonation, as before.

(6) a. Joop heeft een ar/TIkel geschreven over TAAL\kunde. [extraposition]
Joop has an article written on linguistics
'Joop wrote an article on linguistics.'

b. Joop had ze nog /NIET geLE\zen, *die artikelen*. [backgrounding]
Joop had them yet not read those articles
'Joop had not read them yet, those articles.'

c. Joop had iets interes/SANTS\ gelezen: een ar/TIkel over TAAL\kunde. [AT]
Joop had sth. interesting read an article on linguistics
'Joop had read something interesting, an article on linguistics.' (Dutch)

In the case of extraposition (6a), the familiar 'hat contour' (cf. Keijsper 1984; Féry 1993, among others) straddles the right sentence bracket: the main sentence accent is shifted to a syllable within the extraposed phrase (independently of potential contrastive pitch accents). For backgrounding (6b) this is crucially not the case.[6] Likewise, in the presence of an AT (6c) the host clause remains prosodically unaffected; but in this case a second intonational

[5] Ross (1969a) refers to these constructions as 'equatives.'

[6] The usual orthography suggests a pause. Often, a potential pause is not phonetically realized at all, but it can be. Accented ATs and deaccented backgrounded *d*XPs differ in the expected way: the former permit a longer prosodic break much more readily than the latter, deaccented *d*XPs being prosodically less independent due to the absence of an additional sentence accent (Truckenbrodt in press).

main contour arises, containing its own pitch accent (cf. Truckenbrodt in press). In short, whereas extraposition attracts the sentence accent, RD never does.[7] We return to *syntactic* differences between RD and extraposition in sections 4.1 and 5.3 below.

We include in our definition of RD dislocated clauses that are either backgrounded or focused and linked to a correlate (cf. Zwart 2001):

(7) a. {Es / Das} hat mich sehr überrascht, *dass er das gesagt hat.*
it that has me very surprised that he that said has
'It/That surprised me very much, that he said that.'

b. Eines hat mich sehr überrascht: DASS ER DAS GESAGT HAT.
one thing has me very surprised that he that said has
'One thing surprised me very much: that he said that.' (German)

Note that while superficially similar, cases like (7a) differ from genuine *it*-extraposition in their intonational properties, in the way described above. The indicated alternation with *d*-pronouns shows that subject *es* is argumental rather than expletive (cf. Bennis 1986).[8]

While the examples given so far show right-dislocated arguments, adjuncts, too, can occur in right-peripheral position, either backgrounded or focused:

(8) A: Was ist am Dienstag passiert? – B: Da habe ich Maria geküsst, *am Dienstag.*
what is on Tuesday happened then have I Maria kissed on Tuesday
'What happened on Tuesday?' – 'I kissed Mary then, on Tuesday.' (German)

(9) Ich werde bald John Travolta treffen – AM DIENSTAG!
I will soon John Travolta meet on Tuesday
'I'm going to meet John Travolta soon – on Tuesday!' (German)

The intonational properties outlined above allow for right-peripheral adjuncts to be identified as instances of RD even in the absence of an overt correlate (see below): extraposed but not dislocated adverbials can be the sole bearers of sentence stress.

In what follows, we develop a unified analysis of the abovementioned types of RD, according to which their syntactic representation consists of two linearly sequential clauses, which are underlyingly parallel, *modulo* the difference between *d*XP and correlate.

[7] It follows that a right-peripheral *d*XP that cannot be parsed as having undergone extraposition can never be the sole accent-bearing element of the sentence:

(i) *Joop heeft ze gelezen DIE ARTIKELEN.
Joop has them read those articles
'Joop read them, those articles.' (Dutch)

[8] The distinction between dislocated and extraposed clauses is somewhat more complicated than we can discuss here. For further detailed discussion, see Frey 2011 and references provided there.

3 *d*XPs as peripheral fragments

Building on ideas in de Vries 2007a, 2009a, 2011b, we propose that RD constructions are underlyingly biclausal structures, in which two clauses (call them CP_1 and CP_2) are juxtaposed. CP_1 is the host clause containing the correlate; CP_2 is a parallel, linearly subsequent clause, which contains the *d*XP in place of the correlate. Schematically:

(10) $[_{CP_1} \ldots \text{ correlate } \ldots] [_{CP_2} \ldots \ d\text{XP} \ldots]$

Within CP_2, the *d*XP is fronted to the edge (*prefield*) of that clause (11a); at PF, the remainder of the clause is elided (11b):

(11) a. $[_{CP_1} \ldots \text{ correlate } \ldots] [_{CP_2} \ d\text{XP}_i [\ldots \ t_i \ \ldots]] \rightarrow$ PF-deletion
b. $[_{CP_1} \ldots \text{ correlate } \ldots] [_{CP_2} \ d\text{XP}_i \ \sout{[\ldots \ t_i \ \ldots]}]$

To illustrate in a more concrete fashion, consider the examples of backgrounding and specificational ATs given in the preceding section, repeated in (12a) and (13a). According to our proposal, these are represented as shown in (12b) and (13b), respectively:[9]

(12) a. Tasman heeft ze gezien, *die Maori's*.
Tasman has them seen those Maoris
'Tasman saw them, those Maoris.'

b. $[_{CP_1}$ Tasman heeft ze gezien $]$ $[_{CP_2}$ die Maori's$_i$ [~~heeft Tasman t_i gezien~~]]

(13) a. Ich habe einen Star getroffen: DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA.
I have a star met the John Travolta
'I met a star, John Travolta.'

b. $[_{CP_1}$ ich habe einen Star getroffen $]$
$[_{CP_2}$ den John Travolta$_i$ [~~habe ich t_i getroffen~~]]

The *d*XP is fronted within CP_2, and the RD surface pattern is the result of subsequent deletion of redundant material in that clause. Ellipsis creates an anaphoric link between the two clauses, in addition to the cataphoric correlate–*d*XP link.

This analysis of *d*XPs as elliptical (hence, anaphoric) root clauses implies that they have an essentially parenthetical status relative to their hosts; we refer to this configuration as 'anaphoric juxtaposition.'[10] As expected, non-elliptical variants are possible in all cases (i.e. ellipsis is not obligatory),[11] redundancy aside:

[9] For expository convenience, we abstract away from movements within CP_1, head movement, etc.

[10] The term *juxtaposition* is borrowed from Peterson 1999, where it is used as a cover term for non-syntagmatic relations between clause-peripheral and clause-medial parentheticals and their host clauses.

[11] When a backgrounded *d*XP is spelled out in full, as in (14a), the fronted phrase is stressed in the most natural prosodic realization, unlike in the elliptical case where no sentence stress is realized in CP_2 at all.

(14) a. Tasman heeft ze gezien; die Maori's heeft hij gezien.
Tasman has them seen those Maoris has he seen
'Tasman saw them, he saw those Maoris.' (Dutch)

b. Ich habe einen Star getroffen: DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA habe ich getroffen.
I have a star met, the John Travolta have I met
'I met a star, I met John Travolta.' (German)

Our claim is thus that *d*XPs are surface remnants of 'reformulations' of the host clause.

As mentioned above, our approach entails that the relation between host clause and *d*XP is essentially one of parenthesis, the elliptical CP_2 being a non-subordinated root clause. The question of whether or not parenthetical elements are linked to their hosts in a structural or non-structural fashion is a delicate one (for some discussion, see e.g. Burton-Roberts 2005 and contributions in Dehé and Kavalova 2007), and we cannot attempt to resolve it conclusively within the confines of this paper. Here, we will merely point out a number of asymmetries between ATs and backgrounded *d*XPs that lead us to assume that the former are plausibly taken to be structurally unconnected expressions, whereas the latter bear a syntactic relation to their host.

As also observed by Averintseva-Klisch (2009) and Truckenbrodt (in press), ATs but not backgrounded *d*XPs permit sentence adverbs and discourse particles (our examples):[12]

(15) a. Maria hat einen Star getroffen, {vermutlich / wohl} DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA.
Maria has a star met presumably PRT the John Travolta
'Maria met a star, presumably John Travolta.

b. Maria hat ihn getroffen, (*{vermutlich / wohl}) *den John Travolta*.
Maria has him met presumably PRT the John Travolta
intended: 'Maria presumably met John Travolta.'

Truckenbrodt shows that elements of this kind are licensed only in environments that constitute speech acts, and concludes from this that ATs are speech acts separate from the host clause, whereas backgrounded *d*XPs and their hosts together constitute a single speech act.

We add to this two observations supporting this conclusion. First, ATs but not backgrounded *d*XPs can differ from their hosts in illocutionary force:

As we show below, a backgrounded *d*XP is deaccented and discourse-old but new relative to CP_1, whereas all deleted material in CP_2 is given/discourse-old only.

[12] There is a general question as to how complex, multi-constituent fragments of this kind are derived on a move-and-delete approach to clausal ellipsis; see Merchant 2003; Nakao et al. 2012; Lasnik 2013 for some discussion. We have nothing insightful to offer here over and beyond the works cited. For us it suffices to observe that *d*XPs such as that in (15a) are licit fragment expressions in other contexts as well:

(i) A: Welchen Star hat Maria getroffen? – B: {Vermutlich / Wohl} den John Travolta.
which star has Maria met presumably PRT the John Travolta
A: 'Which star did Maria meet?' – B: 'Presumably John Travolta.' (German)

(16) a. Peter hat offenbar irgendeinen berühmten Star getroffen – DEN JOHN
Peter has apparently some famous star met the John
TRAVOLTA (vielleicht)?
Travolta perhaps
'Apparently Peter met a famous star—(perhaps) John Travolta?'

b. *Peter hat ihn offenbar getroffen, *den John Travolta (vielleicht)*?
Peter has him apparently met the John Travolta perhaps
*'Peter apparently met him, (perhaps) John Travolta?' (German)

Second, the propositional meaning of an AT can be negated independently of the proposition expressed by the host clause:

(17) A: Peter hat einen berühmten Star getroffen: DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA.
Peter has a famous star met the John Travolta
'Peter met a famous star: John Travolta.'

B: Nein, (das war) Bruce Willis (den er getroffen hat).
no that was Bruce Willis who he met has
'No, (it was) Bruce Willis (who he met).' (German)

B's response here is not negating the proposition expressed by A's CP_1 (*Peter met a famous star*) but only the content of the elliptical CP_2 (*Peter met John Travolta*).[13] No such independent negation is possible with backgrounded *d*XPs.

The above facts follow straightforwardly from the assumption that ATs are independent speech acts, i.e. their use is equivalent to uttering two consecutive sentences in discourse. Moreover, in the light of the correlation between intonation phrases and speech acts proposed in Selkirk 2011 and Truckenbrodt in press, this view leads us to expect the prosodic differences between backgrounding and AT outlined above. Specifically, (accented) ATs constitute independent intonation phrases while (deaccented) backgrounded *d*XPs are integrated into the intonation phrase defined by their host clause; see Dewald 2012 and Truckenbrodt in press for extensive discussion of these contrasting prosodic patterns. We will consequently treat ATs as syntactically unconnected but anaphorically linked fragments, analogous to fragment answers (Merchant 2004) and question tags in split questions as analyzed by Arregi (2010) (we illustrate both constructions below). By contrast, backgrounded *d*XPs cohere prosodically and pragmatically with their hosts, which we will assume to be grounded in their structural connectedness.

More specifically, we would like to hark back to the idea (first explored in Kraak and Klooster 1968 and Quirk et al. 1985, and revived by Koster 2000) that structural config-

[13] A simple *No, that's wrong*-type negative response is ambiguous: it can be interpreted either as negating CP_1 (*Peter didn't meet any famous star*) or CP_2 (*Peter didn't meet John Travolta*). See Griffiths and de Vries 2014 for more discussion of these issues.

urations similar to coordination can be used not only for semantically symmetrical and non-coreferential relationships, but can also express semantic specification or identification,[14] yielding 'specifying coordination.' Koster (2000) defines a so-called syntactic 'colon phrase' [$_{:\mathrm{P}}$ XP [**:** YP]], similar to a regular coordination phrase [$_{\mathrm{CoP}}$ XP [Co YP]], but with the abstract colon **:** as a coordinator; this kind of coordination ('parallel structure,' in Koster's terms) expresses a cohesion relation between clauses or phrases that are roughly equipotent with respect to the grammatical context, but not necessarily with respect to each other. The precise semantic/pragmatic relationship between the conjuncts is variable, depending on the choice of coordinator as well as on lexical content and context (cf. Kehler 2000). See de Vries 2009b for extensive further discussion and elaboration.

We propose that the CP_1–CP_2 juxtaposition in backgrounding is an instance of specifying coordination in this sense.[15] The two clauses are grammatically equipotent, but stand in an asymmetrical semantic relationship, the linearly second clause specifying the first by adding relevant information to it (we return to this specificational character of backgrounding below). The structure of backgrounding as in (12a) is then roughly as shown in (18a), which contrasts with the purely discursive anaphoric juxtaposition of host clauses and ATs, illustrated for (13a) in (18b).

(18) a. [$_{:\mathrm{P}}$ [$_{\mathrm{CP}_1}$ … ze$_i$ …] [**:** [$_{\mathrm{CP}_2}$ *die Maori's*$_i$ Δ]]] ('Δ' = elided structure)

b. [$_{\mathrm{CP}_1}$ … einen Star$_i$ …] [$_{\mathrm{CP}_2}$ DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA$_i$ Δ]

The connected structure in (18a) naturally gives rise to a single prosodic unit (an intonation phrase in Selkirk's 2011 approach) as well as a unitary speech act, whereas the clauses in (18b) constitute separate speech acts and separate prosodic units, in line with observations in Truckenbrodt in press.

This slight structural asymmetry between ATs and backgrounded *d*XPs thus straightforwardly accounts for the fact that the former but not the latter can occur 'across speakers.'

[14] Cf. Gärtner 2001; den Dikken 2005; de Vries 2009b, and Heringa 2012, among others.

[15] Note that an analysis in these terms is *not* equivalent to syndetic coordination of CP_1 and CP_2, which has different properties. That is, the proposal does not predict that **:** can be freely realized by the conjunctions *and* or *or*, since these are incompatible with the specificational nature of the type of coordination defined by Koster. When these conjunctions appear between host clause and AT, they yield the particular meaning corresponding to the analogous non-elliptical forms.

(i) a. Ich habe einen Star getroffen, und den John Travolta (habe ich getroffen).
I have a star met and the John Travolta have I met
'I met a star, and (I met) John Travolta.'

b. Ich habe einen Star getroffen, oder den John Travolta (habe ich getroffen).
I have a star met or the John Travolta have I met
'I met a star, or (I met) John Travolta.' (German)

'Correlate' and '*d*XP' are not coreferent here, but necessarily extensionally disjoint, owing to the fact that syndetic coordination is not specificational.

Consider the following dialogue, in which the same AT as in (13a) is supplied by speaker B:

(19) A: Maria hat einen Star getroffen. – B: DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA!
Maria has a.ACC start met the.ACC John Travolta
A: 'Maria met a star.' – B: '(She met) John Travolta!' (German)

Backgrounding cannot be discontinuous in this way. B's response in the following (based on (3)) is infelicitous even when the *d*XP is given as a discourse topic:

(20) A: Tasman heeft ze gezien. – B: #*Die Maori's*.
Tasman has them seen those Maoris
A: 'Tasman saw them.' – B: '(He saw) Those Maoris.' (Dutch)

These facts corroborate our assumption that backgrounded *d*XPs are structurally linked to their host clauses, yielding a single speech act, whereas ATs are an instance of discourse-anaphoric juxtaposition, hence prosodically and pragmatically independent expressions.

Importantly, while we deny that backgrounded *d*XPs are pragmatically independent of their hosts in the way ATs are, we thereby do not deny that these, too, have an underlying clausal syntax. This will, in fact, be the central explanans for a wealth of facts to be discussed in the remainder of this paper, specifically in section 4.2. For now, however, let us merely point out two facts that bring out this clausal structure most transparently.

First, *wh*-phrases are permissible *d*XPs in both backgrounding[16] and AT:

(21) A: Peter hat mit vielen Mädels getanzt, aber ich weiß nicht mit welchen.
Peter has with many girls danced but I don't know with which.DAT
'Peter danced with many girls, but I don't know which of them.'
B: Das weiß ich auch nicht, *mit welchen*.
that know I also not with which.DAT
'Which of them (he danced with) I don't know either.' (German)

(22) Peter hat mit Mädels getanzt. Bleibt nur eine Frage: MIT WELCHEN?
Peter has with girls danced remains only one question with which.DAT
'Peter danced with some girls. That leaves one question: which of them?' (German)

In B's response in (21), the *d*XP is discourse-old and part of the speech act defined by the host clause, the entire response being declarative. By contrast, the discourse-new *d*XP in (22) differs in force from its host in the way we already saw in (16a); this follows from it being a separate speech act, hence an ordinary instance of matrix sluicing. Nonetheless, in both cases the *wh-d*XP has an interrogative (not indefinite) interpretation, hence must

[16]Such cases are most natural when the correlate is contrastively stressed; B's response in (21) could then have a continuation like *But I know he danced with* QUITE A FEW*!*, contrasting with the proposition *I don't know which of the girls Peter danced with.*

be heading an $\overline{\text{A}}$-chain within an underlying CP.[17] Note in this connection that correlate *das* 'that' in B's response in (21) is a *clausal* pro-form, relating cataphorically to what is underlyingly an interrogative clause:

(23) $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ das$_i$ ...] $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ [mit welchen]$_k$ [~~er t_k getanzt hat~~]]$_i$ (which ~~he danced with~~)

Analogously, the indefinite correlate *eine Frage* 'one question' in (22) cataphorically relates to the entire CP_2.

Second, Zwart (2001, 2011) notes that right-dislocated scope-sensitive adverbs usually take scope over the entire host clause:[18]

(24) a. Twee mensen hebben vermoedelijk Nauru gezien. [*2 > presumably*]
two people have presumably Nauru seen
'Two people presumably saw Nauru.'

b. Twee mensen hebben Nauru gezien, *vermoedelijk*. [*presumably > 2*]
two people have Nauru seen presumably
'Presumably two people saw Nauru.' (Dutch; Zwart 2011, 79)

This scope asymmetry is exactly what the biclausal analysis leads us to expect, since (25), which corresponds to the postulated underlying structure of the *d*XP in (24b), gives rise to an analogous wide-scope reading of the adverb:

(25) Vermoedelijk hebben twee mensen Nauru gezien. [*presumably > 2*]
presumably have two people Nauru seen
'Presumably two people saw Nauru.' (Dutch)

Clausal ellipsis applying to (25) and specifying coordination (via **:**) of the fragment yield (24b), with the observed reading.[19]

We conclude that the *d*XP is underlyingly clausal and hence a remnant of deletion, regardless of whether it is discourse-new and realized as a separate intonation phrase or not. Since the structural asymmetry between backgrounding and ATs schematized in (18) will be largely orthogonal to the discussion that follows, we will abstract away from it for notational convenience for the most part; we return to the issue in section 5.2 below.

[17] Note that the *wh*-phrase shows case connectivity in both cases, a fact we return to in section 4.2.

[18] This fact is not at variance with the cases in (59): *qua* sentence adverb, *vermoedelijk* has a high base position, presumably its surface position at the left edge of CP_2. It seems to us that a narrow-scope reading (corresponding to "lower" uses of *vermoedelijk*) is possible, too, in both (24b) and (25) below, depending on prosodic properties we will not attempt to disentangle here. For the point at hand, however, only the wide-scope reading of (24b) is relevant.

[19] To complete the argument it is necessary to rule out monosentential derivations for RD, a task we take up in section 4.

We emphasize that our analysis relies on rather uncontroversial and conservative machinery. First, fronting to the prefield is a regular $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement operation in the Germanic V2 languages, satisfying a formal 'EPP'-type requirement in root clauses (Fanselow 2004).[20] Second, the type of clausal ellipsis that reduces CP_2 has been shown to underlie a wide range of elliptical constructions, most prominently sluicing and fragment answers (see Ross 1969b; Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001, 2004; Brunetti 2003; van Craenenbroeck 2010; Temmerman 2013). The following examples illustrate the two phenomena and their syntactic representation according to these analyses:

(26) a. John kissed someone, but I don't know who.
b. $[_{\text{CP}}$ who$_i$ $[$~~he kissed t_i~~$]]$

(27) a. A: What did John say? – B: That he kissed Mary.
b. $[_{\text{CP}}$ $[_{\text{CP}}$ that he kissed Mary$]_i$ $[$~~John said t_i~~$]]$

Arregi (2010) argues convincingly that so-called split questions are likewise derived by clausal juxtaposition and ellipsis in the second clause (a polar interrogative):

(28) a. Qué árbol plantó Juan, un roble?
what three planted Juan an oak
'What tree did Juan plant, an oak?'
b. $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ qué árbol$_i$ plantó Juan $t_i]$ $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ un roble$_k$ $[$~~plant'o Juan t_k~~$]]$ (Spanish)

Our proposal can be seen as a generalization of Arregi's analysis to cases in which the right-hand CP is declarative and its remnant backgrounded or stressed. Analogously to what we have argued above for ATs, Arregi assumes that no formal link relates CP_1 and CP_2 in split questions, i.e. the two clauses surface in anaphoric juxtaposition.

Ott (2012, 2014a) argues for an ellipsis analysis of Contrastive Left-dislocation (CLD) directly parallel to ours, but with reversed directionality of deletion. According to this analysis, CLD involves a biclausal structure and backward clausal ellipsis in the first clause:

[20]Moreover, this fronting has the same information-structural potential as right-peripheral *d*XPs, i.e. fronted XPs can be either backgrounded or focused. Backgrounded left-peripheral XPs are found, for instance, in verum-focus contexts, where everything but a modal particle is deaccented:

(i) A: Ik denk dat Tasman de Maori's niet gezien heeft. – B: *De Maori's* heeft hij WEL gezien.
I think that Tasman the Maoris not seen has the Maoris has he PRT seen
A: 'I don't think that Tasman saw the Maoris.' – B: 'Tasman DID see the Maoris.' (Dutch)

Equally naturally, fronted XPs in the prefield can be (new-information or contrastive) foci:

(ii) A: Wen kennst du, den Peter oder den Hans? – B: DEN HANS kenne ich.
who know you the Peter or the Hans the Hans know I
A: 'Who do you know, Peter or Hans?' – B: 'I know HANS.' (German)

(29) a. Den John Travolta, den kenne ich gut.
the John Travolta him know I well
'John Travolta, I know him well.' (German)

b. [$_{CP_1}$ den John Travolta [~~kenne ich t_i gut~~]] [$_{CP_2}$ den kenne ich gut]

In conjunction with the analysis proposed in this paper, Ott's approach, if on the right track, leads to a near-symmetrical view of certain types of CLD and RD constructions in the Germanic languages. Given the parallel syntactic properties reviewed by Ott and below, this analytical symmetry is a welcome result.[21]

According to our approach, right-dislocated *d*XPs are thus derived analogously to sluiced *wh*-phrases, fragment answers, etc., but employed in a slightly different discursive configuration. As a result, RD dissolves into independently motivated grammatical mechanisms and cross-sentential anaphora; the primary theoretical gain is thus a significant reduction of constructional residue in the theory of Universal Grammar.

In line with this reductionist approach, we assume that ellipsis in CP_2 is subject to general conditions on *recoverability*, requiring that deleted material be in some sense identical to previously given material (the antecedent). Various formal statements of this identity requirement have been proposed in the literature (see the review in Merchant in press), but the matter remains controversial and we will not attempt to settle it here. Intuitively, we want CP_1 and CP_2 to be equivalent in meaning, rendering CP_2 a faithful repetition of CP_1 (as in corresponding pronounced repetitions such as (14b)). For the sake of concreteness, we assume, somewhat simplistically, that deletion in CP_2 yielding the *d*XP surface fragment is felicitous provided that CP_1 and CP_2 are truth-functionally equivalent ("parallel"). This renders the deleted material given/redundant, while the *d*XP is retained either as discourse-new information (in ATs) or as specifying information within the CP_1–CP_2 unit in backgrounding (more on this below). To illustrate, consider the following instance of backgrounding:

(30) [$_{CP_1}$ Ich habe ihn einen Idioten genannt], *den Peter*
I have him an idiot called the Peter
'I called Peter an idiot.' (German)

By requiring CP_1 and CP_2 to be parallel in the above sense, we assign the *d*XP in (30) the underlying repetition structure in (31a), while ruling out the structure and corresponding meaning in (31b) (Δ marks the domains to be deleted), along with infinitely many other truth-functionally non-equivalent structures compatible with the surface remnant.

[21] For further analyses employing clausal ellipsis, see van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006, Kluck 2011, Holmberg 2013, and Griffiths 2014, among many others; see also footnote 39. VP-ellipsis has likewise been argued to figure in certain right-peripheral constructions, such as dependent tag questions (Sailor 2009, in press).

(31) a. $[_{\text{CP}_2}\ [_{\text{DP}}$ den Peter $]_i\ [_{\Delta}$ habe ich t_i einen Idioten genannt $]]$
the Peter have I an idiot called
'I called Peter an idiot.'

b. $[_{\text{CP}_2}\ [_{\text{DP}}$ den Peter $]_i\ [_{\Delta}$ habe ich t_i beleidigt $]]$
the Peter have I insulted
'I insulted Peter.'

We assume that fronted DPs like *den Peter* in (31a) are reconstructed into their base position for purposes of semantic interpretation, a natural corollary of the Copy Theory of movement and an innocent assumption given that fronting is truth-functionally vacuous. We obtain $[\![\text{CP}_1]\!] = I$ *called him an idiot* and $[\![\text{CP}_2]\!] = I$ *called Peter an idiot*, which are truth-functionally equivalent with coreference of correlate and *d*XP (i.e., $[\![\text{CP}_1]\!] \leftrightarrow [\![\text{CP}_2]\!]$). As a result, (31a) is an admissible underlying structure of the *d*XP in (30) and deletion is felicitous. Conversely, (31b) is not an admissible underlying structure, since $[\![\text{CP}_2]\!] = I$ *insulted Peter* fails to entail $[\![\text{CP}_1]\!]$.

The example just considered involved simple coreference of correlate and *d*XP. The calculation of truth-functional equivalence is somewhat more involved with more complex cases, e.g. when the correlate is implicit as in (32a) or quantified as in (33a).

(32) a. $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ Ich habe den Peter getroffen], AM DIENSTAG.
I have the Peter met on Tuesday
'I met Peter, on Tuesday.' (German)

b. $[_{\text{CP}_2}\ [_{\text{AdvP}}$ am Dienstag $]_i\ [_{\Delta}$ habe ich t_i den Peter getroffen $]]$
on Tuesday have I the Peter met

(33) a. $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ Ich habe zwei Freunde getroffen], DEN HANS UND DEN PETER.
I have two friends met ACC Hans and ACC Peter
'I met two friends, Hans and Peter.' (German)

b. $[_{\text{CP}_2}\ [_{\text{DP}}$ den Hans und den Peter$]_i\ [_{\Delta}$ habe ich t_i getroffen $]]$
ACC Hans and ACC Peter have I met

Cases such as (32a) are the counterpart to sluicing with implicit correlates, dubbed "sprouting" by Chung et al. (1995). We assume that CP_1 contains a silent adverbial variable whose value is "filled in" by the subsequent AT, so that both clauses are again interpreted as truth-functionally equivalent. For truth-conditional equivalence to obtain in (33a), the domain of the correlate *zwei Freunde* 'two friends' must be restricted to the individuals Hans and Peter, and CP_2 must be interpreted exhaustively (as familiar from, e.g., answers to *wh*-questions), such that the speaker only met Hans and Peter but no one else relevant in this discourse. The result is the observed interpretation—crucially, the only one available.[22] We will not pursue these details further here, as we cannot develop a comprehensive theory

[22]Thanks to Andreas Haida for valuable discussion of these issues, only partially reflected in these remarks.

of ellipsis identification within the confines of this paper. However, the assumption that deletion in CP_2 is recoverable under truth-functional equivalence of the two clauses involved in RD suffices for our purposes here as one possible and plausible way of implementing the core claim that *d*XPs are remnants of underlying repetitions.

A clarifying note concerning the status of backgrounded *d*XPs as ellipsis remnants (as in (12b)) is in order. Typically, ellipsis deletes given and retains focused or contrastive material. At first glance, our claim that *backgrounded d*XPs can be remnants of clausal ellipsis is at odds with this general picture. We submit that this tension is only apparent. Recall that we take CP_1 and CP_2 in backgrounding to be related by the abstract coordinator **:**, which expresses specification of CP_1 by CP_2. While neither the *d*XP (*qua* discourse topic) nor CP_2 (*qua* repetition of CP_1) are discourse-new, it is crucially the *d*XP that provides additional information about the referent of its correlate, thereby rendering CP_2 specificational relative to CP_1. In (3), for instance, *die Maori's* 'the Maoris' provides specifying/new information relative to the host-internal pronoun *ze* 'them' in this sense, yielding the semantic asymmetry required for specifying coordination. As shown in (34), a backgrounded *d*XP must generally be more specific in its descriptive content than its correlate; (35) shows that the same holds, trivially, for discourse-new ATs.[23]

(34) a. Ich habe ihn gesehen, *den Idioten*.
I have him seen the idiot
'I saw him, the idiot.'

b. *Ich habe den Idioten gesehen, *ihn*.
I have the idiot seen him
*'I saw the idiot, him.'

c. *Ich habe den Peter gesehen, *den Peter*.
I have the Peter seen the Peter
*'I saw Peter$_i$, Peter$_i$.' (German)

(35) a. Der Vererbung liegen Gesetze zugrunde, DIE GESETZE DER BIOCHEMIE.
the heredity lie laws under the laws of biochemistry
'Heredity is based on laws, the laws biochemistry.'

b. *Der Vererbung liegen Gesetze der Biochemie zugrunde, DIE GESETZE.
the heredity lie laws of biochemistry under the laws
*'Heredity is based on the laws of biochemistry, the laws.' (German)

[23] Expectedly, pronominal *d*XPs are only acceptable as stressed, deictic pronouns, hence as a type of AT:

(i) Ich habe den Peter gesehen, IHN (da)! (*pointing at Peter*)
I have the Peter seen him there
'I saw Peter, HIM (over there)!' (German)

Being stressed and presumably constituting a separate speech act, deictic pronouns are naturally incompatible with backgrounding, i.e. no deictic interpretation can be expressed by the *d*XP in (34b).

In short, backgrounding (like ATs) is always specificational within the anaphoric juxtaposition of CP_1 and CP_2, despite the fact that (unlike in the case of ATs) no discourse-new information is introduced by the *d*XP. We submit that it is this 'locally focal' status of backgrounded *d*XPs that renders them legitimate ellipsis remnants: they provide new information relative to CP_1, unlike the fully redundant remainder of CP_2, which consequently undergoes deletion.[24] Since backgrounded *d*XPs cohere prosodically and pragmatically with their hosts in a way ATs do not, however, they necessarily fail to realize focal stress.

The deletion analysis of RD defended here is not without antecedents in the literature, although these have met with little response.[25] Kayne (1994, 78) in passing suggests that cases like *He's real smart, John is* are biclausal structures, the second clause reduced by predicate ellipsis. While Kayne stops short of fleshing out this analysis, a number of authors have developed movement-*cum*-deletion analyses of RD in Japanese: see Tanaka 2001 and references therein. Tanaka proposes that *d*XPs in Japanese RD scramble leftward prior to ellipsis (representations adapted to our terminology here and below):

(36) a. John-ga yonda yo, LGB-*o*.
John-NOM read *LGB*-ACC
'John read it, *LGB*.' (Japanese)

b. [$_{CP_1}$ John-ga *pro* yonda yo] [$_{CP_2}$ *LGB*-o$_i$ [~~John-ga t_i yonda yo~~]]

Park and Kim (2009) propose a similar analysis of ATs in Korean, as in the following:

(37) a. John-i Mary-ekey cwu-ess-ta, CHAYK-UL.
John-NOM Mary-DAT give-PAST-DECL book-ACC
'John gave one to Mary, a book.' (Korean)

b. [$_{CP_1}$ John-i Mary-ekey *pro* cwuessta]
[$_{CP_2}$ chayk-ul$_i$ [~~John-i Mary-ekey t_i cwuessta~~]]

We return to a difference between Park and Kim's proposal and ours in section 6.

Since it is our impression that the abovementioned proposals have not yet permeated the mainstream of syntactic theorizing, it is our goal in this paper to bolster and refine the deletion analysis on the basis of empirical facts drawn from Germanic. Although we cannot provide a detailed crosslinguistic investigation within the confines of this paper, we take the convergence of these analyses to speak to the crosslinguistic viability of the approach.

[24] Note that whether or not we choose to label this informational prominence required for specification via **:** an instance of 'focus,' backgrounded *d*XPs are never contrastive, hence cannot appear with focus-sensitive operators such as *only* or *even*, which invoke sets of alternatives (Wagner 2012).

[25] Dewald (2012) identifies related ideas in the German and French descriptive tradition.

4 The (non-)movement nature of right-dislocation

We now turn to the main virtues of the deletion analysis. It turns out that the grammatical relation between the *d*XP and its host clause is ostensibly schizophrenic: the *d*XP is syntactically external to the host clause, while showing signs of connectivity into it nonetheless. This seemingly paradoxical situation thwarts analyses assuming either peripheral base-generation or displacement of the *d*XP within a monoclausal structure. By contrast, the ellipsis analysis resolves the paradox in a principled and natural fashion.

4.1 Clause-external properties of the *d*XP

It is straightforward to establish that the *d*XP is not part of the sentential domain of the host clause. We already described their prosodic dissociation above: the *d*XP never affects placement of the sentence accent. In semantic terms, too, the *d*XP is 'added on': when realized as an AT it constitutes a separate propositional expression; in backgrounding, where CP_1 and CP_2 form a single speech act, it has no truth-conditional effect at all.

Most significantly from a syntactic point of view, the *d*XP is fully dissociated from structural requirements of the host clause: the latter must always be syntactically complete by itself. This is easily demonstrated by comparing RD of selected and of unselected XPs. Consider backgrounding of argument and adjunct DPs (ATs show the same asymmetry):

(38) a. Ik heb *('m) gezien, *die man*.
I have him seen that man
'I saw him, that man.'

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

What we see here is that the correlate is obligatory in argument RD[26] but optional in adjunct RD (cf. Zwart 2001), showing that an argumental *d*XP does not satisfy selectional needs of the host-clause predicate.[27] This is just what we expect if the *d*XP is syntactically

[26] Right-dislocated VPs and CP/PP arguments likewise require the presence of a correlate in CP_1.

[27] Omission of correlates is felicitous just in case argument drop is licensed independently. This is the case in topic-drop constructions and imperatives (cf. Koopman 2007; Zwart 2001; Averintseva-Klisch 2009, 124f.):

(i) a. Hab' ich gestern getroffen, den Peter. (cf. *Hab' ich gestern getroffen.*)
have I yesterday met the Peter
'I met him yesterday, Peter.'

b. Leg hin, den Ball! (cf. *Leg hin!*)
lay down the ball
'Put it down, that ball.' (German)

These cases thus present no exception to the generalization stated in the text. Once we vary (ia) by means

external to the host clause, as postulated by the biclausal analysis.[28]

Furthermore, right-peripheral *d*XPs are uniformly strong islands for extraction. Consider the following examples of illicit *wh*-extraction from backgrounded clauses:[29]

(39) a. *Wen$_i$ hat Maria das behauptet, *dass er t_i geküsst hat*?
who has Maria that claimed that he kissed has
*'Which person did Maria claim it, that he kissed?' (German)

b. *Wat$_i$ heb je het nogal betreurd, *dat Jan t_i gezegd heeft*?
what have you it rather regretted that Jan said has
*'What did you regret it, that Jan said?' (Dutch; Zwart 2001)

In this property dislocated clauses contrast with postposed object clauses, which are transparent for extraction (cf. Bennis 1986; Büring and Hartmann 1997, a.o.):

(40) Wen$_i$ hat Maria behauptet dass er t_i geküsst hat?
who has Maria claimed that he kissed has
'Who did Maria claim that he kissed?' (German)

Whatever the correct analysis of postposed object clauses, such facts suggest that they are structurally embedded within their host clauses. Conversely, the fact that no such extraction is possible in (39) indicates once again the *d*XP's syntactic externality to the host clause. Subextraction from a *d*XP into the host clause would require illicit movement from CP_2 into CP_1, i.e. across paratactically juxtaposed/coordinated clauses:

(41) *[$_{CP_1}$ wen$_i$ ...] [$_{CP_2}$ dass Peter t_i geküsst hat [~~hat Maria *t* behauptet~~]]

In sum, by locating the *d*XP in a structurally separate clause, the deletion analysis provides a natural explanation for its disjointness from the host clause.

However, considering the facts reviewed above we might be tempted to assume a superficially less complex analysis, according to which the *d*XP is base-generated in its surface position as an adjunct to the host clause. (3) would then have the following structure:

(42) [$_{CP}$ [$_{CP}$ Tasman heeft ze gezien] die Maori's]

of inversion such that topic drop is excluded, omission of the correlate becomes impossible (as in (38a)).

[28] Note, incidentally, how (38a) differs from the Japanese and Korean examples in (36) and (37): unlike German, Japanese/Korean permit object *pro*-drop (Cole 1987), hence a *d*XP can be linked to a null correlate. This is not to say that the correlate in these languages *must* be empty, of course; both Tanaka and Park and Kim point out (for Japanese and Korean, respectively) that full-DP correlates are equally possible.

(i) John-ga ano-hon-o yonda yo, LGB-*o*.
John-NOM the-book-ACC read *LGB*-ACC
'John read the book, LGB.' (Japanese; Tanaka 2001, 552)

[29] On the impossibility of extraction from dislocated noun phrases, see section 5.2 below.

Zwart (2001) proposes an alternative base-generation analysis of RD compatible with Kayne's (1994) ban against right-adjunction. In this analysis, the *d*XP is base-generated as *left*-adjoined to the host clause; subsequent inversion derives the observed linear order:

(43) a. [$_{\text{CP}}$ die Maori's [$_{\text{CP}}$ Tasman heeft ze gezien]] → *inversion*
b. [[$_{\text{CP}}$ Tasman heeft ze gezien]$_i$ [$_{\text{CP}}$ die Maori's t_i]]

By taking the *d*XP to be a base-generated adjunct to the host clause, analyses of this kind derive some of the observed externality effects. However, high-adjunction analyses necessarily fall short of capturing clausal/propositional characteristics of *d*XPs, some of which were reviewed in section 3; this result could only be achieved by a significant complication of the syntax–semantics mapping. There is further direct syntactic evidence against a base-generation approach, to which we turn next.

4.2 Clause-internal properties of the *d*XP

The previous subsection established that *d*XPs in RD are syntactically *external* to their host clauses. Paradoxically, however, the construction simultaneously exhibits a seemingly contradictory set of properties: *d*XPs show connectivity into the host clause, pointing, at first glance, to the conclusion that they are related to a host-internal trace after all.

4.2.1 Case agreement

There is a general and robust requirement that *d*XPs in RD match in case with their host-internal correlate (the systematic exception being predicative ATs, to which we turn in section 6 below). This is illustrated below for German and Icelandic:

(44) a. Ich habe ihm geholfen, *{*der / *den / dem} Peter*.
I have him.DAT helped the.NOM the.ACC the.DAT Peter
'I helped him, Peter.'
b. Ich habe heute einen Star getroffen: DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA!
I have today a.ACC star met the.ACC John Travolta
'I met a star today: John Travolta!' (German)

(45) a. Hann er langbestur, *(hann) Alfreð*.
he.NOM is long best he Alfreð.NOM
'He is by far the best, Alfreð.'
b. Ég þekki hana ekkert, *dóttur hans*.
I know her.ACC nothing daughter.ACC his
'I don't know her at all, his daughter.' (Icelandic; Thráinsson 2007, 363)

If case is assigned to an argument by a case-assigning predicate or an associated functional head, as is standardly assumed, an explanation is called for: how does the *d*XP come to bear case, and why does its case specification co-vary systematically with that of its correlate? Note that with regard to RD of arguments we can raise a similar question about the *d*XP's thematic status: How does the *d*XP come to bear the same θ-role as its correlate (in a way that complies with the Theta Criterion)? Barring additional stipulations, a base-generation analysis is ill-equipped to answer these questions.

By contrast, the deletion analysis accounts for the facts straightforwardly: *d*XP and correlate match in case and θ-role because they enter into parallel grammatical relations (case/θ-assignment) in each CP_1 and CP_2, owing to parallel syntactic structure. To illustrate, consider a simplified representation of (45b):

(46) a. $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ ég þekki hana$_{\text{ACC}}$ ekkert $]$ $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ ég þekki ekkert dóttur hans$_{\text{ACC}}$ $] \rightarrow$
b. $[_{\text{CP}_1}$ ég þekki hana$_{\text{ACC}}$ ekkert $]$ $[_{\text{CP}_2}$ dóttur hans$_{\text{ACC}}$ [~~þekki ég ekkert *t*~~]]

The same line of reasoning has been employed to account for case/θ properties of sluiced *wh*-phrases, fragment answers, and other non-sententials (see the references in section 3 above). Thus, the fragment answer in (47) is derived by deletion under identity just like the *d*XP in (44a), shown in (48), and consequently shows θ/case connectivity as well.

(47) A: Wem hast du geholfen? – B: Dem Peter.
who.DAT did you help the.DAT Peter
A: 'Who did you help?' – B: '(I helped) Peter.' (German)

(48) $[_{\text{CP}}$ dem Peter$_i$ [~~habe ich *t*$_i$ geholfen~~]]

As pointed out by Truckenbrodt (2013), clausal parallelism as the source of parallel case-marking of correlate and *d*XP in RD also provides a straightforward explanation for the inability of controlled *PRO* to serve as the correlate of a *d*XP, as shown in (49b).[30]

(49) a. Peter hat angeordnet $[_{\text{CP}}$ *PRO* die Straße zu fegen]
Peter has ordered the street to sweep
'Peter ordered the street to be swept.'
b. *Peter hat angeordnet $[_{\text{CP}}$ *PRO*$_i$ die Straße zu fegen], *die Arbeiter*$_i$
Peter has ordered the street to sweep the workers
intended: 'Peter ordered them to sweep the street, the workers.' (German)

[30]Note that unlike English *to order* (on the relevant reading), German *anordnen* is not ditransitive but selects a control complement only; consequently, *PRO* is the only possible correlate of the *d*XP.

For the two CPs to be parallel, CP_2 must contain a nonfinite embedded clause; this nonfinite clause, however, does not license the overt subject that surfaces as the *d*XP in (49b).[31] The underlying structure of the source of (49b) is shown in (50a); contrast this with (50b).[32]

(50) a. *$[_{CP_2}$ [die Arbeiter]$_i$ [hat Peter angeordnet [t_i die Straße zu fegen]]]

b. Peter hat angeordnet $[_{CP}$ dass die$_i$ die Straße fegen sollen], *die Arbeiter*$_i$
Peter has ordered that they the street sweep should the workers
'Peter ordered them to sweep the street, the workers.' (German)

Note, again, the difference between (49b) and the Japanese/Korean object-drop cases in (36) and (37): while *PRO* permits no overt counterpart in a parallel syntactic environment, governed *pro* does; hence, the latter but not the former can serve as a correlate in RD.

[31] Morphosyntactic identity of this kind goes beyond purely semantic identity conditions, such as Merchant's (2001). Chung (2013) independently argues that ellipsis sites and their antecedents must contain identical case-assigners, and a number of other facts likewise suggest that at least some syntactic identity is required for clausal ellipsis (Tanaka 2011; Merchant 2013). We cannot go into the issue within the confines of this paper but simply note that no problem arises for our approach, provided that it is compatible with whatever will ultimately turn out to be the correct characterization of identity in ellipsis.

[32] It could be objected that the overt version of the *d*XP in (50b) contains an illicit extraction inducing a *that*–trace effect, which is indeed found in the non-elliptical counterpart (ia). (Note, incidentally, that *anordnen* does generally permit long extraction (ib).)

(i) a. *$[_{CP_2}$ [die Arbeiter]$_i$ hat Peter angeordnet $[_{CP}$ dass t_i die Straße fegen sollen]]
the workers has Peter ordered that the street sweep should
'Peter ordered the workers to sweep the street.'

b. Was hat Peter angeordnet $[_{CP}$ dass die Arbeiter t_i fegen sollen]?
what has Peter ordered that the workers sweep should
'What did Peter order the workers to sweep?' (German)

This objection can be countered in at least two ways. First, there is abundant evidence suggesting that *that*–trace violations are surface (PF) effects (see Kandybowicz 2006 and references therein), and Merchant (2001) shows that they are voided by deletion (see also Bošković 2011).

(ii) It's probable that a certain senator will resign, but which$_i$ [~~it's probable that t_i will resign~~] is a secret.

An alleviating effect of ellipsis is thus expected for (ia) as well. A second possibility is to assume that the elliptical clause is in fact 'smaller' than (ia); on this approach, only the embedded clause (*qua* propositional domain) would antecede the elliptical CP_2, obviating long-distance movement:

(iii) $[_{CP_2}$ [die Arbeiter]$_i$ [sollen t_i die Straße fegen]]
the workers should the street sweep
'The workers should sweep the street.' (German)

See Merchant 2001; Barros et al. 2014 and section 5.2 below on the availability of 'small sources.' We will not attempt to decide between these two alternatives here, as either option appears to be unproblematic.

4.2.2 Reconstruction

There are further properties of RD indicating that the *d*XP bears grammatical relations to constituents of the host clause, specifically evidence of reconstruction for interpretation. Consider the following examples, in which the *d*XP contains a bound pronoun:

(51) A: If I were a teacher, my students would drive me crazy.
B: Die hat doch jeder Lehrer$_i$ gerne, *seine$_i$ Schüler*.
them is PRT every teacher fond of his students
'Every teacher likes them, his students.' (German)
B′: Alle lærere$_i$ liker dem, *elevene sine$_i$*.
all teacher loves them students POSS:REFL
'Every teacher likes his students.' (Norwegian)

(52) Jeder Lehrer$_i$ mag einen Schüler ganz besonders: SEINEN$_i$ KLASSENPRIMUS.
every teacher likes one student very especially his best in the class
'Every teacher likes one student especially: his best student.' (German)

The availability of the bound readings here indicates that the *d*XP—more specifically, its trace—is c-commanded by the binder in the host clause. Similarly, we see that Condition A is satisfied in the following examples:

(53) a. Dem kör han$_i$ ofta, *sina$_i$ nya sportbilar*.
them drives he often, his.REFL new sports cars
'He often drives them, his new sports cars.' (Swedish)
b. Jan$_i$ zag iemand in de spiegel: ZICHZELF$_i$.
Jan saw someone in the mirror himself
'Jan saw someone in the mirror: himself.' (Dutch; de Vries 2011a)

Finally, the following examples show that Condition C precludes a coreferent interpretation of a *d*XP-internal R-expression and a c-commanding pronoun in the host clause:

(54) a. *Sie$_i$ hat ihn mit einer Anderen gesehen, *Marias$_i$ Freund*.
she has him with a.FEM different seen Maria's boyfriend
*'She$_i$ saw Maria$_i$'s boyfriend with a different girl.' (German)
b. *Ze$_i$ heeft hem gisteren nog gezien, *Miekes$_i$ vriendje*.
she has him yesterday still seen Mieke's boyfriend
*'She$_i$ did see him yesterday, Mieke$_i$'s boyfriend.' (Dutch)

(55) *Aber einen Menschen liebt er$_i$ ganz besonders: PETERS$_i$ MUTTER.
but one person loves he very especially Peter's mother
*'There's one person he$_i$ loves especially: Peter$_i$'s mother.' (German)

The following control cases establish that once the coindexed pronoun is embedded, no c-command relation obtains and the inverse acceptability pattern arises:

(56) a. *Die Frau von jedem Lehrer$_i$ mag einen Schüler ganz besonders: SEINEN$_i$
the wife of every teacher likes one student very especially his
KLASSENPRIMUS.
best in the class
*'One student every teacher's$_i$ wife likes especially: his$_i$ best student.' (German)

b. Een kennis van haar$_i$ heeft hem gisteren nog gezien, *Miekes$_i$*
an acquaintance of hers has him yesterday still seen Mieke's
vriendje.
boyfriend
'An acquaintance of hers$_i$ saw him yesterday, Mieke$_i$'s boyfriend.' (Dutch)

Absence of c-command precludes the bound-variable interpretation of the possessive pronoun in (56a) and obviates Condition C in (56b).

In all of the above cases, we see that the *d*XP appears to reconstruct to a host-internal base position flagged by the correlate. Recall, however, that in section 4.1 we found rather clear indications of the *d*XP's structural externality to the host clause. The chief virtue of the deletion analysis is that it resolves this apparent paradox. On our analysis, reconstruction into the host clause is illusory: in actual fact, the *d*XP is interpreted exclusively within the elliptical CP_2; since CP_2 is underlyingly parallel to CP_1 (as required for recoverability of deletion), however, the net result is equivalent to reconstruction into the host clause. To illustrate, on our analysis the reflexive *d*XP in (53b) is underlyingly a clausal structure parallel to that of the antecedent clause, supporting a (reconstructed) bound reading of the reflexive; compare (57b).[33]

(57) a. [$_{CP_2}$ zichzelf$_i$ [~~zag Jan t_i in de spiegel~~]]

b. Zichzelf$_i$ zag Jan$_i$ in de spiegel.
himself saw Jan in the mirror
'Jan saw himself in the mirror.' (Dutch)

[33] As expected on our analysis, connectivity obtains even when parenthetical material linearly intervenes between ATs and their host clause:

(i) Sie$_k$ habe [jedem Jungen]$_i$ etwas abgenommen, meinte [die Lehrerin]$_k$: SEIN$_i$ HANDY.
she had every boy something away taken said the teacher his cell phone
'She had taken something from each of the boys, the teacher said: his cell phone.' (German)

Note that the reporting clause is outside the scope of the host clause, as shown by the fact that coindexation of the R-expression with the host-internal subjects fails to induce a Condition C violation. The fact that the linearly subsequent AT shows connectivity nonetheless is unproblematic on the assumption that it, too, is underlyingly a parenthetical clause, as in our analysis.

Expectedly, an analogous fragment answer supports reconstruction in the same way, again due to the underlying structure in (57a):

(58) A: Wie heeft Peter$_i$ in de spiegel gezien? – B: Zichzelf$_i$.
who has Peter in the mirror seen himself
A: 'Who did Peter see in the mirror?' – B: '(He saw) Himself.' (Dutch)

Our account of connectivity in RD is thus exactly analogous to that presented in Merchant 2004 for fragment answers (see also Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001 on sluicing and den Dikken et al. 2000 and Kluck 2011 on pseudo-clefts and amalgams, respectively).

In addition to binding connectivity, we can observe scope-reconstruction effects in RD. With backgrounding intonation, the *d*XP in (59a) takes narrow scope relative to the universal subject;[34] in (59b), the *d*XP bears no existential presupposition, showing that it is interpreted within the scope of the intensional verb *(sich) wünschen* 'to wish for.'

(59) a. Da kriegt jeder Kopfschmerzen von, *von drei Linguistik-Artikeln*. [$\forall > 3$]
there gets everyone headache of of three linguistics articles
'That gives everyone a headache, three linguistics articles.'

b. Auch Peter wünscht sich eins: EIN EINHORN. [*wish for* $> \exists$]
also Peter wishes REFL one a unicorn
'Peter, too, wishes for one: a unicorn.' (German)

With corresponding intonation, the non-elliptical counterparts to the *d*XPs in (59a) and (59b) give rise to the same readings:

(60) a. Von drei Linguistik-Artikeln kriegt jeder Kopfschmerzen. [$\forall > 3$]
of three linguistics articles gets everyone headache
'Three linguistics articles give everyone a headache.'

b. Ein Einhorn wünscht sich auch Peter. [*wish for* $> \exists$]
a unicorn wishes REFL also Peter
'Peter, too, wishes for a unicorn.' (German)

As with binding connectivity, then, we conclude that scope reconstruction of RD is a consequence of parallelism, not of *bona fide* reconstruction into the host clause. As before, we can maintain the conclusion of section 4.1: the *d*XP is not a constituent of the host clause.

Let us briefly consider an alternative to the deletion analysis that suggests itself at this point, *viz.* a rightward-movement analysis of RD. This kind of analysis would derive the connectivity effects reviewed above and might *prima facie* seem simpler than the deletion analysis (setting aside general objections to rightward movement, cf. Kayne 2010).

[34] A wide-scope reading requires stress on the *d*XP-internal numeral and is thus incompatible with backgrounding.

As far as we can see, there are basically two options for a movement analysis of RD: either the *d*XP is rightward-moved from some sort of 'big-XP' dominating it and the correlate in the base, or the correlate is a phonetically realized trace of the *d*XP. The first option has been proposed for Left-dislocation constructions by Vat (1981) and Grewendorf (2008), and for Romance Clitic Right-dislocation by Cecchetto (1999) and López (2003) (among others). One obvious problem for this kind of analysis is that it assumes an *ad hoc* base structure without any independent motivation (at least in Germanic); also, it is typically left open how this kind of structure can be reconciled with standard assumptions about syntactic selection and semantic interpretation.[35]

A further serious problem for the big-XP analysis is the fact that it is forced to assume extraction from adjuncts in adjunct dislocation. Consider, e.g., a movement derivation of (8), repeated here:

(61) a. Da habe ich Maria geküsst, *am Dienstag*.
then have I Maria kissed on Tuesday
'I kissed Maria then, on Tuesday.' (German)

b. *[[habe ich $\underbrace{[_{\text{AdvP}}\ \text{da}\ t_i\ ]}_{\text{adjunct}}$ Maria geküsst] [am Dienstag]$_i$]

The big XP from which the *d*XP rightward-moves is necessarily an adjunct, hence should be opaque for any subextraction, as in the following extraposition case:

(62) a. Peter hat [$_{\text{AdvP}}$ am Tag [$_{\text{PP}}$ vor der Hochzeit]] geweint.
Peter has at.the day before the wedding cried
'Peter cried on the day before the wedding.'

b. *Peter hat [am Tag t_i] geweint [$_{\text{PP}}$ vor der Hochzeit]$_i$. (German)

The approach is thus forced to assume not only a dubious doubling structure, but an equally dubious movement operation, both of which are in effect construction-specific.[36] For these reasons, we conclude that the big-XP analysis is untenable.

The second kind of analysis, originally entertained (and eventually rejected) in Cinque 1990 for Clitic Left-dislocation and later revived by Grohmann (2003),[37] likewise suffers

[35] It might appear that these problems are solved by an appositive/parenthetical construal of the *d*XP relative to its correlate, however this variant of the 'big-XP' approach merely re-introduces the problem, since appositive constituents share many properties of *d*XPs; see footnote 59. Moreover, appositive XPs cannot leftward-move away from their associates, so that a rightward-movement analysis in these terms would have to find a way to explain this asymmetry.

[36] A reviewer objects that extraposition out of adjuncts is acceptable in certain cases; however, in our view this merely points to the conclusion that extraposition is not movement (see de Vries 2011b), rendering the observation irrelevant to the point at hand. In any case, the various further arguments against a rightward-movement analysis of RD remain unaffected by this point, showing that an analytical distinction between the two phenomena remains warranted.

[37] For arguments against this analysis of Left-dislocation, see Ott 2014a.

from serious deficits. Note, first, that such an analysis necessarily excludes ATs from its scope, given that these typically surface with non-pronominal correlates; the same applies to backgrounding with epithetic correlates (see footnote 2). While pronominal correlates might with some degree of plausibility be taken to be pronounced traces, it is much less clear that clausal or adverbial pro-forms are featural subsets of the corresponding *d*XPs, and certainly no such case can be made for full-XP correlates.

Secondly, this kind of exceptional *copy spell-out* must be appropriately constrained. Grohmann (2003) proposes rather narrow conditions: specifically, the movement step that relates the *d*XP to the pronounced trace must be very local. Grohmann argues, for Left-dislocation and other constructions, that such too-local movement violates a general 'anti-locality' constraint, and copy spell-out applies as a last-resort repair mechanism. It is clear, however, that this reasoning does not extend to RD, where correlates customarily appear *in situ* rather than in a peripheral position. Recall furthermore that we saw examples in section 3 which clearly showed that the *d*XP takes high scope over the entire clause (according to our analysis, over the elliptical CP_2): right-dislocated *wh*-phrases yield an interrogative interpretation, and right-dislocated adverbs take wide scope.[38] A low adjunction site of putative rightward movement can thus be safely ruled out, and there is no reason to assume that correlates and *d*XPs are in some sense 'too close' to one another.

There is an even more general—and we believe, decisive—reason to reject rightward-movement analyses of RD of any kind. This is the simple fact, already illustrated in section 4.1, that in all types of RD the host clause must be syntactically complete by itself:

(63) a. Ik heb *('m) gezien, *die man*.
I have him seen that man
'I saw him, that man.'

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

(64) a. Ich habe *(jemanden) getroffen, DEN PETER.
I have someone met the Peter
'I met someone, Peter.'

b. Ich habe (neulich) den Peter getroffen, AM DIENSTAG.
I have recently the Peter met on Tuesday
'I recently met Peter, on Tuesday.' (German)

[38] A reviewer objects that cases like (24b) might in fact support a Grohmann-style approach, since the high-scope reading would follow from the putative intermediate landing site at the CP edge (corresponding to (25)). However, the approach would predict the correlate to be obligatorily *pronounced* in this left-edge position (repairing the anti-local movement dependency), which is patently incorrect; as pointed out right below, the approach falsely predicts pronunciation of the correlate to be obligatory in all cases of RD.

For a movement analysis of RD, these basic facts are entirely unexpected: why would it be necessary to strand/spell out the correlate if and only if the moved XP is an argument, but not otherwise? No such requirement applies in other known cases of displacement, including rightward movement (*viz.*, extraposition). It seems highly unlikely that this striking asymmetry between RD and uncontroversial instances of displacement could be accounted for by any rightward-movement analysis, without resorting to construction-specific stipulations. By contrast, as pointed out in section 4.1 above, the observed asymmetry is directly predicted by a biclausal analysis of RD, which furthermore offers a straightforward explanation for connectivity effects at the same time.

4.3 Interim summary

So far, we have argued that the core cases of RD—backgrounding and specificational ATs—are derived by juxtaposing a remnant of clausal ellipsis, the *d*XP, with a parallel non-elliptical clause. In backgrounding, the remnant is embedded within an overall discourse-old clause and specificational relative to its correlate; in ATs, it is discourse-new and prosodically prominent. As we have shown, this analysis straightforwardly accounts for the syntactic independence of host clause and *d*XP as well as for the occurrence of connectivity effects, the latter reducing to ordinary reconstruction within the elliptical CP_2.[39]

[39] We note in passing that our analysis naturally encompasses split questions without further modification. In this construction, CP_1 is a *wh*-question, and the appended tag is the remnant of an underlying polar-interrogative CP_2:

(i) a. Was hat Hans gekauft, EIN IPAD?
what has Hans bought an iPad
'What did Hans buy, an iPad?' (German)

b. $[_{CP_1}$ was$_i$ hat Hans t_i gekauft$]$ $[_{CP_2}$ ein iPad$_k$ $[$~~hat Hans t_k gekauft~~$]]$

This analysis is developed in Arregi 2010.

Furthermore, our proposal readily extends to right-peripheral polarity particles, if recent work by Kramer and Rawlins (2011) and Holmberg (2013) is on the right track in assigning polar (*yes*/*no*) responses an underlying clausal syntax (see also Krifka 2013). Backgrounded and focused polarity particles can occur at the right periphery:

(ii) Der Peter hat die Susanne geküsst, *ja*/JA.
the Peter has the Susanne kissed yes
'Peter did kiss Susanne, yes.' (German)

Adopting the Kramer and Rawlins/Holmberg approach to polarity particles, the example has roughly the following structure (abstracting away from details):

(iii) $[_{CP_1}$ der Peter hat die Susanne geküsst $]$ $[_{CP_2}$ ja$_i$ ~~t_i der Peter hat die Susanne geküsst~~ $]$

This structure corresponds directly to a redundant repetition. For reasons of space we leave an in-depth assessment of this extension to future work.

5 Constraints on right-dislocation

We now turn to various constraints on RD that have not been addressed so far. We first discuss the (few) restrictions on the category of the *d*XP and show that these follow directly from the cross-sentential cataphoric relation between correlate and *d*XP, as assumed by our biclausal analysis. We then turn to locality constraints in RD and show how these likewise follow naturally from the analysis presented in section 3. The final subsection discusses parallels between RD and other elliptical constructions that support our specific implementation in terms of clausal ellipsis.

5.1 Categorial restrictions

RD applies to a wide range of categories (cf. Averintseva-Klisch 2009, 182f.). The following examples, adapted from Zwart 2001 and de Vries 2007a, illustrate for backgrounding (ATs are equally unrestricted):

(65) a. ... dat ik *(hem) niet ken, [$_{\text{DP}}$ *die jongen*].
that I him not know the guy
'... that I don't know him, the guy.'

b. ... dat ik *(dat) niet kan, [$_{\text{VP}}$ *een boek schrijven*].
that I that not can a book write
'... that I can't do that, write a book.'

c. ... dat ik *(erover) wil praten, [$_{\text{PP}}$ *over die kwestie*].
that I about that want talk about that issue
'... that I want to talk about that, about that issue.'

d. ... dat hij *(dat) wel nooit zal worden, [$_{\text{AP}}$ *rijk*].
that he that PRT never will become rich
'... that he'll never be that, rich.'

e. ... dat hij het (toen) niet gedaan heeft, [$_{\text{AdvP}}$ *gisteren*].
that he it then not done has yesterday
'... that he didn't do it, yesterday.' (Dutch)

Note that these examples clearly show RD not to be confined to referential categories. The categorial promiscuity illustrated in (65) is expected on the deletion analysis, since virtually any category can be fronted to the prefield (but see below for an exception).

Backgrounded DPs are uniformly definite, given their discourse-old status; an indefinite backgrounded DP would indicate the introduction of a novel referent, incompatible with backgrounding (cf. Averintseva-Klisch 2009, 101). By contrast, indefinites can occur as ATs, which is expected given that they express discourse-new information:

(66) a. Die ist halt so, *die* / **eine Frau*.
she is PRT so the a woman
'She's like that, the/a woman.'

b. Ich habe jemanden gesehen, EINE FRAU.
I have someone seen a woman
'I saw someone, a woman.' (German)

As Zwart (2001) and Averintseva-Klisch (2009, 109f.) note, however, some categories resist backgrounding. Cases in point are (XPs containing) NPIs and non-specific QPs:

(67) a. *... dat niemand hem begroette, *de vader van ook maar iemand*.
that no-one him greeted the father of even only someone
*'... that no-one greeted him, anyone's father.'

b. *... dat ik ze begroette, *iedereen*.
that I them greeted everyone
*'... that I greeted them, everyone.' (Dutch)

(68) a. *Peter liebt sie, *keine blonden Frauen*.
Peter loves them no blonde women
*'Peter loves them, no blonde women.'

b. *Ich mag die nicht, *zwei Männer*.
I like them not two men
*'I don't like them, two men.' (German)

We would like to suggest that neither fact calls for a construction-specific constraint.

Let us first turn to the ban against bare-QP dislocation illustrated in (68). On our analysis, the relation between a backgrounded *d*XP and its pronominal correlate is one of ordinary cross-sentential anaphora. Non-specific QPs are then excluded from backgrounding for the simple reason that they cannot be related to cataphoric free pronouns in general:[40]

(69) Sie$_i$ kamen herein. Dann gingen *(die) zwei Männer$_i$ zur Theke.
they came in then went the two men to the bar
'They$_i$ came in. Then *(the) two men$_i$ went to the bar.' (German)

A biclausal analysis of RD thus automatically excludes non-specific QPs as *d*XPs. See also Ott 2012, 2014a and Wagner 2012 for related observations concerning Left-dislocation.

[40] In presentational constructions the QP introduces a specific referent and can consequently antecede the pronoun in the following clause:

(i) Zwei Männer$_i$ kamen herein. Dann gingen sie$_i$ zur Theke.
two men came in then went they to the bar
'Two men came in. Then they went to the bar.' (German)

The contrast between (69) in the text and (i) thus follows from the fact that an indefinite cannot follow a coreferential definite item in discourse for pragmatically straightforward reasons.

As expected, turning the QP in (68b) into a DP renders RD fully acceptable, since coreference between *d*XP and correlate can be established, as shown in (70a) (from Averintseva-Klisch 2009, 110). QPs can generally occur as ATs (70b), since in this case the correlate is an indefinite rather than a referential pronoun.

(70) a. Ich mag die nicht, *die zwei Männer*.
I like them not the two men
'I don't like those two men.'

b. Dann sahen wir etwas im Nebel: ZWEI MÄNNER!
then saw we something in the fog two men
'Then we saw something in the fog: two men!' (German)

Our reasoning concerning backgrounded QPs immediately rules out backgrounding of NPIs as well, which likewise fail to associate with cataphoric free pronouns. Unlike QPs, however, NPIs cannot function as ATs either, even when embedded in a larger phrase:

(71) *... dat niemand slechts één persoon begroette: DE VADER VAN OOK MAAR
that no-one only one person greeted the father of even only
IEMAND.
someone
*'... that no-one greeted only one person: anybody's father.' (Dutch)

This fact is unsurprising given that NPIs and categories containing them generally resist fronting to the prefield (in traditional terms, NPIs must be licensed 'at S-structure'[41]):

(72) *$[_{DP}$ de vader van ook maar iemand$]_i$ begroette niemand t_i
the father of even only someone greeted nobody
intended: 'Nobody greeted anybody's father.' (Dutch)

If, as we have argued, *d*XPs are derived by fronting and subsequent ellipsis, we automatically and correctly exclude NPIs from RD.[42]

[41] Marcel den Dikken (p.c.) points out that some counterexamples to this generalization have been observed in the literature (e.g. (ia)), but these cannot be reproduced in RD, as evidenced by (the Dutch equivalent of) (ib). Note, however, that backgrounding is barred in (ib) for the straightforward reason that the indefinite *d*XP cannot be cataphorically referred to by the definite correlate, as discussed before (thanks to Craig Sailor for noticing this). Expectedly, the sentence improves when a generic plural is used; furthermore, the AT in (ic) is on a par with (ia).

(i) a. A doctor who knew anything about acupuncture wasn't available.
b. *He wasn't available, a doctor who knew anything about acupuncture.
c. One person was still not available: A DOCTOR WHO KNEW ANYTHING ABOUT ACUPUNCTURE.

[42] The same applies to weak pronouns, which likewise resist fronting to the prefield and cannot be right-dislocated (see (34b)), although in this case RD is precluded anyway by the general requirement, discussed in section 3, that a *d*XP be more descriptive than its correlate.

We conclude that any category that can be fronted to the prefield can be right-dislocated, provided that it can be anaphorically related to an appropriate pro-form (in backgrounding). Nothing else needs to be said, and no construction-specific constraints need to be invoked.

5.2 Locality

We now turn to locality conditions on RD, where there are a number of distinct issues to consider. First, we discuss the status of the *d*XP itself, which, as already mentioned in section 4.1, is an island for extraction. Second, we show the proposed fronting of the *d*XP within CP_2 to be subject to the usual constraints on $\overline{A}$-movement. Indirectly, this corresponds to limitations on the hierarchical distance between correlate and *d*XP. Third, there turns out to be an additional proximity effect in backgrounding, which we show follows from the differential structural representation of backgrounding and ATs argued for in section 3.

We saw in section 4.1 that backgrounded clauses differ from postposed ones in being rigidly opaque for subextraction, a fact that we take to follow from the *d*XP's status as a constituent of an independent (non-subordinated) clause. The same observation holds for dislocated noun phrases: even when these are transparent for extraction while *in situ*, they become opaque once dislocated. For ATs, this is brought out by the examples in (73). The baseline case is (73a); *wh*-extraction from the indefinite DP is fine (73b). A variant of (73a) containing the same DP as an AT is (73c), and now we find that extraction is barred (73d).

(73) a. Ik heb een opvoering van *Les Misérables* gezien.
I have a performance of *Les Misérables* seen
'I saw a performance of *Les Misérables*.'

b. Waar$_i$ heb je een opvoering van t_i gezien?
where have you a performance of seen
'What did you see a performance of?'

c. Ik heb iets leuks gezien, EEN OPVOERING VAN *Les Misérables*.
I have something nice seen a performance of *Les Misérables*
'I saw something nice, a performance of *Les Misérables*.'

d. *Waar$_i$ heb je iets leuks gezien, EEN OPVOERING VAN t_i?
where have you something nice seen a performance of
*'What did you see something nice, a performance of?' (Dutch)

Clearly, then, *d*XPs are islands for extraction. As already pointed out in section 4.1, this follows straightforwardly from our analysis in terms of juxtaposed/coordinated root clauses, which predicts cross-clausal movement to be impossible.

Having established the island status of the *d*XP, let us now turn to locality constraints governing RD more generally. We begin by considering backgrounding in complex sentences,

where the correlate is inside an embedded clause, as exemplified by the following:

(74) a. Piet vertelde dat hij haar geplaagd had, *die vrouw*.
Piet told that he her teased had that woman
'Piet said that he had teased her, that woman.'

b. Ik sprak met iemand die haar geplaagd had, *die vrouw*.
I spoke with someone who her teased had that woman
'I talked to someone who had teased her, that woman.'

c. Piet sprong op toen ze aan kwam fietsen, *die vrouw*.
Piet jumped up when she on came cycling that woman
'Piet jumped up when she arrived cycling, that woman.' (Dutch)

Assuming that CP_2 underlyingly replicates the entire complex antecedent clause, (74a) can be explained as an instance of long-distance movement of the *d*XP within CP_2:

(75) $[_{:P}$ CP_1 $[$ **:** $[_{CP_2}$ die vrouw$_i$ $[$~~vertelde Piet $[t'_i$ dat hij t_i geplaagd had~~$]]]]]$

However, this analysis is problematic with regard to (74b) and (74c), since extraction out of relative and adjunct clauses is generally excluded. For each case in (74), fronting of the *d*XP within CP_2 would structurally correspond to the respective *wh*-extractions in (76), the last two of which are sharply unacceptable:

(76) a. Wie$_i$ vertelde Piet [dat hij t_i geplaagd had]?
who told Piet that he teased had
'Who did Piet tell that he had teased?'

b. *Wie$_i$ sprak je met iemand [die t_i geplaagd had]?
who spoke you with someone who teased had
*'Who did you talk to someone who had teased?'

c. *Wie$_i$ sprong Piet op [toen t_i aan kwam fietsen]?
who jumped Piet up when on came cycling
*'Who did Piet jump up when arrived cycling?' (Dutch)

Thus, (74b) and (74c) cannot be derived in this seemingly simplest fashion. Note, however, that it is far from evident that juxtaposition/coordination of CP_1 and CP_2 as assumed by our analysis should be limited to main clauses, and in fact we would like to argue that the acceptability of cases like (74b) and (74c) furnishes evidence to the contrary.[43]

Specifically, if the elliptical CP_2 can take only the embedded clause as its antecedent, this permits a derivation of (74b) and (74c) that is in full compliance with general locality constraints, as well as an alternative derivation for (74a). The analysis of (74) is then as

[43] As pointed out by a reviewer (citing Kural 1997), it has been claimed that RD in Japanese and Turkish is strictly a root phenomenon. Evaluating this claim and assessing whether or not this constitutes a genuine point of crosslinguistic variation is beyond the scope of the present paper, and we leave it to future research.

shown in (77), with properly local $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement of the *d*XP in each case. The elliptical CP_2 specifies the embedded propositional domain (CP_1), which is extensionally equivalent; the enhanced relative, adverbial or other function can be ignored for this purpose.[44]

(77) a. Piet vertelde...
[$_{\text{CP}_1}$ dat hij haar geplaagd had] [$_{\text{CP}_2}$ die vrouw$_i$ ~~had hij t_i geplaagd~~].(= (74a))

b. Ik sprak met iemand^2...
[$_{\text{CP}_1}$ die^2 haar^1 geplaagd had] [$_{\text{CP}_2}$ die vrouw^1_i ~~had die^2 t_i geplaagd~~].(= (74b))

c. Piet sprong op...
[$_{\text{CP}_1}$ toen ze aan kwam fietsen] [$_{\text{CP}_2}$ die vrouw$_i$ ~~kwam t_i aanfietsen~~]. (= (74c))

Our reasoning here echoes the discussion in Merchant 2001, sec. 5.3 concerning apparent instances of sluicing out of islands.[45] Merchant argues that in cases like (78), movement of the *wh*-phrase fails to induce an island violation because the ellipsis site in fact contains only the embedded propositional domain (i.e. the island itself), as shown in (79).

(78) a. They hired someone [who speaks a Balkan language]—guess which!
b. [That Maxwell killed the judge] was proven, but it's still not clear with what.

(79) a. ...guess [which$_i$ ~~[she speaks t_i]~~]
b. ...not clear [[with what]$_i$ ~~[Maxwell killed the judge t_i]~~]

Merchant and Barros et al. (2014) develop this solution for apparent non-locality in sluicing at some length, which we therefore take to be independently motivated.

According to our proposal in section 3, CP_1 and CP_2 are juxtaposed clauses, linked

[44]It seems reasonable to assume that specification can be asymmetric in this way. An alternative hypothesis is that CP_2 syntactically mimics CP_1 or a lower functional layer within CP_1. In that case, $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement of the *d*XP in a subordinate clause type might be a problem, unless ellipsis can license otherwise unattested movements, comparable, perhaps, to the situation in sluicing with multiple remnants. We leave this possibility open, but we will not entertain it in further detail.

[45]A reviewer observes that our reasoning does not readily extend to cases like the following (see Lasnik 2001 for analogous sluicing cases):

(i) Jeder Lehrer$_i$ hat mit einer Mutter gesprochen die sie gerne hat, *seine$_i$ Schüler*.
every teacher has with a mother spoken who them likes his students
'Every teacher talked to a mother who likes them, his students.' (German)

At first sight it appears that the main clause must be present in the ellipsis site to explain the observed bound reading, precluding, it appears, a non-island source. However, recall that we have argued that backgrounded *d*XPs are remnants of structurally connected clauses in complement position of **:**, the 'specifying' coordinator. Consequently, in cases like (i) we permit binding into the second conjunct by the quantified subject simply by virtue of scoping over the entire embedded **:**P:

(ii) [$_{\text{CP}}$ [jeder Lehrer]$_i$ ... [$_{:\text{P}}$ [$_{\text{CP}_1}$ die sie$_k$ gerne hat] **:** [$_{\text{CP}_2}$ [seine$_i$ Schüler]$_k$ ...]]]

cataphorically (by the correlate) and anaphorically (by deletion); in addition, we suggested, specifying coordination relates CP_1 and CP_2 syntactically in backgrounding, where host clause and *d*XP form a pragmatically and prosodically cohesive unit. As predicted by this analysis, backgrounding is impossible when the correlate is situated within an embedded clause that is not sentence-final:

(80) a. *[Dat Piet haar geplaagd had] vond ik niet erg, *die vrouw*.
that Piet her teased had found I not awful that woman
*'That Piet had teased her I did not think regrettable, that woman.'

b. *Ik heb iemand [die haar geplaagd had] een reprimande gegeven, *die vrouw*.
I have someone who her teased had a reprimand given that woman
*'I took someone who teased her to task, that woman.'

c. *[Toen ze aan kwam fietsen] sprong Piet op, *die vrouw*.
when she on came cycling jumped Piet up that woman
*'When she arrived cycling, Piet jumped up, that woman.' (Dutch)

The deviance of these cases follows directly from the irreconcilability of the observed linear order and specifying coordination of CP_1 and CP_2. The only structural representation compatible with the linear order in (80) is the following:

(81) $*[_{:P}\ [_{CP}\ \ldots\ CP_1\ \ldots\ ]\ \mathbf{:}\ CP_2\ ]$

No specificational relation obtains between the main clause embedding CP_1 on the one hand and CP_2 on the other, ruling out non-local backgrounding.[46] Conversely, the fact that no such interpretation is available shows that movement within CP_2 respects locality, i.e. there is no felicitous derivation of the *d*XPs in (80) in which CP_2 includes the entire antecedent.

Given that parentheticals can occur clause-medially, the above considerations lead us to expect the possibility of sentence-medial dislocation in case the antecedent of CP_2 is a non-final embedded clause. The examples in (82) contrast with those in (80) in this respect.

(82) a. [Dat Piet haar geplaagd had], *die vrouw*, vond ik niet erg.
that Piet her teased had that woman found I not awful
'That Piet had teased her, that woman, I did not think regrettable.'

[46] The effect witnessed in (80) is *prima facie* reminiscent of Ross's (1967) *Right-roof Constraint*, a descriptive statement of the fact that extraposition is clause-bounded. The unacceptability of long-distance extraposition is more categorical to us than that of cases like (80), however, presumably due to the fact that specifying coordination with the matrix clause yields a deviant but not unintelligible interpretation. In fact, Zwart (2001) deems examples similar to those in (80) acceptable, but his judgments strike us as far too generous (an impression confirmed by other speakers we consulted).

b. Ik heb iemand [die haar geplaagd had], *die vrouw*, een reprimande
I have someone who her teased had that woman a reprimand
gegeven.
given
'I took someone who teased her, that woman, to task.'

c. [Toen ze aan kwam fietsen], *die vrouw*, sprong Piet op.
when she on came cycling that woman jumped Piet up
'When she arrived cycling, that woman, Piet jumped up.' (Dutch)

Medial dislocations of this kind cannot surface just anywhere, but only to the immediate right of the clause containing the correlate. This is expected given that these are instantiations of the following structure (compare to the illicit (81)):

(83) $[_{\text{CP}} \ldots [_{:\text{P}} \text{CP}_1 [\mathbf{:} \text{CP}_2]] \ldots]$

Just as our analysis of backgrounding in terms of specifying coordination of CP_1 and CP_2 leads us to expect the deviance of examples like (80), then, it correctly predicts the possibility of medial dislocations as in (82).[47] We emphasize that it is syntactic *hierarchy* and not linear distance that is essential to this explanation. An embedded clause is free to intervene linearly between a correlate that is part of the matrix and the associated *d*XP:

(84) Ze kwam aanfietsen [toen Piet opsprong], *die vrouw*.
she came on cycling when Piet up jumped that woman
'She arrived cycling when Piet jumped up, that woman.' (Dutch)

No problem arises here, given that the string supports a parse in which the matrix clause (= CP_1) and CP_2 are locally coordinated, contrasting crucially with the examples in (80).

We argued in section 3 that ATs differ from backgrounded *d*XPs in being structurally independent expressions. From this perspective it is not surprising that ATs permit structural separation from their host clauses much more readily than backgrounded *d*XPs, rendering configurations analogous to those in (80) acceptable (*mutatis mutandis*):

(85) a. Dat ze zoiets zouden vinden, had niemand verwacht: EEN ECHTE
that they such thing should find had no one expected a real
GOUDSCHAT!
treasure of gold
'No one had expected they would find such a thing: a real treasure of gold!'

[47] An anonymous reviewer wonders if the presence of a medial *d*XP should not disrupt certain syntactic dependencies, such as the dependency between protasis and apodosis in conditional constructions analogous to (82c). It must be borne in mind here that, as explained in section 3, our analysis treats *d*XPs as parenthetical elements, and this is true regardless of whether they occur in peripheral or medial position. Parentheticals generally do not affect syntactic dependencies in the clauses within which they surface (de Vries 2007b), and hence no effect is expected in cases of medial dislocation.

b. Elke pianist die er een heeft, kan zich gelukkig prijzen: EEN
every pianist who there one has can REFL lucky consider a
STEINWAY-VLEUGEL.
Steinway grand piano
'Every pianist who has one can consider himself lucky: a *Steinway*.'

c. Toen hij zag welk dier ze in zijn tas gestopt hadden, schrok Peter
when he saw what animal they in his bag put had startled Peter
verschrikkelijk: EEN VOGELSPIN!
terribly a tarantula
'When they saw what kind of animal they had placed in his bag, Peter was terrified: a tarantula!' (Dutch)

Since ATs are structurally unconnected to their hosts, nothing prevents this kind of separation provided that correlate and AT can be anaphorically linked, as schematized in (86).[48] We assume, as argued above, that CP_1, i.e. the antecedent of deletion in CP_2, is the embedded clause only, voiding extraction out of islands.

(86) $[_{CP} \ldots \boxed{[_{CP_1} \ldots \ DP_i \ldots \ ]} \ldots \ ] \ [_{CP_2} \ dXP_i \ \Delta \ ]$

By contrast, and as shown above, the backgrounding examples in (80) cannot be derived by specifying coordination of CP_1 and CP_2, for this would require a different word order (*viz.*, intraposition as in (82)). Nor can they be derived by including the entire complex clause in CP_2's antcedent domain, which would entail long-distance $\overline{A}$-movement of the *d*XP across island boundaries (analogous to (76b)/(76c)). This proves that standard locality constraints on $\overline{A}$-movement govern fronting of the *d*XP within CP_2.

This conclusion is strengthened by considering effects of the Coordinate-structure Constraint on backgrounding. Witness:

(87) a. *Ik heb [hem en zijn vrouw] uitgenodigd voor het feest, *Piet*.
I have him and his wife invited for the party Piet
*'I invited him and his wife for the party, Piet.'

[48] That is, as long as the clause embedding CP_1 does not introduce elements disrupting this relation, so that the correlate is anaphorically accessible to the *d*XP. It is harder, for instance, to interpret an AT as associating with a correlate inside a relative clause when the head of the relative is itself a suitable correlate:

(i) Peter kennt [jemanden$_i$ [der [einen Hollywoodstar]$_k$ kennt]]: [DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA]$_{i/?k}$.
Peter knows someone who a Hollywood star knows ACC John Travolta
'Peter knows someone who knows a Hollywood star: John Travolta.' (German)

The contrast with examples like (85b) shows clearly that no syntactic locality is at stake here, but merely general preferences of discourse anaphoricity/parsing.

b. *Ik heb [zijn vrouw en hem] uitgenodigd voor het feest, *Piet*.
I have his wife and him invited for the party Piet
*'I invited his wife and him for the party, Piet.' (Dutch)

While permitting local coordination of antecedent and elliptical clause, the sentences in (87) would require illicit extraction of the *d*XP out of a coordinate structure within CP_2, and would thus be expected to be on a par with (88).[49]

(88) a. *Who$_i$ did you invite [t_i and his wife] for the party?
b. *Who$_i$ did you invite [his wife and t_i] for the party?

By contrast, (89a) is fine because (89b) is. While differing minimally from (87a), these sentences crucially involve an adverbial prepositional phrase instead of a genuine coordination, voiding the island violation.

(89) a. Ik heb [hem [met zijn vrouw]] uitgenodigd voor het feest, *Piet*.
I have him with his wife invited for the party Piet
'I invited him with his wife for the party, Piet.'
b. Wie$_i$ heb je t_i met zijn vrouw uitgenodigd voor het feest?
who have you with his wife invited for the party
'Who did you invite with his wife for the party?' (Dutch)

These facts thus support our claim that the *d*XP undergoes movement within CP_2.[50]

[49] As expected, cases like (ia) are fine as well, given the availability of ATB-movement analogous to (ib).

(i) a. Ich habe ein Buch über ihn gelesen und einen Film über ihn gesehen, *über Chomsky*.
I have a book about him read and a movie about him seen about Chomsky
'I read a book about him and I saw a movie about him, Chomsky.' (German)
b. Who$_i$ did you [call up t_i last week] and [invite t_i yesterday]?

Note that (ia) cannot be an instance of Right-node Raising, since the correlates are not conjunct-final.

[50] The picture is somewhat less clear for AT-type RD 'out of' coordinate structures. When the correlate conjunct is appropriately stressed, cases like the following are nearly acceptable:

(i) ?Iedereen herkende tenminste één popster en diens opvallend lange vrouw op het feest:
everyone recognized at least one pop star and his strikingly tall wife at the party
John Travolta.
John Travolta
'Everyone recognized at least one pop star and his strikingly tall wife at the party: John Travolta.'
(Dutch)

Such facts are reminiscent of acceptable cases of seemingly CSC-violating instances of *wh*-extraction in sluicing, documented by Merchant (2001) (who takes the violation to be 'repaired' by PF-deletion; cf. fn. 45). Fragment answers do not seem to be robustly constrained by the CSC either (Merchant 2004, 710).

We suspect that the marginal acceptability of (i) reflects a slight deviation from parallelism in order to accomodate the AT, by ignoring the second conjunct (at the cost of 'sacrificing' entailment in one direction). That something like this might be going on is suggested by the fact that cases like (i) have a feeling of incompleteness to them, i.e. they appear to violate an expectation on the part of the hearer that both conjuncts

Recall from section 3 that specifying coordination in backgrounding yields a strong pragmatic and prosodic cohesion between host clause and *d*XP: prosodically, a single intonation phrase; pragmatically, a single speech act. As a result, there is a strong preference against inserting stressed parenthetical material in between host clause and a backgrounded *d*XP, rather than relegating it to the periphery of the entire RD unit. This is illustrated by the contrast in (90) (where small caps indicate pitch accents):

(90) a. Piet heeft haar OOK gezien, *die vrouw*.
Piet has her also seen that woman
'Piet saw her as well, that woman.'

b. *Piet heeft haar OOK gezien, althans GISTEREN, *die vrouw*.
Piet has her also seen at any rate yesterday that woman
*'Piet saw her as well, that is, yesterday, that woman.' (Dutch)

When the disrupting parenthetical instead occurs clause-medially, prosodic coherence of host clause and *d*XP is respected and the result is again fine:

(91) Piet heeft haar, ik geloof GISTEREN, OOK gezien, *die vrouw*.
Piet has her I believe yesterday also seen that woman
'Piet saw her, I think yesterday, as well, that woman.' (Dutch)

Conversely, if an intervening phrase is backgrounded itself, it can linearly precede a *d*XP, showing that backgrounding can be iterated (we return to multiple RD below).

(92) Piet heeft haar OOK gezien, *gisteren*, *die vrouw*.
Piet has her also seen yesterday that woman
'Piet saw her as well, yesterday, that woman.' (Dutch)

Here, unlike in (90b), the host clause and the backgrounded *d*XPs still constitute a single pragmatic and prosodic unit. Similarly, extraposition within CP_1, as of the PP *voor het feest* in (89a), does not disrupt the specificational relation between CP_1 and CP_2, since the two clauses can still be locally coordinated. As expected, however, the extraposed PP must precede the backgrounded *d*XP, as shown by the contrast between (89a) and the following:[51]

(93) *Ik heb hem met zijn vrouw uitgenodigd, *Piet*, voor het feest.
I have him with his wife invited Piet to the party
*'I invited him with his wife, Piet, to the party.' (Dutch)

ought to be specified by an AT. The unavailability of such accomodation in backgrounding (as documented in the main text) is presumably due to the rigorous parallelism imposed by specifying coordination (cf. footnote 58 below). We leave further investigation of these issues to future work.

[51] Examples like (93) can be salvaged by turning the peripheral PP into an AT preceded by a salient prosodic break (see below); the judgment here assumes extraposition-like intonation.

The pattern obtained by comparison of (90b), (91), (92), and (89a)/(93) reveals the pragmatic and prosodic cohesion of host and *d*XP in backgrounding, implemented by our analysis in terms of specifying coordination of CP_1 and CP_2.

By contrast, given the structural independence of ATs established in section 3, we expect these to be less tightly constrained. This expectation is borne out (see also fn. 33):

(94) a. Piet gaat iets leuks doen, althans VOLgend jaar: NAAR BELGIË REIZEN.
Piet goes sth. nice do anyway next year to Belgium travel
'Piet is going to do something nice, that is, next year: travel to Belgium.'

b. Ik ben een beroemdheid tegengekomen – je raadt het NOOIT – YO-YO MA.
I am a celebrity encountered you guess it never Yo-Yo Ma
'I've met a celebrity—you will never guess who it is—Yo-Yo Ma.' (Dutch)

Unlike what we saw above with backgrounding in (90b), and similar to the facts in (85), ATs readily permit separation from the host by intervening parentheticals.

In the light of the facts reviewed above, we expect backgrounded *d*XPs to obligatorily precede ATs; this, too, is borne out (cf. Averintseva-Klisch 2009, 33). Thus, (90b) above becomes fine with a reversed order, as shown in (95); (96) illustrates for German.

(95) Piet heeft haar OOK gezien, *die vrouw*, althans GISTEREN.
Piet has her also seen that woman at any rate yesterday
'Piet saw her as well, that woman, that is, yesterday.' (Dutch)

(96) a. Dann hat ein Star sie angesprochen, *die Maria*: DER JOHN TRAVOLTA.
then has a star her talked to the Maria the John Travolta
'Then a star talked to her, Maria: John Travolta.'

b. *Dann hat ein Star sie angesprochen: DER JOHN TRAVOLTA, *die Maria*.
then has a star her talked to the John Travolta the Maria
*'Then a star talked to her: John Travolta, Maria.' (German)

The AT in (96a) adds discourse-new information to the discourse unit consisting of host clause and backgrounded *d*XP; consequently its interpolation in between the two is is blocked (96b) by the possibility of subsequent serialization as in (96a).

The net result is that backgrounded *d*XPs are more tightly constrained than ATs, surfacing in linear adjacency to their hosts as a result of the pragmatic and prosodic integration documented in section 3. This cohesion, we suggested, is due to syntactic specifying coordination in backgrounding, as opposed to a purely discursive juxtaposition of CP_1 and CP_2 where the latter is realized as an AT.

To sum up, RD manifests a number of locality constraints. We showed that subextraction from the *d*XP is impossible, a fact that follows automatically from our biclausal analysis and distinguishes RD sharply from extraposition. We then showed that standard

limitations on $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement apply, furnishing indirect evidence for a movement dependency within the elliptical CP_2. In certain configurations, locality constraints can be circumvented by construing the *d*XP as directly specifying an embedded antecedent CP and thus enabling local extraction, consonant with Merchant's analogous claims about sluicing. As expected in the light of the structural asymmetry proposed in section 3, backgrounded *d*XPs surface in linear adjacency to their hosts, whereas ATs are not constrained in this way.

5.3 Parallels with other elliptical constructions

We have argued that *d*XPs in RD are derived analogously to sluiced *wh*-phrases and fragment answers, by $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement and subsequent remnant deletion at PF. Empirical support for this implementation is provided by a crosslinguistic asymmetry concerning preposition-stranding. In his discussion of sluicing, Merchant (2001) establishes the following generalization (his second *form-identity generalization*):

(97) A language *L* will allow preposition stranding under sluicing iff *L* allows preposition stranding under regular *wh*-movement.

The generalization is a direct corollary of Merchant's claim (based on Ross's 1969b seminal analysis) that the *wh*-remnant in sluicing undergoes $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement prior to PF-deletion of its derived sister. Consequently, we find the expected typological split between languages which allow P-stranding under $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement and those that do not reflected in sluicing:

(98) a. Sie hat mit jemandem gesprochen, aber ich weiß nicht *(mit) wem.
she has with someone spoken but I know not with who
'She talked to somebody, but I don't know who.' (German)

b. Per har snakket med noen, men jeg vet ikke ($^{??}$med) hvem.
Per has talked with someone but I know not with who
'She talked to somebody, but I don't know who.' (Norwegian)

Given the general (im-)possibility of P-stranding in the language, Norwegian expectedly allows for the preposition to be stranded inside the ellipsis site whereas German does not.

(99) [DP ~~[… [PP P t_i] …]~~] ✓Norwegian, *German

Fragment answers behave analogously, as documented in Merchant 2004.

In light of the reasoning employed here, we expect the generalization in (97) to extend to RD (*mutatis mutandis*). This prediction is borne out. Consider first backgrounding in German and Dutch, two languages that normally ban P-stranding under $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement:

(100) a. Ich habe mich oft mit ihr gestritten, *(*mit*) *meiner Schwester*.
I have me often with her quarreled with my sister
'I often quarreled with her, with my sister.' (German)

b. Tasman wou er niet over praten, ?*(*over*) *Lutjegast*.
Tasman wanted there not about talk about Lutjegast
'Tasman didn't want to talk about it, about Lutjegast.' (Dutch; Zwart 2011)

As expected, the preposition must be retained on the dislocated PP.[52,53] This contrasts with PP-backgrounding in Icelandic and Norwegian, two languages that do allow P-stranding under $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement; here, the preposition can be (and preferably is) omitted from the *d*XP:

(101) a. Jón talaði við hana, (??*við*) *gömul konuna*.
Jon talked to her to old lady.DEF
'Jon talked to her, (to) the old lady.' (Icelandic)

b. Jeg krangler ofte med ho, (??*med*) *søstera mi*.
I quarrel often with her with sister my
'I often quarrel with her, (with) my sister.' (Norwegian)

The same crosslinguistic contrast obtains in ATs:

(102) a. Mit einem Menschen streite ich mich immer: *(MIT) MEINER
with one person quarrel I REFL always with my
SCHWESTER.
sister
'There's one person that I always quarrel with: with my sister.' (German)

b. Døm snakka bare om én ting: (?OM) LINGVISTIKK.
they talked only about one thing about linguistics
'They talked about only one thing: (about) linguistics.' (Norwegian)

These facts thus furnish evidence for the presence of unpronounced clausal structure and leftward movement of the *d*XP, hence speak in favor of the deletion analysis. Conversely,

[52] A reviewer finds preposition omission in similar examples acceptable; in the German-speaking author's judgment, these are as degraded as sluicing or fragment answers with omitted prepositions. There may well be some speaker variation in this domain (as there is in sluicing), which we have nothing insightful to say about here. In addition, preposition-less *d*XPs may in some cases be alternatively parsed as remnants of a predicational copular clause, a construction we discuss in section 6. Note that the contrast with Icelandic/Norwegian remains in any event, since, as indicated in (101), retention of the preposition in these languages gives rise to degradation, which is not the case for German/Dutch speakers.

[53] Marcel den Dikken (p.c.) points out that there appears to be an asymmetry between RD as in (100b) and corresponding instances of Left-dislocation in Dutch, in that the latter permits a preposition-less *d*XP (as briefly discussed in de Vries 2004, sect. 4.1, fn. 29; 2009a, sect. 3.1). For some reason, LD of selected (and only selected) PPs is somewhat unnatural in Dutch, which can be solved by DP dislocation in combination with an R-pronominal correlate. A full discussion of this issue here would take us too far afield. Note that an additional (and potentially interfering) possibility at the left periphery arises due to the availability of 'hanging topics,' which appear to have no direct counterpart at the right periphery. (See Alexiadou 2006, de Vries 2009a, and references therein on the distinction between types of Left-dislocation.)

P-stranding in RD as in (101) is entirely unexpected on any rightward-movement analysis of RD, given that rightward movement has long been known not to permit P-stranding even in languages that permit P-stranding under leftward movement (Ross 1967).

Furthermore, the P-stranding facts just reviewed provide evidence against an alternative analysis suggested by Truckenbrodt (2013, in press). In his particular implementation of the deletion analysis of RD, which Truckenbrodt likens to gapping (cf. Hartmann 2001), the *d*XP remains *in situ*.

(103) a. Ich habe sie gesehen, *die Maria*.
I have her seen the Maria
'I've seen her, Maria.' (German)

b. [$_{\text{CP}_1}$ ich habe sie gesehen] [$_{\text{CP}_2}$ ~~ich habe~~ die Maria ~~gesehen~~]

Unlike the present analysis, Truckenbrodt's (2013) thus posits deletion of a non-constituent (equivalently, simultaneous deletion of several subconstituents). By contrast, our analysis adopts the view that ellipsis operations target unitary constituents. Empirically, the P-stranding asymmetry provides evidence for movement of the *d*XP; no such crosslinguistic correlation is directly predicted by Truckenbrodt's *in-situ* analysis. By the same token, it is unclear how Truckenbrodt's analysis could account for the unacceptability of NPI-containing *d*XPs (recall (67a)), or for some of the constraints documented in section 5.2.

A further reason against assimilating RD to gapping is that uncontroversial instances of gapping require all remnants to contrast with overt correlates in the antecedent (cf. Hartmann 2001), as shown in (104). By contrast, sluicing permits implicit correlates (105).

(104) *Beth ate yoghurt, and Norma ~~ate (yoghurt)~~ at midnight.

(105) John kissed Mary, but I don't know when.

The fact, then, that we find just this kind of sprouting with right-dislocated adjuncts strongly suggests that RD is derived by clausal ellipsis rather than gapping:

(106) a. Ich habe einen Kuchen gebacken, für meine Freunde.
I have a cake baked for my friends
'I baked a cake, for my friends.'

b. Ich habe den Peter getroffen, gestern.
I have the Peter met yesterday
'I met Peter, yesterday.' (German)

The *d*XP in these examples can be either backgrounded (e.g., when (106a) is used as an answer to the question, *What did you do for your friends?*) or stressed.[54]

Locality constraints provide further evidence for clausal ellipsis in RD. The first constraint concerns linear order. In multiple sluicing, the linear order of the remnants must match that of their correlates in the antecedent clause (cf. Grebenyova 2007).

(107) Jemand hat jemanden geküsst, aber ich weiß nicht {wer
someone.NOM has someone.ACC kissed but I know not who.NOM
wen / *wen wer}.
who.ACC ACC NOM
'Someone kissed someone, but I don't know who kissed whom.' (German)

The same is true for fragment answers with multiple remnants:

(108) A: Who kissed whom?
B: Ich glaube, {der Peter die Maria / *die Maria der Peter}.
I think NOM Peter ACC Maria
'I believe Peter kissed Mary.' (German)

We will not provide an explanation for this fact here, nor will we propose a derivation of cases with multiple remnants. The relevant point for our purposes is that we find the same constraint in multiple RD; this is shown for backgrounding in (109) and for ATs in (110).[55]

(109) Sie hat ihn geküsst, {*die Maria den Hans* / **den Hans die Maria*}.
she has him kissed NOM Maria ACC Hans ACC Hans NOM Maria
'She kissed him, Maria (kissed) Hans.' (German)

(110) Nur eine Frau hat einen Mann geküsst: DIE MARIA DEN PETER /
only one.NOM woman has a.ACC man kissed NOM Maria ACC Peter
*DEN PETER DIE MARIA.
ACC Peter NOM Maria
'Only one woman kissed a man: Maria (kissed) Peter.' (German)

[54] In either case can (106a) be safely distinguished from PP-extraposition by means of intonation, as described in section 2.

[55] In German, the order of ATs can be marginally reversed with strong focal emphasis on both remnants:

(i) ?Nur eine Frau hat einen Mann geküsst: (nämlich) DEN PETER, (und zwar) DIE MARIA!
only one.NOM woman has a.ACC man kissed namely ACC Peter in fact NOM Maria
'Only one woman kissed a man, (namely) Peter, (it was) Maria!' (German)

We suspect that in this case, each *d*XP instantiates an elliptical CP, as suggested by the fact that the two *d*XPs are obligatorily separated by a prosodic break; moreover, as indicated each *d*XP can be accompanied by a sentence adverb (suggesting in Truckenbrodt's in press terms that (i) involves three speech acts). It seems that German permits this option since the reversal is rather transparently marked by the case morphology in cases like (i); when case is not overtly indicated (e.g., when the *d*XPs are names without determiners), and hence also generally in Dutch, such reversal is unacceptable.

Interestingly, this behavior differs from that of multiple extraposition, which mirrors the order of the associates (see de Vries 2009b):

(111) a. Meer jongens hebben de man gezien met de rode hoed dan meisjes.
more boys have the man seen with the red hat than girls
'More boys saw the man with the red hat than girls.'

b. *Meer jongens hebben de man gezien dan meisjes met de rode hoed. (Dutch)

From the perspective of the deletion analysis, this is just what we expect: multiple *d*XPs behave like remnants of clausal ellipsis, but unlike extraposed categories.

Sauerland (1999) observes that multiple sluicing is generally degraded when the two *wh*-remnants are not clause-mates (112), despite the fact that sluicing of a long-distance-moved *wh*-phrase is generally possible. As shown in (113), the same holds for fragment answers.

(112) *Irgendwer$_i$ hat gesagt, dass Hannes etwas$_k$ gekauft hat, aber Maria weiß
someone has said that Hannes something bought has but Maria knows
nicht wer$_i$ was$_k$.
not who what
intended: 'Someone said that Hannes bought something, but Maria doesn't know who said that Hannes bought what.' (German)

(113) A: Who said that Maria bought what? – B: *Der Peter ein Buch.
the.NOM Peter a.ACC book
intended: 'Peter said that Maria bought a book.' (German)

As before, we leave the source of this constraint open and confine ourselves to pointing out that it applies to RD as well:

(114) a. *Er$_i$ kennt den Typen der sie$_k$ geküsst hat, *der Peter$_i$ die Maria$_k$*
he knows the guy who her kissed has NOM Peter ACC Maria
'He knows the guy who kissed her, Peter (knows the guy who kissed) Maria.'

b. *Nur einer kennt das Mädchen das einen Jungen geküsst hat: DER PETER
onlye one knows the girl that a boy kissed has the Peter
DEN HANS.
the Hans
'Only one person knows the girl who kissed a boy: Peter (knows the girl who kissed) Hans.' (German)

These common characteristics of RD on the one hand and sluicing and fragment answers on the other support our claim that *d*XPs are derived in an analogous fashion, i.e. by clausal ellipsis fed by XP-fronting.

6 Predicative afterthoughts

Finally, let us turn to predicative ATs, which we have set aside so far. Recall from section 2 that ATs of this kind attribute some property to the referent of their correlate, rather than specifying it. The following pair illustrates the difference:

(115) *German*

a. Ich habe einen Star getroffen: DEN JOHN TRAVOLTA!
I have a star met the.ACC John Travolta
'I met a star: John Travolta!' [specificational]

b. Ich habe den John Travolta getroffen, EIN BERÜHMTER STAR!
I have the John Travolta met a.NOM famous.NOM star
'I met John Travolta, a famous star!' [predicative]

Importantly for our purposes here, the interpretive difference between specificational and predicative ATs systematically correponds to syntactic differences. Note that the ATs in (115) differ in case: while the case of specificational ATs covaries with that of their correlate (as shown in section 4.2.1), predicative ATs invariably bear nominative case.

We propose that this difference betokens a difference in underlying structure: while specificational ATs are remnants of a redundant repetition, predicative ATs are remnants of predicational copular clauses, in which they function as the predicate. Thus, the *d*XP in (115b) derives from the predicational copular clause in (116a); movement, deletion, and juxtaposition then yield the underlying structure in (116b).

(116) a. Er ist ein berühmter Star.
he is a.NOM famous.NOM star
'He is a famous star.' (German)

b. [$_{\text{CP}_1}$ ich habe den John Travolta getroffen] [$_{\text{CP}_2}$ ein berühmter Star$_i$ [~~ist er t_i~~]]

This analysis transparently reflects the intuitive meaning of examples like (115b), and moreover straightforwardly accounts for their invariant nominative case. At the same time, it brings out a commonality of specificational and predicative ATs, namely propositional semantics. In the case of specificational ATs, this meaning is largely redundant, except for the discourse-new *d*XP; in the case of predicative ATs, it is a (clausal) predication.

Crucially, whether a *d*XP is interpreted as a predicate or as a specification is not an inherent property of the phrase itself;[56] consequently, AT constructions can be ambiguous between a specificational and a predicative reading. An example is the following:

[56] Genericity likewise depends on the grammatical context and discourse. See Heringa and de Vries 2008 for related discussion of relativity of interpretation in appositional constructions.

(117) Ik heb Jan gesproken, MIJN BUURMAN.
I have Jan spoken my neighbor
'I talked to Jan, my neighbor.' (Dutch)

Here, *mijn buurman* can be interpreted as a property of Jan; on this reading, the *d*XP is a predicate. Alternatively, the *d*XP (being definite) can serve as a referential phrase identifying the intended person. The first case can be used felicitously if the referent (Jan) is contextually given, but the hearer does not know that Jan is the speaker's neighbor. The second case can be used if the hearer does not know Jan, who is then identified as the speaker's neighbor. In German, case distinguishes between the two readings at the surface:

(118) a. Ich habe den Jan getroffen, MEIN NACHBAR.
I have the Jan met my.NOM neighbor.NOM
'I met my neighbor Jan/Jan, who is my neighbor.'
b. Ich habe den Jan getroffen, MEINEN NACHBARN.
I have the Jan met my.ACC neighbor.ACC
'I met Jan, (I met) my neighbor.' (German)

Nominative case on the afterthought forces a predicative reading, whereas matching case gives rise to a specificational reading. The *d*XP in (118a) is thus underlyingly represented as a copular clause meaning *He/Jan is my neighbor*, whereas (118b) involves a repetition structure. To illustrate:

(119) [$_{CP_1}$ ich habe den Jan getroffen] ...
a. ... [$_{CP_2}$ [mein Nachbar].NOM$_i$ [~~ist er t_i~~]]
b. ... [$_{CP_2}$ [meinen Nachbarn].ACC$_i$ [~~habe ich t_i getroffen~~]]

As this analysis leads us to expect, predicative ATs permit sentence adverbs just like the corresponding predicational copular clauses:[57]

(120) a. Hans hat den Jan getroffen, angeblich SEIN NACHBAR.
Hans has the.ACC Jan met allegedly his neighbor
'Hans met Jan, allegedly his neighbor.'

[57] We will not attempt to answer the question how both the adverb and the DP can reach the prefield to escape deletion; as noted in section 5.3, this is a general problem for the movement-*cum*-deletion approach (cf. Merchant 2004). What matters for us is that the deletion remnants we are proposing here are attested independently; consider, e.g., the following fragment answer:

(i) A: Wer ist Jan? – B: Angeblich Hans' Nachbar.
who is Jan allegedly Hans' neighbor
A: 'Who is Jan?' – B: 'Allegedly, (he is) Hans' neighbor.' (German)

b. Jan ist angeblich sein Nachbar.
Jan is allegedly his neighbor
'Allegedly, Jan is his neighbor.' (German)

Following the discussion in section 3, where parallel examples involving specificational ATs were presented, this shows that predicative ATs, like specificational ones, are independent speech acts and thus syntactically separate from their hosts. Here, too, the absence of a structural connection between host clause and AT is supported by the fact that an AT like that in (120a) can be supplied by a second speaker.[58] Independent support for this analysis is provided by the fact that predicative ATs can be *i-within-i* expressions, which are known to be restricted to predicative positions but cannot figure as arguments (see Williams 1982; Doron 1994). Witness the following contrast:

(121) a. *[Sein$_i$ eigener größter Feind]$_i$ hatte die Wahl gewonnen.
his own worst enemy had the election won
*'His own worst enemy had won the election.'

b. Peter$_i$ war schon immer [sein$_i$ eigener größter Feind]$_i$.
Peter was already always his own worst enemy
'Peter has always been his own worst enemy.' (German)

A predicative AT of the *i-within-i* type is as acceptable as the predicate in (121b):

(122) Für seine Mutter war Peter$_i$ vor allem eines: [SEIN$_i$ EIGENER GRÖSSTER FEIND]$_i$.
for his mother was Peter especially one thing his own worst enemy
'To his mother, Peter was especially one thing: his own worst enemy.' (German)

As expected, case matching enforces a specificational reading and hence a repetition, excluding an *i-within-i*-type *d*XP:

(123) *Maria liebt den Peter$_i$, [SEINEN$_i$ EIGENEN GRÖSSTEN FEIND]$_i$.
Maria loves the Peter his own worst enemy
*'Maria loves Peter$_i$, [his$_i$ own worst enemy]$_i$.' (German)

This supports our claim that predicative ATs are elliptical predicational copular clauses.

[58] We suggest, tentatively, that the structural connection hypothesized in section 3 to be required for (specificational) backgrounding may be the reason for why *predicative* backgrounding is strictly impossible. Suppose, as seems plausible, that specifying coordination imposes a strong parallelism requirement on the two clauses: for CP_2 to specify CP_1, the two clauses must be parallel up to the difference between correlate and *d*XP, accounting for the relative focal status of the latter. This parallelism is satisfied in standard, i.e. specificational backgrounding, where CP_1 and CP_2 are parallel (as argued above); but no parallelism obtains when CP_2 is a predicational copular clause. Assuming that **:** imposes this strong parallelism requirement, the impossibility of predicative backgrounding follows straightforwardly.

Note that while the analysis correctly predicts the remnant of the elided copular clause to invariably surface with nominative case, it also predicts limited connectivity, owing to the presence of a subject in the underlying copular clause. Witness:

(124) Ik heb Jan$_i$ gezien, EEN VIJAND VAN ZICHZELF$_i$.
I have Jan seen an enemy of himself
'I saw Jan, an enemy of himself.' (Dutch)

Condition A satisfaction under reconstruction is expected here, given our proposal that the underlying structure is a predicational copular clause:

(125) [$_{CP_2}$ hij$_i$ is [een vijand van zichzelf$_i$]] → [$_{CP_2}$ [een vijand van zichzelf]$_i$ [~~is hij$_i$ *t*~~]]
he is an enemy of himself

APs can likewise function as predicative ATs. As mentioned in section 3, Park and Kim (2009) propose an analysis of RD that is in important respects similar to ours; they discuss Korean examples like the following:

(126) John-i sinpwu-lul manna-ass-ta, ACWU YEPPUN.
John-NOM bride-ACC meet-PAST-DECL very pretty
'John met a very pretty bride.' (Korean)

Contrary to the analysis presented above, Park and Kim assume that *acwu yeppun* 'very pretty' is a fronted prenominal modifier in CP_2. They are consequently forced to assume that CP_2 in (126) involves an illicit left-branch extraction (marked *), 'repaired' by ellipsis:

(127) [acwu yeppun$_i$ [~~*John-i *t*$_i$ sinpwu-lul manna-ass-ta~~]] (Park and Kim's analysis)

Parallel cases in Germanic provide direct evidence against this analysis of cases like (126) in terms of left-branch extractions, and for copular clauses as the source of predicative ATs. Consider the German counterpart to (126):

(128) Hans hat eine junge Frau geheiratet, WUNDERSCHÖN.
Hans has a young woman married very pretty
'Hans married a young woman, (she is) beautiful.' (German)

Unlike a prenominal AP (129a), the right-dislocated AP bears no inflection, identifying it as an AP used predicatively (129b).

(129) a. eine wunderschön*(-e) junge Frau
a very pretty-AGR young woman
'a very pretty young woman'

b. Sie ist wunderschön.
she is very pretty
'She is very pretty.' (German)

This strongly suggests that the *d*XP in (128) is a predicative AP, derived in the by-now familiar fashion from an underlying copular clause corresponding to (129b).

(130) $[_{CP_1}$ Hans hat eine junge Frau geheiratet$]$ $[_{CP_2}$ wunderschön$_i$ $[$~~ist sie t_i~~$]]$

As before, the analysis transparently reflects the intuitive meaning of such cases, directly analogous to non-elliptical expressions juxtaposed in discourse:

(131) Hans hat eine junge Frau geheiratet. WUNDERSCHÖN ist sie.
Hans has a young woman married very pretty is she
'Hans married a young woman. She is very pretty.' (German)

We assume that the analysis generalizes to the Korean cases discussed by Park and Kim.

One might object to this analysis of predicative ATs based on the fact that no parallelism of CP_1 and CP_2 is observed here, unlike in the cases discussed previously. However, as discussed at some length in Merchant 2004, 2010, this kind of "limited ellipsis" in copular clauses is recoverable without a linguistic antecedent. Consider the following, uttered without any discourse context:

(132) [John, holding up a *Leica* camera:] Beautiful!

Merchant argues that such cases are derived exactly like predicative ATs on our analysis:

(133) $[_{CP}$ beautiful$_i$ $[$~~this is t_i~~$]]$

Thus, ellipsis in predicational copular clauses, yielding predicative ATs, is licensed not by parallelism of CP_1 and CP_2, but by the general recoverability of limited ellipsis of functional elements.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have shown that the empirically and conceptually most adequate analysis of RD is one that takes its surface form to be derived from an underlyingly biclausal structure, the *d*XP being the remnant of a second root clause reduced by clausal ellipsis. Analyses in terms of either base-generation or movement of the *d*XP in/to its peripheral position were shown to be at odds with basic properties of the construction, which are readily accounted for by the biclausal approach.

The following schema summarizes the refinement of (1) we have developed in this paper:

(134) $\underbrace{[_{\mathrm{CP}_1} \ \ldots \ \text{correlate} \ \ldots]}_{\text{host clause}} \overbrace{[_{\mathrm{CP}_2} \ d\mathrm{XP} \ \langle[\ldots \ t \ \ldots \ ]\rangle]}^{\text{elliptical clause}}$ ($\langle \ldots \rangle$ = PF-deletion)

Deletion in CP_2 is felicitous provided that the two clauses are parallel in underlying form, *modulo* the difference between *d*XP and correlate. The ellipsis remnant is either discourse-new and stressed (AT) or discourse-old but focal/more descriptive relative to its correlate within the backgrounded CP_2 (backgrounding). The prosodic and pragmatic cohesiveness of backgrounded *d*XPs led us to suggest that these are structurally related to their hosts by a functional head mediating specification of CP_1 by CP_2, whereas ATs are prosodically and pragmatically independent units of discourse, linked to the host clause only anaphorically. The analysis identifies *d*XPs of either type as parenthetical elements, which are not directly involved in the composition of the host clause. We also argued that predicative *d*XPs are reduced predicational copular clauses, as brought out by their morphosyntactic and semantic properties.

On our analysis, RD is the result of an interplay of the mechanisms of discourse grammar and sentence grammar: juxtaposition/coordination of clauses, anaphora and cataphora, $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement, and clausal ellipsis. To the extent that our analysis is on the right track and that its ingredients are independently motivated (as we have suggested), it thus eliminates 'right-dislocation' as a construction. While many questions remain,[59] we are confident that our proposal provides a fruitful and coherent framework for future investigations of the right periphery.

[59] An important issue we have been forced to set aside here for reasons of space are the conspicuous commonalities of right-peripheral *d*XPs and certain types of clause-medial parentheticals, specifically non-restrictive appositives (cf. Altmann 1981; Peterson 1999; Koster 2000). In a detailed study, Heringa (2012) shows that such appositives pattern with ATs in having both specificational and predicative usages, with concomitant effects on case analogous to those discussed in section 6. Heringa argues at length that appositives have propositional semantics (see also Potts 2005) and a corresponding clausal syntactic structure. This suggests that our analysis could be extended to (certain kinds of) appositives, which would then be intraposed counterparts of the peripheral *d*XPs discussed here. Such an approach raises the question of how this intraposition is to be implemented, i.e. how appositives get interpolated into the linear order of the host clause. Given that the conceivable options range from clause-medial base-generation to (post-)syntactic movement to extra-grammatical, perhaps purely performative modes of interleaving of utterances, and given that no consensus exists concerning the structural integration of parentheticals in general, we leave the matter to future research. For relevant discussion, see Griffiths and de Vries 2014 and Ott 2014b,c.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2006. Left-dislocation (including CLLD). In *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 668–699. Oxford: Blackwell.

Altmann, Hans. 1981. *Formen der 'Herausstellung' im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Arregi, Karlos. 2010. Ellipsis in split questions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28:539–592.

Averintseva-Klisch, Maria. 2009. *Rechte Satzperipherie im Diskurs*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Barros, Matthew, Patrick D. Elliott, and Gary Thoms. 2014. There is no island repair. Ms., Rutgers University, University College London and University of Edinburgh (`http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002100`).

Bennis, Hans. 1986. *Gaps and dummies*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Bošković, Željko. 2011. Rescue by PF-deletion, traces as (non-)interveners, and the *that*–trace effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42:1–44.

Brunetti, Lisa. 2003. 'Information' focus movement in Italian and contextual constraints on ellipsis. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 22*, ed. Gina Garding and Mimu Tsujimura, 95–108. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Büring, Daniel, and Katharina Hartmann. 1997. Doing the right thing. *The Linguistic Review* 14:1–42.

Burton-Roberts, Noel. 2005. Parentheticals. In *Encyclopedia of language & linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown, 179–182. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Cecchetto, Carlo. 1999. A comparative analysis of left- and right-dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53:40–67.

Chung, Sandra. 2013. Syntactic identity in sluicing: How much, and why. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44:1–44.

Chung, Sandra, William A. Ladusaw, and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:239–282.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A-bar dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cole, Peter. 1987. Null objects in Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:597–612.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2010. *The syntax of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen, and Anikó Lipták. 2006. The crosslinguistic syntax of sluicing: Evidence from Hungarian relatives. *Syntax* 9:248–274.

Dehé, Nicole, and Yordanka Kavalova, ed. 2007. *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

den Dikken, Marcel. 2005. A comment on the topic of topic–comment. *Lingua* 115:691–710.

den Dikken, Marcel, André Meinunger, and Chris Wilder. 2000. Pseudoclefts and ellipsis.

Studia Linguistica 54:41–89.

Dewald, Anika. 2012. Spontansprachliche Versetzungsstrukturen im Deutschen. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cologne.

Doron, Edit. 1994. The discourse function of appositives. In *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Conference of the Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics and of the Workshop on Discourse*, 53–65. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

Fanselow, Gisbert. 2004. Cyclic phonology–syntax interaction: Movement to first position in German. In *Interdisciplinary studies on information structure 1*, ed. Shinichiro Ishihara, Michaela Schmitz, and Anne Schwarz, Working papers of the SFB 632, 1–42. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag.

Féry, Caroline. 1993. *German intonational patterns.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Frey, Werner. 2011. On the 'nominal' character of clauses associated with a pronominal. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft* 2011, Universität Göttingen (`http://bit.ly/1FmdOcI`).

Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2001. Are there V2 relative clauses in German? *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 3:97–141.

Grebenyova, Lydia. 2007. Sluicing in Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 15:49–80.

Grewendorf, Günther. 2008. The left clausal periphery: Clitic left-dislocation in Italian and left-dislocation in German. In *Dislocated elements in discourse*, ed. Benjamin Shaer, Philippa Cook, Werner Frey, and Claudia Maienborn, 49–94. London: Routledge.

Griffiths, James. 2014. Parenthetical verb constructions, fragment answers, and constituent modification. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* (online).

Griffiths, James, and Mark de Vries. 2014. Parenthesis and presupposition in discourse. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 31:39–52.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2003. *Prolific domains.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hartmann, Katharina. 2001. *Right-node raising and gapping.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heringa, Herman. 2012. *Appositional constructions.* Utrecht: LOT.

Heringa, Herman, and Mark de Vries. 2008. Een semantische classificatie van apposities. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 13:60–87.

Holmberg, Anders. 2013. The syntax of answers to polar questions in English and Swedish. *Lingua* 128:31–50.

Kandybowicz, Jason. 2006. COMP–trace effects explained away. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 25*, ed. Donald Baumer, David Montero, and Michael Scanlon, 220–228. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 2010. Why are there no directionality parameters? In *Proceedings*

of WCCFL 28, ed. Mary Byram Washburn, Katherine McKinney-Bock, Erika Varis, Ann Sawyer, and Barbara Tomaszewicz, 1–23. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Kehler, Andrew. 2000. Coherence and the resolution of ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23:533–575.

Keijsper, Cornelia. 1984. Vorm en betekenis in Nederlandse toonhoogtecontouren (parts I and II). *Forum der Letteren* 25:20–37, 113–126.

Kluck, Marlies. 2011. *Sentence amalgamation*. Utrecht: LOT.

Koopman, Hilda. 2007. Topics in imperatives. In *Imperative clauses in Generative Grammar*, ed. Wim van der Wurff, 153–180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koster, Jan. 2000. Extraposition as parallel construal. Ms., University of Groningen.

Kraak, Remmert, and Wim Klooster. 1968. *Syntaxis*. Culemborg: Stam-Kemperman.

Kramer, Ruth, and Kyle Rawlins. 2011. Polarity particles: An ellipsis account. In *Proceedings of NELS 39*, ed. Suzi Lima, Kevin Mullin, and Brian Smith. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Krifka, Manfred. 2013. Response particles as propositional anaphors. In *Proceedings of SALT 23*, ed. Todd Snider, 1–18. eLanguage (online).

Kural, Murat. 1997. Postverbal constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:498–519.

Lambrecht, Knud. 2001. Dislocation. In *Language typology and language universals*, ed. Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible, volume 2, 1010–1078. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *Proceedings of NELS 31*, ed. Minjoo Kim and Uri Strauss, volume 2, 301–320. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Lasnik, Howard. 2013. Multiple sluicing in English? *Syntax* 17:1–20.

López, Luis. 2003. Steps for a well-adjusted dislocation. *Studia Linguistica* 57:193–231.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2003. Remarks on stripping. Ms., University of Chicago.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 27:661–738.

Merchant, Jason. 2010. Three kinds of ellipsis. In *Context-dependence, perspective, and relativity*, ed. François Récanati, Isidora Stojanovic, and Neftalí Villanueva, 141–192. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44:77–108.

Merchant, Jason. in press. Ellipsis: A survey of analytical approaches. In *Syntax: An international handbook*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou and Tibor Kiss. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2^{nd} edition.

Nakao, Chizuru, Masaya Yoshida, and Ivan Ortega-Santos. 2012. On the syntax of *why*-stripping. In *Proceedings of the 30th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Nathan Arnett and Ryan Bennett, 270–280. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Onea, Edgar, and Anna Volodina. 2009. Der Schein trügt *nämlich*. *Linguistische Berichte* 219:291–321.

Ott, Dennis. 2012. Movement and ellipsis in Contrastive Left-dislocation. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 30*, ed. Nathan Arnett and Ryan Bennett, 281–291. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ott, Dennis. 2014a. An ellipsis approach to Contrastive Left-dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45:269–303.

Ott, Dennis. 2014b. Ellipsis in appositives. Ms., Humboldt University of Berlin.

Ott, Dennis. 2014c. Ellipsis in appositives and the syntax of parenthesis. Paper presented at *GLOW 37*, KU Leuven HUBrussel (`http://bit.ly/1mz5Q9I`).

Park, Myung-Kwan, and Sun-Woong Kim. 2009. The syntax of afterthoughts in Korean: Move and Delete. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 17:25–53.

Peterson, Peter. 1999. On the boundaries of syntax. In *The clause in English*, 229–250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The logic of conventional implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Ross, John Robert. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Ross, John Robert. 1969a. Adjectives as noun phrases. In *Modern studies in English*, ed. David A. Reibel and Sanford A. Schane, 352–360. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ross, John Robert. 1969b. Guess who? In *Papers from the fifth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and Jerry L. Morgan, 252–286. Chicago: CLS.

Sailor, Craig. 2009. Tagged for deletion. Master's thesis, UCLA.

Sailor, Craig. in press. VP-ellipsis in tag questions: A typological approach. In *Proceedings of CLS 46*. Chicago: CLS.

Sauerland, Uli. 1999. Locality in ellipsis: Sluicing vs. multiple sluicing. Ms., University of Tübingen.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2011. The syntax–phonology interface. In *The handbook of phonological theory*, ed. John Goldsmith, Jason Riggle, and Alan Yu, 435–484. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2001. Right-dislocation as scrambling. *Journal of Linguistics* 37:551–579.

Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2011. Syntactic identity and ellipsis. *The Linguistic Review* 28:79–110.

Temmerman, Tanja. 2013. The syntax of Dutch embedded fragment answers: on the PF-theory of islands and the WH/sluicing correlation. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 31:235–285.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2013. Some distinctions in the German *Nachfeld*. Ms., ZAS Berlin (to appear in the proceedings of the workshop *Inner-sentential propositional pro-forms: syntactic properties and interpretative effects*).

Truckenbrodt, Hubert. in press. Intonation phrases and speech acts. In *Parenthesis and ellipsis*, ed. Marlies Kluck, Dennis Ott, and Mark de Vries, 301–349. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.

Vat, Jan. 1981. Left-dislocation, connectedness, and reconstruction. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 20:80–103.

de Vries, Mark. 2004. Hoofd-interne relatiefzinnen in het Nederlands. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 9:193–230.

de Vries, Mark. 2007a. Dislocation and backgrounding. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 24:235–247.

de Vries, Mark. 2007b. Invisible constituents? Parentheses as b-merged adverbial phrases. In *Parentheticals*, ed. Nicole Dehé and Yordanka Kavalova, 203–234. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

de Vries, Mark. 2009a. The left and right periphery in Dutch. *The Linguistic Review* 26:291–327.

de Vries, Mark. 2009b. Specifying coordination: An investigation into the syntax of dislocation, extraposition, and parenthesis. In *Language and linguistics: Emerging trends*, ed. Cynthia R. Dreyer, 37–98. New York: Nova.

de Vries, Mark. 2011a. Ellipsis in afterthoughts. Talk presented at LUCL Colloquium, University of Leiden.

de Vries, Mark. 2011b. Extrapositie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16:273–306.

Wagner, Michael. 2012. Contrastive topics decomposed. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5:1–54.

Williams, Edwin. 1982. The NP cycle. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:277–295.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2001. Backgrounding ('right-dislocation') in Dutch. Ms., University of Groningen.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2011. *The syntax of Dutch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.