

A biclausal analysis of right-dislocation *

Dennis Ott & Mark de Vries

Humboldt University of Berlin & University of Groningen

1. Introduction

In right-dislocation (RD), illustrated in (1), a dislocated XP occurs at the outer right periphery of a linearly preceding host clause. We will refer to the right-dislocated XP as the *dXP*; it is anaphorically related to a host-internal *correlate* (*ihn* ‘him’ in (1)).

- (1) Ich kenne ihn gut, den Peter. (German)
I know him well the Peter
‘I know him well, Peter.’

We argue in this paper that RD constructions derive from underlying biclausal structures, in which the right-hand clause is reduced by PF-deletion:

- (2) [CP₁ ich kenne ihn gut] [CP₂ den Peter [~~kenne ich + gut~~]]

As we will show, this analysis relies exclusively on independently motivated mechanisms and derives the core properties of the construction in a principled fashion. Most of our examples will be from German, as this language shows surface-morphological distinctions that prove useful in probing unpronounced structure.

We distinguish two types of RD. The first type, illustrated in (1) and sometimes referred to as ‘backgrounding,’ features a pronominal correlate referring to a discourse topic, which is repeated by the *dXP* (assuming the characteristic low and level intonation of given material). That is, for (1) to be uttered felicitously, *Peter* must have been previously mentioned in discourse.

*For helpful feedback on the material presented here we are indebted to Erich Groat, Jason Merchant, and Jan-Wouter Zwart, as well as to audiences at *TiN Dag 2012* (Utrecht), *GG3 38* (Freiburg), *TABU Dag 2012* (Groningen), *Syntax Lab* (Leiden), the 87th *LSA Meeting* (Boston), the workshop *Workshop Non-sentential Constituents at the Right Periphery in German* (Berlin), and *NELS 43*. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC Grant agreement no. 263836 (project *Incomplete Parenthesis*, PI Mark de Vries).

A second type of RD, sometimes referred to as ‘afterthought’ (AT), features a focused *dXP* providing discourse-new information. In this case, the correlate is typically an indefinite expression, and the *dXP* bears an independent pitch accent.

- (3) Ich habe jemanden getroffen: den Peter!
 I have someone met the Peter
 ‘I met someone: Peter.’

We will provide a unified analysis for the two subtypes of RD. Section 2 sets the scene by explicating the details of this analysis. Sections 3 and 4 then go on to present a number of simple but strong arguments in its favor. Section 5 shows that there is a further type of AT with somewhat different syntactic and interpretive properties, which we account for by assuming a slightly different source structure. Section 6 concludes.

2. A deletion analysis

While backgrounding and AT differ at the level of information structure, we take them to be syntactically identical. Specifically, we argue that either type of RD is a biclausal construction, with two clauses surfacing in juxtaposition to one another. This is illustrated below for backgrounding (4), AT (5), and RD of an adverb, which can be realized as either backgrounded or focused (6).

- (4) [CP₁ ich kenne ihn gut] [CP₂ den Peter [~~kenne ich + gut~~]] = (1)
 (5) [CP₁ ich habe jemanden getroffen] [CP₂ den Peter [~~habe ich + getroffen~~]] = (3)
 (6) a. Ich habe den Peter getroffen, am Dienstag.
 I have the Peter met on Tuesday
 b. [CP₁ ich habe den Peter getroffen] [CP₂ am Dienstag [~~habe ich + den Peter getroffen~~]]

In all cases, the *dXP* is fronted to the left edge of CP₂; subsequently, the remnant clause is deleted (maximally deaccented) in the mapping to PF, indicated by strikethrough. Two anaphoric relations connect the two clauses in the resulting discourse configuration: co-construal of correlate and *dXP*, and the anaphoric ellipsis in CP₂. This *anaphoric juxtaposition* of CP₁ and CP₂ renders the two clauses a coherent discourse unit.

The deletion pattern shown in (4-6) is, crucially, not construction-specific but an instance of *clausal ellipsis*, as it is also found in, e.g., sluicing and fragment answers:

- (7) a. Ich habe jemanden gesehen, aber ich weiß nicht wen.
 I have someone seen but I know not who
 ‘I saw someone, but I don’t know who.’
 b. ... aber ich weiß nicht [wen [~~ich + gesehen habe~~]]
 (8) a. A: Wen hast du getroffen? B: Den Peter.
 who have you met the Peter
 ‘Who did you meet?’ ‘Peter.’

- b. ... [den Peter [~~habe ich t getroffen~~]]

Our claim is thus that a *dXP* as in (4-6) is derived analogously to the *wh*-remnant in (7) and the fragment response in (8). If our analysis is correct, RD dissolves into independently motivated grammatical operations, specifically A-bar movement and clausal ellipsis (for related discussion, see also Kluck 2011 and Ott in press).

Standard constraints on ellipsis identification require CP₁ and CP₂ to be parallel in some sense (see, e.g., Rooth 1992, Fox 1999, and Merchant 2001 for different formal characterizations). For concreteness' sake, we will here assume that the deleted domain in CP₂ and its antecedent domain in CP₁ must be semantically equivalent such that, roughly speaking, mutual entailment holds, in line with Merchant 2001.

To illustrate, consider first (4): the antecedent for deletion is *I know him well*, and the deleted material (visible at the semantic interface), is *I know Peter well*. Ellipsis is felicitous, since elided material and antecedent entail one another depending on a coreferent interpretation of the correlate and the *dXP* (hence a non-coreferent reading is correctly ruled out). In short, mutual entailment is a way of ensuring that deletion targets *given* material only.

Example (6) is slightly different in that the antecedent clause here does not contain an overt correlate of the *dXP*—a possibility that is expected, given that adjuncts are optional material. Examples of this kind are thus akin to the *sprouting* variety of sluicing:

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

In (6), parallelism is satisfied by construing the antecedent as containing a covert variable corresponding to the *dXP*/the sluiced *wh*-phrase (see Chung et al. 1995). That is, the proposition expressed by CP₁ in (6) is *I met Peter at time x*. If we now assume that the trace of the fronted temporal adverb in CP₂ can be analogously construed as a temporal variable (yielding the identical proposition *I met P. at time x*), mutual entailment ensues.

With identity between the two clauses (*modulo* the surface difference between *dXP* and correlate), CP₂ pragmatically expresses a 'specification' of CP₁. To see this, consider non-elliptical variants of (4) and (6). These are possible and express the same meaning:

- (10) a. Ich kenne ihn gut. Den Peter kenne ich gut.
 I know him well the Peter know I well
- b. Ich habe den Peter getroffen. Am Dienstag habe ich ihn getroffen.
 I have the Peter met on Tuesday have I him met

The heavy redundancy of these repetitions favors ellipsis, irrelevantly from a syntactic point of view. Notice that the existence of both the forms in (10) and clausal ellipsis clearly supports the structures postulated in (4-6); thus, it is incumbent upon any attempt to falsify our theory to show that these independently generated forms cannot exist in the particular arrangement yielding the RD surface form.

While parallelism of CP₁ and CP₂ primarily requires *semantic* equivalence, it has been shown that antecedent and ellipsis site must be identical in certain *syntactic* respects as well. Voice is one case in point. Whereas VP-ellipsis often permits 'switching' from

active to passive voice (or vice versa) between antecedent and ellipsis, clausal ellipsis never permits this kind of voice mismatch (see Merchant 2013). Expectedly, voice mismatches are not permitted in RD either:

- (11) a. *Jemand hat Peter geküsst: von Maria.
 someone.NOM has Peter kissed by Maria
intended: ‘Someone kissed Peter. He was kissed by Maria.’
 b. *Plötzlich war Peter von jemandem geküsst worden: eine Frau.
 suddenly was Peter by someone kissed been a.NOM woman
intended: ‘Suddenly Peter had been kissed by someone. A woman had kissed him.’

Another aspect of syntactic identity in ellipsis is case. Chung (2013) shows that, in addition to semantic equivalence, a deleted clausal constituent and its antecedent must contain identical case assigners. This explains why overt pronouns, but not Case-less *PRO* can serve as correlates for dislocated XPs, as shown by the following pair.

- (12) a. *Peter hat befohlen [*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.’
 b. Peter hat befohlen dass sie_i die Straße fegen, die Arbeiter_i.
 Peter has ordered that they the street sweep the workers
 ‘Peter ordered that they sweep the street, the workers.’

For case-assignment to be parallel in CP₁ and CP₂, the *dXP* in (12a) would have to be extracted from a corresponding non-finite embedded clause, as shown in (13). This is patently at variance with the subject correlate’s requirement to be Case-marked, hence no well-formed derivation of (12a) is possible. Note that nominative case on the *dXP* prevents it from being construed as an optional internal argument of the matrix predicate *befehlen* ‘to order,’ which would bear dative case.

- (13) * [_{CP2} die Arbeiter [hat Peter befohlen [*t* die Straße zu fegen]]]

By contrast, in (12b) the *dXP* can raise successive-cyclically to its peripheral position from the embedded finite clause.

We thus have good evidence for clausal ellipsis in RD, reducing an underlying repetition structure to the ‘visible’ surface pattern.

The analysis developed in this section generates two kinds of predictions. On the one hand, the *dXP* is not a constituent of the host clause—consequently, we expect it to reveal this structurally external status through *independence* effects. On the other hand, the *dXP* is a proper constituent of an underlyingly parallel clause within which it moves, leading us to expect detectable *connectivity* effects. In the following two sections, we show that both predictions are borne out.

3. Independence

On the analysis we propose, the *dXP* is not syntactically connected to a position within the host clause; it is a constituent of a structurally separate clause. We therefore expect to find properties of RD that betoken the structural independence of host clause and *dXP*.

A first case in point is the fact that a *dXP* is always irrelevant for the structural well-formedness of the host clause (that is, *dXPs* are always optional).

- (14) a. Ich kenne *(ihn) gut, den Peter.
I know him well the Peter
b. Ich habe (da/dann) den Peter getroffen, am Dienstag.
I have then the Peter met on Tuesday

We see that the correlate of a *dXP* is obligatory if the *dXP* corresponds to selected material (arguments) but obligatory otherwise, i.e. if adjunct material is dislocated.¹ This is just what we expect in light of our claim that *dXPs* are not immediate constituents of their host clauses (but of the parallel CP₂).

The simple contrast in (14) is noteworthy insofar as that it provides straightforward and decisive evidence against a rightward-movement analysis of RD. To the best of our knowledge, there is no known (and uncontroversial) case of movement that obligatorily leaves behind a correlate if the moved element is an argument but not otherwise; we would expect the possibility of a gap in either case.² By contrast, if indeed the *dXP* is properly external to the host's sentential domain, the contrast in (14) follows right away.

A further independence effect is the opacity of the *dXP* for extraction into the host clause. *dXPs* in RD are always strict islands for extraction into the host (cf. Zwart 2001):

- (15) a. *Wen_i hat Maria das behauptet, dass er t_i geküsst hat? (German)
who has Maria that claimed that he kissed has
'[*]Which person did Maria claim it, that he kissed?'
b. *Wat_i heb je het nogal betreurd, dat Jan t_i gezegd heeft? (Dutch)
what have you it rather regretted that Jan said has
'[*]What did you regret it, that Jan said?'

In this respect, *dXPs* differ markedly from extraposed clauses, which remain transparent for extraction (cf. Buring & Hartmann 1997):

- (16) Wen_i hat Maria behauptet dass er t_i geküsst hat? (German)
who has Maria claimed that he kissed has
'Who did Maria claim that he kissed?'

¹Omission of an argumental correlate is possible only in case the correlate occurs in a syntactic environment that independently permits arguments to be dropped, e.g. via topic drop.

²*Binding chains* have been postulated for left-dislocation (Cinque 1990, Frey 2004), but such an approach is neither descriptively nor explanatorily adequate; see Ott in press.

The difference between (15) and (16) follows straightforwardly: while the extraposed clause in (16) is a proper constituent of the host clause, the *d*XP's in (15) are not; consequently, cross-clausal extraction is precluded.

An important corollary of the biclausal analysis is that the dependency between correlate and *d*XP is not one of binding (as in, say, an antecedent–trace relation) but one of ordinary cross-sentential anaphora. This turns out to be a welcome aspect of the analysis, since it explains otherwise curious restrictions on RD.

Note first that RD applies to a heterogeneous set of categories; virtually any category can undergo RD. See the examples in (17), next to *d*NP in (1) and *d*PP in (14b), (24a).

- (17) a. Das wollte ich schon immer mal, [_{VP} ein Buch schreiben].
 that wanted I PRT always PRT a book write
 ‘I’ve always wanted to do that, (to) write a book.’
 b. Das hat sogar Maria gemerkt, [_{CP} dass Peter verliebt ist].
 that has even Maria noted that Peter in.love is
 ‘Even Maria noticed that, that Peter is in love.’
 c. Nur eines ist sie nicht: [_{AP} hübsch].
 only one.thing is she not pretty
 ‘There is one thing that she is not: pretty.’

This is expected on our analysis, since fronting to the prefield is equally categorially unrestricted. However, certain kinds of elements nonetheless cannot appear as *d*XP's. A case in point are bare (non-specific) QPs:

- (18) */# Ich habe sie_i gesehen, zwei Studenten_i.
 I have them seen two students

For a monoclausal analysis, on which the *d*XP would presumably bind the correlate in some way, this asymmetry is unexpected. By contrast, on our analysis the correlate is a free pronoun (or R-expression), and hence we expect it to behave as such. That this is indeed the explanation for the deviance of (18) is confirmed by the fact that bare QPs cannot be co-construed with a cataphoric pronoun in general:

- (19) # Sie_i kamen herein. Dann setzten sich zwei Studenten_i an den Tisch.
 they came in then sat REFL two students at the table
 ‘They came in. Then, two students sat down at the table.’

Note that once we turn the QP either into a referential DP or into an AT, which permits an indefinite correlate, QP dislocation is fine, again as expected.

- (20) a. Ich habe sie_i gesehen, die zwei Studenten_i.
 I have them seen the two students
 b. Dann sahen wir etwas_i: zwei Studenten_i.
 then saw we something two students

The pattern witnessed above is directly replicated in the ‘visibly’ biclausal configurations in (21), which correspond to the underlying structures of (18/20a) and (20b), respectively, prior to PF-deletion.

- (21) a. Ich habe sie_i gesehen, [#(die) zwei Studenten]_i habe ich gesehen.
 I have them seen the two students have I seen
- b. Dann sahen wir etwas_i, [zwei Studenten]_i sahen wir.
 then saw we something two students saw we

Thus, our biclausal analysis accounts for both the categorial indiscriminateness of RD and restrictions imposed by the correlate, which reduce to general restrictions on cross-sentential anaphora. Thus, all facts discussed in this section are straightforwardly explained by the structural independence of host clause and *dXP*.

4. Connectivity

The previous section established the fact that the *dXP* in RD is structurally external to the host clause. This follows from CP₁ and CP₂ being structurally separate clauses. However, note that CP₁ and CP₂ are anaphorically linked by ellipsis in CP₂, which is licensed by parallelism. This reasoning predicts that the *dXP* exhibits properties it acquires as a result of grammatical relations it enters into within CP₂.

The first kind of *connectivity* we find concerns case-marking. In RD, correlate and *dXP* strictly co-vary in case.³ The following examples illustrate:⁴

- (22) a. Er hat die Maria geküsst, der Peter.
 he_{NOM} has the Maria kissed the:_{NOM} Peter
- b. Maria hat ihn geküsst, den Peter.
 Maria has him_{ACC} kissed the:_{ACC} Peter
- c. Maria hat ihm geholfen, dem Peter.
 Maria has him_{DAT} helped the:_{DAT} Peter

The same case-matching effect in RD is observed by Thráinsson (2007) for Icelandic.

This is fully expected on the deletion analysis: both correlate and *dXP* are case-marked ‘in parallel,’ since each clause contains identical case-assigners.

- (23) [CP₁ Maria hat ihm_{DAT} geholfen]
 [CP₂ [dem Peter] [hat Maria <dem Peter_{DAT}> geholfen]]

A related type of connectivity can be observed for prepositions. Consider first the examples in (24), where the preposition governed by the host-internal predicate

³The one principled exception to case matching, predicative ATs, will be discussed in section 5 below.

⁴We use determiners on proper names to mark morphological case, an option in many dialects.

obligatorily accompanies both correlate and *dXP*. German and Dutch generally do not permit P-stranding, hence fronting of the *dXP* within CP₂ must pied-pipe the preposition:

- (24) a. Ich habe den ganzen Tag auf ihn gewartet, *(auf) den Peter. (German)
 I have the whole day for him waited for the Peter
 'I waited for him all day long, [for] Peter.'
- b. Joop wilde niet met 'm praten, *(met) Piet. (Dutch)
 Joop wanted not with him talk with Piet
 'Joop didn't want to talk with him, [with] Piet.'

Icelandic and Norwegian, however, do permit (and in fact prefer) P-stranding under A-bar movement. We therefore expect movement of the *dXP* to strand an associated preposition inside the ellipsis site in these languages. This prediction is borne out:

- (25) a. Jón talaði við hana, (??við) gömul konuna. (Icelandic)
 Jón talked to her to old lady:DEF
 'Jón talked to her, [to] the old lady.'
- b. Jeg krangler ofte med ho, (??med) søsterami. (Norwegian)
 I quarrel often with her with sister my
 'I often quarrel with her, [with] my sister.'

Prepositions in RD thus bring out two types of connectivity: on the one hand, we find a matching effect akin to case matching; on the other hand, the observed (im)possibility of P-stranding contingent on stranding options offered by the respective language testifies to the presence of clausal structure within which the *dXP* A-bar moves. Notably, the above facts are directly analogous to the discussion of connectivity (or *form identity*) in sluicing and fragment answers in Merchant 2001, 2004.

Expectedly, binding-connectivity (or *reconstruction*) effects can likewise be detected in RD, and again these can be explained by reference to the underlyingly parallel structure of CP₂. The examples in (26) illustrate variable binding by a host-internal quantifier 'into' the *dXP* for backgrounding and AT, respectively. (27a) is a case of reflexive binding, and (27b) illustrates a Condition C violation incurred by the intended coreference of correlate and the *dXP*-internal possessor (but absent on a disjoint reading).

- (26) a. Jeder Lehrer_i liebt sie, seine_i Schüler. (German)
 every teacher loves them his students
- b. Einen Schüler liebt jeder Lehrer_i: seinen_i Klassenprimus.
 one students loves every teacher his best.in.class
- (27) a. Maria_i sah etwas im Spiegel: sich_i selbst.
 Maria saw something in.the mirror herself
- b. *Sie_i hatte ihn in der Stadt gesehen, Marias_i Freund.
 she had him in the town seen Maria's friend

A biclausal analysis of right-dislocation

Like case connectivity, binding connectivity in RD follows from parallelism. Consider the underlying pre-deletion structures of the *d*XP in (26b) and (27b):

- (28) a. ... [_{CP2} seinen Klassenprimus liebt jeder Lehrer <seinen Klassenprimus>]
b. ... [_{CP2} Marias Freund hatte sie <Marias Freund> in der Stadt gesehen]

Asymmetric c-command of the trace/lower copy of the *d*XP by the binder, all within CP₂, yields the observed readings. The apparent interaction of *d*XP and host clause are thus illusory: the *d*XP is properly external to the host (as we demonstrated in section 3), but embedded within the unpronounced syntactic structure of the parallel CP₂.

In light of the above discussion, it does not come as a surprise that scope interactions, too, can be detected in RD. In the following example, the numeral quantifier *drei* ‘three’ inside the *d*XP takes scope below the host-internal QP:

- (29) Da kriegt jeder Kopfschmerzen von, von drei Linguistik-Artikeln.
there gets everyone a.headache from from three linguistics.articles
‘For everyone it is the case that three linguistics articles give them a headache.’

Evidently, the observed relative scope is a consequence of reconstruction to the adjunct position below the QP subject within CP₂, analogously to the examples discussed above. A different scopal effect is observed for dislocated sentence adverbs, as in the following:

- (30) weil nur wenige den Yeti gesehen haben, vermutlich.
because only few the Yeti seen have probably
‘for it is probably the case that only few people saw the Yeti.’

The dislocated adverb here takes scope over the entire host clause (cf. Zwart 2001). As a high sentence adverb, *vermutlich* merges high in CP₂:

- (31) [_{CP2} vermutlich haben nur wenige den Yeti gesehen]

Expectedly, the underlying representation in (31) yields the same wide-scope reading of the adverb that we found in (30). The fact that the sentence adverb scopes over the entire clause that it linearly precedes is thus, again, illusory: it is the interior of the parallel CP₂ that is within the syntactic scope of the adverb.

Where there is movement, there is sensitivity to islands, and hence we expect to detect the relevant locality effects in RD as well. The following examples show that a conjunct cannot be dislocated out of a coordinate structure:

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

Again, the facts support the conclusion that there is a movement dependency, which, due to parallelism, appears to relate the *dXP* to the host-internal correlate, but in actual fact connects the *dXP* to its trace within CP₂. Leftward movement of the *dXP* in (32) will then inevitably incur a locality violation:

- (33) *_{[CP₂ Piet [heb ik [t en zijn vrouw] uitgenodigd voor het feest]]}

The picture is seemingly complicated by the fact that other types of islands appear to permit RD while blocking leftward movement. A case in point are relative clauses:

- (34) a. Ik sprak met iemand [die haar geplaagd had], die vrouw. (Dutch)
 I spoke with someone who her teased had that woman
 ‘I talked to someone who had teased her, that woman.’
 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?’

The problem is only apparent, however. Note that in (34a), the island is a clausal/propositional domain itself. Following the discussion of similar (apparent) instances of sluicing ‘out of’ islands in Merchant 2001, we submit that deletion in CP₂ in such cases takes (not the entire complex host clause) but only the embedded propositional domain (i.e., the relative-clause island) itself as its antecedent, voiding the island violation. The derivation of (34) is therefore as shown in (35). Such cases thus pose no threat to the generalization that leftward movement of the *dXP* in CP₂ is sensitive to islands, and hence to the presence of a further hallmark of connectivity in RD.

- (35) Ik sprak met iemand...
_{[CP₁ die haar geplaagd had] [CP₂ die vrouw [had die *t* geplaagd]]} →
_{[CP₁ die haar geplaagd had] [CP₂ die vrouw [~~had die *t* geplaagd~~]]}

We have seen above that the relation between *dXPs* and their host clauses is somewhat schizophrenic, in that we find both *independence* and *connectivity* effects at the same time. On the biclausal deletion analysis, no paradox arises: independence effects testify to the host-external status of the *dXP*, which follows from it being a constituent of a syntactically separate clause; at the same time, connectivity effects can be detected owing to the fact that this separate clause is necessarily underlyingly parallel to the host clause for deletion to apply felicitously.

By contrast, note how problematic this state of affairs is for monoclausal analyses of RD. Independence effects might *prima facie* be taken to support a base-generation/adjunction analysis, but connectivity effects will require additional stipulations. Conversely, a monoclausal movement analysis will successfully account for the observed connectivity effects but will necessarily fall short of explaining independence, i.e. the fact that *dXPs* do not behave like integral constituents of their hosts, unlike displaced *XP*s in uncontroversial cases of syntactic movement.

5. Predicative ATs

So far, we have focused on cases of RD in which CP₂ (the clausal structure underlying the *dXP*), *qua* repetition, specifies CP₁ (the host clause). Let us now turn to predicative ATs. Unlike specificational ATs, which provide identifying information, predicative ATs attribute some property to (the denotation of) their correlate. To see the difference, compare the specificational AT in (36a) to the predicative one in (36b):

- (36) a. Ich habe einen echten Star getroffen: den John Travolta. (German)
I have a.ACC real.ACC star met the.ACC John Travolta
'I met a real star: John Travolta.'
- b. Ich habe den John Travolta getroffen: ein echter Star.
I have the.ACC John Travolta met a.NOM real.NOM star
'I met John Travolta: a real star.'

Importantly for our purposes here, the interpretive difference between specificational and predicative ATs correlates systematically with syntactic differences. Note in particular that the ATs in (36) differ in case: while the case of specificational ATs covaries with that of their correlate, predicative ATs invariably bear nominative case.

We propose that this difference reflects a difference in underlying structure: while specificational ATs are remnants of a redundant specifying clause, predicative ATs are remnants of predication copular clauses, within which they function as the predicate. Thus, the *dXP* in (36b) derives from the predication copular clause in (37a); movement, deletion, and discursive juxtaposition then yield the underlying structure in (37b).

- (37) a. Er ist ein echter Star.
he is a real star
- b. [CP₁ ich habe den John Travolta getroffen] [CP₂ [ein echter Star] ~~ist er~~]

This analysis transparently reflects the intuitive meaning of examples like (36b), 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 with that of CP₁, except for the *dXP* (whence its specificational character); in the case of predicative ATs, it expresses a (clausal) predication.

AT constructions can be ambiguous between a specificational and a predicative reading. Consider (38) from Dutch, a language without morphological case distinctions, as opposed to the German examples in (39).

- (38) Ik heb Jan gesproken, mijn buurman. (Dutch)
I have Jan talked.to my neighbor
'I talked to Jan, (he is/I talked to) my neighbor.'
- (39) a. Ich habe den Jan getroffen, mein Nachbar. (German)
I have the.ACC Jan met my.NOM neighbor
'I met Jan, (he is) my neighbor.'

- b. Ich habe den Jan getroffen, meinen Nachbarn.
 I have the.ACC Jan met my.ACC neighbor
 ‘I met Jan, I met my neighbor.’

In (38), *mijn buurman* ‘my neighbor’ can be interpreted as a property of Jan; on this reading, the *dXP* is a predicate. Alternatively, the *dXP* can serve as a referential phrase specifying the referent of the correlate. While the difference in interpretation is subtle, it is clearly detectable. In German, case distinguishes the two readings at the surface: (39a) has a predicative reading only, whereas matching case in (39b) indicates a parallel clause structure, giving rise to a specificational reading. Consequently, we assume the following underlying structures for (39a) and (39b), respectively:

- (40) [CP₁ ich habe den Jan getroffen] ...
 a. ... [CP₂ [mein Nachbar].NOM [~~ist er t~~]] ‘he is my neighbor’
 b. ... [CP₂ [meinen Nachbarn].ACC [~~habe ich t getroffen~~]] ‘I met my neighbor’

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 (Williams 1982). This is illustrated in English in (41):

- (41) a. John has always been [his_i own worst enemy]_i.
 b. * [His_i own worst enemy]_i won the elections.

As shown in (42a), a predicative AT of the *i-within-i* type is as acceptable as the predicate in (41a). By contrast, a case-agreeing *dXP* enforces a specificational reading, excluding an *i-within-i*-type *dXP* (42b).

- (42) a. Für seine Mutter war Peter vor allem eines: sein eigener größter Feind.
 to his mother was Peter especially one.thing his own worst enemy
 ‘To his mother, Peter was chiefly one thing: his own worst enemy.’
 b. *Maria liebt den Peter, seinen eigenen größten Feind.
 Maria loves the Peter his own worst enemy
 ‘[*]Maria loves Peter, (Maria loves) his own worst enemy.’

The asymmetry in (42), and its correspondence with that in (41), thus lends direct support to our claim that predicative *dXPs* are remnants of predication copular clauses.

Note that while the analysis correctly predicts the remnant of the elided copular clause to invariably surface with nominative case, it also predicts that certain connectivity effects ought to be observable, since the underlying copular clause contains a subject capable of binding into the lower copy of the fronted predicate, as witnessed in (43a). This is expected given our proposal that the underlying structure is as in (43b).

- (43) a. Ik heb Jan_i gezien, een vijand van zichzelf_i. (Dutch)
 I have Jan seen an enemy of himself
 ‘I saw Jan, (he is) an enemy of himself.’

- b. [CP₂ [een vijand van zichzelf] [~~is hij~~ <een vijand van zichzelf>]]

APs can likewise function as predicative ATs, as shown in (44). Such examples are derived in the by-now familiar fashion, *viz.* from an underlying copular clause.

- (44) Hans hat eine junge Frau geheiratet, wunderschön (ist sie). (German)
 Hans has a young woman married beautiful is she
 ‘Hans married a young woman, (she is) beautiful.’

Unlike an AP used as a prenominal modifier (*eine wunderschön-e Frau* ‘a beautiful-AGR woman’), the right-dislocated AP in (44) bears no inflection, identifying it as a non-attributive predicate, similarly to how the invariant nominative case on *dXP* in (36b) identified it as a predicative NP. The analysis reflects the intuitive meaning of such cases, corresponding to the non-elliptical expression indicated in parentheses in (44).

One might object to this analysis of predicative ATs that there is no parallelism between CP₁ and CP₂ in these cases. However, as discussed in Merchant 2004, 2010, “limited ellipsis” is not subject to such constraints on identification because the content of an elided copular clause is generally recoverable without a linguistic antecedent. For instance, fragments like *Ein echter Star!* ‘a real star’ or *Wunderschön!* ‘beautiful’ can be felicitously used deictically.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a biclausal ellipsis analysis of RD constructions. The underlying structure corresponds to either a repetition of two parallel clauses (in backgrounding and specificational ATs), or else to a singular proposition followed by a copular construction expressing a predication (in predicative ATs). The surface pattern of RD in (45a) is thus derived from the form in (45b), where Δ indicates deleted material.

- (45) a. [_{host} ... correlate ...] *dXP*
 b. [CP₁ [... correlate ...]] [CP₂ *dXP* Δ]

On this view, *dXPs* are what one might call *indirectly integrated* into their hosts: they are constituents of a separate clause surfacing in anaphoric juxtaposition. Movement of the *dXP* within CP₂ yields an antecedent–trace dependency and concomitant connectivity effects, which, in cases of specificational backgrounding/AT, yield the illusion of direct integration of the *dXP* into the host.

The combination and simultaneous occurrence in RD of clear-cut indications of the *dXP*’s *externality* relative to the host clause on the one hand and equally clear-cut *connectivity* effects on the other present an insurmountable challenge to monoclausal (movement or base-generation) analyses of RD, but follow elegantly from the proposed deletion-based analysis. Crucially, such an analysis requires no special machinery but only uncontroversial operations, specifically A-bar fronting and clausal ellipsis. In this way, the construction ‘Right-dislocation’ is identified as the superficial result of an interplay of basic operations, and hence in effect eliminated from the theory of UG.

References

- Büring, Daniel, and Katharina Hartmann. 1997. Doing the right thing. *The Linguistic Review* 14:1–42.
- 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.
- Fox, Danny. 1999. Reconstruction, binding theory, and the interpretation of chains. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:157–196.
- Frey, Werner. 2004. Notes on the syntax and the pragmatics of German left dislocation. In *The syntax and semantics of the left periphery*, ed. Horst Lohnstein and Susanne Trissler, 203–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kluck, Marlies. 2011. *Sentence amalgamation*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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. Francois Recanati, Isidora Stojanovic, and Neftali Villanueva, 141–192. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44:77–108.
- Ott, Dennis. in press. An ellipsis approach to Contrastive Left-dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. Ellipsis redundancy and reduction redundancy. In *Proceedings of the Stuttgart Ellipsis Workshop*, ed. Steve Berman and Arild Hestvik, volume 29 of *Arbeitspapiere des SFB* 340.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Edwin. 1982. The NP cycle. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:277–295.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2001. Backgrounding (‘right-dislocation’) in Dutch. Ms., University of Groningen.

Department of German Studies and Linguistics
Unter den Linden 6
10099 Berlin
Germany

Dept. of Linguistics (ATW)
University of Groningen
P.O. Box 716
9700 AS Groningen
The Netherlands

dennis.ott@post.harvard.edu
mark.de.vries@rug.nl