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Overview

• Introduction and main claims

• Monoclausal analyses of Right Dislocation (RD) and the problem of variable binding

• An alternative: biclausal analyses

• Binding patterns with and without RD

• A connection with scope freezing?

• Conclusion
Right Dislocation – main points

• A discourse-given constituent appears to the right edge of a clause;

• RD elements cannot receive contrastive interpretation;

• Cross-linguistically, RD elements are resumed by a clitic and do not leave a gap (Fernández-Sánchez & Ott 2020 for an overview);

• In Italian, cliticless RD is possible (Samek-Lodovici 2015);

• Not to be confused with Marginalisation, i.e. de-stressing *in situ* of D-given elements.
Main Claims

• Monoclausal analyses of RD cannot fully account for variable binding into right-dislocated categories;

• In a biclausal analysis of RD, variable binding can be easily explained;

• Two more assumptions are in order:
  
  • Clitics may be treated as *paycheck* pronouns (Elbourne 2008 a.o.);
  
  • Structures with a dative clitic (and, optionally, a RD IO) behave like Double Object Constructions (DOCs) and display scope freezing effects (Bruening 2001 a.o.).
Monoclausal analyses of RD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base-generation</th>
<th>$A'$-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-attachment</td>
<td>(a) Cardinaletti 2002, De Cat 2007</td>
<td>(b) Vallduví 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Cecchetto 1999, Belletti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004, Bocci 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-attachment</td>
<td>(d) Frascarelli 2004, Frascarelli &amp;</td>
<td>(e) Samek-Lodovici 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ remnant TP</td>
<td>Hinterhölzl 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Right attachment with A’-movement (1b)

• Binding should be possible under reconstruction;

• Grammaticality of binding into a RD category should parallel that of binding into a DP in its thematic position;

• However, this is not always the case:

(2) a. Ho presentato [ogni studente]_i al suo_i/proprio_i TUTOR.
   have.1SG introduced every student to.the his/his.own tutor
   ‘I introduced every student to their tutor.’

   to-him have.1SG introduced every student, to.the his/his.own tutor
Left attachment + individual movements (1c)

• RD is the result of movement to a low TopP (below TP), with, possibly, movement of other constituents across it;

• These approaches may explain ungrammaticality in (2b) as the result of Weak Crossover (when crossing A’-movements are involved, e.g. with movement to a low FocP);

• However, they would have to postulate a different kind of movement when subjects cross RD elements, as WCO effects do not arise:

(3) a. [Ogni studente]i l’ha CONOSCIUTOi, il suoi/i propioi tutor.
   every student him has met, the his/his.own tutor
   ‘Every student has met his/her tutor.’

   b. L’ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]i, il suoi/i proprioi tutor.
     him has met every student, the his/his.own tutor
Base-generation approaches

• No trace in of RD item in TP, so no reconstruction;

• Grammaticality of binding depends on the height of attachment of the binder;

• Preverbal subjects may bind into RD categories if they can c-command out of TP (e.g. Frascarelli 2004);

• But postverbal subjects can bind into RD categories, too (as in (3b)); this would be unexpected:

(3) a. [Ogni studente]_{i} l’ha CONOSCIUTO, il suo_{i}/proprio_{i} tutor.
   every student him has met, the his/his.own tutor
   ‘Every student has met his/her tutor.’

   b. L’ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]_{i}, il suo_{i}/proprio_{i} tutor.
      him has met every student, the his/his.own tutor
(A’-) Left attachment + remnant movement (1e)

• Samek-Lodovici (2015): clitic-resumed RD elements move from a “Big DP” (Cecchetto 1999 a.o.) whose head is the clitic, and should be able to reconstruct;

• This would explain why postverbal subjects can bind RD pronouns, as in (3b);

• But given a <DO IO> unmarked order, (2b) is still unaccounted for;

• In remnant movement configurations, Barss’ Generalisation (Barss 1986, Sauerland & Elbourne 2002, Heck & Assman 2014) applies:

(4) **Barss’ Generalisation**

Reconstruction of α is blocked when α does not c-command its trace at surface level.
More on Barss’ Generalisation

(5) a. \[\exists \text{ Some young lady } \] seems \( t_3 \) to be likely \( t_3 \) to dance with \( \forall \text{ every senator } \). \[\exists > \forall; \forall > \exists \]

b. \[\text{DegP How likely } t_3 \text{ to dance with } [\forall \text{ every senator }] \text{ does } [\exists \text{ some young lady }] \text{ seem to be } t_{\text{DegP}}?\]

\[\exists > \forall; *\forall > \exists\]

• Different analyses of Barss’ Gen.:

• Sauerland & Elbourne (2002): copy theory of reconstruction; subj. raising does not leave a copy;

• Neeleman & van de Koot (2010): semantic computation based on feature percolation;

Monoclausal analyses – final remarks

• Because of Barss’ Generalisation, the approach in (1e) makes the same predictions as the ones in (1d);

• Namely, that grammaticality of binding into RD categories ultimately depends on the binder’s attachment height; reconstruction cannot be taken into account;

• In conclusion, none of the monoclausal approaches considered here can account for the data in (2-3);

• We turn to biclausal analyses to test whether they make the correct predictions.
Biclausal Analyses of RD

• Ott & de Vries (2012, 2016) for Germanic, Fernández-Sánchez (2017) for Romance;

• Two clauses:
  • One (*host clause*) containing the *correlate* (clitic);
  • The other containing the dislocate; the rest of the second clause undergoes ellipsis;
  • The two structures are in a coordination relation, established (in Ott & de Vries 2016) by an abstract colon head (Koster 2000).
Biclausal Analyses of RD

(6) a. L’ho visto IERI, Gianni.
   him have.1SG seen yesterday John
   ‘I saw him yesterday, John.’

b. \[_{p} \left[_{s} \text{L’ho visto IERI} \right] _{e}^{o} \left[_{s} \text{ho visto Gianni ieri} \right] \]
   him have.1SG seen yesterday have.1SG seen John yesterday
There cannot be binding from one clause into the other, as there is no c-command;

Rather, two independent binding relations must be established;

This is easily accounted for in the second clause; but what about the first?

(7) \[ P \left[ S \text{ L’ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]} \right], \cdot : \circ \left[ S \text{ ha conosciuto il suo/proprìo tutor} \right] \]

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

\[ [\text{ogni studente}] \]

every student
In the first clause, no possessor is present;

However, a pronoun may sometimes stand for an expression containing a bound variable: a “paycheck pronoun” (Karttunen 1969, Cooper 1979, Heim & Kratzer 1998, Elbourne 2000, 2008):

(8) The man who gave his paycheck to his wife is wiser than the man who gave it to his mistress.

If clitics allow “paycheck” readings, binding in the first clause can be easily accounted for.
Binding into a clitic

• With a paycheck reading, the clitic would have to be interpreted as a definite description (Cooper 1979, Elbourne 2000);

• The clitic in (9) stands for the definite description *il suo/proprio tutor*; this allows the distributive reading;

• Crucially, this reading is allowed regardless of the presence of a RD item:

(9) [Context: The department has assigned a tutor to each student]
Oggi [,...,...] ’ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]_{i} (, il suo_{i}/proprio_{i} tutor).
today him has met every student (the his/his.own tutor)
‘Today, every student met their tutor.’
Binding into a clitic

• Thus, paycheck clitics explain covariance in the absence of c-command by the RD category (and in the absence of RD altogether);

• In sum, the biclausal analysis predicts that binding into a RD element is possible iff:
  1) In the first clause, the clitic can be construed as a paycheck pronoun;
  2) In the second clause, binding into the corresponding element is grammatical.

• This analysis will be shown to make the correct predictions for a wider set of data.
Full grammaticality

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

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

a. Oggi, [ogni studente]i l[.......]’ha CONOSCIUTO (, il suo_{i}/proprio_{i} tutor).
   today every student him has met (the his/his.own tutor)

b. Oggi [ogni studente]_{i} ha conosciuto il suo_{i}/proprio_{i} TUTOR.
   today every student has met the his/his.own tutor
   ‘Today, every student met their tutor.’
(11)  a.  [Nessuno studente]_{i} \hat{\ldots \ldots} \text{ha ancora CONOSCIUTO (, il suo}_{i}/ proprio}_{i} \text{tutor).}
    no student him has yet met (the his/his.own tutor)
  
b.  Nessuno studente ha ancora conosciuto il suo}_{i}/ proprio}_{i} \text{TUTOR.}
    no student has yet met the his/his.own tutor
    ‘No student has met their tutor yet.’
(12) a. Oggi [i...i...]’ha conosciuto [ogni STUDENTE]_i (, il suo_i/proprio_i tutor).
    today him has met every student (the his/his.own tutor)

    b. Oggi ha conosciuto il suo_i/proprio_i tutor [ogni STUDENTE]_i.
    today has met the his/his.own tutor every student
    ‘Today, every student met their tutor.’
(13) a. Non l[^i^...i^...]’ha ancora conosciuto [nessuno STUDENTE]i (, il suo_i/proprio_i tutor).

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

b. Non ha ancora conosciuto il suo_i/proprio_i tutor [nessuno STUDENTE]i.

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

   ‘No student has met them yet (their tutor).’
When both clauses are ungrammatical, the whole sentence is predicted to be ungrammatical:

(14) a. *Oggi, pro[...i...] gli ha presentato [ogni STUDENTE], a Gianni (, il suo_/proprio_/ tutor).

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

   

b. *Oggi, il suo_/proprio_/ tutor gli ha presentato [ogni STUDENTE], a Gianni.

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

   Intended: ‘Today, every student’s tutor introduced that student to John.’
Ungrammaticality in one clause

• Second clause is grammatical, first clause is ungrammatical;

• Example with DO quantifier and dative clitic;

• A direct object cannot bind into a dative clitic, whether the RD item is present or not;

• The baseline clauses without clitics are grammatical.
Ungrammaticality in one clause

    today to-him have.1SG introduced every student (to.the his/his.own tutor)
    ‘Today, I introduced every student to their tutor.’

b. Oggi ho presentato [ogni studente]i al suo/i/proprio/i TUTOR.
    today have.1SG introduced every student to-the his/his.own tutor

    NEG to-him have.1SG yet introduced no student (to.the his/his.own tutor)

b. Non ho ancora presentato [nessuno studente]i al suo/i/proprio/i TUTOR.
    NEG have.1SG yet introduced no student to.the his/his.own tutor
    ‘I haven’t introduced any student to their tutor yet.’
Ungrammaticality in one clause

(17) [Context: Several authors have sent me one of their articles]
   this week with-him have.1SG discussed every article (with-the its author)

b. Questa settimana ho discusso [ogni articolo]i col suo_i AUTORE.
   this week have.1SG discussed every article with-the its author
   ‘This week, I discussed every article with its author.’

   NEG with-him have.1SG yet discussed no article (with-the its author)

b. Non ho ancora discusso [nessun articolo]i col suo_i AUTORE.
   NEG have.1SG yet discussed no article with-the its author
   ‘I haven’t discussed any article with its author yet.’
The first clause is grammatical, the second clause is not;

When the RD category is absent, the sentences are grammatical;

When it is present, there is variation among speakers’ judgments.
Ungrammaticality in one clause – pt. 2

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

a. Oggi l[...i...]'ho presentato ad [ogni STUDENTE]i (, il %suo_i/%proprio_i tutor).
   today him have.1SG introduced to every student (the his/his.own tutor)
   ‘Today, I introduced to every student their tutor.’

b. Ho presentato il ?suo_i/?proprio_i tutor ad [ogni STUDENTE]i.
   have.1SG introduced the his/his.own tutor to every student

c. Ho presentato ad [ogni studente]i il suo_i/proprio_i TUTOR.
   have.1SG introduced to every student the his/his.own tutor
(20)  a. Non l[...i...]'ho ancora presentato a [nessuno STUDENTE]i (, il %suo\textsubscript{i}/%proprio\textsubscript{i} tutor).

\begin{quote}
NEG him have.1SG yet introduced to no student (the his/his.own tutor)
\end{quote}

‘I haven’t introduced them to any student yet (their tutor).’

b. Non ho ancora presentato il ?suo\textsubscript{i}/??proprio\textsubscript{i} tutor a [nessuno STUDENTE]i.

\begin{quote}
NEG have.1SG yet introduced the his/his.own tutor to no student
\end{quote}

c. Non ho ancora presentato a [nessuno studente]i il suo\textsubscript{i}/proprio\textsubscript{i} TUTOR.

\begin{quote}
NEG have.1SG yet introduced to no student the his/his.own tutor
\end{quote}
Binding by DO quantifier phrases

• (15-18) seem to show a peculiar property of ditransitive structures;

• Binding by a DO quantifier into an IO is possible when the clitic is absent, but impossible when the clitic is present;

• The same happens with the clitic *ci*;

• The judgments given follow from the biclausal analysis, but raise a question:

• Why are DOs unable to bind into dative and locative (paycheck) clitics?
A connection with scope freezing?

• This behaviour may be explained in terms of scope freezing (Barss & Lasnik 1986, Larsson 1988, Bruening 2001 a.o.);

• In a configuration in which the Goal c-commands the Theme, scope is frozen, with the Goal outscoping the Theme (Williams 2006):

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

c. Mary gave a toy to every child. d. Mary gave every child a toy.
A connection with scope freezing?

- Frozen scope has been shown to affect binding patterns, too (Barss & Lasnik 1986, Bruening 2001);

- In Double Object Constructions (DOCs), the Theme cannot take scope over a c-commanding Goal/Recipient;

- The relevant cases observed for Italian (with a dative clitic, or with *ci*) may be analysed as an instance of DOCs.
DOCs in Italian

• Argued for by other authors;

• Holmberg et al. (2017) show Italian may have DOCs with an inanimate causer subject;

• In Italian, the Recipient cannot be passivised, although for independent reasons;

• Pineda (2020) argues for DOCs in Romance (mainly Spanish and Catalan, but also Italian).
Concluding remarks

• Monoclausal analyses of RD run into problems when accounting for variable binding into RD categories;

• A biclausal analysis may explain the whole range of data by assuming two independent, parallel binding relations;

• In the first clause, the clitic may be treated as a paycheck pronoun;

• This explains why absence of a RD item does not affect binding;
Concluding remarks

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

• The internal structure of the elided sentence;

• Does the RD element remain in situ (Fernández-Sánchez, 2017) or does it undergo movement (Ott & de Vries, 2016)?

• Evidence from (lack of) NPIs?

• Interaction between clitic-resumed RD and cliticless RD (Samek-Lodovici 2015), especially in the case of multiple dislocations.
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