

# Movement and Ellipsis in Contrastive Left-Dislocation

Dennis Ott  
University of Groningen

## 1. Introduction

In this paper, I argue that the Germanic construction traditionally labeled *Contrastive Left-dislocation*<sup>1</sup> (CLD) reduces to an interplay of movement and ellipsis in an underlyingly biclausal structure. The resulting analysis relies exclusively on independently motivated grammatical operations ( $\bar{A}$ -movement in syntax and clausal ellipsis/deaccenting at PF), thereby achieving a reduction of constructional residue. The proposal is illustrated below for a simple case of CLD in German:

- (1) a. Den Peter, den kenne ich.  
the Peter him know I  
'I know Peter.'
- b. (i) [<sub>CP<sub>1</sub></sub> den Peter<sub>i</sub> kenne ich  $t_i$ ] [<sub>CP<sub>2</sub></sub> den<sub>k</sub> kenne ich  $t_k$ ] → PF-deletion  
(ii) [<sub>CP<sub>1</sub></sub> den Peter<sub>i</sub> ~~kenne ich  $t_i$~~ ] [<sub>CP<sub>2</sub></sub> den<sub>k</sub> kenne ich  $t_k$ ]

I will henceforth refer to the dislocated left-peripheral XP (*den Peter* in (1a)) as the *dXP*, to the clause following it as the *host clause*, and to the resuming pronominal element (*den* in (1a)) as the *correlate*. In these terms, the construction can be pre-theoretically described as follows:

- (2) *dXP* [<sub>CP</sub> ... correlate ... ]

CLD has been studied quite extensively (see the survey and references in Alexiadou 2006), but space constraints prevent me from doing this vast literature full justice here. I will, however, comment on the shortcomings of existing proposals along the way. For fuller discussion, see Ott 2012.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 I discuss what I refer to as the *dislocation paradox*: the *dXP* simultaneously exhibits clause-external and clause-internal properties. This is the main theoretical challenge faced by any analysis of CLD. In section 3, I suggest that the solution to the paradox is an analysis in terms of biclausal structures and backward ellipsis, akin to backward sluicing. In section 4, I suggest an extension of the analysis to the related phenomenon of Clitic Left-dislocation. Section 5 concludes.

## 2. The dislocation paradox

The central theoretical problem raised by CLD is the ambivalent relation between *dXP* and host clause. *Prima facie*, it is quite evident that the *dXP* is in some genuine sense external to the sentential domain of the host clause. This is brought out most conspicuously by the fact that it precedes a complete V2 clause (resulting in an apparent V3 order), including fronted operators:

- (3) Den Peter, woher kennst du den?  
the.ACC Peter from where know you him.ACC  
'Where did you meet Peter?'

---

\* For questions, comments, and encouragement, I'm indebted to Werner Frey, Erich Groat, Jason Merchant, Mark de Vries, Jan-Wouter Zwart, and the audience at *WCCFL 30*.

<sup>1</sup> I will not discuss English-type Left-dislocation, which patterns with so-called Hanging-topic Left-dislocation constructions in German, Dutch, etc. See van Riemsdijk 1997 on these differences.

Note that such examples straightforwardly falsify the claim (e.g. by Grohmann 2003 and Alexiadou 2006) that movement of the correlate is obligatory in CLD.

When the host clause does contain a ‘visible’ gap, it is easy to show that this gap relates to the correlate, not to the *dXP*. Witness the following:

- (4) Mit seiner Versetzung, da<sub>i</sub> hatte niemand *t<sub>i</sub>* mit gerechnet.  
with their relocation there had no-one with reckoned  
‘No-one had expected their relocation.’

Here, the *dXP* is a PP, whereas the gap inside the host clause matches the category of fronted *da*, which has stranded its associated P in an instance of exceptional P-stranding under R-pronoun movement.

*dXP* and host clause can also be separated by lexical material, such as discourse particles:

- (5) Dem Peter, ja, dem helfe ich oft!  
the.DAT Peter sure him.DAT help I often  
‘Peter, sure, I help him often!’

XPs that are fronted (not dislocated) do not allow this kind of separation.

It is thus tempting to conclude that the *dXP* is truly peripheral to the host clause, base-generated in its surface position as an adjunct to CP (as assumed in Frey 2004 and other works), or even as an unconnected ‘orphan.’

The problem, however, is that—despite the externality indications just mentioned—the *dXP* does show rather clear signs of connectivity into the host clause. Note that in (3) and (5) above it agrees in case with its correlate, as generally required in CLD. The same obligatory covariance in case is observed in Icelandic (examples from Zaenen 1997):

- (6) a. Peysuna sína, hana finnur Ólafur hvergi.  
sweater.ACC REFL it.ACC finds Olaf nowhere  
‘Olaf can’t find his sweater anywhere.’  
b. Þessum hring, honum hefur Ólafur lofað Maríu.  
this.DAT ring it.DAT has Olaf promised Marí  
‘Olaf promised this ring to Mari.’

Governed prepositions are likewise realized obligatorily in both the *dXP* and the correlate:<sup>2</sup>

- (7) Mit meiner Schwester, mit der streite ich mich oft.  
with my sister with her quarrel I REFL often  
‘I often quarrel with my sister.’

Furthermore, the *dXP* reconstructs for binding and scope interpretation. On the most natural reading of (4) above, the pronoun inside the *dXP* is bound by the negative quantifier inside the host clause; variable binding also obtains in the following (from Grohmann 2003):

- (8) Seinen<sub>i</sub> besten Freund, den sollte jeder<sub>i</sub> gut behandeln.  
his.ACC best.ACC friend him.ACC should everyone well treat  
‘Everyone should treat his best friend well.’

The following Icelandic and German examples (from Zaenen 1997 and Grohmann 2003) illustrate satisfaction of Condition A and violation of Condition C under reconstruction, respectively:

- (9) Stoltan afhor öðrum<sub>i</sub>, það tel ég þa<sub>i</sub> ekki vera.  
proud of each other that believe I them not to be  
‘I don’t think they’re proud of each other.’  
(10) \*Der Tatsache dass Alex<sub>i</sub> arm ist, der misst er<sub>i</sub> keine Bedeutung bei.  
the fact that Alex poor is that attaches he no importance to  
\*‘He<sub>i</sub> doesn’t attach any importance to the fact that Alex<sub>i</sub> is poor.’

<sup>2</sup> But see below for crosslinguistic variation in this property.

Clearly, then, a base-generation analysis of CLD is untenable.<sup>3</sup> A movement analysis, however, faces serious challenges as well. The most pressing question is the location of the *dXP*'s trace, given that the host clause provides 'no room' for it. van Haaften et al. (1983) and Grewendorf (2002) suggest that *dXP* and correlate underlyingly merge in a 'big XP,' which is then separated by movement. A major problem for this kind of approach, however, is the fact that adjuncts can be dislocated, as in the following Dutch example from Zwart 1998:

- (11) Gisteren, toen heeft Jan dat boek snel terug gebracht.  
 yesterday then has John that book quickly back brought  
 'John quickly returned the book yesterday.'

Here, the hypothetical 'big XP' comprising *gisteren* and *toen* in the base is necessarily an adjunct, hence extraction of *gisteren* violates the CED.

- (12) \* $gisteren_i \dots [_{AdvP} t_i \text{ toen} ]$   
 $\uparrow$

An alternative approach, first explored in Cinque 1990 and developed in Grohmann 2003, pursues the idea that the correlate is a pronounced trace of the *dXP*. The trigger for this *copy spell-out*, according to Grohmann, is a very local second movement step of the *dXP* within the left periphery, violating a general anti-locality constraint. Evidently, however, no such too-local movement obtains in cases like (3), where the correlate remains *in situ*; consequently, copy spell-out is falsely predicted to be barred. Furthermore, while pronominal correlates might be considered featural subsets of their associated *dXPs*, it is hard to see how this reasoning could be extended to epithetic correlates, as in the following:

- (13) Den Peter, den Idioten habe ich gestern noch gesehen.  
 the Peter that idiot have I yesterday still seen  
 'I saw that idiot Peter yesterday.'

See Ott 2012 for further arguments against the copy spell-out analysis, and Cinque 1990:ch. 2 for arguments against such an analysis for Clitic Left-dislocation.

Regardless of which version of the movement analysis is adopted, the question arises why a V3 configuration is permitted in CLD but barred otherwise in the languages under consideration here (or, conversely, why the verb doesn't raise to second position). Let us therefore now turn to an analysis that avoids these problems while accounting for all of the aforementioned empirical properties.

### 3. An ellipsis analysis

The upshot of the preceding section was that the *dXP* in CLD leads a peculiar double life, existing both inside and outside the sentential domain of the host clause. I would like to suggest that this seemingly paradoxical situation can receive a principled explanation by analyzing the *dXP* as a sentential fragment, derived by familiar mechanisms of ellipsis (which I take to be deletion at PF). On this approach, CLD constructions are underlyingly biclausal, i.e. juxtapositions of two parallel clauses; the linearly first of these clauses is reduced by ellipsis at PF, leaving only the fronted *dXP* as a remnant:

- (14)  $\overbrace{[_{CP_1} dXP_i \langle [ \dots t_i \dots ] \rangle]}^{\text{elliptical clause}} [_{CP_2} \dots \text{anchor} \dots ]$  (' $\langle \dots \rangle$ ' = PF-deletion)  
 $\uparrow$   
 host clause

<sup>3</sup> Frey (2004) supplements his base-generation approach with the following algorithm (essentially a formalization of Cinque's 1990 notion of *binding chain*) to mimic the effect of movement:

- (i) A CHAIN  $\langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \rangle$  is a sequence of nodes sharing the same  $\theta$ -role such that for any  $i, 1 \leq i < n$ ,  $\alpha_i$  c-commands and is coindexed with  $\alpha_{i+1}$ .

Clearly, however, this is an *ad hoc* solution: (i) is a restatement of the problem rather than an explanation. Note also that the algorithm *presupposes* identity in  $\theta$ -role to relate *dXP* and correlate, despite the fact that a base-generation approach provides no explanation for why the *dXP* receives this  $\theta$ -role.

To illustrate with a simple example, consider (1a), repeated below.

- (15) Den Peter, den kenne ich.  
 the Peter him know I  
 ‘I know Peter.’

The *dXP den Peter* is a constituent of CP<sub>1</sub>, underlyingly parallel to CP<sub>2</sub>; the two clauses differ only in that one contains the *dXP*, the other one its correlate with the same grammatical function:

- (16) [CP<sub>1</sub> den Peter<sub>i</sub> kenne ich t<sub>i</sub>] [CP<sub>2</sub> den<sub>k</sub> kenne ich t<sub>k</sub>]

Backward ellipsis in CP<sub>1</sub> then yields the surface pattern characteristic of CLD:

- (17) [CP<sub>1</sub> den Peter<sub>i</sub> ~~kenne ich t<sub>i</sub>~~] [CP<sub>2</sub> den<sub>k</sub> kenne ich t<sub>k</sub>]

The two clauses are doubly linked: first, by the anaphoric ‘resumption’ of the *dXP* by the correlate; and second, by ellipsis in CP<sub>1</sub>, which renders it cataphoric to CP<sub>2</sub>.<sup>4</sup> Note that this interpretive linkage of the clauses provides sufficient leeway to allow for intervening interjections (as in (5)), which do not disrupt discourse coherence (compare, e.g., polarity particles preceding fragment answers).

Importantly, the ellipsis in (17) is not construction-specific but an instance of run-of-the-mill clausal ellipsis. A prominent exponent is sluicing of *wh*-phrases as analyzed by Merchant (2001) and others, which is also known to apply backwards:

- (18) a. John will have something, but I don’t know what.  
 b. I don’t know what, but John will have something.

- (19) PF: [CP what<sub>i</sub> [ ~~John will have t<sub>i</sub>~~ ]]

The sluicing analysis has been extended to fragment answers (Merchant, 2004), split questions (Arregi, 2010), and right-dislocation (Ott & de Vries, 2012, in press), among other proposals.

Before going into further details of the analysis, note that it overcomes the V3 problem thwarting monoclausal analyses of both the base-generation and the movement type. On the analysis put forth here, no V3 structure is generated: each of the two CPs involved is a regular V2 clause (16); V3 arises only the surface, as a result of deletion in CP<sub>1</sub> (17).

I assume that ellipsis in CP<sub>1</sub> is subject to standard constraints on clausal ellipsis. For concreteness’ sake, I adopt the approach to ellipsis parallelism developed in Merchant 2001, according to which elided material must be *given* in a specific sense, according to the following definitions:

- (20) *Focus Condition on clausal ellipsis*  
 A constituent  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha$  a derived sister of a fronted operator, can be deleted only if  $\alpha$  is e-GIVEN.

- (21) *e-GIVENness*  
 An expression  $\Delta$  counts as e-GIVEN iff  $\Delta$  has a salient antecedent A, and A entails E-clo( $\Delta$ ),<sup>5</sup> and  $\Delta$  entails E-clo(A).

The Focus Condition ensures that an example like (1a) can only be derived from the underlying structure in (16), not from that in (22). The reason is that in the latter case, the entailment from ellipsis site ( $\Delta$ ) to antecedent (A) does not hold, hence  $\Delta$  is not e-GIVEN and ellipsis would apply in violation of (20).

- (22) [CP<sub>1</sub> den Peter [ $\Delta$  habe ich t<sub>i</sub> gesehen ]] [CP<sub>2</sub> den<sub>k</sub> [A kenne ich t<sub>k</sub> ]]  
 the Peter have I seen him know I

- (23) a. E-clo( $\Delta$ ):  $\exists x$  . I saw  $x$   
 b. E-clo(A):  $\exists x$  . I know  $x$   
 c. E-clo( $\Delta$ )  $\not\rightarrow$  E-clo(A)

<sup>4</sup> In Ott 2012 it is shown that there are also instances of CLD in which the ellipsis in CP<sub>1</sub> is anaphoric to a preceding clause. These will be set aside here for reasons of space.

<sup>5</sup> The E-closure of  $\alpha$  (E-clo( $\alpha$ )) is the result of replacing all E-marked subelements of  $\alpha$  with variables of the appropriate type.

Merchant's Focus Condition, in conjunction with his definition of e-GIVENness, thus ensures that CP<sub>1</sub> and CP<sub>2</sub> are semantically, and hence usually syntactically, equivalent. At the same time, it is sufficiently flexible to allow for semantically vacuous syntactic differences between the two clauses, such as pied-piping vs. stranding of P in (4).

The ellipsis analysis assumes that the *dXP* is fronted to the edge of CP<sub>1</sub>, enabling constituent deletion. Given the unselective Germanic *Vorfeld*, this imposes virtually no restrictions on the category of the *dXP*—a welcome situation, given that almost any category can undergo CLD. In addition to the examples of DP, PP, and AdvP dislocation given above, witness the following:

- (24) a. [<sub>VP</sub> Den Mt. Everest besteigen], das wollte ich immer schon.  
           the Mt. Everest climb       that wanted I   always PRT  
           'I've always wanted to climb Mt. Everest.'
- b. [<sub>CP</sub> Dass Peter seine Freundin geküsst hat], das glaube ich nicht.  
           that Peter his   girlfriend kissed has that believe I not  
           'I don't believe that Peter kissed his girlfriend.'
- c. [<sub>AP</sub> Schön], das ist sie wirklich nicht.  
           beautiful that is she really not  
           'She really isn't beautiful.'

While this categorial freedom is expected, note that the *dXP* is pronominally 'resumed' in the second clause.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, if independent constraints on movement and/or co-construal are violated, this will impinge on the acceptability of the resulting CLD construction. More precisely, we expect those and only those categories to productively participate in CLD that a) allow fronting to the clausal edge, and b) can be appropriately 'resumed' by a pro-form.

It is straightforward to show that this prediction is borne out. Weak pronouns resist fronting to the clausal edge, hence cannot undergo CLD:

- (25) a. \*Ihn           kenne ich.  
           him.WEAK know I
- b. \*Ihn,           den kenne ich.  
           him.WEAK him know I  
           'I know him.'

Bare QPs can be fronted, however they cannot be anaphorically resumed by a pronoun; consequently, they are excluded from CLD:

- (26) a. \*Alle<sub>i</sub> waren in der Mensa. Die<sub>i</sub> habe ich gesehen.  
           all were in the dining hall them have I seen
- b. \*Alle, die habe ich gesehen.  
           all them have I seen  
           'I saw everybody.'
- (27) a. \*Niemand<sub>i</sub> kam zur Party. Der<sub>i</sub> war woanders.  
           no-one came to the party he was elsewhere
- b. \*Niemand, der kam zur Party.  
           no-one he came to the party  
           'No-one came to the party.'

NPIs are constrained in both ways, i.e. they can neither be fronted nor pronominally resumed:

- (28) a. A: Ich habe hier noch nie auch nur einen einzigen Studenten<sub>i</sub> gesehen.  
           I have here yet never even only a single student seen  
           'I've never even seen a single student here.'

<sup>6</sup> Note that this relation is not one of coreference, as shown by the examples in (24). As shown below, the only condition is that the *dXP* be of a type that can be anaphorically referred to in some way (and that the language provides a suitable pro-form), which is true for predicative categories like VP and AP.



- (34) a. (<sup>??</sup>Med) søstera mi, ho kranġla jeg ofte med.  
with sister my her quarreled I often with  
'I often quarreled with my sister.' (Norwegian)
- b. (<sup>??</sup>Med) min syster, henne blev jag ofta osams med.  
with my sister her became I often upset with  
'I often got upset with my sister.' (Swedish)
- c. (<sup>??</sup>Um) mömmu sína<sub>i</sub>, hana talar hver einasti unglíngur<sub>i</sub> illa um.  
about mother his.ACC her.ACC talks each single youngster badly about  
'Every youngster talks badly about his mother.' (Icelandic)

Like in other elliptical contexts, then, the (im-)possibility of P-stranding betrays movement of the *dXP* in CLD, corroborating my claim that it is a full clausal structure in underlying form.

Summarizing, we can explain the peculiar dual status of the *dXP* in CLD straightforwardly by analyzing it as the surface remnant of a redundant juxtaposed clause. Ellipsis removes the redundancy and moreover cataphorically links the elliptical clause to the host clause. As expected, the *dXP* shows connectivity effects, now understood to be a consequence of ellipsis parallelism rather than literal reconstruction into the host clause. Moreover, no V3 structures must be admitted in the syntax, and the strict V2 requirement for root clauses can be upheld.

#### 4. An extension to clitic left-dislocation

Germanic CLD has a very similar counterpart in Italian, Greek, and other languages, termed *Clitic Left-dislocation* (CILD) and first extensively studied in Cinque 1990:ch. 2. From a syntactic point of view CLD and CILD are a close match, and it is widely assumed that both ought to receive a unified analysis (see, e.g., van Haaften et al., 1983; Demirdache, 1991; Anagnostopoulou, 1994; Wiltschko, 1997); it is therefore natural to extend the ellipsis approach to CILD.

The main difference between CLD and CILD is the use of a clitic pronoun as the correlate of the *dXP* in the latter. Stock examples (from Anagnostopoulou 1994 and Cinque 1990) are given below:

- (35) a. Ton Jani, den ton ksero.  
the.ACC Janis.ACC NEG CL.ACC know.1SG  
'I don't know Janis.' (Greek)
- b. Gianni, lo vedrò domani.  
Gianni him.CL see.FUT.1SG tomorrow  
'I will see Gianni tomorrow.' (Italian)

As documented in detail by Cinque (1990), CILD presents essentially the same theoretical challenges we reviewed in section 2 in the context of CLD. Thus, here, too, the *dXP* appears to be genuinely external to the host clause<sup>10</sup> while at the same time showing clear signs of connectivity. The following (from Cinque 1990 and Alexopoulou et al. 2004) illustrate this for case and binding in Italian/Greek CILD:

- (36) a. {Me / \*Io}, ha detto che mi vede domani.  
me I has.3SG said that me see.FUT.3SG tomorrow  
'She said that she will see me tomorrow.'
- b. {Io / \*Me}, sai che non l' ho più vista.  
I me know.2SG that not her have.1SG anymore seen  
'You know that I haven't seen her anymore.'
- (37) Ti diatrivi tu<sub>i</sub>, tin prosehi kathe fitis<sub>i</sub>.  
the.ACC dissertation his it.CL.ACC take-care-of.3SG each student.NOM  
'Each student takes care of his dissertation.'

<sup>10</sup> Note in this connection that CILD is found in languages (like Italian) that do not have clitic-doubling. This is problematic for analyses (e.g., that of Cecchetto 2000) that assume a clitic-doubling structure to underlie CILD.

- (38) a. A lei<sub>i</sub> / \*se stessa<sub>i</sub>, Maria<sub>i</sub> dice che non ci pensiamo mai.  
of her herself Maria says that not PP.CL think.1PL ever  
‘Maria says that we don’t ever think of her.’  
b. A {\*?lei<sub>i</sub> / se stessa<sub>i</sub>}, Maria<sub>i</sub> non ci pensa.  
of her herself Maria not PP.CL thinks  
‘Maria doesn’t think about herself.’

For reasons of space I cannot review the relevant facts here in further detail; the reader is referred to Alexiadou 2006 and references therein.

The ellipsis approach to CILD assigns the examples in (35) the following underlying structures:

- (39) a. [CP<sub>1</sub> ton Jani<sub>i</sub> [ ~~den ksero t<sub>i</sub>~~ ]] [CP<sub>2</sub> den<sub>k</sub> ton ksero t<sub>k</sub> ]  
b. [CP<sub>1</sub> Gianni<sub>i</sub> [ ~~vedrò domani t<sub>i</sub>~~ ]] [CP<sub>2</sub> lo<sub>k</sub> vedrò domani t<sub>k</sub> ]

We can now explain the observed connectivity effects while accounting for the clause-external status of the *dXP* at the same time, analogously to the reasoning in section 3. A *dXP* can be case-marked/bound by a clause-internal element because the case-assigner/binder is also present in the underlying parallel CP<sub>1</sub> (a result of parallelism enforced by the Focus Condition (20)). The reconstruction effects witnessed in (36)–(38) are thus directly parallel to those witnessed in fragment answers like the following (from Merchant 2004 and Brunetti 2003):

- (40) a. Me pjon milise i Anna?  
with whom spoke the Anna  
‘Who did Anna talk to?’  
b. {\*(Me)} ton Kosta.  
with the Kosta  
‘Kosta.’
- (41) a. Chi vedi allo specchio?  
who see.2SG at the mirror  
‘Who do you see in the mirror?’  
b. {\*Io / me} stessa.  
I me self  
‘Myself.’

The constraints on what kinds of categories can figure as *dXPs* in CILD also appear to largely mirror those operative in CLD. While there are virtually no categorial restrictions (Cinque, 1990), bare QPs that do not permit a specific interpretation are excluded (data from Rizzi, 1997):

- (42) a. \*Nessuno, lo ho visto.  
no-one him.CL have.1SG seen  
‘I saw no-one.’  
b. \*Tutto, lo ho fatto.  
everything it.CL have.1SG done  
‘I didn’t do everything.’

As argued in section 3 above, these facts simply follow from the inability of such ‘radically non-referential’ QPs to be co-construed with *pro*-forms.

The major syntactic difference between CLD and CILD is that while the former is typically recognized to be a root phenomenon,<sup>11</sup> the latter occurs systematically in genuine embedded contexts, as shown by the following Italian example (from Rizzi, 2004):

<sup>11</sup> This is a simplification, as Icelandic generally allows embedded CLD (datum from Thráinsson, 2007:359), unsurprisingly given the ‘generalized V2’ status of the language.

- (i) Jón segir að þessum hring, honum hafi Ólafur lofað Maríu.  
Jon says that this.DAT ring it.DAT has Ólaf promised Marí.  
‘Jon says that Ólaf promised this ring to Marí.’

Such cases appear to be on a par with embedded CILD as in (43). By contrast, German permits genuinely embedded instances of CLD only very marginally, suggesting a difference in complementation between these languages along the lines suggested in the text below.

- (43) Credo che il tuo libro, loro lo apprezzerebbero molto.  
 think.1SG that the your book they it.CL would appreciate a lot  
 ‘I think that they would appreciate your book a lot.’

For embedded CILD, I assume that one of the two clauses is adjoined to the other below the complementizer (I leave open here the directionality of adjunction):

- (44) che [<sub>CP<sub>1</sub></sub> il tuo libro<sub>*i*</sub> [~~loro apprezzerebbero molto<sub>*t<sub>i</sub>*</sub>~~]] [<sub>CP<sub>2</sub></sub> loro lo apprezzerebbero molto ]]

This ties in with Manzini & Savoia’s (2003) analysis of Italian *che* (and other complementizers) as a nominal element taking an entire embedded clause as its complement (see also Roussou, 2010). Presumably, the root/embedded asymmetry between CLD and CILD reduces to differences between the complementation systems employed by these languages (see also note 11).

Like CLD (recall (3)), but unlike XP-fronting, CILD can co-occur with *wh*-movement in the host clause (data from Alexopoulou et al. 2004 and Rizzi 1997):

- (45) a. Ton Gianni, pote ton idhes?  
 the Giannis when him.CL saw.2SG  
 ‘When did you see Giannis?’  
 b. Il premio Nobel, a chi lo daranno?  
 the prize Nobel to whom it.CL give.FUT.3PL  
 ‘Who are they going to award the Nobel prize?’

Facts of this kind prompted Rizzi (1997) to assume a fixed left-peripheral template providing designated landing sites for *d*XPs (TopP) and fronted operators (FocP), to account for the observed ordering (TopP < FocP). Note, however, that this reasoning is based on the assumption that CILD constructions are monoclausal, hence comparable to simple fronting in the relevant sense. The present analysis removes much of the force of Rizzi’s argument by treating CILD as biclausal: facts like those in (45) provide no argument for a left-peripheral template once it is recognized that *d*XPs do not move within the same clausal domain as fronted XPs, but instead constitute separate elliptical clauses. In this way, the approach automatically predicts and *explains* (rather than recasts) the generalization that *d*XPs precede fronted foci/*wh*-phrases (see Benincà & Poletto, 2004), which occupy the edge of CP<sub>2</sub>.

The ellipsis approach to CILD also solves various problems that arise on Rizzi’s own account. One example is the fact that fronted XPs, but not *d*XPs in CILD trigger WCO effects, as shown by the following contrast (from Rizzi, 1997):

- (46) a. ??Gianni<sub>*i*</sub> sua<sub>*i*</sub> madre ha sempre apprezzato.  
 Gianni his mother has always appreciated  
 b. Gianni<sub>*i*</sub>, sua<sub>*i*</sub> madre lo ha sempre apprezzato.  
 Gianni his mother him.CL has always appreciated  
 ‘His mother always appreciated Gianni.’

For Rizzi’s model, this is an unexpected (and unexplained) asymmetry. By contrast, the ellipsis approach—incorporating a semantically-based notion of parallelism (21)—provides sufficient leeway to attribute this discrepancy to *vehicle change* in (46b), a well-known side-effect of ellipsis (Merchant, 2001). That is, the DP *sua madre* in CP<sub>2</sub> licenses deletion of a coreferent pronoun in CP<sub>1</sub>, as shown in the following pre-deletion structure underlying (46b):

- (47) [<sub>CP<sub>1</sub></sub> Gianni<sub>*i*</sub> [<sub>CP<sub>2</sub></sub> ella ha sempre apprezzato *t<sub>i</sub>* ]]

This explains straightforwardly why the WCO effect is obviated in (46b) but not in (46a).

Van Craenenbroeck (2006) draws attention to a rather serious problem for Rizzi’s approach. The fixed positional template predicts ordering relations to be transitive: if A < B and B < C, it follows by transitivity that A < C (where A, B, C correspond to positions in the periphery). Van Craenenbroeck observes that the transitivity inference fails, however, when the distribution of *d*XPs, fronted foci/*wh*-phrases, and the complementizer *che* is considered. To establish this point, van Craenenbroeck presents facts from Venetian Italian, a dialect that permits doubly-filled COMPs:

- (48) a. Me domando el premio Nobel a chi che i ghe lo podarà dar.  
 I wonder the prize Nobel to who that they.CL to him.CL it.CL could give  
 ‘I wonder who they should give the Nobel prize.’  
 b. Me domando chi che Nane ga visto al marcà.  
 I wonder who that Nane has seen at the market  
 ‘I wonder who Nane saw at the market.’  
 c. Me dispiase che a Marco i ghe abia ditto cussi.  
 I’m sorry that to Marco they.CL to him.CL have told so  
 ‘I’m sorry that they said so to Marco.’

First, (48a) shows that *d*XP<sub>s</sub> precede fronted *wh*-phrases. Next, (48b) establishes that a fronted *wh*-phrase precedes *che*. By transitivity, we now expect *d*XP<sub>s</sub> in embedded CILD to precede *che*—contrary to fact, as shown by (48c). The situation is summarized below:

- (49) a. *d*XP < *wh*  
 b. *wh* < *che*  
 c. *che* < *d*XP

While this result is damaging for Rizzi’s assumption of a rigid ordering of landing sites for *d*XP<sub>s</sub> (TopP) and operators (FocP) and the complementizer *che*, it is predicted by the present analysis. In (48a)/(49a), a *d*XP precedes an entire clause with a fronted XP, as in (3) and (45) above; this is underlyingly a biclausal structure. In (48b)/(49b), by contrast, we have a monoclausal structure with simple fronting to the clausal edge. Finally, in (48c)/(49c) we have embedded CILD, an embedded biclausal structure parallel to (44). To summarize schematically:

- (50) a. [<sub>CP<sub>1</sub></sub> *d*XP ... ] [<sub>CP<sub>2</sub></sub> *wh che* ... ]  
 b. [<sub>CP</sub> *wh che* ... ]  
 c. [ ... *che* [[<sub>CP<sub>1</sub></sub> *d*XP ... ] [<sub>CP<sub>2</sub></sub> ... ]]]

The transitivity failure uncovered by van Craenenbroeck thus provides circumstantial evidence for the present approach, and against Rizzi’s.<sup>12</sup>

Clearly, more research is needed to fully establish the validity of the ellipsis approach to CILD. It is clear already, however, that the analysis casts doubt on any theoretical claim based on the assumption that both fronting and CILD involve monoclausal structures, hence that the relative linear ordering of the two indicates clause-internal hierarchical ordering.

## 5. Conclusion

In light of the peculiar combination of properties of CLD reviewed in section 2, attempts to locate the phenomenon on either side of the traditional *movement vs. base-generation* dichotomy are bound to fail. I have suggested in this paper that CLD instantiates a third way of structure-building, as it were: the juxtaposition of unreduced and parallel reduced clauses.

- (51) 
$$\overbrace{[\text{CP}_1 \text{ dXP}_i \langle [\dots t_i \dots] \rangle]}^{\text{elliptical clause}} \underbrace{[\text{CP}_2 \dots \text{anchor} \dots]}_{\text{host clause}} \quad (\langle \dots \rangle = \text{PF-deletion})$$

Note that the generation of (51) requires no special operations beyond  $\bar{A}$ -movement and (backward) clausal ellipsis, hence is an option we expect to be exploited in grammars including these operations.

<sup>12</sup> It is noteworthy that CILD is a pernicious troublemaker throughout the discussion in Rizzi 1997, 2004. This is particularly true with regard to locality, where Rizzi is forced to conclude that “Topics [= *d*XP<sub>s</sub> in CILD, D.O.] appear to fall outside of the observed typology [of Relativized Minimality]” (Rizzi, 2004:247), and eventually to assume “a distinct class including topic constructions, such as Clitic Left-dislocation in Romance” (Rizzi, 2004:243). Clearly, such a retreat to constructions is undesirable. I will return in future work to the question of how much of this special behavior of CILD can be shown to follow from the approach put forth here.

CLD dissolves into movement and ellipsis, reducing the constructional residue ascribed to UG, in line with the main desiderata of the Principles & Parameters framework.

I have furthermore suggested that an extension of the ellipsis approach to CLD may contribute to the principled deconstruction of the rigid template stipulated by ‘cartographic’ approaches to the left periphery, indicating how a treatment of CLD along these lines is able to cope with non-trivial problems arising on a monoclausal approach.

The proposal invites the question whether we also find the reverse linear arrangement, i.e. host clauses *followed* by fragmentary parallel counterparts. In Ott & de Vries 2012, in press it is argued that this is precisely the configuration underlying *right-dislocation*, which exhibits a similarly paradoxical constellation of properties. The reader is referred to Ott & de Vries’s work for further details.

## References

- Alexiadou, Artemis (2006). Left-dislocation (including CLLD). Everaert, Martin & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, Blackwell, Oxford, 668–699.
- Alexopoulou, Theodora, Edit Doron & Caroline Heycock (2004). Broad subjects and clitic left-dislocation. Adger, David, Cécile de Cat & George Tsoulas (eds.), *Peripheries*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 329–358.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena (1994). *Clitic dependencies in Modern Greek*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Salzburg.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena, Henk van Riemsdijk & Frans Zwarts (eds.) (1997). *Materials on left-dislocation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Arregi, Karlos (2010). Ellipsis in split questions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28:3, 539–592.
- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto (2004). Topic, focus, and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. Rizzi, Luigi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 52–75.
- Brunetti, Lisa (2003). ‘Information’ focus movement in Italian and contextual constraints on ellipsis. *Proceedings of WCCFL 22*, Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.
- Cecchetto, Carlo (2000). Doubling structures and reconstruction. *Probus* 12, 93–126.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990). *Types of  $\bar{A}$ -dependencies*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen (2006). Transitivity failures in the left periphery and foot-driven movement operations. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 23, 52–64.
- Demirdache, Hamida (1991). *Resumptive chains in restrictive relatives, appositives, and dislocation structures*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Frey, Werner (2004). Notes on the syntax and the pragmatics of German left-dislocation. Lohnstein, Horst & Susanne Trissler (eds.), *The syntax and semantics of the left periphery*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 203–233.
- Grewendorf, Günther (2002). Left-dislocation as movement. *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics* 2, 31–81.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. (2003). *Prolific domains*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- van Haften, Ton, Rik Smits & Jan Vat (1983). Left-dislocation, connectedness, and reconstruction. Abraham, Werner (ed.), *On the formal syntax of the West Germanic*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 133–154.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Leonardo M. Savoia (2003). The nature of complementizers. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 28, 87–110.
- Merchant, Jason (2001). *The syntax of silence*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Merchant, Jason (2004). Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 27, 661–738.
- Ott, Dennis (2012). An ellipsis approach to Contrastive Left-dislocation. Ms., University of Groningen.
- Ott, Dennis & Mark de Vries (2012). Right-dislocation as deletion. Ms., University of Groningen.
- Ott, Dennis & Mark de Vries (in press). Thinking in the right direction: An ellipsis analysis of right-dislocation. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 2012.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk (1997). Left-dislocation. Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 1–10.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281–337.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2004). Locality and left periphery. Belletti, Adriana (ed.), *Structures and beyond*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 223–251.
- Roussou, Anna (2010). Selecting complementizers. *Lingua* 120:3, 582–603.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2007). *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Wiltschko, Martina (1997). Parasitic operators in German left-dislocations. Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 307–339.
- Zaenen, Annie (1997). Contrastive dislocation in Dutch and Icelandic. Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997), 119–148.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1998). Where is syntax? Syntactic aspects of left-dislocation in Dutch and English. Culicover, Peter W. & Louise McNally (eds.), *The limits of syntax*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, 365–393.

# Proceedings of the 30th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Nathan Arnett  
and Ryan Bennett

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2012

## Copyright information

Proceedings of the 30th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics  
© 2012 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-454-6 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.  
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

## Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.  
To place an order, go to [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com) or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA  
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, [sales@cascadilla.com](mailto:sales@cascadilla.com)

## Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com). Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Ott, Dennis. 2012. Movement and Ellipsis in Contrastive Left-Dislocation. In *Proceedings of the 30th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Nathan Arnett and Ryan Bennett, 281-291. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com), document #2825.