

Scope Freezing Restricts Binding in Italian Right Dislocation

Stefano Castiglioni, Ad Neeleman and Vieri Samek-Lodovici

Binding into right-dislocated categories is generally possible in Italian but fails when the binder is a direct object and the right-dislocated constituent an indirect object or a PP doubled by *ci*, even though direct objects binding into indirect objects or PPs is otherwise acceptable. These data fall into place once it is recognized that cliticization of an indirect object or a PP gives rise to a scope-freezing effect (on a par with English double-object constructions). We develop our account using a biclausal analysis of right dislocation but explore to which extent monoclausal analyses can capture the data as well.

Keywords: right-dislocation, scope freezing, binding, paycheck pronouns

1. Introduction

Consider the examples of right dislocation (RD) in (1)-(3), where *suo* is a pronoun that must be interpreted in the scope of its binder, while *proprio* is an anaphor that must be bound by a c-commanding antecedent. The example in (1a) shows that an object can bind into a PP complement when the latter is in-situ, but not when it is right-dislocated, as in (1b). By contrast, subjects can always bind into right-dislocated complements. This is true whether the subject is preverbal, as in (2a) and (3a), or postverbal, as in (2b) and (3b). (Main stress appears in SMALL CAPS. The data reflect the judgments of at least four speakers from different parts of Italy.)¹

(1) 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.’

b. *Gli ho presentato [ogni STUDENTE]_i al suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

3M.SG.DAT have.1SG introduced every student to.the his/his.own tutor

(2) a. [Ogni studente]_i l’ ha INCONTRATO, il suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

every student 3M.SG.ACC has met the his/his.own tutor

‘Every student has met their tutor.’

b. L' ha incontrato [ogni STUDENTE]_i, il suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

3M.SG.ACC has met every student, the his/his.own tutor

(3) a. [Ogni studente]_i gli ha telefonato, al suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

every student 3M.SG.DAT has called to his/his.own tutor

'Every student called their tutor.'

b. Gli ha telefonato [ogni STUDENTE]_i, al suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

3M.SG.DAT has called every student, to his/his.own tutor

These data are hard to analyse by only looking at the positions of the binder and of the right-dislocated category. For example, one may argue that while in (1a) the direct object quantifier can c-command and take scope over the indirect object, in (1b) the right-dislocated indirect object is too high in the structure for the direct object to bind into. However, this account does not carry over to (2) and (3). While a preverbal subject could c-command the right-dislocated category, a postverbal subject is generally assumed to be too low in the structure to do so, and hence (2b) and (3b) should be unacceptable, at least when the bound category is an anaphor, contrary to fact.

This problem can be solved by referring to the role of the clitic. We hypothesize that using a clitic in the dative construction gives rise to a scope freezing effect not otherwise observed. Just like the indirect object in a double-object construction in English, the dative clitic cannot be interpreted in the scope of the direct object. We show that this explains the unacceptability of (1b), while permitting binding in the structures in (2)-(3). We work out the analysis in terms of a biclausal account of Right Dislocation (RD), primarily because there is strong cross-linguistic evidence that RD may be an elliptical construction. Having presented the analysis, however, we explore whether our core hypothesis can also explain the data on a monoclausal account of RD.

2. Scope freezing

As mentioned, we posit that cliticization of dative arguments gives rise to scope freezing. In other words, such clitics cannot be interpreted in the scope of a direct object. Scope freezing is

attested in a range of constructions in English (Barss and Lasnik 1986, Larson 1988, Bruening 2001). Williams (2005) describes the effect as follows. Suppose that there is an alternation between a structure in which a verb projects its arguments in line with the thematic hierarchy (Theme > Goal) and an alternative structure in which the arguments are realized with the Goal occupying an A-position c-commanding the Theme. Then, the Goal must outscope the Theme in the second structure, as shown by the (b) examples below. (As indicated, judgments presuppose that the universal takes scope over the existential).

- (4) 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.
- (5) a. I loaded every crate onto a truck. b. *I loaded a truck with every crate. $\forall > \exists$
 c. I loaded a crate onto every truck. d. I loaded every truck with a crate.

Clitic placement has been argued to involve phrasal movement followed by an operation combining the clitic with its verbal host (Kayne 1989, Cecchetto 1999, Matushansky 2006, Roberts 2005, 2010, Nevins 2011). The phrasal movement is often taken to be like object shift. If so, we can generalize over cliticization of dative arguments/PPs and dative shift, so that whatever explains scope freezing in double-object constructions also predicts scope freezing with dative/PP clitics.

Cliticization of indirect objects resembles dative shift in three ways. (i) It involves the loss of a preposition: *a* is omitted when an indirect object undergoes cliticization, as is the preposition *con* when *ci* replaces a *with*-PP. (ii) Cliticization leads to reordering: when the DP and PP complements are both cliticized, the clitic-complex *gli_{DAT}-e-lo_{ACC}* shows fixed dative-accusative order rather than the DP-PP order found in-situ. (iii) The scope pattern in (4) and (5) can be replicated using clitics. To show this, we make use of the fact that Italian clitics, as opposed to English pronouns, allow indefinite readings (Ippolito 2017). For example, if A asks B whether they would like a red sweater for their birthday, B may utter (6) in reply (where the accusative clitic is read as ‘one’).

(6) No, grazie. Me l' hanno già regalato.

no, thanks. 1.DAT 3M.SG.ACC have.3PL already given

'No, thanks. They already gave me one.'

Given this property of Italian clitics, we can test scopal relations between clitics and full DP/PP arguments. As it turns out, an accusative clitic can be interpreted in the scope of an in-situ quantified indirect object, but a dative clitic cannot be interpreted in the scope of an in-situ quantified direct object:

(7) a. [Context: Should we give a toy to each of these children? No, it's not necessary.]

Maria l' ha già dato ad ogni bambino. $\forall > \exists$, with *lo* referring to 'a toy'

Mary 3M.SG.ACC has already given to every child

'Mary already gave a toy to every child.'

b. Maria gli ha già dato ogni giocattolo. $*\forall > \exists$, with *gli* referring to 'a child'

Mary 3M.SG.DAT has already given every toy

'Mary already gave him/her every toy.'

Cliticization does not lead to scope freezing with subjects, whether preverbal or postverbal:

(8) [Context: Should we give a toy to each of these children? No, it's not necessary.]

<Ogni bambino> l' ha già ricevuto <ogni bambino>. $\forall > \exists$, *lo* = 'a toy'

every child 3M.SG.ACC has already received every child

'Every child has already received one.'

Thus, dative cliticization patterns with dative shift in fixing the scope of the direct and indirect objects, but not the scope of objects with respect to subjects. We claim that this effect explains the data in (1)-(3), and especially the unacceptability of (1b). In the next section, we present an implementation of this idea in terms of a biclausal analysis of RD.

3. A biclausal account of RD

In biclausal analyses, the clitic and the dislocated element are part of separate clauses, with most of the second clause elided. There is disagreement on whether the right-dislocated category

remains in situ (Truckenbrodt 2016, Fernández-Sánchez 2017) or is fronted prior to ellipsis (Ott and De Vries 2012, 2016). For concreteness' sake, we opt for the in-situ analysis, but nothing of substance hinges on this. Thus, an example like (9) is assigned the structure given. The colon head uniting the two clauses requires that the second clause specifies the first (Koster 2000).

- (9) [_P [_S L' ho visto IERI] [_{':} :° [_S ~~ho~~ visto Gianni ieri]]]
 3M.SG.ACC have.1SG seen yesterday have.1SG seen John yesterday
 'I saw him yesterday, John.'

In this analysis, apparent binding into a dislocated category cannot involve binding from the first into the second clause, as there is no scope/c-command. For example, in (2b) (analyzed as (10)), the subject *ogni studente* in the first clause does not c-command or take scope over *il suo/proprio tutor*.

- (10) [_P [_S L' ha incontrato ogni STUDENTE], [_{':} :° [_S ~~ha~~ incontrato
 3M.SG.ACC has met every student has met
~~ogni studente~~ il suo/proprio tutor]]]
 every student the his/his.own tutor

Rather, separate binding relations must be established in each clause in (10), in accordance with the colon head's specification requirement (see Ott and De Vries 2016 on binding in German RD). In the second clause, the postverbal subject binds the possessor contained in the object.

That the first clause would host a parallel binding relation seems puzzling, as no constituent corresponding to the possessor is present. Note, however, that variable binding into pronouns is possible (see (11)). Such 'paycheck pronouns' are analyzed as disguised definite descriptions containing a bound variable (Karttunen 1969, Cooper 1979, Heim and Kratzer 1998, Elbourne 2008). We mark paycheck readings with an index between brackets.

- (11) The man who_i gave his_i paycheck to his wife is wiser than the man who_j gave it_{ij} to his mistress.

Ippolito (2017) shows that clitics permit paycheck readings. Hence, (2b) can be analyzed as in

(12).²

(12) [_iP [_S L_[i]’ ha incontrato [ogni STUDENTE]_i], [_i’ :^o [_S ~~ha incontrato~~
3SG.M.ACC has met every student has met
[~~ogni studente~~]_i; il suo_i/proprio_i tutor]]]
every student the his/his.own tutor

Thus, the biclausal analysis predicts that binding into a right-dislocated category is possible only if the clitic in the first clause can be construed as a paycheck pronoun and binding into the corresponding element in the second clause is acceptable.³ Both conditions are met in (12). The example in (13a) demonstrates that (in the context provided) a paycheck reading is permitted; (13b-c) show that the subject can bind into the object whether the order is SVO or VOS.

(13) [Context: Last week, each student was assigned a tutor.]

a. Lunedì, l_[i]’ ha incontrato [ogni STUDENTE]_i.

Monday 3M.SG.ACC has met every student

‘On Monday, every student met him/her.’

b. Lunedì, ha incontrato il suo_i/proprio_i tutor [ogni STUDENTE]_i.

Monday, has met the his/his.own tutor every student

‘On Monday, every student met their tutor.’

c. Lunedì, [ogni studente]_i ha incontrato il suo_i/proprio_i TUTOR.

Monday, every student has met the his/his.own tutor

We now show that the biclausal analysis captures the full data set, including (1) and (2).

4. Binding Patterns with and without RD

Given the above, the acceptability of apparent binding into a right-dislocated category is a function of the grammaticality of binding in the two clauses assumed in the biclausal analysis. We test this claim using examples with a pronominal/anaphoric possessor as the bound category and a universal/negative quantifier that functions as subject, direct object or indirect object as the binder.

We start with cases where binding is acceptable in both clauses of the biclausal analysis. The examples in (14)-(15) and (16)-(17) concern binding into a right-dislocated category by a preverbal or postverbal subject. The (a) examples match the first clause and prove that preverbal and postverbal subjects can bind into an accusative clitic, yielding a paycheck reading. The (b) examples match the second clause and prove that preverbal and postverbal subjects can bind a possessor contained in a direct or indirect object. Unless stated otherwise, all judgments from (14) onwards presuppose a context in which the department has assigned each student a tutor.

(14) a. Oggi, [ogni studente]_i l_{ij}' ha INCONTRATO.

today every student 3M.SG.ACC has met

'Today, every student met theirs.'

b. Oggi [ogni studente]_i ha incontrato il suo_i/proprio_i TUTOR.

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

'Today, every student met their tutor.'

(15) a. [Nessuno studente]_i l_{ij}' ha ancora INCONTRATO.

no student 3M.SG.ACC has yet met.

'No student has met theirs yet.'

b. [Nessuno studente]_i ha ancora incontrato il suo_i/proprio_i TUTOR.

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

'No student has met their tutor yet.'

(16) a. Oggi l_{ij}' ha incontrato [ogni STUDENTE]_i.

today 3M.SG.ACC has met every student

'Today, every student met theirs.'

b. Oggi ha incontrato 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.'

(17) a. Non l_{ij} ' ha ancora incontrato [nessuno STUDENTE]_i.

NEG 3M.SG.ACC has yet met no student

'No student has met theirs yet.'

b. Non ha ancora incontrato il suo_i/proprio_i tutor [nessuno STUDENTE]_i.

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

'No student has met their tutor yet.'

(One informant from Northern Italy finds (17a,b) marginally – rather than fully – acceptable.)

Note that the grammaticality of (14a,b) explains the acceptability of preverbal subjects binding into right-dislocated objects, as in (2a) above, while the grammaticality of (16a,b) explains the acceptability of binding by postverbal subjects, as in (2b).

Next, we show that when both clauses are ungrammatical, the corresponding RD construction is unacceptable as well. Examples (18)-(21) involve binding into a right-dislocated subject by either a direct object ((18) and (19)) or an indirect object ((20) and (21)). As before, the (a) examples match the first clause in a biclausal analysis, with paycheck-style binding into the clitic, while the (b) examples match the second clause, with the category containing the bound possessor in-situ. The corresponding RD construction is provided in the (c) examples. RD of a subject requires a silent *pro* pronoun rather than a clitic. Evidence for the fact that the subject in the (c) examples is right-dislocated comes from its being destressed and discourse-given. In (19) and (21) we give the full form of the quantifier *nessuno*, but the judgements also hold with the more natural *nessun*.

(18) a. *Oggi, pro_{ij} ha presentato [ogni STUDENTE]_i a Gianni.

today has introduced every student to John

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

b. *Oggi, il suo_i/proprio_i tutor ha presentato [ogni STUDENTE]_i a Gianni.

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

c. *Oggi, *pro*_[i] gli ha presentato [ogni STUDENTE]_i, a Gianni,
 today 3M.SG.DAT has introduced every student to John
 il suo_i/proprio_i tutor.
 the his/his.own tutor

(19) a. **pro*_[i] non ha ancora presentato [nessuno STUDENTE]_i a Gianni.

NEG has yet introduced no student to John

Intended: ‘No student’s tutor has introduced that student to John yet.’

b. *Il suo_i/proprio_i tutor non ha ancora presentato [nessuno STUDENTE]_i a Gianni.

the his/his.own tutor NEG has yet introduced no student to John

c. **pro*_[i] non gli ha ancora presentato [nessuno STUDENTE]_i, a Gianni,

NEG 3M.SG.DAT has yet introduced no student to John

il suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

the his/his.own tutor

(20) a. *Oggi, *pro*_[i] ha dato ad [ogni STUDENTE]_i un consiglio.

today has given to every student some advice

Intended: ‘Today, every student’s tutor gave some advice to that student.’

b. *Oggi, il suo_i/proprio_i tutor ha dato ad [ogni STUDENTE]_i un consiglio.

today the his/his.own tutor has given to every student some advice

c. *Oggi, *pro*_[i] l’ ha dato ad [ogni STUDENTE]_i, un consiglio,

today 3M.SG.ACC has given to every student some advice

il suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

the his/his.own tutor

(21) a. **pro*_[i] non ha ancora dato a [nessuno STUDENTE]_i un consiglio.

NEG has yet given to no student, some advice

Intended: ‘No student’s tutor has given advice to that student yet.’

b. *Il suo_i/proprio_i tutor non ha ancora dato un consiglio a [nessuno STUDENTE]_i.

the his/his.own tutor NEG has yet given some advice to no student

c. **pro*_[i] non l' ha ancora dato a [nessuno STUDENTE]_i, un consiglio,

NEG 3M.SG.ACC has yet given to no student, some advice

il suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

the his/his.own tutor

The biclausal analysis also predicts that RD is unacceptable when just one of the two underlying clauses is ill-formed. We first consider the crucial case in which the first clause is ungrammatical. Scope freezing implies that direct objects cannot bind into right-dislocated indirect objects because they cannot bind into the dative clitic in the first clause. This explains the unacceptability of (1b), repeated as (22c) (the (a) and (b) examples still match the first and second clause of the biclausal analysis).

(22) a. *Oggi gli_[i] ho presentato [ogni STUDENTE]_i.

today 3M.SG.DAT have.1SG introduced every student

Intended: '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

c. *Oggi gli_[i] ho presentato [ogni STUDENTE]_i, al suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

today 3M.SG.DAT have.1SG introduced every student to.the his/his.own tutor

(23) a. *Non gli_[i] ho ancora presentato [nessuno STUDENTE]_i.

NEG 3M.SG.DAT have.1SG yet introduced no student

Intended: 'I haven't introduced any student to their tutor yet.'

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

c. *Non gli_i ho ancora presentato [nessuno STUDENTE]_i,

NEG 3M.SG.DAT have.1SG yet introduced no student

al suo_i/proprio_i tutor.

to.the his/his.own tutor

Right dislocation with the clitic *ci*, which associates with a PP, presents a similar pattern.

The (a) examples in (24)-(25) show that direct objects cannot bind into *ci*, even though binding into the non-dislocated PP in the (b) examples is possible. The unacceptability of the corresponding right-dislocated constructions in the (c) examples thus follows from the ungrammaticality of the first clause. (We omit the anaphoric possessor *proprio*, which requires an animate binder.)

(24) [Context: Several authors have sent me one of their articles]

a. *Questa settimana ci_i ho discusso [ogni ARTICOLO]_i.

this week with.him/her have.1SG discussed every article

Intended: 'This week, I discussed every article with 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

c. *Questa settimana ci_i ho discusso [ogni ARTICOLO]_i, col suo_i autore.

this week with.him/her have.1SG discussed every article with.the its author

(25) a. *Non ci_i ho ancora discusso [nessun ARTICOLO]_i.

NEG with.him/her have.1SG yet discussed no article

Intended: 'I haven't discussed any article with its author yet.'

b. Non ho ancora discusso [nessun articolo]_i col suo_i AUTORE.

NEG have.1SG yet discussed no article with.the its author

c. *Non ci_i ho ancora discusso [nessun ARTICOLO]_i, col suo_i autore.

NEG with.him/her have.1SG yet discussed no article with.the its author

The ungrammaticality of the first clause has a familiar source. As the following data

show, *ci*, like the dative clitic, induces scope freezing effects:

(26) a. [Context: I indicated to each student where to find their tutor]

Oggi ci è andato ogni studente. $\forall > \exists$

today, there is gone every student

‘Today, every student went there.’ (each student to a different place)

b. [Context: I told Mary where to hide every Easter egg for the treasure hunt]

*Oggi, ci ha nascosto ogni uovo. $\forall > \exists$

today, there has hidden every egg

Intended: ‘Today, she hid every egg there’ (each egg in a different place).

Finally, we consider RD constructions in which a PP argument binds into a dislocated DP. The reduced acceptability of such constructions follows from the status of their second clause alone. The (a) examples in (27)-(28) are fully acceptable. The (b) examples, instead, display speaker variation, with some accepting them and some finding them markedly worse than the (a) examples. We think that this variation emerges from variation in the structure of VP. In Italian, the DP and PP complements of ditransitive verbs can potentially appear in either order: while DP-PP is unmarked, only PP-DP allows binding of a possessor in the DP. The variation in judgments can thus be understood if some speakers only allow for unmarked order in the second clause, as in (b), while others also allow for marked order, as in (c). Speakers in the first group will find the (d) example, with the PP complement binding into a right-dislocated DP less than acceptable. Speakers in the second group will allow even this binding configuration.

(27) a. Oggi l'_i ho presentato ad [ogni STUDENTE]_i.

today 3M.SG.ACC have.1SG introduced to every student

‘Today, I introduced every student’s tutor to that student.’

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
- d. Oggi l'_[i] ho presentato ad [ogni STUDENTE]_i, il %suo_i/%proprio_i tutor.
 today 3M.SG.ACC have.1SG introduced to every student the his/his.own tutor
- (28) a. Non l'_[i] ho ancora presentato a [nessuno STUDENTE]_i.
 NEG 3M.SG.ACC have.1SG yet introduced to no student
 'I haven't introduced any student's tutor to any student yet.'
- b. Non ho ancora presentato il %suo_i/%proprio_i tutor a [nessuno STUDENTE]_i.
 NEG have.1SG yet introduced the his/his.own tutor to no student
- c. Non ho ancora presentato a [nessuno studente]_i il suo_i/proprio_i TUTOR.
 NEG have.1SG yet introduced to no student the his/his.own tutor
- d. Non l'_[i] ho ancora presentato a [nessuno STUDENTE]_i,
 NEG 3M.SG.ACC have.1SG yet introduced to no student
 il %suo_i/%proprio_i tutor.
 the his/his.own tutor

Summing up, binding into a right-dislocated category gives marginal or unacceptable results if one or both clauses assumed under the biclausal analysis are ill formed. The biclausal analysis derives the full set of data, relying crucially on the independently-motivated assumption that cliticization of dative arguments and PPs gives rise to scope-freezing effects with respect to direct objects.

5. Monoclausal analyses

We conclude by considering whether monoclausal analyses of RD can use scope freezing to account for the binding data. Such analyses should in principle be able to prevent a direct object binding into a right-dislocated indirect object. Consider (1b), repeated as (30). On the intended reading in (31), the universal direct object scopes over the existential dislocated phrase, which in

turn binds, and hence must scope over, the variable that corresponds to the clitic (boldfaced *y*). Scope relations being transitive, the direct object must hence scope over the clitic as well. This is exactly what the scope freezing hypothesis rules out, so that (31) is not a possible reading of (30).

(30) *Gli_i ho presentato [ogni STUDENTE]_i, al suo_i/proprio_i tutor.
 3M.SG.ACC have.1SG introduced every student to.the his/his.own tutor

(31) For every student *x*, there is a *y*, *y* is *x*'s tutor, and I introduced *x* to *y*.

Thus, scope freezing provides a theory-independent explanation of the unacceptability of examples like (30).

Any theory of RD, however, must also explain why postverbal subjects can bind anaphors and pronouns contained in right-dislocated phrases, as in (32) (repeated from (2b)).

(32) L'_i ha incontrato [ogni STUDENTE]_i, il suo_i/proprio_i tutor.
 3M.SG.ACC has met every student, the his/his.own tutor

This problem rules out a subset of mono-clausal analyses of RD. While we cannot discuss such analyses in detail, we may distinguish two types: those assuming that a right-dislocated XP attaches higher than a postverbal subject, as in (33a), and those assuming that it attaches lower, as in (33b).

(33) a. [[_{TP} cl-V ... S ...] XP] b. [_{TP} cl-V [S [... XP ...]]]

The layout in (33a) can be derived in various ways. XP could be base-generated in its surface position (Cardinaletti 2002, De Cat 2007), it could have undergone rightward movement (Vallduví 1992), or it could be base-generated in, or be moved to, a position to the *left* of TP, with TP subsequently moving across it (Frascarelli 2004, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007, Giorgi 2015, Samek-Lodovici 2015). As for the low-attachment layout in (33b), argued for in Cecchetto (1999), Belletti (2004) and Bocci (2013), it assumes movement of XP to a position lower than T', followed by movement of other material, such as the subject and the verb, across XP to structurally higher positions.

A problem for most high-attachment analyses is that anaphors like *proprio* in (32) must be

bound under c-command. Since the postverbal subject does not c-command XP in (33a), XP must reconstruct to a position lower than the binder. Such reconstruction is impossible in most high-attachment analyses, leaving the acceptability of (32) unexplained. In base-generation accounts (Cardinaletti 2002, De Cat 2007, Frascarelli 2004, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007 and Giorgi 2015), there is no trace for the dislocated phrase to reconstruct to, ruling out both (30) and (32). In Samek-Lodovici's (2015) analysis, reconstruction is ruled out by Barss's (1986) generalization, which states that reconstruction of α is blocked whenever α does not c-command its trace at surface level (Sauerland and Elbourne 2002, Heck and Assmann 2014). Crucially, the remnant TP-movement following the XP's dislocation removes the XP-trace from XP's c-command domain.

Reconstruction *is* possible in Vallduví's (1992) account as it assumes that XP undergoes simple rightward movement. Hence, this analysis is compatible with the binding data if combined with the scope freezing hypothesis. However, Vallduví's analysis predicts a fundamental similarity between RD and clitic left dislocation which is at odds with the divergent syntactic properties of these constructions (Cecchetto 1999, Villalba 2000, and Samek-Lodovici 2015:151).

Low attachment analyses are compatible with the binding data, as well. They capture the acceptability of (32) as the subject in (33b) c-commands XP, and they can rule out (30) by appealing to the scope freezing hypothesis. They do face some other issues, though. Low attachment is usually motivated with Ross' Right-Roof Constraint, which prevents rightward dislocation beyond the clause. However, RD can create orders that violate the Right-Roof Constraint if analyzed as movement. In (34), for example, the dislocated object *i ragazzi* follows the subject of the main clause, even though the corresponding clitic *li* is generated in the lower clause (see Samek-Lodovici 2015 for discussion).

(34) Ha promesso di aiutar-li_i MARCO, [i ragazzi]_i.

has promised of to-help-3M.PL.ACC Mark, the boys.

‘MARK promised to help the boys.’

In addition, low-attachments analyses imply that the clitic *c*-commands the dislocated phrase. This creates a potential Principle C violation, which is avoided by effectively stipulating that Italian – a non-clitic-doubling language – allows for clitic doubling in RD structures. Other issues affecting low-attachment analyses include the ordering of dislocated and in-situ constituents, the licensing of negative phrases, and the interaction with focus (see Samek-Lodovici 2015 for a review).⁴

In sum, we have argued that the subject-object asymmetry in (1) and (2) has its source in the scope-freezing effect induced by dative cliticization. This is sufficient to capture the data, given an analysis of RD that allows binding into right-dislocated categories. We have shown that most high-attachment analyses must be rejected as not sufficiently liberal to allow such binding, and briefly described the issues that in our view favor a biclausal analysis amongst those accounts consistent with the binding data once the scope-freezing hypothesis is adopted.

Footnotes

Earlier versions of this squib were presented at the 2021 LAGB meeting, at the Romance Linguistics Circle (2021) and at UCL (during the 2022 PhD Day). We would like to thank the audiences at these events for useful comments and questions. We would also like to thank the editors for their guidance, and two anonymous *Linguistic Inquiry* reviewers for constructive criticism that has led to significant improvements in content and presentation.

¹ A reviewer does not find (3b) acceptable. We therefore checked the data in (2) and (3) with four additional speakers, who did not report a contrast between binding into DPs and PPs in RD (so the acceptability markings in (2) and (3) are based on judgments from eight speakers in total).

² The second clause in (12) could in principle either have SVO or VOS order, given that these orders are the ones permitted if both clauses are pronounced, with the second specifying the first (note that the subject can bind into the object in sentences with VOS order; see Samek-Lodovici 2015:69). Given that structural parallelism facilitates ellipsis, VOS order is the more likely option.

³ Despite appearances, the paycheck pronoun is not licensed through backwards anaphora. Rather, the clitic is dependent on a referent in the preceding discourse, which in turn explains why clitic right-dislocated categories are typically discourse-given (Lambrecht 1994; see also Williams 1997).

⁴ Cecchetto and Chierchia (1999) propose a monoclausal analysis of *left* dislocation in which DPs move while PPs are base-generated in their surface position. The analysis is based on the observation that left-dislocated DPs reconstruct for scope while left-dislocated PPs do not. This asymmetry, however, does not carry over to RD (see fn. 1).

References

- Barss, Andrew. 1986. *Chains and anaphoric dependence*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Barss, Andrew, and Howard Lasnik. 1986. A note on anaphora and double objects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 347–354.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In *The structure of CP and IP. The cartography of syntactic structures* (Vol. 2), ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 16–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benincà, Paolo., and Poletto, Cecilia. (2004). Topic, focus and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In *The structure of CP and IP. The cartography of syntactic structures* (Vol. 2), ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 52–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bocci, Giuliano. 2013. *The syntax–prosody interface: A cartographic perspective with evidence from Italian*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. QR obeys Superiority: Frozen scope and ACD. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 233–273.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2002. Against optional and null clitics. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization. *Studia Linguistica* 56: 29–57.
- Cecchetto, Carlo. 1999. A comparative analysis of left and right dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53: 40–67.
- Cecchetto, Carlo, and Gennaro Chierchia. 1999. Reconstruction in dislocation constructions and the syntax/semantics interface. In *Proceedings of the 17th West Coast Conference in Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Kimary N. Shahin, Susan Blake and Eun-Sook Kim, 132–146. Stanford University: CSLI Publications.
- Cooper, Robin. 1979. The Interpretation of Pronouns. In *Selections from the Third Groningen Round Table* (Vol. 10), ed. by Frank Heny and Helmut Schnelle, 61–92. Leiden: Brill.
- De Cat, Cécile. 2007. French dislocation without movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 485–534.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2008. The interpretation of pronouns. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2: 119–

- Fernández-Sánchez, Javier. 2017. *Right dislocation as a biclausal phenomenon; Evidence from Romance Languages*. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Frascarelli, Mara. 2004. Dislocation, clitic resumption and Minimality. A comparative analysis of left and right topic constructions in Italian. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2002*, ed. by Reineke Bok-Bennema, Bart Hollebrandse, Brigitte Kampers-Manhe and Petra Sleeman, 99–118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Frascarelli, Mara, and Roland Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of topics in German and Italian. In *On information structure, meaning and form: Generalizations across languages*, ed. by Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler, 117–127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giorgi, Alessandra. 2015. Discourse and the syntax of the left periphery. In *Discourse-oriented syntax*, ed. by Josef Bayer, Roland Hinterhölzl and Andreas Trotzke, 229–250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heck, Fabian, and Anke Assmann. 2014. Barss' Generalization and the strict cycle at LF. In *Topics at Infl (Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 92)*, ed. by Anke Assmann, Sebastian Bank, Doreen Georgi, Timo Klein, Philipp Weisser and Eva Zimmermann, 527–560. Universität Leipzig.
- Heim, Irene and Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ippolito, Michela. 2017. Indefinite pronouns. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, ed. by Andrew Lamont and Katerina Tetzloff, 99–108. University of Massachusetts at Amherst: GSLA.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1969. Pronouns and variables. In *Papers from the 5th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by R. Binnick et al., 108–116. Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.
- Kayne, Richard. 1989. Facets of Romance past participle agreement. In *Dialect variation and the theory of grammar*, ed. by Paola Benincà, 85–104. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Koster, Jan. 2000. Extraposition as parallel construal. Ms., University of Groningen.
- Lambrecht, Knut. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larson, Richard. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 335–391.
- Matushansky, Ora. 2006. Head movement in linguistic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37: 69–109.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2011. Multiple agree with clitics: Person complementarity vs. omnivorous number. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29: 939–971.
- Ott, Dennis, and Mark de Vries. 2012. Thinking in the right direction: An ellipsis analysis of right-dislocation. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 29: 123–134.
- Ott, Dennis, and Mark de Vries. 2016. Right-dislocation as deletion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34: 641–690.
- Roberts, Ian. 2005. *Principles and parameters in a VSO language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and head movement: Clitics, incorporation, and defective goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Samek-Lodovici, Vieri. 2015. *The interaction of focus, givenness, and prosody: A study of Italian clause structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sauerland, Uli, and Paul Elbourne. 2002. Total reconstruction, PF movement, and derivational order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 283–319.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2016. Some distinctions in the right periphery of the German clause. In *Inner-sentential propositional proforms: Syntactic properties and interpretative effects*, ed. by Werner Frey, André Meinunger and Kerstin Schwabe, 105–146. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vallduví, Enric. 1992. *The informational component*. New York: Garland.
- Villalba, Xavier. 2000. *The syntax of sentence periphery*. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Williams, Edwin. 1997. Blocking and anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 577–628
- Williams, Edwin. 2006. Circumstantial evidence for Dative Shift. In *Organizing grammar: Linguistic*

studies in honor of Henk van Riemsdijk, ed. by Hans Broekhuis, Norbert Corver, Riny Huijbregts,
Ursula Kleinhenz and Jan Koster. 661-668. Berlin: Mouton.

(Castiglione)

UCL Linguistics

Chandler House

2 Wakefield Street

London, WC1N 1PF

UK

stefano.castiglione.20@ucl.ac.uk

(Neeleman)

UCL Linguistics

Chandler House

2 Wakefield Street

London, WC1N 1PF

UK

a.neeleman@ucl.ac.uk

(Samek-Lodovici)

University College London

Foster Court

345 Department of Italian

London

WC1 6BT

UK

v.samek-lodovici@ucl.ac.uk