

Locality and right-dislocation

Mark de Vries

University of Groningen

Right-dislocation constructions, including backgrounding and specificational afterthoughts, are subject to various limitations. Dislocated phrases themselves are islands for extraction. Moreover, there are proximity effects between dislocated phrases and their correlate in the host clause. The main effect reduces to the regular constraints on A-bar movement. This is explained from the perspective of a biclausal analysis in which the dislocated phrase is fronted within its own, elliptical clause. As a result, right-dislocated phrases related to a deeply embedded correlate are only possible if the embedded clause is sentence-final. Otherwise, a dislocated constituent may surface in an intraposed position, next to the embedded clause. Finally, there is an additional prosodic constraint on backgrounding, which is irrelevant for afterthoughts; consequently, the latter must follow the former if they are combined in one sentence.

Keywords: A-bar movement, afterthoughts, ellipsis, locality, right-dislocation

1. Introduction

This paper discusses locality effects in right-dislocation (RD) constructions, in particular backgrounding and specificational afterthoughts. These are illustrated in (1a) and (1b), respectively. Such sentences are structurally similar, and what they have in common is that the dislocated phrase corefers with an expression in the host clause, called the correlate. The difference is in the intonation and the information structure: Backgrounded phrases represent discourse-given or otherwise salient information and are typically pronounced with a deaccented intonation (low and level, in declarative sentences); by contrast, afterthoughts contain new information and are pronounced with an independent pitch accent.¹ In what follows, dislocated constituents are italicized; the coreferential correlates in the host clause are underlined. Throughout this paper I use Dutch examples, but similar patterns are attested in German and English, and probably many other languages.

- (1) a. Ik heb m nog niet ontmoet, *de nieuwe medewerker*.
 I have him not yet met the new employee
 'I haven't met him yet, the new employee.'
 b. Ik heb iets moois gekregen, *een zilveren horloge*!
 I have something beautiful received a silver watch
 'I got something beautiful, a silver watch!'

Dislocation is not a regular movement construction; yet, it is a priori plausible that there are limitations regarding the grammatical distance between a dislocated constituent and its correlate. I will confirm this intuition and show how it can be made more precise.

Theoretically, my analysis builds on Ott & de Vries (2012, 2013), a biclausal view of RD, which was presented at last year's Linguistics in the Netherlands conference. A schematic representation is (2), where CP_1 is the matrix clause typically containing a correlate of the dislocated constituent dXP . XP can be any syntactic category, but I focus on noun phrases and object clauses in this paper. In (2), the second clause CP_2 is basically a repetition of the first, but with dXP replacing the correlate.² This constituent is fronted so that the rest of the clause can be elided, similarly to the situation in sluicing, fragment answers, and other instances of clausal ellipsis, which are licensed by semantic parallelism. I assume the two clauses are syntactically related by means of specifying coordination, for ease of representation simply indicated by a colon here.³ A concrete example is (3), which corresponds to (1a).

- (2) $[_{CP_1} \dots \text{correlate} \dots] : [_{CP_2} dXP_i \dots t_i \dots]$
 (3) $[_{CP_1} \text{Ik heb } \underline{m} \text{ nog niet ontmoet}] : [_{CP_2} [\text{de nieuwe medewerker}]_i \text{ heb ik } t_i \text{ nog niet ontmoet}]$.

Thus, a dislocated constituent is in fact a remnant of an elliptical clause. Summarized in a nutshell, such a biclausal analysis resolves a paradox that cannot be explained by means of rightward movement or simple right-hand base-generation: Namely, the dislocated constituent is both *independent* of the host clause, and at the same time *connected* to it. The host clause CP_1 is syntactically and prosodically complete by itself (this is highly problematic for a rightward movement hypothesis). Still, dXP may express dependencies (case, binding, ...) as if it occupies the position of the correlate (this is highly problematic for monoclausal base-generation). In the biclausal analysis in (2), such dependencies are automatically licensed by the elliptical context within CP_2 . In addition, various similarities with sluicing provide evidence for A-bar fronting of dXP within CP_2 . There is no need nor space to repeat the extensive argumentation from the cited literature here, so in the remainder of this paper, the biclausal analysis will simply be treated as a given.

With respect to potential locality conditions on RD, there are a number of things issues to consider. These are to be discussed in separate sections below. Firstly, there is the status of *dXP* itself, which is arguably an island for extraction. Secondly, the proposed fronting of *dXP* within CP_2 is shown to be subject to the usual constraints on A-bar movement. Indirectly, this corresponds to limitations on the hierarchical distance between the correlate and *dXP*. Along the way, a number of interesting puzzles are solved, including the distribution of intraposed dislocated phrases. Thirdly, there turns out to be an additional proximity effect resulting from prosodic requirements. These are more stringent for backgrounding than for afterthoughts. Generally, the attested patterns follow naturally from the biclausal perspective sketched above, and in some respects even provide indirect additional evidence for the approach — which is convenient, but not essential in the light of the primary evidence that is available. The purported value of this paper is therefore in the clarification of the empirical patterns concerning locality in RD, as well as in providing an insightful theoretical explanation of those patterns themselves, given certain established background assumptions.

2. Dislocated phrases are islands

Consider the following examples: The complement clause in (4a) can be dislocated. In (4b) it is backgrounded, and a correlate pronoun surfaces in the direct object position. (4c) shows that regular *wh*-extraction from the complement clause in (4a) is perfectly possible, but extraction from the dislocated clause in (4b) is unacceptable (4d).

- (4) a. Je hebt al eerder gezegd dat we dat gaan doen.
 you have already before said that we that go do
 ‘You already said before that we are going to do that.’
 b. Je hebt het al eerder gezegd, *dat we dat gaan doen*.
 you have it already before said that we that go do
 ‘You already said it before, that we are going to do that.’
 c. Wat_i heb je al eerder gezegd dat we *t_i* gaan doen?
 what have you already before said that we go do
 ‘What did you already say before that we are going to do?’
 d. *Wat_i heb je het al eerder gezegd, *dat we t_i gaan doen*?
 what have you it already before said that we go do
 ‘[*]What did you already say it before, that we are going to do?’

Similarly, movement from dislocated complex noun phrases is impossible. For afterthoughts, this is illustrated in (5). The basic sentence is in (5a). In (5c),

wh-R-extraction (stranding P) is fine. A variant containing an afterthought is (5b), but then extraction is excluded (5d).⁴

- (5) a. Ik heb een opvoering van Les Misérables gezien.
 I have a performance of Les Misérables seen
 'I saw a performance of Les Misérables.'
- b. Ik heb iets leuks gezien, een opvoering van Les Misérables.
 I have something nice seen a performance of Les Misérables
 'I saw something nice, a performance of Les Misérables.'
- c. Waar_i heb je een opvoering van *t_i* gezien?
 where have you a performance of seen
 'What did you see a performance of?'
- d. *Waar_i heb je iets leuks gezien, een opvoering van *t_i*?
 where have you something nice seen a performance of
 '[*]What did you see something nice, a performance of?'

Clearly then, the visible *dXP*, independently of its categorial status, behaves like an island. This follows straightforwardly from the biclausal approach. Recall that the elliptical CP containing *dXP* is not subordinated within the clause containing the correlate; therefore, movement from the second clause into the first is simply impossible.

3. Dislocation in complex sentences

Next, let us examine the situation in complex sentences. Is it possible for a correlate to be inside an embedded clause? Strikingly, the following instances of back-grounding are all acceptable (and I will show later that the situation is similar for afterthoughts). Example (6a) illustrates this for object clauses, (6b) for relative clauses, and (6c) for adjunct clauses. It does not seem to matter whether the correlate is a subject or an object.

- (6) a. Piet vertelde dat hij haar geplaagd had, *die vrouw*.
 Piet told that he her teased had that woman
 'Piet said that he had teased her, that woman.'
- b. Ik sprak met iemand die haar geplaagd had, *die vrouw*.
 I spoke with someone who her teased had that woman
 'I talked to someone who had teased her, that woman.'
- c. Piet sprong op toen ze aan kwam fietsen, *die vrouw*.
 Piet jumped up when she on came cycling that woman
 'Piet jumped up when she arrived cycling, that woman.'

If it were the case that CP_2 elliptically repeats the entire sentence, (6a) can be explained as an instance of long-distance movement — considering that dXP is fronted within the complex CP_2 , which is shown in (7):

- (7) [$_{CP1}$ Piet vertelde [dat hij haar geplaagd had]] : [$_{CP2}$ *die vrouw_i* ~~vertelde Piet~~
[~~dat hij t_i geplaagd had~~]]

However, this leads to problems with the other examples, since extraction out of relative clauses or adjunct clauses is generally excluded. In (6a–c), fronting of dXP within CP_2 would structurally correspond to the *wh*-movements in (8a–c), respectively, of which the last two are strongly unacceptable:

- (8) a. *Wie_i* vertelde Piet [dat hij t_i geplaagd had]?
who told Piet that he teased had
'Who did Piet tell that he had teased?'
b. **Wie_i* sprak je met iemand [die t_i geplaagd had]?
who spoke you with someone who teased had
'[*]Who did you talk to someone who had teased?'
c. **Wie_i* sprong Piet op [toen t_i aan kwam fietsen]?
who jumped Piet up when on came cycling
'[*]Who did Piet jump up when arrived cycling?'

Thus, the sentences in (6b/c) cannot be derived in this fashion. There is, however, a clear-cut solution to this puzzle. If the biclausal analysis involves coordination of clauses, it is far from evident why this process should be limited to main clauses, and in fact, I argue that there is indirect evidence to the contrary — see (11) below.

First note that if the elliptical CP_2 can target embedded clauses as well, there is a possible derivation for the two problematic sentences (6b/c), and an alternative one for (6a). The analysis of (6a–c) may then correspond roughly to (9a–c), in which there is only local A-bar movement of dXP . In each case, the elliptical clause CP_2 specifies the core proposition of CP_1 , i.e. the underlying argument structure, which is extensionally equivalent; the enhanced relative, adverbial or other function can be ignored for this purpose (see also Rooth 1992 and Merchant 2001 on ellipsis licensing). One could say that the elided constituent is discourse-anaphoric with respect to the 'e-given' material in the preceding context.

- (9) a. Piet vertelde [$_{CP1}$ dat hij haar geplaagd had] : [$_{CP2}$ *die vrouw_i* ~~had hij t_i geplaagd~~].
b. Ik sprak met iemand² [$_{CP1}$ die² haar¹ geplaagd had] : [$_{CP2}$ *die vrouw_i*¹ ~~had die² t_i geplaagd~~].
c. Piet sprong op [toen ze aan kwam fietsen] : [$_{CP2}$ *die vrouw_i* ~~kwam t_i aanfietsen~~].

Reasoning the other way around, it is ellipsis that makes it possible as well as necessary to coordinate nonparallel CPs.⁵ If we want to — redundantly — spell out CP₂, the original *dXP* does not need to (and in fact cannot) be A-bar moved, and we can regularly coordinate syntactically subordinate clauses; see (9c'), for example:

- (9) c.' Piet sprong op [toen ze aan kwam fietsen] : (dat wil zeggen) [toen *die vrouw* aan kwam fietsen.]

Here, *dat wil zeggen* 'that is to say' optionally explicates the specificational relationship between CP₁ and CP₂.

Second, we predict that RD is impossible if the correlate is in an embedded clause that is not sentence-final, for the evident reason that CP₂ cannot target a non-final embedded clause and at the same time be linearly rightmost. That this is indeed correct is illustrated in (10), which contrasts strikingly with examples of the type in (6).⁶

- (10) a. *[Dat Piet haar geplaagd had], vond ik niet erg, *die vrouw*.
that Piet her teased had found I not awful that woman
'[*]That Piet had teased her I did not think regrettable, that woman.'
b. *Ik heb iemand [die haar geplaagd had] een reprimande gegeven, *die vrouw*.
I have someone who her teased had a rebuke given that woman
'[*]I gave someone who teased her a rating, that woman.'
c. * [Toen ze aan kwam fietsen], sprong Piet op, *die vrouw*.
when she on came cycling jumped Piet up that woman
'[*]When she arrived cycling, Piet jumped up, that woman.'

Third, we predict the existence of sentence-medial dislocation in exactly these cases, where specification targets a non-final embedded clause. Minimal pairs with (10) are provided in (11):

- (11) a. [Dat Piet haar geplaagd had], *die vrouw*, vond ik niet erg.
that Piet her teased had that woman found I not awful
'That Piet had teased her, that woman, I did not think regrettable.'
b. Ik heb iemand [die haar geplaagd had], *die vrouw*, een reprimande gegeven.
I have someone who her teased had that woman a rebuke given
'I gave someone who teased her, that woman, a rating.'
c. [Toen ze aan kwam fietsen], *die vrouw*, sprong Piet op.
when she on came cycling that woman jumped Piet up
'When she arrived cycling, that woman, Piet jumped up.'

Medial dislocations of the specificational type cannot surface just anywhere, but only to the right of the clause containing the correlate. Combined with the clausal analysis of *dXP*, this is highly suggestive of CP coordination.

I wish to stress that it is syntactic hierarchy and not linear distance between the correlate and *dXP* that is essential to the above story. That is, the number of intervening major constituents, words, or syllables is irrelevant in principle. For instance, an embedded clause can easily intervene linearly between a correlate that is part of the matrix and a backgrounded *dXP*, which contradicts Averintseva-Klisch (2009: 29–31). The point is that the correlate must be sufficiently salient. This is illustrated in (12).⁷

- (12) [*Ze* kwam aanfietsen [toen Piet opsprong]], *die vrouw*.
 she came on.cycling when Piet up.jumped that woman
 ‘She arrived cycling when Piet jumped up, that woman.’

As expected, *die vrouw* ‘that woman’ can be related to the main clause subject *ze* ‘she’ without difficulties.

Consider again the sentences in (10). They cannot be derived by specification of the embedded clause, for that would lead to a different word order (that is, intraposition as in (11)). Neither can they be derived by specification of the main clause, for that would require long-distance A-bar movement of *dXP* across island boundaries (comparable to (8b/c)). This proves that the regular constraints on A-bar movement are active in dislocation constructions as we envision them. This picture is strengthened if we test the coordinate structure constraint on noun phrases:⁸

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

The sentences in (13) are unacceptable because the derivation of CP_2 would structurally correspond to (14).⁹

- (14) a. *Wie_i heb je [*t_i* en zijn vrouw] uitgenodigd voor het feest?
 who have you and his wife invited for the party
 ‘[*]Who did you invite and his wife for the party?’
 b. *Wie_i heb je [zijn vrouw en *t_i*] uitgenodigd voor het feest?

By contrast, (15a) is fine because (15b) is. Although the difference with (13a) is apparently minimal, these sentences involve an adverbial prepositional phrase; therefore, there is no island violation.

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

Thus, the usual constraints on A-bar movement are operative in dislocation constructions, but sometimes these can be avoided by means of an alternative way of construing the sentence.

Finally, what remains to be shown is that afterthoughts indeed pattern the same way as backgrounding. A few relevant illustrations here will serve the point:

- (16) a. Joop sprong op [toen Mieke iets moois liet zien], *een zilveren horloge*!
 Joop jumped up when Mieke something beautiful let show a silver watch
 'Joop jumped up when Mieke showed something beautiful, a silver watch!'
 b. * [Toen Mieke iets moois liet zien] sprong Joop op, *een zilveren horloge*!
 c. [Toen Mieke iets moois liet zien], *een zilveren horloge*!, sprong Joop op.
 (17) * Mieke heeft [iets moois en deze lelijke klok] aan Joop getoond, *een zilveren horloge*!
 Mieke has something beautiful and this ugly clock to Joop shown a silver watch
 '[*] Mieke showed something beautiful and this ugly clock to Joop, a silver watch!'

As before, construal with a correlate in an embedded clause is only possible if this clause is sentence-final, or if the dislocated material is interpolated right next to the clause containing the correlate.¹⁰ Furthermore, dislocation is subject to the coordinate structure constraint.

4. A consequence of the prosodic difference between backgrounding and afterthoughts

So far, backgrounding and specificational afterthoughts have been shown to behave similarly, and they receive the same structural analysis. It is worth reporting that there are also differences, but crucially, these are due to the prosodic and information-structural differences already mentioned in the introduction.

In the case of backgrounding, *dXP* acts as a prosodic clitic onto with respect to the previous intonation phrase: It does not contain a pitch accent of its own, it does not cause additional pitch movements, and so there is no intonation phrase boundary between CP_1 and *dXP* (see also Dewald 2012, among others). The conventionally written comma in text is usually not prosodically realized as a pause, although of course a brief and prosodically meaningless interruption of the speech signal is always possible.

If a backgrounded phrase is not prosodically independent, we expect a disruption of the intonational contour at the right boundary of the clause to which *dXP* relates to be unacceptable. This can be tested with parentheses. No parenthesis can intervene between the matrix and the dislocated phrase. This is illustrated by the contrast in (18), where pitch accents are indicated with capitals, and backgrounding with a smaller font size:

- (18) a. Piet heeft haar OOK gezien, *die vrouw*.
 Piet has her also seen that woman
 ‘Piet saw her as well, that woman.’
 b. ?*Piet heeft haar OOK gezien, althans GISTeren, *die vrouw*.
 Piet has her also seen at.any.rate yesterday that woman
 ‘[*]Piet saw her as well, that is, yesterday, that woman.’

If an interruption is *not* at the right boundary, the result is fine:

- (19) Piet heeft haar, ik geloof GISTeren, OOK gezien, *die vrouw*.
 Piet has her I believe yesterday also seen that woman
 ‘Piet saw her, I think yesterday, as well, that woman.’

This is quite interesting as it proves that linear distance as defined before is not the issue: The number of elements intervening between the correlate and *dXP* is irrelevant. We noticed this in the previous section as well, there from the perspective of syntactic hierarchy.

Furthermore, if an intervening phrase is backgrounded itself, it can be directly preceding the relevant *dXP* after all. I take this to mean that prosodic cliticization can be iterated.

- (20) Piet heeft haar OOK gezien, gisteren, *die vrouw*.
 Piet has her also seen, yesterday, that woman
 ‘Piet saw her as well, yesterday, that woman.’

Turning to afterthoughts now, we do not expect any intervention effects, contrary to the situation for backgrounding. The reason is that afterthoughts form a prosodically independent intonational unit with its own pitch accent (consequently, a short pause between CP_1 and *dXP* comes much more natural). In (21), to be

compared with (18b), it is clear that there can be an interrupting parenthetical at the place of attachment of *dXP* (or CP_2 , to be more precise).

- (21) a. Piet gaat iets LEUKS doen, althans VOLgend jaar: *naar BELgië reizen*.
 Piet goes something nice do at.any.rate next year to Belgium travel
 ‘Piet is going to do something nice, that is, next year: traveling to Belgium.’
 b. Ik ben een beROEMDheid tegengekomen — je raadt het NOOIT —
Yo-Yo MA.
 I am a celebrity encountered you guess it never Yo-Yo Ma
 ‘I’ve met a celebrity — you will never guess who it is — Yo-Yo Ma.’

When backgrounding and afterthoughts are combined, we expect the former to precede the latter obligatorily. A relevant example is (18b) above, which becomes fine with a reversed order:

- (22) Piet heeft haar OOK gezien, *die vrouw*, althans GISTeren.
 Piet has her also seen that woman at.any.rate yesterday
 ‘Piet saw her as well, that woman, that is, yesterday.’

This has been observed for German as well; see Averintseva-Klisch (2009: 33), for instance. The net effect ties in neatly with the general tendency to push focused material to the right.

Thus, we established that there is a prosodic constraint on backgrounding but not on the use of afterthoughts. This prosodic intervention effect complements the findings about syntactic locality.

5. Conclusion

To sum up, RD is subject to various non-linear proximity effects, which can be explained from the perspective of a biclausal analysis involving sluicing-style ellipsis. I argued that extraction from *dXP* is impossible, and that the usual limitations on A-bar movement apply, which can be taken as indirect evidence for assuming such a movement within the elliptical CP_2 in the first place. For backgrounding in particular, there is an additional prosodic limitation. Depending on the configuration, locality constraints can apparently be lifted by construing *dXP* directly with an embedded CP. For non-final clauses, this automatically results in medial dislocation.

Notes

* This paper was brought about in close collaboration with Dennis Ott. Thanks to the TINdag audience, as well as three anonymous reviewers for valuable comments and questions. This study was carried out as part of the project *Incomplete Parenthesis*, financially supported by the European Research Council.

1. A type of dislocation that cannot be dealt with here is the *predicative* afterthought, in which the right-peripheral phrase constitutes a property attributed to the correlate; see Ott & de Vries (2013) for further discussion.

2. If *dXP* represents an adverbial phrase, there is often no correlate. Depending on the intonation, the dislocated phrases in (i) can be interpreted as either backgrounded phrases or afterthoughts:

- (i) Mieke heeft (toen/er/ø) een boek gelezen, *gisteren/in de tuin/waarschijnlijk*.
 Mieke has then a book bought yesterday/in the garden/probably
 ‘Mieke read a book (then/there/ø), yesterday/in the garden/probably.’

As will become evident in a moment, an argument slot cannot be left unexpressed in the host clause, but there is no such requirement for adjuncts. In fact, Ott & de Vries (2013) argue that this is a knock-down argument against the idea of rightward movement in dislocation constructions.

3. I argued in previous work that it is likely a full-blown X-bar category, following ideas by Jan Koster. As this is not essential for the present purposes, representations will be abbreviated here.

4. A reviewer wonders why sentences like (i) are excluded:

- (i) * Wie heb je gezien, *welke man*?
 who have you seen which man
 ‘[*]Who did you see, which man?’

On the biclausal account, the relation between a dislocated phrase and its correlate involves regular cross-clausal coreference. Non-referential/non-specific phrases are then automatically excluded. See also Zwart (2001), Averintseva-Klish (2009), and Ott & de Vries (2013) for a discussion of potential indefinite and/or quantificational *dXPs*.

5. It seems reasonable to assume that specification can be asymmetric in this way. Nevertheless, an alternative hypothesis is that CP_2 syntactically mimics CP_1 or a lower functional layer within CP_1 . In that case, A-bar movement of *dXP* in a subordinate clause type seems problematic (e.g., in (9c') SpecCP is already occupied) — unless ellipsis can license otherwise unattested movements, comparable, perhaps, to the situation in sluicing with multiple remnants. I leave this possibility open, but I will not discuss it in further detail.

6. A reviewer wonders if there is a potential alternative analysis of (10a), for instance:

- (i) * [$_{CP1}$ [Dat Piet haar geplaagd had] vond ik niet erg] : [$_{CP2}$ [*die vrouw*_i ~~had Piet t_i geplaagd~~] ~~vond ik niet erg~~].

However, this would involve (clausal) deletion of a non-constituent, which is generally disallowed.

7. A reviewer also suggests the following (artificial) example, with two potential correlates for *dXP*:

- (i) \underline{Z}_e kwam aanfietsen [toen \underline{z}_e opsprong], *die vrouw*_{ij}.

Indeed, both readings are clearly available (depending on the context), as one would expect. There might be slight proximity preferences due to performance factors, but that does not seem essential in any way.

8. Note that example (13a) improves if we add *en zijn vrouw* 'and his wife' to *dXP*, which would prevent a violation of the coordinate structure constraint (although the sentence is then redundant in a marked way). Thanks to a reviewer for bringing this up. Another reviewer correctly notes that interpolation of *Piet* after the first conjunct and/or *Marie* after the second conjunct would be possible. In such cases, the relevant phrases are used as bona fide appositions, and therefore probably attached at the level of DP, not CP.

9. The following contrast is perhaps unexpected, but can be explained:

- (i) % Ik heb zijn vrouw NIET, maar hemzelf WEL uitgenodigd, *Piet*.
I have his wife NEG but himself AFFIRMATIVE invited Piet
'I did not invite his wife, but himself I did, Piet.'
(ii) *Ik heb hemzelf WEL, maar zijn vrouw NIET uitgenodigd, *Piet*.

The reason why (i) is acceptable for some speakers is probably because the host sentence itself is biclausal due to right node raising in combination with gapping:

- (iii) Ik heb zijn vrouw niet uitgenodigd, maar ik heb hemzelf wel uitgenodigd.

Dislocation can now directly target the second clause, which contains the correlate:

- (iv) ... [ik heb hemzelf wel uitgenodigd], [*Piet*_i heb ik wel *t*_i uitgenodigd].

In (ii) this is impossible, since the correlate is in the first clause, which is non-final.

10. Let me add a slight complication and a comparative note on extraposition here. As is well-known since Ross (1967), extraposition is subject to a strong Right Roof Constraint; see (i), where the relative clause relating to *een boek* 'a book' is postposed across the embedded clause as well as the matrix. In RD, a similar configuration is also deviated (ii), but not as strongly (depending on the particular example). Similar data have been reported before in Zwart (2001), whose judgments on RD are even more liberal.

- (i) * [Dat hij een boek gelezen heeft] verbaast me zeer *dat Grunberg heeft geschreven*.
that he a book read has surprises me very that Grunberg has written
'[*]That he read a book highly surprises me that Grunberg wrote.'
(ii) ?? [Dat hij het echt gelezen heeft] verbaast me zeer, *dit dikke boek*.
that he it really read has surprises me very this thick book
'[??]That he actually read it highly surprises me, this thick book.'

To the extent that the contrast is real, it requires an explanation. The reason is probably that the derivation of RD is somewhat different from extraposition. The biclausal analysis enables a derivation for RD with specification at the level of the matrix, combined with long distance movement within a complex, elliptical CP₂. This is sketched in (iii); compare also (7) in the main

text above. What is relevant here is that the judgment in (iv) is the same: Extraction from a weak (semi-factive) island is far from perfect, but not completely unacceptable.

(iii) [_{CP1} [Dat hij het echt gelezen heeft] verbaast me zeer] : [_{CP2} *dit dikke boek_i* ~~verbaast me zeer~~ [~~dat hij *t_i* gelezen heeft~~]]

(iv) ?? Wat_i verbaast je zeer [dat hij *t_i* gelezen heeft]?

what surprises you very that he read has

‘[??]What does it surprise you that he read?’

I cannot go into details for extraposition here. According to de Vries (2011:293), even a ‘coordination plus ellipsis’ analysis of extraposition would exclude (i), because the proposed stripping-style ellipsis involved would lead to unrecoverability (gapping across clause boundaries is generally excluded).

References

- Averintseva-Klisch, Maria. 2009. *Rechte Satzperipherie im Diskurs*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Dewald, Anika. 2012. *Versetzungsstrukturen im Deutschen*. Cologne: University of Cologne dissertation.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. Ellipsis redundancy and reduction redundancy. In Steve Berman & Arild Hestvik (eds.), *Proceedings of the Stuttgart Ellipsis Workshop* (vol. 29 of *Arbeitspapiere des SFB* 340).
- Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- Ott, Dennis & Mark de Vries. 2012. Thinking in the right direction: An ellipsis analysis of right-dislocation. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 29. 123–133.
- Ott, Dennis & Mark de Vries. 2013. Right-dislocation as deletion. Manuscript, University of Groningen. (under review, NLLT)
- Vries, Mark de. 2011. Extrapositie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16(3). 273–306.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2001. Backgrounding (‘right-dislocation’) in Dutch. Unpublished manuscript, University of Groningen.

Author's address

Mark de Vries
 Department of Linguistics, University of Groningen
 P.O. Box 716
 9700 AS Groningen, The Netherlands
 mark.de.vries@rug.nl