

# AGAINST OPTIONAL AND NULL CLITICS. RIGHT DISLOCATION VS. MARGINALIZATION\*

*Anna Cardinaletti*

*Abstract.* This paper contains a discussion of (Italian) Right Dislocation, which seems to instantiate an optional anticipatory clitic pronoun. It will be shown that the distribution of the anticipatory pronoun is not free. When the clitic is absent, we do not have an instance of Right Dislocation, but of Marginalization. The structural analysis of Right Dislocation suggested here is similar to Kayne's (1994) analysis of English Right Dislocation, the structure of Marginalization contains an *in situ* distressed constituent. Depending on how optionality is interpreted, it is possible to conclude that clitic pronouns are neither optional nor null.

## 1. Introduction

This paper is a case study of apparent lexical optionality. The empirical basis is provided by Italian Right Dislocation, which seems to instantiate an optional anticipatory clitic pronoun. It will be shown that contrary to *prima facie* evidence, the distribution of the anticipatory pronoun is not free. When the clitic is present, we are dealing with Right Dislocation; when it is absent, we have an instance of Marginalization ("*emarginazione*", cf. Antinucci & Cinque 1977). The two sentence types can be differentiated syntactically, interpretively and prosodically. The structural analysis of Right Dislocation suggested here differs from both Kayne's (1994) and Cecchetto's (1999) analyses of Romance Right Dislocation, but is similar to Kayne's (1994) analysis of English Right Dislocation. The structure of Marginalization contains an *in situ* distressed constituent (as in Cardinaletti 1998, 2001).

Depending on how optionality is interpreted, it is possible to conclude that clitic pronouns are neither optional nor null. The former conclusion complies with the principle of Full Interpretation (cf. Chomsky 1986, 1995), while support for the latter conclusion can be found at the syntax-phonology interface.

\* I should like to thank Carlo Cecchetto, Guglielmo Cinque, Mara Frascarelli and two anonymous reviewers of *Studia Linguistica* for their detailed comments on a previous version of this paper.

## 2. Optional clitic pronouns

### 2.1. *The problem*

In Italian, a left-dislocated object DP must co-occur with a resumptive clitic pronoun (1), while a right-dislocated object DP seems to be anticipated by a clitic pronoun only optionally (2):<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. Il giornale, l'ho già comprato.  
           the newspaper, [I] it have already bought
- b. \* Il giornale, ho già comprato.
- (2) a. L'ho già comprato, il giornale.  
           [I] it have already bought, the newspaper
- b. Ho già comprato, il giornale.

Although the different distribution of the clitic pronouns in (1) and (2) has been observed on a number of occasions (see, for example, Benincà 1988:§1.4.1, Kayne 1994:79, Cecchetto 1997) and often added to the asymmetries between Left and Right Dislocation, the nature and source of this asymmetry is not yet understood.

Some attempts have been made, but they explain the paradigm only partially. In Cinque (1990:§2.3.5), the obligatoriness of the clitic pronoun in (1) is attributed to the fact that no empty category (specified by the feature system [ $\pm$ anaphoric;  $\pm$ pronominal]) could be associated with the left-dislocated DP. In this approach, it is unclear, however, why such a requirement is not operative in (2). Cecchetto (1997) analyses the empty category occurring in the base position differently in the two cases. In Left Dislocation, the empty category is an A'-bound *pro*, which Cecchetto characterises via the features [ $-$ anaphoric,  $+$ pronominal,  $+$ variable]. Since *pro* is licensed only by the presence of overt morphology, a clitic pronoun must be inserted. This explains the contrast in (1). In Right Dislocation, the empty category occurring in the base position can be a NP-trace, i. e. [ $+$ anaphoric,  $-$ pronominal,  $-$ variable]. Since no clitic is necessary for its licensing, a sentence like (2b) is grammatical. This explains the contrast between (1b) and (2b). Cecchetto's analysis is unable however to address the related question of why (2a) is also possible. If a clitic pronoun is unnecessary, we could expect (2a) to be ungrammatical. Why is (2a) grammatical with the unnecessary anticipatory clitic? The issue of optionality arises.

<sup>1</sup> In both (2a) and (2b), the sentence-final argument, which is presupposed, has a low pitch intonation contour and can be separated from the clause by an intonational break (signalled by a comma). Although both constructions in (2) are also possible in Spanish, the investigation here is limited to Italian. For Spanish see Zubizarreta (1998).

## 2.2. Two interpretations of optionality

The first question to be addressed is how to phrase the optionality of the clitic pronoun in (2). There are in principle two different interpretations of optionality:

- (i) the clitic pronoun is structurally present but not overtly realized, i.e. sentences like (2b) contain a null counterpart of the clitic pronoun in (2a), or:
- (ii) there is no anticipatory clitic pronoun at all, i.e. sentences like (2b) are Right Dislocations that contain no counterpart of the clitic pronoun in (2a).

Neither of these two hypotheses is innocent, and both have a number of unwelcome consequences. The hypothesis that (2b) contains a non-overt counterpart of the clitic pronoun in (2a) clearly raises the question as to why the null variant of the clitic is impossible in (1b). If (i) were a viable solution, (1b) should be grammatical, which it is not. With the second interpretation of optionality, not only does the question arise of the asymmetry between Left and Right Dislocation, but there is also a further problem if the principle of Full Interpretation is assumed (cf. Chomsky 1986, 1995). Since (2a) and (2b) have different numerations, how can they be considered as one and the same sentence? Given that Full Interpretation requires that no lexical element be disregarded, it is unclear how the clitic pronoun in (2a) can be disregarded.

## 2.3. The proposal

The aim of this paper is to show that these problems do not arise if the sentences in (2) are analysed correctly. In spite of *prima facie* evidence, the optionality of the clitic pronoun in (2) is only apparent. (2a) and (2b) are not one and the same construction, but instances, respectively, of Right Dislocation and Marginalization.<sup>2</sup> Sentences like (2b) do not contain a null counterpart of the clitic pronoun in (2a), nor are they Right Dislocations that contain no counterpart of the clitic pronoun. I therefore follow Antinucci & Cinque's (1977) original intuition that (2a) is structurally different from (2b). I differ from these authors, however, in that I take the marginalized object in (2b) not to be moved rightwards, but to occur in its VP-internal position (cf. Cardinaletti 1998, 2001). The structure of the Marginalization sentence in (2b) is the one depicted in (3):<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Other works have hinted at the need to differentiate (2b) from (2a): see Frascarelli (1997, 2000), and Cecchetto (1999:Appendix, 65).

<sup>3</sup> In (3), I abstract away from the movement of the object to a functional projection above VP in order to check case because this movement does not distinguish between marginalized and non-marginalized *in situ* objects.

- (3) [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* ho [<sub>FP</sub> già [<sub>AspP</sub> comprato<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> il giornale]]]]

In (3), the past-participle is moved to an aspectual head (Cinque 1999). This movement is empirically motivated by the observation that a (focused) subject, which I take to be in specVP, can occur between the verb and a marginalized object (cf. Cardinaletti 1998, 2001):<sup>4</sup>

- (4) [<sub>IP</sub> ha [<sub>AspP</sub> comprato<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Gianni t<sub>i</sub> il giornale]]]

The analysis of Right Dislocation is different. Following Kayne's (1994:78) antisymmetric analysis of English Right Dislocation, the object is taken to occur outside of the clause containing the anticipatory clitic in a position that is structurally lower than this clause. The following structure is assigned to (2a):

- (5) [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* l'ho già comprato ] X<sup>o</sup> [<sub>DP</sub> il giornale]]

The two hypotheses in (3) and (5) immediately capture the data in (1) and (2):

- when the dislocated constituent is a DP, Left and Right Dislocation are alike in requiring the presence of a clitic pronoun (cf. Cinque's 1990 proposal in section 2.1), hence the similarity between (1a) and (2a).<sup>5</sup> Marginalization does not contain any anticipatory clitic pronoun: the object DP occurs in its VP-internal position inside the clause, and no clitic doubling is possible in Italian;
- the contrast between (1b) and (2b) is due to the structural asymmetry between the left and right edges of the clause. Dislocation is possible at both edges (although instantiating different structures, i.e. a left-peripheral specTopicP, see Rizzi 1997, and the XP in (5) respectively).<sup>6</sup> Marginalization is restricted to the right edge because objects are postverbal.

<sup>4</sup> (4) is an instance of VSO with the subject in focus, i.e. VSO. Unlike Spanish, Italian does not allow the same word order with the object in focus: VSO. See Cardinaletti (1999:§6.2) for an account of the Spanish / Italian contrast in terms of the different properties of the "middle field" subject position that hosts the subject in VSO.

<sup>5</sup> Left-dislocated PPs seem to co-occur with a resumptive clitic only optionally. Compare (1b) with (i):

- (i) a. A Gianni, (gli) abbiamo già parlato.  
to Gianni [we] to-him have already talked  
b. Di questo, (ne) abbiamo già parlato.  
about this [we] of-it have already talked

Rizzi (1997:322) arrives at the conclusion that the optionality of the resumptive pronoun with left-dislocated PPs is apparent. The presence or absence of the resumptive clitic pronoun corresponds to two different constructions, which he calls (Clitic) Left Dislocation and Simple Preposing respectively. Example (37) in section 5 below shows that the same conclusion holds for right-dislocated PPs.

<sup>6</sup> Cecchetto (1997, 1999) has very convincingly demonstrated that Left Dislocation is not the mirror image of Right Dislocation. The analysis of Right Dislocation suggested here, though different, is consistent with his conclusions.

## 2.4. Organisation of the paper

This paper is organized as follows: in section 3, several empirical arguments are discussed that support the structural analysis of the two sentences in (2) as it was presented in (3) and (5), respectively. Section 4 contains a discussion of some of the data in Cecchetto (1997, 1999) and shows that the present analysis can also account for these. Section 5 is devoted to a comparison between the “clause-external” analysis of Right Dislocation defended in this paper and the “clause-internal” hypothesis proposed in Kayne (1994) and Cecchetto (1997, 1999), and shows that neither Kayne’s nor Cecchetto’s analyses can be adopted for right-dislocated constituents. It further tries to establish the nature of the head X in (5) and includes discussion of another potential analysis of Right Dislocation, i.e. the double-topicalization analysis. Section 5 also addresses two different accounts of Marginalization that invoke clause-internal topicalization of the marginalized constituent. Section 6 contains a discussion on the consequences of the conclusions of this paper as regards the optionality issue. In section 7, the analysis is extended to subjects. Right-dislocated and marginalized subjects are assigned a structure parallel to right-dislocated and marginalized objects. The non-overt subject pronoun *pro* is shown not to be optional, on a par with overt object clitic pronouns. Section 8 contains the conclusions.

## 3. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization

### 3.1. The distribution of accusative ‘a’

Marginalization can be distinguished from Right Dislocation on the basis of the following data from colloquial Central and Southern Italian: whereas a right-dislocated [+human] accusative object (in particular, proper names and personal pronouns) can be preceded by the Case-marking preposition *a*, the object in Marginalization cannot (Cardinaletti 1988:20):

- (6) a. L’abbiamo invitato noi, *a* Gianni.  
him have invited we, to Gianni
- b. Vi abbiamo promosso, *a* voi, anche se non lo meritavate.  
[we] you have passed, to you, even if [you] not it deserved
- (7) a. Abbiamo invitato noi, (\**a*) Gianni.  
have invited we, to Gianni
- b. Ho promosso io, (\**a*) voi, anche se non lo meritavate.  
have passed I, to you, even if [you] not it deserved

In order to analyse (7) as a Right Dislocation, the ancillary hypothesis is necessary that the preposition *a* only appears if a(n overt) clitic pronoun is used as an anticipatory element. Given the *ad hoc* flavour of this

constraint, (7) is analysed as an instance of Marginalization rather than of Right Dislocation. Since the marginalized object occurs in its base position, the sentences in (7) display the same pattern as the simple sentences in (8) where the object is not preceded by *a*:

- (8) a. Abbiamo invitato (\*a) Gianni.  
       [we] have invited (to) Gianni  
       b. Ho promosso (\*a) voi.  
       [I] have passed (to) you

### 3.2. *Argument order*

Consider the different order of the objects in (9) and (10). While the order of arguments is free in (9), it is not in (10), where the sentence in (9b) is much more marked than in (9a):<sup>7</sup>

- (9) a. Ce l'ha nascosto il bambino, il libro, sotto il letto.  
       there it has hidden the child, the book, under the bed  
       b. Ce l'ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, il libro.  
       (10) a. Ha nascosto il bambino, il libro, sotto il letto.  
       b. ?? Ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, il libro.

If (9) and (10) were both instances of Right Dislocation, it would be hard to attribute the contrast to the mere presence or absence of the clitic pronoun or to its being overt or non-overt. If (9) and (10) instantiate different constructions, the contrast can be described as follows. While the order of right-dislocated arguments is free (9), the order of the objects following the subject in Marginalization in (10) is the same as the unmarked order of arguments (11):

- (11) a. Il bambino ha nascosto il libro sotto il letto.  
       b. ?? Il bambino ha nascosto sotto il letto il libro. (with unmarked intonation)

(11) shows that a direct object cannot follow a PP in the unmarked order. This is also true in Marginalization (10b). In both (10a) and (11a), the order of the objects is thus the one provided by the syntax, whereas there

<sup>7</sup> Interestingly, Calabrese (1992:97) only provides examples parallel to (10a):

- (i) a. Ha guardato Piero, le montagne, con il binocolo.  
       has looked Piero, at the mountains, with the binoculars  
       b. Ha messo Sandro, il libro, nel cassetto.  
       has put Sandro, the book, in the drawer

and Frascarelli (2000:§3.2.5.5) reports that no example parallel to (10b) is found in the corpus *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato* (LIP, De Mauro 1993). The same contrast between (9) and (10) is found in Spanish. The different argument order is the only syntactic asymmetry between Right Dislocation and Marginalization that is discussed in Zubizarreta (1998:156ff).

is no such constraint on the order of right-dislocated arguments in (9) because they are clause-external. Both (12a) and (12b) are possible:

- (12) a. [<sub>YP</sub> [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> ce l'ha nascosto il bambino] X° [<sub>DP</sub> il libro]] Y° [<sub>PP</sub> sotto il letto]].  
 b. [<sub>YP</sub> [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> ce l'ha nascosto il bambino] X° [<sub>PP</sub> sotto il letto]] Y° [<sub>DP</sub> il libro]].

A direct object can appear after a PP if it is heavy (13a). Again, Marginalization in (13b) behaves like unmarked, subject-initial sentences:<sup>8</sup>

- (13) a. Il bambino ha nascosto sotto il letto [il libro che abbiamo comprato ieri].  
 the child has hidden under the bed the book that [we] have bought yesterday  
 b. Ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, [il libro che abbiamo comprato ieri].

### 3.3. Objects co-occurring with complement clauses

Calabrese (1982) discusses another contrast between Right Dislocation and Marginalization. When the direct object *Mario* is right-dislocated, as in (14a), it can be far away from the verb *convinto* by which it is selected and can follow the infinitival complement *a fare* of the verb *convinto*. If *Mario* is not anticipated by a clitic pronoun, as in (14b), the sentence is ungrammatical:

- (14) a. Che cosa l'hai convinto [a fare], Mario?  
 what [you] him have convinced to do, Mario?  
 b. \* Che cosa hai convinto [a fare], Mario?  
 what [you] have convinced to do, Mario?

Once more, the difference between the two sentences in (14) cannot be due to the mere presence or absence of the clitic pronoun or to its being overt or non-overt. Rather, the contrast in (14) can be captured under the structural hypothesis defended in this paper. In (14a) the object *Mario* occurs at the end of the whole sentence, as to be expected when it is right-dislocated outside of the clause. In (14b) the marginalized object *Mario* cannot occur after the infinitival clause because this is not its base position. Its VP-internal position is immediately after the verb *convinto*, as in (15):

- (15) Che cosa hai convinto Mario [a fare]?  
 what [you] have convinced Mario to do?

<sup>8</sup> I should like to thank Francisco Ordóñez for drawing my attention to this case.

Since they respect the word order of (15), the following sentences are grammatical, as expected. In (16a) the focused object *Mario* precedes the marginalized complement clause *a fare*. In (16b–c) the marginalized object *Mario* precedes the marginalized clause *a fare*. In (16b) it is the verb which is focused, while in (16c) it is the postverbal subject:

- (16) a. Che cosa hai convinto Mario, [a fare]?  
 b. Che cosa hai convinto, Mario, [a fare]?  
 c. Che cosa hai convinto tu, Mario, [a fare]?  
     what have convinced you, Mario, to do?

### 3.4. Left-peripheral verbal constituents

A further argument for the differentiation between (2a) and (2b) is provided by the distribution of the complements of left-peripheral past participles. Benincà (1988:§2.3.3) observes that the object of a preposed verb cannot be represented by a full DP (17a). The only admissible complement is a clitic pronoun or a right-dislocated DP (17b–c).<sup>9</sup>

- (17) a. \* Finito, non ha la minestra.  
         finished, [he] not has the soup  
 b. Finita, non l'ha.  
         finished<sub>fem</sub>, [he] not it<sub>fem</sub> has  
 c. Finita, non l'ha, la minestra.  
         finished<sub>fem</sub>, [he] not it<sub>fem</sub> has, the soup

The restriction against full DP complements in (17a) can be understood as a violation of constituency. If the past participle is moved from its base position to the left-peripheral position involved in Left Dislocation (specTopicP, Rizzi 1997), a complement DP cannot be left stranded since it builds a constituent with the past participle (cf. the grammatical sentence: *Finito la minestra, non ha* “finished the soup, [he] not has”). A clitic pronoun, as in (17b), does not interfere with the movement of the past participle since it is adjoined to the auxiliary; nor does a right-dislocated constituent, as in (17c), since, as suggested in (5), it occurs outside of the sentence.

<sup>9</sup> (17a) is slightly different from Benincà's (1988:§2.3.3) original sentence in (i), which contains a feminine past participle, agreeing with the feminine DP *la minestra*:

(i) \* Finita, non ha la minestra.

As pointed out to me by Mara Frascarelli (p.c.), (i) is independently ungrammatical because in Italian past participle agreement only takes place with clitic pronouns and is ungrammatical with full DPs:

(ii) a. Non ha finito / \*finita la minestra.  
         [he] not has finished / finished<sub>fem</sub> the soup  
 b. Non l'ha \*finito / finita.  
         [he] it<sub>fem</sub> not has finished / finished<sub>fem</sub>



The crucial observation is that in (17c) the clitic pronoun is not optional. The absence of the clitic yields an ungrammatical sentence:

- (18) \* Finito, non ha, la minestra.  
finished, [he] not has, the soup

Once more, the contrast between (17c) and (18) would be unexpected if (18) were an instance of Right Dislocation with no anticipatory pronoun or with a null pronoun. If (18) is an instance of Marginalization of the object, as claimed here, the contrast between (17c) and (18) can be explained by the assumed structural difference between Right Dislocation and Marginalization. Since in (18) the object occurs in its VP-internal position, (18) represents a constituency violation on a par with (17a).

Something similar can be said as regards the case in which an infinitival verb appears in a sentence-initial position (sentences built on Benincà's 1988:§2.4 examples):

- (19) a. \* Volere, vorrei un caffè.  
[to] want, [I] would-want a coffee  
b. Volere, lo vorrei.  
[to] want, [I] it would-want  
c. Volere, lo vorrei, un caffè.  
[to] want, [I] it would-want, a coffee  
d. \* Volere, vorrei, un caffè.

Here, the movement analysis is less straightforward given that the lexical verb occurs both inside the clause and in the left-peripheral position. Whatever the correct analysis of (19), these sentences distinguish between Right Dislocation (19c) and Marginalization (19d), and show once more that the marginalized object in (19d) behaves like the *in situ* object in (19a).

### 3.5. Extraction

As discussed by Belletti (1998:24), the quantitative clitic pronoun *ne* can be extracted out of a marginalized object. This supports the proposal made in this paper that a marginalized constituent occupies a VP-internal position:

- (20) Ne ha comprato Gianni, uno.  
of-them has bought Gianni, one

(20) cannot be contrasted with a sentence containing a right-dislocated object. Although the following sentence is ungrammatical, the ungrammaticality may be due to the fact that the cluster *ne lo / lo ne*, formed by the anticipatory clitic pronoun *lo* and the extracted clitic *ne*, is excluded in Italian for independent reasons:

- (21) \* Ne lo / \*Lo ne ha comprato Gianni, uno.  
 of-them it has bought Gianni, one

Extraction possibilities can however be tested with the *wh*-movement out of embedded clauses. As shown by the following data, extraction is possible out of a marginalized clause, (22) and (23a), but it is impossible out of a right-dislocated clause (23b) (cf. Belletti 1988:10ff):

- (22) Che cosa<sub>i</sub> hai convinto Mario, [a fare t<sub>i</sub> ]? (= (16a))  
 what [you] have convinced Mario, to do?
- (23) a. Che cosa<sub>i</sub> ha detto, Gianni, [che avrebbe fatto t<sub>i</sub> ]?  
 what has said, Gianni, that [he] would do?  
 b. \* Che cosa<sub>i</sub> l<sub>k</sub>'ha detto, Gianni, [che avrebbe fatto t<sub>i</sub> ]<sub>k</sub>?  
 what it has said, Gianni, that [he] would do?

If (22)–(23a) and (23b) were both instances of Right Dislocation, it would be hard to attribute the contrast to the mere presence or absence of the anticipatory clitic pronoun or to its being overt or non-overt. The pattern in (22)–(23) can be explained straightforwardly if the absence of the clitic pronoun, as in (22)–(23a), implies that the clause is marginalized in its VP-internal position, while the presence of the clitic pronoun, as in (23b), implies that the clause is right-dislocated in a clause-external position, which counts as an island for extraction.

### 3.6. *Quantified expressions*

The contrast between (24) and (25) shows that quantified objects cannot be right-dislocated,<sup>10</sup> but that they can be marginalized:

- (24) a. \* Non l'ha invitato Gianni, nessuno.  
 not him has invited Gianni, anybody  
 b. \* L'hanno incontrato i rappresentanti, ogni studente.  
 him have met the delegates, every student
- (25) a. A: Ho sentito che Maria non ha invitato nessuno.  
 [I] have heard that Maria not has invited anybody  
 B: No, non ha invitato Gianni, nessuno.  
 no, not has invited Gianni, anybody  
 b. A: Il preside ha incontrato ogni studente.  
 the dean has met every student  
 B: No, hanno incontrato i rappresentanti, ogni studente.  
 no, have met the delegates, every student

<sup>10</sup> See Calabrese (1992:93ff). Quantified objects cannot be left-dislocated either:

(i) \* Nessuno, Gianni non l'ha invitato.  
 anybody, Gianni not him has invited

Quantified expressions must bind a variable at LF, but they do not do so in (24). Neither the clitic pronoun nor the clitic trace qualify as variables, nor does the trace in A'-position if the quantified expression is raised at LF (cf. Rizzi 1986b, 1997). Given that in Marginalization the object stays inside VP, the sentences in (25) are grammatical because the quantified constituents occur in a position from where they can be raised to the relevant LF-position to be interpreted.

### 3.7. Binding phenomena

The postverbal subject of the main clause c-commands the subject of the marginalized embedded clause (Calabrese 1992:100; 102,fn.14). This is consistent with the analysis of Marginalization proposed in (3) and (4). Both the subject and the clausal complement occupy their VP-internal positions:

- (26) a. Ha detto Mario<sub>i</sub>, che *pro*<sub>i</sub> avrebbe fatto queste cose.  
           has said Mario, that [he] would-have done these things  
       b. Non ha detto nessuno<sub>i</sub>, che *pro*<sub>i</sub> avrebbe fatto queste cose.  
           not has said nobody, that [he] would-have done these things

However, if the complement clause is anticipated by a clitic pronoun, i.e. it is right-dislocated, the postverbal subject cannot bind the subject of the embedded clause. In (27a) a co-reference reading, which does not imply c-command, is possible. In (27b), where c-command is required in order to establish the bound variable reading, ungrammaticality is produced:

- (27) a. L'ha detto Mario<sub>i</sub>, che *pro*<sub>i</sub> avrebbe fatto queste cose.  
           it has said Mario, that [he] would-have done these things  
       b. \* Non l'ha detto nessuno<sub>i</sub>, che *pro*<sub>i</sub> avrebbe fatto queste cose.  
           not it has said nobody, that [he] would-have done these things

Once more, the proposed structural hypothesis can explain the difference between Right Dislocation and Marginalization.

### 3.8. The interpretive and prosodic properties

The element that precedes a marginalized constituent is necessarily an instance of contrastive focus (28). It is very marginal as a noncontrastive focus, i.e. as an answer to a *wh*-question (29). The contrast is illustrated here with a focused subject preceding a marginalized direct object (sentence (28) from Frascarelli 1997:80):<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion of the two types of focus, see Zubizarreta (1998:1–7) and the references quoted there. Frascarelli (2000:§3.2.5.5) reports that the corpus *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato* (LIP, De Mauro 1993) contains no examples like (29B). All attested cases are of the type (28B).

- (28) A: Posso guidare io durante il viaggio?  
 can drive I during the trip?  
 B: No, non mi piace come guidi: porterà Mara, la macchina.  
 no, [I] not like how [you] drive: will-drive Mara, the car
- (29) A: Chi porterà la macchina?  
 who will-drive the car?  
 B: ?? Porterà Mara, la macchina.

If the object is right-dislocated, the subject can be an instance of noncontrastive focus:

- (30) A: Chi porterà la macchina?  
 B: La porterà Mara, la macchina.  
 it will-drive Mara, the car

The contrast between (29) and (30) is a further argument against analysing the object without an anticipatory clitic as right-dislocated.

The different interpretive properties of (29) and (30) follow from the different structures assigned to the two constructions and correlate with different prosodic properties.

If Right Dislocation has the structure in (5), the focused element that precedes the right-dislocated constituent – the subject in (30B) – counts as the lowest constituent in the clause. It can therefore be assigned phrasal prominence by the Nuclear Stress Rule (cf. Cinque 1993, Zubizarreta 1998:18–19).

In Marginalization, the focused element that precedes the marginalized constituent – the subject in (28B) – is not the most embedded constituent in the clause (the marginalized object is). This prevents it from being assigned phrasal prominence by the Nuclear Stress Rule. The subject in (28B) is assigned stress via the Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule (see Zubizarreta 1998:44–45 and the references quoted there), which overrides the Nuclear Stress Rule. The presupposed object, which is defocalized, is destressed or bears an echo stress, copied directly from the context (Zubizarreta 1998:46–49, 73–78).

The question as to whether the prosodic properties of a right-dislocated constituent are the same as those of an *in situ* destressed constituent must remain open here. For Spanish, Zubizarreta (1998:151–158) has observed that sentences containing a right-dislocated constituent have a different intonation from sentences containing an *in situ* destressed constituent. In the latter case, “there is no prosodic boundary between the nuclear pitch-accented word and the material immediately following it. On the other hand, [ . . . ] the right-dislocated object constitutes a distinct prosodic phrase from the preceding material and it bears its own pitch accent. [ . . . ] I therefore conclude that (a) right-dislocated phrases, unlike focused phrases, constitute an independent prosodic unit and (b) this prosodic unit is the intonational phrase” (Zubizarreta 1998:154,156). If these

observations also turn out to be valid for Italian, the syntactic proposal made in this paper can readily predict the prosodic difference by locating the marginalized constituent in clause-internal position and the right-dislocated constituent in clause-external position. Only the latter forms an intonational phrase on its own (see Nespor & Vogel 1986).

#### 4. Cecchetto's data

In this section some of Cecchetto's (1997, 1999) data are discussed. The phenomena he analyses do not distinguish between Right Dislocation and Marginalization, as is shown by (31)–(32), where the sentences (30b) and (31b) with no clitic pronoun display the same pattern as Cecchetto's sentences (30a) and (31a) with the clitic pronoun. The structural analysis proposed here is able to account for these facts without any adjustment.

First, both in Right Dislocation and Marginalization, binding by the matrix subject yields an impossible result (sentence (31a) from Cecchetto 1999:44):

- (31) a. \* *pro<sub>i</sub>* lo smentisce sempre dopo poche ore, l'annuncio che [un  
[he] it denies always after few hours the announcement that a  
politico]<sub>i</sub> dà alla stampa.  
politician gives to-the press  
b. \* *pro<sub>i</sub>* smentisce sempre dopo poche ore, l'annuncio che [un  
[he] denies always after few hours the announcement that a  
politico]<sub>i</sub> dà alla stampa.  
politician gives to-the press

In (31b) the subject *c*-commands the clause-internal object and produces a principle C violation. (31a) is ungrammatical for the same reason: the matrix subject *c*-commands the right-dislocated constituent (cf. Kayne 1994:22–27 for *c*-command of a specifier out of the phrase that it is the specifier of), and the same violation is produced.

Second, both Right Dislocation and Marginalization obey Ross's (1967) Right Roof Constraint (sentence (32a) from Cecchetto 1999:46):

- (32) a. \* Che gliela presti, mi sembra strano, la macchina.  
that [you] to-her it lend, [it] to-me seems strange, the car  
b. \* Che le presti, mi sembra strano, la macchina.

In (32b), the subject clause *che le presti* cannot be raised leaving the marginalized object *la macchina* behind since this violates constituency (this analysis of (32b) is the same as Cecchetto's analysis of (32a)). The ungrammaticality of (32a) suggests a similar analysis, under the hypothesis that the XP projection in (5) is embedded under the complementizer *che*, as shown in (33):<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Frascarelli (p.c.) finds (32a) better than (32b). This might be considered another argument for distinguishing between the two constructions. This contrast is unexpected

- (33) Mi sembra strano [<sub>CP</sub> che [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* gliela presti] X° [<sub>DP</sub> la macchina]]].

The sequence *che gliela presti* cannot be raised since it does not form a constituent. What can be raised is the whole CP, as in (34):

- (34) [<sub>CP</sub> Che *pro* gliela presti, la macchina], mi sembra strano [<sub>CP</sub> t ].

## 5. The clause-internal vs. the clause-external analysis of Right Dislocation

Assuming the structure in (5), right-dislocated constituents occur outside of the clause that contains the anticipatory clitic pronoun. I have called this proposal the “clause-external analysis” of Right Dislocation:

- (5) [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* l’ho già comprato ] X° [<sub>DP</sub> il giornale]]

(5) differs from Kayne’s (1994) and Cecchetto’s (1997), (1999) “clause-internal analysis” of (Romance) Right Dislocation.<sup>13</sup> Kayne (1994:78–83) suggests that in Romance, right-dislocated constituents occur in complement position (and enter a clitic-doubling structure with the clitic pronoun).<sup>14</sup> Similarly to Kayne, Cecchetto (1997, 1999) takes right-dislocated elements to be clause-internal. Unlike Kayne, who analyses right-dislocated elements as being moved covertly to the Topic projection in the CP area, as shown in (35a,a’), Cecchetto suggests that right-dislocated elements are moved overtly to a Topic projection above VP, as shown in (35b):<sup>15</sup>

---

however given (33). Assuming (33), (32a) can be considered acceptable only if *la macchina* is analysed as an afterthought. This analysis is not possible for (32b): in the embedded clause *che le presti*, the internal argument of the transitive verb *prestare* is missing (cf. \**Mi sembra strano [che le presti]*, \*[*Che le presti*] mi sembra strano).

<sup>13</sup> (5) is the structure proposed by Kayne (1994:78) for English Right Dislocation.

<sup>14</sup> Kayne’s analysis of Romance Right Dislocation is thus essentially the same as what is proposed in this paper for Marginalization (*modulo* clitic doubling).

<sup>15</sup> As underlined by Benincà (1988:§1.4.1), there is a subtle semantic difference between the topic in Left Dislocation and the topic in Right Dislocation. The former can be present in the shared knowledge of speaker and hearer without being present in the preceding linguistic context, while the latter must be present in the immediate linguistic context (in Benincà and Poletto 2001:31, the former is called a *Topic*, the latter a *Theme*). In (i), the b. and c. sentences are ungrammatical because the right-dislocated object *il vino* is not present in the preceding discourse:

- (i) a. Il dolce, lo porto io; il vino, lo porti tu.  
       the dessert, it bring I; the wine, it bring you  
       b. \* Il dolce, lo porto io; lo porti tu, il vino.  
       c. \* Lo porto io, il dolce; lo porti tu, il vino.

Cecchetto (1999:58,fn.23) explains this difference by assuming that the topic feature checked in the Topic projection above VP and the one checked in the Topic projection in the CP area are different, which in turn supports his proposal of two different Topic projections.

- (35) a. [<sub>IP</sub> l'ho già [<sub>AspP</sub> comprato<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> il giornale ]]]  
 a' [<sub>TopicP</sub> il giornale<sub>k</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> l'ho già [<sub>AspP</sub> comprato<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>k</sub> ]]]]  
 b. [<sub>IP</sub> l'ho già [<sub>AspP</sub> comprato<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TopicP</sub> il giornale<sub>k</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>k</sub> ]]]]

Comparing the two proposals, both (5) and (35) can account for the fact that the right-dislocated constituent cannot contain a DP co-referential with the matrix subject, as in (31a) above. The DP *un politico* is c-commanded by the matrix subject *pro* in both (5) (cf. Kayne 1994:22–27) and (35).

Evidence for the clause-internal analysis and against the clause-external analysis defended in this paper seems to come from the following ungrammatical sentence, discussed in Cecchetto (1999:51):

- (36) \* Credo che un critico d'arte non lo<sub>i</sub> restituirebbe mai,  
 [I] think that a critic of art not it would-give-back never,  
 al miliardario che gli presta [un quadro di valore]<sub>i</sub>.  
 to-the millionaire who to-him lends a picture of value

Cecchetto analyses (36) as a violation of principle C. The object clitic *lo* c-commands the right-dislocated constituent that contains the co-referential DP *un quadro di valore*.

The ungrammaticality of (36) is unexpected assuming the analysis proposed in this paper. Given the structure in (5), the clitic pronoun does not c-command the right-dislocated constituent, and grammaticality should be expected, but this is not the case.

Notice however that (36) is an instance of Right Dislocation without an anticipatory clitic pronoun. In this case, the right-dislocated constituent is a dative PP. If anticipatory dative clitics are optional, as currently assumed, the sentence should also be ungrammatical when the clitic is present. However, the sentence with the clitic pronoun is an improvement:

- (37) ? Credo che un critico d'arte non glielo<sub>i</sub> restituirebbe mai, al  
 [I] think that a critic of art not to-him it would-give-back never, to-the  
 miliardario che gli presta [un quadro di valore]<sub>i</sub>.  
 millionaire who to-him lends a picture of value

This means that (36) is not the same construction as (37). (36) is an instance of Marginalization, and (37) is an instance of Right Dislocation, which in turn implies that right-dislocated PPs also require anticipatory clitics (see fn. 5). Given the structure proposed in (3), (36), as expected, is a principle C violation.

While the ungrammaticality of (36) can be explained both by the present account and by the clause-internal account, the grammaticality of (37), predicted by my analysis, is unexpected following Cecchetto's analysis of Right Dislocation since the object clitic *lo* c-commands the right-dislocated constituent that contains the co-referential DP *un quadro di valore*. On the basis of the contrast between (36) and (37), I conclude

that the clause-external analysis of Right Dislocation is superior to the clause-internal one.

The two analyses of Right Dislocation are now further compared on the basis of the data discussed in the previous sections of this paper. While some of the data can also be derived from the clause-internal analysis of Right Dislocation, the phenomena discussed in sections 3.3, 3.4, and 3.8 cannot. Let us analyse each case in turn, focusing on Cecchetto's variant of the clause-internal analysis:

- section 3.3: if in (14a) the object *Mario* moves to the specTopicP position above VP, the embedded clause *a fare* that precedes it should be moved to some higher specTopicP position. If this analysis of (14a) is correct, the ungrammaticality of (14b) becomes surprising. Why should it not be possible to move the embedded clause to the same position in (14b) (while the object *Mario* is destressed *in situ*)?
- section 3.4: the contrast in (17) can be captured only if (17c) can be analysed as an instance of Remnant Topicalization (cf. den Besten & Webelhuth 1990 for German). The right-dislocated constituent is raised to a position that is outside of the verbal constituent moved to the sentence-initial position:

- (38) a. [<sub>IP</sub> non l'ha [<sub>XP</sub> la minestra<sub>k</sub> [<sub>AspP</sub> finita<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>k</sub> ]]]]  
       b. [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>AspP</sub> finita<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>k</sub> ]]<sub>j</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> non l'ha [<sub>XP</sub> la minestra<sub>k</sub> [<sub>AspP</sub> t<sub>j</sub> ]]]]

But in Italian, this movement is never possible:<sup>16</sup>

- (39) \* L'ha, la minestra, finita.

This reasoning is confirmed by sentences containing adverbs. As shown in (40c–e), a right-dislocated object follows a manner adverb such as *bene* “well”, on a par with both the “normal”, accented object in (40a) and the marginalized object in (40b):<sup>17</sup>

- (40) a. Ha fatto bene i compiti.  
       [he] has done well the homework  
       b. Ha fatto bene, i compiti.  
       c. Li ha fatti bene, i compiti.  
       [he] them has done well the homework

<sup>16</sup> In German, the DP movement assumed in the Remnant Topicalization in (ii) is independently needed to account for (i) (den Besten & Webelhuth 1990):

- (i) Ich habe das Buch<sub>i</sub> nicht [ t<sub>i</sub> gelesen].  
       I have the book not read  
       (ii) [ t<sub>i</sub> gelesen]<sub>k</sub> habe ich das Buch<sub>i</sub> nicht t<sub>k</sub>.

Unlike German, Italian allows Remnant topicalization in the case of clitic pronouns, as in (17b), but not with DPs, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (39).

<sup>17</sup> (40d) is grammatical in the irrelevant reading in which the adverb *bene* is separated from the clause by a clear pause and gets some emphatic accent, which might suggest an analysis of it as an afterthought.



- d. \* Li ha fatti, i compiti, bene.  
 e. \* Li ha, i compiti, fatti bene.

Since the adverb *bene* is located at a very low level in the structure (Cinque 1999), the specTopicP position to which a right-dislocated constituent is moved in Cecchetto's analysis must be immediately above VP. Notice now how if the verbal projection is moved to sentence-initial position, it can include the adverb and the object, accented or marginalized, (41a–b), or only the adverb, (41c–d):

- (41) a. Fatto bene i compiti, non ha di certo.  
       b. Fatto bene, i compiti, non ha di certo.  
           done well the homework, [he] not has for sure  
       c. Fatti bene, non li ha di certo.  
       d. Fatti bene, non li ha di certo, i compiti.  
           done well [he] not them has for sure, the homework

In order to get (41d), the right-dislocated object *i compiti* should move to a position that is higher than both the past participle and the adverb, a position to which an object cannot otherwise move (see (39) and (40d–e) above).

- section 3.8: the interpretive and prosodic contrast between (29) and (30) cannot be explained if the clause-internal analysis of Right Dislocation is adopted. In neither case would the post-verbal subject count as the last constituent in the clause (in both cases the object would). As a result, the subject should be an instance of contrastive focus in both cases, which is not the case.

In conclusion, unless independent analyses are found to account for these data, the clause-external analysis of Right Dislocation defended in this paper is superior to the clause-internal analysis proposed by Kayne (1994) and Cecchetto (1997, 1999).

### 5.1. The double-topicalization analysis of Right Dislocation

Assuming (5) as the representation of Right Dislocation, the question arises as to the nature of the X head. An intriguing possibility is that X is a Topic head in the Comp area (Rizzi 1997), and that (5) arises through a sort of double topicalization (Kayne, class lectures 1995, quoted in Cecchetto 1999:48ff). First, the DP *il giornale* is moved to specTopicP; second, the entire clause is moved to a higher specTopicP:<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The clause cannot move to specCP, as assumed in Frascarelli (1997, 2000), because it can also follow a complementizer (see (33) above):

- (i) a. Mi sembra strano [<sub>CP</sub> che [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> la macchina]<sub>k</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* gliela presti t<sub>k</sub>]]].  
       b. Mi sembra strano [<sub>CP</sub> che [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* gliela presti t<sub>k</sub>]<sub>j</sub> Topic° [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> la macchina]<sub>k</sub> Topic° [<sub>IP</sub> t<sub>j</sub> ]]]].

- (42) [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* l'ho già comprato  $t_k$ ]<sub>j</sub> Topic° [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> il giornale]<sub>k</sub> Topic° [<sub>IP</sub>  $t_j$  ]]]

Notice that (42) is a clause-external analysis of Right Dislocation and does not display the problems of the clause-internal analysis discussed above in section 5.

Cecchetto (1999:§3) highlights how the derivation in (42) contains both theoretical and empirical problems. Firstly, it entails a massive violation of the Proper Binding Condition since the clause in the highest specTopicP contains an unbound trace, and, secondly, it cannot account for (32a) and (36). It can be added that the semantic difference between Left and Right Dislocation mentioned in fn. 15 also seems to be unaccounted for if (42) is assumed.

As for (32a), I have shown in (33) above that the sequence *che gliela presti* cannot be moved because it is not a constituent. There is another derivation that should be blocked: the one in which the object *la macchina* is left-dislocated in front of the matrix clause and the entire clause is then moved to the left, providing the intermediate step in (43a) and the final structure in (43b):

- (43) a. [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>La macchina</sub>]<sub>k</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* mi sembra strano che gliela presti  $t_k$ ]].  
 b. [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro* mi sembra strano che gliela presti  $t_k$ ]<sub>j</sub> Topic° [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> la macchina]<sub>k</sub> Topic° [<sub>IP</sub>  $t_j$  ]]].

In (43b), the embedded clause *che gliela presti  $t_k$*  is a constituent. It cannot however be further moved to get the ungrammatical sequence in (32a) because, contrary to what is assumed in Cecchetto (1999:53, fn.14), there is no landing site for its movement. No Topic projection is available (note how in (43b) the topicalized constituent is an IP), and adjunction to IP is excluded under antisymmetric assumptions. Contrary to Cecchetto's conclusion, (32a) can be accounted for even if (42) is assumed.

As for (36), the sentence is not ungrammatical if the anticipatory dative clitic pronoun is inserted, as I have shown in (37). The double-topicalization analysis thus correctly predicts that (37) is not ungrammatical.

As for the semantic difference between Left and Right Dislocation discussed in fn. 15, this seems to be predicted by (42). Notice that given two familiar elements in the left-periphery of the clause, the first can be an element present in the shared knowledge of speaker and hearer, but not present in the preceding linguistic context (a *Topic*), while the second must be present in the immediate linguistic context (a *Theme*) (cf. fn. 15):

- (44) a. Hai spedito le mie lettere?  
 [you] have sent the my letters?

- b. Sì, a Gianni, le tue lettere, gliel'ho già spedite. (Devo ancora spedire quelle per Maria.)  
yes, to Gianni, the your letters, [I] to-him them have already sent.  
I have still to send those for Maria
  - c. ?? Sì, le tue lettere, a Gianni, gliel'ho già spedite. (Devo ancora spedire quelle per Maria.)
- (45) a. Hai scritto a Gianni?  
[you] have written to Gianni?
- b. Sì, le tue lettere, a Gianni, gliel'ho già spedite. (Io gli devo ancora scrivere.)  
yes, the your letters, to Gianni, [I] to-him them have already sent.  
I to-him have still to write
  - c. ?? Sì, a Gianni, le tue lettere, gliel'ho già spedite. (Io gli devo ancora scrivere.)

Since in (42), the right-dislocated constituent is moved to the lowest of the Topic projections of the CP area, it is predicted that it can only be a *Theme* and cannot be a *Topic*.

The only criticism of (42) that remains is a theoretical one, i.e. the fact that (42) entails a violation of the Proper Binding Condition, but this is not the appropriate place to discuss this issue. I conclude by saying that we either recognize X in (5) as a Topic head, as shown in (42), with the issue raised by Cecchetto remaining as an open question, or we maintain, as Kayne (1994:78) does, that an antisymmetric account of Right Dislocation requires “as novel an analysis” as in (5), where the nature of the X head has still to be established.

## 5.2. The internal-topicalization analysis of Marginalization

I have suggested that a marginalized object stays *in situ* like a non-marginalized object. Two competing analyses are found in literature, which invoke a sort of clause-internal topicalization of the marginalized constituent. Both are discussed here.

According to Frascarelli (1997, 2000), marginalized objects are adjoined to VP, as shown in (46):

- (46) [<sub>FP</sub> ha comprato<sub>i</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> Gianni<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> il giornale<sub>k</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>k</sub> ]]]]  
has bought Gianni the newspaper

While nothing changes substantially in our argumentation if string-vacuous VP-adjunction of the marginalized constituent is assumed, questions arise as to the location of the focused subject and the verb. In (46) the focused subject occurs in specIP and the verb occupies a F head above IP. Neither of these assumptions can be adopted. As for the former, if a focused subject were in its canonical specIP position, it should always agree with the verb, but this is not the case (see section 7.1 below

for discussion). As for the latter, the lexical verb and the auxiliary cannot be analysed as a single head moved together to F°. If this were so, sentences like (17b,c) would be ungrammatical. This analysis is also implausible for those cases in which adverbs intervene between the auxiliary and the lexical verb: *Ha sempre comprato Gianni, il giornale* ‘has always bought Gianni, the newspaper’. If adverbs occur in designated functional projections (Cinque 1999), they cannot occur in one and the same head together with the auxiliary and the lexical verb (see Frascarelli 1997:190ff for discussion). Unless the assumptions regarding the subject and the verb are abandoned, (46) cannot be adopted.

Another internal-topicalization analysis of Marginalization is proposed by Belletti (1998, 1999). Marginalized constituents are taken to occur in a Topic position above VP, as shown in (47):<sup>19</sup>

- (47) [<sub>IP</sub> ha [<sub>AspP</sub> comprato<sub>i</sub> [<sub>FocusP</sub> Gianni<sub>j</sub> [<sub>TopicP</sub> il giornale<sub>k</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>k</sub> ]]]]]

(47) does not have the same problems as (46). The focused postverbal subject is taken to occur in a Focus position immediately above the Topic projection, and the verbal forms occur in their canonical positions.

If this analysis of Marginalization is adopted, nothing substantially changes in our argumentation.<sup>20</sup> I have not adopted it here, however, because it seems to raise the question of the ordering of the Focus and Topic projections. While in (47) it is assumed that in the clause-internal area above VP topics follow focused constituents, in the CP area topics can only precede focused constituents. As suggested by Benincà and Poletto (2001), Rizzi’s (1997) proposal that the focus projection in the CP area is surrounded by Topic projections, as in (48a), should be partially rephrased as in (48b), where the Topic projection only precedes the Focus projection:

- (48) a. [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>FocusP</sub> [<sub>TopicP</sub> [ . . . [<sub>IP</sub> ]]]]]]  
 b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>FocusP</sub> [ . . . [<sub>IP</sub> ]]]]]

If the CP area and the area above VP are symmetric, as currently assumed, the ordering of the projections in (47) cannot be correct.

<sup>19</sup> Belletti’s analysis of Marginalization is essentially the same as Cecchetto’s analysis of Right Dislocation (*modulo* clitic doubling). As the data in the preceding sections have shown, the specifier of the Topic projection in (47) cannot host right-dislocated objects (*pace* Cecchetto 1997, 1999), otherwise the asymmetries between marginalized and right-dislocated objects would remain mysterious.

<sup>20</sup> Notice that in order to account for the fixed order of marginalized arguments (section 3.2), the Topic projections above VP should reproduce the VP-internal order of non-marginalized arguments (unlike the Topic projections in the CP area, where the argument order is free). Secondly, in order to account for the ungrammaticality of (18), the movement of the past participle to the Aspectual head (see section 2.3) must be made obligatory. Otherwise the preposing of VP, which contains the unmoved past participle and the trace of the marginalized constituent, would be possible.

In conclusion, since (3) does not raise any of the above questions, I keep the analysis of Marginalization as in (3).

## 6. Against lexical optionality

If the absence of the clitic pronoun implies that a structure different from Right Dislocation is used, i.e. Marginalization, the conclusion can be drawn that clitic pronouns cannot be optional, nor can they be null.

As for the former conclusion, it complies with the principle of Full Interpretation. Since superfluous lexical elements are not allowed, lexical optionality cannot exist. A sentence with a clitic pronoun cannot be the same syntactic entity as a sentence without one, and this is shown by the data presented.

The latter conclusion has yet to be fully understood. A possible understanding of the restriction that clitic pronouns cannot be null comes from the analysis of the syntactic and phonological properties of clitic pronouns. Cardinaletti & Starke (1999:192–197) suggest that the derivation of clitic pronouns should be decomposed into two steps: XP-movement followed by X<sup>0</sup> movement. While the XP-movement step has a merely syntactic motivation (i.e. the need for the pronouns to be associated with case-features), the head-movement step is motivated by considerations relevant at the syntax-phonology interface. Via head-movement, a clitic pronoun, which has no prosody-related features, ends up in the prosodic domain of a non-clitic element. If this analysis is correct, it seems plausible to assume that something that is phonologically null does not need to, and hence cannot, undergo this type of movement. This means that null clitic pronouns do not exist, which in turn confirms the current assumption that null pronouns are not clitic, but weak (cf. Rizzi 1986a, Cardinaletti & Starke 1999:§3.4).

## 7. Right-dislocated vs. marginalized subjects

The previous discussion regarding objects can be extended to subjects. If in the Right Dislocation of subjects, an anticipatory null subject *pro* were optional, a sentence such as (49) could be freely analysed as (50a) or (50b):

(49) Non ha ancora telefonato, Gianni.  
not has yet called, Gianni

(50) a. *pro* non ha ancora telefonato, Gianni.  
b. Non ha ancora telefonato, Gianni.

As in the case of objects, it is possible to show that (50a) and (50b) have different syntactic properties, which can be captured structurally by

assuming two different representations, parallel to the ones proposed for right-dislocated and marginalized objects respectively:<sup>21</sup>

(51) [XP [IP *pro*<sub>arg</sub> non ha ancora telefonato ] X° [DP Gianni ]]

(52) [IP *pro*<sub>expl</sub> non ha [FP ancora [AspP telefonato<sub>i</sub> [VP Gianni t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]

Before proceeding, it is necessary to note that a marginalized subject can follow a focused verb, as in (49), or a focused adverb, as in *Ha parlato bene, Gianni* ‘has spoken well, Gianni’. However, an unstressed subject that follows a focused object, as in (53a), is necessarily right-dislocated and must thus be assigned the structure (51), as shown in (53b):

(53) a. Vuole il caffè, Gianni.

[he] wants the coffee, Gianni

b. [XP [IP *pro*<sub>arg</sub> vuole il caffè ] X° [DP Gianni ]]

This is so because there is no VP-internal post-object position for the subject (cf. Cardinaletti 1998, 2001 for detailed discussion). A marginalized subject can only precede a marginalized object, as in (54), where the verb is focused on a par with the verb in (49):

(54) a. Vorrebbe, Gianni, il caffè (ma non può berlo).

would-want, Gianni, the coffee (but [he] cannot drink it)

b. [IP *pro*<sub>expl</sub> vorrebbe<sub>i</sub> [VP Gianni t<sub>i</sub> il caffè ]]

### 7.1. Agreement phenomena

In some Italian varieties (e.g. the Central Italian variety spoken in the area of Ancona), a marginalized subject, as in (55b), behaves like a focused postverbal subject, as in (55a), in that it may fail to agree in number with the finite verb:

(55) a. Questo disegno l’ha fatto quei bambini lì.

this drawing it has done those children there

b. È arrivati, i mobili.

has arrived, the pieces of furniture

Whatever the reason for the lack of verbal agreement with postverbal subjects (see Guasti & Rizzi 1999 for discussion), the fact that a marginalized subject behaves like a focused subject confirms the structural proposals made in (52) and (4), respectively. In both cases, the subject is VP-internal.

<sup>21</sup> As in the case of objects (see section 5.2), nothing in our argumentation changes if a marginalized subject occurs in a Topic position above VP, as in Belletti (1998, 1999):

(i) [IP non ha [FP ancora [AspP telefonato<sub>i</sub> [TopicP Gianni<sub>j</sub> [VP t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]

However, as noted above for objects, this position cannot host right-dislocated subjects, which must be clause-external.

Right Dislocation differs from Marginalization in that it always requires verbal agreement. This is shown in (56), where the subject is clearly right-dislocated as it follows a right-dislocated object:

- (56) L' \*ha / hanno fatto ieri, il disegno, quei bambini lì.  
[they] it \*has / have done yesterday, this drawing, those children there

The necessary agreement in (56) depends on the presence of preverbal *pro* (57) and on the fact that agreement is obligatory with preverbal subjects (58) (see Cardinaletti 1997:§2.3):

- (57) a. *pro*<sub>arg</sub> l'hanno fatto ieri, il disegno, quei bambini lì.  
b. [<sub>YP</sub> [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> *pro*<sub>arg</sub> l'hanno fatto ieri] X<sup>o</sup> [<sub>DP</sub> il disegno]] Y<sup>o</sup> [<sub>DP</sub> quei bambini lì]].
- (58) Quei bambini \*ha / hanno fatto questo disegno.  
those children \*has / have done this drawing

## 7.2. Extraction

As in the case of VP-internal focused subjects (59a), *ne*-extraction is possible out of marginalized subjects of unaccusative verbs (59b), which confirms their VP-internal location. Extraction out of right-dislocated subjects, on the other hand, is impossible. This is shown by (59c), where the subject follows another right-dislocated constituent:

- (59) a. Ne è venuto uno.  
of-them has come one  
b. Ne è venuto ieri, uno.  
of-them has come yesterday, one  
c. ?? Gliene è stato regalato, a Gianni, uno.  
to-him of-them has been given, to Gianni, one

## 7.3. Quantified expressions

If a marginalized subject occurs in the VP-internal position, it can, as expected, be a quantified expression. The sentences in (60) are grammatical. If the subject is right-dislocated outside of the clause, then, as expected, it cannot be a quantified constituent. The sentences in (61) are ungrammatical and are parallel to (62), where the subject *nessuno* is clearly right-dislocated since it follows the right-dislocated object *Maria*:<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> See Calabrese (1992:93ff). Subject quantifiers cannot be left-dislocated either:

(i) \* Nessuno, Maria, (non) l'ha invitata.  
nobody, Maria, [he] (not) her has invited

- (60) a. Può già andare, ogni ragazzo.  
           can already go, every boy  
       b. Può già ritirare, ogni ragazzo, la (sua) macchina.  
           can already go-and-take, every boy, the (his) car
- (61) a. A: Che cosa non ha fatto nessuno?  
           what not has done anybody?  
       B: \* Non ha fatto questo, nessuno.  
           [he] not has done this, anybody  
       b. A: Chi ha incontrato, ogni studente?  
           whom has met, every student?  
           “Who has every student met?”  
       B: \* Ha incontrato il preside, ogni studente.  
           [he] has met the dean, every student
- (62) \* Non l’ha invitata, Maria, nessuno.  
       [he] not her has invited, Maria, anybody

The ungrammaticality of (61) and (62) is due to the fact that the quantified constituent cannot be adequately interpreted. The quantified subject cannot be raised to the relevant specifier position to get its interpretation at LF, and a violation of Full Interpretation occurs.

#### 7.4. *Subjects in interrogative and exclamative sentences*

The above observations have some consequences for the analysis of interrogative and exclamative sentences, which very often contain clause-final, unstressed subjects (cf. Antinucci & Cinque 1977). These behave like marginalized subjects and differ from right-dislocated subjects in that:

- they may fail to trigger verb agreement in the Central Italian variety that allows lack of agreement (see section 7.1 above):<sup>23</sup>

Notice that (61b) is marginally possible if the quantified subject has a partitive reading, similarly to *ognuno di quegli studenti* ‘each of those students’.

<sup>23</sup> Belletti (1998:25) notes that in some Northern Italian dialects, here exemplified by Fiorentino, subject agreement is optional with (focused) postverbal subjects in declarative sentences (as shown by the non-agreeing masculine subject clitic *gl’* in the a. sentence), but obligatory with postverbal subjects in interrogative sentences (as shown by the agreeing feminine subject clitic *l’* in the c. sentences, which contrast with b.) (examples from Brandi & Cordin 1981):

- (i) a. Gl’è venuto le su’ sorelle.  
           it has come the his sisters  
       b. \* Icché gl’ha portato, la Maria?  
           what it has brought the Maria?  
       c. Icché l’ha portato, la Maria?  
           what she has brought the Maria?  
       c’. Quando l’è venuta, la Maria?  
           when she has come, the Maria?



- (63) a. Cosa ha fatto, i bambini?  
           what has done, the children?  
       b. Cosa ha fatto, i bambini, a scuola?  
           what has done, the children, at school?
- (64) Che bel disegno ha fatto, quei bambini!  
       how nice drawing has done, those children!

The fact that lack of agreement in the Central Italian variety is not just a hallmark of focused postverbal subjects, but is also a possibility for marginalized subjects, is confirmed by (65b), where a marginalized, non-agreeing subject does not induce weak crossover, which is only induced by a focused subject, (65a):<sup>24</sup>

- (65) a. \*? Attualmente, in un loro<sub>i</sub> appartamento vive i ragazzi<sub>i</sub>.  
           at present, in one their apartment lives the boys  
       b. Attualmente, in quale loro<sub>i</sub> appartamento vive, i ragazzi<sub>i</sub>?  
           at present, in which their apartment lives the boys?

• they allow *ne*-extraction:

- (66) Quando ne è arrivato, uno?  
       when of-them has arrived, one?
- (67) Come ne è arrivato presto, uno!  
       how of-them has arrived early, one!

• they can be quantified expressions:

- (68) a. Quando è partito, ogni ragazzo?  
           when has left, every boy?  
       b. Quando è andato, ogni ragazzo, in montagna?  
           when has gone, every boy, to the mountains
- (69) a. Che bella casa ha comprato, ogni tuo parente!  
           what a nice house has bought, every your relative!  
       b. Che bella casa ha comprato, ogni tuo parente, ai propri genitori!  
           what a nice house has bought, every your relative, to-the his parents!

---

These dialects thus differ from the Central Italian variety exemplified in (63). We tentatively suggest that Northern Italian dialects do not allow the Marginalization of subjects. In interrogative sentences they only allow right-dislocated subjects, which obligatorily trigger agreement of the verb (see section 7.1 and (70)-(71)). The reason for this language variation is unclear, but it is very likely that it correlates with the fact that the dialects discussed by Belletti have subject clitics, while the variety exemplified in (63) does not.

<sup>24</sup> The sentences in (65) are parallel to the sentences in (i), discussed in Belletti (1998:26):

- (i) a. \*? Attualmente, in un suo<sub>i</sub> appartamento vive Gianni<sub>i</sub>.  
           at present, in one his apartment lives Gianni  
       b. Attualmente, in quale suo<sub>i</sub> appartamento vive, Gianni<sub>i</sub>?  
           at present, in which his apartment lives Gianni?

Nothing of course prevents a subject from being right-dislocated in interrogative and exclamative sentences. Subject-verb agreement is obligatory, as in the case of a right-dislocated subject following a right-dislocated object, (70b) and (71b) (see also (56)):

- (70) a. Cosa hanno fatto, i bambini?  
           what [they] have done, the children?  
       b. Quando li hanno finiti, i compiti, i bambini?  
           when [they] them have finished, the homework, the children?
- (71) a. Che bel disegno hanno fatto, quei bambini!  
           how nice drawing [they] have done, those children!  
       b. Come l'hanno fatto bene, il disegno, quei bambini!  
           how [they] it have done well, the drawing, those children!

### 7.5. *Interpretive and prosodic properties*

The interpretive and prosodic properties of marginalized subjects mirror those of marginalized objects. The material preceding a marginalized subject is necessarily an instance of contrastive focus, (72a) vs. (72b), while this restriction does not hold for right-dislocated subjects, which can be preceded by noncontrastive focus, (73). Since the anticipatory element of a right-dislocated subject is null, in order to differentiate (72b) from (73) I use data with quantified subjects and *ne*-extraction. See section 3.5 above for the reason why *ne* is possible in (72) and impossible in (73):

- (72) a. A: Ne è arrivato oggi, uno?  
           of-them has arrived today, one?  
       B: No, ne è arrivato ieri, uno (non oggi).  
           no, of-them has arrived yesterday, one (not today)
- b. A: Quando ne è arrivato, uno?  
           when of-them has arrived, one?  
       B: ?? Ne è arrivato ieri, uno.  
           of-them has arrived yesterday, one
- (73)   A: Quando ne è arrivato, uno?  
       B: (\*Ne) è arrivato ieri, uno.

### 7.6. *On the non-optionality of pro*

The preceding sections have shown that the non-overt pronoun *pro* behaves like clitic pronouns in that it cannot be optional. Depending on whether it is present or absent, two different constructions are found: Right Dislocation and Marginalization respectively. Consequently, the principle of Full Interpretation applies to non-overt constituents as well.

This conclusion is not surprising. Grammar should not be sensitive to

the overtness of the elements that undergo the syntactic derivation. Non-overt constituents need to be computed and interpreted at the syntax-semantics interface on a par with their overt counterparts, and differ from their overt counterparts only at the syntax-phonology interface. *Pro* in the Italian sentence *pro ho mangiato* has the same syntactic and semantic properties of *I* in the English sentence *I have eaten*, but the phonological content is different.

## 8. Conclusions

In this paper, alleged cases of Right Dislocation without an anticipatory pronoun have been analysed as Marginalization. The two constructions have different syntactic, interpretive and prosodic properties, which have been accounted for by assuming the structures proposed in (3) and (5) respectively. Specifically, the structure proposed by Kayne (1994) for Romance Right Dislocation has been shown to be better able to analyse Marginalization than Right Dislocation. A marginalized constituent occurs in its base position inside the clause; it is defocalized and destressed. Right Dislocation, on the other hand, should be analysed as involving a clause-external constituent, occurring in the complement position of a functional head in whose specifier the clause containing the anticipatory clitic is found, as in Kayne's (1994) analysis of English Right Dislocation.

In the second part of the paper, the analysis has been extended to right-dislocated and marginalized subjects. Similar properties have been found, which support the different structural hypothesis proposed here. Post-verbal subjects occurring in interrogative and exclamative sentences have proved to be marginalized and not necessarily right-dislocated.

If the absence of the clitic pronoun implies that a structure different from Right Dislocation is used, the conclusion can be drawn that clitic pronouns cannot be optional, nor can they be null. The former conclusion also holds true for non-overt *pro* in the Right Dislocation of subjects, which is not optional.

The conclusion that clitic pronouns and *pro* cannot be optional complies with the principle of Full Interpretation. The conclusion that clitic pronouns cannot be null can be explained as a restriction applying at the syntax-phonology interface. This in turn confirms the current assumption that null pronouns are not clitic, but weak.

## References

- ANTINUCCI, F. & CINQUE, G. 1977. Sull'ordine delle parole in italiano: l'emarginazione. *Studi di grammatica italiana* 6, 121–146.
- BELLETTI, A. 1988. The Case of Unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.1, 1–34.
- BELLETTI, A. 1998. "Inversion" as focalization. Ms., University of Siena.

- BELLETTI, A. 1999. *Aspects of the Low IP Area*. Talk given at the Workshop on the Cartography of Syntactic Positions and Semantic Types, Certosa di Pontignano, November 1999.
- BENINCÀ, P. 1988. L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate. *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, ed. L. Renzi, vol.1: 115–194. Bologna: il Mulino (New edition 2001).
- BENINCÀ, P. & POLETO, C. 2001. *Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers*. Ms., University of Padua and CNR.
- DEN BESTEN, H. & WEBELHUTH, G. 1990. Stranding. *Scrambling and Barriers*, ed. G. Grewendorf & W. Sternefeld, 77–92. Amsterdam: Academic Press.
- BRANDI, L. & CORDIN, P. 1981. Dialetti e italiano: un confronto sul parametro del soggetto nullo. *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 6, 33–87.
- CALABRESE, A. 1982. Alcune ipotesi sulla struttura informazionale della frase in italiano e sul suo rapporto con la struttura fonologica. *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 7, 3–78.
- CALABRESE, A. 1992. Some remarks on focus and logical structure in Italian. *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 91–127.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 1988. Sul riordinamento postverbale dei costituenti in italiano. *ATI Journal* 53, 12–30.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 1997. Subjects and clause structure. *The New Comparative Syntax*, ed. L. Haegeman, 33–63. London: Longman.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 1998. A second thought on *Emarginazione*: Destressing vs. “Right Dislocation”. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 8.2, 1–28.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 1999. Italian “emphatic” pronouns are post-verbal subjects. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 9, 59–92.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 2001. A second thought on *Emarginazione*: Destressing vs. “Right Dislocation”. *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, ed. G. Cinque & G. Salvi, 117–135. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- CARDINALETTI, A. & STARKE, M. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency. A case-study of the three classes of pronouns. *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, EALT/EUROTYP 20–5, ed. H. van Riemsdijk, 145–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CECCHETTO, C. 1997. *Clitic Right Dislocation is not the Mirror Image of Clitic Left Dislocation*. DIPSCO, Milan, Ms.
- CECCHETTO, C. 1999. A comparative analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53(1), 40–67.
- CHOMSKY, N. 1986. *Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- CHOMSKY, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- CINQUE, G. 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- CINQUE, G. 1993. A null theory of phrase and compound stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 239–298.
- CINQUE, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DE MAURO, T. 1993. *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato*. Milano: Etaslibri.
- FRASCARELLI, M. 1997. *L'interfaccia sintassi-fonologia nelle costruzioni di focalizzazione e topicalizzazione dell'italiano*. University of Roma Tre, Ph.D. diss.
- FRASCARELLI, M. 2000. *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- GUASTI, M.T. & RIZZI, L. 1999. *Agreement and Tense as distinct syntactic positions: Evidence from acquisition*. University of Siena, Ms.
- KAYNE, R.S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- NESPOR, M. & VOGEL, I. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- RIZZI, L. 1986a. Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501–557.
- RIZZI, L. 1986b. On the status of subject clitics in Romance. *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, ed. O. Jaeggli & C. Silva-Corvalán, 391–419. Dordrecht: Foris.
- RIZZI, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of Grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- ROSS, J.R. 1967. *Constraints On Variables in Syntax*. MIT, Ph.D. diss.
- ZUBIZARRETA, M.-L. 1998. *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

*Received May 5, 2001*

*Accepted November 12, 2001*

*Anna Cardinaletti*  
*Dipartimento di Studi interdisciplinari su*  
*traduzione, lingue e culture*  
*University of Bologna*  
*Corso Diaz 64*  
*47100 Forlì*  
*Italy*  
*cardin@unive.it*