

Alessandra Giorgi  
Ca' Foscari University of Venice  
giorgi@unive.it

## Discourse and the syntax of the left periphery: Clitic Left Dislocation and Hanging Topic

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In this work I consider the properties of Clitic Left Dislocation – henceforth, CLLD – and Hanging Topic – henceforth, HT – in Italian.

Rizzi (1997) proposed a fine-grained analysis of the left periphery of the clause. Most notably, he proposed that the syntactic space pertaining to the complementizer should not be considered as a single projection, but should be better conceived of as a *layer*, i.e. as a set of hierarchically ordered projections. Rizzi's proposal on the structure of the left periphery of the clause is the following:

- (1) C<sub>FORCE</sub> TOP<sub>1</sub>\* FOC TOP<sub>2</sub>\* C<sub>FIN</sub> IP

In the *Government and Binding* framework, the left periphery – i.e. the portion of the tree on the left of the subject – is constituted by a single head and a single specifier position, in Rizzi's (1997) approach, on the contrary, the heads and the specifier positions in the left periphery have each a different function in that each of them can host only a particular kind of item, according to the specification of the head.

Note also that in the Government and Binding framework, the specifier of C can be filled only by moved phrases, as for instance *wh*-phrases or phrases preceding the verb in V2 constructions. However, in the same framework, a focused phrase is argued to be moved, whereas topics, at least clitic left dislocation (henceforth, CLLD), are usually analyzed as base generated – see Cinque (1990). Under these assumptions it turns out, therefore, that the C-layer is a hybrid one, mixing movement, for the derivation concerning a contrastive focus, and base generation, for CLLD and HT.<sup>1</sup>

The unmoved status of CLLD and HT, moreover, is a very interesting anomaly in the theory of grammar, because the obvious question arising in this connection is how come CLLD is possible at all, being neither an argument – the argument being the clitic – nor an operator connected to a variable, as I will briefly illustrate below.

Here I argue that the unmoved status of HT and CLLD follows from their peculiar syntax, given

---

<sup>1</sup> A reviewer points out, correctly, that this is not necessarily a problem, other categories being hybrid as well, as for instance *vP*. However, I think that it is a characteristic worth pointing out.

that the heads projecting the phrases where they are hosted are *prosody-oriented heads*. Prosody-oriented heads are not associated to a lexical content – even if they probably have to be endowed with structure building features, specifying the category of their complement – but to a phonological one, i.e. are read off at the interface with phonology and assigned a particular prosodic value. The interaction of these phrases, generated inside prosody-oriented projections, with the rest of syntax is the object of this paper.

## 2. A BRIEF CHARACTERIZATION OF CLITIC LEFT DISLOCATION AND HANGING TOPIC

In this section I briefly summarize some of the well-known properties of these two kinds of constructions. To a certain extent, HT and CLLD resemble each other – in that they both occur in the left periphery and are connected to an argument, in most cases overtly realized, inside the clause – but they also crucially differ under many points of view. In this section I will outline the main differences relevant for the subsequent analysis.<sup>2</sup>

The first important difference between CLLD and HT is the absence of the preposition with HT, whereas its presence is obligatory with CLLD. Consider for instance the following example:

(2) *A Gianni*, Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo

To Gianni, Maria to him-gave a beautiful present

(3) *Gianni*, Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo

Gianni, Maria to him-gave a beautiful present

Another difference concerns the relationship established between the left peripheral position and the sentence. In the case of CLLD there is either a clitic or a zero – according to Frascarelli (2000) a *pro*. Whereas HT can have a clitic, a pronoun or an epithet as a resumptive element, as illustrated by the following examples:<sup>3</sup>

(4) Gianni, *gli* hanno dato un bel voto

Gianni, they gave him a good mark

(5) Gianni, hanno dato un bel voto perfino a lui

---

<sup>2</sup> CLLD expresses given information. HT most often expresses given information as well, but can also be used to introduce a new item in the discourse, depending upon the context. The literature on this issue is quite extensive and the data are well-known. Hence, for reasons of space, I will not discuss each single piece of evidence here, but only highlight the most relevant points. See, among the others, Cinque (1990), Frascarelli (2000) and references cited there.

<sup>3</sup> The relationship can also be kind-token one, as in the following example (Poletto, p.c.):

i. Fiori, mi piacciono i garofani  
Flowers, I like carnations

Gianni, they gave a mark even to him

(6) Gianni, hanno dato un bel voto perfino a quel cretino

Gianni, they gave a good mark even to that idiot

Furthermore, as discussed in the literature, there are no reconstruction effects. Consider the following contrast:<sup>4</sup>

(7) Non ho invitato molti ragazzi

I did not invite many boys

(8) Molti ragazzi, non li ho invitati

Many boys, I did not them-cl invite

Sentence (7), where the quantified NP is in the scope of negation actually means ‘I invited some boys’, whereas sentence (8) – an example of CLLD – can only mean ‘there are many boys, whom I did not invite’. HT patterns with CLLD:<sup>5</sup>

(9) *Molti ragazzi*, non *gli* ho fatto un regalo

Many boys, I to them-did not made a present

Reconstruction for binding purposes is also ruled out. Consider the following examples, discussed by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007):

(10) *La mia foto con Leo<sub>i</sub>*, lui<sub>i</sub> non l’ha ancora mostrata (Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl, ex.9)

My picture with Leo, he did not it-show yet

---

<sup>4</sup> For an analysis of CLLD as base generated, see Anagnostopoulou (1997), Cinque (1990), Frascarelli (2000, 2004), Iatridou (1995) and Suñer (2006). For an analysis in terms of movement, see López (2009) and Villalba (1998). Let me only point out that the arguments in favor of movements, such as sensitivity to strong island, could cease to be a problem once the properties of the connection of the clitic, or of the *pro*, with the dislocated phrase are better analyzed within a theory of phases. Recall also that HT is not sensitive to strong islands. However, I will not further address this issue here.

<sup>5</sup> Note that the clitic *gli* in this sentence is a third person singular enclitic, whereas the antecedent is plural. This however is the form used in normal speech by most speakers. There is a weak plural form, the pronoun *loro*, which can be used in these cases, but it gives rise to a sort of hyper-correct style, which I will not consider here:

i. Molti ragazzi, non ho fatto loro un regalo

Many boys, I did not give them a present.

Independently of these considerations, let me point out that both the example (i) and (9) in the text are however slightly marginal – i.e. ‘?’ – to my ear.

(11) *Il mio ritratto con Leo<sub>i</sub>, lui<sub>i</sub> non gli ha ancora trovato una cornice adatta*

My portrait with Leo, he did not for it—found a suitable frame yet

(12)\**Lui<sub>i</sub> non ha ancora mostrato la mia foto con Leo<sub>i</sub>*

He did not show yet my picture with Leo

(13)\**Lui<sub>i</sub> non ha ancora trovato una cornice alla mia foto con Leo<sub>i</sub>*

He did not find yet a frame for my picture with Leo

If the *picture-NP* is in object position, principle C is violated. No such violation takes place in sentence (10), which is an example of CLLD, and in example (11), an example of HT.

Let's consider now the well-known observation that in these constructions a single argument is realized by means of two phrases: a clitic – or a pronoun or epithet in the case of HT – and the left peripheral phrase. In the literature, the nature of the clitic has been extensively discussed; here I will consider mainly CLLD and extend the conclusions to HT as well.<sup>6</sup>

The relevant issue to be considered is the moved or un-moved nature of the left peripheral phrase: if it is claimed that the left peripheral phrase is moved, then the clitic should either be an instance of clitic doubling, or a resumptive pronoun, given that the “real” argument must be the phrase in the left periphery.

As for the doubling analysis, standard Italian doesn't have any doubling strategy. The clitic in fact cannot double a phrase, neither moved, nor un-moved. Consider the following example:

(14)\**Chi/a chi lo hai salutato?*

Whom/to whom him-cl (you) have greet

The *wh-* cannot be doubled, independently of case realization, i.e. both the accusative *chi* (who) and the *a*-marked/ dative phrase *a chi* (to whom), give rise to ungrammatical sentences. Analogously, a post-verbal object cannot be doubled, as in the following case:

(15)\**Lo salutano Mario*

him- cl (they) greet Mario

‘they are greeting Mario’

Hence, the hypothesis that the clitic is an instance of clitic doubling is to be excluded.

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. for instance Cinque (1990, ch. 2 and 3)

Furthermore, the clitic is not the spell-out of a moved phrase, i.e., it is not a resumptive clitic, as for instance, it does not license parasitic gaps. Consider the following example, from Cinque (1990, ch.3, ex.6):

- (16)\*Gianni, l'ho cercato per mesi, senza trovare *e*  
Gianni I have looked for him for months, without finding

Notice also the contrast with a focus reading of the left peripheral phrase, as in the following case:<sup>7</sup>

- (17) GIANNI ho cercato per mesi, senza trovare *e*  
Gianni-foc (I) have looked for months, without finding  
'I looked for Gianni for months, without finding'

The focused phrase licenses a parasitic gap, whereas CLLD does not. Therefore, Focus is compatible with a movement analysis, whereas CLLD is not.

Given that the clitic is neither resumptive, nor a double, the alternative hypothesis must be considered, namely that the clitic is the actual argument, whereas the left peripheral phrase is somehow *added* to the structure. In this sense, the left dislocated phrase is not moved, but base generated in the left peripheral position as opposed to a focus phrase.

The hypothesis developed in the literature is that in the clitic left dislocated phrase is inserted in TopP and bound to a clitic/*pro* in argument position.<sup>8</sup>

A further argument in favor of this idea, as discussed in the literature, is that CLLD is immune from weak-crossover effects, as shown by the following example:

- (18) Gianni<sub>i</sub>, suo<sub>j</sub> padre l<sub>i</sub>'ha licenziato (from Benincà and Poletto, 2004, ex.9)  
Gianni <sub>i</sub>, his<sub>j</sub> father him<sub>i</sub>-fired  
'Gianni's father fired Gianni'

Conversely, Focus shows weak-crossover effects. Consider the following example:

- (19) \*GIANNI<sub>i</sub>, suo<sub>j</sub> padre ha licenziato t<sub>i</sub>

---

<sup>7</sup> See below for a discussion about other asymmetries between Focus, CLLD and HT.

<sup>8</sup> See along this line, originally proposed by Cinque (1990), Frascarelli (2000) and Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007). For a very important analysis, from a slightly different point of view, see Samek-Lodovici (2015).

GIANNI, his father has fired  
'Gianni's father fired Gianni'

Moreover, the phrases appearing on the right of FOCUS also show wco effects. Consider the following example, where the post-focus phrase is the object of *presentare* (introduce) (from Benincà & Poletto, 2004, ex 11):

- (20) ?\*A MARIA, Giorgio<sub>i</sub>, sua<sub>i</sub> madre presenterà  
To Maria, Giorgio, his mother will introduce  
'His(G.) mother will introduce Giorgio to Maria'

This sentence is very marginal. To provide further evidence, consider also the following example:

- (21) I fiori, MARIA (non Paola), a Gianni li ha comprati  
Flowers, Maria (not Paola), to Gianni them-cl has bought

In example (20) the leftmost phrase *i fiori* (the flowers) is connected to a clitic, *li*, whereas the post-focal one, i.e. the dative *a Gianni* (to Gianni), is not. Hence, for this reason, the *a* phrase is not an instance of CLLD, and *i fiori* (the flowers) is.

Consider now the following contrast:

- (22) I FIORI (non i cioccolatini), la sua<sub>i</sub> fidanzata comprerà a Gianni<sub>i</sub>  
Flowers (non chocolate), his fiancé will buy to Gianni  
(23) ?\*I FIORI (non i cioccolatini), a Gianni<sub>i</sub>, la sua<sub>i</sub> fidanzata comprerà  
Flowers (not chocolate), to Gianni his fiancé will buy

Again, there is a clear contrast between (22) and (23) due to the presence of the pronoun. Under the reading in which the pronoun refers to Gianni, movement to the left gives rise to wco. For completeness, note that the following sentences do not contrast:<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> A reviewer points out that example (23) is indeed marginal, but to her/his ear it is better than example (20). This might have to do with a different status of a post-focal accusative with respect to a dative, since datives often seem to occur more freely than accusatives. I will not pursue this matter here. As to a characterization of a post-focal non-CLLD phrase, several hypotheses can be pursued. For instance, Benincà and Poletto (2004) propose that they are (a type of) focus projections. The issue concerning the informational import of a post-focal phrase certainly deserves further inquiry.

(24) I FIORI (non i cioccolatini), Maria comprerà a Gianni

Flowers (non chocolate), his fiancé will buy to Gianni

(25) I FIORI (non i cioccolatini), a Gianni, Maria comprerà

Flowers (not chocolate), to Gianni his fiancé will buy

Hence, if the pronoun is not there, the sentences are perfectly acceptable. Coherently with these observations, (26) patterns with (18) above:

(26) A Gianni<sub>i</sub>, I FIORI (non i cioccolatini), la sua<sub>i</sub> fidanzata gli comprerà

To Gianni<sub>i</sub>, flowers (non chocolate), his<sub>i</sub> fiancé to him-cl will buy

in this case CLLD appear on the left of Focus. Note that with respect to weak crossover, HT patterns with CLLD:

(27) Gianni<sub>i</sub>, suo<sub>i</sub> padre gli<sub>i</sub> ha fatto un regalo

Gianni, his father to him-cl has made a present

Meaning: Gianni's father made a present to Gianni

In (27) *Gianni* is a HT, and its presence does not trigger weak crossover. The generalization following from these considerations, according to Benincà and Poletto (2004), is that there is no movement on the left of focus. I endorse here this conclusion and propose that the elements on the left of Focus, from a syntactic point of view, belong to a radically different layer, i.e. they are not part of the C-layer at all.

Let's consider now some word order properties. HT must precede CLLD, as in the following example:

(28) Gianni, quel libro, glielo hanno già comprato

Gianni, that book, to him-it- (they) have already bought

*Gianni* is a HT, and *quel libro* (that book) is a CLLD; in (28) *Gianni*, the HT, precedes *quel libro* (that book), the CLLD. The reverse order is impossible, as shown by the following example:

(29)\**Quel libro*, Gianni, glielo hanno già comprato

That book, Gianni, to him-it-(they) have already bought

Hence, HT is the leftmost phrase. Moreover, HT cannot be embedded. Consider for instance the following sentences:

(30)\*Mario ha detto, *Gianni*, che non *gli* daranno il passaporto

Mario said, Gianni, that they to him-will not issue the passport

(31)\*Mario ha detto che, *Gianni*, non *gli* daranno il passaporto

Mario said that, Gianni, they to him-will not issue the passport

In example (30) the HT *Gianni* follows the main verb and precedes the complementizer, whereas in sentence (31) it follows *che* (that). Both examples are ungrammatical. On the contrary, CLLD can be embedded and follows the complementizer, as in the following examples:

(32)Mario ha detto che, *a Gianni*, *gli* daranno il passaporto

Mario said that to Gianni, they to him-will issue the passport

(33)\*Mario ha detto, *a Gianni*, che *gli* daranno il passaporto

Mario said that to Gianni, they to him-will issue the passport

The ungrammaticality of example (33) shows that CLLD cannot precede the complementizer *che* (that), hence it precedes TP.<sup>10</sup> Finally, example (34) shows that HT can be connected with an embedded clause, as shown by the fact that the clitic *gli* can be located in the subordinate clause:

(34)*Gianni*, Mario ha detto che *gli* daranno il passaporto

Gianni, Mario said that they to him-will issue the passport

Note also that HT cannot appear on the right of a Focus:

(35)\*MARIO (non Paolo), Gianni, gli darà un premio

Mario (not Paolo), Gianni, to him-cl will give a prize

‘Mario-Foc will give a prize to Gianni-HT’

CLLD precedes Focus. Cf. the following example (from Benincà and Poletto, 2004, ex.3):<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Irrelevantly, example (33) can have the interpretation according to which the *a*-phrase is an argument of *dire* (say).

<sup>11</sup> A reviewer points out that an example such as the one in (37) improves in the following context:

i. Speaker A: Quindi, il libro di poesie lo regalerete a Carlo  
Hence, the book of poems, you will give it to Carlo



- (36) Un libro di poesie, A GIANNI, lo regalerete  
 A book of poems, TO GIANNI, you will give it
- (37)\* A GIANNI, un libro di poesie, lo regalerete  
 TO GIANNI, a book of poems, you will give it  
 ‘You will give a book of poems to Gianni’

In these examples as well, A GIANNI must be interpreted contrastively: *a Gianni, non a Paolo* (to Gianni, not to Paolo). Note that for some Italian speakers (36) is grammatical. I will come back to these examples below.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, as well-known, both CLLD and HT are associated with a peculiar prosody, which can include a pause after the CLLD phrase and the HT.<sup>13</sup>

Concluding this section, the considerations above show that the C-layer is not homogeneous: part of it is moved there – FOCUS and lower items – whereas the other part – HT and CLLD – is base generated. Moreover, modulo the considerations concerning (37), both HT and CLLD precede Focus.

### 3. AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

The following question is now to be answered: How is it possible for base-generated phrases to exist at all in left-peripheral positions? As noted above, so far the data highlight a non-uniformity in

- 
- ii.      ?(?)No, A GIANNI, il libro di poesie, lo regaleremo  
           No, TO GIANNI, the book of poems, we will give it

I agree with the reviewer that the sentence improves, even if I find it is still quite marginal. The improved acceptability might be due to an *echo* effect, i.e. to the fact that speaker A already uses a CLLD and speaker B is not using it for her own informational purposes, but simply as a repetition of an already provided context. In other words, with respect to speaker B, the dislocated phrase does not have a special informational value, which is attributed to it only by speaker A.

<sup>12</sup> Actually, sentence (37) can vary its grammaticality status, according to its intonation. The issue is quite subtle and should be experimentally checked. With respect to (36), I agree with Benincà and Poletto (p.c.) that if the dislocated phrase is associated to the same intonational pattern used in (i), the sentence is ungrammatical:

- i.       Un libro di poesie, lo regalerete a Gianni  
           A book of poems, it-CL you will give to Gianni  
           ‘You will give a book of poems to Gianni’

There might be other intonational patterns, under which sentence (36) is more acceptable. I will briefly discuss this question below.

<sup>13</sup> On the nature and properties of the intonational patterns associated with topics, see Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007). In particular, they point out on p. 95 that “[*there is*] a specific and systematic correlation between discourse and intonational properties of topic constituents”. On the notion of *pauses* in phonology, see among the others, Nespor and Vogel (1986); see Dehé (2007), for a discussion of the notion of *restructuring*, which might be relevant in this case.

the C-layer, at least with respect to what was proposed by Rizzi (1997): part of the C-layer is derived by movement and part of it is not.

In a pure cartographic perspective this is not a problem. According to this approach, the relevant constraint to be met by the structure is that the left peripheral items carry a feature – [+top] or [+hanging topic], in this case – matching the feature of the heads already present in the relevant positions, i.e., TOP and HT. However, this seems largely a restatement of the facts, and does not provide a real insight into the issue, especially because this proposal says nothing about the observations that the items in the left periphery are associated to a strong intonational pattern and belong to a *discourse* level, being licensed only under appropriate discourse conditions.<sup>14</sup>

In order to provide a better insight, I am going to argue that the unmoved items on the left of Focus are not part of the C-layer. Building on a proposal by Giorgi (2014, to appear a, to appear b) on parentheticals, I argue in favor of the existence of an additional layer in the left periphery, projected by what I dub *prosody-oriented heads*. I argue here that CLLD and HT share with parentheticals the properties of occupying positions created by such heads, which nevertheless project regular phrases in the syntax.

### 3.1 A few words on parentheticals

The properties of parentheticals have drawn a lot of attention by scholars studying prosody and its interaction with syntax, and it is impossible for me to attempt here a summary of all the important insights on this issue. Hence, I will only highlight the properties relevant for the present discussion. In what follows I briefly summarize my former proposal with respect to parentheticals, and then in section 3.2 I discuss its outcomes when applied to CLLD and HT.<sup>15</sup>

Parentheticals have always been considered as more or less *external* to the structure of the host sentence. This opinion is certainly intuitively justified, given the existence of examples like the following one:

(38) Jane Austen – please take a seat! (*uttered by the speaker to somebody entering the room in that moment*) – published her masterpiece *Emma* in 1815

In example (38) the parenthetical is connected to the host exclusively by means of the extra-linguistic context, namely the circumstances under which the sentence happened to be uttered. This is not the case, however, in the following examples:

---

<sup>14</sup> Actually, there is no mention of HT in Rizzi's (1997) work, but I am extending his theory and propose that HT can be treated in a way analogous to Topic.

<sup>15</sup> For an overview of the many issues concerning parentheticals, I refer the reader to the very important collection edited by Dehé and Kavalova (2007) and references cited there.

(39) Jane Austen – as everybody knows – published her masterpiece *Emma* in 1815

(40) Jane Austen – explained the literature professor – published her masterpiece *Emma* in 1815

In examples (39) and (40) the parenthetical is connected, in ways to be specified, to the content of the host. In (39) *J.A. published her masterpiece Emma in 1815* is what everybody knows and, analogously, in (40) it represents the content of the explanation by the professor. In a way, therefore, the host – the sentence hosting the parenthetical – expresses the very content of the *knowing* and of the *explaining*.<sup>16</sup>

According to some scholars, independently of the type of parenthetical, for instance Espinal (1991) and Burton-Roberts (1999), the host and the supplement are to be represented as completely independent, for instance by means of a three-dimensional tree, where each sentence corresponds to a syntactic structure situated on a plan merely intersecting with that of the other. According to many others – for instance, Potts (2002, 2005) – the two sentences are adjoined; he hypothesizes right adjunction of parenthetical *as*-clauses to the host ones.<sup>17</sup>

I cannot enter here a full discussion of the pros and cons of these hypotheses. Let me simply point out that the idea of a three-dimensional tree could be a reasonable hypothesis for sentences like the one in (38); less so, however, for examples (39) and (40).<sup>18</sup>

I will therefore put aside the three-dimensional hypothesis and concentrate on more integrated representations.

Even the adjunction hypothesis, on the other hand, presents some shortcomings, given that in order to adopt it, one has to discard Kayne's (1994) results on antisymmetry. In Giorgi (2014), I propose a syntactic representation for parentheticals in the spirit of Kayne's hypotheses on adjunction, by introducing an intermediate head, so that asymmetric c-command obtains.<sup>19</sup>

I capitalize on the proposal by Selkirk (2005) on parentheticals, who argues that they must be associated with a *comma feature*, in order to be assigned the correct prosodic pattern, i.e. the

---

<sup>16</sup> It must be pointed out moreover, that example (38) has presumably a different prosody with respect to (39) and (40), lacking, at least to my ear, a real *comma intonation*. This point however requires further study. Note also that even a three-dimensional tree has to be linearized and that such a linearization algorithm should be made explicit. On this issue see Moltmann (1992).

<sup>17</sup> In the literature the term *supplement* identifies parentheticals together with appositive relatives.

<sup>18</sup> In (38) in fact the parenthetical is connected to the host only by virtue of the situation in which they happen to be uttered, and not because of an interpretive relation. In example (39) and (40), on the contrary, the host is understood as the argument of the parenthetical.

<sup>19</sup> Kayne's (1994) analysis of adjunction is one of the most important tenets of the cartographic approach, beginning with Cinque's (1999) proposal for adverbs, and has proved very productive from a heuristic point of view.

*comma intonation*. She proposes that the *host* sentence – i.e., the sentence the parenthetical is attached to – must be associated with such a feature as well.<sup>20</sup>

In translating Selkirk’s (2005) proposal in syntactic terms, I argue that the item enabling the assignation of the correct prosodic contour is not just a feature, but a head in syntax, projecting therefore a full phrase. Since Selkirk proposes that both the parenthetical and the host are assigned this feature, I propose that there are two constituents projected by such heads.

Hence, prosody-oriented heads, do not correspond to lexical entries in the traditional way, but to phonological features, triggering phonological operations. For this reason, the phrases they project present a mixed behavior, which is a welcome consequence of this idea: on one hand, the prosody-oriented phrases obey the structural constraints imposed on syntactic structures, but on the other, they give rise to a separate domain, i.e. largely non-permeable with respect to the other, purely syntactic, items.

Hence, the comma feature is a head, which I dub K, and projects a constituent; one head K is associated with the parenthetical and another one with the host sentence. As discussed in Giorgi (2014) the host sentence is the *complement* of K, in a structural sense, even if there is no *subordination* relation, due to the nature of the head K, which is *not* a complementizer.<sup>21</sup>

The proposed structure is therefore the following:

$$(41) [_{KP} \mathbf{K} \textit{parenthetical} [_{KP} \mathbf{K} [ \textit{host} ] ] ]$$

In previous work, I applied this hypothesis to the parentheticals introducing Free Indirect Discourse – henceforth FID – and Quotations – henceforth QU. For the sake of clarity, let me illustrate some examples here. The following one is a FID example:

(42) The new ration did not start till tomorrow and he had only four cigarettes left, *Winston thought* (adapted, Orwell, 1984, ch. 5)

FID is a narrative style, which creates the illusion in the reader of listening to the thoughts of the character in the story. Example (42) is such a case, and the relevant FID interpretation is due to the

---

<sup>20</sup> Selkirk (2005, §2): “Root sentences and supplements form a natural class, in that *they both are comma phrases*, and so [...] set off by Intonational Phrase edges from what surrounds them.” See also Dehé (2009) for a discussion.

<sup>21</sup> Parentheses are in fact syntactically independent from the rest of the clause in many interesting ways – see among the others deVries (2007). Again, it is not possible to consider these aspects here, but let me point out that in this respect they are therefore similar to CLLD and HT, which as illustrated above, are not derived by means of movement.

presence of the parenthetical *Winston thought*. According to the hypothesis I developed, example (42) has the underlying structure in (43):

(43)<sub>[KP</sub> **K** [*Winston thought* [<sub>KP</sub> **K** [<sub>CP</sub> The new ration... ] ] ] ]

The derivation in (44) takes place, permitting the host sentence to appear in a position preceding the parenthetical:

(44)<sub>[KP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> The new ration... ] **K** [*Winston thought* [<sub>KP</sub> **K** ~~The new ration...~~ ] ] ]

This derivation might be thought of as an ellipsis.<sup>22</sup> Quotations share the same properties:

(45) I will leave tomorrow, *John said*

Sentence (44) is generated as the structure in (45):

(46)<sub>[KP</sub> **K** [*John said* [<sub>KP</sub> **K** [ I will leave tomorrow ] ] ] ]

Ellipsis gives rise to the structure illustrated in (46):

(47)<sub>[KP</sub> [ I will leave tomorrow ] **K** [*John said* [<sub>KP</sub> **K** ~~I will leave tomorrow~~ ] ] ]

There are several arguments in favor of this representation, but for a full discussion I refer the reader to the articles mentioned above. Summarizing, the main advantage of this proposal concerns the possibility of treating parentheticals on a par with all the other syntactic structures – without resorting to three-dimensional trees or to linearization procedures violating the LCA – distinguishing at the same time this kind of phrases from the *normal* syntactic ones. Furthermore, a ellipsis proposal might account for a variety of orderings, beside the one derived above. For instance an analogous derivation gives rise to the sentence in (47), where ellipsis takes place both on the right and on the left of the parenthetical (see Giorgi, to appear b):

(48) Mary, *said John*, will leave tomorrow

---

<sup>22</sup> Under this hypothesis, there is no (syntactic) movement in front of a parenthetical, but deletion of phonological content, which we might hypothesize to be already represented there. See Giorgi (to appear b) for a discussion of this point.

(49)<sub>[KP</sub> **K** [*said John* <sub>[KP</sub> **K** [ Mary will leave tomorrow] ] ] ]

(50)<sub>[KP</sub> [ Mary ~~will leave tomorrow~~] **K** [*said John* <sub>[KP</sub> **K** ~~Mary~~ will leave tomorrow] ] ]

This analysis might shed light on the phenomenon of *backtracking*, so far quite poorly understood. It often happens that the speaker repeats the same string – as documented in spoken language corpora – both on the right and on the left of the parenthetical. Consider for instance the following examples, taken from the International Corpus of English (ICE) and Diachronic Corpus of Present-Day Spoken English (DCPSE) corpora respectively, where the backtracked portion appears in boldface:

(51)But a different role <,> uh because **when we get to the time of Ezra**, as with the more classical Wellhausen uh hypothesis, **when we get to the time of Ezra** we have the further narrowing of the office of priest (ICE-GB: s1b-001, #9) (from Dehé and Kavalova, 2007, 3)

(52)But **I believe that if** at this stage, and it isn't too late because it's only what six months since your brother died, **I believe that if** you can bear... (DCPSE: DL-D08, #135) (From Kavalova, 2007, p.160)

The presence of the same structure on both sides of the parenthetical, at the step preceding ellipsis, can account for this phenomenon.

This analysis can be extended also to other types of parentheticals, besides QU and FID. For instance, Giorgi (to appear a) develops a similar analysis for parenthetically used adverbs such as *probabilmente* (probably), in sentence like the following one,

(53)Gianni ha, probabilmente, ha mangiato un panino  
Gianni has, probably, eaten a sandwich

Here I want to show that this proposal can be extended to CLLD, and in a slightly different way, to HT. I suggest that the dislocated phrase is merged in the K-layer as part of the left periphery, and therefore does not belong to the C-layer, in that it is internal to a prosody-oriented head, and not a purely syntactic one.

#### 4. BACK TO CLLD AND HT

A CLLD phrase appears in the spec of a prosody-oriented head, dubbed *Disl*, as in *Dislocation*. The difference between parentheticals and CLLD is that with CLLD only one prosody-oriented head appears, whereas they are two in the case of parentheticals.

Consider for instance the following cases, already presented in section 2:

- (54) *A Gianni*, Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo  
 To Gianni Maria to him-gave a wonderful present  
 ‘Maria gave Gianni-CLLD a wonderful present’

Example (54) exhibits the structure in (55):

- (55) [<sub>KP</sub> *A Gianni* **Disl** [ <sub>CP</sub> Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo ] ]

The left dislocated phrase occupies the specifier position of a projection headed by the prosody-oriented head. It is not clear what exactly the peculiar prosody of CLLD actually is – hence, what the reading at the interface of the prosody-oriented head should be – but I endorse here the hypothesis by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007), who argue that topics in the left periphery are associated with typical patterns.<sup>23</sup>

Note that, as illustrated in example (56), CLLD can be embedded, i.e. it can appear in the left periphery of a subordinate clause on the right of the complementizer *C*. Analogously to what proposed above, the structure corresponding to example (56) is the one in (57):<sup>24</sup>

- (56) Tutti sanno che *a Gianni*, Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo  
 Everybody knows that to Gianni, Maria to him-has given a wonderful present  
 ‘Everybody knows that Maria gave Gianni-CLLD a wonderful present’

- (57) Tutti sanno [<sub>CP</sub> che [<sub>KP</sub> *A Gianni* **Disl** [Maria *gli* ha fatto un bellissimo regalo ] ] ]  
 Everybody knows that to Gianni, Maria to him-has given a wonderful present  
 ‘Everybody knows that Maria gave Gianni-CLLD a wonderful present’

Moreover, cf. section 2 above, the clitic itself can be embedded with respect to the dislocated phrase, as shown by the following example:<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> This issue requires further analysis, to better clarify the interactions between this hypothesis and prosodic realization. An experimental method should be adopted, such as the one in Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007).

<sup>24</sup> Therefore, in Rizzi’s (1997) framework, an embedded CLLD immediately follows Force.

(58) *A Gianni*, tutti sanno che Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo

To Gianni, everybody knows that Maria to him-gave a wonderful present

‘Everybody knows that Maria gave a wonderful present to Gianni-CLLD’

In this case the structure would be the one already proposed for example (55) above. Interestingly, this property is shared by HT, as already pointed out above and illustrated here by example (59):

(59) *Gianni*, tutti sanno che Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo

*Gianni*, everybody knows that Maria to him-gave a wonderful present

‘every body knows that Maria gave a wonderful present to Gianni-HT’

Recall also that HT cannot be embedded, i.e. it cannot appear in the left periphery, neither after or before the complementizer *che* (that):

(60)\*Tutti sanno, *Gianni*, che Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo

Everybody knows that, to Gianni, Maria to him-gave a wonderful present

(61)\*Tutti sanno che, *Gianni*, Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo

Everybody knows that, to Gianni, Maria to him-gave a wonderful present

Finally consider that clitic dislocated phrases can appear on the right – Clitic Right Dislocation, CLRD – as shown by the following example:

(62) Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo, *a Gianni*

Maria to him-gave a wonderful present, to Gianni

‘Maria gave Gianni-CLRD a wonderful present’

This position is not available for HT:

(63)\* Maria *gli* ha dato un bellissimo regalo, *Gianni*

Maria to him-gave a very nice present, Gianni

‘Maria gave a wonderful present to Gianni-HT’

---

<sup>25</sup> CLLD and HT are sensitive to strong islands, see Cinque (1990). I think that the analysis provided by Frascarelli (2000) with respect to these facts is compatible with the framework sketched here.



There is a minimal contrast between examples (62), with CLRD, and (63), with HT.

Let's consider now the account of CLRD, given this framework. The representation following from the hypothesis sketched above is the following:

(64)<sub>[KP</sub> Maria gli ha fatto un bellissimo regalo **Dis** <sub>[KP</sub> A Gianni **Dis** [ ~~Maria gli ha fatto un bellissimo regalo~~ ] ] ]

There is a second head *Dis* preceding the dislocated phrase, as can be detected by the prosody associated with these sentences, requiring a pause between the clause and the phrase. The clause appears in the highest spec, whereas the one on the right is deleted.<sup>26</sup>

How can we explain the contrast between CLLD and HT? I propose that the structure associated with HT is similar for some aspects to the one of CLLD, but with a main important difference. On one hand, in fact, HT occupies the Spec of a prosody-oriented head, but on the other, this head has very different properties. I'll capitalize here on an observation by Cinque (2008), who claims that discourses actually give rise to syntactic trees, following the same rules of syntactic projections holding on sentences:

(65) "Discourse fragments do not consist of just concatenations of CPs" (from Cinque 2008, 59)

Cinque (2008) develops this idea, proposing the structure in (65) for a discourse such as the one given in (66):

(66) John is no longer here. He left at noon. (Cinque 2008, ex.59)

(67)<sub>[HP</sub> CP [ **H** CP ] ]

Where H is the *discourse* head, connecting the two sentences. This representation holds for non-sentences as well. Consider for instance the following example, where the first part of the discourse is a nominal expression:

---

<sup>26</sup> On the notion of *pause* see however Döring (2007). As noted by the reviewer, there is a difference between the structure hypothesized for parentheticals and CLLD, in that a clitic left dislocated phrase occupies the spec position of *Dis*, whereas a parenthetical does. The reason for this hypothesis lies simply in considerations of simplicity, since there is no reason for suggesting a more articulated structure for CLLD. Parentheticals, on the contrary, exhibits various properties which must be accounted for by means of a more complex structure. See Giorgi (to appear b).

(68)A pink shirt? I will never wear any such thing in my life! (Cinque 2007, ex.61)

(69)<sub>[HP DP [ H CP ] ]</sub>

Cinque (2007) however does not elaborate on this idea. Here, I propose that this idea applies to HT as well, giving rise to the structure in (70):

(70)<sub>[HP Gianni [ H [Maria gli ha fatto un bellissimo regalo ] ]</sub>

Gianni, Maria to him-cl has given a wonderful present

The head H, differently from the head K, or Dis of parentheticals and CLLD, does not admit of ellipsis in the same way. In other words, ellipsis can obviously occur inside the complement or the specifier of the head H, but not *across*, in that the content of the complement would not be recoverable from the specifier of a higher head H.<sup>27</sup>

The immediate consequence of this proposal is that HT can only be the leftmost phrase in a sentence and can only be a root phenomenon. Moreover, due to the lack of ellipsis, there is no HT on the right, whereas the position on the right is available to dislocated phrases.

Note also that for me, and for other Italian speakers as well, HT can have an independent illocutionary force, with an independent prosody. In example (72) HT is associated with an interrogative prosody and in (73) with an exclamative one. These sentences can be felicitous in a context where speaker A utters (71) and speaker B answers with (72), or (73).<sup>28</sup>

(71)Speaker A: Credo che Maria abbia litigato con Gianni

I think that Maria quarreled with Gianni

(72)*Gianni?* Ma tutti sanno che Maria gli ha fatto un bellissimo regalo!

*Gianni?* But everybody knows that Maria to him-gave a very nice present

(73)*Ah, Gianni!* Per fare pace Maria gli ha fatto un bellissimo regalo

*Ah, Gianni!* To make peace Maria to him-gave a very nice present

---

<sup>27</sup> This idea requires further elaboration, which, for reasons of space cannot be provided here. Note that fragments appearing in answers are not examples of ellipsis across sentences. The ellipsis process is in fact internal to sentence (ii):

i. Who was invited at the party?

ii. John ~~was invited at the party~~

<sup>28</sup> Note however that for some Italian speakers HT is always very marginal and in general requires a strong context in order to be accepted at all.

Nothing similar happens with CLLD. For instance, given the same context, it is impossible to answer with (75) or (76):

(74)Speaker A: Credo che Maria abbia litigato con Gianni

I think that Maria quarreled with Gianni

(75)\**A Gianni?* Ma tutti sanno che Maria gli ha fatto un bellissimo regalo!

*To Gianni?* But everybody knows that Maria to him-gave a very nice present

(76)\**Ah, a Gianni!* Per fare pace Maria gli ha fatto un bellissimo regalo

*Ah, to Gianni!* To make peace Maria to him-gave a very nice present

Summarizing these observations, I argue that HT and the sentence form a discourse, which, following Cinque's suggestion, can be syntactically represented as a tree. On the other hand, CLLD is the specifier of a prosody-oriented head forming a single sentence, in which the prosody-oriented head occupies a left peripheral position. CLRD is derived from the same structure.

Let's now briefly go back to example (37), repeated here:

(77)\*A GIANNI un libro di poesie, lo regalerete

TO GIANNI a book of poems, you will give it

'You will give a book of poems to Gianni'

As I pointed out above, this sentence is acceptable for some speakers, though not for me. In the light of what I proposed above, there is a possible representation for this sentence, which might explain its status. The dislocated phrase could be in fact associated with a parenthetical prosody, which is indeed different from the normal CLLD one. This intonation is the one found in the following sentence:<sup>29</sup>

(78)Maria gli ha, a Gianni, dato un bellissimo regalo

Maria to him-cl has, to Gianni, given a wonderful present

'Maria gave a wonderful present to Gianni'

---

<sup>29</sup> For me there is indeed a sharp difference between (77) and (78). In (77) in fact the parenthetical intonation is quite unnatural to my ear, due to the fact that in general a focus preceding a parenthetical is very marginal. See the discussion in Giorgi (2014).

This position cannot be a left dislocated position, but it can be derived according to the proposal sketched above for parentheticals, in the following way:

(79)<sub>[KP</sub> **K** *a Gianni* <sub>[KP</sub> **K** [ *Maria gli ha dato un bellissimo regalo* ] ] ]

(80)<sub>[KP</sub> [ *Maria gli ha dato un bellissimo regalo* ] **K** [ *a Gianni* <sub>[KP</sub> **K** [ [~~*Maria gli ha dato un bellissimo regalo*~~] ] ] ] ]

In these cases the head hosting *a Gianni* is the head K of parentheticals, and not the head Dis. For some speakers, however, in this case, the association of the purely parenthetical intonation to CLLD might be more difficult, or impossible. The issue is open to further empirical investigation.

### Concluding remarks

I developed here the idea that CLLD and HT are embedded in phrases projected by prosody-oriented heads and that for this reason they appear to be base generated, even if, as is well-known, they are not arguments – the real argument being the clitic or resumptive phrase. HT has a looser connection with the sentence, since it forms with it a discourse and cannot be viewed as simply a portion of the sentence itself. The head relevant for HT is a discourse head H, the one relevant for CLLD is the head Dis. Both heads are prosodic in nature, having prosodic content, and no syntactic content or interpretation. Parentheticals as well show up in phrases headed by a prosody-oriented head, the head K. By hypothesis, these heads are presumably different from each other with respect to their intonational properties, but this point, though intuitive, must be experimentally addressed in further work.

This proposal on one hand explains the systematic association of these phrases with a peculiar intonation, as noted for instance by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007), on the other, it contributes to highlight some differences between HT and CLLD, in that the former cannot be embedded and cannot appear on the right. Finally, it also accounts for the fact that for some speakers CLLD can follow a focus projection, given that CLLD can also be used as a parenthetical item. Parentheticals however, as I argued elsewhere, are in general not easily preceded by a focus, hence the marginality for some speakers of example (37), repeated as (77) above.

In the light of these observations, it is possible that Rizzi's (1997) left periphery should be conceived of in a slightly different way. It is to be considered as strictly part of syntax up to the focus projection, but as part of the prosody-syntax interface as far as its leftmost portion is concerned.

## REFERENCES

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1997. Clitic left dislocation and contrastive left dislocation. In Henk van Riemsdijk & Frans Zwarts (eds.), *Materials on Left Dislocation*, 151–192. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Andrews, Avery Delano III, 1975. *Studies in the Syntax of relative and Comparative Clauses*, MIT PhD Diss. Cambridge, MA.
- Burton-Roberts, Noel, 2006. Parentheticals. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 9 (2nd edition), Amsterdam: Elsevier Science. 179-182.
- Beninca', Paola and Cecilia Poletto, 2004, Topic Focus and V2: Defining the CP Sublayers, in: L.Rizzi (Ed.) *The structure of CP and IP*, New York, Oxford University Press, 52-75.
- Cinque, Guglielmo, 1990. *types of A-bar dependencies*. LI Monograph, Cambridge MA, The MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo, 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2008, Two Types of Nonrestrictive Relative Clauses. In Olivier Bonami and Cabredo Hofherr Patricia (eds.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 7*. Paris. 99-137.
- Dehé Nicole and Yadranka Kavalova (eds.), 2007. *Parentheticals*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Dehé, Nicole, 2009. Clausal parentheticals, intonational phrasing, and prosodic theory, *Journal of Linguistics*, 45, 569 – 615.
- Döring, Sandra, 2007. Quieter, faster, lower and set off by pauses? In Dehé and Y. Kavalova, (eds.), 2007, *Parentheticals*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 285- 307.
- Espinal, Maria Teresa, 1991. The representation of disjunct constituents. *Language* 67(4), 726- 762.
- Frascarelli, Mara, 2000. *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*, Kluwer Pub.
- Frascarelli, Mara. 2004. Dislocation, Clitic Resumption and Minimality: A comparative analysis of left and right Topic constructions in Italian. In Reineke Bok-Bennema, Bart Hollebrandse, Brigitte Kampers-Mahne & Petra Sleeman (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, 98–118. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Frascarelli, Mara and Roland Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of Topics in German and Italian. In *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*, Susanne Winkler and Kerstin Schwabe (Eds), Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 87-116.
- Giorgi, Alessandra, 2014. Prosodic Signals as Syntactic Formatives in the Left Periphery in: Anna Cardinaletti, Cinque Guglielmo, Endo Yoshio, *On Peripheries: Exploring Clause Initial and Clause Final Positions*, Hituzi Syobo Publishing ,Tokyo, 161-188.
- Giorgi, Alessandra, (to appear a). Epistemic adverbs, the prosody-syntax interface and the theory of

- phases, *Proceedings of the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, NYU, 2014.
- Giorgi, Alessandra, (to appear b). Integrated parentheticals in quotations and free indirect discourse in Capone, Alessandro et Al. (eds.): *Indirect Reports and Pragmatics*, Springer.
- Kayne, Richard, 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, LI Monograph, MIT Press.
- Huddleston Rodney and Geoffrey Pullum, 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press,
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1995. Clitics and island effects. In Roumyana Izvorski & Victoria Tredinnick (eds.), *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 2, 11–30. Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania.
- Kayne, Richard, 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, LI Monograph, MIT Press
- López, Luis. 2009. *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*. (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moltmann, Friederike, 1992, On the interpretation of three-dimensional trees, in Barker Chris and David Dowty *Proceedings of SALT2, Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics*, Volume 40, 261-281.
- Nespor, Marina and Irene Vogel, (1986), *Prosodic Phonology*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Potts, Christopher, 2002. The syntax and semantics of as-parentheticals. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20(3), 623-689.
- Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The logic of conventional implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi, 1997, The fine structure of the left periphery, In L. Haegeman. (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.
- Samek-Lodovici, Vieri, 2015. *The Interaction of Focus and Givenness in Italian Clause Structure*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Selkirk, Lisa, 2005, Comments on intonational phrasing. In, Sonia Frota, Marina Vigario and Maria Joao Freitas (eds.), *Prosodies*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter. 11-58.
- Suñer, Margarita. 2006. Left dislocation with and without epithets. *Probus* 18. 127–158.
- Villalba, Xavier. 1998. Right dislocation is not right dislocation. In Olga Fullana & Francesc Roca (eds.), *Studies on the Syntax of Central Romance Language*, 227–241. Girona: Universitat de Girona.
- de Vries, Mark, 2007. Invisible constituents? In: Dehé Nicole and Yadranka Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 203-235.