THE SYNTAX AND PRAGMATICS OF DISLOCATION: A NON-TEMPLATIC APPROACH*

Dennis Ott
University of Ottawa

1.   Introduction and Background

Many (probably all) languages permit so-called *dislocation* constructions, in which a dislocated 'satellite' phrase (henceforth, Σ) appears at the outer periphery of its host clause, the latter containing a correlate (φ) that is anaphorically or cataphorically related to Σ.

In *left-dislocation* (LD) constructions, Σ precedes the host clause and is resumed by pronominal φ (a clitic, d-pronoun, or personal pronoun, depending on the language).

(1)   a.   [$_\Sigma$ Il   Premio Nobel], a chi   lo$_\phi$ daranno?
                the Prize   Nobel   to whom it   they will give
                'To whom will they give the Nobel Prize?'   (Italian)

       b.   [$_\Sigma$ Þessum   hring], honum$_\phi$ hefur Ólafur lofað   Maríu.
                this.DAT ring   him.DAT has   Olaf   promised Marí
                'Olaf promised this ring to Mari.'   (Icelandic)

Σ can be of any major category and shows connectivity into the host (Alexiadou 2006).[1]

In *right-dislocation* (RD), Σ appears at the right periphery, and the host clause contains a cataphoric definite pronoun or indefinite noun phrase.

(2)   a.   La$_\phi$ lavó   mamá, [$_\Sigma$ la   mamadera].
                it   washed.3SG mom   the milk bottle
                'Mom washed the milk bottle.'   (Spanish)

       b.   Jan heeft [$_\phi$ iets   moois]   gebouwd: [$_\Sigma$ een gouden iglo].
                Jan has   something beautiful built   a   golden igloo
                'Jan built something beautiful: a golden igloo.'   (Dutch)

Constructions such as (2a), in which the Σ is discourse-given, are standardly referred to as 'backgrounding right-dislocation' (or simply 'right-dislocation'; Zubizarreta 1998), whereas constructions of the type in (2b), in which the Σ is discourse-new, are sometimes called 'afterthought' (Ott and de Vries 2016). Like LD, RD permits Σ to be of any major category and exhibits connectivity effects.

---

[1]For reasons of space, I am setting aside in this paper so-called 'hanging topics,' which differ in crucial ways from true LD (van Riemsdijk 1997).

Most analyses of dislocation constructions adopt a *cartographic* perspective, taking Σs to occupy a dedicated position within a fixed cascade of peripheral projections (see Rizzi 1997, Cecchetto 2000, Benincà and Poletto 2004, Belletti 2005, among others). For instance, the left-peripheral Σ in (1a) is analyzed as having moved to a 'Top(ic)P(hrase),' hierarchically ordered above 'Foc(us)P(hrase),' which hosts fronted operators.

(3) $[_{TopP}$ il Premio Nobel $[_{FocP}$ a chi $[_{TP}$ lo daranno $[_{VP}$ ... $]]]]$ = (1a)

Right-dislocation constructions have likewise been argued to involve movement of the Σ to a TopP (in this case, a low instance of this projection just above VP); its right-peripheral surface position is taken to be the result of movement of all other VP-internal constituents into domains above TopP (Cecchetto 2000).

(4) $[_{TP}$ la lavó $[_{FocP}$ mamá $[_{TopP}$ la mamadera $[_{VP}$ ... $]]]]$ = (2a)

As discussed elsewhere, analyses of this ilk are fundamentally flawed, in that they fail to account for a number of significant asymmetries between Σs and moved XPs (such as *wh*-phrases and fronted foci). Alternative analyses that take Σs to be base-generated in their peripheral surface positions are likewise untenable, given their inability to account for connectivity and locality effects in dislocation (see below). Most importantly, cartographic analyses fall short of *explaining* generalizations about syntactic and interpretive properties of Σs, but rather *restate* these in terms of largely unconstrained peripheral templates without independent justification (Fanselow 2006, Ott 2015, Chomsky et al. to appear).

In this paper, I outline an alternative, non-templatic approach that avoids the problems and *ad hoc* assumptions of cartographic analyses. Building on previous work, which I briefly summarize in section 2, I assume that Σs are not part of the syntactic structure of the host clause, but rather juxtaposed elliptical expressions. In section 3, I show how this analysis of Σs paves the way for a principled explanation of their discursive/information-structural properties, invoking only general principles of question-driven discourse. It will turn out that the approach renders cartography's peripheral templates altogether obsolete.

2.   Dislocation as Ellipsis

The central challenge for analyses of LD and RD is to reconcile seemingly conflicting syntactic properties of Σs, which behave like extra-clausal elements on the one hand, yet show connectivity and locality effects reminiscent of movement dependencies on the other.

Σs precede or follow a syntactically complete host clause, i.e. they are not connected to a gap. (In V2 languages such as German, LD thus gives rise to superficial 'verb-third' orders.) They are furthermore prosodically separated from the host and always appear in an outer-peripheral position relative to fronted clause-internal operators such as *wh*-phrases or foci (Benincà and Poletto 2004):[2]

---

[2]The situation is more complicated in the case of RD, since Σs connected to a cataphoric ϕ permit interpolation into the host clause to a position closer to (but always following) ϕ; see Ott 2016 and section 3.5.

(5) a. [$_\Sigma$ Un libro di poesie], A GIANNI lo$_\phi$ regalerete.
         a book of poems   to Gianni it   you will give

   b. *A GIANNI, [$_\Sigma$ un libro di poesie], lo$_\phi$ regalerete.
         to Gianni   a book of poems   it   you will give
         'You will give a book of poems to Gianni.'   (Italian)

At the same time, other properties of Σs suggest, at first sight, that they are derivationally related to the interior of the host after all. For instance, Σs match clause-internal ϕ in morphological case (6) and are interpreted in its position for binding purposes (7).

(6) a. [$_\Sigma$ Þessum hring], honum$_\phi$ hefur Ólafur lofað   Maríu.
            this.DAT ring   him.DAT has   Olaf   promised Marí
            'Olaf promised this ring to Mari.'

   b. Ég þekki hana$_\phi$ ekkert, [$_\Sigma$ dóttur   hans].
       I   know her.ACC nothing   daughter.ACC his
       'I don't know his daughter at all.'   (Icelandic)

(7) a. [$_\Sigma$ Tin mitera tu$_i$], kathenas$_i$ tin$_\phi$ agapai.
            ACC mother his   everyone her.ACC loves
            'Everyone loves their mother.'   (Greek)

   b. *[$_\Sigma$ A   la hermana de María$_i$], ella$_i$ aún no la$_\phi$ ha visto.
           ACC the sister   of Maria   she still not her.ACC has seen
           'Maria's sister, she hasn't seen her yet.'   (Spanish)

Furthermore, Σs are subject to (some) locality constraints (Cinque 1990, Villalba 2000). For example, Σs cannot be connected to a ϕ inside a relative-clause island:

(8) *[$_\Sigma$ A Carlo], ti   parlerò   del le persone [$_{RelCl}$ che gli$_\phi$ piacciono].
         to Carlo   to you talk.1SG.FUT of the people   that to him appeal
         'I will talk to you about the people that appeal to Carlo.'   (Italian)

(9) *La noia [$_{RelCl}$ que en$_\phi$ parla a la tesi] era alemanya, [$_\Sigma$ de Kant].
     the girl   that of it talks in the thesis was German   of Kant
     'The girl that talks about Kant in the thesis was German.'   (Catalan)

The solution to this paradox, developed in Ott 2014, 2015, 2016, Ott and de Vries 2016 and adopted here, is to analyze Σs are elliptical sentence fragments. Below, S is the elliptical clause underlying Σ, and H the host clause containing ϕ.

(10) [$_S$ ~~kathenas, agapai~~ [$_\Sigma$ tin mitera tu$_i$]] [$_H$ kathenas$_i$ tin$_\phi$ agapai]
          (everyone loves)   ACC mother his   everyone her.ACC loves

(11) [$_H$ ég þekki hana$_\phi$ ekkert] [$_S$ [$_\Sigma$ ~~ég þekki~~ dóttur   hans ~~ekkert~~]
          I   know her.ACC nothing   (I know) daughter.ACC his   (nothing)

On this approach, Σs are not syntactically connected to their hosts at all, but only en-

dophorically via ellipsis in S and co-construal of Σ and ϕ. Σs are clause-external, and their peripheral ordering the result of clausal juxtaposition of S and H in discourse. Ellipsis in S is formally equivalent to deletion in short answers; 'reconstruction' effects—such as case matching (6) and binding connectivity (7)—follow from general parallelism constraints on ellipsis (Merchant 2004, Reich 2007, Weir 2014). For further details and advantages of this approach, see Ott 2014, 2015, 2016, Ott and de Vries 2016, Fernández 2016.

3. Dislocations in Discourse

The ellipsis approach to dislocation outlined in the preceding section reconciles the seemingly conflicting syntactic properties of Σs, but it leaves open how are interpreted in discourse and relative to their host clauses. In what follows, I will sketch the idea that the interpretation of Σs can be understood in terms of question-driven discourse models, which assume that rational discourse is structured by *Questions Under Discussion* (QUDs; Velleman and Beaver 2016, Beaver et al. 2017). Before showing how the interpretation of Σs can be understood in these terms, I will outline some central assumptions of this approach.

3.1 Background: Question-driven Discourse

QUDs can be explicit questions, or accommodated by the hearer on the basis of shared assumptions. Discourse moves are *relevant* if they address the current QUD, ensuring discourse coherence. Information-structural markings reflect the underlying discourse structure, thereby aid in the accommodation of implicit QUDs (Roberts 1996/2012, Büring 2003, Krifka 2007, Onea 2016). *Focus* serves to indicate the current QUD the speaker is addressing, by making salient in discourse the alternatives corresponding to its denotation. *Contrastive topics* indicate the existence of relevant questions the speaker is *not* currently addressing, i.e. represent a strategy of *deviating* from the QUD.

To illustrate, consider the following example (from Krifka 2011), where F and CT markings stand for focus and contrastive topic, respectively.

(12)   [I visited my PARENTS last week.]$_F$ [My FATHER]$_{CT}$ is FINE$_F$, but [my MOTHER]$_{CT}$ is [in a HOSPITAL]$_F$.

We can understand the information-structural properties of the components of this sequence in terms of the implicit QUDs that the speaker responds to:

(13)   Q1: What's new?
        A1: [I visited my PARENTS last week.]$_F$
            Q2: How are they?
                Q3: How is your father?
                    A3: [My FATHER]$_{CT}$ is FINE$_F$,
                Q4: How is your mother?
                    A4: …but [my MOTHER]$_{CT}$ is [in a HOSPITAL]$_F$.

The first, all-focus sentence can be understood as a response to the general question Q1. Q2 is a possible follow-up question to A1, and the speaker's subsequent CT-marking of *my father* in A3 (marked by a distinct prosody) indicates that she is addressing a *subquestion* of Q2, i.e. Q3. At the same time, the CT indicates that there are further relevant subquestions, leading to Q4, which is in turn answered by A4. The implicit questions being addressed must be accommodated by the hearer; alternatively, they could be asked explicitly.

To be relevant, answers must be *congruent* to the questions they address. Following Rooth (1992), Reich (2007) and others, but simplifying significantly, we can state this requirement in terms of matching of the denotations of the current QUD and an answer A.[3]

(14) *Question–answer Congruence* (simplified)
      A is a congruent answer to QUD iff $[\![QUD]\!] = [\![A]\!]^F$.

(15) Q: Who did Mary kiss? = {Mary kissed Peter, Mary kissed John, … }
      A: ~~She kissed~~ PETER$_F$. = {Mary kissed Peter, Mary kissed John, … }   = $[\![Q]\!]$
      A′: #~~She likes~~ PETER$_F$. = {Mary likes Peter, Mary likes John, … }   ≠ $[\![Q]\!]$

With these tools in hand, we can now address the interpretation of Σs. Recall that the ellipsis approach to dislocation outlined in section 2 assimilates Σs syntactically to short answers; the claim developed below is that they constitute answers also in pragmatic terms, albeit of different kinds depending on their linear positioning relative to their host.

3.2   Right-dislocation

Let us first consider RD. As mentioned in the introduction, right-peripheral Σs are either given and backgrounded (as in (2a)), or else focused (as in (2b)).

I propose that right-dislocated *focal* Σs ('afterthoughts') address an implicit QUD raised by ϕ. Consider the example in (2b), repeated below in the context of a question:

(16) Q: What happened?

      A: Jan heeft iets   moois   gebouwd: een gouden iglo.
          Jan has something beautiful built   a   golden igloo
          'Jan built something beautiful: a golden igloo.'   (Dutch)

The example (and cases of this kind in general) can be understood as shown in (17) below. H = A1 responds to the initial Q1. The presence of the indefinite *iets moois* 'something beautiful' raises a further (potential) question, Q2, which compositionally derives from A1 and essentially asks for specification of the indefinite's referent. This question is answered by S = A2, reduced to a short answer at the surface.[4]

---

[3]For details and more accurate renditions of the congruence requirement, see Rooth 1992, Reich 2007, Weir 2014. The simplified formulation in (14), while not entirely correct, suffices for present purposes.

[4]Note that S could be pronounced in full, incurring some perceived redundancy avoided by ellipsis. See also notes 6 and 10 below.

(17)   Q1: What happened?

        A1: [$_H$ Jan built [$_\phi$ something beautiful]]

             Q2: What did he build? $\rightarrow$ *accommodated QUD*

             A2: [$_S$ ~~he built~~ [$_\Sigma$ a golden igloo]$_F$]^5

Indefinites under negation do not raise questions in the same way; in the terminology of AnderBois 2014, they are not *inquisitive* in this context. This is why the focal Σ in (18) is distinctly odd compared to its counterpart in (16) above, despite the fact that the host clauses in both cases are truth-conditionally equivalent.

(18)   #It's not the case that Jan built something beautiful: a golden igloo.

    At first sight, *backgrounded* Σs do not fit into this schema, being deaccented and hence seemingly non-focal. Nevertheless, I propose that this type of RD can be understood in an analogous fashion: a backgrounded Σ responds, 'preemptively' as it were, to a potential question about discourse-anaphoric ϕ. This ensures its referential resolution, and hence ultimately proper Common Ground (CG) update. Consider the following example from Lambrecht 2001, in the context of husband and wife at the dinner table:

(19)   Ça n'a   pas de goût, ce poulet.
       that NEG-has not of taste this chicken
       'This chicken has no taste.'   (French)

The discursive analysis of this case is shown in (20) below. In the given context, the question *How is the chicken?* = Q1 can be considered sufficiently salient for it to be accommodated by the QUD; H = A1 then responds to this question. While this resolves Q1, there could be insecurity on the hearer's side about the reference of demonstrative *ça* 'that'; for this reason, the speaker supplements A1 with the fragment *ce poulet* 'this chicken' = A2, responding to the implicit clarification question Q2.

(20)   Q1: How is the chicken? $\rightarrow$ *accommodated QUD*

        A1: [$_H$ that$_\phi$ has no taste]

             Q2: What has no taste? $\rightarrow$ *ensures proper CG update*

             A2: [$_S$ [$_\Sigma$ this chicken]$_F$ ~~has no taste~~]

Above, I have indicated that Σ—*qua* answer to Q2—is focal. if so, why is it not prosodically marked but rather intonationally backgrounded? What is crucial is that A2 responds to a question (Q2) that is considered by the speaker to be already resolved at this point in discourse, having asserted A1. I suggest that prosodic demotion of the focal Σ in RD is used

---

^{5}While this is not crucial here, note that I am not adopting Merchant's (2004) analysis of fragments, according to which focal material must be extracted to a peripheral position prior to deletion. For reasons discussed in Weir 2014, Ott and Struckmeier in press and elsewhere, I take the approach's apparent benefits to be outweighed by its false predictions concerning the range of (im)possible fragments.

to prevent accommodation on the hearer's part of some *unresolved* QUD (the principal role of focus intonation). This is what distinguishes the backgrounding and 'afterthought' varieties of RD: while in (16) above, Σ responds to an unresolved question (= Q2 in (17)), Σ in (19) is merely used by the speaker to ensure proper CG update, triggering accommodation of a redundant clarification question (= Q2 in (20)) she herself considers resolved.[6]

Note that, on present terms, the relation between ϕ and Σ is one of discourse anaphora, since H and S are independent sentences (root clauses). The proposal above explains why the two elements are necessarily interpreted as coreferential:[7] if they were not, Σ would not constitute a relevant answer to the question engendered by the host.[8]

3.3   Left-dislocation

Having discussed right-peripheral Σs, let us now turn to LD. In general, Σs at the left periphery are contrastive topics (López 2016). Following Büring (2003), we can take this to mean that left-dislocated Σs are used to indicate that the speaker is deviating from the current QUD, leading the hearer to accommodate a *subquestion* thereof. Consider the following Spanish example (from López 2016), with two consecutive LD constructions in the context of a question.

(21)   Q: Where is the silverware?

        A: Los cuchillos, ya   los   puse   sobre la mesa. Los tenedores, los
             the knives   already them put.1SG on   the table the forks   them
             dejé en el   armario.
             left in the cupboard
             'I already put the knives on the table. I left the forks in the cupboard.'

The speaker here responds to the initial question with the fragment *los cuchillos* 'the knives,' which is not a congruent answer to the question, whose denotation is the set of propositions providing the location of the silverware. Instead of answering the QUD, the fragment thus functions as a trigger for accommodation of a subquestion, as shown below.

---

[6]Note that in this case, unlike what was noted in footnote 4 for the 'afterthought' variety of RD, S could not be fully pronounced. I believe that this has to do with the fact that Σ itself is deaccented; with full pronunciation of equally deaccented S, the overt signal would no longer establish any informational difference between the specificational Σ and the purely redundant material in S.

[7]Strictly speaking, the notion of coreference is too narrow here, since predicative categories such as APs and VPs can be dislocated.

[8]However, the speaker can employ discourse connectives to render salient questions that do not directly concern the referent of ϕ. Consider:

(i)   John built something nice, *and also* an igloo.

The connectives *and also* here indicate that Σ responds to a question such as *What else did he build?*; without their presence, such a question would not be salient enough to be accommodated by the hearer.

(22) Q1: Where is the silverware?

      A1: [$_S$ ~~I put~~ [$_\Sigma$ the knives] ~~on the table~~]

          Q2: Where are the knives?   = *subquestion of Q1*

            A2: [$_H$ I put them$_\phi$ on the table]

      A3: [$_S$ ~~I left~~ [$_\Sigma$ the forks] ~~in the cupboard~~]

          Q3: Where are the forks?   = *subquestion of Q1*

            A3: [$_H$ I left them in the cupboard]

By highlighting alternatives, a left-peripheral Σ thus indicates that there are other relevant QUDs that are not going to be addressed by the following H, i.e. each H in (22) by itself does not exhaustively answer the QUD (= Q1). This is precisely the discourse function of contrastive topics (Büring 2003).[9] Note that I am abstracting away here from procedural aspects of ellipsis resolution: the hearer can only resolve the ellipsis underlying Σ once the postcedent has been uttered, a general property of 'backward' ellipsis (cf. *I don't know what ~~she bought~~, but she bought something*).[10]

    Note that H does not necessarily need to *assert* an answer to the subquestion indicated by Σ; it can also ask a new question in turn. Recall example (1a) above, repeated below.

(23) [$_\Sigma$ Il   Premio Nobel], a chi   lo$_\phi$ daranno?
      the Prize   Nobel to whom it   they will give
    'To whom will they give the Nobel Prize?'   (Italian)

The construction in (23) could in the context of a question such as *Who received which prize?*; the fragment then indicates that there is a relevant subquestion about the Nobel Prize among others about other prizes, which the following H spells out.

3.4 The left/right asymmetry in dislocation

It is important to highlight that the approach outlined above does not merely provide an explanation for the interpretive properties of Σs in terms of their relation to explicit or

---

[9]It is noteworthy in this connection that in languages such as Italian and Spanish, LD seems to be the *only* way of realizing contrastive topics, whereas languages such as German and Dutch can freely do so by means of either LD or simple fronting to the prefield. As suggested by Wagner (2012), this difference is plausibly due to the fact that languages such as Italian are 'single-focus languages' that do not permit more than one focus per sentence (Stoyanova 2008), whereas languages such as German do. If contrastive topics are simply foci within a sequence of foci—the linearly first indicating a subquestion, the subsequent one answering it—languages of the Italian type will necessarily resort to a sequence of sentences to realize CT-marking.

[10]Note that, unlike in the case of 'afterthought' RD (see footnote 4, S could not be fully pronounced as a non-elliptical utterance in LD. This should not be taken to indicate that deletion in this case is *syntactically* obligatory; rather, overt pronunciation of S would lead to a prosodic impasse. The deleted material could not be pronounced with low-flat intonation, given that this would signal illicit anaphoric deaccenting. On the other hand, if the deleted material were pronounced with normal accentuation, this would provide a conclusive answer to the accommodated subquestion, making the subsequent host clause fully redundant and not licensed by any implicit question. Ellipsis in S in LD is thus, in effect, pragmatically obligatory.

implicit questions, but correctly predicts interpretive asymmetries between left- and right-peripheral Σs. Only left-peripheral Σs can function as contrastive topics, whereas right-peripheral ones cannot be; and only right-peripheral Σs can be foci (in the sense explicated in the above discussion), whereas left-peripheral ones cannot be.

Consider first left-peripheral Σs. To perform their function as contrastive topics, Σs must linearly precede the entire host clause (5): we cannot answer the QUD (or ask a new question, as in (23)) before triggering accommodation of the relevant subquestion to be addressed; either option would lead to an incoherent discourse, simply because answers must follow the questions they address. (24) and (25) illustrate for (5a) and (5b), respectively.

(24) Q1: Who am I going to give what?
         A1: [$_S$ ~~you will give~~ [$_\Sigma$ a book of poems] ~~to someone~~]
                Q2: Who am I going to give a book of poems?
                       Q3: [$_H$ you will give it$_\phi$ to GIANNI]

(25) Q1: Who am I going to give what?
         A1: To GIANNI   → *(incongruent) answer to Q1*
                Q2: [$_\Sigma$ a book of poems]   → *no salient subquestion*

Consequently, a right-peripheral Σ could never be contrastive: in cases such as (16) and (19) above, H already addresses the QUD, so it would be incoherent to 'retroactively' highlight a subquestion to be addressed (again for the simple reason that questions must precede their answers in discourse). Conversely, a left-peripheral Σ could never be focal: specification of ϕ cannot precede ϕ, simply because prior to utterance of H, the relevant question could not be accommodated.

Importantly, the present approach *derives* the interpretive properties of Σs and the relevant differences between LD and RD entirely from the ways in which left- and right-peripheral Σs relate to the explicit or implicit questions defining their contexts, and the discursive arrangement (preceding/following) of Σs relative to their hosts. In conjunction with the analysis of Σs as independently generated sentence fragments, this conclusion renders cartographic templates, which merely restate the relevant interpretive properties in terms of functional heads and their projections, altogether superfluous, and in fact undermines a central premise of the cartographic program as a whole, *viz.* the assumption that sentence peripheries are composed by (narrow-)syntactic means.

3.5 Locality

In addition to connectivity effects, the apparent island-sensitivity of dislocation constructions (as illustrated in (8) and (9) above) has been widely taken to support the idea that Σs derivationally originate within their host clauses and reach their peripheral positions by means of syntactic displacement. Evidently, this explanation is not available to the ellipsis-based approach to dislocation, which claims that Σs are not part of their host's syntactic structure at all, but constitute independently generated expressions.

What I would like to suggest is that apparent island-sensitivity in dislocation in fact reflects question/answer incongruence. Consider, first, LD with an island-internal ϕ:

(26) *[$_\Sigma$ A Carlo], ti   parlerò   del le persone [$_{RelCl}$ che gli$_\phi$ piacciono].
       to Carlo   to you talk.1SG.FUT of the people   that to him appeal
      'I will talk to you about the people that appeal to Carlo.'   (= (8))

What would be a relevant context for this construction to be used? Given that *a Carlo* 'to Carlo' is focus-marked, the QUD could be something like *Who will you talk to?*, as shown in (27). Σ will then trigger accommodation of a subquestion about Carlo, but the following host clause will necessarily assert an incongruent response to this question.

(27)   Q: Who will you talk to?
        A: To Carlo, ... → Will you talk to Carlo?
                        ... #I will talk to you about the people that appeal to him.

On the other hand, if the initial question is as shown in (28), so that the host clause would in fact constitute a meaningful response, the initial fragment could not be felicitously used to highlight a subquestion of this QUD.

(28)   Q: Who will you talk to me about?
        A: #To Carlo, ... → ???
                        ... I will talk to you about the people that appeal to him.

In other words, cases such as (26) are not infelicitous due to syntactic island violations, but because either host clause or Σ would necessarily incur discursive incoherence.

Next, consider illicit RD across finite clauses, as illustrated in (9), repeated below:

(29)   *La noia [$_{RelCl}$ que en$_\phi$ parla a la   tesi]   era alemanya, [$_\Sigma$ de Kant].
        the girl   that of it talks in the thesis was German   of Kant
        'The girl that talks about Kant in the thesis was German.'   (= (9))

At first sight, it is tempting to conclude that RD is constrained by the Right-roof Constraint, analogously to extraposition, and hence an instance of rightward movement.[11] However, the ellipsis-based approach furnishes an alternative explanation building on the fact that implicit questions must be sufficiently salient to be successfully accommodated and get 'replaced' by more salient questions as discourse proceeds (Onea 2016).

Consider (29), a case of backgrounding RD. The conclusion of section 3.2 was that Σs in RD are answers to (new or redundant) clarification questions about ϕ. I submit that the infelicity of cases such as (29) is not due to the Right-roof Constraint or some other constraint on movement, but rather due to the fact that the question Σ responds to is no longer salient at the point where Σ is uttered. By the time H has been asserted, the content of the relative clause has ceased to be salient, and consequently only questions about the

---

[11]Although the analysis of extraposition as movement is in fact rather problematic; see de Vries 2009, 2011.

primary content of the assertion (e.g., about the referent of *la noia* 'the girl') are salient. In order for the Σ to be licensed as a response to a question about *en* 'of it/him' (*What does she talk about in the thesis?*), it must be linearly interpolated into the host, to a position where the relevant question is salient.

(30)   a.   La noia [$_\text{RelCl}$ que en$_\phi$ parla a la tesi], [$_\Sigma$ de Kant], era alemanya.
        the girl   that of it talks in the thesis   of Kant   was German

   b.   [$_\text{H}$ the girl who talks about 'it'$_\phi$ in the thesis. . .
                                    → What does she talk about in the thesis?
                                    [$_\text{S}$ ~~she talks~~ [$_\Sigma$ about Kant] ~~in the thesis~~ . . .]

For further discussion of these kinds of *medial* dislocations, see Ott 2016, in preparation, where it is argued that linear interpolation of Σ into its host reflects not structural (syntactic) integration, but integration in production.

   The validity of the above explanation *vis-à-vis* movement-based alternatives can be established by considering cases in which Σ and ϕ are likewise separated by an island/finite-clause boundary, but the juxtaposition of Σ and H does not lead to Σ not being licensed (as argued for the case above). The prediction of the current approach, i.e. that such cases should be felicitous, appears to be borne out. Consider the following examples, which show that neither LD nor RD is blocked by the Coordinate-structure Constraint.[12]

(31)   a.   Dem   Peter, dem   und seiner Frau vertraue ich nicht.
        the.DAT Peter him.DAT and his.DAT wife trust   I   not
        'I don't trust Peter and his wife.'

   b.   Ich habe den   und seine Frau   gestern   gesehen, den Peter.
        I   have him.ACC and his   wife.ACC yesterday seen   the Peter
        'I saw Peter and his wife yesterday.'   (German)

Movement-based analyses of dislocation would falsely predict island violations, hence infelicity in these cases. By contrast, the ellipsis approach is entirely consistent with their infelicity, given that none of the problems noted above for (26) and (29) arise in (31). (31a) could be uttered in the context of a question such as *Who do you trust?*; in the manner outlined in section 3.3, Σ *dem Peter* 'Peter' then indicates that a subquestion, *Do you trust Peter?* is about to be addressed, which the following host clause coherently responds to. In (31b), the speaker uses the Σ *den Peter* 'Peter' to trigger accommodation of a redundant clarification question *Who did you see yesterday?*, which Σ responds to. Since only the first conjunct, the d-pronoun *den* 'him,' is referentially deficient, the second conjunct is disregarded for purposes of clarification.

   Cases such as those in (31) thus support the current proposal: locality effects in dislocation are pragmatic, not syntactic in nature. I hasten to add that a broader and more systematic investigation of relevant facts, as well as further elucidation of the ever-elusive

---

[12]The relevant test cases could not be constructed in languages such as Italian or Spanish, since these do not permit clitics to be coordinated; hence the resort to German in (31).

notion of salience employed in the above explanation, are necessary in order to fully establish the validity of the proposals of this section. For the moment, however, these tasks must be left to future work.

4.   Conclusions

In previous work, I have argued that Σs are independently generated elliptical expressions, discursively juxtaposed to non-elliptical clauses. In this paper, I have shown how this analysis can be wedded to question-driven discourse models in order to provide principled explanations for the interpretive properties of Σs. The juxtaposed Σ-fragment serves either to indicate that the speaker is addressing a subquestion of the QUD (*left-dislocation*), or to respond to an implicit question raised by ϕ (*right-dislocation*). While only informally and incompletely presented in this paper, this general approach *derives* both syntactic and interpretive properties of dislocation constructions from independent principles, rendering cartography's stipulative phrase-structural templates obsolete.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2006. Left-dislocation (including CLLD). In *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk. Oxford: Blackwell, 668–699.

AnderBois, Scott. 2014. The semantics of sluicing: beyond truth conditions. *Language* 90(4): 887–926. doi:10.1353/lan.2014.0110.

Beaver, David, Craige Roberts, Mandy Simons, and Judith Tonhauser. 2017. Questions Under Discussion: where information structure meets projective content. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 3: 265–284.

Belletti, Adriana. 2005. Extended doubling and the VP periphery. *Probus* 17: 1–35.

Benincà, Paola and Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, focus, and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In *The structure of CP and IP*, ed. Luigi Rizzi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 52–75.

Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 26(5): 511–545.

Cecchetto, Carlo. 2000. Doubling structures and reconstruction. *Probus* 12: 93–126.

Chomsky, Noam, Àngel J. Gallego, and Dennis Ott. to appear. Generative Grammar and the Faculty of Language: insights, questions, and challenges. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* .

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A-bar dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fanselow, Gisbert. 2006. On pure syntax (uncontaminated by information structure). In *Form, structure, and grammar*, ed. Patrick Brandt and Eric Fuß. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 137–158.

Fernández, Javier. 2016. Topics at the left edge of infinitive clauses in Spanish and Catalan. *Borealis* 5(2): 111–134.

Féry, Caroline and Shinichiro Ishihara, eds. 2016. *The Oxford handbook of information structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. In *The notions of information structure*, ed. Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow, and Manfred Krifka. Potsdam: University of Potsdam, 13–55.

Krifka, Manfred. 2011. Questions. In *Semantics*, ed. Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger, and Paul Portner, vol. 2. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1742–1758.

Lambrecht, Knud. 2001. Dislocation. In *Language typology and language universals*, ed. Martin Haspelmath et al., vol. 2. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1010–1078.

López, Luis. 2016. Dislocations. In Féry and Ishihara (2016).

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 27: 661–738.

Onea, Edgar. 2016. *Potential Questions at the semantics–pragmatics interface*. Leiden: Brill. doi:10.1163/9789004217935.

Ott, Dennis. 2014. An ellipsis approach to Contrastive Left-dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(2): 269–303.

Ott, Dennis. 2015. Connectivity in left-dislocation and the composition of the left periphery. *Linguistic Variation* 15(2): 225–290.

Ott, Dennis. 2016. Ellipsis in appositives. *Glossa* 1(1): article 34. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.37.

Ott, Dennis. in preparation. Peripheral fragments: Dislocation as deletion. Ms., University of Ottawa.

Ott, Dennis and Volker Struckmeier. in press. Particles and deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49.

Ott, Dennis and Mark de Vries. 2016. Right-dislocation as deletion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34(2): 641–690. doi:10.1007/s11049-015-9307-7.

Reich, Ingo. 2007. Toward a uniform analysis of short answers and gapping. In *On information structure, meaning and form*, ed. Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 467–484.

van Riemsdijk, Henk. 1997. Left-dislocation. In *Materials on left-dislocation*, ed. Elena Anagnostopoulou, Henk van Riemsdijk, and Frans Zwarts. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–10.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. Liliane Haegeman. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.

Roberts, Craige. 1996/2012. Information structure: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. In *Papers in semantics*, ed. Jae Hak Yoon and Andreas Kathol, vol. 49 of *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics*. Republished in *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5, 1–69.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1(1): 75–116.

Stoyanova, Marina. 2008. *Unique focus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Velleman, Leah and David Beaver. 2016. Question-based models of information structure. In Féry and Ishihara (2016).

Villalba, Xavier. 2000. *The syntax of sentence periphery*. Ph.D. thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

de Vries, Mark. 2009. Specifying coordination: An investigation into the syntax of dislocation, extraposition, and parenthesis. In *Language and linguistics: Emerging trends*, ed. Cynthia R. Dreyer. New York: Nova, 37–98.

de Vries, Mark. 2011. Extrapositie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16(3): 273–306.

Wagner, Michael. 2012. Contrastive topics decomposed. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5: 1–54.

Weir, Andrew. 2014. *Fragments and clausal ellipsis*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 1998. *Prosody, focus, and word order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.