A second thought on Emarginazione: Destressing vs. "Right Dislocation"*
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Italian exhibits both VSO and VOS word orders, with different prosodic properties. When the sentence-final element is focused (here indicated by bold), only VOS is possible, while VSO is impossible:

(1) a. *Ha comprato Gianni il giornale. *VSO has bought Gianni the newspaper
b. Ha comprato il giornale Gianni. VOS

VSO sequences may however arise in the format exemplified in (2)a, whose VOS counterpart is (2)b. What is now focused is the constituent closer to the verb, the subject and the object respectively. The sentence-final argument, which is presupposed, has a low pitch intonation contour and can be separated from the clause by an intonational break (here indicated by the comma): 1

---

* A previous version of the paper has been presented in classes at the University of Stuttgart in May 1996. Many thanks go to Adriana Belletti, Guglielmo Cinque, Maria Teresa Guasti, Riny Huijbregts, Richard Kayne, Francisco Ordóñez, Giampaolo Salvi, Christina Tortora, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta for comments on an earlier written version.

1 Interrogative sentences display the same pattern as (1) and (2):

(i) a. *Ha comprato Gianni il giornale? *VSO
b. Ha comprato il giornale Gianni? VOS
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(2) a. Ha comprato Gianni, il giornale. VSO
b. Ha comprato il giornale, Gianni. VOS

Antinucci and Cinque (1977) call the process in (2) "emarginazione". They suggest that the object in VSO and the subject in VOS is marginalized at the end of the clause, and that emarginazione differs from Right Dislocation. In the former construction, the constituent at the end of the clause is not anticipated by a pronominal copy. Compare (2) with (3):²

(3) a. Lo ha comprato Gianni, il giornale. clVS,O
   it has bought Gianni, the newspaper
b. pro ha comprato il giornale, Gianni. proVO,S
   [he] has bought the newspaper, Gianni

In this paper, I concentrate on (2). In particular, I show that in spite of the apparently similar prosodic and pragmatic properties exhibited by these two sentences, there are many differences between VSO and VOS. This suggests that emarginazione does not correspond to a uniform syntactic process, and that the two sentences in (2) instantiate different constructions. In (2)a, the object is destressed in situ; in (2)b, the subject is right-dislocated, i.e. (2)b corresponds to (3)b. (I keep the traditional term "Right Dislocation" without however implying rightward movement or base generation in a rightward position.) As will become clear below, the different analysis of VSO and VOS is exactly what is expected under the antisymmetric approach of Kayne (1994).³

c. Ha comprato Gianni, il giornale? VSO

d. Ha comprato il giornale, Gianni? VOS

² In (3)b the pronominal copy is the null category pro. Although it is not audible, its presence is assumed in analogy to (3)a, where the copy is realized by the accusative clitic pronoun lo.

³ The differences between VSO and VOS also indicate that emarginazione is not a PF phenomenon, since it is sensitive to the syntactic function of the marginalized element. For the analysis of
The paper is organized as follows. In section 1, the analysis of VSO is undertaken. I first show that (2)a is not an instance of Right Dislocation of the object, as sometimes claimed. Secondly, it is proposed that both the subject and the object are in situ. Hence, focused constituents need not move to specFocusP before Spell-Out. An aside on the distribution of the weak negative quantifier niente 'nothing' ends this section. Section 2 is devoted to the discussion of VOS. Here too, the focused constituent, i.e., the object, is taken to occur in its base position inside VP. In section 3, VOS is compared to VOS, i.e. (1)b, which is analysed in terms of leftward scrambling of the object, following work by Ordóñez (1997, 1998) on Spanish (In this paper, (1)a is not analysed). In section 4, some data concerning verb-subject agreement in a Central Italian variety will be used to corroborate the analysis. Section 5 finally discusses those constructions in which it is the subject which is destressed.

1. THE ANALYSIS OF VSO

We start with the observation that in VSO, the object is not right-dislocated. I follow the original intuition by Antinucci and Cinque (1977), according to which (2)a is structurally different from (3)a, and depart from the proposal, sometimes made, that (2)a is structurally identical to (3)a, the only difference being that an anticipatory clitic pronoun is not present or not pronounced in the former. In other words, that proposal takes the pronominal copy to be optional in Right Dislocation (whereas it is obligatory in Left Dislocation, see Cinque 1990:§2.3.5). As far as I know, however, nothing seems to independently support this conclusion, and the data rather seem to speak to the

emarginazione as a PF-movement rule, see Calabrese (1982, 1992). According to this analysis, emarginazione applies in order to guarantee the required adjacency between the focused argument and the verb, which must form an intonational group.

Notice that if (2)b is to be analysed as (3)b, I should refer to VOS as proVOS. For ease of exposition, in the rest of the paper I keep using VOS.
contrary. Consider first the contrast between (4) and (5). Quantified objects cannot be right-dislocated,\textsuperscript{4} but they can follow a focused subject in VSO:

(4) a. \* Non l'ha invitato \textbf{Gianni}, nessuno. \hspace{1cm} \*c\hspace{1cm} \textit{VS}, \textit{O} \\
    * not him has invited Gianni, anybody \\
    b. \* L'hanno incontrato \textbf{i rappresentanti}, ogni studente. \*c\hspace{1cm} \textit{VS}, \textit{O} \\
    * they have met the delegates, every student

(5) a. A: Ho sentito che Maria non ha invitato nessuno. \\
    [I] have heard that Maria not has invited anybody \\
    B: No, non ha invitato \textbf{Gianni}, nessuno. \hspace{1cm} \textit{VSO} \\
    * no, not has invited Gianni, anybody \\
    b. A: Il preside ha incontrato ogni studente. \\
    * the dean has met every student \\
    B: No, hanno incontrato \textbf{i rappresentanti}, ogni studente. \hspace{1cm} \textit{VSO} \\
    * no, have met the delegates, every student

VSO can be distinguished from Right Dislocation also on the basis of the following data: whereas in colloquial Italian a right-dislocated [+human] object (proper name or personal pronoun) can be preceded by the preposition \textit{a}, the object in VSO cannot (see Cardinaletti 1988):

(6) a. L'abbiamo invitato \textbf{noi}, a Gianni. \hspace{1cm} \text{c\hspace{1cm} \textit{VS}, \textit{a O}} \\
    * him have invited we, to Gianni \\
    b. Vi abbiamo promosso, a voi, anche se non lo meritavate. \\
    * \text{pro c\hspace{1cm} \textit{V}, \textit{a O}} \\
    [we] you have passed, to you, even if [you] not it deserved

(7) a. \* Abbiamo invitato \textbf{noi}, a Gianni. \hspace{1cm} \*\textit{VS \hspace{1cm} a O} \\

\textsuperscript{4} See Calabrese (1992:93ff). Object quantifiers cannot be left-dislocated either:

(i) \* Nessuno, Gianni non l'ha invitato. \\
    * anybody, Gianni not him has invited
b. * Ho promosso io, a voi, anche se non lo meritavate. *VS a O have passed I, to you, even if [you] not it deserved

Furthermore, whereas the order of right-dislocated arguments is free, (8), the order of the objects following the subject in VSO is the same as the unmarked order of arguments, (9) (see Zubizarreta 1998:156ff for the same contrasts in Spanish):\(^5\)

(8) a. Ce l’ha nascosto il bambino, il libro, sotto il letto. clVS,O there it has hidden the child, the book, under the bed
b. Ce l’ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, il libro. clVS,O

(9) a. Ha nascosto il bambino, il libro, sotto il letto. VSO
b.* Ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, il libro. *VSO
c. Il bambino ha nascosto il libro sotto il letto.
d. * Il bambino ha nascosto sotto il letto il libro.
   (with unmarked intonation)

As shown in (9)d, a direct object cannot follow a PP in the unmarked order. This is also true in VSO, (9)b. However, a direct object can appear after a PP if it is heavy, (10)b. Again, VSO behaves like subject-initial sentences, (10)a (thanks to Francisco Ordóñez for having drawn my attention to this case):

(10)a. Ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, [il libro che abbiamo comprato ieri]. VSO
b. Il bambino ha nascosto sotto il letto [il libro che abbiamo comprato ieri].

\(^5\) Interestingly, Calabrese (1992:97) only gives examples parallel to (9)a:

(i) a. Ha guardato Piero, le montagne, con il binocolo. VSO has looked Piero, at the mountains, with the binoculars
b. Ha messo Sandro, il libro, nel cassetto. VSO has put Sandro, the book, in the drawer
the child has hidden under the bed the book that [we] have bought yesterday

These data not only show that in VSO the object is not right-dislocated, but they also suggest the analysis of VSO. The arguments are all inside VP. The subject is in specVP (and is stressed in situ); the object occupies the complement position of the verb (and is distressed in situ) (see section 1.1 below). The structural representation of (the relevant portion of) (2)a is as in (11) (for an analysis of past participle movement to an aspectual head, see Cinque 1997):

(11)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp} \\
\text{Asp^o} \\
\text{comprato}_i \\
\text{Gianni} \\
\text{V^o} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{t_i} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{il giornale}
\end{array}
\]

That the subject is in VP is confirmed by the fact that it follows very low adverbs such as bene ‘well’: *Ha risolto bene Gianni, il problema* ‘has solved well Gianni, the problem’.

Given that the object stays inside VP, it becomes possible to understand why the sentences in (5) are grammatical. Negative quantifiers are c-commanded by the negative marker *non*, as required; universally quantified constituents occur in a position from where they can raise to the relevant LF-position to get interpreted.\(^6\)

---

\(^6\) Antinucci and Cinque (1977:145) claim that the following sentence is ungrammatical because the marginalized constituent *il formaggio* is not in the scope of the negative marker *non*:

(i) Non hanno mangiato *i bambini, il formaggio* (*ma il dolce*).

not have eaten the children, the cheese (but the cake)

If the negative marker c-commands the marginalized constituent, as is suggested here, the ungrammaticality of (i) should be due to a different reason. It is straightforward to assume that negation
As expected if the marginalized object is in its base position, (7) patterns with simple sentences where the object is not preceded by a: *Abbiamo invitato (a) Gianni, Ho promosso (a) voi.

As for (9) and (10), the order of the destressed objects is the one provided by the syntax, as shown in (9)c and (10)b, whereas there is no such constraint on the order of right-dislocated arguments. Consider a similar contrast between Right Dislocation and emarginazione, discussed in Calabrese (1982). If the direct object Mario is right-dislocated, as in (12), it can be far away from the verb convinto by which it is selected and can follow the infinitival complement of convinto. If Mario is not anticipated by a clitic pronoun, as in (13)a, the result is ungrammatical; in other words, Mario cannot be marginalized after the infinitival clause because this is not its base position. Its base position is immediately after the verb convinto, as in (13)b:

\begin{align*}
(12) & \quad \text{Che cosa l'hai convinto [a fare], Mario?} \\
(13)a. & \quad \ast \text{Che cosa hai convinto [a fare], Mario?} \\
(13)b. & \quad \text{Che cosa hai convinto Mario [a fare]?
}\end{align*}

The fact that in (2)a the subject is in specVP and the object is in complement position implies that the subject c-commands the object (see Kayne 1994:150, fn.15). This is confirmed by (14). In (14)a, the quantifier ogni binds the pronoun contained in the destressed object, and the bound reading of the pronoun is obtained. In (14)b, the subject Gianni binds the anaphor in the destressed object. In (14)c, the subject pronoun lui c-commands the R-expression Gianni contained in the destressed object, and ungrammaticality is produced. In (14)d, the anaphor propri is not bound by Gianni, which causes the ungrammaticality of the sentence. In (14)e, in spite of the fact that the

---

interacts with focus, and that only something which is focused can be contrasted. The grammatical counterpart, where the focused element is contrasted, is (ii) (Antinucci and Cinque 1977:145):

\begin{align*}
(ii) & \quad \text{Non hanno mangiato i bambini, il formaggio, ma i topi.} \\
& \quad \text{not have eaten the children the cheese, but the mice}
\end{align*}
quantifier ogni does not c-command it, the pronoun sua can have a bound reading. The quantifier can always have scope over the subject if this is focused; consider Suaj madre ha visitato ogni ragazzo ('his mother has visited every boy') (see Zubizarreta 1998:11-15 for discussion):

(14)a. Ha visitato ogni ragazzo, sua madre. VSO
has visited every boy, his mother
b. Ha visitato Gianni, i propri genitori. VSO
has visited Gianni, the his parents
c. * Ha visitato lui, la madre di Gianni. *VSO
has visited he, the mother of Gianni
d. * Hanno visitato i propri genitori, Gianni. *VSO
have visited the his parents, Gianni
e. Ha visitato sua madre, ogni ragazzo. VSO
has visited his mother, every boy

Finally consider the following sentences, which, according to Calabrese (1992:100; 102, fn.14), show that the post-verbal main subject c-commands the subject of the embedded clause. This is coherent with the analysis proposed in (11):

(15)a. Ha detto Mario, di PRO essere stato in America. VSO
has said Mario, of having been in America
b. Ha detto Mario, che pro avrebbe fatto queste cose. VSO
has said Mario, that [he] would-have done these things

1.1. **ON THE FOCUS PROPERTIES OF VSO**

I am assuming here that focused constituents can stay in their VP-internal position and need not move overtly to specFocusP (see Rizzi 1997). In the latter analysis, the derivation of e.g. (2)a should proceed as follows: the object (il giornale) is “scrambled” to some position to the left, the focused subject (Gianni) is moved overtly to
specFocusP, and the rest of the sentence (*ha comprato*) is moved to a position preceding it, presumably specTopicP: \( [\text{TopicP} \ [j \ \text{ha comprato} \ t_j] \text{k} [\text{FocusP} \ [\text{Gianni}] \ [\text{IP} \ ... \ [\text{il giornale}]_i [\text{XP} \ t_k] \ ] \ ] ] \). In sentences such as (16), this analysis would produce a configuration in which the post-verbal subject is not c-commanded by the negative marker *non*, (16)a, and by a clitic pronoun adjoined to 1\(^o\), (16)b. Ungrammaticality and grammaticality, respectively, would be expected, contrary to fact:

(16)a. Non ha parlato **nessuno**, a Gianni. VSO
not has spoken anybody, to Gianni

b. * Lo\(_j\) presenterà **la madre di Gianni**, a Maria. *VSO
him will-introduce the mother of Gianni, to Maria

Another piece of evidence for VP-internal focus is the fact that multiple foci are possible *in situ*, (17)a, while they are impossible in sentence-initial position, (17)b:

(17)a. (?\) Ha letto **Gianni le riviste** (e **Mario i libri**).
has read Gianni the magazines (and Mario the books)

b. * **Gianni le riviste** ha letto (e **Mario i libri**).

(17) can be accounted for if sentence-initial focus is movement to specFocusP, a unique position, while there is no such restriction on *in situ* focus. Notice that multiple foci make the order VSO possible in Italian (while it is ungrammatical with focus on only the object, i.e. *VSO*, cf. (1)a).\(^7\)

In VSO, the subject is necessarily an instance of contrastive focus, (18)a, and is marginal as a noncontrastive focus, i.e., as an answer to a *wh*-question, (18)b (for the discussion of the two types of focus, see Zubizarreta 1998:1-7 and the references quoted there):

\(^7\) Multiple foci give rise to the typical linked or paired focus reading also found with multiple *wh*-
The sentence in (17)a can be used as an answer to a question such as (i), in a context in which it is not clear who read what:

(i) Insomma, chi ha letto cosa?
well, who has read what?
(18)a. A: Posso guidare io durante il viaggio?
can drive I during the trip?
B: No, non mi piace come guidi: porterà Mara, la macchina.
VSO (Frascarelli 1996:80)
no, [I] not like how [you] drive: will-drive Mara, the car
b. A: Chi porterà la macchina?
who will-drive the car?
?? B: Porterà Mara, la macchina. ??VSO

Contrastive focus seems to be the most natural reading of the following sentence as well (taken from Frascarelli 1996:275), although the context is not provided:

(19) Dovrebbe avere lui la distinta. VSO
should have he the slip

The fact that in VSO the subject is not the most embedded constituent in the clause prevents that it is assigned phrasal prominence by the Nuclear Stress Rule; the only way to stress the subject in VSO is via the Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule (see Zubizarreta 1998:44-45 and the references quoted there). The presupposed object, which follows the stressed subject, is destressed, as usual.

Interestingly, if the object is right-dislocated, the subject can be an instance of noncontrastive focus, i.e., it counts as the lowest constituent in the clause (which suggests that it must have a structure parallel to (29)b below):

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

The contrast between (18)b and (20) can be seen as a further argument against analysing the object in VSO as right-dislocated.
1.2. *AN ASIDE ON NIENTE*

(5)a above contrasts with the following:

(21)    A: Maria non ha fatto niente.
        Maria not has done anything

*    B: No, non ha fatto Gianni, niente.    *VSO
        no, not has done Gianni, anything

The ungrammaticality of the Spanish counterpart of (21)B is attributed by Zubizarreta (1994:44) to the fact that negative elements such as nada ‘nothing’ may not be distressed:

(22)    * No probó Juan nada.    *VSO
        not tried Juan anything

Since nessuno in (5)a is possible, a difference should be assumed between nessuno and niente in this respect. There is however a more plausible analysis. The ungrammaticality of (21)B is due to the fact that Italian unstressed niente (and presumably Spanish nada in (22)) is a weak element (in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke 1994) which cannot remain in the base position, but must be moved outside VP before Spell-out. The overt movement of weak niente necessarily puts it in a position which precedes a post-verbal subject, (23)a vs. a’, while other negative objects are free to follow or precede the subject, (23)b,b’. 8 Weak niente can also end up to the left of

---

8 (23)b is sensibly better than (1)a. The fact that the VSO order improves in the case of negative elements can be due to the fact that here negative elements behave like multiple foci (see (17)a above). In this perspective, (23)b should be analysed as a VSO structure.
weak adverbs such as bene, (23)c, c’, while other negative objects necessarily follow bene, (23)d vs. d’:9

(23)a. * Non ha fatto nessuno niente.
    not has done anybody anything

    a’. Non ha fatto niente; nessuno t
    not has done anything anybody

b. ? Non ha fatto nessuno [nessuna cosa].
    not has done anybody any thing

b’. Non ha fatto [nessuna cosa]; nessuno t
    not has done any thing anybody

c. Non ha fatto bene niente; t
    [he] not has done well anything

9 Modified niente, a strong element in Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1994) typology, differs from weak niente (and behaves like the DP nessuna cosa in (23)b,b’,d,d’) in that it can either follow or precede the subject, (i)\(\prime\), and can only appear after bene, (i)\(\prime\) vs. (i)\(\prime\) (for similar differences in the leftward movement of French weak and strong rien, see Obenauer 1998):

(i) a. ? Non ha fatto nessuno [quasi niente].
    not has done anybody almost anything

    a’. Non ha fatto [quasi niente]; nessuno t
    not has done almost anything anybody

b. Non ha fatto bene [quasi niente].
    [he] not has done well almost anything

b’. * Non ha fatto [quasi niente]; bene t
    [he] not has done almost anything well

Notice that a sentence like (ii) can only have the interpretation in (iii)a, parallel to (23)c’, where niente is an object. Niente in (ii) cannot be a post-verbal subject, i.e., (ii) cannot mean (iii)b:

(ii) Non chiude niente bene.
    not closes anything well

(iii) a. He does not close anything well.

    b. Nothing closes well.
Anna Cardinaletti

c'. Non ha fatto niente; bene t_i t_j.
[he] not has done anything well
d. Non ha fatto bene [nessuna cosa].
[he] not has done well any thing
d*. Non ha fatto [nessuna cosa] bene t_i.
[he] not has done any thing well

Compare *niente* with the French counterpart *rien*, whose weak status is clearly manifested by the fact that it must precede the past participle, while objects follow it:

(24)a. * Je n'ai fait rien.
b. Je n'ai rien fait.
I not have anything done
c. Je n'ai fait aucune chose / J'ai fait beaucoup de choses.
I not have done any thing / I have done many things

2. THE ANALYSIS OF VOS

The analysis of (2)b is radically different from the analysis of (2)a proposed above. VOS does not show the basic word order. Whereas the object occurs in its base position inside VP, the subject does not. Since there is no post-object position for the subject (see Kayne 1994, who excludes the existence of a rightward specVP), the subject must be outside VP. The only possible analysis is that the subject is right-dislocated. This means that in (2)b the subject is anticipated by *pro*, as in (3)b. In other words, (2)b is always to be analysed as (3)b.

That in VOS, the subject is right-dislocated can be shown on the basis of the following observation. Take a VOS sentence such as (25) where the object is represented by a clause, and where an object of the embedded verb follows the matrix subject (adapted from Antinucci and Cinque 1977:142). As the contrast between (25)a
and (25)b shows, the object *la macchina* is necessarily anticipated by a clitic pronoun, which means that it is right-dislocated:

(25)a. * Quando ha detto [che potrò ritirare], Giorgio, la macchina? *VOS

b. Quando ha detto [che la potrò ritirare], Giorgio, la macchina? VOS

when [he] has said that [I (it) will-be-able [to] go-and-take, Giorgio, the car?

Notice now that the clitic pronoun is not necessary in (26):

(26) Quando potrà ritirare, Giorgio, la macchina? VSO
when will-be-able [to] go-and-take, Giorgio, the car?

I take the contrast between (25)a and (26) to mean that in the former the subject is right-dislocated (which forces *la macchina* to be right-dislocated as well), whereas in the latter both the subject and the object are distressed in situ (see section 5).

If the subject in VOS is right-dislocated, we expect that it cannot be a quantified constituent. The expectation is borne out. The sentences in (28) are parallel to (27), where the subject *nessuno* is clearly right-dislocated since it follows the right-dislocated object *Maria*:10

(27) * Non l’ha invitata, Maria, nessuno. *pro cl V,O,S
[he] not her has invited, Maria, anybody

(28)a. A: Che cosa non ha fatto nessuno?
what not has done anybody?

10 See Calabrese (1992:93ff). Subject quantifiers cannot be left-dislocated either:

(i) * Nessuno, Maria, (non) l’ha invitata.
anybody, Maria, [he] (not) her has invited

Notice that (28)b is marginally possible if the quantified subject has partitive reading.
* 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

For the structural representation of (2)b, I adopt Kayne's (1994:78) analysis of English right- dislocated subjects. Given his antisymmetric approach, right-dislocated subjects must be structurally lower than what precedes them. This is obtained by generating the right-dislocated item as the complement of a functional projection whose specifier hosts the whole clause. (29)a is Kayne's (1994:78) example (42), (29)b is the parallel representation of (2)b:

(29)a.  
[ [ he's real smart ] X° [ John]]

b.  
[ [ pro ha comprato il giornale ] X° [ Gianni ]]

Given the structure (29)b, the ungrammaticality of (27) and (28) reduces to the fact that the quantified constituents cannot be adequately interpreted: in (27) and (28)a the negative quantifier is not c-commanded by the negative marker *non*; in (28)b the quantified constituent cannot raise to the relevant specifier position to get its interpretation at LF. In both cases, a violation of Full Interpretation arises. (If, as suggested by (20), (29)b is also the representation of right-dislocated objects, (4) is excluded as a violation of Full Interpretation as well.)

Given the structure (29)b, the object does not c-command the subject. This explains why the judgments of the following sentences are the reverse of those in (14) above (notice that (30)e,e' are ungrammatical not because of the lack of c-command, but, on a par with the VOS sentences in (28), because the subject is quantified; on (30)e' also see fn. 10):

(30)a.  
* pro ha visitato **ogni j ragazzo**, sua j madre.  
[she] has visited every boy, his mother

*VOS
b. * pro hanno visitato Giannij, i proprij genitori.  *VOS
   [they] have visited Gianni, the his parents

c. pro ha visitato luij, la madre di Giannij.  VOS
   [she] has visited him, the mother of Gianni

d. pro ha visitato i proprij genitori, Giannij.  VOS
   [he] has visited the his parents, Gianni

e. * pro non ha visitato suaq madre, nessunoq.  *VOS
   [he] not has visited his mother, anybody

e'. * pro ha visitato suaq madre, ogniq ragazzo.  *VOS
   [he] has visited his mother, every boy

Sentence (30)a is ungrammatical because the quantifier does not c-command the
pronoun inside the right-dislocated subject, and no bound reading of the pronoun can
arise. Similarly, the right-dislocated subject in (30)b contains an anaphor not bound by
its antecedent. Sentences (30)c and (30)d are grammatical because the object does not c-
command the subject, and there is no violation of binding principles. In (30)d, the
anaphor propri is bound by the pre-verbal null subject. As is the case for he and John in
English (29)a, a coreference relationship is established in (30)c and (30)d between pro
and the right-dislocated subject.

Finally, notice that the object in VOS differs from the subject in VSO in that it can
be noncontrastive focus. Compare (31) with (18)b above:

(31) A: Cosa ha portato, Gianni?
    what has brought, Gianni?
   B: Ha portato il dolce, Gianni.  VOS
   [he] has brought the dessert, Gianni

In VOS, stress on the object, which is the most embedded constituent in the clause,
can be provided by the Nuclear Stress Rule (see Cinque 1993, Zubizarreta 1998:17-19
and the references quoted there), and the noncontrastive focus reading of the object can
arise. (See the end of section 1.1 for the parallel cVSO case in which the object is
right-dislocated, and the post-verbal subject ends up being the lowest constituent in the
clause, stressed via the Nuclear Stress Rule.) As for the right-dislocated subject, it gets
destressed. Whether the prosodic properties of a right-dislocated constituent are the same as those of an in situ destressed constituent (as in VSO) or not remains an open question (see Zubizarreta 1998:151-158 for some observations on Spanish).

3. VOS IS DIFFERENT FROM VOS

Let's now compare VOS with VOS, where the subject is focused. Although the linear order is the same, the different semantic and phonological properties reflect a different syntactic structure.

Whereas, as seen above, VOS is produced by the right-dislocation of the subject, VOS arises by moving ("scrambling") the presupposed object to the left past the subject, as in (32) (see Ordóñez 1997, 1998 for Spanish; for the movement of the verb to Asp°, see (11) above):

11 Since moved objects follow low adverbs such as bene, their landing site must be very low (see (23)d,d' and fn. 9 for the same effect found with the movement of negative DPs and strong nichte, respectively):

(i) a. Ha risolto bene il problema Gianni t_i. VOS
    has solved well the problem Gianni
    b. *Ha risolto il problema bene Gianni t_i. *VOS

Notice that object movement to the left is more natural with light objects. Compare (1)b with (ii) (cf. Guasti and Nespor (1996) and Zubizarreta (1998:22-23) for the discussion of heaviness effects):

(ii) a. ?Ha comprato il giornale del mattino Gianni. ?VOS
    has bought the newspaper of-the morning Gianni
As I did for VSO above, I assume that in VOS the subject is an *in situ* focus. As the following sentences show, the post-verbal subject is c-commanded by 1°-adjoined negative marker and clitic pronouns. If the focused subject were moved overtly to SpecFocusP and the rest of the clause were moved to specTopicP, the judgements of (33) should be the reverse (see section 1.1):

(33)a. Non stima Gianni **nessuno**. VOS

b. ??Ha comprato un bel mazzo di fiori gialli Gianni. ??VOS
   has bought a nice bunch of yellow flowers Gianni

No such heaviness effects are found in VSO and VOS, which confirms that in these cases the subject and the object, respectively, are *in situ* (see sections 1 and 2):

(iii)  
   a. Ha comprato **la madre di Gianni**, il giornale. VSO
      has bought the mother of Gianni, the newspaper
   
   b. Ha comprato **il ragazzo che ho visto ieri**, il giornale. VSO
      has bought the boy that [I saw yesterday, the newspaper

(iv)   
   a. Ha comprato **il libro di Gianni**, Maria. VOS
      [she] has bought the book by Gianni, Maria
   
   b. Ha comprato **il libro che è uscito ieri**, Maria. VOS
      [she] has bought the book that has appeared yesterday, Maria

---

12 This analysis has been proposed by Ordóñez (1997) and Zubizarreta (1998) for Italian VOS.
not esteems Gianni anybody

b. * Lo_{i} presenterà a Maria la madre di Gianni. *VOS
   him will-introduce to Maria the mother of Gianni

If in VOS the subject occurs in specVP, we expect that there is no restriction on quantified subjects. The sentences in (34) contrast with (28) above:

(34)a. Non ha fatto questo nessuno. VOS
   not has done this anybody
b. Ha incontrato il preside ogni studente. VOS
   has met the dean every student

The analysis in (32) implies that in VOS the object c-commands the subject, and accounts for (35). In (35)a and (35)b, the moved object c-commands and binds the pronoun contained in the subject. In (35)c, the moved object pronoun c-commands the R-expression, and there is a violation of principle C.13

13 In (35)b (adapted from Cecchetto 1997:6), the anaphoric possessive proprio has been embedded. The simple DP gives ungrammatical results:

(i) * Hanno visitato Gianni_{i} i propri_{i} genitori. *VOS
   have visited Gianni the his parents

Notice also that (35)c differs from (30)c in that the object pronoun is modified by anche. In a sentence such as (ii), the strong pronoun is necessarily focused. As shown in (iii), it is generally so: if the presence of a strong pronoun is not motivated by focalization, a clitic pronoun is used instead:

(ii) * Ha visitato lui_{i} la madre di Gianni_{i}. *VOS
   has visited him the mother of Gianni
(iii)a. La madre di Gianni_{i} ha visitato lui_{i}.
   b. La madre di Gianni_{i} lo_{i} ha visitato.

In order to avoid a sentence such as (ii), which is ungrammatical for independent reasons (because a focused DP is scrambled), in (35)c I have chosen another way of licensing a strong pronoun, namely modification by anche.
(35)a. Ha visitato ogni\textsuperscript{i} ragazzo sua\textsubscript{i} madre. VOS
has visited every boy his mother
b. Ha visitato Gianni\textsubscript{i} un collega della propria\textsubscript{i} moglie. VOS
has visited Gianni a colleague of-the his wife
c. * Ha visitato anche lui\textsubscript{i} la madre di Gianni\textsubscript{i}. *VOS
has visited also him the mother of Gianni

As (35) shows, object movement affects LF-related phenomena such as binding relations. I take this to mean that object movement takes place before Spell-Out.

As in other instances of "scrambling", in VOS reconstruction effects are found:

(36)a. Ha visitato i propri\textsubscript{i} genitori Gianni\textsubscript{i}. VOS
has visited the his parents Gianni
b. Ha visitato sua\textsubscript{i} madre ogni\textsuperscript{i} ragazzo. VOS
has visited his mother every boy

In both (36)a and (36)b, the binder is the subject. The generalization seems to be that when the binder is the subject, reconstruction effects are obtained. They can be accounted for by assuming that the c-command relationship and the binding one are established in the base position and cannot be changed by movement operations (see Ordóñez 1997:48-52, 1998 for discussion).\textsuperscript{14}

In VOS, differently from VSO, the subject can be a noncontrastive focus (compare (37) with (18)b). Being the most embedded constituent in the clause, the Nuclear Stress Rule can apply to it:

\textsuperscript{14} (36) might also be derived by scrambling the verb and the object together: \textit{Ha [visitato i propri\textsubscript{i} genitori]\textsubscript{k} Gianni\textsubscript{k}t\textsubscript{k}. Ha [visitato sua\textsubscript{i} madre]\textsubscript{k} ogni\textsubscript{i} ragazzo t\textsubscript{k}.} We will not try to decide between the two analyses for Italian. We only notice that reconstruction is needed in the parallel cases of scrambling in German, for which an analysis in terms of [V O] scrambling is unavailable:

\textit{i) Ich glaube, daß [seinem\textsubscript{i} Vater]\textsubscript{k} jeder\textsubscript{t\textsubscript{k}} die Bilder gezeigt hat} \quad \text{(Ordóñez 1997:48)}

I think that to-his father everyone the pictures shown has
4. VERB-SUBJECT AGREEMENT

The different derivation of VSO and VOS (and of VOS and VOS) is confirmed by the following data concerning verb-subject agreement.

In the Central Italian variety spoken in the area of Ancona, the verb may fail to agree in number with a post-verbal subject, (38). Agreement is instead obligatory if the subject is right-dislocated, as in (39), where the subject follows a right-dislocated object:

(38)a. Questo disegno l'ha fatto **quei bambini li**. VS
    this drawing it has done those children there
b. Ha fatto il disegno **quei bambini li**. VOS
    has done the drawing those children there

(39)a. *L'ha fatto **ieri**, il disegno, **quei bambini li**. *pro cl V adv,O,S
    [they] it has done yesterday, this drawing, those children there
b. L'hanno fatto **ieri**, il disegno, **quei bambini li**. pro cl V adv,O,S
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[they] it have done yesterday, this drawing, those children there

Whatever the reason for the lack of verb agreement with post-verbal subjects, the necessary agreement in (39) depends on the presence of pre-verbal pro (40) and on the fact that agreement is obligatory with pre-verbal subjects, (41) (see Cardinaletti 1997:§2.3):

(40) pro l'hanno fatto ieri, il disegno, quei bambini lì.

(41)a. * Quei bambini ha fatto questo disegno.

those children has done this drawing

b. Quei bambini hanno fatto questo disegno.

those children have done this drawing

With this in mind, consider the subject in VSO and VOS. The former behaves like post-verbal subjects in that agreement may fail, (42)a. The latter instead patterns with right-dislocated subjects, in that it obligatorily agrees with the verb, (42)b vs. (42)c. This supports our interpretation of VOS as a right-dislocated structure:

(42)a. ? Ha fatto i bambini, il disegno (non la maestra). VSO

has done the children, the drawing (not the teacher)

b. * Ha fatto questo disegno, i bambini. *VOS

[they] has done this drawing, the children

c. Hanno fatto questo disegno, i bambini. VOS

[they] have done this drawing, the children

The same paradigm is found in interrogative sentences:

(43)a. Ha fatto i bambini, il disegno? VSO

b. * Ha fatto questo disegno, i bambini? *VOS

c. Hanno fatto questo disegno, i bambini? VOS
5. **SUBJECT DESTRESSING**

We have seen so far that a distressed subject is necessarily right-dislocated when it follows an object. However, when it is the only post-verbal argument or when it is followed by a distressed object, nothing excludes that the subject itself be distressed *in situ*. We exemplify here with declarative (44)-(45), interrogative (46)-(47) and exclamative (48) sentences with main stress on the verb:\footnote{15 For unknown reasons, the sentences are very marginal if the constituent following the distressed subject is a predicative AP or DP (thanks to Richie Kayne for asking about predicative elements):

(i) a. ?? Potrebbe **diventare**, Gianni, malato / mio consulente / il mio avvocato. \textit{VSPred}
   could become, Gianni, sick / my adviser / the my lawyer
b. ?? Quando è **stata**, Maria, malata / (la) tua segretaria? \textit{VSPred}
   when has been, Maria, sick / (the) your secretary?

This cannot be due to the impossibility of distressing a predicative AP or DP, since the following sentences are grammatical:

(ii) a. Potrebbe diventare **Gianni**, malato / mio consulente / il mio avvocato. \textit{VSPred}

b. È stata **Maria**, malata / (la) tua segretaria? \textit{VSPred}

c. Sembra Gianni, intelligente. \textit{VSPred}
   seems Gianni, intelligent

d. Si sono sentiti **i soldati**, scoperti. \textit{VSPred}
   themselves have felt the soldiers, discovered}

(44)a. Può già **andare**, Gianni. \textit{VS}
can already go, Gianni
b. Può già **ritirare**, Gianni, la macchina. \textit{VSO}
can already go-and-take, Gianni, the car

(45) A: Non sento Chiara da molto tempo ormai ... sono un po’ preoccupato.
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[I] not hear from Chiara for a while now ... [I] am a bit worried
B: Ma dai ... vedrai che stasera telefonerà, Chiara! VS
(Frascarelli 1996:115)
n o w o r r y ... [you] will-see that tonight will-call, Chiara

(46) a. Quando è **partito**, Gianni? VS
   when has left, Gianni?
   
   b. Quando è **andato**, Gianni, in montagna? VSO
   when has gone, Gianni, to the mountains?

(47)a. È **partito**, Gianni? VS
   has left, Gianni?
   
   b. Ha **finito**, Gianni, il lavoro? VSO
   has finished, Gianni, the work?

(48)a. Che bella casa ha **comprato**, Gianni! VS
   what a nice house has bought, Gianni!
   
   b. Che bella casa ha **comprato**, Gianni, a Maria! VSO
   what a nice house has bought, Gianni, to Maria!

Since they are destressed in situ, quantified subjects are now possible, as expected:

(49)a. Può già **andare**, ogni ragazzo. VS
   can already go, every boy
   
   b. Può già **ritirare**, ogni ragazzo, la (sua) macchina. VSO
   can already go-and-take, every boy, the (his) car

(50)a. Quando è **partito**, ogni ragazzo? VS
   when has left, every boy?
   
   b. Quando è **andato**, ogni ragazzo, in montagna? VSO
   when has gone, every boy, to the mountains
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(51)a. È **partito**, ogni ragazzo?  
 has left, every boy?  

b. Ha **finito**, ogni ragazzo, il lavoro?  
 has finished, every boy, the work?

(52)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!

Binding facts corroborate the above hypothesis. The data in (53) are parallel to (14) above (notice that (53)e differs from (14)e because the subject is not focused in the former; compare (53)e with *Suai madre ha già visitato ogni ragazzo 'his mother has already visited every boy’):

(53)a. Ha già **visitato**, ogni ragazzo, sua madre.  

b. Ha già **visitato**, Giannì, i propri genitori.  

c. * Ha già **visitato**, lui, la madre di Giannì.  

*VSO

d. * Hanno già **visitato**, i propri genitori, Giannì.  

*VSO

e. * Ha già **visitato**, sua madre, ogni ragazzo.  

*VSO

Finally in Anconetano, VS(O) subjects pattern with post-verbal subjects in optionally triggering agreement, as expected (see Cardinaletti 1997:$2.3$):

(54)a. Ha già **mangiato**, i bambini?  
 has already eaten, the children?

b. Ha già **finito**, i bambini, i compiti?  
 has already finished, the children, the homeworks?

(55)a. Cosa ha **fatto**, i bambini?  
 what has done, the children?
CONCLUSION

On the basis of the distribution of quantified constituents, of binding phenomena, and of agreement patterns, I have shown that the so-called *emarginazione* construction corresponds to two different structures depending on the syntactic function of the marginalized constituent. In VSO, the object is distressed in its base position; in VOS, the subject is “right-dislocated” (i.e. base-generated in a position structurally lower than the clause, see (29)b). This is exactly what is expected under the antisymmetric approach of Kayne (1994), where there is no post-object position for the subject (i.e., no rightward specVP). The analysis is confirmed by the semantic and prosodic properties of the two constructions: In VSO the subject is contrastively focused, and is assigned stress by the Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule; in VOS the object can be noncontrastively focused, and is assigned stress by the Nuclear Stress Rule. Nothing, of course, prevents the subject from being distressed. Section 5 has shown that this is the case in sentences where the verb is focused.

The distinction between destressing and Right Dislocation has an important implication. It supports the proposal that post-verbal focused constituents occur in their base-position inside VP. An alternative proposal, which involves a rightward focus position above VP to which focused elements are moved (see Samek-Lodovici 1994, Belletti and Shlonsky 1995), would be forced to analyse all material following the focused constituent as right-dislocated, thus failing to capture the asymmetries pointed out above.
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