

# 神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

## Right-dislocation in an SOV language

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 神戸市外国語大学外国学研究所 公開日: 2007-03-26 キーワード: 作成者: Campana, Mark メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/1166">https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/1166</a>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 International License.



# **"Right-dislocation in an SOV language"\***

**Mark Campana,**

**Kobe City University of Foreign Studies**

**Summary:** This paper looks at Right-dislocation in SOV languages, where verbs and functional category suffixes are canonically located in clause final position. Unlike the case in SVO languages, such ancillary information adds a 'cost' to lookahead processing, and is typically associated with intonation shifts and pragmatic interpretation. In Khakas, Turkish, Japanese and Korean, various discourse-functions are seen to follow from this phenomenon.

## **1. Preliminaries**

All languages have strategies for managing information. Some are universal (or nearly so), while others are specific to one language group or another. Focusing represents one kind of management strategy, whereby constituents are preposed in some languages, or moved to a designated focus position in another. Discourse markers can also help to determine the relative importance of syntactic elements; prosodic features facilitate such information too. In this paper, we consider one type of construction called "backing", whereby constituents are moved to the end of the sentence/utterance. The language is Khakas, a member of the Turkic group (South Siberian) spoken in the area of Abakan (Russian Federation). The data are taken from Borgoyakova, Topoyev & Knapp (2002), who offer a rough functionalist account. Our purpose is to understand these facts and observations as interface phenomena between syntax and pragmatics.

---

\* This project has benefited from helpful discussion with several members of the linguistics department at the University of Padova: Alessio Muro, Federico Damonte, Andrea Padovan among them. Dr. Prof. Paula Beninca allowed my stay at UP to be both stimulating and relaxing, perfect conditions for a sabbatical. I am especially indebted to Norio Nasu for providing useful Japanese data, likewise Isser Selchuk for Turkish. John Whitman delivered timely assistance when I needed it most. Thanks to all the members of the audience in Palazzo Muldura, as well as those attending the third workshop on Altaic formal linguistics (WAFL) at Moscow State University.

Backing is the positioning of phrasal material on the right periphery of the clause, very much like Right Dislocation: *There goes **the guy** who scratched my car, **the little weasel***. As in RD, the dislocated element is often associated with an NP or pronoun within the clause. This has led to various syntactic accounts. There are cases, however, when the connection between the backed element and the main clause cannot be cast in terms of movement: *It looks like Bonds is set to break Hank Aaron's record--not that he deserves the same recognition or anything*. Here the speaker is offering a comment on the proposition of the first clause. Such expressions are sometimes regarded as 'afterthoughts' having little to do with core syntax. Our claim, however, is that they can facilitate the acquisition of syntactic structures, hence must be part of an integrated system.

The key to understanding backing (we argue) is to see it first for what it is not, a strictly rule-governed syntactic process. This is not to say that core principles cannot be observed, or that they do not manipulate the 'space' within which other functors operate. Not surprisingly, backing has a lot to do with talk-in-interaction, where planning and context also contribute to interpretation. No-one really knows what goes on in the mind of the speaker (except possibly the speaker), but for one reason or another s/he associates a meaning with the utterance whenever an element is backed. Of course, much depends on what is meant by 'meaning': here we refer to (conversational) implicature (Grice, originally).

One of the most salient properties of backing is the sound. Unlike left-dislocations, Right-dislocation and nearly all forms of backing are characterized by a marked lowering of voice intensity, as well as critical breaks or pauses (boldface): *That girl, she's going to leave you* vs. *She's going to leave you, **that girl***. As such (we claim), it sends a clear message to the listener to take note: 'There is a reason for this deviation from normal sentence intonation, and you may now begin your search for its intended meaning.' This is the Gricean way, applied to sound. At the same time, the vocal downshift draws attention to the rightmost edge of S, and to the cluster of morphosyntactic features that make up the categories IP/CP. In Khakas and Japanese, these are directly adjacent to the verbal complex. Especially for language learners then, the sound of backing provides a key insight into sentence-structure.

## 2. Backing in Khakas

The data in this section are taken from Borgoyakova, Topoyev, & Knapp (2002), who comment on a narrative originally recorded by the Russian linguist N.F. Katanov one hundred years earlier. At that time, Khakas was not a written language. Nominally SOV, it apparently displayed a fair amount of mixed orders in the period of the recording. We surmise that other SOV languages displayed similar properties, including Turkish, Korean and Japanese. It is thus particularly interesting to examine processes that position constituents post-verbally (or post-IP/CP). To what extent are they tolerated, given otherwise stable head-final tendencies?

BT&K offer various suggestions as to the role of backing structures in a narrative text. What they call 'refocus', 'defocus', ellipsis and 'afterthought' therefore refer to discourse, rather than to grammatical functions. Here we take them at their word, and assume that contextually derived meaning is regularly applied to structures in which backed elements occur. In other words, backed elements adhere to their host clause 'for a reason', but not necessarily for the purpose of eliminating an abstract feature, as might be assumed in the Minimalist Program.<sup>1</sup>

The first kind of backing identified by BT&K is assigned the function defocus. The authors claim the speaker uses it in order to defocus, or draw attention away from information that might otherwise be construed as important to the listener. In (1), the speaker has probably introduced a term he thinks the listener doesn't (need to) know about; the defocusing constituent is a more general term, easier to process so that attention can be focused on the action of tying instead.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The original sentences and their glosses appear in Cyrillic. They have been carefully romanized into what looks like Turkish (Line 1), and again into a version of I.P.A. that is appropriate for Turkic languages (Line 2). Special thanks to Alessio Muro. Lines have been skewed to allow for alignment of word & morpheme glosses; successive lines are indented.

<sup>2</sup> The following abbreviations are used by the authors: ABL=ablative; ACC=accusative; CND=conditional; COM=comitative; DAT=dative; DIM=diminutive; DIR=directive; EQ=equative; GCNJ=gerund/conjunctive; GEN=genitive; GMNR=gerund/manner; GNEG=gerund/negative; GSQ=gerund/sequential; HAB=habitual; IMP2P=imperative; IMPF.PRT=imperfect particle; LOC-locative; NEG=negative; PF=perfect; PL=plural; PF.PRT=perfect participle, etc.

(1) Defocused NP ('taby'=a kind of paper; one 'arsin'=70cm)

- 1 *Paza xaziŋ pazina palyir pır kizek arsinja taabı, paza pır kizek xolis* (#17)
- 2 paza xaziŋ baz-i-ga palya-ar pır kizek arsin-ja taabı paza pır kizek xolis
- 3 and birch head-3Ps-DAT tie-IMPF.PRT one pc. arsin-EQ taby and one pc. canvas
- 4 To the top of another birch they'll tie a piece of taby an arsin long, **a piece of canvas**

(2) Defocused adverbial

- 1 *Annaŋ pasxa parylir çon: olyan-uzax, uluy-kıçig toozazi pörükterine idök kiççek çalama palyap alçadirlar, uzuni tört-iligje.* (#21)
- 2 annaŋ basxa parçla-ar çon olyan-uzax uluy-kıçig tooza-i pörük-lar-i-ga
- 3 then another many.go-IMPF.PTC people child-grandchild big-small all-3S hat-PL-3s-DAT
- idök kiçig-ek çalama palya-p a-lçadır-lar uzun-i tört-ilig-je
- so small-DIM shaman's.band tie-PF PR.INFR-3p long-3s four-finger-EQ
- 4 The other people that will go with him--children & grandchildren, large & small (all of them) will also tie 'small shaman's bands' to their hats--**about four finger-widths long.**

In (2) above, the speaker may have perceived some incomprehension on the part of the listener ("How small is small?"), hence he quantifies the adverb in order to resolve the issue. Similarly in (3), a defocusing function would follow from an anticipated question like "Which side?".

(3) Defocused adverbial

- 1 *Alastap alıp, payaayı xaziŋniŋ salaazina palyap südın stol xırına turıysçalar, üstü sarınaŋ.* (#35)
- 2 alasta-p alıp payayı xaziŋ-niŋ salaa-i-ga palya-p süt-in-i
- 3 fumigate-PF.GCNJ that birch-GEN branch-3S-DAT tie-GCNJ milk-3S-ACC
- turıys-ça-lar stol xırı-i-ya üstü sarı-i-daŋ
- table.side-3S-DAT stand-PR-3P top side-3SS-ABL
- 4 Having fumigated them, they tie them to the branches of that birch (sic), and put the milk to the side of the table **on the south side.**

Every language allows for afterthoughts. In Khakas, these consist of verbal (mainly gerundival) material that would otherwise be found within the main clause. Nevertheless, the information that afterthoughts convey surfaces again later in the narrative. Although the authors do not say so, they hint that the speaker is aware of their importance, and hence it is included at this point. On hearing (4), the listener must be wondering (subconsciously, of course) why the speaker mentions this particular action now; the natural inclination would be to cooperate in storing it for retrieval later in the discourse.

(4) Afterthought (VP)

1 *Arayanī pīr kīzī, ayaχχa uryan arayanī, χaziηzari nanīpčadīr,*  
*tos samnaχpīnaη suzīp alīp.* (#41)

2 arax-i-nī pīr kīzī ayaχ-ga ur-gan araya-nī χaziη-zar-i

3 wine-ACC one man bowl-DAT pour-PF.PTC wine-ACC birch-DIR-3S

nani-čadīr tos samnaχ-i-naη suzīp alīp

give.drink.offering-PR birch.bark spoon-3S-COM scoop-PF-GCNI

4 One man sprinkles wine from the wine poured into the bowl as a drink-offering toward the birch, **scooping it with the birch-bark spoon.**

In (5), the speaker adds an intensifier to the utterance, although it could have been included in the proposition itself. This might represent a self-perceived error of omission, or it could signal an important detail that underlies his beliefs.

(5) Afterthought (VP)

1 *Soolarīnaη pasχa ulus parča, χosti-χosti pazīp.* (#48)

2 soo-lar-i-daη basχa ulus par-ča χosti-χosti basīp

3 end-PL-3S-ABL another people go-PR nearby-nearby step-GCNI

4 After them, the other people go together, **very very closely.**

A third type of backing in Khakas is called "ellipsis", which involves a dislocated element that shares information with another constituent in the discourse.<sup>3</sup> According

<sup>3</sup> This usage of the term is only obliquely related to the technical one shared by formal linguists.

to the authors, the narrator does this to "avoid wordiness" in bringing a specific topic to its conclusion. One wonders how this concept could be translated into a semantic operator on par with e.g. [wh]; for this and other reasons, we assume that backing and its signature sound are keyed to context, i.e. their meaning is derived pragmatically.

(6) Elided SV

- 1 *Ol ayaxxa pizilax toyirapçadirlar, anaη araya uribisçalar, pii südin.* (#38)
- 2 ol ayax-ga pizilax toyira-çadır-lar anaη araya ur-ibis-ça-lar pii süt-î-nî
- 3 DEM bowl-DAT curd.cheese cut.up-PR-3PL then wine pour-PF-PR-3PL mare milk-3S-ACC
- 4 They cut the curd cheese into bowls, pour the wine and (they pour) **mare's milk**.

The antecedent of the backed element in (6) does not appear in the same sentence. Still, the narrator appends it here so that the listener will not confuse wine with mare's milk (since both are pourable). As before, the speaker seems to be aware of the listener's plight, and uses backing as a means of repair.

(7) Elided VO (#51; DO='drink offering')

- 1 *Annaηarnî alyaan kizî, ayayîn tutxan kizî izibökçedirler, nanaan kizî izibökçe, anaη toozalarî.* (#51)
- 2 an-naη-lar-nî alya-gan kizî ayax-î-nî tut-gan kizî
- 3 3SP-ABL-PL-ACC bless-PF.PTC man bowl-3S-ACC hold-PF.PTC man izî-ba-oχ-çadır-lar nanî-gan kizî izî-ba-oχ-ça anaη tooza-lar-î heat-NEG-also-PR-3PL give (DO)-PF.PTC man heat-NEG-also-PR then all-PL-3S
- 4 The sacrificer gives a drink to the ones following him; the man holding the bowl will drink, then the man giving the drink-offerings will drink, **then the others (will drink)**.

The backed constituent in (7) has a sentence-internal antecedent whose repetition would be mysterious if not for the presence of a universal quantifier, which in utterance-final position facilitates the summing up of the drinking topic. The same effect can be observed in (8) below, where the backed element is stacked with similar items,

'together', 'too'.

(8) Elided SV-V

- 1 *Xazandayī itternī pray stolʹya sīyarčadirlar, tos ayaxxa pazoχ toʻyirapčadirlar, pizīlayin xadoχ. (#60)*
- 2 xazan-dayī it-lar-nī pray stol-ga sīyar-čadīr-lar tos
- 3 cauldron located.in meat-PL-ACC every table-DAT get.out-PR-3PL birch.bark  
ayax-ga pazoχ toʻyira-čadīr-lar pizīlaχ-ī-nī xada-oχ  
bowl-DAT again cut.up-PR-3PL curd.cheese-3PL-ACC together.with-also
- 4 They take out all the meat-pieces from the cauldron onto the table, and chop it again into the bark bowl (they take out/chop) **together with the curd-cheese too**

The remaining cases of backing are grouped into a category called refocus. This term does not refer to new information as in the technical usage of focus; rather, refocused elements convey old and/or backgrounded information reminiscent of topics. Their function is thus fairly straightforward: to reestablish a topic that has been obscured by intervening material, or "to give it more weight."

(9) Refocused PP

- 1 *Xazīḡnī pazoχ üs xati ibīrčeler, pazoχ, payaayoχ čili, nanīpčalar xazīḡzar. #(58)*
- 2 xazīḡ-nī pazoχ üs xati ibīr-ča-lar pazoχ payayī-oχ čili
- 3 birch-ACC again three times go.around-PR-3PL again that-also like  
nanī-ča-lar xazīḡ-zar  
give (DO)-PR-3PL birch-DIR
- 4 Again, they go around the birch three times, and again--as before--they sprinkle drink-offerings **toward the birch.**

The backed constituent in (9) is also a repetition, but a different PP indicates that the birch is still the topic. Control of topic is essential in narration, and here the speaker seems to be aware of it; by lowering his voice, he signals this awareness to the listener. (10) shows yet another universal quantifier in utterance-final position. Rather than summing up (or perhaps in addition to it), this redirects attention to the whole ceremony, of which the listener--through the narration itself--has become a part. Such are the interactional effects of backing structures classified as refocusing.

(10) Refocused quantifier

- 1 *Nanarda, payaayī xurayannarniñ teerizīn ääzi poziniñ xurayaniniñ teerizīn alčadır, pastap pīrni, anañ pasxazīn alyaan kīzee pīrčedir pray.* (#73)
- 2 nan-ar-da payayī xurayan-lar-niñ teerī-i-nī ää-i pos-i-niñ
- 3 go.home-IMPf.PTC-LOC that lamb-PL-GEN skin-3S-ACC master-3S 3S-GEN  
 xurayan-i-niñ teerī-i-nī al-čadır pastap pīr-nī anañ basxa-i-niñ  
 lamb-3S-GEN skin-3S-ACC take-PR at.first at.first-ACC then another-3S-ACC  
 alya-gan kīzi-ga pīr-čadır pray  
 bless-PF.PTC man-DAT give-PR every
- 4 Going home, the owner of the lambs takes his own lamb's skin and then gives the sacrificer first one, **(then) all the others.**

While there is no voice recording of the narrative, BT&K note that intonation plays a crucial role in backing structures.<sup>4</sup> As such--and because of the diverse functional meanings that follow from them--a pragmatic approach seems well-suited to their explanation. Still, syntactic permutations have led other researchers to consider a strictly formal account. Some of their observations are discussed below.

**3. The syntax of backing**

In sound and form, backing resembles Right-dislocation, which has a long history of syntactic analysis (Ross 1967; Kuno 1978; Kayne 1993; in Whitman 2000). Typical cases involve an NP appended to the right periphery of a clause co-indexed with a pronoun inside: *He's the first one I've given an "A" to, **that student.*** The question is, what is the relationship between these two elements? If it were subject to Island Conditions, movement might be implicated. In English (11) this appears not to be the case, while in Korean complex NPs--but not complement clauses--are ruled out.

(11) Island Conditions/English (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005)

I don't know [<sub>NP</sub> any young linguists who have read it in its entirety], *LSLT*

---

<sup>4</sup> Comrie (1981) also observes that post-verbal material in SOV languages is distinguished by special intonation patterns.

(12) Island Conditions/Korean (Choe 1987; in Whitman 2000)

- a. Chelswu-nun [Phikaso-ka  $\phi$  kuli-ess-ta-ko] chwuchukha-ess-ta, [i kulim-ul]  
 C.-TOP P.-NOM paint-PAST-IND-C conjecture-PAST-IND this picture-ACC  
 'Chelswu conjectured that Picasso painted it, **this picture**. [complement clause]
- b. ??Chelswu-ka [[ $\phi$  maul-ey nathana-ss-ta-nun] somun-ul] tul-ess-ta, [horangi-ka]  
 C-NOM village-in appear-PAST-IND-C rumor-ACC hear-PAST-IND tiger-NOM  
 '(\*)Chelswu hear a rumor that it appeared in the village, **a tiger**' [Complex NP]

These data lead to different conclusions, but might be explained via obvious typological differences between the languages. Kural (1997) shows that RDCs in Turkish (closer to Khakas) are also subject to Island Conditions, but Issever (pc) provides contradictory evidence:

(13) Island Conditions in Turkish (operative)

- a. \*pro [Op<sub>i</sub> [Ahmet'in t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>i</sub> verdigi] kitab]-<sub>i</sub> sevdim Ayse'ye<sub>i</sub>  
 Ahmet-GEN give-PAST-3SG book-ACC like-PAST-3SG A.-DAT  
 'I liked the book that Ahmet gave to Ayse' [CNP/RC]
- b. \*pro [[Ahmet t<sub>i</sub> yedigi] icin] sana kızdım pastay<sub>i</sub>  
 Ahmet-NOM eat-PAST-3SG for you-DAT anger-PAST-1SG cake-ACC  
 'I got angry with you because Ahmet ate the cake' [CED]

(14) Island Conditions in Turkish (non-operative)

- a. Ahmet [ t<sub>i</sub> kitab-i]-ni aldı- $\phi$  Ayse-nin<sub>i</sub>.  
 A.-NOM book-POSS-ACC take-PST-3sg A.-GEN  
 'Lit: Ahmet has borrowed Ayse's book.' [CNP/possessor]
- b. Ahmet [Ayse-nin t<sub>i</sub>] aldı- $\phi$  kitab-ı-nı<sub>i</sub>.  
 A.-NOM A.-GEN take-PST-3sg book-POSS-ACC  
 'Lit: Ahmet has borrowed Ayse's book.' [CNP/possessee]

Again the judgments are conflicted, this time in the same language. Although they could be explained on the basis of different constructions, the context and/or way in which they were uttered could also play a role. Note how the English gloss of (12b) improves with 'that tiger'; this suggests that pragmatic factors such as deixis and intonation contribute to well-formedness.

What is the position in which backed elements appear? According to Kural, the simplest answer would be 'right-adjoined to CP'. This accounts for the wide scope that right-dislocated quantifiers have over others inside the clause:

(15) Wide scope of backed QP (Kural 1997, 18)

- a. Herkes      dun      aramis      [**uc kisi**]yi  
 everyone-NOM yesterday call-PAST-3S three person-ACC  
 (3y, for all x [x called y yesterday]; \*For all x, 3y [x called y yesterday])
- b. [**Uc kisi**]yi      dun      aramis      **herkes**  
 three person-ACC yesterday call-PAST-3S everyone-NOM  
 (For all x, 3y [x called y yesterday]; \*3y, for all x [x called y yesterday])  
 BOTH: both: 'Everyone called three people yesterday'

In addition, the CP-adjunction analysis can easily accommodate instances of multiple RD in Turkish and Japanese:

(16) Multiple backing in Turkish (Issever, pc)

- a.  $t_i t_j$  yaz-di- $\phi$       **Ali**<sub>i</sub>      **mektup**<sub>j</sub>.  
 write- PST.3sg A.-NOM letter  
 'Ali wrote a letter.'      [subject, (bare) object]
- b. Ahmet- $\phi$   $t_i t_j t_k$  oku-du- $\phi$       **Ayse'**<sub>k</sub> **kitab-i**<sub>i</sub>      **dun**<sub>k</sub>.  
 A.-NOM      read-PST-3sg A-DAT      book-ACC yesterday  
 'Yesterday Ahmet read the book to Ayse.'      [subject, object, adverb]

(17) Multiple backing in Japanese (Nasu, pc)

- a. Taroo-ga[  $e_i$  ][  $e_j$  ] ronbun-o kaki-hazime-tayo,      **kinoo**<sub>i</sub>      **ie-de**<sub>j</sub> (ne)  
 Taro-NOM paper-ACC to.write-begin-PAST PRT yesterday home-at (PRT)  
 'Taro began to write a paper, and he did so yesterday, at home (by the way)'
- b. [  $e_i$  ][  $e_j$  ] yattokaki-hazime-ta      yo, **Taroo-ga**<sub>i</sub>, **sono ronbun-o**<sub>j</sub>.  
 finally to.write-begin-Past PRT      Taro-Nom that paper-Acc  
 'He<sub>i</sub> finally began to write it<sub>j</sub>, (did) Taro<sub>i</sub>, that paper<sub>j</sub>'
- c. [  $e_i$  ][  $e_j$  ] itte-ta yo, **Taroo-ga**<sub>i</sub>, [**Hanako-ga wau**      **tte**]<sub>j</sub>.  
 say-PAST PRT      Taro-Nom H.-NOM to.be.blamed Comp  
 'He said, (did) Taro, that Hanako was to be blamed'

Nevertheless, syntactic adjunction to CP happens for a reason, e.g. to check off an uninterpretable (and universal) feature. As we saw in Section two, however, the types of meaning applied to backing structures in Khakas are highly irregular and context-dependent. Moreover, there are theoretical problems with (right) adjunction, especially in light of the Linear Correspondence Axiom (Kayne 1994).<sup>5</sup> Cann, Kempson & Otsuka (2002) even deny that WS is a necessary feature of Right-dislocated QPs, in marked contrast to Kural's observations:

(18) The narrow scope of Right-dislocated QPs

Her hoca      govrevlendir-mis      **bir**    **asistan-i**  
 every student    give.duties-INFL      an assistant-ACC  
 'Every teacher gave an assistant duties'

These and other facts cast doubt on the CP adjunction hypothesis of backing/Right-dislocation. For their part, Kayne (1994) and Whitman (2000) assume (roughly) that RD is derived first by leftward movement of the target NP from a parallel clause, followed by deletion of the remnant. This captures several properties of the construction (including cases of multiple RD), but not the wide scope of quantifiers (17). Moreover, it does not address the motivation for movement and deletion, or the way(s) in which the discourse meanings in Khakas could arise.

Are there any special properties of the Right-dislocated constituent? As we have seen, many kinds of syntactic category can appear in post-verbal position. Nevertheless, it has been claimed that only DPs with a particular semantic make-up are well-formed there. Khakas does not provide conclusive evidence, so again we turn to Turkish. Initially it was believed that only definite DPs were licit, but later this class was expanded to include both definite and indefinite (i.e. specific) DPs. Apparently, however, even non-specific ones with the indefinite article *bir* are attested after the verbal complex (Issever, pc):

---

<sup>5</sup> Kural considers two alternatives by which Kayne's proposals might be implemented, and attempts to show how each is unsatisfactory with respect to the scope effects. Also, (18) is a reconstruction of CK&O's (38), based on *what they say* about narrow scope in the text.

(18) DP-types in post-verbal position (Turkish)

a. Nesrin de geliyor **partiye**

'Nesrin will come to *the party* as well' [+DF]

b. (Dun gece onbes kisi vardi ya) sigara-si-ni yanik unutmus **bir misafir**

'(There were fifteen people last night you know.) *A guest* left his cigarette burning' [+SP/-DF]

c. Bu adamlardan kaci gormus dun **bir film?**

'Of these, how many have seen *a film?*' [-SP/-DF]

d. A: Hadi bakalim sen dersini calis.

'Get to it now and study your lessons'

B: Bugun calismayacagim **ders**

'I won't study today' [-SP/bare]

From this we conclude that there is no semantic constraint on what kind of element can undergo backing. Nevertheless, there is an informational one: the backed element must be presupposed: focus and/or wh-phrases are not allowed in this position.

In English too, there are non-semantic aspects to Right-dislocation. According to Whitman (2000), the RDC must contain 'assertive content':

(19) Discourse conditions on RDCs (Whitman 2000)

- a. ??Bill Clinton works his butt off, the President of the United States (does).
- b. ?Bill Clinton works his butt off, the former Governor of Arkansas (does).
- c. Bill Clinton works his butt off, the former procrastinator (does).

These facts are clearly pragmatic in nature, hence what is needed to accommodate them is a theory that allows phonological and/or contextual factors to have some influence over their well-formedness.

#### 4. The sound of backing, generally

One such theory is a version of Combinatory Categorical Grammar, as proposed by Steedman (2000). In it, surface structures (PF) are enriched with intonation and

information structure, with features of the latter (e.g. THEME & RHEME) contributing to the interpretation of syntactic structures (LF). Given the distinctive sound characteristics of Right-dislocation and backing, this theory is especially useful. Left- and Right-dislocation are represented here with their phrasal tunes, or 'signature' sounds (pitch accents: H\*=sharply rising; %=utterance-final boundary):

(20) Dislocation, left & right

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| a. (That student) (is the first one) (to get an "A") | [intonation phrases] |
| b. That student, he's the first one to get an "A".   | [Left-dislocation]   |
| H*                      H                      L%    |                      |
| c. He's the first one to get an "A", that student.   | [Right-dislocation]  |
| LH%      L(%?)                                       |                      |

According to Steedman, phrasal tunes are associated with specific discourse meanings that distinguish information type and/or propositional attitude. The sharply rising pattern in (20b) is characteristic of a discourse THEME, for instance, while the falling one in (20c) typifies RHEME (=COMMENT). Crucially, linguistic categories of this kind are also presuppositional in that they may engender conversational implicatures. Among other things, this enables us to capture the 'assertiveness' requirement in (19), as well as the various applied meanings of backing in Khakas: defocus, refocus and 'avoid wordiness'... and maybe even 'afterthought'.

Left- and Right-dislocations can also be compared in terms of information structure. In (20b), the Left-dislocated constituent has the flair of a TOPIC, while the clause to which it relates is a FOCUS in the sense that it provides new information. In (20c), on the other hand, the dislocated constituent could be a REFOCUS or an AFTERTHOUGHT (now elevated to the status of an information structure category), whereas the main clause is just a main clause-- it is *not* a TOPIC. In natural conversation, these categories are associated with distinctive intonation patterns. (20b) starts on a high note, sustaining it through the juncture (marked by a brief pause) to the main clause. (20c) follows a standard sentence intonation pattern until the juncture, at which time the voice level down-shifts sharply.

With this as background, we offer the following demonstration, where each of the short stretches of natural English conversation illustrate 'Refocus', 'Defocus' and 'Avoid Wordiness':

(21) Refocus: We were talking about Tom when all of a sudden Marcia jumped up and started raving about this guy she met last week at the movie theater and wanted to call her again so she gave him her number. So we listened to this story for a while but eventually got back to talking about the important thing, **Tom**.

(22) Defocus (describing how to adjust glasses by yourself): First you have to get a pair of pliers or something strong enough and small enough to bend the metal near the hinges. Usually they have this really strong spring inside so when you carry it around you have to keep it from opening up, **like with a rubber-band or something**.

(23) 'Avoid Wordiness': The train usually leaves about five minutes late. It doesn't take that long for people to get on and off, but for some reason they think it does--never mind the problems it may cause, **just longer**.

In (21), Tom is spoken with an even pitch, although it could be low. The pause that precedes it is more important, a clear signal to the listener that the backed element must be related to the previous discourse. Although the backed element might refer to Marcia's guy 'Jack', the structure--and sound--of the text would be different. In (22), the backed adverbial/PP is uttered with a falling pitch, perhaps even accompanied by a gesture signaling the irrelevance of the rubber-band itself. In fact, a digression may have already begun with the second sentence, making the backed element seem even less germane to the overall topic than the speaker had intended. In (23), the backed element is spoken with a high-rising pitch, a sound that reveals the speaker's attitude.

The point of this exercise is to show how, in Steedman's (2000) framework, "phrasal tunes are associated with specific discourse meanings distinguishing information type and/or propositional attitude" (p.4). At the same time, "[they] are also presuppositional, in that they may engender conversational implicatures (p.6). Note that the converse is not true: no given implicature could ever be consistently

associated with the same discourse meaning (function) and/or phrasal tune. This many-to-one relationship is a necessary condition for explaining the meaning applied to backing structures in general, as in Khakas.

The model sketched out above also addresses the so-called syntax of RD constructions. In the following, the insertion of discourse markers appears to alter the effects of erstwhile Island Condition violations in Japanese and English:

(24) Empathy intervention (Japanese)

- a. \*[[kono aida o tabeta] ebi-wa] oishi-katta ne, [ano resutoran-de]  
 this between eat-PERF shrimp-TOP delicious TAG that restaurant-at  
 'The shrimp that we ate the other day (there) were delicious, weren't they,  
 at the restaurant' (from/based on Kuno 1978; in Whitman 2000)  
 [RD/RC=\*]

- b. [[kono aida o tabeta] ebi-wa] oishi-katta-ne, **hora**, [ano resutoran-de]  
 this between eat-PERF shrimp-TOP delicious TAG EMP that restaurant-at  
 'The shrimp that we ate the other day (there) were delicious, weren't they, at  
 the restaurant, *you know*' (from/based on Ross 1967; in Whitman 2000)  
 [RD/RC=OK!]

(25) Empathy intervention (English)

- a. ?\*That they spoke to the janitor about the robbery yesterday is terrible, the cops.  
 b. That they spoke to the janitor about the robbery yesterday is terrible, **I mean**,  
 the cops.

In addition, the scope of quantifiers in Turkish (15,18) may also be determined by contextual factors linked to discourse planning. This applies to the English gloss of Korean example (12b) as well.

Nevertheless, the world of implicature is sometimes fuzzy: despite our best efforts to extend meaning, there is no guarantee that the listener will get it. Aware of this, speakers may adopt strategies to repackage dislocations as structure. Whitman (2000) proposes that auxiliaries in RD constructions support a movement analysis: extra structure is required with head positions that can be filled:

(26) RD and inverted auxiliaries (Whitman 2000)

- a. They're hard workers, **are** those students/those students **are**
- b. They solved the problem, **did** those students/those students **did**

This is compatible with the viewpoint outlined here, if e.g. head positions can provide the loci for pragmatic interpretation too. The same idea extends to the following Japanese cases, where there is a strong tendency to introduce a *second* sentence-final particle in RD constructions. The latter can be regarded as a functional position to be interpreted via context (i.e. pragmatically).

(27) Sentence-final particles (Japanese)

- a. Taroo-ga kinoo[  $e_i$  ] ronbun-o kaki-hazime-ta yo, **ie-de<sub>i</sub>** (ne)  
Taro- NOM yesterday paper- ACC write-begin-PAST PRT home-at (PRT)
- b. Taroo-ga[  $e_i$  ]ie-de ronbun-o kaki-hazime-ta yo, **kinoo<sub>i</sub>** (ne).  
Taro-NOM home-at paper-ACC write-begin-PAST PRT yesterday (PRT)  
Intended: 'Taro began to write a paper at home, and he did so yesterday (by the way).'
- c. Taroo-ga[  $e_i$  ][  $e_j$  ]ronbun-o kaki-hazime-ta yo, **kinoo<sub>i</sub>** **ie-de<sub>j</sub>** (ne)  
Taro- NOMpaper-ACC write-begin-PAST PRT yesterday home-at (PRT)  
Intended: 'Taro began to write a paper, and he did so yesterday, at home (by the way)'

Of course a purely formal account could be offered for the data in (27) which, to my knowledge, have never been discussed in the literature. As Culicover and Jackendoff (2005) note, however, "any configuration of linear relationships can be derived by well-chosen applications of iterated raising to well-chosen underlying structures" (304). While Right-dislocated constituents don't play a huge role in the grammatical description of *any* language, we see them more as 'teachers of syntax' that lead language-learners towards the acquisition of (SOV) word order in general, and functional categories in particular.

## 5. Conclusion

In many theories, features of the discourse are assumed to project structure just like syntactic ones. However, it is not obvious that they should be treated the same way. Syntactic structure is largely a product of the lexicon, whereas talk-in-interaction

draws on many different systems. Lexical items represent codified instructions for pronunciation and interpretation, but nothing much related to deixis, presupposition or implicature. Inasmuch as sentence-meaning is affected by discourse markers, phrasal tunes and other packaging devices, it is essential to adopt a theory with a feedback loop: PF to LF, or its equivalent. This at least explains how the authors of the Khakas narrative could arrive at the contextually-dependent types of meaning applied to the backing structures.

Finally, consider Cinque's (1999) theory of adverbs, where for each one there is a separate projection consisting of a specifier (which hosts the adverb), and a functional head. The result is a very elaborate conception of phrase structure. How does this system come about? Does the child have an innate knowledge of the adverb grid, even though not every category is realized in her language? If so, there would be an enormous amount of information coded on the genome. Alternatively, one might suppose that only categories for which there is some evidence are projected. This is standardly taken to be lexical, but may also include specific intonation contours or phrasal tunes such as those associated with backing in Khakas or Right-dislocation generally. It seems likely then, that at least some functional categories can be acquired through the medium of sound, lessening the amount of information attributed to UG. In the case of SOV languages, functional category heads (those relating to Tense, Mood, Aspect) are located at the juncture of syntactic and intonational phrases, where sound can easily inform structure. This remains a topic for further investigation.

### **References**

- Borgoyakova, T., I. Topoyev, & P. Knapp (2002). 'Khakas interlinear text with comments on discourse features'. In Cliften & Cliften.
- Cann, R., R. Kempson, & M. Otsuka (2002). 'On right and left dislocation: A dynamic perspective'. *Journal of Language*.
- Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Cliften, J., & D. Cliften (eds.). *Comments on Discourse Strategies in Ten Turkic Languages*. SIL International (North Eurasia Group), St. Petersburg.

- Culicover, P., & R. Jackendoff (2005). *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, B. (1981). *The Languages of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, John A. (1994). *A performance theory of order and constituency*. Cambridge.
- Huang, C.-T. James (1984). 'On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 15 (531-74).
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Kural, M. (1997). 'Postverbal constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:3; 498-519.
- Steedman, Mark (2000). 'Information structure and the syntax-phonology interface.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.4 (649-89).
- Tsujimura, N. (2002). *Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Vovin, A. (2005). 'The end of the Altaic controversy'. In *CAJ* 49.1.
- Whitman, J. (2000). 'Right Dislocation in English and Japanese'. In Takami, A., A. Kamio, & J. Whitman (eds.): *Syntactic and Functional Explorations in honor of Susumo Kuno*. Kurosio Publishers, Tokyo.