

Backgrounding ('right dislocation') in Dutch

Jan-Wouter Zwart

November 2001

1. Dislocation

The Dutch sentences in (1) illustrate the word order types traditionally referred to as 'left dislocation' (1a) and 'right dislocation' (1b) (Ross 1967:232, 236):

- (1) a. *Die jongen,* ik ken 'm niet
that guy I know him not
b. Ik ken 'm niet, *die jongen*
I know him not that guy

In (1), a noun phrase appears at the left or right edge of the sentence, and its canonical position is occupied by what looks like a resumptive pronoun.

The left dislocation construction (1a) sounds unnatural to me, and a topicalization construction, where the pronoun is deictic and fronted (as is common with deictic elements in Dutch), appears to be much preferred:

- (2) *Die jongen,* die ken ik niet
that guy DEM know I not

In contrast, the right dislocation construction (1b) sounds quite natural, particularly as part of the colloquial register. It is all the more surprising, therefore, to find that little or no attention has been directed toward this kind of construction in Dutch.

Apart from the presence of the 'resumptive' pronoun, right dislocation is characterized by a low and level pitch intonation on the 'dislocated' phrase. The function of right dislocation is not to express an afterthought, but to push the information expressed in the right dislocated phrase to the background (cf. also Erguvanli 1984). Afterthought *adds* information and lacks the two formal properties of right dislocation: it does not require the presence of a resumptive pronoun and it requires a normal intonational contour (pitch indicated by font size):

- (3) Ik heb *iemand* ontmoet, *een MEISJE*/**een meisje*
I have someone met a girl

Backgrounding, which appears to be a typical function of right dislocation, is absent from left dislocation or topicalization. In (1a), for example, *die jongen* 'that guy' is not backgrounded but proposed as the 'theme', and in (2), *die jongen* is presented as a discourse familiar entity, but, as a familiar entity, it appears to be foregrounded rather than backgrounded. From here on, the construction type in (1b) is referred to as 'backgrounding' rather than 'right dislocation'.

The term 'right dislocation' actually refers to the movement operation deriving constructions like (1b). The relation between the resumptive pronoun and the backgrounded material was argued by Ross (1967:237) to be constrained by a locality

condition which he took to be typical of rightward movement ('upward boundedness'). This constraint is illustrated in (4)-(5):

- (4) a. [*A gun* [*which I had cleaned*]] went off
- b. [*A gun*] went off [*which I had cleaned*]
- (5) a. [That [*a gun* [*which I had cleaned*]] went off] surprised me
- b. [That [*a gun*] went off [*which I had cleaned*]] surprised me
- c. * [That [*a gun*] went off]] surprised me [*which I had cleaned*]

(4) illustrates extraposition of a relative clause, a standard instantiation of rightward movement. The same extraposition, this time taking place within a subject sentence, derives (5b) from (5a). (5c) shows that further extraposition to the right edge of the matrix clause is not possible.

Examples showing that the same constraint is operative in 'right dislocation' are given in (6) (from Ross 1967, see also Postal 1971:137, note 19, Emonds 1976:32-34, and the discussion in Rodman 1974, section 5, and Gundel 1974, chapter 4):

- (6) a. *They* spoke to the janitor about that robbery yesterday, *the cops*
- b. [That *they* spoke to the janitor about that robbery yesterday, *the cops*] is terrible
- c. *? [That *they* spoke to the janitor about that robbery yesterday] is terrible, *the cops*

Interestingly, the crucial example (6c) is marked *?, contrasting with the stark ungrammaticality that characterizes violations of upward boundedness, as in (5c). This suggests that the deviance of the right dislocation example in (6c) is not explained by conditions on rightward movement (as also argued by Gundel 1974 [1988:134]). Indeed, Dutch examples where right dislocation violates the upward boundedness constraint can be formed without great difficulty, as in (7) (see also Gundel, loc. cit.):

- (7) [*Dat hij het gelezen heeft*] *verbaast me zeer,*
that he it read has *surprises me enormously*

Oorlog en vrede.

War and Peace

If so, evidence that right dislocation actually involves rightward movement is absent.

This ties in with the generalization of Kayne (1994), according to which all movement is to the left. Kayne himself (1994:78f) proposes that right dislocated material occupies its original (complement) position, and that the resumptive pronoun associated with it functions as a doubling clitic familiar from Romance clitic doubling constructions. The problem with this proposal is that it predicts a strong upward boundedness effect (as the 'dislocated' material has not been moved, but occupies its base position adjacent to the verb), which Kayne (1994:81) finds in Romance, but which I believe is absent in Germanic (cf. (6c), (7), and (14) below).

If the backgrounded material is neither moved to the right (as proposed by Ross 1967) nor in its base position (as proposed by Kayne 1994), the question of where it is and how it gets there is still unanswered. The exact same question arises with

‘extraposed’ material, such as the relative clause in (5b), and complement clauses more generally in Dutch. As can be seen in (8a), complement clauses in Dutch appear to the right of the verb in embedded clauses, unlike complement noun phrases (8b).

- (8) a. ..dat Jan betreurde [dat hij dat gezegd had]
 that John regretted that he that said had
 b. ..dat Jan zijn uitspraken betreurde
 that John his pronouncements regretted

As with backgrounded material, the extraposed complement clause is probably not in its base position, as it can be separated from the verb by adverbs, prepositional phrases, etc.:

- (9) ..dat Jan gezegd had tegen Piet [dat hij het
 that John said had to Pete that he it

 gedaan had]
 done had

Disallowing rightward movement, on the force of Kayne (1994), the position of the embedded clause is unaccounted for.

Koster (2000) proposes to describe extraposition in Dutch as involving a coordination of sorts, which he calls ‘parallel construal’. The idea is that the extraposed clause is base generated as the second member of a coordinated structure, where the first member consists of (part of) the material to the left of the extraposed clause (hence, the ‘main clause’), and the conjunction (notated by the colon sign :) is silent:

- (10) ..dat Jan [_{XP} (het) gezegd had tegen Piet] : [dat hij het gedaan had]

The proposal rests on two assumptions: (i) the extraposed clause is in fact in parallel construal with a (possibly empty) pronominal element in the object position of the main clause, indicated by *het* ‘it’ in (10), and (ii) the effect of asymmetric coordination in (10) is the result of a general possibility, namely that a larger constituent, *XP* in (10), performs the function of one of its terms, the pronoun in (10) (‘pied piping’).

As Koster shows, his proposal can easily be applied to afterthought constructions (like (3)), and it is tempting to consider its applicability to backgrounding as well (especially since the presence of a pronoun in the main clause is one of the two defining characteristics of backgrounding). However, closer investigation reveals that backgrounding and extraposition differ fundamentally in a number of respects, suggesting that yet another operation must be assumed to account for the syntax of backgrounding.

2. Extraposition vs. backgrounding

In the remainder of this article we focus on backgrounding vs. extraposition of complement clauses in Dutch. Backgrounding (‘right dislocation’) of complement clauses shows the same word order as complement clause extraposition, which explains why (to the best of my knowledge) its features have not been discussed before. Since

complement clauses obligatorily appear to the right of the verb in embedded clauses, complement clause backgrounding appears to target *the canonical complement clause position*. However, the two defining characteristics of backgrounding are operative with complement clause backgrounding as well.

First, constructions of clausal complementation may show two clearly distinguishable intonation patterns. In one pattern, the complement clause participates in the intonation contour of the construction as a whole (with the verb in the extraposed clause taking the most prominent pitch accent), and has its own internal intonation contour as well. This is the complement clause extraposition type, illustrated in (11). In the other pattern, illustrated in (12), the complement clause has the low, level pitch characteristic of backgrounding.

(11) ..dat hij (het) beTREURD heeft dat hij dat geZEGD heeft
that he it regretted has that he that said has

(12) ..dat hij *(het) NOGAL beTREURD heeft dat hij dat gezegd heeft
that he it quite regretted has that he that said has

Second, as can be seen in (12), the intonation pattern characteristic of backgrounding requires the presence of the pronoun *het* 'it' in the main clause. In extraposition, the pronoun is either absent (with nonfactive verbs), or optionally present (as in (11)). (The situation is slightly different with raising verbs like *schijnen* 'seem' taking a finite complement clause. These require the presence of a subject pronoun, expletive *het* 'it', but the intonation pattern shows that the complement clause in these cases cannot be backgrounded.)

It is now easy to see that complement clause extraposition in Dutch obeys the upward boundedness condition ((13), cf. (4)-(5)), whereas complement clause backgrounding does not (14):

(13) a. [Dat hij (het) beTREURD heeft [dat hij dat geZEGD heeft]]
that he it regretted has that he that said has

verbaast me zeer
surprises me enormously

b. * [Dat hij (het) beTREURD heeft] verbaast me zeer
that he it regretted has surprises me enormously

[dat hij dat geZEGD heeft]
that he that said has

(14) a. [Dat hij het NOGAL beTREURD heeft
that he it quite regretted has

[dat hij dat gezegd heeft]] verbaast me zeer
that he that said has surprises me enormously

b. [Dat hij het NOGAL beTREURD heeft] verbaast me

that he it quite regretted has surprises me

zeer [dat hij dat gezegd heeft]
 enormously that he that said has

(14) replicates the absence of the upward boundedness effect with backgrounded noun phrases illustrated above in (7).

Another notorious difference between complement clause extraposition and complement clause backgrounding is that backgrounding, unlike extraposition, creates an island for extraction.

(15) Wat_i heb je ([?]het) beTREURD
 what have you it regretted

[dat Jan t_i geZEGD heeft] ?
 that John said has

(16) * Wat_i heb je het NOGAL beTREURD
 what have you it rather regretted

[dat Jan t_i gezegd heeft] ?
 that John said has

Earlier discussions of these facts took islandhood to be a function of the presence of the pronoun *het* (cf. Hoekstra 1983, Bennis 1986), but as far as I can see, these discussions did not make the distinction between extraposition and backgrounding explicit. To my ear, the presence of *het* 'it' in the extraposition type (15) yields a mild deviance at best, whereas the backgrounding type (16) is sharply ungrammatical (with the intonation indicated). This point can be strengthened when we consider extraposition cases where the presence of *het* is obligatory, namely in the subject position of raising predicates (i.e., in cases where *het* is the expletive subject). In these cases, extraction across *het* is not unacceptable:

(17) a. [Welk boek]_i schijnt het [dat Jan t_i gelezen heeft] ?
 which book seems it that John read has

b. [Welk boek]_i is het duidelijk [dat Jan t_i gelezen heeft] ?
 which book is it clear that John read has

c. [Welk boek]_i valt het jou op
 which book falls it you up [=does it strike you]

[dat Jan t_i gelezen heeft] ?
 that John read has

The pronoun associated with the extraposed complement clause is also obligatory in the complement of a preposition, where it takes on locative morphology (*het* 'it' > *er* 'there') (18a). As with *het*, the presence of *er* does not appear to block extraction (18b).

- (18) a. Ik ben *er* van overtuigd
 I am there of convinced
- [dat Jan het boek gelezen heeft]
 that John the book read has
- ‘I am convinced that John read the book.’
- b. [Welk boek]_i ben je *er* van overtuigd
 which book are you there of convinced
- [dat Jan *t_i* gelezen heeft] ?
 that John read has
- ‘Which book are you convinced that John read?’

In all, it seems that islandhood is not effected by the presence of a pronoun associated with the extraposed clause, but is a property of backgrounded complement clauses, which happen to feature such a pronoun invariably.

(Note that this also casts doubt on Bennis’ (1986) analysis of the status of extraposed clauses associated with a pronoun in the main clause as adjunct clauses. Rather, it seems that extraposed complement clauses behave like complements, regardless the presence of an associated pronoun in the main clause, whereas backgrounded complement clauses behave like adjuncts. This also supports Koster’s conjecture that extraposed clauses are always associated with a possibly empty pronoun in the main clause.)

A further distinction between extraposed and backgrounded complement clauses is that an extraposed complement clause cannot be stranded under fronting of the verb selecting it, as in (19). As (20) shows, the situation is the other way around with backgrounded clauses.

- (19) a. [BetREURD [dat hij dat geZEGD heeft]]
 regretted that he that said has
- HEEFT hij (het) niet
 has he it not
- b. * [BetREURD] HEEFT hij (het) niet
 regretted has he it not
- [dat hij dat geZEGD heeft]
 that he that said has
- (20) a. [BetREURD] HEEFT hij *(het) niet
 regretted has he it not
- [dat hij dat gezegd heeft]
 that he that said has

- b. * [BetREURD [dat hij dat gezegd heeft]]
 regretted that he that said has
- HEEFT hij het niet
 has he it not

The ungrammaticality of (19b) can be understood as the interruption of an intonational contour (cf. Truckenbrodt 1995). The ungrammaticality of (20b) seems to indicate that the main clause verb and the backgrounded clause do not form a constituent.

These phenomena (upward boundedness, islandhood, stranding vs. pied piping) suffice to indicate that complement clause extraposition and complement clause backgrounding are two separate phenomena, even if the surface syntactic position (at the right edge of the clause) does not indicate that a distinction should be made.

3. Parallel construal?

In Koster's analysis of extraposition as parallel construal, the upward boundedness effect that is characteristic of extraposition (and afterthought) is derived from a condition on 'pied piping'. Recall that in (10), the extraposed clause, which is in parallel construal with the pronoun *het* 'it', is in fact coordinated with the constituent *XP* containing the pronoun. *XP* performs the function of *het* in a way reminiscent of pied piping in fronting constructions like (21), where *XP* performs the function of its interrogative term *which students*:

- (21) [_{XP} The parents of *which students*] did the principal insult ?

On this view, the ungrammaticality of (13b), the upward boundedness effect with complement clause extraposition, can be seen as the result of a violation of a locality condition on pied piping. Compare (22) (= (13a)), where pied piping is restricted to the clause containing the pronoun, and (23) (= (13b)), where pied piping is extended to include the matrix clause:

- (22) [[_{XP} that he *it* regretted has] : [that he said that]] surprises me

- (23) [_{XP} [that he *it* regretted has] surprises me] : [that he said that]

Accepting this implementation of the upward boundedness constraint, it is clear that backgrounding does not involve parallel construal, since the upward boundedness effect is absent with backgrounding (as shown in (7) and (14)).

Moreover, the island effect of backgrounding (16) and the effect of stranding under verb phrase fronting (20) do not fall out from the parallel construal analysis.

4. Proposal

I would like to propose that backgrounded material is generated in a position c-commanding the main clause, i.e. in a very high specifier position, which is subsequently

crossed over by leftward movement of the main clause. These steps are illustrated schematically in (24):

- (24) I. [BACKGROUND [MAIN CLAUSE]]
 II. [MAIN CLAUSE]_i [BACKGROUND t_i]

It is assumed here that all leftward movement operations (wh-movement, focusing, topicalization) take place within the constituent marked MAIN CLAUSE in (24), as it were in a cycle prior to the merger of the background material.

On these assumptions, the properties of backgrounded complement clauses can be readily explained.

The absence of the upward boundedness effect is expected, as there is no principled reason why the complexity of the MAIN CLAUSE should affect the possibility of adding backgrounded material in a higher cycle of the derivation.

The island status of the backgrounded clause follows since the target of the extraction is located within the constituent marked MAIN CLAUSE in (24). That is, extraction out of a backgrounded clause violates the cyclic principle of the derivation (i.e. an operation cannot target a lower cycle).

The stranding effect under verb phrase fronting follows since the backgrounded material is added at a stage in the derivation where the fronting (inside the MAIN CLAUSE) has already taken place. It also follows since the backgrounded material and the fronted verb are not a constituent at any point in the derivation.

5. Consequences

The analysis of backgrounding as merger in a position c-commanding the main clause (24.I), followed by crossover of the main clause to a position to the left of the background material (24.II), predicts that backgrounded material will always appear to the right of extraposed material. This prediction is borne out:

- (25) a. Ik heb *hem* verTELD
 I have him told
 [dat ik het beTREURde] *die jongen*
 that I it regretted that guy
 b. * Ik heb *hem* verTELD *die jongen*
 I have him told that guy
 [dat ik het beTREURde]
 that I it regretted

Without the low, level intonation on *die jongen* ‘that guy’, the sentence is acceptable, but in that case *die jongen* is not interpreted as backgrounded, but as either afterthought material or parenthetically. The particular intonational pattern associated with backgrounding entails that the background material cannot be followed by any pitch carrying material, hence that the background material must come last.

Another consequence of the analysis in (24) is that backgrounding does not leave a gap (trace, copy) in the main clause. This partially explains the presence of the pronoun in the main clause: overt material is needed in the main clause to express the argument status and/or grammatical function associated with the backgrounded material. The overt material can be a weak personal pronoun, as illustrated in (1b), or also a distal demonstrative element which must then be fronted inside the main clause:

(26) *Die* KEN ik niet, *die jongen*

Distal demonstratives are always used anaphorically in Dutch, whereas proximal demonstratives are used for cataphoric relations. The use of a distal vs. proximate demonstrative, then, can also be used as a probe for extraposition (27a) vs. backgrounding (27b):

(27) a. ..dat ik DIT/#DAT beSEF, dat ALles verANDert
 that I DEM.PROX/DIST realize that everything changes
 b. ..dat ik dat/#dit beSEF, dat alles verandert
 that I DEM.DIST/PROX realize that everything changes

The fact that a non-cataphoric pronoun is used in the main clause in backgrounding constructions may be taken to support the analysis of backgrounding in (24.I), where the pronoun occurs in the c-command domain of the backgrounded material.

Note in this connection that the backgrounded material cannot be less referential than the material associated with it in the main clause. While the backgrounded material can be a pronoun, as illustrated below, it cannot be referentially dependent on the overt material in the main clause:

(28) * ..dat ik *die jongen* KEN, *hem/hemzelf/zichzelf*
 that I that guy know PRON/PRON-SELF/REFL-SELF

Nor can the backgrounded material contain a negative polarity item dependent on a negative element inside the main clause:

(29) * ..dat niemand *hem* beGROETte, *de vader van ook maar iemand*
 that noone him greeted the father of anyone-NPI

These facts, too, are explained if the backgrounded material is generated in a position c-commanding the main clause.

A fact that does not fall out from the analysis in (24) is that quantified expressions cannot be backgrounded:

(30) * ..dat ik *ze* begroette, *iedereen*
 that I them greeted everyone

The analysis in (24) also leads us to predict that there will be no categorial restrictions on backgrounded material. This appears to be by and large correct, another marked distinction with extraposition, which is limited to clauses and PPs in Dutch. Consider the following set of examples:

- (31)
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------|------|------------|-------|---------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. DP | ..dat | ik | <i>hem</i> | niet | KEN, | <i>die jongen</i> | |
| | | that | I | him | not | know | that guy |
| b. VP | ..dat | ik | <i>dat</i> | niet | KAN, | <i>een boek schrijven</i> | |
| | | that | I | that | not | can | a book write |
| c. PP | ..dat | ik | <i>er</i> | niet | over | wil PRATEN, | <i>over die jongen</i> |
| | | that | I | there | not | about want talk | about that guy |
| d. AP | ..dat | hij | <i>dat</i> | wel | NOOIT zal | WORDen, | <i>rijk</i> |
| | | that | he | that | PROBAB | never will | become rich |
| e. AdvP | ..dat | hij | het | NIET | geDAAN heeft, | <i>gisteren/waarschijnlijk/*snel</i> | |
| | | that | he | it | not | done has | yesterday/probably/quickly |

(The restriction on the type of adverb allowed in backgrounding noted in (31e) is apparently related to the fact that certain adverb types, in particular VP-adverbs (manner adverbs), resist deaccenting (cf. Zwart 1997:96). Notice also that adverb backgrounding is exceptional in not requiring an overt associate in the main clause.)

A related fact, noted by Haslinger (2000), is that extraposed complement clauses associated with a PP-internal pronoun, as in (32), cannot double the preposition:

- (32)
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------|---------------------------|-------------|-------|----|----------------|------------|-----------|------|---|
| ..dat | ik | [_{pp} <i>er</i> | <i>op</i>] | REken | [| (* <i>op</i>) | <i>dat</i> | <i>je</i> | KOMT |] |
| | that | I | there on | count | on | | that | you | come | |

This follows both on a movement account, with *er* spelling out the trace of the extraposed clause, or on a parallel structure account: in both cases one does not expect the preposition to show up in the extraposed complement clause. With backgrounded complement clauses, however, the preposition can be doubled:

- (33)
- | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------|-----|---------------------------|-------------|--------|----------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| ..dat | ik | WEL | [_{pp} <i>er</i> | <i>op</i>] | REken, | [(<i>op</i>) | <i>dat</i> | <i>je</i> | <i>komt</i>] |
| | that | I | AFFIRM | there on | count | on | that | you | come |

Assuming the analysis in (24), the possibility of the preposition in (33) can simply be ascribed to the possibility of backgrounding the entire PP consisting of the preposition *op* ‘on’ and the embedded clause *dat je komt* ‘that you come’.

It can also be shown that backgrounded material takes scope over material in the main clause. Consider the example in (34), where, on the most natural reading, *twee keer* ‘twice’ takes scope over *vermoedelijk* ‘probably’:

- (34)
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|------|------|--------------|-----------|----------|-----|
| ..dat | hij | twee | keer | vermoedelijk | overleden | was | |
| | that | he | two | times | probably | deceased | was |
| | ‘..that it happened twice that he was believed dead.’ | | | | | | |
| | # ‘..that he is believed to have died twice.’ | | | | | | |

The second, improbable reading of (34) is the only one allowed when *vermoedelijk* ‘probably’ is backgrounded:

- (35)
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|------|------|-----------|----------|---------------------|----------|
| ..dat | hij | twee | keer | overLEDen | was | <i>vermoedelijk</i> | |
| | that | he | two | times | deceased | was | probably |
| | ‘..that he is believed to have died twice.’ | | | | | | |
| | * ‘..that it happened twice that he was believed dead.’ | | | | | | |

The obligatory wide scope of backgrounded material follows from the analysis in (24), on the assumption that scope is determined as a function of c-command at the moment of merger (cf. Epstein et al. 1998).

Note in this context that the wide scope of postverbal material in Turkish is taken by Kural (1997) to suggest that Turkish features specifiers on the right c-commanding to their left. But since the postverbal material in question is backgrounded (as discussed extensively by Erguvanlı 1984), Kural's conclusion is not warranted if the analysis of backgrounding in (24) has any plausibility (Zwart 2001).

The proposed analysis predicts that backgrounded material can always be interpreted as having matrix scope. Thus, next to (34)-(35) we have (36):

- (36) a. Hij heeft twee keer beweerd
 he has two times claimed
- dat hij vermoedelijk overleden was
 that he probably deceased was
- ‘He claimed twice that he had probably died.’
 # ‘He probably claimed twice that he had died.’
- b. Hij heeft twee keer beweerd
 he has two times claimed
- dat hij overleden was, *vermoedelijk*
 that he deceased was probably
- ‘He claimed twice that he had probably died.’
 ‘He probably claimed twice that he had died.’

As can be seen in the interpretation of (36b), a backgrounded adverb like *vermoedelijk* ‘probably’ can equally well be associated with the matrix clause as with the embedded clause. This is predicted under the proposed analysis, where the backgrounded material is generated in a position c-commanding the matrix clause.

We can make an even stronger prediction, namely that backgrounded material associated with a resumptive pronoun in the embedded clause will be able to take scope over the matrix clause. This situation is exemplified in examples like (38), expanded from the simple case in (37).

- (37) a. Jan heeft twee keer het eerste kievitseï gevonden $2 > 1$
 John has twice the first plover's egg found $\#1 > 2$
 ‘John twice found the first plover's egg.’
 [note: this refers to the Frisian springtime tradition of looking for the year's first plover's egg, hence the scopal relation of $2 > 1$ forces an interpretation where John won the contest in two different years]
- b. Jan heeft het twee keer gevonden, *het eerste kievitseï* $1 > 2$
 John has it twice found the first plover's egg $\#2 > 1$
 ‘John found the first plover's egg twice.’
 [this example has the strange reading where John found the first plover's egg twice in the same year, indicating a scopal relation $1 > 2$, i.e. with wide scope of the backgrounded material]

- (38) a. Jan is er twee keer in geslaagd
 John is there twice in succeeded
- om het eerste kievitseï te vinden 2>1
 COMP the first plover's egg to find *1>2
- ‘John twice managed to find the first plover’s egg [in different years].’
 * ‘John twice managed to find the first plover’s egg [in a single year].’
- b. Jan is er twee keer in geslaagd
 John is there twice in succeeded
- om het te vinden, *het eerste kievitseï* 1>2
 that it to find the first plover’s egg 2>1
- ‘John twice managed to find the first plover’s egg [in different years].’
 ‘John twice managed to find the first plover’s egg [in a single year].’

As noted, the first plover’s egg can be found only once each year, so when *the first plover’s egg* is interpreted as having scope over *twice*, a peculiar reading results where the first egg is found twice (suggesting foul play). This reading, however improbable, is available in (37b), indicating the familiar wide scope of backgrounded material, and even in (38b), indicating matrix scope of backgrounded material associated with the embedded clause. This again falls out from the analysis proposed here, where the backgrounded material is generated in a position c-commanding all other material.

It is tempting to consider all sentence final material with the proper intonational characteristics (i.e. low, level pitch) as backgrounded material, i.e. as generated in the high c-commanding position proposed here (cf. (24)). At least the following elements may be considered in this connection:

- (39) a. mildly emphatic sentence final pronouns (cf. Zwart 2000)
 Die hai ik moeten ötspeulen, *ikke* (Brabantish, De Bont 1962:460)
 that had I must-INF out-play-INF I-EMPH
 ‘I should have played that one, me [of cards].’
- b. right peripheral objects in imperatives (cf. Den Dikken 1992)
 Leg neer *die bal* !
 put-IMP down that ball
 ‘Put that ball down!’
- c. pronominal vocatives (cf. Bennis 2002)
 Doorlopen, *jullie* !
 on-walk you-PL
 ‘Walk on, you!’
 [note: nonpronominal vocatives may lack the required low and level intonation]
- d. quotatives (cf. Branigan and Collins 1993)
 ‘Ik kom,’ *zei Jan*
 I come said John
 ‘I’m coming,’ said John.’
- e. tags

Hij is incognito of zo
he is incognito or something

[note: many sentence final discourse particles like *hoor* 'hear' and *zeg* 'say' lack the required level and low intonation]

It is too early to decide for each of these cases whether the analysis of backgrounding proposed here applies to them as well. My first impression is that these elements generally receive an interpretation which accords well with the high c-commanding background position indicating in (24). Thus, the right peripheral noun phrase in (39b), the vocative in (39c), and the quotative in (39d) are easily interpreted as taking the remainder of the sentence 'in their domain':

- (40) a. Die bal: leg neer!
b. Jullie: doorlopen!
c. Jan zei: ik kom

(The inversion in the quotative (*Jan zei — zei Jan*) is of course remarkable, and requires further discussion.) Note that the verb in quotative inversion constructions need not be a verb of saying, unlike in 'straight' quotative constructions:

- (41) a. Ik kom, knipoogde Jan
I come winked John
'I'm coming, John said with a wink.'
b. Jan zei/#knipoogde dat hij kwam
John said/winked that he came
'John said/signaled (*said) with a wink that he was coming.'

This can be understood if the quotative part in (41a) is generated in the background position from where it does not select the quote, whereas in (41b) it is generated in a lower, sentence internal position, from where it does select the quote.

Nonpronominal vocatives may show a rising pitch at the end, when the addressee is summoned. A second person pronoun is generally not summoned but already included in the speech event, and so are nonpronominal vocatives like *mijn kind* 'my child', *sukkel* 'dorkhead'. Possibly the additional rising pitch is part of an intonational layer unrelated to background status, but not in conflict with it. This may also explain the rising pitch on discourse tags like *zeg* 'say' and *hoor* 'hear', which intuitively seem to belong in the high background position proposed here.

The 'mildly emphatic' pronoun in (39a) is not interpreted contrastively (like in 'I am the one who should have played that card'), and does not convey new information or introduce a new participant. Finally, the tag element *of zo* in (39e), formally the second part of a conjunction phrase, seems an unlikely candidate for such a high position as the background position in (24), as it seems to take part of the remainder of the clause as its first conjunct (in this case, *incognito*). However, it may be the case that the combination *of zo* has grammaticalized into a discourse particle indicating uncertainty. If so, *of zo* is part of a typologically not infrequent class of sentence final discourse particles which do however seem to be associated with the higher functional field, in that they characterize the nature of the clause as a whole.

Interestingly, Ogawa (1997) discusses an analysis of right dislocation in Japanese which is similar in some respects to the analysis under consideration here. An example of right dislocation in Japanese is given in (36) (cf. Saito 1985: PAGES):

- (36) Mary-ga kare-o mitayo, John-o
 Mary-NOM him-ACC saw John-ACC
 'Mary saw him, John.'

Ogawa (1997) considers the possibility that *John-o* has been raised leftward from the position marked by *kare-o* to a specifier position c-commanding the entire clause, which is then raised past *John-o* to a higher specifier position, as in (24.II). The analysis under consideration here differs minimally from Ogawa's proposal, in that *John-o* would not be raised to but base-generated in the specifier position c-commanding the main clause.

On the strength of the analysis in (24) of backgrounding in Dutch, we may assume that a similar derivation applies to right-dislocation in strict head-final languages like Turkish and Japanese. This could then be taken to support Kayne's (1994) conjecture that the head final status of these languages is the result of massive leftward movement across the position of the verb.

References

Bennis, Hans. 1986. *Gaps and dummies*. Foris, Dordrecht.

Bennis, Hans. 2002. *Kom JIJ ook maar naar die lezing!* Het subject in Nederlandse imperatieven. Paper presented at the Linguistics Colloquium, University of Groningen, January 11.

De Bont, A.P. 1962. *Dialekt van Kempenland meer in 't bijzonder d'Oerse taol. Part one*. Van Gorcum/Prakke & Prakke, Assen.

Branigan, Phil and Chris Collins. 1993. Verb movement and the quotative construction in English. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 18, 1-13.

Den Dikken, Marcel. 1992. Empty operator movement in Dutch imperatives. *Language and cognition* 2, 51-64. Center for Language and Cognition, Groningen.

Emonds, Joseph. 1976. *A transformational approach to English syntax: root, structure preserving, and local transformations*. Academic Press, New York.

Epstein, Samuel David, Erich M. Groat, Ruriko Kawashima, Hisatsugu Kitahara. 1998. *A derivational approach to syntactic relations*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Erguvanlı, Eser Ermine. 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. California University Press, Berkeley.

Gundel, Jeannette K. 1974. *The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory*. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin. Reprinted 1988 Garland, New York.

Haslinger, Irene. 2000. Prepositions with tensed clauses as their complement in Dutch, Frisian, and Norwegian. Paper presented at the TABU-dag, Groningen, June 16.

Hoekstra, Teun. 1983. The distribution of sentential complements. *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1983*, 93-103.

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Koster, Jan. 2000. Extraposition as parallel construal. Ms., University of Groningen.

Kural, Murat. 1997. Postverbal constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 498-519.

Ogawa, Yuka. 1997. Dislocation à droite en japonais selon l'hypothèse universelle de Kayne. Ms., University of Geneva.

Postal, Paul M. 1971. *Crossover phenomena*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York.

Rodman, Robert. 1974. On left dislocation. *Papers in linguistics* 7.3/4, 437-466. Reprinted in Anagnostopoulou, E., et al, eds., *Materials on left dislocation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1997, pp. 31-54.

Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Dissertation, MIT.

Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 1995. Extraposition from NP and prosodic structure. *NELS* 25, 503-517.

Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 1997. *Morphosyntax of verb movement: a minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 2000. *Ikke en de default-nominatief: een reactie op Hoeksema*. *TABU* 30, 175-182.

Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 2001. The antisymmetry of Turkish. Paper presented at the TIN-dag, Utrecht, February 3.