



# A quantitative comparative study of right-dislocation in Catalan and Spanish<sup>☆,☆☆,★</sup>

Xavier Villalba<sup>\*</sup>

Centre de Lingüística Teòrica, Departament de Filologia Catalana, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona Edifici B, 08013 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 31 May 2010

Received in revised form 28 December 2010

Accepted 5 January 2011

### Keywords:

Right-dislocation

Information structure

Syntax

Topic

Catalan

Spanish

## ABSTRACT

Since the comparative work by Vallduví (1992, 1994), we know that similar information packagings may resort to completely different formal mechanisms across languages. For instance, right-dislocation (RD) is a highly productive backgrounding strategy in Catalan, but a marginal one in English, resorting in stress shift. To our current understanding, one might take this situation to be a casual state of affairs, or rather, one may raise the stronger hypothesis that understandable and definable factors exist underlying crosslinguistic variation at the syntax/information structure interface. This enterprise has been partially pursued for typologically distant languages (e.g. Catalan vs. English vs. Finnish vs. Turkish), but unlike much recent work in syntax (Kayne, 1996, 2001) very little or no attention has been paid to a microparametric comparative point. Crucially, a finer-grained comparison of closely related languages may shed light on the current hypotheses concerning the syntax/information structure interface. In this paper I will pursue this task, concentrating on the role of RD in two genetically related Romance languages: Catalan, and Spanish. My first goal is to quantify the degree of productivity of RD in these two kindred languages through a corpus based analysis. The second goal is to determine the range of formal mechanisms that Spanish resorts to in order to fulfil the discourse roles typically associated with RD in Catalan. Finally, my third goal will consist of putting forward a hypothesis to explain the factors that determine the quite different discourse management of the formal mechanisms available in these two languages.

© 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Our current understanding of the discourse role of right-dislocation (RD), although incomplete, has grown to a considerable degree. Pioneering works like Chafe (1976), Dik (1978), Lambrecht (1981) and Geluykens (1987) have placed RD on the agenda of mainstream pragmatic studies, and paved the way to studies combining interpretive and syntactic aspects of the construction (see, among others: Ashby, 1988; Brunetti, 2009; Cecchetto, 1999; Lambrecht, 1994; Mayol, 2007; Vallduví, 1992, 1994; Villalba, 2000). Of these new studies, the work by Vallduví (1992, 1994) has proved particularly

<sup>☆</sup> A very preliminary version of this paper was presented at the congress “Discourse and Grammar 2008: Illocutionary force, information structure and subordination between discourse and grammar” (Ghent, 2008), and at the *Seminari de Lingüística Formal* of the University Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona, 2007).

<sup>☆☆</sup> I would like to thank the audiences for their comments. I also thank two anonymous reviewers for the *Journal of Pragmatics* for their comments and suggestions, which have greatly contributed to improving this paper. Finally, I am very grateful to Laia Mayol for her perceptive insight and careful proofreading.

<sup>★</sup> The research underlying this article was partially supported by grants HUM2006-13295-C02-01/FILO (MEC and FEDER), and 2009SGR1079 (DIUE). Usual disclaimers apply.

<sup>\*</sup> Tel.: +34 93 5811368; fax: +34 93 5812782.

E-mail address: [Xavier.Villalba@uab.es](mailto:Xavier.Villalba@uab.es).

URL: <http://blogs.uab.cat/xaviervillalba>

influential, as it shows, by comparing English and Catalan, that RD is a productive backgrounding strategy (a tail in his terminology) in the latter language, functionally equivalent to English stress shift—a point confirmed in full detail by means of a corpus study by Mayol (2007). Consider an emblematic example:

- (1) A: What did Maria bring?  
 a. B: Maria brought THE WINE.  
 b. B': La Maria va portar EL VI.
- (2) A: What did Maria do with the wine?  
 a. B: Maria BROUGHT the wine.  
 b. B': La Maria el VA PORTAR, el vi.

While English can mark the focused element by simply shifting the accent, as the contrast between (1)a and (2)a shows, Catalan instead must resort to RD in order to allow the verb to be sentence-final, and get the main stress associated to focus through the Nuclear Stress Rule (Chomsky and Halle, 1968; Cinque, 1993; see Vallduví, 1992, 1994 for details of its application in Catalan).

Yet, as recognised by Vallduví (1992) himself, this is an incomplete picture, for English allows a “Catalan solution” as well in the case at hand, namely RD:

- (3) a. A: What did Maria do with the wine?  
 b. B: Maria brought it, the wine.

In turn, as far as we know, Catalan lacks the stress-shift mechanism:

- (4) a. A: What did Maria do with the wine?  
 b. B: \*La Maria VA PORTAR el vi.  
 the.FEM Maria PAST.3SG bring the wine

Yet, the picture becomes even more complex when we shift focus from the classic macroparametric comparative point of view to a microparametric one (Kayne, 1996, 2001, 2005). We do know that the use of RD is sharply different in English and Catalan, and coarse-grained factors easily come to mind, such as the availability of a pronominal clitic system. Notwithstanding, we should probably come to very different answers if two closely related languages were compared. Under such circumstances, the resort to such rough and ready proposals would be necessarily constrained.

In this article I will pursue this enterprise by comparing the role of RD in two genetically related Romance languages: Catalan, and Spanish. While both languages display RD, it is striking that very little attention has been paid to this construction in Hispanic literature (see for instance, the scarce comments and a handful of examples in a major grammatical work such as Bosque and Demonte, 1999), to such an extent that Mercedes Sedano has worked towards proving its very existence: “This article is aimed at demonstrating that the structure known as “right-dislocation” (RD) – *Lo vi ayer, a Juan* (I saw him yesterday, John) – does occur in Spanish and has a topic-marking function.” (Sedano, 2006:60). It is certainly illustrative comparing the goals of Sedano’s paper with the negative judgments by Fabra (1956) regarding the ubiquitous presence of RD in Catalan texts, which he perceived as a violation of the logical order of sentence. Given this state of affairs, my first goal is to quantify the degree of productivity of RD in these two kindred languages, to test on empirical grounds the scarce impressionistic comments scattered across the literature on Catalan RD. Specifically, this study includes a detailed comparison of a Catalan text and a wide range of RD occurrences, and its Spanish translation.

The second goal is to study the mechanisms that Spanish resorts to in order to fulfil the discourse roles typically associated with RD in Catalan. If it is the case that RD is much less common in Spanish than in Catalan, it is of great importance to determine the range of formal mechanisms that Spanish favors with respect to Catalan RD, and their degree of equivalence and specialization.

Finally, although this paper is mainly committed to developing an empirical study on the main features and productivity of RD in Catalan and Spanish, my third goal will consist of establishing a hypothesis on the basis of the strong contrast between these two closely related languages on this particular point. Yet, due to the limitations of the material under study, my aim will be to put forward a line of research for a future far-reaching study rather than offer a full-fledged explanation of the factors that underlie the quite different management of the discourse-driven grammatical mechanisms available in Catalan and Spanish.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Text corpus

The corpus for study was the classical Catalan play *Terra baixa* by Àngel Guimerà (In Àngel Guimerà, Teatre. MOLC 26, Barcelona: Ed. 62 and “la Caixa”. 1998; 23th edition; premiere 1897), which is particularly related to the spoken colloquial

register, the register in which right-dislocation is most natural. For comparison, the Spanish translation *Tierra baja: drama en tres actos y en prosa* by José Echegaray; premiere 1896 was chosen (digital version from the Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes). Unless otherwise noted by '[X(avier)V(illalba)]', translations of examples correspond to Owen W. Gillpatrick's English version *Marta of the Lowlands*, New York, Doubleday, Page & Company, 1915 (available on-line at the Internet Archive <http://www.archive.org/>). I have respected the text conventions and orthography, but for the sake of clarity, I have regularized throughout, the examples of the name of the character Xeixa, which Echegaray and Gillpatrick translate as 'Morrucho'.

As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, since I compare the Catalan original with its Spanish translation, some doubts might be raised on the linguistic value of the Spanish translation. As far as the constructions under study are concerned, the Spanish translation is sufficiently faithful. Obviously, some cases of Catalan RD lack a correlate in the Spanish translation because of a strong reshaping of a particular piece of text, which may include suppressions (see section 3.2), which I have indicated, and then discarded in the statistic analysis in order to keep the comparison under appropriate standards.

## 2.2. Identification method

The identification of the occurrences of right-dislocation in the Catalan text was based on the following features:

- right-peripheral element,
- resumptive clitic,
- separation by a comma,
- context.

Consider one example (the page numbers correspond to the Catalan edition):

- (5) PEPA: És que no ens n'amaguem cap, nosaltres, d'any! p. 164  
 "PEPA: 'Cause, we don't hide our age!" [XV]

Here, the constituent *d'any* lit. 'of year' appears in a right-peripheral position, separated from the core of the sentence by a comma, and connected to the partitive clitic *n'*. Yet, it must be remarked that, apart from the presence of a right-detached element, neither a resumptive element nor a comma were always present. The most obvious case was that of right-dislocated subjects, which lack resumptive element, since Catalan lacks subject clitics (leaving aside the case of indefinite subjects of unaccusative verbs, which may be resumed by means of the partitive *clitic en* 'of it'; see Martí, 2002). In the preceding example, the subject pronoun *nosaltres*, 'we', appears separated from the core of the sentence by means of a comma, and it is followed by the right-dislocated NP object, which has stranded the negative polarity item *cap* 'any/no' in the sentence-final focus position. Hence, despite the lack of resumptive clitic, it seems safe enough to conclude that this constituent is a right-dislocate.

It goes without saying that such an identification method showed a certain degree of uncertainty, since the use of the comma to separate the right-dislocate was not systematic, as the following example shows:

- (6) ANTÒNIA (al Xeixa): I aquest que no ho volia que ho sapiguéssim!  
 "ANTÒNIA [to XEIXA]. You didn't want us to know!" p. 166

All in all, the number of occurrences studied – 226 in the original Catalan text – was high enough to decide that the putative instances of misidentification did not significantly affect the generalizations and conclusions of the article.

## 2.3. Variables studied

Five variables were studied: category, grammatical function, discourse function, antecedent distance, and Spanish realization. I comment on these in some detail in the following paragraphs.

### 2.3.1. Category

Eight different values were considered for the category variable, which are exemplified next:

1. determiner phrase (DP),
2. pronoun (PRO),
3. demonstrative (DEM),
4. noun phrase (NP),
5. complementizer phrase (CP),
6. preposition phrase (PP),
7. adjective phrase (AP),
8. adverb (ADV).

- determiner phrase (DP):

- (7) a. ANTÒNIA (cridant): Marta! Marta!  
 “ANTÒNIA (screaming): Marta! Marta!” [XV]  
 b. PEPA (cridant): Som les Perdigones. Surt!  
 “PEPA (screaming): We are the Perdigones. Come out!” [XV]  
 c. XEIXA: No sortirà pas, la Marta. p. 163–164  
 “XEIXA: I don’t think she’ll come.” p. 4

• pronoun (PRO)<sup>1</sup>:

- (8) XEIXA: Doncs que us caseu o no us caseu, vosaltres? p. 164  
 “XEIXA. Answer yourself! Will you marry or will you not marry? p. 5”

• demonstrative (DEM):

- (9) XEIXA garbellant blat. Després PEPA i ANTÒNIA. XEIXA: Tant se me’n dóna que quedi net o brut, aquest blat. p. 163  
 “XEIXA is discovered sifting wheat. XEIXA. What does it matter whether the wheat’s clean or whether it ain’t clean?” p. 3

• noun phrase (NP):

- (10) a. XEIXA: Com que ja l’heu passat, lo floret de la joventut... Que l’Antònia deu anar pels quaranta. (A la Pepa.) I tu, minyona, si fa no fa!...  
 “XEIXA: Since you have left youth away... Antònia must be getting in the forties. (To Pepa.) And you, more or less the same!... [XV]  
 b. PEPA: És que no ens n’amaguem cap, nosaltres, d’any! p. 164  
 “PEPA: ‘Cause, we don’t hide our age!” [XV]

• complementizer phrase (CP):

- (11) a. NURI: L’hi ha fet anar l’hereu Sebastià. Com que ell és l’amo de tu, i de mi, i de l’ermità, i de la Marta, mira’t, ell fa els casaments, i mira’t, se casen, i... mira’t... és l’amo. Plega’m aquest punt, corre. (No li fan cas.) pp. 165–166  
 “NURI [petulantly]. Well, it was the master your master, and mine, and Tomas’s, and Marta’s. They will be married because he wants them to be, and because he is the master. [Offers yarn to ANTONIA.] Hold this yarn for me!” pp. 8–9  
 b. ANTÒNIA (al Xeixa): I aquest que no ho volia que ho sapiguéssim! p. 166  
 “ANTÒNIA [to XEIXA]. You didn’t want us to know!” p. 9

• prepositional phrase (PP):

- (12) a. SEBASTIÀ: Au, Xeixa, a casament.  
 “SEBASTIÀ: Come on, Xeixa, to the ceremony.” [XV]  
 b. XEIXA: No hi vaig jo, a casament. p. 180  
 “XEIXA [sullenly]. Because I’m not goin’.” p. 37

<sup>1</sup> Since stressed pronouns can be easily right-dislocated in Catalan, one must reject as false the claim by Ziv (1994) that “the impossibility of stressed pronouns to occur as NP, in RD is independently predictable on the basis of the unstressed nature of any NP, in RD” fn. 28.

- adjective phrase (AP):

- (13) a. MARTA: [...] Dolenta d'aquí ben endintre! (Per son cap.) Perquè si no ho fos tant, de dolenta, tindria més esperit, jo, i ja fa temps que hauria fugit d'aquesta casa, o m'hauria tirat pel xuclador de la resclosa! p. 169  
 “MARTA. [...] I'm bad! If I were not bad, I would have run away long ago or drowned myself in the pool.” p. 16

- adverb (ADV):

- (14) PERRUCA: Jo no hi torno aquí! p. 200  
 “PERRUCA. I am not coming back, here!” [XV]

### 2.3.2. Grammatical function

As regards the grammatical function variable, seven values were considered:

1. subject (S),
2. direct object (O),
3. indirect object (IO),
4. prepositional complement (PC),
5. attribute (ATTR),
6. locative (LOC),
7. noun complement (NC).

Now we offer examples displaying the variables under study:

- subject (S),

- (15) XEIXA: I doncs, que no ha baixat, aquell pastor? p. 169  
 “XEIXA. Ain't the shepherd comin'?” p. 16

- direct object (O):

- (16) MOSSÈN (al Xeixa): I deixeu-lo estar vós a l'avi! p. 181  
 “MOSSÈN (to XEIXA). And let the old man go!” [XV]

- indirect object (IO):

- (17) XEIXA (a part): Jo l'hi haig de contar tot, al Tomàs. p. 170  
 “XEIXA [aside]. I'll tell Tomàs!” p. 17

- prepositional complement (PC):

- (18) SEBASTIÀ (dominant-se): Tens raó, que no hi pensàvem de vestir al bon mosso; al... al letxuguino. p. 176  
 “SEBASTIAN [ironically]. We must deck this fine fellow in his wedding clothes!” p. 30

- attribute (ATTR)<sup>2</sup>:

- (19) MANELIC: Bon mosso. Si vol dir tirar dret amb la fona i botre com els isards cingles avall i cingles amunt, i dur la Marta a coll-i-bé, saltant les passeres de Riubanc quan les neus se fonen, oidà, sí que ho sóc, de bon mosso. p. 176

<sup>2</sup> Under the heading attribute we included predicative complements such as the following:

- (i) a. TOMÀS (a Xeixa): Malagrat! Després que et tenen tants anys aquí!  
 “TOMAS. Scamp! After eatin' the master's read all these years!”  
 b. XEIXA: No m'ho digueu malagrat, Tomàs, que no sabeu amb qui tracteu. p. 181  
 XEIXA. Don't you call me a scamp!” 38

“MANELICH. Well, there's nothin' to laugh at. If to be a fine fellow means to throw farther with the sling than anybody, to leap from cliff to cliff like the goats, to carry Marta on my shoulder through the deep places in the river when the snow comes down, then I am a fine fellow!” p. 30

- locative (LOC):

- (20) a. SEBASTIÀ: Au, Xeixa, a casament.  
 “SEBASTIÀ: Come on, Xeixa, to the ceremony.” [XV]  
 b. XEIXA: No hi vaig jo, a casament. p. 180  
 “XEIXA [sullenly]. Because I'm not goin'.” p. 37

- noun complement (NC):

- (21) XEIXA (no deixant-les dir): [...] I vaja, que si no es casa la Nuri quan siga més grandeta, se'n perdrà la mena, dels Perdigons. p. 164  
 “XEIXA. So if Nuri don't marry when she's a little older, the breed of partridges will be lost...” p. 6

### 2.3.3. Discourse function

The choice of the values for the discourse function was a synthesis of different proposals, particularly [Ashby \(1988\)](#) for French, [Grosz and Ziv \(1998\)](#) for English and Hebrew, [Mayol \(2006, 2007\)](#) for Catalan, and [Brunetti \(2009\)](#) for Italian. Moreover, I left aside the repair function, because, as argued at length by [Ziv \(1994\)](#), [Grosz and Ziv \(1998\)](#) and [Villalba \(2000\)](#), it is fulfilled by an independent construction (afterthought) with clearly distinctive properties from that of RD (cf. [Geluykens, 1987](#)).

First, we considered topic activation. As already noted by [Lambrecht \(1981\)](#) regarding French RD, the dislocate recovers referents which are either physically present in the context of utterance or have been introduced in the discourse, and makes them salient enough to be activated as discourse topics (see [Lambrecht, 1981](#); [Ziv, 1994](#) for discussion, and [Grosz and Ziv, 1998](#) for a formalization in the context of Centering Theory). Consider, first, a clear case of a physically available antecedent (the antecedent is marked in *italics*):

- (22) XEIXA garbellant blat. Després PEPA i ANTÒNIA. XEIXA: Tant se me'n dóna  
 que quedí net o brut, aquest blat.  
 “XEIXA is discovered sifting wheat. XEIXA. What does it matter whether the wheat's clean or whether' it ain't clean?” p.163

Since this is the first conversational turn in the whole play, the referent of the dislocate *aquest blat*, ‘this wheat’, does not qualify as discourse-old, but it is obviously physically salient, as the playwright's comment shows.

Consider now the activation of a previous discourse topic (the last two lines by Nuri and Antònia are omitted in the English translation):

- (23) a. NURI (corrent): L'ermità! L'ermità!  
 “NURI. Tomas is coming!”  
 b. TOMÀS: Ai! Ai! I quina cruixidera d'ossos, Xeixa! “TOMAS  
 [entering]. Ay! How tired I am!”  
 c. XEIXA: I doncs, que no ha baixat, aquell pastor?  
 “XEIXA. Ain't the shepherd comin'?”  
 d. NURI: Se diu Manelic. Quin nom més bufó! Fa cabrit. “NURI. His  
 name is Manelic. What a nice name! It sounds goatish.” [XV]  
 e. ANTÒNIA: I que no baixa? “ANTONIA. Why, isn't he coming?”  
 [XV] p. 169

Here the referent *aquell pastor*, ‘that shepherd’ [=Manelic], is already part of the common ground, in [Stalnaker's \(2002\)](#) sense, as indicated by the use of the demonstrative.<sup>3</sup> Yet, this topic is not maximally active, for it was introduced two scenes before, on page 167, so that it be rendered maximally active by means of right-dislocation. Then it can become the discourse topic, and be retaken by means of a null pronoun in Nuri's and Antònia's lines.

<sup>3</sup> For Stalnaker, the common ground is “the mutually recognized shared information in a situation in which an act of trying to communicate takes place” [Stalnaker \(2002:704\)](#).

Regarding this discourse function, one anonymous reviewer raises the question of whether RD may introduce a new referent. This possibility is not considered in the literature, where the assumption is made that right-dislocates must be highly presuppositional. As Ziv (1994, fn 27) notes, “RDs cannot be used to introduce discourse-new entities which are not situationally evoked, and even in instances of textually inferred entities, the two seem to abide by somewhat distinct set-inferencing constraints.” (similar claims are made in Brunetti, 2009; Mayol, 2006, 2007; Villalba, 2000, 2009). He offers the following contrast between Left dislocation and RD:

- (24) I went on a bus this morning.  
 a. LD: The driver, I was afraid he was going to collide into a truck.  
 b. RD: \*He was drunk, the driver.

As it will become clearer in section 2.3.4, the picture is a bit more complex, for examples exist where an antecedent cannot be easily identified, such as the following:

- (25) a. XEIXA: Escolteu. Que no hi haviéu estat mai per aquestes terres?  
 “XEIXA: Say! Were you never here before honest?”  
 b. TOMÀS: No, fill.  
 “TOMAS. No, son! Why?”  
 c. XEIXA: Ni al mas de l'amo, ni aquí? “MORRUCHO. Nor at the master's house?”  
 d. TOMÀS: Veuràs: jo menava terres d'un oncle del Sebastià, d'allà vora Figueres. [...] I si tu ja ho saps que fa quatre dies que hi som! P. 171  
 “TOMAS. No! I was working a piece of land for Sebastian's uncle over there near Figueres. [...] But you already know that we have just arrived here!” [XV]

In this case, although the dislocate is a purely discourse-new referent, it is assumed by the speaker to be part of the common ground, and it can be accommodated by the listener, following the conversational strategies described by Lewis (1975) and Stalnaker (2002). So then, pending a more detailed study, I will side with the mainstream position that RD does not introduce pure new discourse topics. The second value for discourse function is the continuation of an active topic:

- (26) a. ANTÒNIA (cridant): Marta! Marta! PEPA (cridant): Som les Perdigones. Surt!  
 “ANTÒNIA (screaming): Marta! Marta!” PEPA (screaming): We are the Perdigones. Come out!” [XV]  
 b. XEIXA: No sortirà pas, la Marta. [...] p. 164  
 “XEIXA: I don't think she'll come...” p. 4

Here, Marta is the discourse topic and is maximally active, but it is expressed by means of a right-dislocate. From a purely functional point of view, continuation topics have received no proper account in the literature, for, under standard assumptions, the referent is already an active topic, and one would expect that the dislocate be simply omitted (see Mayol, 2006, 2007; Brunetti, 2009).<sup>4</sup> Yet, this quandary is even more apparent in an example like the following, where the same referent appears as a right-dislocate in two consecutive utterances:

- (27) Jo no el vui, no, a aquest home! Jo no l'haig de voler al Manelic!  
 “I don't want him, no, this man! I cannot want him, Manelic!” p. 169

Notwithstanding, Grosz and Ziv (1998) and Mayol (2007) argue that the presence of the right-dislocate does play a role here: it adds an expressive flavor, typically, one of surprise or irritation, which would suggest that the optionality is more apparent than real. We will return to this issue in the discussion section.<sup>5</sup>

The last discourse function value is that of evaluative epithet (Grosz and Ziv, 1998; Mayol, 2007):

- (28) JOSEP: Doncs l'ermità, que no pensa mal, va dir a l'amo que coneixia un minyó que és pastor, i que no s'havia mogut mai de la vora dels moltons allà pels camins de les Punxales, i que era un tros de pa.  
 Al sentir-ho l'amo va esclafir a riure, perquè ja el coneixia an aquell beneit de pastor. p. 167

<sup>4</sup> The distinction traced here between activation and continuation resembles the distinction between pronouns and definite DPs traced in Vallduví (1992: fn. 49), who builds on previous insights by Chafe (1976) and Prince (1981): “definites trigger an activation of a dormant preexistent address. Pronouns simply indicate that their referent is in activation at the time of utterance”.

<sup>5</sup> Laia Mayol (p.c.) raised my attention to the fact that a high percentage of right-dislocated continuation topics involved some kind of presupposition denial grammatically encoded by means of negation or emphatic markers. Currently, we are working on this promising line of research.



“JOSEP: Well, Tomas the hermit, who is always sayin’ or doin’ the wrong thing, told the master not meanin’ any harm that he knew a lad, a shepherd, who had lived all his life up there in the mountain of the Cabreriza, among the goats, and that he was soft as dough. When the master heard him say that about Manelich that’s the shepherd’s name he began to laugh, because he already knew him.” p. 12

Here the right-dislocate (re)introduces or continues a previously introduced referent (*un minyó* ‘a lad’), but appending it with an epithet, which transmits the speaker’s attitude toward the referent. Henceforth, omission of the dislocate would not yield to ungrammaticality, but it would entail the loss of the evaluative information.

#### 2.3.4. Distance with respect to the discourse antecedent

As complementary to the discourse function, a variable was considered concerning the distance between the dislocate and its antecedent in the discourse, which owes much to Givón’s (1983) work on topic continuity. The typology was threefold, including local, non-local, and inferable antecedents. First of all, we considered local those explicit antecedents of the RD in the same or previous utterance (the antecedent appears in *italics*):

- (29) NANDO: Doncs afigureu’s-e si ho és, de rucàs, que amb prou feines ha vist quatre persones en sa vida, i encara mascles, que *de dones*. . . potser ni la ferum n’ha sentit, **de les dones**.  
 “NANDO: He’s a brute an animal ! He’s never seen anything in his life but goats hardly ever a man and a woman Why, he’s never laid eyes on one, . . .” pp. 167–168
- (30) a. SEBASTIÀ: Au, Xeixa, *a casament*.  
 “SEBASTIÀ: Come on, Xeixa, to the ceremony.” [XV]  
 b. XEIXA: No hi vaig jo, **a casament**. p. 180  
 “XEIXA [sullenly]. Because I’m not goin’.” p. 37

If the antecedent was explicit, but two or more utterances away, we classified it as nonlocal, as in the following typical example:

- (31) a. NURI: L’ermità? L’ermità se n’havia anat a buscar el pastor; un pastor que és de molt lluny, de molt lluny, per casar-lo aquest vespre amb la Marta.  
 “NURI. Why, the shepherd! The one who is comin’ from far off to marry Marta to-night.”  
 b. PEPA (alçant-se): Ja m’ho temia jo.  
 “ANTONIA [wagging her head]. I thought as much!”  
 c. ANTÒNIA: Aquest vespre?  
 “PEPA. To-night! Do you hear, Antonia?”  
 d. XEIXA (tornant al garbell. A part): Té, elles ho han sapigut!  
 “XEIXA [returning to his work]. Now they know.”  
 e. ANTÒNIA: I qui l’hi ha fet anar, al Tomàs [=l’ermità]? pp. 165–166  
 “PEPA. And who sent Tomas to fetch the shepherd?” p. 8

Here the antecedent *l’ermità*, ‘the hermit’, is made salient four utterances later by means of the right-dislocated *al Tomàs*, ‘to Tomas’.

Finally, the category of inferable antecedents included all implicit antecedents that could be recovered from the context either because of their indexical character or by means of bridging. First, consider an instance of indexical antecedent:

- (32) XEIXA garbellant blat. Després PEPA i ANTÒNIA. XEIXA: Tant se me’n dóna que quedí net o brut, aquest blat.  
 p. 163  
 “XEIXA is discovered sifting wheat. XEIXA. What does it matter whether the wheat’s clean or whether’ it ain’t clean?” p. 3

Now consider the following example, already commented in section 2.3.3:

- (33) MARTA: No sé per què tinc de plorar d’aquesta manera! Tants anys que no ploro aixís! . . . Si jo em pensava que ja ni en sabia! (Se va eixugantse amb pauses.) Jo havia de dir que no, i sempre que no, al Sebastià; per força no m’hi [=amb el Manelic; XV] casarien! Ara ho veig, ara, lo desgraciada que sóc. (Pausa.) Si no sóc ningú, jo, ningú; que em van agafar com a una bèstia, i com una bèstia m’han criat; i ara. . . Mareta meva! (Pausa.) Jo no el vui, no, a aquest home! Jo no l’haig de voler al Manelic! p. 169



“MARTA [alone]. I’m not crying! Why, it’s years since I’ve cried! I thought I’d forgotten how! [Pause.] I ought to have told Sebastian I would not marry that man that he should not drive me to church with him! [Pause.] Yet, why not? I’m nobody! For him less than nobody. For Sebastian, I have been a beast, nothing more ! Oh, my mother! I don’t want him, this man! I will not want him, Manelic.”[XV]

Here the referent Manelic is already part of the discourse context, as indicated by its pronominalization by means of oblique pronoun *hi* – *per força no m’hi casarien* ‘he should not drive me to church with him’ – and its resumption with a demonstrative – *a aquest home* ‘this man’. Yet, this antecedent is not maximally active – the discourse topic is Marta – although recoverable from the context by means of right-dislocation.

### 2.3.5. Spanish realization

The last variable considered was the Spanish realization of the occurrences of RD in the original Catalan text. In order to determine the different values, we examined the texts, and the following possibilities were found:

- right-dislocation,
- left-dislocation,
- canonical position,
- explanation,
- omission.

In the first case, the Catalan RD translated as a RD in the Spanish text (the Spanish digital version is not page-numbered):

- (34) a. NURI: Jo ja fa temps que ho sabia que la Marta ho deia que era de l’hereu Sebastià, sinó que no ho entenia aleshores, ves. (Riu amb candidès.) p. 165
- b. NURI.- Pues yo... ya lo sabía que la Marta era del amo, y que en mandando él que se casara... se había de casar.
- c. NURI. Well, I – I knew Marta belonged to the master, and that when he told her to marry, she would have to marry. p. 9

The second possibility involved converting the Catalan RD into a left-dislocation in the Spanish text:

- (35) a. MANELIC: [...] Ara a dir lo parenostre pels de casa. Aquell per la muller ja no el puc resar, que ja en tinc ja, de muller. p. 186
- b. MANELICH.- Ahora a rezar (En voz baja.) el Padrenuestro de mis padres. El Padrenuestro para... mi mujer... no tengo que rezarlo... porque mujer... mujer... ya la tengo... ya la tengo...
- c. I say my prayers; first a paternoster, and then another paternoster, which makes two paternosters. [He looks from one to another for approval. All nod assent.] The first for the souls of my father and my mother, because they loved each other so; one is enough for both. And the other paternoster do you know what it is for? Why, so the Lord would send me a good wife! p. 24

The third option consisted of replacing the Catalan dislocate in its canonical position in the Spanish text:

- (36) a. XEIXA garbellant blat. Després PEPA i ANTÒNIA. XEIXA: Tant se me’n dóna que quedí net o brut, aquest blat. p. 163
- b. EL MORRUCHO, cribando trigo; después, PEPA y ANTONIA; por último, NURI. MORRUCHO.- Bastante me importa a mí que el trigo quede limpio o que no quede limpio. Para el amo va a ser, conque, ¿qué más da?
- c. XEIXA is discovered sifting wheat. XEIXA. What does it matter whether the wheat’s clean or whether it ain’t clean? p. 3

Another possibility was rephrasing the RD by means of an explanation:

- (37) a. NURI (...): Sí que hi són, sí, els de casa,... p. 216
- b. NURI: (...) Sí, sí; ahí los tienes: los de casa;
- c. NURI. Yes, yes, they’re all there! p. 103

Finally, the omission of the right-dislocate was also possible, as in the following example, where the dislocated pronoun is simply omitted in the Spanish text, since, because Spanish is a null-subject language, its content can be recovered from the verbal morphology:

- (38) a. NURI: Això! Que n'hem d'aprendre de casar-nos, nosaltres. p. 167  
 b. NURI.- Eso, ja la boda! Para que aprendamos cómo hay que hacer para casarse.  
 c. NURI [delighted]. Oh, yes! Then I shall see how people act when they get married! p. 11

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Catalan

The Catalan text contained 226 occurrences of RD. In the following paragraphs the distribution of these occurrences is described regarding the variables studied.

##### 3.1.1. Category

The most frequent categories were PP (23.45%), DP (23.01%), and CP (20.80%) (Table 1).

It is worth noting that the sum of nominal categories (DP + PRO + DEM + NP) amounted to 50.00% of the occurrences. If one added the CP category, which is not inherently nominal, but covers the most typical nominal functions, the coverage rose to 70.80%. Finally, for the sake of completeness, it must be taken into account that 22 of the 53 PP occurrences corresponded to instances of direct objects introduced by the differential object marker *a*, so that one might consider them non full-fledged PPs.

##### 3.1.2. Grammatical function

By far, the most common grammatical function was that of direct object, which amounted to half the cases (50.44%), followed by that of subject, which amounted to a quarter (25.22%). Attribute, indirect object, prepositional complement and locative functions were under the 10% range, and noun complements amounted to less than 1% of the cases (Table 2).

##### 3.1.3. Discourse function

The activation of topic showed the highest frequency (59.29%), followed at a certain distance by the continuation function (36.28%). In contrast, the occurrence of evaluative epithets was very low: 4.42%.

##### 3.1.4. Distance with respect to the discourse antecedent

Both inferable and local antecedents displayed a similar frequency: 40.71% and 40.27%, respectively. Nonlocal antecedents fared much lower: 19.03%.

**Table 1**

Frequency of Catalan right-dislocates regarding category.

	Frequency	%
PP	53	23.45
DP	52	23.00
SC	47	20.80
PRO	31	13.72
DEM	19	8.41
NP	11	4.87
AP	10	4.42
Adv	3	1.33
Total	226	100.00

**Table 2**

Frequency of Catalan right-dislocates regarding grammatical function.

	Frequency	%
Direct object	114	50.44
Subject	57	25.22
Attribute	19	8.40
Prepositional complement	16	7.08
Locative	11	4.87
Indirect complement	7	3.10
Noun complement	2	0.88
Total	226	99.99

**Table 3**

chi-square values of variables (up) and predicted values (down) for a 95% confidence level.

CAT	GF	DF	DIST
CAT	365.62 (42) 55.76 (40)	41.73 (14) 23.68 (14)	57.44 (14) 23.68 (14)
GF	365.62 (42) 55.76 (40)	29.72 (12) 21.03 (12)	29.89 (12) 21.03 (12)
DF	41.73 (14) 23.68 (14)	29.72 (12) 21.03 (12)	175.55 (4) 9.49 (4)
DIST	57.44 (14) 23.68 (14)	29.89 (12) 21.03 (12)	175.55 (4) 9.49 (4)

Degree of freedom appears between brackets.

**Table 4**

Compared frequency values of Catalan RD regarding discourse function and antecedent distance.

	Local	Nonlocal	Inferable
Activation	6 (4.48%)	134 (31.34%)	86 (64.18%)
Continuation	76 (93.90%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (6.10%)
Epithet	9 (90.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)
Total	91 (40.27%)	43 (19.03%)	92 (40.71%)

### 3.1.5. Relations across variables

Two clear relations were found between variables: grammatical category and grammatical function, and discourse function and antecedent distance. Regarding the former, the chi-square test revealed a strong dependent relation, particularly as the chi-square was 365.62, 42 degrees of freedom, whereas the predicted value for 40 degrees of freedom was 55.76 at a 95% confidence level (see the values of the chi-square for all the variables in Table 3). This strong dependency was confirmed by the ANOVA tests: when category was chosen as the explicative variable,  $F = 31.84$  for 7 degrees of freedom, which was far greater than the predicted 2.09 value for a 95% confidence level. When discourse function was chosen as the explanatory variable,  $F = 15.22$  for 6 degrees of freedom, which, again, was far greater than the predicted 2.10 value for a 95% confidence level. Since the relation between these two variables was not of particular interest to the study of RD, I leave out the description of the particular data.

When we considered discourse function and antecedent distance, we found that whereas activation topics typically had inferable antecedents (64.18%) and to a lesser extent nonlocal antecedents (31.34%), continuation topics had a massive preference for local antecedents (93.90%) (I provide the complete figures in Table 4).<sup>6</sup>

Statistical tests confirmed this correlation: chi-square was 175.55, whereas the predicted value for 4 degrees of freedom was 9.49 for a 95% confidence level. This strong dependency was confirmed by the ANOVA tests: when distance was chosen as the explanatory variable,  $F = 69.80$  for 2 degrees of freedom, which was far greater than the predicted 19.9 value for a 95% confidence level. When discourse function was chosen as the explanatory variable,  $F = 191.39$  for 2 degrees of freedom, which, again, was far greater than the predicted 19.9 value for a 95% confidence level.

Concerning the interaction of the nondependent variables, some regularities were found. For instance, the most habitual categories as topic (re)introducers were CP (31.85%), DP (29.20%), PRO (18.58%) and PP (13.27%). Moreover, DP was the most frequent topic continuator (38.18%) and the almost sole instance of evaluative epithet (88.89%). The details appear in Table 5.

Also certain categories showed preferences concerning distance with respect to the antecedent. On the one hand, right-dislocated pronouns were massively connected to an inferable antecedent: 25 of 31 cases (80.65%). CP and demonstratives followed this tendency as well, but to a lesser extent: 57.45% and 42.11%, respectively. On the other hand, NPs, APs, and DPs strongly tended to have local antecedents: 81.82%, 80.00%, and 59.62%, respectively (the details can be consulted in Table 6).

Finally, regarding grammatical function and distance, more than half the right-dislocated subjects had inferable antecedents (56.14%), and a huge majority of attributes had local antecedents (84.21%). Direct and indirect objects, instead did not show a clear tendency: direct objects chose equally local and inferable antecedents (42.11% and 40.35%, respectively), and indirect objects had identical preference for local and nonlocal antecedents (42.86% and 42.86%, respectively). I summarize the results in Table 7.

<sup>6</sup> An anonymous reviewer points out that RD with the continuation function must have local antecedents by definition. In other words, we expect all continuation cases of RD to be local. I agree with this overall intuition, and the five residual cases of inferable continuation RD can be accounted for as instances where the antecedent is not mentioned in the preceding discourse (hence, inferable), but it is an active and salient part of the common ground. Hence, although not local in the strict sense (no explicit mention exists in the preceding utterances), this handful of cases could not be considered prototypical inferable RDs.

Furthermore, one must also take into account that the nonlinear development of discourse by several characters creates a potential source for misclassification in theater plays, particularly in those cases where two topics are active in two independent lines. In any event, we can conclude that the strong correlation between continuation RDs and local antecedents are a logical necessity, rather than an empirical finding.

**Table 5**

Frequency of Catalan right-dislocates regarding discourse function and category.

	Topic activation	Topic continuation	Evaluative epithet
DP	33 (29.2%)	42 (38.18%)	8 (88.89%)
CP	36 (31.85%)	16 (14.54%)	0
PRO	21 (18.58%)	9 (8.1%)	0
PP	15 (13.27%)	14 (12.72%)	1 (11.11%)
DEM	5 (4.42%)	10 (9%)	0
NP	3 (2.65%)	10 (9%)	0
AP	0	9 (8.1%)	0
ADV	2 (66.67%)	1 (33.33%)	0
Total	134	82	10

**Table 6**

Frequency of Catalan right-dislocates regarding antecedent distance and category.

	Local	Nonlocal	Inferable
DP	31 (59.62%)	7 (13.46%)	14 (26.92%)
CP	12 (25.53%)	8 (17.02%)	27 (57.45%)
PRO	2 (6.45%)	4 (12.90%)	25 (80.65%)
PP	21 (39.62%)	17 (32.08%)	15 (28.30%)
DEM	7 (36.84%)	4 (21.05%)	8 (42.11%)
NP	9 (81.82%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)
AP	8 (80.00%)	1 (10.00%)	1 (10.00%)
ADV	1 (33.33%)	1 (33.33%)	1 (33.33%)
Total	91 (40.27%)	43 (19.03%)	92 (40.71%)

**Table 7**

Frequency of Catalan right-dislocates regarding antecedent distance and function.

	Local	Nonlocal	Inferable
S	15 (26.32%)	10 (17.54%)	32 (56.14%)
O	48 (42.11%)	20 (17.54%)	46 (40.35%)
CN	1 (50.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (50.00%)
IO	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)
LOC	4 (36.36%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)
ATTR	16 (84.21%)	1 (5.26%)	2 (10.52%)
PC	4 (25.00%)	5 (31.25%)	7 (43.75%)
Total	91 (40.27%)	43 (19.03%)	92 (40.71%)

### 3.2. Spanish

Of the 226 occurrences of RD in the Catalan text, 75 (33.19%) disappeared in the Spanish translation. Of the remaining 151 occurrences, only 7 (4.64%) corresponded to RD, which yields a ratio of 1 Spanish RD for every 32.28 instances of Catalan RD. By far, the most common alternative option was realizing the Catalan right-dislocate in its canonical position, which amounted to 101 occurrences (66.89%), followed at a remarkable distance by the omission of the right-dislocate: 57 occurrences (23.84%). The values are displayed in Table 8.

**Table 8**

Frequency of Spanish realizations of Catalan right-dislocates.

	Frequency	%
Canonical position	101	66.89
Omission	57	23.84
Right-dislocation	7	4.64
Left-dislocation	5	3.31
Apposition	2	1.32
Total	151	100.00

**Table 9**

In situ occurrences of right-dislocates in the Spanish text, regarding grammatical function.

	O	S	CN	IO	ATTR	LOC	PC	Total
Freq.	46	25	1	6	10	5	8	101
%	45.54	24.75	0.99	5.94	9.90	4.95	7.92	99.99

**Table 10**

Occurrences of right-dislocates in the Spanish text.

category	Grammatical	Function discourse	Function distance
CP	O	Activation	Nonlocal
CP	O	Activation	Nonlocal
CP	O	Activation	Nonlocal
DP	S	Epithet	Local
dem	S	Activation	Inferable
PP	O	Activation	Nonlocal
pro	S	Continuation	Local

### 3.2.1. Canonical position

Regarding category, of the 101 occurrences in canonical position, PP, DP, and CP behaved similarly: PP scored 26 (25.74%), DP, 24 (23.76%), and CP, 23 (22.77%). Pronouns and demonstratives were less common: 11 (10.89%), and 8 (7.92%), respectively. Finally, AP and NP fared quite low: 5 (4.95%), and 4 (3.96%), respectively.

When grammatical function was considered, objects were by far the predominant value – 46 occurrences (45.54%) – followed at a high distance by the subject function: 25 occurrences (24.75%). None of the other functions reached 10% (see the values in Table 9).

Regarding discourse function, of the 101 occurrences in canonical position, 63 (62.38%) corresponded to instances of activation of topic in the Catalan text, 37 (36.63%) to instances of continuation of topic in the Catalan text, and only 1 (0.99%) to evaluative epithets.

Finally, concerning antecedent distance, of the 101 occurrences in canonical position, 40 (39.60%) corresponded to inferable antecedents in the Catalan text, 37 (36.63%) to instances of local antecedents, and 24 (23.76%) to nonlocal antecedents.

### 3.2.2. Omission

Regarding category, of the 36 cases of omission, pronouns and DPs behaved similarly: pronouns scored 13 (36.11%), and DPs 11 (30.56%). PPs amounted to 6 occurrences (16.67%), and CP 3 (8.33%). Finally, NP and AP fared quite low – 2 (5.56%), and 1 (2.78%), respectively – whereas no cases of demonstratives were found.

When grammatical function was considered, object and subject rated alike – 18 (50.00%) and 16 (44.44%) occurrences, respectively – whereas the only other attested function, attribute, was testimonial: 2 occurrences (5.56%).

Regarding discourse function, of the 36 occurrences involving the omission of the right-dislocate, 19 (52.78%) corresponded to instances of activation of topic in the Catalan text, 14 (38.89%) to instances of continuation of topic in the Catalan text, and only 3 (8.33%) to evaluative epithets.

Finally, concerning antecedent distance, of the 36 cases of omission, local and inferable antecedents rated similarly – 18 (50.00%) and 16 (44.44%) occurrences, respectively – whereas nonlocal antecedents were testimonial: 2 occurrences (5.56%).

### 3.2.3. Right-dislocation

The properties of the Catalan right-dislocates which survived as RD in the Spanish text appear summarized in Table 10.

Even though the data were scarce, a pattern predominated: a CP direct object dislocate with an activation function and a nonlocal antecedent (see (34) above).

### 3.2.4. Left-dislocation

The properties of the five occurrences of Catalan right-dislocates which are reconstructed as left-dislocations in the Spanish text appear summarized in Table 11.

**Table 11**

Occurrences of right-dislocates in the Spanish text.

Category	Grammatical	Function discourse	Function distance
NP	O	Continuation	Local
PP	NC	Continuation	Local
PP	LOC	Activation	Nonlocal
PP	LOC	Activation	Nonlocal
PP	O	Activation	Inferable

**Table 12**

Occurrences of explanations in the Spanish text.

Category	Grammatical	Function discourse	Function distance
CP	O	Activation	Inferable
DP	S	Continuation	Local

### 3.2.5. Explanation

The properties of the two occurrences of Catalan right-dislocates which are reconstructed as explanations in the Spanish text appear summarized in Table 12.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. The productivity of right-dislocation

The data from section 3 show the extremely marginal role of right-dislocation in Spanish when compared with Catalan: from a quantitative point of view, the ratio was 1/32.28, which confirms the intuition scattered throughout literature that RD is far more common in Catalan than in Spanish. Furthermore, when the data are considered in some detail, one can appreciate that besides frequency, qualitative differences exist, showing that the properties of RD seem quite different in each language. First of all, Catalan RD affects all the categories, and grammatical functions. In contrast, Spanish RD is restricted to sentences, demonstratives and DPs, and to subject and object functions. Concerning discourse function, Spanish RD showed a sharp preference for topic activation, which heavily outnumbered the frequency of the topic continuation by 57.14; whereas in Catalan, the preference for topic activation with respect to topic continuation was less striking: 23.01 (see Table 13 for the particular frequencies).

Finally, clear differences also appeared regarding the distance to the antecedent between both languages (see Table 14): Catalan had an equally high preference for local (40.27%) and inferable antecedents (40.71%), whereas Spanish RD preferred nonlocal antecedents (57.14%).

Obviously, the very few occurrences of RD in the Spanish text (7 cases) call for a very cautionary interpretation of these contrasts. Yet, we can safely conclude that RD in Spanish is a very marginal resource, and its uses are qualitatively distinct from that of RD in Catalan.

### 4.2. The roots of variation

As discussed in section 3.2, realization of the dislocate in its canonical position is the prevalent alternative strategy in Spanish (66.89%). The main question that these figures raise is the following: is the realization of the dislocate in its canonical position in Spanish a functional equivalent of Catalan RD? If one considers the analysis of Catalan RD by Mayol (2006, 2007), the answer must be negative (see Ziv, 1994; Grosz and Ziv, 1998, for a similar position from a different standpoint). Mayol remarks that her corpus included a 10.7% of Catalan RD which, to her judgment, were amenable to a canonical realization. Yet, she makes two important remarks. On the one hand, such a possibility is available when the antecedent of the dislocate has been introduced in the previous discourse or forms part of the common ground (i.e. it is inferable). On the other hand,

**Table 13**

Relative frequency of Catalan and Spanish right-dislocates regarding discourse function.

	Catalan	Spanish
Topic activation	59.29	71.43
Topic continuation	36.28	14.29
Evaluative epithet	4.42	14.29
Total	99.99	100.01

**Table 14**

Relative frequency of Catalan and Spanish right-dislocates regarding distance to the antecedent.

	Catalan	Spanish
Local	40.27	28.57
Nonlocal	19.03	57.14
Inferable	40.71	14.29
Total	100.0	100.0

each mechanism entails different information packagings: the RD version treats the dislocate as background, whereas the *in situ* alternative treats all the material as part of the rheme.

If we translate Mayol's intuitions to our set of variables, we would expect Spanish canonical realizations to correspond to activation topics, and to inferable and nonlocal antecedents. As for the discourse function, this seems to be fairly correct: 62.38% of the cases corresponded to activation topics, far ahead of the 36.33% of continuation topics. Concerning distance, the prediction is fulfilled by a similar range: nonlocal and inferable antecedents totalled 63.36% of the occurrences (23.76% and 39.60%, respectively). So then, we can conclude that in Spanish, the canonical position is the most common alternative for Catalan RD with a topic activation function.

While this might be considered a remarkable empirical accomplishment, we can still ask why Spanish does not make use of the specialized RD construction to obtain the desired background reading, and prefers a complex combination of realization in canonical position and some kind of accommodation process. One interesting line of research might be to pursue the fact that Spanish lacks oblique clitics, which makes Spanish RD a less regular and unambiguous mechanism for marking activation topics. In contrast, realization in canonical position is a maximally efficient mechanism: any category or function receives a similar treatment. It is, hence, more general a mechanism in Spanish than RD, and it is favored, in spite of the fact that, since it treats the information that Catalan encodes by means of RD as if it were new information, one could argue that confusion with focus should *prima facie* disfavor such a solution.<sup>7</sup>

If this line of research proves correct, one could speculate that, leaving aside additional factors, the richer the clitic system is, the more common RD will be. Although based on intuitive grounds, Lisa Brunetti (p.c.) confirms that the productivity of RD in Italian seems to be closer to Catalan than to Spanish. Crucially, even though Italian shares a full pronominal clitic system with Catalan, its use of RD is less pervasive. This might have to do with the availability of *emmarginazione* 'marginalization', see Antinucci and Cinque (1977), Cardinaletti (2002) and Belletti (2004). Obviously, a fully comparative and quantitative study is needed before drawing any firm conclusion.

## 5. Conclusions

In this paper I have studied the role of RD in two genetically related Romance languages: Catalan, and Spanish. In the first place, I have quantified the degree of productivity of RD in these two kindred languages through a corpus-based analysis. I have shown that these two languages make very different use, both quantitatively and qualitatively, of RD; particularly, while RD is a pervasive mechanism in Catalan for activation and continuation topics, Spanish makes very marginal use of RD: only 1 occurrence for every 32.38 occurrences of Catalan RD. Moreover, I have shown as well, that RD in Catalan and Spanish does not differ on quantitative grounds only, but they seem to fulfil quite different roles in each language. That is, Catalan RD affects all categories, and grammatical functions, and admits both topic activation and topic continuation functions. In contrast, Spanish RD is restricted to sentences, demonstratives and DPs, and to subject and object functions, and shows a sharp preference for topic activation. Thus, our corpus-based comparative study confirmed with solid empirical evidence the intuition underlying traditional grammatical literature; that Catalan RD is a nuclear mechanism for articulating information in sentence and discourse, whereas Spanish RD has a marginal role.

The second major conclusion at which we have arrived is that Spanish resorts to realization in canonical position as the main alternative mechanism to Catalan RD: it amounted to 66.89% of occurrences in the Spanish text, followed at a great distance by the omission of the right-dislocate (23.84%). Remarkably, Spanish canonical realizations tend to correspond to activation topics (62.38% of the cases), and to inferable and nonlocal antecedents (63.36% of the occurrences, when both categories were added).

Finally, I have put forward a line of research to explain the factors that determine such a different discourse management of the formal mechanisms available in these two languages, namely, that Spanish cannot resort to RD as a pervasive mechanism for, unlike Catalan (or French or Italian), it lacks a full paradigm of pronominal clitics, which makes RD less general a mechanism for marking activation or continuation topics. Although the resort to canonical realization might raise a problematic ambiguity with respect to focus, I have shown that the particular pragmatic conditions imposed on this device (probably supplemented by a particular prosodic marking) ensure a high degree of efficiency at singularizing the construction.

## References

- Antinucci, F., Cinque, G., 1977. Sull'ordine delle parole in italiano. *l'emarginazione*. Studi di Grammatica Italiana 6, 121–146.
- Ashby, W., 1988. The syntax, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics of left- and right dislocation in French. *Lingua* 75, 203–229.
- Belletti, A., 2004. Aspects of the low VP area. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Bosque, I., Demonte, V. (Eds.), 1999. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Espasa, Madrid.
- Brunetti, L., 2009. On links and tails in Italian. *Lingua* 119 (5), 756–781.
- Cardinaletti, A., 2002. Against optional and null clitics. Right dislocation vs. marginalization. *Studia Linguistica* 56, 29–57.
- Cecchetto, C., 1999. A comparative analysis of left and right dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53, 40–67.

<sup>7</sup> It could also be the case that, as Ziv (1994) suggests, the potential informational ambiguity between focus and canonical realization of background material can be resolved by means of additional prosodic mechanisms. Obviously, as two anonymous reviewers point out, the written nature of our corpus does not allow us to test such a hypothesis, so I leave the question for a future research.



- Chafe, W.L., 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In: Li, C. (Ed.), *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 25–55.
- Chomsky, N., Halle, M., 1968. *The Sound Pattern of English*. Harper & Row, New York.
- Cinque, G., 1993. A null theory of phrase and compound stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 239–298.
- Dik, S.C., 1978. *Functional Grammar*. North Holland, Amsterdam.
- Fabra, P., 1956. *Gramàtica catalana*. Teide, Barcelona.
- Geluykens, R., 1987. Tails (right-dislocations) as a repair mechanism in English conversation. In: Nuyts, J., de Schutter, G. (Eds.), *Getting One's Word into Line*. Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 119–129.
- Givón, T. (Ed.), 1983. *Topic Continuity in Language*. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Grosz, B., Ziv, Y., 1998. Centering, global focus and right dislocation. In: Walker, M., Joshi, A., Prince, E. (Eds.), *Centering in Discourse*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 39–51.
- Kayne, R.S., 1996. Microparametric syntax. Some introductory remarks. In: Black, J., Montapanyane, V. (Eds.), *Microparametric Syntax and Dialectal Variation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Filadelfia, pp. ix–ix10.
- Kayne, R.S., 2001. Syntactic variation. *Studies in romance dialectology*. *Romance Philology* 54, 492–499.
- Kayne, R.S., 2005. Some notes on comparative syntax with special reference to English and French. In: Cinque, G., Kayne, R.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 3–69.
- Lambrecht, K., 1981. *Topic antitopic and verb-agreement in non-standard French*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Lambrecht, K., 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, Focus and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lewis, D., 1975. Adverbs of quantification. In: Keenan, E. (Ed.), *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 3–15.
- Martí, N., 2002. El SN: els noms. In: Solà, J., Lloret, M.R., Mascaró, J., Saldanya, M.P. (Eds.), *Gramàtica del català contemporani*, vol. 2. Empúries, Barcelona, pp. 1281–1335.
- Mayol, L., 2006. The discourse function of right-dislocation in Catalan. In: *Proceedings of the Sprik Conference 2006: Explicit and Implicit Information in Text. Information Structure across Languages*.
- Mayol, L., 2007. Right-dislocation in Catalan: its discourse function and counterparts in English. *Languages in Contrast* 7, 203–220.
- Prince, E.F., 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In: Cole, P. (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 14. Radical Pragmatics*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 223–255.
- Sedano, M., 2006. Sobre la dislocación a la derecha en español. *Lingua Americana* 18, 59–73.
- Stalnaker, R.C., 2002. Common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25, 701–721.
- Vallduví, E., 1992. *The Informational Component*. Garland, New York.
- Vallduví, E., 1994. Detachment in Catalan and information packaging. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 573–601.
- Villalba, X., 2000. *The syntax of sentence periphery*. Ph.D. thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Villalba, X., 2009. *The Syntax and Semantics of Dislocations in Catalan*. Lambert Academic Publishing, Köln.
- Ziv, Y., 1994. Left and right dislocations: discourse functions and anaphora. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 629–664.

**Xavier Villalba** (BA, Universitat de Barcelona, Spain; PhD, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain) is a professor of Catalan Linguistics at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (Spain). His main research interests are in information structure and syntax, especially the syntactic realization of topic construction in Romance. He has published extensively on right dislocation, including the 2009 book *The Syntax and Semantics of Dislocations in Catalan* (Köln, Lambert Academic Publishing). He has also published a number of articles and reviews in international journals of linguistics.