Microparametric variation at the syntax/information structure interface
A quantitative comparative study of right-dislocation in Catalan and Spanish

Abstract

Since the pioneering work by Enric Vallduví (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 back-grounding strategy in Catalan, but a marginal one in English, which resorts to stress shift. To our current understanding, one might take this situation 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 for fulfilling the discourse roles typically associated to RD in Catalan. Finally, my third goal will consist in advancing a hypothesis to explain the factors that determine the quite different discourse management of the formal mechanisms available in these two languages.

Key words: right-dislocation; pragmatics; syntax; topic; destressing; Catalan; Spanish

1 Introduction

Our current understanding of the discourse role of right-dislocation (RD), even though incomplete, has grown to a considerable degree, since the initial proposals that considered RD a mere discourse repairing mechanism or afterthought

(Chafe (1976); Geluykens (1987, 1994)). Actually, after much work (see among others Mayol (2006, 2007); Vallduví (1992, 1994); Villalba (2000)), we do know that not only the formal properties of RD and afterthoughts are sharply different, but their discourse roles as well. This finding became even clearer after the seminal work by Vallduví (1992, 1994), who showed through the comparison between English and Catalan, that RD was 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 (2006, 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.

Whereas English can mark the focused element by simply shifting the accent, as the contrast between (2)a and (2)b 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 recognized by Vallduví himself (Vallduví (1992)) , 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 with the wine
   b.   B: *La   Maria VA   PORTAR el   vi.
         B: the.FEM Maria PAST.1SG bring   the wine

This state of affairs is certainly intriguing. Why should Catalan lack deaccenting? Or conversely, why should English have right-detachment besides deaccenting? When confronted with these questions, two attitudes may be

taken up. We can assume that there is no issue at all, that this is just a casual state of affairs without any explanation beyond chance, inasmuch as the fact that not all languages have applicatives or noun incorporation or tone features (this is Vallduví's position, for instance). This might be quite so, and at this point, the current research has nothing more conclusive to say that acknowledging the fact that different languages resort to different mechanism to obtain the same result. Nevertheless, although in many senses frustrating, another position might be pursued, not relying on chance but on understandable and definable structural factors, for the wider the perspective we seek the more illuminating the conclusions we may arrive at. Notwithstanding, this enterprise would receive a better prospect if the center shifts 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, like the availability of a pronominal clitic system. Yet, 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 from the comparison of 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. The second goal is to determine the range of formal mechanisms that Spanish resorts to for fulfilling the discourse roles typically associated to RD in Catalan. Finally, the third goal will consist in advancing a hypothesis to explain the factors that determine the quite different discourse management of the formal mechanisms available in Catalan and Spanish.

2 Methods

2.1 Text corpus

As a departing point, we selected the classical Catalan play *Terra baixa* by Àngel Guimerà (In Teatre. MOLC 26, Barcelona: Ed. 62 and "la Caixa". 1998; 23th edition; premiere 1897), which reflected in a fairly representative way the spoken colloquial register, which is the one where right-dislocation is most natural. For the comparison, the Spanish translation *Tierra baja: drama en tres actos y en prosa de José Echegaray; premiere 1896* was chosen (digital version from the Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes). Unless otherwise noted by means of '[XV]', The English translations correspond to Martha's of the Lowlands, English version by Owen W. Gillpatrick (available online at the Internet Archive http://www.archive.org/details/martaoflowlandst00guimiala).

2.2 Identification method

The identificaton of the occurences of right-dislocation in the Catalan text was based on the following features:

- right-peripheric element
- resumptive clitic
- separation by a comma
- context

It must be remarked that, leaving aside 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, for Catalan lacks subject clitics (leaving aside the case of indefinite subjects of inaccusative verbs, which may be resumed by means of the partitive clitic *en* 'of it'; see Martí (2002)). In this case, the context and the presence of a comma were taken as evidence enough for analyzing the subject as a right-dislocate, as in the following example:

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

Here, the subject pronoun 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. It goes without saying that such an identification method showed a certain degree of incertitude, for the use of the comma to separate the right-dislocate wasn't systematic, as the the following example shows:

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

All in all, the number of ocurrences studied –232 in the original Catalan text– was high enough to consider that the putative instances of misidentification didn't affect the generalizations and conclusions of the article in a significative way.

2.3 Variables studied

Four variables were studied: category, grammatical function, discourse function, and antecedent distance. We comment them in some detail in the follow-

ing paragraphs.

2.3.1   Category

Six different values where considered for the category variable, which are exemplified next:

- 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.
            "XEIXA: I don't think she'll come."

- pronoun (PRO):

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

- noun phrase (NP):

(9)   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!
            "PEPA: 'Cause, we don't hidden our age!" [XV] p.164

- complementizer phrase (CP):

(10)   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.)
            "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!

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

- prepositional phrase (PP):

(11) a. SEBASTIÀ: Au, Xeixa, A CASAMENT.
"Come on, Xeixa, to the cerimony." [XV]
b. XEIXA: No hi vaig jo, **a casament**.
"MORRUCHO [sullenly]. Because I'm not goin'." p. 180

- adjective phrase (AP):

(12) 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!
I'm bad! If I were not bad, I would have run away long ago or drowned myself in the pool.

2.3.2 Grammatical function

Concerning the grammatical function variable, eight values were considered, as the following examples display:

- subject (S):

(13) XEIXA: I doncs, que no ha baixat, aquell pastor?
"XEIXA: Ain't the shepherd comin'?" p.169

- direct object (DO):

(14) MOSSÈN (al Xeixa): I deixeu-lo estar vós a l'avi!
"MOSSÈN (to XEIXA): And let the old man go!" [XV]

- indirect object (IO):

(15) XEIXA (a part): Jo l'hi haig de contar tot, al Tomàs. "MORRUCHO [aside]. I'll tell Tomas!"

- prepositional complement (PC):

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

- atribute (ATR):

(17)   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 Riublanc quan les neus se fonen, oidà, sí que ho sóc, de bon mosso.
"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. 176

- predicative (PRED):

(18)   a.   TOMÀS (a Xeixa): Malagraït! Després que et tenen tants anys aquí!...
"TOMAS. Scamp ! After eatin' the master's bread all these years !"
        b.   XEIXA: No m'ho digueu malagraït, Tomàs, que no sabeu amb qui tracteu.
"MORRUCHO. Don't you call me a scamp!" p. 181

- locative (LOC):

(19)   a.   SEBASTIÀ: Au, Xeixa, a casament.
"Come on, Xeixa, to the wedding."
        b.   XEIXA: No hi vaig jo, a casament.
"I am not going to the wedding." p. 180

- noun complement (NC):

(20)   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.
"MORRUCHO. So if Nuri don't marry when she's a little older, the breed of partridges will be lost..." p. 164

The choice of the values for the discourse function was a synthesis of the current proposals (Ashby (1988); Grosz and Ziv (1998); Mayol (2006)), leaving aside the repair function; for, as argued at length by Grosz and Ziv (1998); Villalba (2000), this discourse function is fulfilled by an independent construction –*afterthought*– with distinctive properties.

First, we considered topic introduction:

(21)   a.   NURI (corrent): L'ermità, l'ermità!
           "NURI (running): Tomàs is coming!"
      b.   TOMÀS: Ai, ai! I quina cruixidera als 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'? p.169

Topic introduction doesn't come for free, but must involve a referent which is present in the common ground or, more precisely, it assumed by the speaker to be part of this common ground. In the latter case, the speaker can introduce a hearer-new topic, which can be accommodated by the hearer, following the conversational strategies described by Lewis (1975); Stalnaker (2002). A subtype of this function involves the resumption of a previously introduced, but inactive referent (i.e. topic shift):

(22)   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 eixugant-se amb pauses.) Jo havia de dir que no, i sempre que no, al Sebastià; per força no m'hi 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!
      "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] p. 169

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 topic is not active –the sentence topic is Marta–, so that it must be rendered active by means of right-dislocation.

The second value for discourse function is the continuation of an already active topic:

(23) a. ANTÒNIA (cridant): Marta! Marta!
     b. PEPA (cridant): Som les Perdigones. Surt!
        "ANTONIA [calling out]. Here we are! Come out, woman!"
     c. XEIXA: No sortirà pas, la Marta. [...]
        "XEIXA: I don't think she'll come...." p.164

From a functional point of view, continuation topics are difficult to justify, for the referent is already an active topic, and one would expect simply omission. Indeed, when the right-dislocate fulfills the continuation role, it is typically optional, as discussed by Grosz and Ziv (1998); Mayol (2006). Yet, these authors show that the presence of the right-dislocate adds an expressive flavor –typically, surprise or irritation–, which would suggest that the optionality is more apparent than real. Yet, for space reasons, we cannot discuss this issue here.

The last discourse function value is that of EVALUATIVE EPITHET (Grosz and Ziv (1998); Mayol (2006)):

(24) 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.*
     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.167

Here the right-dislocate (re)introduces or continues a previously introduced referent, but appending it with a predicative valorative content, which transmits the speaker attitude toward the referent. Obviously, 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 of the discourse function, a variable was considered concerning the 'distance' between the dislocate and its antecedent in the discourse. The typology was threefold, including local, non-local, and inferrable antecedents. First of all, we considered local those explicit antecedents in the same or previous utterance that the dislocate:

(25)   a.   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, ..." p.167-168

(26)   a.   SEBASTIÀ: Au, Xeixa, a casament.
"Come on, Xeixa, to the wedding."
          b.   XEIXA: No hi vaig jo, a casament.
"I am not going to the wedding." p. 180

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

(27)   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]?
"PEPA. And who sent Tomas to fetch the shepherd?" p. 165-6

Here the antecedent *l'ermità* 'the hermit' is retaken four utterances later by means of the right-dislocated *al Tomàs* 'to Tomas'.

Finally, the category of inferrable antecedents included all implicit antecedents that could be recovered from the context either because of their deictic character or through bridging. First, consider an instance of deictical antecedent:

(28)   XEIXA garbellant blat. Després PEPA i ANTÒNIA. XEIXA: Tant
         se me'n dóna que quedi 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

Now consider the following example, already commented in 2.3.3:

(29)   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
         eixugant-se amb pauses.) Jo havia de dir que no, i sempre que no, al
         Sebastià; per força no m'hi 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!
         "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] p.
         169

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 active
–the sentence topic is Marta–, even though recoverable from the context by
means of right-dislocation.

3 Results

3.1 Catalan

The Catalan text contained 232 occurences of right-dislocation. In the next
paragraphs the distribution of these occurences is described regarding the four
variables studied.

3.1.1 Category

The most frequent category was DP (35,8%), followed by CP (22,4%) (Table 1).

	Frequency	%
DP	83	35,8
SC	52	22,4
PRO	30	12,9
PP	30	12,9
DEM	15	6,5
NP	13	5,6
AP	9	3,9
Total	232	100,0

Table 1
Frequency of Catalan right-dislocates regarding category.

It is worth noting that the sum of nominal categories (DP+PRO+DEM+NP) amounted the 60,8% of the ocurrences. If one added the CP category, which is not inhrently nominal, but covers the most typical nominal functions, the coverage boosted up to 83,2%.

3.1.2 Function

By far, the most common grammatical function was that of direct object (54,3%), followed by that of subject (24,6%). The other functions were either rare –atribute, indirect object, prepositional complement and locative– or almost nonexistent –noun complement and predicative– (Table 2) .

3.1.3 Discourse function

Both the (re)introduction and the continuation of topic displayed a similar frequency: 48,7% and 47,4%, respectively. In contrast, the occurence of evaluative epithets was very low: 3,9%.

3.1.4 Distance with respect to the discourse antecedent

The most frequent category was that of local antecedent (48,3%), followed by the inferrable category (39,2%), as summarized in Table 3.

	Frequency	%
direct object	126	54,3
subject	57	24,6
atribute	16	6,9
prepositional complement	14	6,0
locative	9	3,9
indirect complement	6	2,6
predicative	2	0,9
noun complement	2	0,9
Total	232	100,0

Table 2
Frequency of Catalan right-dislocates regarding grammatical function.

	Frequency	%
local	112	48,3
nonlocal	29	12,5
inferrable	91	39,2
Total	232	100,0

Table 3
Frequency of Catalan right-dislocates regarding distance to the antecedent.

3.1.5 Relations across variables

The ANOVA analyses found significant dependencies between the grammatical category and the grammatical function: $F=51,427$ and $p<0,000$ for category–grammatical function and $F=17,063$ and $p<0,000$ for grammatical function–category. Significant dependencies were also found between the discourse function and the distance to the antecedent: $F=197,916$ and $p<0,000$ for discourse function–distance and $F=83,648$ and $p<0,000$ for distance–discourse function. The ANOVA calculations were confirmed by the linear correlation, which was very high between the grammatical category and the grammatical function (0,506) and between the discourse function and the distance to the antecedent (-0,751).

Concerning the interaction of the nondependent variables, some generalizacions were found. For instance, the most habitual categories as topic (re)introductors were CP (31,85%), DP (29,2%), PRO (18,58%) and PP (13,27%). Moreover, DP was the most frequent topic continuator (38,18%) and the almost unique instance of evaluative epithet (88,89%). The details appear in Table 4.

	topic (re)introduction	topic continuation	evaluative epithet
DP	33 (29,2%)	42 (38,18%)	8 (88,89%)
SC	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
Total	113	110	9

Table 4

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

3.2   Spanish

The Spanish translation had 10 occurrences of right-dislocation (against the 232 occurrences of right-dislocation in the Catalan text), which appear summarized in Table 5.

	category	grammatical function	discourse function	distance
1	CP	DO	topic (re)introduction	inferrable
2	CP	DO	topic (re)introduction	nonlocal
3	demostratiu	SUBJ	topic (re)introduction	inferrable
4	DP	SUBJ	evaluative epithet	local
5	DP	SUBJ	topic (re)introduction	inferrable
6	DP	DO	topic continuation	local
7	CP	DO	topic (re)introduction	inferrable
8	DP	DO	topic (re)introduction	local
9	DP	SUBJ	topic continuation	local
10	DP	DO	topic continuation	local

Table 5

Occurences of right-dislocates in the Spanish text.

Only DP and CP were significant (60% i 30%), respectively –the remaining 10% corresponded to demonstratives. Moreover, only the subject (40%) and direct object (60%) functions were found. Concerning the discourse function, the most frequent was that of topic (re)introduction (60%), followed by that of topic continuation (30%), and that of evaluative epithet (10%). Finally, as for the distance to the antecedent, local antecedents figured the 50% and

inferrable antecedents, the 40%, leaving the 10% for nonlocal antecedents.

3.2.1 Alternative strategies

Once confirmed that Spanish made a very marginal use of right-dislocation, the next step was determine which alternative strategies it resorted to in order to obtain the discourse functions that were associated with right-dislocation in Catalan. The range of options was wide enough.

Leaving aside the already mentioned 10 occurences of right dislocation, the first alternative option was realizing the Catalan right-dislocate in its canonical position, which amounted to 100 occurrences (66,22%):

(30) a. ANTÒNIA (al Xeixa): I aquest que no ho volia que ho sapiguéssim!
   b. ANTONIA.- (Al MORRUCHO.) Tú no querías que lo supiéramos.
   c. ANTONIA [to MORRUCHO]. You didn't want us to know!

The second major alternative strategy was the omission of the right-dislocate (37 occurrences, 24,50%):

(31) a. NURI: Això! Que n'hem d'apendre de casar-nos, nosaltres.
   b. NURI.- Eso, ¡a 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!

The third alternative strategy consisted in left-dislocation (5 occurrences, 3,31%):

(32) 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.
   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!

Finally, for completeness, two cases of an explanatory adpositions were found (1,32%):

(33)   a.   NURI (. . .): Sí que hi són, sí, els de casa,...
           b.   NURI: (. . .) Sí, sí; ahí los tienes: los de casa;
           c.   NURI. Yes, yes, they're all there!

When taken together, we obtained the following picture (see Table 6). The resort to leave the element in its canonical position was by large the prevalent alternative strategy (66,22%), followed at some distance by omission of the dislocate (24,50%). The resort to either left or right-dislocation was much more marginal a solution (3,31% and 4,63%, respectively). Finally, the explanatory adposition solution proved almost insignificant: 1,32%.

	occurences	%
canonical position	100	66,22
omission	37	24,50
right-dislocation	7	4,63
left-dislocation	5	3,31
adposition	2	1,32
Total	151	99,98

Table 6
Alternative strategies in Spanish to Catalan right-dislocation.

4   Discussion

4.1   The productivity of right-dislocation

The comparison of the Catalan and Spanish data from 3 shows the extremely marginal role of right-dislocation in Spanish. From a quantitative point if view, the ratio was 1/23,2. Furthermore, from a qualitative point of view, one can appreciate that Catalan right-dislocation affects all the categories, grammatical and discourse functions, and distances to the antecedent. In contrast, Spanish right-dislocation is restricted to nominal and sentence categories (DP, DEM, and CP) and to typically nominal grammatical functions. Concerning the discourse function, Spanish showed a sharp preference for topic (re)reintroduction (60%), which doubled the value of the topic continuation category (30%), whereas both categories fared equally in Catalan (see Table 7).

	Catalan	Spanish
topic (re)introduction	48,7	60
topics continuation	47,4	30
evaluative epithet	3,9	10
Total	100,0	100,0

Table 7
Relative frequency of Catalan and Spanish right-dislocates regarding discourse function.

Finally, no differences appeared in the distance to the antecedent between both languages, as depicted in Table 8:

	Catalan	Spanish
local	48,3	50
nonlocal	12,5	10
inferrable	39,2	40
Total	100,0	100,0

Table 8
Relative frequency of Catalan and Spanish right-dislocates regarding distance to the antecedent.

4.2   The roots of variation

As discussed in 3.2.1, realization of the dislocate in its canonical position is the prevalent alternative strategy in Spanish (66,22%). [1] In this subsection, I will advance an explanation of this behavior.

Since Spanish lacks oblique clitics, it turns out that Spanish RD cannot cover 'safely' the whole range of uses it covers in Catalan (or French or Italian). Yet, realization in canonical position does: any category or function receives a similar treatment. It is, hence, more general a mechanism in Spanish that RD, and it is favored. However, 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 disfavor such a solution. The solution to this quandary comes from the consideration of an additional factor: destressing.

We have mentioned in 1 that English, besides the general stress-shifting strategy, allows a "Catalan solution" as well, namely right-dislocation:

---

[1] As Mayol (2006) points out, this option is available in Catalan as well, but ito a lesser extent: the 10,7% of the occurences of her corpus.

(34)   a.   A: What did Maria do with the wine?
        b.   B: Maria BROUGHT the wine.
        c.   B: Maria brought it, the wine.

In turn, Catalan lacks the stress-shift mechanism:

(35)   a.   A: What did Maria with the wine
        b.   B: *La   Maria VA PORTAR el   vi.
            B: the.FEM Maria PAST.1SG bring the wine

Crucially, (Zubizarreta, 1998, 2.4) shows us that Spanish behaves like English in this respect, for it can resort either to destressing or to right-dislocation:

(36)   a.   A: El libro Lo destruyó el   perro, ¿verdad?
            A: the book it   destroyed the dog   true
              THE DOG destroyed the book, didn't it?'
        b.   B: No. [$_{-F}$ Destruyó] [$_{+F}$ JUAN], [$_{-F}$ el libro]
        c.   B: No. Lo destruyó JUAN, el libro.

The contrast between destressing and right-dislocation has a clear syntactic counterpart. (Zubizarreta, 1998, 151ff) points out that destressing, besides the lack of resumptive clitic, displays a right word order of the elements, in contrast with right-dislocation ((Zubizarreta, 1998, ch. 3, exs. 160, 164)):

(37)   a.   Escondió el   NIÑO el   libro debajo de   la   cama.
            hiddened the kid   the book under   the.FEM bed
              'The KID hiddened the book under the bed.'
        b.   *Escondió el NIÑO debajo de la cama el libro.

(38)   a.   Lo escondió el NIÑO, el libro, debajo de la cama. '. Lo escondió
            el NIÑO, debajo de la cama, el libro.

On these grounds, Zubizarreta concludes that deaccented elements remain in situ , so that they interfere with the correct assignment of main stress to the focus through the Nuclear Stress Rule. Therefore, Spanish must resort to a marked rule assigning emphatic stress. In contrast, the movement of the dislocates in the right-dislocation version leaves the focus in final position, where it receives main stress in the normal way (it was Laca (1986) who firstly advanced the intuition that RD is an indirect mechanism for allowing one element to receive focus, an idea that was further developed by Vallduví (1992).

Now we can look at the prevalent use of the *in situ* solution in the Spanish text from a different point of view. Even though apparently, a confusion with focus might arise, one can speculate that the combination of canonical realization with destressing avoids such a shortcoming. Henceforth, this combination proves both maximally general (it covers all cases, unlike RD), and distinct from focus (it involves destressing, unlike focus).

Obviously, since we are working with a written corpus, we cannot directly test this hypothesis. However, if this line of research was correct, we would expect that this strategy would be mostly favored in those contexts where the presence of the topical constituent were necessary. This is precisely the case. When we consider the different pragmatic functions associated with the 100 cases of realization in canonical position of the Spanish text, 66 occurrences correspond to (re)introduction of topic, 32 to continuation of topic, and only 2 to explanatory adpositions. Hence, pending a detailed study of an oral corpus, we can advance the provisional conclusion that the combination of the realization in canonical position plus destressing is the prevalent strategy in Spanish grammar for covering the uses of Catalan RD. Moreover, we can also conclude that this state of affairs follows from the basic fact that Spanish has a smaller pronominal system than Catalan, which makes Spanish RD less general a mechanism than realization in canonical position. [2]

5   Conclusions

In this article we have shown, on the basis of a quantitative analysis of a Catalan text and its Spanish translation that these two languages show a very different management of linguistic resources to obtain the same discourse effect, particularly, whereas RD is a pervasive mechanism in Catalan for (re)introducing and continuating a topic, Spanish makes a very marginal use of RD. Instead, it mainly resorts to realization in canonical position plus destressing. For one thing, Spanish has a smaller pronominal system than Catalan, which makes Spanish RD less general a mechanism than realization in canonical position.

---

[2] If this line of research proves correct, one could speculate that, leaving aside additional factors, the richer the clitic system is, the more common will be RD. Even though based on intuitive grounds, Lisa Brunetti confirms me 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); Belletti (2004). Obviously, a fully comparative and quantitive study is needed before stating any solid conclusion.

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.

Cardinaletti, A., 2002. Against optional and null clitics. right dislocation vs. marginalization. Studia Linguistica 56, 29–57.

Chafe, W. L., 1976. Giveness, 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.

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.

Geluykens, R., 1994. Right dislocation and self-repair. In: The pragmatics of discourse anaphora in English: evidence from conversational repair. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 89–124.

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–xvii.

Kayne, R. S., 2001. Syntactic variation. studies in romance dialectology. Romance Philology 54, 492–499, part 2.

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.

Laca, B., 1986. Notes per a un estudi del pleonasme pronominal en català. In: Estudis de llengua i literatura catalanes XIII (Miscel.lània Antoni Badia i Margarit, 5). Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, Barcelona, pp. 65–88.

Lewis, D., 1975. Adverbs of quantification. In: Keenan, E. (Ed.), Formal Semantics of Natural Language. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 3–15, reprinted in Portner and Partee. eds. 178-188.

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, Ch. sintaxi-5, 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.

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.

Zubizarreta, M. L., 1998. Prosodic, Focus, and Word Order. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.