Dislocating NPs to the Right: Anything Goes? Semantic and Pragmatic Constraints *

Maria Averintseva-Klisch
Deutsches Seminar
University of Tuebingen

maria.averintseva@uni-tuebingen.de

Sebastian Buecking
Deutsches Seminar
University of Tuebingen

sebastian.buecking@uni-tuebingen.de

Abstract

In our paper we investigate the semantics and pragmatics of the NP-right disloca-tion (RD) in German, concentrating in particular on the conditions under which dislocation is possible. We argue that semantic properties of the NP are relevant for the possibility of having an NP dislocated: it has to have a type <e> denotation. This requirement allows particular definite NPs as well as kind-referring terms and excludes quantified NPs. We propose a semantic account of RD in terms of 'sep-arate performatives' thereby explaining the distributional facts. Furthermore, we show how the function of RD as a discourse topic marker endorses the requirement of the type <e> denotation for the RD-NP.

1   Introduction

Among discourse structuring strategies German inter alia allows for NP-right dislocation (= RD) as exemplified in (1):

(1)   Sie   geht jeden Tag joggen, meine Schwester.
        She$_i$ goes every day jogging [my   sister]$_i$

According to Averintseva-Klisch (2007), German RDs exhibit the following properties: formally, they consist of an NP at the right end of a clause and a coreferent pronoun inside the clause. RDs are prosodically and syntactically part of their host sentence.

Pragmatically, they mark the current discourse topic referent. These characteristics distinguish RDs from so called Afterthoughts, which are prosodically and syntactically independent NPs resolving a potentially unclear prononimal reference, cf. (2):

(2)   (context: Peter$_1$ and Karl$_2$ returned from their holidays.)

     a.   Hast Du ihn$_?$ schon gesehen, | (ich meine) den KARL$_2$?
          Have you him$_?$ already seen,   PAUSE (I   mean) [the Karl.ACCENT]$_2$

Whereas Afterthoughts are morphosyntactically and semantically unrestricted, RDs do not allow for every NP-type. In the present paper we will address the semantics and pragmatics of RD, focussing in particular on the conditions under which dislocation is possible.

In his seminal work on dislocation in German, Altmann (1981) primarily relies on morphosyntactic criteria. He suggests that only definite particular NPs like in (1) are possible instantiations of RD. He supports this claim with ill-formed indefinite examples like (3):

(3)   Er ging vorbei, *ein Student.
         he$_i$ went along [a student]$_i$

However, it has not been noticed that the picture becomes more complex taking into account generic contexts. Look at (4) for illustration:

(4)   (context: Modern women are very conscious of their health. They eat nothing fat nor sweet.)

     a.   Sie geht jeden Tag joggen, die moderne Frau.
          she$_i$ goes every day jogging [the modern woman]$_i$

     b.   Sie gehen jeden Tag joggen, moderne Frauen.
          they$_i$ go every day jogging [modern women]$_i$

     c.   Sie geht jeden Tag joggen, *eine moderne Frau.
          she$_i$ goes every day jogging [a modern woman]$_i$

As expected, definites are also well-formed in generic contexts, cf. (4-a). Surprisingly though, there is a significant split within the group of indefinites. Contra Altmann's prediction, bare plurals are grammatical in RD-position while being formally indefinite, cf. (4-b).[1] But generics do not render all NP-types grammatical in dislocation: the indefinite singular is still ruled out, cf. (4-c).

These facts are supplemented by another observation not properly captured in the literature. As illustrated in (5), overtly quantified NPs cannot surface in RD-position:

---

[1] Altmann remarks that as an exception indefinite NPs are possible in what he calls 'defining contexts'. This resembles our observation. But Altmann neither discusses the exact conditions of these data nor gives a principled explanation for them.

(5)   Sie   gehen jeden Tag joggen, *alle / *manche / *viele Frauen.
       they$_i$ go   every day jogging [all   / some   / many women]$_i$

In our paper, we aim at covering these distributional data in a principled manner. Section 2 is concerned with central semantic properties of an NP allowing it to be right-dislocated. Starting out with standard assumptions on generics, it will be argued that only type <e> denotations are possible candidates for RD. In Section 3 we will analyse RDs as a separate 'meaning dimension' in the sense of Potts (2005, 2007) and Portner (2007) thereby explaining the need for a semantically self-contained NP provided by <e> denotations. Section 4 connects the formal type <e> constraint to the function of RD as a dicourse topic marking device.

2   Type <e> generalization

Following Krifka et al. (1995) one standardly distinguishes between 'kind-referring NPs' and 'characterizing sentences' as two types of genericity in natural language. Kind-referring NPs are analysed as proper names. Sentences containing them can thus be represented as direct predication over a kind-individual, cf. (6) and (7):

(6)   a.   Die Dronte ist ausgestorben.
             the dodo   is extinct
       b.   Dronten sind ausgestorben.
             dodos   are extinct

(7)   EXTINCT (dodo$_{\text{KIND}}$)

The examples in (6) suggest that in languages like German and English both definite singulars and bare plurals potentially refer to entities of the ontological sort 'kind'.[2] Indefinite singulars on the contrary do not allow for direct kind reference. As shown in (8), they are incompatible with a kind-selecting predicate like *to be extinct*:[3]

(8)   *Eine Dronte ist augestorben.
        a   dodo   is extinct

---

[2]In the literature there is an extensive discussion on the exact modelling of kind-referring terms and their relation to particular instances. Especially the default reference of bare plurals is under debate, cf. Carlson (1977), Krifka et al. (1995), Chierchia (1998), Krifka (2004), to name but a few. We are only concerned with the descriptive fact that definite singulars and bare plurals *can* refer to kinds, no matter how the kind-reference is derived.

[3]Taxonomic readings are a systematic exception to this: *A dog is extinct* is grammatical if *a dog* refers to a subkind of the superordinate kind *Canidae*, e.g. the wolf (*Canis lupus*). Taxonomic NPs display the whole gamut of syntactic configurations known for every count noun. Since their semantics have to be modelled in their own fashion, we ignore them in the present study (cf. Krifka et al. 1995 for details). The assumption that indefinite singulars are never kind denoting has been challenged in Dayal (2004) and Müller-Reichau (2006). However, we follow the standard analysis given above.

However, indefinite singulars are grammatical in case of characterizing sentences, cf. (9):

(9)   Ein Löwe brüllt.
         a   lion   roars

(10)   GEN (x,s) [lion (x) & s is a typical situation wrt roaring & s contains x; x roars in s]
         (reads as: If x is a lion and s is a typical situation with regard to roaring and s contains x, then x roars in s)

As exemplified in (10), the generic interpretation of characterizing sentences arises due to a silent dyadic operator called GEN, hence involving quantification over entities. Note that in this case the generic force does not depend on the NP *ein Löwe*. Summing up so far we get a split within the class of indefinites: whereas bare plurals are potentially generic by themselves, indefinite singulars as such have no generic potential.

We assume that this difference can explain the data on Right Dislocation, repeated in (11):

(11)   (context: Modern women are very conscious of their health. They eat nothing fat nor sweet.)
         a.   Sie   geht jeden Tag joggen, die   moderne Frau.
               she_i goes every day jogging [the modern   woman]$_i$
         b.   Sie   gehen jeden Tag joggen, moderne Frauen.
               $they_i$ go   every day jogging [modern   women]$_i$
         c.   Sie   geht jeden Tag joggen, *eine moderne Frau.
               she_i goes every day jogging [a   modern   woman]$_i$

For generics, RD-NPs have to be kind-referring terms. The formal definite-indefinite distinction is not crucial. Definite singulars and indefinite plurals are allowed in RD-position since they potentially refer to kind-individuals, cf. (11-a) and (11-b), indefinite singulars are ruled out since they do not, cf. (11-c).[4]

---

[4]Krifka et al. (1995, 11) confine genuine kind-reference to well-established kinds invoking the following contrast in case of definite singulars:

(i)   a.   The Coke bottle has a narrow neck.
         b.   ??The green bottle has a narrow neck.

One might wonder if 'modern women' are conceivably interpreted as a well-established kind in this sense. Krifka et al. (1995, 70) note that it is quite difficult to specify when a language promotes an NP to a kind-term. Furthermore, they raise the ontologically motivated question if kinds are created and destroyed by language itself. We in fact think that in appropriate contexts like the one given in (11) a promotion to kind-reference can be accomodated quite fast: the NP 'modern women' might differ in certain aspects from typical well-established natural kinds like *Canis lupus*, but at least for the discourse segment under discussion the corresponding NP is enhanced to a name for a specific type of individual entity. Remark that even the definite singular – the least disputable case of direct kind-reference – is possible, cf. (11-a). In addition, one has to keep in mind that there is considerable disagreement what bare plurals in the default case refer to; see footnote 2 for further literature.

Recalling that the generic reading in case of indefinite singulars arises due to the generic quantifier GEN, we hypothesize that quantifying in dislocated NPs is ruled out. This suits well the observation that overtly quantified RD-NPs are generally ill-formed, cf. the repeated example (12):

(12)   Sie   gehen jeden Tag joggen, *alle / *manche / *viele Frauen.
        they$_i$ go   every day jogging [all   / some   / many women]$_i$

Speaking in terms of semantic types, one can capture the data by assuming that in RD only NPs of type <e> are licensed. Semantically, this assumption is based on the idea that RD-NPs are not open formulas, but expressions referring to specific individual entities be they particular objects or kinds. The corresponding restriction is stated in (13). It correctly predicts that both definite NPs and kind-referring NPs are grammatical in RD, irrespective of their ontologically motivated different sortal status, cf. (14):

(13)   *Type <e> generalization*
        a.   (...) pron$_i$ (...) RD-NP$_i^{<e>}$
        b.   *(...) pron$_i$ (...) RD-NP$_i^{<<e,t>, t>}$

(14)   a.   Sie   geht jeden Tag joggen, meine Schwester$_i^{<e_{object}>}$
              she$_i$ goes every day jogging [my   sister]$_i$
        b.   Sie   gehen jeden Tag joggen, moderne Frauen$_i^{<e_{kind}>}$
              they$_i$ go   every day jogging [modern women]$_i$

One may ask why it should be the case that only type <e> NPs are allowed in RD. In order to be interpretable, NPs of type <<e,t>, t> call for functional connection to the sentence they are part of. A corresponding compositional derivation however is blocked in (13-b) because there is no quantifying 'in' or 'out' of the RD-NP. Hence open formulas in RD cannot be connected via functional application to the rest of the sentence and are therefore ill-formed. In contrast, (13-a) is grammatical because an RD-NP of type <e> has its own referential force, i.e. it doesn't call for being part of the compositionally derived meaning of the clause.

This analysis seems conclusive. But it leads to a follow-up question: in which way other than compositional derivation does the RD-NP contribute to the meaning of the clause? We propose that analysing RD as a separate meaning dimension correctly captures the specific meaning contribution of RD-NPs. This analysis will be discussed in section 3 and refine our understanding of RDs as self-contained semantic expressions.

3   RD as separate meaning dimension

3.1   Separate performative account

Following Potts (2005, 2007), Portner (2007) distinguishes between two separate dimensions of meaning sentences might have: (i) 'at issue-meaning', which is the compositionally generated semantic content of the utterance and (ii) 'separate performative', i.e. an additional meaning which is a separate speech act, supplying instructions for the interpretation of the semantic content.[5] For instance, Portner (2007, 412ff) assumes that NP appositions like in (15) introduce a separate performative:

(15)   Amir, my new neighbour, is from Israel.

By uttering (15) the speaker makes two speech acts: first, he asserts that Amir is from Israel, which is the regular 'at-issue' meaning of the sentence in (15). Second, in a separate speech act he *performs* the assertion that Amir is his new neighbour:

(16)   Amir, my new neighbour, is from Israel.
        at-issue meaning: [λw. FROM ISRAEL (Amir) in a given world w]
        separate performative: {[λw. the speaker thereby asserts that Amir is his new neighbour in w]}

As all performatives a separate performative does not influence the truth conditions of the sentence since it is automatically true when understood. Potts (2007, 477) presents data from embedded structures providing additional evidence for the separate character of appositions. He shows that they are semantically non-embeddable. So, in (17), the separate performative can be only contributed to the speaker of the main clause but not to Felix:

(17)   As Felix said, Amir, his new neighbour, is from Israel.
        = Felix said that Amir is from Israel.

---

[5]Portner (2007) uses two terms for the separate meaning dimension: 'separate performative' as well as 'expressive meaning'. The first term captures the character of a separate meaning, i.e. the idea of a separately performed speech act not influencing the truth condition of the whole sentence. That is why we adopt the term 'separate performative' in our paper.

The term 'expressive meaning' might be misleading since the separate meaning does not necessarily have to be expressive in the proper sense of the word. Portner (2007) takes this term from Potts (2005), who uses it describing the meaning of expressive units like *lovely vase* or *this damn thing*. Generalizing from the behaviour of expressives onto other phenomena, Potts formulates the assumption of two separate meaning dimensions. For Potts (2005, 2007), expressive meanings build a subclass of conventional implicatures; for these he advocates an analysis as a separate meaning dimension in the sense introduced above. Potts' original analysis of conventional implicatures is explicitly one as a semantic, and not a pragmatic phenomenon. This issue depends on independent theoretical assumptions about the exact place of the boundary between semantics and pragmatics. Without taking any far-reaching theoretical obligations, we understand the complete meaning of the sentence as being a pair of at-issue meaning and separate performative.

$\neq$ Felix said that Amir is his new neighbour (and that Amir is from Israel).

A meaning of a given sentence S is accordingly a set of two meaning dimensions, cf. (18):

(18)   meaning for a sentence S: $<A_S, C_S>$
    a. A_S: at-issue meaning of S
    b. C_S: set of separate performatives of S (C_S: $\{C1_S, C2_S, \dots\}$) (cf. Portner
        2007, 413)

Whereas A_S is constituted compositionally, C_S is a simple sum of separate performatives.

3.2   RD as separate performative

Returning to RD we argue that RD does not take part in the compositional making up of the utterance meaning. In the given context, the semantic content of (19-a) with RD or (19-b) without RD is exactly the same: the predication 'GO JOGGING EVERY day' is applied to the argument 'they' which in turn is identifiable with 'modern women' via an equivalence relation in the discourse model, cf. (20). Note that in the given context the reference is unambigous.

(19)   Moderne Frauen   sind sehr gesundheitsbewusst.   Sie   essen weder
    [Modern women]$_i$ are very conscious-of-their-health. They$_i$ eat   neither
    Fett noch Süßes.
    fat   nor   sweet.
    a.   Sie   gehen jeden Tag joggen.
        they$_i$ go   every day jogging
    b.   Sie   gehen jeden Tag joggen, moderne Frauen.
        they$_i$ go   every day jogging [modern women]$_i$

(20) A_S for (19-a) and (19-b): [λwλx. GO JOGGING EVERY DAY (x) in w, x = y,
MODERN WOMEN (y)][6]

What the RD contributes is the separate meaning dimension, instantiated as a signal to the addressee to activate (or to hold activated)[7] the mental representation of modern women, cf. (21).

(21)   Sie   gehen jeden Tag joggen, moderne Frauen.
    they$_i$ go   every day jogging [modern women]$_i$

---

[6]This informal DRT-oriented A_S (cf. Kamp and Reyle 1993) is meant to capture the idea that the referent of the anaphor is introduced in the previous context and connected to it via equivalence relation. Crucially, x is not a predicate but an individual according to this representation.

[7]It is possible to mark the maintenance of the old discourse topic as well as to promote some discourse referent to the new discourse topic with RD (cf. Averintseva-Klisch 2006).

    a. A_S: [$\lambda w \lambda x$. GO JOGGING EVERY DAY (x), x = y, MODERN WOMEN (y)]

    b. C_S introduced by RD-NP: {[$\lambda z \lambda w$. signal to the adressee z to hold activated the mental representation of the modern women in w]}[8]

To return to the quantification: as we have shown, quantified NPs are excluded in RD, cf. repeated (22):

(22)   a. *Sie   gehen jeden Tag joggen, alle / manche / viele Frauen.
               they$_i$ go   every day jogging [all / some   / many women]$_i$

    b. *Sie geht jeden Tag joggen, eine moderne Frau.
           she$_i$ goes every day jogging [a   modern woman]$_i$

Portner (2007, 411) notices that in a similar way quantifiers are in general unable to function as vocatives, cf. (23-a) vs. (23-b):[9]

(23)   a. Anna, please, hurry up!
        b. *Some woman, please, hurry up!

Vocatives, like RD, introduce a separate performative meaning so that Portner (2007, 414) assumes the semantics of (23-a) to be like in (24):

(24)   Anna, hurry up!

    a. A_S: [$\lambda x \, \lambda w$. the speaker urges the addressee x to hurry up in w]

    b. C_S: {[λw. the speaker requests Anna's attention in w]}

The point here is that both for RD and vocative it is impossible to have a quantifier in one dimension and the quantified expression in the other. Obviously, if the separate performative contains a quantifier, this quantifier cannot search for variables at the at-issue-meaning and would thus stay an open formula through the completion of the meaning computation. In other words, it is necessary for both meaning dimensions to be saturated independently of each other. This corresponds to the descriptive generalization made in section 2 that RD-NPs have to be semantically of type <e> (no matter whether <e_{object}> or <e_{kind}>, as we have argued above). Given the analysis at hand, this is not an idiosyncratic peculiarity of RD, but follows immediately from the fact that RD introduces a separate performative.

Accordingly, we would expect other constructions introducing separate performatives to disallow quantifying across meaning dimensions too. As shown above, this is indeed

---

[8]Example (21) shows that meaning dimensions as understood here cannot be compared with the differentiation of the context-free underspecified 'semantic form' and 'conceptual structure' that includes context-driven specifications of the meaning, as proposed by Bierwisch (1987). The separate performative is the semantic contribution of RD-NP to the meaning of the clause, which is specific to a particular linguistic construction and thus independent of the particular context.

[9]The same seems to be true of NP appositions, as Potts (2007, 494) argues. However, there are some peculiarities in need of further clarification.

the case with vocatives. Moreover, we receive additional evidence from the so-called 'Hanging topic' construction (= HT) in German (cf. Frey 2004). This is a construction in which a prosodically and syntactically autonomous NP, optionally combined with an addition like *à propos / zum Thema* ('concerning / talking about'), etc. is added to the left of the clause, and there is a resumptive clause-internal pro-form inside the clause, as in (25):

(25)   Moderne Frauen, sie   gehen oft   joggen.
        [modern women]$_i$ they$_i$ go   often jogging

It has been previously shown that HT also introduces a separate performative meaning (cf. Portner (2007) for English and Averintseva-Klisch (2006) for German), so we would expect, that HT disallows quantified NPs too. This is indeed the case, cf. (26):

(26)   *(*A propos) alle / viele / manche Frauen, sie   gehen oft   joggen.
        to   concern [all / many / some   women]$_i$ they$_i$ go   often jogging
        '*(*Talking about) all/many women, they often jog.'

Interestingly, a quantified phrase can occur in a HT construction only if it has a metalinguistic reading so that *alle / viele Frauen* ('all / many women') is a quotation, cf. (27):

(27)   A propos "alle Frauen", das   ist / *die   sind wieder so   ein typisches
        to concern ["all women"]$_i$ that$_i$ is / *they$_i$ are again such a   typical
        Klischee.
        cliché

This is, however, precisely the case where the quantified phrase has been shifted to a type <e> denotation.

Furthermore, Hanging Topic constructions allow us to argue against the assumption that solely the type incompatibility of the pronominal NP *sie* ('they') (type <e>) and the quantified NP *alle Frauen* ('all women') (type <<e,t>t>) prohibits the semantic coindexing of these NPs. If the linear order of the NPs is 'quantified NP – pronominal NP', then generally coindexing is possible, as in (28):

(28)   Alle Frauen   sind gesundheitsbewusst.   Sie   gehen gern   joggen.
        [all women]$_i$ are conscious-of-their-health. they$_i$ go   eagerly jogging

However, in case of HT coindexing is excluded. Hence, the linear order cannot be responsible for allowing or disallowing operations like quantification or binding. Instead, the assignment to different meaning dimensions forbids the necessary semantic operations. This makes it plausible that also in case of RD it is the separation of meaning

dimensions which is decisive.[10]

To sum up: we can explain the type <e> generalization via assuming the analysis of RD as constituting a separate meaning dimension. However, there is one case, namely proper names, that seems to constitute a counterevidence to the type <e> account of the RD-NP, as we will show in the following.

3.3   RD and proper names

In German, proper names, in particular personal forenames like *Susanne* or *Peter*, are generally used without article. Since PNs are usually considered to be prototypical type <e> denotations, the proposed type <e> generalization predicts them to be fine in RD. However, this is not the case: PNs are ruled out in RD, cf. (29):

(29)   Sie   geht jeden Tag joggen, *Anna / *Christine.
         [she]$_i$ goes every day jogging *Anna / *Christine

Proper names thus present a problem for an account that is solely based on type semantics since PNs and ordinary definite description like *the woman* do not differ semantically. However, it is well-known that they differ in their discourse pragmatic characteristics: PNs are generally assumed to be context-independently, i.e. externally anchored (cf. Kamp and Reyle 1993). In contrast, the reference of definite descriptions is taken to be context-dependent in that the definite article presupposes that the NP it takes denotes a salient singleton set in a given context (cf. Farkas 2002, 215ff).

This reasoning suggests that discourse-pragmatic factors additionally constrain the choice of RD-NPs. In order to substantiate this claim we will in the following consider the discourse function of RD in detail.

4   The discourse function of RD

We assume that every discourse segment has a discourse topic, which may either stay implicit or be explicitly marked.[11] One such explicit linguistic device to mark the current discourse topic is the RD. This is exemplified in (30), where the right-dislocated NP marks explicitly the carp referent as the topic for the following segment (which is a detailed description of the carp, its habits and its looks; cf. also Averintseva-Klisch 2006, 2007).

---

[10]We could not test this issue directly with RD because of independent constraints on anaphoric chains, cf. Consten and Schwarz-Friesel (2007).

[11]Note that we clearly distinguish between discourse topic as a referent and sentence topic which is obligatorily bound to a certain expression having a particular structural position. Thus, for German, the 'vorfeld' (Molnár 1991) and the position in the 'mittelfeld' immediately above the base position of sentence adverbials (Frey 2004) have been proposed as sentence topic positions. Discourse topics tend to be resumed as sentence topics, but this is a tendency and not a necessity, cf. also Tomlin et al. (1997).

(30)   Wer weiß, wie beschwerlich der Heimweg für ihn$_k$ und den Jungen geworden
       wäre, wenn ihnen das Glück nicht den Karpfen Cyprinus$_i$ zur Hilfe geschickt
       hätte! Ahnungslos kam er$_i$ dahergeschwommen, der Karpfen Cyprinus$_i$. Er$_i$
       war schon ein alter Herr, hatte Moos auf dem Rücken und liebte es, während
       des Schwimmens stillvergnügt vor sich$_i$ hin zu blubbern. (O. Preussler, Der
       kleine Wassermann)
       'Who knows, how hard the way home would have been for him$_k$ and the boy,
       if fortune had not sent [the carp Cyprinus]$_i$ to help them. He came swimming
       along suspecting nothing, [the carp Cyprinus]$_i$. He$_i$ was an elderly gentleman
       with moss on his back and (he$_i$) loved bubbling along joyfully while swimming.'

The theoretical status of discourse topics has been extensively discussed in the literature.
In particular, discourse topics have been analysed as a proposition (cf. Asher 1993, 2004),
as a question the discourse answers (cf. von Stutterheim and Klein 2002, Büring 2003) or
as an entity (cf. Dik 1997). Given the independently motivated idea that RDs mark the
discourse topic, the type <e> restriction on RD supports the entity based analysis of the
discourse topic. More specifically, this entity presumably is a person- or object-referring
discourse referent. Thus we understand discourse topic as the discourse referent that is
most salient in terms of stable activation in the current discourse segment.[12]

Since the RD-NP is an explicit marker of the discourse topic, we argue for the following
minimal condition: it has to be assured that the corresponding referent is anchored
within the discourse model. This requirement of internal anchoring is fulfilled in case
of definite descriptions since these are by definition interpreted only within a particular
discourse model. Crucially, as we argued above, this does not hold for PNs as they are
only externally anchored. This explains why PNs are ungrammatical in RD position.

It is well known though, that German allows for PNs with a definite article, as in (31)
from von Heusinger and Wespel (2007, 332):

(31)   Der George Bush bricht nicht sein Ehrenwort.
       the George Bush breaks not   his   word

In general, the use of a definite article with PNs in German is considered purely optional
(or, to be more exact, to be a matter of dialectal or stilistic variation; e.g. Farkas 2002,
von Heusinger and Wespel 2007). Interestingly, PNs with definite article are licensed in
RD, cf. (32):

(32)   Sie   geht jeden Tag joggen, die Anna   / die Christine.
       [she]$_i$ goes every day jogging [the Anna]$_i$ / [the Christine]$_i$

We argue that the definite article functions as an explicit device to anchor PNs within
the discourse model, leading to a change of the discourse status of the corresponding

---

[12]By discourse segment we understand a relatively small, thematically contiguous part of a discourse;
roughly, a discourse segment is minimally an utterance, or, as is more often the case, several interrelated
utterances.

referent: it is not anymore externally, but internally anchored thereby fulfilling the discourse pragmatic condition for RD-NPs given above.[13]

Our analysis predicts that in other explicit discourse topic marking constructions the distribution of PNs should be parallel. As Frey (2004) shows, Hanging Topic in German is such a construction as it is used to mark a change of the current discourse topic. In fact, PNs are ungrammatical as Hanging Topics, cf. (33-a), unless they are anchored analogously to the RD with a definite article, cf. (33-b). Alternatively, the anchoring can occur with lexical means, e.g. the addition *a propos* ('talking about') like in (33-c):[14]

(33)   a. *Christine, ich habe sie gerade getroffen.
             Christine I   have her just   met
        b. Die Christine, ich habe sie gerade getroffen.
             the Christine I   have her just   met
        c. A propos Christine, ich habe sie gerade getroffen.
             to concern Christine I   have her just   met

Two caveats are to be made here: first, we assume that the request of explicit anchoring in the discourse applies only to overt marking of the discourse topic through a specific linguistic construction like RD or Hanging Topic. It is of course possible to talk about a person and to refer to it with a bare PN (although even here the variant with the definite article might be preferred), as long as the corresponding referent is only the implicit discourse topic, cf. (34):

(34)   (Die) Christine ist sehr gesundheitsbewusst.   Sie isst weder Fett noch
        (the) Christine is very conscious-of-her-health she eats neither fat   nor
        Süßes. Jeden Donnerstag geht sie schwimmen. Ja, und dreimal   pro
        sweet every thursday   goes she swimming   yes, and three-times per
        Woche geht (die) Christine joggen.
        week   goes (the) Christine jogging

Second, the requirement of explicit anchoring for PN in discourse topic marking constructions is proposed for German. We expect it to be generally valid in languages which allow in a similar way for both bare PNs and PNs with definite article. We do not make any predictions for languages that either do not allow or necessarily request an article with PNs. Further investigations might be worthwhile.

To sum up this section: we have shown that the type <e> constraint on the RD-NP still holds, but it has to be supplemented with discourse-pragmatic considerations. As RD explicitly marks the current discourse topic, the corresponding referent has to be

---

[13]Note that the requirement of the definite article is not due to prosodic considerations here; prosodically, the NP *die Anna* behaves exactly like bare name *Christine*, both being instances of amphibrachic structures, cf. also the prosodic minimal pair *die Jana* ('the Jana') vs. *Diana*. The ungrammaticality of bare PNs in RD-NP applies irrespective of their length and accenting.

[14]This option is not available for RD out of independent syntactic and prosodic reasons, cf. Averintseva-Klisch (2006).

anchored in the discourse model either inherently or via an overt device like the definite article.[15]

5   Conclusion

It is not primarily the morphosyntactic distinction between definite and indefinite NPs that is crucial for right-dislocating, but semantic properties of the NP: the RD-NP is restricted to <e> type denotations, thereby excluding quantified NPs and allowing NPs referring to object individuals and kind individuals. Semantically, these findings can be traced back to a bipartite meaning analysis, differentiating between at-issue-meaning and separate performative: RD-NPs merely add a separate performative without being part of the compositional meaning of the clause. Therefore open formulas are out and only type <e> denotations are well-formed.

Pragmatically, RD is an explicit discourse topic marking device. Hence we argued for the following pragmatic constraint supplementing the semantic type <e> restriction: the referent of the RD-NP has to be internally anchored in the dicourse model. This condition explains the ungrammaticality of bare PNs in RD. At the same time it correctly predicts that PNs with a definite article are well-formed in RD since the article functions as an overt anchor.

Furthermore, our analysis of RD might contribute to the more general issue of the theoretical status of discourse topics. If one buys the assumption of RD as an overt discourse topic marker, then the fact that RD allows only type <e> entities is strong evidence for theories defining discourse topic as a person- or object-referring discourse referent.

References

Altmann, Hans (1981) *Formen der "Herausstellung" im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, Freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Asher, Nicholas (1993) *Reference to Abstract Objects in Discourse*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Asher, Nicholas (2004) "Discourse Topic", *Theoretical Linguistics* **30**, 163–201.

Averintseva-Klisch, Maria (2006) "'Separate Performative' Account of German Right Dislocation", *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* **44**, 15–28.

---

[15]In light of the given restriction on ordinary bare PNs in RD, a question arises with regard to the exact modelling of kind terms. As mentioned in section 2, they are standardly analysed as a sort of proper names (cf. Krifka et al. 1995). Nevertheless, contrary to ordinary PNs they as such are well-formed in RD. We speculate that this difference is due to the decriptive content associated with kind terms. Although a term like *modern women* is interpretable as a name of a particular kind, the predicative character of the constituent parts is presumably still present. This suits well the assumption that kind terms like *modern women* are ad hoc constructed within the progression of a particular discourse (cf. footnote 4). Therefore, kind terms allow internal anchoring not available for ordinary PNs.

Averintseva-Klisch, Maria (2007) "Anaphoric properties of the German right dislocation", in M. Schwarz-Friesel, M. Consten and M. Knees (eds.) *Anaphors in Text. Cognitive, formal and applied approaches to anaphoric reference*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 165–182.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1987) "Semantik der Graduierung.", in M. Bierwisch and E. Lang (eds.) *Grammatische und konzeptuelle Aspekte von Dimensionsadjektiven*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 91–286.

Büring, Daniel (2003) "On D-Trees, Beans, and B-Accents", *Linguistics and Philosophy* **26**(5), 511–545.

Carlson, Gregory N. (1977) *Reference to kinds in English*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Published in 1980 by Garland, New York.

Chierchia, Gennaro (1998) "Reference to Kinds across Languages", *Natural Language Semantics* **6**, 339–405.

Consten, Manfred and Schwarz-Friesel, Monika (2007) "Anapher", in L. Hoffmann (ed.) *Handbuch der deutschen Wortarten*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 265–292.

Dik, Simon C (1997) *The Theory of Functional Grammar*, rev. ed., ed. by K. Hengevelt. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Dayal, Veneeta (2004) "Number Marking and (In)definiteness in Kind Terms", *Linguistics and Philosophy* **27**, 393–450.

Farkas, Donka (2002) "Specificity Distinctions", *Journal of Semantics* **19**, 213–243.

Frey, Werner (2004) "Pragmatic properties of certain German and English left peripheral constructions", *Linguistics* **43**(1), 89–129.

Kamp, Hans and Reyle, Uwe (1993) *From discourse to logic*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Krifka, Manfred et al. (1995) "Genericity: An Introduction", in G. N. Carlson and F. J. Pelletier (eds.) *The generic book*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1–124.

Krifka, Manfred (2004) "Bare NPs: Kind-referring, Indefinites, Both, or Neither?", in Robert B. Young and Yuping Zhou (eds.) *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) XIII, University of Washington, Seattle*, Cornell: CLC Publications, 180–203.

Molnár, Valeria (1991) *Das TOPIK im Deutschen und Ungarischen*, Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell.

Müller-Reichau, Olav (2006) *Indefinite reference to kinds. The pumpkin crusher puzzle*, ms.

Portner, Paul (2007) "Instructions for Interpretation as Separate Performatives", in K. Schwabe and S. Winkler (eds.) *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form: Generalizations Across Languages*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 407–425.

Potts, Christopher (2005) *The logic of conventional implicatures*, Oxford: OUP.

Potts, Christopher (2007) "Conventional Inplicatures: A Distinguished Class of Meanings", in G. Ramchand and Ch. Reiss (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, Oxford: OUP, 475–501.

Tomlin, Russel S. et al. (1997) "Discourse Semantics", in T. A. Van Dijk (ed) *Discourse as Structure and Process*, London: SAGE Publications, 63–111.

von Heusinger, Klaus and Wespel, Johannes (2007) "Indefinite proper names and quantification over manifestations", in E. Puig-Waldmller (ed.) *Proceedings of SuB11*, Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 332–345. URL: http://mutis.upf.es/glif/pub/sub11

von Stutterheim, Christiane and Klein, Wolfgang (2002) "Quaestio and L-perspectivation", in C. F. Graumann and W. Kallmeyer (eds.) *Perspective and perspectivation in discourse*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 59–88.