GERMAN PP-DISLOCATIONS TO THE LEFT AND TO THE RIGHT: AGAINST A SYMMETRIC APPROACH[*]

Maria Averintseva-Klisch
Universität Tübingen
maria.averintseva@uni-tuebingen.de

Fabienne Salfner
Centre for General Linguistics (ZAS) Berlin
salfner@zas.gwz-berlin.de

Abstract

We consider the discourse functions of PP-dislocations to the left (PP-LD) and to the right (PP-RD) in German. Whilst it is often assumed that these constructions are symmetric, we argue that they differ in a crucial way. In the majority of cases PP-LD is built with the clause-internal proform *da* (approx.: 'there'), and the PP serves to restrict a 'topic situation' *da* refers to. PP-RD, on the contrary, is only possible with a clause-internal proform consisting of a preposition + pronoun. Cases where *da* as clause-internal proform is used with a coreferent PP to the right of the sentence are shown to be 'afterthoughts', i.e. repair constructions.

1 Introduction

German left and right dislocations are constructions consisting of an XP (NP, PP, VP, CP) at the very beginning (LD) or, respectively, at the very end (RD) of a sentence with a coreferent proform inside the clause (cf. Altmann 1981).[1] The most common and mostly investigated kind of dislocations are NP dislocations as in (1a) and (1b).

(1) a. Den Karl,   den   habe ich schon   gesehen.   (LD)
         the $\text{Karl}_{acc,i}$ $\text{the}_{acc,i}$ have I   already seen
     b. Er   hat die Prüfung bestanden, der Karl.   (RD)
         $\text{he}_{nom,i}$ has the exam   passed   the $\text{Karl}_{nom,i}$

The constructions this paper is concerned with are illustrated in (2) and (3). (2) is an example of a left-dislocated PP and (3) of a right-dislocated PP[2]:

---

[1]Note that Topicalization and Extraposition are thus excluded due to not having a coreferent clause-internal proform. Furthermore, concerning LD we only consider constructions that Altmann (1981) and Frey (2004) define as German Left Dislocations. We do not account for the construction called Hanging Topic (HT), cf. (i):

(i)   Der Hans,   ihn   mag ich nicht.
       the $\text{Hans}_{nom,i}$ $\text{him}_{acc,i}$ like I   not.

Altmann (1981) states that a construction that would correlate with HT does not exist at the right periphery and HT could therefore not be included in our investigation. For differentiation between LD and HT, see among others Frey (2004).

[2]Most of our examples are taken from the TüBa-D/S (Tübinger Baumbank des Deutschen / Spontansprache). This is a syntactically manually annotated corpus on the basis of spontaneous dialogues, consisting of approx.

(2)   und am Montag, da werden wir dann schauen, wie müde wir sind.   (PP-LD)
        and on Monday *da* will   we then see   how tired we are
        [TüBa-D/S cd38, s1010]

(3)   Haben Sie da auch Urlaub   geplant in der Periode?   (PP-RD)
        have   you *da* also holidays planned in the timespan
        [TüBa-D/S cd15, s843]

The first impression could be that PP-LD and PP-RD are formally symmetrical. Similarly, one might assume a functional symmetry of LD and RD, as both are usually considered as topic-related devices (cf. Lambrecht 2001). For NP-LD Frey (2004) argues that it is used to refer to the aboutness-topic of its sentence. Averintseva-Klisch (2006) claims for NP-RD that it is used to mark the current discourse topic. In the literature on dislocation constructions, opinions concerning the similarity of LD and RD differ. Altmann (1981) states that RD is "neither formally nor functionally the mirror-image of LD" (Altmann 1981, p. 6) In contrast, there are approaches which assume that RD is derived from a LD. For instance, Gundel (1977, p. 119) claims for English that an "optimal analysis for these constructions [LD and RD] is one which derives RD from LD by a rule that moves the dislocated NP to the right of the sentence". Recently, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) have proposed a similar analysis for Italian, deriving RD from LD via VP-inversion. Culicover and Jackendoff (2005, p. 339) also assume that "RD is syntactically and semantically identical to LD", although they adopt a base-generation analysis for both LD and RD. All these analyses would predict that RD is symmetrical to LD.

We will argue that German PP-RD and PP-LD are non-symmetrical. They differ not only functionally but also formally, concerning the form of the resumptive proform. We will show in section 2 that the default proform for PP-LD is a demonstrative *da* , which is not possible with a PP-RD.[3] Considering first the function of LD and RD: both are topic-related, but in a crucially different way. We will show that the function of LD is to restrict the 'topic situation' relative to which an assertion is made (section 2). At the right periphery we will distinguish between two kinds of constructions. One of them, which we call 'RD proper', marks the discourse topic, and is thus also topic-related. The other kind which we call 'afterthought' is a repair construction, which is not concerned with topic (section 3). Thus, only LD and RD proper are comparable at all. However, discourse topic and topic situation are different facets of topicality, and thus LD and RD are functionally asymmetrical. This functional difference correlates with the different choice of clause-internal resumptive proform, as we will show.

2   PP-dislocations to the left

At first we will have a closer look at the left-dislocation of PPs. The commonly used resumptive proform here is *da*.[4] It is a pronominal adverb which is commonly used as a local or temporal deictic, approximately meaning "there". However, it is very difficult to translate *da*, as it has a very broad variety of usage in German. Ehrich (1983, p. 203) distinguishes between deictic *da*, which can be local and temporal, and anaphoric *da*, which has temporal, causal, final and

---

38000 sentences.

[3]In a similar way NP-LD and NP-RD also differ with respect to their clause-internal proforms: whereas with NP-LD only weak demonstrative pronouns *der*, *die*, *das* are possible, NP-RD allows personal pronouns (cf. Altmann 1981).

[4]In Fritzsche (2005) a corpus study was carried out showing that 89% of all sentences with left-dislocated PPs used *da* as resumptive pronoun.

consecutive uses. By looking at PP-LD, we will show how a unified analysis of these different uses of *da* might look. First to some examples, see (4):[5]

(4) a. [Im   Hof]$_i$, da$_i$ spielen die Kinder.
         [in.the yard]$_i$ *da$_i$* play   the children
     b. Am Montag, da$_i$ geht er ins   Kino.
         [on Monday]$_i$ *da$_i$* goes he to.the movies
     c. Ohne   ihr Notebook, da$_i$ kann Anna nicht arbeiten.
         [without her laptop]$_i$ *da$_i$* can   Anna not   work

Explaining the semantic relation between *da* and the left-dislocated PP turns out to be problematic. Traditionally, *da* is analysed as either locative or temporal, cf. Zifonun et al. (1997). In (4a), where the PP *auf dem Hof* ('in the yard') is a locative modifier, *da* could refer to the spatial argument, the inner region of the yard. Analogously, *da* could refer to the relevant time span in (4b), where the PP *am Montag* ('on Monday') is a temporal modifier.

Therefore, a straightforward solution would suggest that *da* is coreferent with the - spatial or temporal - argument. However, this solution would be inappropriate for examples like (4c), as the PP here cannot have a spatial or temporal reference; intuitively, what *da* refers to here are situations of Anna being without her laptop: (4c) is interpreted as "whenever a situation that Anna does not have her laptop holds, she cannot work". However, a PP as such cannot have a situational reference. That is why we will argue in the following that in (4c), and generally, *da* refers to the 'topic situation', and the PP serves as a frame setter restricting this situation. We will later see that the assumption that *da* does not refer to the PP directly via coreference, but indirectly via 'topic situation' can explain several phenomena relating to left-dislocation of PPs (see section 2.1).

The idea of interpreting *da* as a situation related pronoun is not really new. It has already been mentioned by Ehrich (1983) that in certain contexts *da* can only be interpreted as referring to the described situation as a whole. And also Kratzer (2006) analysed *da* as 'topic situation' pronoun. Both consider cross-sentential phenomena as in (5):

(5) Anna hat kein Notebook mit. Da kann sie nicht arbeiten.
     Anna has no   laptop   with *da* can she not   work
     'Anna doesn't have a laptop with her. So she cannot work.'

In (5), *da* refers to a situation of Anna not having her laptop. Such a situation might be described by one or more sentences or it might also be introduced by a PP as in (4c). We will assume that in sentences with left-dislocated PPs, *da* refers to a 'topic situation' that is restricted by the PP. The concept of a 'topic situation' was introduced by Maienborn (2001) as a generalization of Klein's notion of 'topic time'. Klein (1994) defines *topic time* as the "time for which the claim that e [the event] is made."(Klein 1994, p. 3)

(6)   The light was on.   Klein (1994, p. 2,ex. 1)

In (6) the topic time is the time span the speaker is talking about, e.g., the moment when the speaker looked into the room. In contrast, the utterance time of (6) is the time when the speaker utters the sentence and the event time is the time span when the light was really on, i.e., several seconds, minutes or hours, etc.

Analogously, the 'topic situation' is the situation[6] for which the sentence makes a proposition.

(7)   a.   Die gesamte Innenstadt wurde gesperrt.
            the whole   city   was   blocked

        b.   Als   der französische Premierminister nach Berlin kam, wurde die gesamte
            when the French   prime.minister to   Berlin came was   the whole
            Innenstadt gesperrt.
            city   blocked

When a speaker utters a sentence like (7a) she has a special discourse situation (=the topic situation) in mind about which she is making her assertion. In (7b) this topic situation is restricted by the clause 'when the French Prime minister came to Berlin', and for this topic situation the claim that the whole city was blocked is made.

There are other possiblities to restrict topic situations, for example the PP in (8):

(8)   In Berlin fahren die öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel die ganze Nacht.
          in Berlin go   the public   transport   the whole night

In (8) the PP *in Berlin* is ambiguous. The preferred interpretion is doubtless that of a claim about Berlin: 'regarding (situations in) Berlin one can say that the public transport goes all night long'. Even so the interpretation that the public transport goes all night long and this process is localized in Berlin is possible. This would not be a general assertion about Berlin but about public transport.[7] We claim that what left-dislocation does is to prevent such ambiguities and to ensure the first interpretation. A left-dislocated PP has always to be interpreted as an frame-setting modifier[8] restricting a 'topic situation' to which the resumptive proform *da* refers, see (4c), here repeated as (9):

(9)   Ohne   ihr Notebook, da kann Anna nicht arbeiten.
          without her laptop   *da* can Anna not   work

In (9), the 'topic situation' is the situation that Anna does not have her laptop, i.e.Anna not having her laptop sets the scene for the state that Anna cannot work. One point to be made in advance is that whilst NP-LDs are commonly analysed as aboutness-topics in the sense of Reinhart (1981) (cf. Frey 2004), from our point of view 'topic situation' can be analysed neither as aboutness-topic nor as familiarity-topic in the sense of Krifka (1992). A detailed comparison of different topics cannot be included here, but see our example (9), where obviously *Anna* is the aboutness-topic, and not the left-dislocated PP. To speak metaphorically, the 'topic situation" sets the scene for the aboutness-topic-referent to act on.

---

[6]In the relevant literature it is controversial what "situations" actually are. We understand "situation" here as a cover term for propositionally structured referents that are bound in time and/or space, such as events, processes and certains kinds of states (cf. Maienborn 2005a). The peculiarity of 'topic situation' is that it serves as "scene setting" for some other situation. For detailed discussion of the status of situations see Kratzer (2006).

[7]In Maienborn (2001) such differences are analysed in detail. We will turn to it more in section 2.1.2.

[8]More about it in section 2.1.2

In the following we will present three observations concerning possible and impossible LD-PPs, which at the first glance might seem disconnected, but which could all easily be explained under the assumption that *da* refers to the topic situation that the LD-PP restricts.

2.1 Constraints on PP-LD

There are three observations that correlate with our claim that PP-LD promotes the PP to a frame-setting modifier that restricts the topic situation, see also Salfner (2006).

2.1.1 *Da* can refer to PPs with semantically different but coherent parts

Left-dislocation of several PPs as in (10) is possible. Under the assumption that *da* does not refer to the PP directly via coreference, but indirectly via 'topic situation', cases of multiple fronting can be immediately captured.

(10)   Am Montag in der Universität, da habe ich Anna getroffen.
         on   Monday at the university   *da* have I   Anna met

In (10), *da* simultaneously refers to the location *Universität* ('university') and the time *Montag* ('Monday'). Thus, *da* refers to the situation as a whole. With respect to their semantics both PPs differ as the first is locative and the second temporal. Nevertheless, they are coherent. 'Coherent' means here that the parts of the complex PP must be pragmatically suitable.[9] A sentence like (11) is infelicitous, because the two PPs appear to be somehow incongruent.

(11)   ?Am Montag ohne   Peter, da habe ich Anna getroffen.
         on   Monday without Peter *da* have I   Anna met.

Certainly, one could imagine contexts where (11) could be felicitious, but it is more difficult than in (10).

Now, the question arises whether the left-dislocated PPs in examples like (10) constitutes one single PP or several PPs restricting one topic situation. We assume the latter to be the case. Generally, for the prefield it is assumed for German that it can only be occupied by one single XP. Insofar examples like (10) are problematic. In research on complex PPs it is often proposed that a complex PP consisting of temporal and locative PPs should be analysed as one single PP, e.g. Wunderlich (1984) or Zifonun et al. (1997). Both argue that one PP is simply the modifier of the other, even though in different ways.[10] Müller (2003) shows that modifier approaches cannot explain sentences like (12):

(12)   Im   Hause am   Bergsee   zur Sommerzeit sei es freilich   nur   ein
         in.the house at.the mountain.lake at   summer.time is it   certainly only a
         Harmonicum.
         harmonic.thing (Müller (2003, ex. 23a))

---

[9]A detailed analysis of this 'pragmatically suitability' is still missing.

[10]Wunderlich (1984) assumes an appositive modification in the case of identical semantic roles. Zifonun et al. (1997) refine the modification analysis to cover cases with different semantic roles. They claim that one PP is a restrictive modifier of the other.

The temporal PP *zur Sommerzeit* ('at summer time') cannot be a modifier for the complex locative PP *im Hause am Bergsee* ('in the house at the mountain lake'), neither restrictively nor as a appositive. Thus, for this example we cannot assume one single PP, but only two separate PPs. If it is possible to have more than one fronted PP in a canonical verb-second sentence (i.e. without left dislocation), then one would also expect this to be possible in a sentence with left-dislocation. Even though there are semantic-pragmatic restrictions for all PPs together to restrict one 'topic situation'.

The following examples taken from the KONKRET-corpus[11] illustrate the variety of complex modifiers in left-dislocation:

(13)   a.   Aber hier, aber jetzt, vor   den Spätzle und dem Toastbrot, da ist - sie
             but   here but   now in.front.of the pasta   and the toast   *da* is - they
             waren selber   gar nicht gefasst   darauf - plötzlich kein Stück mehr übrig von
             were   themself   not   prepared to   - suddenly no   piece more left   of
             ihrem Schweigen.
             their   silence
             'But here and now, in front of the pasta and the toast, there is -and even they were not prepared for it- suddenly nothing left of their silence.'

        b.   Auf dem Bahnhof von Biarritz jedoch, im   Smalltalk mit dem jungen Mann,
             on   the   station   of   Biarritz though in.the small.talk with the   young   man,
             im   vollen Wartesaal   in der dunklen Ecke, da beginnt ein Leuchten, ...
             in.the full   waiting.room in the dark   corner *da* begins   a   glow   ...
             'But at the station in Biarritz, making smalltalk with a young man in a dark corner of the crowded waiting room, there begins a glimmer...'

It is obviously possible that several PPs and adverbs describe one single situation (= 'topic situation'), in making several aspects of this situation available to the hearer. In such cases, the resumptive pronoun *da* can refer to this situation and to all of its aspects (e.g. time, location,...).

2.1.2   Left-dislocation is only possible for frame-setting modifiers

Maienborn (2001) differentiates three types of locative adverbial modifiers: Frame-setting modifiers, event-external modifiers and event-internal modifiers. Example (14) covers all three types:

(14)   In den Anden werden Schafe vom   Pfarrer auf dem Markplatz   an den Ohren
        in the Andes are   sheep from.the priest   on   the   marketplace at the   ears
        gebrandmarkt.
        branded   (Maienborn (2001, ex. 16))

The PP *in den Anden* ('in the Andes') is a 'frame-setting modifier'. It restricts the scope for the proposition, meaning that the proposition is true only with respect to the region of the Andes. The PP *auf dem Marktplatz* ('on the marketplace') is an event-external modifier. It localises the overall event. This means that the event of branding takes place on the marketplace. Event-external modification is generally considered to be the standard case for adverbial modification.

---

[11]The KONKRET-corpus is a corpus of written language, namely the Konkret magazin, provided by the chair for corpus linguistics at the Humboldt-University Berlin.

Finally, the PP *an den Ohren* ('at the ears') is an event-internal modifier. Internal modifiers locate an entity that serves some function within the eventuality in that they convey, for example, additional instrumental or manner information about this eventuality (cf. Maienborn 2001, p. 218). Our observation is that, under neutral intonation, left-dislocation of modifier PPs is only possible if the PP is a frame-setting modifier.

(15)   a.   In Frankreich, da marinieren die Köche das Huhn   in Rotwein.
                in France   *da* marinate   the cooks the chicken in red.wine

          b.   ?In Rotwein, da marinieren die Köche das Huhn.
                in red.wine *da* marinate   the cooks the chicken.

          c.   ?In der Küche, da streitet Peter mit Anna.
                in the kitchen *da* quarrels Peter with Anna

In (15a) with a left-dislocated PP which most naturally lends itself to a frame-setting interpretation, the sentence is acceptable regardless of any variation in its intonation. See, in contrast, (15b) and (15c). In (15b) the event-internal modifier *in Rotwein* ('in red wine') has been left-dislocated. Under neutral intonation, the sentence is infelicitous. Only a contrastive pronunciation, see (16a) or a so called 'hat contour', see (16b) could lead to a felicitous interpretation:

(16)   a.   In ROtwein, DA marinieren die Köche das Huhn,   und NICHT in
                in red.wine *da* marinate   the cooks the chicken and not   in
                Ingwersauce.
                ginger.dressing

          b.   In /ROtwein, da marinieren die Köche das HUhn\ (und in /INGwersauce den
                in red.wine   *da* marinate   the cooks the chicken and in ginger.dressing the
                FIsch\.
                fish

Interestingly, according to our informal questioning, native speakers, if forced to interpret (15b), tend to assume a situation in which the cook is situated in red wine while marinating the chicken; i.e. the intended interpretation as an event-internal modifier fails, rather the PP is interpreted as an event-external modifier.[12] Similar observations hold for (15c): Only a strong contrastive intonation can save the sentence, see (17a).

(17)   a.   In der KÜche, DA streitet Peter mit Anna (und nicht im   Bad).
                in the kitchen *da* quarrels Peter with Anna and not   in.the bathroom

          b.   In der /KÜche, da streitet Peter mit ANna\ (und im   /BAd   mit EVa\).
                in the kitchen *da* quarrels Peter with Anna   and in.the bathroom with Eva

However, the case in ((15c)) is more intricate. The sentence could be felicitous under neutral intonation under an interpretation of the locative as a frame-setting modifier. In this case the interpretation would be that the kitchen is Peter's preferred location to quarrel with Maria (in contrast, e.g., to the living room.), see (18):

(18) In der Küche, da streitet Peter mit Anna und im Wohnzimmer trinkt er Bier /
in the kitchen *da* quarrels Peter with Anna and in.the living.room drinks he beer /
streitet er mit Clara.
quarrels he with Clara

Here, the PP *in der Küche* ('in the kitchen') clearly is a frame-setting modifier as it restricts the scope for the proposition *Peter quarrels with Anna*, and its left-dislocation results in a well-formed sentence.

All in all these findings show that under neutral intonation[13] only frame-setting modifiers can be dislocated to the left. If an event-external modifier is left-dislocated it gets an interpretation as a frame-setter. Under the claim that *da* refers to the 'topic situation' this is what we expect, as frame-setting modifiers always restrict a 'topic situation', see Maienborn (2005b) .

2.1.3 Left-dislocation of PPs used as coherence relations markers and their resumption by *da*

With Grabski and Stede (2006) we assume that PPs can also be considered as "coherence bearing units". Such coherence-related PPs differ with respect to their possibility to restrict 'topic situations'.

In (19) the PP *trotz des schlechten Wetters* ('despite the bad weather') is only used in order to establish a coherence relation 'concession' between the embedded DP *des schlechten Wetters* ('the bad weather') and the matrix clause. This PP does not restrict a topic situation.

(19) Trotz des schlechten Wetters gehen wir schwimmen.
despite the bad weather go we swim

As the PP does not restrict a topic situation, under our analysis we would expect that the PP cannot be left-dislocated. Example (20) shows the expected outcome.

(20) *Trotz des schlechten Wetters, da gehen wir schwimmen.
despite the bad weather *da* go we swim

This kind of inacceptability does not only concern concessive PPs. Similarly, PPs introducing causal relations cannot be left-dislocated, see (21).

(21) a. Durch diese Aktion wurde die Regierung gestoppt.
by this action was the government stopped
b. *Durch diese Aktion, da wurde die Regierung gestoppt.
by this action *da* was the government stopped

Let us point out that it is not the causal semantics of the preposition that prevents left dislocation, but the fact that the PP establishes a causal coherence relation, see (22a) and (22b) where the preposition for expressing *concerning* and *because of* is the same in German:

(22) a. Wegen der WM, da mache ich mir keine Sorgen.
concerning the World-Cup, *da* make I me no worries

---

[13]The observation that contrastive intonation can save odd sentences could not be followed up in this paper, although it certainly deserves further study.

b. *Wegen   der WM,   da kommt Peter schon   am Montag.
   because.of the World-Cup, *da* comes Peter already on Monday

The crucial difference between the PPs in (22a) and (22b) is already hinted at by the different English translations for the preposition *wegen*. In (22a) the PP *wegen der WM* ('concerning the World-Cup') acts as a frame-setting modifier in the preferred reading according to which the speaker is not worrying about the World-Cup. If the PP were an argument of a causal coherence relation, the interpretation would be that the World-Cup is the reason for the speaker not to worry. The first reading is the preferred one. In (22b), the obvious interpretation is that the PP expresses a coherence relation with the matrix clause: The World-Cup is the reason for Peter coming on Monday. As expected (22b) is unacceptable.

One could assume that the causal prepositions are special in this respect but for any kind of prepositions the semantics of the particular preposition is not crucial for its ability to be left-dislocated or not. This becomes clear if we have a closer look at the preposition *bei*. Grabski and Stede (2006) have found different coherence relations triggered by the preposition *bei*. For example, *bei* can be used for conditionals as well as for concessives. Whilst in the case of *trotz* ('despite'), the semantics of *trotz* yields the concessive relation, in the case of *bei*, the choice of a particular coherence relation arises from the reader's interpretation and world knowledge (cf. Grabski and Stede 2006).

An example for the preposition *bei* triggering a concession relation is (23a). And again, as we can see in (23b) a left-dislocation is not acceptable.

(23)   a.   Bei   allem Verständnis für Tierliebe   kann dem Antrag der
              despite all   sympathy   for love.of.animals can   the   request of.the
              Bienenfreunde leider   nicht stattgegeben werden.
              friends.of.bees regrettably not   allowed   be
        b.   *Bei   allem Verständnis für Tierliebe,   da kann dem Antrag der
              despite all   sympathy   for love.of.animals *da* can   the   request of.the
              Bienenfreunde leider   nicht stattgegeben werden
              friends.of.bees regrettably not   allowed   be

Example (23b) demonstrates that the unacceptability actually has its reason in the type of co-herence relation (i.e. concession in this case), and not in the choice of the particular preposition. In the case of concessions and causal relations, there is no 'topic situation' available to which the pronoun *da* could refer.

However, actually there are PPs that express a coherence relation with respect to their host sentence and that still can be left-dislocated, namely PPs establishing a conditional relation, see (24).

(24)   Bei starken Gewittern, da werden die Katzen unruhig.
        at   heavy   storms,   *da* become the cats   agitated

Why is it impossible to left-dislocate concessive PPs and PPs in causal coherence relations, but possible for PPs in a conditional coherence relation?

Due to the fact that frame-setters restrict propositions, they establish conditional structures. Thus, frame-setters and conditional PPs are similar. As frame-setting modifiers inherently re-strict a 'topic situation', we expect conditional PPs to also be able to restrict a 'topic situation'.

Therefore the left-dislocation of conditional PPs should be acceptable.

Thus, regardless whether a PP establishes a coherence relation or not, the crucial issue is whether the PP restricts a 'topic situation'.

In discussing three apparently unconnected characteristics of PP-LD (multiple PP-dislocation, restriction to frame-setters and inacceptability of concessive and causal PPs in LD) we have shown that these can easily be accounted for under the claim that the left-dislocated PP and its proform *da* are related to each other via 'topic situation'. In the following we will turn to right-dislocated PPs and see whether this analysis for PP-LD can be carried over to PP-RD in German.

3 PP-dislocations to the right

In this section, we will discuss the potential counterpart of PP-LD at the right. However, we will show that the alleged similarity of PP dislocations to the left and to the right is only apparent, and these constructions differ in a crucial way. To be able to do this we will first introduce a distinction between two superficially similar constructions which we call 'right dislocation proper' (further RD) and 'afterthought' (AT). The latter is a local repair device that cannot really be compared with LD. The former, RD proper, is a topic-marking device and is thus comparable with LD, even if LD and RD relate to topic in a different way, as we will argue. Since the kind of RD in German that has been mostly investigated so far is that involving NP dislocations (e.g., Altmann 1981, Selting 1994) we will first make this distinction with regard to NP-dislocations in section 3.1, and then apply it to PP-dislocations in sections 3.2 and 3.3.

3.1 Right dislocation proper vs. afterthought

We argue that the label of NP-dislocation to the right (cf. example (1b) in section 1) actually comprises two functionally and formally different constructions, which we name 'RD proper' and 'afterthought'. The former is a discourse-structuring device that serves to mark the discourse topic[14], see (25). The latter is a local repair device, clarifying a pronominal reference that might otherwise stay unclear, see (26).

(25)   ("Der Taifun!" rief Lukas dem Kapitän zu. "Da ist er!')
        '"The typhoon!" Lukas called to the captain.' "Here it comes!"

        Ja, da   war er$_i$, der Taifun$_i$ (RD-NP)
        yes there was it$_i$ the typhoon$_i$
        'Yes, there it came, the typhoon. [...]' [M. Ende, Jim Knopf und die Wilde 13, p. 190.]

(26)   (Peter und Karl sind auch schon   aus   dem Urlaub   zurück.) Hast Du ihn$_i$ schon
        Peter and Karl are   also already from their holidays back   have you him$_i$ already
        gesehen, (ich meine) den Karl$_i$?   (AT-NP)
        seen   I   mean   the Karl$_i$
        'Peter and Karl have also already returned from their holidays. Have you seen him yet, I mean Karl?'

---

[14]We understand 'discourse topic' here as a discourse referent a particular discourse segment is about (cf. also Averintseva-Klisch (2006) for the discussion of this term).

These functional differences correlate with prosodic and syntactic ones. For reasons of space we can only very briefly summarize these, but cf. Averintseva-Klisch (2006, p. 16-18) for details and examples. Generally, there is ample evidence that RD belongs prosodically and syntactically in a much more straightforward way to its host sentence than does AT. Prosodically, RD is part of its host sentence's tone contour, whilst AT builds a prosodic unit of its own. Considered syntactically, RD-NP has to agree morphologically with the clause-internal proform, which suggests that the NP is part of the clause, as morphological agreement is a sentence-bound phenomenon.[15] Moreover, RD occupies a fixed position in the host sentence (at its right periphery), and does not allow insertions between the host sentence and the RD-NP, i.e. neither subordinate clause insertion nor optional additions of any kind like *ich meine* ('I mean'), *tatsächlich* ('really') etc. This leads to the assumption that RD is syntactically part of its host sentence, presumably a right IP-adjunct. AT, by contrast, can vary its position in its host sentence. Furthermore, AT does not strictly require morphological agreement between the NP and the clause-internal pronoun, and it allows various insertions between the host sentence and AT-NP. These prosodic and syntactic differences suggest that RD and AT are really two different constructions and are not merely two functions of one and the same construction.

With this distinction between RD and AT in mind we now turn to PP dislocations to the right, and first consider the case that is potentially parallel to LD: PPs to the right of the sentence with coreferent clause-internal *da*.

3.2 PP-dislocations with da

In the TüBa/DS corpus we found a number of cases with a PP to the right of the sentence and clause-internal *da*[16]. However, the ones in which *da* and the PP are coreferent are not RDs but afterthoughts, as a closer investigation shows, cf. (27):

(27) ja, jetzt müssen wir uns   überlegen, wie wir da$_i$ hinkommen [nach Hannover]$_i$.
      yes now must   we REFL think-over how we *da$_i$* come   [to   Hannover]$_i$
      [TüBa-D/S cd15, s701]

(27) is a clear case of an AT: here, the whole discourse is concerned with planning a business trip to Hannover. In the preceding segment the communication partners extensively discuss the possible time of their trip, and then switch to the options for reaching their destination. This means that the destination (i.e. Hannover) is given, and thus the pronominal reference with *da* is justified, but it might be unclear to the hearer as the immediately preceding discourse segment is concerned with the time, and not the destination of the trip. The speaker adds the PP to prevent a possible misunderstanding which is a typical case of an afterthought.[17]

---

[15]Consten (2004, p. 91) shows that intersentential anaphoric resumption is generally possible without gender agreement, whereas this is impossible for intrasentential anaphora.

[16]We checked approx. one third of the TüBa D/S corpus manually for PP-RD. We have found 52 instances with a PP to the right of the clause and a potentially coreferent proform inside the clause (i.e. such proforms that might theoretically corefer with a PP). As a closer investigation taking the context into account showed, only in 27 cases were the PP and the proform really coreferent. In all of these cases the PP served to clarify the reference of the proform, so that the corresponding constructions could be classified as ATs. 20 out of 27 (i.e. 74%) have *da* as the clause-internal proform.

[17]PP-ATs are to be distinguished from cases like (i), where *da* and PP appear to be coreferent at first glance, but are not:

In our corpus we did not find any examples of PP-RD proper with *da*. In other words, all ostensible PP-dislocations with *da* are 'afterthoughts' with a PP resolving an unclear reference of *da*, i.e. local repairs not having anything to do with topicality. Thus, there is no symmetry between LD, where *da* is the preferred proform, and RD proper, which does not occur with *da*. We will show in section 3.3 that this is not coincidental, but RD proper is not possible with *da* as a proform for theoretical reasons .

Now, the question is, are there any 'PP-RDs proper' at all? In the following we will show that these do indeed occur, but with another kind of clause-internal proform.

3.3   PP-RDs proper

We found PP-RD proper with a preposition + personal pronoun as a clause-internal proform, as in (28):

(28)　　Heute bin ich [über sie]$_i$　hergefallen, [über meine Leichen im　　Kleiderschrank]$_i$.
　　　　today am I　[over them]$_i$ pounced.on [over my　　corpses in.the wardrobe]$_i$
　　　　Ganz an den Rand gedrückt hängen sie, vergessen auf der Stange,[...] Es sind liebge-
　　　　wonnene Leichen, zu sehr begehrt als dass sie einmal ihr Grab im Altkleidersack finden
　　　　könnten.
　　　　'Today I pounced on them, on my wardrobe corpses (i.e. old dresses). They hang there
　　　　at the very fringe, forgotten on the clothes rail [...]. These are dear corpses, too well
　　　　loved to find their tomb in a bag for old clothes one day.'
　　　　[http://momente.twoday.net, found on 07.08.06.]

The text following the RD sentence shows that the referent of the NP embedded in the PP, i.e. "wardrobe corpses" (old dresses are meant here, actually), is the discourse topic of the corresponding segment. Thus this is a RD proper according to our definition. This means that the PP in (28), or to be more exact, the NP embedded in it, functions in exactly the same way as the NP in (25). The reason for this is the following: The German verb *herfallen* ('pounce on') has an idiosyncratic feature of being subcategorized for a PP as its argument,[18] whereas the regular case for German transitive verbs would be an NP in accusative. In other words it is the fact that *herfallen* governs a PP and not an NP that leads to a PP being able to be dislocated in RD-proper. We expect a PP-RD proper to be always possible with 'prepositional objects'. This is indeed the case, cf. (29):

(i)　　Ich wollte　mit　Ihnen noch einen Termin　　ausmachen für unser Arbeitstreffen　　wie　schaut es
　　　　I　wanted with　you　still　[an　appointment fix　　for our　business-meeting]$_i$ how looks　it
　　　　da　bei Ihnen aus so in　der nächsten Zeit?
　　　　da$_i$ at　you　out so [in the next　　time]$_{*i}$
　　　　[TüBa-D/S cd15, s445ff]

Here *da* refers back to an already introduced situational referent "fixing of an appointment for our business meeting", whereas the right-peripheral PP is an extraposed modifier without any coreferent proform

[18]In traditional terms, the *über*-PP seleczed by *herfallen* is a so-called 'prepositional object', which means that the choice of the particular P is not semantically motivated but is part of the lexical entry of the verb. In contrast,the *über*-PP in e.g. *über den Zaun klettern* ('to climb over the fence') is an 'adverbial complement' with argument status. In the latter case the verb is subcategorized for a PP with particular semantics (in the case of *klettern* ('climb') a directional PP), whereas the choice of the preposition in each particular case depends on several factors including the meaning of the embedded NP (cf. *to climb over the fence / through the window / to the top* etc.).

(29)   (Gestern hat mein Bruder angerufen. Dass er sich das überhaupt getraut hat, nach allem, was er getan hat!)
'My brother has called me yesterday. I wonder that he even dared this after all he has done.'

Ich habe mich so   über ihn geärgert, über den Verräter.[19]Er ist schuld,
I   have REFL so.much about him got.angry, about the traitor   he is responsible
dass meine Mutter nicht mehr mit mir spricht.
that my   mother not   more with me talk
'I was so angry with him, this traitor. He is responsible for my mother not talking to me.'

With other PPs, e.g. with PP-adjuncts as in (30), or adverbial complements as in (31) RD-proper is very marked.

(30)   ??Ich habe in ihr$_i$ gekocht, in unserer Küche$_i$.
       I   have in her$_i$ cooked in our   kitchen$_i$

(31)   ??Heute habe ich vor   ihm$_i$ gestanden, vor   ihrem Haus$_i$.
       Today have I before it$_i$ stood   before her   house$_i$

However, such cases become significantly better if the context clearly marks the referent of the embedded NP as discourse topic, e.g. (32) and (33): [20]

(32)   Heute habe ich zum   letzten Mal in ihr$_i$ gekocht, in unserer Küche$_i$. Lange Zeit war
       today have I   for.the last   time in her$_i$ cooked in our   kitchen$_i$ long time was
       sie der wichtigste   Raum in unserer Wohnung.
       she$_i$ the most.important room in our   flat

(33)   Heute habe ich vor   ihm$_i$ gestanden, vor   ihrem Haus$_i$. Ja, dieses alte
       today have I in.front.of it$_i$ stood   in.front.of her house$_i$ yes this   old
       Haus mit dem roten Dach und dem schiefen Schornstein! Immer noch ist es für
       house with the red   roof and the lopsided chimney   ever   still is it for
       mich der schönste   Ort auf Erden.
       me   the most.beautiful place on earth
       'Today I stood again in front of it, her house. Oh, this old house with its red roof and its lopsided chimney! Even now it is still the most beautiful place on earth for me.'

Thus, PPs as such are dispreferred means of referring to discourse topics but still, in a certain context, such reference is possible - however, only if the referent of the NP is accessible for being marked as the discourse topic. In the case of preposition + personal pronoun the nominal

---

[19]It is possible that in addition to marking the discourse topic, RD-NP also gives emotional evaluation of the corresponding referent, as it is the case in (29). However, the evaluation in such cases is only an additional function RD might have, since it is quite natural that the speaker has an emotional attitude towards her topic or tends to evaluate her topic. Still, RD is in no way confined to emotionally loaded expressions.

[20]For reasons of space, in this paper we do not consider so-called 'pronominal adverbs' (cf. Zifonun et al. 1997), i.e., forms consisting of $da(r)$ + P, e.g. darauf ('there-on'). Pronominal adverbs as such are very frequent in German, but we have not found any instance of LD with pronominal adverbs as proform and only one single instance with AT. For these reasons we have disregarded them for the time being, even if it would undoubtedly be promising to investigate the possibility of pronominal adverbs in LD and RD.

referent is accessible, being referred to with the pronoun. In contrast, with *da* the nominal referent is not accessible: as we have argued in section 2, *da* refers to the 'topic situation' as a whole. Nominal referents that are participants of the 'topic situation' alone are not available as discourse topics. This explains why there are no RDs proper with *da* as an intraclausal proform. Furthermore, *da*, i.e. the proform used for referring to the 'topic situation', cannot be used cataphorically. It does not seem to be possible to introduce first the proposition and only then the 'topic situation', i.e. the "scene setting" for the situation described in it. In this respect *da* differs from situational anaphors like *dies* or *das* (both approx. 'this') in German. The latter ones, not being confined to referring to the 'topic situation', can be used cataphorically as in (34):

(34)   Das$_i$ hat mir gerade noch gefehlt, [dass Du auch noch krank wirst!]$_i$
         that$_i$ has me just   yet   missed [that you also yet ill   become]$_i$
         'That's the last thing I needed, that you fall ill as well'

In this case a situational referent is first established through the proform, and then gets specified through the following sentence(s) describing it. In contrast, *da* can only refer to situations that are already established in the discourse.

In other words, *da* as an anaphor is oriented strictly to the left. It seems that this orientation to the left is further restricted in that *da* is set to look for the nearest available antecedent. This might be due to the fact that *da* is a demonstrative form historically akin to such forms as *das* or *dies* ('this'), cf. Heidolph et al. (1981, p. 686). Demonstratives are generally assumed to refer to the nearest available antecedent, cf. Zifonun et al. (1997, p. 558).[21] In the case of *da* and LD this antecedent is, on grounds of linearity, bound to be the left-dislocated PP, which restricts the 'topic situation'. The presence of such constructionally-given antecedents is a peculiarity of LD. If we now compare LD to cross-sentential cases of *da*-reference, we see that there is no constructionally-given antecedent. The antecedent has to be found in the preceding context. The same applies to PP-ATs: *da* refers back to an already introduced (topic) situational referent, and this reference is then made explicit with the added PP.

To sum up this section: we have shown that apparent PP-RD turns out to subsume two different constructions, depending on the form of the intraclausal proform: With *da* and a coreferent PP, only 'afterthought' is possible, but not RD-proper. By contrast, *da* is a proform that is used regularly for LD, so that the two constructions differ in this respect. RD proper is only possible with a clause-internal preposition + personal pronoun, preferably with PP-RD being an idiosyncratic argument. In this case the referent of the embedded NP is marked as being the discourse topic for the following segment.

3.4   LD vs. RD: Summing up

In our paper we have argued that the superficially similar PP-LD and PP-RD in German are non-symmetrical in a crucial way, formally as well as functionally. PP-LD is, in an overwhelming majority of cases, realized with the resumptive proform *da*. The function of the LD is that the

---

[21]Thus, Bosch et al. (2007) argue that in the case of two nominal referents and an anaphor that might equally refer to each of them like in (i), a demonstrative anaphor chooses the nearest one as its antecedent:

(i)   Paul$_1$ wollte mit Peter$_2$ laufen   gehen. Aber er$_1$ / der$_2$ war erkältet.
        Paul$_1$ wanted with Peter$_2$ running go   but   he$_1$ / DEM$_2$ had a cold

PP restricts a 'topic situation' referred to with *da*. On the other hand, PP-RD is not possible with *da*, but only with an intraclausal PP (preposition + personal pronoun). Functionally, the referent of the NP embedded in the PP is the discourse topic for the following discourse segment. Thus, both are topic related devices, but in different ways: PP-LD restricts the 'topic situation', i.e. the 'scene setting' for the proposition. PP-RD marks the referent of the NP embedded in the dislocated phrase as the discourse topic for the following segment. PP-RD is restricted to the cases with a clause-internal PP, as only in this case is the referent of the embedded NP available.

PP-RDs proper are very rare, which is expected under our analysis: A PP is only used in a RD proper when there is (for independent reasons) no possibility to use a NP, the latter being the default case for RD proper. PP-RD proper is thus mostly used with prepositional objects. In this respect it also contrasts with PP-LD where the possibility of left-dislocating a PP is independent of its syntactic function. What LD does is to take a PP and to promote it to a frame-setting modifier, as we have argued in 2.1.2. This happens irrespective of whether this PP was originally a modifier or an argument PP.

With *da* as a clause-internal proform and a PP to the right of the clause, only an 'afterthought', i.e. a repair device, is possible. In this case *da* refers back to the 'topic situation' that is already established in the discourse, and the PP additionally clarifies this reference.

We argued that this LD-RD-asymmetry corresponds to the referential properties of *da*: *da* being a demonstrative is set to refer to the nearest available antecedent to the left. In the case of LD this antecedent denotes the 'topic situation' that is restricted by the left-dislocated PP. In the case of RD there is no constructionally-inherent given antecedent, as *da* can never be used cataphorically.

The essential point of our proposal is that LD and RD are comparable, but non-symmetric. The functional difference of defining the topic situation (LD) vs. marking the topical referent for the following segment (RD) corresponds to the placement of the construction to the left resp. to the right of the clause. LD is especially apt to "set the scene" for the proposition exactly because it is placed to the left, i.e. before the proposition. In contrast, the fact that RD is placed to the right of (i.e. after) the clause explains its being used for structuring the discourse segment following the RD sentence. That means that the crucial dissimilarities between LD and RD we discussed in this paper arise by virtue of their placement. In investigating the formal and functional characteristics of PP-LD and PP-RD we hope to make a contribution to the description of general functional differences between the left and the right periphery.

References

Altmann, H.: 1981, *Formen der "Herausstellung" im Deutschen*, Niemeyer, Tübingen.

Averintseva-Klisch, M.: 2006, 'Separate Performative' Account of the German Right Dislocation, *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* **44**, 15–28. Proceedings of the Sinn und Bedeutung 10.

Bosch, P. et al.: 2007, The Non-subject Bias of German Demonstrative Pronouns, *in* M. Schwarz-Friesel et al. (eds), *Anaphors in Texts*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 145–164.

Consten, M.: 2004, *Anaphorisch oder deiktisch? Zu einem integrativen Modell domänengebundener Referenz.*, Niemeyer, Tübingen.

Culicover, P. and Jackendoff, R.: 2005, *Simpler Syntax*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ehrich, V.: 1983, *Da* im System der lokalen Demonstrativadverbien des Deutschen, *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* **2**(2), 197–219.

Frascarelli, M. and Hinterhölzl, R.: 2007, Types of Topics in German and Italian, *in* S. Winkler and K. Schwabe (eds), *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form: Generalizations across languages*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Frey, W.: 2004, Notes on the Syntax and the Pragmatics of German Left Dislocation, *in* H. Lohnstein and S. Trissler (eds), *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, de Gruyter, pp. 203–233.

Fritzsche, F.: 2005, *Präpositionalphrasen an der linken Peripherie: Überlegungen zu ihrer Syntax und Semantik*, Master's thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. http://www.salfner.de/Fabienne/magisterarbeit.pdf.

Grabski, M. and Stede, M.: 2006, "bei": Intra-clausal Coherence Relations Illustrated with a German Preposition, *Discourse Processes* **41**(2), 195–219.

Gundel, J.: 1977, *Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*, IULC, Bloomington.

Heidolph, K. et al.: 1981, *Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.

Klein, W.: 1994, *Time in Language*, Routledge, London and New York.

Kratzer, A.: 2006, Situations in Natural Language Semantics, *To appear in: The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, The Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford, CA.

Krifka, M.: 1992, A compositional Semantics for Multiple Focus Constructions, *Linguistische Berichte* **4**, 17–53. Informationsstruktur und Grammatik.

Lambrecht, K.: 2001, Dislocation, *in* M. Haspelmath et al. (eds), *Language Typology and Language Universals / Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien. An International Handbook, Vol.2*, de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 1050–1078.

Maienborn, C.: 2001, On the Position and Interpretation of Locative Modifiers, *Natural Language Semantics* **9**, 191–240.

Maienborn, C.: 2005a, A discourse-based account of Spanish *ser/estar*, *Linguistics* **43**(1), 155–180.

Maienborn, C.: 2005b, On the Limits of the Davidsonian Approach: The Case of Copula Sentences., *Theoretical Linguistics* **31**(3), 275–316.

Müller, S.: 2003, Mehrfache Vorfeldbesetzung, *Deutsche Sprache* **31**(1), 29–62.

Reinhart, T.: 1981, Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics., *Philosophica* **27**, 53–93.

Salfner, F.: 2006, Semantic of Left-dislocated Prepositional Phrases, *Proceedings of the First Central European Student Conference in Linguistics*, Budapest. http://www.nytud.hu/cescl/proceedings.html.

Selting, M.: 1994, Konstruktionen am Satzrand als interaktive Ressource in natürlichen Gesprächen, *in* B. Haftka (ed.), *Was determiniert Wortstellungsvariation?*, Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 299–318.

Wunderlich, D.: 1984, Zur Syntax der Präpositionalphrase im Deutschen, *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* **3(1)**, 65–99.

Zifonun, G. et al.: 1997, *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, de Gruyter, Berlin.